

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Ghaemmaghmi v. Dignity Health

Ghaemmaghmi · No. CV-24-00052-PHX-KML · Decided December 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona resolves three discovery disputes in Ghaemmaghmi’s action against Dignity Health concerning paid time off for physicians. The court requires Dignity to provide contact information for all physicians in the relevant period, directs the parties to propose a deadline for production responsive to RFPs 8–10, and requires plaintiff’s counsel to identify which of 34 physicians it continues to represent.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Krissa M. Lanham
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
DECIDED	December 22, 2025
DOCKET	CV-24-00052-PHX-KML
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties submitted three discovery disputes for resolution during litigation concerning Dignity Health's provision of paid time off to physicians.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court discovery order; precedential status is unknown.
PARTIES	Vafa Ghaemmaghmi v. Dignity Health

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- privilege
- attorney client privilege
- civil procedure
- employee benefits

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- employment law
- health law
- evidence

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Dignity Health's discovery responses could be limited to physicians employed by Dignity Health Medical Group rather than all Dignity physicians during the relevant period.
2. Whether the court should impose a deadline for Dignity Health's production responding to requests for production 8 through 10.
3. Whether plaintiff's counsel had to identify which of the 34 physicians named in the prelitigation demand letter counsel continued to represent.

HOLDINGS

1. Dignity Health must provide contact information and discovery responses concerning all Dignity physicians during the requested relevant period, rather than limiting the responses to physicians employed by Dignity Health Medical Group.
2. The parties must confer and file a joint proposed deadline for completing Dignity Health's production responding to RFPs 8 through 10; if they cannot agree, they may submit separate proposed deadlines.
3. Plaintiff's counsel must identify which of the 34 physicians on whose behalf counsel previously sent a demand letter counsel continues to represent.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"These allegations dictate that the court should not limit a potential class at this stage, before it has even been proposed." (at 2)

"The parties must confer and file a joint proposed deadline for the production to be complete." (at 2)

"This disclosure constitutes a waiver of the attorney-client privilege" (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Vafa Ghaemmaghami worked under a contract that allegedly entitled him to participate in employee benefit plans, including paid time away. His claims potentially concerned physicians employed by Dignity Health beyond the Dignity Health Medical Group affiliate, and plaintiff's complaint described a potential class involving all similarly situated Dignity physicians. Before suit, plaintiff's counsel sent a demand letter to Dignity on behalf of 34 physicians and later refused to identify which of those physicians counsel continued to represent.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff sought discovery concerning physicians covered by allegedly applicable paid-time-off policies, production deadlines for requests for production 8 through 10, and the identities of physicians whom plaintiff's counsel continued to represent after sending a prelitigation demand letter. The court resolved the disputes by ordering broader physician-contact discovery, requiring the parties to propose a production deadline, and requiring plaintiff's counsel to identify the physicians it continued to represent.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- State v. Sucharew, 66 P.3d 59, 65 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2003)
- Naranjo v. Sukenic in & for Cnty. of Maricopa, 524 P.3d 1123, 1131 (Ariz. 2023)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-arizona/2025/ghaemmaghami-v-dignity-health-v8jlk40>