1	Please note:	
2	It reflects the law as of the date we completed it. Becau	arch and writing project we did for a customer some time ago. se the law may have changed since that time, please use it
3	solely to evaluate the scope and quality of our work.	
4	If you have questions or comments, please contact Jim	Schenkel at 415-553-4000, or email info@quojure.com.
5		
6	Attorney for Plaintiff	
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	COUNTY OF REDWOOD	
10	MARY JONES,	Case No.:
11	Plaintiff,	Ex Parte Application for Relief under Code of Civil Procedure § 473(b) from
12	vs.	Denial of Motion to Quash Subpoenas;
13	DEFCO, LLC, et al.,	Denial of Motion to Quash Subpoenas; Points and Authorities; Declaration of Louise Lawyer; [Proposed] Order
14	Defendants.	
15	/	
16	District Control of the Control of t	and a manufacture of the control of
17		art ex parte for an order granting discretionary
18		(b) from the Court's order denying plaintiff's
19		enas for the production of psychiatric and
20	psychotherapy records, or, in the alternative	ve, if the court finds that the facts do not
21	support discretionary relief, for an order gr	ranting mandatory relief based on the attached
	attorney affidavit of fault in the form of the	e declaration of plaintiff's counsel, Louise
22	Lawyer, as set forth in § 473(b).	
23		
24	Dated:	
25		Louise Lawyer Attorney for Plaintiff
26		•
27		
28		1

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Defendant is vigorously pursuing its demand that plaintiff's psychotherapists

comply with its subpoenas and turn over plaintiff's confidential mental health records. As

the matter now stands, those subpoenas are outstanding and the psychotherapists could

comply with them at any time. Once that sensitive personal information is disclosed to

defendants and their counsel, plaintiff will be irreparably harmed, since there will be no

way to unring the bell. It is essential, therefore, that this matter be heard as quickly as

possible, rather than waiting the several months it may take to have the matter heard on

2

3

4

1

This matter should be heard ex parte. 1.

5 6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13

14

Plaintiff is entitled to relief under Code of Civil Procedure § 473(b). 2.

15 16 17 18 19

formal noticed motion.

A party may apply for an order granting relief from default under § 473(b) "upon any such terms as may be just ... from a judgment, dismissal, order or other proceeding taken against him or her through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect." Relief may be granted for any step taken in a case whether by the court or by one of the parties. Zellerino v. Brown (1991) 235 Cal. App.3d 1097, 1105. Granting relief is either discretionary, based on the court's examination of the facts and circumstances surrounding the default, or mandatory, if the attorney for the party seeking relief files an "affidavit of fault." Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b).

22 23

20

21

24 25

26 27

28

In this case, plaintiff and her counsel seek relief from the order entered refusing to quash subpoenas duces tecum directed to plaintiff's psychotherapists because plaintiff's motion to quash did not include a separate statement as required under California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1345(a). This relief should be granted on the grounds that plaintiff's counsel failed to grasp that the phrase "in a deposition" could refer also to production of documents without the giving of oral deposition testimony. The facts are

set forth in the attached declaration of Louise Lawyer, plaintiff's counsel.

Plaintiff seeks discretionary relief or, in the alternative, mandatory relief from the default. Under § 473(b) relief is mandatory on the filing of the attorney affidavit of fault even if the attorney's neglect is "inexcusable." *Beeman v. Burling* (1990) 216 Cal.App.3d 1586, 1604. Here, the error relates in part to counsel's lack of knowledge that a separate statement was required in connection with the motion to quash subpoenas for production of documents.

3. The factual basis for granting relief

As set forth in more detail in counsel's declaration, the events that led to the default are as follows:

Defendant served on plaintiff's psychotherapists subpoenas for the production of business records, seeking plaintiff's confidential mental health records. Such information is privileged. Evid. Code § 1014. The psychotherapist-patient privilege is an aspect of the patient's constitutional right to privacy. *Roe v. Superior Court* (1991) 229 Cal.App.3d 832, 837; Cal. Const., Art. 1, § 1.

But because plaintiff's complaint included claims for emotional distress damages, defendant was entitled to inquire about her emotional health. Plaintiff adamantly opposed the release of that information, and instead agreed to dismiss her claims for emotional distress damages if defendant would withdraw the subpoenas. Plaintiff did dismiss those claims, but defendant reneged on its agreement to withdraw the subpoenas, and continues to insist that the psychotherapists produce their records.

Plaintiff moved to quash the subpoenas, but through counsel's misunderstanding the motion was incomplete because it lacked the separate statement required under California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1345(a). Although defendant did not raise this defect in its papers, and neither defendant nor the court mentioned it at the hearing, the court denied plaintiff's motion to quash because of that deficiency in the moving papers.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiff's ex parte motion for relief under Code of Civil Procedure § 473 should be granted on a discretionary basis because the inconvenience of a missing separate statement is far outweighed by the irreparable harm that will result if plaintiff's psychiatric and psychotherapy records are disclosed to opposing counsel and to defendants. In the alternative, because plaintiff's attorney has filed her "attorney affidavit of fault," relief is mandatory.

The matter should be resolved ex parte to avoid the irreparable harm that will result if plaintiff's mental health records are divulged before this matter can be heard on noticed motion.

Respectfully submitted,

LOUISE LAWYER Attorney for Plaintiff

DECLARATION OF LOUISE LAWYER

I, Louise Lawyer, declare as follows:

I am an attorney licensed to practice in the State of California, and the attorney of record for plaintiff Mary Jones in this action. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth below.

1.	The details of the underlying	motion to quash deposition subpoenas for the
production o	of business records that defenda	nt served on plaintiff's psychotherapists are
contained in	my declaration dated	, in support of that motion. Briefly, the
parties had a	greeed that defendant would w	ithdraw its subpoenas on plaintiff's
psychothera	pists in return for plaintiff's dis	missal of her claims for emotional distress

2	that it was entitled to her mental health records.	
3	2. When I was preparing the motion to quash the subpoenas, I read the	
4	requirements of California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1345(a), which calls for a separate	
5	statement in connection with certain discovery motions. The only one that might have	
6	applied was Rule 3.1345(a)(5), a motion "to quash the production of documents or	
7	tangible things at a deposition." (Emphasis added.) Since the records sought to be	
8	produced here were simply to be copied and produced to defendants' counsel, and not in	
9	connection with a deposition at which oral testimony was to be taken, I mistakenly	
10	thought that the separate statement was not required.	
11	3. I accept full responsibility for my failure to include a separate statement	
12	with plaintiff's motion to quash subpoenas. A proposed separate statement is attached as	
13	Exhibit A.	
14	4. This matter should be heard and decided ex parte because of the risk that	
15	plaintiff's confidential mental health records may be divulged to defendants and their	
16	counsel before the matter can be heard on a formal, noticed motion. My client has	
17	repeatedly insisted to me that she does not want the records released. Yet defendant's	
18	counsel wrote to me on, saying: "We intend to vigorously pursue	
19	compliance with the subpoenas."	
20	5. Based on this declaration, and my acknowledgment of responsibility for	
21	plaintiff's incomplete motion to quash subpoenas, I am requesting that, under Code of	
22	Civil Procedure § 473(b), the court grant relief from its order entered, and	
23	that the court grant plaintiff's motion to quash deposition subpoenas for the production of	
24	business records, filed	
25	6. On, ata.m. {**NOTE: before 10 a.m.!**}, I notified	
26	defendants' counsel when and where this application would be made. [OR spell out	
27	unsuccessful efforts to reach opposing counsel.}	
28	E	

1 | damages, but even after plaintiff did dismiss those claims defendant continued to insist

1	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the	
2	foregoing is true and correct.	
3		
4	Dated:	
5	Louise Lawyer	
6		
7	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE	
8	APPLICATION FOR RELIEF UNDER CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE	
9	§ 473(b) FROM DENIAL OF MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENAS	
10	Application having been made by plaintiff Mary Jones for relief under Code of	
11	Civil Procedure § 473(b) from the court's order denying her motion to quash deposition	
12	subpoenas for the production of business records, dated, and good cause	
13	appearing therefor,	
14	IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion, now being complete with the addition of	
15	the separate statement required under California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1345(a)(5), is	
16	GRANTED , and the deposition subpoenas for production of business records served by	
17	defendant on plaintiff's psychotherapists, [redacted], are hereby QUASHED.	
18		
19	Dated:	
20	Index of the Superior Count	
21	Judge of the Superior Court	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	6	

Ex Parte Application for Relief under Code of Civil Procedure § 473(b) from Denial of Motion to Quash Subpoenas; Points and Authorities; Declaration of Louise Lawyer; [Proposed] Order

1		
2		
3		
4	Attorney for Plaintiff	
5		
6		
7	,	
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	COUNTY OF REDWOOD	
10	MARY JONES,	Case No.:
11	Plaintiff,	SEPARATE STATEMENT RE MOTION TO QUASH DEPOSITION
12	vs.	SUBPOENAS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF BUSINESS
13	DEFCO, LLC, et al.,	RECORDS [CRC, Rule 3.1345(a)(5)]
14	Defendants.	[ORO, Rule 3.1343(a)(3)]
15		
16	Inspection demand No 1:	
17		CALIFORNIA TO: [redacted]:
18		ness records described in item 3, as follows:
19	·	, Location: [redacted] by delivering a true,
20	legible, and durable copy of the business reco	
21	inner wrapper with the title and number of the	
22	subpoena clearly written on it. The inner wrap	
23	envelope or wrapper, sealed, and mailed to the deposition officer at the address in item 1.	
24		
25	sooner than 20 days after the issuance of the c	·
26	whichever date is later). Reasonable costs of le	
27	,	<i>y</i> , <i>y</i> : 1 11 12 01
28	7	

1	copying them, and postage, if any, are recoverable as set forth in Evidence Code
2	§ 1563(b). The records shall be accompanied by an affidavit of the custodian or other
3	qualified witness pursuant to Evidence Code section 1561.
4	3. The records to be produced are described as follows: All records and documents
5	pertaining to Mary Jones, including medical records relating to treatment rendered to
6	Mary Jones and any notes, files, records relating thereto.
7	4. IF YOU HAVE BEEN SERVED WITH THIS SUBPOENA AS A
8	CUSTODIAN OF CONSUMER OR EMPLOYEE RECORDS UNDER CODE OF
9	CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 1985.3 OR 1985.6 AND A MOTION TO QUASH OR
10	AN OBJECTION HAS BEEN SERVED ON YOU, A COURT ORDER OR
11	AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES, WITNESSES, AND CONSUMER OR
12	EMPLOYEE AFFECTED MUST BE OBTAINED BEFORE YOU ARE REQUIRED
13	TO PRODUCE CONSUMER OR EMPLOYEE RECORDS.
l4	DISOBEDIENCE OF THIS SUBPOENA MAY BE PUNISHED AS A
15	CONTEMPT BY THIS COURT. YOU WILL ALSO BE LIABLE FOR THE SUM OF
16	FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS AND ALL DAMAGES RESULTING FROM YOUR
17	FAILURE TO OBEY.
18	Date issued:
19	Response, answer, or objection:
20	The motion [for order quashing deposition subpoena for production of business
21	records] will be made on the ground that there is no good cause for production of the
22	documents sought. In that Plaintiff has dismissed her claims for emotional distress and
23	the records sought are those of Plaintiff's psychotherapists. Thus, since there are no
24	claims for emotional distress damages, there is no need to subpoena the records of
25	Plaintiff's psychotherapists.
26	Factual and legal reasons for compelling further responses, answers, or production:
27	Not applicable.
28	8

1	Definitions, instructions, and other matters required to understand each request:
2	Not applicable.
3	Dependencies on responses given to another discovery request:
4	None.
5	Relevant pleadings, other documents in the file, or other items of discovery:
6	The complaint contained claims for emotional distress damages. These claims
7	were dismissed on, rendering the mental health information sought by
8	defendants' subpoenas irrelevant. Further details concerning the procedural history and
9	correspondence of counsel are contained in the Declaration of Louise Lawyer in support
10	of motion to quash deposition subpoenas for business records, dated Briefly,
11	defendants' counsel agreed to withdraw the subpoenas if the claims for emotional distress
12	damages were dismissed, but following their dismissal counsel continued, and continues,
13	to insist that such information be disclosed by plaintiff's psychotherapists.
14	
15	Inspection demand No. 2:
16	
17	[A second demand, identical to the first, has been redacted.]
18	
19	
20	Dated: LOUISE LAWYER
21	Attorney for Plaintiff Mary Jones
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	9