| | Case 2:10-cv-00899-JWS Document 68 | 39 Filed 10/09/15 Page 1 of 6 |
|---|---|---|
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAM A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations RONALD J. HOLLAND, Cal. Bar No. 1486 rholland@sheppardmullin.com ELLEN M. BRONCHETTI, Cal. Bar No. 22 ebronchetti@sheppardmullin.com PAUL S. COWIE, Cal. Bar No. 250131 (Pro pcowie@sheppardmullin.com Four Embarcadero Center, 17th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-4109 Telephone: 415-434-9100 Facsimile: 415-434-3947 Attorneys for Defendants SWIFT TRANSPORTATION CO. OF ARIZONA, LLC, INTERSTATE EQUIPME LEASING, LLC, CHAD KILLEBREW and JERRY MOYES | 87 (Pro Hac Vice) 6975 (Pro Hac Vice) Hac Vice) |
| | | |
| 11 | INITED STATES | DISTRICT COURT |
| 12 | | ICT OF ARIZONA |
| 13 | FOR THE DISTR | ICT OF ARIZONA |
| 14 | W' ' ' W. D Like Dec. 1. and | Case No. CV 10 800 DUV IWS |
| 15 | Virginia Van Dusen; John Doe 1; and Joseph Sheer, individually and on behalf of | Case No. CV 10-899-PHX-JWS DECLARATION OF ROBERT |
| 16 | all other similarly situated persons, | MUSSIG IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS SWIFT |
| 17 18 | Plaintiffs, | TRANSPORTATION CO. OF ARIZONA, LLC AND INTERSTATE |
| 18 19 | V. | EQUIPMENT LEASING, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' |
| 20 | Swift Transportation Co., Inc.; Interstate Equipment Leasing, Inc.; Chad Killibrew; | MOTION FOR SANCTIONS |
| 20 | and Jerry Moyes, | [Filed Concurrently with Opposition] |
| 21 | Defendants. | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 20 | SMRH:473353598.1 | Case No. CV 10-899-PHX-JWS USSIG DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' |
| | | PPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR SANCTIONS |

DECLARATION OF ROBERT MUSSIG

I, Robert Mussig, declare as follows:

I am an attorney for Defendants Swift Transportation Co. of Arizona, LLC;
 Interstate Equipment Leasing, LLC; Chad Killebrew; and Jerry Moyes in the above
 referenced action. I am an associate with the law firm Sheppard, Mullin, Richter &
 Hampton. I make this declaration based on my own personal knowledge and, if called as a
 witness, I could and would testify competently concerning the facts set forth below.

9

1

2

3

Immediately following the Court's July 15, 2015 order compelling Plaintiffs'
 requests for production, Defendants began analyzing the order in order to determine
 exactly which documents they were required to produce, and also began searching for
 responsive documents.

14

3. Less than two weeks later, Plaintiffs' counsel, Dan Getman, contacted me 15 and requested a status update on the document production. In response, I explained: "We 16 have been working diligently to ascertain precisely which documents Swift must produce 17 18 in order to comply with the Court's discovery order, and to obtain those documents from our client so they can be produced." I instructed Plaintiffs' counsel that Defendants 19 20 "obviously intend to comply with the Court's order fully and in good faith." At no point did I or any of Defendants' other attorneys ever indicate that Defendants would 21 refuse to produce responsive documents. Defendants diligently continued searching for 22 responsive documents in both Swift and IEL's voluminous records. Attached hereto as 23 Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of my email to Plaintiffs' counsel. 24

25

4. Plaintiffs' followed up again approximately one month later. On August 31,
27 2015, Mr. Getman emailed me and asked about the status of the production. Attached
28 hereto as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of Mr. Getman's email.

Case No. CV 10-899-PHX-JWS

| 1 | 5. On September 4, 2015, less than a week after receiving Mr. Getman's email, | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2 | Defendants produced nearly a thousand pages of documents. The documents produced | | |
| 3 | directly address whether Plaintiffs are independent contracts or employees. Such | | |
| 4 | documents include: Plaintiffs' Owner Operator agreements; Plaintiffs' leasing | | |
| 5 | agreements; all Owner Operator agreement templates used within the last ten years; | | |
| 6 | recruiting materials such as brochures and magazine, radio, and internet advertisements; all | | |
| 7 | five versions of the information packet given to new Owner Operators within recent years; | | |
| 8 | training materials including manuals, booklets, and presentations; policy documents on | | |
| 9 | topics such as to whom IEL leases trucks; and Plaintiffs' Company Driver personnel files | | |
| 10 | including their employment applications, DAC employment history reports, and | | |
| 11 | performance reviews. These documents are responsive to several of Plaintiffs' requests for | | |
| 12 | production, such as: | | |
| 13 | • The owner operator contract templates used in the last ten years. [Responsive to | | |
| 14 | Request No. 3] | | |
| 15 | • Each and every owner operator contract signed by the named Plaintiffs along with | | |
| 16 | • Each and every owner operator contract signed by the named Flamthis along with accompanying documents. [Responsive to Request Nos. 4 and 64] | | |
| 17 | accompanying documents. [Responsive to Request Nos. 4 and 04] | | |
| 18 | • Each and every equipment lease signed by the named Plaintiffs. [Responsive to | | |
| 19 | Request No. 8, 10, and 76] | | |
| 20 | • A spreadsheet of each named Plaintiffs' driver movement details listing information | | |
| 21 | such as the origin, designation, and miles of every trip taken. [Responsive to | | |
| 22 | Request No. 34] | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | • Contracts and brochures from companies that owner operators can but do not | | |
| 25 | necessarily have to contract with for services such as health insurance or accounting | | |
| 26 | services. [Responsive to Request No. 79] | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | -2- Case No. CV 10-899-PHX-JWS | | |
| | -2- Case No. CV 10-899-PHX-JWS SMRH:473353598.1 MUSSIG DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' | | |

| 1 | |
|---|--|
| 1 | • Documents related to the cancelation of contracts between Defendants and the |
| 2 | named Plaintiffs. [Responsive to Request Nos. 12 and 54] |
| 3 4 5 | • Various Owner Operator recruiting materials, including internet, radio, magazine, and other print advertisements. [Responsive to Request No. 24] |
| 6 | • Training and policy materials, including mentor training program agreements, |
| 7 | handouts, booklets, and presentations. [Responsive to Request Nos. 35, 36, 37, 38, |
| 8 | 94, and 96] |
| 9 10 11 12 13 | • Personnel files of the named-Plaintiffs' for the time period that they worked as company drivers, which includes documents such as employment applications, performance evaluations, and DAC employment history files. [Responsive to Request Nos. 43, 44, 45, and 53] |
| 14 | 6. On September 4, 2015, in connection with Defendants' document |
| 15 | production, I informed Plaintiffs' counsel by email that Defendants were still searching for |
| 16 | documents and would produce them as soon as they were located. Attached hereto as |
| 17 | Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of my email September 4, 2015 email. |
| 18 | |
| 19 | 7. On September 10, 2015, Plaintiffs' counsel, Lesley Tse, emailed regarding a |
| 20 | separate matter. In her email, she conceded that Plaintiffs seek the documents at issue here |
| 21 | in order to prepare for the depositions of Defendants' corporate representatives under |
| 22 | FRCP 30(b)(6). Attached hereto as Exhibit D is a true and correct copy of Ms. Tse's |
| 23 | email. |
| 24 | |
| 25 | 8. Following Defendants' production and status update, Plaintiffs never |
| 26 | contacted Defendants again regarding any potential motion. Plaintiffs never informed |
| 27 | Defendants that they would file a motion because they had not yet received the remainder |
| 28 | -3-Case No. CV 10-899-PHX-JWSSMRH:473353598.1MUSSIG DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR SANCTIONS |

of the document production. Plaintiffs never tried to reach a compromise with Defendants regarding a timeline to produce the remaining documents.

9. Defendants have continued to produce documents even after Plaintiffs filed their motion. All told, Defendants have produced nearly two thousand pages of documents in response to the Court's order. Defendants have produced essentially all documents pertaining to the named plaintiffs, as well as the vast majority of the policies that would have applied to them. Defendants have produced over three thousand pages of documents throughout the pendency of the litigation.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this Declaration was executed on October 9, 2015, at Los Angeles, California.

| 14 | |
|----|-------------------------------|
| 15 | /s/ Robert Mussig |
| 16 | Robert Mussig |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |
| | -4- Case No. CV 10-899-PHX-JV |

OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

| | Case 2:10-cv-00899-JWS Document 689 Filed 10/09/15 Page 6 of 6 |
|----|--|
| | |
| 1 | CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE |
| 2 | I hereby certify that on October 9, 2015, I electronically transmitted the attached |
| 3 | document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a |
| 4 | Notice of Electronic filing to the following CM/ECF registrants: |
| 5 | Susan Joan Martin |
| 6 | Jennifer Lynn Kroll Martin & Bonnett PLLC |
| 7 | 1850 N. Central Ave.; Ste. 2010 Phoenix, AZ 85004 |
| 8 | Dan Getman |
| 9 | Edward John Tuddenham Lesley Tse |
| 10 | Getman & Sweeney, PLLC 9 Paradies La. |
| 11 | New Paltz, NY 12561 |
| 12 | Attorneys for Defendants |
| 13 | /s/ Ronald Holland |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | -5- Case No. CV 10-899-PHX-JWS |
| | SMRH:473353598.1 MUSSIG DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR SANCTIONS |