

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
PROVIDENCE, SC

SUPERIOR COURT

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND,

Plaintiff,

v.

AECOM TECHNICAL SERVICES, INC., *et al.*,

Defendant.

C.A. No. PC-2024-04526

**DEFENDANT AECOM TECHNICAL SERVICES, INC.'S RENEWED MOTION TO
COMPEL PLAINTIFF STATE OF RHODE ISLAND'S ANSWERS TO AECOM'S
FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

Defendant, AECOM Technical Services, Inc. ("AECOM"), pursuant to Rule 37 of the Rhode Island Superior Court Rules of Civil Procedure, respectfully moves this Court for an Order compelling Plaintiff, the State of Rhode Island (the "State") to serve full, complete, and Rule 33-compliant answers to AECOM's First Set of Interrogatories.

This motion arises from a broad and recurring failure by the State to disclose the factual bases of its claims in response to interrogatories seeking that information. Many of AECOM's interrogatories are directed to the specific facts underlying the allegations set forth in the State's Amended Complaint, including the acts or omissions the State contends give rise to liability, the facts supporting its notice and causation theories, and the bases for its claimed damages. Yet despite multiple opportunities to cure, the State has declined to identify those facts, instead relying on boilerplate objections, circular cross-references, broad document citations, and vague assertions that "discovery is ongoing."

As detailed more fully in the accompanying Memorandum of Law, the State has failed to comply with its obligations under Rule 33 despite multiple opportunities to cure, including after

agreeing to serve amended responses following AECOM's prior motion to compel. The State's February 2, 2026 supplemental responses remain materially deficient.

Specifically, the State's responses are deficient in the following respects, many of which stem from its failure to answer interrogatories seeking the factual bases of its pleaded allegations:

- 1) The State has failed to provide any substantive response to Interrogatory No. 21, which seeks core damages information, including the categories, amounts, calculations, and factual bases for the damages the State claims to have suffered;
- 2) The State has failed to provide separate and complete answers to individual interrogatories, improperly relying on broad document citations, cross-references, generalized assertions, and boilerplate objections instead of providing narrative factual responses as required;
- 3) The State has invoked Rule 33(d) improperly by directing AECOM to broad categories of documents rather than identifying, with any degree of specificity, the facts supporting its claims;
- 4) The State has failed to disclose the factual bases for its allegations against AECOM in the Amended Complaint; and
- 5) The State has improperly qualified its responses with vague "discovery is ongoing" reservations, instead of providing full and complete answers based on information presently known or reasonably available, as Rule 33 requires.

Accordingly, AECOM respectfully requests that the Court enter an Order:

- a) Compelling the State to serve amended, Rule 33-compliant responses to AECOM's First Set of Interrogatories, including but not limited to Interrogatory No. 21, by a date certain set by the Court;

- b) Requiring that such responses provide complete, narrative, interrogatory-specific factual answers, identifying the facts the State contends support its claims of liability, notice, causation, and damages;
- c) Prohibiting reliance on Rule 33(d) except where its requirements are strictly satisfied, including identification of specific business records and precise locations within those records from which the answers may be derived;
- d) Prohibiting incorporation-by-reference, circular cross-referencing, and document citations as substitutes for sworn interrogatory answers;
- e) Requiring the State to withdraw boilerplate reservations that “discovery is ongoing” or that it “reserves the right to supplement,” except as permitted under Rule 26(e) following a complete response; and
- f) Granting such other and further relief as the Court deems just and appropriate, including, if warranted, costs and fees associated with this motion.

RULE 37 CERTIFICATION

AECOM certifies that it made repeated good-faith efforts to resolve these disputes through the detailed deficiency notices issued on November 12, 2025 and February 26, 2026. The State has declined to further amend its responses.

Respectfully submitted,

AECOM TECHNICAL SERVICES, INC.

By Its Attorneys,

LAMONTAGNE, SPAULDING & HAYES, LLP

/s/ Amanda Prosek

Amanda Prosek (#7677)
100 Midway Road, Suite 15
Garden City Center
Cranston, RI 02920
Tel: (401) 270-7094
Mobile: (401) 573-0053
aprosek@lshattorneys.com

COZEN O'CONNOR

/s/ Wendy Venoit

Courtney Richards (#10593)
Wendy Venoit (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Michael Filbin (*admitted pro hac vice*)
200 State Street, Suite 1105
Boston, MA 02109
Tel: (617) 849-5100
Fax: (857)-488-4870
crichards@cozen.com
wvenoit@cozen.com
mfilbin@cozen.com

Lawrence M. Prosen (*admitted pro hac vice*)
2001 M Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 304-1449
Fax: (202) 400-2715
lprosen@cozen.com

Dated: June 8, 2026

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 8, 2026, I electronically filed and served this document through the electronic filing system on all counsel of record.

The document is available for viewing and/or downloading from the Rhode Island Judiciary's electronic filing system.

/s/ Amanda R. Prosek
Amanda