Henzel v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

Doc. 66

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiffs Barret Henzel, Allan Carso, Gary Lundin, Joshua Luekenga, Craig Rodney Michaelis, Bryce Kelly, Clint McDaniel, and Dan Michael (collectively, "Plaintiffs") and Defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. ("Wells Fargo") (collectively, the "Parties") jointly submit this Stipulation and [Proposed] Order for its first request to modify the briefing schedule on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Discovery Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(3)(B)(iv) (ECF No. 62). Wells Fargo has requested a modification to the briefing schedule because the disputes implicate the Bank Secrecy Act ("BSA") and requirements relating to the federal suspicious activity report ("SAR") privilege—issues of significant importance to Wells Fargo and its regulators that enforce these requirements. Plaintiffs do not oppose this request, but otherwise do not take a position on Wells Fargo's request. Plaintiffs withdraw their request for an extension on the reply brief. In support of the stipulation and request for modification of the briefing schedule, and pursuant LR 7-1 and LR IA 6-2, the Parties state as follows:

- 1. On January 17, 2023, Plaintiffs filed a Motion to Compel Discovery under Fed. R Civ. P. 37(a)(3)(B)(iv) ("Motion").
- 2. Plaintiffs' Motion places at issue seven requests (Nos. 1, 13-17, 19) from their First Set of Production of Documents and seeks discovery regarding (i) account-opening procedures, (ii) account-monitoring systems, (iii) account reviews and investigations by bank personnel, and (iv) corporate policies and procedures. See Motion at 8.
- 3. In Wells Fargo's responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents ("RFP Responses"), Wells Fargo objected and asserted the SAR privilege, stating that Plaintiffs sought disclosure of information relating to statutory and regulatory requirements for detecting and reporting potentially suspicious transaction activity as described in the BSA, 31 U.S.C. § 5318, pursuant to 12 C.F.R. § 21.11, 31 C.F.R. § 103.18, 31 U.S.C. § 5318(g)(2)(A)(i), and applicable regulatory guidance.
- 4. Wells Fargo contends that under the BSA, banks are required to file a SAR when they detect a known or suspected violation of federal law or a suspicious transaction relating to money laundering or terrorist financing. See 12 C.F.R. § 21.11. It is Wells Fargo's position tha the scope of the SAR privilege implicates extremely sensitive information that should be given the

3

6

12

13

9

17

22

20

27 28 utmost care and consideration because federal law prohibits a bank from disclosing a SAR or whether a SAR has been filed. See, e.g., 31 U.S.C. § 5318(g)(2); 12 C.F.R. § 21.11(k).

- 5. Wells Fargo has requested a one-week extension to file its opposition to Plaintiff's Motion.
- 6. Wells Fargo contends that good cause exists to modify the briefing schedule because (i) the Parties' disputes concerning the scope of the SAR privilege and the requirements under the BSA involve a sensitive area of law with federal prohibitions, regulator interest, and public policy considerations, (ii) there is conflicting case law outside of this Circuit on these issues, and (iii) Wells Fargo has requested a limited extension of time of seven days.
- 7. Wells Fargo requests modification of the current briefing schedule on the Motion as follows:

Event	Current Deadline	Proposed New Deadline
Wells Fargo Response to	January 31, 2023	February 7, 2023, or on
Plaintiff's Motion		another date convenient for
		the Court
Plaintiffs' Reply to Wells	February 7, 2023	February 14, 2023, or on
Fargo's Response		another date convenient for
		the Court.
Hearing on the Motion	None Set	No Change

- 8. Plaintiffs, without joining in Wells Fargo's characterizations in of the BSA in paragraph 4 above, take no position on Wells Fargo's request and do not seek an extension for their reply brief. If the Court approves this stipulation, Plaintiffs will reply to Wells Fargo's opposition within the time contemplated by Local Rule 7-2(b)—seven days after service of the response. In other words, should the Court grant Wells Fargo's request for an extension for its opposition to February 7, 2023, Plaintiff will respond no later than February 14, 2023.
- 9. The Parties reached this stipulation in good faith and not for purposes of delay. NOW THEREFORE, the Parties hereby stipulate, and respectfully request that the Court order, as follows:
 - 1. Wells Fargo's response deadline to Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Discovery is extended up to and including February 7, 2023.

1	2. Plaintiffs' deadline to reply to Wells Fargo's response, consistent with the time		
2	allocated for reply in the Local Rules, is due February 14, 2023.		
3			
4 5	Dated: January 27, 2023	By: /s/ Miles N. Clark (with permission) Miles N. Clark (NBN 13848)	
		LAW OFFICES OF MILES N. CLARK, LLC	
6 7		5510 S. Fort Apache Rd., Suite 30 Las Vegas, NV 89148-7700	
8		(702) 856-7430 miles@milesclarklaw.com	
9		Liaison Counsel	
10			
11		By: /s/ Daniel C. Girard (with permission) Daniel C. Girard (pro hac vice)	
12		Jordan Elias (pro hac vice)	
13		Makenna Cox (pro hac vice) GIRARD SHARP LLP	
14		601 California Street, Suite 1400 San Francisco, California 94108	
15		Telephone: (415) 981-4800	
16		Facsimile: (415) 981-4846 dgirard@girardsharp.com	
17		apolk@girardsharp.com	
		jelias@girardsharp.com mcox@girardsharp.com	
18			
19		By: /s/ Eric Gibbs (with permission)	
20		Eric Gibbs (pro hac vice)	
21		David K. Stein (pro hac vice) Emily Beale (pro hac vice)	
22	IT IS SO ORDERED.	GIBBS LAW GROUP LLP	
23	Dated: January 30, 2023	1111 Broadway, Suite 2100 Oakland, CA 94607	
24		Telephone: (510) 350-9700 Facsimile: (510) 350-9701	
25	Nancy J. Koppe	ds@classlawgroup.com	
26	United States Magistrate Judge	eg@classlawgroup.com eb@classlawgroup.com	
27			
28			

Case 2:22-cv-00529-GMN-NJK Document 66 Filed 01/30/23 Page 5 of 6

Case 2:22-cv-00529-GMN-NJK Document 66 Filed 01/30/23 Page 6 of 6 Fax: 310.315.8210 KdeVyver@mcguirewoods.com ABaiardo@mcguirewoods.com ALe@mcguirewoods.com