	•		
1	Jimmie L. Williams, Jr., State Bar No. 14	44691	
2	jwilliams@burnhambrown.com BURNHAM BROWN		
3	A Professional Law Corporation P.O. Box 119		
4	Oakland, California 94604		
5	1901 Harrison Street, 14th Floor		
6	Oakland, California 94612 Telephone: (510) 444-6800		
7	Facsimile: (510) 835-6666		
8	Attorneys for Respondent BFIGroup Corporation		
9	(formerly known as BFIGroup Divino Corporation)		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	CENTRAL DISTRIC		
13		No. 2:12-cv-08898-PSG-CW	
15	In re Application of Rusal Global Management B.V. for Order to Obtain		
16	Discovery for Use in a Foreign	DISCOVERY MATTER – RESPONDENT BFIGROUP	
17	Proceeding	CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO	
18		COURT'S REQUEST FOR UPDATED STATEMENT ON THE	
19		STATUS OF RESPONDENT'S	
20		CASE AGAINST THE PETITIONER, UC RUSAL	
21			
22		Date: October 17, 2013 Time: 4:00 p.m.	
23		Ct. No.: 640 Magistrate Judge: Hon. Carla Woehrle	
24		Discovery Cut Off: None set	
25		Pretrial Conference: None set Trial: None set	
26		d	
27	Within the Respondent's Motion to Quash the Petitioner's Subpoenas		
28	1	ONICE TO COLID TIC	
	RESPONDENT BFIGROUP CORPORATION'S RESPONDENT FOR UPDATED STATEMENT ON THE PETITIONER, UC RUSAL	ONSE TO COURT'S Case No. CV 12-08898 TATUS OF RESPONDENT'S	

4

1

567

9 10

8

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

2021

2223

2425

26

2728

(Docket No. 19, pages 21 - 22), it proposed that the purpose behind the Petitioner's subpoenas was to harass the Respondent and force it to unnecessarily expend resources to deal with this litigation. Now, it is patently clear that the Petitioner actions have justified this proposition.

Within the Respondent's Motion to Quash, the Petitioner was informed that all of the Respondent's records relating to ALSCON were transferred to Nigeria. (id.) The Respondent further reminded the Petitioner of the previous edicts held by its former counsel that the Federal Republic of Nigeria and its Courts was most appropriate forum for the disputes between the parties, as all relevant evidence and events regarding the matter were located in the country. (id.)

So, what does the Petitioner do when they are informed that they must defend themselves in Nigeria against a lawsuit filed by the Respondent, and have the opportunity to gather the records they assert are vital to their proceedings before the LCIA? **NOTHING.**

Why has the Petitioner not propounded a single discovery demand upon the Respondent? Why has the Petitioner not sought to have any subpoenas issued for the case before the Federal High Court in Nigeria? Why has the Petitioner's new counsel, Sidley Austin, refused to inform opposing counsel and this Court why it is necessary to continue the pursuit of the subject subpoenas?

It is because the Petitioner has never needed the requested records, or desired to obtain them from the Respondent. The Petitioner sole motivation for these subpoenas is the harassment of the Respondent. Surely, the Petitioner's counsel has communicated the current status of these cross-motions to its client and to its client's Nigerian counsel. Yet, despite knowing the above and having the ability to request the desired records, they sit on their hands.

Our United States Courts' should not allow itself to be used as a pawn in a party's clear efforts to manipulate the Court's processes for the purpose of

subterfuge and harassment. For these reasons, and those articulated within the Motion to Quash, the Respondent respectfully requested that the subject subpoenas be quashed. **BURNHAM BROWN** Dated: October 14, 2013 By: Jimmie L. Williams Attorneys for BFIGROUP CORPORATION

1			
2	Re:	In re Application of Rusal Global Management B.V. for Order to Obtain Discovery for Use in a Foreign Proceeding	
3	Court:	U.S. District Court, Central District of California	
4	Action No:	2:12-cv-08898-PSG-CW	
5		DDOOF OF SEDVICE	
		PROOF OF SERVICE	
6	I declare that I am over the age of 18, not a party to the above-entitled		
7	action, and am an employee of Burnham Brown whose business address is 1901 Harrison Street, 14 th Floor, Oakland, Alameda County, California 94612 (mailing address: Post Office Box 119, Oakland, California 94604).		
8			
9			
10	On October 14, 2013, I served the following document(s) in the following		
11	manner(s):		
	RESPONDEN	T BFIGROUP CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO COURT'S	
12	REQUEST FOR UPDATED STATEMENT ON THE STATUS OF		
13	RESPONDENT'S CASE AGAINST THE PETITIONER, UC RUSAL		
14	PROOF OF SERVICE		
15	1 ROOF OF SI	ERVICE	
16		AIL: By placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope th postage thereon on the date and place shown below following	
17	L .	dinary business practice. I am familiar with this business' practice	
18	for	r collecting and processing documents for mailing. On the same	
19		y that documents are placed for collection and mailing, it is	
		posited in the ordinary course of business with the United States stal Service in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.	
20			
21	MIL	Control Control	
22	Ms. Jamie Bar Mr. Robert Ma		
23	Sidley Austin,	,	
24	555 California	Street, Suite 2000	
25	San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 772-1200		
26	· ·	415) 772-7400 415) 772-7400	
	,	omartin@sidley.com	
27	jb	partlett@sidley.com	
28		4	
- 1	1	-1	

RESPONDENT BFIGROUP CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO COURT'S REQUEST FOR UPDATED STATEMENT ON THE STATUS OF RESPONDENT'S

CASE AGAINST THE PETITIONER, UC RUSAL

Case No. CV 12-08898

Case 2:12-cv-08898-PSG-CW Document 54 Filed 10/14/13 Page 5 of 5 Page ID #:1632