

1 Gregory J. Marshall (#019886)
Taryn J. Gallup (#035002)
2 Amanda Z. Weaver (#034644)
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
3 One Arizona Center
400 E. Van Buren, Suite 1900
4 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
Telephone: 602.382.6000
5 gmarshall@swlaw.com
tgallup@swlaw.com
6 aweaver@swlaw.com

7 David B. Chenkin (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Kenneth C. Rudd (*admitted pro hac vice*)
8 ZEICHNER ELLMAN & KRAUSE LLP
1211 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor
9 New York, NY 10036
212.223.0400
10 dchenkin@zeklaw.com
krudd@zeklaw.com

11 *Attorneys for Defendants U.S. Bank National*
12 *Association and Hilda H. Chavez*

13 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

14 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

15 PETER S. DAVIS, as Receiver of
DENSCO INVESTMENT
16 CORPORATION, an Arizona corporation,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 U.S. BANK, NA, a national banking
organization; HILDA H. CHAVEZ and
20 JOHN DOE CHAVEZ, a married couple;
JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., a
21 national banking organization;
SAMANTHA NELSON f/k/a
22 SAMANTHA KUMBALECK and
KRISTOFER NELSON, a married couple;
23 and VIKRAM DADLANI and JANE DOE
DADLANI, a married couple.

24 Defendants.
25

No. CV2019-011499

**JOINT STATEMENT OF
DISCOVERY OR DISCLOSURE
DISPUTE RE PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE
OF RULE 30(B)(6) DEPOSITION
REGARDING TWENTY (20)
CHECKS**

(Assigned to the Hon. Dewain D. Fox)

26 On August 25, 2022, this Court ordered a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of U.S. Bank and
27 directed the parties' counsel to work together to narrow the Rule 30 (b)(6) notice to "the
28 twenty (20) checks and the databases discussed." The parties have since conferred, but

1 were unable to reach agreement regarding the inclusion of paragraph (c) of the attached
2 Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notice that Plaintiff has proposed. *See* Ex. A. Thus, in compliance
3 with the Court’s August 25, 2022 Order, the parties now file this joint statement.

4 **U.S. Bank’s Statement:**

5 As a reminder, the Court authorized deposition inquiry into U.S. Bank’s retention
6 schedules regarding certain cashier’s check transactions that U.S. Bank *reversed* in early
7 2014 (*i.e.*, the bank voided the transactions and did not pay the checks), and for which U.S.
8 Bank understandably had no record of by the time Plaintiff finally filed this lawsuit in late
9 2019. Since the Court’s Order, U.S. Bank produced its retention schedules, showing how
10 any documentation of those *reversed* cashier’s check transactions fell beyond retention by
11 the time Plaintiff filed this lawsuit.¹ Against this backdrop, U.S. Bank provides its position
12 regarding Plaintiff’s proposed topic (c):

13 Plaintiff’s deposition topics (a)(1)-(5) and (b) fully cover the discovery this Court
14 authorized in its Order, but Plaintiff’s proposed topic (c), seeking testimony about U.S.
15 Bank’s “efforts” in responding to two document subpoenas served on U.S. Bank in 2016
16 and 2017 in another, now dismissed lawsuit, goes too far. Topic (c) is improper and should
17 be disallowed for several reasons.

18 First, neither of the subpoenas sought documentation of the checks at issue. As to
19 the 2016 subpoena, Plaintiff limited the sought-after production in its cover letter to “front
20 and back copies of all cashier’s checks paid from the accounts,” and the 2017 subpoena
21 primarily sought “communications.” A reasonable, responsive search would not have
22 included documentation of *reversed* check transactions, as those checks were not “paid”
23 from the account. Moreover, Plaintiff did not dispute the adequacy of U.S. Bank’s
24 productions in that now dismissed lawsuit, even though Plaintiff possessed copies of the
25 *reversed* cashier’s checks at issue and was accordingly aware of them.

26
27 ¹ Plaintiff insists that federal law and the bank’s retention schedules required the bank to
28 retain these records through the filing of this lawsuit. U.S. Bank welcomes the argument,
as Plaintiff is plainly wrong on both points.

1 Second, the retention schedules for documentation of the *reversed* cashier check
2 transactions at issue lapsed *before* the first of the subpoenas was served on U.S. Bank, so
3 U.S. Bank would not have possessed documents of these transactions by the time it
4 responded to the 2016 subpoena anyway. For this reason, deposition inquiry on this topic
5 could not yield any relevant information.

6 Third, the subject of U.S. Bank's compliance with either subpoena in a now
7 dismissed case cannot be raised in this Court, nor did the service of either subpoena put
8 U.S. Bank on reasonable notice that it would be sued by Plaintiff in 2019 such that U.S.
9 Bank's duty to preserve documents was triggered per Ariz. R. Civ. P. 37(g)(1) by its receipt
10 of either subpoena.

11 Fourth, Plaintiff's topic (c) (*i.e.*, the bank's "efforts" in responding to subpoenas) is
12 suffused with attorney / client privileged information, as the department that complies with
13 subpoenas is part of the law division, and the paralegals tasked with responding to
14 subpoenas work at the direction and supervision of the bank's legal counsel. Yet, Plaintiff's
15 proposed topic (c) purports to invade that privilege by inquiring into why the law division
16 made the decisions that it did in responding to these subpoenas.

17 Fifth, Plaintiff's topic (c) imposes a disproportionate burden on U.S. Bank, which
18 would task U.S. Bank with reconstructing decisions legal division personnel made five (5)
19 and six (6) years ago responding to subpoenas Plaintiff deemed satisfied in a now dismissed
20 case – two of thousands of subpoenas legal division personnel have processed since – all
21 without the prospect of benefiting the litigation process in this case in any meaningful way.
22 For these reasons, the Court should disallow Plaintiff's proposed topic (c).

23 **Plaintiff's Position:**

24 U.S. Bank's response to subpoenas issued by the Receiver in 2016 and 2017 is not a
25 new topic. It was included in the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notice that was the subject of the
26 parties' August 8, 2022 Joint Statement of Discovery or Disclosure Dispute; and the
27 subpoena response was the first topic addressed by the Receiver in its portion of the Joint
28

1 Statement.² In keeping with the Court's August 25, 2022, Order, the previous request for
2 testimony regarding the subpoena response has been limited to the 20 Cashier's Checks for
3 which the Court authorized Rule 30(b)(6) deposition testimony.
4

5 The subpoenas are related to this case. The Receiver was appointed in August 2016
6 in *Arizona Corporation Commission v. DenSco*, CV 2016-14126. This is an on-going civil
7 action, and overlaps with this case. In November 2016, the Receiver subpoenaed records
8 from US Bank. The subpoena was broad.³ In particular, the subpoena paragraph (2)(c)
9 requested:
10

11 For the period from January 1, 2010 to date, all documents that refer to, relate to, or
12 concern any transaction in any account, including, but not limited to, the front and
13 back of canceled checks, front and back of any cashier's checks, wire transfer
documents, deposit slips and withdrawal slips.⁴

14 The 20 cashier's checks were issued by US Bank and given to the customer Menaged's
15
16

17 ² The Plaintiff and US Bank disagree of the federal law regarding retention of records;
18 whether US Bank's policies allowed for the destruction of void check lists and cashier's
19 check lists; and whether a *Willits* instruction is appropriate. The Plaintiff Receiver and US
20 Bank disagree on federal as to how long documents related to these 20 cashier's checks
21 need to be retained; disagree whether their document destruction policies apply to the void
22 check lists; and disagree as to whether a *Willits* instruction should be called for. But those
23 issues are not now before the Court. The issue in this dispute is simply whether the
24 Plaintiff Receiver can take discovery.

25 ³ The cover letter stated: "The subpoena request is very broad. At this time please provide
26 us with . . . copies of all transaction items over \$1,000, including cancelled checks, wire
27 transfer details, and the front and back copy of each deposit item [and] front and back
28 copies of all cashier's checks paid from the accounts." Hilda Chavez testified the 20
checks were paid for from funds in the account.

⁴ On August 24, 2017, the Receiver issued a second subpoena to US Bank in the
Receivership civil action. Among other documents, the subpoena asked for ". . . (c)
Regulatory or compliance reports prepared by you or your agents; and (d) Internal analyses,
notes or reports prepared by you." Again, the list or database of issued cashier's checks and
void cashier's checks would be regulatory or compliance or internal reports.

1 company Easy Investments. They plainly fell within the subpoenas. By US Bank policy,
2 they should not have been “reversed,” and, even then, they should be listed on a void check
3 list.
4

5 US Bank’s argument that the topic is “suffused” with attorney client issues is not
6 correct. Plaintiff Receiver seeks no communication between counsel and an employee at
7 US Bank. Rather, discovery is sought as to what was done to look for the subpoenaed
8 documents. In any event, counsel can object at a deposition if necessary.
9

10 US Bank’s argument that the discovery is disproportionate ignores the facts of the
11 case. Of the 60 cashier’s checks used in this fraud, 20 of the cashier’s checks were not
12 produced by US Bank.⁵ The discovery goes to core issues in the case directly relevant to
13 the knowledge of US Bank employees of the Easy Investment fraud.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ⁵ Plaintiff’s liability expert concludes based on the daily check balance reports of Easy
28 Investments, that there were insufficient funds for these cashier’s checks to be issued on
those days, and that they were issued and destroyed in violation of US Bank policies.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DATED this 28th day of November, 2022.

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

By: /s/Gregory Marshall

Gregory J. Marshall
Taryn J. Gallup
Amanda Z. Weaver
One Arizona Center
400 E. Van Buren, Suite 1900
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202

David B. Chenkin (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Kenneth C. Rudd (*admitted pro hac vice*)
ZEICHNER ELLMAN & KRAUSE LLP
1211 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor
New York, NY 10036

*Co-Counsel for Defendants U.S. Bank
National Association and Hilda H.
Chavez*

OSBORN MALEDON, P.A.

By: /s/Colin F. Campbell (with permission)

Colin F. Campbell
Geoffrey M. T. Sturr
Timothy J. Eckstein
Joseph N. Roth
John S. Bullock
BriAnne N. Illich Meeds
Osborn Maledon, P.A.
2929 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100
Phoenix, Arizona 85012

Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 COPY of the foregoing e-filed and e-served via
2 TurboCourt this 28th day of November, 2022:

3 Colin F. Campbell, Esq.
4 Geoffrey M. T. Sturr, Esq.
5 Timothy J. Eckstein, Esq.
6 Joseph N. Roth, Esq.
7 John S. Bullock, Esq.
8 BriAnne N. Illich Meeds, Esq.
9 Osborn Maledon, P.A.
10 2929 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100
11 Phoenix, Arizona 85012
12 ccampbell@omlaw.com
13 gsturr@omlaw.com
14 teckstein@omlaw.com
15 jroth@omlaw.com
16 jbullock@omlaw.com

17 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

18 Nicole Goodwin, Esq.
19 Paul J. Ferak
20 Jonathan H. Claydon, Esq.
21 Greenberg Traurig
22 2375 E. Camelback Road #700
23 Phoenix, Arizona 85016
24 goodwinn@gtlaw.com
25 ferakp@gtlaw.com
26 claydonj@gtlaw.com

27 *Attorneys for Defendants JP Morgan Chase*
28 *Bank, Samantha Nelson, Kristofer Nelson,*
Vikram Dadlani, and Jane Doe Dadlani

29 /s/ Eileen Henry
30 4889-7853-3932

EXHIBIT A

