



# NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

One Elk Street, Albany, New York 12207 • 518.463.3200 • www.nysba.org

## COMMERCIAL AND FEDERAL LITIGATION SECTION

2014-2015 Officers

### PAUL D. SARKOZI

Chair  
Tannenbaum Helpem Syracuse &  
Hirschrift LLP  
900 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
212/508-7524  
FAX 212/937-5207  
sarkozi@thsh.com

### JAMES M. WICKS

Chair-Elect  
Farrell Fritz PC  
1320 RXR Plaza  
Uniondale, NY 11556-1320  
516/227-0617  
FAX 516/336-2204  
jwicks@farrellfritz.com

### MARK A. BERMAN

Vice-Chair  
Ganter & Shore LLP  
360 Lexington Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10017  
212/922-9250  
FAX 212/922-9335  
mberman@gantershore.com

### JACLYN H. GRODIN

Secretary  
Tannenbaum Helpem Syracuse &  
Hirschrift LLP  
900 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
212/508-6700  
FAX 212/371-1084  
grodin@thsh.com

### DEBORAH E. EDELMAN

Treasurer  
Supreme Court of the State of New York  
60 Centre Street – Room 232  
New York, NY 10007  
646/386-3214  
FAX 212/748-7793  
dedelman@courts.state.ny.us

### Delegates to the House of Delegates

Gregory K. Arenson  
Paul D. Sarkozi  
David H. Tennant  
Vincent J. Syracuse, Alternate

### FORMER CHAIRS:

Robert L. Haig  
Michael A. Cooper  
Shira A. Scheindlin  
Harry P. Trueheart, III  
P. Kevin Castel  
Mark H. Alcott  
Gerald G. Paul  
Mark C. Zauderer  
Bernice K. Leber  
John M. Nonna  
Jack C. Auspitz  
Sharon M. Porcellio  
Jay G. Safer  
Cathi A. Baglin  
Lewis M. Smoley  
Lauren J. Wachtler  
Stephen P. Younger  
Lesley F. Rosenthal  
Carrie H. Cohen  
Peter Brown  
Vincent J. Syracuse  
Jonathan D. Lupkin  
David H. Tennant  
Tracee E. Davis  
Gregory K. Arenson

August 14, 2014

VIA ELECTRONIC AND FIRST CLASS MAIL

John W. McConnell, Esq., Counsel  
Office of Court Administration  
25 Beaver Street, 11th Floor  
New York, New York 10004

Dear Mr. McConnell:

On behalf of the New York State Bar Association's Commercial and Federal Litigation Section, I enclose the attached memoranda with the Section's comments on the new proposed rules of the Commercial Division relating to (a) the imposition of sanctions and (b) the presumptive number and duration of depositions.

If you have any questions about the Section's comments, please let me know.

Respectfully yours,



Paul D. Sarkozi  
Chair

Enclosure

To: John W. McConnell

From: Commercial and Federal Litigation Section of the New York State Bar Association

RE: Proposed Commercial Division rule change concerning sanctions

Date: August 12, 2014

The Commercial and Federal Litigation Section of the New York State Bar Association (the "Section") submits the following comments in response to your memorandum dated June 27, 2014 with respect to the proposed adoption of a Preamble to the Rules of the Commercial Division addressing the imposition of sanctions for dilatory litigation conduct, failure to appear for scheduled matters, undue delay in producing relevant documents and other conduct causing unnecessary expense and delay.

The Section endorses the adoption of the proposed Preamble.

The Section is of the opinion that the proposed preamble provides the Court with the ability to express its intent within the context of existing rules and statutes that already cover the topic of sanctions. By providing a statement of its intent and the specific provisions of existing rules and laws that give the Court the power to mete out sanctions, litigants and counsel are being provided with ample additional and prior notice that non-compliance with Court rules and Orders will not be tolerated and may not be without cost to the violators.

While some may conclude that the proposed preamble is unnecessary, it satisfies our sense of fairness as this addition is intended to give notice to all constituencies that the Court intends a noteworthy change in its approach to sanctions.

To: John W. McConnell

From: Commercial and Federal Litigation Section of the New York State Bar Association

RE: Proposed Commercial Division rule changes concerning presumptive limitations on number and length of depositions

Date: August 12, 2014

The Commercial and Federal Litigation Section of the New York State Bar Association (the "Section") submits the following comments in response to your memorandum dated June 20, 2014 with respect to the proposed adoption of new Commercial Division Rule and amendment of Commercial Division Rules 8(b) and 11(c), relating to presumptive limitations on the number and duration of depositions.

The Section endorses the proposed new Rule and the proposed amendments.

The adoption of presumptive limitations on the length and number of depositions in cases governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure did not, from the anecdotal experiences of our members, thwart or impair the ability of commercial litigants in federal court to obtain effective discovery. Lawyers are creative; they can figure out how to do more with less. Witness the effect of page limits on briefs and time limits on oral arguments.

Boundaries provide reasons for lawyers to be more efficient. And if both lawyers conclude they cannot get the job done within the limitations, proposed Rule 9(a)<sup>1</sup> gives them the flexibility to agree to vary the limitations in their case, without seeking relief from the Court. To the extent that the limitation imposes a greater burden on one party than another, the Court will undoubtedly entertain the grounds for exceeding the limitation, while at the same time providing protection to the objecting party who will at least have the rule to rely upon in the first instance. (The limitations might also cause the parties to communicate in more detail about witnesses in advance of serving notices to identify the witnesses who can provide the "biggest bang" for the "discovery buck.")

The presumptive limitations also impose a sense of proportionality, which is clearly consistent with the trend in the Commercial Division's analysis of other discovery issues, notably electronic discovery. A case involving a \$200,000 dispute could (and should?) be fairly litigated with fewer than ten depositions.

The Committee also notes that there is nothing in the proposed rule changes that precludes a party from seeking protection within the presumptive limits. That is, if the dispute

---

<sup>1</sup> The Section notes that Rule 9 has been assigned to Accelerated Adjudication Actions, so that the numbering of the proposed rule needs to be changed. In addition, the Section notes that Amendment No. 1 makes reference to proposed Rule 9(a)(iii), which does not appear anywhere in the proposed rule.

involves limited issues and a relative small amount in controversy, a party who notices nine depositions might well be faced with a motion for protection under CPLR 3103.

In any event, the flexibility to seek relief from the limitations appears to have been a sufficient safety valve in federal practice and there is no reason to doubt its efficacy before the Commercial Division. While the Committee did hesitate momentarily when noting that the Delaware Superior Court did not have such a presumptive limitation, on further reflection it was concluded that a presumptive limitation in the Commercial Division would likely be yet another “selling” point for commercial litigation in the Commercial Division.