

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Charles Quick v. Centres Villa Limited Partnership, et al.

No. 1:25-cv-00037-BAM, United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (December 11, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California partially granted Charles Quick’s motion to compel responses to his second sets of interrogatories and requests for production. The court ordered certain defendants to respond without objection, allowed other defendants fourteen days to respond, and awarded \$529.50 in expenses against the nonresponding defendants under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Barbara A. McAuliffe
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 11, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00037-BAM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to compel responses to interrogatories and requests for production and sought monetary sanctions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(5)(A).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied its broad discretion over discovery and the standards governing the permissible scope of discovery under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26 and motions to compel under Rule 37.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Charles Quick v. Centres Villa Limited Partnership, Centres Clovis Aldi, Ltd., Simon-Oakley Town Center, LLC, Blue Whale Capital LLC

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- sanctions
- attorney fees
- civil procedure
- architectural barriers

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

discovery

attorney fees

sanctions

Americans with Disabilities Act

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether defendants should be compelled to respond to plaintiff's second set of interrogatories and requests for production.
2. Whether plaintiff was entitled to reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(5)(A).
3. Whether the discovery responses of Simon-Oakley Town Center, LLC and Blue Whale Capital LLC should be provided without objection.

HOLDINGS

1. Because Simon-Oakley Town Center, LLC and Blue Whale Capital LLC failed to respond to plaintiff's second set of interrogatories and requests for production and failed to oppose the motion, they must provide written responses and produce documents without objection.
2. If they had not already done so, Centres Villa Limited Partnership and Centres Clovis Aldi, Ltd. were required to provide written responses and produce documents within fourteen days of service of the order.
3. Simon-Oakley Town Center, LLC and Blue Whale Capital LLC were required to pay plaintiff's reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, in the amount of \$529.50, jointly and severally. No expenses were awarded against Centres because its inadvertent failure to respond and ongoing compliance made an award unjust.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26 provides that parties "may obtain discovery regarding any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party's claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case." (at 3)

"If a court grants a motion to compel, then the court also must order the party "whose conduct necessitated the motion ... to pay the movant's reasonable expenses incurred in making the motion, including attorney's fees." (at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that defendants violated the Americans with Disabilities Act and related state law by failing to remove access barriers at a shopping center in Clovis, California. Plaintiff electronically served defendants with a second set of interrogatories and requests for production, but defendants failed to provide responses within the required period. After meet-and-confer efforts, plaintiff moved to compel. Centres attributed its nonresponse to counsel's inadvertence and represented that responses were being prepared, while Simon-Oakley Town Center and Blue Whale Capital filed no opposition and provided no responses.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff served defendants with a second set of interrogatories and requests for production on October 14, 2025. Defendants did not timely respond, and plaintiff filed a motion to compel on November 20, 2025. Centres Villa Limited Partnership and Centres Clovis Aldi, Ltd. opposed the motion; Simon-Oakley Town Center, LLC and Blue Whale Capital LLC did not respond. The court granted the motion in part, ordered discovery responses on specified deadlines, and awarded plaintiff \$529.50 in expenses against the nonresponding defendants.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Hallett v. Morgan, 296 F.3d 732, 751 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Gates v. Deukmejian, 987 F.2d 1392, 1398 (9th Cir. 1993)
- Gonzalez v. City of Maywood, 729 F.3d 1196, 1202 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Sorenson v. Mink, 239 F.3d 1140, 1145 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Trujillo v. Singh, No. 1:16-cv-01640 LJO-EPG, 2017 WL 1831941, at *3 (E.D. Cal. May 8, 2017)
- Trujillo v. GH Food Mart, Inc., No. 1:20-cv-00368-AWI-SKO, 2020 WL 4697139, at *7 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2020)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 CHARLES QUICK, Case No. 1:25-cv-00037-BAM 12 Plaintiff, ORDER
GRANTING IN PART PLAINTIFF CHARLES QUICK’S MOTION TO COMPEL 13 v.
DISCOVERY RESPONSES FROM ALL DEFENDANTS, AND FOR SANCTIONS 14
CENTRES VILLA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, et al., (Doc. 50) 15 Defendants. 16 17 I.
INTRODUCTION 18 Plaintiff Charles Quick moves to compel Defendants Centres Villa Limited
Partnership, 19 Centres Clovis Aldi, Ltd., Simon-Oakley Town Center, LLC, and Blue Whale
Capital LLC to 20 respond to Plaintiff’s Second Set of Interrogatories and Second Set of Requests
for Production of 21 Documents.¹ (Doc.

50.) Plaintiff also seeks expenses, including attorneys’ fees, for having to file 22 the motion to
compel. (Doc. 50-1 at 2, 4.) Defendants Centres Villa Limited Partnership and 23 Centres Clovis
Aldi, Ltd (collectively “Centres”) filed an opposition to the motion on November 24 26, 2025.
(Doc. 52.) Defendants Simon-Oakley Town Center LLC and Blue Whale Capital LLC 25 failed to
respond to the motion.

The Court found the motion suitable for decision without oral 26 argument, vacated the hearing set
for December 5, 2025, and the matter is deemed submitted. 27 1 Plaintiff filed a withdrawal of the
motion as to Defendant Wal-Mart Realty Company on December 4, 28 2025, along with a notice
of settlement as to Defendant Wal-Mart Realty Company. (See Docs. 54, 55.)

1 (Doc. 53.) Having considered the parties' briefs and record in this action, Plaintiff's motion to 2
compel and for sanctions will be granted in part. 3 II. RELEVANT BACKGROUND 4 Plaintiff
initiated this action against Defendants Centres, Simon-Oakley Town Center, 5 LLC, Blue Whale
Capital LLC, and Wal-Mart Realty Company on January 9, 2025. (Doc. 1.) 6 Plaintiff alleges
violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and related state law 7 for the failure to
remove barriers to access at the Sunflower Marketplace shopping center in 8 Clovis, California.

(Doc. 35.) 9 On October 14, 2025, Plaintiff electronically served all defendants with a Second Set
of 10 Interrogatories and Second Set of Requests for Production of Documents. (Doc. 51,
Amended 11 Declaration of Tanya E. Moore ("Amended Moore Decl.") ¶¶ 2-3, Exs. A, B.)

The requests seek 12 information and documents relevant to the claims and defenses in this action.
(Amended Moore 13 Decl. ¶ 4.) Defendants did not respond to the requests. 14 On November 19,
2025, when Plaintiff did not receive responses, Plaintiff's counsel's 15 office emailed defense
counsel inquiring as to the outstanding discovery responses, advising that 16 Plaintiff was
preparing a motion to compel, and stating Plaintiff's position that all objections had 17 been
waived due to untimeliness.

(Amended Moore Decl. ¶ 5.) 18 Between November 19 and November 20, 2025, Plaintiff's
counsel met and conferred 19 telephonically with counsel for each defendant. Plaintiff's counsel
advised that if full and 20 complete responses were not received by the end of the business day on
November 20, then 21 Plaintiff would have to file a motion to compel due to the impending
discovery deadlines and 22 upcoming noticed depositions.

Further meet and confer took place by email. (Amended Moore 23 Decl. ¶ 6.) 24 On November
20, 2025, Plaintiff filed the instant motion to compel and for sanctions 25 pursuant to Local Rule
251(e). (Doc. 50.) Plaintiff requests that the Court order defendants to 26 serve full and complete
responses, without objection, to Plaintiff's Second Set of Interrogatories 27 and Second Set of
Requests for Production of Documents.

(Doc. 50-1 at 2.) Plaintiff also seeks 28 monetary sanctions against defendants for their failure to
comply with the Federal Rules of Civil 1 Procedure, which necessitated the instant motion. (Id.)
As of November 21, 2025, no responses 2 to the discovery at issue had been received. (Id. ¶ 7.) 3
On November 26, 2025, Centres filed their opposition to the motion.

(Doc. 52.) In 4 support of their opposition, Centres' counsel declares that due to an unusually
heavy caseload, he 5 did not see the October 14, 2025 email and was unaware of the second set of
requests until 6 receiving subsequent communications from Plaintiff's counsel. (Doc. 52-1;
Declaration of 7 Steven R. Stoker ("Stoker Decl.") ¶ 2.) Centres' counsel further declares that on
November 19, 8 2025, he received an email from Plaintiff's counsel inquiring about outstanding
discovery 9 requests.

Because Centres' counsel had not realized that a second set of discovery requests had 10 been served, counsel believed the inquiry pertained to the first set of discovery. Centres' counsel 11 knew that he had served responses to the first set of discovery. Since the email was sent to all 12 counsel, Centres' counsel thought it was meant for others and not him.

(Id. ¶ 3.) Centres' 13 counsel also declares that on November 20, 2025, Plaintiff's counsel telephoned to meet and 14 confer about the lack of responses. Centres' counsel advised Plaintiff's counsel that he did not 15 know what she was talking about, but that he would look into it immediately. Upon further 16 inquiry, Centres' counsel determined that verifications for the responses to the first set of 17 discovery had not been provided and immediately took steps to correct that.

Later that same day, 18 without further efforts to meet and confer, Plaintiff's counsel filed the motion to compel. (Id. ¶ 19 4.) Upon conducting a more thorough review, Centres' counsel discovered the October 14, 2025 20 email pertaining to service of Plaintiff's second set of discovery requests. Centres' counsel has 21 since been working diligently to correct the oversight and indicates that he will serve responses to 22 the second set of discovery requests on Plaintiff's counsel.

(Id. ¶ 5.) Centres' counsel requests 23 that the Court decline to impose sanctions while Centres' responses are being completed and 24 served. (Doc. 52 at 2.) 25 No other oppositions or responses to the instant motion to compel were filed, and Plaintiff 26 did not reply to Centres' opposition. L.R. 251(e). 27 /// 28 /// 1 III. LEGAL STANDARD 2 "Broad discretion is vested in the trial court to permit or deny discovery...." *Hallett v. 3 Morgan*, 296 F.3d 732, 751 (9th Cir.

2002) (citation omitted). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26 4 provides that parties "may obtain discovery regarding any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to 5 any party's claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). 6 Information within the scope of discovery need not be admissible in evidence to be discoverable.

7 Id. However, the Court must limit the extent of discovery if it determines that (1) the discovery 8 sought is unreasonably cumulative, duplicative or can be obtained from other source that is more 9 convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive, (2) the party seeking discovery has had ample 10 opportunity to obtain the information by discovery, or (3) the proposed discovery is outside the 11 permissible scope.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C)(i)-(iii). 12 A party may propound written interrogatories relating to any matter that may be inquired 13 to under Rule 26(b). Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(a). Rule 33 requires that, unless otherwise agreed upon or 14 ordered, the responding party must serve its answers and any objections to interrogatories within 15 thirty (30) days after being served.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(2). Parties must respond to the fullest extent possible, and any objections must be stated with specificity. Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(3)-(4). 17 A party may serve on any other party a request within the scope of Rule 26(b) to produce 18 and permit the requesting party or its representative to inspect, copy, test, or sample the following 19 items in the responding party's possession, custody or control: any designated documents, 20 electronically stored information or tangible things.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(a)(1). The party to whom 21 the request is directed must respond in writing within 30 days after service. Fed. R. Civ. P. 22 34(b)(2)(A). "For each item or category, the response must either state that inspection and related 23 activities will be permitted as requested or state with specificity the grounds for objecting to the 24 request, including the reasons." Fed.

R. Civ. P. 34(b)(2)(B). 25 If a party fails to answer an interrogatory submitted under Rule 33 or fails to produce 26 documents under Rule 34, then the party seeking discovery may move for an order compelling 27 answers or production. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(3)(B). 28 1 IV. DISCUSSION 2 A. Interrogatories and Requests for Production 3 Plaintiff electronically served his Second Set of Interrogatories and Second Set of 4 Requests for Production, on October 14, 2025.

Defendants failed to timely respond. Plaintiff 5 therefore requests an order compelling defendants to immediately serve full and complete 6 responses, without objection, to each of the interrogatories and requests for production. (Doc. 50- 7 1.) 8 Without any apparent justification, Defendants Simon-Oakley Town Center LLC and Blue 9 Whale Capital LLC have failed to provide responses to Plaintiff's second set of written 10 interrogatories and second set of requests for production of documents.

Further, these defendants 11 have failed to respond to the motion to compel. Accordingly, the Court finds that Plaintiff is 12 entitled to written responses and production of documents, without objection, to Plaintiff's second 13 set of interrogatories and requests for production propounded on Defendants Simon-Oakley Town 14 Center LLC and Blue Whale Capital LLC. 15 However, based on the representations of Centres' counsel, it appears that the failure to 16 respond was inadvertent and that Centres are in the process of complying with Plaintiff's second 17 set of written discovery requests.

Accordingly, to the extent Centres has not yet served its 18 responses, it shall do so within fourteen (14) days of the date of this order. 19 B. Request for Expenses 20 Plaintiff seeks an award of monetary sanctions due to defendants' failure to respond and 21 provide discovery responses. If a court grants a motion to compel, then the court also must order 22 the party "whose conduct necessitated the motion... to pay the movant's reasonable expenses 23 incurred in making the motion, including attorney's fees." Fed.

R. Civ. P. 37(a)(5)(A). However, 24 the court must not award expenses if “the movant filed the motion before attempting in good faith 25 to obtain the disclosure or discovery without court action”; “the opposing party’s nondisclosure, 26 response, or objection was substantially justified”; or “other circumstances make an award of 27 expenses unjust.” Fed. R. Civ.

P. 37(a)(5)(A)(i)-(iii). 28 As discussed above, it appears to the Court that Centres’ failure to respond to Plaintiff’s 1 second set of written discovery requests was due to inadvertence, and not willful, and that Centres 2 are in the process of complying with Plaintiff’s second set of written discovery requests following 3 meet and confer discussions.

The Court therefore finds that these circumstances make the award 4 of expenses unjust. 5 However, as to the remaining defendants, the Court finds that awarding reasonable 6 expenses is mandatory as there is no evidence that Defendants Simon-Oakley Town Center LLC 7 and Blue Whale Capital LLC’s failure to respond to Plaintiff’s second set of written discovery 8 requests was substantially justified or that other circumstances make an award of expenses unjust.

9 This is particularly true in the absence of any response from these defendants to the motion to 10 compel. The Court therefore finds that Defendants Simon-Oakley Town Center LLC and Blue 11 Whale Capital LLC’s are required to pay Plaintiff’s expenses under Rule 37(a)(5). 12 District courts have broad discretion in determining the reasonableness of the fees.

Gates 13 v. Deukmejian, 987 F.2d 1392, 1398 (9th Cir. 1992). The Ninth Circuit utilizes the “lodestar” 14 method to determine what constitutes reasonable attorneys’ fees. Gonzalez v. City of Maywood, 15 729 F.3d 1196, 1202 (9th Cir. 2013).

Under the “lodestar” method, the district court multiplies 16 the number of hours reasonably expended by a reasonable hourly rate. Id. Reasonable hourly rates 17 are determined by the “prevailing market rates in the relevant community.” Sorenson v. Mink, 239 18 F.3d 1140, 1145 (9th Cir. 2001) (citation omitted). 19 Plaintiff seeks \$1,579.50 for the expenses incurred.

(Doc. 50-1 at 4-5.) Counsel declares 20 that she spent 4.0 hours on efforts to obtain defendants’ discovery responses, including 3.5 hours 21 on meet and confer efforts and 0.5 hours reviewing the motion and supporting documents, at a 22 requested hourly rate of \$300.00. (Amended Moore Decl. ¶¶ 8-9.) Counsel further declares that 23 her paralegal, Whitney Law, spent 3.3 hours on meet and confer efforts and preparing the motion 24 to compel at a requested hourly rate of \$115.00.

(Id. ¶¶ 10-11.) The Court finds that Plaintiff is 25 entitled to “the reasonable expenses incurred in making the motion, including attorney’s fees,” 26 which, by counsel’s own declaration, is limited to 0.5 hours of attorney time and 3.3 hours of 27 paralegal time. Rule 37(a)(5)(A) provides for recovery of the “expenses incurred in making the 28 motion,” not meet and confer expenses.

Consistent with other courts in this district, the Court 1 also finds that the hourly attorney and paralegal rates requested here are reasonable. See *Trujillo 2 v. Singh*, No. 1:16-cv-01640 LJO-EPG, 2017 WL 1831941, at *3 (E.D. Cal. May 8, 2017); 3 accord e.g., *Trujillo v. GH Food Mart, Inc.*, No. 1:20-cv-00368-AWI-SKO, 2020 WL 4697139, 4 at *7 (E.D. Cal. Aug.

13, 2020). The Court therefore will order Defendants to pay Plaintiff's 5 reasonable expenses in the amount of \$529.50 (0.5 x \$300 + 3.3 x \$115) within seven (7) days 6 from the date of this order. 7 V. CONCLUSION AND ORDER 8 Based on the above, it is HEREBY ORDERED as follows: 9 1. Plaintiff's Motion to Compel, Doc. 50, is GRANTED in part. 10 2. Within seven (7) days from the date of service of this order, Defendants Simon- 11 Oakley Town Center LLC and Blue Whale Capital LLC shall provide written 12 responses and produce documents without objection to Plaintiff's Second Set of 13 Interrogatories and Second Set of Requests for Production.

14 3. Within fourteen (14) days from the date of service of this order, Defendants Centres 15 Villa Limited Partnership and Centres Clovis Aldi, Ltd, if they have not already done 16 so, shall provide written responses and produce documents in response to Plaintiff's 17 Second Set of Interrogatories and Second Set of Requests for Production. 18 4. Within seven (7) days from the date of service of this order, Defendants Simon- 19 Oakley Town Center LLC and Blue Whale Capital LLC, joint and severally, shall pay 20 Plaintiff's expenses in the amount of \$529.50.

21 IT IS SO ORDERED. 22 23 Dated: December 11, 2025 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe _ UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 24 25 26 27 28