

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

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