Doc. 256

22

23

25

Third Party Defendant moves the Court for Sanctions and to Compel 1 Third party Plaintiff's Responses to Third Party Defendant's 2 Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents. These 3 documents were placed in US Mail on or about January 12, 2006. I 4 initiated contact with Mr. Ivey to ensure the 30 day deadline was going 5 to be met, he instead asked for a two-week extension. With that 6 additional time, Impulse still failed to meet its discovery obligations. At 7 the status conference in the Fall, Impulse sought 3+ additional months 8 for discovery, it has squandered this time by not seeking any discovery 9 of this (or other) third party defendant and will likely petition the Court 10 for still more time. 11 12 Third Party Defendant's Motion to Compel is pursuant to FRCP 37(a)(2) (3)(4). Impulse has failed to make the required Rule 26 disclosures to 13 the undersigned. Further, Impulse has provided evasive, incomplete 14 disclosure, answer, or response to discovery propounded by the 15 undersigned. 16 17 Examples of the foregoing are duplicated below. However, Impulse's 18 entire response to discovery is replete with these examples. 19 20 21

INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

Please provide the full contact information (and URL or web address in the form of http://www.) for the owner of each opt-in web page that you allege that third party defendant opted in at.

RESPONSE:

Impulse asserts the Ambiguity, Irrelevancy and Overbreadth Objections. The information sought will not lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Bushman v. New Holland, 83 Wn. 2d 429, 433-34 (1974); Felix A. Thillet, Inc. v. Kelly-Springfield Tire Co., 41 F.R.D. 55 (D.P.R. 1966). Further, Bonnie Gordon does not have standing to request information on behalf of all third party defendants. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections, Impulse refers Bonnie Gordon to the attachment-appended hereto as "Updated Gordon Opt-In Information."

INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

Detail all personally identifying information which is collected by Impulse and/or its marketing partners

RESPONSE:

Impulse asserts the Ambiguity, Irrelevancy and Overbreadth Objections. The information sought will not lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. <u>Bushman v. New Holland</u>, 83 Wn. 2d 429, 433-34 (1974); <u>Felix A. Thillet. Inc. v. Kelly-Springfield Tire Co.</u>, 41 F.R.D. 55 (D.P.R. 1966). Notwithstanding the foregoing objections, Impulse refers Bonnie Gordon to attachment appended hereto as "Updated Gordon Opt-in Information". This "document" appears to be a quickly thrown together Excel spreadsheet with information scattered about on it — basically useless.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

List all IP addresses and domains wherein marketing emails (spam) was sent from since August 1, 2003.

RESPONSE:

Impulse asserts the Ambiguity, Irrelevancy and Overbreadth Objections. The information sought will not lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. <u>Bushman v. New Holland</u>, 83 Wn. 2d 429, 433-34 (1974); <u>Felix A. Thillet, Inc. v. Kelly-Springfield Tire Co.</u>, 41 F.R.D. 55 (D.P.R. 1966). Notwithstanding the foregoing objections, Impulse refers Bonnie Gordon to the attachment appended hereto as "Updated Gordon Opt-In Information."

INTERROGATORY NO. 18:

Provide full captioned information regarding all lawsuits that you have been a party to since 8/1/03.

RESPONSE:

Impulse asserts the Ambiguity, Irrelevancy and Overbreadth Objections. The information sought will not lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. <u>Bushman v. New Holland</u>, 83 Wn. 2d 429, 433-34 (1974); <u>Felix A. Thillet, Inc. v. Kelly-Spring field Tire Co.</u>, 41 F.R.D. 55 (D.P.R. 1966).

The Request for Production (RFP) by Impulse is exemplified by the

following: Responding to Request 1-6, Impulse states, "This Third Party

Defendant Bonnie Gordon has no standing to propound discovery on

behalf of Plaintiff or other Third Party Defendant's (sic).

Notwithstanding this Objection, as to Third Party Plaintiff Bonnie

1	Gordon, continues its location of written documents and will
2	supplement this production" In RFP 7-8, Impulse states, in part, "A
3	response to this request for production will not lead to discovery of
4	admissible evidence". No. 9 is simply called "irrelevant".
5	
6	Third party Defendant asks the Court to award Sanctions per FRCP
7	37(a)(4) in an amount equal to or greater than the Sanctions demanded
8	by Impulse of Plaintiff. Or, in the alternative, simply require/order
9	compliance with the rules.
10	
11	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States
12	that the foregoing is true and correct.
13	
14	Bonnie F. Gordon, Pro Se
15	9804 Buckingham Drive
16	Pasco, WA 99301
17	509-210-1069
18	
19	EXECUTED this 6th day of March, 2006.
20	Ban 2 &
21	
22	Certificate of Service
23	I. hereby, certify that on March 6, 2006, I filed this motion with this
24	I, hereby, certify that on March 6, 2006, I filed this motion with this Court. I have served Bob Siegel, Peter J. Glantz, Sean A. Moynihan, Floyd E. Ivey, Jamila Gordon, James Gordon III, Jonathan Gordon, Emily Abbey, and Robert Pritchett by other means.
25	Emily Abbey, and Robert Pritchett by other means.