Request for Clarification

Google hereby submits the following request for clarification regarding the meaning and implications of Paragraph 2 of the Court's October 6, 2009 Order Granting in Part Google Inc.'s Motion to Compel Perfect 10 to Produce Complete and Unredacted Financial Documents and Other Damages-Related Documents, and Amazon.com and Alexa Internet's Joinder Therein (the "Order").

At the September 22, 2009 hearing on Google's Motion to compel Perfect 10 to produce certain financial records in unredacted form (the "Motion"), the Court issued an order from the bench compelling Perfect 10 to produce its financial statements and tax returns in complete and unredacted form, with three narrow exceptions pertaining to (1) credit card numbers, and (2) the names of patients and (3) treating physicians in entries for medical expenses. Counsel for the Amazon Defendants confirmed this order at the hearing as follows:

MR. JANSEN: AS I UNDERSTAND THE COURT'S ORDER, IS IT, EVERYTHING IS UNREDACTED EXCEPT VERY -- THREE VERY LIMITED THINGS, WHICH ARE THE CREDIT CARD NUMBERS, THE NAMES OF PATIENTS, AND THE NAMES OF DOCTORS. EVERYTHING ELSE IS UNREDACTED.

THE COURT: I THINK YOU'RE CORRECT.

Declaration of Thomas Nolan (filed concurrently herewith), at Exhibit A (September 22, 2009 Hearing Transcript at 59:12-17).

Following that hearing, the parties submitted (Proposed) Orders confirming the Court's oral rulings. The Court adopted Perfect 10's version of Paragraph 2 (addressing production of settlement information). This Paragraph provides (*inter alia*) that "Perfect 10 may not redact information regarding the date, payor, and amount of any such settlement payments," and that "Perfect 10 is not required to produce any information about any settlements with third parties, other than the

26

27

28

date, payor, and amount of any such settlement payments, and may redact settlement information it is not required to produce."

Google understands this Paragraph to require Perfect 10 to produce its financial reports and tax returns with the date, payor, and settlement amount of any settlement payments received unredacted, and to permit Perfect 10 to redact other settlement information that might be reflected on the face of the financial reports and tax returns (if any). Particularly because the relevant portion of Google's Motion pertained only to removing the redactions on Perfect 10's financial reports and tax returns, Google does not understand the Order to suggest that the Court has ruled that Perfect 10 need not produce settlement information in any other context, or as reflected in any other documents.

Perfect 10 has advised that it disagrees with Google's interpretation of the Order in this respect, and further, that it reads the Order as relieving Perfect 10 from any obligation to produce any other documents that might contain settlement information. Stated another way, Perfect 10 construes this aspect of the Court's order granting Google's motion to compel unredacted financial records as a protective order in favor of Perfect 10, relieving Perfect 10 from its production obligations regarding discovery requests that were not even before the Court on Google's Motion. Of course, Perfect 10 has not filed a motion for protective order relieving it from the obligation to produce documents containing settlement information (such as settlement agreements), nor have the parties briefed that issue, nor does Google believe that the Court has issued such a protective order.

Accordingly, Google respectfully requests that the Court confirm that (1) Paragraph 2 of the October 6, 2009 Order is limited only to the issue of what redactions Perfect 10 was ordered to remove from its financial records and tax returns, and (2) the Court has made no ruling (including in Paragraph 2 of this Order) granting Perfect 10 a protective order relieving it from the obligation to produce any other documents that may include settlement information.

1	Respectfully Subm	nitted,
2	DATED: October 21, 20	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER &
3		HEDGES, LLP
4		Rat 1 11. " 12 Va. 1.
5		By Rachel Herrick Kassabian
6		Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		