

September 10, 2012

MICHAEL D. ROUNDS¹
MATTHEW D. FRANCIS²

ARTHUR A. ZORIO¹
RYAN E. JOHNSON
MATTHEW G. HOLLAND
ADAM P. McMILLEN²
ADAM YOWELL¹
STEVEN CALOJARO¹

OF COUNSEL-
KELLY G. WATSON¹
MARC D. FOODMAN^{1,3}
STEVEN T. POLIKALAS^{1,4}

¹ Also licensed in California
² Also licensed in Utah
³ Also licensed in Massachusetts
⁴ Also licensed in Tennessee

5371 Kietzke Lane
Reno, Nevada 89511
(775) 324-4100
Fax (775) 333-8171
renoinfo@watsonrounds.com

10000 West Charleston Blvd.
Suite 240
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135
(702) 636-4902
Fax (702) 636-4904
vegasinfo@watsonrounds.com

One Embarcadero Center
Suite 4100
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415)243-4090
Fax (415)243-0226
sfinfo@watsonrounds.com

www.watsonrounds.com

Reply to: Reno_1

Reza Zandian
8775 Costa Verde Blvd.
San Diego, CA 92122


Re: *Margolin v. Zandian, et al.*
First Judicial District Court, Case No. 090C00579 1B

Dear Mr. Zandian:

On July 16, 2012, we served you with Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Admission. Your responses to those requests were due on or before August 20, 2012. However, you have not yet responded. "The sanction for failure to serve timely answers or objections to requests for admissions is that all matters in the request are deemed admitted." *Wagner v. Carex Investigations & Sec. Inc.*, 93 Nev. 627, 630, 572 P.2d 921, 923 (1977).

Also, on July 16, 2012, we served you with Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories. Since you did not respond to the interrogatories, any objections to the interrogatories are deemed waived. *See* NRCP 33(b)(4). In addition, as the requesting party, we "may seek an order compelling discovery if the other party 'fails to answer an interrogatory submitted under Rule 33.'" *United States v. Parker*, 2:08-CV-01200-LDG, 2011 WL 5325475 (D. Nev. 2011) (*citing* Rule 37(a)(3)(B)(iii)). "An evasive or incomplete response must be treated as a failure to respond." *Id.* (*citing* Rule 37(a)(4)).

Also, on July 16, 2012, we served you with Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents. You did not respond to these requests either. "Rule 34 permits each party to serve the opposing party with document requests, and states that the party 'to whom the request is directed must respond in writing within 30 days after being served,' unless the parties stipulate or the court permits a shorter or longer time period." *Haddad v. Interstate Mgmt. Co., LLC*, 2:11-CV-01265-PMP, 2012 WL 398764 (D. Nev. 2012) (*citing* Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(a) and (b)(2)(A)). "If a party fails to file timely objections to [discovery] requests, such failure constitutes a waiver of any objections which a party might have to the requests." *Ramirez v. County of Los Angeles*, 231 F.R.D. 407, 409 (C.D. Cal. 2005) (*quoting* *Krewson v. City of Quincy*, 120 F.R.D. 6, 7 (D. Mass 1988)); *see also Richmark Corp v. Timber Falling Consultants*, 959 F.2d 1468, 1473 (9th Cir. 1992) (holding that the "failure to object to



Reza Zandian
September 10, 2012
Page 2

discovery requests within the time required constitutes a waiver of any objection.").

It is hereby demanded that you respond, without objection, to the requests for admissions, the requests to produce documents (including the actual production of documents), and the interrogatories no later than September 17, 2012. If you do not provide proper responses to these requests by September 17, 2012, we will be forced to immediately file a motion to compel such responses. *See* Rule 37(a)(3)(B)(iii) and (iv).

Please call me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Adam P. McMillen

WATSON ROUNDS
A Professional Corporation