

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

STELA CARAMAN

Plaintiff,

v.

THE PARTNERSHIPS, AND
UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATIONS
IDENTIFIED IN SCHEDULE "A",

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:26-cv-1510-MRH

Honorable Marilyn J. Horan

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO CONDUCT LIMITED DISCOVERY FROM
THIRD-PARTY ONLINE RETAIL PLATFORMS**

Plaintiff Stela Caraman ("Plaintiff"), pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(d)(1), respectfully moves for leave to serve limited expedited written discovery upon third-party online retail platforms. The requested discovery is narrowly directed to information uniquely within the platforms' possession concerning the identities of Defendants and their marketplace activity involving only the infringing products identified in the Complaint.

Plaintiff requests an Order providing that, within seven (7) calendar days after entry of the Order, Plaintiff may serve written discovery requests upon third-party online retail platforms, to be answered within thirty (30) days after service. The discovery requests will be limited solely to the following categories of information for Defendants' respective online marketplace accounts and listings concerning the infringing products identified in the Complaint:

1. The identities and locations of Defendants, their officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and any persons acting in active concert or participation with them, including all

known contact information and all associated e-mail addresses; and

2. The Defendants' sales revenues and city and state for delivery of only infringing products and listing history related to their respective online marketplaces related to the infringing products in the Complaint.¹

District courts have broad power to require early document production and to permit expedited discovery pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(b). “While a standard for assessing motions for early or expedited discovery has not been announced by the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, [t]he prevailing approach in this Circuit is to apply the ‘good cause’ or reasonableness standard” which requires the court to “consider [] the totality of the circumstances to discern whether the need for expedited discovery, in consideration of the administration of justice, outweighs the prejudice to the responding party.” *Curran v. Venango County*, No. 1:23-cv-00019-RAL, 2023 WL 3166419, at *1 (W.D. Pa. Apr. 28, 2023) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). Generally, a party may not seek discovery prior to a Rule 26(f) conference unless authorized by a court order. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d)(1).

Defendants are foreign individuals or entities who have both the incentive and capability to hide or destroy relevant business records and other discoverable information and documentation upon learning of this action. Plaintiff respectfully submits that there is good cause for this Court to grant Plaintiff the expedited discovery requested herein. Through third-party production, Plaintiff needs to establish that Defendants 1) are based in China, 2) whether their addresses are “known” for the purposes of determining whether the the Hague Convention applies in this case, and 3) have sold the infringing products stated in the Complaint into this

¹ Plaintiff requests the above-relief based on this Court’s Order Following Status Conference, dated July 9, 2026, in *CJB Global Imports, Inc. v. Schedule A Defendants*, 26-cv-00702-MJH, Dkt. No. 23.

jurisdiction.

If this Court were to deny expedited discovery, Plaintiff may lose the opportunity to effectively pursue its claims against Defendants because there are several facts that Plaintiff can not yet confirm, including: (a) the true identities of all Defendants; (b) the full scope of Defendants' infringing conduct; (c) the source(s) and present location(s) of Defendants' inventory of Infringing Products; and (d) the location(s) of the revenue received by Defendants from their infringing sales. *See Admarketplace, Inc. v. Tee Support, Inc.*, No. 1:13-cv-05635, 2013 WL 4838854, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Sep. 11, 2013) (finding that a plaintiff "who has potentially meritorious claim and no ability to enforce it absent expedited discovery, has demonstrated good cause for expedited discovery"). Therefore, only through an order from the Court allowing expedited discovery may Plaintiff be able to ascertain the full extent of Defendants' infringement.

Good cause supports this limited relief for the reasons set forth in Plaintiff's accompanying Brief in Support.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Pete Wolfgram
Pete Wolfgram
pwolfgram@stratumlaw.com
STRATUM LAW LLC
E. York St. Ste. 223
Philadelphia, PA, 19125
Attorney for Stela Caraman