

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

10 BEAUTYKO LLC; LINOI LLC; SHOP  
11 FLASH USA INC.; BEAUTYKO USA INC.;  
AND BENNOTI USA INC.,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 AMAZON FULFILLMENT SERVICES,  
15 INC.,

16 Defendant.

Case No. 16-355RSM

AMENDED ORDER DENYING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR  
SANCTIONS AND ORDERING  
AMENDED ERRATA

17 This matter comes before the Court *sua sponte* to correct a scrivener's error in its  
18 September 29, 2017, Order Denying Defendant's Motion for Sanctions and Ordering Amended  
19 Errata, Dkt. #83. The Court incorrectly referred to the underlying Motion as "Dkt. #71" in the  
20 first and last paragraphs. The correct docket number is "Dkt. #68." The Court has made this  
21 sole change below, and this Amended Order replaces the Court's prior Order.  
22

23 This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Amazon Fulfillment Services, Inc.  
24 ("Amazon")'s Motion for Sanctions. Dkt. #68.  
25

26 On October 18, 2016, Amazon took the deposition of Avi Sivan, principal of Plaintiff  
27 companies. Dkt. #69 ("Declaration of Vanessa Power") at ¶ 2. Discovery closed on November  
28 11, 2016. Dkt. #20. On March 23, 2017, Plaintiffs notified Amazon via letter that they had

AMENDED ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND  
ORDERING AMENDED ERRATA - 1

1 learned of “certain inaccuracies in Mr. Sivan’s deposition testimony.” Dkt. #69-2. Plaintiffs  
2 explained that Mr. Sivan “seeks to correct his deposition testimony” and that an “amended  
3 errata will follow.” *Id.* After mediation and months of settlement discussions, Dkt. #69 at ¶ 3,  
4 the amended errata was never produced. On July 18, 2017, Plaintiffs’ counsel sought leave to  
5 withdraw. Dkt. #50. On July 31, 2017, the Court heard Amazon’s telephonic Motion to  
6 Compel production of the amended errata, and delayed ruling until Plaintiffs acquired new  
7 counsel. *See* Dkt. #56.

9         The Court held a second telephonic hearing on August 30, 2017. Dkt. #61. Amazon  
10 summarized the situation thusly: “...we previously had a telephonic Motion to Compel the  
11 amended errata of Beautyko’s principal Avi Sivan, and Your Honor deferred ruling on that and  
12 gave Plaintiffs an opportunity upon securing new counsel to either have that motion amended  
13 or to file a response.” Dkt. #69-3 (transcript of hearing) at 2:6–11. Plaintiffs’ new counsel  
14 responded with “I do think that in terms of an actual response to the Motion to Compel, we are  
15 comfortable saying that there will be some sort of correction or supplementation made to Mr.  
16 Sivan’s deposition testimony. And so to the extent that the request was for an order from you  
17 directing that to occur, that will happen.” *Id.* at 5:7–12. The Court then stated that it would  
18 give Plaintiffs’ counsel “until September 6th... to decide what you’re going to do in this and  
19 then how you’re going to respond to the motion that’s currently out there.... if for whatever  
20 reason we miss that deadline, the Court will seriously considered [sic] imposing the types of  
21 sanctions as indicated by [Amazon’s counsel].” *Id.* at 6:17–7:2.

22         On September 6, 2017, Plaintiffs produced to Amazon a declaration signed by Mr.  
23 Sivan entitled “Deposition of Avi Sivan Errata and Supplement.” Dkt. #69-1. The declaration  
24 does not serve the technical purpose of an errata in that it does not strike or specifically correct  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 testimony from a deposition line-by-line. Instead, the declaration is made to “clarify the  
2 record” and “supplement deposition testimony with respect to certain questions.” *Id.* at ¶3.

3 Amazon now argues that this declaration is insufficient and that Plaintiffs should be  
4 sanctioned for violation of a court order. *See* Dkt. #68. The Court agrees that Plaintiffs’  
5 supplemental declaration is not an amended errata. Amazon was clearly seeking an amended  
6 errata in its telephonic motion, and Plaintiffs’ declaration strikes the Court as less than  
7 sufficient to satisfy Amazon’s requested relief. As it stands, Amazon was prejudiced by  
8 Plaintiffs’ promise to produce an amended errata that has yet to materialize. However, the  
9 Court cannot find that Plaintiffs have violated a court order. According to the transcript, the  
10 Court was satisfied with Plaintiffs’ response that they would provide “some sort of correction  
11 or supplementation made to Mr. Sivan’s deposition testimony.” Amazon did not object to this  
12 phrasing. The Court ended the telephonic proceedings by ordering Plaintiffs to respond with a  
13 correction or supplementation by a certain deadline. The Court stated that if Plaintiffs  
14 completely failed to respond it would consider sanctions. Plaintiffs did not completely fail to  
15 respond, and in fact produced essentially what they promised.

16  
17  
18  
19 Given all of the above, the Court will deny this Motion and instead order Plaintiffs to  
20 produce, no later than Monday, October 6, 2017, an amended errata correcting Mr. Sivan’s  
21 deposition testimony line-by-line. This amended errata must conform to the requirements of  
22 Rule 30(e).

23  
24 The Court has reached this conclusion with minimal reliance on the parties’ extensive  
25 briefing. Considering especially the Response and Reply briefs, the Court is dismayed that this  
26 small discovery issue, allowed well after the deadline for discovery motions, has grown into  
27 both a request for a discovery “do-over” and an attempted trial on the merits of this case.  
28

1 Plaintiffs' suggestion that Mr. Sivan's deposition be reopened now, nearly a year after  
2 the close of discovery, is unreasonable. *See* Dkt. #77 at 5. Amazon's eager agreement does not  
3 create good cause. *See* Dkt. #82 at 4–5. Mr. Sivan can explain any discrepancies in his prior  
4 testimony on the witness stand, and Amazon will have plenty of material for cross-  
5 examination. The Court will not allow this case to move backwards, and any prejudice to the  
6 parties caused by the passing of court deadlines is due solely to the actions and inactions of the  
7 parties and their counsel.

9 Both parties also improperly delve into the merits of this case.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs interpret this  
10 Motion as “a misplaced attempt to sidestep what Amazon cannot prove at trial: the existence of  
11 any contractual terms actually breached by the Plaintiff entities...” Dkt. #77 at 1. Plaintiffs  
12 then attempt to convince the Court of the *nonexistence* of such contractual terms by citing to  
13 interrogatory responses and attaching *over 1,000 pages* of documents under seal. *Id.* at 6–7;  
14 Dkt. #81. Not only do Plaintiffs fail to separate these documents into individual exhibits or cite  
15 to them by page number, Plaintiffs do not cite to these documents *at all* in briefing. This  
16 strikes the Court as litigation in bad faith. Amazon takes the bait, *e.g.* by arguing that it “defies  
17 logic and basic principles of contract law” for Plaintiffs to “take the position that unless the  
18 Contract expressly states that a ‘new item’ must be a ‘new item,’ it is permissible for Beautyko  
19 to sell Amazon duplicate items but call them all unique.” Dkt. #82 at 3–4. The parties can save  
20 these merits arguments for the jury. Because the Court did not and will not rely on the 1,000  
21 plus pages of sealed documents, the Court need not rule on the pending Motion to Seal (Dkt.  
22 #79) and will deny it as moot, and strikes the sealed documents from the record.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> This is especially ill-advised given the parties' previous request for leave to file dispositive motions well after the March 14, 2017, deadline, and the Court's Order denying that leave. *See* Dkt. #75.

1 Having reviewed the relevant briefing and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby  
2 finds and ORDERS that:

3 (1) Defendant Amazon's Motion for Sanctions (Dkt. #68) is DENIED.

4 (2) Plaintiffs shall produce to Amazon an amended errata of Mr. Sivan's deposition  
5 testimony, as stated above, **no later than 5:00 p.m. on Monday, October 2, 2017.**

6 (3) Plaintiffs' Motion to Seal (Dkt. #79) is DENIED AS MOOT.

7 (4) Plaintiffs' sealed documents (Dkt. #81) are STRICKEN and shall remain sealed.

8  
9  
10 DATED this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of October 2017.

11  
12  
13 

14 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
15 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE