

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

PRASANNA
SANKARANARAYANAN,

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-1745-RAJ

Petitioner,

ORDER

v.

DHIVYA SASHIDHAR

Respondent.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Court held a telephone conference on January 3, 2025 at 2:00 pm (PST) to discuss an outstanding discovery issue. For the reasons stated below, the Court amends its Order Granting Respondent’s Motion to Compel (“Order Compelling Discovery”). Dkt. # 40.

1 **II. DISCUSSION**

2 On December 31, 2024, the Court issued the Order Compelling Discovery. Dkt. #
3 40. On January 1, 2025, Petitioner filed a response to Respondent’s initial motion, which
4 asked the Court to modify the Order Compelling Discovery. Dkt. # 43. On January 2,
5 2025, the Court declined to modify the Order Compelling Discovery for RFP Nos. 10, 22,
6 and 23. Dkt. # 45.

7 The Court reserved its decision on RFP No. 7 and set a telephone conference to hear
8 from the parties about “whether the Court should narrow the scope of discovery of the
9 financial records and documents. . . [and] . . . what constitutes a reasonable limit on the
10 scope of discovery.” *See id.* at 2. Respondent’s RFP No. 7 requested: “All of your
11 Singapore, United States, and India banking, investment, and/or trust records from the past
12 two years.” In Respondent’s Motion to Compel Discovery, Respondent asserted that the
13 location, the movement, and manner of movement of Petitioner’s assets was relevant to the
14 totality of the circumstances of the habitual residence of the child. *See* Dkt. # 35 at 3.

15 At the telephone conference, the Court heard from both the parties regarding the
16 RFP No. 7. Counsel for Respondent indicated discovery for RFP No. 7 could be limited
17 to the location of an asset and a single document supporting the identity and location of
18 that asset. Therefore, the Court will limit the scope of discovery for RFP No. 7 to a single
19 document that identifies Petitioner’s banking, investment, and/or trust records located in
20 Singapore, the United States, and India from the past two years.

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

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the Court amends the Order Compelling Discovery.
Dkt. # 40. **The Court directs Petitioner to comply with this Order and provide
Respondent with the above-mentioned documents by January 4, 2025 at 4:00 pm
(PST).**

Dated this 3rd day of January, 2025.



The Honorable Richard A. Jones
United States District Judge