



1 of 1 DOCUMENT

DEERING'S CALIFORNIA CODES ANNOTATED
Copyright (c) 2011 by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc.
a member of the LexisNexis Group.
All rights reserved.

*** THIS DOCUMENT IS CURRENT THROUGH URGENCY CHAPTER 28 OF THE 2011 SESSION ***
SPECIAL NOTICE: CHAPTERS ENACTED BETWEEN OCTOBER 20, 2009, AND NOVEMBER 2, 2010, ARE
SUBJECT TO REPEAL BY PROPOSITION 22.

CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE
Part 4. Miscellaneous Provisions
Title 4. Civil Discovery Act
Chapter 13. Written Interrogatories
Article 1. Propounding Interrogatories

GO TO CALIFORNIA CODES ARCHIVE DIRECTORY

Cal Code Civ Proc § 2030.030 (2011)

§ 2030.030. Number of specially prepared and official form interrogatories that may be propounded; Number to which party must respond

(a) A party may propound to another party either or both of the following:

(1) Thirty-five specially prepared interrogatories that are relevant to the subject matter of the pending action.

(2) Any additional number of official form interrogatories, as described in Chapter 17 (commencing with Section 2033.710), that are relevant to the subject matter of the pending action.

(b) Except as provided in Section 2030.070, no party shall, as a matter of right, propound to any other party more than 35 specially prepared interrogatories. If the initial set of interrogatories does not exhaust this limit, the balance may be propounded in subsequent sets.

(c) Unless a declaration as described in Section 2030.050 has been made, a party need only respond to the first 35 specially prepared interrogatories served, if that party states an objection to the balance, under Section 2030.240, on the ground that the limit has been exceeded.

HISTORY:

Added Stats 2004 ch 182 § 23 (AB 3081), operative July 1, 2005.

NOTES:

Historical Derivation:

Former CCP § 2030 (c)(1), added Stats 1986 ch 1334 § 2, amended Stats 1987 ch 86 § 12, Stats 1988 ch 553 § 4, ch 575 § 1, Stats 1991 ch 1090 § 11.

Law Revision Commission Comments:**2004**

Subdivision (a) of Section 2030.030 continues the first sentence of former Section 2030(c)(1) without substantive change.

Subdivision (b) continues the second and third sentences of former Section 2030(c)(1) without change, except to conform the cross-reference.

Subdivision (c) continues the fourth sentence of former Section 2030(c)(1) without change, except to conform the cross-references.

Editor's Notes

For notes of decisions derived from cases decided under former CCP § 2030, see *CCP § 2030.010*.

Collateral References:

Cal. Forms Pleading & Practice (Matthew Bender(R)) ch 194 "Discovery: Interrogatories".

Cal. Points & Authorities (Matthew Bender(R)) ch 84 "Discovery: Interrogatories" § 84.20.

Cal. Employment Law (Matthew Bender(R)), § .

Cal. Employment Law (Matthew Bender(R)), § 61.04.

Cal. Fam. Law Practice & Procedure (Matthew Bender(R)), § 110.14.

Cal. Fam. Law Practice & Procedure (Matthew Bender(R)), § 110.33.

Cal. Fam. Law Practice & Procedure (Matthew Bender(R)), § 110.34.

Matthew Bender (R) Practice Guide: Cal. Debt Collection and Enforcement of Judgments §§ 10.15, 10.17.

Hierarchy Notes:

Pt. 4, Tit. 4 Note

Pt. 4, Tit. 4, Ch. 13, Art. 1 Note

LexisNexis 50 State Surveys, Legislation & Regulations

Depositions & Interrogatories

NOTES OF DECISIONS

Monetary sanction for frivolous objections to special interrogatories was appropriate under *CCP § 2023.030(a)* because a vagueness objection to a term defined by statute lacked substantial justification; moreover, questions that required reference to an answer to an earlier interrogatory were not incomplete under *CCP § 2030.060(d)* or compound, conjunctive, or disjunctive under § 2030.060(f), because the interrogatories did not arguably exceed the limit of 35 as provided in *CCP § 2030.030(b)*. *Clement v. Alegre (2009, 1st Dist) 2009 Cal App LEXIS 1568*.

Combining a motion for sanctions with requests for other relief, which included the striking of class claims, was not improper. *Tucker v. Pacific Bell Mobile Services (2010, 1st Dist) 2010 Cal App LEXIS 1255*.

Trial court did not err in granting a motion for sanctions where no prior motion to compel deposition responses had been filed. On its face, *CCP § 2025.480* does not require a party to move to compel answers before seeking monetary sanctions pursuant to *CCP § 2023.030*. *Tucker v. Pacific Bell Mobile Services (2010, 1st Dist) 2010 Cal App LEXIS 1255*.

Costs of a future deposition could not be awarded as a discovery sanction under *CCP § 2023.030*, subd. (a), because those costs had not yet been incurred. *Tucker v. Pacific Bell Mobile Services (2010, 1st Dist) 2010 Cal App LEXIS 1255*.

Before expenses can be awarded as sanctions under *CCP § 2023.030*, subd. (a), they must be incurred, which means that the individual seeking sanctions must have already become liable for those expenses. *Tucker v. Pacific Bell Mobile Services (2010, 1st Dist) 2010 Cal App LEXIS 1255*.