Winston & Strawn LLP 333 South Grand Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90071-1543	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Rebecca Calkins (SBN: 195593) Email: realkins@winston.com Erin Ranahan (SBN: 235286), Email: eranahan@winston.com WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 333 South Grand Avenue, 38 th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-1543 Telephone: 213-615-1700 Facsimile: 213-615-1700 Jennifer A. Golinveaux (SBN 203056) Email: jgolinveaux @winston.com WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 101 California Street San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: 415-591-1506 Facsimile: 415-591-1506 Facsimile: 415-591-1400 Michael S. Elkin (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) Email: melkin@winston.com Thomas P. Lane (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) Email: tane@winston.com WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 200 Park Avenue New York, New York 10166 Telephone: 212-294-6700 Facsimile: 212-294-4700 Attorneys for Defendant VEOH NETWORKS, INC.	
	19	UMG RECORDINGS, INC., et al.)	CT OF CALIFORNIA Case No. CV 07 5744 – AHM (AJWx)
	20	Plaintiffs,	
	21 22	v) VEOH'S STATEMENT OF NON- OPPOSITION TO UMG'S MOTION TO COMPEL VEOH TO APPEAR AT DEPOSITIONS
	23	VEOH NETWORKS, INC, <i>et al.</i>	Hearing: December 8, 2008
	24	Defendants.) Courtroom: 690
	25		Discovery Cut-Off: January 12, 2009
	26	}	
	27))	
	28 VEOH'S STATEMENT OF NON-OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO LA:229768.1 Case No. CV 07 5		ON TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL Case No. CV 07 5744 – AHM (AJWx) Dockets.Justia.con

Veoh hereby files this Statement of Non-opposition in response to Plaintiffs' motion to compel Veoh to appear at [a second] Rule 30(b)(6) deposition, filed November 12, 2008 ("Motion").

4 ||

I.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

VEOH'S OFFER TO STIPULATE TO THE RELIEF SOUGHT

Despite the fact that through their Motion Plaintiffs seek to obtain a *second* 30(b)(6) deposition of Veoh (on twenty-nine additional topics) while simultaneously refusing to provide Veoh dates for Veoh's *first* 30(b)(6) deposition of Plaintiffs (which deposition Veoh noticed *four months ago*), Veoh nonetheless, in an effort to resolve this matter informally, offered on November 24 to stipulate to permit each side to serve up to three, non-duplicative 30(b)(6) notices.¹ Plaintiffs' counsel acknowledged that this would resolve all issues raised in the Motion, as Plaintiffs did not believe there would be any need for more than three 30(b)(6) notices in any event. (Declaration of Rebecca Lawlor Calkins ["Calkins Decl. ¶ 5]).

Despite acknowledging that Veoh's offer would satisfy Plaintiffs' 30(b)(6) needs, Plaintiffs did not promptly stipulate in good faith on the issue of additional 30(b)(6) notices and allow this motion to come off the Court's overburdened calendar. Instead, Plaintiffs opted to withhold any agreement to stipulate unless and until Veoh agreed to Plaintiffs' defiance of this Court's November 20 order instructing Plaintiffs to provide Veoh dates for Plaintiffs' 30(b)(6) witnesses by November 24 ("Order"). (Calkins Decl. ¶ 6). In other words, Plaintiffs attempted to use Veoh's good faith effort to resolve the issue herein as a bargaining chip in an attempt to gain support for Plaintiffs' failure to comply with this Court's Order.

25 26

¹ Veoh also requested that Plaintiffs eliminate Topic No. 10 and narrow Topics 6, 12, 13, 20, 23 in Plaintiffs' second 30(b)(6) notice, which Plaintiffs agreed to do. Veoh expressly stated that this was without prejudice to Veoh's right to assert other objections to topics and Veoh expressly reserves all rights.

Winston & Strawn LLP333 South Grand Avenue333 South Grand AvenueLos Angeles, CA 90071-154391929394949597979898999991919192939394949595969797989899999999919494959596979798989899999999999999919192939494949595969797989899999999999994949495959696979797989899999999949494959596969696<

12

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

II.

VEOH'S DISCUSSIONS WITH PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL

Veoh's counsel had multiple telephone calls with Plaintiffs' counsel on November 24, during which Veoh suggested that the parties stipulate to each side taking additional, non-duplicative 30(b)(6) depositions. During these calls, Veoh's counsel also identified certain particularly problematic topics in Plaintiffs' second 30(b)(6) notice. Plaintiffs' counsel agreed to eliminate Topic No. 10 and to narrow and clarify Topics Nos. 6, 12, 13, 20, 23. (Calkins Decl. ¶ 10). After checking internally, Plaintiffs' counsel reported that he thought the stipulation would be fine, but asked that Veoh provide a date as to when Veoh believed it would be in a position to provide dates for Plaintiffs' second 30(b)(6) deposition. (Calkins Decl. ¶ 7).

Veoh responded that it could provide dates for its designees on December 4, 2008. At approximately 7:00 p.m. November 24, Plaintiffs' counsel stated he would send internal emails with the information immediately, and would get back to Veoh's counsel as soon as possible. (Calkins Decl. ¶ 8). At 10:36 p.m., Plaintiffs' counsel emailed Veoh, suddenly conditioning the stipulation to three non-duplicative 30(b)(6) notices for each side on a demand that Plaintiffs' own obligation pursuant to the Order, *i.e.* to produce dates for Veoh's first 30(b)(6) notice by November 24, be pushed back ten additional days to December 4, raising the familiar argument that "UMG cannot be in a position where Veoh has all of UMG's dates, but UMG has none of Veoh's." (Calkins Decl. ¶¶4, 9, Exh. C). Plaintiffs made no mention of the Order in that email, but it was clear Plaintiffs already planned to defy the Order, as an earlier communication from Plaintiffs on the subject provided dates for only two designees covering only four of Veoh's forty-one topics.²

As Plaintiffs' counsel responded to Veoh too late in the evening on November 24 to permit Veoh to file its responsive pleading that day, Veoh's Statement of Nonopposition is presented today.

27 28

 $||^2$ Plaintiffs identified three designees but failed to provide dates for the third.

