

1 Susan L. Oliver, Esq. (Bar No. 160902)  
Emily M. Straub, Esq. (Bar No. 259141)  
2 TYSON & MENDES  
5661 La Jolla Boulevard  
3 La Jolla, CA 92037  
Telephone: (858) 459-4400

4 Attorneys for Defendant DAVID ARAMBULA

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**  
Superior Court of California,  
County of San Diego  
**03/08/2019** at 04:54:00 PM  
Clerk of the Superior Court  
By Vanessa Bahena, Deputy Clerk

5  
6  
7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
8 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO – HALL OF JUSTICE

9  
10 CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13  
14 DAVID ARAMBULA; CITY OF LEMON  
GROVE; and DOES 1 through 1,000,

15  
16 Defendants.

Case No. 37-2018-00023369-CU-PO-CTL  
[Complaint Filed: May 11, 2018]

Judge: Hon. Richard S. Whitney  
Dept: C-68

**SEPARATE STATEMENT IN  
SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT DAVID  
ARAMBULA'S MOTION TO  
COMPEL PLAINTIFF  
CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS TO  
ANSWER DEPOSITION QUESTIONS  
AND PRODUCE DOCUMENTS, AND  
TO REQUEST RELIEF FROM THE  
SEVEN-HOUR DEPOSITION RULE**

*(Notice of Motion and Motion,  
Memorandum of Points and Authorities,  
Notice of Lodgment, Declaration of Emily  
M. Straub, and [Proposed] Order filed  
concurrently herewith)*

**Hearing**

Date: June 14, 2019  
Time: 10:30 a.m.  
Dept: C-68

Trial Date: December 13, 2019

1 Pursuant to rule 3.1345 of the California Rules of Court, Defendant David Arambula hereby  
2 submits the following separate statement in support of his motion to compel Plaintiff Christopher  
3 Williams to answer deposition questions and produce documents. The first section of the separate  
4 statement addresses the deposition questions in dispute. The second section of the separate statement  
5 addresses the document requests accompanying Plaintiff's deposition notice which are in dispute.

6 **I.**

7 **DEPOSITION QUESTIONS IN DISPUTE**

8 **1. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

9 BY MS. STRAUB:

10 Q . . . . So as you sit here today do you know if you produced any documents that would  
11 be responsive to this particular request [ Request for Production No. 6 accompanying Plaintiff's  
12 deposition notice] previously in this lawsuit?

13 (January 8, 2019 deposition of Christopher Williams ("Williams Depo") at 25:23-26:1, attached as  
14 Exhibit 13 to Notice of Lodgment.)

15 **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

16 MR. BRIGGS:

17 I'm going to object that, number one, anything dealing with applications concerning his  
18 business are outside the scope of this lawsuit. And they're equally available if they have been filed  
19 with the City of Lemon Grove. You're free to request them in the Public Records Act. But you're  
20 outside the scope of discovery here. They may also be subject to his right of privacy and business  
21 matters unrelated to this lawsuit. You can -- actually, I'm going to instruct him not to answer on six,  
22 seven, eight, nine, ten and eleven because they all deal with applications and that's outside the scope  
23 of this lawsuit.

24 (Williams Depo at 26:2-15.)

25 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

26 An attorney is not permitted to instruct a witness not to answer a deposition question on any  
27 ground other than privilege. (*Stewart v. Colonial Western Agency, Inc.* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 1006,  
28 1014-1015.) Whether Plaintiff has responsive documents in his possession and/or has knowledge of  
whether he has produced responsive documents in the past is by no means privileged. (*Hernandez  
v. Sup. Ct.* (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 285, 293.)

1           Additionally, the subject matter of the document request at issues is otherwise a discoverable  
2 subject matter. The document request that is the subject matter of the deposition question at issue  
3 here concerns documents comprising the medical marijuana dispensary applications Plaintiff  
4 intended to discuss with Mr. Arambula, including any documents submitted to the City of Lemon  
5 Grove to supplement those applications. (Plaintiff's Deposition Notice at 3:15-17, attached as  
6 Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.) In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special  
7 damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout  
8 Plaintiff's discovery responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana  
9 dispensary applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation  
10 between himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover  
11 lost revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had  
12 his applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's  
13 Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's  
14 Supplemental Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2; Plaintiff's Responses  
15 to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10; Plaintiff's January 8, 2019 deposition  
16 transcript ("Plaintiff's Depo") at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25,  
17 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25.) Documents and information bearing  
18 on Plaintiff's medical marijuana dispensary applications, appeals, and business plans therefore  
19 unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible discovery. They are relevant not only to  
20 Plaintiff's damage claims, but also to Plaintiff's claims that the rejection of his applications and  
21 appeals lacked merit. The scope of permissible discovery is:

22  
23           [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
24 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
25 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
26 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
27 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
28 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any

///  
28

1 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
2 property.

3 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

4 **2. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

5 BY MS. STRAUB:

6 Q Moving on to nine and I'm just reading it. Any and all documents comprising your  
7 applications for the operation of medical marijuana dispensaries in the City of Lemon Grove other  
8 the, in caps, APPLICATION, meaning the applications that you sought to discuss with Mr.  
9 Arambula. Do you have any documents in your possession that would be responsive to this request?

10 A So do I have other documents that are not necessarily the specific application?

11 Q For example, if there were other applications, and I don't know if you have them, I'm  
12 just asking for documents if you have them for medical marijuana dispensaries that were not  
13 applications that are, you know, ones that you wanted to talk to Mr. Arambula about?

14 A I guess I'm just a little confused on the question. Do I have other applications in other  
15 cities or --

16 Q Just in City of Lemon Grove. I'm just wondering if you have any other documents  
17 that comprise applications for other properties in the City of Lemon Grove?

18 MR. BRIGGS: I'm going to object to that question. Let me make sure I understand, you're  
19 asking about applications other than in the City of Lemon Grove?

20 MS. STRAUB: No. It says any and all documents comprising your applications for the  
21 operation of medical marijuana dispensaries in the City of Lemon Grove other than the, in caps,  
22 defined APPLICATIONS.

23 (Williams Depo at 31:17-32:25.)

24 **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

25 MR. BRIGGS: Object that it's vague and ambiguous. I'm also going to object that it violates  
26 his privacy rights and instruct the witness not to answer. If I understand it you're asking about  
27 applications in the City of Lemon Grove other than the ones he was actually going to talk to Mr.  
28 Arambula about.

MS. STRAUB: Just for medical marijuana dispensaries.

MR. BRIGGS: Understood. But other than what he had on his mind when he was going to  
talk to your client about?

MS. STRAUB: Yes.

MR. BRIGGS: I will stand on the objection and instruct him not to answer.

(Williams Depo at 33:1-15.)



1 Plaintiff's claims that the rejection of his applications and appeals lacked merit. The scope of  
2 permissible discovery is:

3  
4 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
5 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
6 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
7 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
8 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
9 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
property.

10 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

11 **3. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

12 Q Okay. Moving on to Number 11 on page 4. Any and all documents depicting  
13 communications between you and Taisha Brown concerning your applications. Do you have any  
14 documents responsive to this particular request in your possession, sir?

15 (Williams Depo at 37:10-12.)

16 **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

17 MR. BRIGGS: I'm going to object on that it's outside is the scope of discovery. It's also  
18 protected by his business rights and privacy, and instruct the witness not to answer.

19 MS. STRAUB: Are you serious, dude? I'm looking at text messages between him and Taisha  
20 Brown you've already produced and you're going to instruct your witness not to answer?

21 MR. BRIGGS: If you have something you can ask him about it, but this is asking about  
22 applications. He's not going to get into his applications. The applications are outside the  
23 scope of discovery.

24 MS. STRAUB: Just so I'm sure I understand your objection, you're instructing your client  
25 not to answer whether he has documents responsive to document request Number 11; is that right?

26 MR. BRIGGS: Yes.

27 (Williams Depo at 37:13-38:9.)

28 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

An attorney is not permitted to instruct a witness not to answer a deposition question on any  
ground other than privilege. (*Stewart v. Colonial Western Agency, Inc.* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 1006,

1 1014-1015.) Whether Plaintiff has responsive documents in his possession is by no means  
2 privileged. (*Hernandez v. Sup. Ct.* (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 285, 293.)

3 Additionally, the subject matter of the document request at issues is otherwise a discoverable  
4 subject matter. The document request that is the subject matter of the deposition question at issue  
5 here concerns documents comprising communications between Taisha Brown and Plaintiff  
6 concerning the medical marijuana dispensary applications Plaintiff intended to discuss with Mr.  
7 Arambula. (Plaintiff's Deposition Notice at 4:1-2, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)  
8 Taisha Brown (a) initiated contact with Plaintiff for the purposes of offering to help Plaintiff with  
9 his medical marijuana dispensary applications, (b) discussed having a meeting with herself, Plaintiff  
10 and Mr. Arambula to discuss these applications, and (c) acted as a liaison in arranging for a meeting  
11 to take place. (Plaintiff Depo at: 98:12-25, 99:1-5 and 13-18, 100:21-25, 124:3-25, 125:1-7, 126:11-  
12 25, 127:1-18, attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) The subject physical altercation  
13 occurred on or about just before midnight at the same location of this meeting.

14 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
15 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
16 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
17 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
18 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
19 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
20 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
21 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
22 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
23 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
24 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
25 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
26 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's medical marijuana  
27 dispensary applications, appeals, and plans for the meeting with Mr. Arambula therefore  
28 unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible discovery. They are relevant not only to

1 Plaintiff's damage claims, but also to Plaintiff's claims that the rejection of his applications and  
2 appeals lacked merit. The scope of permissible discovery is:

3  
4 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
5 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
6 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
7 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
8 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
9 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
property.

10 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

11 **4. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

12 Q Perfect. Moving on. Sixteen. Any and all documents depicting communications  
13 between you and anyone other than your attorney regarding the applications. Do you have any  
14 documents responsive to this request in your possession, sir?

15 (Williams Depo at 43:10-15.)

16 **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

17 MR. BRIGGS: We're going to object it's outside the scope of permissible discovery and that  
18 it intrudes on his rights to privacy. And I will instruct him not to answer.

19 (Williams Depo at 43:16-19.)

20 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

21 An attorney is not permitted to instruct a witness not to answer a deposition question on any  
22 ground other than privilege. (*Stewart v. Colonial Western Agency, Inc.* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 1006,  
23 1014-1015.) Whether Plaintiff has responsive documents in his possession is by no means  
24 privileged. (*Hernandez v. Sup. Ct.* (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 285, 293.)

25 Additionally, the subject matter of the document request at issues is otherwise a discoverable  
26 subject matter. The document request that is the subject matter of the deposition question at issue  
27 here concerns documents comprising communications between Plaintiff and anyone else (excluding  
28 his attorney) regarding the medical marijuana dispensary applications he intended to discuss with



1 Mr. Arambula. (Plaintiff's Deposition Notice at 4:11-12, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of  
2 Lodgment.) In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's  
3 Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery  
4 responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary  
5 applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between  
6 himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost  
7 revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his  
8 applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's  
9 Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's  
10 Supplemental Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6  
11 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9,  
12 10, attached as Exhibit 5 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-  
13 25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25,  
14 attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's  
15 medical marijuana dispensary applications, appeals, and business plans therefore unquestionably fall  
16 within the ambit of permissible discovery. They are relevant not only to Plaintiff's damage claims,  
17 but also to Plaintiff's claims that the rejection of his applications and appeals lacked merit. The  
18 scope of permissible discovery is:

19 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
20 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
21 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
22 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
23 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
24 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
25 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
26 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
27 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
28 property.

(Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

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

**5. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

Q Okay. Let's move on to 18. There's a typo there. It says Andy. It's not Andy. It's any and all documents depicting communications between any persons, excluding you personally concerning the applications. And that would exclude communications between you and your attorney of course that are in your possession. Do you have any documents that would be responsive to this request in your possession, sir?

(Williams Depo at 45:2-10.)

**OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

MR. BRIGGS: I'm going to object that it's outside the scope of permissible discovery and it violates his financial right of privacy and instruct him not to answer.

(Williams Depo at 45:11-14.)

**JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

An attorney is not permitted to instruct a witness not to answer a deposition question on any ground other than privilege. (*Stewart v. Colonial Western Agency, Inc.* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 1006, 1014-1015.) Whether Plaintiff has responsive documents in his possession is by no means privileged. (*Hernandez v. Sup. Ct.* (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 285, 293.)

Additionally, the subject matter of the document request at issues is otherwise a discoverable subject matter. The document request that is the subject matter of the deposition question at issue here concerns documents comprising communications between persons other than Plaintiff regarding the medical marijuana dispensary applications he intended to discuss with Mr. Arambula. (Plaintiff's Deposition Notice at 4:11-12, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.) In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to Mr.

1 Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's  
2 Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5 to Notice  
3 of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25,  
4 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of  
5 Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's medical marijuana dispensary  
6 applications, appeals, and business plans therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of  
7 permissible discovery. They are relevant not only to Plaintiff's damage claims, but also to Plaintiff's  
8 claims that the rejection of his applications and appeals lacked merit. The scope of permissible  
9 discovery is:

10 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
11 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
12 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
13 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
14 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
15 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
16 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
17 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
18 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
19 property.

20 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

21 **6. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

22 Q So let's start with the oldest child. What is his or her name?

23 (Williams Depo at 59:13-14.)

24 **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

25 MR. BRIGGS: I'm going to object. You're not going to ask questions about minors.

26 MS. STRAUB: Are you instructing your witness not to answer?

27 MR. BRIGGS: Yeah. I'm instructing him not to answer. It's outside the scope of discovery  
28 and right of privacy.

(Williams Depo at 59:15-21.)

**JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

An attorney is not permitted to instruct a witness not to answer a deposition question on any  
ground other than privilege. (*Stewart v. Colonial Western Agency, Inc.* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 1006,

1 1014-1015.) The names of Plaintiff's two daughters are not privileged. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010;  
2 *Puerto v. Sup. Ct.* (2008) 158 Cal.App.4th 1242, 1249-1250.) Plaintiffs' children would clearly have  
3 knowledge of discoverable information bearing on Plaintiff's general damage claims. Plaintiff  
4 testified to various ways in which the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
5 Plaintiff's ability to participate in activities with his children, and otherwise affected his relationship  
6 with his children. (Plaintiff Depo at 61:13-14, 316:16-25, 317:1-5, 341:4-22, 342:1-15, 343:2-10  
7 and 20-25, 344:1-12, 345:2-19, attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) Plaintiff's children  
8 live with Plaintiff and otherwise bear witness to the daily impact the alleged injuries and recovery  
9 process had on Plaintiff. There is no privilege or other legal authority preventing the disclosure of  
10 Plaintiff's daughters' names. The scope of permissible discovery is:

11  
12 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
13 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
14 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
15 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
16 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
17 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
18 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
19 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
20 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
21 property.

22 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

23 **7. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

24 Q We can get into the detail about the applications at issue in this lawsuit. But I guess  
25 I'd just like a general understanding and background of what's your interest in opening up a medical  
26 marijuana dispensary in the City of Lemon Grove?

27 (Williams Depo at 76:12-17.)

28 **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

MR. BRIGGS: I'm going to object. It's outside the scope of discovery and invades on his  
business financial right of privacy and instruct him not to answer.

(Williams Depo at 76:18-21.)

1 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

2 An attorney is not permitted to instruct a witness not to answer a deposition question on any  
3 ground other than privilege. (*Stewart v. Colonial Western Agency, Inc.* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 1006,  
4 1014-1015.) Plaintiff's interest in opening up a medical marijuana dispensary in the City of Lemon  
5 Grove is by no means privileged. Plaintiff puts the subject matter of his prospective medical  
6 marijuana businesses, as well as associated applications and appeals, directly at issue in this lawsuit.

7 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
8 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
9 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
10 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
11 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
12 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
13 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
14 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
15 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
16 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
17 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
18 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
19 Notice of Lodgment.) The scope of permissible discovery is:

20 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
21 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
22 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
23 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
24 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
25 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
26 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
27 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
28 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
property.

(Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

1                   **8. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

2           Q       Why get into that business now?

3 (Williams Depo at 80:2.)

4                   **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

5           MR. BRIGGS: Objection. It's outside the scope of discovery and invades his right of privacy.  
6 He's not going to answer that question.

7 (Williams Depo at 80:3-5.)

8                   **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

9           An attorney is not permitted to instruct a witness not to answer a deposition question on any  
10 ground other than privilege. (*Stewart v. Colonial Western Agency, Inc.* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 1006,  
11 1014-1015.) Plaintiff's interest in getting into the medical marijuana dispensary business, and the  
12 timing of getting into such business, are by no means privileged. Plaintiff puts the subject matter of  
13 his prospective medical marijuana businesses, as well as associated applications and appeals,  
14 directly at issue in this lawsuit. In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages.  
15 (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's  
16 discovery responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary  
17 applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between  
18 himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost  
19 revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his  
20 applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's  
21 Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's  
22 Supplemental Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6  
23 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9,  
24 10, attached as Exhibit 5 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-  
25 25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25,  
26 attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) The scope of permissible discovery is:

27                   [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
28                   the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,

1 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
2 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
3 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
4 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
5 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
6 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
7 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
8 property.

9 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

10 **9. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

11 Q Okay. What's your interest in the cannabis business?

12 (Williams Depo at 80:21-22.)

13 **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

14 MR. BRIGGS: Objection. Outside the scope of discovery and violates his right of privacy.  
15 I'm instructing him not to answer.

16 (Williams Depo at 80:23-25.)

17 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

18 An attorney is not permitted to instruct a witness not to answer a deposition question on any  
19 ground other than privilege. (*Stewart v. Colonial Western Agency, Inc.* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 1006,  
20 1014-1015.) Plaintiff's interest in the cannabis business is by no means privileged. Plaintiff puts the  
21 subject matter of his prospective medical marijuana businesses, as well as associated applications  
22 and appeals, directly at issue in this lawsuit. In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special  
23 damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout  
24 Plaintiff's discovery responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana  
25 dispensary applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation  
26 between himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover  
27 lost revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had  
28 his applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's  
Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's

1 Supplemental Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6  
2 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9,  
3 10, attached as Exhibit 5 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-  
4 25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25,  
5 attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) The scope of permissible discovery is:

6 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
7 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
8 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
9 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
10 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
11 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
12 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
13 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
14 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
15 property.

16 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

17 **10. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

18 Q Did you have a business model put together for 8260 Broadway?

19 (Williams Depo at 81:4-5.)

20 **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

21 MR. BRIGGS: I'm going to object. It's outside the scope of discovery and violates his right  
22 of privacy and instruct him not to answer.

23 (Williams Depo at 81:6-8.)

24 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

25 Plaintiff places the business plans and finances of his prospective medical marijuana  
26 dispensaries at issue, thereby waiving any privilege in this regard. (*See, e.g., Weingarten v. Sup. Ct.*  
27 (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 268, 274.) Such information is directly relevant to Plaintiff's damage claims  
28 and therefore discoverable.

In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals



1 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
2 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
3 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
4 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
5 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
6 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
7 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
8 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
9 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
10 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's medical marijuana  
11 dispensary business plans and finances therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible  
12 discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

13 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
14 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
15 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
16 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
17 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
18 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
19 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
20 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
21 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
22 property.

23 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

24 **11. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

25 BY MS. STRAUB:

26 Q Did you have a budget put together for 8260 Broadway when you filed your  
27 application for a medical marijuana dispensary permit?

28 (Williams Depo at 81:9-12.)

**OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

MR. BRIGGS: I'm going to object that it's outside the scope of permissible discovery and  
violate his right of privacy and instruct him not to answer.

(Williams Depo at 81:13-16.)

1 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

2 Plaintiff places the business plans and finances of his prospective medical marijuana  
3 dispensaries at issue, thereby waiving any privilege in this regard. (*See, e.g., Weingarten v. Sup. Ct.*  
4 (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 268, 274.) Such information is directly relevant to Plaintiff's damage claims  
5 and therefore discoverable.

6 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
7 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
8 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
9 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
10 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
11 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
12 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
13 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
14 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
15 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
16 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
17 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 15 to  
18 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's medical marijuana  
19 dispensary business plans and finances therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible  
20 discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

21 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
22 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
23 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
24 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
25 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
26 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
27 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
28 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
property.

(Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

1                   **12. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

2                   BY MS. STRAUB:

3                   Q       Have you ever had a budget for your intended medical marijuana dispensary at 8260  
4 Broadway?

5                   (Williams Depo at 81:17-20.)

6                   **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

7                   MR. BRIGGS: I'm going to object that it's outside the scope of permissible discovery and  
8 violates his right of privacy and instruct him not to answer.

9                   (Williams Depo at 81:21-24.)

10                  **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

11                 Plaintiff places the business plans and finances of his prospective medical marijuana  
12 dispensaries at issue, thereby waiving any privilege in this regard. (*See, e.g., Weingarten v. Sup. Ct.*  
13 *(2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 268, 274.*) Such information is directly relevant to Plaintiff's damage claims  
14 and therefore discoverable.

15                 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
16 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
17 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
18 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
19 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
20 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
21 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
22 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
23 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
24 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
25 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
26 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
27 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's medical marijuana  
28 dispensary business plans and finances therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible  
discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

1 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
2 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
3 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
4 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
5 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
6 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
7 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
8 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
9 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
10 property.

11 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

12 **13. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

13 Q Okay. Let's move on to 6915 through 35 North Avenue. Have you ever had a business  
14 model plan for a medical marijuana dispensary at this location, sir?

15 (Williams Depo at 82:1-4.)

16 **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

17 MR. BRIGGS: I'm going to object that it's outside the scope of permissible discovery and  
18 violates his right of privacy and instruct the witness not to answer.

19 (Williams Depo at 82:5-8.)

20 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

21 Plaintiff places the business plans and finances of his prospective medical marijuana  
22 dispensaries at issue, thereby waiving any privilege in this regard. (*See, e.g., Weingarten v. Sup. Ct.*  
23 (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 268, 274.) Such information is directly relevant to Plaintiff's damage claims  
24 and therefore discoverable.

25 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
26 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
27 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
28 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.

1 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
2 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
3 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
5 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
6 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's medical marijuana  
7 dispensary business plans and finances therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible  
8 discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

9 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
10 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
11 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
12 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
13 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
14 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
15 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
16 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
17 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
18 property.

15 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

17 **14. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

18 BY MS. STRAUB:

19 Q Have you ever had a budget estimate -- or excuse me. Have you ever had a budget  
20 for the operation of a medical marijuana dispensary at 6915 North Avenue?

21 (Williams Depo at 82:9-13.)

22 **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

23 MR. BRIGGS: Objection. Outside the scope of permissible discovery and violates his right  
24 of privacy and instruct him not to answer.

25 (Williams Depo at 82:14-16.)

26 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

27 Plaintiff places the business plans and finances of his prospective medical marijuana  
28 dispensaries at issue, thereby waiving any privilege in this regard. (*See, e.g., Weingarten v. Sup. Ct.*

1 (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 268, 274.) Such information is directly relevant to Plaintiff's damage claims  
2 and therefore discoverable.

3 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
4 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
5 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
6 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
7 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
8 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
9 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
10 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
11 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
12 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
13 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
14 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
15 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's medical marijuana  
16 dispensary business plans and finances therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible  
17 discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

18 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
19 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
20 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
21 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
22 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
23 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
24 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
25 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
26 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
27 property.

28 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

1                   **15. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

2                   Q       Okay. Moving on to 2295 Lemon Grove Way. Sir, you have -- have you ever had a  
3 business plan model for a medical marijuana dispensary at this location?

4 (Williams Depo at 82:23-83:1.)

5                   **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

6                   MR. BRIGGS: Objection. Outside the scope of permissible discovery and violates his right  
7 of privacy, and instruct the witness not to answer.

8 (Williams Depo at 83:2-5.)

9                   **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

10                  Plaintiff places the business plans and finances of his prospective medical marijuana  
11 dispensaries at issue, thereby waiving any privilege in this regard. (*See, e.g., Weingarten v. Sup. Ct.*  
12 (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 268, 274.) Such information is directly relevant to Plaintiff's damage claims  
13 and therefore discoverable.

14                  In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
15 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
16 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
17 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
18 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
19 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
20 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
21 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
22 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
23 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
24 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
25 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
26 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's medical marijuana  
27 dispensary business plans and finances therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible  
28 discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

1 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
2 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
3 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
4 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
5 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
6 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
7 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
8 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
9 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
10 property.

11 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

12 **16. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

13 BY MS. STRAUB:

14 Q Have you ever had a business budget for your intended medical marijuana dispensary  
15 at 2295 Lemon Grove Way?

16 (Williams Depo at 83:6-9.)

17 **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

18 MR. BRIGGS: Objection. Outside the scope of permissible discovery, violates his right of  
19 privacy, and instruct the witness not to answer.

20 (Williams Depo at 83:10-13.)

21 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

22 Plaintiff places the business plans and finances of his prospective medical marijuana  
23 dispensaries at issue, thereby waiving any privilege in this regard. (*See, e.g., Weingarten v. Sup. Ct.*  
24 (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 268, 274.) Such information is directly relevant to Plaintiff's damage claims  
25 and therefore discoverable.

26 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
27 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
28 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not



1 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
2 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
3 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
4 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
5 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
6 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25.) Documents and  
7 information bearing on Plaintiff's medical marijuana dispensary business plans and finances  
8 therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible discovery. The scope of permissible  
9 discovery is:

10 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
11 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
12 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
13 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
14 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
15 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
16 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
17 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
18 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
19 property.

20 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

21 **17. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

22 BY MS. STRAUB:

23 Q Moving on to 8280 Broadway. With regard to your medical -- intended medical  
24 marijuana dispensary at that location, sir, have you ever had a business plan model?

25 (Williams Depo at 83:14-18.)

26 **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

27 MR. BRIGGS: Objection. Outside the scope of permissible discovery, and violates his right  
28 of privacy. And I instruct him not to answer.

(Williams Depo at 83:19-22.)

1                    **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

2                    Plaintiff places the business plans and finances of his prospective medical marijuana  
3 dispensaries at issue, thereby waiving any privilege in this regard. (*See, e.g., Weingarten v. Sup. Ct.*  
4 (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 268, 274.) Such information is directly relevant to Plaintiff’s damage claims  
5 and therefore discoverable.

6                    In Plaintiff’s Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff’s Complaint at  
7 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff’s discovery responses and  
8 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
9 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
10 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
11 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
12 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff’s Responses to Mr. Arambula’s Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
13 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff’s Supplemental Responses to  
14 Mr. Arambula’s Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
15 Plaintiff’s Responses to Mr. Arambula’s Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
16 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff’s Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
17 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
18 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff’s medical marijuana  
19 dispensary business plans and finances therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible  
20 discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

21                    [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
22 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
23 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
24 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
25 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
26 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
27 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
28 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
property.

(Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

1                   **18. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

2                   BY MS. STRAUB:

3                   Q       Sir, have you ever had a business budget for your intended medical marijuana  
4                   dispensary at 8280 Broadway?

5                   (Williams Depo at 83:23-84:1.)

6                   **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

7                   MR. BRIGGS: Objection. Outside the scope of permissible discovery. It violates his right of  
8                   privacy. I instruct the witness not to answer.

9                   (Williams Depo at 84:2-5.)

10                  **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

11                 Plaintiff places the business plans and finances of his prospective medical marijuana  
12                 dispensaries at issue, thereby waiving any privilege in this regard. (*See, e.g., Weingarten v. Sup. Ct.*  
13                 (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 268, 274.) Such information is directly relevant to Plaintiff's damage claims  
14                 and therefore discoverable.

15                 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
16                 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
17                 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
18                 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
19                 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
20                 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
21                 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
22                 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
23                 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
24                 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
25                 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
26                 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
27                 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's medical marijuana

28                 ///

1 dispensary business plans and finances therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible  
2 discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

3 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
4 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
5 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
6 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
7 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
8 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
9 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
10 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
11 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
12 property.

13 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

14 **19. DEPOSITION LINE OF QUESTIONING:**

15 BY MS. STRAUB:

16 Q Okay. So other than those e-mails, is there anything else that you did before re-  
17 submitting paperwork to the City with regard to your permit application for 6195-35 North Avenue?

18 A I hired the necessary specialized knowledge to come up with the plans and the  
19 requirements of what Lemon Grove asked me to do.

20 Q Okay. Who did you hire?

21 (Williams Depo at 90:21-91:4.)

22 **OBJECTIONS AND INSTRUCTION NOT TO ANSWER:**

23 MR. BRIGGS: I'm going to object. It's outside the scope of discovery and violates his right  
24 of privacy. If you want to ask him -- and instruct him not answer. If you want to ask whether it's  
25 been disclosed in any public documents, that would be fine.

26 (Williams Depo at 91:5-10.)

27 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING A RESPONSE:**

28 An attorney is not permitted to instruct a witness not to answer a deposition question on any  
ground other than privilege. (*Stewart v. Colonial Western Agency, Inc.* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 1006,  
1014-1015.) The names of individuals Plaintiff retained to help him satisfy the medical marijuana  
dispensary application requirements are by no means privileged. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010;  
*Puerto v. Sup. Ct.* (2008) 158 Cal.App.4th 1242, 1249-1250.) Individuals who provided services to

1 fulfill Plaintiff's medical marijuana dispensary application requirements would unquestionably have  
2 discoverable information concerning the content and adequacy of those applications. Such  
3 information would be relevant to Plaintiff's claim his applications were denied without merit and  
4 solely as a result of the subject physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula. The scope  
5 of permissible discovery is:

6 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
7 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
8 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
9 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
10 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
11 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
12 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
13 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
14 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
15 property.

16 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

## 17 II.

### 18 DOCUMENT REQUESTS IN DISPUTE

#### 19 1. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:

20 Any and all photographs depicting the physical injuries YOU attribute to the INCIDENT.

21 (Plaintiff Depo Notice at 3:5-6, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

22 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

23 As used herein, the term INCIDENT shall mean the July 2017 physical altercation between  
24 YOU and Mr. Arambula at issue in this lawsuit.

#### 25 OBJECTIONS:

#### 26 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

27 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
28 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

1 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

2 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

3 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
4 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.) The  
5 requested documents are relevant to Plaintiff's damage claims because Plaintiff contends he  
6 sustained injuries from the subject physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula. The  
7 scope of permissible discovery is:

8 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
9 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
10 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
11 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
12 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
13 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
14 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
15 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
16 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
17 property.

18 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

19 Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff's objections apply to this particular document request is not  
20 specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for Plaintiff  
21 to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation, is  
22 nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
23 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these  
24 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. Of that  
25 document production, four photographs are responsive to the document request currently at issue. If  
26 Plaintiff has no additional responsive documents in his possession, custody, or control, Plaintiff  
27 should have indicated as much with his objections to the requests for production accompanying his  
28 deposition notice. Plaintiff did not do so. Plaintiff has an outstanding obligation to produce all  
documents in his possession, custody, and/or control that are responsive to the subject request for  
production.

1           **2. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

2           Any and all DOCUMENTS that evidence and/or depict the amount(s) of past lost earnings  
3 YOU seek to recover in this lawsuit.

4 (Plaintiff Depo Notice at 3:7-8, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

5           As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

6           As used herein, the term As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as  
7 defined by *California Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating,  
8 photographing, photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means  
9 of recording upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including  
10 letters, words, pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created,  
11 regardless of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also  
12 include electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be  
13 located on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds,  
14 cellular telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

15           **OBJECTIONS:**

16           **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

17           **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
18 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
19 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
20 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
21 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

22 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

23           **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

24           Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in  
25 his possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
26 Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff's objections apply to this particular document request is not  
27 specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for  
28 Plaintiff to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation,

1 is nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
2 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these  
3 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. More  
4 importantly, Plaintiff did not previously produce any documents responsive to the subject  
5 document request.

6 Plaintiff places the past lost earnings he claims he would have made via has prospective  
7 medical marijuana dispensary businesses at issue, thereby waiving any financial and/or business  
8 privacy or privilege in this regard. (*See, e.g., Weingarten v. Sup. Ct.* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 268,  
9 274.) Such information is directly relevant to Plaintiff's damage claims and therefore discoverable.  
10 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19,  
11 attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
12 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
13 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
14 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
15 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
16 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
17 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
18 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
19 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
20 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's January 8, 2019 deposition transcript ("Plaintiff's Depo") at:  
21 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-  
22 25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information  
23 bearing on past lost earnings Plaintiff claims he would have made via has prospective medical  
24 marijuana dispensary businesses therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible  
25 discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

26 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
27 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
28 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may



1 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
2 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
3 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
4 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
5 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
6 property.

(Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

6 **3. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

7 Any and all DOCUMENTS that support YOUR claim for the past lost earnings YOU seek  
8 to recover in this lawsuit.

9 (Plaintiff Depo Notice at 3:9-10, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

10 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

11 As used herein, the term As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any “writing” as  
12 defined by *California Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating,  
13 photographing, photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means  
14 of recording upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including  
15 letters, words, pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created,  
16 regardless of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also  
17 include electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be  
18 located on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds,  
19 cellular telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

20 **OBJECTIONS:**

21 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

22 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
23 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
24 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
25 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
26 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

27 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

1                                    **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

2            Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in  
3 his possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
4 Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff’s objections apply to this particular document request is not  
5 specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for  
6 Plaintiff to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation,  
7 is nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
8 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these  
9 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. More  
10 importantly, Plaintiff did not previously produce any documents responsive to the subject  
11 document request.

12            Plaintiff places the past lost earnings he claims he would have made via his prospective  
13 medical marijuana dispensary businesses at issue, thereby waiving any financial and/or business  
14 privacy or privilege in this regard. (*See, e.g., Weingarten v. Sup. Ct.* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 268,  
15 274.) Such information is directly relevant to Plaintiff’s damage claims and therefore discoverable.  
16 In Plaintiff’s Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff’s Complaint at 4:19,  
17 attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff’s discovery responses and  
18 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
19 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
20 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
21 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
22 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff’s Responses to Mr. Arambula’s Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
23 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff’s Supplemental Responses to  
24 Mr. Arambula’s Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
25 Plaintiff’s Responses to Mr. Arambula’s Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
26 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff’s Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
27 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
28 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on past lost earnings Plaintiff claims he

1 would have made via has prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses therefore  
2 unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible discovery. The scope of permissible discovery  
3 is:

4 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
5 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
6 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
7 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
8 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
9 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
10 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
11 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
12 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
13 property.

14 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

15 **4. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

16 Any and all DOCUMENTS that evidence and/or depict the amount(s) of future lost earnings  
17 YOU seek to recover in this lawsuit.

18 (Plaintiff Depo Notice at 3:11-12, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

19 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

20 As used herein, the term As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any “writing” as  
21 defined by *California Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating,  
22 photographing, photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means  
23 of recording upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including  
24 letters, words, pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created,  
25 regardless of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also  
26 include electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be  
27 located on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds,  
28 cellular telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

**OBJECTIONS:**

**TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

1           **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
2 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
3 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
4 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
5 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
6 documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
7 would be unduly burdensome.

8 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

9  
10           **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

11           Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in  
12 his possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
13 Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff's objections apply to this particular document request is not  
14 specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for  
15 Plaintiff to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation,  
16 is nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
17 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these  
18 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. More  
19 importantly, Plaintiff did not previously produce any documents responsive to the subject  
20 document request.

21           Plaintiff places the future lost earnings he claims he would have made via his prospective  
22 medical marijuana dispensary businesses at issue, thereby waiving any financial and/or business  
23 privacy or privilege in this regard. (*See, e.g., Weingarten v. Sup. Ct.* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 268,  
24 274.) Such information is directly relevant to Plaintiff's damage claims and therefore discoverable.  
25 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19,  
26 attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
27 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
28 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.

1 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
2 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
3 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
5 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
6 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on future lost earnings Plaintiff claims  
7 he would have made via has prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses therefore  
8 unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible discovery. The scope of permissible discovery  
9 is:

10 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
11 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
12 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
13 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
14 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
15 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
16 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
17 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
18 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
19 property.

20 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

21 **5. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

22 Any and all DOCUMENTS that support YOUR claim for the future lost earnings YOU  
23 seek to recover in this lawsuit.

24 (Plaintiff Depo Notice at 3:13-14, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

25 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

26 As used herein, the term As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing"  
27 as defined by *California Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing,  
28 photostating, photographing, photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every  
other means of recording upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation,  
including letters, words, pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record  
thereby created, regardless of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term

1 DOCUMENTS shall also include electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody,  
2 or control, which may be located on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote  
3 data terminals, clouds, cellular telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

4 **OBJECTIONS:**

5 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

6 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
7 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
8 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
9 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
10 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

11 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

12 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

13 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in  
14 his possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
15 Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff's objections apply to this particular document request is not  
16 specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for  
17 Plaintiff to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation,  
18 is nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
19 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these  
20 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. More  
21 importantly, Plaintiff did not previously produce any documents responsive to the subject  
22 document request.

23 Plaintiff places the future lost earnings he claims he would have made via has prospective  
24 medical marijuana dispensary businesses at issue, thereby waiving any financial and/or business  
25 privacy or privilege in this regard. (*See, e.g., Weingarten v. Sup. Ct.* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 268,  
26 274.) Such information is directly relevant to Plaintiff's damage claims and therefore discoverable.  
27 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19,  
28 attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and

1 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
2 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
3 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
4 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
5 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
6 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
7 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
8 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
9 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
10 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 5 to  
11 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on future lost earnings Plaintiff claims  
12 he would have made via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses therefore  
13 unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible discovery. The scope of permissible discovery  
14 is:

15 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
16 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
17 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
18 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
19 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
20 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
21 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
22 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
23 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
24 property.

25 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

26 **6. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

27 Any and all DOCUMENTS comprising the APPLICATIONS, including any and all  
28 DOCUMENTS submitted with the APPLICATIONS and in supplement to the initial submission  
of the APPLICATIONS.

(Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 3:15-17, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

1 As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any “writing” as defined by *California*  
2 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
3 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
4 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
5 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
6 of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
7 electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located  
8 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
9 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

10 As used herein the term APPLICATIONS shall mean the applications YOU allege YOU  
11 intended to discuss with Mr. Arambula at the MEETING.

12 As used herein, the term MEETING shall mean the July 2017 meeting at issue in this  
13 lawsuit during YOUR visit to Mr. Arambula’s residence, including all time spent by YOU at Mr.  
14 Arambula’s residence on that date up until the time of the INCIDENT.

15 **OBJECTIONS:**

16 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

17 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
18 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
19 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
20 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
21 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

22 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

23 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

24 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
25 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
26 Plaintiff’s objection that the requested documents are outside the scope of permissible discovery is  
27 unmeritorious and improper. In Plaintiff’s Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages.  
28 (Plaintiff’s Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff’s



1 discovery responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary  
2 applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between  
3 himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost  
4 revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his  
5 applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's  
6 Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's  
7 Supplemental Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6  
8 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9,  
9 10, attached as Exhibit 5 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-  
10 25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25,  
11 attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's  
12 medical marijuana dispensary applications, appeals, and business plans therefore unquestionably fall  
13 within the ambit of permissible discovery. They are relevant not only to Plaintiff's damage claims,  
14 but also to Plaintiff's claims that the rejection of his applications and appeals lacked merit. The  
15 scope of permissible discovery is:

16 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
17 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
18 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
19 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
20 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
21 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
22 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
23 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
24 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
25 property.

26 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

27 **7. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

28 Any and all DOCUMENTS comprising appeals to the City Council for the City of Lemon  
29 Grove concerning the APPLICATIONS, including any and all DOCUMENTS submitted with the  
30 appeals.

(Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 3:18-20, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

1 As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California*  
2 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
3 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
4 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
5 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
6 of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
7 electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located  
8 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
9 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

10 As used herein the term APPLICATIONS shall mean the applications YOU allege YOU  
11 intended to discuss with Mr. Arambula at the MEETING.

12 As used herein, the term MEETING shall mean the July 2017 meeting at issue in this  
13 lawsuit during YOUR visit to Mr. Arambula's residence, including all time spent by YOU at Mr.  
14 Arambula's residence on that date up until the time of the INCIDENT.

15 **OBJECTIONS:**

16 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

17 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
18 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
19 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
20 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
21 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

22 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

23 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

24 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
25 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
26 Plaintiff's objection that the requested documents are outside the scope of permissible discovery is  
27 unmeritorious and improper. In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages.

28 (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's

1 discovery responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary  
2 applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between  
3 himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost  
4 revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his  
5 applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's  
6 Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's  
7 Supplemental Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6  
8 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9,  
9 10, attached as Exhibit 5 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-  
10 25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25,  
11 attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's  
12 medical marijuana dispensary applications, appeals, and business plans therefore unquestionably fall  
13 within the ambit of permissible discovery. They are relevant not only to Plaintiff's damage claims,  
14 but also to Plaintiff's claims that the rejection of his applications and appeals lacked merit. The  
15 scope of permissible discovery is:

16 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
17 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
18 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
19 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
20 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
21 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
22 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
23 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
24 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
25 property.

26 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

## 27 **8. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

28 Any and all DOCUMENTS comprising the resubmission of any and all of the  
APPLICATIONS, including any and all DOCUMENTS submitted with the resubmitted  
APPLICATIONS and in supplement to the resubmission of the APPLICATIONS.

(Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 3:21-23, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

1 As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California*  
2 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
3 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
4 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
5 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
6 of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
7 electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located  
8 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
9 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

10 As used herein the term APPLICATIONS shall mean the applications YOU allege YOU  
11 intended to discuss with Mr. Arambula at the MEETING.

12 As used herein, the term MEETING shall mean the July 2017 meeting at issue in this  
13 lawsuit during YOUR visit to Mr. Arambula's residence, including all time spent by YOU at Mr.  
14 Arambula's residence on that date up until the time of the INCIDENT.

15 **OBJECTIONS:**

16 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

17 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
18 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
19 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
20 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
21 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

22 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

23 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

24 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
25 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
26 Plaintiff's objection that the requested documents are outside the scope of permissible discovery is  
27 unmeritorious and improper. In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages.  
28 (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's

1 discovery responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary  
2 applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between  
3 himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost  
4 revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his  
5 applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's  
6 Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's  
7 Supplemental Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6  
8 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9,  
9 10, attached as Exhibit 5 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-  
10 25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25,  
11 attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's  
12 medical marijuana dispensary applications, appeals, and business plans therefore unquestionably fall  
13 within the ambit of permissible discovery. They are relevant not only to Plaintiff's damage claims,  
14 but also to Plaintiff's claims that the rejection of his applications and appeals lacked merit. The scope  
15 of permissible discovery is:

16 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
17 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
18 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
19 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
20 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
21 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
22 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
23 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
24 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
25 property.

26 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

27 **9. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

28 Any and all DOCUMENTS comprising YOUR applications for the operation of medical  
marijuana dispensaries in the City of Lemon Grove other than the APPLICATIONS.

(Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 3:24-25, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

1 As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California*  
2 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
3 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
4 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
5 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
6 of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
7 electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located  
8 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
9 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

10 As used herein the term APPLICATIONS shall mean the applications YOU allege YOU  
11 intended to discuss with Mr. Arambula at the MEETING.

12 As used herein, the term MEETING shall mean the July 2017 meeting at issue in this  
13 lawsuit during YOUR visit to Mr. Arambula's residence, including all time spent by YOU at Mr.  
14 Arambula's residence on that date up until the time of the INCIDENT.

15 **OBJECTIONS:**

16 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

17 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
18 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
19 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
20 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
21 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

22 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

23 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

24 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
25 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)

26 Plaintiff's objection that the requested documents are outside the scope of permissible discovery is  
27 unmeritorious and improper. In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages.

28 (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's

1 discovery responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary  
2 applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between  
3 himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost  
4 revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his  
5 applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's  
6 Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's  
7 Supplemental Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6  
8 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9,  
9 10, attached as Exhibit 5 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-  
10 25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25,  
11 attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on Plaintiff's  
12 medical marijuana dispensary applications, appeals, and business plans therefore unquestionably fall  
13 within the ambit of permissible discovery. They are relevant not only to Plaintiff's damage claims,  
14 but also to Plaintiff's claims that the rejection of his applications and appeals lacked merit. The scope  
15 of permissible discovery is:

16 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
17 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
18 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
19 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
20 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
21 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
22 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
23 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
24 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
25 property.

26 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

27 **10. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

28 Any and all DOCUMENTS evidencing and/or depicting any and all communications  
between YOU and any and all employees, elected officials, and any other PERSONS working for  
the City of Lemon Grove that pertain or relate to YOUR APPLICATIONS.

(Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 3:26-28, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

1 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

2 As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California*  
3 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
4 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
5 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
6 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
7 of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
8 electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located  
9 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
10 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

11 As used herein the term APPLICATIONS shall mean the applications YOU allege YOU  
12 intended to discuss with Mr. Arambula at the MEETING.

13 As used herein, the term MEETING shall mean the July 2017 meeting at issue in this  
14 lawsuit during YOUR visit to Mr. Arambula's residence, including all time spent by YOU at Mr.  
15 Arambula's residence on that date up until the time of the INCIDENT.

16 As used herein, the terms PERSON and PERSONS mean human being, partnership, firm,  
17 association, joint venture, corporation, receiver, any group or combination acting as a unit, or any  
18 other business type, governmental agency, or legal entity.

19 **OBJECTIONS:**

20 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

21 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
22 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
23 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
24 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
25 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

26 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)  
27  
28



1                                   **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

2           Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
3 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
4 Plaintiff's objection that the requested documents are outside the scope of permissible discovery is  
5 unmeritorious and improper. In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages.  
6 (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's  
7 discovery responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary  
8 applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between  
9 himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost  
10 revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his  
11 applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's  
12 Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's  
13 Supplemental Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6  
14 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9,  
15 10, attached as Exhibit 5 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-  
16 25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25,  
17 attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on  
18 communications concerning Plaintiff's medical marijuana dispensary applications, appeals, and  
19 related matters therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible discovery. They are  
20 relevant not only to Plaintiff's damage claims, but also to Plaintiff's claims that the rejection of his  
21 applications and appeals lacked merit. The scope of permissible discovery is:

22  
23           [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
24 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
25 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
26 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
27 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
28 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any

///  
28

1 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
2 property.

3 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

4 **11. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

5 Any and all DOCUMENTS depicting communications between YOU and Taisha Brown  
6 concerning YOUR APPLICATIONS.

7 (Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 4:1-2, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

8 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

9 As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California*  
10 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
11 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
12 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
13 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
14 of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
15 electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located  
16 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
17 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

18 As used herein the term APPLICATIONS shall mean the applications YOU allege YOU  
19 intended to discuss with Mr. Arambula at the MEETING.

20 As used herein, the term MEETING shall mean the July 2017 meeting at issue in this  
21 lawsuit during YOUR visit to Mr. Arambula's residence, including all time spent by YOU at Mr.  
22 Arambula's residence on that date up until the time of the INCIDENT.

23 **OBJECTIONS:**

24 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

25 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
26 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
27 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
28 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of

///  
28

1 documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
2 would be unduly burdensome.

3 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

4 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

5 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
6 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
7 Plaintiff's objection that the requested documents are outside the scope of permissible discovery is  
8 unmeritorious and improper. Taisha Brown (a) initiated contact with Plaintiff for the purposes of  
9 offering to help Plaintiff with his medical marijuana dispensary applications, (b) discussed having a  
10 meeting with herself, Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula to discuss these applications, and (c) acted as a  
11 liaison in arranging for a meeting to take place. (Plaintiff Depo at: 98:12-25, 99:1-5 and 13-18,  
12 100:21-25, 124:3-25, 125:1-7, 126:11-25, 127:1-18, attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.)  
13 The subject physical altercation occurred on or about just before midnight at the same location of  
14 this meeting.

15 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
16 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
17 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
18 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
19 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
20 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
21 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
22 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
23 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
24 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
25 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
26 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
27 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on communications concerning  
28 Plaintiff's medical marijuana dispensary applications, appeals, and related matters therefore

1 unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible discovery. The scope of permissible discovery  
2 is:

3 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
4 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
5 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
6 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
7 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
8 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
9 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
10 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
11 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
12 property.

13 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

14 **12. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

15 Any and all DOCUMENTS depicting communications between YOU and Taisha Brown  
16 concerning the INCIDENT.

17 (Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 4:3-4, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

18 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams

19 As used herein, the term INCIDENT shall mean the July 2017 physical altercation between  
20 YOU and Mr. Arambula at issue in this lawsuit.

21 As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California*  
22 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
23 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
24 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
25 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
26 of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
27 electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located  
28 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

1                   **OBJECTIONS:**

2                   **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

3                   **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
4 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
5 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
6 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
7 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

8 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

9                   **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

10                   Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
11 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
12 Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff's objections apply to this particular document request is not  
13 specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for Plaintiff  
14 to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation, is  
15 nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
16 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these  
17 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. Of that  
18 document production, a few pages of text messages between Plaintiff and Ms. Brown would be  
19 responsive to the document request currently at issue. If Plaintiff has no additional responsive  
20 documents in his possession, custody, or control, Plaintiff should have indicated as much with his  
21 objections to the requests for production accompanying his deposition notice. Plaintiff did not do  
22 so. Plaintiff has an outstanding obligation to produce all documents in his possession, custody,  
23 and/or control that are responsive to the subject request for production.

24                   Plaintiff's claims of liability and damages arise out of and/or related to the subject physical  
25 altercation between Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula. Taisha Brown (a) initiated contact with Plaintiff for  
26 the purposes of offering to help Plaintiff with his medical marijuana dispensary applications,  
27 (b) discussed having a meeting with herself, Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula to discuss these  
28 applications, and (c) acted as a liaison in arranging for a meeting to take place. (Plaintiff Depo at:

1 98:12-25, 99:1-5 and 13-18, 100:21-25, 124:3-25, 125:1-7, 126:11-25, 127:1-18, attached as Exhibit  
2 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) The subject physical altercation occurred on or about just before  
3 midnight at the same location of this meeting.

4 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
5 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
6 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
7 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
8 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
9 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
10 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
11 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
12 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
13 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
14 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
15 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
16 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on communications concerning the  
17 physical altercation between Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula therefore unquestionably fall within the  
18 ambit of permissible discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

19 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
20 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
21 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
22 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
23 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
24 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
25 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
26 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
27 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
28 property.

(Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

1           **13. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

2           Any and all DOCUMENTS depicting communications between YOU and Taisha Brown  
3 concerning the MEETING.

4 (Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 4:5-6, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

5           As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

6           As used herein, the term MEETING shall mean the July 2017 meeting at issue in this  
7 lawsuit during YOUR visit to Mr. Arambula's residence, including all time spent by YOU at Mr.  
8 Arambula's residence on that date up until the time of the INCIDENT.

9           As used herein, the term INCIDENT shall mean the July 2017 physical altercation between  
10 YOU and Mr. Arambula at issue in this lawsuit.

11           As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California*  
12 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
13 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
14 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
15 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
16 of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
17 electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located  
18 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
19 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

20           **OBJECTIONS:**

21           **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

22           **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
23 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
24 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
25 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
26 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

27 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

1                                   **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

2           Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
3 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
4 Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff’s objections apply to this particular document request is not  
5 specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for Plaintiff  
6 to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation, is  
7 nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
8 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these  
9 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. Of that  
10 document production, a few pages of text messages between Plaintiff and Ms. Brown would be  
11 responsive to the document request currently at issue. If Plaintiff has no additional responsive  
12 documents in his possession, custody, or control, Plaintiff should have indicated as much with his  
13 objections to the requests for production accompanying his deposition notice. Plaintiff did not do  
14 so. Plaintiff has an outstanding obligation to produce all documents in his possession, custody,  
15 and/or control that are responsive to the subject request for production.

16           Plaintiff’s claims of liability and damages arise out of and/or related to the subject physical  
17 altercation between Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula. Taisha Brown (a) initiated contact with Plaintiff for  
18 the purposes of offering to help Plaintiff with his medical marijuana dispensary applications,  
19 (b) discussed having a meeting with herself, Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula to discuss these  
20 applications, and (c) acted as a liaison in arranging for a meeting to take place. (Plaintiff Depo at:  
21 98:12-25, 99:1-5 and 13-18, 100:21-25, 124:3-25, 125:1-7, 126:11-25, 127:1-18, attached as Exhibit  
22 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) The subject physical altercation occurred on or about just before  
23 midnight at the same location of this meeting.

24           In Plaintiff’s Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff’s Complaint at  
25 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff’s discovery responses and  
26 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
27 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
28 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned



1 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
2 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
3 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
4 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
5 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
6 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
7 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
8 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on communications concerning the  
9 subject meeting between Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit  
10 of permissible discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

11 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
12 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
13 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
14 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
15 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
16 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
17 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
18 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
19 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
20 property.

21 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

22 **14. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

23 Any and all DOCUMENTS depicting communications between YOU and anyone other  
24 than YOUR attorney regarding the INCIDENT.

25 (Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 4:7-8, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

26 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

27 As used herein, the term INCIDENT shall mean the July 2017 physical altercation between  
28 YOU and Mr. Arambula at issue in this lawsuit.

As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California  
Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording

1 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
2 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
3 of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
4 electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located  
5 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
6 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

7 **OBJECTIONS:**

8 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

9 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
10 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
11 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
12 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
13 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

14 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

15 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

16 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
17 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
18 Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff's objections apply to this particular document request is not  
19 specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for Plaintiff  
20 to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation, is  
21 nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
22 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these  
23 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. Of that  
24 document production, a few news articles and a sheriff's report would be responsive to the document  
25 request currently at issue. If Plaintiff has no additional responsive documents in his possession,  
26 custody, or control, Plaintiff should have indicated as much with his objections to the requests for  
27 production accompanying his deposition notice. Plaintiff did not do so. Plaintiff has an outstanding

28 ///

1 obligation to produce all documents in his possession, custody, and/or control that are responsive to  
2 the subject request for production.

3 Plaintiff's claims of liability and damages arise out of and/or related to the subject physical  
4 altercation between Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula. In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified  
5 special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.)  
6 Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his  
7 medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the  
8 physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is  
9 seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana  
10 dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's  
11 Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to  
12 Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories  
13 at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's  
14 Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo  
15 at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25,  
16 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and  
17 information bearing on communications concerning the subject physical altercation between  
18 Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible discovery.  
19 The scope of permissible discovery is:

20 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
21 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
22 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
23 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
24 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
25 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
26 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
27 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
28 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
property.

(Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

1                   **15. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

2                   Any and all DOCUMENTS depicting communications between YOU and anyone other  
3 than YOUR attorney regarding the MEETING.

4 (Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 4:9-10, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

5                   As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

6                   As used herein, the term MEETING shall mean the July 2017 meeting at issue in this lawsuit  
7 during YOUR visit to Mr. Arambula's residence, including all time spent by YOU at Mr.  
8 Arambula's residence on that date up until the time of the INCIDENT.

9                   As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California*  
10 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
11 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
12 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
13 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
14 of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
15 electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located  
16 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
17 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

18                   **OBJECTIONS:**

19                   **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

20                   **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
21 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
22 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
23 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
24 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

25 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

26                   **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

27                   Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
28 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)

1 Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff's objections apply to this particular document request is not  
2 specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for Plaintiff  
3 to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation, is  
4 nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
5 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these  
6 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. Of that  
7 document production, a few pages of text messages between Plaintiff and Ms. Brown would be  
8 responsive to the document request currently at issue. If Plaintiff has no additional responsive  
9 documents in his possession, custody, or control, Plaintiff should have indicated as much with his  
10 objections to the requests for production accompanying his deposition notice. Plaintiff did not do  
11 so. Plaintiff has an outstanding obligation to produce all documents in his possession, custody,  
12 and/or control that are responsive to the subject request for production.

13 Plaintiff's claims of liability and damages arise out of and/or related to the subject physical  
14 altercation between Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula. Taisha Brown (a) initiated contact with Plaintiff for  
15 the purposes of offering to help Plaintiff with his medical marijuana dispensary applications,  
16 (b) discussed having a meeting with herself, Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula to discuss these  
17 applications, and (c) acted as a liaison in arranging for a meeting to take place. (Plaintiff Depo at:  
18 98:12-25, 99:1-5 and 13-18, 100:21-25, 124:3-25, 125:1-7, 126:11-25, 127:1-18, attached as Exhibit  
19 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) The subject physical altercation occurred on or about just before  
20 midnight at the same location of this meeting.

21 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
22 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
23 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
24 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
25 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
26 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
27 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
28 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to

1 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
2 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
3 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo") at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
4 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
5 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on communications concerning the  
6 subject meeting between Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit  
7 of permissible discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

8 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
9 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
10 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
11 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
12 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
13 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
14 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
15 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
16 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
17 property.

18 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

19 **16. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

20 Any and all DOCUMENTS depicting communications between YOU and anyone other than  
21 YOUR attorney regarding the APPLICATIONS.

22 (Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 4:11-12, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

23 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

24 As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California*  
25 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
26 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
27 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
28 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located

///

1 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
2 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

3 As used herein the term APPLICATIONS shall mean the applications YOU allege YOU  
4 intended to discuss with Mr. Arambula at the MEETING.

5 As used herein, the term MEETING shall mean the July 2017 meeting at issue in this  
6 lawsuit during YOUR visit to Mr. Arambula's residence, including all time spent by YOU at Mr.  
7 Arambula's residence on that date up until the time of the INCIDENT.

8 **OBJECTIONS:**

9 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

10 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
11 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
12 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
13 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
14 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

15 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

16 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

17 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
18 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
19 Plaintiff's objection that the requested documents are outside the scope of permissible discovery is  
20 unmeritorious and improper. In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages.  
21 (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's  
22 discovery responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary  
23 applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between  
24 himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost  
25 revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his  
26 applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's  
27 Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's  
28 Supplemental Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6

1 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9,  
2 10, attached as Exhibit 5 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-  
3 25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25,  
4 attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on  
5 communications concerning Plaintiff's medical marijuana dispensary applications, appeals, and  
6 related matters therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible discovery. They are  
7 relevant not only to Plaintiff's damage claims, but also to Plaintiff's claims that the rejection of his  
8 applications and appeals lacked merit. The scope of permissible discovery is:

9 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
10 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
11 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
12 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
13 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
14 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
15 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
16 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
17 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
18 property.

15 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

17 **17. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

18 Any and all DOCUMENTS depicting communications between YOU and anyone other  
19 than YOUR attorney regarding Mr. Arambula.

20 (Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 4:13-14, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

21 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

22 As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California*  
23 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
24 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
25 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
26 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
27 of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
28 electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located



1 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
2 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

3 **OBJECTIONS:**

4 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

5 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
6 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
7 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
8 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
9 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

10 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

11 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

12 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
13 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
14 Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff's objections apply to this particular document request is not  
15 specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for Plaintiff  
16 to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation, is  
17 nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
18 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these  
19 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. Of that  
20 document production, a few news articles, a few pages of text messages, and a sheriff's report would  
21 be responsive to the document request currently at issue. If Plaintiff has no additional responsive  
22 documents in his possession, custody, or control, Plaintiff should have indicated as much with his  
23 objections to the requests for production accompanying his deposition notice. Plaintiff did not do  
24 so. Plaintiff has an outstanding obligation to produce all documents in his possession, custody,  
25 and/or control that are responsive to the subject request for production.

26 Plaintiff sued Mr. Arambula. Plaintiff's claims of liability and damages arise out of and/or  
27 related to the subject physical altercation between Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula. Documents and  
28 information bearing on communications Plaintiff had with others concerning Mr. Arambula

1 therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible discovery. The scope of permissible  
2 discovery is:

3 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
4 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
5 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
6 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
7 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
8 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
9 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
10 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
11 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
12 property.

13 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

14 **18. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

15 Andy (sic) and all DOCUMENTS depicting communications between any PERSONS  
16 (excluding YOU) concerning the APPLICATIONS, excluding communications between YOU and  
17 YOUR attorney, that are in YOUR possession, custody, and/or control.  
18 (Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 4:15-17, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

19 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

20 As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California*  
21 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
22 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
23 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
24 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
25 of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
26 electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located  
27 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
28 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

As used herein the term APPLICATIONS shall mean the applications YOU allege YOU  
intended to discuss with Mr. Arambula at the MEETING.

1 As used herein, the term MEETING shall mean the July 2017 meeting at issue in this  
2 lawsuit during YOUR visit to Mr. Arambula's residence, including all time spent by YOU at Mr.  
3 Arambula's residence on that date up until the time of the INCIDENT.

4 **OBJECTIONS:**

5 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

6 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
7 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
8 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
9 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
10 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

11 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

12 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

13 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in  
14 his possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
15 Plaintiff's objection that the requested documents are outside the scope of permissible discovery  
16 is unmeritorious and improper. In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages.  
17 (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout  
18 Plaintiff's discovery responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical  
19 marijuana dispensary applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical  
20 altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking  
21 to recover lost revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary  
22 businesses had his applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses  
23 to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of  
24 Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2,  
25 attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special  
26 Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at:  
27 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-  
28 25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and

1 information bearing on communications concerning Plaintiff's medical marijuana dispensary  
2 applications, appeals, and related matters therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of  
3 permissible discovery. They are relevant not only to Plaintiff's damage claims, but also to  
4 Plaintiff's claims that the rejection of his applications and appeals lacked merit. The scope of  
5 permissible discovery is:

6 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
7 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
8 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
9 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
10 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
11 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
12 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
13 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
14 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
15 property.

16 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

17 **19. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

18 Any and all DOCUMENTS depicting communications between any PERSONS (excluding  
19 YOU) concerning the INCIDENT, excluding communications between YOU and YOUR attorney,  
20 that are in YOUR possession, custody, and/or control.

21 (Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 4:18-20, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

22 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

23 As used herein, the term INCIDENT shall mean the July 2017 physical altercation between  
24 YOU and Mr. Arambula at issue in this lawsuit.

25 As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California*  
26 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
27 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
28 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located

1 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
2 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

3 **OBJECTIONS:**

4 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

5 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
6 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
7 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
8 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
9 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

10 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

11 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

12 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
13 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
14 Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff's objections apply to this particular document request is not  
15 specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for Plaintiff  
16 to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation, is  
17 nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
18 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these  
19 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. Of that  
20 document production, a few news articles and a sheriff's report would be responsive to the document  
21 request currently at issue. If Plaintiff has no additional responsive documents in his possession,  
22 custody, or control, Plaintiff should have indicated as much with his objections to the requests for  
23 production accompanying his deposition notice. Plaintiff did not do so. Plaintiff has an outstanding  
24 obligation to produce all documents in his possession, custody, and/or control that are responsive to  
25 the subject request for production.

26 Plaintiff's claims of liability and damages arise out of and/or related to the subject physical  
27 altercation between Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula. In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified  
28 special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.)

1 Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his  
2 medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals were wrongfully rejected as a result of the  
3 physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is  
4 seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned via his prospective medical marijuana  
5 dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's  
6 Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos. 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to  
7 Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories  
8 at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's  
9 Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo  
10 at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25, 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25,  
11 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and  
12 information bearing on communications concerning the subject physical altercation between  
13 Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit of permissible discovery.  
14 The scope of permissible discovery is:

15 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
16 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
17 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
18 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
19 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
20 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
21 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
22 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
23 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
24 property.

25 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

26 **20. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

27 Andy (sic) and all DOCUMENTS depicting communications between any PERSONS  
28 (excluding YOU) concerning the MEETING, excluding communications between YOU and  
YOUR attorney, that are in YOUR possession, custody, and/or control.

(Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 4:21-23, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

1 As used herein, the term MEETING shall mean the July 2017 meeting at issue in this lawsuit  
2 during YOUR visit to Mr. Arambula's residence, including all time spent by YOU at Mr.  
3 Arambula's residence on that date up until the time of the INCIDENT.

4 As use herein the term DOCUMENTS shall mean any "writing" as defined by *California*  
5 *Evidence Code* § 250, i.e., handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing,  
6 photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording  
7 upon any tangible thing, any form of communication or representation, including letters, words,  
8 pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless  
9 of the manner in which the record has been stored. The term DOCUMENTS shall also include  
10 electronically stored information in YOUR possession, custody, or control, which may be located  
11 on computer (laptop and desktop) servers and/or drives, remote data terminals, clouds, cellular  
12 telephones, and any other handheld electronic devices.

13 **OBJECTIONS:**

14 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

15 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
16 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
17 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
18 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
19 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

20 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

21 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

22 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
23 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
24 Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff's objections apply to this particular document request is not  
25 specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for Plaintiff  
26 to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation, is  
27 nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
28 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these

1 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. Of that  
2 document production, a few pages of text messages between Plaintiff and Ms. Brown would be  
3 responsive to the document request currently at issue. If Plaintiff has no additional responsive  
4 documents in his possession, custody, or control, Plaintiff should have indicated as much with his  
5 objections to the requests for production accompanying his deposition notice. Plaintiff did not do  
6 so. Plaintiff has an outstanding obligation to produce all documents in his possession, custody,  
7 and/or control that are responsive to the subject request for production.

8 Plaintiff's claims of liability and damages arise out of and/or related to the subject physical  
9 altercation between Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula. Taisha Brown (a) initiated contact with Plaintiff for  
10 the purposes of offering to help Plaintiff with his medical marijuana dispensary applications,  
11 (b) discussed having a meeting with herself, Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula to discuss these  
12 applications, and (c) acted as a liaison in arranging for a meeting to take place. (Plaintiff Depo at:  
13 98:12-25, 99:1-5 and 13-18, 100:21-25, 124:3-25, 125:1-7, 126:11-25, 127:1-18, attached as Exhibit  
14 14 to Notice of Lodgment.) The subject physical altercation occurred on or about just before  
15 midnight at the same location of this meeting.

16 In Plaintiff's Complaint, he prays for unspecified special damages. (Plaintiff's Complaint at  
17 4:19, attached as Exhibit 1 to Notice of Lodgment.) Throughout Plaintiff's discovery responses and  
18 deposition testimony, Plaintiff alleges (a) his medical marijuana dispensary applications and appeals  
19 were wrongfully rejected as a result of the physical altercation between himself and Mr. Arambula  
20 that is at issue in the litigation, and (b) he is seeking to recover lost revenue he would have earned  
21 via his prospective medical marijuana dispensary businesses had his applications and appeals not  
22 been wrongfully rejected. (Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at Nos.  
23 8.1., 8.2, 9.1, attached as Exhibit 4 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to  
24 Mr. Arambula's Form Interrogatories at No. 8.2, attached as Exhibit 6 to Notice of Lodgment;  
25 Plaintiff's Responses to Mr. Arambula's Special Interrogatories at Nos. 9, 10, attached as Exhibit 5  
26 to Notice of Lodgment; Plaintiff's Depo at: 274:18-25, 275:1-25, 276:1-25, 277:1-8 and 12-25,  
27 278:1-25, 279:1-9, 330:6-12 and 21-25, 331:1-25, 332:1-16, 336:12-25, attached as Exhibit 14 to  
28 Notice of Lodgment.) Documents and information bearing on communications concerning the



1 subject meeting between Plaintiff and Mr. Arambula therefore unquestionably fall within the ambit  
2 of permissible discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

3 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
4 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
5 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
6 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
7 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
8 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
9 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
10 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
11 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
12 property.

13 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

14 **21. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

15 Any and all DOCUMENTS that support YOUR claims against Mr. Arambula in the above  
16 captioned lawsuit.

17 (Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 4:24-25, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

18 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

19 **OBJECTIONS:**

20 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

21 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
22 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January  
23 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
24 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
25 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
26 documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
27 would be unduly burdensome.

28 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

**JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)  
Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff's objections apply to this particular document request is not  
specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for Plaintiff

1 to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation, is  
2 nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
3 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these  
4 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. If Plaintiff  
5 has no additional responsive documents in his possession, custody, or control, Plaintiff should have  
6 indicated as much with his objections to the requests for production accompanying his deposition  
7 notice. Plaintiff did not do so. Plaintiff has an outstanding obligation to produce all documents in  
8 his possession, custody, and/or control that are responsive to the subject request for production.

9 Plaintiff sued Mr. Arambula. Documents in Plaintiff's possession, custody, and/or control  
10 that support Plaintiff's claims against Mr. Arambula unquestionably fall within the ambit of  
11 permissible discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

12 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
13 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
14 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
15 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
16 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
17 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
18 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
19 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
20 document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
21 property.

18 (Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

20 **22. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION:**

21 Any and all DOCUMENTS that support YOUR claims against the City of Lemon Grove in  
22 the above-captioned matter.

23 (Plaintiff's Depo Notice at 4:26-27, attached as Exhibit 7 to Notice of Lodgment.)

24 As used herein, the terms YOU and YOUR shall mean Plaintiff Christopher Williams.

25 **OBJECTIONS:**

26 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

27 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff Christopher Williams objects to the  
28 deposition notice and request for production of documents scheduled for January

1 8,2019, on the following grounds: (i) "APPLICATIONS" as defined in the notice  
2 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; (ii) categories 23-26 in the notice  
3 are outside the scope of permissible discovery; and (iii) the production of  
documents that have already been produced during discovery in this lawsuit  
would be unduly burdensome.

4 (Plaintiff Objections at 1:1, attached as Exhibit 8 to Notice of Lodgment.)

5 **JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPELLING PRODUCTION:**

6 Plaintiff violated his statutory obligation to produce any and all responsive documents in his  
7 possession, custody, and/or control at the time of his deposition. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280.)

8 Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff's objections apply to this particular document request is not  
9 specified. The only potentially applicable objection, that it would be unduly burdensome for Plaintiff  
10 to produce responsive documents he already produced during the course of the litigation, is  
11 nevertheless unmeritorious and improper. To date, Plaintiff has produced a mere 64 pages of  
12 documents and a video clip in response to written discovery. Indeed, a reproduction of these  
13 documents as a whole, let alone in part, could not be unduly burdensome even in theory. If Plaintiff  
14 has no additional responsive documents in his possession, custody, or control, Plaintiff should have  
15 indicated as much with his objections to the requests for production accompanying his deposition  
16 notice. Plaintiff did not do so. Plaintiff has an outstanding obligation to produce all documents in  
17 his possession, custody, and/or control that are responsive to the subject request for production.


18 Plaintiff sued the City of Lemon Grove. Documents in Plaintiff's possession, custody, and/or  
19 control that support Plaintiff's claims against the City of Lemon Grove unquestionably fall within  
20 the ambit of permissible discovery. The scope of permissible discovery is:

21 [A]ny matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in  
22 the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action,  
23 if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably  
24 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery may  
25 relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or of any other  
26 party to the action. Discovery may be obtained of the identity and location of  
27 persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter, as well as of the  
28 existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any  
document, electronically stored information, tangible thing, or land or other  
property.

(Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010.)

1 Dated: March 8, 2019

TYSON & MENDES LLP

2  
3 By:   
4 Susan L. Oliver  
5 Emily M. Straub  
6 Attorneys for Defendant DAVID ARAMBULA  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28