

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

T.E.N. Investments, Inc. v. Chapter Kris Jackson, Aristocrat Motors Inc., Christopher Adam Jackson, Aristocrat Motor Company, Inc., and Snowy Owl LLC

T.E.N. Investments · No. 25-cv-2104-TC-JBW · Decided April 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Kansas grants in part and denies in part Plaintiff T.E.N. Investments, Inc.’s motion to compel discovery responses from pro se defendants Chapter Jackson and Christopher Jackson. The court orders Chapter Jackson to produce specified documents and provide supplemental interrogatory responses, and orders Christopher Jackson to provide supplemental interrogatory responses, all within 30 days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Kansas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jennifer B. Wieland
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Kansas
DECIDED	April 15, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-2104-TC-JBW
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a) to compel pro se defendants Chapter Jackson and Christopher Jackson to provide discovery responses. The motion was decided as an uncontested motion because the defendants did not file an opposition.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Discovery motions are evaluated under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including whether the requested discovery requires a response under Rules 33 and 34 and whether asserted objections are supported. Unreasserted objections may be deemed abandoned, although the court exercised discretion to consider the pro se defendants' objections despite their failure to oppose the motion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	T.E.N. Investments, Inc. v. Chapter Kris Jackson, Aristocrat Motors Inc., Christopher Adam Jackson, Aristocrat Motor Company, Inc.,

TOPICS

discovery dispute civil procedure trademark infringement trademark law reasonable accommodation

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure intellectual property commercial litigation disability accommodation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Chapter Jackson should be compelled to produce documents responsive to specified requests for production and provide complete answers to specified interrogatories.
2. Whether Christopher Jackson should be compelled to provide complete answers to specified interrogatories.
3. Whether the Jacksons' objections were waived or otherwise should be overruled because they did not oppose the motion to compel.
4. Whether Chapter Jackson's asserted vision impairment excused her from responding to interrogatories or producing responsive documents.

HOLDINGS

1. Chapter Jackson must produce all documents responsive to Requests for Production 1-4, 6, 8-10, 13-15, 17-19, 29, and 31-44, or serve supplemental responses stating without objection that no responsive documents exist.
2. Chapter Jackson must serve supplemental responses fully answering Interrogatories 1-3, 7-10, and 12-20 without objection.
3. Christopher Jackson must serve supplemental responses fully answering Interrogatories 1-3 and 7-17 without objection.
4. The court declined to deem the Jacksons' objections abandoned solely because they failed to file an opposition, and instead considered the objections in ruling on the motion.
5. Chapter Jackson's vision impairment was not a valid objection to answering interrogatories or producing responsive documents, and the court did not impose an accommodation obligation on plaintiff based on the record presented.
6. The request to compel Christopher Jackson to produce documents was denied because his responses stated that he possessed no responsive documents and plaintiff did not show that he actually had responsive documents within his possession, custody, or control.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Any objection the responding party does not reassert in its response to a motion to compel is deemed abandoned.” (6)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

T.E.N. Investments alleges that the defendants used the ARISTOCRAT MOTORS trademark through a fraudulent United States trademark application, sham business entities, and fictitious business-name registrations in fall 2024. Plaintiff served each Jackson with interrogatories and requests for production on November 21, 2025. The Jacksons served objections and responses but did not fully answer numerous interrogatories or clearly state whether documents were being withheld based on objections. Plaintiff attempted to confer, but both Jacksons ended the January 19, 2026 call, and the court found further conferral efforts likely futile.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

T.E.N. Investments filed claims involving trademark infringement, unfair competition, false designation of origin, and related relief. The court previously entered default judgment and a permanent injunction against the entity defendants, while the claims against Chapter and Christopher Jackson remained pending. After serving interrogatories and requests for production and attempting to confer, plaintiff moved to compel. The court granted the motion in part and denied it in part, ordering both Jacksons to provide specified supplemental interrogatory answers and ordering Chapter Jackson to produce specified documents.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Mercado v. Arrow Truck Sales, Inc., No. 23-2052-HLT-ADM, 2024 WL 1557539, at *2 (D. Kan. Apr. 10, 2024)
- Kannaday v. Ball, 292 F.R.D. 640, 644 (D. Kan. 2013)
- Firestone v. Hawker Beechcraft International Service Co., No. 10-1404, 2011 WL 13233153, at *2 (D. Kan. Sept. 28, 2011)