

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

8  
9 FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE  
CORPORATION as Receiver for Washington  
Mutual Bank,

10  
11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 ARCH INSURANCE COMPANY, *et al.*,

14 Defendants.

No. C14-545RSL

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO TAKE  
MORE THAN TEN DEPOSITIONS

15 This matter comes before the Court on "Plaintiff Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's  
16 Motion to For Leave to Take More Than Ten Depositions." Dkt. # 93. Plaintiff seeks  
17 permission to conduct up to nineteen depositions in this matter, including three depositions that  
18 certain defendants also wish to take and accordingly do not oppose as depositions in excess of  
19 the ten-deposition limit. Plaintiff has identified each of the proposed deponents, explained their  
20 connection with this litigation, and set forth the information they hope to acquire from each  
21 witness. Having reviewed the memoranda, declarations, and exhibits submitted by the parties,  
22 the Court finds as follows:


23 The ten-deposition limit set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(a)(2)(A) is not absolute, and in  
24 light of the number of corporate defendants and non-party witnesses involved in this litigation,  
25 plaintiff has shown that relief from that limit is consistent with the principles set forth in Fed. R.  
26 Civ. P. 26(b)(2). See Dkt. # 93 at 6–10; Dkt. # 122 at 5–6; Thykkuttathil v. Keese, No. C12-

27  
28 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
FOR LEAVE TO TAKE ADDITIONAL DEPOSITIONS - 1

1 1749RSM, 294 F.R.D. 601, 603 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 13, 2013) (“The breadth and complexity of  
2 the case is a factor for the Court to consider in determining whether enlargement is warranted.”).  
3 Defendants make no individualized effort to show that these depositions would be unreasonably  
4 cumulative, unduly burdensome, or irrelevant. Instead, defendants argue that plaintiff’s request  
5 is premature, as plaintiff has not yet taken the ten depositions provided for in Rule 30(a)(2)(A)  
6 or attempted to use alternative discovery methods to obtain the information sought. Dkt. # 95.  
7 While parties should “ordinarily exhaust their allowed number of depositions” before requesting  
8 more, Thykkuttathil, 294 F.R.D. at 603, the Court is satisfied that the impending discovery  
9 deadline of June 1, 2017, warrants an order granting leave sooner rather than later.  
10

11 For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiff’s motion for leave to take additional depositions  
12 (Dkt. # 93) is GRANTED.  
13

14 SO ORDERED this 5th day of April, 2017.  
15

16   
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 Robert S. Lasnik  
19 United States District Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27