

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION**

In the Matter of)	
)	CPSC Docket No: 12-1
)	CPSC Docket No: 12-2
)	CPSC Docket No: 13-2
MAXFIELD AND OBERTON)	
HOLDINGS, LLC)	
AND)	
CRAIG ZUCKER, individually and as)	
an officer of)	
MAXFIELD AND OBERTON)	
HOLDINGS, LLC)	
AND)	HON. DEAN C. METRY
ZEN MAGNETS, LLC)	
AND)	
STAR NETWORKS USA, LLC)	
)	
)	
Respondents.)	

**ORDER DENYING RESPONDENT CRAIG ZUCKER’S MOTION TO LIMIT
ACCESS TO DOCUMENT PRODUCTIONS AND DISCOVERY**

Background

On March 8, 2014, Respondent Craig Zucker filed a Motion to Limit Access to Document Productions and Discovery (Motion to Limit). In the Motion to Limit, Mr. Zucker notes the above-captioned matter is a consolidated proceeding, and CPSC has served subpoenas on third parties, including the MOH Liquidating Trust and Jake Bronstein, seeking documents related to Maxfield and Oberton and Craig Zucker.

Mr. Zucker argues “[d]ocuments produced by the Trust and Mr. Bronstein contain confidential business information of M&O...and...confidential personal information relating to Mr. Zucker, as do the discovery responses of Mr. Zucker.” Mr. Zucker notes that Star Networks USA, LLC and Zen Magnets, LLC were competitors of Maxfield and

Oberton, and both companies opposed consolidation of the proceedings. He further notes neither company would have access to the information absent the consolidation.

On March 18, 2014, Counsel for Respondents Zen Magnets, LLC and Star Networks USA, LLC filed a Joint Response to Respondent Craig Zucker's Motion to Limit Access to Document Productions and Discovery (Joint Response). In the Joint Response, Counsel argues that, due to the general nature of the Motion to Limit, Mr. Zucker has not demonstrated a need to limit discovery. Counsel suggests Mr. Zucker "does not describe with particularity which documents should be protected," and concedes Maxfield and Oberton is no longer a competitor of Zen Magnets, LLC and Star Networks USA, LLC. Counsel further notes there is already a Protective Order in place for the instant proceeding.

To date, Complaint Counsel has not filed a response to the Motion to Limit. See 16 C.F.R. § 1025.23(c).

Discussion

Pursuant to 16 C.F.R. § 1025.31(h), discovery responses are to be filed with all parties to a proceeding. However, 16 C.F.R. § 1025.31(d) provides that, for good cause shown, the undersigned may limit or modify discovery through various means.


In the instant case, as noted by Counsel for Zen Magnets, LLC and Star Networks USA, LLC, the Motion to Limit is general, and requests protection for unspecified documents that "may contain confidential personal information" or "confidential business information of M&O." Due to the general nature of the Motion, any order granting the relief requested would be unclear and difficult, if not impossible, to enforce.

WHEREFORE,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Respondent Craig Zucker's Motion to Limit Access to Document Productions and Discovery is **DENIED**. The parties shall proceed with discovery.

SO ORDERED.

Done and dated this 26th day of March, 2014, at Galveston, TX



DEAN C. METRY
Administrative Law Judge