

1 Matt Steiner, #101409 KAMINE, STEINER & UNGERER 2 350 South Figueroa Street, Suite 250 Los Angeles, California 90071 ORIGINAL FILED 3 (213) 972 0119 4 JUL 29 1992 5 Attorneys for C. E. BUGGY, INC. LOS ANGLLLS SUPERIOR COURT 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT 10 11 12 SWINERTON & WALBERG, etc., et al., No. BC 029478 13 Plaintiff, And Consolidated Cases VS. 14 OPPOSITION OF C. E. BUGGY HUNTINGTON HOTEL PARTNERS, et al., TO BANK'S MOTION TO 15 EXTEND DISCOVERY CUTOFF Defendants. 16 Hearing DATE: August 6, 1992 17 AND CONSOLIDATED ACTIONS TIME: 1:30 PM DEPT. 18 Discovery Cut-off 8/15/92 19 Motions Cut-off 9/30/92 Trial Date None Set 20 21 I. ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION TO DAI-ICHI-KANGYO BANK'S MOTION TO EXTEND DISCOVERY CUT-OFF DATE 22 23 24 Generations to come will hear lawyers tell 25 of the Case of the Huntington Ritz-Carlton Hotel. It is the stuff of construction law lore-26 27 how law firms now numbering over two score slugged it out for months, and then on into years, 28

003.042

-1-

1 while their fee bills confirmed all their clients' worst fears. 2 It seemed for a time that total deforestation 3 Would come from the paper used in this litigation. But one day a ray of hope appeared— 4 5 Lien claimants and counsel in one voice all cheered. 6 That was the day that Commissioner Levin 7 handed us one little piece of heaven 8 by stating ex cathedra, as we all remember 9 "This case will go to trial no later than December." 10 11 I represent C. E. Buggy, a subcontractor 12 who in this case is but one small factor. He's owed forty thousand-a decent amount, 14 but in a pool of ten million it doesn't much count. 15 All Buggy can do is offer his prayers 16 that despite the gymnastics of the megabuck players, 17 someday soon-maybe in just a little while-This titanic struggle will go to trial. 18 19 In our hearts there burns one tiny ember: 20 The case will start trial this year come December. 21 22 Now something has happened—The bank got new lawyers. With more and more ravenous paper destroyers, 23 these new gladiators put their staffs to new tests-24 25 One day they served seventy discovery requests! 26 New bevies of lawyers in their lofty aeries Demanded the utmost from their secretaries. 27 28 Scores of depositions were hastily set

and they're still not through noticing depositions yet. Because after all those, there are sure to be minions of experts, in depo, with well trained opinions. It may all be necessary, but just the same it's darn hard for Buggy to stay in this game. The battle of paper has become so extensive that just keeping the file open is very expensive. To make matters worse, the new guys want to extend the discovery that was long ago scheduled to end on August 15 (which was set back in May by Commissioner Levin as the very last day).

One can't fault Bank's new guys for giving their all when they've only just now had to pick up the ball. But while I understand what they're trying for their clients, the claimants and their counsel have placed much reliance on Commissioner Levin's pledge from the bench into which they would now throw a big monkey wrench.

21

22

23

24

25

26

Sure, Bank says the trial date won't be affected by extending discovery to the date they've selected. But I have to say, with all respect, that sooner or later we will have to expect a Motion to Continue the trial based upon the need of clients and counsel and experts to read, understand and give a lot of thought to all the discovery responses they've got. The discovery garnered will do them no good

27 28

003.042

If they don't get more time, to get it all understood.

So while they say "we won't throw the trial off track,"

I say "Heed this warning: In November, they'll be back."

Extending discovery for even just a short while sows a potential need for delaying the trial.

To encourage such a delay there is no real need because the existing cutoff was not only ordered, but agreed.

Besides, more time means more discovery served and the claimants are already sufficiently unnerved by the voluminous, duplicative requests they've received (which really do have to be seen to be believed).

As claimants, we don't find this all very funny—

Our cases are all "We did the work—you owe us the money."

(Of course there are competing claims of delays, but they don't affect most of the claimants in this case; Most subs and suppliers had their suits instituted over amounts which are essentially undisputed. The problem on this project is not the delays, or that it was not completed within so-many days. When finally stripped of all the posturing trash, the problem is simple: Owner ran out of cash!)

Please rein-in this bloodbath as much as you can by rejecting the extension-of-discovery plan. The new lawyers all want to test their mettle, but the claimants just want this darn mess to settle.

1	Nothing settles cases like a trial date
2	and there's no good reason to extend our wait.
3	Extending discovery by any amount
4	potentially delays the day of account.
5	Keep bright the star which has been beckoning—
6	A December 1992 Ritz-Carlton Day of Reckoning.
7	
8	II. AUTHORITY
9	The moving papers do not establish good cause for the extension per
10	CCP §2024(e).
11	BANK's moving papers do not demonstrate diligence in pursuing
12	discovery (CCP §2024(e)(2)).
13	The extension is likely to prevent the case from going to trial as
14	presently contemplated, for the reasons set forth above (CCP §2024(e)(3)).
15	
16	KAMINE, STEINER & UNGERER
17	11/10=0
18	Jan 17
19	by Matt Steiner, Attorneys for C. E. BUGGY, INC.
20	Attorneys for C. J. DOGGT, EVC.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	