

1 David Stebbins 123 W. Ridge Ave., APT D, Harrison, AR 72601
2 (870) 204-6516 acerthorn@yahoo.com

3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4 DAVID STEBBINS, PLAINTIFF

5 VS. Case 4:23-cv-00321-MMC

6 SYDNEY REDFIELD, d.b.a. SIDALPHA DEFENDANTS

7 **MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY, FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER, AND FOR**
8 **DETERMINATION OF SUFFICIENCY UNDER FRCP 36(a)(6)**

9 Comes now, pro se Plaintiff David Stebbins, who hereby submits the following Motion to
10 Compel Discovery, for protective order, and for determination of sufficiency under FRCP 36(a)
11 (6) in the above-styled action.

12 The Defendant has responded to my initial waive of discovery requests. However, his
13 responses are grossly insufficient as a matter of law.

14 I attempted to meet and confer with defense counsel, but he was frustratingly
15 uncooperative and utterly refused to confer in good faith. This attempt satisfies my requirement
16 under Local Rule 37-1(a) to attempt in good faith to resolve the discovery dispute without court
17 action.

18 Please find attached the following exhibits:

- 19 • **Exhibit A:** Defendant's Responses to my Requests for Admissions
- 20 • **Exhibit B:** Defendant's Responses to my Requests for Production
- 21 • **Exhibit C:** Defendant's Responses to my Interrogatories
- 22 • **Exhibit D:** Defendant's Responses to my Requests to Permit Inspection
- 23 • **Exhibit E:** My attempts over email to explain the discovery responses' shortcomings tot
24 he defense counsel.
- 25 • **Exhibit F:** A copy of the first ever email I sent to the Defendant, with the portion where I
26 asked him to hear my side of the story highlighted.

27 Exhibits A-D all collectively satisfy the requirements of Local Rule 37-2, which requires
28 that a motion to compel discovery “set forth each request in full, followed immediately by the

1 objections and/or responses thereto.” If I were to provide that in the body of the Memorandum, it
2 would be impossible to keep the memorandum under 25 pages.

3 Speaking of which, please also find attached a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in
4 Support of this Motion.

5 Wherefore, premises considered, I respectfully pray that this Motion to Compel
6 Discovery, for Protective Order, and for Determination of Sufficiency under FRCP 36(a)(6) be
7 granted, costs incurred be awarded, that the defense counsel be properly sanctioned, and for any
8 other relief to which I may be entitled.

9 So requested on this, the 25th day of June, 2026.

10
11

/s/ David Stebbins
David Stebbins (pro se)

Exhibit A

1 J. Curtis Edmondson (SBN 236105)
2 Law Offices of J. Curtis Edmondson
3 Beaverton Plaza Building
4 3720 SW 141st Avenue, Suite 212
5 Beaverton, OR 97005
6 Phone: (503) 336-3749
7 Email: jcedmondson@edmolaw.com
8 Attorney for Defendants

9
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

12 DAVID STEBBINS,
13 Plaintiff,
14 v.
15 SYDNEY REDFIELD dba SIDALPHA,
16 Defendants.

Case No. 4:23-cv-00321-MWC

**DEFENDANT SYDNEY REDFIELD
dba SIDALPHA’s RESPONSES TO
PLAINTIFF’S FIRST SET OF
REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS**

17 PROPOUNDING PARTY: Plaintiff, DAVID STEBBINS
18 RESPONDING PARTY: Defendant, SYDNEY REDFIELD DBA
19 SIDALPHA
20 SET NO.: ONE

21 Defendant SYDNEY REDFIELD DBA SIDALPHA (“SIDALPHA” or
22 “Defendant”) hereby responds to Plaintiff DAVID STEBBINS’ (“STEBBINS” or
23 “Plaintiff”) Requests for Admissions pursuant to FRCP 36, as follows:

24
25 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

26 1. Defendant objects to these Requests to the extent they seek
27 information, which is already in the custody of Plaintiff, or is in the possession of
28 other parties, or the public domain that Plaintiff has equal access to. To the extent

1 that Plaintiff is seeking such information which is more readily available from other
2 sources or already in the possession of Plaintiff, Defendant objects to these
3 discovery requests as unduly burdensome.

4 2 Defendant further objects to the Requests to the extent they seek to
5 impose duties and obligations beyond those authorized by, or imposed by, Federal
6 Rules of Civil Procedure Rules 26 and 36. To the extent the Requests seek to
7 impose obligations greater than those imposed by such Rules, they are overly broad
8 and unduly burdensome.

9 3. Finally, Defendant objects to the term “the smear video in question”
10 defined as “the smear video” in many of Plaintiff’s Requests for Admissions. This
11 term is not properly defined and thus speculative.

12 Notwithstanding these General Objections, Defendant further responds to the
13 individual requests below:

14
15 **RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS**

16 **REQUEST NO. 1:** Admit the Defendant owns and operates the YouTube channel
17 located at <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCidP2JUrfwr59oY88LsHaVg>.

18 **OBJECTIONS:** Compound in form. Vague and ambiguous as to “owns.”

19 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections: Defendant admits that he
20 operates the YouTube channel located at
21 <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCidP2JUrfwr59oY88LsHaVg>. Deny that he
22 “owns” the channel.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 2:** Admit the Defendant has total control over any and all videos
25 posted to the aforementioned channel, as well as all text-based posts and comments
26 posted by that account, to the extent that he is, necessarily, the “publisher” of said
27 content.
28

1 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “total control” and “the
2 publisher;” compound in form.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, admit in part, deny in part.
4 Defendant admits he controls whether videos and comments remain on his channel,
5 but deny that he has “total control” of all videos and posts on his YouTube channel.
6

7 REQUEST NO. 3: Admit in January of 2022, the Defendant announced on
8 Twitter (now known as X) his intention to make a video about “Acerthorn.”

9 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to the term “announced.”

10 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Admit.
11

12 REQUEST NO. 4: Admit Acerthorn is my alias on YouTube and other social
13 medias.

14 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to the meaning of “my alias” and
15 “other social medias”; and compound in form as evidenced by the use of “and.”

16 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Admit in part; deny in part.
17 Admit that Defendant is aware of Plaintiff’s alias of Acerthorn on YouTube, but
18 deny as to the remaining allegations due to a lack of knowledge and/or belief as to
19 Plaintiff’s aliases on “other social medias.”
20

21 REQUEST NO. 5: Admit whenever anyone (including the Defendant) mentions
22 “Acerthorn,” it is presumed they (sic) talking about me.

23 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to the meaning of the term
24 “anyone”.

25 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant cannot admit or
26 deny based on a lack of knowledge and/or belief after a reasonable inquiry, and on
27 that basis: Deny.
28

1 **REQUEST NO. 6:** Admit the smear video in question (“the smear video”) was
2 published on February 12, 2022, and can be found at the following URL
3 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WB-Xd1qDKIY>.

4 **OBJECTIONS:** Compound as evidenced by the use of “and.” Further, there
5 is no video at this URL as it states “Video unavailable” when it is clicked.

6 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
7 or deny based on a lack of knowledge and/or belief after a reasonable inquiry, and
8 on that basis, Deny.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 7:** Admit prior to him making the smear video, I contacted the
11 Defendant through his email address of sidalpha@sidalpha.com, asking him to hear
12 my side of the story before making his video about me.

13 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to the terms “asking him” and “his
14 video about me”; and unintelligible as to “the smear video” which is undefined.

15 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, admit in part, deny in part.
16 Admit that Plaintiff e-mailed Defendant with a cease-and-desist request, but deny
17 that Plaintiff asked Defendant to hear and consider Plaintiff’s “side of the story.”

18
19 **REQUEST NO. 8:** Admit the Defendant rejected my offer to tell my side of the
20 story with no reason given.

21 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to the terms “my offer,” and “the
22 story.”

23 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections: Deny, as there was no offer
24 to “tell his side of the story”.

25
26 **REQUEST NO. 9:** Admit the reasoning provided in Dkt. 74-4, ¶ 15 in this case is
27 substantially the correct reason why the Defendant refused to hear my side of the
28 story.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the reasoning provided” and “the story;” and this request incorporates by reference a separate document which is not attached hereto or permitted under FRCP 36(a). A request must be full and complete in and of itself.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections: Defendant is unable to admit or deny based on a lack of knowledge and/or belief as to the meaning of the referenced document or video, and on that basis, Deny.

REQUEST NO. 10: Admit the Defendant's decision to make the video about me was motivated by the one-sided story fed to him by various biased informants, who go by such aliases as InitiativeKookie, SkibbityDibbity, xArtemisWolf, SofiannP, TGP482, and Cretosis, among others (“the Defendant's informants”).

OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “video about me” and “biased informants,” and “among others”—all of which are undefined. Also, compound in form.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

REQUEST NO. 11: Admit all of the Defendant's informants were biased, malicious liars and bullies who sought only to harass, dox, and torment me, entirely for its own sake, out of pure hatred, malice, and spite (“informants' motives”).

OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the Defendant’s informants,” “dox” “torment me,” “its own sake” and “informants’ motives”; also compound in form.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, based on a lack of information and/or belief of the alleged informants’ motives after a reasonable inquiry, and on that basis, Deny.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 12: Admit the Defendant's informants sought out the Defendant to spread their smear campaign against me on their behalf because of the fact that he has over 100,000 subscribers on YouTube, meaning he could distribute their smear message on their behalf to far more people than they could ever hope to spread it themselves.

OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “Defendant’s informants,” “their smear campaign,” “on their behalf,” and “their smear message.”

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit or deny based on a lack of information and/or belief after a reasonable inquiry, and on that basis: Deny.

REQUEST NO. 13: Admit the Defendant knew about his informants' motives long before making the smear video about me, yet chose to believe their biased accusations against me anyway.

OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “his informants’ motives” and “their biased accusations”.

RESPONSE: Without waiving said objections, Deny.

REQUEST NO. 14: Admit that although criticism is protected by the First Amendment, harassment is a crime in every state in the USA.

OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “criticism” and “harassment,” which are undefined.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant lacks information or belief as to whether every state in the USA qualifies certain behaviors as “harassment” after a reasonable inquiry, and on that basis, Deny.

REQUEST NO. 15: Admit that harassment is never criticism, and criticism is

1 never harassment.

2 OBJECTIONS: Unintelligible as phrased, argumentative, and vague and
3 ambiguous as to “criticism” and “harassment” neither of which is a defined term.
4 Also, compound in form.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving objections, Defendant lacks information or
6 belief as to whether criticism qualifies as “harassment” after a reasonable inquiry,
7 and on that basis, Deny.

8
9 **REQUEST NO. 16:** Admit that harassment is the repeated engaging of one or
10 more activities that serve no legitimate purpose and are designed primarily to
11 harass, annoy, or alarm a victim for the sadistic or demented amusement of the
12 perpetrators.

13 OBJECTIONS: Unintelligible as phrased, argumentative, and vague and
14 ambiguous as to “harassment” and “sadistic or demented amusement of the
15 perpetrators.” Calls for expert opinion.

16 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant lacks information
17 or belief to understand the meaning of this Request after a reasonable inquiry, and
18 on that basis, Deny.

19
20 **REQUEST NO. 17:** Admit that in Case 4:22-cv-00546-JSW in the Northern
21 District of California, Dkt. 32, ¶¶ 57-85, I provide an apt and objectively accurate
22 description of what constitutes harassment as a matter of law, what constitutes
23 doxxing, and how to distinguish these two malum in se actions from First
24 Amendment-protected criticism.

25 OBJECTIONS: Unintelligible as phrased, argumentative, and vague and
26 ambiguous as to “apt,” “harassment,” “doxxing,” “these two malum,” “in se
27 actions,” all of which are undefined. Compound in form as it includes an
28 incorporation of by reference to a document outside this Request which makes it

1 not full and complete in and of itself.

2 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant lacks information
3 or belief as to the referenced document(s) after a reasonable inquiry, and on that
4 basis, Deny.

5
6 REQUEST NO. 18: Admit that except to the extent it is relevant to legal process,
7 it is my otherwise absolute right to not be forced to read or listen to someone else's
8 speech.

9 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “legal process” and
10 “my...absolute right;” and disjunctive in form.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant cannot admit or
12 deny based on a lack of information and/or belief of the undefined terms after a
13 reasonable inquiry, and on that basis, Deny.

14
15 REQUEST NO. 19: Admit that any time anyone (including InitiativeKookie)
16 creates a new social media account or uses any alternative account (including pre-
17 existing ones) to make contact with me after I had already blocked one of their
18 accounts is automatically, necessarily, and to the exclusion of all other factors, a
19 violation of my aforementioned right to not be forced to listen to anyone else's
20 speech except to the extent it is relevant to legal process, it is my otherwise absolute
21 right to not be forced to read or listen to someone else's speech.

22 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “anyone,” “InitiativeKookie”
23 and “my...absolute right;” compound and disjunctive in form.

24 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
25 or deny based on a lack of information and/or belief after a reasonable inquiry, and
26 on that basis, Deny.

27
28

1 **REQUEST NO. 20:** Admit that many of the Defendant's informants – including
2 InitiativeKookie – repeatedly made multiple new accounts on multiple platforms,
3 including YouTube, Discord, Reddit, and Twitch, among others, for the sole and
4 express purpose of continuing to hurl insults at me even after I had already blocked
5 them. **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “Defendant’s informants,”
6 “InitiativeKookie” and “for the sole purpose ... to hurl insults at me.” Calls for
7 speculation, and is compound in form.

8 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
9 or deny based upon a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

10
11 **REQUEST NO. 21:** Admit that these multiple account creations violated my
12 aforementioned right to not be a captive audience, which in turn constituted
13 harassment (as defined by requested admissions #16 & #17 above) and, therefore, a
14 crime.

15 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to the terms “these multiple
16 account creations,” “my aforementioned right,” “harassment” and “a crime”—terms
17 which are not defined. Also, compound in form.

18 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
19 or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

20
21 **REQUEST NO. 22:** Admit that the Defendant believes that, although his
22 informants were absolutely malicious bullies who were harassing me just because
23 they can, it is nevertheless my ethical duty to shut up, bend over, and take the
24 harassment like a punk.

25 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “his informants” “malicious
26 bullies who were harassing me,” “my ethical duty,” and “take the harassment like a
27 punk.” Also, compound in form and argumentative.

28 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.

1 **REQUEST NO. 23:** Admit that were it not for InitiativeKookie starting the
2 aforementioned campaign of hate, harassment, doxxing, and cyberstalking against
3 me, but instead had simply left me alone after I had blocked him the first time, as
4 was his legal duty, none of the other events which the Defendant complained of in
5 his smear video (with the exception of Defamation #10, which had already
6 happened) would have occurred, thus making InitiaveKookie's initial harassment
7 after I had blocked time the but-for cause of everything that the Defendant accused
8 me of except for Defamation #10.

9 **OBJECTIONS:** Unintelligible as phrased; vague and ambiguous as to
10 “InitiativeKookie,” “campaign of hate...,” “his “legal duty” and “but-for-cause of
11 everything.” Also, compound and disjunctive in form.

12 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
13 or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

14
15 **REQUEST NO. 24:** Admit that despite the aforementioned but-for causation
16 caused by InitiativeKookie, the Defendant purposefully omitted this causation from
17 his smear video with the express intent of making me appear as an unprovoked
18 villain.

19 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “the aforementioned but-for
20 causation,” “InitiativeKookie,” “purposefully omitted this causation” “and “an
21 unprovoked villain.” Improperly seeks to incorporate the “aforementioned but-for
22 causation” by reference, making the request incomplete in and of itself.

23 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.

24
25 **REQUEST NO. 25:** Admit that at the time of publishing the smear video, I had
26 only 2,108 subscribers on YouTube and received fewer than 1,000 views per day on
27 average.

28

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for speculation; compound in form.

2 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
3 or deny as he lacks information and belief about subscribers to Plaintiff’s YouTube
4 account, and on that basis, Deny.

5
6 REQUEST NO. 26: Admit that the extremely limited success described in the
7 aforementioned requested admission is not enough to give me nearly the level of
8 “pervasive fame” or “immense persuasive power and influence” (key words being
9 “pervasive” and “immense”) to the extent necessary to make me an “all purpose
10 public figure” as set forth in *Gertz v. Welch*, 418 U.S. 323 (1974).

11 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the aforementioned requested
12 admission,” “level of ‘pervasive fame’”, “immense persuasive power and
13 influence” and “all purpose public figure.” Also, compound in form, and
14 improperly incorporates other request by reference such that it is not full and
15 complete in and of itself as required.

16 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
17 or deny based on a lack of understanding as to the meaning of terms therein, and on
18 that basis, Deny.

19
20 REQUEST NO. 27: Admit that prior to the smear video, the controversy between
21 the Defendant's informants and myself as limited exclusively to those parties
22 directly involved, having no more “public interest” than an auto collision lawsuit
23 between two entirely unimportant individuals. Instead, it was the Defendant's smear
24 video which amplified the publicity of the matter to such a degree that I might
25 otherwise be considered a “limited purpose public figure,” but that only happened
26 after, and specifically because, of the Defendant's smear video.

27
28

1 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the controversy between the
2 Defendant’s informants and myself,” and “amplified the publicity of the matter:”
3 Also, compound and/or disjunctive in form.

4 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to
5 admit or deny based on a lack of knowledge or belief, and on that basis, Deny.
6

7 REQUEST NO. 28: Admit that I never “voluntarily” inserted myself into the
8 creation of the Defendant's smear video, but instead only reached out to him in
9 reaction to his pre-existing announcement that he was going to make it.

10 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “announcement” and “him.”
11 Compound in form.

12 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
13 or deny based on a lack of knowledge or belief, and on that basis, Deny.
14

15 REQUEST NO. 29: Admit that I only offered to tell the Defendant my side of the
16 story over private email, not on a public website like Twitter.

17 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “my side of the story.”

18 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.
19

20 REQUEST NO. 30: Admit that I always form a subjective, good faith belief that a
21 video is not fair use before I issue a DMCA Takedown against it.

22 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “subjective, good faith belief,”
23 and DMCA Takedown.” Calls for speculation.

24 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to
25 admit or deny without knowing what Plaintiff’s subjective belief was, and on that
26 basis, Deny.
27
28

1 **REQUEST NO. 31:** Admit that prior to making the smear video, the Defendant
2 admitted publicly on Twitter (now known as X) that I sincerely believe that all of
3 my DMCA Takedowns were valid and that the corresponding videos were not fair
4 use.

5 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “I ... believe,” “all of my
6 DMCA Takedowns,” “the corresponding videos,” Compound in form.

7 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.
8

9 **REQUEST NO. 32:** Admit that the Defendant knew, at the time of publishing the
10 smear video, that I held a sincere and good faith belief that the videos I had taken
11 down were not fair use.

12 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “sincere ... belief,” and “not
13 fair use.” Compound in form and calls for speculation.

14 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
15 or deny based on a lack of information and/or belief, and on that basis, Deny.
16

17 **REQUEST NO. 33:** Admit that during the smear video, the Defendant repeatedly
18 accused me of issuing DMCA Takedowns without considering fair use in violation
19 of *Lenz v. Universal Music Corp.*, 815 F. 3d1145 (9th Cir. 2015).

20 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “fair use” and “in violation of
21 *Lenz v. Universal Music Corp.*....”

22 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.
23

24 **REQUEST NO. 34:** Admit that had the defendant admitted that my behavior was
25 legal, but merely expressed his opinion that it was unethical, it would most likely
26 have resulted in significantly less public backlash against me.

27 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “my behavior was legal”,
28 “unethical,” and “less public backlash.” Calls for speculation.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant cannot admit or
2 deny based on a lack of knowledge and belief, and on that basis, Deny.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 35**: Admit that the accusation that I do not consider fair use
5 before issuing DMCA Takedowns, if true, would make me unfit for my trade of
6 being a YouTube content creator.

7 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “accusation,” “I do not consider
8 fair use,” and “would make me unfit for my trade.”

9 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to
10 admit or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

11
12 **REQUEST NO. 36**: Admit that during the smear video, the Defendant accused me
13 of issuing a false DMCA Takedown against Skibbidy Viddity for reposting in its
14 entirety the livestream of the debate he and I had on December 20, 2021.

15 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to the terms and “Skibbidy
16 Viddity” and “the debate he and I had.”

17 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

18
19 **REQUEST NO. 37**: Admit that the Defendant's entire reasoning for thinking that
20 the DMCA Takedown was false is because he believed that Skibbidy Viddity was a
21 co-author of the livestream.

22 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “Skibbidy Viddity” and “the
23 livestream.”

24 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

25
26 **REQUEST NO. 38**: Admit that Skibbidy Viddity never participated in fixing the
27 December 21, 2021 livestream into a tangible medium of expression.

28 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “Skibbidy Viddity,”

1 “participated in,” “the December 21, 2021 livestream” and “a tangible medium of
2 expression.”

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

4
5 **REQUEST NO. 39:** Admit that the Defendant's sole, exclusive reason for
6 claiming, in the smear video, that Skibbidy Viddity was a co-author of the
7 December 20, 2021 livestream is because he participated in the debate and
8 discussion which the livestream captured and broadcast. He made absolutely no
9 other attempts to justify how Skibbidy Viddity was a co-author of the stream
10 besides that.

11 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “Skibbidy Viddity” and “the
12 December 20, 2021 livestream,” “the livestream;” compound in form and not full
13 and complete in and of itself.

14 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 40:** Admit that Defendant never had any communications with
17 Skibbidy Viddity directly, but instead based his accusations against me regarding
18 my interactions with Skibbidy Viddity entirely on what other people told the
19 Defendant, based on what those people thought they were told by Skibbidy Viddity.
20 In other words, the Defendant's evidence in support of this count of defamation is
21 subject to Federal Rule of Evidence #805 before it can be admissible at trial.

22 OBJECTIONS: Unintelligible as phrased. Vague and ambiguous as to
23 “Skibbidy Viddity,” “his accusations against me,” “those people,” and “Federal
24 Rule of Evidence #805.” Consists of two separate requests as phrased.

25 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

26
27 **REQUEST NO. 41:** Admit that at the time I issued the DMCA Takedown against
28 Skibbidy Viddity, I sincerely and in good faith believed that the reposting of the

1 livestream violated my copyright. Regardless of whether that belief was correct or
2 even reasonable, I held it sincerely and in good faith.

3 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “Skibbidy Viddity,” “violated
4 my copyright.” Consists of two separate requests; compound in form.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

6
7 **REQUEST NO. 42**: Admit that at the time of publishing the smear video, the
8 Defendant knew that I held the aforementioned sincere good faith belief in the
9 illegality of Skibbidy Viddity's reposting.

10 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “Skibbidy Viddity,” “illegality.”
11 “reposting,” and “the aforementioned ...belief” which appears to be incorporating
12 other statements by reference, making this Request not full and complete in and of
13 itself.

14 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 43**: Admit that during this section of the smear video, the
17 Defendant clearly conveyed to his audience that my DMCA Takedown of Skibbidy
18 Viddity's reposting of the stream was “false” (aka in violation of 17 USC § 512(f))
19 because of Skibbidy Viddity being a co-author.

20 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “this section,” “my DMCA
21 Takedown,” “Skibbidy Viddity,” and “reposting of the stream was ‘false.’”

22 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 44**: Admit that had the defendant admitted that my behavior was
25 legal, but merely expressed his opinion that it was unethical, there is a reasonable
26 chance it would have resulted in significantly less public backlash against me.

27 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “my behavioral was legal,”
28 “unethical,” “less public backlash.” Calls for speculation.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

2
3 **REQUEST NO. 45**: Admit that the accusation that I issued a false DMCA
4 Takedown against Skibbidy Viddity in violation of 17 USC § 512(f), if true, would
5 make me unfit for my trade of being a YouTube content creator.

6 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “a false DMCA Takedown,”
7 “Skibbidy Viddity,” and “unfit for my trade.”

8 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 46**: Admit that during the smear video, the Defendant claimed
11 that I had issued three strikes to a YouTube channel called xArtemis Wolf and had
12 her channel permanently terminated.

13 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “I had issued three strikes,” and
14 “permanently terminated.” Compound in form.

15 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Admit.

16 **REQUEST NO. 47**: Admit that creator had, in fact, made another channel less
17 than 24 hours after her first channel was terminated, and had gotten nearly all of her
18 old subscribers back in less than a week after creating the second channel (“the
19 mitigating factor”).

20 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “creator” and “the mitigating
21 factor”. Also, compound in form and calls for speculation.

22 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
23 or deny for lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

24
25 **REQUEST NO. 48**: Admit that the Defendant had actual knowledge (not just
26 constructive knowledge) of the mitigating factor at the time of publishing the smear
27 video.

28

1 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the mitigating factor.”

2 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

3

4 REQUEST NO. 49: Admit that despite possessing the aforementioned actual
5 knowledge, the Defendant did not mention the mitigating factor at any point in his
6 smear video.

7 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the mitigating factor” and “the
8 aforementioned actual knowledge” which incorporates by reference something
9 outside the request, and is not full and complete in and of itself.

10 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
11 or deny for lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

12

13 REQUEST NO. 50: Admit that by omitting the mitigating factor, the Defendant
14 either knew, or acted in reckless disregard to the risk, that people would believe that
15 xArtemis Wolf was, even as of the time of publication of the smear video, without
16 any YouTube channel at all.

17 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “omitting the mitigating factor;”
18 calls for speculation; disjunctive in form and irrelevant to the issues in this case.

19 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

20

21 REQUEST NO. 51: Admit that during the smear video, the Defendant accused me
22 of offering to pay to dox an anonymous user who goes by the alias
23 “InitiativeKookie.”

24 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “accused me” and
25 “InitiativeKookie.”

26 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, admit that Defendant shared
27 Acerthorn’s video clip which stated, “I’m offering a payment of up to \$100 if you
28 can give me his real name and address” as part of Plaintiff’s efforts to pay other

1 viewers to doxx a fellow creator for him.

2
3 **REQUEST NO. 52:** Admit that to support this accusation, the Defendant used a
4 clip from a video where I offered a reward of \$100 to anyone who could identify
5 InitiativeKookie's legal name and address, so I could sue him for cyberstalking and
6 harassment.

7 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “this accusation,”
8 “InitiativeKookie,” “cyberstalking” and “harassment.” Compound in form.

9 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, admit that Defendant shared
10 Acerthorn’s own video clip which stated, “I’m offering a payment of up to \$100 if
11 you can give me his real name and address” as part of his effort to pay others to
12 doxx a fellow creator for him.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 53:** Admit that the video the Defendant used was not meant to
15 dox InitiativeKookie, but only to locate him so I could use lawful channels to get
16 him to stop harassing me.

17 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “the video ...used,” “dox
18 InitiativeKookie” and “harassing me.” Calls for speculation.

19 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to
20 admit or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

21 **REQUEST NO. 54:** Admit that the video in question was, effectively, no more
22 unethical than what these ladies were doing in this playlist:

23 [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a4T3D5fD8EM&list=PLpL3n7W6QqgDavHIk](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a4T3D5fD8EM&list=PLpL3n7W6QqgDavHIknoPUxa=eRP5LP67Y)
24 [noPUxa=eRP5LP67Y](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a4T3D5fD8EM&list=PLpL3n7W6QqgDavHIknoPUxa=eRP5LP67Y).

25 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “the video in question,”
26 “unethical,” and “this playlist.” Also, incorporates by reference a link that is not
27 permitted since it does not make the Request full and complete in and of itself.

28 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.

1 **REQUEST NO. 55:** Admit that I never had any intention, nor did I ever state
2 anything suggesting that I had the intention, to publish InitiativeKookie's legal
3 name or address anywhere on the Internet, or use it for any purpose whatsoever
4 other than legal process.

5 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for speculation; compound and/or disjunctive in form;
6 and vague and ambiguous as to “I never had any intention,” and “legal process.”

7 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to
8 admit or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 56:** Admit that without said publication, my behavior cannot
11 possibly constitute “doxxing,” no matter how unethically I acquired the
12 information.

13 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “said publication,” and
14 “unethically I acquired the information.” Calls for speculation.

15 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
16 or deny based on a lack of information and belief, and on that basis, Deny.

17 **REQUEST NO. 57:** Admit that the clip the Defendant used was knowingly
18 stripped of relevant context mentioned in the past four requested admissions, with
19 the express intent of making it appear to his viewers that I was merely attempting to
20 dox InitiativeKookie with no legitimate purpose behind it other than to inflict pain
21 on InitiativeKookie for its own sake.

22 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “the clip...used,” “attempting to
23 dox,” “InitiativeKookie,” “stripped of ...content mentioned in the past four
24 requested admissions”, which incorporates by reference such information which is
25 impermissible.

26 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.
27
28

1 **REQUEST NO. 58:** Admit that the implied motive described in the previous
2 requested admission was not my motive.

3 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “my motive,” and “the implied
4 motive described in the previous requested admission,” which incorporates another
5 request making this Request incomplete in and of itself.

6 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant cannot admit or
7 deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

8
9 **REQUEST NO. 59:** Admit that Defendant knew that he had no evidence that the
10 aforementioned implied motive was my motive, yet he chose to imply that I had
11 this motive anyway.

12 **OBJECTIONS:** Argumentative; vague and ambiguous as to “my motive,”
13 “this motive,” and “the aforementioned implied motive,” which impermissibly
14 incorporates part of an earlier request making it incomplete rather than full and
15 complete in and of itself.

16 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.

17 **REQUEST NO. 60:** Admit that during the smear video, the Defendant claimed
18 that InitiativeKookie was a minor, with the express intention of making my acts
19 appear more heinous than they otherwise would be without that fact.

20 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “InitiativeKookie,” and
21 “heinous.”

22 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 61:** Admit that this statement was false, and the Defendant either
25 knew it was false or acted in reckless disregard to whether or not it as true.

26 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “this statement,” “false,” and “it
27 as true.” Compound in form.

28 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.

1 **REQUEST NO. 62:** Admit that this accusation, if true, would make me unfit for
2 my trade of being a YouTube content creator.

3 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “this accusation,” and “make
4 me unfit for my trade.”

5 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.

6
7 **REQUEST NO. 63:** Admit that if I had in fact committed the act which Defendant
8 accused me of committing in Requested Admission #51, it would have been a crime
9 of moral turpitude (e.g. harassment).

10 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “the act which Defendant
11 accused me of committing” and “crime of moral turpitude.” This request is not full
12 and complete in and of itself as it refers to RFA #51.

13 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.

14 **REQUEST NO. 64:** Admit that during the smear video, the defendant publicly
15 accused me of attempting to bully him into not making the smear video.

16 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “accused me of attempting to
17 bully him.”

18 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Admit.

19
20 **REQUEST NO. 65:** Admit that the Defendant's sole reasoning for saying I
21 attempted to bully him was because, prior to posting the smear video, I had made
22 my own video asking my own viewers to report the smear video for harassment
23 when it was published (“the rally video”).

24 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “sole reasoning,” “I attempted to
25 bully him,” and “harassment.” Compound in form.

26 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.

27
28

1 **REQUEST NO. 66:** Admit that the Defendant's sole reasoning for believing that
2 the rally video constituted bullying is because, since I did not at the time know,
3 word for word, exactly what the Defendant was going to say about me in the smear
4 video, I could not possibly have known that the smear video was going to say
5 anything factually incorrect about me.

6 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “sole reasoning,” “the rally
7 video,” “constituted bullying.

8 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 67:** Admit that one does not need to know, word for word
11 exactly, what someone else will say in order to accurately predict the gist of what
12 he will say.

13 **OBJECTIONS:** Unintelligible as phrased.

14 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
15 or deny based on a lack of information or belief as to the meaning of this statement,
16 and on that basis, Deny.

17 **REQUEST NO. 68:** Admit that in the case of the rally video, I accurately
18 predicted that the defendant was going to make false allegations about me by taking
19 into account (A) the people who were informing the defendant, (B) the lies those
20 informants had already told about me, (C) the Defendant's refusal to hear my side
21 of the story before publishing the smear video, and (D) the tweets the Defendant
22 had already made in reference to me, among other factors.

23 **OBJECTIONS:** Compound and/or disjunctive in form, vague and ambiguous
24 as to “the rally video,” “the people...informing the defendant,” “those informants,”
25 and “the tweets...already made.”

26 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
27 or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.
28

1 **REQUEST NO. 69:** Admit that as long as the smear video was both false and
2 defamatory, my prediction in the rally video was still accurate.

3 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “false and defamatory,” and
4 “the rally video;” and compound in form.

5 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny

6
7 **REQUEST NO. 70:** Admit that as long as my prediction was accurate, the rally
8 video was not bullying, but instead was a proper response to imminent illegal
9 activity (ie defamation & harassment) from the Defendant, on par with notifying the
10 police when someone makes a credible threat to show up at your home to assault
11 you but hasn't actually appeared at your home yet.

12 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “my prediction,” “the rally
13 video,” “imminent illegal activity,” and “assault you;” compound and/or disjunctive
14 in form.

15 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.

16 **REQUEST NO. 71:** Admit that during the smear video, the Defendant made
17 numerous statements about me, and it was reasonable for people to infer from these
18 statements that my propensity for litigation was not merely above average, but
19 literally infinite, aka that I will literally sue anyone and everyone for anything and
20 everything, even for things that are plainly not illegal (“the implied statement”).

21 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “my propensity for litigation,”
22 and “not illegal.” Compound and unintelligible as phrased.

23 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.

24
25 **REQUEST NO. 72:** Admit that the implied statement, if said or implied by the
26 Defendant, would be objectively and patently false.

27 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “the implied statement,” and
28 “false.”

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
2 or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

3
4 REQUEST NO. 73: Admit that the implied statement, if said or implied by the
5 Defendant, would effectively accuse me of committing “malicious prosecution,”
6 which is a crime of moral turpitude.

7 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the implied statement,” and
8 “malicious prosecution.”

9 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
10 or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

11
12 REQUEST NO. 74: Admit that during the smear video, the defendant stated that I
13 was aggressive towards commenters myself despite always demanding civility from
14 others.

15 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “I was aggressive” and
16 “commenters;” unintelligible as phrased.

17 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
18 or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

19 REQUEST NO. 75: Admit that also during the smear video, the Defendant said
20 that, from my point of view (not his),that “no critique of [me] or [my] channel can
21 be suffered, tolerated or allowed to exist unless its sole purpose is to praise [me],
22 because anything other than abject praise is viewed to be harassment and doxing.”

23 OBJECTIONS: Compound and/or disjunctive in form; unintelligible as
24 phrased; vague and ambiguous as to “abject praise” and harassment.”

25 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

26
27 REQUEST NO. 76: Admit that both of these statements were knowingly false and
28 are in fact contradicted by multiple publicly visible comments posted by me,

1 including but not limited to those provided in Dkt. 71-2 and Dkt. 71-3.

2 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “these statements” and
3 “knowingly false;” and reference to docket numbers of documents is an
4 incorporation by reference that makes the Request not full and complete in and of
5 itself.

6 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

7
8 **REQUEST NO. 77**: Admit that either the Defendant knew about these
9 exculpatory comments at the time of publishing the smear video, or he would have
10 known about them if he had agreed to hear my side of the story before making the
11 smear video.

12 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “these exculpatory comments;”
13 compound and/or disjunctive in form and not full and complete in and of itself.

14 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
15 or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

16
17 **REQUEST NO. 78**: Admit that these two statements, if true, would make me unfit
18 for my trade of being a YouTube content creator.

19 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “these two statements,” and
20 “unfit for my trade.”

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
22 or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 79**: Admit that the contents of ¶¶ 105-108 of the Complaint in
25 this case are an apt and accurate description of the concept of “reactive abuse,” as
26 defined by therapists, psychologists, and other relevant experts.

27 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “an apt” “reactive abuse.”
28 Compound in form.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
2 or deny based on a lack of information or belief as to an expert’s definition of
3 “reactive abuse,” and on that basis, Deny.

4
5 REQUEST NO. 80: Admit that during the smear video, the Defendant clearly
6 intended to convey to his viewers that my purported acts of aggressive and/or
7 unprofessional conduct towards the defendant's informants such as Skibbidy
8 Viddity and InitiativeKookie were entirely unprovoked by those informants.

9 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “my purported acts of
10 aggressive ...conduct,” “defendant’s informants” “Skibbidy Viddity,”
11 “InitiativeKookie” and “those informants.”

12 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

13
14 REQUEST NO. 81: Admit that to the contrary, my messages towards those
15 people were textbook “reactive abuse,” as defined by ¶¶ 105-108 of the Complaint
16 in this case.

17 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “my messages,” “those people,”
18 and “reactive abuse.” Improperly incorporates by reference information in a
19 pleading not attached, which is impermissible as not being full and complete in and
20 of itself.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to
22 admit or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

23
24 REQUEST NO. 82: Admit that the messages depicted in Dkt. 71-4 & 71-5 of this
25 case accurately depict the harassment and torment which the Defendant's
26 informants have subjected me to, which caused the reactive abuse.

27 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the messages,” “harassment
28 and torment” and “reactive abuse” which are all undefined. Improperly

1 incorporates by reference information in a pleading not attached, which makes this
2 request not full and complete in and of itself.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to
4 admit or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 83:** Admit that either the Defendant knew, at the time of
7 publishing the smear video, about the harassment and bullying depicted in Dkt. 71-
8 4 & 71-5 of this case, or he would have known about it if he had agreed to hear my
9 side of the story before making the smear video.

10 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “harassment and bullying.”
11 Improperly incorporates by reference information in a pleading not attached, which
12 makes this request not full and complete in and of itself.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to
14 admit or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 84:** Admit that much like with Requested Admission #40 above,
17 the Defendant never interacted with Skibbidy Viddity directly, but instead based his
18 accusations against me in the smear video based entirely on “hearsay within
19 hearsay.”

20 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “Skibbidy Viddity.” Improperly
21 incorporates by reference information in a pleading not attached, which makes this
22 request not full and complete in and of itself.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to
24 admit or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

25
26 **REQUEST NO. 85:** Admit that in 2011, I was charged (“the indictment”) with
27 domestic violence (“the crime”).

28 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “domestic violence (“the

1 crime’”.

2 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny – see published case at
3 <https://www.leagle.com/decision/inarco20160907016>.

4
5 **REQUEST NO. 86**: Admit that I was never convicted of the crime. Instead, the
6 charges were ultimately dismissed without a conviction (“the dismissal”).

7 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “convicted,” and “the crime.”
8 Compound and/or disjunctive in form.

9 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

10
11 **REQUEST NO. 87**: Admit that I never plead guilty to the crime.

12 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “plead guilty,” and “the crime.”

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
14 or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 88**: Admit that aside from the alleged victim's entirely
17 uncorroborated word, there was never any evidence that I committed the crime. No
18 fingerprint evidence, no DNA evidence, no other eyewitnesses, no video footage,
19 no photographs, no medical experts providing medical opinions, nothing (“the lack
20 of evidence”).

21 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “alleged victim,” and consists of
22 multiple requests in this one Request. Calls for speculation.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
24 or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny

25 **REQUEST NO. 89**: Admit that during the smear video, the Defendant reported on
26 the indictment.

27 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the indictment.”

28 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny as Defendant only

1 reported on the appeal, see <https://www.leagle.com/decision/inarco20160907016>.

2
3 **REQUEST NO. 90:** Admit that however, the Defendant failed to report the
4 dismissal or the lack of evidence.

5 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague as to “the dismissal” and “the lack of evidence.”
6 Consists of two requests in one, and disjunctive in form.

7 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to
8 admit or deny based on a lack of information or belief since there was no reference
9 to the record being expunged, and on that basis, Deny.

10
11 **REQUEST NO. 91:** Admit that by reporting on the indictment but not the
12 dismissal, it was both reasonable of the viewers to assume, and the Defendant's
13 express intent to leave his viewers with the assumption, that I was convicted of the
14 crime and/or that I committed the crime.

15 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “the indictment,” “the
16 dismissal,” and “the crime.” Compound in form.

17 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.

18 **REQUEST NO. 92:** Admit that the Defendant either knew, at the time of
19 publishing the smear video, of both the dismissal and lack of evidence, or would
20 have known about both if he had agreed to hear my side of the story before making
21 the smear video.

22 **OBJECTIONS:** Irrelevant; compound and/or disjunctive in form. Vague and
23 ambiguous as to “the dismissal,” and “lack of evidence.”

24 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
25 or deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

26
27 **REQUEST NO. 93:** Admit that the crime which Defendant said I was charged
28 with (while omitting the dismissal for want of evidence) is a crime of moral

1 turpitude.

2 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the crime.”

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
4 or deny based on a lack of information or belief (he is not an attorney in Arkansas),
5 and on that basis, Deny.

6 **REQUEST NO. 94**: Admit that even if I am ultimately considered to be a limited
7 purpose public figure, the criminal indictment that happened years ago has nothing
8 to do with the controversy that makes me a limited purpose public figure.

9 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the criminal indictment.”

10 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
11 or deny based on a lack of information or belief (he is not an attorney in Arkansas),
12 and on that basis, Deny.

13 **REQUEST NO. 95**: Admit that for three days after the smear video was
14 published, the Defendant and I interacted over email, where I repeatedly begged the
15 Defendant to remove the video and explaining that it was defamation.

16 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “defamation”.

17 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

18 **REQUEST NO. 96**: Admit that these requests constitute a retraction request.

19 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “these requests.”

20 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Deny.

21 **REQUEST NO. 97**: Admit that the Defendant refused to retract the smear video.

22 OBJECTIONS: None.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Admit that Defendant
24 declined to retract the video he created and posted.
25
26
27
28

1 **REQUEST NO. 98:** Admit that the Defendant published the smear video with the
2 express intent of causing me as much public shame, humiliation, reputational harm,
3 and especially loss of ability to turn my YouTube channel into a profitable self-
4 employment endeavor as possible.

5 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “reputational harm,” and
6 “profitable self-employment endeavor.” Compound in form.

7 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny
8

9 **REQUEST NO. 99:** Admit that the Defendant fully succeeded in his intention to
10 inflict the injuries mentioned in the previous requested admission.

11 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “intention to inflict the
12 injuries,” and “the previous requested admission.” Also, incorporates by reference
13 prior requests for admission, that are not defined.

14 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Deny.
15

16 **REQUEST NO. 100:** Admit that after the smear video was published, I was
17 bombarded with an onslaught of malicious harassment from online strangers who
18 believed the Defendant's statements about me.

19 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “malicious harassment,” “online
20 strangers”, and “Defendant’s statements about me.” Calls for speculation.

21 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
22 or deny based on a lack of information or belief of what others did, and on that
23 basis, Deny.
24

25 **REQUEST NO. 101:** Admit that the harassment mentioned in the previous
26 requested admission caused me great stress.

27 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “harassment,” “in the
28 previously requested admission.” Calls for speculation, and incorporates by

1 reference certain prior admission which is not defined.

2 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
3 or deny based on a lack of information or belief of what caused Plaintiff's stress,
4 and on that basis, Deny.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 102:** Admit that the stress mentioned in the previous requested
7 admission lead to me becoming afflicted with pneumonia that my immune system
8 would normally have easily fought off, were it not for the stress I was under due to
9 the Defendant's smear video.

10 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to "the stress I was under," and "in
11 the previously requested admission." Calls for speculation, and incorporates by
12 reference certain prior admission which is not identified.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, Defendant is unable to admit
14 or deny based on a lack of information or belief of what caused Plaintiff's stress,
15 and on that basis, Deny.

16
17 **REQUEST NO. 103:** Admit that the pneumonia could have killed me.

18 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to "the pneumonia;" and calls for
19 an expert witness opinion (Defendant is not a doctor) and calls for speculation.

20 RESPONSE: Without waiving objections, Defendant is unable to admit or
21 deny based on a lack of information or belief of Plaintiff's illness, and on that basis,
22 Deny.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 104:** Admit that my hospitalization as a result of the
25 aforementioned pneumonia would have cost six (possibly seven) figures had it not
26 been covered by my health insurance.

27 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to "the aforementioned
28 pneumonia;" and calls for an expert witness opinion and calls for speculation.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving objections, Defendant is unable to admit or
2 deny based on a lack of information or belief of the costs of Plaintiff’s alleged
3 hospital stay, and on that basis, Deny.

4
5 REQUEST NO. 105: Admit that if the facts mentioned in the previous five
6 requested admissions are proven (whether at trial, on the motions, or by the
7 defendant admitting same in response to this request for admissions), then my
8 damages for stress, emotional distress, humiliation, and pain & suffering are
9 reasonably calculated to be worth at least \$1,000,000.

10 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous and calls for an expert witness
11 opinion. Incorporates by reference the 5 requests for admission making this request
12 not full and complete in and of itself.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving objections, Defendant is unable to admit or
14 deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

15
16 REQUEST NO. 106: Admit that because of the smear video, I have lost nearly all
17 ability to turn my YouTube channel into a profitable venture and/or full-time
18 income.

19 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “profitable venture.” Calls for
20 an expert witness opinion.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving objections, Defendant is unable to admit or
22 deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

23
24 REQUEST NO. 107: Admit that the injury mentioned in the previous requested
25 admission was, in fact, the Defendant's purpose for posting the smear video.

26 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the injury” and “purpose.”
27 Incorporates by reference to other discovery request, making this request not full
28 and complete in and of itself.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving objections, Deny.

2
3 REQUEST NO. 108: Admit that many other YouTube creators have declined to
4 collaborate with me (thereby stunting my growth and earnings potential on
5 YouTube) primarily because of the rumors contained in the Defendant's smear
6 video.

7 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the rumors.” Calls for
8 speculation of the conduct of others.

9 RESPONSE: Without waiving objections, Defendant is unable to admit or
10 deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

11
12 REQUEST NO. 109: Admit that if the facts mentioned in the previous three
13 requested admissions are proven (whether at trial, on the motions, or by the
14 defendant admitting same in response to this request for admissions), then my
15 damages for loss of earnings potential are reasonably calculated to be worth at least
16 \$1,000,000.

17 OBJECTIONS: Incorporates by reference the prior 3 requests which does
18 not make this request full and complete in and of itself.

19 RESPONSE: Without waiving objections, Defendant is unable to admit or
20 deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

21
22 REQUEST NO. 110: Admit that the Defendant posted his smear video fully in the
23 knowledge that the injury mentioned in the previous requested admission was
24 substantially certain to occur as a result of his smear video.

25 OBJECTIONS: Unintelligible as phrased; incorporates by reference “the
26 previous requested admission” (thus making this request not full and complete in
27 and of itself), and vague and ambiguous as to “the injury.”

28 RESPONSE: Without waiving objections, Deny.

1 **REQUEST NO. 111:** Admit that had the Defendant refused to make the smear
2 video, his informants might have continued their harassment and defamation
3 campaign against me, but it would not have been distributed enough to cause me
4 nearly the extent of injuries that I actually suffered as a result of the Defendant's
5 smear video and his large viewer base.

6 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “his informants,” “their
7 harassment and defamation campaign,” and “injuries that I actually suffered.”

8 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving objections, Deny.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 112:** Admit that had the Defendant proceeded with making the
11 video, but instead of smearing me, he told the truth (that his original informants
12 were mere bullies looking to harass me, dox me, cyberstalk me, and inflict as much
13 pain and suffering on me as possible, entirely for its own sake, and solely out of
14 pure hatred, malice, and spite), thereby exposing his informants rather than me,
15 there is a good chance they would even have given up their harassment and
16 defamation campaign against me.

17 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “his informants,” “their
18 harassment and defamation campaign.” Calls for speculation as to the conduct of
19 others.

20 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving objections, Defendant is unable to admit or
21 deny based on a lack of information or belief, and on that basis, Deny.

22
23 Dated: June 21, 2026

I, Sidney Redfield dba Sidalpha, declare
under penalty of perjury that the above
Responses to Plaintiff’s First Set of Requests
for Admissions are true and correct to the
best of my knowledge.

24
25
26
27 */s/ Sidney Redfield*

28 _____
Sidney Redfield dba Sidalpha, Defendant

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

As to objections:

/s/ J. Curtis Edmondson

J. Curtis Edmondson
Attorney for Defendant

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, J. Curtis Edmondson, hereby certify that I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this action. My business address is LAW OFFICES OF J. CURTIS EDMONDSON, 3720 SW 141st Avenue, Suite 212, Beaverton OR 97005.

On June 21, 2026, I served the following document: **DEFENDANT SIDNEY REDFIELD dba SIDALPHA’s RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF’S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS**

to the following persons:

David Stebbins
123 W. Ridge Ave., APT D
Harrison, AR 7260
acerthorn@yahoo.com

Service was completed in the following matter:

X **By E-mail or Electronic Transmission:** Via E-mail or Electronic Transmission, by transmitting a true copy of the document(s) to the persons at the corresponding electronic address as indicated above on the above-mentioned date. I am readily familiar with this firm’s electronic mail system and did not receive any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

/s/ J. Curtis Edmondson
J. Curtis Edmondson
Attorney for Defendant

Exhibit B

1 J. Curtis Edmondson (SBN 236105)
2 Law Offices of J. Curtis Edmondson
3 Beaverton Plaza Building
4 3720 SW 141st Avenue, Suite 212
5 Beaverton, OR 97005
6 Phone: (503) 336-3749
7 Email: jcedmondson@edmolaw.com
8 Attorney for Defendants

9
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

12 DAVID STEBBINS,
13 Plaintiff,
14 v.
15 SIDNEY REDFIELD dba SIDALPHA,
16 Defendants.

Case No. 4:23-cv-00321-MWC

**DEFENDANT SIDNEY REDFIELD
dba SIDALPHA's RESPONSES TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST
INTERROGATORIES**

17 PROPOUNDING PARTY: Plaintiff, DAVID STEBBINS
18 RESPONDING PARTY: Defendant, SIDNEY REDFIELD DBA
19 SIDALPHA
20 SET NO.: ONE

21
22 Defendant SIDNEY REDFIELD DBA SIDALPHA ("SIDALPHA" or
23 "Defendant") hereby responds to Plaintiff DAVID STEBBINS' ("STEBBINS" or
24 "Plaintiff") First Set of Interrogatories pursuant to FRCP 33, as follows:

25 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

26 1. Defendant objects to these Interrogatories to the extent they seek
27 information, which is already in the custody of Plaintiff, or is in the possession of
28 other parties, or the public domain that Plaintiff has equal access to. To the extent

1 that Plaintiff is seeking such information which are more readily available from
2 other sources or already in the possession of Plaintiff, Defendant objects to these
3 discovery requests as unduly burdensome.

4 2 Defendant further objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek
5 to impose duties and obligations beyond those authorized by, or imposed by,
6 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rules 26 and 33. To the extent the Interrogatories
7 seek to impose obligations greater than those imposed by such Rules, they are
8 overly broad and unduly burdensome.

9 3. Defendant objects to the term “the smear video in question” defined as
10 “the smear video” in many of Plaintiff’s discovery requests. Also, objection to
11 “evidence.” These terms are not properly defined and thus speculative.

12 Notwithstanding these General Objections, Defendant further responds to the
13 individual interrogatories below:

14
15 **RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES**

16
17 **INTERROGATORY NO. 1:** State the names, addresses, email addresses, and
18 phone numbers of all people who you have even a slight chance of calling as a
19 witness at trial, using the testimony of during a motion for summary judgment, or
20 who may have evidence relevant to this proceeding, and provide a brief but
21 accurate summary of the testimony they will give or the evidence they have in their
22 possession. Update your answers as necessary when new witnesses or custodians of
23 evidence become known to you.

24 **OBJECTIONS:** This interrogatory is both a conjunctive and disjunctive
25 question.

26 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving objections, SidAlpha does not have the
27 names, addresses, e-mail addresses and phone numbers of all potential trial
28 witnesses, except SidAlpha will testify.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: State with specificity your factual and legal basis for each of the affirmative defenses listed in Pages 9-10 of your Complaint. For the legal basis of each defense, provide accompanying legal citations.

OBJECTIONS: Conjunctive in form, and consists of more than one interrogatory at a time. Defendant did not file a Complaint, but for each affirmative defense in his Answer (Docket 68) defendant responds:

RESPONSES:

a. FIRST DEFENSE – TRUTH

Defendant’s statements as alleged in the Complaint are true or substantially true and therefore cannot support a claim for Defamation – the statements are true.

b. SECOND DEFENSE – OPINION

Defendant’s statements as alleged in the Complaint consist of his opinion.

c. THIRD DEFENSE – QUALIFIED PRIVILEGE

Defendant’s statements as alleged in the Complaint were made in good faith and without malice to recipients who share a common interest in the subject matter, and they are therefore privileged under California Civil Code § 47(c). Acerthorn has injected himself into a public dispute on his retaliatory actions, and there are numerous witnesses of these facts who are similarly interested in this issue.

d. FOURTH DEFENSE – FAIR REPORTING PRIVILEGE

Defendant’s statements constitute fair and true reports of official proceedings or public records (lawsuits), and are privileged under California Civil Code § 47(d).

e. FIFTH DEFENSE – FIRST AMENDMENT

Defendant’s statements were made about Plaintiff as a public figure, and were not made with actual malice, and are therefore protected by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

f. SIXTH DEFENSE – CONSENT

Defendant’s statements were made with Plaintiff’s consent.

1 **g. SEVENTH DEFENSE – DE MINIMUS CURAT LEX**

2 Defendant’s statements were made in fact with no cognizable damages
3 having been suffered.

4 **h. EIGHTH DEFENSE – MITIGATION OF DAMAGES**

5 Defendant’s statements were made, but Plaintiff failed to take reasonable
6 steps to mitigate any damages he claims to have suffered.

7 **i. NINTH DEFENSE – EQUITABLE DEFENSES**

8 Plaintiff’s claims against Defendant are barred, in whole or in part, by the
9 equitable doctrine of unclean hands, estoppel, waiver and/or laches.

10
11 **INTERROGATORY NO. 3:** State with specificity the Defendant's reason for
12 refusing my request to hear my side of the story before making the smear video.

13 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague as and ambiguous as to the meaning of “smear
14 video”.

15 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, assuming Plaintiff means the
16 video that I made and posted on my YouTube channel, Plaintiff never specifically
17 requested that Defendant hear “...my side of the story...” This is evidenced by
18 Acerthorn’s cease and desist letter not demanding I hear his side of the story—he
19 just was insisting I take down the video.

20
21 **INTERROGATORY NO. 4:** State with specificity all evidence you have which
22 proves that my messy living conditions are, objectively, more likely to have been
23 the cause of my pneumonia than the stress I suffered from the smear video. Be sure
24 to take into account the totality of the circumstances, including but not limited to:

25 (A) the fact that the pneumonia happened immediately after the smear video
26 when the harassment I received was at its apex, and

27 (B) the fact that I had been living in these messy conditions for years before
28

1 the smear video without getting pneumonia

2 (C) the fact that haven't gotten pneumonia again to this day despite still living
3 in equally messy conditions, and

4 (D) the fact that my surgeon personally opined that the stress I received was
5 the most likely cause and explicitly stated, after seeing a picture of my messy
6 apartment, that I most likely did not get the pneumonia from the mess.

7 Please also remember that the applicable burden of proof in a civil case is
8 “preponderance of the evidence,” meaning that my version of events (that I got
9 pneumonia from the stress) only needs to be “more likely” (aka a simple majority
10 of probability, aka 50.01% to 49.99%) to be true than the defendant's version of
11 events (that I got pneumonia from living in a messy apartment).

12 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert opinion testimony, or at last a review of
13 Plaintiff’s medical records and probably treating physician’s care they provided.

14 RESPONSE: Defendant’s video never discussed Plaintiff’s living
15 conditions. Other contributors to my research and video may have mentioned this
16 fact, but I have no opinion about what appears to be a filthy environment or the
17 cause of Plaintiff’s medical conditions or pneumonia.

18 **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:** State with specificity all of the evidence which
19 proves that I suffered no reputational harm, stress, or loss of ability to earn a living
20 from my YouTube channel as a direct or indirect result of the smear video.

21 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to the terms “no reputational harm,
22 stress...” and calls for an expert opinion.

23 RESPONSE: From what I understand, it appears that Plaintiff had about
24 2,000 subscribers before my video was published, and now he has 5,790
25 subscribers, an increase in popularity. As a result, it appears Plaintiff has suffered
26 no harm in subscribership.
27
28

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 6:** Aside from the injunctions requested in ¶ 155 & ¶
2 157 in the Complaint (complete with the consequences mentioned in ¶ 158 of
3 same), state with specificity what other relief can be awarded to me that would
4 actually make me whole in practice. While responding to this, keep in mind the fact
5 that Sydney Redfield almost certainly does not have the assets necessary to
6 monetarily compensate me for these injuries, even if he spends the rest of his life
7 with his wages being garnished, so please incorporate that into your response to this
8 interrogatory.

9 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for an expert witness opinion, and is conjunctive
10 and/or disjunctive in form. Vague and ambiguous as to the terms “make me whole
11 in practice.”

12 **RESPONSE:** Plaintiff is not entitled to any relief in this action. See,
13 Defendant’s Answer on file herein.

14
15
16
17 Dated: June 21, 2026

I, Sidney Redfield dba Sidalpha, declare
under penalty of perjury that the above
Responses to Plaintiff’s First Interrogatories
are true and correct to the best of my
knowledge.

/s/ Sidney Redfield

Sidney Redfield dba Sidalpha, Defendant

As to objections:

/s/ J. Curtis Edmondson

J. Curtis Edmondson
Attorney for Defendant

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, J. Curtis Edmondson, hereby certify that I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this action. My business address is LAW OFFICES OF J. CURTIS EDMONDSON, 3720 SW 141st Avenue, Suite 212, Beaverton OR 97005.

On June 21, 2026, I served the following document: **DEFENDANT SIDNEY REDFIELD dba SIDALPHA’s RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF’S INTERROGATORIES**

to the following persons:

David Stebbins
123 W. Ridge Ave., APT D
Harrison, AR 7260
acerthorn@yahoo.com

Service was completed in the following matter:

X **By E-mail or Electronic Transmission:** Via E-mail or Electronic Transmission, by transmitting a true copy of the document(s) to the persons at the corresponding electronic address as indicated above on the above-mentioned date. I am readily familiar with this firm’s electronic mail system and did not receive any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

/s/ J. Curtis Edmondson
J. Curtis Edmondson
Attorney for Defendant

Exhibit C

1 J. Curtis Edmondson (SBN 236105)
2 Law Offices of J. Curtis Edmondson
3 Beaverton Plaza Building
4 3720 SW 141st Avenue, Suite 212
5 Beaverton, OR 97005
6 Phone: (503) 336-3749
7 Email: jcedmondson@edmolaw.com
8 Attorney for Defendant

9
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

12 DAVID STEBBINS,
13 Plaintiff,
14 v.
15 SYDNEY REDFIELD dba SIDALPHA,
16 Defendants.

Case No. 4:23-cv-00321-MWC

**DEFENDANT SIDNEY REDFIELD
dba SIDALPHA's RESPONSES TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST
SET OF REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION**

17 PROPOUNDING PARTY: Plaintiff, DAVID STEBBINS
18 RESPONDING PARTY: Defendant, SIDNEY REDFIELD DBA
19 SIDALPHA
20 SET NO.: ONE

21 Defendant SIDNEY REDFIELD DBA SIDALPHA ("SIDALPHA" or
22 "Defendant") hereby responds to Plaintiff DAVID STEBBINS' ("STEBBINS" or
23 "Plaintiff") Requests for Production pursuant to FRCP 34, as follows:

24
25 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

26 1. Defendant objects to these Requests to the extent they seek documents,
27 which is already in the custody of Plaintiff, or is in the possession of other parties,
28 or the public domain that Plaintiff has equal access to. To the extent that Plaintiff is

1 seeking such documents which are more readily available from other sources or
2 already in the possession of Plaintiff, Defendant objects to these discovery requests
3 as unduly burdensome.

4 2 Defendant further objects to the Requests to the extent they seek to
5 impose duties and obligations beyond those authorized by, or imposed by, Federal
6 Rules of Civil Procedure Rules 26 and 34. To the extent the Requests seek to
7 impose obligations greater than those imposed by such Rules, they are overly broad
8 and unduly burdensome.

9 3. Defendant objects to the term “the smear video in question” defined as
10 “the smear video” in many of Plaintiff’s Requests for Production. Also, objection
11 to the terms “evidence,” and “proves.” These terms are not properly defined and
12 thus speculative.

13 Notwithstanding these General Objections, Defendant further responds to the
14 individual requests below:

15
16 **RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTIONS**

17
18 **REQUEST NO. 1:** Provide affidavits of all witnesses you intend to call on your
19 behalf, stating with specificity what they will testify about when called.

20 OBJECTIONS: Seeks attorney work-product and/or attorney-client
21 privileged documents not subject to disclosure; premature in scope if seeking
22 documents that witnesses may reference at trial; vague and ambiguous as to
23 “affidavits.”

24 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections: No such “affidavits” have
25 been obtained by Defendant to date.

26
27 **REQUEST NO. 2:** Provide all evidence which shows that the Defendant's refusal
28 to hear my side of the story before making the smear video was a reasonable and

1 prudent decision.

2 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “Defendant’s refusal,” “my side
3 of the story” and “a reasonable and prudent decision.” Irrelevant to the issues in the
4 case, and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents.

7
8 **REQUEST NO. 3**: Provide all written communications (including over email, text
9 message Discord, Twitter, or any other communications platform) between the
10 defendant and all of the people associated with the following aliases: ●Creetosis,
11 ●SoffianP, ●SkibbidyDibbity, ●xArtemisWolf, ●InitiativeKookie, ●Enclave Emily,
12 ●Echo Wilder, ●Viroza (formerly known as "Just Emi"), ●Rogue, the Internet Man,
13 ●All other persons whose correspondence with the Defendant contributed, however
14 nominally, to the content of the smear video.

15 OBJECTIONS: Compound in form and consists of several interrogatories in
16 one; vague and ambiguous as to “the smear video.”

17 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
18 documents.

19
20 **REQUEST NO. 4**: All evidence in your possession which proves that I issued my
21 DMCA Takedowns and engaged the panoply of activities described in the smear
22 video solely in an attempt to silence criticism of me.

23 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to the meaning of “my DMCA
24 Takedowns” and “panoply of activities”; also compound in form.

25 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
26 documents.

27
28 **REQUEST NO. 5**: All evidence in your possession which proves that I do not

1 consider fair use to the standards required by law under *Lenz v. Universal Music*
2 *Corp.*, 801 F. 3d 1126 (9th Cir. 2015) before issuing DMCA Takedowns, taking
3 into account the arguments I made in ¶¶ 16-20 and ¶¶ 21-49 of the Complaint in
4 this case.

5 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “I do not consider fair use to the
6 standards required by law...” “DMCA Takedowns” and “the arguments I made...”
7 Also incorporates by reference other documents that are not attached to the
8 Request.

9 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
10 documents.

11
12 **REQUEST NO. 6:** All evidence in your possession which proves that Skibbidy
13 Dibbity met all the legal requirements to be considered a co-author of the December
14 20, 2021 livestream debate, taking into account the case laws of *Community for*
15 *Creative Non-Violence v. Reid*, 490 US 730,737 (1989) (“As a general rule, the
16 author is ... the person who translates an idea into a fixed, tangible expression
17 entitled to copyright protection”) as well as *Garcia v. Google, Inc.*, 786 F. 3d733,
18 744 (9th Cir. 2015) (citing *Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid*)
19 (“Garcia's copyright claim faces yet another statutory barrier: She never fixed her
20 acting performance in a tangible medium, as required by [copyright law] ... For
21 better or for worse, Youssef and his crew 'fixed' Garcia's performance in the
22 tangible medium ... However one might characterize Garcia's performance, she
23 played no role in fixation”).

24 OBJECTIONS: Compound in form; vague and ambiguous as to “met all the
25 legal requirements,” and “the December 20, 2021 livestream debate.” Calls for an
26 expert and/or legal opinion.

27 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 7: All evidence which proves that the “mitigating factor” mentioned in ¶¶ 60-61 of the Complaint and which I dubbed the “mitigating factor” in Dkt. 70 is, in fact, “entirely irrelevant” for purposes of establishing liability for defamation and/or calculating my reputational harm.

OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the ‘mitigating factor’” and “my reputational harm;” and incorporates by reference another document that is not attached to this request. Seeks an expert or legal opinion.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

REQUEST NO. 8: All evidence in your possession which proves that the “re-aggravating factor” mentioned in Dkt. 70-4, ¶ 15 is objectively correct, keeping in mind the limitations imposed upon you by Federal Rule of Evidence 802.

OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to the terms “the ‘re-aggravating factor’” and “objectively correct.” Incorporates by reference another document that is not attached to this request. Calls for an expert and/or legal opinion.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

REQUEST NO. 9: All evidence in your possession which proves that I did, in fact, offer to pay to “dox” InitiativeKookie, instead of merely intending using his personal information in order to lawfully hold him accountable in court, bearing in mind the arguments contained in ¶¶ 65-77 of the Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as the meaning of “dox”; and incorporates by reference another document that is not attached to this request. Seeks information that is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 10**: All evidence which proves that I attempted to bully the
5 Defendant.

6 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “prove,” and “attempted to
7 bully.” Seeks an expert and/or legal opinion.

8 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
9 documents.

10
11 **REQUEST NO. 11**: All evidence which proves that the interpretation provided in
12 ¶ 91 is not a reasonable implication from the Defendant's smear video.

13 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “not a reasonable implication.”
14 Also, incorporates by reference a separate document that is not attached to the
15 request; calls for an expert and/or legal opinion; and seeks attorney work-product
16 and/or attorney-client privileged documents.

17 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
18 documents.

19
20 **REQUEST NO. 12**: All evidence which proves that the statements of fact about
21 me described in ¶ 91 of the Complaint is an opinion rather than a fact.

22 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “proves” and “the statements of
23 fact about me.” Incorporates by reference another document that is not attached to
24 the Request. Calls for an expert and/or legal opinion; and seeks attorney work-
25 product and/or attorney-client privileged documents.

26 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
27 documents.

28

1 **REQUEST NO. 13:** All evidence which proves that the statements of fact about
2 me described in ¶ 91 of the Complaint is substantially true.

3 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “proves,” “the statements of fact
4 about me,” and “substantially true.” Calls for an expert and/or legal opinion.

5 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents.

7
8 **REQUEST NO. 14:** All evidence which proves that the reasonable implications
9 identified in ¶ 91 of the Complaint could not also be reasonably deemed
10 defamatory.

11 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to ”proves,” “the reasonable
12 implications,” and “reasonably deemed defamatory” which are undefined. Seeks an
13 expert and/or legal opinion.

14 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
15 documents.

16
17 **REQUEST NO. 15:** All evidence which proves that the Defendant neither
18 intended nor endorsed the inference mentioned in Request for Production #11.

19 **OBJECTIONS:** Unintelligible as phrased, vague and ambiguous as to
20 “proves,” “the inference mentioned,” and is disjunctive in form. Calls for an expert
21 and/or legal opinion.

22 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
23 documents.

24
25 **REQUEST NO. 16:** All evidence which proves that the Defendant's two
26 statements about me mentioned in Dkt 71-7 (describing me as “being aggressive
27 despite his always demanding civility from others” as well as describing me as “a
28 person that hurls insults threats and curses at the drop of a hat and then demands

1 civility from others”) are, in fact, true.

2 OBJECTIONS: Unintelligible as phrased. Vague and ambiguous as to
3 “proves,” “Defendant’s two statements about me” Compound in form.

4 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
5 documents.

6
7 **REQUEST NO. 17:** All evidence which proves that the harassment and bullying
8 described in ¶¶ 110-112 of the Complaint and documented in Dkt. 71-4 and Dkt.
9 71-5 never occurred.

10 OBJECTIONS: Unintelligible as phrased, vague and ambiguous as to
11 “proves,” compound in form; and incorporates by reference other documents not
12 attached to the Request.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 18:** All evidence which proves that the harassment and bullying
17 described in ¶¶ 110-112 of the Complaint and documented in Dkt. 71-4 and Dkt.
18 71-5, even if true, do not rise to the level of “reactive abuse” described in ¶¶ 105-
19 108 of the Complaint.

20 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “proves,” “harassment and
21 bullying,” and “reactive abuse.” Calls for expert and/or legal opinion, and
22 incorporates by reference other documents which are not attached to the Request.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents.

25
26 **REQUEST NO. 19:** All evidence which proves that, even if the contents of Dkt.
27 71-4 and Dkt. 71-5 are accepted as true, the statements made about me by the
28 Defendant as described in ¶ 109 of the Complaint are still substantially true despite

1 the omission of these facts as alleged in ¶ 110 of same.

2 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “proves,” “the statements made
3 about me,” and “still substantially true despite the omission of these facts.”

4 Unintelligible as phrased. Calls for attorney work-product and/or attorney-client
5 privileged documents and/or an expert witness opinion, and incorporates by
6 reference other documents which are not attached to the Request.

7 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
8 documents.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 20**: All evidence which proves that I was convicted of the crime
11 for which I was indicted back in 2011.

12 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “proves,” “convicted,” and “the
13 crime for which I was indicted.”

14 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
15 documents.

16
17 **REQUEST NO. 21**: All evidence which proves that I did, in fact, commit the
18 crime for which I was indicted back in 2011.

19 OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “proves,” “the crime for which
20 I was indicted.” Seeks documents equally available to Plaintiff.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 22**: Provide all evidence which supports your defense of truth.

25 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
26 attorney work-product privileged documents.

27 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 23: Admit all evidence which supports your defense that the smear video merely expressed the Defendant's opinion and provided no objective statements of fact.

OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “the smear video,” and “no objective statements of fact.” Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

REQUEST NO. 24: All evidence which supports your defense of qualified privilege.

OBJECTIONS: Vague and ambiguous as to “qualified privilege.” Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

REQUEST NO. 25: All evidence which supports your defense of fair reporting privilege, bearing in mind that the fair reporting privilege requires a reporter to accurately report favorable verdicts.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

REQUEST NO. 26: All evidence which supports your claim that I am a public figure.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents.

5
6 REQUEST NO. 27: All evidence which supports your defense that the smear
7 video is protected by the First Amendment.

8 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
9 attorney work-product privileged documents.

10 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
11 documents.

12
13 REQUEST NO. 28: All evidence which supports your defense that I consented to
14 the smear video being made and published.

15 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
16 attorney work-product privileged documents. Seeks documents equally available to
17 Plaintiff.

18 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
19 documents.

20
21 REQUEST NO. 29: All evidence which supports your defense that I suffered no
22 cognizable damages as a result of the smear video.

23 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. Seeks documents equally available to
25 Plaintiff.

26 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
27 documents.

28

1 **REQUEST NO. 30:** All evidence which supports your defense that I failed to take
2 reasonable steps to mitigate damages.

3 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
4 attorney work-product privileged documents. Seeks documents equally available to
5 Plaintiff.

6 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
7 documents.

8
9 **REQUEST NO. 31:** All evidence which supports your defense that I failed to
10 timely request a retraction.

11 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
12 attorney work-product privileged documents.

13 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 32:** All evidence which supports your defense that I acted with
17 unclean hands.

18 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
19 attorney work-product privileged documents. Seeks documents equally available to
20 plaintiff.

21 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 33:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 2
25 of your Answer to Complaint.

26 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
27 attorney work-product privileged documents. Seeks documents equally available to
28 Plaintiff.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 34**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 3
5 of your Answer to Complaint.

6 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
7 attorney work-product privileged documents. Seeks documents equally available to
8 Plaintiff.

9 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
10 documents.

11
12 **REQUEST NO. 35**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 4
13 of your Answer to Complaint.

14 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
15 attorney work-product privileged documents.

16 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
17 documents.

18
19 **REQUEST NO. 36**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 5
20 of your Answer to Complaint.

21 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
22 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
23 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
24 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

25 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
26 documents.

27
28 **REQUEST NO. 37**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 6

1 of your Answer to Complaint.

2 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
3 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
4 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
5 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

6 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
7 documents.

8
9 **REQUEST NO. 38**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 7
10 of your Answer to Complaint.

11 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
12 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
13 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
14 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

15 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
16 documents.

17
18 **REQUEST NO. 39**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 8
19 of your Answer to Complaint.

20 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
21 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
22 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
23 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

24 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
25 documents.

26
27 **REQUEST NO. 40**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 9
28 of your Answer to Complaint.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents.

7 REQUEST NO. 41: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 10
8 of your Answer to Complaint.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents.

15
16 REQUEST NO. 42: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 11
17 of your Answer to Complaint.

18 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
19 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
20 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
21 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

22 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
23 documents.

24
25 REQUEST NO. 43: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 12
26 of your Answer to Complaint.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 44:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 13
7 of your Answer to Complaint.

8 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
9 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
10 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
11 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

12 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
13 documents.

14
15 **REQUEST NO. 45:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 14
16 of your Answer to Complaint.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents.

23 **REQUEST NO. 46:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 15
24 of your Answer to Complaint.

25 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
26 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
27 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
28 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 47:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 16
5 of your Answer to Complaint.

6 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
7 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
8 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
9 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

10 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
11 documents.

12
13 **REQUEST NO. 48:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 17
14 of your Answer to Complaint.

15 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
16 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
17 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
18 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

19 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
20 documents.

21
22 **REQUEST NO. 49:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 18
23 of your Answer to Complaint.

24 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
25 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
26 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
27 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

28 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped

1 documents.

2

3 **REQUEST NO. 50:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 19
4 of your Answer to Complaint.

5 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
6 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
7 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
8 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

9 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
10 documents.

11

12 **REQUEST NO. 51:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 20
13 of your Answer to Complaint.

14 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
15 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
16 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
17 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

18 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
19 documents.

20

21 **REQUEST NO. 52:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 21
22 of your Answer to Complaint.

23 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 53: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 22 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

REQUEST NO. 54: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 23 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

REQUEST NO. 55: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 24 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

1 **REQUEST NO. 56:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 25
2 of your Answer to Complaint.

3 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
4 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
5 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
6 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

7 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
8 documents.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 57:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 26
11 of your Answer to Complaint.

12 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
13 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
14 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
15 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

16 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
17 documents.

18
19 **REQUEST NO. 58:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 27
20 of your Answer to Complaint.

21 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
22 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
23 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
24 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

25 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
26 documents.

27
28 **REQUEST NO. 59:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 28

1 of your Answer to Complaint.

2 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
3 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
4 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
5 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

6 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
7 documents.

8

9 **REQUEST NO. 60**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 29
10 of your Answer to Complaint.

11 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
12 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
13 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
14 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

15 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
16 documents.

17

18 **REQUEST NO. 61**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 30
19 of your Answer to Complaint.

20 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
21 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
22 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
23 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

24 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
25 documents.

26

27 **REQUEST NO. 62**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 31
28 of your Answer to Complaint.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents.

7
8 REQUEST NO. 63: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 32
9 of your Answer to Complaint.

10 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
11 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
12 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
13 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

14 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
15 documents.

16
17 REQUEST NO. 64: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 33
18 of your Answer to Complaint.

19 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents.

25
26 REQUEST NO. 65: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 34
27 of your Answer to Complaint.

28 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or

1 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
2 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
3 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

4 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
5 documents.

6
7 **REQUEST NO. 66:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 35
8 of your Answer to Complaint.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 67:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 36
17 of your Answer to Complaint.

18 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
19 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
20 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
21 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

22 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
23 documents.

24
25 **REQUEST NO. 68:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 37
26 of your Answer to Complaint.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents.

5
6
7 **REQUEST NO. 69:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 38
8 of your Answer to Complaint.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 70:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
17 39 of your Answer to Complaint.

18 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
19 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
20 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
21 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

22 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
23 documents.

24
25 **REQUEST NO. 71:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 40
26 of your Answer to Complaint.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 72:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 41
7 of your Answer to Complaint.

8 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
9 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
10 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
11 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

12 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
13 documents.

14
15 **REQUEST NO. 73:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 42
16 of your Answer to Complaint.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 74:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 43
25 of your Answer to Complaint.

26 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
27 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
28 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in

1 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

2 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
3 documents.

4
5 **REQUEST NO. 75**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 44
6 of your Answer to Complaint.

7 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 76**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 45
15 of your Answer to Complaint.

16 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
17 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
18 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
19 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

20 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
21 documents.

22
23 **REQUEST NO. 77**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
24 46 of your Answer to Complaint.

25 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
26 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
27 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
28 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 78**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 47
5 of your Answer to Complaint.

6 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
7 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
8 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
9 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

10 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
11 documents.

12
13 **REQUEST NO. 79**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 48
14 of your Answer to Complaint.

15 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
16 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
17 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
18 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

19 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
20 documents.

21
22 **REQUEST NO. 80**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 49
23 of your Answer to Complaint.

24 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
25 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
26 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
27 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

28 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped

1 documents.

2
3 **REQUEST NO. 81:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 50
4 of your Answer to Complaint.

5 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
6 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
7 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
8 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

9 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
10 documents.

11
12 **REQUEST NO. 82:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
13 51 of your Answer to Complaint.

14 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
15 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
16 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
17 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

18 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
19 documents.

20
21 **REQUEST NO. 83:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 52
22 of your Answer to Complaint.

23 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 84: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 53 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

REQUEST NO. 85: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 54 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

REQUEST NO. 86: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 55 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

1 **REQUEST NO. 87:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 56
2 of your Answer to Complaint.

3 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
4 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
5 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
6 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

7 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
8 documents.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 88:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 57
11 of your Answer to Complaint.

12 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
13 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
14 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
15 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

16 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
17 documents.

18
19 **REQUEST NO. 89:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 58
20 of your Answer to Complaint.

21 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
22 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
23 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
24 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

25 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
26 documents.

27
28 **REQUEST NO. 90:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 59

1 of your Answer to Complaint.

2 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
3 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
4 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
5 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

6 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
7 documents.

8
9 **REQUEST NO. 91**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 60
10 of your Answer to Complaint.

11 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
12 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
13 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
14 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

15 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
16 documents.

17
18 **REQUEST NO. 92**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 61
19 of your Answer to Complaint.

20 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
21 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
22 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
23 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

24 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
25 documents.

26
27 **REQUEST NO. 93**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 62
28 of your Answer to Complaint.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents.

7
8 REQUEST NO. 94: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 63
9 of your Answer to Complaint.

10 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
11 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
12 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
13 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

14 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
15 documents.

16
17 REQUEST NO. 95: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 64
18 of your Answer to Complaint.

19 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents.

25
26 REQUEST NO. 96: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 65
27 of your Answer to Complaint.

28 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or

1 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
2 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
3 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

4 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
5 documents.

6
7 **REQUEST NO. 97:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 66
8 of your Answer to Complaint.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 98:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 67
17 of your Answer to Complaint.

18 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
19 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
20 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
21 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

22 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
23 documents.

24
25 **REQUEST NO. 99:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 68
26 of your Answer to Complaint.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 100:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
7 69 of your Answer to Complaint.

8 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
9 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
10 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
11 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

12 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
13 documents.

14
15 **REQUEST NO. 101:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
16 70 of your Answer to Complaint.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 102:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
25 71 of your Answer to Complaint.

26 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
27 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
28 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in

1 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

2 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
3 documents.

4
5 **REQUEST NO. 103:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
6 72 of your Answer to Complaint.

7 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 104:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
15 73 of your Answer to Complaint.

16 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
17 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
18 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
19 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

20 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
21 documents.

22
23 **REQUEST NO. 105:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
24 74 of your Answer to Complaint.

25 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
26 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
27 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
28 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 106**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
5 75 of your Answer to Complaint.

6 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
7 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
8 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
9 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

10 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
11 documents.

12
13 **REQUEST NO. 107**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
14 76 of your Answer to Complaint.

15 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
16 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
17 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
18 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

19 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
20 documents.

21
22 **REQUEST NO. 108**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
23 77 of your Answer to Complaint.

24 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
25 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
26 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
27 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

28 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped

1 documents.

2

3 **REQUEST NO. 109:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
4 78 of your Answer to Complaint.

5 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
6 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
7 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
8 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

9 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
10 documents.

11

12 **REQUEST NO. 110:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
13 79 of your Answer to Complaint.

14 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
15 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
16 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
17 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

18 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
19 documents.

20

21 **REQUEST NO. 111:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
22 80 of your Answer to Complaint.

23 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 112: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 81 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

REQUEST NO. 113: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 82 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

REQUEST NO. 114: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 83 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents.

1 **REQUEST NO. 115:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
2 84 of your Answer to Complaint.

3 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
4 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
5 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
6 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

7 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
8 documents.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 116:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
11 85 of your Answer to Complaint.

12 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
13 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
14 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
15 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

16 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
17 documents.

18
19 **REQUEST NO. 117:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
20 86 of your Answer to Complaint.

21 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
22 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
23 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
24 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

25 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
26 documents.

27
28 **REQUEST NO. 118:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶

1 87 of your Answer to Complaint.

2 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
3 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
4 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
5 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

6 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
7 documents.

8

9 **REQUEST NO. 119**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
10 88 of your Answer to Complaint.

11 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
12 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
13 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
14 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

15 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
16 documents.

17

18 **REQUEST NO. 120**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
19 89 of your Answer to Complaint.

20 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
21 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
22 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
23 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

24 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
25 documents.

26

27 **REQUEST NO. 121**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
28 90 of your Answer to Complaint.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents.

7
8 REQUEST NO. 122: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
9 91 of your Answer to Complaint.

10 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
11 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
12 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
13 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

14 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
15 documents.

16
17 REQUEST NO. 123: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
18 92 of your Answer to Complaint.

19 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents.

25
26 REQUEST NO. 124: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
27 93 of your Answer to Complaint.

28 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or

1 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
2 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
3 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

4 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
5 documents.

6
7 **REQUEST NO. 125:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
8 94 of your Answer to Complaint.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 126:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
17 95 of your Answer to Complaint.

18 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
19 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
20 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
21 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

22 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
23 documents.

24
25 **REQUEST NO. 127:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
26 96 of your Answer to Complaint.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 128:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
7 97 of your Answer to Complaint.

8 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
9 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
10 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
11 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

12 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
13 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

14
15 **REQUEST NO. 129:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
16 98 of your Answer to Complaint.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 130:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
25 99 of your Answer to Complaint.

26 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
27 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
28 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in

1 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

2 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
3 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

4
5 **REQUEST NO. 131:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
6 100 of your Answer to Complaint.

7 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 132:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
15 101 of your Answer to Complaint.

16 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
17 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
18 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
19 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

20 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
21 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

22
23 **REQUEST NO. 133:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
24 102 of your Answer to Complaint.

25 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
26 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
27 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
28 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 134:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
5 103 of your Answer to Complaint.

6 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
7 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
8 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
9 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

10 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
11 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

12
13 **REQUEST NO. 135:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
14 104 of your Answer to Complaint.

15 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
16 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
17 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
18 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

19 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
20 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

21
22 **REQUEST NO. 136:** All evidence upon which you based your denials
23 made in ¶ 105 of your Answer to Complaint.

24 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
25 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
26 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
27 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

28 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped

1 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

2
3 **REQUEST NO. 137:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
4 106 of your Answer to Complaint.

5 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
6 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
7 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
8 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

9 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
10 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

11
12 **REQUEST NO. 138:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
13 107 of your Answer to Complaint.

14 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
15 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
16 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
17 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

18 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
19 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

20
21
22 **REQUEST NO. 139:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
23 108 of your Answer to Complaint.

24 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
25 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
26 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
27 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

28 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped

1 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

2
3 **REQUEST NO. 140:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
4 109 of your Answer to Complaint.

5 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
6 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
7 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
8 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

9 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
10 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

11
12 **REQUEST NO. 141:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
13 110 of your Answer to Complaint.

14 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
15 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
16 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
17 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

18 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
19 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

20
21 **REQUEST NO. 142:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
22 111 of your Answer to Complaint.

23 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 143: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 112 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 144: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 113 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 145: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 114 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

1 **REQUEST NO. 146:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
2 115 of your Answer to Complaint.

3 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
4 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
5 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
6 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

7 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
8 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 147:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
11 116 of your Answer to Complaint.

12 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
13 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
14 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
15 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

16 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
17 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

18
19 **REQUEST NO. 148:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
20 117 of your Answer to Complaint.

21 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
22 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
23 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
24 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

25 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
26 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

27
28 **REQUEST NO. 149:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶

1 118 of your Answer to Complaint.

2 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
3 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
4 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
5 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

6 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
7 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

8
9 **REQUEST NO. 150**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
10 119 of your Answer to Complaint.

11 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
12 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
13 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
14 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

15 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
16 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

17
18 **REQUEST NO. 151**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
19 120 of your Answer to Complaint.

20 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
21 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
22 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
23 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

24 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
25 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

26
27 **REQUEST NO. 152**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
28 121 of your Answer to Complaint.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

7
8 REQUEST NO. 153: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
9 122 of your Answer to Complaint.

10 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
11 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
12 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
13 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

14 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
15 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

16
17 REQUEST NO. 154: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
18 123 of your Answer to Complaint.

19 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

25
26 REQUEST NO. 155: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
27 124 of your Answer to Complaint.

28 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or

1 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
2 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
3 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

4 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
5 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

6
7 **REQUEST NO. 156:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
8 125 of your Answer to Complaint.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 157:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
17 126 of your Answer to Complaint.

18 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
19 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
20 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
21 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

22 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
23 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

24
25 **REQUEST NO. 158:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
26 127 of your Answer to Complaint.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 159:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
7 128 of your Answer to Complaint.

8 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
9 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
10 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
11 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

12 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
13 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

14
15 **REQUEST NO. 160:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
16 129 of your Answer to Complaint.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 161:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
25 130 of your Answer to Complaint.

26 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
27 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
28 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in

1 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

2 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
3 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

4
5 **REQUEST NO. 162:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
6 131 of your Answer to Complaint.

7 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 163:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
15 132 of your Answer to Complaint.

16 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
17 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
18 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
19 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

20 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
21 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

22
23 **REQUEST NO. 164:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
24 133 of your Answer to Complaint.

25 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
26 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
27 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
28 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 165**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
5 134 of your Answer to Complaint.

6 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
7 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
8 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
9 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

10 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
11 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

12
13 **REQUEST NO. 166**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
14 135 of your Answer to Complaint.

15 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
16 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
17 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
18 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

19 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
20 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

21
22 **REQUEST NO. 167**: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
23 136 of your Answer to Complaint.

24 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
25 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
26 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
27 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

28 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped

1 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

2
3 **REQUEST NO. 168:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
4 137 of your Answer to Complaint.

5 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
6 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
7 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
8 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

9 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
10 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

11
12 **REQUEST NO. 169:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
13 138 of your Answer to Complaint.

14 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
15 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
16 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
17 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

18 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
19 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

20
21 **REQUEST NO. 170:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
22 139 of your Answer to Complaint.

23 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 171: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 140 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 172: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 141 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 173: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 142 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 174: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 143 of your Answer to Complaint.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

7
8 REQUEST NO. 175: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
9 144 of your Answer to Complaint.

10 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
11 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
12 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
13 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

14 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
15 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

16
17 REQUEST NO. 176: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
18 145 of your Answer to Complaint.

19 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

25
26 REQUEST NO. 177: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
27 146 of your Answer to Complaint.

28 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or

1 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
2 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
3 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

4 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
5 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

6
7 **REQUEST NO. 178:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
8 147 of your Answer to Complaint.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 179:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
17 148 of your Answer to Complaint.

18 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
19 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
20 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
21 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

22 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
23 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

24
25 **REQUEST NO. 180:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
26 149 of your Answer to Complaint.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 181:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
7 150 of your Answer to Complaint.

8 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
9 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
10 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
11 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

12 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
13 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

14
15 **REQUEST NO. 182:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
16 151 of your Answer to Complaint.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 183:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
25 152 of your Answer to Complaint.

26 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
27 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
28 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in

1 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

2 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
3 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

4
5 **REQUEST NO. 184:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
6 153 of your Answer to Complaint.

7 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 185:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
15 154 of your Answer to Complaint.

16 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
17 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
18 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
19 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

20 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
21 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

22
23 **REQUEST NO. 186:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
24 155 of your Answer to Complaint.

25 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
26 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
27 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
28 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

3
4 REQUEST NO. 187: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
5 156 of your Answer to Complaint.

6 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
7 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
8 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
9 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

10 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
11 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

12
13 REQUEST NO. 188: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
14 157 of your Answer to Complaint.

15 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
16 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
17 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
18 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

19 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
20 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

21
22 REQUEST NO. 189: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
23 158 of your Answer to Complaint.

24 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
25 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
26 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
27 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

28 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped

1 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

2
3 **REQUEST NO. 190:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
4 159 of your Answer to Complaint.

5 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
6 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
7 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
8 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

9 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
10 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

11
12 **REQUEST NO. 191:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
13 160 of your Answer to Complaint.

14 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
15 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
16 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
17 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

18 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
19 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

20
21 **REQUEST NO. 192:** All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶
22 161 of your Answer to Complaint.

23 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 193: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 162 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 194: All evidence upon which you based your denials made in ¶ 163 of your Answer to Complaint.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 195: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #1 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 196: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #2 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 197: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #3 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 198: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #4 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the

1 amount in controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under
2 FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 199**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
7 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #5 is untrue, or at least, that you
8 have a good reason for denying it.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 200**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
17 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #6 is untrue, or at least, that you
18 have a good reason for denying it.

19 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

25
26 **REQUEST NO. 201**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
27 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #7 is untrue, or at least, that you
28 have a good reason for denying it.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

7
8 REQUEST NO. 202: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
9 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #8 is untrue, or at least, that you
10 have a good reason for denying it.

11 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
12 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
13 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
14 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

15 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
16 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

17
18 REQUEST NO. 203: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
19 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #9 is untrue, or at least, that you
20 have a good reason for denying it.

21 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
22 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
23 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
24 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

25 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
26 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

27
28 REQUEST NO. 204: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all

1 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #10 is untrue, or at least, that you
2 have a good reason for denying it.

3 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
4 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
5 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
6 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

7 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
8 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 205**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
11 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #11 is untrue, or at least, that you
12 have a good reason for denying it.

13 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
14 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
15 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
16 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

17 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
18 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

19
20 **REQUEST NO. 206**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
21 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #12 is untrue, or at least, that you
22 have a good reason for denying it.

23 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 207: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #13 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 208: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #14 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 209: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #15 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 210**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
5 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #16 is untrue, or at least, that you
6 have a good reason for denying it.

7 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 211**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
15 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #17 is untrue, or at least, that you
16 have a good reason for denying it.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 212**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
25 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #18 is untrue, or at least, that you
26 have a good reason for denying it.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 213:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
7 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #19 is untrue, or at least, that you
8 have a good reason for denying it.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 214:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
17 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #20 is untrue, or at least, that you
18 have a good reason for denying it.

19 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

25
26 **REQUEST NO. 215:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
27 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #21 is untrue, or at least, that you
28 have a good reason for denying it.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

7
8 REQUEST NO. 216: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
9 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #22 is untrue, or at least, that you
10 have a good reason for denying it.

11 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
12 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
13 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
14 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

15 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
16 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

17
18 REQUEST NO. 217: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
19 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #23 is untrue, or at least, that you
20 have a good reason for denying it.

21 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
22 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
23 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
24 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

25 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
26 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

27
28 REQUEST NO. 218: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all

1 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #24 is untrue, or at least, that you
2 have a good reason for denying it.

3 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
4 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
5 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
6 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

7 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
8 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 219**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
11 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #25 is untrue, or at least, that you
12 have a good reason for denying it.

13 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
14 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
15 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
16 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

17 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
18 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

19
20 **REQUEST NO. 220**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
21 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #26 is untrue, or at least, that you
22 have a good reason for denying it.

23 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 221: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #27 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 222: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #28 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 223: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #29 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 224**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
5 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #30 is untrue, or at least, that you
6 have a good reason for denying it.

7 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 225**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
15 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #31 is untrue, or at least, that you
16 have a good reason for denying it.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 226**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
25 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #32 is untrue, or at least, that you
26 have a good reason for denying it.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 227:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
7 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #33 is untrue, or at least, that you
8 have a good reason for denying it.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 228:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
17 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #34 is untrue, or at least, that you
18 have a good reason for denying it.

19 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

25
26 **REQUEST NO. 229:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
27 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #35 is untrue, or at least, that you
28 have a good reason for denying it.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

7
8 REQUEST NO. 230: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
9 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #36 is untrue, or at least, that you
10 have a good reason for denying it.

11 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
12 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
13 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
14 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

15 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
16 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

17
18 REQUEST NO. 231: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
19 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #37 is untrue, or at least, that you
20 have a good reason for denying it.

21 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
22 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
23 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
24 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

25 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
26 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

27
28 REQUEST NO. 232: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all

1 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #38 is untrue, or at least, that you
2 have a good reason for denying it.

3 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
4 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
5 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
6 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

7 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
8 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 233**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
11 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #39 is untrue, or at least, that you
12 have a good reason for denying it.

13 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
14 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
15 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
16 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

17 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
18 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

19
20 **REQUEST NO. 234**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
21 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #40 is untrue, or at least, that you
22 have a good reason for denying it.

23 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 235: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #41 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 236: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #42 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 237: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #43 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 238**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
5 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #44 is untrue, or at least, that you
6 have a good reason for denying it.

7 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 239**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
15 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #45 is untrue, or at least, that you
16 have a good reason for denying it.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, after a reasonable search,
22 Defendant will make responsive documents, if any, available for inspection at
23 defense counsel's office in Beaverton, Oregon at a mutually convenient time and
24 date. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

25
26 **REQUEST NO. 240**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
27 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #46 is untrue, or at least, that you
28 have a good reason for denying it.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

7
8 REQUEST NO. 241: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
9 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #47 is untrue, or at least, that you
10 have a good reason for denying it.

11 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
12 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
13 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
14 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

15 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
16 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

17
18 REQUEST NO. 242: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
19 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #48 is untrue, or at least, that you
20 have a good reason for denying it.

21 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
22 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
23 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
24 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

25 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
26 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

27
28 REQUEST NO. 243: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all

1 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #49 is untrue, or at least, that you
2 have a good reason for denying it.

3 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
4 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
5 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
6 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

7 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
8 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 244**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
11 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #50 is untrue, or at least, that you
12 have a good reason for denying it.

13 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
14 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
15 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
16 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

17 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
18 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

19
20 **REQUEST NO. 245**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
21 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #51 is untrue, or at least, that you
22 have a good reason for denying it.

23 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 246: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #52 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 247: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #53 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 248: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #54 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 249**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
5 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #55 is untrue, or at least, that you
6 have a good reason for denying it.

7 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 250**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
15 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #56 is untrue, or at least, that you
16 have a good reason for denying it.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 251**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
25 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #57 is untrue, or at least, that you
26 have a good reason for denying it.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 252:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
7 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #58 is untrue, or at least, that you
8 have a good reason for denying it.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 253:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
17 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #59 is untrue, or at least, that you
18 have a good reason for denying it.

19 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

25
26 **REQUEST NO. 254:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
27 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #60 is untrue, or at least, that you
28 have a good reason for denying it.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

7
8 REQUEST NO. 255: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
9 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #61 is untrue, or at least, that you
10 have a good reason for denying it.

11 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
12 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
13 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
14 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

15 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
16 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

17
18 REQUEST NO. 256: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
19 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #62 is untrue, or at least, that you
20 have a good reason for denying it.

21 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
22 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
23 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
24 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

25 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
26 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

27
28 REQUEST NO. 257: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all

1 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #63 is untrue, or at least, that you
2 have a good reason for denying it.

3 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
4 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
5 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
6 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

7 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
8 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 258**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
11 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #64 is untrue, or at least, that you
12 have a good reason for denying it.

13 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
14 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
15 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
16 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

17 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
18 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

19
20 **REQUEST NO. 259**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
21 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #65 is untrue, or at least, that you
22 have a good reason for denying it.

23 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 260: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #66 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 261: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #67 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 262: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #68 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 263**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
5 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #96 is untrue, or at least, that you
6 have a good reason for denying it.

7 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 264**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
15 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #70 is untrue, or at least, that you
16 have a good reason for denying it.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 265**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
25 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #71 is untrue, or at least, that you
26 have a good reason for denying it.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 266:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
7 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #72 is untrue, or at least, that you
8 have a good reason for denying it.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 267:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
17 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #73 is untrue, or at least, that you
18 have a good reason for denying it.

19 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

25
26 **REQUEST NO. 268:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
27 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #74 is untrue, or at least, that you
28 have a good reason for denying it.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

7
8 REQUEST NO. 269: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
9 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #75 is untrue, or at least, that you
10 have a good reason for denying it.

11 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
12 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
13 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
14 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

15 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
16 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

17
18 REQUEST NO. 270: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
19 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #76 is untrue, or at least, that you
20 have a good reason for denying it.

21 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
22 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
23 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
24 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

25 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
26 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

27
28 REQUEST NO. 271: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all

1 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #77 is untrue, or at least, that you
2 have a good reason for denying it.

3 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
4 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
5 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
6 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

7 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
8 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 272**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
11 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #78 is untrue, or at least, that you
12 have a good reason for denying it.

13 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
14 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
15 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
16 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

17 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
18 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

19
20 **REQUEST NO. 273**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
21 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #79 is untrue, or at least, that you
22 have a good reason for denying it.

23 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 274: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #80 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 275: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #81 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 276: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #82 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 277**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
5 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #83 is untrue, or at least, that you
6 have a good reason for denying it.

7 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 278**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
15 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #84 is untrue, or at least, that you
16 have a good reason for denying it.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 279**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
25 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #85 is untrue, or at least, that you
26 have a good reason for denying it.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 280:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
7 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #86 is untrue, or at least, that you
8 have a good reason for denying it.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 281:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
17 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #87 is untrue, or at least, that you
18 have a good reason for denying it.

19 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, after a reasonable search,
24 Defendant will make responsive documents, if any, available for inspection at
25 defense counsel's office in Beaverton, Oregon at a mutually convenient time and
26 date. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

27
28 **REQUEST NO. 282:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all

1 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #88 is untrue, or at least, that you
2 have a good reason for denying it.

3 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
4 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
5 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
6 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

7 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
8 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 283**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
11 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #89 is untrue, or at least, that you
12 have a good reason for denying it.

13 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
14 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
15 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
16 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

17 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
18 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

19
20 **REQUEST NO. 284**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
21 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #90 is untrue, or at least, that you
22 have a good reason for denying it.

23 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 285: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #91 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 286: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #92 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 287: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #93 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 288**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
5 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #94 is untrue, or at least, that you
6 have a good reason for denying it.

7 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 289**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
15 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #95 is untrue, or at least, that you
16 have a good reason for denying it.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 290**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
25 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #96 is untrue, or at least, that you
26 have a good reason for denying it.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 291:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
7 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #97 is untrue, or at least, that you
8 have a good reason for denying it.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 292:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
17 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #98 is untrue, or at least, that you
18 have a good reason for denying it.

19 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

25
26 **REQUEST NO. 293:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
27 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #99 is untrue, or at least, that you
28 have a good reason for denying it.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

7
8 REQUEST NO. 294: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
9 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #100 is untrue, or at least, that
10 you have a good reason for denying it.

11 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
12 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
13 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
14 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

15 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
16 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

17
18 REQUEST NO. 295: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
19 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #101 is untrue, or at least, that
20 you have a good reason for denying it.

21 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
22 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
23 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
24 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

25 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
26 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

27
28 REQUEST NO. 296: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all

1 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #102 is untrue, or at least, that
2 you have a good reason for denying it.

3 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
4 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
5 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
6 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

7 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
8 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

9
10 **REQUEST NO. 297**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
11 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #103 is untrue, or at least, that
12 you have a good reason for denying it.

13 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
14 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
15 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
16 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

17 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
18 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

19
20 **REQUEST NO. 298**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
21 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #104 is untrue, or at least, that
22 you have a good reason for denying it.

23 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
24 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
25 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
26 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

27 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
28 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUEST NO. 299: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #105 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 300: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #106 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

REQUEST NO. 301: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #107 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.

OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

3
4 **REQUEST NO. 302**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
5 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #108 is untrue, or at least, that
6 you have a good reason for denying it.

7 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 303**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
15 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #109 is untrue, or at least, that
16 you have a good reason for denying it.

17 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
18 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
19 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
20 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

21 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
22 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

23
24 **REQUEST NO. 304**: In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
25 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #110 is untrue, or at least, that
26 you have a good reason for denying it.

27 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
28 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through

1 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
2 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

3 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
4 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

5
6 **REQUEST NO. 305:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
7 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #111 is untrue, or at least, that
8 you have a good reason for denying it.

9 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
10 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
11 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
12 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

13 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
14 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

15
16 **REQUEST NO. 306:** In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all
17 evidence which proves that Requested Admission #112 is untrue, or at least, that
18 you have a good reason for denying it.

19 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

25
26 **REQUEST NO. 307:** All evidence which proves that the relief you suggest in
27 your response to Interrogatory #6 would, in fact, succeed in making me whole for
28 the reputational harm I have suffered.

1 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
2 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
3 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
4 controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

5 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
6 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

7
8 REQUEST NO. 308: All evidence which proves that the injunctive relief
9 requested in ¶ 155 & ¶ 157 of the Complaint is impossible to provide.

10 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
11 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
12 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
13 controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

14 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
15 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

16
17 REQUEST NO. 309: In the event that it is found that it is, in fact, impossible to
18 provide the injunctive relief requested in ¶ 155 and/or ¶ 157 of the Complaint,
19 produce all evidence which proves that said impossibility is not the direct result of
20 the Defendant's own conduct (e.g. publishing the smear video in the first instance)
21 to the extent contemplated in *United States v. Asay*, 614 F. 2d 655 (9th Cir. 1980)
22 (“Inability to comply with an order is ordinarily a complete defense to a charge of
23 contempt. An exception exists when the person charged is responsible for the
24 inability to comply”).

25 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
26 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
27 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
28 controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

1 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
2 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

3
4 REQUEST NO. 310: All evidence which shows that I did not get pneumonia
5 shortly after the publishing of the smear video.

6 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
7 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
8 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
9 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

10 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
11 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

12
13 REQUEST NO. 311: All evidence which shows that my pneumonia was not
14 caused by the stress from being harassed because of the smear video.

15 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
16 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
17 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
18 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

19 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
20 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

21
22 REQUEST NO. 312: All evidence which shows that any acts of defamation the
23 Defendant committed against me were not done with actual malice.

24 OBJECTIONS: Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
25 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
26 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
27 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

28 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped

1 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

2
3 **REQUEST NO. 313:** All evidence which shows that the Defendant did not
4 publish the smear video with the intention to inflict the injuries mentioned in
5 Requested Admissions #91-#100, to the extent contemplated by *In re Su*, 290 F. 3d
6 1140, 1142 (9th Cir. 2002).

7 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
8 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
9 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
10 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

11 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
12 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 314:** All evidence which shows that the Defendant did not believe
15 that injuries mentioned in Requested Admissions #91-#100 (and especially the
16 injuries mentioned in Requested Admissions #97-#100) were substantially certain
17 to occur as a result of his smear video, to the extent contemplated by *In re Su*, 290
18 F. 3d 1140, 1142 (9th Cir. 2002).

19 **OBJECTIONS:** Calls for expert witness opinion and attorney-client and/or
20 attorney work-product privileged documents. This and subsequent requests through
21 314 are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
22 controversy and the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

23 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, see attached Batestamped
24 documents. Discovery is ongoing and continuing.

25
26 Dated: June 21, 2026

/s/ J. Curtis Edmondson

27
28

J. Curtis Edmondson
Attorney for Defendant

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, J. Curtis Edmondson, hereby certify that I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this action. My business address is LAW OFFICES OF J. CURTIS EDMONDSON, 3720 SW 141st Avenue, Suite 212, Beaverton OR 97005.

On June 21, 2026, I served the following document: **DEFENDANT SIDNEY REDFIELD dba SIDALPHA’s RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF’S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION**

to the following persons:

David Stebbins
123 W. Ridge Ave., APT D
Harrison, AR 7260
acerthorn@yahoo.com

Service was completed in the following matter:

X **By E-mail or Electronic Transmission:** Via E-mail or Electronic Transmission, by transmitting a true copy of the document(s) to the persons at the corresponding electronic address as indicated above on the above-mentioned date. I am readily familiar with this firm’s electronic mail system and did not receive any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

/s/ J. Curtis Edmondson
J. Curtis Edmondson
Attorney for Defendant

Exhibit D

1 J. Curtis Edmondson (SBN 236105)
2 Law Offices of J. Curtis Edmondson
3 Beaverton Plaza Building
4 3720 SW 141st Avenue, Suite 212
5 Beaverton, OR 97005
6 Phone: (503) 336-3749
7 Email: jcedmondson@edmolaw.com
8 Attorney for Defendant

9
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

12 DAVID STEBBINS,
13 Plaintiff,
14 V.
15 SYDNEY REDFIELD dba SIDALPHA,
16 Defendants.

Case No. 4:23-cv-00321-MWC

**DEFENDANT SIDNEY REDFIELD
dba SIDALPHA’s RESPONSE TO
PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST TO PERMIT
INSPECTION**

17 PROPOUNDING PARTY: Plaintiff, DAVID STEBBINS
18 RESPONDING PARTY: Defendant, SIDNEY REDFIELD DBA
19 SIDALPHA
20 SET NO.: ONE

21 Defendant SIDNEY REDFIELD DBA SIDALPHA (“SIDALPHA” or
22 “Defendant”) hereby responds to Plaintiff DAVID STEBBINS’ (“STEBBINS” or
23 “Plaintiff”) First Request to Permit Inspection pursuant to FRCP 34, as follows:

24
25 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

26 1. Defendant objects to these Requests to the extent they seek documents,
27 which is already in the custody of Plaintiff, or is in the possession of other parties,
28 or the public domain that Plaintiff has equal access to. To the extent that Plaintiff is

1 seeking such documents which are more readily available from other sources or
2 already in the possession of Plaintiff, Defendant objects to these discovery requests
3 as unduly burdensome.

4 2 Defendant further objects to the Requests to the extent they seek to
5 impose duties and obligations beyond those authorized by, or imposed by, Federal
6 Rules of Civil Procedure Rules 26 and 34. To the extent the Requests seek to
7 impose obligations greater than those imposed by such Rules, they are overly broad
8 and unduly burdensome.

9 Notwithstanding these General Objections, Defendant further responds to the
10 individual requests below:

11
12 **RESPONSES TO REQUESTS TO PERMIT INSPECTION**

13
14 **REQUEST NO. 1:** For the duration of discovery in this action, send an invitation
15 to the gmail account of acerthorn@gmail.com to provide view-only access to the
16 analytics section of the Defendant's "SidAlpha" YouTube channel

17 OBJECTIONS: Seeks attorney work-product and/or attorney-client
18 privileged documents not subject to disclosure; vague and ambiguous as to
19 "SidAlpha YouTube channel." Seek confidential and private information not
20 relevant nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of evidence in this case.
21 Oppressive and burdensome in scope. This and the 314 requests for production are
22 not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in controversy and
23 the parties' relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

24 RESPONSE: Without waiving any objections, after a reasonable search,
25 Defendant will make responsive documents, if any, available for inspection at
26 defense counsel's office in Beaverton, Oregon at a mutually convenient time and
27 date.
28

1 **REQUEST NO. 2:** For the duration of discovery in this action, provide the
2 Plaintiff with access to the Defendant's X account (formerly known as Twitter),
3 including his DM inbox and sent box of same.

4 **OBJECTIONS:** Vague and ambiguous as to “DM inbox.” Seeks
5 confidential and private information not relevant nor reasonably likely to lead to the
6 discovery of evidence in this case. Compound in form. This and the 314 requests
7 for production are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount
8 in controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP
9 26.

10 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, after a reasonable search,
11 Defendant will make responsive documents, if any, available for inspection at
12 defense counsel’s office in Beaverton, Oregon at a mutually convenient time and
13 date.

14
15 **REQUEST NO. 3:** For the duration of discovery in this action, provide the
16 Plaintiff with full access to the entirety of the Defendant's discord account,
17 including his DM section, the ability to see everything in his Discord server located
18 at discord.com/channels/243273897049456640 (even things that are normally only
19 visible to moderators or administrators), as well as any other discord servers he is a
20 part of, and everything he is able to see in them.

21 **OBJECTIONS:** Compound in form and consists of several interrogatories in
22 one; seeks confidential and private information not relevant nor reasonably likely to
23 lead to the discovery of evidence in this case. This and the 314 requests for
24 production are not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the amount in
25 controversy and the parties’ relative access to relevant information under FRCP 26.

26 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving any objections, after a reasonable search,
27 Defendant will make responsive documents, if any, available for inspection at
28 defense counsel’s office in Beaverton, Oregon at a mutually convenient time and

1 date.

2

3

Dated: June 21, 2026

/s/ J. Curtis Edmondson

4

J. Curtis Edmondson
Attorney for Defendant

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, J. Curtis Edmondson, hereby certify that I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this action. My business address is LAW OFFICES OF J. CURTIS EDMONDSON, 3720 SW 141st Avenue, Suite 212, Beaverton OR 97005.

On June 21, 2026, I served the following document: **DEFENDANT SIDNEY REDFIELD dba SIDALPHA’s RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF’S FIRST REQUEST TO PERMIT INSPECTION**

to the following persons:

David Stebbins
123 W. Ridge Ave., APT D
Harrison, AR 7260
acerthorn@yahoo.com

Service was completed in the following matter:

X **By E-mail or Electronic Transmission:** Via E-mail or Electronic Transmission, by transmitting a true copy of the document(s) to the persons at the corresponding electronic address as indicated above on the above-mentioned date. I am readily familiar with this firm’s electronic mail system and did not receive any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

/s/ J. Curtis Edmondson
J. Curtis Edmondson
Attorney for Defendant

Exhibit E

Re: Defendant's responses to Plaintiff's Discovery Set One (SID 1.002)

From: Acerthorn (acerthorn@yahoo.com)

To: jcedmondson@edmolaw.com

Date: Monday, June 22, 2026 at 06:17 PM CDT

First of all... **"I will meet and confer with you after you lay out which discovery requests you have an issue with in detail"**

Wow, you've got some nerve! Considering that you refuse to give any details in your responses (which is the whole point of me having a problem with them, for the reasons set out below), you are pretty hypocritical demanding that I tell you anything "in detail."

I will say this much: 1-2 additional weeks to sort this out is unacceptable. You already got a 3 week extension, so you don't need even MORE time to get this right.

That said, here is a brief breakdown of most of the problems in your responses:

AI Transcript

First, your AI-generated transcript of the smear video is inadmissible. [Here's some proof](#). You should review that proof quickly, because Google will automatically delete it after 10 days.

Did you produce ALL the evidence you have? Or just all the evidence you think you need?

You attached two sets of "batestamped files" to your discovery responses, one set containing PDF documents, and another set containing videos.

Remember that I asked for "all" evidence. That is to say... not just all the evidence you think you need, but all the evidence you have, period.

Is this evidence you've provided genuinely all the evidence you have? For example, if, upon taking your client's deposition, none of the evidence in these "batestamp files" actually show that I don't consider fair use before issuing a DMCA Takedown, do you admit that you won't be able to produce any more evidence, because you've already provided all the evidence you have? Same with all my other counts of defamation and all of your clients' affirmative defenses.

Take, for instance, your response to Interrogatory #5. You provide only one single solitary detail in support of your claim "that I suffered no reputational harm, stress, or loss of ability to earn a living from my YouTube channel, and that detail is... my subscriber count then and now. That's it. That's all you've provided. Even though I clearly asked for "all of the evidence," that's all the evidence you gave.

So does that mean that you concede that, if I can produce literally any evidence at all of harm (whether it be to my YouTube channel or even just pain and suffering damages) that isn't related to my subscriber count, you won't have jack all evidence to refute it?

And if so, does that mean you will consent to a protective order, whereby the court explicitly forbids the Defense from offering any evidence in his defense except what he's already produced in response to these initial discovery requests? After all, if this is all the evidence you've got, and you suddenly come forth with new evidence, that necessarily means that the new evidence is just made up, right?

But if that isn't "all the evidence you have," and you claim that you reserve the right to supplement these responses at a later date if you feel you need to, then you haven't replied in full to my requests for "all evidence." That means that your responses are incomplete and you need to supplement them.

So which is it? Will you admit that your responses are incomplete and that you need to supplement them? Or will you insist that your responses are in fact complete and consent to a protective order forbidding you from offering any more evidence?

Your boilerplate objections

Next, your objections are boilerplate. You don't give any specific details to support the objections. Not only is this not allowed, but federal courts in California have a policy of treating such boilerplate objections as if no objection has been made at all. [Here's a case](#) citing to multiple federal California cases to prove it.

Now, combine that with the well-established law that says that, if you fail to timely object to a discovery request, you forever forfeit the right to object to it. You are stuck substantively responding to the discovery request, even if it was otherwise totally objectionable.

Your "vagueness" objections

Whenever you make an objection on the grounds that certain terms are undefined, these are necessarily in bad faith. For example, when objecting to Requested Admission #7, when you say "unintelligible as to "the smear video" which is undefined," this is an outright lie. You know damn well what I mean by "the smear video," as I have been using that term literally for the entire case, ever since filing the Complaint. For you to say that "the smear video" is undefined is simply a bad faith attempt at [sealioning](#) by asking for copious amounts of tedious definitions that you already know full well the definitions of.

And there are plenty of other "vagueness" objections that are just as bad faith, claiming that certain terms are undefined when you know damn well they are.

As a result, I am skeptical that your objections will survive a Rule 36(a)(6) motion. And since it's now too late for you to make any new objections, all you can do instead is abandon them.

Your copy-pasted responses to my Requests for Production

First of all, your objections to the requests for production are just as boilerplate as those in your interrogatory and RFA responses. For example, you frequently claim that it "Seeks information that is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." This is not a valid objection, because you don't give specific reasons, which the plain text of Rule 34 requires you to provide. Same with your repeated objection that a request "calls for an expert opinion." So on and so forth.

Not only that, but it's literally a bald-faced lie. For example, Request for Production #7 asked you to show evidence that "I paid to dox InitiativeKookie." You raised the relevance objection

there. But how is that even remotely not relevant? It's literally one of my counts of defamation! Defamation #4 to be exact! So for you to say that this is "neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence," you're just straight up lying.

And that's not going to bode well for your client at trial, when he is a proven perjurer.

And again, there's a lot more to this than just Request for Production #7. All of your responses were like that. I just used #7 as an illustrative example.

Your non-responses to my requests for production

Across nearly all of your responses to my requests for production, all you do is merely tell me to "see attached Batestamped documents." But you don't tell me exactly what batestamped documents you're actually referring to.

So let me get this straight: For each of these responses, you expect me to sift through the ENTIRETY of your batestamped documents - all 3GB plus of them - and try to find the needle in the haystack that I'm not even convinced is even there?! Is that basically what you expect me to do?!

For example, when I look over the PDF document titled "Discord - SidAlpha Discord - situation-room," I see [this exchange](#) between your client and what appears to be one of his Discord server members. But that exchange doesn't appear to have anything at all to do with me!

So are you seriously telling me that I need to see THAT exchange is somehow indispensible to me understanding your response to for example, Requested Admission #204?!

Why can't you just tell me, in your response to each RFP, which specific batestamped documents actually relate to each specific RFP response?

Now, you may hear that last question and smugly reply "We're not required to do that." Except... you are! [Here's proof!](#) That case law clearly says that you must provide "individualized, complete responses... accompanied by production of each of the documents responsive to the request, regardless of whether the documents have already been produced."

So yes, you are indeed required to provide specific references to the individual batestamped files - including timestamps for videos and page numbers (possibly even individualized messages) for the PDF pages. Only give citation to the specific batestamped files that actually support your responses to each RFP, and don't include any batestamp files that don't support your answers to each one. That may require you provide the same evidence multiple times, but that's what the case law requires.

Oh, and you don't get to object to this simply because my discovery requests are super-broad either. [Here's a case law](#) to prove that too. Of course, since you can't raise any new objections, that's a moot point by this point anyway.

So you need to amend your RFP responses in order to provide specific, individualized references to specific batestamped files. Instead of just telling me to "see attached batestamped files" and then expecting me to sift through a haystack in search of a needle I'm not convinced is even there, you need to just tell me **exactly** where the needle is for each RFP

response.

Responses to Interrogatories

In addition to the problems with your response to Interrogatory #5 as outlined above, most of your interrogatory responses were outright ducking the questions. There were only 7 interrogatories in total, so I will address each one individually.

Interrogatory #2:

I asked you to give **specific** factual and legal bases for each of your defenses! **SPECIFIC!!!** All you did was simply restate each defense. You provided absolutely no new details that weren't already listed in your Answer to Complaint. This is insufficient and you need to update your responses to each.

Interrogatory #3:

You claim that I never made any request to hear my side of the story, but this is a bald-faced lie. [Here is a screenshot](#) of the email I sent your client, and highlighted is the sentence where I asked him to hear my side of the story.

Even barring that, [here's another publicly-visible post](#) where I very clearly asked him to hear my side of the story. And [here's another one!](#)

That's THREE separate instances, predating the publication of the smear video, where I very clearly did ask him to hear my side of the story before publishing it!

As I said earlier, lying during discovery won't bode well for your client at trial.

So again, you need to amend your response to this interrogatory and actually give a straight answer.

Interrogatory #6:

This does not respond to the substance of the interrogatory. I clearly understand that you don't believe I am entitled to any relief. That was not what I asked. The interrogatory demanded that you assume you might be liable to me for defamation and work from there. The interrogatory demanded that you provide specific suggestions for injunctive relief in place of that which I requested in ¶¶ 155-158 of the Complaint.

If you can't think of any other set of injunctions that would make me whole in practice (and yes, despite your objection, you know damn well what I mean by that), you can just say that! But then, your client would be locked into the relief I requested in the Complaint, because by your own admission, I can't be made whole without it!

So you need to update your response to this interrogatory and actually give a straight answer.

Conclusion

I'm about to hit the gym. Please respond substantively to each of these problems.

Sincerely,
Acerthorn

On Monday, June 22, 2026 at 04:42:20 PM CDT, J. Curtis Edmondson <jcedmondson@edmolaw.com> wrote:

David,

From your email it appears you have issues with quite a few of our responses.

We provide you with over 1GB of document production, answered your interrogatories, and request for admissions. (There are over 400 of them). We objected to your inspection demands under Rule 26

You need to list each discovery request by number and identify the deficiency separately by discovery number.
Example:

RPD 1 -

...

RPD 253 -

RFA 4 -

ROG 3 -

....

ROG 5 -

This should be in a separate document.

Then I will review each discovery request and see if it can be resolved. Then we can have a zoom call to confer on the subset of disputed items.

This process may take 1-2 weeks depending on the number of issues you have. If it is 4-5 total, it will be pretty quick. If it is 200+, it will take longer.

B. Regards,

J. Curtis Edmondson, Counsel
Law Offices of J. Curtis Edmondson
Patents, Copyrights, Trademarks, Trade Secrets, and Unfair Competition
ph: (503) 336-3749 | fax: (503) 482-7418
jcedmondson@edmolaw.com | www.edmolaw.com
Licensed in Washington, Oregon, California, DC, and before the USPTO

 **Edmondson IP Law**

On 06/22/2026 1:36 PM PDT Acerthorn <acerthorn@yahoo.com> wrote:

For what it's worth, we can probably knock out large chunks of these problems in one fell swoop, since you typically gave the same answer multiple times. By explaining the legal insufficiency of these boilerplate objections, I can hopefully educate you of 99% of the problems in 2-3 fell swoops.

So I highly doubt this is going to take literally all day for us to sort through.

So will 8AM PST tomorrow be a good time to call?

Sincerely,
Acerthorn

On Monday, June 22, 2026 at 03:32:12 PM CDT, Acerthorn <acerthorn@yahoo.com> wrote:

Except that's just it: You didn't respond to them. Not really.

Can you take a call at 8am pacific tomorrow? It'll last however long it takes for us to work this out.

[Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer](#)

On Mon, Jun 22, 2026 at 7:24 AM, J. Curtis Edmondson
<jcedmondson@edmolaw.com> wrote:

David,

You served approximately 400 discovery requests and we responded to them.

If this a request for a meet and confer, send me some dates and times, and for how long, and I will send you a zoom link for one that matches my schedule.

In Best Regards,

J. Curtis Edmondson, Counsel
Law Offices of J. Curtis Edmondson
Patents, Copyrights, Trademarks, Trade Secrets, and Unfair Competition
ph: (503) 336-3749 | fax: (503) 482-7418
jcedmondson@edmolaw.com | www.edmolaw.com
Licensed in Washington, Oregon, California, DC, and before the USPTO



On 06/21/2026 8:52 PM PDT Acerthorn <acerthorn@yahoo.com> wrote:

Your responses are insufficient and reek of bad faith. When are you going to be available in the next day or two to call and discuss the matter?

Sincerely,
Acerthorn

On Sunday, June 21, 2026 at 10:05:04 PM CDT, J. Curtis Edmondson
<jcedmondson@edmolaw.com> wrote:

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/hijp46jhaio53p5iadgpb/001-PL-RPD-S1-20250621.zip?rlkey=4ztitnmn1rzx6w7fn96efow6e&st=du334ntt&dl=0>
<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/khiho8bxexianogi1xrh/002-PL-RPD-S1-20250621.zip?rlkey=0wr65ei5iiojl0915cyccltpp&st=8hb03gwo&dl=0>
<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/9cj74154emherkkw8lp7r/003-PL-RPD-S1-20260621.pdf?rlkey=d0h6is3yoz13w1y7gvk2i5box&st=k9pwe9kz&dl=0>
<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/mumvlfjp2vj7ppgl82ay8/SID-1.002-RESP-to-PLF-s-Req-to-Permit-Insp-20260621-final-to-serve.pdf?rlkey=145zzwwfmffltvg0ulla2dnqn&st=of2beqov&dl=0>
<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/mqh4jur4tmvrghz70k18k/SID-1.002-RESP-to-PLF-s-RFAs-20260621-final-to-serve.pdf?rlkey=3mzs1xho8pncgzkgwjz3vvpg4&st=qu9aotyy&dl=0>
<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/8nv7jm58j0dtjz3a8wyi4/SID-1.002-RESP-to-PLF-s-RPD-20260621->

final-to-serve.r1.pdf?rlkey=ar0waw72sr9mvmc54cchcaw1w&st=ty9ezs5c&dl=0
<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/4m7yenv27oe2s35flustx/SID-1.002-RESP-to-PLFs-Rogs-20260621-to-serve.pdf?rlkey=rxy455facw54hgpu6yvqt1xkk&st=x6mdpo9b&dl=0>

On 06/21/2026 3:14 PM PDT Acerthorn <acerthorn@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Edmondson,

This is polite reminder that your discovery responses are due today. If you do not reply, all of the requested admissions will be deemed admitted automatically. Also, you have already been granted an extension of time to reply to discovery, so you've had more than enough time as it is.

Sincerely,
Acerthorn

Exhibit F

Re: Hello

From: SidAlpha (sidalpha@sidalpha.com)

To: acerthorn@yahoo.com

Date: Sunday, January 16, 2022 at 04:40 PM CST

No.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: acerthorn <acerthorn@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, January 16, 2022 4:46:54 AM

To: SidAlpha <sidalpha@sidalpha.com>

Subject: Hello

Dear Mr. Sid Alpha,

I doubt this will do very much good, since you seem to already have your mind made up about me. But I feel compelled to at least try.

People have been sending you highly cherry-picked information about me, and you have been regurgitating it on your Twitter account, almost verbatim. You should have reached out to me and asked for my side of the story first before you just assumed that what you were getting was the full picture.

Please cease and desist.

Your's truly ...

A digital signature graphic for 'Acer thorn'. The text 'Acer' is on the top line and 'thorn' is on the bottom line, both in a bold, white, sans-serif font with a black outline. The background is a blue square with a white hexagonal pattern.

1 David Stebbins 123 W. Ridge Ave., APT D, Harrison, AR 72601
2 (870) 204-6516 acerthorn@yahoo.com

3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4 DAVID STEBBINS, PLAINTIFF
5 VS. Case 4:23-cv-00321-MMC
6 SYDNEY REDFIELD, d.b.a. SIDALPHA DEFENDANTS

7 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORIES IN SUPPORT OF**
8 **MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY, FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER, AND FOR**
9 **DETERMINATION OF SUFFICIENCY UNDER FRCP 36(a)(6)**

10 Comes now, pro se Plaintiff David Stebbins, who hereby submits the following Memora-
11 ndum of Points and Authorities in Support of my Motion to Compel Discovery, for Protective
12 Order, and for Determination of Sufficiency under FRCP 36(a)(6) in the above-styled action.

13 **I: TABLE OF CONTENTS**

14	Section	Page
15	I: TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
16	II: TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
17	III: FACTS	1
18	III-1: Defendant's Discovery Responses	1
19	III-2: Defendant's Bad Faith Refusal to Confer	1
20	IV: SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	2
21	V: ARGUMENT AND RELIEF REQUESTED	3
22	V-1: Request for Protective Order	3
23	V-2: Defendant's boilerplate objections	5
24	V-2-A: Relief Requested	7
25	V-3: Failure to make any reasonable inquiry	7
26	V-3-A: Relief Requested	8
27	V-4: Non-Individualized and Incomplete RFP Responses	9
28	V-4-A: Relief Requested	12

1	V-5: Evasive and Incomplete Interrogatory Responses	12
2	V-5-A: Interrogatory #2	13
3	V-5-B: Interrogatory #3	13
4	V-5-C: Interrogatory #4	14
5	V-5-D: Interrogatory #5	14
6	V-5-E: Interrogatory #6	15
7	V-6: The Defense should be sanctioned for its bad faith.	16
8	VI: CONCLUSION	17

II: TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

10	Statutes & Rules	Page(s)
11	• Fed.R.Civ.P. 33	5,13
12	• Fed.R.Civ.P. 34	5,9
13	• Fed.R.Civ.P. 36	5,7,9
14	• Schwinghamer, N. F. (n.d.). “Your Boilerplate Objections are	5,6,17
15	Garbage, and They Make You Look Dumb.”	
16	https://www.nfsesq.com/your-boilerplate-objections-are-garbage-and-they-make-you-	
17	look-dumb/#your-boilerplate-objections-are-garbage-and-they-make-you-look-dumb	
18	Case Law	Page(s)
19	• Asea, Inc. v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co., 669 F.	8
20	2d 1242, 1245 (9th Cir. 1981)	
21	• Cadles of West Virginia, LLC v. Alvarez,	5
22	No. 20-CV-2534, Aug 1, 2022 *at 5 (S.D.C.A.)	
23	• Cheteni v. Vella, No. 23-cv-06286, Dkt. 135,	8
24	Aug 26, 2025 *at 6 (N.D.C.A.)	
25	• Clement v. Alegre, 177 Cal.App.4th 1277 (2009)	17
26	• Khan v. San Francisco Dept. of Public Health,	8
27	No. 24-cv-9289, Dkt. 36, Dec 12, 2025 *at 5 (N.D.C.A.)	
28	• Loop AI Labs v. Gatti, No. 15-cv-00798,	9

1	Dkt. 648, May 6, 2016 *at 3-4 (N.D.C.A.)	
2	• Standon v. Superior Court, 225 Cal.App.3d 898 (1990)	17
3	• Williams v. Taser Int'l, Inc. (N.D.Ga 2007)	17
4	2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 40280	

1 **III: FACTS**

2 The following facts are relevant to this motion:

3 **III-1: Discovery Responses**

4 On June 21, 2026, the Defendant served me with responses to my discovery requests. See
5 **Exhibits A-D**. In addition to his direct responses to my Requests for Admissions, Interrogatories,
6 Requests for Production, and Requests to Permit Inspection, he also provided two other sets of
7 files, which he refers to as “batestamp files.” These two sets of files can be viewed and
8 downloaded at the following two URLs:

- 9 1. [https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/hijp46jhaio53p5iadgpb/001-PL-RPD-S1-20250621.zip?
10 rlkey=4ztitnmn1rx6w7fn96efow6e&st=du334ntt&e=1&dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/hijp46jhaio53p5iadgpb/001-PL-RPD-S1-20250621.zip?rlkey=4ztitnmn1rx6w7fn96efow6e&st=du334ntt&e=1&dl=0)
- 11 2. [https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/khiho8bxexianogilxrh/002-PL-RPD-S1-20250621.zip?
12 rlkey=0wr65ei5iiojl0915cycyltpp&st=8hb03gwo&e=1&dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/khiho8bxexianogilxrh/002-PL-RPD-S1-20250621.zip?rlkey=0wr65ei5iiojl0915cycyltpp&st=8hb03gwo&e=1&dl=0)

13 In case the Defendant attempts to delete these files from Dropbox before the Court has a
14 chance to download them for its own records, you can see an archive of the batestamp files at the
15 following URL: [https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1oqb6-
16 W_zInrMC0n0cLPHzbq7QPKNIJf?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1oqb6-W_zInrMC0n0cLPHzbq7QPKNIJf?usp=sharing)

17 I found the majority of those responses to be insufficient and, on Monday, June 22, 2026,
18 I contacted the Defendant over email, and explained to him a multitude of the problems I had
19 with his discovery responses. See **Exhibit E**.

20 **III-2: Defendant's Bad Faith Refusal to Confer**

21 We met over Zoom on June 24, 2026. However, from the outset, it was clear that the
22 Defense Counsel had no intention of conferring in good faith. He repeatedly insisted that we
23 tackle each discovery request one at a time, even though there are more than 400 discovery
24 responses at issue; tackling all of them would have taken literally all day, and would have
25 resulted in numerous repetitive arguments. I repeatedly explained to him that I was not required
26 to do things “his way,” and that I was going to explain the handful of problems (set for the
27 below) that the overwhelming majority of his discovery responses had, and use only handful of
28 specific examples to illustrate.

1 Despite this reasonable structure, the Defendant refused to engage in good faith,
2 repeatedly bringing up matters previously discussed even after we had disposed of them, and
3 repeatedly acting like I only had problems with the few specific discovery responses I was using
4 as exmaples, even though I repeatedly made clear that was not how I was going about discussing
5 the matter.

6 Once it became clear that the Defense Counsel had no intention of engaging in good faith,
7 I ended the conference and proceeded to draft this motion. My efforts satisfy the requirement
8 under the Federal Rules to attempt in good faith to resolve the matter without court action, as
9 well as the requirements in Local Rule 37-1(a).

10 IV: SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

11 Because my discovery requests clearly requested “all evidence” (not just all the evidence
12 he thinks he needs, but all the evidence he has) and the Defendant's responses purported on their
13 face to comply with that portion of the requests, the evidence already submitted by the Defendant
14 should be considered the entirety of all the evidence he has. I therefore ask that the Court issue a
15 protective order forbidding the Defendant from offering any more evidence to support any of his
16 affirmative defenses or to refute any of my elements of prima facie defamation.

17 The Defendant's objections are boilerplate. Therefore, they are insufficient as a matter of
18 law for want of specificity, detail, or reasons, and, per this Court's policy, should be treated as a
19 failure to object at all. From this, the Defendant should be held to have forfeited the right to raise
20 *any* objections to my discovery requests, thereby forcing them to respond substantively to each
21 discovery request.

22 When citing lack of knowledge as a reason for inability to admit or deny a requested
23 admission, the Defense must conduct a reasonable inquiry before he is allowed to use that
24 excuse. The Defendant clearly didn't even *try* to inquire before admitting or denying. Therefore,
25 the Court should either deem all of those facts to be admitted, or require the Defendant to amend
26 his answers.

27 When responding to my requests for production, the Defendant failed to give individual-
28 ized, complete responses to each, even though I am entitled to same. Therefore, he should be

1 made to comply.

2 Many of the Defendant's Interrogatory responses are evasive and incomplete as well. He
3 should be made to amend those.

4 In addition, the Defense should be sanctioned for its clear bad faith attempt to sealion me,
5 its bad faith attempt to give me the run-around, and its bad faith attempt to needlessly drag out
6 the costs of this litigation.

7 **V: ARGUMENT AND RELIEF REQUESTED**

8 Nearly all of the Defendant's discovery responses were inadequate. Only a handful of
9 them were sufficient. But the vast majority of them were legally inadequate for the same handful
10 of reasons. Therefore, to save time, I will list each problem that I have with the responses, and
11 then I ask the Court to order that the Defendant amend all of his discovery responses to comply
12 with the law. While I will occasionally point to specific discovery responses in order to *illustrate*
13 my problems, those examples are just that: Illustrative examples. Just because I only mention 5-6
14 discovery responses does not mean those are the only ones that need amending.

15 The only exception to this is the responses to the Interrogatories. I will address each of
16 them individually, but only because there are so few of them that I can afford to.

17 **V-1: Request for Protective Order, blocking the Defendant from providing any new**
18 **evidence.**

19 The discovery requests demanded that he produce "all evidence." Not just all the
20 evidence he believed he needed, but all the evidence he had, period, which supported his case.

21 This is one of the few parts of the request that the defendant never objected to, boilerplate
22 or otherwise. Therefore, he must respond substantively to this.

23 Take, for instance, their response to Interrogatory #5. They provide only one single
24 solitary detail in support of their claim "that I suffered no reputational harm, stress, or loss of
25 ability to earn a living from my YouTube channel," and that detail is... my subscriber count then
26 and now. That's it. That's all they've provided. Even though I clearly asked for "all of the
27 evidence," that's all the evidence they gave. So does that mean that they concede that, if I can
28 produce literally any evidence at all of harm (whether it be to my YouTube channel or even just

1 pain and suffering damages) that isn't related to my subscriber count, they won't have jack all
2 evidence to refute it?

3 I therefore ask that the Court to issue a protective order in this case. I intend to rely in
4 good faith on the Defense's representation that this is all the evidence he had about me when he
5 made the smear video, and I intend to limit and restrict my future discovery requests accordingly.
6 However, in doing so, I become vulnerable to trial by ambush. Suppose, for a minute, that I am
7 taking Sydney Redfield's deposition, and I show him the "batestamped files" and ask him to
8 point out where, in those batestamped files, it shows that I do not consider fair use whenever I
9 issue a DMCA Takedown (not that the videos I had taken down were fair use despite my belief to
10 the contrary, but that I didn't consider fair use at all), only for the Defendant to say "Well, it's not
11 in there, but I do have this other evidence here," then suddenly, there's a whole new waive of
12 discovery requests I need to make in order to be truly ready for trial!

13 Same with all other counts of defamation and all other facts which have the potential to
14 be relevant tot his case.

15 To protect me from that and similar types of prejudices, I ask the Court to issue a
16 protective order restricting the Defendant, except for the limited exceptions outlined below, from
17 offering any evidence, outside of the "batestamped files" (as amended by his upcoming amended
18 discovery responses) to support his claims that the state-ments he made about me in the smear
19 video are true, his opinion, or were otherwise defensible.

20 I am also moving for the Defendant to be ordered to amend its discovery responses. So he
21 may include a new wave of evidence in his defense, but this should be the last time.

22 An exception to this ban on new evidence can exist if (A) it relates exclusively to the
23 damages I have suffered or the relief I am entitled to, not to liability in the first instance, and (B)
24 he reasonably did not have access to that evidence prior to producing it in this case. The first
25 element of this exception is necessary because, if he didn't have access to that evidence at the
26 time of publishing the smear video, it obviously wasn't a factor in his determination that any of
27 the things he said about me are true.

28 If the Defendant attempts to introduce any new evidence, not disclosed in his first, or

1 upcoming amended, discovery responses, that doesn't fit within this exception, then I ask that the
2 Court, per this protective order, block him from doing so.

3 **V-2: Defendant's boilerplate objections are legally insufficient.**

4 In all discovery responses, the grounds for an objection must be stated with specificity.
5 See Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(b)(4); Fed.R.Civ.P. 34(b)(4); Fed.R.Civ.P. 36(a)(5). Boilerplate objections
6 are not allowed and are heavily frowned upon by the Court. See Schwinghamer:

7 “Boilerplate objections waste judicial resources, inflate litigation costs, and erode
8 the integrity of the discovery process. They force unnecessary meet-and-confer
9 efforts and motions to compel, consuming time that should be spent resolving the
10 merits of the case. California courts have repeatedly criticized 'generalized,
11 unsupported' objections as a misuse of the discovery process.

12 Worse, they deprive the requesting party of the ability to evaluate the claimed
13 grounds for withholding information. An objection must allow the other side—
14 and the court—to assess its legitimacy. When counsel simply parrots phrases like
15 'privileged' or 'unduly burdensome' without explanation, it becomes impossible to
16 test those assertions. That is why courts increasingly impose sanctions for
17 boilerplate discovery responses—they are not merely sloppy; they are
18 obstructive.”

19 See also *Cadles of West Virginia, LLC v. Alvarez*, No. 20-CV-2534, Aug 1, 2022 *at 5
20 (S.D.C.A.):

21 “Where the responding party provides a boilerplate or generalized objection, the
22 objections are inadequate and tantamount to not making any objection at all. As
23 courts have repeatedly pointed out, blanket objections are patently improper, and
24 we treat the general objections as if they were never made. The responding party
25 must clarify, explain, and support its objections. The grounds for objecting to a
26 request must be stated and ... it is well established that boilerplate objections do
27 not suffice.” (citations and quotations omitted).
28

29 Here, the Defendant raised objections to nearly every discovery request, but none of these
30 objections had any details or reasons to support them. When responding to requests for
31 admissions, he will consistently throw around such words as “unintelligible” and “compound,”
32 but never explain what he means by that. In responding to my requests for production, he
33 repeatedly makes similar undefined and boilerplate objections, such as “compound in form” or
34 “calls for an expert opinion,” even when the requests do not appear to call for any expert

1 opinions.

2 One of the most notorious and reoccurring objections he makes is the “vague and
3 ambiguous” objection, where he takes various terms that are reasonably clear, and simply calls
4 them “undefined.” In addition to providing no details or specificity (which already renders his
5 objections improper anyway), they are all demonstrably false. “The 'vague and ambiguous'
6 [objection] requires that the responding party truly cannot understand the question... It is
7 amazing how many well educated attorneys, with degrees from prestigious schools hanging on
8 their walls, lose the ability to understand basic English words when interrogatories are served.”
9 See Schwinghamer, supra.

10 For example, when objecting to Requested Admission #7, the Defense says
11 "unintelligible as to 'the smear video' which is undefined." This is an outright lie. The Defense
12 knows full well what I mean by "the smear video," as I have been using that term literally for the
13 entire case, ever since filing the Complaint. For him to say that "the smear video" is undefined is
14 simply a bad faith attempt at sealioning by asking for copious amounts of tedious definitions that
15 you already know full well the definitions of.

16 Another example is found at Requested Admission #87, where I asked him to admit that
17 “I never plead guilty to the crime.” He objects, saying “Vague and ambiguous as to 'plead guilty,'
18 and 'the crime.’” But the phrase “the crime” is not the least bit ambiguous. In addition to it being
19 clearly defined in the context of this case (where I am suing him, in part, for reporting that I was
20 accused of a crime but lying by omission for failing to also report that those charges were
21 dismissed, so clearly, THAT must be “the crime” I'm asking him to admit to facts regarding), it is
22 also clearly defined within the context of *The Requests for Admissions!* Scroll up for a little bit,
23 up to Request No. 85, where I ask him to admit that “in 2011, I was charged (“the indictment”)
24 with domestic violence (“the crime”).” In doing that, I clearly establish that “the crime” was the
25 domestic violence charge that forms the basis for Defamation #10 in the instant case. It's just like
26 when I'm typing a motion, and I assign short names to various parties, witnesses, and pieces of
27 evidence, at the outset of the memorandum, and refer to them by their short names for the rest of
28 the brief. It's the same logic here.

1 In these and many more examples, the Defendant claims that various terms are “undef-
2 ined” when employing even a slight amount of common sense would quickly define the terms
3 for him to a degree sufficient to respond.

4 His other objections are similarly without merit. None of the requests are unintelligible.
5 None of them are cumulative or compound in form. None of them call for expert opinions, and
6 even if some of them do, that alone is not a grounds for objection, at least not without further
7 context and argument which the defendant utterly fails to provide.

8 These are all insufficient as a matter of law, since the law overwhelmingly states that
9 objections must be specific.

10 V-2-A: Relief Requested

11 I therefore ask that the Court declare all of the following:

- 12 1. That all of the Defendant's objections to all of my discovery requests are boilerplate
13 objections and, therefore, are legally insufficient.
- 14 2. Therefore, per the longstanding policy of this and other federal district courts, the
15 Defendant is held to have filed no objection at all to any of my discovery requests.
- 16 3. This, combined with the equally-well-established public policy that a party waives any
17 discovery objection not timely raised, means that the Defendant cannot raise any new
18 objections to my discovery requests in his upcoming amended answers, but must instead
19 respond substantively and in full to each request.

20 **V-3: Defendant failed to make any reasonable inquiry into any of the requested admissions.**

21 Moving onto the responses to each discovery request, the Defendant responds to the
22 majority of the requests for admissions¹ by claiming that he cannot admit or deny any of them for
23 lack of knowledge. However, the Defendant doesn't get to just make that claim. “The answering
24 party may assert lack of knowledge or information as a reason for failing to admit or deny only if
25 the party states that it has made reasonable inquiry and that the information it knows or can
26 readily obtain is insufficient to enable it to admit or deny.” See Fed.R.Civ.P. 36(a)(4). Much like

1 57 out of 112 to be exact. Specifically, he responds to Requested Admissions 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18,
19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 47, 49, 53, 55, 56, 67, 68, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84,
87, 88, 90, 92, 93, 94, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, and 112 this way.

1 with boilerplate objections, it is not enough that the responding party simply say that it has made
2 a reasonable inquiry; much like with discovery objections, the responding party must “state fully
3 those efforts.” See Khan v. San Francisco Dept. of Public Health, No. 24-cv-9289, Dkt. 36, Dec
4 12, 2025 *at 5 (N.D.C.A.).

5 Here, in all eight requested admissions where the defendant claims he cannot admit or
6 deny, he never states any effort he made to inquire into the matters before claiming lack of
7 knowledge. Therefore, his claims for lack of knowledge should be tossed out summarily for the
8 same reasons as his boilerplate objections.

9 One of the requirements of the “reasonably inquiry” is that the must consult all evidence
10 which is reasonably available to him. See Asea, Inc. v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co., 669 F. 2d
11 1242, 1245 (9th Cir. 1981) (“a party may not refuse to admit or deny a request for admission
12 based upon a lack of personal knowledge if the information relevant to the request is reasonably
13 available to him”). When something is filed on record in the very case where the admission is
14 sought, that is enough to grant the responding party the ability to admit or deny. See Cheteni v.
15 Vella, No. 23-cv-06286, Dkt. 135, Aug 26, 2025 *at 6 (N.D.C.A.) (finding an ability to admit or
16 deny where “[t]he documents cited by [the requesting party] were filed in this case and remain
17 readily accessible”).

18 So, for example (and just to remind the Court, this is JUST an illustrative example; all of
19 the responses mentioned in the footnote above are subject to this), in his response to Requested
20 Admission #87, he claims he lacks information to admit or deny that I did not plead guilty to the
21 crime. However, he has the court transcripts for that case! Not only did I disclose those court
22 transcripts in my 26(a) initial disclosures, but I also attached them to my “Motion for Partial
23 Summary Judgment on the Issue of Liability for Defamation #10” in this case, which is Dkt. 74
24 on Pacer. Therefore, the Defendant absolutely had access to the documents he would need in
25 order to verify the truth of this requested admission, yet he makes no indication that he actually
26 made any reasonable inquiry into the matter whatsoever.

27 V-3-A: Relief Requested

28 “On finding that an answer does not comply with this rule, the court may order either that

1 the matter is admitted or that an amended answer be served.” See Fed.R.Civ.P. 36(a)(5). Here,
2 the Court should do the former, ordering that all the requested admissions listed in the footnote
3 above be deemed admitted by the Defendant. This is the appropriate response to the Defendant's
4 bad faith. He didn't even try to make a reasonable inquiry to obtain the knowledge he needed to
5 admit or deny these facts. He shouldn't get a second chance when it's patently obvious he didn't
6 put forth literally any effort the first time.

7 If, however, the Court insists on the more lenient sanction that the Defendant doesn't
8 deserve – ordering that amended answers be served within seven days of its order – then I at least
9 ask that the Court warn the Defendant that he must state with specificity what inquiries he has
10 actually made before submitting his amended responses.

11 **V-4: Defendant's responses to my Requests for Production are not individualized and are**
12 **incomplete.**

13 First, all of the defendant's objections to my requests for production are insufficient for
14 the same reasons as set forth in Section V-2 above.

15 That said, whenever a party requests production of documents (or “RFP” for short) under
16 Fed.R.Civ.P. 34, “[t]he requesting party is entitled to individualized, complete responses to each
17 of the requests, accompanied by production of each of the documents responsive to the request,
18 regardless of whether the documents have already been produced to the requesting party.” See
19 Loop AI Labs v. Gatti, No. 15-cv-00798, Dkt. 648, May 6, 2016 *at 3-4 (N.D.C.A.) (cleaned up).
20 Here, all of the Defendant's RFP Responses except for his response to No. 1 fail to meet this
21 requirement.

22 Of the remaining 313 RFP responses, two of them – RFP #239 and #281 – both give
23 wholly untenable responses: “after a reasonable search, Defendant will make responsive
24 documents, if any, available for inspection at defense counsel’s office in Beaverton, Oregon at a
25 mutually convenient time and date.”

26 That's not how it works! The Defendant does not get to force me to drive across the
27 country just to look at documents in-person, not when it is perfectly technologically viable for
28 them to simply send me the documents over email, which they've already done anyway for the

1 batestamped files! For these two responses, the Defendant deserves to be sanctioned just for the
2 sheer audacity.

3 Of the remaining 311 responses to RFPs, all of them – literally every single last one of
4 them – give the exact same, copied and pasted response: “see attached batestamped files.” But he
5 doesn't tell me exactly what batestamped documents he's actually referring to.

6 So let me get this straight: For each of these responses, the Defendant expects me to sift
7 through the ENTIRETY of your batestamped documents - all 3GB plus of them - and try to find
8 the needle in the haystack that I'm not even convinced is even there?! Is that basically what the
9 Defendant expect me to do?!

10 Not only that, but some portions of his batestamped files appear to be entirely irrelevant
11 to this case. For example, when I look over the PDF document titled "Discord - SidAlpha
12 Discord - situation-room," I see this exchange between the Defendant and what appears to be one
13 of his Discord server members:



Hank 1/13/2022 3:01 PM

man there is some crazy ass people who live in my complex

There was someone who was playing there stereo way too loud today.

One of my neighborbors stomps over to them

knocks on the door gets let in and throws the unit out the window.



SidAlpha 1/14/2022 6:33 PM

LMAO

14 But that exchange doesn't appear to have anything at all to do with me. So is the
15 Defendant seriously telling me that me seeing that exchange is somehow indespensible to me
16 understanding his response to for example, RFP #204?! Technically, that exchange is included in
17 his official response to RFP #204, so he apparently is claiming that it is in fact relevant.

18 Except that he isn't. He's clearly expecting me to just sift through this haystack of
19 evidence in search of a needle that most likely doesn't exist at all. But why does he have to do
20 that? Why can't he just tell me which specific batestamped files go with which RFP resposne?!

21 The Defendant may counter that argument by smugly declaring “I'm not required to do

1 that,” except that he is! As I showed above, case law unequivocally entitles me to individualized
2 and complete responses. At a minimum, this forbids the Defendant from simply giving the same,
3 copy-pasted and blanket response to each RFP.

4 In fact, just like with his boilerplate objections, just like with his lack of reasonable
5 inquiry before claiming lack of knowledge in response to the requests for admissions, it is clear
6 here that he didn't even try to comply in good faith with the requirement for individualized and
7 complete responses. This is evidenced by the fact that there are plenty of times when his copy-
8 pasted response of “see attached batestamp files” doesn't even make any sense at all, let alone
9 qualify as an individualized and complete response.

10 For example (and again, I emphasize that these are just illustrative examples, not
11 exclusive or comprehensive of the problem), there is his response to RFP #197. This RFP stated
12 “In the event that it is denied, in whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that
13 Requested Admission #3 is untrue, or at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.” The
14 first seven words of that RFP clearly indicate that he only has to respond to this RFP if he denies,
15 in whole or in part, Requested Admission #3. However, he *admitted* to Requested Admission #3!
16 So he doesn't have to respond to that RFP at all!

17 Now sure, you may argue that this makes his response to RFP #197 sufficient. But that's
18 not the point. The point is that, by submitting the same copy-pasted response to this RFP, despite
19 it not making any sense in this case, is proof that the Defendant didn't even attempt to put forth
20 any actual effort to respond substantively to any of these requests.

21 Then there's his response to RFP #216. This RFP stated “In the event that it is denied, in
22 whole or in part, provide all evidence which proves that Requested Admission #22 is untrue, or
23 at least, that you have a good reason for denying it.” In this case, Requested Admission #22
24 stated “the Defendant believes that, although his informants were absolutely malicious bullies
25 who were harassing me just because they can, it is nevertheless my ethical duty to shut up, bend
26 over, and take the harassment like a punk.” Unlike Requested Admission #3, the Defendant
27 denied this requested admission, so he is still required to respond substantively to this RFP.

28 This RFP, in essence, asks him to show evidence proving that he genuinely believes that I

1 have an ethical right to stand up to bullies using whatever legal means I have available to me.
2 That's basically what he said when he denied Requested Admission #22, so that's what I'm asking
3 him to prove with RFP #216.

4 And his response to that is... “see attached batestamp files.”

5 Honestly, what's more likely at this point? That, at some point in the more than 3GB
6 worth of batestamped files, there exists definitive proof that he believes I have the right to stand
7 up to bullies, and I just need to find that needle in the haystack? Or that this evidence isn't
8 actually anywhere in that haystack of evidence, he knows it's not there, and he's just using “see
9 attached batestamped files” as his stock response to everything?

10 As you can see from these two examples, it's obvious that he isn't even *trying* to
11 cooperate in good faith in discovery.

12 V-4-A: Relief Requested

13 For these reasons, I ask that the Court...

- 14 1. Order the Defendant, within seven days of its order, to amend his responses, and to
15 provide individualized, complete responses to each RFP.
- 16 2. When responding, specify exactly which files support his response to the current RFP,
17 and exclude all files which don't support it.
- 18 3. Failure to provide individualized and complete responses will result in the underlying
19 facts being taken in my favor. For RFP #33-#194 and RFP #195-#306, if he fails to
20 provide individualized and complete responses, this means the underlying statements in
21 his Answer, as well as my Requests for Admissions, will be deemed admitted, and all the
22 dispositive effects that entails.

23 **V-5: The Defendant's response to many Interrogatories are evasive and incomplete.**

24 All of the Defendant's responses to my Interrogatories, except the first one, are evasive
25 and incomplete.

26 Just like with the requests for admissions and requests for production, the Defendant's
27 objections to these interrogatories re boilerplate and, therefore, legally tantamount to making no
28 objection at all. Now that the deadline for raising objections has passed, the Defendant is forever

1 precluded from raising any now. See Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(b)(4) (“Any ground not stated in a timely
2 objection is waived unless the court, for good cause, excuses the failure”).

3 V-5-A: Interrogatory #2

4 Interrogatory #2 demanded that the defendant “state with specificity your factual and
5 legal basis for each of the affirmative defenses listed in Pages 9-10 of your Complaint. For the
6 legal basis of each defense, provide accompanying legal citations.” This interrogatory clearly
7 called for *specific* factual and legal bases! ***S-P-E-C-I-F-I-C!*** Of course, given the Defendant's
8 track record, it's clear he has no intention of stating *anything* in his defense with any degree of
9 specificity.

10 All the Defendant has done here is merely restate the defenses he listed in his answer. He
11 provides no new factual allegations and no new legal bases, which is precisely what this
12 interrogatory calls for. And since he never objected to this interrogatory (since his boilerplate
13 objections are tantamount to no objection at all), he *must* respond and give me the information I
14 asked for. And he hasn't done that.

15 I therefore ask the Court to order the Defendant to submit an amended response within
16 seven days, responding in full to the interrogatory. If he fails to provide specific factual
17 allegations and specific legal bases (with legal citations to boot), he risks being barred from
18 presenting those defenses.

19 V-5-B: Interrogatory #3

20 Interrogatory #3 asked the Defendant to “[s]tate with specificity the Defendant's reason
21 for refusing my request to hear my side of the story before making the smear video.” The
22 Defendant's response was to claim that I never requested him to hear my side of the story.

23 This is a bald-faced lie. The Defendant isn't simply wrong; he's *lying*. **Exhibit F** is a copy
24 of the email I sent to the Defendant, but I have highlighted the sentence where I asked him to
25 hear my side of the story. So clearly, I did make that request.

26 Barring that, there are multiple instances where I asked him publicly on Twitter to hear
27 my side of the story before publishing the smear video. Here are just two examples:

- 28 1. <https://x.com/acerthorn/status/1483262663610322944>

1 2. <https://x.com/acerthorn/status/1485433694370336770>

2 So with that, you have at least three proven instances where I asked him, before the smear
3 video was published. Clearly, his claim that I never asked him to do that is false.

4 I therefore ask that the Court order him to amend his answer within seven days and
5 respond substantively to the interrogatory. If he fails to comply, I ask that the Court sanction him
6 by ordering that the element of “actual malice” be deemed established for purposes of this action.

7 V-5-C: Interrogatory #4

8 In Interrogatory #4, I asked the Defendant to “[s]tate with specificity all evidence you
9 have which proves that my messy living conditions are, objectively, more likely to have been the
10 cause of my pneumonia than the stress I suffered from the smear video.” I also reminded him of
11 multiple factors that weigh in favor of this being a false diagnosis, including my surgeon's own
12 diagnosis (and that surgeon was listed in my 26(a) initial disclosures as a relevant witness).

13 The Defendant declined to respond substantively to this interrogatory, claiming instead
14 that he never gave any opinion to this effect, but admitting that his witnesses (who he identifies
15 in his 26(a) initial disclosures) did in fact give this opinion.

16 The Defendant is completely missing the point. First of all, he admits that his witnesses
17 have given this opinion. And since it is clearly relevant to this case (since it touches upon
18 whether or not the defendant's smear video was the butt-for cause of my damages), that makes it
19 discoverable. Second, even if *nobody* on his team said it, that alone doesn't make this
20 interrogatory improper. So he still has to respond to it.

21 I therefore ask the Court to order him to amend his answer within seven days and respond
22 substantively to the interrogatory. If he fails to comply, or if he fails to provide a sufficient
23 factual basis for this belief, then I ask that the Court, as a sanction, order that it be deemed
24 established for purposes of this action that the Defendant's smear video, and the harassment and
25 stochastic terrorism I suffered as a result of that smear video, was in fact the but-for cause of my
26 pneumonia and, therefore, my pain and suffering damages.

27 V-5-D: Interrogatory #5

28 Interrogatory #5 asked the Defendant to “[s]tate with specificity ***all of the evidence*** which

1 proves that I suffered no reputational harm, stress, or loss of ability to earn a living from my
2 YouTube channel as a direct or indirect result of the smear video.” Emphasis added.

3 His response was limited exclusively to the fact that I have gained only a few thousand
4 subscribers in the more than four years since the smear video was published.

5 Bear in mind that I clearly asked him for “all of the evidence.” Not just evidence he felt
6 would be sufficient, but all evidence, period. And since he never objected², he *has* to respond to
7 this.

8 Therefore, this response is only complete and responsive if he is willing to affirm, under
9 penalty of perjury, that this is, indeed, where his evidence of my lack of harm in this case begins
10 and ends, and that he doesn't have any more evidence.

11 I therefore ask the Court to order the defendant, within seven days, to do one of two
12 things: Either...

- 13 1. Certify under penalty of perjury that this one small detail is in fact his entire universe of
14 evidence in support of his claim that I have suffered no harm as a result of his
15 defamation, and consent to being locked into presenting ONLY that evidence in his
16 defense, consistent with the protective order I am requesting in Section V-1 above, or
- 17 2. Amend his answer to this interrogatory to genuinely include every single itty bitty piece
18 of evidence he has, whether he needs it or not, with the warning that he will not be
19 permitted to offer any additional evidence after this point, consistent with the protective
20 order I am requesting in Section V-1 above.

21 V-5-E: Interrogatory #6

22 Interrogatory #6 asks the defendant, “Aside from the injunctions requested in ¶ 155 & ¶
23 157 in the Complaint (complete with the consequences mentioned in ¶ 158 of same), state with
24 specificity what other relief can be awarded to me that would actually make me whole in
25 practice. While responding to this, keep in mind the fact that Sydney Redfield almost certainly
26 does not have the assets necessary to monetarily compensate me for these injuries, even if he
27 spends the rest of his life with his wages being garnished, so please incorporate that into your
28 response to this interrogatory.”

2 His boilerplate objections don't count.

1 The Defendant did not reply substantively at all to this request. Instead, all he said was
2 that he did not believe I was entitled to any relief in this action.

3 That is a completely evasive answer. I asked him what relief he could suggest that would
4 make me whole in practice, not what relief he felt I was entitled to. In other words, I asked him
5 to assume that he would be found liable for defamation and work from there. Of course he
6 doesn't think I'm entitled to any relief; he doesn't get to make that call.

7 Think about it this way: In the fairly recent Idaho defamation case of Rebecca Scofield v.
8 Ashley Guillard – which you can learn about here: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=80h2048o7Fc)
9 [v=80h2048o7Fc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=80h2048o7Fc) – the Plaintiff obtained a summary judgment on the issue of liability. They then
10 went to trial solely on the issue of damages. At that point, did Guillard get to argue that Scofield
11 is “not entitled to any relief?” Of course not. At that point, she had to argue facts (and specific
12 facts at that) in order to minimize the relief she would have to pay.

13 Likewise, in this interrogatory, I asked the Defendant to offer an alternative injunction to
14 that which I ask for in the Complaint, that would make me whole in practice. Of course, if I
15 cannot prove defamation, this injunction would be moot, but that doesn't mean he gets to just
16 ignore the interrogatory.

17 I therefore ask the Court to order the defendant to amend his response within seven days
18 and provide a substantive and complete response to this interrogatory. If he fails to do so, the
19 Court should sanction him by ordering that it be deemed admitted by the Defendant that nothing
20 short of the injunctive relief requested in the Complaint would be sufficient to make me whole.

21 **V-6: The Defense should be sanctioned for its bad faith.**

22 In addition to being made to amend their responses, the Court should also consider
23 imposing sanctions on the defense counsel for acting in bad faith in the first place. At every step,
24 the Defendant hasn't even *attempted* to cooperate in good faith with discovery requests. From his
25 boilerplate objections, to his complete failure to make any reasonable inquiry into requested
26 admissions, to his copy-pasted, non-individualized and incomplete responses to my requests for
27 production, to his utter failure to give straight answers in the first instance, the Defense Counsel
28 has acted in bad faith at every turn.

1 In addition to amending his discovery responses, such systemic bad faith is deserving of
2 sanctions in its own right. Boilerplate objections have been condemned by appellate courts as
3 “nuisance objections” and, even when involving important privileges, have necessitated
4 monetary sanctions to compensate for the time wasted in eliminating them. See *Standon v.*
5 *Superior Court* (1990) 225 Cal.App.3d 898 (re impropriety of boilerplate “nuisance” objections);
6 *Clement v. Alegre* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 1277 (re imposition of sanctions for “meritless” and
7 “nitpicking” objections); *Williams v. Taser Int’l, Inc.* (N.D.Ga 2007) 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
8 40280 (“Even a cursory review of Taser’s discovery responses in this case reveals that its
9 answers to Plaintiffs’ discovery requests are, almost without exception, qualified by boilerplate
10 objections to the relevancy of the discovery sought, the undue burdens associated with its
11 production, etc”).

12 As Schwinghamer writes in his article...

13 “Misuses of the discovery process include making unmeritorious objections and
14 evasive responses that obstruct legitimate discovery efforts. When a party repeat-
15 edly asserts generic objections without factual or legal support, the court may
16 impose monetary sanctions, and in egregious cases, issue or evidentiary sanctions.

17 California courts have consistently upheld sanctions in this context ... The court
18 emphasized that discovery must be conducted in good faith and that a party who
19 obstructs that process by refusing to provide straightforward responses acts in bad
20 faith and at their peril.

21 ...

22 Boilerplate objections are not just lazy—they are a direct violation of the duty of
23 candor and cooperation that governs California discovery. And when attorneys
24 persist in using them, sanctions are not only justified—they’re overdue.”

25 I therefore ask the Court to consider issuing appropriate sanctions against the Defense
26 Counsel directly, in order to deter him from engaging in this sort of bad faith, uncooperative
27 behavior in the future.

28 VI: CONCLUSION

29 Wherefore, premises considered, I respectfully pray that this motion to compel discovery,
30 for protective order, and for determination of sufficiency be granted in whole, costs incurred be

1 awarded, for the Defense Counsel to be properly sanctioned in order to deter this sort of bad faith
2 conduct in the future, and for any other relief to which I may be entitled.

3 So requested on this, the 25th day of June, 2026.

4 /s/ David Stebbins
5 David Stebbins (pro se)