

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.

OPINION

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