

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Amanda Broomes, et al. v. FullBeauty Brands Operations, LLC

Broomes v. FullBeauty Brands Operations, LLC, No. 24-cv-03558-RFL (KAW) (N.D. Cal. Dec. 17, 2025) · No. 24-cv-03558-RFL (KAW) · Decided December 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The court terminated the parties’ September 3, 2025 joint discovery letter concerning Plaintiffs’ interrogatories after resolving Defendant’s motion to compel arbitration. The court ordered the parties to meet and confer regarding supplementation, questioned the scope and proportionality of requested discovery, and noted that certain interrogatories may improperly exceed the applicable limit.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Kandis A. Westmore
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	December 17, 2025
DOCKET	24-cv-03558-RFL (KAW)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The magistrate judge addressed a joint discovery letter concerning Plaintiffs' interrogatories after the presiding judge resolved Defendant's motion to compel arbitration and referred the case for discovery purposes.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- class actions
- arbitration
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties' discovery dispute should be resolved through the joint discovery letter or instead through a meet-and-confer process.

2. Whether the proposed interrogatories were potentially overbroad, improperly compound, and beyond the 25-interrogatory limit.
3. Whether discovery should be limited to information relevant to the defined class and proportionate to the needs of the case.

HOLDINGS

1. The court terminated the joint discovery letter and ordered the parties to meet and confer regarding whether Defendant's supplementation would resolve the interrogatory dispute.
2. The court advised that discovery should be evaluated against the class definition and proportionality requirements, and that interrogatories seeking numerous categories of information for each product or each day may be improperly compound and may exceed the 25-interrogatory limit.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The Court TERMINATES the discovery letter." (at 2)

"Thus, the Court ORDERS the parties to meet and confer as to whether Defendant's supplementation would resolve the discovery dispute." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs served interrogatories seeking information concerning merchandise offered or sold on Eloquii.com, including multiple categories of information for each product and, in one interrogatory, twelve types of information for each day of the class period. The court noted that the proposed discovery appeared broader than the class definition and potentially compound, and that Defendant had stated it was amenable to supplementing its responses if the litigation proceeded.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties filed a joint discovery letter on September 3, 2025. Defendant objected in part because its motion to compel arbitration was pending. On December 11, 2025, the presiding judge ordered arbitration as to one of the six named Plaintiffs, and the matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Westmore for discovery. The court terminated the discovery letter and directed the parties to meet and confer, with permission to submit a compliant joint discovery letter if they could not resolve the dispute.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *AngioScore, Inc. v. TriReme Med., Inc.*, No. 12-CV-03393-YGR, 2014 WL 7188779 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2014)

OPINION

Broomes

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 AMANDA BROOMES, et al., Case No. 24-cv-03558-RFL (KAW) 8 Plaintiffs,

ORDER TERMINATING 9/3/2025

9 v. DISCOVERY LETTER

10 FULLBEAUTY BRANDS OPERATIONS, Re: Dkt. No. 74

LLC,

11 Defendant. 12

13 On September 3, 2025, the parties filed a joint discovery letter regarding Plaintiffs' 14
interrogatories. (Discovery Letter, Dkt. No. 74.) One of Defendant's primary objections therein 15
was whether discovery was appropriate given its then-pending motion to compel arbitration. 16
(Discovery Letter at 3-4.) On December 11, 2025, the presiding judge resolved Defendant's 17
motion to compel arbitration, finding that arbitration was required only as to one of the six named
18 Plaintiffs. (See Dkt. No. 86 at 1, 9.) That same day, the case was referred to the undersigned for
19 purposes of discovery. (Dkt. No. 87.) 20 The Court TERMINATES the discovery letter. Again,
one of Defendant's primary 21 objections was that discovery was not warranted because of the
motion to compel arbitration. 22 Defendant further stated that it was "amenable to supplementing
its response" if litigation 23 proceeded. (Discovery Letter at 5.) Thus, the Court ORDERS the
parties to meet and confer as to 24 whether Defendant's supplementation would resolve the
discovery dispute. 25 To provide guidance as to the parties' meet and confer, the Court also notes
that to the 26 extent Plaintiffs are seeking discovery as to "all merchandise that has been offered
and/or sold" on 27 Eloquii.com, it is unclear why this scope is appropriate given that the class
definition is limited to 1 150.) While Plaintiffs argue that discovery should not be limited to
products that they purchased, 2 || they fail to explain why products that are outside the class
definition would be discoverable and 3 || proportionate to the needs of this case. (See Discovery
Letter at 2.) 4 Likewise, the interrogatories that seek nine to sixteen different types of information
for 5 every product (including one interrogatory that seeks twelve types of information for each
day of 6 || the class period) appears to be improperly compound and would quickly exceed the 25-
7 || interrogatory limit. See *AngioScore, Inc. v. TriReme Med., Inc.*, No. 12-CV-03393-YGRUSC),
8 2014 WL 7188779 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2014) (finding that interrogatories which sought four
types 9 || of information for twelve affirmative defenses needed to be "counted as separate
interrogatories, 10 || and in so counting, Plaintiff has exceeded the 25 interrogatory limit").
Plaintiff does not address 11 this issue except to assert that the information sought is relevant. (See
Discovery Letter at 2-3.) 12 || The parties should explore whether such discovery is more
appropriately dealt with other 5 13 discovery devices rather than interrogatories. 14 If the parties

are unable to resolve their issues, the parties shall file a joint discovery letter 3 15 || that complies with the Court's Standing Order. (See Judge Westmore Standing Order 4] 13-14.) a 16 IT IS SO ORDERED. 3 17. || Dated: December 17, 2025 18 Kank te 19 United States Magistrate Judge 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-ca/2025/amanda-broomes-et-al-v-fullbeauty-brands-operations-llc-7358wyu0>