

1 MESSNER REEVES LLP
Allan Claybon (SBN 239021)
2 650 Town Center Drive, Suite 700
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
3 Telephone: (310) 909-7440
Facsimile: (310) 889-0896
4 E-mail: aclaybon@messner.com

5 Mark Collier (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Charles C. Cavanagh (SBN 198468)
6 1550 Wewatta Street, Suite 710
Denver, CO 80202
7 Telephone: (303) 623-1800
Facsimile: (303) 623-0552
8 E-mail: mcollier@messner.com
ccavanagh@messner.com

9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
10 SAN DIEGO PATIENTS COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, INC.;
and BRADFORD HARCOURT
11

12 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
13 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

14 SAN DIEGO PATIENTS COOPERATIVE)
15 CORPORATION, INC., a California)
cooperative corporation, and BRADFORD)
16 HARCOURT, an individual,)

17 Plaintiffs,)

18 v.)

19 RAZUKI INVESTMENTS, L.L.C., a)
California limited liability company;)
20 BALBOA AVE COOPERATIVE, a)
California cooperative corporation;)
21 AMERICAN LENDING AND)
HOLDINGS, LLC, a California limited)
22 liability company; SAN DIEGO UNITED)
HOLDINGS GROUP, LLC, a California)
23 limited liability company; CALIFORNIA)
CANNABIS GROUP, a nonprofit mutual)
24 benefit corporation; SALAM RAZUKI, an)
individual; NINUS MALAN, an individual,)
25 KEITH HENDERSON, an individual, AND)
DOES 1-20, INCLUSIVE,)

26 Defendants.)
27)
28)

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

04/05/2024 at 08:48:00 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By Nora Lopez, Deputy Clerk

Case No. 37-2017-00020661-CU-CO-CTL

Honorable Michael T. Smyth, Dept. C-67

**SEPARATE STATEMENT RE
JUDGMENT CREDITOR BRADFORD
HARCOURT'S MOTION TO COMPEL
JUDGMENT DEBTOR RAZUKI
INVESTMENTS, LLC TO RESPOND
FURTHER TO FIRST SET OF REQUESTS
FOR PRODUCTION**

Date: July 19, 2024

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Courtroom: C-67

Complaint Filed: June 7, 2017

Trial Date: October 27, 2023

**SEPARATE STATEMENT RE JUDGMENT CREDITOR BRADFORD HARCOURT'S
MOTION TO COMPEL JUDGMENT DEBTOR RAZUKI INVESTMENTS, LLC
TO RESPOND FURTHER TO FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION**

1 Pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.1345, judgment creditor Bradford Harcourt
2 (“Judgment Creditor”) submits this Separate Statement in support of his Motion To Compel
3 Judgment Debtor Razuki Investments, LLC To Respond Further To First Set Of Requests For
4 Production.

5
6 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:**

7 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

8 All articles of incorporation or organization, partnership and/or joint venture
9 agreements, charters, bylaws, corporate minute books, and other Documents Relating To the
10 formation of any business entity in which You have owned an interest, either directly or
11 indirectly, at any time since October 17, 2016.

12 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

13 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
14 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
15 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
16 parties.

17 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

18 A. **Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His**
19 **Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.**

20 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
21 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
22 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
23 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
24 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
25 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
26 way as pretrial discovery.”).

1 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
2 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
3 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
4 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
5 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
6 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
7 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
8 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
9 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

10 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

11 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
12 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

13 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
14 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
15 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
16 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
17 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
18 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
19 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
20 (2004).

21 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
22 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
23 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

24 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
25 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
26 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
27 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.

1 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
2 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
3 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
4 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
5 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
6 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
7 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

8 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
9 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

10 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
11 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
12 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
13 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
14 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
15 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
16 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
17 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
18 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
19 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
20 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
21 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
22 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
23 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
24 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
25 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
26 information to collect on his Judgment.

1 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
2 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is ““to compel the judgment
3 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
4 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.”” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
5 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

6 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
7 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
8 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
9 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
10 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
11 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

12 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
13 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
14 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
15 court.” *Id.*

16 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
17 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
18 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

19 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
20 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
21 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
22 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
23 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
24 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
25 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
26 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

1 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
2 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
3 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
4 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
5 production of documents.

6 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

7 Not applicable.

8 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

9 Not applicable.

10 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

11 Not applicable.

12 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:**

13 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

14 Documents identifying all shareholders, directors, officers, partners, members,
15 managers, or other owners or operators of any business entity in which You have owned an
16 interest, either directly or indirectly, at any time since October 17, 2016.

17 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

18 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
19 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
20 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
21 parties.

22 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

23 A. Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His
24 Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.

25 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
26 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
27 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” SCC

1 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); accord *Moorer v.*
2 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
3 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
4 way as pretrial discovery.”).

5 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
6 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
7 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
8 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
9 earnings (e.g., tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
10 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
11 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. See Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
12 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
13 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

14 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

15 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
16 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

17 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
18 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
19 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
20 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
21 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; see also *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
22 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
23 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
24 (2004).

25 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
26 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
27 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

1 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
2 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
3 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
4 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
5 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
6 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
7 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
8 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
9 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
10 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
11 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

12 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
13 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

14 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
15 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
16 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
17 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
18 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
19 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
20 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
21 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
22 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
23 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
24 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
25 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
26 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
27 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.

1 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
2 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
3 information to collect on his Judgment.

4 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
5 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is ““to compel the judgment
6 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
7 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.”” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
8 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

9 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
10 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
11 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
12 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
13 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
14 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

15 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
16 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
17 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
18 court.” *Id.*

19 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
20 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
21 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

22 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
23 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
24 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
25 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
26 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
27 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
28

1 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
2 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

3 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
4 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
5 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
6 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
7 production of documents.

8 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

9 Not applicable.

10 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

11 Not applicable.

12 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

13 Not applicable.

14 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:**

15 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

16 All Documents Relating To all corporate entities or businesses identified in Your
17 response to Interrogatory No. 1, served concurrently herewith.

18 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

19 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
20 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
21 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
22 parties.

23 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

24 A. **Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His**
25 **Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.**

26 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
27 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
28

1 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
2 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
3 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
4 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
5 way as pretrial discovery.”).

6 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
7 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
8 assets....” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
9 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
10 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
11 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
12 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
13 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
14 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

15 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

16 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
17 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

18 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
19 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
20 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
21 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
22 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
23 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
24 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
25 (2004).

1 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
2 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
3 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

4 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
5 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
6 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
7 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
8 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
9 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
10 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
11 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
12 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
13 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
14 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

15 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
16 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

17 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
18 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
19 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
20 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
21 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
22 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
23 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
24 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
25 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
26 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
27 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
28

1 furtherance of compelling state interests.” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
2 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
3 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
4 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
5 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
6 information to collect on his Judgment.

7 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
8 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
9 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
10 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
11 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

12 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
13 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
14 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
15 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
16 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
17 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

18 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
19 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
20 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
21 court.” *Id.*

22 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
23 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
24 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

25 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
26 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
27 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.

1 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
2 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
3 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
4 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
5 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

6 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
7 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
8 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
9 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
10 production of documents.

11 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

12 Not applicable.

13 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

14 Not applicable.

15 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

16 Not applicable.

17 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:**

18 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

19 All Documents identified in Your response to Interrogatory No. 5, served concurrently
20 herewith.

21 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

22 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
23 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
24 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
25 parties.

1 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

2 A. **Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His**
3 **Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.**

4 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
5 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
6 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
7 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
8 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
9 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
10 way as pretrial discovery.”).

11 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
12 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
13 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
14 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
15 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
16 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
17 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
18 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
19 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

20 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

21 B. **Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate**
22 **Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.**

23 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
24 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
25 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
26 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
27 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
28

1 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
2 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
3 (2004).

4 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
5 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
6 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

7 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
8 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
9 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
10 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
11 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
12 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
13 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
14 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
15 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
16 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
17 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

18 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
19 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

20 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
21 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
22 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
23 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
24 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
25 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
26 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
27 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
28

1 judgment,' then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
2 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
3 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection ““but may yield in the
4 furtherance of compelling state interests.”” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
5 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
6 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
7 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
8 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
9 information to collect on his Judgment.

10 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
11 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is ““to compel the judgment
12 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
13 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.”” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
14 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

15 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
16 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
17 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
18 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
19 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
20 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

21 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
22 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
23 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
24 court.” *Id.*

25 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
26 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
27 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

1 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
2 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
3 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
4 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
5 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
6 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
7 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
8 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

9 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
10 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
11 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
12 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
13 production of documents.

14 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

15 Not applicable.

16 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

17 Not applicable.

18 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

19 Not applicable.

20 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:**

21 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

22 All Documents identified in Your response to Interrogatory No. 7, served concurrently
23 herewith.

24 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

25 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
26 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
27

28

1 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
2 parties.

3 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

4 A. Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His
5 Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.

6 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
7 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
8 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
9 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
10 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
11 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
12 way as pretrial discovery.”).

13 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
14 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
15 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
16 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
17 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
18 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
19 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
20 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
21 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

22 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

23 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
24 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

25 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
26 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
27 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
28

1 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
2 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
3 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
4 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
5 (2004).

6 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
7 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
8 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

9 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
10 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
11 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
12 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
13 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
14 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
15 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
16 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
17 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
18 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
19 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

20 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
21 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

22 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
23 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
24 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
25 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
26 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
27 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
28

1 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
2 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
3 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
4 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
5 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
6 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
7 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
8 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
9 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
10 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
11 information to collect on his Judgment.

12 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
13 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
14 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
15 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
16 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

17 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
18 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
19 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
20 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
21 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
22 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

23 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
24 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
25 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
26 court.” *Id.*

1 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
2 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
3 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

4 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
5 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
6 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
7 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
8 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
9 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
10 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
11 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

12 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
13 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
14 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
15 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
16 production of documents.

17 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

18 Not applicable.

19 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

20 Not applicable.

21 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

22 Not applicable.

23 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:**

24 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

25 All non-privileged Documents Relating To all legal actions identified in Your response
26 to Interrogatory No. 8, served concurrently herewith.

27
28

1 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

2 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
3 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
4 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
5 parties.

6 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

7 A. Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His
8 Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.

9 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
10 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
11 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
12 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
13 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
14 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
15 way as pretrial discovery.”).

16 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
17 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
18 assets....” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
19 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
20 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
21 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
22 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
23 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
24 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

25 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.
26
27
28

1 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
2 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

3 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
4 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
5 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
6 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
7 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
8 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
9 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
10 (2004).

11 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
12 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
13 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

14 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
15 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
16 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
17 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
18 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
19 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
20 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
21 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
22 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
23 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
24 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

25 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
26 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

1 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
2 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
3 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
4 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
5 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
6 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
7 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
8 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
9 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
10 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
11 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
12 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
13 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
14 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
15 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
16 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
17 information to collect on his Judgment.

18 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
19 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
20 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
21 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
22 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

23 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
24 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
25 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
26 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
27
28

1 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
2 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

3 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
4 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
5 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
6 court.” *Id.*

7 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
8 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
9 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

10 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
11 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
12 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
13 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
14 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
15 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
16 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
17 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

18 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
19 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
20 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
21 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
22 production of documents.

23 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

24 Not applicable.

25 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

26 Not applicable.

27
28

1 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

2 Not applicable.

3 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:**

4 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

5 All Documents Relating To all debts and liabilities identified in Your response to
6 Interrogatory No. 9, served concurrently herewith.

7 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

8 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
9 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
10 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
11 parties.

12 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

13 A. **Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His**
14 **Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.**

15 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
16 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
17 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
18 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
19 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
20 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
21 way as pretrial discovery.”).

22 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
23 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
24 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
25 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
26 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
27 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
28

1 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
2 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
3 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

4 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

5 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
6 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

7 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
8 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
9 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
10 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
11 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
12 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
13 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
14 (2004).

15 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
16 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
17 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

18 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
19 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
20 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
21 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
22 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
23 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
24 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
25 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
26 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
27
28

1 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
2 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

3 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
4 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

5 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
6 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
7 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
8 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
9 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
10 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
11 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
12 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
13 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
14 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
15 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
16 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
17 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
18 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
19 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
20 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
21 information to collect on his Judgment.

22 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
23 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
24 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
25 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
26 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

1 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
2 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
3 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
4 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
5 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
6 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

7 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
8 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
9 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
10 court.” *Id.*

11 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
12 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
13 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

14 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
15 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
16 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
17 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
18 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
19 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
20 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
21 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

22 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
23 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
24 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
25 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
26 production of documents.

27
28

1 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

2 Not applicable.

3 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

4 Not applicable.

5 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

6 Not applicable.

7 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:**

8 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

9 All Documents Relating To all accounts held with any bank, brokerage firm, investment
10 firm, or other financial institution identified in Your response to Interrogatory No. 10, served
11 concurrently herewith.

12 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

13 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
14 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
15 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
16 parties.

17 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

18 A. **Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His**
19 **Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.**

20 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
21 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
22 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
23 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
24 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
25 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
26 way as pretrial discovery.”).

1 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
2 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
3 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
4 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
5 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
6 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
7 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
8 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
9 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

10 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

11 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
12 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

13 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
14 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
15 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
16 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
17 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
18 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
19 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
20 (2004).

21 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
22 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
23 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

24 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
25 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
26 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
27 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.

1 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
2 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
3 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
4 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
5 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
6 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
7 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

8 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
9 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

10 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
11 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
12 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
13 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
14 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
15 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
16 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
17 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
18 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
19 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
20 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
21 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
22 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
23 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
24 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
25 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
26 information to collect on his Judgment.

1 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
2 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is ““to compel the judgment
3 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
4 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.”” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
5 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

6 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
7 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
8 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
9 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
10 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
11 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

12 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
13 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
14 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
15 court.” *Id.*

16 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
17 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
18 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

19 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
20 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
21 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
22 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
23 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
24 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
25 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
26 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

1 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
2 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
3 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
4 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
5 production of documents.

6 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

7 Not applicable.

8 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

9 Not applicable.

10 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

11 Not applicable.

12 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:**

13 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

14 All Documents Relating To all vehicles, aircraft, boats, or other water vessels identified
15 in Your response to Interrogatory No. 11, served concurrently herewith.

16 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

17 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
18 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
19 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
20 parties.

21 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

22 A. Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His
23 Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.

24 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
25 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
26 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
27 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
28

1 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
2 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
3 way as pretrial discovery.”).

4 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
5 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
6 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
7 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
8 earnings (e.g., tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
9 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
10 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
11 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
12 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

13 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

14 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
15 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

16 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
17 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
18 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
19 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
20 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
21 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
22 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
23 (2004).

24 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
25 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
26 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

27
28

1 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
2 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
3 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
4 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
5 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
6 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
7 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
8 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
9 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
10 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
11 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

12 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
13 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

14 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
15 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
16 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
17 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
18 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
19 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
20 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
21 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
22 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
23 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
24 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
25 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
26 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
27 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.

1 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
2 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
3 information to collect on his Judgment.

4 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
5 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is ““to compel the judgment
6 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
7 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.”” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
8 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

9 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
10 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
11 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
12 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
13 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
14 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

15 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
16 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
17 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
18 court.” *Id.*

19 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
20 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
21 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

22 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
23 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
24 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
25 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
26 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
27 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
28

1 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
2 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

3 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
4 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
5 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
6 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
7 production of documents.

8 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

9 Not applicable.

10 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

11 Not applicable.

12 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

13 Not applicable.

14 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:**

15 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

16 All Documents Relating To all tangible property identified in Your response to
17 Interrogatory No. 12, served concurrently herewith.

18 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

19 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
20 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
21 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
22 parties.

23 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

24 A. **Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His**
25 **Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.**

26 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
27 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
28

1 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
2 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
3 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
4 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
5 way as pretrial discovery.”).

6 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
7 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
8 assets....” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
9 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
10 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
11 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
12 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
13 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
14 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

15 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

16 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
17 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

18 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
19 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
20 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
21 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
22 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
23 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
24 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
25 (2004).

1 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
2 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
3 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

4 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
5 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
6 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
7 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
8 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
9 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
10 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
11 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
12 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
13 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
14 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

15 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
16 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

17 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
18 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
19 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
20 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
21 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
22 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
23 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
24 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
25 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
26 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”]). Moreover, the
27 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
28

1 furtherance of compelling state interests.” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
2 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
3 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
4 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
5 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
6 information to collect on his Judgment.

7 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
8 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
9 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
10 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
11 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

12 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
13 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
14 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
15 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
16 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
17 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

18 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
19 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
20 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
21 court.” *Id.*

22 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
23 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
24 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

25 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
26 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
27 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.

1 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
2 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
3 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
4 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
5 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

6 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
7 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
8 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
9 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
10 production of documents.

11 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

12 Not applicable.

13 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

14 Not applicable.

15 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

16 Not applicable.

17 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:**

18 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

19 All Documents Relating To all intangible property identified in Your response to
20 Interrogatory No. 13, served concurrently herewith.

21 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

22 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
23 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
24 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
25 parties.

1 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

2 A. **Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His**
3 **Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.**

4 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
5 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
6 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
7 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
8 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
9 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
10 way as pretrial discovery.”).

11 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
12 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
13 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
14 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
15 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
16 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
17 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
18 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
19 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

20 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

21 B. **Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate**
22 **Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.**

23 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
24 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
25 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
26 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
27 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
28

1 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
2 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
3 (2004).

4 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
5 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
6 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

7 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
8 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
9 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
10 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
11 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
12 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
13 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
14 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
15 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
16 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
17 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

18 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
19 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

20 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
21 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
22 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
23 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
24 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
25 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
26 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
27 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
28

1 judgment,' then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
2 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
3 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection ““but may yield in the
4 furtherance of compelling state interests.”” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
5 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
6 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
7 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
8 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
9 information to collect on his Judgment.

10 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
11 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is ““to compel the judgment
12 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
13 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.”” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
14 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

15 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
16 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
17 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
18 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
19 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
20 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

21 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
22 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
23 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
24 court.” *Id.*

25 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
26 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
27 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

1 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
2 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
3 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
4 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
5 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
6 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
7 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
8 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

9 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
10 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
11 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
12 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
13 production of documents.

14 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

15 Not applicable.

16 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

17 Not applicable.

18 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

19 Not applicable.

20 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:**

21 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

22 All Documents Relating To all insurance policies identified in Your response to
23 Interrogatory No. 16, served concurrently herewith.

24 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

25 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
26 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
27

28

1 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
2 parties.

3 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

4 A. Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His
5 Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.

6 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
7 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
8 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
9 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
10 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
11 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
12 way as pretrial discovery.”).

13 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
14 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
15 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
16 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
17 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
18 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
19 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
20 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
21 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

22 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

23 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
24 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

25 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
26 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
27 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
28

1 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
2 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
3 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
4 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
5 (2004).

6 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
7 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
8 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

9 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
10 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
11 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
12 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
13 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
14 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
15 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
16 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
17 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
18 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
19 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

20 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
21 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

22 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
23 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
24 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
25 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
26 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
27 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.

1 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
2 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
3 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
4 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
5 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
6 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
7 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
8 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
9 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
10 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
11 information to collect on his Judgment.

12 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
13 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
14 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
15 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
16 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

17 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
18 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
19 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
20 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
21 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
22 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

23 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
24 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
25 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
26 court.” *Id.*

1 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
2 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
3 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

4 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
5 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
6 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
7 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
8 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
9 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
10 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
11 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

12 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
13 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
14 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
15 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
16 production of documents.

17 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

18 Not applicable.

19 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

20 Not applicable.

21 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

22 Not applicable.

23 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:**

24 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

25 All Documents Relating To all safe deposit boxes identified in Your response to
26 Interrogatory No. 17, served concurrently herewith.

27
28

1 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

2 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
3 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
4 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
5 parties.

6 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

7 A. Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His
8 Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.

9 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
10 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
11 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
12 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
13 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
14 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
15 way as pretrial discovery.”).

16 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
17 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
18 assets....” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
19 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
20 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
21 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
22 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
23 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
24 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

25 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.
26
27
28

1 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
2 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

3 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
4 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
5 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
6 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
7 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
8 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
9 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
10 (2004).

11 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
12 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
13 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

14 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
15 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
16 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
17 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
18 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
19 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
20 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
21 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
22 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
23 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
24 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

25 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
26 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

1 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
2 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
3 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
4 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
5 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
6 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
7 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
8 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
9 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
10 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
11 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
12 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
13 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
14 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
15 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
16 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
17 information to collect on his Judgment.

18 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
19 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
20 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
21 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
22 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

23 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
24 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
25 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
26 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
27
28

1 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
2 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

3 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
4 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
5 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
6 court.” *Id.*

7 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
8 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
9 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

10 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
11 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
12 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
13 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
14 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
15 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
16 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
17 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

18 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
19 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
20 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
21 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
22 production of documents.

23 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

24 Not applicable.

25 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

26 Not applicable.

27
28

1 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

2 Not applicable.

3 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:**

4 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

5 All Documents Relating To all third parties identified in Your response to Interrogatory
6 No. 19, served concurrently herewith, including, without limitation, all Documents Relating To
7 all Communications with all such third parties.

8 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

9 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
10 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
11 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
12 parties.

13 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

14 A. Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His
15 Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.

16 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
17 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
18 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
19 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
20 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
21 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
22 way as pretrial discovery.”).

23 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
24 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
25 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
26 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
27 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock

1 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
2 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
3 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
4 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass'n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

5 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

6 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
7 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

8 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
9 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
10 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
11 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
12 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
13 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
14 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
15 (2004).

16 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
17 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
18 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

19 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
20 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
21 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
22 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
23 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
24 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
25 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
26 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
27 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
28

1 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
2 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

3 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
4 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

5 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
6 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
7 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
8 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
9 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
10 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
11 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
12 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
13 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
14 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
15 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
16 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
17 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
18 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
19 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
20 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
21 information to collect on his Judgment.

22 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
23 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
24 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
25 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
26 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

1 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
2 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
3 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
4 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
5 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
6 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

7 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
8 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
9 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
10 court.” *Id.*

11 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
12 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
13 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

14 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
15 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
16 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
17 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
18 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
19 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
20 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
21 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

22 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
23 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
24 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
25 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
26 production of documents.

27
28

1 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

2 Not applicable.

3 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

4 Not applicable.

5 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

6 Not applicable.

7 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:**

8 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

9 All Documents Relating To all transferees identified in Your response to Interrogatory
10 No. 20, served concurrently herewith, including, without limitation, all Documents Relating To
11 all Communications with all such transferees.

12 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

13 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
14 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
15 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
16 parties.

17 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

18 A. **Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His**
19 **Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.**

20 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
21 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
22 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
23 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
24 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
25 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
26 way as pretrial discovery.”).

1 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
2 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
3 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
4 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
5 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
6 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
7 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
8 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
9 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

10 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

11 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
12 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

13 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
14 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
15 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
16 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
17 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
18 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
19 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
20 (2004).

21 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
22 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
23 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

24 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
25 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
26 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
27 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.

1 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
2 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
3 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
4 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
5 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
6 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
7 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

8 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
9 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

10 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
11 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
12 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
13 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
14 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
15 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
16 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
17 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
18 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
19 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
20 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
21 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
22 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
23 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
24 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
25 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
26 information to collect on his Judgment.

1 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
2 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is ““to compel the judgment
3 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
4 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.”” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
5 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

6 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
7 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
8 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
9 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
10 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
11 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

12 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
13 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
14 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
15 court.” *Id.*

16 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
17 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
18 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

19 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
20 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
21 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
22 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
23 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
24 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
25 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
26 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

1 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
2 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
3 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
4 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
5 production of documents.

6 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

7 Not applicable.

8 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

9 Not applicable.

10 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

11 Not applicable.

12 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:**

13 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

14 All Documents Relating To all state and federal income tax returns, and all related forms
15 and schedules (including all amended returns, forms, and schedules) filed by Razuki
16 Investments, LLC at any time since October 17, 2016.

17 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

18 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
19 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
20 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
21 parties.

22 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

23 A. Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His
24 Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.

25 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
26 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
27 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” SCC

1 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); accord *Moorer v.*
2 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
3 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
4 way as pretrial discovery.”).

5 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
6 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
7 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
8 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
9 earnings (e.g., tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
10 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
11 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. See Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
12 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
13 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

14 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

15 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
16 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

17 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
18 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
19 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
20 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
21 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; see also *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
22 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
23 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
24 (2004).

25 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
26 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
27 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

1 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
2 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
3 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
4 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
5 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
6 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
7 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
8 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
9 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
10 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
11 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

12 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
13 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

14 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
15 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
16 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
17 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
18 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
19 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
20 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
21 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
22 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
23 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
24 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
25 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
26 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
27 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.

1 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
2 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
3 information to collect on his Judgment.

4 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
5 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is ““to compel the judgment
6 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
7 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.”” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
8 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

9 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
10 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
11 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
12 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
13 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
14 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

15 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
16 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
17 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
18 court.” *Id.*

19 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
20 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
21 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

22 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
23 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
24 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
25 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
26 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
27 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
28

1 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
2 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

3 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
4 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
5 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
6 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
7 production of documents.

8 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

9 Not applicable.

10 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

11 Not applicable.

12 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

13 Not applicable.

14 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:**

15 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

16 All Documents Relating To all financial statements, balance sheets, income statements,
17 cash flow statements, profit and loss statements, and loan applications prepared or submitted by
18 You or on Your behalf at any time since October 17, 2016.

19 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

20 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
21 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
22 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
23 parties.

1 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

2 A. **Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His**
3 **Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.**

4 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
5 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
6 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
7 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
8 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
9 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
10 way as pretrial discovery.”).

11 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
12 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
13 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
14 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
15 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
16 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
17 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
18 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
19 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

20 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

21 B. **Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate**
22 **Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.**

23 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
24 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
25 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
26 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
27 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
28

1 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
2 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
3 (2004).

4 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
5 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
6 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

7 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
8 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
9 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
10 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
11 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
12 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
13 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
14 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
15 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
16 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
17 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

18 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
19 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

20 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
21 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
22 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
23 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
24 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
25 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
26 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
27 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
28

1 judgment,' then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
2 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
3 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection ““but may yield in the
4 furtherance of compelling state interests.”” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
5 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
6 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
7 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
8 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
9 information to collect on his Judgment.

10 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
11 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is ““to compel the judgment
12 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
13 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.”” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
14 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

15 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
16 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
17 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
18 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
19 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
20 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

21 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
22 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
23 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
24 court.” *Id.*

25 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
26 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
27 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

1 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
2 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
3 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
4 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
5 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
6 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
7 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
8 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

9 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
10 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
11 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
12 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
13 production of documents.

14 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

15 Not applicable.

16 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

17 Not applicable.

18 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

19 Not applicable.

20 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:**

21 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

22 Documents sufficient to identify all of Your affiliates, subsidiaries, parent companies, or
23 any other company that has or claims an interest in the Razuki Investments, LLC, including the
24 name, address or location, and state or country of incorporation or organization of any such
25 entity, and the nature of Your affiliation or corporate or other organizational relationship with
26 any such entity.

27
28

1 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

2 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
3 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
4 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
5 parties.

6 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

7 A. Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His
8 Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.

9 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
10 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
11 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
12 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
13 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
14 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
15 way as pretrial discovery.”).

16 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
17 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
18 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
19 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
20 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
21 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
22 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
23 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
24 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

25 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.
26
27
28

1 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
2 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

3 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
4 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
5 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
6 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
7 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
8 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
9 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
10 (2004).

11 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
12 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
13 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

14 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
15 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
16 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
17 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
18 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
19 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
20 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
21 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
22 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
23 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
24 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

25 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
26 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

1 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
2 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
3 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
4 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
5 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
6 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
7 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
8 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
9 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
10 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
11 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
12 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
13 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
14 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
15 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
16 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
17 information to collect on his Judgment.

18 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
19 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
20 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
21 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
22 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

23 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
24 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
25 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
26 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
27
28

1 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
2 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

3 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
4 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
5 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
6 court.” *Id.*

7 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
8 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
9 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

10 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
11 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
12 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
13 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
14 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
15 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
16 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
17 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

18 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
19 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
20 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
21 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
22 production of documents.

23 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

24 Not applicable.

25 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

26 Not applicable.

27
28

1 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

2 Not applicable.

3 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:**

4 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

5 All Documents Relating To any corporation, subsidiary, limited liability company, trust,
6 partnership, or other business entity of any kind or nature in which You currently own, hold, or
7 claim any type of interest in, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, or in which You owned,
8 held, or claimed any type of interest in, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, at any time
9 since October 17, 2016.

10 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

11 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
12 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
13 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
14 parties.

15 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

16 A. Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His
17 Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.

18 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
19 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
20 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
21 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
22 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
23 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
24 way as pretrial discovery.”).

25 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
26 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
27 assets....” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
28

1 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
2 earnings (e.g., tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
3 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
4 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
5 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
6 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

7 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

8 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
9 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

10 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
11 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
12 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
13 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
14 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
15 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
16 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
17 (2004).

18 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
19 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
20 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

21 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
22 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
23 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
24 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
25 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
26 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
27 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
28

1 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
2 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
3 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
4 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

5 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
6 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

7 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
8 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
9 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
10 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
11 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
12 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
13 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
14 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
15 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
16 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
17 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
18 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
19 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
20 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
21 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
22 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
23 information to collect on his Judgment.

24 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
25 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
26 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
27
28

1 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
2 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

3 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
4 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
5 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
6 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
7 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
8 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

9 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
10 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
11 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
12 court.” *Id.*

13 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
14 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
15 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

16 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
17 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
18 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
19 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
20 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
21 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
22 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
23 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

24 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
25 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
26 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
27
28

1 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
2 production of documents.

3 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

4 Not applicable.

5 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

6 Not applicable.

7 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

8 Not applicable.

9 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:**

10 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

11 If You claim that any of Your Revenue, Income, or Assets are exempt from collection,
12 all Documents evidencing the basis for such exemption.

13 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

14 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
15 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
16 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
17 parties.

18 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

19 A. **Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His**
20 **Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.**

21 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
22 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
23 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
24 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
25 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
26 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
27 way as pretrial discovery.”).

1 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
2 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
3 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
4 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
5 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
6 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
7 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
8 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
9 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

10 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

11 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
12 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

13 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
14 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
15 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
16 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
17 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
18 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
19 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
20 (2004).

21 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
22 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
23 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

24 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
25 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
26 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
27 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.

1 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
2 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
3 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
4 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
5 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
6 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
7 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

8 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
9 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

10 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
11 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
12 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
13 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
14 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
15 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
16 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
17 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
18 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
19 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
20 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
21 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
22 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
23 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
24 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
25 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
26 information to collect on his Judgment.

1 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
2 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is ““to compel the judgment
3 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
4 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.”” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
5 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

6 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
7 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
8 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
9 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
10 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
11 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

12 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
13 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
14 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
15 court.” *Id.*

16 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
17 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
18 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

19 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
20 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
21 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
22 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
23 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
24 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
25 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
26 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

1 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
2 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
3 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
4 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
5 production of documents.

6 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

7 Not applicable.

8 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

9 Not applicable.

10 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

11 Not applicable.

12 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:**

13 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

14 All Documents Relating To any and all debts or liabilities owed to You by any third
15 party, including, but not limited to, all claims, causes of action, lawsuits, judgments, or liens
16 You now have or had at any time since October 17, 2016.

17 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

18 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
19 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
20 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
21 parties.

22 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

23 A. Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His
24 Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.

25 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
26 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
27 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” SCC

1 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); accord *Moorer v.*
2 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
3 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
4 way as pretrial discovery.”).

5 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
6 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
7 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
8 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
9 earnings (e.g., tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
10 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
11 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. See Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
12 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
13 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

14 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

15 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
16 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

17 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
18 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
19 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
20 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
21 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; see also *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
22 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
23 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
24 (2004).

25 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
26 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
27 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

1 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
2 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
3 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
4 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
5 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
6 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
7 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
8 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
9 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
10 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
11 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

12 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
13 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

14 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
15 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
16 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
17 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
18 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
19 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
20 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
21 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
22 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
23 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
24 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
25 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
26 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
27 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.

1 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
2 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
3 information to collect on his Judgment.

4 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
5 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is ““to compel the judgment
6 debtor to give information concerning his property . . . , according the widest scope for inquiry
7 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.”” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
8 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

9 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
10 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
11 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
12 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
13 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
14 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

15 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
16 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
17 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
18 court.” *Id.*

19 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
20 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
21 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

22 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
23 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
24 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
25 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
26 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
27 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
28

1 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
2 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

3 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
4 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
5 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
6 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
7 production of documents.

8 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

9 Not applicable.

10 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

11 Not applicable.

12 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

13 Not applicable.

14 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:**

15 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

16 All Documents Relating To or evidencing any third party’s possession, ownership, or
17 control of any of Your Assets, in whole or in part.

18 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

19 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
20 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
21 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
22 parties.

23 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

24 A. **Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His**
25 **Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.**

26 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
27 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
28

1 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
2 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
3 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
4 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
5 way as pretrial discovery.”).

6 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
7 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
8 assets....” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
9 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
10 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
11 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
12 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
13 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
14 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

15 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

16 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
17 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

18 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
19 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
20 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
21 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
22 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
23 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
24 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
25 (2004).

1 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
2 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
3 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

4 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
5 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
6 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
7 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
8 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
9 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
10 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
11 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
12 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
13 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
14 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

15 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
16 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

17 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
18 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
19 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
20 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
21 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
22 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
23 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
24 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
25 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
26 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”]). Moreover, the
27 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
28

1 furtherance of compelling state interests.” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
2 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
3 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
4 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
5 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
6 information to collect on his Judgment.

7 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
8 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
9 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
10 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
11 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

12 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
13 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
14 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
15 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
16 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
17 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

18 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
19 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
20 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
21 court.” *Id.*

22 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
23 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
24 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

25 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
26 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
27 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.

1 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
2 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
3 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
4 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
5 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

6 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
7 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
8 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
9 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
10 production of documents.

11 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

12 Not applicable.

13 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

14 Not applicable.

15 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

16 Not applicable.

17 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:**

18 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

19 All Documents Relating To or evidencing any transaction in which You transferred any
20 interest in any of Your assets over the value of \$10,000.00, in whole or in part, to any transferee
21 at any time since October 17, 2016.

22 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

23 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
24 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
25 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
26 parties.

1 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

2 A. **Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His**
3 **Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.**

4 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
5 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
6 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
7 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
8 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
9 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
10 way as pretrial discovery.”).

11 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
12 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
13 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
14 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
15 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
16 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
17 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
18 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
19 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

20 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.

21 B. **Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate**
22 **Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.**

23 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
24 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
25 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
26 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
27 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
28

1 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
2 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
3 (2004).

4 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
5 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
6 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

7 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
8 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
9 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
10 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
11 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
12 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
13 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
14 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
15 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
16 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
17 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

18 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
19 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

20 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
21 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
22 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
23 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
24 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
25 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
26 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
27 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
28

1 judgment,' then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
2 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
3 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection ““but may yield in the
4 furtherance of compelling state interests.”” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
5 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
6 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
7 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
8 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
9 information to collect on his Judgment.

10 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
11 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is ““to compel the judgment
12 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
13 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.”” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
14 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

15 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
16 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
17 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
18 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
19 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
20 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

21 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
22 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
23 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
24 court.” *Id.*

25 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
26 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
27 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

1 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
2 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
3 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
4 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
5 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
6 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
7 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
8 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

9 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
10 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
11 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
12 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
13 production of documents.

14 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

15 Not applicable.

16 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

17 Not applicable.

18 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:**

19 Not applicable.

20 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:**

21 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the request:**

22 All Documents You provided to any transferee in connection with any due diligence he,
23 she, or it conducted before engaging in any transfer of any interest in any of Your assets over
24 the value of \$10,000.00, in whole or in part, to any transferee at any time since October 17,
25 2016.

26
27
28

1 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(2) – text of the response, answer, or objection:**

2 Razuki Investments objects to the request as vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad,
3 unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated to lead to
4 the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights of third
5 parties.

6 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(3) – reasons for compelling further response:**

7 A. Judgment Creditor Is Entitled To Conduct Discovery To Aid In The Enforcement Of His
8 Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor.

9 “A judgment creditor may conduct discovery directly against the judgment debtor by
10 means of a judgment debtor examination ([Cal. Civ. Proc. Code] § 708.110), written
11 interrogatories (§ 708.020), and requests for production of documents (§ 708.030).” *SCC*
12 *Acquisitions, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal.App.4th 741, 751-752 (2015); *accord Moorer v.*
13 *Noble L.A. Events, Inc.*, 32 Cal. App. 5th 736, 743 (2019); *Li v. Yan*, 247 Cal.App.4th 56, 65
14 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
15 way as pretrial discovery.”).

16 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
17 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
18 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
19 (2006)). Thus, requests for production of documents disclosing a judgment debtor’s assets or
20 earnings (*e.g.*, tax returns, financial statements, payroll stubs, real property deeds, stock
21 certificates, passbooks, deposit account statements, bonds, trust deeds, automobile ownership
22 certificates, promissory notes, etc.) are entirely appropriate. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.),
23 *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1391.6 (June 2023 Update)
24 (citing *Lee v. Swansboro Country Property Owners Ass’n*, 151 Cal. App.4th 575, 581 (2007)).

25 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s requests for production to Judgment Debtor are proper.
26
27
28

1 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
2 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

3 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
4 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
5 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
6 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
7 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
8 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
9 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
10 (2004).

11 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served two sets of responses to Judgment
12 Creditor’s requests for production. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Exs. E-F.) Both sets of responses
13 consisted entirely of the same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

14 When Judgment Creditor’s counsel called Judgment Debtor’s counsel to meet-and-
15 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor’s counsel relied primarily on
16 objections that Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
17 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
18 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor’s counsel offered to limit
19 the temporal scope of the discovery requests and agreed that Judgment Debtor could produce
20 responsive information and documents subject to the Stipulation and Protective Order to which
21 Judgment Debtor had already agreed. (*Id.*) Rather than agree to these conditions – or to
22 propose any others under which Judgment Debtor would provide substantive information in
23 response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests – Judgment Debtor’s counsel responded
24 bluntly, “We’re never going to agree.” (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 13 & Ex. H.)

25 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
26 discovery requests on the basis of the asserted objections is improper.

1 Judgment Debtor’s assertion of privacy concerns on behalf of Defendant Salam Razuki
2 does not justify its refusal to comply with Judgment Creditor’s proper discovery requests.
3 “Code of Civil Procedure section 708.030, subdivision (a), allows a judgment creditor to obtain
4 information about a third party, provided the document ‘is in the possession, custody, or
5 control’ of the judgment debtor and ‘the demand requests information to aid in enforcement of
6 the money judgment.’” *Moorer*, 32 Cal. App. 5th at 743 (citing *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.
7 App. 4th at 752-753 [“If the document requested is ‘in the possession, custody, or control of the
8 party on whom the demand is made’ and has ‘information to aid in enforcement of the money
9 judgment,’ then the document is subject to discovery under section 708.030, regardless of
10 whether the document relates to the judgment debtor or to third parties.”].) Moreover, the
11 constitutional right of privacy does not provide absolute protection “‘but may yield in the
12 furtherance of compelling state interests.’” *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal.App.4th at 754 (quoting
13 *People v. Wharton*, 53 Cal. 3d 522, 563 (1991)). “Obtaining information to collect on a
14 judgment is ‘a valid significant interest.’” *Id.* at 755 (quoting *Hooser v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal.
15 App. 4th 997, 1007 (2000)). Therefore, any right of privacy that Mr. Razuki may have in the
16 requested information must yield to Judgment Creditor’s countervailing interest in obtaining
17 information to collect on his Judgment.

18 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
19 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
20 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
21 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
22 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

23 In *Troy v. Superior Court*, 186 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014 (1986), a judgment debtor
24 petitioned for relief to restrain enforcement of a contempt order entered against him after he
25 refused to answer questions at a judgment debtor examination, citing his privilege against self-
26 incrimination, the marital privilege, and relevancy. The Court of Appeal denied the petition,
27
28

1 concluding, “the purpose of a judgment debtor examination is to leave no stone unturned in the
2 search for assets which might be used to satisfy the judgment.”

3 Moreover, “beyond only leaving no stone unturned,” California courts have concluded
4 that judgment debtor discovery implicates a “strong public policy.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 68.
5 “That policy is to prevent fraud against creditors. And against lenders. And perhaps against the
6 court.” *Id.*

7 In light of the “strong public policy” of affording judgment creditors wide latitude in the
8 discovery of information to aid in the collection of their judgments, Judgment Debtor should not
9 be heard to argue that Judgment Creditor’s reasonable discovery requests are overbroad.

10 Rather, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to provide further, substantive responses
11 to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. After pending for years, this matter finally went to
12 trial, and Judgment Creditor obtained a significant money judgment against Judgment Debtor.
13 (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. B.) After denying Judgment Debtor’s unmeritorious post-trial
14 motions, the Court entered the Judgment On Jury Verdict on February 14, 2024. (*Id.*)
15 Nevertheless, Judgment Debtor has not only refused to agree to pay the Judgment, but has now
16 asserted invalid objections in response to Judgment Creditor’s discovery requests. (Cavanagh
17 Decl., ¶¶ 4-5 & 7 & Exs. C & E-F.)

18 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
19 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
20 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
21 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s requests for the
22 production of documents.

23 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(4) – text of relevant definitions:**

24 Not applicable.

25 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(5) – text of other relevant requests/responses:**

26 Not applicable.

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

Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(6) – summary of relevant pleadings:

Not applicable.

Dated: April 5, 2024

MESSNER REEVES LLP



Allan B. Claybon
Mark Collier
Charles C. Cavanagh
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I am employed in the County of Denver, Colorado. I am over the age of eighteen years
3 and not a party to the within entitled action; my business address is 1550 Wewatta Street, Suite
4 710, Denver, Colorado 80202.

5 On April 5, 2024, I caused to be served the foregoing document described as:

6 **SEPARATE STATEMENT RE JUDGMENT CREDITOR BRADFORD HARCOURT’S**
7 **MOTION TO COMPEL JUDGMENT DEBTOR RAZUKI INVESTMENTS, LLC TO**
8 **RESPOND FURTHER TO FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION** on the
9 interested parties as follows:
10

11 Douglas Jaffe
12 LAW OFFICES OF DOUGLAS JAFFE
13 501 West Broadway, Suite 800
14 San Diego, CA 92101
15 T.:(619) 400-4945
16 F.: (619) 400-4947
17 E.: dougjaffelaw@gmail.com
18 Attorney for Defendants Razuki Investments,
19 L.L.C. and Keith Henderson and
20 Defendant/Cross-Complainant Salam Razuki

David K. Demergian
DEMERGIAN LAW
501 West Broadway, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
T: (619) 239-3015
F: (619) 239-3029
E: david@demergianlaw.com
Attorney for Defendants/Cross-Defendants
Ninus Malan, San Diego United Holdings,
LLC, American Lending and Holdings, LLC

17 J. Scott Russo
18 RUSSO & DUCKWORTH, LLP
19 3404 Via Oporto, Suite 201
20 Newport Beach, CA 92663
21 T.: (949) 752-7106
22 F.: (949) 752-0629
23 E.: jsrusso@russoandduckworth.com
24 Attorney for Defendant Keith Henderson

22 ELECTRONIC-SERVICE/E-MAIL: Pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule
23 2.251(b)(1)(B), a court order or by consent/agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail
24 and/or electronic submission, I cause the above-referenced document(s) to be sent to the persons
indicated above at the email address set forth above from either the Court’s electronic filing
service or by personal email.

25 BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY [CCP §1013(a)] By placing the original a true
26 copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope(s) addressed as to the above-named counsel of record
27 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.

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

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Colorado that the forgoing is true and correct.

DATED: April 5, 2024

/s/ Tara L. Nelson
Tara L. Nelson