Robert L. Stepans
Ryan R. Shaffer
James C. Murnion
Victoria K.M. Gannon
Meyer, Shaffer & Stepans, PLLP
430 Ryman Street
Missoula, MT 59802
Tel: (406) 543-6929
Fax: (406) 721-1799
rob@mss-lawfirm.com
ryan@mss-lawfirm.com
james@mss-lawfirm.com
katy@mss-lawfirm.com

Matthew L. Merrill (appearing *pro hac vice*) Merrill Law, LLC 6631 Mariposa Court Denver, CO 80221 Tel: (303) 947-4453 matthew@merrillwaterlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA BILLINGS DIVISION

TRACY CAEKAERT, and CAMILLIA MAPLEY,	Case No. CV-20-52-BLG-SPW
Plaintiffs, vs.  WATCHTOWER BIBLE AND TRACT SOCIETY OF NEW YORK, INC., and WATCH TOWER BIBLE AND TRACT SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA.,	PLAINTIFFS' REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR SANCTIONS RE: WTNY'S NON- COMPLIANCE WITH COURT ORDER (ECF No. 85) RE: WTPA'S RESPOSNE
Defendants,	<i>)</i> ) )

Plaintiffs Tracy Caekaert and Camillia Mapley submit the following Reply Brief in Support of their Motion for Sanctions re: Watchtower Bible and Tract Society's ("WTNY") Non-Compliance with Court Order (ECF No. 85) re:

Case 1:20-cv-00052-SPW Document 300 Filed 12/04/23 Page 2 of 3

Defendant Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania's ("WTPA")

Response.

WTPA argues that the first, third, and fourth sanctions sought against

WTNY are not permissible because they would "significantly impact WTPA if

granted." However, the first and third sanctions sought, by their very terms, do not

affect WTPA's ability to defend itself in this case. The first requested sanction

would restrict WTNY's ability to present evidence and argument; WTPA's ability

to present evidence and argument would not be affected. The third requested

sanction would strike some of WTNY's affirmative defenses; WTPA's affirmative

defenses would not be affected. WTPA makes no showing how these two

sanctions would impair its ability to present argument and defenses at trial. The

fourth requested sanction would admittedly affect WTPA. As such, if the Court is

convinced this sanction is inappropriate as applied to WTPA, it can simply remove

WTPA from the list of entities in the requested sanction.

DATED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2023.

By: <u>/s/ Ryan Shaffer</u>

Ryan R. Shaffer

MEYER, SHAFFER & STEPANS PLLP

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Plaintiffs' Reply Brief in Support of Motion for Sanctions re: WTNY's Noncompliance with Court Order re: WTPA's Response

## **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.3(d)(2), Plaintiff hereby certifies that this brief complies with the length requirement for briefs, and that this brief contains 187 words, excluding the caption, certificates of service, and compliance, table of contents, and authorities, and exhibit index.

By: <u>/s/ Ryan Shaffer</u>
Ryan R. Shaffer
MEYER, SHAFFER & STEPANS PLLP

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to Local Rule 1.4, this document has been served on all parties via electronic service through the Court's Case Management/Electronic Case Filing (CM/ECF) system.

By: <u>/s/ Ryan Shaffer</u>
Ryan R. Shaffer
MEYER, SHAFFER & STEPANS PLLP

Attorneys for Plaintiffs