Γ				Γ		
			1			3
			11:34:22	1	little bit late starting this morning. As I am sure you all	
		1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		11:34:28	2	know, we are very busy over here, the judges, and the court
	3	IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE		11:34:32	3	reporters as well. I know that you are all busy, also. I
1	4	LEADER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., ) Civil Action		11;34:34	4	do apologize for having to move the call back a bit to track
1	5	a Delaware corporation,	) }	11:34:38	5	down a court reporter.
	6	Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant,	) }	11:34:40	6	The purpose of the call today is to talk about
	7	v.	<b>}</b>	11:34:44	7	the latest discovery disputes that the parties have put in
	8	FACEBOOK, INC.,	) )	11:34:48	8	front of me. Both sides are complaining about certain
	9	a Dolaware Corporation,  Defendant and Counterclaim	) )	11:34:52	9	aspects of the other side's discovery to date. I have, of
	10		) No. 08-862-JJF-LPS	11:34:56	10	course, reviewed the letters, and I do want to give you all
	11			11:35:00	11	a chance to add a little bit more, if you wish, to what you
	12	Wilmington, Delaw		11:35:04	12	set out in the letters.
	13	Friday, October 23, 11:30 a.m.		11:35:06	13	Let's start with Facebook's complaint and your
	14	•		11:35:14	14	request that there be more complete responses to your
	15 16			11:35:18	15	Interrogatories Nos. 4 and 11 regarding the allegation of
	17	BEFORE: HONORABLE LEONARD P. STARK,	J.S.M.J.	11:35:22	16	willful infringement. And I want to hear first from
	18	APPEARANCES:		11:35:26		Facebook on that, please.
	19	PHILIP A. ROVNER, ESQ.		11:35:26		MS. KEEFE: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
	20	Potter Anderson & Corroon LL -and-	2			
	21	PAUL J. ANDRE, ESQ., and JAMES R. HANNAH, ESQ.		11:35:28		Good morning.
	22	King & Spalding (Silicon Valley, CA)		11:35:28		Your Honor, it is interesting, having read the
	23	Counsel fo Technologi		11:35:32		opponent's opposition brief, I might be able to
	24	, cultioned ga	ad, and,	11:35:34		short-circuit some of this.
	25			11:35:36	23	This is another case where we had asked for more
				11:35:40	24	information and received more information in their
J			<del></del>	11;35;42	25	opposition brief than we had in the original response. If
: 			2			4
1	1 A	PPEARANCES CONTINUED:		11:35:46	1	Your Honor would be willing to simply order that the facts
2	2	STEVEN L. CAPONI, ESQ		11:35:50	2	contained in the opposition letter be their interrogatory
		Blank Rome LLP		11:35:56	3	response, I think we would be satisfied, since they have
3	3	-and-		11:36:00	4	said in their opposition letter that these facts are all
***************************************		HEIDI L. KEEFE, ESQ., and		11:36:02	5	they have. Those are more than in their response. If they
4	4	MARK R. WEINSTEIN, ESQ.		11:36:06	6	are all concatenated and turned into a response, I think we
] ,	-	Cleary Godward & Kronish LLP		11:36:10	7	would be satisfied.
	5	(Paio Alto, CA)		11:36:10	8	THE COURT: Let's stop you there and see what
6	6			11:36:12	9	the plaintiff's position is, just on what you have said so
	7	Counsel for Facebook, 1	ıc.	11:36:16	10	far.
8	8			11:36:16	11	MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, I think most of what we
	9			11:36:20	12	put in our letter brief was a response. We have no problem
10				11:36:28	13	supplementing a response to that level. The big issue with
11				11:36:30		this is that willfulness is really an examination of the
11:33:44 13		THE COURT: Good morning, e	vervone. This is	11:36:32		defendant's activity. We haven't had a chance to do that
11:33:44 14		<del>-</del> -	,			
	4 3	udge Stark. Who is there, please?			16	vet. We can supplement our interrogatory with what's in our
11;33;46 15		MR. ROVNER: Good morn	ng, Your Honor. This is	11:36:36		yet. We can supplement our interrogatory with what's in our letter brief and make this issue go away.
	5			11:36:36 11:36:38	17	letter brief and make this issue go away.
11:33:46 15 11:33:48 16 11:33:52 17	5 6 P 7 W	MR. ROVNER: Good morn thil Rovner from Potter Anderson on Vith me on the line is Paul Andre and	behalf of the plaintiff.	11:36:36 11:36:38 11:36:44	17 18	letter brief and make this issue go away.  THE COURT: Ms. Keefe, if I order Leader to
11:33:46	5 6 P 7 W 8 &	MR. ROVNER: Good morn thil Rovner from Potter Anderson on With me on the line is Paul Andre and Spalding.	behalf of the plaintiff. I James Hannah from King	11:36:36 11:36:38 11:36:44 11:36:48	17 18 19	letter brief and make this issue go away.  THE COURT: Ms. Keefe, if I order Leader to supplement its interrogatories, let's say, by next
11:33:46	5 6 P 7 W 8 & 9	MR. ROVNER: Good morn thil Rovner from Potter Anderson on Vith me on the line is Paul Andre and Spalding. MR. CAPONI: Good morni	behalf of the plaintiff. I James Hannah from King ng, Your Honor. Steve	11:36:36 11:36:38 11:36:44 11:36:48 11:36:54	17 18 19 20	letter brief and make this issue go away.  THE COURT: Ms. Keefe, if I order Leader to supplement its interrogatories, let's say, by next  Wednesday, to incorporate the contents of its letter, that
11:33:46	5 6 P 7 W 8 & 9	MR. ROVNER: Good morn thil Rovner from Potter Anderson on With me on the line is Paul Andre and Spalding.	behalf of the plaintiff. I James Hannah from King ng, Your Honor. Steve I the phone is also Heidi	11:36:36 11:36:38 11:36:44 11:36:48 11:36:54 11:36:58	17 18 19 20 21	letter brief and make this issue go away.  THE COURT: Ms. Keefe, if I order Leader to supplement its interrogatories, let's say, by next  Wednesday, to incorporate the contents of its letter, that is the end of this dispute and you withdraw your request for
11:33:46	5 6 P 7 W 8 & 9 0 C	MR. ROVNER: Good morn thil Rovner from Potter Anderson on Vith me on the line is Paul Andre and Spalding. MR. CAPONI: Good morni Caponi from Blank Rome, With me o	behalf of the plaintiff. I James Hannah from King ng, Your Honor. Steve I the phone is also Heidi y Godward.	11:36:38 11:36:44 11:36:48 11:36:54 11:36:58 11:37:02	17 18 19 20 21 22	letter brief and make this issue go away.  THE COURT: Ms. Keefe, if I order Leader to supplement its interrogatories, let's say, by next  Wednesday, to incorporate the contents of its letter, that is the end of this dispute and you withdraw your request for a stay with respect to willful infringement discovery?
11:33:46	5 6 P 7 W 8 & 9 0 C 1 K	MR. ROVNER: Good morn thil Rovner from Potter Anderson on Vith me on the line is Paul Andre and Spalding. MR. CAPONI: Good morni Saponi from Blank Rome. With me of Geefe and Mark Weinstein from Clear	behalf of the plaintiff.  I James Hannah from King  ng, Your Honor. Steve  I the phone is also Heidi  y Godward.  g to everyone.	11:36:36 11:36:38 11:36:44 11:36:48 11:36:54 11:37:02 11:37:04	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	letter brief and make this issue go away.  THE COURT: Ms. Keefe, if I order Leader to supplement its interrogatories, let's say, by next  Wednesday, to incorporate the contents of its letter, that is the end of this dispute and you withdraw your request for a stay with respect to willful infringement discovery?  MS. KEEFE: Not quite, Your Honor. Close.
11:33:46 15 11:33:48 16 11:33:52 17 11:33:58 18 11:33:58 19 0 20	5 P W 8 & 9 C C 1 K 2 2 3 4 1	MR. ROVNER: Good morn thil Rovner from Potter Anderson on Vith me on the line is Paul Andre and Spalding. MR. CAPONI: Good morni Saponi from Blank Rome. With me of Ceefe and Mark Weinstein from Clear	behalf of the plaintiff.  I James Hannah from King  Ing, Your Honor. Steve  I the phone is also Heidi  Y Godward.  I to everyone.  I der Technologies,	11:36:38 11:36:44 11:36:48 11:36:54 11:36:58 11:37:02	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	letter brief and make this issue go away.  THE COURT: Ms. Keefe, if I order Leader to supplement its interrogatories, let's say, by next  Wednesday, to incorporate the contents of its letter, that is the end of this dispute and you withdraw your request for a stay with respect to willful infringement discovery?

	_	1	
4	5	4	7
11;37;12 1	open. Tied in from his opposition letter was that these are	11:39:42 1	MR. HANNAH: Your Honor, James Hannah
11:37:18 2	all the facts they have. And therefore I would assume that	11:39:44 2	representing Leader. Good morning,
11:37:20 3	in his supplementation he would remove the "on information	11:39:46 3	Simply, we are just asking for Facebook to
1 14 4	and belief," because these are the only facts that he has	11;39;50 4	provide a complete response and all the technical documents
.26 5	right now and this is all there is. So it is not an	11:39:56 5	that it has that we have identified the source code modules
11:37:32 6	open-ended thing. This is what he has as of right now.	11:40:00 6	for. As Your Honor remembers, we were asked to identify
11:37:36 7	We know if something else comes up somewhere	11:40:04 7	source code modules for which we sought technical documents,
11:37:38 8	down the line, he can always move to amend those responses.	11:40:08	for which we found infringing technology. We identified
11:37:42 9	But as of right now, the responses need to be clear and	11:40:10 9	those documents we identified those source code modules
11:37:46 10	complete and not simply information and belief, because that	11:40:16 10	to Facebook, and Facebook, in turn, produced approximately
11:37:48 11	is not appropriate. That's why if we could incorporate it	11:40:20 11	4,000 pages, most of those, 3900 of them were public
11:37:52 12	in the opposition, since they said this is all I have, that	11:40:26 12	documents. Of that we have got about 400 pages which were a
11:37:56 13	was the fight.	11:40:30 13	screen shot of a wicking. We do not have any e-mails, which
11;37:56 14	THE COURT: Mr. Andre, I understood that is what	11:40:38 14	Facebook has refused to produce. We do not have any design
11:38:00 15	you would be offering to do. That is, that you have	11:40:42 15	documents. We don't have any development documents. All of
11:38:02 16	provided the full basis of what you know today, prior to	11:40:46 16	these documents are highly relevant to our case.
11:38:10 17	getting discovery on willful infringement, you have provided	11;40:50 17	For instance, the e-mails and the design
11:38:14 18	everything that you know about the basis for your willful	11:40:52 18	developments documents, the development documents will
11:38:18 19	infringement claim, and you reserve the right to supplement	11:40:56 19	provide information as to when there were product changes,
11:38:20 20	to the extent you find something else in discovery.	11:40:58 20	and we can see when different functionality was implemented
11:38:24 21	Did I get your position correct, Mr. Andre?	11:41:00 21	by Facebook. It will provide info as to how employees
11:38:26 22	MR. ANDRE: You did, Your Honor.	11:41:04 22	characterized the operation and functionality of the site.
11:38:26 23	THE COURT: Ms. Keefe, that's what you are	11:41:08 23	It will provide information on how the system operates, so
11:38:28 24	looking for?	11:41:10 24	we have an idea about how each application interacts with
41-28:30 25	MS. KEEFE: I think it is. I think the only	11:41:14 25	the source code modules. We can look at the source code
. 1	6		8
11:38:32 1	6 thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to	11:41:16 1	8 itself.
11:38:32 1		11:41:16 <b>1</b>	
	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to		itself.
11:38:34 2	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if	11:41:16 2	itself.  But seeing the e-mails, the design documents,
11:38:34 <b>2</b> 11:38:38 <b>3</b>	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the	11:41:20 3	itself.  But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.	11:41:20 3 11:41:24 4	itself.  But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is	11:41:16 2 11:41:20 3 11:41:24 4 11:41:28 5	itself.  But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.	11:41:16 2 11:41:20 3 11:41:24 4 11:41:28 5 11:41:32 6	itself.  But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.	11:41:16	itself.  But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that	11/41/16	itself.  But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement	11/41/16 2 11/41/20 3 11/41/24 4 11/41/28 5 11/41/32 6 11/41/34 7 11/41/38 8 11/41/42 9 11/41/44 10	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?  MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.	11/41/16 2 11/41/20 3 11/41/24 4 11/41/28 5 11/41/32 6 11/41/34 7 11/41/38 8 11/41/32 9	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in there, we do not see any instructions, any troubleshooting
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?	11/41/20 3 11/41/20 4 11/41/24 4 11/41/28 5 11/41/32 6 11/41/34 7 11/41/38 8 11/41/32 9 11/41/44 10 11/41/48 11 11/41/52 12	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?  MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Any problem with that from your end, Mr. Andre?	11:41:16	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in there, we do not see any instructions, any troubleshooting guides.  The e-mails will allow us to also narrow and
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?  MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Any problem with that from your end, Mr. Andre?  MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.	11/41/20 3 11/41/24 4 11/41/28 5 11/41/32 6 11/41/34 7 11/41/38 8 11/41/42 9 11/41/44 10 11/41/48 11 11/41/52 12 11/41/54 13	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in there, we do not see any instructions, any troubleshooting guides.  The e-mails will allow us to also narrow and focus our discovery in depositions. If we don't have any
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?  MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Any problem with that from your end, Mr. Andre?  MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.  THE COURT: I believe that takes care in full of	11:41:16 2 11:41:20 3 11:41:24 4 11:41:28 5 11:41:32 6 11:41:34 7 11:41:38 8 11:41:42 9 11:41:44 10 11:41:52 12 11:41:54 13 11:41:58 14 11:41:58 14 11:42:02 15	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in there, we do not see any instructions, any troubleshooting guides.  The e-mails will allow us to also narrow and focus our discovery in depositions. If we don't have any e-mail communications and if we don't have any design
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?  MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Any problem with that from your end, Mr. Andre?  MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.  THE COURT: I believe that takes care in full of Facebook's issue. Is that right, Ms. Keefe?	11:41:16	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in there, we do not see any instructions, any troubleshooting guides.  The e-mails will allow us to also narrow and focus our discovery in depositions. If we don't have any e-mail communications and if we don't have any design documents, development documents, we are shooting in the
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?  MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Any problem with that from your end, Mr. Andre?  MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.  THE COURT: I believe that takes care in full of Facebook's issue. Is that right, Ms. Keefe?  MS. KEEFE: I believe, Your Honor.	11:41:16	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in there, we do not see any instructions, any troubleshooting guides.  The e-mails will allow us to also narrow and focus our discovery in depositions. If we don't have any e-mail communications and if we don't have any design documents, development documents, we are shooting in the dark. We don't know exactly the engineers that we need to
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?  MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Any problem with that from your end, Mr. Andre?  MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.  THE COURT: I believe that takes care in full of Facebook's issue. Is that right, Ms. Keefe?  MS. KEEFE: I believe, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Fine. I appreciate you flagging	11:41:16	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in there, we do not see any instructions, any troubleshooting guides.  The e-mails will allow us to also narrow and focus our discovery in depositions. If we don't have any e-mail communications and if we don't have any design documents, development documents, we are shooting in the dark. We don't know exactly the engineers that we need to depose to ask about the infringing technology, the
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?  MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Any problem with that from your end, Mr. Andre?  MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.  THE COURT: I believe that takes care in full of Facebook's issue. Is that right, Ms. Keefe?  MS. KEEFE: I believe, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Fine. I appreciate you flagging that way of dealing with it for me.	11:41:20 3 11:41:24 4 11:41:28 5 11:41:22 6 11:41:34 7 11:41:38 8 11:41:42 9 11:41:48 11 11:41:52 12 11:41:54 13 11:41:58 14 11:42:06 16 11:42:08 17 11:42:16 19	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in there, we do not see any instructions, any troubleshooting guides.  The e-mails will allow us to also narrow and focus our discovery in depositions. If we don't have any e-mail communications and if we don't have any design documents, development documents, we are shooting in the dark. We don't know exactly the engineers that we need to depose to ask about the infringing technology, the infringing source code modules. So it's putting Leader in a
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?  MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Any problem with that from your end, Mr. Andre?  MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.  THE COURT: I believe that takes care in full of Facebook's issue. Is that right, Ms. Keefe?  MS. KEEFE: I believe, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Fine. I appreciate you flagging that way of dealing with it for me.  Let's move on, then, to Leader's various	11:41:16	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in there, we do not see any instructions, any troubleshooting guides.  The e-mails will allow us to also narrow and focus our discovery in depositions. If we don't have any e-mail communications and if we don't have any design documents, development documents, we are shooting in the dark. We don't know exactly the engineers that we need to depose to ask about the infringing technology, the infringing source code modules. So it's putting Leader in a very difficult situation, not having these technical
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?  MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Any problem with that from your end, Mr. Andre?  MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.  THE COURT: I believe that takes care in full of Facebook's issue. Is that right, Ms. Keefe?  MS. KEEFE: I believe, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Fine. I appreciate you flagging that way of dealing with it for me.  Let's move on, then, to Leader's various complaints about Facebook's compliance with the Court's	11:41:16	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in there, we do not see any instructions, any troubleshooting guides.  The e-mails will allow us to also narrow and focus our discovery in depositions. If we don't have any e-mail communications and if we don't have any design documents, development documents, we are shooting in the dark. We don't know exactly the engineers that we need to depose to ask about the infringing technology, the infringing source code modules. So it's putting Leader in a very difficult situation, not having these technical documents.
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?  MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Any problem with that from your end, Mr. Andre?  MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.  THE COURT: I believe that takes care in full of Facebook's issue. Is that right, Ms. Keefe?  MS. KEEFE: I believe, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Fine. I appreciate you flagging that way of dealing with it for me.  Let's move on, then, to Leader's various complaints about Facebook's compliance with the Court's September 4th order. Let me hear first from Leader on	11:41:16	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in there, we do not see any instructions, any troubleshooting guides.  The e-mails will allow us to also narrow and focus our discovery in depositions. If we don't have any e-mail communications and if we don't have any design documents, development documents, we are shooting in the dark. We don't know exactly the engineers that we need to depose to ask about the infringing technology, the infringing source code modules. So it's putting Leader in a very difficult situation, not having these technical documents.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I appreciate that
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?  MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Any problem with that from your end, Mr. Andre?  MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.  THE COURT: I believe that takes care in full of Facebook's issue. Is that right, Ms. Keefe?  MS. KEEFE: I believe, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Fine. I appreciate you flagging that way of dealing with it for me.  Let's move on, then, to Leader's various complaints about Facebook's compliance with the Court's September 4th order. Let me hear first from Leader on this one.	11:41:16	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in there, we do not see any instructions, any troubleshooting guides.  The e-mails will allow us to also narrow and focus our discovery in depositions. If we don't have any e-mail communications and if we don't have any design documents, development documents, we are shooting in the dark. We don't know exactly the engineers that we need to depose to ask about the infringing technology, the infringing source code modules. So it's putting Leader in a very difficult situation, not having these technical documents.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I appreciate that you have come up with a list of the potential relevance of
11:38:34	thing I would also note, Your Honor, is that I would like to simply reserve the right to move for a commensurate stay if I move for summary judgment of non-willfulness based on the facts in the record. That can happen at a later time.  THE COURT: That is not a matter that is actually in dispute today.  MS. KEEFE: Correct.  THE COURT: Any problem with the mechanism that I give Mr. Andre till next Wednesday to formally supplement his response with the contents of the letter?  MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Any problem with that from your end, Mr. Andre?  MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.  THE COURT: I believe that takes care in full of Facebook's issue. Is that right, Ms. Keefe?  MS. KEEFE: I believe, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Fine. I appreciate you flagging that way of dealing with it for me.  Let's move on, then, to Leader's various complaints about Facebook's compliance with the Court's September 4th order. Let me hear first from Leader on	11:41:16	But seeing the e-mails, the design documents, the development documents, and how the source code modules operate gives us a full picture of the Facebook website and what's been accused of infringement.  The list goes on and on, Your Honor. It gives you insight as to how the employees use the site and how Facebook instructs the employees to use the site. It gives us insight to see how Facebook instructs its users to use the site, because we do not see any technical manuals in there, we do not see any instructions, any troubleshooting guides.  The e-mails will allow us to also narrow and focus our discovery in depositions. If we don't have any e-mail communications and if we don't have any design documents, development documents, we are shooting in the dark. We don't know exactly the engineers that we need to depose to ask about the infringing technology, the infringing source code modules. So it's putting Leader in a very difficult situation, not having these technical documents.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I appreciate that

11:45:46 24

11:45:58 25

The definition of "technical document" that you

included did not specify, as I read it, e-mails, nor do I

11:48:52 24

11:48:52 25

interject.

That is absolutely untrue. We absolutely have

	17		19
11:54:18 1	documents. I have been doing this a long time. I have seen	11:58:52 1	do searches, that is about it. That declaration was not
11:54:22 2	a lot of different patent cases involving this technology.	11:56:54 2	what I would call going to the level needed to produce
11:54;24 3	I have never seen such a small production of technical	11:56:58 3	documents in this type of case.
28 4	documents.	11:57:00 4	As far as e-mail goes, they didn't try to search
, .30 5	My guess is, on the e-mail side, they have not	11:57;04 5	for technical documents. I mean, I wish e-mails were not
11:54:34 6	done anything to search for technical documents that would	11,57,08 6	part of discovery, I really do, because they are the biggest
11:54:38 7	normally happen in the course of this type of litigation.	11:57:10 7	pain in discovery in these types of cases.
11:54:40 8	When we start taking these depositions, my guess is that the	11:57:14 8	But that is not the rules at this point.
11:54:44 9	engineers are going to start identifying a lot of documents	11:57:14 9	E-mails are part of the documents that you have to collect.
11:54:46 10	that they have that they used that we do not have access to.	11:67:18 10	And there was no agreement between the parties that e-mails
11;54;50 11	The only thing we have at this point other than	11:57:20 11	would not be collected.
11:54:52 12	the 390 pages is the source code. We can't use the source	11:57:22 12	So at this point, we are being prejudiced
11:54:54 13	code in deposition. We are lawyers. We are not technical	11:57:26 13	because we spent the hours, hundreds of attorney hours
11:54:58 14	experts.	11:57:30 14	reviewing e-mails, producing them, and they didn't try,
11:66:00 15	So it is something that puts us at a huge	11:57:34 15	other than the fact they didn't even try to look at for
11:55:04 16	disadvantage by them just, you know, not fulfilling their	11:57:40 16	technical information in the e-mails, but then their
11:55:06 17	obligations under the Federal Rules.	11:57:42 17	declaration was such that they have outside counsel do the
11:55:08 18	E-mails, as Your Honor knows, are required to be	11:57:46 18	search.
11:55:12 19	produced. They are relevant documents under the Federal	11:57:46 19	Other than my own experience, that is what I
1f:55:16 <b>20</b>	Rules of Civil Procedure. Just because they haven't done it	11:57:50 20	rely on.
11:55:20 21	in the last eight months and it will be a burden on them to	11:57:50 21	THE COURT: I am prepared to rule on this. I am
11:55:22 22	do it now, it seems to be prejudicial to us. We produced	11:57:58 22	denying Leader's request for production of further technical
11,55:24 23	our e-mails. It was a burden. But that's what the rulings	11:58:04 23	documents. I believe, considering the fact that we have had
11:55:28 24	call for.	11:58:08 24	extensive discussions and analysis of what technical
.14.55:28 25	I am more concerned with the technical documents	11:58:14 25	documents and what access to source code Facebook was going
	18		20
11:55:32 1	18 than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a	11:58:18 1	20 to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that
11:55:32 1		11:58:18 1	
	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a	١ _	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that
11:55:36 2	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I	11:58:26 2	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that
11:55:36 2	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some	11:58:26 2	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to
11:55:36 <b>2</b> 11:55:40 <b>3</b> 11:55:42 <b>4</b>	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how	11:58:26 <b>2</b> 11:58:36 <b>3</b> 11:58:38 <b>4</b>	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the
11:55:36 <b>2</b> 11:55:40 <b>3</b> 11:55:42 <b>4</b> 11:55:48 <b>5</b>	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at.	11:58:26	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that
11:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.	11:58:26	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed
11:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record	11:58:26	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical
11:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other	11:58:26	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point,
\$1:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to	11:58:26	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance
11:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at.  That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to do your depositions? If you find there is more, that would	11:58:26	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance of additional documents from Facebook, technical documents,
11:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to	11:58:26	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance of additional documents from Facebook, technical documents, that is, and particularly the very minimal relevance of any
11:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at.  That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to do your depositions? If you find there is more, that would	11:58:26	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance of additional documents from Facebook, technical documents,
11:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to do your depositions? If you find there is more, that would show that Facebook didn't comply with its discovery	11:58:26 2 11:58:30 3 11:58:38 4 11:58:38 5 11:58:46 6 11:58:50 7 11:58:50 9 11:59:02 10 11:59:03 11 11:59:14 12 11:59:14 12 11:59:14 13 11:59:24 14 11:59:28 15	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance of additional documents from Facebook, technical documents, that is, and particularly the very minimal relevance of any
11:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to do your depositions? If you find there is more, that would show that Facebook didn't comply with its discovery obligations, they are going to have to produce them then,	11:58:26 2 11:58:30 3 11:58:38 4 11:58:42 5 11:58:46 6 11:58:50 7 11:58:50 1 11:59:51 10 11:59:02 10 11:59:03 11 11:59:14 12 11:59:14 12 11:59:24 14 11:59:28 15 11:99:32 16	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance of additional documents from Facebook, technical documents, that is, and particularly the very minimal relevance of any e-mails. Weighing that against the burden that I believe would be imposed if Facebook were required to do anything more than the searches that it has already indicated it has
\$1:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to do your depositions? If you find there is more, that would show that Facebook didn't comply with its discovery obligations, they are going to have to produce them then, and maybe you will be moving for sanctions. I don't know.	11:58:26 2 11:58:38 4 11:58:38 4 11:58:46 6 11:58:50 7 11:58:50 9 11:59:54 10 11:59:14 12 11:59:14 12 11:59:14 12 11:59:24 14 11:59:24 14 11:59:25 15 11:59:32 16	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance of additional documents from Facebook, technical documents, that is, and particularly the very minimal relevance of any e-mails. Weighing that against the burden that I believe would be imposed if Facebook were required to do anything more than the searches that it has already indicated it has done for e-mails, particularly by searching for keywords on
\$1:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to do your depositions? If you find there is more, that would show that Facebook didn't comply with its discovery obligations, they are going to have to produce them then, and maybe you will be moving for sanctions. I don't know.  What do you have today that should cause me,	11:58:26 2 11:58:30 3 11:58:38 4 11:58:46 6 11:58:50 7 11:58:50 9 11:59:02 10 11:59:14 12 11:59:14 12 11:59:14 12 11:59:24 14 11:59:35 15 11:59:32 16 11:59:35 17 11:59:34 17	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance of additional documents from Facebook, technical documents, that is, and particularly the very minimal relevance of any e-mails. Weighing that against the burden that I believe would be imposed if Facebook were required to do anything more than the searches that it has already indicated it has done for e-mails, particularly by searching for keywords on the most relevant keywords related to this case, that
\$1:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to do your depositions? If you find there is more, that would show that Facebook didn't comply with its discovery obligations, they are going to have to produce them then, and maybe you will be moving for sanctions. I don't know.  What do you have today that should cause me, other than your past experience, to believe that they are	11:58:26	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance of additional documents from Facebook, technical documents, that is, and particularly the very minimal relevance of any e-mails. Weighing that against the burden that I believe would be imposed if Facebook were required to do anything more than the searches that it has already indicated it has done for e-mails, particularly by searching for keywords on the most relevant keywords related to this case, that balance favors, in my view quite strongly, Facebook at this
11:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to do your depositions? If you find there is more, that would show that Facebook didn't comply with its discovery obligations, they are going to have to produce them then, and maybe you will be moving for sanctions. I don't know.  What do you have today that should cause me, other than your past experience, to believe that they are not being forthcoming when they insist that they are?	11:58:26	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance of additional documents from Facebook, technical documents, that is, and particularly the very minimal relevance of any e-mails. Weighing that against the burden that I believe would be imposed if Facebook were required to do anything more than the searches that it has already indicated it has done for e-mails, particularly by searching for keywords on the most relevant keywords related to this case, that balance favors, in my view quite strongly, Facebook at this point in this case.
11:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to do your depositions? If you find there is more, that would show that Facebook didn't comply with its discovery obligations, they are going to have to produce them then, and maybe you will be moving for sanctions. I don't know.  What do you have today that should cause me, other than your past experience, to believe that they are not being forthcoming when they insist that they are?  MR. ANDRE: The declarations provided by the attorney, the search method they used, they really just looked at the wicking. It is something —-these cases come	11:58:26	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance of additional documents from Facebook, technical documents, that is, and particularly the very minimal relevance of any e-mails. Weighing that against the burden that I believe would be imposed if Facebook were required to do anything more than the searches that it has already indicated it has done for e-mails, particularly by searching for keywords on the most relevant keywords related to this case, that balance favors, in my view quite strongly, Facebook at this point in this case.  I am mindful that depositions will be starting I
11:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to do your depositions? If you find there is more, that would show that Facebook didn't comply with its discovery obligations, they are going to have to produce them then, and maybe you will be moving for sanctions. I don't know.  What do you have today that should cause me, other than your past experience, to believe that they are not being forthcoming when they insist that they are?  MR. ANDRE: The declarations provided by the attorney, the search method they used, they really just looked at the wicking. It is somethingthese cases come along, you generally talk to the engineers who work on this.	11:58:26	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance of additional documents from Facebook, technical documents, that is, and particularly the very minimal relevance of any e-mails. Weighing that against the burden that I believe would be imposed if Facebook were required to do anything more than the searches that it has already indicated it has done for e-mails, particularly by searching for keywords on the most relevant keywords related to this case, that balance favors, in my view quite strongly, Facebook at this point in this case.  I am mindful that depositions will be starting I think about three or four weeks from now that will include
11:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to do your depositions? If you find there is more, that would show that Facebook didn't comply with its discovery obligations, they are going to have to produce them then, and maybe you will be moving for sanctions. I don't know.  What do you have today that should cause me, other than your past experience, to believe that they are not being forthcoming when they insist that they are?  MR. ANDRE: The declarations provided by the attorney, the search method they used, they really just looked at the wicking. It is somethingthese cases come along, you generally talk to the engineers who work on this. You then have e-mails to the company, saying do you have	11:58:26 2 11:58:30 3 11:58:38 4 11:58:38 5 11:58:46 6 11:58:50 7 11:58:50 7 11:58:51 10 11:59:14 12 11:59:14 12 11:59:14 12 11:59:24 14 11:59:25 15 11:59:32 16 11:59:35 17 11:59:42 18 51:59:42 18 51:59:42 20 11:59:54 21 11:59:55 22 12:00:92 23	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance of additional documents from Facebook, technical documents, that is, and particularly the very minimal relevance of any e-mails. Weighing that against the burden that I believe would be imposed if Facebook were required to do anything more than the searches that it has already indicated it has done for e-mails, particularly by searching for keywords on the most relevant keywords related to this case, that balance favors, in my view quite strongly, Facebook at this point in this case.  I am mindful that depositions will be starting I think about three or four weeks from now that will include 30(b)(6) depositions. I agree with Facebook that Leader can
11:55:36	than the e-mails, given search terms for e-mails, to run a search five or ten times. But the technical documents I have a huge concern with, because we have to identify some of the engineers based on 398 pages, but I don't know how many more there are out there that we should be looking at. That is my big issue.  THE COURT: But what is it that is in the record other than your prior experience in other cases with other types of companies that should cause me to doubt the repeated representations from Facebook that they have provided the responsive technical documents, send you off to do your depositions? If you find there is more, that would show that Facebook didn't comply with its discovery obligations, they are going to have to produce them then, and maybe you will be moving for sanctions. I don't know.  What do you have today that should cause me, other than your past experience, to believe that they are not being forthcoming when they insist that they are?  MR. ANDRE: The declarations provided by the attorney, the search method they used, they really just looked at the wicking. It is somethingthese cases come along, you generally talk to the engineers who work on this.	11:58:26	to have to provide, given how we got here, given that that access to the entire source code has been provided and that there can be no better discovery for plaintiff in trying to prove infringement in a case like this than to have the access to the source code, and mindful of the fact that plaintiff's expert indicated in a declaration that he needed full access to the source code, along with technical documents in order to make a meaningful discovery of the source code, and that I thereafter ordered that to happen, and that that happened, I am satisfied at this point, weighing what I find to be the likely very minimal relevance of additional documents from Facebook, technical documents, that is, and particularly the very minimal relevance of any e-mails. Weighing that against the burden that I believe would be imposed if Facebook were required to do anything more than the searches that it has already indicated it has done for e-mails, particularly by searching for keywords on the most relevant keywords related to this case, that balance favors, in my view quite strongly, Facebook at this point in this case.  I am mindful that depositions will be starting I think about three or four weeks from now that will include

1	21		23
12:00:16 1	there are other documents. If it turns out that Facebook	12:02:60 1	being the date certain, since you are not deposing anyone
12:00:22 2	has not actually been sufficiently forthcoming with its	12:02:56 2	until at least November 21?
12:00:26 3	production of technical documents, then we will deal with	12:02:58 3	MR. ANDRE: We are concerned with a huge
30 4	that when you are able to show that to me. But at this	12:03:02 4	document dump on the last day of written discovery, the last
.34 5	point I accept the representations, and I find that Facebook	12:03:04 5	day they can produce documents. We are mindful that we may
12:00:36 6	has done enough with respect to production of technical	12:03:08 6	get hundreds of thousands of documents at the last hour.
12:00:40 7	documents. And I am not going to order them to do anything	12:03:12 7	THE COURT: Didn't I give you until March 1st to
12:00:42 8	more in that regard.	12:03:14	complete depositions of fact witnesses?
12:00:44 9	Let's move on to, I think Leader is next,	12:03:16 9	MR. ANDRE: You did, Your Honor.
12:00:48 10	raising an issue about the sufficiency of the production of	12:03:18 10	THE COURT: I don't understand how, even if they
12:00;50 11	marketing and financial documents.	12:03:20 11	are waiting to dump all that on you on November 20th, you
12:00:54 12	MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, we just wanted to follow	12:03:24 12	are going to be unduly prejudiced to complete your
12:01:00 13	up on this issue, the fact that Facebook has not given us	12:03:26 13	depositions by March 1st.
12:01:04 14	any type of date certain as to when they would produce	12:03;30 14	MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, I don't know if it would
12:01:08 15	these marketing and financial documents. They keep saying	12:03:32 15	be unduly prejudicial. It is just prejudicial in the fact,
12:01:12 16	we are going to produce, we are going to produce, we will do	12:03:36 16	they haven't even produced 2008 yet at this point. There is
12:01:18 17	it before November 20th, but they don't give us any set	12:03:40 17	no reason why they are withholding these documents. I
12:01:20 18	time. Holding out to the 11th hour is an issue for us.	12:03:44 18	understand we have discovery cutoffs for a reason. We have
12:01:24 19	They have not given us firm representations, or given us	12:03:48 19	asked for Facebook to actually produce documents in a timely
12:01:28 20	business plans or any type of market information,	12:03:52 20	manner.
12:01:32 21	advertising, things of that nature.	12:03:52 21	At this point, we are not getting any of the
12:01:34 22	What we are asking for, what we asked previously	12:03:56 22	financial documents, either. That is the reason we wanted
12:01:36 23	is give us a date certain and we won't have to go to court,	12:04:00 23	to see if Your Honor would give us a date certain as to when
12:01:40 24	because you have been stalling for months. And they won't	12:04:02 24	they should start the production of at least the 2008
12:01:42 25	give us a date certain. That's why we are moving on the	12:04:06 25	documents.
1	22		24
12:01:46 1	marketing and financial documents.	12:04:06 1	
	marketing and financial documents.  THE COURT: Facebook.		THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by
12:01:48 2	THE COURT: Facebook.	12:04:06 <b>1</b> 12:04:10 <b>2</b> 12:04:14 <b>3</b>	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing
12:01:48 2	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the	12:04:10 2	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing  its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing
12:01:48 <b>2</b> 12:01:48 <b>3</b> 12:01:50 <b>4</b>	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the	12:04:10 <b>2</b> 12:04:14 <b>3</b> 12:04:18 <b>4</b>	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing  its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing  and financial documents. I accept the representation that
12:01:48 <b>2</b> 12:01:48 <b>3</b> 12:01:50 <b>4</b> 12:01:54 <b>5</b>	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet,	12:04:10 2 12:04:14 3 12:04:18 4 12:04:20 5	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the	12:04:10 2 12:04:14 3 12:04:18 4 12:04:20 5 12:04:24 6	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless	12:04:10	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and	12:04:10	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.	12:04:10	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and	12:04:10	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like	12:04:10	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.	12:04:10	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.  On the marketing and other types of documents, I	12:04:10 2 12:04:14 3 12:04:18 4 12:04:20 5 12:04:24 6 12:04:28 7 12:04:30 8 12:04:34 9 12:04:34 10 12:04:46 12 12:04:46 12	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any documents from previous litigations.  Let me hear from Leader on that first, please.
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.  On the marketing and other types of documents, I am not sure that I completely understand which ones they	12:04:10	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any documents from previous litigations.  Let me hear from Leader on that first, please. MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, the supplementation of
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.  On the marketing and other types of documents, I am not sure that I completely understand which ones they want and how they want them, but I have never refused to	12:04:10	THE COURT: All right. The date certain is by  November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any documents from previous litigations.  Let me hear from Leader on that first, please. MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, the supplementation of the interrogatories regarding our willful infringement is
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.  On the marketing and other types of documents, I am not sure that I completely understand which ones they want and how they want them, but I have never refused to produce them. I have been checking, and they will have them	12:04:10	November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any documents from previous litigations.  Let me hear from Leader on that first, please.  MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, the supplementation of the interrogatories regarding our willful infringement is relying upon some of this information from the previous
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.  On the marketing and other types of documents, I am not sure that I completely understand which ones they want and how they want them, but I have never refused to produce them. I have been checking, and they will have them by the end of discovery, which is no prejudice to anyone	12:04:10 2 12:04:14 3 12:04:18 4 12:04:20 5 12:04:24 6 12:04:28 7 12:04:34 9 12:04:34 10 12:04:40 11 12:04:46 12 12:04:48 13 12:04:52 14 12:04:56 16 12:04:66 16	November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any documents from previous litigations.  Let me hear from Leader on that first, please.  MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, the supplementation of the interrogatories regarding our willful infringement is relying upon some of this information from the previous litigation to show you what the relevance is.
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.  On the marketing and other types of documents, I am not sure that I completely understand which ones they want and how they want them, but I have never refused to produce them. I have been checking, and they will have them by the end of discovery, which is no prejudice to anyone because depositions don't even start until the end of	12:04:10	November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any documents from previous litigations.  Let me hear from Leader on that first, please.  MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, the supplementation of the interrogatories regarding our willful infringement is relying upon some of this information from the previous litigation to show you what the relevance is.  There are two points that we put in our letter
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.  On the marketing and other types of documents, I am not sure that I completely understand which ones they want and how they want them, but I have never refused to produce them. I have been checking, and they will have them by the end of discovery, which is no prejudice to anyone because depositions don't even start until the end of November/beginning of December. They will have all the	12:04:10	November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any documents from previous litigations.  Let me hear from Leader on that first, please.  MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, the supplementation of the interrogatories regarding our willful infringement is relying upon some of this information from the previous litigation to show you what the relevance is.  There are two points that we put in our letter brief that we will be supplementing our interrogatory with.
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.  On the marketing and other types of documents, I am not sure that I completely understand which ones they want and how they want them, but I have never refused to produce them. I have been checking, and they will have them by the end of discovery, which is no prejudice to anyone because depositions don't even start until the end of November/beginning of December. They will have all the documents before then.	12:04:10	November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any documents from previous litigations.  Let me hear from Leader on that first, please.  MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, the supplementation of the interrogatories regarding our willful infringement is relying upon some of this information from the previous litigation to show you what the relevance is.  There are two points that we put in our letter brief that we will be supplementing our interrogatory with.  Those came from the fact that we had the deposition
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.  On the marketing and other types of documents, I am not sure that I completely understand which ones they want and how they want them, but I have never refused to produce them. I have been checking, and they will have them by the end of discovery, which is no prejudice to anyone because depositions don't even start until the end of November/beginning of December. They will have all the documents before then.  THE COURT: So the date certain is November 20	12:04:10	November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any documents from previous litigations.  Let me hear from Leader on that first, please.  MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, the supplementation of the interrogatories regarding our willful infringement is relying upon some of this information from the previous litigation to show you what the relevance is.  There are two points that we put in our letter brief that we will be supplementing our interrogatory with. Those came from the fact that we had the deposition testimony of the founder of Facebook, on the codes, the
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.  On the marketing and other types of documents, I am not sure that I completely understand which ones they want and how they want them, but I have never refused to produce them. I have been checking, and they will have them by the end of discovery, which is no prejudice to anyone because depositions don't even start until the end of November/beginning of December. They will have all the documents before then.  THE COURT: So the date certain is November 20 and you will do your best to provide documents sooner on a	12:04:10	November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any documents from previous litigations.  Let me hear from Leader on that first, please.  MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, the supplementation of the interrogatories regarding our willful infringement is relying upon some of this information from the previous litigation to show you what the relevance is.  There are two points that we put in our letter brief that we will be supplementing our interrogatory with. Those came from the fact that we had the deposition testimony of the founder of Facebook, on the codes, the basic website, on the two-week period and using the source
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.  On the marketing and other types of documents, I am not sure that I completely understand which ones they want and how they want them, but I have never refused to produce them. I have been checking, and they will have them by the end of discovery, which is no prejudice to anyone because depositions don't even start until the end of November/beginning of December. They will have all the documents before then.  THE COURT: So the date certain is November 20 and you will do your best to provide documents sooner on a rolling basis as you have been doing.	12:04:10	November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any documents from previous litigations.  Let me hear from Leader on that first, please.  MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, the supplementation of the interrogatories regarding our willful infringement is relying upon some of this information from the previous litigation to show you what the relevance is.  There are two points that we put in our letter brief that we will be supplementing our interrogatory with. Those came from the fact that we had the deposition testimony of the founder of Facebook, on the codes, the basic website, on the two-week period and using the source codes to develop Facebook. He also destroyed anything
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.  On the marketing and other types of documents, I am not sure that I completely understand which ones they want and how they want them, but I have never refused to produce them. I have been checking, and they will have them by the end of discovery, which is no prejudice to anyone because depositions don't even start until the end of November/beginning of December. They will have all the documents before then.  THE COURT: So the date certain is November 20 and you will do your best to provide documents sooner on a rolling basis as you have been doing.  MS. KEEFE: Absolutely, Your Honor.	12:04:10	November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any documents from previous litigations.  Let me hear from Leader on that first, please.  MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, the supplementation of the interrogatories regarding our willful infringement is relying upon some of this information from the previous litigation to show you what the relevance is.  There are two points that we put in our letter brief that we will be supplementing our interrogatory with. Those came from the fact that we had the deposition testimony of the founder of Facebook, on the codes, the basic website, on the two-week period and using the source codes to develop Facebook. He also destroyed anything having to do with the original source code.
12:01:48	THE COURT: Facebook.  MS. KEEFE: The most interesting thing on the financial documents is we have actually given them, the document we produced on September 20th was a spread sheet, which was sufficient to show all of the financials for the company. I am not sure what more they want on that, unless they want me to produce all of the canceled checks and everything that goes into that.  They actually have documents sufficient to show full financials. If they need something else, I would like them to tell me exactly what it is.  On the marketing and other types of documents, I am not sure that I completely understand which ones they want and how they want them, but I have never refused to produce them. I have been checking, and they will have them by the end of discovery, which is no prejudice to anyone because depositions don't even start until the end of November/beginning of December. They will have all the documents before then.  THE COURT: So the date certain is November 20 and you will do your best to provide documents sooner on a rolling basis as you have been doing.  MS. KEEFE: Absolutely, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Mr. Andre, what is wrong with that	12:04:10	November 20th, 2009. I am satisfied that Facebook is doing its best to produce the relevant and responsive marketing and financial documents. I accept the representation that they will continue to do that, that they will complete that production by November 20th, and that that will provide sufficient opportunity for the plaintiff to complete the necessary fact depositions, consistent with the schedule provided for completion of fact depositions.  Let's move on. I think the final issue is whether Facebook should be compelled to produce any documents from previous litigations.  Let me hear from Leader on that first, please.  MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, the supplementation of the interrogatories regarding our willful infringement is relying upon some of this information from the previous litigation to show you what the relevance is.  There are two points that we put in our letter brief that we will be supplementing our interrogatory with. Those came from the fact that we had the deposition testimony of the founder of Facebook, on the codes, the basic website, on the two-week period and using the source codes to develop Facebook. He also destroyed anything

		<u> </u>	
	25	4	27
12:05;32	obviously relevant to our case. We are not asking for	12:08:18	and copying it and producing it. There is no search
12:05:36 2	everything from the previous litigation. What we are asking	12:08:22 2	required. These are litigation documents.
12:05:38 3	for are Facebook witnesses that he talked about, the	12:08:24 3	That is what we are asking for, Your Honor.
1 12 4	founding of Facebook, the development of the website, the	12:08:26 4	THE COURT: All right. With respect to this
.46 5	materials relied upon when they were writing the Facebook	12:08:28 5	one, I am today also going to deny Leader's request for
12:05:50 6	code, all that isn't in that previous litigation. And as we	12:08:34 6	production of the litigation documents. But that is without
12:05:56 7	are now going to be supplementing an interrogatory with	12:08:38 7	prejudice to it being raised again. If this is going to
12:05;58	information from that, I would like to have the actual	12:08:44 8	remain in dispute, I would like to see it raised fairly
12:06:02 9	physical transcripts of those depositions instead of relying	12:08:50 9	soon, within the next 30 days or so. But right now, I think
12:06:06 10	upon those that are still on the Internet.	12:08:54 10	it is premature for me to rule today, given that what I have
12:06:12 11	THE COURT: All right, Facebook.	12:09:00 11	heard from Mr. Andre is a significant narrowing of what the
12:06:14 12	MS. KEEFE: Your Honor, I am a little flummoxed,	12:09:04 12	purpose is and therefore what the breadth is of what
12:06:18 13	because this is absolutely the first time I have heard any	12:09:10 13	litigation documentation Leader thinks it needs.
12:06:20 14	of this. As we noted in our letter, this is an issue that	12:09:14 14	The fact that Leader is now going to be
12:06:24 15	Your Honor specifically ordered in July, that if they wanted	12:09:16 15	supplementing its interrogatories next Wednesday, consistent
12:06:26 16	to come back and readdress this issue after the motion had	12:09:20 16	with my order from earlier in the call, does not provide any
12:06:30 17	been denied, that we need to meet and confer in good faith	12:09:24 17	basis for requiring Leader to be provided with any prior
12:06:34 18	regarding the topic.	12:09:32 18	litigation documents, because my order is that the
12;06;34 19	We started to talk about the fact that they were	12:09:36 19	supplementation next Wednesday will extend only so far as
12:06:38 20	going to be asking again for litigation documents, and the	12:09;44 20	Leader incorporating its letter response into its
12:06:44 21	parties specifically agreed to meet and confer on this issue	12:09:50 21	supplemental interrogatory responses, which means what
12:06:46 22	on Tuesday. So the first time I have ever heard that there	12:09:54 22	Leader will be doing is saying, on the record, what
12:06:48 23	is any next Tuesday, sorry. This is the first time I	12:10:00 23	information it has based on publicly available information
12:06:52 24	have heard that there is any narrowing of any relevance of	12:10:04 24	to support its willful infringement claim. There will be
17.75:54 25	any form. I still contend that the burden, again, of all of	12:10:08 25	further supplementation of that if and when Leader learns
/	26	<u> </u>	28
12:07:00 1	the prior litigation based on the fact that they are	12:10:12 1	something in discovery to add to its willful infringement
12:07:06 2	absolutely irrelevant, not regarding the same technology,	12:10:16 2	contentions.
12:07:08 3	not regarding the same patent, overweighs any de minimis	12;10:18 3	So the requirement to provide supplemental
12:07:12 4	relevance. If Your Honor is inclined to do anything, I	12:10:20 4	responses to the interrogatories does not provide a basis
12:07:16 5	think we should at least meet and confer first. Also, I	12:10:24 5	for requiring Facebook to produce any additional or any
12:07:18 6	stand by the fact that the relevance doesn't outweigh	12:10:28 6	previous litigation documents at this time.
12:07:22 7	anything.	12:10:30 7	I can tell you and this may be relevant to
	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Andre, do you want to	12:10:34 8	your meeting and conferring I am inclined to the view
12:07:22 8	respond?	12:10:40 9	that prior deposition testimony related to what materials
12:07:24 10	MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, on October 16th, our	12:10:48 10	were relied on in the development of the Facebook website
12:07:28 11	letter, Exhibit 10 to our brief, you see that we once again	12:10:50 11	sounds to me like it may very well prove to be relevant and
12:07:32 12	requested documents from the previous litigation. Mr.	12:10:54 12	the production of it could also streamline and thereby make
12:07:40 13	•	12:11:00 13	·
12:07:42 14	Hannah had a meet-and-confer with counsel for Facebook,	12:11:00 13	more efficient the deposition process in this case.
12:07:46 15	saying that we cannot wait any longer on this and we will	12:11:02 14	I am not prepared at this time to put that in a
12:07:46 15	move in the court on it. They said we can keep talking	12:11:10 16	ruling. At this point, I am denying, as I said, the request
12:07:50 10	about it. We said, no, we need an answer now because we	12:11:10 10	for the production, but without prejudice to it being
	need those documents because we do want to supplement our	12:11:16 18	renewed fairly soon, after a further meet-and-confer based
12:07:56 18	willful infringement case. Obviously, stuff that we got	1	on everything else that we have talked about today.
12:07:58 19	from the previous testimony is relevant to that and is	12:11:20 19	I think that's all the issues that the parties
12:08:00 20	really key to it.	12:11:22 20	have raised. Am I correct about that, Mr. Andre?
2 21	So we did tell them that this was an issue and	12:11:24 21	MR. ANDRE: That's correct, Your Honor. Thank
12:08:06 22	that we were going to move on it.	12:11:26 22	You.
12:08:08 23	Secondly, like I said, this is no burden to them	12:11:26 23	THE COURT: And, Ms. Keefe, am I correct about
12:08:12 24	at all. This is in their file. This is in sitting their	12:11:30 24	that?
12:08:16 <b>25</b>	lawyers' files right now. This is a matter of taking it out	12:11:30 <b>25</b>	MS. KEEFE: Yes, you are, Your Honor. Thank you 10/27/2009 07:01:37 At
7 of 14 she	ets Page 25 t	to 28 of 29	10/2//2009 U/:U1:37 AP

```
29
       1
            very much.
12:11:32
       2
12:11:32
                       THE COURT: I have one question for all of you.
       3
12:11:34
                       The objections to one of my earlier discovery
       4
            orders, are those still pending? I believe those would be
    10
       5
            Facebook's objections. Are those objections still pending?
   44
       6
            Or have they been mooted by subsequent developments?
12:11:48
12:11:52
                        MS. KEEFE: I believe they have been mooted by
       8
12:11:52
            subsequent developments, Your Honor, and we would withdraw
       9
12:11:56
12:11:56 10
                       THE COURT: If that is the case, put together a
12:12:00 11
            letter of some sort, or some sort of filing, so Judge Farnan
12:12:02 12
            will see that and know that he doesn't have to deal with
12:12:06 13
            those.
12:12:06 14
                       MS. KEEFE: Absolutely, Your Honor.
12:12:08 15
                       THE COURT: Thank you all for your time.
12:12:10 16
                   (Counsel respond "Thank you.")
12:12:12 17
                        (Conference concluded at 12:10 p.m.)
      18
      19
            Reporter: Kevin Maurer
      20
      21
      22
      23
      24
      25
```

# 'document' [1] - 11:16 08-862-JJF-LPS [2] -1:10, 2:24 10[1] - 26:11 11[1] - 3:15 11:30 [1] - 1:13 11th [1] - 21:18 12:10 [1] - 29:17 16th [1] - 26:10 1st [2] - 23:7, 23:13 20[1] - 22:21 200 [2] - 14:17, 14:21 2006 [2] - 9:24 2007 [1] - 9:25 2008 [2] - 23:16, 23:24 2009 [4] - 1:13, 9:22, 11:9, 24:2 20th [7] - 11:9, 16:11. 21:17, 22:5, 23:11, 24:2, 24:6 21[1] - 23:2 23 [1] - 1:13 26 [3] - 11:12, 12:9, 16:4 30 [3] - 10:15, 11:22, 27:9 30(b)(6 [3] - 16:14, 20:23 30(b)(6)[1] - 20:24 300 [2] - 14:23, 14:24

ŧ

0

1

2

## 330 [1] ~ 9:8 390 [1] - 17:12 3900 [1] ~ 7:11 398 [2] - 16:25, 18:4 4 4 [1] - 3:15 4,000[1] - 7:11 40[1] - 10:21 400 [1] - 7:12 4th [1] - 6:22

3

## Α

a.m [1] - 1:13 able [10] - 3:21, 9:21, 10:1, 10:17, 14:10, 15:11, 15:22, 15:24, 16:9, 21:4 absolute [1] - 13:7 absolutely [9] - 12:23, 12:25, 13:4, 15:10, 22:24, 25:13, 26:2, 29:14 accept [3] - 11:3, 21:5, 24:4 access [7] - 9:2, 9:10, 17:10, 19:25, 20:2, 20:5, 20:7 accused [1] - 8:5 action [1] - 2:24 Action [1] - 1:4 activity [1] - 4:15 actual [1] - 25:8 add [3] - 3:11, 15:9, 28:1 additional [2] - 20:12, 28:5 address [2] - 9:6, 9:17 advertising [1] - 21:21 advising [1] - 13:9 affected [1] - 15:1 ago [3] - 11:19, 12:20, 12:22 agree [2] - 9:2, 20:23 agreed [1] - 25:21 agreement [1] - 19:10 allegation [1] - 3:15 alleged [1] - 9:11 allow [1] - 8:13 almost [1] - 14:22 Alto [1] - 2:5 amend [1] - 5:8 amount[3] - 10:14, 14:5, 14:12 analysis [1] - 19:24 AND [1] - 1:2 Anderson [2] - 1:19, 2:16 Andre [10] - 2:17, 4:24, 5:14, 5:21, 6:9, 6:13, 22:25, 26:8, 27:11, 28:20 ANDRE [14] - 1:20, 4:11, 5:22, 6:14, 6:24, 16:21, 18:19, 21:12, 23:3, 23:9, 23:14, 24:14, 26:10,

answer [1] - 26:16

answers [2] - 16:3,

20:25 anticipation [1] - 13:4 apologize [1] - 3:4 apologizing (1) - 2:25 APPEARANCES [2] -1:17, 2:1 application [2] - 7:24, 10:16 appreciate [2] - 6:18, 8:22 appropriate [1] - 5:11 argument[1] - 11:25 aside [1] - 13:19 aspect [2] - 10:16, 14:22 aspects [2] - 3:9, 9:17 assume [1] - 5:2 attorney [2] - 18:20, 19:13 attorneys [1] - 18:25 available [1] - 27:23

24:1 В 9:24 balance [2] - 9:9, 20:19 7:22 balancing [1] - 9:3 based [7] - 6:3, 14:8, 15:15, 18:4, 26:1, 27:23, 28:17 basic [1] - 24:22 basing [1] - 13:13 basis [7] - 5:16, 5:18, 17:20 13:8, 13:18, 22:23, 27:17, 28:4 civil [1] - 2:24 BEFORE [1] - 1:16 began [1] - 9:20 27;24 behalf [1] - 2:16 belief [2] ~ 5:4, 5:10 best [2] - 22:22, 24:3 better [1] - 20:3 between [2] - 13:11, 19:10 beyond [1] - 16:18 big [2] ~ 4:13, 18:6 biggest [1] - 19:6 bit [3] - 3:1, 3:4, 3:11 Blank [2] - 2:2, 2:20 24:23 breadth [1] - 27:12 brief [6] - 3:21, 3:25, 4:12, 4:17, 24:19, 26:11 6:2 burden [9] - 9:7, 13:22, 14:3, 14:16, 17:21, 17:23, 20:14, 12:7, 12:14 25:25, 26:23 burdensome [1] -

busy [2] - 3:2, 3:3

CA (2) - 1:22, 2:5

canceled [1] - 22:8

cannot[1] - 26:14

Caponi [1] - 2:20

## C

CAPONI [2] - 2:2, 2:19 care [2] - 6:15, 10:20 case [14] - 3:23, 7:16, 9:5, 10:15, 12:19, 16:5, 19:3, 20:4, 20:18, 20:20, 25:1, 26:18, 28:13, 29:10 cases [4] - 17:2, 18:8, 18:21, 19:7 certain [8] - 3:8, 21:14, 21:23, 21:25, 22:21, 23:1, 23:23, chance [2] - 3:11, 4:15 changes [2] - 7:19, characterized [1] checking [1] - 22:16 checks [1] - 22:8 chose [1] - 14:22 circuit [2] - 3:22, 9:4 circumstances [1] -Civil [3] - 1:4, 11:23, claim [3] - 5:19, 14:18, clear [2] - 5:9, 13:7 Cleary [2] - 2:4, 2:21 close [1] - 4:23 code [23] - 7:5, 7:7, 7:9, 7:25, 8:3, 8:19, 9:2, 9:11, 9:21, 12:3, 13:25, 14:2, 14:5, 17:12, 17:13, 19:25, 20:2, 20:5, 20:7, 20:9, 24:24, 25:6 codes [2] ~ 24:21, collect [1] - 19:9 collected [1] - 19:11 commensurate [1] communications [5] -8:15, 11:10, 12:6, companies [1] - 18:9 company [2] - 18:23, 22:7

compelled [1] - 24:11 complaining [1] - 3:8 complaint [1] - 3:13 complaints [1] - 6:21 complete [7] - 3:14, 5:10, 7:4, 23:8, 23:12, 24:5, 24:7 completely [1] - 22:14 completion [1] - 24:9 compliance |11 - 6:21 complicated [1] - 15:7 comply [1] - 18:13 concatenated [1] - 4:6 concern [4] - 15:21, 16:1, 16:23, 18:3 concerned [2] ~ 17:25, 23:3 concluded [1] - 29:17 conducted [1] - 15:15 confer [7] - 13:10, 15:14, 25:17, 25:21, 26:5, 26:13, 28:17 Conference [2] - 1:14, 29:17 conferring [1] - 28:8 considering [1] -19:23 consistent [2] - 24:8, 27:15 contained [1] - 4:2 contend [1] - 25:25 contention [1] - 13:18 contentions [1] - 28:2 contents [2] - 4:20, 6:10 context [1] - 11:3 continue [2] - 4:25, 24:5 **CONTINUED** [1] - 2:1 copying [1] - 27:1 corporation [1] - 1:4 Corporation [1] - 1:8 correct [5] - 5:21, 6:7, 28:20, 28:21, 28:23 correspondence [1] -13:11 Corroon [1] - 1:19 Counsel [1] - 2:7 counsel [5] - 1:23, 18:25, 19:17, 26:13, 29:16 Counterclaim [2] -1:5, 1:9 course [2] - 3:10, 17:7 COURT [36] ~ 1:1, 2:13, 2:22, 4:8, 4:18, 5:14, 5:23, 6:5, 6:8, 6:12, 6:15, 6:18, 8:22, 10:4, 10:20, 11:25, 13:8, 13:15,

business [1] - 21:20

14:13, 15:21, 16:20, 18:7, 19:21, 22:2, 22:21, 22:25, 23:7, 23:10, 24:1, 25:11, 26:8, 27:4, 28:23, 29:2, 29:10, 29:15 court [4] - 3:2, 3:5, 21:23, 26:15 Court's [1] - 6:21 cutoffs [1] - 23:18

## D

dark [2] - 8:17, 10:12 database [1] ~ 15:18 date [8] - 3:9, 21:14, 21:23, 21:25, 22:21, 23:1, 23:23, 24:1 days [2] - 11:22, 27:9 de [1] ~ 26:3 deal [3] - 16:19, 21:3, 29:12 dealing [1] - 6:19 December [1] - 22:19 declaration [3] - 19:1, 19:17, 20:6 declarations [1] -18:19 Defendant [2] - 1:6, 1:9 defendant's [1] - 4:15 define [1] - 12:1 defined [3] - 12:6, 12:7, 12:14 defined.. [1] ~ 11:17 definition [2] - 10:24, 11:14 **DELAWARE**[1] - 1:2 Delaware [3] ~ 1:4, 1:8, 1:12 denied [2] - 16:24, 25:17 deny [1] - 27:5 denying [2] - 19:22, 28:15 depose [5] - 8:18, 15:23, 15:24, 16:17, 20:25 deposing [1] - 23:1 deposition [6] - 10:7, 10:8, 17:13, 24:20, 28:9, 28:13 depositions [14] -8:14, 10:5, 10:15, 10:22, 17:8, 18:12, 20:21, 20:23, 22:18, 23:8, 23:13, 24:8, 24:9, 25:9

7:17, 8:2, 8:15, 9:19, 10:2, 12:11, 18:24 designate [1] - 20:24 destroyed [1] - 24:23 develop [1] - 24:23 development [9] -7:15, 7:18, 8:3, 8:16, 9:18, 10:2, 12:11, 25:4, 28:10 developments [3] -7:18, 29:6, 29:8 diagrams [1] - 11:13 different [2] - 7:20, 17:2 difficult [1] - 8:20 disadvantage [1] -17:16 discovery [18] - 3:7, 3:9, 4:22, 5:17, 5:20, 8:14, 11:22, 16:25, 18:13, 19:6, 19:7, 20:3, 20:8, 22:17, 23:4, 23:18, 28:1, 29:3 discussed [1] - 14:16 discussing [1] - 11:1 . discussions [1] -19:24 disingenuous [1] -9:16 dispute [4] - 4:21, 6:6, 13:18, 27:8 disputes [1] - 3:7 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:1, 1:2 document [3] - 10:24, 22:5, 23:4 documentation [2] -11:14, 27:13 documents [78] -6:25, 7:4, 7:7, 7:9, 7:12, 7:15, 7:16, 7:18, 8:2, 8:3, 8:16, 8:21, 9:19, 10:2, 10:9, 11:2, 11:10, 11:20, 12:1, 12:5, 12:6, 12:10, 12:13, 14:6, 14:11, 14:14, 15:25, 16:9, 16:10, 17:1, 17:4, 17:6, 17:9, 17:19, 17:25, 18:2, 18:11, 18:24, 19:3, 19:5, 19:9, 19:23, 19:25, 20:8, 20:12, 21:1, 21:3, 21:7, 21:11, 21:15, 22:1, 22:4, 22:10, 22:13, 22:20, 22:22, 23:5, 23:6, 23:17,

23:19, 23:22, 23:25,

24:4, 24:12, 25:20,

26:12, 26:17, 27:2, 27:6, 27:18, 28:6 done [7] - 10:6, 13:4, 15:2, 17:6, 17:20, 20:17, 21:6 doubt[1] - 18:9 down [3] - 3:5, 5:8, 15:1 dump [2] - 23:4, 23:11 during [3] - 10:8, 13:10, 15:14

Ε

example [1] - 15:11 excluded [1] - 14:20 Exhibit[1] - 26:11 experience (3) - 18:8, 18:17, 19:19 expert [1] - 20:6 experts [1] - 17:14 extend [1] - 27:19 extended [1] - 16:18 extensive [1] - 19:24 extent [2] - 5:20, 10:5

### F

e-mail [8] - 8:15, Facebook [49] - 2:7, 11:18, 12:8, 13:12, 2:24, 3:17, 7:3, 7:10, 14:4, 15:18, 17:5, 7:14, 7:21, 8:4, 8:8, 19:4 8:9, 9:3, 9:14, 9:23, e-mails [40] - 7:13, 10:3, 10:4, 11:4, 7:17, 8:2, 8:13, 8:24, 11:8, 11:11, 12:13, 9:8, 9:14, 9:15, 9:16, 13:14, 13:18, 14:8, 9:18, 10:2, 10:9, 15:3, 15:6, 16:24, 10:12, 10:25, 11:1, 18:10, 18:13, 19:25, 11:5, 11:20, 12:3, 20:12, 20:15, 20:19, 12:7, 12:14, 12:17, 20:23, 21:1, 21:5, 12:18, 12:21, 13:1, 21:13, 22:2, 23:19, 13:13, 15:5, 15:10, 24:2, 24:11, 24:21, 16:1, 17:18, 17:23, 24:23, 25:3, 25:4, 18:1, 18:23, 19:5, 25:5, 25:11, 26:13, 19:9, 19:10, 19:14, 28:5, 28:10 19:16, 20:14, 20:17 FACEBOOK [1] ~ 1:8 early [1] - 13:3 Facebook's [4] - 3:13, effectively [1] - 16:24 6:16, 6:21, 29:5 efficient [1] - 28:13 fact [13] - 19:15, efficiently [2] - 15:22, 19:23, 20:5, 21:13, 15:24 23:8, 23:15, 24:8, eight[3] - 11:19, 24:9, 24:20, 25:19, 11:21, 17:21 26:1, 26:6, 27:14 either [1] - 23:22 facts [5] - 4:1, 4:4, 5:2, employees [4] - 7:21, 5:4, 6:4 8:7, 8:8, 9:8 fairly [3] ~ 14:11, 27:8, end [4] - 4:21, 6:12, 28:17 22:17, 22:18 faith [1] - 25:17 ended [1] - 5:6 far [3] - 4:10, 19:4, engineering [3] -27:19 10:22, 12:12, 15:23 Farnan [1] - 29:11 engineers [8] - 8:17, favor [2] - 9:10, 13:24 10:5, 10:16, 16:8, favors [1] - 20:19 17:9, 18:4, 18:22, February [1] - 11:9 20:25 Federal [3] - 11:23, entire [4] - 9:2, 14:18, 17:17, 17:19 14:22, 20:2 fight[1] - 5:13 ESQ [6] - 1:19, 1:20, figure [2] - 14:25, 1:21, 2:2, 2:3, 2:4 15:16 essentially [1] - 15:3 file [1] - 26:24 exactly [4] - 8:17, files [4] - 14:17, 14:21, 9:19, 16:13, 22:12 15:1, 26:25 examination [1] - 4:14 filing [1] - 29:11 examine [1] - 9:18

final [1] - 24:10

financial [6] - 21:11, 21:15, 22:1, 22:4, 23:22, 24:4 financials [2] - 22:6, 22:11 fine [1] - 6:18 firm [1] - 21:19 first [9] - 3:16, 6:22, 11:4, 16:3, 24:13, 25:13, 25:22, 25:23, 26:5 five [1] - 18:2 flagging [1] - 6:18 flowcharts [1] - 11:13 flummoxed [1] - 25:12 focus [2] - 8:14, 10:17 follow [1] - 21:12 FOR [1] - 1:2 form [1] - 25:25 formally [1] ~ 6:9 forthcoming [2] -18:18, 21:2 forward [1] - 13:21 founder [1] - 24:21 founding [1] - 25:4 four [1] - 20:22 free [1] - 9:10 Friday [1] - 1:13 front [1] - 3:8 fulfilled [1] - 11:23 fulfilling [1] - 17:16 fuli [7] - 5:16, 6:15, 8:4, 9:2, 9:10, 20:7, 22:11

finally [1] - 16:13

#### G

10:14, 11:14, 14:6

functionality [3] -

furthermore [3] -

7:20, 7:22, 11:11

generally [1] - 18:22 given [9] - 9:10, 18:1, 20:1, 21:13, 21:19, 22:4, 27:10 Godward [2] - 2:4, 2:21 guess [2] - 17:5, 17:8 guides [1] - 8:12

#### Н

hannah [1] - 13:8 Hannah [9] - 2:17, 6:24, 7:1, 13:17, 14:16, 14:19, 14:21, 16:20, 26:13

design [8] - 7:14,

HANNAH [8] - 1:21, 7:1, 9:13, 10:8, 11:7, 12:4, 13:10, 13:25 hear [3] - 3:16, 6:22, 24:13 heard [5] - 4:24, 25:13, 25:22, 25:24, 27:11 Heidi [1] ~ 2:20 HEIDI [1] - 2:3 helping [1] - 16:6 highly [3] - 7:16, 12:18, 12:21 holding [1] - 21:18 Honor [44] - 2:15, 2:19, 3:18, 3:20, 4:1, 4:11, 4:23, 5:22, 6:1, 6:11, 6:14, 6:17, 6:24, 7:1, 7:6, 8:6, 9:13, 10:11, 11:7, 12:4, 12:23, 13:25, 15:8, 15:19, 16:3, 16:13, 16:18, 16:21, 17:18, 21:12, 22:24, 23:9, 23:14, 23:23, 24:14, 25:12, 25:15, 26:4, 26:10, 27:3, 28:21, 28:25, 29:8, 29:14 HONORABLE [1] -1:16 hour [2] - 21:18, 23:6 hours (2) - 19:13 house [1] - 18:25 huge [4] - 14:3, 17:15, 18:3, 23:3 hundreds [2] ~ 19:13,

1

23:6

idea [3] - 7:24, 9:22, 9:24 identification [1] -14:20 identified [7] - 7:5, 7:8, 7:9, 14:1, 14:5, 14:24, 16:8 identifies [1] - 16:16 identify [8] - 7:6, 10:4, 15:11, 15:22, 16:4, 16:9, 16:15, 18:3 identifying (1) - 17:9 implementation [1] -12:11 implemented [1] -7:20 imposed [1] - 20:15 IN [2] - 1:1, 1:2

in-house [1] - 18:25 INC [2] - 1:4, 1:8 Inc [4] - 1:23, 2:7, 2:24 inclined [2] - 26:4, 28:8 include [2] - 12:14, 20:22 included [1] - 10:25 including [4] - 11:17, 12:6, 12:7, 15:25 incorporate [2] - 4:20, 5:11 incorporating [1] -27:20 incredibly [1] - 15:7 indicated [2] - 20:6, 20:16 individuals [1] - 16:12 info [1] - 7:21 information [13] -3:24, 5:3, 5:10, 7:19, 7:23, 10:1, 19:16, 21:20, 24:16, 25:8, 27:23 infringement [12] -3:16, 4:22, 5:17, 5:19, 8:5, 9:1, 9:19, 20:4, 24:15, 26:18, 27:24, 28:1 infringing [5] - 7:8, 8:18, 8:19, 9:11, 9:17 insight[2] - 8:7, 8:9insist [1] - 18:18 instance [3] - 7:17, 9:23, 12:9 instead [1] - 25:9 instructions [1] - 8:11 instructs [2] - 8:8, 8:9 interacts [1] - 7:24 interesting [2] - 3:20, 22:3 interject [2] - 12:24, 13:6 Internet [1] - 25:10 Interrogatories [1] -3:15 interrogatories [4] -4:19, 24:15, 27:15, 28:4 interrogatory [5] - 4:2, 4:16, 24:19, 25:7, 27:21 inventors [1] - 15:13 involve [1] - 14:23 involving [1] - 17:2 irrelevant [1] - 26:2 issue [16] - 4:13, 4:17, 6:16, 8:25, 11:2,

14:14, 14:15, 18:6,

21:10, 21:13, 21:18, 24:10, 25:14, 25:16, 25:21, 26:21 issued [1] - 9:23 issues [2] - 11:6, 28:19 itself [1] - 8:1

#### J

James [3] - 2:17, 6:24, 7:1

JAMES [1] - 1:21

Judge [2] - 2:14, 29:11

judges [1] - 3:2

judgment [1] - 6:3

July [2] - 9:22, 25:15

jump [1] - 16:21

## K

**KEEFE** [16] - 2:3, 3:18, 4:23, 5:25, 6:7, 6:11, 6:17, 12:23, 14:15, 16:2, 22:3, 22:24, 25:12, 28:25, 29:7, 29:14 Keefe [7] - 2:21, 4:18, 5:23, 6:16, 13:15, 14:14, 28:23 keep [2] - 21:15, 26:15 Kevin [1] - 29:19 key [1] - 26:20 keywords [2] - 20:17, 20:18 King [2] - 1:21, 2:17 knows [1] - 17:18

## L

Kronish [1] - 2:4

lamb [1] - 13:2 large [1] - 15:4 last [4] - 17:21, 23:4, 23:6 late [1] - 3:1 latest [1] - 3:7 lawyers [1] - 17:13 lawyers' [1] - 26:25 IEADER [1] - 1:4 Leader [20] - 1:23, 2:23, 4:18, 6:22, 7:2, 8:19, 12:20, 13:1, 15:12, 15:22, 20:23, 21:9, 24:13, 27:13, 27:14, 27:17, 27:20, 27:22, 27:25

Leader's [3] - 6:20, 19:22, 27:5 learns [1] - 27:25 least [4] - 14:23, 23:2, 23:24, 26:5 left [1] - 11:22 **LEONARD** [1] - 1:16 letter [12] - 4:2, 4:4, 4:12, 4:17, 4:20, 5:1, 6:10, 24:18, 25:14, 26:11, 27:20, 29:11 letters [2] - 3:10, 3:12 level [2] - 4:13, 19:2 light[1] - 9:3 likely [1] - 20:11 limited [5] - 10:14, 14:5, 14:7, 14:25, 16:12 line [2] - 2:17, 5:8 list [4] - 8:6, 8:23, 10:15, 12:2 listed [1] - 14:17 listening [1] - 16:23 literally [1] - 14:18 litigation [13] - 17:7, 24:17, 24:25, 25:2, 25:6, 25:20, 26:1, 26:12, 27:2, 27:6, 27:13, 27:18, 28:6 litigations [1] - 24:12 LLP [3] - 1:19, 2:2, 2:4 look [6] - 7:25, 9:21, 12:4, 12:9, 13:11, 19:15 looked [3] - 13:19, 13:20, 18:21 looking [4] - 5:24, 11:3, 11:5, 18:5 low[1] - 13:23

## M

mail [8] - 8:15, 11:18, 12:8, 13:12, 14:4, 15:18, 17:5, 19:4 mails [40] - 7:13, 7:17, 8:2, 8:13, 8:24, 9:8, 9:14, 9:15, 9:16, 9:18, 10:2, 10:9, 10:12, 10:25, 11:1, 11:5, 11:20, 12:3, 12:7, 12:14, 12:17, 12:18, 12:21, 13:1, 13:13, 15:5, 15:10, 16:1, 17:18, 17:23, 18:1, 18:23, 19:5, 19:9, 19:10, 19:14, 19:16, 20:14, 20:17 manner [1] - 23:20

manuals [1] - 8:10 March [2] - 23:7, 23:13 mark [2] - 2:4, 2:21 market[1] - 21:20 marketing [5] - 21:11, 21:15, 22:1, 22:13, 24:3 materials (2) - 25:5, 28:9 matter [3] - 6:5, 6:25, 26:25 Maurer [1] - 29:19 McKibben [1] - 13:2 mean [5] - 9:13, 10:10, 11:16, 12:17, 19:5 meaningful [1] - 20:8 means [1] - 27:21 mechanism [1] - 6:8 meet [7] - 13:10, 15:14, 25:17, 25:21, 26:5, 26:13, 28:17 meet-and-confer [4] -13:10, 15:14, 26:13, 28:17 meeting [1] - 28:8 mention [1] - 12:3 method [1] - 18:20 might[1] - 3:21 mindful [3] - 20:5, 20:21, 23:5 minimal [2] - 20:11, 20:13 minimis [1] - 26:3 modules [9] - 7:5, 7:7, 7:9, 7:25, 8:3, 8:19, 14:1, 14:2, 14:5 momentarily [1] -13:16 months [9] - 9:7, 11:19, 11:21, 12:19, 12:22, 13:20, 14:9, 17:21, 21:24 mooted [2] - 29:6, 29:7 morning [7] - 2:13, 2:15, 2:19, 2:22, 3:1, 3:19, 7:2 most [5] - 4:11, 7:11, 10:5, 20:18, 22:3 motion [1] - 25:16 move [9] - 3:4, 5:8, 6:2, 6:3, 6:20, 21:9, 24:10, 26:15, 26:22 moving [2] - 18:15, 21:25 MR [22] - 2;15, 2:19, 4:11, 5:22, 6:14, 6:24, 7:1, 9:13, 10:8,

11:7, 12:4, 13:10,

13:25, 16:21, 18:19,

21:12, 23:3, 23:9, 23:14, 24:14, 26:10, 28:21 MS [15] - 3:18, 4:23, 5:25, 6:7, 6:11, 6:17, 12:23, 14:15, 16:2, 22:3, 22:24, 25:12, 28:25, 29:7, 29:14

## Ν

names [2] ~ 15:12, 15:13 narrow [2] - 8:13, 15:17 narrowed [2] - 14:17, 14:18 narrowing [2] - 25:24, 27:11 narrowiy [1] - 15:10 nature [3] - 14:7, 15:14, 21:21 necessary [1] - 24:8 need [9] - 5:9, 8:17, 9:18, 10:18, 10:21, 22:11, 25:17, 26:16, 26:17 needed [2] - 19:2, 20:6 needs (2) - 16:18, 27:13 never [3] - 12:10, 17:3, 22:15 next [7] - 4:19, 6:9, 21:9, 25:23, 27:9, 27:15, 27:19 non [1] - 6:3 non-willfulness [1] -6:3 none [1] - 8:24 normally [1] - 17:7 Nos [1] - 3:15 note [1] - 6:1 noted [2] - 15:8, 25:14 notice [2] - 11:19, 12:15 notify [1] - 16:17 November [6] - 21:17, 22:21, 23:2, 23:11, 24:2, 24:6 November/ beginning [1] -22:19 number [5] - 12:2, 12:18, 15:12, 16:8, 16:19 numbers [1] - 13:4

## 0

objections [3] - 29:3, 29:5 obligation [1] - 16:4 obligations [3] ~ 11:23, 17:17, 18:14 obviously [3] - 16:19, 25:1, 26:18 October [3] - 1:13, 16:11, 26:10 OF [1] - 1:2 offering [1] - 5:15 once [1] - 26:11 one [8] - 6:23, 12:9, 13:17, 15:3, 16:6, 27:5, 29:2, 29:3 ones [2] - 14:21, 22:14 open [3] ~ 5:1, 5:6, 10:23 open-ended [1] - 5:6 operate [1] - 8:4 operated [1] - 9:23 operates [1] - 7:23 operation [2] - 7:22, 12:13 opponent's [1] - 3:21 opportunity [1] - 24:7 opposition [6] - 3:21, 3:25, 4:2, 4:4, 5:1, 5:12 order [9] - 4:1, 4:18, 6:22, 10:11, 14:1, 20:8, 21:7, 27:16, 27:18 ordered [2] - 20:9, 25:15 orders [1] - 29:4 original [2] - 3:25, 24:24 outside [2] - 18:25, 19:17 outweigh [1] - 26:6 overweighs [1] - 26:3 own [1] - 19:19

## Ρ

p.m [1] - 29:17 pages [5] - 7:11, 7:12, 16:25, 17:12, 18:4 pain [1] - 19:7 Palo [1] - 2:5 paper [1] - 13:2 part [2] - 19:6, 19:9 particular [3] - 9:17, 10:16, 11:11 particularly [4] - 8:25, 9:6, 20:13, 20:17 parties [4] - 3:7, 19:10, 25:21, 28:19

past [1] - 18:17 patent [7] - 9:23, 12:18, 13:3, 15:12, 17:2, 26:3

Paul [1] - 2:17 PAUL [1] - 1:20

**pending** [2] ~ 29:4, 29:5 **people** [6] ~ 10:17,

14:24, 15:1, 15:2, 15:6

percent [1] - 14:2 performance [1] -12:12

period [1] - 24:22 persons [3] - 16:15, 16:16, 16:17

PHC [1] - 15:1 Phil [1] - 2:16

PHILIP [1] - 1:19 phone [1] - 2:20 physical [1] - 25:9

picture [1] - 8:4 Plaintiff [2] - 1:5, 1:10

plaintiff [3] - 2:16, 20:3, 24:7

plaintiff's [2] - 4:9, 20:6 plans [1] - 21:20

**point**[10] - 13:18, 17:11, 19:8, 19:12, 20:10, 20:20, 21:5, 23:16, 23:21, 28:15

points [1] - 24:18 portions [1] - 14:19

position [2] - 4:9, 5:21 possibility [1] - 10:23

possibly [1] - 9:9 potential [1] - 8:23

Potter [2] - 1:19, 2:16

**prejudice** [3] - 22:17, 27:7, 28:16

prejudiced [2] - 19:12, 23:12

prejudicial [3] - 17:22, 23:15 premature [1] - 27:10

premature [1] - 27:10 prepared [2] - 19:21, 28:14

present [1] - 9:25 previous [8] - 24:12,

24:16, 24:25, 25:2, 25:6, 26:12, 26:19, 28:6

previously [1] - 21:22 problem [4] - 4:12, 6:8, 6:12, 10:20 Procedure 121 - 11:24. 17:20 process [1] - 28:13 produce [14] - 7:14, 14:4, 18:14, 19:2, 21:14, 21:16, 22:8, 22:16, 23:5, 23:19, 24:3, 24:11, 28:5 produced [9] ~ 7:10, 12:19, 12:22, 16:10, 16:25, 17:19, 17:22, 22:5, 23:16 producing [2] - 19:14, 27:1 product [3] - 7:19, 9:12, 15:4 production [15] - 11:8, 14:11, 15:25, 16:11, 16:12, 17:3, 19:22, 21:3, 21:6, 21:10, 23:24, 24:6, 27:6, 28:12, 28:16 products [1] - 15:13

12:12
prove [2] - 20:4, 28:11
provide [10] - 7:4,
7:19, 7:21, 7:23,
20:1, 22:22, 24:6,
27:16, 28:3, 28:4
provided [7] - 5:16,
5:17, 18:11, 18:19,
20:2, 24:9, 27:17
public [1] - 7:11
publicly [1] - 27:23
purpose [2] - 3:6,
27:12
pursuant [1] - 14:1

programming [1] -

put [7] - 3:7, 4:12, 4:25, 16:15, 24:18, 28:14, 29:10

puts [1] - 17:15 putting [2] - 8:19, 13:19

Q

questions [2] - 10:7, 10:18 quick [1] - 16:22 quite [3] - 4:23, 11:6, 20:19 quoting [1] - 11:15

## R

raised [3] - 27:7, 27:8, 28:20 raising [1] - 21:10 read [2] - 3:20, 10:25 readdress [1] - 25:16 real [1] - 16:22 really [5] - 4:14, 11:21, 18:20, 19:6, 26:20 reason [3] - 23:17, 23:18, 23:22 reasonable [1] - 14:10 received [1] - 3:24 recently [1] - 11:6 record [4] - 2:23, 6:4, 18:7, 27:22 recordings [1] - 11:16 reference [1] - 11:1 refused [3] - 7:14, 15:17, 22:15 regard [1] - 21:8 regarding [5] - 3:15, 24:15, 25:18, 26:2, related [2] - 20:18, 28:9 relating [3] - 11:5, 11:10, 12:10 relatively [1] - 13:23 relevance [8] - 8:23, 13:23, 20:11, 20:13, 24:17, 25:24, 26:4, 26:6 relevant [15] - 7:16, 8:25, 9:15, 10:5, 10:18, 12:19, 12:21, 17:19, 18:24, 20:18, 24:3, 25:1, 26:19, 28:7, 28:11 relied [2] - 25:5, 28:10 rely [1] - 19:20 relying [2] - 24:16, 25:9 remain [1] - 27:8 remembers [1] - 7:6 remove [1] - 5:3 renewed [1] - 28:17 repeated [2] - 13:5, 18:10 reporter [1] - 3:5 Reporter [1] - 29:19 reporters [1] - 3:3 representation [4] -9:6, 11:4, 13:14, representations [4] -14:8, 18:10, 21:5, 21:19 representing [1] - 7:2

request [5] - 3:14,

28:15

4:21, 19:22, 27:5,

requested [1] - 26:12

requests [3] - 11:8,

16:11, 16:12 require [1] - 10:4 required [3] - 17:18, 20:15, 27:2 requirement (1) - 28:3 requiring [2] - 27:17. 28:5 research [1] - 12:11 reserve [2] - 5:19, 6:2 respect [3] - 4:22, 21:6, 27:4 respond (3) - 16:1, 26:9, 29:16 response [10] - 3:25, 4:3, 4:5, 4:6, 4:12, 4:13, 6:10, 7:4, 16:20, 27:20 responses [5] - 3:14, 5:8, 5:9, 27:21, 28:4 responsive [2] -18:11, 24:3 rest[1] - 15:19 reviewed [2] - 3:10, 9:9 reviewing [1] - 19:14 RFP [2] - 11:12, 12:9 RFPs [3] - 11:9, 11:15, 12:5 role [2] - 10:10, 10:13 rolling [1] - 22:23 Rome [2] - 2:2, 2:20 Rovner [1] - 2:16 **ROVNER** [2] - 1:19, 2:15 Rule [1] - 16:4 rule [2] - 19:21, 27:10 Rules [3] - 11:23, 17:17, 17:20 rules [1] - 19:8 ruling [1] - 28:15 rulings [1] - 17:23 run (1) - 18:1

#### S

sanctions [1] - 18:15 satisfied [4] - 4:3, 4:7, 20:10, 24:2 schedule [2] - 9:5, 24:8 schematics [1] - 11:12 screen [1] - 7:13 search [14] - 9:16, 13:5, 13:13, 14:17, 14:25, 15:7, 15:17, 17:6, 18:1, 18:2, 18:20, 19:4, 19:18, 27:1 searched [7] - 9:14,

12:16, 12:17, 12:20, 13:1, 13:12, 15:10 searches [4] - 15:15, 19:1, 20:16 searching [1] - 20:17 secondarily [1] - 16:7 secondly [1] - 26:23 see [11] - 4:8, 7:20, 8:9, 8:10, 8:11, 10:10, 14:9, 23:23, 26:11, 27:8, 29:12 seeing [1] - 8:2 send [1] - 18:11 separate [1] - 16:2 September [2] - 6:22, served [1] - 11:8 set [2] - 3:12, 21:17 shall [1] - 11:16 sheet [1] - 22:5 shooting [2] - 8:16. 10:12 short[2] - 3:22, 14:11 short-circuit [1] - 3:22 shot (2) - 7:13, 9:6 show [5] - 18:13, 21:4, 22:6, 22:10, 24:17 showing [1] - 10:22 side [1] - 17:5 side's [1] - 3:9 sides [1] - 3:8 significant [2] - 9:7, 27:11 Silicon [1] - 1:22 simply [5] - 4:1, 5:10, 6:2, 7:3, 10:6 single [2] - 14:22, 15:4 site [8] - 7:22, 8:7, 8:8, 8:10, 9:23, 14:18, 14:20, 14:23 sitting (1) - 26:24 situation [1] - 8:20 small [1] - 17:3 snapshot[1] - 9:22 somewhere [1] - 5:7 soon [2] - 27:9, 28:17 sooner [1] - 22:22 sorry [3] - 12:23, 13:6, 25:23 sort [2] - 29:11 sought [1] - 7:7 sounds [2] - 8:24, source [23] - 7:5, 7:7, 7:9, 7:25, 8:3, 8:19, 9:2, 9:11, 9:21, 12:2, 13:25, 14:2, 14:5, 17:12, 19:25, 20:2,

20:5, 20:7, 20:9,

24:22, 24:24

Spalding [2] - 1:21, 2.18 specific (1) - 14:15 specifically (3) - 16:8. 25:15, 25:21 specify [1] - 10:25 spent [1] - 19:13 spread [1] - 22:5 stalling [1] - 21:24 stand [1] - 26:6 Stark [1] - 2:14 STARK [1] - 1:16 start [6] - 2:25, 3:13, 17:8, 17:9, 22:18, 23:24 started [1] - 25:19 starting [3] - 3:1, 12:2, 20:21 states [1] - 12:5 STATES [1] - 1:1 stay [2] - 4:22, 6:2 Steve [1] - 2:19 STEVEN [1] - 2:2 still [7] - 4:25, 10:12, 11:22, 25:10, 25:25, 29:4, 29:5 stop [1] - 4:8 straightforward [1] -9:1 streamline [1] - 28:12 strongly [1] - 20:19 structure [1] - 12:12 stuff [1] - 26:18 subsequent [2] - 29:6, 29:8 subset [1] - 12:1 sufficiency [1] - 21:10 sufficient [3] - 22:6, 22:10, 24:7 sufficiently (1) - 21:2 summary [1] - 6:3 supplement [5] - 4:16, 4:19, 5:19, 6:9, 26:17 supplemental [2] -27:21, 28:3 supplementation [4] -5:3, 24:14, 27:19, 27:25 supplementing [4] -4:13, 24:19, 25:7,

# T

support [2] - 16:5,

system [1] - 7:23

27:15

27:24

tailored [1] - 15:10

technical (32) - 6:25. 7:4, 7:7, 8:10, 8:20, 10:9, 10:24, 11:2, 11:6, 11:20, 12:1, 12:10, 14:6, 14:11, 14:14, 15:15, 15:25, 16:25, 17:3, 17:6, 17:13, 17:25, 18:2, 18:11, 19:5, 19:16, 19:22, 19:24, 20:7, 20:12, 21:3, 21:6 TECHNOLOGIES [1] -1:4 Technologies [5] -1:23, 2:23, 12:20, 13:2, 15:12 technology [5] - 7:8, 8:18, 9:18, 17:2, 26.2 Telephone [1] - 1:14 ten [3] - 14:2, 16:18, 18:2 term [3] - 11:15, 12:21, 13:1 terms [2] - 11:17, 18:1 testimony [4] - 24:21, 24:25, 26:19, 28:9 THE [37] - 1:1, 1:2, 2:13, 2:22, 4:8, 4:18, 5:14, 5:23, 6:5, 6:8, 6:12, 6:15, 6:18, 8:22, 10:4, 10:20, 11:25, 13:8, 13:15, 14:13, 15:21, 16:20, 18:7, 19:21, 22:2, 22:21, 22:25, 23:7, 23:10, 24:1, 25:11, 26:8, 27:4, 28:23, 29:2, 29:10, 29:15 thereafter [1] - 20:9 thereby [1] - 28:12 therefore [2] - 5:2, 27:12 thinks [1] - 27;13 thoroughly [1] - 11:2 thousands [1] - 23:6 three [2] - 16:2, 20:22 throughout [1] - 15:18 Tied [1] - 5:1 timely [1] - 23:19 today [8] - 3:6, 5:16, 6:6, 13:22, 18:16, 27:5, 27:10, 28:18 together [1] - 29:10 topic [2] - 16:15, 25:18 topics [1] - 20:24 touch [1] - 14:22 touches [1] - 14:18

transcripts (11 - 25:9) tremendous (1) -14:16 troubleshooting [1] -8:11 try [3] - 19:4, 19:14, 19:15 trying [2] - 14:24, 20:3 Tuesday [2] - 25:22, 25:23 turn [3] - 7:10, 13:15, 14:13 turned [1] - 4:6 turns [2] - 10:21, 21:1 two [3] - 13:11, 24:18, 24:22 two-week [1] - 24:22 type [5] - 16:24, 17:7, 19:3, 21:14, 21:20 types [3] - 18:9, 19:7, 22:13

## U

U.S.M.J [1] - 1:16 under [4] - 11:23, 16:4, 17:17, 17:19 understood [1] - 5:14 unduly [2] - 23:12, 23:15 UNITED [1] - 1:1 unless [1] - 22:7 untrue [1] - 12:25 untruth [1] - 13:7 up [6] - 5:7, 8:23, 13:7, 16:11, 16:16, 21:13 users [1] - 8:9

#### V

Valley [1] - 1:22 various [1] - 6:20 versus [1] - 13:22 view [2] - 20:19, 28:8

## W

wait [1] - 26:14
waiting [1] - 23:11
web [1] - 15:4
website [6] - 8:4,
11:11, 12:13, 24:22,
25:4, 28:10
Wednesday [4] - 4:20,
6:9, 27:15, 27:19
week [1] - 24:22
weeks [1] - 20:22
weigh [2] - 9:9, 13:22

track [1] - 3:4

weighing [3] - 13:24, 20:11, 20:14 **WEINSTEIN** [1] - 2:4 Weinstein [1] - 2:21 welcome [1] - 9:5 white [1] - 13:2 wicking (2) - 7:13, 18:21 willful [8] - 3:16, 4:22, 5:17, 5:18, 24:15, 26:18, 27:24, 28:1 willfulness [2] - 4:14, 6:3 willing [2] - 4:1, 4:25 Wilmington [1] - 1:12 wish [2] - 3:11, 19:5 withdraw [2] - 4:21, 29:8 withholding [1] -23:17 witness [1] - 16:16 witnesses [4] - 15:23, 16:5, 23:8, 25:3 words [1] - 12:20 writing [1] - 25:5 writings [1] - 11:16 written [1] - 23:4



year [1] - 11:9 yesterday [1] - 13:6