1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Alexandria Division TIGERS LIMITED, et al., Plaintiffs, : Case No. 1:15-cv-947 -vs-TAMERLANE GLOBAL SERVICES, et al., Defendants. HEARING ON MOTIONS December 18, 2015 Before: Michael S. Nachmanoff, U.S. Mag. Judge APPEARANCES: Katherine L. McKnight, Counsel for the Plaintiffs

Michael C. Whitticar, Counsel for the Defendants

answer the discovery. There was discovery responses in process at that time. It came as a complete surprise to me. I told him not to do it. I advised against it. I told him I was either going to withdraw or disclose to the Court that I advised against it. He authorized me to disclose to the Court that I advised against it.

But from, you know, from a legal perspective as someone who is used to dealing with rules and discovery in this court, I think it's indefensible.

From a layman's perspective, I can sort of understand what he was thinking because, you know, he was going to go out of business if he lost the case on Monday and, you know, he didn't want to spend time and money having lawyers go over 150 interrog -- you know, 150 document requests and 50-something interrogatories if he was going to go out of business anyway.

I do believe, however, that certain requests are, you know, significantly overbroad and that the objections were well taken to those requests. Those being the requests that say, you know, describe all facts on which you dispute any allegation of the complaint or denied any allegation of the complaint when each party denied over 50 allegations of the complaint.

And then there is another one, all facts on which you -- on which you base any of your affirmative defenses.

Well, there were five affirmative defenses, so that's 55 parts

and subparts right there. And we did timely object to those interrogatories as being overly burdensome -- overbroad, and unduly burdensome.

And then there are things where they're asking us for, you know, all of the documents about all of the moves and jobs between Tigers and my clients. And I think there is really only one job or one move that is in dispute. They say we got a \$160,000 payment out of them by promising that we were going to use it to pay a subcontractor and that was fraud.

Our position is, you owed us that money anyway. And the reason I didn't pay it to the subcontractor was because he tried to jack up the prices and hold the -- hold hostage the shipment that was there in Afghanistan.

So I think that discovery, at least as to Artemis and Tamerlane, is due to be compelled. I do believe that there are some legitimate objections that were timely made, and that the scope should be limited to facts relating to the move that's at issue, the alleged fraudulent procurement of the money; and two, the alter ego issues of the financial and legal relationships between the clients.

And with those exceptions, Your Honor, I don't really contest the motion to compel. I agree that the discovery is overdue.

MS. McKNIGHT: Your Honor, briefly to respond to a few points.

First, the requests that defendants' counsel was referring to, the O'Brien requests, were included in the same mailing as the requests to Artemis and Tamerlane. We're not sure what happened to them when they were received by defendants' counsel, but they were included in that same mailing.

Regardless of the facts of that issue, if defendant had raised -- defendants' counsel had raised that issue in their response brief this week, we could have provided the Court with more facts about that issue so you could have made a ruling on that. We don't think that's been fully briefed.

Number two, to the extent that defendants intend to rely on objections to withhold documents, and again because we have not received any responses to document requests or answers to interrogatories, we don't know -- we don't know whether or to what extent defendants expect to withhold information or documents subject to their objections.

But to the extent they do wish to withhold information or documents subject to those objections, as you will see in Exhibit C to our motion, those objections are boilerplate and, frankly, not legitimate as defendants' counsel just suggested. Very bare bones objections, boilerplate, no information or detail about why any of these discovery requests would be overly broad or unreasonable.

Finally, and I touched on this already, but just to

privilege and a privilege log is provided, or has some other

25

truly compelling reason, I can assure you that sanctions will be imposed for failure to fully comply at this point.

Had there been issues about oppressiveness or overbreadth, counsel had the opportunity to file a motion for a protective order. If there was a desperate need for additional time and that couldn't have been worked out collaboratively, counsel could have filed a motion to continue or extend that time. None of those things were done, and that cannot be placed on the responsibility of the client.

So the motion is granted and full responses are required to be produced. Frankly, I'm inclined to require them to be produced by next Wednesday at noon. I realize this is a terrible time, but the plaintiffs are now in a position where discovery closes on January 15.

So if counsel want to make an agreement to alter that date due to schedules, you can do so, but given the situation that your client has put you in and that you have put yourself in, I see no other alternative than to order it in that short period of time.

MR. WHITTICAR: All I can say in response, when we were scheduling depositions my clients told me they are going on vacation from the 19th to the 28th. But I don't know if that has any impact on the Court's ruling or not. We did offer them up for depositions on the 29th and 30th.

THE COURT: Well, I will hear from Ms. McKnight. I

assume that getting these documents prior to the taking of the deposition is important.

MS. McKNIGHT: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No, the documents have to be produced by December 24 at noon.

And with regard to those depositions, I know that was not subject to the motion, but it was referenced I believe in a footnote. I assume that those have now been sent and will not be moved because discovery is going to cut off on January 15, and those depositions need to be taken. Are those set?

MR. WHITTICAR: They have not been set, Your Honor. And that's one of the many reasons I feel I need to withdraw from this case, including my client not listening to me about these very matters. Because I have a vacation scheduled from January 1 through 10th, and I have a full schedule of depositions and hearings in the month of January.

And I was wondering if I might be heard or able to set some sort of emergency motion to withdraw because they're insulting me, they are cursing at me, they are threatening Bar complaints. And there are no Fridays available between now and the end of discovery for me to move to withdraw. And I am wondering if I might be heard on an expedited motion to withdraw.

THE COURT: Well, that matter is not before the Court today. So I can't rule on it today.

```
1
               MR. WHITTICAR: No, I don't want you to rule on it.
 2
     I am just wondering if we might be able to set one for next
 3
     week.
 4
               THE COURT: Well, if you file a motion, I will
 5
     consider it. The Court, of course, is not going to be
     available, but if there needs to be some emergency hearing, we
 6
 7
     can arrange one and deal with it by phone.
 8
               I will tell you that, you know, of course you have an
 9
     obligation to advise your clients of the results of this motion
10
     and the results of noncompliance.
11
               MR. WHITTICAR: Naturally.
12
               THE COURT: And if you're going to withdraw, there
13
     needs to be either consent from the client; or, if there isn't
14
     consent, we need to have them in here or participate in a way
15
     so that they understand the consequence of losing counsel.
16
               Individuals can represent themselves pro se, entities
17
     cannot. So, you know, they run the risk of being found in
18
     default and having serious consequences.
               MR. WHITTICAR: Understood.
19
20
               THE COURT: Okay. Any other matters to address
21
     today?
22
               MS. McKNIGHT: No, Your Honor.
23
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Court will be in
24
     recess.
25
               NOTE: The hearing concluded at 10:59 a.m.
```

CERTIFICATE of TRANSCRIPTION I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript that was typed by me from the recording provided by the court. Any errors or omissions are due to the inability of the undersigned to hear or understand said recording. Further, that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the above-styled action, and that I am not financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the above-styled action. /s/ Norman B. Linnell Norman B. Linnell Court Reporter - USDC/EDVA