UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ROBERT BOULE,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERIK EGBERT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C17-0106RSM

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO COMPEL AND FOR EXTENSION OF DISCOVERY DEADLINE

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Defendant's Motions to Compel Discovery (Dkt. #40) and to Allow Certain Discovery After March 26th (Dkt. #55). Having reviewed the motions, the responses thereto and replies in support thereof, along with the remainder of the record, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS:

1. Defendant's Motion to Compel (Dkt. #40) is GRANTED. For the reasons set forth by Defendant in his motion, the Court agrees that Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures are deficient with respect to his calculation of damages. Accordingly, **no later than ten (10) days from the date of this Order**, Plaintiff shall supplement his initial disclosures with an explanation of how he calculated his lost-profit claim and an identification of the documents he used to make such calculations. Likewise, **no later than ten (10) days from the date of this Order,** Plaintiff shall fully respond to Defendant's Interrogatory No. 10 and Request for Production No. 6 regarding Fikret Kaya. The Court agrees with Defendant that Plaintiff presents no applicable authority

precluding the release of such information in the context of civil litigation discovery. Finally, it now appears that Plaintiff will respond to Defendant's Interrogatory Nos. 19 and 20. Therefore, **no later than ten (10) days from the date of this Order**, Plaintiff shall serve his supplemental responses to those requests.

2. Defendant's Motion to Allow Certain Discovery After March 26, 2018 (Dkt. #55) is GRANTED. For the reasons set forth in Defendant's motion, the Court finds good cause for an extension of the discovery deadline for certain areas of discovery. Accordingly, Defendant may resume the deposition of Plaintiff, depose Agents Andersen and Olson, and subpoena certain records from the United States **no later than April 23, 2018**. Although Plaintiff does not object to an extension of the discovery deadline, he does object to the scope and proposed extension. Dkt. #56. However, Plaintiff has failed to propound his own motion, and fails to show good cause for an extension of all discovery. Therefore, **for all discovery other than that identified by this Court above, the discovery deadline of March 26, 2018, applies.** Nothing in this Order precludes Plaintiff from moving for an extension of the discovery deadline should he believe such an extension is necessary. However, Plaintiff must support such a motion under the applicable Rule 16 standard.

DATED this 27 day of March, 2018.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE