1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ANDREW FLORES California State Bar No. 272958 LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW FLORES 7880 Broadway Lemon Grove CA 91945 Telephone: (619)356-1556 Fax: (619) 274-8053 Email: Andrew@FloresLegal.Pro Attorney for the Defendants CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS and PICK AXE HOLD	ELECTRONICALLY FILED Superior Court of California, County of San Diego 08/21/2020 at 01:53:00 PM Clerk of the Superior Court By Gen Dieu, Deputy Clerk DING LLC	
8			
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO – HALL OF JUSTICE		
11			
12	RICARDO VIDAL, d.b.a., SCHNELLZUG	CASE NO. 37-2018-00044217-CU-BC-CTL	
13	CAPITAL, Plaintiff,		
14	v.	DEFENDANTS/CROSS-COMPLAINANT'S EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR AN ORDER	
15 16	PICK AXE HOLDING, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS, an individual; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,	TO REOPEN DISCOVERY PURSUANT TO CCP § 2024.050	
17	Defendants.		
18			
19	CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS, an individual,		
20	Cross-Complainant) v.)		
21)		
22	RICARDO VIDAL, an individual, and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,		
23	Cross-Defendants.		
24)		
25			
26	///		
27	///		
28			

TO THE COURT AND TO ALL PARITES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on August 25, 2020 at 8:45 a.m., or as soon has may be heard in the above entitled court, Defendants/Cross-Plaintiffs Pick Axe Holdings, LLC and Christopher Williams by and through their counsel of record, Andrew Flores, will move this Court for an order to reopen discovery pursuant to CCP § 2024.050.

The application will be made on the grounds that due to the unprecedented global pandemic, and Executive Order N-33-20 ("stay at home order"), this Court's closure and limited operations, and the Court's rescheduling of the trial in this matter to December 18, 2020, give reasonable grounds, in the equity and the interest of justice, to reopen discovery for a limited time.

DATED: August 19, 2020 THE LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW FLORES

By_____

ANDREW FLORES
Attorney for Defendant/Cross-Complainants
CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS & PICK AXE
HOLDING LLC

1 2

ANDREW FLORES California State Bar No. 272958 LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW FLORES 945 4 TH Ave, Suite 412 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: (619)356-1556 Fax: (619) 274-8053 Email: Andrew@FloresLegal.Pro Attorney for the Defendants CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS and PICK AXE HOL	DING LLC		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA			
COUNTY OF SAN DIEG	O – HALL OF JUSTICE		
RICARDO VIDAL, d.b.a., SCHNELLZUG	CASE NO. 37-2018-00044217-CU-BC-CTL		
Plaintiff,) 		
v.	DEFENDANT/CROSS-COMPLAINANTS' MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND		
1	AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF EX PARTE APPLICATION TO REOPEN DISCOVERY		
an individual; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,	PURSUANT TO CCP § 2024.050		
Defendants.			
CUDICTORUED WILLIAMS : 1' '1 1			
- (
)			
through 50, inclusive,			
Cross-Defendants.			
	California State Bar No. 272958 LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW FLORES 945 4 TH Ave, Suite 412 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: (619)356-1556 Fax: (619) 274-8053 Email: Andrew@FloresLegal.Pro Attorney for the Defendants CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS and PICK AXE HOL SUPERIOR COURT COUNTY OF SAN DIEG RICARDO VIDAL, d.b.a., SCHNELLZUG CAPITAL, Plaintiff, v. PICK AXE HOLDING, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS, an individual; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, Defendants. CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS, an individual, Cross-Complainant v. RICARDO VIDAL, an individual, and DOES 1		

The Court should exercises it's discretion to reopen discovery because it is necessary to obtain additional information in order to properly prepare for trial, which is currently set for December 18, 2020 and/or to file a dispositive motion before the trial date. This limited reopening is unlikely to interfere with the trial calendar or prejudice any party.

A. <u>Background</u>. On or about September 27, 2019 the Court continued the trial in this matter to June 19, 2020 with a discovery cut off date of May 16, 2020. On or about March 17, 2020 the Court closed operation but for limited "emergency" matters. Additionally, on or about March 17, 2020 the Governor of California issued an executive order, ordering a people of this state "stay at home" but for "essential workers." The Court then resumed operations (albeit still on a limited bases) on May 26, 2020. Effectively the Court was closed for operations for a period of sixty-nine calendar days. On May 16, 2020 the Court, on its own motion rescheduled the trial from June 16, 2020 to December 18, 2020.

On July 1, 2020 Defendant/Cross-Complainant served upon Plaintiffs Request for Admissions (Set One, 34 Requests), Special Interrogatories (Set One, 33 Interrogatories), and Form Interrogatories (Set One).

- **B.** <u>Legal Standard</u>. On a motion of any party, accompanied by a declaration stating facts showing a reasonable and good-faith attempt at an informal resolution of each issue presented by the motion, the court make grant leave to reopen discovery after a new trial date has been set. CCP § 2024.050(a).
- **C.** <u>Factors to be Considered</u>. In exercising its discretion to grand leave to reopen discovery, the court is required to take into consideration any matter relevant to the leave requested, including but not limited to the following.
 - 1. The necessity and reasons for the discovery. (CCP § 2025.050(b)(a));
- 2. The diligence of the party seeking the discovery, and the reasons the discovery was not completed earlier;
- 3. Any likelihood, or absence thereof that permitting the discovery will prevent the case from going to trial on the date set, or otherwise interfere with the trial calendar, or result in prejudice to any other party. (CCP § 2024.050(b)(3));

4. The length of time that has elapse between the dates previously set, and the date presently set for trial of the action. (CCP§ 2024.050(b)(4)).

D. ARGUMENT

- a. Meet and Confer Requirement. As further detailed in the attached declaration, on July 1, 2020 Defendants/Cross-Complainant served upon Plaintiff's counsel three separate discovery devices described above. On July 3, 2020 Defendants/Cross-Complainant's attorney sent a curtsey copy to Plaintiff's attorney Michael Cindrich. A few days later attorney Robert Crissman, of Mr. Cindrich's office called Defendants/Cross-Complainant's counsel to discuss possible settlement in the case. On July 30, 2020 Defendants/Cross-Complainant's counsel sent Messrs. Cindrich and Crissman an email requesting confirmation that they would in fact respond to the discovery requests and outlining the equitable reasons why discovery should be extended.
- b. <u>Court Have Authority to Reopen Discovery on an Ex Parte Basis, Upon Showing of Good Cause.</u> A court ma reopen discovery based on an *ex parte* application. For example in Hernandez v. Superior Court, the court of appeals issued a writ of mandate reversing the trial court's denial of an ex parte application to reopen discovery because the application was supported by a showing of good cause. 115 Cal. App. 4th 1242, 1245, 1247-48 (2004).
- c. Why Discovery Should be Reopened. No discovery had been conducted by either side. Though this case involves a very narrow issue regarding an alleged breach of contract this discovery is necessary to prepare for trial and potentially for case dispositive motion purposes. The COVID-19 pandemic significantly hindered the ability of Defendants/Cross-Complainant's attorney to conduct the discovery as the stay at home order compelled closure of his solo practice. It is just and fair to reopen discovery for a short time.
- d. The Trial has Been Continued to December 18, 2020. The Court, due to the court closures caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, continued the trial in this matter till December 18, 2020. As such, under CCP § 2024.050(a) states "On motion of any party, the court may grant leave to complete discovery proceedings, or to have a motion concerning discovery heard, closer to the initial trial date, or to reopen discovery *after a new trial date has been set*." (emphasis added).

1	E.	Request for Order. It is	s the request of Defendants/Cross-Complainant to reopen discovery		
2	to a date for which Plaintiff Vidal can respond to discovery served on July 1, 2020 and if necessary, t				
3	compel appropriate answers.				
4					
5	DATED:	August 21, 2020	THE LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW FLORES		
6			By		
7			ANDREW FLORES Attorney for Defendants/Cross-Complainant		
8			CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS and PICK AX HOLDING		
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					