
open. Tied in from his opposition letter was that these are all the facts they have. And therefore $I$ would assume that in his supplementation he would remove the "on information and bellef, ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ because these are the only facts that he has right now and this is all there is. So it is not an open-ended thing. This is what he has as of right now. We know if something else comes up somewhere down the line, he can always move to amend those responses. But as of right now, the responses need to be clear and complete and not simply information and belief, because that is not appropriate. That's why if we could incorporate it in the opposition, since they said this is all $I$ have, that was the fight.

THE COURT: Mr. Andre, I understood that is what you would be offering to do. That is, that you have provided the full basis of what you know today, prior to getting discovery on willful infringement, you have provided everything that you know about the basis for your willful infringement claim, and you reserve the right to supplement to the extent you find something else in discovery. Did I get vour position correct, Mr. Andre? MR. ANDRE: You did, Your Honor. THE COURT: Ms. Keefe, that's what you are looking for?

MS. KEEFE: I think it is. I think the only
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 belleve, 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.

MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, James Hannah will be

MR. HANNAH: Your Honor, James Hannah
representing Leader. Good morning.
Simply, we are just asking for Facebook to
provide a complete response and all the technical documents that it has that we have identified the source code modules for. As Your Honor remembers, we were asked to identify source code modules for which we sought technical documents, for which we found infringing technology. We identified those documents -- we identified those source code modules to Facebook, and Facebook, in turn, produced approximately 4,000 pages, most of those, 3900 of them were public documents. Of that we have got about 400 pages which were a screen shot of a wicking. We do not have any e-mails, which Facebook has refused to produce. We do not have any design documents. We don't have any development documents. All of these documents are highly relevant to our case.

For instance, the e-mails and the design developments documents, the development documents will provide information as to when there were product changes, and we can see when different functionality was implemented by Facebook. It will provide info as to how employees characterized the operation and functionality of the site. It will provide information on how the system operates, so we have an idea about how each application interacts with the source code modules. We can look at the source code
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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 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 guildes.

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 the e-mails. But I got to tell you, none of that sounds like it's particularly relevant where the issue is a documents.
$\square$
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straightforward question of infringement and you now have
full access to the entire source code. I do agree with
Facebook that there has to be some balancing here in light of the circuit that got us to where we are and to where we are in the case schedule. So you are welcome to take another shot. But particularly address the representation that there would be a significant burden of many months and 330 employees that would have to have their e-mails reviewed. How could that balance possibly weigh in your favor when you have been given free access to the full source code, which is, after all, the alleged infringing product?

MR. HANNAH: Your Honor, I mean, we believe that Facebook should have already searched their e-mails for the relevant e-mails. We believe that saying that they have to search now for the e-mails is disingenuous of them. To address the particular aspects about the infringing technology, we need the e-mails to examine the development and design documents to know exactly when the infringement began.

The source code that we were able to look at was a snapshot from about July 2009. So we have no idea how the Facebook site operated when the patent issued, for instance, in 2006. We have no idea what changes were made from 2006
to be able to have that information is if we have the development documents, the design documents, the e-mails from Facebook.

THE COURT: If I require Facebook to identify the most relevant engineers for depositions, to the extent they haven't done that already, why can't you just simply ask those questions in deposition?

MR. HANNAH: Well, during deposition we would like to have the e-mails and the technical documents so that we can see what their role is. I mean, I have a feeling that if you order that, Your Honor, and we do not have the e-mails, we are still going to be shooting in the dark as to what their role is.

Furthermore, we have a limited amount of depositions in this case. So if they give us a list of 30 engineers working on a particular aspect or application, then we are not going to be able to focus in on the people that are going to be relevant and questions that we need to ask.

THE COURT: That is a problem I can take care of. If that's what they do and it turns out you need $\mathbf{4 0}$ engineering depositions and you can make that showing, I am open to that possibility.

The definition of "technical document" that you included did not specify, as $I$ read it, e-mails, nor do I
recall any reference to e-mails when we were discussing thoroughly the issue of what technical documents you are looking for. In that context, why should I not accept the representation of Facebook that the first time they had any thought that you were looking for e-mails relating to technical issues was quite recently?

MR. HANNAH: Your Honor, this comes back to our requests for production, which were served on Facebook on February 20th of this year, of 2009. Those RFPs all ask for all documents and communications relating to the functionality of the Facebook website. In particular, there is an RFP 26 that asks for ali schematics. It asks for all flowcharts. It asks for all diagrams.

## Furthermore, the definition of documentation

that we have in the RFPs says, and I am quoting, "The term 'document' shall mean all writings and recordings as those terms are defined..."" and it goes on to say including e-mail.

So they have had notice from eight months ago that we wanted emmails, we wanted all technical documents. And we just really haven't anything in eight months. Now we have $\mathbf{3 0}$ days left in discovery, and they still haven't fulfilled their obligations under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

THE COURT: What about their argument that you
go on to define technical documents as a subset of documents and there you list a number of things, starting with source code, and you don't mention e-mails?

MR. HANNAH: Your Honor, if you look at our RFPs, it states that we asked for all documents and communications. We have documents defined as including e-mails. Communications is also defined as including e-mail.

For instance, RFP 26, if you look at that one, it never says that we want all technical documents relating to the research, design, implementation, development, engineering, programming, structure, performance or operation of the Facebook website. Those are all documents, communications, which is defined to include e-malls.

They have had notice of this for a long time now. For them to say that they haven't searched any of their e-mails -- I mean, they haven't even searched the e-mails for the patent number, apparently, which is highly relevant to this case and should have been produced months ago. Even the words Leader Technologies wasn't searched for in the e-mails, which is another highly relevant term that should have been produced months ago.

MS. KEEFE: Your Honor, I am absointely sorry to interject.

That is absolutely untrue. We absolutely have
searched the e-mails for the term Leader. Leader

Technologies, McKibben, Lamb, white paper, anything that was
an early thing that had to do with the patent and the patent numbers. We have absolutely done that, and in anticipation of this call actually had the search repeated agaĩn yesterday. I am sorry to interject there. But that was an absolute untruth that $I$ wanted to clear up.

THE COURT: Mr. Hannah, what is your basis for advising me that those circumstances have not happened?

MR, HANNAH: During the meet-and-confer, you can look at the correspondence that was between the two, they stated that they have not searched in their e-mail and that they will not search through their e-mails. I am basing this off the representation of Facebook.

THE COURT: Ms. Keefe, I will turn to you momentarily.

One further thing, Mr. Hannah: Do you have a basis to dispute the contention of Facebook at this point, putting aside whether they should have looked more, whether they have looked, that it would take them months to do what you are asking them to do going forward, and if $I$ have to weigh that burden today versus what seems to me the relatively low relevance, how could I find that that weighing comes out in your favor?

MR. HANNAH: Well, Your Honor, the source code
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modules that we have identified pursuant to your order was only about ten percent of the source code modules. So I do not belleve that there is a huge burden, that they are going to have to produce a lot of e-mail, because we have identified a limited amount of the source code modules. Furthermore, they have told us that the technical documents was limited in nature.

So based on those representations from Facebook, I do not see how it can take many months, as they have stated. I believe we would be able to get a reasonable production of the technical documents in a fairly short amount of time.

THE COURT: All right. Let me turn it to Ms. Keefe to talk about technical documents just on that issue.

MS. KEEFE: On the specific issue that Mr . Hannah just discussed, the burden would be tremendous. The 200 files that they listed in their narrowed search, as they claim it's narrowed, literally touches the entire site. I would ask Mr. Hannah to let me know which portions of the site are actually excluded from that identification. As we have told Mr. Hannah, those 200 files, because of the ones they chose, touch almost every single aspect of the entire site. We have told him that that would involve at least 300 people. The 300 people that we identified in trying to figure out how we would have to do this search we limited
down to people who actually affected those PHC files, not people who may have talked about them or may have done something else. This is essentially, Facebook is a one large web single product.

So if we are talking about e-mails about
Facebook, that's all these people do all day every day. And that search would be incredibly complicated and burdensome, as Your Honor has noted.

The only other thing I would like to add is that we absolutely have searched e-mails for narrowly tailored things that we were able to identify, for example, the patent number, the Leader Technologies, the names of the inventors, the names of their products, anything of that nature. What we said during the meet-and-confer was we had not conducted technical searches or searches based on things that we couldn't understand or figure out, because they refused to narrow what they were asking us to search throughout the e-mail database.

I think Your Honor understands the rest of it well.

THE COURT: Let me just ask you, the concern that Leader is not going to be able to efficiently identify which engineering witnesses it should depose and is not going to be able to efficiently depose them without some further production of technical documents, including
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e-mails, respond to that concern, please.
MS. KEEFE: I think there are three separate answers to that, Your Honor. The first is that we understand our obligation under Rule 26 to identify witnesses that we are going to use to support our case. That will be one way of helping them.

Secondarily, they actually have already identified a number of engineers that they specifically want to have documents from. They were able to identify those from the documents that were produced already. Those came up in their requests for production on October 20th. There were requests for production limited to those individuals.

And then finally, Your Honor, this is exactly what a $30(b)(6)$ is used for. They can give us a $30(b)(6)$ topic that asks us to identify those persons. We will put up a witness who identifies those persons, and they can notify us which of those persons they would like to depose.

If Your Honor needs to extended beyond the ten number, that is obviously something that we will deal with.

THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Hannah, any response?
MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, I would like to jump in real quick.

My concern is -- and I have been listening to this -- is that Facebook has effectively denied any type of discovery to us. They produced 398 pages of technical
documents. I have been doing this a long time. I have seen a lot of different patent cases involving this technolagy. I have never seen such a small production of technical dacuments.

My guess is, on the e-mail side, they have not done anything to search for technical documents that would normally happen in the course of this type of litigation. When we start taking these depositions, my guess is that the engineers are going to start identifying a lot of documents that they have that they used that we do not have access to.

The only thing we have at this point other than the $\mathbf{3 9 0}$ pages is the source code. We can't use the source code in deposition. We are fawyers. We are not technical experts.

So it is something that puts us at a huge disadvantage by them just, you know, not fulfiling their obligations under the Federal Rules.

E-mails, as Your Honor knows, are required to be produced. They are relevant documents under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Just because they haven't done it in the last eight months and it will be a burden on them to do it now, it seems to be prejudicial to us. We produced our emails. It was a burden, But that's what the rulings call for.

I am more concerned with the technical documents
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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 depasitions? 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 deciarations provided by the attorney, the search method they used, they really just looked at the wicking. It is something ---these 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 relevant documents? What are your design documents? They had in-house attorneys and outside counsel
do searches, that is about it. That declaration was not what I would call going to the level needed to produce documents in this type of case.

As far as e-mail goes, they didn't try to search
for technical documents. I mean, I wish e-mails were not part of discovery, 1 really do, because they are the biggest pain in discovery in these types of cases.

But that is not the ruies at this point.
E-mails are part of the documents that you have to collect. And there was no agreement between the parties that e-mails would not be collected.

So at this point, we are being prejudiced
because we spent the hours, hundreds of attorney hours reviewing e-mails, producing them, and they didn't try, other than the fact they didn't even try to fook at for technical information in the e-mails, but then their declaration was such that they have outside counsel do the search.

Other than my own experience, that is what I
rely on.
THE COURT: I am prepared to rule on this. I am denying Leader's request for production of further technical documents. I believe, considering the fact that we have had extensive discussions and analysis of what technical documents and what access to source code Facebook was going
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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 meaningfuk 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 designate some of these topics on 30(b)(6). They can get their answers and you can depose engineers and ask them if
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marketing and financial documents.
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 ${ }_{r}$ 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
being the date certain, since you are not deposing anyone until at least November 21?

MR. ANDRE: We are concerned with a huge document dump on the last day of written discovery, the last day they can produce documents. We are mindful that we may get hundreds of thousands of documents at the last hour.

THE COURT: Didn't I give you until March 1st to complete depositions of fact witnesses?

MR. ANDRE: You did, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I don't understand how, even if they are waiting to dump all that on you on November 20th, you are going to be unduly prejudiced to complete your depositions by March 1st.

MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, I don't know if it would be unduly prejudicial. It is just prejudicial in the fact, they haven't even produced 2008 yet at this point. There is no reason why they are withholding these documents. I understand we have discovery cutoffs for a reason. We have asked for Facebook to actually produce documents in a timely manner.

At this point, we are not getting any of the financial documents, either. That is the reason we wanted to see if Your Honor would give us a date certain as to when they should start the production of at least the 2008 documents.
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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 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.

That testimony from previous litigation is
the prior litigation based on the fact that they are absolutely irrelevant, not regarding the same technology, not regarding the same patent, overweighs any de minimis relevance. If Your Honor is inclined to do anything, I think we should at least meet and confer first. Aiso, I stand by the fact that the relevance doesn't outweigh anything.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Andre, do you want to respond?

MR, ANDRE: Your Honor, on October 16th, our letter, Exhibit 10 to our brief, you see that we once again requested documents from the previous litigation. Mr. Hannah had a meet-and-confer with counsel for Facebook, saying that we cannot wait any longer on this and we will move in the court on it. They said we can keep talking about it. We said, no, we need an answer now because we need those documents because we do want to supplement our willful infringement case. Obviousiy, stuff that we got from the previous testimony is relevant to that and is really key to it.

So we did tell them that this was an issue and that we were going to move on it.

Secondly, like I said, this is no burden to them at all. This is in their file. This is in sitting their lawyers' files right now. This is a matter of taking it out
and copying it and producing it. There is no search required. These are fitigation documents.

That is what we are asking for, Your Honor, THE COURT: All right. With respect to this
one, I am today also going to deny Leader's request for production of the litigation documents. But that is without prejudice to it being raised again. If this is going to remain in dispute, I would like to see it raised fairly soon, within the next 30 days or so. But right now, I think it is premature for me to rule today, given that what $I$ have heard from Mr. Andre is a significant narrowing of what the purpose is and therefore what the breadth is of what litigation documentation Leader thinks it needs.

The fact that Leader is now going to be supplementing its interrogatories next Wednesday, consistent with my order from earlier in the call, does not provide any basis for requiring Leader to be provided with any prior litigation documents, because my order is that the supplementation next Wednesday will extend only so far as Leader incorporating its letter response into its supplemental interrogatory responses, which means what Leader will be doing is saying, on the record, what information it has based on publicly available information to support its willful infringement claim. There will be further supplementation of that if and when Leader learns
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something in discovery to add to its willful infringement contentions.

So the requirement to provide supplemental responses to the interrogatories does not provide a basis for requiring Facebook to produce any additional or any previous litigation documents at this time.

I can tell you -- and this may be relevant to your meeting and conferring $-\mathbf{I}$ am inclined to the view that prior deposition testimony related to what materials were relied on in the development of the Facebook website sounds to me like it may very well prove to be relevant and the production of it could also streamline and thereby make more efficient the deposition process in this case.

I am not prepared at this time to put that in a ruling. At this point, I am denying, as I said, the request for the production, but without prejudice to it being renewed fairly soon, after a further meet-and-confer based on everything else that we have talked about today.

I think that's all the issues that the parties
have raised, Am I correct about that, Mr. Andre?
MR, ANDRE: That's correct, Your Honor, Thank
you.
that?
THE COURT: And, Ms. Keefe, am I correct about

MS. KEEFE: Yes, you are, Your Honor. Thank you
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