

1 Steven W. Blake, Esq., SBN 235502
2 Andrew E. Hall, Esq., SBN 257547
3 **BLAKE LAW FIRM**
4 533 2nd Street, Suite 250
5 Encinitas, CA 92024
6 Phone: (858) 232-1290
7 Email: *steve@blakelawca.com*
8 Email: *andrew@blakelawca.com*

9 Attorneys for Defendant
10 STEPHEN LAKE

11 **SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA**
12 **COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, HALL OF JUSTICE**

13 AMY SHERLOCK, an individual and on behalf of
14 her minor children, T.S. and S.S., ANDREW
15 FLORES, an individual;

16 Plaintiffs,

17 vs.

18 GINA M. AUSTIN, an individual; AUSTIN
19 LEGALGROUP, a professional corporation,
20 LARRY GERACI, an individual, REBECCA
21 BERRY, an individual; JESSICA MCELFFRESH,
22 an individual; SALAM RAZUKI, an individual;
23 NINUS MALAN, an individual; FINCH,
24 THORTON, AND BARID, a limited liability
25 partnership; ABHAY SCHWEITZER, an
26 individual and dba TECHNE; JAMES (AKA JIM)
27 BARTELL, an individual; NATALIE TRANG-MY
28 NGUYEN, an individual, AARON MAGAGNA,
29 an individual; BRADFORD HARCOURT, an
30 individual; SHAWN MILLER, an individual;
31 LOGAN STELLMACHER, an individual;
32 EULENTIAS DUANE ALEXANDER, an
33 individual; STEPHEN LAKE, an individual,
34 ALLIED SPECTRUM, INC., a California
35 corporation, PRODIGIOUS COLLECTIVES,
36 LLC, a limited liability company, and DOES 1
37 through 50, inclusive,

38 Defendants.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

02/17/2023 at 10:08:00 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By E- Filing, Deputy Clerk

Case No. **37-2021-00050889-CU-AT-CTL**

**NOTICE OF RULING ON
DEFENDANT STEPHEN LAKE'S
MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY
RESPONSES AND FOR SANCTIONS**

Hearing Date: February 17, 2023
Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.

Case Filed: December 3, 2021
Department: C-75
Judge: Hon. James A. Mangione
Trial Date: None


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
88

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on February 17, 2023 at 9:00 a.m., this case came on for hearing on Defendant STEPHEN LAKE’s (“Defendant”) Motion to Compel Discovery Responses and for Sanctions against Plaintiffs AMY SHERLOCK, an individual and on behalf of her minor children, T.S. and S.S (“PLAINTIFFS” or “SHERLOCK”). The Court adopted its tentative ruling, which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference as **Exhibit “1”**.

Dated: February 17, 2023

BLAKE LAW FIRM

By: 

STEVEN W. BLAKE, ESQ.
ANDREW E. HALL, ESQ.
Attorneys for Defendant,
STEPHEN LAKE

EXHIBIT 1

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

HALL OF JUSTICE

TENTATIVE RULINGS - February 16, 2023

EVENT DATE: 02/17/2023

EVENT TIME: 09:00:00 AM

DEPT.: C-75

JUDICIAL OFFICER: James A Mangione

CASE NO.: 37-2021-00050889-CU-AT-CTL

CASE TITLE: SHERLOCK VS AUSTIN [EFILE]

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited

CASE TYPE: Antitrust/Trade Regulation

EVENT TYPE: Discovery Hearing

CAUSAL DOCUMENT/DATE FILED:

Defendant Steven Lake's Motion to Compel is granted in part.

The parties agree that the discovery has been provided, rendering the motion moot. However, Defendant requests sanctions based on Plaintiffs' delayed responses. (Cal. Rules of Ct. rule 3.1348(a) ("The court may award sanctions under the Discovery Act in favor of a party who files a motion to compel discovery, even though no opposition to the motion was filed, or opposition to the motion was withdrawn, or the requested discovery was provided to the moving party after the motion was filed.")) As no explanation was provided for the delay in responding to discovery, the Court grants Defendant's request.

Defendant is awarded monetary sanctions of \$1,920.

The minute order is the order of the Court.