1	JOHN THEODORE DEAN (State Bar No. 65600)			
2	Attorney at Law 2678 Raven Circle			
3	Corona, California 92882 Telephone: 951-734-3146			
4	Attorney for Defendants			
5	Attorney for Defendants ERIC PARK, TAL GOLAN, INFORMATION SUPERBRAND, INC., SPORTSPEDIA, INC.,			
6	TRAVELPEDIÁ, INC., and AUTOPEDÍA, INC.			
7	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
8	COUNTY OF ORANGE, CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER			
10	COUNTY OF ORANGE, CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER			
11	DAVID MA	ΔX,)	CASE NO: 30-2010-00357210	
12		Plaintiff,	Complaint Filed: March 25, 2010	
13	VS.		Trial Date: None Set	
14	ERIC PARK; TAL GOLAN; INFORMATION) SUPERBRAND, INC.; SPORTSPEDIA, INC.;) TRAVELPEDIA, INC.; AUTOPEDIA, INC.;)		OBJECTION TO DISCOVERY	
15	DOES 1 thro	DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,		
16	Defendants.			
17	·			
18				
19	Defendants ERIC PARK, TAL GOLAN, INFORMATION SUPERBRAND, INC.,			
20	SPORTSPEDIA, INC., TRAVELPEDIA, INC., and AUTOPEDIA, INC., ("Responding			
21	Parties") hereby object to the following discovery requests served by Plaintiff DAVID MAX on			
22	May 24, 2010:			
23	(A) Form Interrogatories to Defendant ERIC PARK			
24	(B) Special Interrogatories to Defendant ERIC PARK			
25	(C) Requests for Admissions to Defendant ERIC PARK		ant ERIC PARK	
26	(D) Demand to Produce Documents to Defendant ERIC PARK		Defendant ERIC PARK	
27	(E) Form Interrogatories to Defendant TAL GOLAN			
28	(F) Special Interrogatories to Defendant TAL GOLAN			
	1			
	MAX vs. PARK et al. OCSC CASE NO. 30-2010-00357210 OBJECTION TO DISCOVERY			
į	g ·			

////

- 2. In each case, the number of requests for admission exceeds 35, and although attorney for Plaintiff subsequently furnished the declaration required by Code of Civil Procedure section 2033.050, said party did not comply with code requirements at the time the requests for admission were initially served. In addition, the number of requests for admission is unwarranted, or it is unreasonable to require Responding Parties to answer within the normal time for a response. In addition, the requests for admission are duplicative, and it is unreasonable to require Responding Parties to separately respond to duplicate requests.
- 3. The scope of the foregoing discovery requests and the documents requested are overly broad, and the requests are beyond the scope of permissible discovery (not relevant to the subject matter or likely to lead to discovery of admissible evidence.) Compliance would be unreasonably difficult and expensive, such that the requests are oppressive and burdensome under the circumstances.
- 4. Plaintiff served as the trusted custodian of records for Responding Parties over the course of many years. Upon termination, Plaintiff failed and refused to return the corporate and business records belonging to Responding Parties, and Plaintiff wrongfully remains in possession of such records. Information necessary to complete responses is solely within the control and custody of Plaintiff. Therefore, the requests are intentionally designed to be oppressive and burdensome under the circumstances.
- 5. The information contained in responses is confidential and proprietary to Responding Parties as privileged or trade secrets. Plaintiff has already exhibited a tendency to improperly disclose confidential information belonging to Responding Parties publically. If responses were to be provided, Plaintiff likely would continue to wrongfully disclose such information.

Plaintiff has employed the entirety of the foregoing discovery requests as a 6. discovery method in a manner to specifically cause unwarranted annoyance, embarrassment, or oppression, or undue burden and expense. Dated: June 28, 2010 JOHN THEODORE DEAN, Attorney for Defendants ERIC PARK, TAL GOLAN, INFORMATION SUPERBRAND, INC., SPORTSPEDIA, INC., TRAVELPEDIA, INC., and AUTOPEDIA, INC.

PROOF OF SERVICE § 1013a(3) Code Civ. Proc. REVISED 1/1/88 2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE 3 I am employed in the County of Riverside, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is: 2678 Raven Circle, Corona, California 4 92882. 5 On June 28, 2010, I served the within documents described as: 6 **OBJECTION TO DISCOVERY** 7 on the interested parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed 8 envelope addressed as follows: 9 Ralph Rogari, Esq. Rehm & Rogari 12121 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 600 10 Los Angeles CA, 90025 11 XX BY MAIL: I deposited such envelope, with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the mail at 12 Corona, California. 13 I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Corona, California, in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the parties served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation 14 15 date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing affidavit. 16 BY FAX: I caused a copy to be transmitted via facsimile to the following telephone number between the hours of 8:30 am. and 5:00 p.m.: 17 BY PERSONAL SERVICE: I caused to be delivered such envelope by hand to the offices 18 of the addressees. XX (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the 20 above is true and correct. (Federal) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the Bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made. Executed on June 28, 2010, at Corona, California.

JOHN THEODORE DEAN

1

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28