

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

9 THERESA ORTLOFF,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 DAVE TRIMMER, a Chief of the  
Washington State Ferries, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.  
14

No. C16-1257RSL

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
FOR DISCOVERY DEFAULT OR  
TO COMPEL DISCOVERY  
RESPONSES

15 This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's "Motion for Discovery Default or to  
16 Compel Discovery." Dkt. # 22. Plaintiff seeks an order compelling defendants to produce  
17 several thousand emails that defendants mentioned in response to plaintiff's interrogatories.  
18 Having reviewed the memoranda, declarations, and exhibits submitted by the parties, the Court  
19 finds as follows.

20 In this lawsuit, plaintiff sues her former employer, the Washington State Ferries (WSF),  
21 as well as various other WSF employees, for several alleged violations of her constitutional  
22 rights, harassment, and retaliation. Plaintiff seeks an order requiring defendants to produce all  
23 emails in their possession "related to" plaintiff herself, as well as all emails "related to" six  
24 comparator employees. Defendants have indicated that they are willing to produce emails  
25 generated by running searches for the seven names in question, but ask plaintiff to provide  
26

27 ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
28 FOR DISCOVERY DEFAULT OR TO  
COMPEL DISCOVERY RESPONSES - 1

1 additional search terms so that they might limit the total number of responsive emails to those  
2 that are relevant to this case. Moreover, defendants have by now produced an additional batch  
3 of emails “related to” plaintiff herself. Dkt. # 28 at 7. Plaintiff still seeks production of the  
4 “comparator” emails, as well as emails “related to” plaintiff from the email accounts of other  
5 WSF employees, and argues that defendants’ unwillingness to produce all responsive emails is  
6 evidence of bad faith.

7  
8       You don’t need a weatherman  
9       To know which way the wind blows.

– Bob Dylan  
10       *Subterranean Homesick Blues*  
11       © Columbia Records 1965

12       The ill winds that have blown this discovery dispute into this courtroom are a product of  
13 an outrageous posture by plaintiff’s lawyer (seeking a default judgment of \$900,000 for a minor  
14 discovery dispute where the primary cause is his own failure to communicate with opposing  
15 counsel) and an overly restricted response perspective by the State’s lawyer, who must have a  
16 better idea of what relevant documents plaintiff is entitled to even without the benefit of agreed  
17 “search terms.” The Court is extremely disappointed in the fact that this motion was filed, and  
18 the parties must do a better job of meeting face-to-face and working through future problems  
19 related to discovery.

20       Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, parties may generally obtain discovery  
21 regarding any non-privileged matter that is relevant to any party’s claim or defense and  
22 proportional to the needs of the case. Information need not be admissible at trial to be  
23 discoverable. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). During discovery, parties must, without awaiting a  
24 discovery request, provide to the other parties a set of initial disclosures, including copies or  
25 descriptions of all documents, electronically stored information, and tangible things that the  
26 disclosing party has in its possession or control and that the disclosing party may use to support  
27 its claims or defenses, Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(A)(ii). Additionally, a party may request the

1 production of certain documents in the other party's control; the party served with such requests  
2 for production must comply within 30 days. Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(b)(2)(A). The party seeking  
3 discovery may move for an order compelling disclosure or discovery after good-faith attempts to  
4 obtain compliance without court action have been unsuccessful. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1).

5        Though plaintiff requests entry of default against the defendants as a discovery sanction,  
6 the Court concludes that default would be a disproportionately harsh penalty in the context of  
7 this relatively minor discovery dispute, where – contrary to plaintiff's hyperbolic assertions –  
8 there does not appear to be any evidence of willfulness or bad faith. See Fair Housing of Marin  
9 v. Combs, 285 F.3d 899, 905 (9th Cir. 2002) ("In the Ninth Circuit, [default] sanctions are  
10 appropriate only in 'extreme circumstances' and where the violation is 'due to willfulness, bad  
11 faith, or fault of the party.'" (citations omitted)).

12        Rather, the dispute here appears to result from the parties' failure to cooperate. Plaintiff's  
13 attorney was wrong to resist defendants' good-faith effort to provide relevant discovery by  
14 refusing the request for additional search terms. Such resistance ultimately creates more work  
15 for everyone, including the Court. In addition, the State knows enough about the allegations  
16 here to figure out what plaintiff needs: any emails from or to any of the WSF defendants  
17 mentioning the plaintiff, plus anything mentioning the comparator employees in the context of  
18 their refusing work assignments or showing a lack of mechanical aptitude during their  
19 probationary periods.

20  
21        For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiffs' motion to compel discovery responses (Dkt.  
22 # 22) is GRANTED in part. The parties are directed to meet and confer to establish additional  
23 search terms that will assist defendants in narrowing the universe of responsive emails to those  
24 that are truly relevant to this litigation. This conference shall take place no later than seven days  
25 from the date of this order. Once additional search terms have been designated, defendants shall  
26

1 produce the narrowed batch of responsive emails no later than Friday, June 16, 2017. To the  
2 extent privacy concerns remain, the parties are encouraged to consider a stipulated protective  
3 order limiting the use of discovery materials to this litigation.

4  
5 DATED this 5th day of June, 2017.

6  
7 

8 Robert S. Lasnik  
9 United States District Judge  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26