51320/2625518.2

28

Joint Proposal Regarding Discovery Master

Doc. 35

PERFECT 10, INC., a California corporation, CV07-5156 AHM (SHx) 1 Plaintiff. 2 V. 3 4 MICROSOFT CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, 5 Defendant. 6 7 8 9 Pursuant to the Court's Order of August 20, 2008, the parties jointly 10 recommend the following judge to act as Discovery Master in these matters: 11 (1) Judge Dickran M. Tevrizian, retired United States District Judge, 12 Central District of California, currently at JAMS. http://www.jamsadr.com/neutrals/Bio.asp?NeutralID=1920 13 14 Judge Tevrizian (ret.) is available to take the appointment. 15 The parties have made considerable efforts to identify candidates for 16 appointment as Discovery Master who are qualified under the Court's stated 17 criteria, available to take the position, free of conflicts, and acceptable to all 18 parties. Many potential candidates were ultimately found unavailable, however, 19 because they are not accepting appointments in discovery matters, or because of 20 conflicts. As such, the parties have to date reached agreement only on Judge 21 Tevrizian (ret.) as a proposed candidate. The parties will continue to make further 22 inquiries to identify additional candidates for the appointment, and will continue to 23 attempt to reach agreement thereon. 24 Google Inc., Amazon.com, Inc., Alexa Internet, A9.com, Inc., and Microsoft 25 Corporation agree and believe that the fees of the appointed Discovery Master 26 should be split equally between the parties to the disputed matter or motion, except 27 that the Discovery Master may apportion fees differently if it is determined that 28 one party has taken an unreasonable position with respect to the particular issue.

For example, in a motion by Google against Perfect 10, each would pay half the

1 discovery master's fees, and the other defendants would not be responsible for any 2 discovery master fees. Perfect 10, Inc. objects to this proposed method of 3 apportioning fees, and to the defendants raising this issue at the last minute. 4 Perfect 10 believes this would constitute a change in the fee-splitting procedure 5 that it understood was contemplated by the Court – one-fourth for each of the 6 defendants (or one-third each if the Discovery Master was not going to be 7 appointed in the Microsoft case). Perfect 10 believes that requiring Perfect 10 to 8 pay one half of the fees of the Discovery Master, which is what the defendants now 9 seem to be proposing, would simply be overly burdensome and unfair to Perfect 10 10. If the Court is contemplating such a change in the way fees are allocated, 11 Perfect 10 requests to be heard on this subject. 12 Finally, Microsoft Corporation joins in the proposal of Judge Tevrizian (ret.) 13 without conceding the necessity for appointment of a Discovery Master in its case, 14 Perfect 10, Inc. v. Microsoft Corporation, Case No. 07-cv-5156 AHM (SHx). 15 Respectfully submitted, 16 Dated: September 4, 2008 LAW OFFICES OF JEFFREY N. MAUSNER 17 18 By: /s/ Jeffrey N. Mausner Jeffrey N. Mausner 19 Attorneys for Plaintiff Perfect 10, Inc. 20 Dated: September 4, 2008 TOWNSEND & TOWNSEND & CREW 21 22 23 By: /s/ Mark T. Jansen (with permission) 24 Attorneys for Defendants Amazon.com, Inc., A9.com, Inc., and Alexa Internet 25 26 27

28

1	Dated:	September 4, 2008	WINSTON & STRAWN, LLP
2			
3			By: /s/ Andrew P. Bridges (with permission)
4			By: /s/ Andrew P. Bridges (with permission) Andrew P. Bridges Attorneys for Defendant Microsoft
5			Corporation
6	Datade	Santambar 4 2009	OHINN EMANIJEI
7	Dated.	September 4, 2008	QUINN EMANUEL
8			
9			By: <u>/s/ Michael T. Zeller (with permission)</u> Michael Zeller
10			Attorneys for Defendant Google, Inc.
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	1		

E1330/363EE18