

their disclosure under Rule 26. Moreover, even after discovery closed, the parties conducted a telephonic meet-and-confer regarding the confidentiality of all exhibits shortly before submission of their respective motions for summary judgment; at that time, Equifax never disclosed its intention to submit Exhibit 9A under seal, although Exhibit 9A was subsequently filed under seal in Equifax's response.

According to Plaintiff, it remains unclear when Equifax first discovered the existence of Exhibit 9A, although it appears to be a document executed several years ago. Moreover, Exhibit 9A refers to an entirely new subset of Equifax documents, particularly "Transaction Document Number 2," which suggests that to the degree Exhibit 9A purports to be a "contract" between Equifax and its third-party mailing vendor, it is an out-of-date version of the same. Therefore, it is Plaintiff's contention that Exhibit 9A was not only untimely provided, but cannot be used for

any of the propositions it purports to establish.

As for Exhibit 9B, Equifax has not presented any argument for why it never produced the "reinvestigation results" in discovery. Regardless, it is Plaintiff's position that these results are apropos of nothing, as Equifax's third party mailing vendor has already affirmed that it has no evidence that the "reinvestigation results" were ever actually mailed to Plaintiff at any time.

time in Equifax's response to Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment. – despite the fact that

they were requested in discovery and Equifax's 30(b)(6) testified in a manner which necessitated

Summary of Defendant's Argument

It is Equifax's position that the FIS Card Agreement was never requested by Plaintiff during discovery and only became relevant because of the arguments made for the first time in Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, and that such submission does not contradict Equifax's prior testimony. [Doc. 26.] For instance, Equifax's representative testified to the fact that Equifax contracts with FIS Card for print-and-mail services in her initial deposition. This fact has never been in dispute. Further, Ms. Smith testified that the files are transmitted electronically to FIS Card in an electronic format, and it is Equifax's position that her Declaration only clarifies her testimony. Nonetheless, Equifax has agreed to withdraw both Exhibits that have resulted in the above-referenced dispute so as not to waste the Court's resources with unnecessary

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

26

27

28

motion practice or to distract the Court from the material issues.

In an effort to resolve the parties' dispute, counsel for the parties have met and conferred in good faith, and have reached an agreement to the items below. This stipulation is filed in good faith and not intended to cause delay.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and among counsel, as follows:

- 1. Equifax shall be permitted to withdraw from the record of this case the EFX Response Brief [Doc. 37], including the Smith Declaration [37-9] and accompanying Exhibits 9A and 9B, within three days of the Court's execution of the instant stipulation. At that time, Equifax shall be permitted to file a corrected and revised EFX Response Brief and Smith Declaration in the form previously exchanged between counsel for the parties on October 6, 2017. Such filing will specifically withdraw Exhibits 9A and 9B, and the references to each, from the EFX Response Brief and the Smith Declaration.
- 2. Plaintiff's deadline for filing his Reply in support of his Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 30) shall be extended two (2) weeks from the date of Equifax's corrective filing identified above.
- 3. By agreeing to this Stipulation, Plaintiff is not waiving any right to challenge the corrected filing of the EFX Response Brief or to seek any relief it deems appropriate in replying to it,

21 /// 22 /// 23 /// 24 /// 25 ///

///

///

/// ///

///

	1	and Plaintiff expressly reserves the right to do so. Equifax likewise does not waive any right		
	2	to respond to the relief Plaintiff may seek in a future reply.		
	3	Dated: October 9, 2017		
Snell & Wilmer LLP. LAW OFFICES 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suire 1100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 702.784,5200	4	IT IS SO STIPULATED:		
	5			
	6	Knepper & Clark, LLC	SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.	
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	/s/ Miles N. Clark Matthew I. Knepper Miles N. Clark 10040 W. Cheyenne Ave., Suite 170-109 Las Vegas, NV 89129 matthew.knepper@knepperclark.com miles.clark@knepperclark.com Counsel for Plaintiff David H. Krieger Haines & Krieger, LLC 8985 S. Eastern Avenue Suite 350 Henderson, NV 89123 dkrieger@hainesandkrieger.com Counsel for Plaintiff Sean N. Payne Payne Law Firm, LLC 9550 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 253-A213	By: /s/ Bradley T. Austin Bradley T. Austin Nevada Bar No. 13064 3883 Howard Hughes Pkwy Suite 1100 Las Vegas, NV 89169 Tel: 702-784-5200 Fax: 702-784-5252 Email: baustin@swlaw.com Attorneys for Defendant Equifax Information Services LLC	
	18	Las Vegas, NV 89123 seanpayne@spaynelaw.com		
	19	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
	20			
	21	IT IS SO ORDERED:		
	22	II IS SO ORDERED.		
	23			
	24	RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II United States District Judge		
	25			
	26	DATED: <u>October 12, 2017.</u>		
	27			
	28			