 a b c c c d d<	1			
 4 5 6 7 8 BUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 9 <l< td=""><td>2</td><td></td><td></td></l<>	2			
5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 10 WILLIAM HARRIS, 11 Plaintiff, 12 v. 13 SEARS HOLDING CORPORATION, 14 Defendant. 15 This comes before the Court on Defendant is motion to compel discovery (Dkt. No. 54), 17 Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 57), and Plaintiff's motion to limit his deposition 18 (Dkt. No. 61). Having reviewed the motions, the responses (Dkt. Nos. 58, 63), the reply (Dkt. 19 No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court 16 GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion 12 ior reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 13 GRANTS in part and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 14 for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 15 for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 16 State the motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion 17 Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 18 Motis plaintiff's motion to li	3			
 6 7 8 BUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 9 10 11 12 12 13 14 15 14 15 16 16 17 18 19 14 16 17 16 17 18 19 19 11 19 11 11 12 14 15 16 17 16 17 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 11 12 14 15 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 14 15 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 11 12 12 14 15 14 15 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 14 15 14 15 15 16 17 18 19 10 10 11 11 12 14 15 15 16 16 17 18 18 19 19 10 11 14 15 15 16 17 18 18 19 19 10 10 11 14 14 15 15 16 16 17 18 18 19 19 10 10	4			
7 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATLE 10 WILLIAM HARRIS, CASE NO. C10-1339 MJP 11 Plaintiff, ORDER ON DISCOVERY MOTIONS 12 v. MOTIONS 13 SEARS HOLDING CORPORATION, MOTIONS 14 Defendant. MOTIONS 15 This comes before the Court on Defendant's motion to compel discovery (Dkt. No. 54), Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 57), and Plaintiff's motion to limit his deposition 18 (Dkt. No. 61). Having reviewed the motions, the responses (Dkt. Nos. 58, 63), the reply (Dkt. 19 No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court 10 GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion 11 for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 12 Backgrout	5			
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 10 WILLIAM HARRIS, 11 Plaintiff, 12 V. 13 SEARS HOLDING CORPORATION, 14 Defendant. 15 This comes before the Court on Defendant's motion to compel discovery (Dkt. No. 54), 17 Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 57), and Plaintiff's motion to limit his deposition 18 (Dkt. No. 61). Having reviewed the motions, the responses (Dkt. Nos. 58, 63), the reply (Dkt. 19 No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court 10 GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion 12 for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 12 Background	6			
 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE WILLIAM HARRIS, CASE NO. C10-1339 MJP Plaintiff, ORDER ON DISCOVERY MOTIONS SEARS HOLDING CORPORATION, Defendant. This comes before the Court on Defendant's motion to compel discovery (Dkt. No. 54), Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 57), and Plaintiff's motion to limit his deposition (Dkt. No. 61). Having reviewed the motions, the responses (Dkt. Nos. 58, 63), the reply (Dkt. No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. Background 	7			
9 10 WILLIAM HARRIS, CASE NO. C10-1339 MJP 11 Plaintiff, ORDER ON DISCOVERY 12 v. MOTIONS 13 SEARS HOLDING CORPORATION, MOTIONS 14 Defendant. Defendant. 15 This comes before the Court on Defendant's motion to compel discovery (Dkt. No. 54), 17 Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 57), and Plaintiff's motion to limit his deposition 18 (Dkt. No. 61). Having reviewed the motions, the responses (Dkt. Nos. 58, 63), the reply (Dkt. 19 No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court 20 GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion 21 for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 22 Background	8			
11 Plaintiff, ORDER ON DISCOVERY 12 v. 13 SEARS HOLDING CORPORATION, 14 Defendant. 15 16 This comes before the Court on Defendant's motion to compel discovery (Dkt. No. 54), 17 Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 57), and Plaintiff's motion to limit his deposition 18 (Dkt. No. 61). Having reviewed the motions, the responses (Dkt. Nos. 58, 63), the reply (Dkt. 19 No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court 20 GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion 21 for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 22 Background	9			
12 v. 13 SEARS HOLDING CORPORATION, 14 Defendant. 15	10	WILLIAM HARRIS,	CASE NO. C10-1339 MJP	
 12 v. 13 SEARS HOLDING CORPORATION, 14 Defendant. 15 16 This comes before the Court on Defendant's motion to compel discovery (Dkt. No. 54), 17 Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 57), and Plaintiff's motion to limit his deposition 18 (Dkt. No. 61). Having reviewed the motions, the responses (Dkt. Nos. 58, 63), the reply (Dkt. 19 No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court 20 GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion 21 for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 22 Background 	11	Plaintiff,		
14Defendant.1516This comes before the Court on Defendant's motion to compel discovery (Dkt. No. 54),17Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 57), and Plaintiff's motion to limit his deposition18(Dkt. No. 61). Having reviewed the motions, the responses (Dkt. Nos. 58, 63), the reply (Dkt.19No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court20GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion2122Background	12	v.	MOTIONS	
 15 16 This comes before the Court on Defendant's motion to compel discovery (Dkt. No. 54), 17 Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 57), and Plaintiff's motion to limit his deposition 18 (Dkt. No. 61). Having reviewed the motions, the responses (Dkt. Nos. 58, 63), the reply (Dkt. 19 No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court 20 GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion 21 for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 22 Background 	13	SEARS HOLDING CORPORATION,		
 This comes before the Court on Defendant's motion to compel discovery (Dkt. No. 54), Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 57), and Plaintiff's motion to limit his deposition (Dkt. No. 61). Having reviewed the motions, the responses (Dkt. Nos. 58, 63), the reply (Dkt. No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 	14	Defendant.		
 Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 57), and Plaintiff's motion to limit his deposition (Dkt. No. 61). Having reviewed the motions, the responses (Dkt. Nos. 58, 63), the reply (Dkt. No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 	15			
 18 (Dkt. No. 61). Having reviewed the motions, the responses (Dkt. Nos. 58, 63), the reply (Dkt. 19 No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court 20 GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion 21 for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 22 Background 	16	5 This comes before the Court on Defendant's motion to compel discovery (Dkt. No. 54),		
 19 No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court 20 GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion 21 for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 22 Background 	17	Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 57), and Plaintiff's motion to limit his deposition		
 20 GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion 21 for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 22 Background 	18	(Dkt. No. 61). Having reviewed the motions, the responses (Dkt. Nos. 58, 63), the reply (Dkt.		
 21 for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition. 22 Background 	19	No. 59), all related filings, and having held oral arguments on June 10, 2011, the Court		
22 Background	20	GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, DENIES Plaintiff's motion		
	21	for reconsideration, and DENIES Plaintiff's motion to limit deposition.		
23 Plaintiff William Harris ("Harris") is a pro se litigant suing Defendant Sears Holding Co.	22	2 Background		
	23			
24 ("Sears"). Harris claims Defendant wrongfully terminated him from his position as a delivery	24			

contractor in March 2008. (<u>Id.</u>) Harris's claims for breach of contract and promissory estoppels
 are the only surviving claims after motions to dismiss and summary judgment.

3 Specifically, Harris alleges he entered into a voluntary agreement with Chris Koenig, a 4 Sears manager, in which Harris agreed to "provide a whole range of services" in exchange for 5 "certain contract protections." (Id. at 2.) Harris believes Sears broke this implied contract when they fired him. In addition, Harris alleges Sears' acting representative, Ricardo Sierra, 6 7 threatened him with violence if he did not surrender his private delivery truck upon termination. (Id. at 4). Sierra is an employee of 3PD, Inc., a third-party company who manages the 8 9 relationship between Sears and independent contractors. According to the complaint, Defendant 10 retains possession of the delivery truck. (Id.)

11

12

Discussion

1. Motion to Compel

Sears's motion to compel discovery is largely moot because Harris has since provided
some of the documents Sears requested. Based on Sears's reply brief and oral arguments,
however, the following documents remain outstanding: tax documents verifying Harris's income
from 2005 to the present, documents related to arbitration proceedings held between 3PD, Inc.
and Harris, leasing documents related to Harris's truck, and business licenses and registration
materials.

The Court ORDERS Harris to: (1) provide Sears with his tax returns or sign a release allowing Sears to make a request for the information from the IRS, (2) provide Sears with the arbitration documents he has in his possession or sign a release allowing Sears to make a request for the documents from the private arbitrator, and (3) provide Sears with the leasing documents or sign a release allowing Sears to make the request from the lender. Harris must comply with the Court's Order within seven (7) days of the hearing on oral arguments. The Court extends
 the cutoff for discovery by thirty (30) days. To the extent Sears seeks business licenses and
 registration, the Court observes those documents are available on the internet.

2. <u>Motion for Reconsideration</u>

4

Harris believes his claim for tortious interference with contractual relations should be
restored because Sears failed to disclose 3PD, Inc. operated under "a very similar type of
arrangement" as Harris's arrangement with Chris Koenig. The Court disagrees and Harris's
motion is untimely. <u>See LR 7(h)(2)(requiring motions for reconsideration be filed within</u>
fourteen days after the order to which it relates is filed).

Under Local Rule 7(h), "[m]otions for reconsideration are disfavored." LR 7(h). "The
court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior
ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its
attention earlier with reasonable diligence." <u>Id.</u>; <u>see also Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos</u>
<u>Pharma</u>, 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009)(finding a motion for reconsideration warranted only
when a district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or
when there is an intervening change in the controlling law).

Here, the Court dismissed the tortious interference claim because Harris failed to specify
what contractual relationship was interfered with. It was unclear whether Harris believed Sears
interfered with his contract with 3PD, Inc. or if Sears believed Sears breached its own contract
with Harris. Even considering Sears's failure to disclose 3PD's arrangement, it remains unclear
what contract Harris refers to. Harris has failed to demonstrate manifest error.

The Court DENIES Harris's motion for reconsideration.

22 23

//

24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22

23

24

3. Motion to Limit Deposition

Harris originally sought to limit his deposition. Based on oral arguments, however, the deposition appears to have occurred on Monday, June 6, 2011. The Court DENIES the motion as moot.

Conclusion

The Court GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Defendant's motion to compel, as
discussed above. To allow the parties time to complete discovery, the Court extends the cut-off
for discovery by thirty (30) days. The Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration and
motion to limit his deposition.

The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

Dated this 14th day of June, 2011.

Maeshuf Helena

Marsha J. Pechman United States District Judge