

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

WILLIAM ANTHONY COLÓN,
Plaintiff

v.

RUBÉN BLADES, ROBERTO
MORGALO, MARTÍNEZ MORGALO &
ASSOCIATES,

Defendants

RUBÉN BLADES,

Cross-Plaintiff

v.

CIVIL 07-1380 (JA)

ROBERT MORGALO, in his personal
capacity and as owner and member
of MARTÍNEZ, MORGALO &
ASSOCIATES, LLC; MARTÍNEZ,
MORGALO & ASSOCIATES, LLC,

Cross-Defendants

ROBERT J. MORGALO,

Plaintiff

v.

RUBÉN BLADES, RUBÉN BLADES
PRODUCTIONS, INC.,

Defendants

OPINION AND ORDER

3
4 This matter is before the court on motion to compel production of
5 documents filed by the defendant and cross-plaintiff, Rubén Blades ("Mr. Blades"),
6 on February 16, 2010, against the defendant, Roberto Morgalo ("Mr. Morgalo"),
7 and plaintiff, William Anthony Colón ("Mr. Colón"). (Docket No. 119.) On
8 February 18, 2010, Mr. Morgalo filed a motion in opposition to Mr. Blades'
9 request. (Docket No. 121.) On February 22, 2010, Mr. Blades replied. (Docket
10 No. 124.) On March 2, 2010, Mr. Colón filed an informative motion on this
11 matter. (Docket No. 134.) For the reasons set forth below, Mr. Blades' motion
12 is hereby GRANTED.
13

14 I. BACKGROUND

15
16 On December 3, 2008, a first set of interrogatories and a request for
17 production of documents was served on Mr. Morgalo by Mr. Blades pursuant to
18 Rules 33 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (Docket No. 124, at 3,
19 ¶ 1.) On March 20, 2009, Mr. Blades filed a motion to compel Mr. Morgalo to
20 answer the interrogatories and request for production of documents. (Docket No.
21 93.) On May 12, 2009, the court granted Mr. Blades' motion. (Docket No. 101.)
22 On May 22, 2009, Mr. Morgalo filed its answer to Mr. Blades' first set of
23 interrogatories and request for production of documents. (Docket No. 103.)
24

25
26 On February 16, 2010, Mr. Blades filed a motion to compel pursuant to
27 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a), requesting the court to order both Mr.
28

2
3 Morgalo and Mr. Colón's attorney to produce a box of documents containing
4 financial information of Martínez, Morgalo & Associates ("MMA"). (Docket No.
5 119, at 2, ¶ 1.) According to Mr. Blades, Mr. Morgalo gave the box to Mr. Colón's
6 attorney on or about April 23, 2009. (Id.) Mr. Blades claims that despite his
7 numerous requests he has been denied access to the documents. (Id.) Mr.
8 Blades states that if the documents are not produced, Mr. Morgalo should be
9 prohibited from offering as evidence the documents contained in the box. (Id. ¶
10 3.) Mr. Blades also requests the court to order Mr. Morgalo to pay reasonable
11 expenses, including \$1,000 in attorney's fees, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
12 Procedure 37(a)(5)(A). (Id. at 3, ¶ 1.)

13
14
15
16 On February 18, 2010, Mr. Morgalo responded to Mr. Blades' motion.
17 (Docket No. 121.) Mr. Morgalo argues that on April 21, 2009, he visited the
18 offices of Mr. Blades' attorney to be present at Mr. Colón's deposition. (Docket
19 No. 121, at 2, ¶ 1.) Mr. Morgalo claims that on that day he brought the box
20 containing the documents requested by Mr. Blades. (Id.) Mr. Morgalo claims that
21 he presented the box to Mr. Colón and Mr. Blades' attorneys. (Id.) Mr. Morgalo
22 claims that he delivered the box to the offices of Mr. Colón's counsel on April 22,
23 2009. (Id. at 3, ¶¶ 3 & 4.)
24

25
26 According to Mr. Morgalo, Mr. Blades acknowledged on more than one
27 occasion the receipt of the documents. (Id. at 4-5, ¶¶ 5-7.) Mr. Morgalo thus
28

2
3 believes that he should not be compelled to produce the documents requested by
4 Mr. Blades. (Id. at 6, ¶ 12.) He argues that Mr. Colón should be ordered to
5 return the documents to him. (Id.) Mr. Morgalo also contends that Mr. Colón and
6 not him, should be ordered to produce the documents requested by Mr. Blades.
7 (Id.) Moreover, Mr. Morgalo posits that Mr. Blades' request for payment of
8 reasonable expenses and attorneys fees is not appropriate because the documents
9 requested by him have already been produced. (Id. at 6-7, ¶ 14.) Mr. Morgalo
10 also claims that the negligence and inaction of Mr. Blades and Mr. Colón's
11 attorneys has caused him an additional financial burden. (Id. at 7, ¶ 16.) He
12 therefore requests an award for reasonable expenses and attorneys' fees in an
13 amount no smaller than \$1,000 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
14 37(a)(5)(B). (Id.)

15
16
17
18 On February 22, 2010, Mr. Blades replied. (Docket No. 124.) In his motion
19 Mr. Blades argues that contrary to what Mr. Morgalo claims he never acknowledge
20 receipt of the documents contained in the box. (Id. at 3, ¶ 7.) Mr. Blades claims
21 that even though it was agreed that the documents were going to be jointly
22 reviewed, Mr. Colón's attorney never gave him the opportunity to examine them.
23 (Id. at 4, ¶ 10.)

24
25
26 According to Mr. Blades, Mr. Colón's attorney informed him that he could
27 not locate the box in his office. (Id. at 5, ¶ 17.) Mr. Blades claims that the box
28

2
3 is still in the possession of Mr. Colón's attorney and that it has not been retrieved
4 by Mr. Morgalo's attorneys for examination or production. (Id. at 4, ¶ 12.) Mr.
5 Blades argues that Mr. Morgalo has to produce the documents even though they
6 are not in his possession. (Id. at 6-7.) To ensure that the documents are
7 produced, Mr. Blades requests that sanctions be imposed because he believes that
8 Mr. Morgalo and Mr. Colón's conduct cannot be "substantially justified." (Id. at 8.)
9
10

11 On March 2, 2010, Mr. Colón filed an informative motion as to the
12 whereabouts of the documents requested by Mr. Blades. (Docket No. 134.) Mr.
13 Colón claims that on May 29, 2009, his attorney received a call from Mr. Morgalo
14 to see if they could return the documents requested by Mr. Blades. (Id. at 2, ¶
15 3.) According to Mr. Colón, Mr. Morgalo "either personally, or thorough another
16 person picked [the] documents after May 29, 2009." (Id. at 2-3, ¶ 4.) Mr. Colón
17 also claims that Mr. Morgalo went to his attorney's office to search for the
18 documents. (Id. at 4, ¶ 7.) However, Mr. Colón claims that they were not able
19 to find them. (Id.) Mr. Colón states that his attorney continued searching in his
20 office for the documents but that he has not been able to find them. (Id.)
21
22

23 II. ANALYSIS

24 Rule 34(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that "[a] party
25 may serve on any other party a request within the scope of Rule 26(b): (1) to
26 produce and permit the requesting party or its representative to inspect, copy,
27
28

2
3 test, or sample [any document that is] in the responding party's possession,
4 custody or control[.]" Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(a)(1). "Legal ownership or actual
5 physical possession is not required; documents are considered to be under a
6 party's 'control' when that party has the right, authority or ability to obtain those
7 documents upon demand." Green v. Fulton, 157 F.R.D. 136, 142 (D. Me. 1994)
8 (citations omitted). If a party who has been requested to provide certain
9 documents pursuant to Rule 34(a)(1) fails to produce them, the party who made
10 the request may move for an order compelling discovery pursuant to Federal Rule
11 of Civil Procedure 37(a). Afreedi v. Bennett, 517 F. Supp. 2d 521, 525 (D. Mass.
12 2007).

13
14
15
16 Mr. Morgalo contends that he cannot be compel to produce the documents
17 requested by Mr. Blades because they already have been produced. (Docket No.
18 121, at 4-5, ¶¶ 7-10.) He claims that the box containing the documents
19 requested by Mr. Blades was given to Mr. Colón's attorney. (Id.) Mr. Morgalo
20 argues that Mr. Blades' assertion that the documents produced were not
21 responsive to his request shows that he was able to review them. (Id.) On the
22 other hand, Mr. Blades claims that although Mr. Morgalo gave the documents to
23 Mr. Colón's attorney he has not been given the opportunity to examine them.
24 (Docket No. 124, at 4, ¶ 10.) Mr. Blades notes that contrary to what Mr. Morgalo
25 claims, he did not inspect the documents. (Id.) He argues that his assertion that
26
27
28

2
3 the claims were unresponsive was only based on Mr. Morgalo's lack of compliance
4 with Rule 34. (Id. at 5, ¶ 18.) According to Mr. Blades, before delivering the box,
5 Mr. Morgalo was supposed to create a log providing a description of the
6 documents. (Id.) However, according to Mr. Blades, Mr. Morgalo delivered the
7 box without providing the requested description. (Id.)
8

9
10 Mr. Morgalo has failed to show that the documents requested were properly
11 produced. When a party claims that the requested documents have already been
12 produced, it must indicate that fact under oath in response to the request.
13 Rayman v. Am. Charter Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n, 148 F.R.D. 647, 651 (D. Neb.
14 1993). Nevertheless, if the party fails to make a clear and specific statement of
15 such compliance under oath, the court may order it to produce the documents
16 requested. Id.
17

18 Mr. Morgalo has not provided any statement under oath in which it is
19 indicated that the documents requested by Mr. Blades have been produced. Thus,
20 Mr. Morgalo cannot pretend that he has complied with the discovery request made
21 by Mr. Blades by giving the box of documents to Mr. Colón's attorney. As Mr.
22 Blades indicates, Mr. Morgalo had the duty of labeling the documents requested.
23 He failed to do so. In re Sulfuric Acid Antitrust Litig., 231 F.R.D. 351, 363 (N.D.
24 ILL. 2005) (court held that documents that are kept in storage have to be
25
26
27
28

2
3 organized and labeled because they are not considered to be kept in usual course
4 of business).

5
6 Mr. Morgalo might not have been required to label the documents if he had
7 shown that they were kept in the usual course of business. United States v.
8 O’Keefe, 537 F. Supp. 2d 14, 19 (D.D.C. 2008) (citing Washington v. Thurgood
9 Marshall Acad., 232 F.R.D. 6, 10 (D.D.C. 2005); Doe v. District of Columbia, 231
10 F.R.D. 27, 35 (D.D.C. 2005)). Also, the documents, even if they were kept in
11 storage, would not have been needed to be identified if Mr. Morgalo had shown
12 “that the way in which . . . [they were] kept . . . [did] not change[] from how they
13 were kept in the usual course of business.” In re Sulfuric Acid Antitrust Litigation,
14 231 F.R.D. at 363. To do this, “[a]ll that [was] needed [was] the testimony of a
15 person with knowledge of how the records were originally kept and how they were
16 maintained in storage.” Id. (citing Hagemeyer N. Am., Inc. v. Gateway Data Sci.
17 Corp., 222 F.R.D. 594, 598 (W.D. Wis. 2004)). Mr. Morgalo made no attempt to
18 satisfy this burden. As such, I find that Mr. Blades’ motion to compel must be
19 granted regardless of whether or not he has possession of the documents
20 requested. See Green v. Fulton, 157 F.R.D. at 136 (“Legal ownership or actual
21 physical possession is not required; documents are considered to be under a
22 party’s “control” when that party has the right, authority or ability to obtain those
23 documents upon demand.”)
24
25
26
27
28

2
3
4 However, since it is certain at the present that the documents will not be
5 produced by Mr. Morgalo because they were lost by Mr. Colón's attorney, the
6 appropriate remedy is to preclude Mr. Morgalo from offering as evidence the
7 documents requested by Mr. Blades and/or any testimony related to them. Taylor
8 v. Illinois, 484 U.S. 400, 425-26 (1988) (Excluding evidence is only appropriate
9 when there are not any other sanctions that could sufficiently correct or deter
10 discovery violations); Pérez v. Hyundai Motor Co., 440 F. Supp. 2d 57, 62 (D.P.R.
11 2006) ("Sanctions for spoliation range from dismissal of the action, exclusion of
12 evidence or testimony or instructing the jury on a negative inference to spoliation
13 whereby jury may infer that party that destroyed evidence did so out of realization
14 that it was unfavorable.") (citing Driggin v. Am. Sec. Alarm Co., 141 F. Supp. 2d
15 113, 120 (D. Me. 2000); Vázquez-Corales v. Sea-Land Serv., Inc., 172 F.R.D. 10,
16 13 & 15 (D.P.R. 1997)).

17
18
19 Two things need to be considered by courts in order to determine whether
20 a sanction, as the one being imposed here, is appropriate. Pérez v. Hyundai
21 Motor Co., 440 F. Supp. 2d at 61. First, the severity of the prejudice that the
22 non-offending party might suffer if the documents are not produced. Id. Second,
23 whether the non-offending party bears any responsibility for the prejudice. Id.
24 (quoting Driggin v. Am. Sec. Alarm Co., 141 F. Supp. 2d at 121.)
25
26
27
28

2
3
4 In the this case, Mr. Blades claims that “[i]n order to adequately prepare for
5 the taking of [“Mr. Morgalo’s] deposition as well as to adequately prepare [his]
6 defense” it is necessary for him to be allowed to inspect and copy the documents
7 requested. (Docket No. 124, at 6.) Mr. Blades is correct. This is an action for
8 breach of contract and collection of monies. (Docket No. 45, at 1, ¶ 1.)
9 According to Mr. Colón, he and Mr. Blades agreed “to perform at a musical concert
10 in San Juan, Puerto Rico, for a \$350,000 fee to be evenly split between them.”
11 (Id. at 2, ¶ 9.) Mr. Colón claims that Mr. Blades contracted the services of MMA
12 and Mr. Morgalo to handle the collection of the \$350,000. (Id. at 2, ¶ 11.) Mr.
13 Colón claims that a few days prior to the concert, Mr. Blades informed him that
14 Mr. Morgalo had disappeared with their money. (Id. at 2-3, ¶ 13.) Mr. Colón also
15 claims that Mr. Blades told him “that he would personally be responsible for his
16 full payment.” (Id. at 3, ¶ 15.) Mr. Colón thus claims that Mr. Blades owns him
17 \$115,000 plus interest, cots and reasonable attorneys’ fees. (Id. at 3, ¶¶ 16 &
18 18.)
19
20
21

22 Mr. Blades on the other hand denies that he had agreed to be personally
23 responsible for paying Mr. Colón. (Docket No. 48, at 8, ¶ 15.) According to Mr.
24 Blades he was paid \$68,000 prior to concert while Mr. Colón was paid \$62,500.
25 (Id. at 8-9, ¶ 16 & Docket No. 56, at 6, ¶ 20.) Mr. Blades claims that after
26 deducting the expenses incurred on account of the concert performance, he and
27
28

2
3 Mr. Colón are still each owed less than \$70,000. (Docket No. 48, at 8, ¶ 15.) Mr.
4 Blades claims that Mr. Morgalo and MMA received the \$62,500 on or about
5 February 2002 for a concert to be performed between him and Mr. Cheo Feliciano.
6 (Docket No. 56, at 5, ¶ 15.)
7

8 However, Mr. Blades states that the concert was cancelled and he never
9 received the \$62,500. (Id. at 5, ¶ 15.) Mr. Blades claims that Mr. Morgalo and
10 MMA wrongfully applied the \$62,500 as a credit to the concert in which he and Mr.
11 Colón performed. (Id.) Mr. Blades claims that the money that is owed to him and
12 Mr. Colón was used by Mr. Morgalo and MMA to pay other debts without their
13 knowledge and consent. (Id. at 7, ¶¶ 25-26.)
14
15

16 It is clear that based on the nature of the action and the allegations made
17 by the parties, the documents requested by Mr. Blades are relevant. The
18 documents appear to contain financial information regarding Mr. Morgalo and
19 MMA, which if not produced would substantially prejudice Mr. Blades since he will
20 not be able to adequately defend himself from Mr. Colón or move forward with his
21 claims against Mr. Morgalo and MMA.
22

23 As to whether or not Mr. Blades bears any responsibility for the prejudice,
24 I find that he does not. There is no indication of any delay on the part of Mr.
25 Blades in seeking out the documents in question. On the contrary, ever since Mr.
26 Morgalo turned the documents over to Mr. Colón's attorney, Mr. Blades has
27
28

2
3 constantly tried to get them in order to examine and copy them. However, all of
4 Mr. Blades' attempts to get the documents have been frustrated by Mr. Morgalo
5 and Mr. Colón's attorney's gross mishandling of the documents. As litigants in this
6 case, both Mr. Morgalo and Mr. Colón's attorney had the responsibility of
7 preserving and avoiding the destruction or loss of the documents requested.
8
9 Pérez v. Hyundai Motor Co., 440 F. Supp. 2d at 61 (quoting Pérez-Velasco v.
10 Suzuki Motor Co. Ltd., 266 F. Supp. 2d 266 (D.P.R.2003) (citing Vázquez-Corales
11 v. Sea-Land Serv., Inc., 172 F.R.D. at 11-12). They failed to do so. Therefore
12 I find that there is no reason to deny Mr. Blades' motion to compel.
13

14
15 Accordingly, if the court, as in this case, grants a party's motion to compel
16 discovery under Rule 37(a)(1), it must award the moving party reasonable cost
17 associated with filing the motion, including attorney's fees, unless it can be shown
18 that (1) the moving party filed the motion before attempting in good faith to
19 obtain the discovery without court intervention, (2) the opposing party's failure
20 to disclose was substantially justified, or (3) other circumstances make an award
21 of expenses unjust. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(5). I find that none of the three
22 exceptions in Rule 37(a)(5) are satisfied in this case.
23

24
25 First, Mr. Blades on numerous occasions tried to obtain the documents in
26 question from Mr. Morgalo and Mr. Colón's attorney before filing the motion to
27 compel. Second, I have not been presented with any substantial justification for
28

2
3
4 Mr. Morgalo's refusal to produce the documents requested. Mr. Morgalo contends
5 only that since the documents requested by Mr. Blades were produced after they
6 were given to Mr. Colón's attorney, the court cannot impose an award for
7 reasonable cost and attorney's fees against him. He also claims that the
8 requested discovery is not under his control or that of his attorneys. I find that
9 neither argument justifies Mr. Morgalo's failure to produce the documents
10 requested. Mr. Morgalo was responsible at all times for making sure that the
11 documents were kept safe. However, he failed to do so. Mr. Morgalo's duty to
12 protect the documents did not end when they were turned over to Mr. Colón's
13 attorney. Also, Mr. Morgalo had the obligation to respond to Mr. Blades' discovery
14 request regardless of whether or not he was in possession of the documents when
15 they were requested by Mr. Blades. Thus, there is no doubt that Mr. Morgalo was
16 in fact in control of the discovery request. Third, the award of reasonable cost
17 and attorney's fees associated with filing the motion to compel and the reply
18 memoranda is justified given the protracted litigation in this case, which to some
19 degree has been caused by Mr. Morgalo's failure to produce the documents
20 requested by Mr. Blades. As such, Mr. Morgalo is ordered to pay Mr. Blades
21 \$1,000 in attorney's fees incurred in preparing the motion to compel and the reply
22 memorandum pursuant to Rule 37(a)(5)(A).
23
24
25
26
27
28

2

3

III. CONCLUSION

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

For the reasons set forth above, Mr. Blades' motion to compel production of documents is GRANTED. As such, Mr. Morgalo is precluded from presenting as evidence any of the documents requested by Mr. Blades and/or any testimony related to them. Also, Mr. Morgalo is ordered to pay \$1,000 in attorney's fees to Mr. Blades.

11

At San Juan, Puerto Rico, this 19th day of March, 2010.

12

S/ JUSTO ARENAS

13

Chief United States Magistrate Judge

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28