

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)