MESSNER REEVES LLP	ELECTRONICALLY FILED	
Allan Claybon (SBN 239021)	Superior Court of California, County of San Diego	
650 Town Center Drive, Suite 700 Costa Mesa, CA 92626	06/28/2023 at 03:01:00 PM	
Telephone: (310) 909-7440 Facsimile: (310) 889-0896	Clerk of the Superior Court By Malka Manneh,Deputy Clerk	
E-mail: aclaybon@messner.com	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Mark Collier (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)		
Charles C. Cavanagh (SBN 198468) 1550 Wewatta Street, Suite 710		
Denver, CO 80202 Telephone: (303) 623-1800		
Facsimile: (303) 623-0552 E-mail: mcollier@messner.com		
ccavanagh@messner.com		
Attorneys for Plaintiffs SAN DIEGO PATIENTS COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, INC.;		
and BRADFORD HARCOURT		
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO		
SAN DIEGO PATIENTS COOPERATIVE	Case No. 37-2017-00020661-CU-CO-CTL	
CORPORATION, INC., a California		
cooperative corporation, and BRADFORD HARCOURT, an individual,	Honorable Eddie C. Sturgeon, Dept. C-67	
Plaintiffs,	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND	
v	AUTHORITIES RE: PLAINTIFF SAN DIEGO PATIENTS COOPERATIVE	
RAZUKI INVESTMENTS, L.L.C., a California limited liability company;	CORPORATION, INC.'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST DEFENDANTS NINUS MALAN; AMERICAN LENDING	
BALBOA AVE COOPERATIVE, a	AND HOLDINGS, LLC; AND SAN DIEGO	
California cooperative corporation; AMERICAN LENDING AND HOLDINGS, LLC, a California limited	UNITED HOLDINGS GROUP, LLC	
liability company; SAN DIEGO UNITED HOLDINGS GROUP, LLC, a California	Date: December 8, 2023 Time: 9:00 a.m.	
limited liability company; CALIFORNIA	Courtroom: C-67	
CANNABIS GROUP, a nonprofit mutual benefit corporation; SALAM RAZUKI, an		
individual; NINUS MALAN, an individual, () KEITH HENDERSON, an individual, AND	Complaint Filed: June 7, 2017 Trial Date: August 25, 2023	
DOES 1-20, INCLUSIVE,		
Defendants.		
	1	
MEMO OF D'S 2. A'S DE DI AINTHEE SAN DI	ECO DATIENTS COODED ATIVE CODDOD ATION	
INC.'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAIN	IEGO PATIENTS COOPERATIVE CORPORATION,	

Ш

1	Plaintiff San Diego Patients Cooperative Corporation, Inc. ("Plaintiff") respectfully		
2	submits this Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of its motion for sanctions		
3	against defendants Ninus Malan ("Malan"); American Lending and Holdings, LLC ("American		
4	Lending"); and San Diego United Holdings Group, LLC ("San Diego United") (collectively,		
5	"Defendants") for their disobedience of the Court's Order compelling them to respond to		
6	Plaintiff's supplemental discovery requests and to pay monetary sanctions.		
7	I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>		
8	In this fraud action, plaintiffs San Diego Patients Cooperative Corporation, Inc. and		
9	Bradford Harcourt allege that defendants Salam Razuki and Ninus Malan, along with several of		
10	their affiliated companies, violated a joint venture agreement to share in the profits from the		
11	l operation of a legal medical marijuana dispensary in San Diego.		
12	This matter is set for trial on August 25, 2023, with a discovery and motion cut-off date		
13	of July 28, 2023.		
14	In the years that this action has been pending, the parties have exchanged numerous sets		
15	of written discovery requests. Late last year, Plaintiff served supplemental discovery requests,		
16	asking several of the defendants to supplement their prior responses to Plaintiff's interrogatories		
17	and requests for production.		
18	Because Plaintiff considered the objections initially served by Defendants to be without		
19	merit, and because Defendants failed to supplement those responses, despite agreeing to do so,		
20	Plaintiff filed several motions to compel Defendants to provide substantive responses to		
21	Plaintiff's supplemental discovery requests.		
22	At the May 11, 2023, hearing on Plaintiff's ex parte application to advance the hearing		
23	date on those motions to compel, Defendants' counsel stipulated that Defendants would provide		
24	further responses to Plaintiff's supplemental discovery requests within thirty days.		
25	Accordingly, the Court ordered Defendants to do so. The Court also ordered Defendants to pay		
26	Plaintiff sanctions in the amount of \$3000.		
27			
28	1		
	MEMO OF P'S & A'S RE PLAINTIFF SAN DIEGO PATIENTS COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, INC.'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST DEFENDANTS NINUS MALAN; AMERICAN LENDING AND HOLDINGS, LLC; AND SAN DIEGO UNITED HOLDINGS GROUP, LLC		

Ш

1	Despite their stipulation to do so, the Court's Order, and multiple requests from Plaintif		
2	e ach of Malan, American Lending, and San Diego United has failed both to serve further		
3	responses to Plaintiffs' supplemental discovery requests and to pay the sanctions award.		
4	Defendants have not proffered any purported justification for their failure to obey the Court's		
5	Order. Therefore, Defendants' non-compliance must be considered to constitute willful		
6	disobedience, which warrants both a finding of contempt and the imposition of relatively severe		
7	sanctions.		
8	For the foregoing reasons, each of Malan, American Lending, and San Diego United		
9	should be found in contempt, and evidentiary and further monetary sanctions should be imposed		
10	against each of them.		
11	II. <u>RELEVANT PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL HISTORY</u>		
12	The trial of this matter is scheduled to begin on August 25, 2023, and the motion and		
13	discovery completion deadline is July 28, 2023. (Cavanagh Decl., \P 2.)		
14	On September 28, 2022, Plaintiff served a supplemental interrogatory and a		
15	supplemental request for production on each of Malan, American Lending, and San Diego		
16	United. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3.)		
17	On April 16, 2023, Plaintiff filed motions to compel each of Malan, American Lending,		
18	8 and San Diego United to provide substantive responses to Plaintiff's supplemental discovery		
19	P requests. (Cavanagh Decl., \P 4.) Plaintiff requested sanctions in the amount of \$3160 in		
20	0 connection with each of the six motions to compel that it filed against Defendants. (<i>Id.</i>)		
21	Because the Court's earliest availability to hear the motions to compel was after the		
22	current trial date, Plaintiff filed an ex parte application to advance the hearing date. (Cavanagh		
23	Decl., ¶¶ 5-6.)		
24	At the May 11, 2023, hearing on Plaintiff's ex parte application, counsel for Malan,		
25	American Lending, and San Diego United stipulated that each would provide substantive		
26	responses to Plaintiff's supplemental discovery requests within thirty days. (Cavanagh Decl.,		
27	¶ 7.)		
28	2		
	MEMO OF P'S & A'S RE PLAINTIFF SAN DIEGO PATIENTS COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, INC.'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST DEFENDANTS NINUS MALAN; AMERICAN LENDING AND HOLDINGS, LLC; AND SAN DIEGO UNITED HOLDINGS GROUP, LLC		

1	Accordingly, on May 11, 2023, the Court ordered Malan, American Lending, and San		
2	Diego United to provide further responses to Plaintiff's supplemental discovery requests within		
3	thirty days. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. A.) The Court further ordered Malan, American		
4	Lending, and San Diego United to pay Plaintiff sanctions in the amount of \$3000. (<i>Id.</i>)		
5			
6	to Plaintiff's supplemental discovery requests or paid the sanctions award within thirty days of		
7	the Court's Order. (Cavanagh Decl., \P 8.)		
8	Plaintiff's counsel has repeatedly reached out to counsel for Malan, American Lending,		
9	and San Diego United, to inquire about the overdue discovery responses and the sanctions		
10	payment and to warn Defendants that Plaintiff would seek relief – including a finding of		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15	responses to Plaintiff's supplemental discovery requests, paid the \$3000 sanctions award, or		
16	proffered any excuse or justification for failing to obey the Court's Order. (<i>Id.</i>)		
17	III. <u>ARGUMENT</u>		
18	Once a party has been ordered to answer discovery or to produce documents, more		
19	severe sanctions are available for a continued failure to make discovery. Specifically, "[i]f a		
20	party fails to obey an order compelling further response to interrogatories, the court may		
21	make those orders that are just, including the imposition of an issue sanction, an evidence		
	sanction, or a terminating sanction" See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 2030.300(e). In addition to		
22	sanction, or a terminating sanction" See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 2030.300(e). In addition to		
22 23	sanction, or a terminating sanction" See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 2030.300(e). In addition to any such sanction, "the court may impose a monetary sanction" Id.		
23	any such sanction, "the court may impose a monetary sanction" Id.		
23 24	any such sanction, "the court may impose a monetary sanction" <i>Id.</i> The moving party need only show the failure to obey an earlier discovery order;		
23 24 25	 any such sanction, "the court may impose a monetary sanction" <i>Id.</i> The moving party need only show the failure to obey an earlier discovery order; thereafter, the burden of proof shifts to the party seeking to avoid sanctions to establish a 		
23 24 25 26	 any such sanction, "the court may impose a monetary sanction" <i>Id.</i> The moving party need only show the failure to obey an earlier discovery order; thereafter, the burden of proof shifts to the party seeking to avoid sanctions to establish a satisfactory excuse for its conduct. <i>See Corns v. Miller</i>, 181 Cal. App. 3d 195, 201 (1986); 		

1

A. Evidentiary Sanctions Against Defendants Are Warranted.

2 "Disobeying a court order to provide discovery" is a "misuse of the discovery process." 3 Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 2023.010(g). Accordingly, a court "may make those orders that are just" 4 if a party fails to obey a prior discovery order. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 2030.300(e). 5 Numerous cases have held that severe sanctions are warranted for failure to comply with a 6 court's discovery order, particularly where the failure is willful. See, e.g., R.S. Creative, Inc. v. Creative Cotton, Ltd., 75 Cal. App. 4th 486, 495 (1999); Vallbona v. Springer, 43 Cal. App. 4th 7 1525, 1545 (1996); Biles v. Exxon Mobil Corp., 124 Cal. App. 4th 1315, 1327 (2004); Aghaian 8 9 v. Minassian, 64 Cal. App. 5th 603, 618-620 (2021). 10 Here, Defendants' failures to provide further responses to Plaintiff's supplemental 11 discovery requests and to pay the sanctions award must be characterized as willful 12 disobedience. The supplemental discovery requests at issue were served by Plaintiff back on 13 September 28, 2022. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3.) After Defendants were afforded more-than-14 sufficient time to provide substantive responses to those requests, but failed to do so, despite 15 promises that they would, Plaintiff filed several motions to compel on April 16, 2023. 16 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 4.) On May 11, 2023 – at a hearing on Plaintiff's *ex parte* application to 17 advance the hearing date on Plaintiff's motions to compel – Defendants *stipulated* before the 18 Court that they would serve further responses to Plaintiff's supplemental discovery requests 19 within thirty days. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7.) Accordingly, the Court ordered Defendants to 20 provide further responses to Plaintiff's supplemental discovery requests within thirty days. 21 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. A.) The Court also ordered Defendants to pay Plaintiff sanctions in 22 the amount of \$3000. (Id.) After both stipulating and being ordered to serve their further 23 discovery responses within thirty days – i.e., by June 10, 2023 – Defendants not only knowingly 24 allowed that deadline to pass without compliance, but also have failed to proffer any excuse or 25 justification for their non-compliance. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 8-14 & Ex. B.) Under these 26 circumstances, Defendants' non-compliance must be viewed not merely as a failure to obey but 27 as an example of willful disobedience.

28

MEMO OF P'S & A'S RE PLAINTIFF SAN DIEGO PATIENTS COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, INC.'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST DEFENDANTS NINUS MALAN; AMERICAN LENDING AND HOLDINGS, LLC; AND SAN DIEGO UNITED HOLDINGS GROUP, LLC

1	In deciding whether and which sanctions to impose for disobedience to discovery orders,			
2	a court may consider several factors, including the time elapsed since the discovery was served;			
3	whether the party received extensions of time to respond; and the existence of, and compliance			
4	with, prior court orders compelling discovery. See Deyo v. Kilbourne, 84 Cal. App. 3d 771, 796			
5	(1978). Among other things a court is authorized to prohibit a disobedient party from			
6	introducing designated matters into evidence. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 2023.030(c); see also			
7	Waicis v. Superior Court, 226 Cal. App. 3d 283, 287 (1990); Deeter v. Angus, 179 Cal. App. 3d			
8	241, 255 (1986); Vallbona v. Springer, 43 Cal. App. 4th 1525, 1545 (1996).			
9	Here, given the failure of Defendants to provide substantive responses to Plaintiff's			
10	supplemental discovery requests, an appropriate evidentiary sanction for their willful			
11	disobedience would be to preclude them from introducing at the trial of this matter any evidence			
12	that is not disclosed in the written discovery responses they served and/or the documents they			
13	produced in this litigation prior to the filing of this motion – i.e., June 28, 2023.			
14	B. <u>Plaintiff Is Entitled To Additional Monetary Sanctions Against Defendants.</u>			
15	In addition to any other sanction that may be imposed, a court is authorized to order a			
16	disobedient party to pay the reasonable expenses, including attorneys' fees, incurred as a result			
17	of the failure to obey. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 2023.030(a).			
18	When Plaintiff filed its motions to compel on April 16, 2023, Plaintiff requested			
19	monetary sanctions of \$3160 for each of its six motions. (Cavanagh Decl., \P 4.)			
20	At the hearing on Plaintiff's <i>ex parte</i> application to advance the hearing date on			
21	Plaintiff's motions to compel, after Defendants' counsel stipulated to serving further responses			
22	to Plaintiff's supplemental discovery requests within thirty days, the Court ordered Defendants			
23	jointly to pay a total of only \$3000 (i.e., \$500 per motion) in sanctions. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 &			
24	Ex. A.)			
25	In light of Defendants' willful disobedience with the Court's prior Order, Defendants			
26	should be ordered not only to compensate Plaintiff for the fees incurred in bringing the instant			
27	motion, but also to compensate Plaintiff for the bulk of the fees that it incurred in making its			
28	5			
	MEMO OF P'S & A'S RE PLAINTIFF SAN DIEGO PATIENTS COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, INC.'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST DEFENDANTS NINUS MALAN; AMERICAN LENDING AND HOLDINGS, LLC; AND SAN DIEGO UNITED HOLDINGS GROUP, LLC			

prior motions to compel. See Deyo v. Kilbourne, 84 Cal. App. 3d 771, 796 (1978) (purpose of
 allowing courts to issue monetary sanctions against a disobedient party in addition to other
 sanctions that may be imposed is to compensate the requesting party for the costs and fees
 incurred in enforcing discovery).

5 In connection with this motion, Plaintiff's counsel reasonably spent approximately two 6 and three-quarter hours drafting this Memorandum of Points and Authorities, drafting his 7 Declaration, preparing the Separate Statement, drafting the Notice of the Motion, and preparing 8 the Proposed Order. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 15.) In addition, Plaintiff's counsel anticipates 9 reasonably spending a total of approximately 1 hour reviewing the expected Opposition and the 10 legal authorities cited therein, a total of approximately 2 hours preparing Plaintiff's reply brief, 11 and a total of approximately 1.5 hours preparing for and attending the hearing on Plaintiff's 12 motion. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 16.) Thus, at counsel's customary and reasonable hourly rate of 13 \$395 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 17), Plaintiff will have incurred approximately \$2863.75 in fees in 14 connection with this motion.

As noted above, Plaintiff previously requested monetary sanctions in the amount of \$3160 in connection with each of its prior six motions to compel – one each against Malan, American Lending, and San Diego Holdings for failure to provide appropriate responses to Plaintiff's supplemental interrogatories and one each against Malan, American Lending, and San Diego Holdings for failure to provide appropriate responses to Plaintiff's supplemental requests for production. Of that \$18,960 total, the Court initially awarded only \$3000, or \$500 per motion to compel.

Plaintiff requests now the balance of its initial request – i.e., \$16,960 – plus the
additional \$2863.75 incurred in connection with this motion, for a total of \$18,823.75, or
approximately \$6000 against each of Malan, American Lending, and San Diego United.

IV.

For the foregoing reasons, each of Malan, American Lending, and San Diego United
should be (1) precluded from offering at the trial of this matter any evidence that is not

28

25

MEMO OF P'S & A'S RE PLAINTIFF SAN DIEGO PATIENTS COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, INC.'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST DEFENDANTS NINUS MALAN; AMERICAN LENDING AND HOLDINGS, LLC; AND SAN DIEGO UNITED HOLDINGS GROUP, LLC

CONCLUSION

1	disclosed in the written discovery responses they served and/or the documents they produced in			
2	this litigation prior to the filing of this motion; and (2) ordered to pay additional monetary			
3	sanctions in the amount of \$6000.			
4				
5	Dated: June 28, 2023 MESSNER REEVES LLP			
6	hule Covery C			
7	Allan B. Claybon Mark Collier			
8	Charles C. Cavanagh			
9	Attorneys for Plaintiffs			
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21 22				
22				
23				
25				
26				
27				
28	7			
	7 MEMO OF P'S & A'S RE PLAINTIFF SAN DIEGO PATIENTS COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, INC.'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST DEFENDANTS NINUS MALAN; AMERICAN LENDING AND HOLDINGS, LLC; AND SAN DIEGO UNITED HOLDINGS GROUP, LLC			

		NE SEDVICE				
PROOF OF SERVICE						
I am employed in the County of Denver, Colorado. I am over the age of eighteen years						
and not a party to the within entitled action; my business address is 1550 Wewatta Street, Suite						
710, Denver, Colorado 80202.						
On June 28, 2023, I caused to be served the foregoing document described as:						
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES RE: PLAINTIFF SAN DIEGO						
PATIENTS COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, INC.'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS						
AGAINST DEFENDANTS NINUS MALAN; AMERICAN LENDING AND HOLDINGS,						
LLC; AND SAN DIEGO U	NITED HOLDIN	NGS GROUP, LLC on the interested parties as				
follows:						
Douglas Jaffe LAW OFFICES OF DOUGL	AS IAFFF	David K. Demergian DEMERGIAN LAW				
501 West Broadway, Suite 80 San Diego, CA 92101		501 West Broadway, Suite 800 San Diego, CA 92101				
T.:(619) 400-4945 F.: (619) 400-4947		T: (619) 239-3015 F: (619) 239-3029				
E.: dougjaffelaw@gmail.cor Attorney for Defendants Raz		E: david@demergianlaw.com Attorney for Defendants/Cross-Defendants				
L.L.C. and Keith Henderson Defendant/Cross-Complainan	and	Ninus Malan, San Diego United Holdings, LLC, American Lending and Holdings, LLC				
Balboa Ave Cooperative		California Cannabis Group				
8963 Balboa Avenue, Unit E San Diego, CA 92123		1011 Camino Del Rio S #210 San Diego, CA 92108				
[x] ELECTRONIC-SERVICE/E-MAIL: Pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 2.251(b)(1)(B), a court order or by consent/agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail and/or electronic submission, I cause the above-referenced document(s) to be sent to the persons						
service or by personal email.	address set forth a	bove from either the Court's electronic filing				
		[31013(a)] By placing [] the original [x] a true				
copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope(s) addressed as to the above-named counsel of record or parties in propria persona. I caused such envelope to be deposited in the Federal Express box at 11620 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90025, which is regularly maintained by Federal Express, with delivery fees pre-paid and provided for, addressed to the person on whom said document is to be served. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Colorado that the						
				forgoing is true and correct.		
				DATED: June 28, 2023		/s/ Tara L. Nelson
		Tara L. Nelson				