

The Honorable Marsha J. Pechman

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

ALYSSA WILSON and JOHN WILSON, on  
behalf of themselves and all others similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PEOPLECONNECT, INC., a Delaware  
Corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:22-CV-00016-MJP

JOINT MOTION AND ~~PROPOSED~~  
ORDER TO EXTEND DEADLINES

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:  
March 13, 2024

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26, Plaintiffs Izzo and Wilson and Defendant PeopleConnect, Inc., by and through their undersigned attorneys, respectfully request the Court to extend the deadline for the Parties to complete arbitration-related discovery to April 26, 2024, and extend the deadline for Defendant to answer or otherwise respond to May 31, 2024.

1. On September 26, 2023, the Court ordered the Parties to complete arbitration-related discovery by December 26, 2023. (Dkt. 33). The Court also set a deadline for Defendant to answer or otherwise respond by January 25, 2024. (*Id.*)

JOINT MOTION AND ORDER TO EXTEND  
DEADLINES - 1  
No. 2:22-cv-00016-MJP

GORDON | 600 University Street  
TILDEN | Suite 2915  
THOMAS | Seattle, WA 98101  
CORDELL | 206.467.6477

1           2.       On November 7, 2023, the Court granted the Parties' joint motion to extend the  
2  
3 deadline to complete arbitration-related discovery by February 26, 2024, and for Defendant to  
4  
5 answer or otherwise respond by March 27, 2024. (Dkt. 35).  
6

7           3.       On February 22, 2024, the Parties filed a Joint Motion and Proposed Order to  
8  
9 Extend Deadlines. (Dkt 38). Prior to the filing of this motion, Defendant's 30(b)(6) deposition and  
10  
11 Plaintiff Izzo's deposition were taken. Defendant, however, has been unable to take the deposition  
12  
13 of Plaintiff Wilson or Plaintiffs' counsel, as detailed below, despite both depositions having been  
14  
15 timely noticed.  
16

17           4.       On February 26, 2024, the Court denied the Parties' Joint Motion and Proposed  
18  
19 Order to Extend Deadlines without prejudice. (Dkt. 39). The Court indicated that the Parties'  
20  
21 motion lacked sufficient detail regarding Plaintiff Wilson's medical condition and its impact on  
22  
23 the scheduling of his deposition, as well as the delay in completing the depositions of Plaintiffs'  
24  
25 counsel. (*Id.*).  
26

27           5.       Plaintiff Wilson was scheduled to be deposed on Tuesday, February 6 in Columbus,  
28  
29 Ohio.  
30

31           6.       On the afternoon of Friday, February 2, 2024, Plaintiff Wilson's counsel informed  
32  
33 Defendant's counsel that, earlier in the day, Plaintiff Wilson's doctor had identified a serious  
34  
35 health issue that required further consultation and potential treatment. *See* Declaration of Samuel  
36  
37 J. Strauss, ¶5. As a result, Plaintiff Wilson had various medical appointments scheduled the  
38  
39 following week, including on February 6, to discuss his diagnosis with his medical team. *Id.*  
40  
41 Should the Court require additional details about Mr. Wilson's health issue and medical  
42  
43 appointments, Plaintiffs' counsel will provide that for *in camera* review given the sensitive nature  
44  
45 of the information. *Id.*

1           7.       Although Defendant’s counsel was prepared to extend their trip to Columbus to  
2  
3 take Mr. Wilson’s deposition on February 7, 2024, on February 6, 2024, while the parties were in  
4  
5 Columbus, Ohio, his counsel informed Defendant’s counsel that he was not able to be deposed at  
6  
7 all that week. Strauss Decl., ¶¶ 6-8.

8  
9           8.       On February 28, 2024, the Parties conferred regarding discovery in this case.  
10  
11 Defendant’s counsel asked for Mr. Wilson’s availability to sit for a deposition in the month of  
12  
13 March and also dates for counsels’ depositions. On March 4, 2024, Plaintiffs’ counsel informed  
14  
15 Defendant’s counsel that Plaintiff Wilson and his counsel were not available under the week of  
16  
17 April 3-5, 2024, at the earliest. The parties have agreed to take Plaintiff Wilson’s deposition on  
18  
19 April 3, 2024.

20  
21           9.       Regarding the production of documents by and depositions of Plaintiffs’ counsel,  
22  
23 the Parties agree that those subpoenas should be held in abeyance pending completion of Mr.  
24  
25 Wilson’s deposition. By way of background, on January 25, 2024, Defendant served subpoenas  
26  
27 for production of documents and for deposition on two of Plaintiffs’ counsel. Defendant served  
28  
29 those subpoenas based on the Ninth Circuit’s holding in *Knapke v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, that  
30  
31 PeopleConnect is entitled to discovery on the “contours of” and “limits of” Plaintiffs’ counsel’s  
32  
33 authority to act on Plaintiffs’ behalf and that attorney-client privilege may be waived if the client  
34  
35 “simultaneously den[ies] an agency relationship regarding the arbitration agreement” while  
36  
37 seeking to shield “communications that would bear directly on that issue.” 38 F.4th 824, 834 (9th  
38  
39 Cir. 2022). Defendant also served those subpoenas based on this Court’s order in *Boshears*, where  
40  
41 this Court ordered counsel in that case to produce an email chain that plaintiff claimed was  
42  
43 privileged based upon the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Knapke. Boshears v. PeopleConnect*, No.  
44  
45 C21-1222, Dkt. 79 at 3 (Dec. 18, 2023).

1           10.     Plaintiffs have objected to the subpoenas for production of documents based  
2  
3 primarily on claims of attorney-client privilege and, during subsequent meetings regarding the  
4  
5 subpoenas, have indicated that they also object to the deposition of their attorneys on the same  
6  
7 basis. They have informed Defendant they intend to move to quash the subpoenas.  
8

9           11.     Defendant believes it cannot determine whether it will need to depose Plaintiffs’  
10  
11 counsel and, to the extent it does, the specifics of the questions until after Plaintiff Wilson has been  
12  
13 deposed. Indeed, it is possible Plaintiff Wilson has sufficient knowledge of his attorneys’ activity  
14  
15 on Classmates.com and related issues that third-party discovery from his counsel may prove to be  
16  
17 unnecessary. For example, in *Boshears v. PeopleConnect, Inc.* (No. 2:21-cv-01222), Defendant  
18  
19 concluded that Plaintiff Boshears’ testimony was sufficiently comprehensive to obviate the need  
20  
21 for any additional discovery from his attorneys.  
22

23           12.     Based on that experience, the Parties agreed as part of their meet and confer efforts  
24  
25 to hold the third-party subpoenas in abeyance to allow Defendant to appropriately define the scope  
26  
27 of its third-party discovery efforts. This also would avoid having the Parties prematurely present  
28  
29 and adjudicate a motion to quash to the Court.  
30

31           13.     Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 provides the Court with the discretion to set the schedule for  
32  
33 discovery.  
34

35           14.     The Parties thus jointly request that this Court extend the deadlines in its existing  
36  
37 scheduling order such that the deadline for the Parties to complete arbitration-related discovery  
38  
39 would be extended to April 26, 2024, and the deadline for Defendant to answer or otherwise  
40  
41 respond would be extended to May 31, 2024. That would allow the deposition of Plaintiff Wilson  
42  
43 to go forward on Wednesday, April 3, 2024, negotiate the scope of the subpoenas directed at  
44  
45 Plaintiffs’ counsel, to the extent those negotiations are not successful present a submission

1 pursuant to Local Rule 37, and take any depositions of Plaintiffs' counsel during the week of April  
2  
3 22, 2024.  
4

5 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiffs and Defendant respectfully request the Court to extend the  
6  
7 deadline for the Parties to complete arbitration-related discovery to April 26, 2024, and the  
8  
9 deadline for Defendant to answer or otherwise respond to May 31, 2024.  
10

11 DATED this 13th day of March, 2024.  
12

13  
14 PEOPLECONNECT, INC.

15 ALYSSA IZZO AND JOHN WILSON

16 /s/ Michael Rosenberger

17 /s/ Samuel J. Strauss

18 Michael Rosenberger, WSBA #17730  
19 Gordon Tilden Thomas & Cordell LLP  
20 600 University Street, 2915  
21 Seattle, Washington 98101  
22 Telephone: 206-467-6477  
23 mrosenberger@gordontilden.com

18 Samuel J. Strauss  
19 Raina C. Borrelli (*pro hac vice*)  
20 **TURKE & STRAUSS LLP**  
21 613 Williamson St, Ste 201  
22 Madison, WI 53703  
23 Telephone: 608-237-1775  
24 Facsimile: 608-509-4423  
25 raina@turkestrauss.com  
26 sam@turkestrauss.com

27 Benjamin T. Halbig (*pro hac vice*)  
28 Jenner & Block LLP  
29 455 Market Street, Suite 2100  
30 San Francisco, California 94105  
31 Telephone: 628-267-6800  
32 bhalbig@jenner.com

33 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

34 Debbie L. Berman (*pro hac vice*)  
35 Wade A. Thomson (*pro hac vice*)  
36 Clifford W. Berlow (*pro hac vice*)  
37 Hope H. Tone-O'Keefe (*pro hac vice*)  
38 Jenner & Block LLP  
39 353 North Clark Street  
40 Chicago, IL 60654  
41 Telephone: 312-222-9350  
42 dberman@jenner.com  
43 wthomson@jenner.com  
44 cberlow@jenner.com  
45 htoneokeefe@jenner.com

Attorneys for Defendant PeopleConnect, Inc.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 14, 2024



Marsha J. Pechman  
United States Senior District Judge