UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

No.	CV 23-00353-GW (ASx)	Date	June 26, 2026
Title	AirDoctor, LLC v. Lonni, Inc., et al.		

Present: The Honorable	Alka Sagar, United States Magistrate Judge
Alma Felix	Not reported
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder
Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:	Attorneys Present for Defendants:
N/A	N/A

Proceedings (In Chambers): **ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER AND FOR SANCTIONS (Dkt. No. 324); ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS' EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER ENFORCING DISCOVERY ORDERS. (Dkt. No. 325)**

On June 25, 2026, Plaintiff and Counter-Defendants ("Plaintiff") filed an *ex parte* application for a protective order barring discovery regarding the AD3500 replacement filter and request for sanctions, accompanied by the declaration of Ashley Sands and Exhibits A-E (Dkt. No. 324). On June 26, 2026, Defendants and Counterclaim Plaintiffs ("Defendants") filed their opposition to the application. (Dkt. No. 330).

On June 26, 2026, Defendants and Counterclaim Plaintiffs ("Defendants") filed an *ex parte* application for an order enforcing discovery orders, accompanied by the Declaration of Kevin O'Connor and exhibit A. (Dkt No. 325). On June 26, 2026, Plaintiff and Counter-Defendants ("Plaintiff") filed an opposition, accompanied by the declaration of Jason Drangel and exhibits A-B. (Dkt. No. 328).

Plaintiff seeks a protective order barring Defendants from questioning deposition witnesses regarding the AD3500 filter and permitting Plaintiff to instruct witnesses not to answer questions seeking AD3500 discovery based on this Court's Order, dated June 18, 2026, finding Defendants' requests for production of documents regarding the AD3500 filter were not relevant or proportional to the claims in

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

No.	CV 23-00353-GW (ASx)	Date	June 26, 2026
Title	AirDoctor, LLC v. Lonni, Inc., et al.		

this case. *See* Dkt. No. 315 at 2. Plaintiff claims that Defendants questioned Plaintiff's Rule 30(b)(6) witness, Michael Pederson, about the AD3500 filter, including questions regarding the AD3000 and the AD3500 filter. Plaintiff contends that such questioning violates the Court's Order. (dkt. No. 324). In their opposition, Defendants contend that because the Court held that Plaintiff could not withhold responsive documents that reference or include data where that information is maintained with, or forms part of, data concerning relevant products, including AD3000 filters, or financial records that are intertwined with, overlap or commingled with records of the AD3500 filter, their questions of the witness "fell within the overlap discovery preserved by the [Court's] Order." (Dkt. No. 330 at 5). The Court agrees. The Court's Order addressed a pending discovery request for the production of documents relating to the AD3500 filter based on Plaintiff's assertion, at the hearing on the motion, that it did not maintain separate records regarding the sales, costs, and other information regarding its AD3000 and AD35000 filters, there was significant overlap in the records maintained in the regular course of business, and it would be unduly burdensome to review such records to extract information relating only to the AD3000 filter. Although neither party sought clarification on whether questions regarding the overlap in Plaintiff's AD3000/AD3500 filters could be posed to deposition witnesses, the Court finds that such questions do not violate the Court's Order. Accordingly, Plaintiff's request for a protective order barring such questioning is DENIED. Plaintiff may not instruct witnesses not to respond to questions regarding Plaintiff's *shared* advertising, product information, testing, sales, and expenses relating to the AD3000/AD3500 filters. However, questions that pertain solely to the AD3500 filter (i.e.. dimensions, design features, etc…) are not permitted as the Court has found such information not relevant to the claims or proportional to the needs of the case. Plaintiff's request for sanctions is DENIED.

Defendants seek an order (1) directing Plaintiff to produce Helen Christoni whose deposition has been noticed, both individually and under Rule 30(b)(1), for deposition on July 2, 2026, or between July 6 and 10, 2026, and no later than July 10, 2026; (2) directing Plaintiff and counsel to permit witnesses to answer questions, (except as permitted by Rule 30(c)(2)), concerning overlap between the AD3000 and AD3500 air filters, commingled data regarding these filters and shared advertising, shared testing, shared financial data, and witness preparation as to such overlap; (3) granting Defendants leave to supplement the record in connection with Plaintiff's pending motion to compel and request for sanctions; and (4) granting Defendants leave to file a motion for sanctions premised on, *inter alia*, Plaintiff's deposition obstruction, violations o Court orders, and destruction of tested samples. (Dkt. No. 325).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

No.	CV 23-00353-GW (ASx)	Date	June 26, 2026
Title	AirDoctor, LLC v. Lonni, Inc., et al.		

Defendants' request to compel the in-person deposition of Helen Christoni on or before July 10, 2026 is DENIED without prejudice as this issue is currently addressed in Plaintiff's *ex parte* application to extend the fact discovery cut-off solely as to that deposition which is pending before District Judge Wu. (*see* Dkt. No. 326).

Defendant's request for an order permitting questioning of witnesses regarding the overlap in AD3000/AD3500 filters is GRANTED, as set forth above.

Defendants' remaining requests do not merit *ex parte* relief. Defendants' requests for leave to (1) supplement the record in connection with Plaintiff's pending motion to compel (Dkt. Nos. 200, 203); and (2) file a motion for sanctions are DENIED without prejudice to seeking such relief by regularly noticed motion. *See* Mission Power Eng'g Co. v. Continental Cas. Co., 883 F. Supp.488, 492 (C.D.C. Cal 1995).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

cc: George H. Wu
United States District Judge

0 : 00

Initials of Preparer AF