

1)

Assuming that there is proper Subject Matter Jurisdiction and personal jurisdiction, the analysis are as follows:

1) The issue here is whether the court should rule in favor of Priscilla's motions to compel further responses to her interrogatories to Grocery

When a party files a complaint, he/she may not send more than 25 interrogatories at a time. Interrogatories may be sent at any time to any party involved. Once an interrogatory has been filed, parties must respond by denying or admitting with reasonable belief and knowledge that their answers are truthful and to the best of their abilities.

Here, Priscilla sent **26** interrogatories. Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, she may only send 25. Grocery's response was vague when it said "Objection. These interrogatories are flawed." If Priscilla had sent only 25 interrogatories, then her motion to compel further responses from Grocery to understand what exactly is flawed about the interrogatories would have been proper. Priscilla asked for the names and addresses of every Grocery employee who worked on the construction of the soda display that fell on her and every soda company employee who did so. She also asked for a copy of every training manual Grocery has used in training its employees. These requests would have been proper if she may **only** sent send a set of **25** interrogatories. Since Priscilla sent a set of **26** interrogatories, the court would likely strike the last interrogatory, #26 - "please provide copies of every training manual Grocery has used in training its employees."

Therefore, the court should grant Priscilla's motion to compel further responses to interrogatory #25, but deny #26. .

2) The issue here is whether the court should deny Grocery's motion to compel

Discovery requests can be made after a Rule 26(f) conference has been had. The conference allows the parties to discuss with the court a timeline for when information can be exchanged, what information needs to be exchanged, and identify issues to be argued in court. There are required disclosures that each party must make such as any documents, tangible things, and ESI's that are useful to their own case or the other party's case. A party may request the opposing party to submit to mental and physical examination if the requesting party reasonably believes that the opposing party requires one. The court must grant approval for a party to receive a mental or physical examination. These exams are useful to assist counsel, parties, and the court to determine the severity of the injury, receive an explanation from a doctor, and assess the parties overall health. Discovery requests outside of the scope of the cause of action are not usually allowed. The attorney requesting the exam usually chooses the doctor. The results of the exam must be sent to the requesting counsel (opposing party here) and the injured party/plaintiff may ask to receive a copy of the exam.

Here, Grocery properly made a request for Priscilla to submit to a physical exam because a very large display of bottled soda products fell on her, bruising her head and entire body. A doctor would be able to examine the severity of her injuries and speak to the impact of the bottle falling on her. Grocery would choose the doctor that Priscilla is to go see. The results of the examination must be sent to Grocery's counsel and Priscilla may ask the doctor for a copy of the results as well. Grocery arguably made a proper request for Priscilla to submit to a mental exam because she was hit in the head and her head was bruised. She could have a concussion and there is reason for Grocery to doubt her level of competency and reasonably believe that she has concussion that would affect her judgment. Priscilla would argue that she would not need a mental exam and ultimately, the court would decided whether she needs a mental exam. Lastly, Grocery improperly made a discovery request for Priscilla's tax returns since 2015. Priscilla has sued grocery for negligently maintaining the display and sought damages for her medical expenses, pain and suffering, and lost wages. Priscilla's tax returns have nothing to do with the allegations and thus are made improperly.

Therefore, the court should grant Grocery's motion to compel Priscilla to submit to a mental and physical examination, but deny Priscilla's tax returns since 1995.

3) The issue here is whether Grocery's properly responded to Priscilla's interrogatory about its expert

Experts may be hired to determine a situation related to the issue at hand. Work product is any information that a party created in anticipation of trial. Expert's may be hired in anticipation of trial and any information and conclusions made by the expert would be deemed privileged information.

Here, before Priscilla filed her lawsuit, but after the injury occurred, Grocery hired Xavier, an expert on grocery store displays to investigate the accident. Although his findings were unfavorable and Grocery has not identified Xavier as a witness, Grocery is not required to provide the names of all experts it hired for the litigation.

Therefore, Grocery properly responded to Priscilla's interrogatory about its expert because this information is privileged work product.

4) The issue is whether the court should sustain Grocery's assertion of privilege with regard to Xavier.

If a party makes a proper privilege assertion, courts usually sustain the privilege. An individual that has actual or apparent authority to act behalf of another party may be deemed an agent. Work performed during the ordinary course of business is not privileged and will be required to be produced to the other party, whether it is favorable or not.

Here, Xavier is an independent contractor, but works exclusively for Grocery, and would be deemed to have actual and apparent authority to act on behalf of Grocery. If the court finds that the work that Xavier performed was routine and during the ordinary course of business, the court may require Grocery to produce the results to Priscilla. If after every accident, Xavier performs an assessment and performs an investigation, then this information would not be privileged.

Therefore, if the court finds that Xavier investigating the accident was during the ordinary course of business, the court would likely sustain Grocery's privilege assertion with regard to Xavier and require Grocery to compel the names and opinions that Xavier made.

Question #1 Final Word Count = 1057

END OF EXAM