

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)
27)
28)
Defendants.)

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

04/05/2024 at 08:29:00 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
INTERROGATORIES**

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 INTERROGATORIES**

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 Interrogatories.
4

5 **INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

6 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

7 State the name, address, and state of incorporation or organization of any corporate
8 entity or other business in which Razuki Investments LLC has, either directly or indirectly, had
9 any type of interest at any time 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 interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, compound,
12 overbroad, unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated
13 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights
14 of third 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, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
2 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor's
3 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor's real
4 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
5 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor's
6 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
7 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
8 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
9 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

10 Therefore, Judgment Creditor's interrogatories 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 its responses to Judgment Creditor's
22 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
23 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 interrogatories.

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

6 Not applicable.

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

8 Not applicable.

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

10 Not applicable.

11 **INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

12 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

13 Identify all real property in which Razuki Investments, LLC has, either directly or
14 indirectly, had any type of interest at any time since October 17, 2016.

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

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

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

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

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

1 (2016) (“[D]ocument requests to a judgment debtor can be propounded and served in the same
2 way as pretrial discovery.”).

3 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
4 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
5 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
6 (2006)). Thus, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
7 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
8 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
9 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
10 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor’s
11 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
12 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
13 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
14 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

15 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories 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 its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
2 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
3 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 interrogatories.

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

11 Not applicable.

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

13 Not applicable.

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

15 Not applicable.

16 **INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

17 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

18 Describe all sources of income, revenue, or remuneration of any kind received by
19 Razuki Investments, LLC at any time since October 17, 2016, including, without limitation, all
20 sources of any payments for goods and services, interest income, operating income, payments
21 on accounts receivables, commissions, agency fees, loan repayments, rents, royalties, license
22 fees, dividends, distributions, payments relating to sales of assets, payments on contracts, or any
23 other payment or remuneration received by Razuki Investments, LLC in connection with the
24 operation of its business.

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

26 Razuki Investments objects to the interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, compound,
27 overbroad, unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated
28

1 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights
2 of third 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, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
17 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
18 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
19 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
20 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor’s
21 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
22 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
23 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
24 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

25 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories 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 its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
12 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
13 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 interrogatories.

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

23 Not applicable.

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

25 Not applicable.

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

27 Not applicable.

28

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

2 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

3 State the amount of all income declared by Razuki Investments, LLC on all state and
4 federal income tax returns and all related forms and schedules (including all amended returns,
5 forms, and schedules) filed at any time since October 17, 2016.

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

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

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

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

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

21 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
22 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
23 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
24 (2006)). Thus, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
25 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
26 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
27 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the

1 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor's
2 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
3 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
4 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
5 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

6 Therefore, Judgment Creditor's interrogatories to Judgment Debtor are proper.

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

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

17 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served its responses to Judgment Creditor's
18 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
19 same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

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

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

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

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

23 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
24 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
25 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
26 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
27 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 interrogatories.

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

27 Not applicable.

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

2 Not applicable.

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

4 Not applicable.

5 **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

6 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

7 Identify all documents evidencing any income, revenue, or remuneration of any kind
8 received by Razuki Investments, LLC from any source at any time since October 17, 2016.

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

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

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

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

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

24 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
25 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
26 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
27 (2006)). Thus, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:

1 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor's
2 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor's real
3 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
4 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor's
5 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
6 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
7 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
8 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

9 Therefore, Judgment Creditor's interrogatories to Judgment Debtor are proper.

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

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

20 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served its responses to Judgment Creditor's
21 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
22 same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

23 When Judgment Creditor's counsel called Judgment Debtor's counsel to meet-and-
24 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor's counsel relied primarily on
25 objections that Judgment Creditor's discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
26 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
27 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor's counsel offered to limit
28

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

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

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

26 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
27 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
28

1 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
2 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
3 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

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

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

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

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

25 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
26 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
27
28

1 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
2 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories.

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 **INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

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

11 Identify and describe all debts and liabilities owed by Razuki Investments, LLC at any
12 time since October 17, 2016.

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

14 Razuki Investments objects to the interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, compound,
15 overbroad, unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated
16 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights
17 of third 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, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
5 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
6 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
7 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
8 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor’s
9 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
10 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
11 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
12 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

13 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories 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 its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
25 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
26 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 interrogatories.

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

8 Not applicable.

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

10 Not applicable.

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

12 Not applicable.

13 **INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

14 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

15 Identify and describe all debts and liabilities owed by Razuki Investments, LLC at any
16 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 interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, compound,
19 overbroad, unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated
20 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights
21 of third 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, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
9 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
10 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
11 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
12 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor’s
13 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
14 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
15 each such transfer. See Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
16 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

17 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories to Judgment Debtor are proper.

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

20 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
21 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
22 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
23 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
24 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; see also *SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
25 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
26 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
27 (2004).

1 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
2 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
3 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 interrogatories.

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

11 Not applicable.

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

13 Not applicable.

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

15 Not applicable.

16 **INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

17 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

18 Identify by jurisdiction and case number all legal actions in which Razuki Investments,
19 LLC has been a party at any time since October 17, 2016.

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

21 Razuki Investments objects to the interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, compound,
22 overbroad, unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated
23 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights
24 of third 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, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
15 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
16 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
17 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
18 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor’s
19 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
20 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
21 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
22 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

23 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories to Judgment Debtor are proper.

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

26 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
27 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
28

1 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
2 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
3 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
4 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
5 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
6 (2004).

7 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
8 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
9 same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

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

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

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

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

13 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
14 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
15 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
16 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
17 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

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

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

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

17 Not applicable.

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

19 Not applicable.

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

21 Not applicable.

22 **INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

23 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

24 Identify and describe all debts and liabilities presently owed to Razuki Investments,
25 LLC by any person or entity.
26
27
28

1 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories to Judgment Debtor are proper.
2 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
3 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

4 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
5 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
6 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
7 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
8 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
9 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
10 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
11 (2004).

12 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
13 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
14 same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

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

26 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
27 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 interrogatories.

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

23 Not applicable.

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

25 Not applicable.

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

27 Not applicable.

28

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

2 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

3 Identify all banks, brokerage firms, investment firms, or other financial institutions for
4 any account which Razuki Investments, LLC currently owns, holds, or claims an interest in, in
5 whole or in part, or owned, held, or claimed an interest in, in whole or in part, at any time since
6 October 17, 2016.

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

8 Razuki Investments objects to the interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, compound,
9 overbroad, unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated
10 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights
11 of third 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, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
26 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
27 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
28

1 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
2 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor's
3 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
4 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
5 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
6 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

7 Therefore, Judgment Creditor's interrogatories 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 its responses to Judgment Creditor's
19 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
20 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 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories.

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 **INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

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

9 Identify and describe all vehicles, aircraft, boats, or other water vessels that Razuki
10 Investments, LLC currently owns, holds, or claims an interest in, directly or indirectly, in whole
11 or in part, or owned, held, or claimed an interest in, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, at
12 any time since October 17, 2016.

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

14 Razuki Investments objects to the interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, compound,
15 overbroad, unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated
16 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights
17 of third 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, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
5 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
6 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
7 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
8 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor’s
9 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
10 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
11 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
12 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

13 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories 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 its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
25 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
26 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 interrogatories.

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

8 Not applicable.

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

10 Not applicable.

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

12 Not applicable.

13 **INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

14 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

15 Identify and describe any and all tangible property with a value over \$10,000.00 which
16 Razuki Investments, LLC currently owns, holds, or claims an interest in, directly or indirectly,
17 in whole or in part, or owned, held, or claimed an interest in, directly or indirectly, in whole or
18 in part, 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 interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, compound,
21 overbroad, unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated
22 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights
23 of third 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, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
15 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
16 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
17 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
18 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor’s
19 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
20 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
21 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
22 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

23 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories to Judgment Debtor are proper.

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

26 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
27 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
28

1 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
2 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
3 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
4 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
5 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
6 (2004).

7 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
8 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
9 same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

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

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

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

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

13 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
14 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
15 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
16 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
17 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

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

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

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

17 Not applicable.

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

19 Not applicable.

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

21 Not applicable.

22 **INTERROGATORY NO. 13:**

23 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

24 Identify and describe all intangible property with a value over \$10,000.00 which Razuki
25 Investments, LLC currently owns, holds, or claims any type of interest in, directly or indirectly,
26 in whole or in part, or owned, held, or claimed any type of interest in, directly or indirectly, in
27 whole or in part, at any time since October 17, 2016.

1 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories to Judgment Debtor are proper.
2 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
3 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

4 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
5 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
6 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
7 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
8 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
9 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
10 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
11 (2004).

12 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
13 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
14 same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

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

26 Judgment Debtor’s refusal to provide substantive responses to Judgment Creditor’s
27 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 interrogatories.

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

23 Not applicable.

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

25 Not applicable.

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

27 Not applicable.

28

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

2 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

3 Identify all persons who have been a member, manager, owner, employee, or agent of
4 Razuki Investments, LLC at any time since October 17, 2016.

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

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

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

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

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

20 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
21 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
22 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
23 (2006)). Thus, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
24 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
25 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
26 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
27 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor’s

1 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
2 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
3 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
4 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

5 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories 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 its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
17 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
18 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 interrogatories.

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

27 Not applicable.

28

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

2 Not applicable.

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

4 Not applicable.

5 **INTERROGATORY NO. 15:**

6 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

7 Identify and describe all of Razuki Investments, LLC’s affiliates, subsidiaries, parent
8 companies, or any other company that claims, or has claimed, an interest in Razuki Investments,
9 LLC at any time 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 interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, compound,
12 overbroad, unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated
13 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights
14 of third 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, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
2 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor's
3 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor's real
4 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
5 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor's
6 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
7 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
8 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
9 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

10 Therefore, Judgment Creditor's interrogatories 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 its responses to Judgment Creditor's
22 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
23 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 interrogatories.

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

6 Not applicable.

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

8 Not applicable.

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

10 Not applicable.

11 **INTERROGATORY NO. 16:**

12 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

13 Identify all policies of insurance Razuki Investments, LLC currently owns, holds, or
14 claims any type of interest in, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, or has been covered
15 under at any time since October 17, 2016.

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

17 Razuki Investments objects to the interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, compound,
18 overbroad, unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated
19 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights
20 of third 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, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
8 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
9 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
10 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
11 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor’s
12 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
13 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
14 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
15 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

16 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories to Judgment Debtor are proper.

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

19 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
20 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
21 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
22 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
23 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
24 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
25 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
26 (2004).

1 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
2 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
3 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 interrogatories.

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

11 Not applicable.

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

13 Not applicable.

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

15 Not applicable.

16 **INTERROGATORY NO. 17:**

17 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

18 Identify any safe deposit boxes that Razuki Investments, LLC has either rented or had
19 access to at any time since October 17, 2016.

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

21 Razuki Investments objects to the interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, compound,
22 overbroad, unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated
23 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights
24 of third 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, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
15 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
16 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
17 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
18 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor’s
19 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
20 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
21 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
22 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

23 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories to Judgment Debtor are proper.

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

26 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
27 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
28

1 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
2 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
3 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
4 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
5 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
6 (2004).

7 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
8 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
9 same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

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

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

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

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

13 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
14 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
15 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
16 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
17 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

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

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

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

17 Not applicable.

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

19 Not applicable.

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

21 Not applicable.

22 **INTERROGATORY NO. 18:**

23 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

24 If you claim that any of the revenue, income, or assets of Razuki Investments, LLC is
25 exempt from judgment enforcement in this action, identify all such revenue, income, or assets
26 and state the basis for the claimed exemption.

27
28

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

2 Razuki Investments objects to the interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, compound,
3 overbroad, unduly burdensome, calls for a legal conclusion, irrelevant/not reasonably calculated
4 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, equally available, and invades the privacy rights
5 of third 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, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
20 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
21 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
22 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
23 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor’s
24 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
25 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
26 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
27 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

1 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories to Judgment Debtor are proper.
2 B. Compelling Judgment Debtor To Provide Further, Substantive Responses Is Appropriate
3 Because Its Boilerplate Objections To The Discovery Requests Are Without Merit.

4 Written discovery requests to a judgment debtor may be enforced in the same manner as
5 written discovery requests in a civil action, “to the extent practicable.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
6 §§ 708.020(c) & 708.030(c). Thus, where a judgment debtor responds unsatisfactorily, a
7 judgment creditor may make a motion to compel answers. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
8 §§ 2030.290, 2030.300, 2031.300 & 2031.310; *see also SCC Acquisitions*, 243 Cal. App. 4th at
9 753 (trial court authorized to compel production of documents in judgment debtor’s possession,
10 custody, and control); *Best Prods., Inc. v. Superior Court*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1189-90
11 (2004).

12 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
13 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
14 same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

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

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

28

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 interrogatories.

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

23 Not applicable.

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

25 Not applicable.

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

27 Not applicable.

28

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 19:**

2 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

3 Identify each third party who currently possesses, owns, or controls any of the real
4 property, vehicles, tangible property, or intangible property identified by Razuki Investments,
5 LLC in response to these interrogatories.

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

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

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

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

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

21 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
22 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
23 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
24 (2006)). Thus, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:
25 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor’s
26 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor’s real
27 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the

1 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor’s
2 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
3 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
4 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
5 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

6 Therefore, Judgment Creditor’s interrogatories to Judgment Debtor are proper.

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

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

17 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served its responses to Judgment Creditor’s
18 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
19 same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

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

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

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

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

23 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
24 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
25 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
26 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
27 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 interrogatories.

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

27 Not applicable.

28

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

2 Not applicable.

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

4 Not applicable.

5 **INTERROGATORY NO. 20:**

6 **Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c)(1) – text of the interrogatory:**

7 Identify all transferees of any of the income or assets of Razuki Investments, LLC over
8 the value of \$10,000.00 at any time since October 17, 2016.

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

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

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

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

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

24 The purpose of such supplementary proceedings is “to uncover all assets the judgment
25 debtor has that could respond to the judgment – to ‘leave no stone unturned in the search for
26 assets....’” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 66 (quoting *Jogani v. Jogani*, 141 Cal. App. 4th 158, 172
27 (2006)). Thus, interrogatories seeking the following information are entirely appropriate:

1 identifying information about the judgment debtor, information regarding the judgment debtor's
2 income and expenses; the description, value, and location of all of the judgment debtor's real
3 and personal assets; the name and address of all other creditors of the judgment debtor, the
4 amount owed to them, and whether they have any liens or encumbrances on the debtor's
5 property; and the present value, description, and location of all real and personal assets
6 transferred by the debtor to third persons in the last seven years, and the consideration paid for
7 each such transfer. *See* Hon. Alan M. Ahart (Ret.), *Cal. Prac. Guide: Enforcing Judgments &*
8 *Debt*, Ch. 6G-2, ¶ 6:1380 (June 2023 Update).

9 Therefore, Judgment Creditor's interrogatories to Judgment Debtor are proper.

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

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

20 Here, on March 20, 2024, Judgment Debtor served its responses to Judgment Creditor's
21 interrogatories. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶ 7 & Ex. E.) Each of the responses consisted entirely of the
22 same objections to each request. (*Id.*)

23 When Judgment Creditor's counsel called Judgment Debtor's counsel to meet-and-
24 confer regarding the asserted objections, Judgment Debtor's counsel relied primarily on
25 objections that Judgment Creditor's discovery requests were overbroad as to time and infringed
26 upon the purported privacy rights of defendant Salam Razuki. (Cavanagh Decl., ¶¶ 9-12 & Ex.
27 H.) However, during the meet-and-confer process, Judgment Creditor's counsel offered to limit
28

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

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

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

26 Judgment Debtor’s assertion that the discovery requests are overbroad is similarly
27 unavailing. As noted above, the object of post-judgment discovery is “‘to compel the judgment
28

1 debtor to give information concerning his property ... , according the widest scope for inquiry
2 concerning the property and business affairs of the judgment debtor.” *Li*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at
3 66 (quoting *Kyne v. Eustice*, 215 Cal. App. 2d 627, 632 (1963)).

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

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

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

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

25 Judgment Creditor is entitled to Judgment Debtor’s substantive responses to Judgment
26 Creditor’s discovery responses in order to aid in the enforcement of Judgment Creditor’s
27
28

1 Judgment against Judgment Debtor. Therefore, Judgment Debtor should be compelled to
2 provide further, substantive responses to each of Judgment Creditor's interrogatories.

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
10 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 INTERROGATORIES** on the interested parties
9 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.

