



1 time frame, beginning sometime before the November 3, 2001 agreement and ending with the law firms's  
2 representation of Amiga, Inc. (Washington) in 2004. Even after that, the law firm was involved with  
3 Amino Development Corporation ("Amino"). *Id.* Amino has been sued by defendant in a separate  
4 lawsuit, and while the Court has declined to consolidate these cases for case management reasons,  
5 discovery may be expedited by the document production requested here. The same counsel are  
6 representing the parties in the two matters, and plaintiff Amino has represented to the Court that there are  
7 no conflicts between it and Amiga, Inc. *See, Hyperion VOF v. Amino Development Corporation, C07-*  
8 *1761RSM, Dkt. # 17, p.5.* The Court thus finds that the scope of the document request is not overly  
9 broad, and that any burden to the third party deponent is greatly outweighed by the potential value of the  
10 discovery to the defendant. *Moon v. SCP Pool Corp., 232 F.R.D. 633, 637 (C.D. Cal. 2005).*  
11 Defendant has offered to minimize any burden by reviewing the documents at the deponent law firm's  
12 office before they are copied, to identify which ones are actually needed.

13 Accordingly, plaintiff's motion to quash is DENIED. Deponent shall comply with the subpoena  
14 for document production within 15 days of the date of this Order.

15 DATED this 17<sup>th</sup> day of January 2008.

16 

17 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27