

1 “privilege” is timely interposed [C.C.P. § 2030.290; and *Scottsdale Ins. Co. v. Superior Court*
2 (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 263], the Defendant fails to establish the foundational prerequisites for
3 invoking any “privilege”, and the Defendant provides no explanation whatsoever for what is
4 “privileged” about the type of information sought in this discovery.

5 The objection concerning the maximum number of special interrogatories was cured
6 during the “meet and confer” process by provision of a Declaration for Additional Discovery.
7 See Motion Exhibit “C”, hereto.

8 The Court is requested to overrule all of these objections.

9 The Court is further requested to issue a monetary sanction for these frivolous, time-
10 consuming objections. There is no substantial justification for the multiplying of objections,
11 and attempting to apply them all to every interrogatory through the impermissible use of
12 “general objections”. *Korea Data Systems Co. v. Superior Court* (1997) 51 Cal.App.4th 1513,
13 1516, noted that our courts “recognize the use of “boiler plate” objections as were provided in
14 this case may be sanctionable”

15
16 **SPECIAL INTERROGATORY NO. 45 :**

17 If an officer, director, or managing agent of The Diocese of Tehuacan has had written
18 communication(s) with Nicholas Aguilar in which the subject of Aguilar's transfer to
19 California was discussed, please describe the substance of the communication(s).

20 **RESPONSE:**

21 The Diocese incorporates by reference its Preliminary Statement and General
22 Objections set forth above. The Diocese further objects to this Interrogatory because Plaintiff
23 has exceeded the maximum number of special interrogatories authorized by Section 2030.030
24 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and declines to respond to this Interrogatory on the
25 same grounds.

26 **LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS FOR COMPELLING FURTHER RESPONSE:**

27 The objections made to this interrogatory are too general and/or meritless and/or
28 frivolous, warranting sanctions. The objecting party has the burden of justifying an objection

1 to an interrogatory. *Coy v. Superior Court* (1962) 58 Cal.2d 210, 220.

2 Defendant's "General Objections" are prohibited. C.C.P. § 2030.210 requires that
3 interrogatories be responded to separately. Subdivision (a) of Section 2030.210 states:

4 **(a) The party to whom interrogatories have been propounded shall**
5 **respond in writing under oath separately to each interrogatory by any of**
6 **the following:**

6 (1) An answer containing the information sought to be discovered.

7 (2) An exercise of the party's option to produce writings.

8 **(3) An objection to the particular interrogatory.**

9 [Emphasis added.]

10 Code of Civil Procedure Section 2030.240, subdivision (b), further provides that:

11 **(b) If an objection is made to an interrogatory or to a part of an**
12 **interrogatory, the specific ground for the objection shall be set forth**
13 **clearly in the response.** If an objection is based on a claim of privilege, the
14 particular privilege invoked shall be clearly stated. If an objection is based on
15 a claim that the information sought is protected work product under Chapter
16 4 (commencing with Section 2018.010), that claim shall be expressly
17 asserted.

15 The subject interrogatory is relevant to the subject matter jurisdiction issue for which
16 discovery is allowed at this stage in the litigation.

17 No privileges are involved in the subject matter of the interrogatory. The "General
18 Objection" of "privilege" is too general as the Defendant does not identify any specific
19 "privilege" for this particular interrogatory, the objection is waived because no specific
20 "privilege" is timely interposed [C.C.P. § 2030.290; and *Scottsdale Ins. Co. v. Superior Court*
21 (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 263], the Defendant fails to establish the foundational prerequisites for
22 invoking any "privilege", and the Defendant provides no explanation whatsoever for what is
23 "privileged" about the type of information sought in this discovery.

24 The objection concerning the maximum number of special interrogatories was cured
25 during the "meet and confer" process by provision of a Declaration for Additional Discovery.

26 See Motion Exhibit "C", hereto.

27 The Court is requested to overrule all of these objections.

28 The Court is further requested to issue a monetary sanction for these frivolous, time-

1 consuming objections. There is no substantial justification for the multiplying of objections,
2 and attempting to apply them all to every interrogatory through the impermissible use of
3 “general objections”. *Korea Data Systems Co. v. Superior Court* (1997) 51 Cal.App.4th 1513,
4 1516, noted that our courts “recognize the use of “boiler plate” objections as were provided in
5 this case may be sanctionable”

6
7 **SPECIAL INTERROGATORY NO. 46 :**

8 Does The Diocese of Tehuacan own any property in California, United States of America?

9 **RESPONSE:**

10 The Diocese incorporates by reference its Preliminary Statement and General
11 Objections set forth above. The Diocese further objects to this Interrogatory because Plaintiff
12 has exceeded the maximum number of special interrogatories authorized by Section 2030.030
13 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and declines to respond to this Interrogatory on the
14 same grounds.

15 **LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS FOR COMPELLING FURTHER RESPONSE:**

16 The objections made to this interrogatory are too general and/or meritless and/or
17 frivolous, warranting sanctions. The objecting party has the burden of justifying an objection
18 to an interrogatory. *Coy v. Superior Court* (1962) 58 Cal.2d 210, 220.

19 Defendant’s “General Objections” are prohibited. C.C.P. § 2030.210 requires that
20 interrogatories be responded to separately. Subdivision (a) of Section 2030.210 states:

21 **(a) The party to whom interrogatories have been propounded shall**
22 **respond in writing under oath separately to each interrogatory by any of**
23 **the following:**

24 (1) An answer containing the information sought to be discovered.

25 (2) An exercise of the party's option to produce writings.

26 **(3) An objection to the particular interrogatory.**

27 [Emphasis added.]

Code of Civil Procedure Section 2030.240, subdivision (b), further provides that:

28 **(b) If an objection is made to an interrogatory or to a part of an**

1 interrogatory, **the specific ground for the objection shall be set forth**
2 **clearly in the response.** If an objection is based on a claim of privilege, the
3 particular privilege invoked shall be clearly stated. If an objection is based on
4 a claim that the information sought is protected work product under Chapter
5 4 (commencing with Section 2018.010), that claim shall be expressly
6 asserted.

7 The subject interrogatory is relevant to the subject matter jurisdiction issue for which
8 discovery is allowed at this stage in the litigation.

9 No privileges are involved in the subject matter of the interrogatory. The "General
10 Objection" of "privilege" is too general as the Defendant does not identify any specific
11 "privilege" for this particular interrogatory, the objection is waived because no specific
12 "privilege" is timely interposed [C.C.P. § 2030.290; and *Scottsdale Ins. Co. v. Superior Court*
13 (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 263], the Defendant fails to establish the foundational prerequisites for
14 invoking any "privilege", and the Defendant provides no explanation whatsoever for what is
15 "privileged" about the type of information sought in this discovery.

16 The objection concerning the maximum number of special interrogatories was cured
17 during the "meet and confer" process by provision of a Declaration for Additional Discovery.
18 See Motion Exhibit "C", hereto.

19 The Court is requested to overrule all of these objections.

20 The Court is further requested to issue a monetary sanction for these frivolous, time-
21 consuming objections. There is no substantial justification for the multiplying of objections,
22 and attempting to apply them all to every interrogatory through the impermissible use of
23 "general objections". *Korea Data Systems Co. v. Superior Court* (1997) 51 Cal.App.4th 1513,
24 1516, noted that our courts "recognize the use of "boiler plate" objections as were provided in
25 this case may be sanctionable"

26 **SPECIAL INTERROGATORY NO. 47 :**

27 If The Diocese of Tehuacan does own property in California, United States of America, please
28 identify the property.

1 RESPONSE:

2 The Diocese incorporates by reference its Preliminary Statement and General
3 Objections set forth above. The Diocese further objects to this Interrogatory because Plaintiff
4 has exceeded the maximum number of special interrogatories authorized by Section 2030.030
5 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and declines to respond to this Interrogatory on the
6 same grounds.

7 LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS FOR COMPELLING FURTHER RESPONSE:

8 The objections made to this interrogatory are too general and/or meritless and/or
9 frivolous, warranting sanctions. The objecting party has the burden of justifying an objection
10 to an interrogatory. *Coy v. Superior Court* (1962) 58 Cal.2d 210, 220.

11 Defendant's "General Objections" are prohibited. C.C.P. § 2030.210 requires that
12 interrogatories be responded to separately. Subdivision (a) of Section 2030.210 states:

13 **(a) The party to whom interrogatories have been propounded shall**
14 **respond in writing under oath separately to each interrogatory by any of**
the following:

15 (1) An answer containing the information sought to be discovered.

16 (2) An exercise of the party's option to produce writings.

17 **(3) An objection to the particular interrogatory.**

18 [Emphasis added.]

19 Code of Civil Procedure Section 2030.240, subdivision (b), further provides that:

20 **(b) If an objection is made to an interrogatory or to a part of an**
21 **interrogatory, the specific ground for the objection shall be set forth**
22 **clearly in the response.** If an objection is based on a claim of privilege, the
23 particular privilege invoked shall be clearly stated. If an objection is based on
a claim that the information sought is protected work product under Chapter
4 (commencing with Section 2018.010), that claim shall be expressly
asserted.

24 The subject interrogatory is relevant to the subject matter jurisdiction issue for which
25 discovery is allowed at this stage in the litigation.

26 No privileges are involved in the subject matter of the interrogatory. The "General
27 Objection" of "privilege" is too general as the Defendant does not identify any specific
28 "privilege" for this particular interrogatory, the objection is waived because no specific

1 “privilege” is timely interposed [C.C.P. § 2030.290; and *Scottsdale Ins. Co. v. Superior Court*
2 (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 263], the Defendant fails to establish the foundational prerequisites for
3 invoking any “privilege”, and the Defendant provides no explanation whatsoever for what is
4 “privileged” about the type of information sought in this discovery.

5 The objection concerning the maximum number of special interrogatories was cured
6 during the “meet and confer” process by provision of a Declaration for Additional Discovery.
7 See Motion Exhibit “C”, hereto.

8 The Court is requested to overrule all of these objections.

9 The Court is further requested to issue a monetary sanction for these frivolous, time-
10 consuming objections. There is no substantial justification for the multiplying of objections,
11 and attempting to apply them all to every interrogatory through the impermissible use of
12 “general objections”. *Korea Data Systems Co. v. Superior Court* (1997) 51 Cal.App.4th 1513,
13 1516, noted that our courts “recognize the use of “boiler plate” objections as were provided in
14 this case may be sanctionable”

15
16 **SPECIAL INTERROGATORY NO. 48 :**

17 If The Diocese of Tehuacan does own property in California, United States of America, please
18 state the date the property was acquired.

19 **RESPONSE:**

20 The Diocese incorporates by reference its Preliminary Statement and General
21 Objections set forth above. The Diocese further objects to this Interrogatory because Plaintiff
22 has exceeded the maximum number of special interrogatories authorized by Section 2030.030
23 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and declines to respond to this Interrogatory on the
24 same grounds.

25 **LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS FOR COMPELLING FURTHER RESPONSE:**

26 The objections made to this interrogatory are too general and/or meritless and/or
27 frivolous, warranting sanctions. The objecting party has the burden of justifying an objection
28 to an interrogatory. *Coy v. Superior Court* (1962) 58 Cal.2d 210, 220.

1 Defendant's "General Objections" are prohibited. C.C.P. § 2030.210 requires that
2 interrogatories be responded to separately. Subdivision (a) of Section 2030.210 states:

3 **(a) The party to whom interrogatories have been propounded shall**
4 **respond in writing under oath separately to each interrogatory by any of**
5 **the following:**

6 (1) An answer containing the information sought to be discovered.

7 (2) An exercise of the party's option to produce writings.

8 **(3) An objection to the particular interrogatory.**

9 [Emphasis added.]

10 Code of Civil Procedure Section 2030.240, subdivision (b), further provides that:

11 **(b) If an objection is made to an interrogatory or to a part of an**
12 **interrogatory, the specific ground for the objection shall be set forth**
13 **clearly in the response.** If an objection is based on a claim of privilege, the
14 particular privilege invoked shall be clearly stated. If an objection is based on
15 a claim that the information sought is protected work product under Chapter
16 4 (commencing with Section 2018.010), that claim shall be expressly
17 asserted.

18 The subject interrogatory is relevant to the subject matter jurisdiction issue for which
19 discovery is allowed at this stage in the litigation.

20 No privileges are involved in the subject matter of the interrogatory. The "General
21 Objection" of "privilege" is too general as the Defendant does not identify any specific
22 "privilege" for this particular interrogatory, the objection is waived because no specific
23 "privilege" is timely interposed [C.C.P. § 2030.290; and *Scottsdale Ins. Co. v. Superior Court*
24 (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 263], the Defendant fails to establish the foundational prerequisites for
25 invoking any "privilege", and the Defendant provides no explanation whatsoever for what is
26 "privileged" about the type of information sought in this discovery.

27 The objection concerning the maximum number of special interrogatories was cured
28 during the "meet and confer" process by provision of a Declaration for Additional Discovery.

29 See Motion Exhibit "C", hereto.

30 The Court is requested to overrule all of these objections.

31 The Court is further requested to issue a monetary sanction for these frivolous, time-
32 consuming objections. There is no substantial justification for the multiplying of objections,

1 and attempting to apply them all to every interrogatory through the impermissible use of
2 "general objections". *Korea Data Systems Co. v. Superior Court* (1997) 51 Cal.App.4th 1513,
3 1516, noted that our courts "recognize the use of "boiler plate" objections as were provided in
4 this case may be sanctionable"

5
6 **SPECIAL INTERROGATORY NO. 49 :**

7 If The Diocese of Tehuacan does own property in California, United States of America, please
8 describe the nature of use of the property.

9 **RESPONSE:**

10 The Diocese incorporates by reference its Preliminary Statement and General
11 Objections set forth above. The Diocese further objects to this Interrogatory because Plaintiff
12 has exceeded the maximum number of special interrogatories authorized by Section 2030.030
13 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and declines to respond to this Interrogatory on the
14 same grounds.

15 **LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS FOR COMPELLING FURTHER RESPONSE:**

16 The objections made to this interrogatory are too general and/or meritless and/or
17 frivolous, warranting sanctions. The objecting party has the burden of justifying an objection
18 to an interrogatory. *Coy v. Superior Court* (1962) 58 Cal.2d 210, 220.

19 Defendant's "General Objections" are prohibited. C.C.P. § 2030.210 requires that
20 interrogatories be responded to separately. Subdivision (a) of Section 2030.210 states:

21 **(a) The party to whom interrogatories have been propounded shall**
22 **respond in writing under oath separately to each interrogatory by any of**
23 **the following:**

24 (1) An answer containing the information sought to be discovered.

25 (2) An exercise of the party's option to produce writings.

26 **(3) An objection to the particular interrogatory.**

27 [Emphasis added.]

Code of Civil Procedure Section 2030.240, subdivision (b), further provides that:

28 **(b) If an objection is made to an interrogatory or to a part of an**

1 interrogatory, the specific ground for the objection shall be set forth
2 clearly in the response. If an objection is based on a claim of privilege, the
3 particular privilege invoked shall be clearly stated. If an objection is based on
4 a claim that the information sought is protected work product under Chapter
5 4 (commencing with Section 2018.010), that claim shall be expressly
6 asserted.

7 The subject interrogatory is relevant to the subject matter jurisdiction issue for which
8 discovery is allowed at this stage in the litigation.

9 No privileges are involved in the subject matter of the interrogatory. The "General
10 Objection" of "privilege" is too general as the Defendant does not identify any specific
11 "privilege" for this particular interrogatory, the objection is waived because no specific
12 "privilege" is timely interposed [C.C.P. § 2030.290; and *Scottsdale Ins. Co. v. Superior Court*
13 (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 263], the Defendant fails to establish the foundational prerequisites for
14 invoking any "privilege", and the Defendant provides no explanation whatsoever for what is
15 "privileged" about the type of information sought in this discovery.

16 The objection concerning the maximum number of special interrogatories was cured
17 during the "meet and confer" process by provision of a Declaration for Additional Discovery.
18 See Motion Exhibit "C", hereto.

19 The Court is requested to overrule all of these objections.

20 The Court is further requested to issue a monetary sanction for these frivolous, time-
21 consuming objections. There is no substantial justification for the multiplying of objections,
22 and attempting to apply them all to every interrogatory through the impermissible use of
23 "general objections". *Korea Data Systems Co. v. Superior Court* (1997) 51 Cal.App.4th 1513,
24 1516, noted that our courts "recognize the use of "boiler plate" objections as were provided in
25 this case may be sanctionable"

26 **SPECIAL INTERROGATORY NO. 50 :**

27 Please identify each and every communication in whatever form that any cleric, priest, brother,
28 or lay employees of The Diocese of Tehuacan has had with any person incardinated with The
Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles, A Corporation Sole.

1 RESPONSE:

2 The Diocese incorporates by reference its Preliminary Statement and General
3 Objections set forth above. The Diocese further objects to this Interrogatory because Plaintiff
4 has exceeded the maximum number of special interrogatories authorized by Section 2030.030
5 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and declines to respond to this Interrogatory on the
6 same grounds.

7 LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS FOR COMPELLING FURTHER RESPONSE:

8 The objections made to this interrogatory are too general and/or meritless and/or
9 frivolous, warranting sanctions. The objecting party has the burden of justifying an objection
10 to an interrogatory. *Coy v. Superior Court* (1962) 58 Cal.2d 210, 220.

11 Defendant's "General Objections" are prohibited. C.C.P. § 2030.210 requires that
12 interrogatories be responded to separately. Subdivision (a) of Section 2030.210 states:

13 **(a) The party to whom interrogatories have been propounded shall**
14 **respond in writing under oath separately to each interrogatory by any of**
the following:

15 (1) An answer containing the information sought to be discovered.

16 (2) An exercise of the party's option to produce writings.

17 **(3) An objection to the particular interrogatory.**

18 [Emphasis added.]

19 Code of Civil Procedure Section 2030.240, subdivision (b), further provides that:

20 **(b) If an objection is made to an interrogatory or to a part of an**
21 **interrogatory, the specific ground for the objection shall be set forth**
22 **clearly in the response.** If an objection is based on a claim of privilege, the
23 particular privilege invoked shall be clearly stated. If an objection is based on
a claim that the information sought is protected work product under Chapter
4 (commencing with Section 2018.010), that claim shall be expressly
asserted.

24 The subject interrogatory is relevant to the subject matter jurisdiction issue for which
25 discovery is allowed at this stage in the litigation.

26 No privileges are involved in the subject matter of the interrogatory. The "General
27 Objection" of "privilege" is too general as the Defendant does not identify any specific
28 "privilege" for this particular interrogatory, the objection is waived because no specific

1 “privilege” is timely interposed [C.C.P. § 2030.290; and *Scottsdale Ins. Co. v. Superior Court*
2 (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 263], the Defendant fails to establish the foundational prerequisites for
3 invoking any “privilege”, and the Defendant provides no explanation whatsoever for what is
4 “privileged” about the type of information sought in this discovery.

5 The objection concerning the maximum number of special interrogatories was cured
6 during the “meet and confer” process by provision of a Declaration for Additional Discovery.
7 See Motion Exhibit “C”, hereto.

8 The Court is requested to overrule all of these objections.

9 The Court is further requested to issue a monetary sanction for these frivolous, time-
10 consuming objections. There is no substantial justification for the multiplying of objections,
11 and attempting to apply them all to every interrogatory through the impermissible use of
12 “general objections”. *Korea Data Systems Co. v. Superior Court* (1997) 51 Cal.App.4th 1513,
13 1516, noted that our courts “recognize the use of “boiler plate” objections as were provided in
14 this case may be sanctionable”

15
16 **SPECIAL INTERROGATORY NO. 51 :**

17 Has any person incardinated in The Diocese of Tehuacan been accused of sexually abusing
18 minors while that incardinated person was in California, United States of America?

19 **RESPONSE:**

20 The Diocese incorporates by reference its Preliminary Statement and General
21 Objections set forth above. The Diocese further objects to this Interrogatory because Plaintiff
22 has exceeded the maximum number of special interrogatories authorized by Section 2030.030
23 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and declines to respond to this Interrogatory on the
24 same grounds.

25 **LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS FOR COMPELLING FURTHER RESPONSE:**

26 The objections made to this interrogatory are too general and/or meritless and/or
27 frivolous, warranting sanctions. The objecting party has the burden of justifying an objection
28 to an interrogatory. *Coy v. Superior Court* (1962) 58 Cal.2d 210, 220.

1 Defendant's "General Objections" are prohibited. C.C.P. § 2030.210 requires that
2 interrogatories be responded to separately. Subdivision (a) of Section 2030.210 states:

3 **(a) The party to whom interrogatories have been propounded shall**
4 **respond in writing under oath separately to each interrogatory by any of**
5 the following:

6 (1) An answer containing the information sought to be discovered.

7 (2) An exercise of the party's option to produce writings.

8 **(3) An objection to the particular interrogatory.**

9 [Emphasis added.]

10 Code of Civil Procedure Section 2030.240, subdivision (b), further provides that:

11 **(b) If an objection is made to an interrogatory or to a part of an**
12 **interrogatory, the specific ground for the objection shall be set forth**
13 **clearly in the response.** If an objection is based on a claim of privilege, the
14 particular privilege invoked shall be clearly stated. If an objection is based on
15 a claim that the information sought is protected work product under Chapter
16 4 (commencing with Section 2018.010), that claim shall be expressly
17 asserted.

18 The subject interrogatory is relevant to the subject matter jurisdiction issue for which
19 discovery is allowed at this stage in the litigation.

20 No privileges are involved in the subject matter of the interrogatory. The "General
21 Objection" of "privilege" is too general as the Defendant does not identify any specific
22 "privilege" for this particular interrogatory, the objection is waived because no specific
23 "privilege" is timely interposed [C.C.P. § 2030.290; and *Scottsdale Ins. Co. v. Superior Court*
24 (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 263], the Defendant fails to establish the foundational prerequisites for
25 invoking any "privilege", and the Defendant provides no explanation whatsoever for what is
26 "privileged" about the type of information sought in this discovery.

27 The objection concerning the maximum number of special interrogatories was cured
28 during the "meet and confer" process by provision of a Declaration for Additional Discovery.

29 See Motion Exhibit "C", hereto.

30 The Court is requested to overrule all of these objections.

31 The Court is further requested to issue a monetary sanction for these frivolous, time-
32 consuming objections. There is no substantial justification for the multiplying of objections,

1 and attempting to apply them all to every interrogatory through the impermissible use of
2 "general objections". *Korea Data Systems Co. v. Superior Court* (1997) 51 Cal.App.4th 1513,
3 1516, noted that our courts "recognize the use of "boiler plate" objections as were provided in
4 this case may be sanctionable"

5
6 **SPECIAL INTERROGATORY NO. 52 :**

7 If a person incardinated in The Diocese of Tehuacan has been accused of sexually abusing a
8 minor in California, please describe how The Diocese of Tehuacan became aware of the abuse.

9 **RESPONSE:**

10 The Diocese incorporates by reference its Preliminary Statement and General
11 Objections set forth above. The Diocese further objects to this Interrogatory because Plaintiff
12 has exceeded the maximum number of special interrogatories authorized by Section 2030.030
13 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and declines to respond to this Interrogatory on the
14 same grounds.

15 **LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS FOR COMPELLING FURTHER RESPONSE:**

16 The objections made to this interrogatory are too general and/or meritless and/or
17 frivolous, warranting sanctions. The objecting party has the burden of justifying an objection
18 to an interrogatory. *Coy v. Superior Court* (1962) 58 Cal.2d 210, 220.

19 Defendant's "General Objections" are prohibited. C.C.P. § 2030.210 requires that
20 interrogatories be responded to separately. Subdivision (a) of Section 2030.210 states:

21 **(a) The party to whom interrogatories have been propounded shall**
22 **respond in writing under oath separately to each interrogatory by any of**
23 **the following:**

24 (1) An answer containing the information sought to be discovered.

25 (2) An exercise of the party's option to produce writings.

26 **(3) An objection to the particular interrogatory.**

27 [Emphasis added.]

28 Code of Civil Procedure Section 2030.240, subdivision (b), further provides that:

(b) If an objection is made to an interrogatory or to a part of an

1 interrogatory, **the specific ground for the objection shall be set forth**
2 **clearly in the response.** If an objection is based on a claim of privilege, the
3 particular privilege invoked shall be clearly stated. If an objection is based on
4 a claim that the information sought is protected work product under Chapter
5 4 (commencing with Section 2018.010), that claim shall be expressly
6 asserted.

7 The subject interrogatory is relevant to the subject matter jurisdiction issue for which
8 discovery is allowed at this stage in the litigation.

9 No privileges are involved in the subject matter of the interrogatory. The "General
10 Objection" of "privilege" is too general as the Defendant does not identify any specific
11 "privilege" for this particular interrogatory, the objection is waived because no specific
12 "privilege" is timely interposed [C.C.P. § 2030.290; and *Scottsdale Ins. Co. v. Superior Court*
13 (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 263], the Defendant fails to establish the foundational prerequisites for
14 invoking any "privilege", and the Defendant provides no explanation whatsoever for what is
15 "privileged" about the type of information sought in this discovery.

16 The objection concerning the maximum number of special interrogatories was cured
17 during the "meet and confer" process by provision of a Declaration for Additional Discovery.
18 See Motion Exhibit "C", hereto.

19 The Court is requested to overrule all of these objections.

20 The Court is further requested to issue a monetary sanction for these frivolous, time-
21 consuming objections. There is no substantial justification for the multiplying of objections,
22 and attempting to apply them all to every interrogatory through the impermissible use of
23 "general objections". *Korea Data Systems Co. v. Superior Court* (1997) 51 Cal.App.4th 1513,
24 1516, noted that our courts "recognize the use of "boiler plate" objections as were provided in
25 this case may be sanctionable"

26 **SPECIAL INTERROGATORY NO. 53 :**

27 If a person incardinated in The Diocese of Tehuacan has been accused of sexually abusing a
28 minor in California, please state the date The Diocese of Tehuacan became aware of the abuse.

1 RESPONSE:

2 The Diocese incorporates by reference its Preliminary Statement and General
3 Objections set forth above. The Diocese further objects to this Interrogatory because Plaintiff
4 has exceeded the maximum number of special interrogatories authorized by Section 2030.030
5 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and declines to respond to this Interrogatory on the
6 same grounds.

7 LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS FOR COMPELLING FURTHER RESPONSE:

8 The objections made to this interrogatory are too general and/or meritless and/or
9 frivolous, warranting sanctions. The objecting party has the burden of justifying an objection
10 to an interrogatory. *Coy v. Superior Court* (1962) 58 Cal.2d 210, 220.

11 Defendant's "General Objections" are prohibited. C.C.P. § 2030.210 requires that
12 interrogatories be responded to separately. Subdivision (a) of Section 2030.210 states:

13 **(a) The party to whom interrogatories have been propounded shall**
14 **respond in writing under oath separately to each interrogatory by any of**
the following:

15 (1) An answer containing the information sought to be discovered.

16 (2) An exercise of the party's option to produce writings.

17 **(3) An objection to the particular interrogatory.**

18 [Emphasis added.]

19 Code of Civil Procedure Section 2030.240, subdivision (b), further provides that:

20 **(b) If an objection is made to an interrogatory or to a part of an**
21 **interrogatory, the specific ground for the objection shall be set forth**
22 **clearly in the response.** If an objection is based on a claim of privilege, the
23 particular privilege invoked shall be clearly stated. If an objection is based on
a claim that the information sought is protected work product under Chapter
4 (commencing with Section 2018.010), that claim shall be expressly
asserted.

24 The subject interrogatory is relevant to the subject matter jurisdiction issue for which
25 discovery is allowed at this stage in the litigation.

26 No privileges are involved in the subject matter of the interrogatory. The "General
27 Objection" of "privilege" is too general as the Defendant does not identify any specific
28 "privilege" for this particular interrogatory, the objection is waived because no specific

1 "privilege" is timely interposed [C.C.P. § 2030.290; and *Scottsdale Ins. Co. v. Superior Court*
2 (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 263], the Defendant fails to establish the foundational prerequisites for
3 invoking any "privilege", and the Defendant provides no explanation whatsoever for what is
4 "privileged" about the type of information sought in this discovery.

5 The objection concerning the maximum number of special interrogatories was cured
6 during the "meet and confer" process by provision of a Declaration for Additional Discovery.
7 See Motion Exhibit "C", hereto.

8 The Court is requested to overrule all of these objections.

9 The Court is further requested to issue a monetary sanction for these frivolous, time-
10 consuming objections. There is no substantial justification for the multiplying of objections,
11 and attempting to apply them all to every interrogatory through the impermissible use of
12 "general objections". *Korea Data Systems Co. v. Superior Court* (1997) 51 Cal.App.4th 1513,
13 1516, noted that our courts "recognize the use of "boiler plate" objections as were provided in
14 this case may be sanctionable"

15

16 Dated: July 23, 2007

CARCIONE, CATTERMOLLE, DOLINSKI,
OKIMOTO, STUCKY, UKSHINI,
MARKOWITZ & CARCIONE, LLP

17

18

19



20

By: _____
Attorney for Plaintiff

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28