

**PUBLIC**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Traffic Jam Events, LLC,	)	
a limited liability company,	)	Docket No. 9395
	)	
and	)	
	)	
David J. Jeansonne II, individually and as an	)	
officer of Traffic Jam Events, LLC,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	

**ORDER ON COMPLAINT COUNSEL’S MOTION TO COMPEL**

**I.**

On October 16, 2020, Complaint Counsel filed a motion seeking to compel Respondents Traffic Jam Events, LLC and David J. Jeansonne II to provide further discovery. Specifically, Complaint Counsel challenges as inadequate and incomplete the production of Documents, and disclosures provided in Respondents’ Opposition on October 21, 2020. Included in Respondents’ Opposition was a request for oral argument, as to which Complaint Counsel filed an opposition. Oral argument is unnecessary and the request for oral argument is therefore DENIED.

For the reasons set forth below, the Motion is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

**II.**

**A. Summary of Pleadings**

The Complaint against Respondents alleges three counts of violating the FTC Act. Count I alleges deceptive advertising regarding COVID-19 government stimulus benefits.

Complaint ¶¶ 15-16; see also ¶ 5 (alleging that Respondents have disseminated or caused to be disseminated deceptive advertisements and promotional materials, including advertisements purporting to provide COVID-19 stimulus relief to consumers [I]n or around March 2020, consumers to dealerships under the guise that valuable government relief related to COVID-19 was available at designated locations for a short

**B. Relevant Background Facts**

Based on the Motion, the



### **III.**

#### **A. Scope of Discovery**

The permissible scope of discovery is governed by Commission Rule of Practice 3.31(c), which provides in pertinent part: reasonably expected to yield information relevant to the allegations of the complaint, to the propos



include any of Respondents advertising for any product or service. Such relief requires consideration of, among other things, the seriousness and deliberateness of the violation and whether the respondent has a history of prior violations. In re Telebrands Corp<sup>140</sup> F.T.C. 278, 334-





List consistent with this Order and the requirements of the Scheduling Order by November 6, 2020.

3.

to attempt to reach an

agreement is not reached, Complaint Counsel may file a motion to compel under Rule 3.37. resolved by this Order. To the extent an

ORDERED:



D. Michael Chappell  
Chief Administrative Law Judge

Date: October 28, 2020