1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	
3	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4	WESTERN DIVISION
5	
6	
7	RUPA MARYA,)
8	PLAINTIFF,) CV 13-4460-GHK(MRW)
9) V.) LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
10) JUNE 6, 2014)
11	WARNER CHAPPELL MUSIC, INC.,) (2:01 P.M. TO 2:37 P.M.)
12	DEFENDANT.)
13)
14	,
15	TELEPHONIC HEARING
16	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL R. WILNER UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
17	APPEARANCES: SEE NEXT PAGE
18	COURT REPORTER: RECORDED; COURT SMART
19	COURTROOM DEPUTY: VERONICA MC KAMIE
20	TRANSCRIBER: DOROTHY BABYKIN
21	COURTHOUSE SERVICES 1218 VALEBROOK PLACE
22	GLENDORA, CALIFORNIA 91740 (626) 963-0566
23	(020) 303-0300
24	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING; TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE.
25	INAMBORIET EKODOCED DI IKAMBOKIFITOM SEKVICE.

		_
1		
2	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER FREEMAN & HERZ
3		BY: BETSY C. MANIFOLD ATTORNEY AT LAW
4		750 B STREET SUITE 2770
5		SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101
6	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON LLP BY: ADAM I. KAPLAN
7		MELINDA E. LE MOINE ATTORNEYS AT LAW
8		355 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE 35TH FLOOR
9		LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071
LO		
L1		
L 2		
L3		
L 4		
L 5		
L6		
L 7		
L 8		
L 9		
20		
21		
22		
23		

1		
2	CV	13-4460-GHK(

CV 13-4460-GHK (MRWX)

INDEX

JUNE 6, 2014

PROCEEDINGS: TELEPHONE CONFERENCE RE DISCOVERY MOTION

	-
1	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; FRIDAY, JUNE 6, 2014; 2:01 P.M.
2	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GOOD AFTERNOON EVERYBODY.
3	THIS IS JUDGE WILNER IN LOS ANGELES.
4	WE'RE ON THE RECORD IN MARYA OR WELL, LET'S CAL
5	IT GOOD MORNING TO YOU VERSUS WARNER CHAPPELL MUSIC,
6	CV 13-4460-GHK(MRWX).
7	COULD I HAVE APPEARANCES FOR THE PLAINTIFF, PLEASE
8	MS. MANIFOLD: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR.
9	BETSY MANIFOLD, WOLF HALDENSTEIN, ON BEHALF OF THE
10	PLAINTIFFS.
11	THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON.
12	AND FOR THE DEFENSE.
13	MS. LE MOINE: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR.
14	THIS IS MELINDA LE MOINE ON BEHALF OF THE
15	DEFENDANTS FROM MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON. AND WITH ME IS ADAM
16	KAPLAN, ALSO FROM MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON.
17	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GOOD AFTERNOON TO BOTH OF
18	YOU.
19	I WANTED TO GET YOU FOLKS ON THE PHONE TO DISCUSS
20	THE MOTION THAT I RECEIVED EARLIER THIS WEEK.
21	I WORK VERY HARD TO TAKE A LOOK AT EVERY PIECE OF
22	PAPER THAT COMES THROUGH MY CHAMBERS IN MY CIVIL CASES, IN M
23	CRIMINAL CASES, IN MY CASES ON APPEAL FROM STATE COURT AND

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES JUST TO SORT OF SEE -- SEE WHAT'S

24

25

GOING ON.

AND WHEN I GET A DISCOVERY MOTION IN OUR COURT'S

JOINT FORMAT I LIKE TO SPEND A LITTLE BIT OF TIME GOING

THROUGH -- GOING THROUGH THE PAPERS -- EVEN THOUGH THEY'RE

NOTICED FOR A HEARING SEVERAL WEEKS FROM NOW -- JUST TO TAKE

A LOOK AT IT AND SEE WHAT'S REALLY GOING ON AND TO SEE

WHETHER IT MAKES SENSE TO GET INVOLVED A LITTLE BIT EARLIER.

SOMETIMES I PICK UP THE PAPERS AND I SEE SOMETHING KIND OF GLARING. I SEE SOME CONDUCT THAT IS REALLY PROBLEMATIC AND IT WARRANTS GETTING INVOLVED QUICKLY. AND I TEND TO HAVE PRETTY GOOD SUCCESS IN RESOLVING THOSE KINDS OF MOTIONS SHORT OF A HEARING.

IN THIS CASE WHEN I LOOKED AT YOUR PAPERS I DID NOT HAVE ANYTHING OF REMOTE CONCERN ABOUT HOW THE MATTER HAS BEEN HANDLED. TO THE CONTRARY, IT'S A VERY PROFESSIONAL SET OF PAPERS AND SOME REALLY INTERESTING AND LEGITIMATE ARGUMENTS ON BOTH SIDES.

BUT I STILL FELT IT MIGHT BE APPROPRIATE GIVEN THE CIRCUMSTANCES HERE TO REACH OUT -- NOT TO GIVE YOU A RULING TODAY AND NOT NECESSARILY TO SOLICIT ARGUMENT FROM YOU TODAY.

BUT, QUITE FRANKLY, SINCE YOU TOOK THE TIME AND TROUBLE AND CLIENT FUNDS TO PUT THESE PAPERS TOGETHER FOR THE PURPOSE OF HAVING ME RULE ON IT OR AT LEAST GIVE YOU MY THOUGHTS, IT MAY MAKE SENSE TO GIVE YOU MY PRELIMINARY THOUGHTS HERE PARTICULARLY GIVEN THE KIND OF UNIQUE TIMING HERE ON THE CASE.

IN ADDITION TO LOOKING AT YOUR PAPERS, I'VE LOOKED AT THE DOCKET. I'M AWARE THAT WE'RE ON OUR FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT, THAT THERE WAS SOME MOTION PRACTICE IN FRONT OF CHIEF JUDGE KING.

I SPOKE BRIEFLY WITH CHIEF JUDGE KING THE OTHER

DAY. I GOT TO CONFESS. I STARTED THE CONVERSATION BY SAYING

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO HIM. I HOPE THAT DOESN'T GET ME IN TROUBLE

WITH ANYBODY.

BUT HE TOLD ME ABOUT -- SORT OF THE TIMING OF THE CASE AND THE FACT THAT YOU FOLKS HAD ASKED FOR KIND OF AN EXPEDITED DISCOVERY DATE FOR WHAT YOU'RE CALLING THE FIRST PHASE OF THIS CASE. AND THAT GIVES ME A COUPLE OF THOUGHTS WITH RESPECT TO THE TIMING AND PROGRESS OF THE DISCOVERY HERE.

BUT I KNOW YOU FEEL LIKE YOU'RE UNDER THE GUN IN

TERMS OF THE TIMING THAT YOU'VE IMPOSED ON YOURSELVES. AND,

SO, I WANTED TO -- WANTED TO GIVE YOU MY THOUGHTS ON THAT AS

WELL AND TO SEE IF THERE IS A WAY FORWARD.

THE END RESULT OF OUR DISCUSSION HERE TODAY -- AND IT MAY JUST BE A ONE-SIDED DISCUSSION FOR ME HERE. LIKE I SAID, YOU'RE NOT REQUIRED TO ARGUE HERE TODAY. AND YOU MAY BE MORE INTERESTED IN THINKING ABOUT WHAT I HAVE TO SAY AND FIGURING OUT WHAT YOU WANT TO DO.

BUT THE END RESULT TODAY IS YOU MAY WANT TO TAKE
ANOTHER RUN AT SITTING DOWN IN LIGHT OF MY THOUGHTS AND

SEEING IF THERE'S SOMETHING TO BE WORKED OUT OR,

ALTERNATIVELY, WHETHER YOU CAN FOCUS ON A MORE DISCRETE ISSUE

OR SET OF ISSUES HERE AND PROVIDE ME WITH SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFS

THAT MAY BE A LITTLE BIT MORE FOCUSED ON THE ISSUES THAT I

THINK ARE AT PLAY HERE.

MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THIS IS A CASE INVOLVING
THE RIGHTS TO HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO YOU, A CASE THAT WAS -- OR A
SONG THAT WAS ORIGINALLY COPYRIGHTED IN THE 19TH CENTURY.
THERE ARE ISSUES REGARDING THE VALIDITY OF THE COPYRIGHT AND
ITS EXTENSION, ALLEGATIONS OF INFRINGEMENT AND SO FORTH.

AND, THEN, THE DISCOVERY REQUESTS THAT PLAINTIFF

SERVED FOR WHATEVER THOSE RECORDS WERE MET WITH INVOCATION OF

PRIVILEGE AND EVENTUALLY THE PRODUCTION OF A PRIVILEGE LOG

AND THEN A SECOND PRIVILEGE LOG WHICH MR. KAPLAN FORWARDED TO

THE COURT SEPARATELY THE OTHER DAY WHEN I NOTICED THAT IT HAD

BEEN INADVERTENTLY --

DON'T WORRY ABOUT IT.

-- BUT IT HAD NOT BEEN ATTACHED TO THE MOVING PAPERS.

I UNDERSTAND AND I TAKE SERIOUSLY PLAINTIFF'S CLAIM

THAT THE PRIVILEGE LOG WAS PRODUCED AFTER EITHER THE DEADLINE

SET FORTH IN RULE 30 -- OH, I ALWAYS GET CONFUSED -- 33 OR

34, WHICHEVER ONE IT IS AND, PERHAPS, AFTER A TIME WHEN THERE

WAS AN AGREED-UPON EXTENSION.

AND THE BURLINGTON NORTHERN ARGUMENT THAT PRIVILEGE

IS WAIVED IF IT'S INVOKED IMPROPERLY OR BELATEDLY IS AN ARGUMENT THAT I'M FAMILIAR WITH. I SEE IT, YOU KNOW, FROM TIME TO TIME. AND I'M WELL AWARE OF THE FACTORS THAT THE CIRCUIT HAS IDENTIFIED IN MAKING THAT DETERMINATION AS TO WHETHER PRIVILEGE HAS BEEN WAIVED AND, NOTWITHSTANDING THE PRODUCTION OF A LOG, DOCUMENTS MUST BE PRODUCED.

I WILL -- AND, THEN, THERE WERE OTHER ARGUMENTS
THAT WERE PRESENTED IN THE PAPERS REGARDING THE MANNER IN
WHICH THE LOG WAS PREPARED AND WHETHER THERE WERE AMBIGUOUS
PHRASES USED AND WHETHER THE PRIVILEGE WAS APPROPRIATELY
BEING RAISED AND WHETHER SUFFICIENT INFORMATION WAS BEING
PROVIDED TO THE PLAINTIFF SO THAT THE PLAINTIFF AND/OR THE
COURT COULD TEST THE VALIDITY OF THE INVOCATION OF THE
PRIVILEGE.

AND, THEN, YOU GET INTO ISSUES THAT ARE A LITTLE

BIT MORE UNIQUE, WHICH IS THE ISSUE OF WAIVER AND THIRD

PARTIES AND JOINT -- JOINT OR COMMON INTEREST IN THE EXERCISE

OF THE RIGHTS HERE AND WHETHER PRIVILEGE APPLIES TO SOME OF

THE MATERIALS THAT ARE AT ISSUE HERE.

LET ME JUST TAKE A PAUSE.

MS. MANIFOLD, RECOGNIZING I MAY HAVE GLIDED THROUGH

SOME OTHER THINGS HERE, AM I GENERALLY IN THE BALLPARK HERE?

MS. MANIFOLD: YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE YOU'RE SPOT

ON.

THE COURT: OKAY. THAT'S NICE.

MS. LE MOINE.

MS. LE MOINE: THAT SOUNDS LIKE THE THREE CLAIMS THAT ARE MADE, YES.

THE COURT: OKAY.

ALL RIGHT. WELL, I APPRECIATE THAT. LIKE I SAID,
I HAVEN'T WORKED IT UP IN FULL, BUT I SPENT, YOU KNOW, A GOOD
PART OF TIME THIS WEEK ON IT BECAUSE IT'S AN INTERESTING
ISSUE AND IT'S AN IMPORTANT CASE. AND I WANT TO MAKE SURE I
GET -- I GET SOME OF THESE ISSUES RIGHT.

I MEAN, I'LL TELL YOU -- I'LL TELL YOU RIGHT NOW.

I DON'T SEE THE BURLINGTON NORTHERN ISSUE AS BEING A WINNER
HERE. I'M WELL AWARE THAT THERE ARE CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE BIG
FIRMS AND BIG COMPANIES LIKE TO BIG FIRM AND BIG COMPANY
ANOTHER LITIGANT. AND I UNDERSTAND VERY, VERY WELL
THE CONCEPT OF BEING SLOW-PLAYED IN DISCOVERY AND BEING
DELAYED AND -- YOU KNOW, PARTICULARLY IN A CASE WHERE THE
PARTIES HAVE AGREED -- AGREED JOINTLY -- TO SHORT DEADLINES,
I AM VERY AWARE OF THE POTENTIAL OF PREJUDICE HERE WITH
RESPECT TO THE LATE ROLL-OUT OF THINGS.

I REALLY DON'T WANT TO HAVE TO SPEND A LOT OF TIME
ON WHAT YOUR DISCUSSIONS WERE, OR WHAT YOUR CONFIRMATION
LETTERS WERE, OR WHAT YOUR COUNTER-CONFIRMATIONS EMAILS WERE.
ACTUALLY, I'M BLESSED THAT YOU DIDN'T SUBMIT TO ME A TON OF
THOSE MATERIALS. USUALLY LAWYERS WANT ME TO KNOW EXACTLY
WHAT THEIR LETTERS SAY, AND I HAVE ENDLESS DECLARATIONS ABOUT

THAT.

IF YOU REALLY WANT ME TO FIGURE OUT WHETHER THERE
WAS AN EXTENSION OFFERED AND TAKEN AND WHETHER IT WAS RENEWED
AND ALL THAT, I'M HAPPY TO BRING YOU UP TO FEDERAL COURT AND
PUT YOU ON THE STAND, SWEAR YOU IN, AND UNDER PENALTY OF
PERJURY I'LL ASK YOU MYSELF. MAYBE WE DON'T NEED TO GO THAT
WAY.

AND THE HISTORIC NATURE OF THESE DOCUMENTS, SOME OF WHICH GO
BACK A FAIRLY LONG TIME, THEY MAY HAVE BEEN PRODUCED IN OTHER
LITIGATION. THEY MAY -- IT MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE BEEN A BIG
BURDEN TO ASSEMBLE THEM. BUT I GOT TO SAY THAT FOR DISCOVERY
THAT WAS SERVED IN FEBRUARY AFTER FOUR ITERATIONS OF A
COMPLAINT AND, YOU KNOW, FOR RESPONSES THAT WERE ORIGINALLY
DUE IN MARCH AND PERHAPS EXTENDED INTO APRIL, THE PRODUCTION
OF A LOG IN MAY DOESN'T STRIKE ME AS THE MOST NEFARIOUS OF
CONDUCT HERE.

I RECOGNIZE, AND I WANT TO GIVE SOME REAL THOUGHT
TO THE FACT THAT THAT LOG WAS SUPPLEMENTED IN JUNE, KIND OF
AS THE PARTIES WERE GEARING UP FOR THIS. AND, YOU KNOW, I
UNDERSTAND THE CONCEPT THAT YOU PUSH THE MOTION TO TRY AND
GET A RESULT.

I DON'T THINK WE GET INTO THE RULE OF -- RULE 37
WHERE SOMEONE IS A PREVAILING PARTY IF DISCOVERY IS PRODUCED
AFTER THE MOTION HAS BEEN FILED, YOU KNOW, THEREBY MOOTING

THE MOTION. THAT'S A TACTIC THAT I DON'T HAVE ANY TIME FOR AND THE RULES DON'T HAVE ANY TIME FOR. BUT I DON'T -- I DON'T HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT THAT OCCURRED HERE.

YEAH, THERE WAS A SUPPLEMENTAL LOG THAT CAME OUT.

BUT THE SUPPLEMENTAL LOG WENT A LONG WAY TO ALLEVIATING SOME

OF THE ISSUES THAT WERE RAISED IN SORT OF POINT 2 OF THE

MOTION, WHICH IS, GEE, I REALLY DON'T KNOW WHAT CONCERNING

MEANS OR, YOU KNOW, HOW THESE DOCUMENTS ARE BEING DESCRIBED.

I SAT THERE AND KIND OF DID A RUDIMENTARY SIDE BY
SIDE OF THE MAY LOG AND THE JUNE LOG. AND MY FIRST TAKE WAS
THAT THE JUNE LOG WAS BETTER. THE JUNE LOG WAS MORE
DETAILED. THE JUNE LOG WAS MORE RESPONSIVE TO THE CONCERNS
THAT MS. MANIFOLD AND HER TEAM HAD RAISED.

AND, YOU KNOW, NOT GREAT THAT IT CAME IN THIS

SEQUENCE OF EVENTS. BUT, AGAIN, IT WAS REASONABLY PROMPT.

AND GIVEN SOME OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES AND THE UNIQUE NATURE OF

SOME OF THESE ISSUES, AND FOREIGN COMPANIES AND FIGURING OUT

WHO IS WHO, AGAIN, I GOT TO SAY I'M NOT THE MOST MORTALLY

OFFENDED BY WHAT I SAW. ALTHOUGH I'M NOT INTENDING TO

PRECLUDE THE PLAINTIFFS FROM IDENTIFYING SOME MORE

DEFICIENCIES HERE. BUT WHAT I THOUGHT HAD BEEN PRETTY GOOD

ORIGINALLY, ALTHOUGH PERHAPS LATE, SEEMED TO GET BETTER,

ALBEIT EVEN LATER.

AND WE CAN TALK ABOUT DATES BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO HAVE -- I DON'T WANT TO BASE A RULING OR CAUSE THE PARTIES TO

INCUR COSTS OR TAKE POSITIONS BASED ON TIMING. IF I
RECOMMEND A CHANGE IN THE DATES HERE TO CHIEF JUDGE KING TO
GIVE SOMEONE RELIEF HERE, THAT MAY BE THE RELIEF YOU REALLY
WANT ON THESE ISSUES.

THEN, WE GET INTO THIS ISSUE OF THE THIRD PARTY AND THE JOINT INTEREST OR THE COMMON INTERESTS. AND I DON'T MEAN TO GET TURNED AROUND ON THIS, IS THIS THE WAIVER, THIS IS THE EXCEPTION TO THE WAIVER. YOU CAN HELP ME OUT IF I NEED TO BE HELPED OUT ON THIS.

BUT THE ISSUE IS THAT THERE IS A CLAIM OF PRIVILEGE EXTENDING -- WE'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT THE ROLE OF NON-LAWYERS OR INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS OR SORT OF LOCAL AGENTS WHO MAY FALL WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE PRIVILEGE. BUT THIS IS SORT OF THE NIDEC ISSUE THAT WAS RAISED HERE, WHICH HAS TO DO WITH GOING SORT OF WELL BEYOND WHAT COULD BE THE EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONSHIP OR THE EMPLOYER-INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR RELATIONSHIP.

AND THAT GETS INTO THIS -- OH, HERE IT IS -- "THE COMMON INTEREST EXCEPTION TO THE RULE WAIVING PRIVILEGE."

GOOD. I GOT IT NOW.

AND I READ -- I READ THE PARTIES' CASES HERE. I

MEAN, THE MGA CASE IS A CASE FROM THIS DISTRICT. IT'S CHIEF

JUDGE SEGAL, AND I READ THAT QUITE CLOSELY. NIDEC FROM JUDGE

CHEN UP IN THE NORTHERN DISTRICT. THE PATENT CASES I FOUND

TO BE OF INTEREST, NOT JUST THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT'S DECISION

THAT WAS CITED IN YOUR PAPERS BUT, ALSO, AS TO THE MORE RECENT ONE IN THE GENENTECH CASE BY JUDGE GREWAL INVOLVING PATENT LITIGATION UP IN THE NORTHERN DISTRICT.

I MEAN, THERE'S DEFINITELY -- DEFINITELY AN

INTERESTING ISSUE HERE, WHICH RAISES SOME LEGAL QUESTIONS.

IT ALSO RAISES SOME INTERESTING FACTUAL QUESTIONS. AND THIS

MAY BE WHERE I NEED TO GET SOME MORE DEVELOPMENT.

MY UNDERSTANDING -- AND, AGAIN, THERE'S GOING TO BE SOME DETAILS HERE THAT I JUST CAN'T GET RIGHT BECAUSE I'M NOWHERE NEAR AS FAMILIAR WITH ALL THIS STUFF AS YOU FOLKS ARE. BUT WHEN WARNER -- I'M GOING TO CALL IT WARNER FOR SHORTHAND. WHEN WARNER OR WARNER'S LEGAL STAFF WAS DEALING WITH THE LICENSING ENTITIES IN THE U.K., IN FRANCE AND, PERHAPS, ELSEWHERE, AND IN COMMUNICATIONS THAT THOSE ENTITIES APPEARED TO HAVE HAD WITH PERHAPS THEIR LAWYERS, THERE IS AN ASSERTION THAT THERE IS THIS COMMONALITY WHICH BRINGS THOSE COMMUNICATIONS WITHIN THE PRIVILEGE.

I DON'T KNOW. AND I -- AND I DON'T KNOW BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW THAT I KNOW ENOUGH FACTUALLY ABOUT WHO THESE ENTITIES ARE, THE NATURE OF THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH WARNER. YOU KNOW, THE ISSUE IN NIDEC HAD TO DO WITH WE'VE GOT PATENT LITIGATION OR WE'VE GOT LITIGATION I GUESS IT IS. AND WE WANT TO DISCLOSE SOME OF THAT TO A POTENTIAL PURCHASER FOR ISSUES THAT ARE UNRELATED TO THE ACTUAL PROSECUTION OF THOSE CASES OR PROTECTION OF RIGHTS. BUT THAT WAS VALUATION OF A

BUSINESS IN THE CONTEXT OF A TAKE-OVER.

AND THE NIDEC COURT -- AND I UNDERSTAND THAT THE NIDEC HOLDING IS THAT JUST BECAUSE YOU'RE DISCLOSING THESE CONFIDENTIAL ISSUES IN A CONFIDENTIAL MANNER, THAT DOESN'T -- THAT DOESN'T SEEM TO FALL WITHIN THE PRIVILEGE BECAUSE THAT'S COMMONALITY OF A FINANCIAL INTEREST OR A BUSINESS INTEREST AS OPPOSED TO A LEGAL INTEREST.

AND THE PATENTEE LICENSEE CASES SEEM TO BE A BIT DIFFERENT. AND THE NATURE OF WHAT'S GOING ON HERE GIVEN THAT THESE ARE LICENSING ENTITIES AND AGENCIES THAT ARE OPERATING THE COPYRIGHTS AND THEY HAVE REQUIREMENTS TO MAINTAIN THE INTEGRITY OF THOSE RIGHTS GIVES ME SOME REASON TO PAUSE WHETHER IT DOES OR DOES NOT FALL INTO THE COMMON INTEREST RULE HERE.

AND, SO, MAYBE THAT'S A GOOD PLACE FOR ME TO PAUSE AND SEE WHETHER —— WHETHER ANYBODY WANTS TO BE HEARD HERE.

BECAUSE THIS IS AN AREA WHERE FRANKLY WE CAN GO A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DIRECTIONS. YOU FOLKS COULD, AND PERHAPS SHOULD, MAYBE TAKE ANOTHER RUN AT SITTING DOWN AND FIGURING OUT WHETHER YOU NEED SOME MORE INFORMATION ON THIS ISSUE TO DETERMINE WHETHER THIS IS A LEGITIMATE INVOCATION OF PRIVILEGE.

YOU FOLKS --

MS. MANIFOLD: YOUR HONOR, IF I COULD BE HEARD FIRST SINCE IT IS MY MOTION.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MS. MANIFOLD: I JUST -- I WANTED TO MAKE JUST A COUPLE OF OBSERVATIONS --

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MS. MANIFOLD: -- BASED ON THE COURT'S COMMENTS TO US.

AND I APPRECIATE THE COURT'S VIEW WITH REGARD TO THE NATURE OF THE DELAY IN THE <u>BURLINGTON NORTHERN</u> WAIVER.

AND I THINK THAT THE PARTIES HAVE THROUGHOUT THIS LITIGATION

-- AND I THINK THE COURT HAS MADE THAT OBSERVATION AND HAS

DEALT WITH EACH OTHER WITH COURTESY AND COOPERATION. AND I'M

VERY PLEASED THAT -- AND I'M SURE MY -- DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL

WILL JOIN ME IN THIS IN SAYING THAT WE'RE PLEASED THAT THE

COURT HAS NOTED THAT IN OUR PAPERS.

THE COURT: YES.

MS. MANIFOLD: AND I CERTAINLY -- WE DON'T DISPUTE THAT AN EXTENSION WAS GIVEN TO -- FOR THE PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS OR FOR THE PRODUCTION OF OBJECTIONS.

SO, IF THE COURT IS BASED ON THE COMMENTS SOMEWHAT SINGULARLY UNIMPRESSED BY THE DELAY THAT WE POINTED OUT IN THE PRODUCTION LOG, THEN, I CERTAINLY WILL TAKE THAT INTO CONSIDERATION WITH REGARD TO ANY SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING AND WHERE THE PLAINTIFFS PLAN TO FOCUS THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR ISSUES.

AND I KNOW THAT THE COURT RAISED THE ISSUE OF THE

POTENTIAL FOR RULE 37 FINES. I DON'T THINK EITHER PARTY HAS
ANY INTEREST IN THAT. I THINK WE WOULD JUST PREFER TO FOCUS
ON THE LEGAL ISSUES AND GET A RESOLUTION IN THE MOST
PRACTICAL AND EFFICIENT WAY. AND IF THAT MEANS THE COURT HAS
TO DO IT, OR WE CAN FURTHER MEET AND CONFER, I THINK WE'RE
CAPABLE OF DOING EITHER.

THE COURT: AHH, BUT YOU SEE -- YOU HAVE THE PROBLEM THERE THOUGH. RULE 37 IS MANDATORY.

MS. MANIFOLD: OKAY.

THE COURT: RULE -- RULE 37(A)(5) SAYS THAT IF A MOTION IS GRANTED FOR -- TO COMPEL PRODUCTION, THE COURT MUST AFTER GIVING AN OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD REQUIRE THE PARTY WHOSE CONDUCT NECESSITATED THE MOTION OR THEIR ATTORNEY TO PAY EXPENSES.

THERE ARE EXCEPTIONS TO IT, BUT IF THE MOTION IS DENIED, THEN, I MUST -- AGAIN, THIS IS 37(A)(5)(B), I MUST TAKE UP THE ISSUE OF ATTORNEY'S FEES.

SO, YOU KNOW, AGAIN, ONCE YOU FOLKS LAUNCHED THE MOTION, THINGS COME INTO PLAY, NOT THE LEAST OF WHICH MY OBLIGATION TO AT LEAST TAKE THIS UP OR REQUIRE YOU TO ADDRESS IT, WHICH MAY ALSO BE SOMETHING YOU WANT TO TAKE INTO YOUR CALCULUS AS YOU MOVE FORWARD.

MS. MANIFOLD: I UNDERSTAND, YOUR HONOR.

AND I -- AND GETTING TO THE NEXT POINT WAS THAT I

THINK ONE OF THE KEY FOCUSED -- AND WHAT PLAINTIFFS HAD

PLANNED TO FOCUS MORE CLEARLY ON IN THEIR SUPPLEMENTAL

MEMORANDUM WAS THE COMMON INTEREST, WHICH I THINK IS WHAT THE

COURT HAS BEEN MOST FOCUSED ON. AND I THINK THAT THAT'S

WHERE THERE ARE SEVERAL DOCUMENTS THAT BASED ON THE ARGUMENTS

IN OUR BRIEFING DON'T COME WITHIN THE COMMON INTEREST. AND I

THINK THAT THAT'S THE CLEAREST AND THE MOST FOCUSED ARGUMENT

THAT THE PLAINTIFFS HAD PLANNED TO MAKE IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL

BRIEFING.

THE COURT: OKAY. WELL, I MEAN, LOOK, ONE THING WE CAN DO IS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFS. YOU KNOW, I DO HAVE TO SAY THAT YOU MAY -- YOU MAY WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT BECAUSE I THOUGHT YOUR PAPERS WERE THINNEST IN THAT AREA, EVEN THOUGH YOU WERE AWARE THAT THE ISSUE WAS THERE. I MEAN, IT SEEMS LIKE YOU SPENT MOST OF YOUR TIME ON THE OTHER POINTS AND KIND OF THREW THIS IN AT THE END.

I WILL SAY THAT I'M NOT -- I'M NOT AVERSE TO IN

CAMERA INSPECTION OF SOMETHING THAT'S LIMITED. AND, YOU

KNOW, I HAVE NO WAY OF KNOWING THAT A 137 DOCUMENTS WITH 300

PAGES OUT OF 2,000 -- BLAH, BLAH, BLAH, BLAH -- I HAVE NO WAY

OF KNOWING WHETHER THAT IS A REASON -- IT'S GOING TO BE

REALLY BURDENSOME ON THE COURT TO DO THIS.

I DON'T KNOW THAT I'LL HAVE ENOUGH INFORMATION TO

DO AN INTELLIGENT REVIEW OF PRIVILEGE. SO, I THINK I NEED TO

SEE -- I NEED TO SEE SOME MORE GUIDANCE FROM YOU FOLKS AHEAD

OF TIME ON THE ISSUE, RECOGNIZING THAT THE PLAINTIFFS ARE

KIND OF BLIND BECAUSE THE WHOLE POINT IS THAT THEY'RE NOT GOING TO SEE THESE RECORDS.

BUT IF I'M DOING AN IN CAMERA REVIEW, AND PUTTING

MY OTHER CASES ON HOLD, YOU KNOW, RULE 37 MOST DEFINITELY

COMES INTO PLAY THEN. BECAUSE THAT'S ME INTERVENING IN A WAY

IN A DISCOVERY DISPUTE THAT IS FAIRLY EXTRAORDINARY.

NOW, IF WE'RE TALKING ABOUT A DOZEN PIECES OF

PAPER, IT MAY NOT BE AS MUCH AS OTHERWISE THREATENED, BUT,

YOU KNOW, IT'S OF SIGNIFICANCE, AND IT SHOULD NOT BE IN THE

ORDINARY COURSE. SO, I WANTED TO LET YOU KNOW ABOUT THAT.

I TAKE SERIOUSLY THE DEFENSE'S POSITION THAT, YOU KNOW, THEY DON'T WANT TO HAVE TO SUBMIT EVERYTHING AND HAVE ME DO THIS WORK. THE WHOLE POINT OF THE PRIVILEGE LOG IS NOT THAT SOMEBODY PREPARES A PRIVILEGE LOG AND THEN THE OTHER SIDE SAYS I DON'T BELIEVE IT. JUDGE, YOU LOOK AT IT. IT'S THE OPPOSITE. IT'S -- THE PRIVILEGE LOG IS PRESUMPTIVELY VALID UNLESS WE'VE GOT A PROBLEM OR SOMETHING UNIQUE AND DEFINABLE.

THIS MAY -- MAY BE UNIQUE AND DEFINABLE. BUT IN

ORDER TO DEMONSTRATE THE UNIQUENESS AND TO GIVE ME THAT

DEFINITION AS TO WHAT I SHOULD BE LOOKING FOR, I THINK I MAY

NEED MORE ON THE LAW BUT, PERHAPS MORE IMPORTANTLY, SORT OF

THE NATURE OF WHAT I MIGHT BE LOOKING AT AND THE NATURE OF

THESE PARTIES. I HAVE SOME RUDIMENTARY UNDERSTANDING OF

LICENSING AGENTS. YOU KNOW, THESE WERE EQUATED TO ASCAP AND

BMI EXCEPT MAYBE OVERSEAS. BUT, YOU KNOW, I'M NOT SURE I
UNDERSTAND. I'M NOT SURE THAT I KNOW WHAT I'D BE LOOKING FOR
IN ORDER TO MAKE THE INTELLIGENT DECISION THAT I'M EXPECTED
TO MAKE.

MS. MANIFOLD: YOUR HONOR, BETSY MANIFOLD FOR THE PLAINTIFFS.

AND I -- IF I MAY -- AND I APOLOGIZE IF THIS WOULD BE IMPROPER IN THIS CONTEXT, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO THROW OUT THE QUESTION TO DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL TO SEE IF --

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MS. MANIFOLD: -- THERE'S A WILLINGNESS BASED ON THE COURT'S WILLINGNESS FOR US TO PERHAPS CONTINUE THE MEET-AND-CONFER PROCESS FOR A DISCRETE PERIOD OF TIME AND THEN PERHAPS RESUBMIT A MORE -- BASED ON -- BECAUSE UNFORTUNATELY WE GOT THE AMENDED PRIVILEGE LOG AT THE SAME TIME WE -- OUR PAPERS WERE ALREADY FILED. SO, IT WAS VERY DIFFICULT. WE BASICALLY COULDN'T TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION ANY OF THE CHANGES IN THE PRIVILEGE LOG. AND I THINK THAT THERE COULD BE MORE FACTUAL DETAIL PROVIDED BY THE DEFENDANTS THAT COULD ANSWER SOME OF THE QUESTIONS BOTH THAT ARE RAISED BY THE PRIVILEGE LOG AND THAT THE COURT RAISED.

THE COURT: WELL, THE ANSWER --

MS. MANIFOLD: AND I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S A PROCESS THAT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO RAISE AT THIS POINT OR --

THE COURT: NO.

MS. MANIFOLD: -- IF WE SHOULD JUST PROCEED TO SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING.

THE COURT: NO. THE -- NO. THE ANSWER IS IT'S ABSOLUTELY APPROPRIATE.

LOOK, I'M GOING TO BE -- BECAUSE YOU -- BECAUSE -LIKE I SAID, YOU FOLKS HAVE DONE -- HAVE DONE FINE HERE.

THIS IS NOT THE KIND OF CASE WHERE I FEEL LIKE I HAVE TO
BRING THE HAMMER ON LAWYERS. TO THE CONTRARY, I WILL SPEAK
FREELY. ANYTHING THAT YOU CAN AGREE UPON WILL BE BETTER FROM
YOUR PERSPECTIVES THAN ANYTHING THAT I CAN IMPOSE UPON YOU.

OKAY. I SAY THAT BECAUSE YOU ARE MORE FAMILIAR WITH THE
ISSUES HERE. YOU ARE MORE FAMILIAR WITH WHAT YOU NEED. YOU
ARE MORE FAMILIAR WITH, PERHAPS, WHAT YOU CAN GIVE UP IN -YOU KNOW, ZEALOUSLY REPRESENTING YOUR CLIENTS BUT ALSO
PRACTICALLY REPRESENTING YOUR CLIENTS AND PUTTING IT IN THE
HANDS OF SOMEONE ELSE -- BE IT A FEDERAL JUDGE OR DISCOVERY
MASTER OR SOME GUY OFF THE STREET -- LIKELY IS NOT IN YOUR
CLIENT'S INTERESTS.

SO, IN THE ORDINARY COURSE, ANYTHING THAT YOU CAN AGREE UPON IS GOOD FOR YOU AND IS IN YOUR INTERESTS.

AND I'M HAPPY TO PUSH THE PAUSE BUTTON HERE. AND THAT'S WHY I WANTED TO LET YOU KNOW THAT IF YOU FEEL LIKE BECAUSE OF THE CHANGE IN THE CIRCUMSTANCE AND BECAUSE YOU NOW HAVE, YOU KNOW, SOME OF THE INFORMATION YOU WERE SEEKING,

MS. MANIFOLD, FROM THE DEFENSE -- AND THEY'VE COMPLIED AND,

YOU KNOW, OR GETTING TOWARDS COMPLIANCE OR WHATEVER -- WE CAN PUSH PAUSE. IF THE RELIEF YOU NEED IS A BRIEF CONTINUANCE OF THE DISCOVERY CUT-OFF TO SORT OF MAINTAIN THE STATUS QUO AND AVOID PREJUDICE, LIKE I SAID, I'LL PICK UP THE PHONE AND CALL JUDGE KING -- CHIEF JUDGE KING AND SEE WHAT I CAN DO.

I'M HAPPY TO GET YOU FOLKS BACK ON THE PHONE TO SORT OF SEE WHERE THINGS ARE AND TO TAKE YOUR TEMPERATURE.

UNFORTUNATELY, I DO HAVE SOME PERSONAL TRAVEL COMING UP THE NEXT COUPLE OF WEEKS, BUT I CAN MAKE MYSELF AVAILABLE, AND I WILL MAKE MYSELF AVAILABLE AS A SERVICE TO YOU FOLKS IF THAT MAKES SENSE. IF YOU WANTED TO GET ON THE PHONE A WEEK FROM NOW AND LET ME KNOW THAT YOU'VE WORKED IT OUT OR THAT YOU'VE REDUCED THE SCOPE OF THINGS --

AND, MS. LE MOINE, I'M HAPPY TO HEAR FROM YOU AS WELL ON THIS --

-- BUT IF THAT'S THE WAY FORWARD, THAT'S FINE WITH ME. AND, THEN, THIS HAS BEEN A SUCCESS.

MS. LE MOINE: YOUR HONOR, I WILL CHIME IN HERE.

I'VE LEARNED A LESSON, WHICH IS WHEN YOU -- WHEN YOU DON'T

DISAGREE WITH ANYTHING, YOU DON'T SAY ANYTHING. BUT --

THE COURT: RIGHT ON.

MS. LE MOINE: SO -- AS I MAY BE MAKING A MISTAKE.

BUT I THINK YOU'RE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT, AND I APPRECIATE YOUR

HAVING TO LOOK AT IT QUICKLY SO THAT WE COULD SORT OF FOCUS

ON, YOU KNOW, WHERE THE -- THE INTERESTING ISSUE HERE. AND I

AGREE WITH YOU IT'S AN INTERESTING ONE, AN INTERESTING LEGAL ISSUE.

I AM CONFIDENT THAT THE DOCUMENTS -- AND IT'S A

SUBSET OF THE WHOLE -- OF THE LOG -- THAT ARE EXCHANGED WITH

LICENSING AGENTS, ARE PRIVILEGED, AND THAT THEY ARE PROTECTED

AGAINST WAIVER BY THE COMMON INTEREST DOCTRINE.

I'M HAPPY TO SIT DOWN WITH PLAINTIFFS AGAIN AND
HAVE A CHAT ABOUT HOW TO KEEP THIS -- MAYBE TO FOCUS THIS AND
SEE WHERE THAT DISCUSSION GOES AND ALLEVIATE ANY BURDEN ON
THE COURT.

THE COURT: AND ONE THING -- AND I APPRECIATE THAT,

AND I APPRECIATE THE SPIRIT ON BOTH SIDES. I MEAN, ONE THING

YOU MAY WANT TO DO IS MAYBE A LITTLE BIT OF PEEK-A-BOO.

MAYBE DISCLOSE A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT WHAT YOU HAVE TO LET

HER MAKE AN INTELLIGENT DECISION. AND IF IT'S REALLY THAT

MUCH OF A LAY-DOWN FROM YOUR SIDE -- YOU KNOW, I'M NOT

TALKING ABOUT YOU WAIVING THE PRIVILEGE OR SHOWING HER THE

DOCUMENTS, BUT MAYBE YOU CAN BE A LITTLE BIT MORE EXPRESS IN

THIS AREA TO GIVE HER -- TO GIVE HER COMFORT THAT SHE'S NOT

JUST GIVING AWAY THE FARM.

I MEAN, PART OF WHAT I WAS THINKING ABOUT WAS, YOU KNOW -- I'M NOT LOOKING TO PLAY GAMES OR ANYTHING, BUT MAYBE WE HAVE TO DO A SAMPLE. AND MAYBE THE SAMPLING CAMERA IS MUTUALLY AGREED-UPON DOCUMENTS, YOU KNOW, WHERE BOTH SIDES FEEL VERY CONFIDENT THAT THESE ARE -- ARE OR ARE NOT

PRIVILEGED. AND I LOOK AT FIVE OF THEM. AND IF A MAJORITY
ARE PRIVILEGED AND PROPERLY PRIVILEGED, THEN, PLAINTIFF IS
GOING TO PAY SOME FEES. AND IF THE MAJORITY ARE NOT PROPERLY
PRIVILEGED, THEN, THE DEFENSE IS GOING TO PAY FEES. AND
YOU'LL PUT YOUR MONEY WHERE YOUR MOUTH IS. OR MAYBE THERE'S
SOME OTHER SANCTIONS OR CONSEQUENCES COMING IN THAT I HAVEN'T
PUT INTO FIRM THOUGHT.

BUT I WANT TO GIVE YOU FOLKS AN INCENTIVE TO

RESOLVE THIS. AND THE INCENTIVE IS NOT JUST ME RULING ON IT

BUT DOING IT IN A WAY THAT PROTECTS OUR RESOURCES HERE AND

KEEPS YOUR CASE MOVING. BECAUSE YOU'RE GOING TO SLOW DOWN IF

YOU HAVE TO HAVE ME LOOK AT IT. OKAY. YOU JUST ARE. AND

THAT'S NOT IN ANYBODY'S -- NOT IN ANYBODY'S INTERESTS.

SO, YEAH, IF YOU WANT TO SIT DOWN, SOMEBODY WANTS

TO BUY SOMEBODY A CUP OF COFFEE, ALTHOUGH --

YOU'RE DOWN IN SAN DIEGO, RIGHT, MS. MANIFOLD?

MS. MANIFOLD: I AM, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SOMEBODY DELIVERS HER A CUP
OF COFFEE.

(LAUGHTER.)

MS. MANIFOLD: RIGHT.

THE COURT: MAYBE YOU CAN FIGURE SOMETHING OUT OR

MAYBE FIGURE --

MS. MANIFOLD: MAYBE WE COULD BOTH BUY EACH OTHER A
CUP OF COFFEE --

MS. LE MOINE: I COULD FAX YOU A CUP OF COFFEE.

(LAUGHTER.)

THE COURT: YOU MEET IN IRVINE. IT'S HALFWAY. I
MEAN, FIGURE SOMETHING OUT. I MEAN, THE LAST THING I WANT IS
MORE EMAILS GOING BACK AND FORTH, MORE KIND OF SNITOGRAM
LETTERS GOING BACK AND FORTH. YOU KNOW, SOMEBODY PUT
SOMEBODY ON AN IPAD AND DO A FACE TIME DISCUSSION
FACE-TO-FACE. AND PUT SOME CARDS ON THE TABLE.

YOU HAVE A PROTECTIVE ORDER IN THIS CASE, CORRECT?

MS. MANIFOLD: YES, YOUR HONOR.

MS. LE MOINE: WE DO, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: YES, I DID SIGN THAT. SO, THERE'S DISCLOSURE ISSUES, YOU KNOW, YOU CAN WORK WITH THAT.

WHAT MAKES SENSE IS A WAY FORWARD HERE.

MS. MANIFOLD: MY SUGGESTION -- I THINK ONE OF THE KEY MOTIVATING FACTORS FOR THE FILING AND THE ISSUES WITH THE FILINGS THAT WE'VE HAD UP UNTIL NOW IS THAT WE'RE VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE DISCOVERY CUT-OFF. AND IT'S IMPORTANT TO BOTH SIDES THAT WE MAINTAIN THAT PACE. AND IF WE'RE JUST DOWN TO THIS ISSUE, IF WE COULD EXTEND OUT THE DISCOVERY CUT-OFF FOR JUST THIS ISSUE SO THAT THE DEFENSE AND PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL COULD SIT DOWN AND HAVE SOME OF THE DISCUSSIONS THAT THE COURT'S THINKING ABOUT, ESPECIALLY WITH THE VIEWS THAT YOU'VE GIVEN US, WHICH I THINK HAVE BEEN VERY HELPFUL, AND SEE IF WE CAN SIT DOWN AND EITHER WORK

EVERYTHING OUT OR ELSE, YOU KNOW, NARROW IT DOWN TO 10

DOCUMENTS MAYBE AS THE COURT SUGGESTS OR 5 -- WHERE BOTH

SIDES ARE JUST VERY CONFIDENT ON BOTH SIDES, AND THE COURT IS

GOING TO HAVE TO RESOLVE IT OR SEE IF WE CAN NEGOTIATE

SOMETHING.

SO, I DON'T KNOW QUITE HOW THE MECHANICS OF THAT
WOULD WORK. BUT AT THIS POINT WE UNFORTUNATELY CONCURRENTLY
HAVE THE COPY THAT'S ON FILE WITH THE COURT. AND THE
DEFENDANT'S REFORMATTING AND SIGNING THE FINAL VERSION
UNFORTUNATELY MESSED UP SOME OF THE PLAINTIFF'S TABLES ON
PAGE 20, WHICH DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL VERY KINDLY POINTED OUT TO
ME BEFORE THIS CALL. AND WE ARE ATTEMPTING TO FIX THAT AND
REFILE THE PAPERS.

BUT I'M WONDERING IF IT'S NECESSARY TO DO THAT IF
MAYBE IN --

THE COURT: NO.

MS. MANIFOLD: -- TWO WEEKS WE SHOULD SIMPLY REFILE WHATEVER JOINT STIPULATION WE CAN AGREE ON AT THAT TIME AND THEN GO FORWARD THAT WAY. I MEAN, I'M TRYING TO WORK OUT THE MECHANICS --

MS. LE MOINE: RIGHT.

MS. MANIFOLD: -- AND I'M NOT QUITE SURE WHAT TO DO.

MS. LE MOINE: WELL, LET ME, IF I CAN LIKE MAYBE

JUST MAKE A SUGGESTION ON MECHANICS --

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MS. LE MOINE: -- PERHAPS WE JUST HAVE A STAY OF

THE PERIOD, OF THE DISCOVERY PERIOD WHICH ENDS ON THE 25TH -
MAYBE A STAY OF EVERYTHING FOR TWO WEEKS TO TRY TO RESOLVE

THIS ISSUE.

THE COURT: WELL --

MS. LE MOINE: AND ADDRESS THE POINTS THAT THE COURT HAS RAISED AND SEE IF WE CAN COME BACK TO THE COURT.

SO, WE DON'T NECESSARILY MOVE THE DATES, BUT WE KEEP IN MIND THAT WE'RE TAKING LIKE A -- THAT WE MIGHT MOVE IT OUT TWO WEEKS BECAUSE WE'RE TAKING A TWO-WEEK STAY TO JUST FOCUS AND RESOLVE THIS PRIVILEGE QUESTION.

THE COURT: HOW ABOUT THIS. HOW ABOUT WE HAVE A CONFERENCE CALL A WEEK FROM TUESDAY. WE'LL SET IT FOR THE 17TH. AND WE WILL SEE WHERE THINGS ARE AND WHETHER THERE'S GOING TO BE MORE FILING -- I MEAN, I DON'T WANT TO KILL A TREE AND REFILE THE ORIGINAL MOTION. YOU FILED. YOU FILED IN GENERAL. WE'RE NOT THAT FORMAL HERE.

IF THERE'S GOING TO BE SOMETHING ELSE FILED, YOU KNOW, IT'S GOING TO BE FOCUSED AND IT'S GOING TO BE ON THE ISSUES THAT REALLY MATTER. AND IF YOU HAVEN'T FIGURED IT OUT BY THE 17TH, THEN, THINGS HAVE FALLEN APART.

I CAN EASILY RECOMMEND TO JUDGE KING -- AND I'LL

CALL HIM TODAY -- THAT THE CUT-OFF DATE AND OTHER LITIGATION

DATES -- I DON'T QUITE KNOW THE NUANCE OF YOUR SCHEDULING

ORDER, BUT JUST TO KICK EVERYTHING OUT TWO OR THREE WEEKS TO

1	ENABLE US TO EITHER RESOLVE THIS OR, YOU KNOW, NOBODY BE
2	PREJUDICED BY IT.
3	MS. MANIFOLD: THAT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO
4	PLAINTIFF.
5	MS. LE MOINE: THAT'S FINE WITH DEFENDANTS AS WELL
6	YOUR HONOR.
7	THE COURT: IS IT ALL DATES, OR IS IT JUST THE
8	DISCOVERY CUT-OFF ON THE FIRST PHASE?
9	MS. MANIFOLD: I THINK JUST THE DISCOVERY CUT-OFF
10	WOULD BE THE ONLY DATE THAT WOULD BE NECESSARILY KICKED OUT.
11	THE COURT: OKAY. I DON'T KNOW WHEN YOU WERE
12	SUPPOSED TO BE FILING YOUR FIRST MSJ. SO, IF IT'S JUST TWO
13	WEEKS ON THE DISCOVERY CUT-OFF DATE, AND THAT WE'RE GOING TO
14	GET BACK ON THE PHONE
15	DOES THE 17TH APPEAR TO WORK FOR YOU FOLKS?
16	MS. MANIFOLD: YES, YOUR HONOR.
17	MS. LE MOINE: YES
18	MS. MANIFOLD: THIS IS PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL.
19	MS. LE MOINE: YES, THE 17TH WORKS FOR DEFENSE
20	COUNSEL ALSO, YOUR HONOR.
21	THE COURT: WHY DON'T WE TENTATIVELY DO THIS. I'M
22	GOING TO BE ON THE EAST COAST ON THAT DAY, BUT I WILL MAKE

ARRANGEMENTS TO GET ON THE PHONE WITH YOU ALL.

BE NOON ON THE EAST COAST.

WE'LL SET IT FOR 9:00 A.M. PACIFIC TIME. THAT WILL

23

24

HOWEVER -- AND I WANT TO BE REAL CLEAR -- IF YOU FOLKS FIGURE IT OUT, IF YOU FOLKS RESOLVE THIS AND YOU DON'T WANT TO SPEND ANY MORE TIME WITH ME, FEEL FREE NOT TO RUIN MY VACATION.

(LAUGHTER.)

THE COURT: AND ALL YOU HAVE TO DO IS PICK UP THE PHONE AND CALL MS. MC KAMIE, MY COURTROOM DEPUTY. SHE'S AT 894-5496. AND SHE WILL TAKE THE MATTER OFF IN ITS ENTIRETY WITHOUT A FURTHER FILING IF YOU'VE REACHED AN AGREEMENT OR SOME SORT OF COMPROMISE. SO, THAT'S SORT OF YOUR INCENTIVE THERE.

SO, IF YOU DON'T NEED ME, YOU DON'T NEED TO GET ME
ON THE PHONE JUST TO SAY WE DON'T NEED YOU, JUDGE. YOU CAN
TAKE IT DOWN.

IF YOU DO NEED ME, THEN, WE WILL SET UP A BRIDGE CALL ON JUNE 17TH AT 9:00, 9:00 IN THE MORNING, AND WE'LL FIGURE OUT WHERE THINGS ARE.

YOU MAY NEED TO STAND BY BECAUSE IF FOR A PERSONAL REASON I NEED TO CHANGE THAT TIME THE DAY BEFORE, WE'LL TRY AND GET AN EMAIL NOTICE OUT TO ALL OF YOU.

MS. MANIFOLD: YOUR HONOR, AND WE'LL WELCOME TO USE THE SAME CONFERENCE CALL AND NUMBERS.

AND JUST SO PLAINTIFFS ARE CLEAR, OUR SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF WOULD NOT BE DUE ON JUNE 11TH. WE'RE KICKING THOSE DATES OUT. AND IF WE'RE BACK ON THE PHONE WITH THE COURT ON

THE 17TH, THEN, WE WILL IN ESSENCE RESET THE DATES FOR EITHER

A SUPPLEMENTAL FILING -- A SUPPLEMENTAL MEMO AND/OR AN ORAL

ARGUMENT.

IS THAT CORRECT?

THE COURT: THAT'S -- I HAVEN'T ORDERED AN SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF, AND I'M NOT GOING TO ACCEPT IT UNTIL I KNOW THAT YOU FOLKS KNOW WHAT THE BRIEF IS ABOUT.

MS. MANIFOLD: OKAY. THANK YOU.

THE COURT: SO, YOU'RE NOT ENTITLED TO THAT AS OF RIGHT UNDER OUR LOCAL RULE, AND I'M NOT ORDERING IT.

OKAY?

IF WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A HEARING ON THIS, THEN,
WE'RE GOING TO SET A NEW DATE. AND WE'RE GOING TO SET A NEW
DATE FOR THE HEARING. BUT I'D LIKE TO GIVE YOU FOLKS ANOTHER
SHOT AT WORKING THIS OUT. RECOGNIZING THAT THINGS HAVE MOVED
AND CHANGED, AND THAT YOU NOW HAVE THE BENEFIT OF, DUBIOUS AS
IT MAY BE, OF MY THOUGHTS ON THE MOTION.

MS. MANIFOLD: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, YOUR HONOR.
YOU'VE BEEN VERY HELPFUL.

THE COURT: OKAY.

MS. LE MOINE: THANK YOU.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ANYTHING ELSE?

MS. MANIFOLD: AND FOR THE CORRECTED FILING, MAY WE GO AHEAD AND JUST HAVE LEAVE TO FILE THE CORRECTED FILING SO WE HAVE THE FORMATTING CORRECT ON WHAT'S BEFORE THE COURT?

OR SHOULD WE BOTHER? 1 2 THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW WHAT'S WRONG WITH IT. 3 WHAT'S WRONG WITH YOUR FILING? MS. MANIFOLD: THERE WERE --4 5 MS. LE MOINE: I CAN -- SINCE IT'S MY FAULT, I GET -- THE CHART -- ONE OF THE CHART EXCERPTS OF THE PRIVILEGE 6 7 LOG THAT PLAINTIFFS INCLUDED IN THEIR SECTION STARTING ON PAGE 20 --8 THE COURT: YES. 9 10 MS. LE MOINE: -- DOESN'T -- THE NUMBERS ARE OFF. 11 IT'S NOT -- NOT ALL THE NUMBERS THAT THEY'RE CHALLENGING ARE 12 INCLUDED. 13 SO, IT'S ACTUALLY NOT A TERRIBLE ERROR BECAUSE YOU CAN REFER TO THE ACTUAL LOG. 14 15 MS. MANIFOLD: YES. THE COURT: YES. NO, THE LOG -- THE LOG ITSELF IS 16 17 18 MS. LE MOINE: SOMEHOW IN THE MYSTERIOUS FORMATTING 19 THAT GOES ON WITH MICROSOFT WORD THAT IS BEYOND MY 20 COMPREHENSION, THE LOGS GOT TO BE -- THE EXCERPTS IN THE 21 DRAFT GOT SCREWED UP.

THE COURT: I WASN'T LOOKING -- I WASN'T LOOKING AT

WHAT WAS IN -- WHAT I WAS LOOKING AT WAS EXHIBIT A, WHICH I

MS. LE MOINE: RIGHT. YES.

UNDERSTAND TO BE THE ACTUAL DOCUMENT.

22

23

THE COURT: IF THAT'S FINE, I DON'T CARE THAT A 1 COPY OF THE DOCUMENT IS NOT A COPY OF THE DOCUMENT. YOU'VE 2 3 MADE YOUR RECORD, LAWYERS, AND YOUR RECORD IS -- YOUR LAWYERLY RECORD IS THAT EXHIBIT A IS THE FINE DOCUMENT. 4 5 THAT'S ALL I'LL LOOK AT. MS. LE MOINE: AND EXHIBIT B IS THE REVISED AS FOR 6 7 JUNE 2ND. 8 MS. MANIFOLD: AND I AGREE ON BOTH. 9 THE COURT: OKAY. 10 WELL, EXHIBIT B AS IT'S NOW BEEN FILED, YES. 11 MS. MANIFOLD: YES. 12 THE COURT: THAT WAS A BIGGER ISSUE, BUT YOU FOLKS 13 HAVE RESOLVED IT. SO, THAT'S FINE. 14 MS. MANIFOLD: RIGHT. 15 THE COURT: OKAY. SO --MS. MANIFOLD: THAT WAS MY FAULT. 16 17 (LAUGHTER.) 18 THE COURT: WE'RE NOT LOOKING BACK. WE'RE LOOKING 19 FORWARD, FOLKS. 20 MS. MANIFOLD: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: IT'S NOT --21 22 MS. LE MOINE: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, YOUR HONOR. 23 APPRECIATE IT.

THE COURT: NOT AT ALL.

ANYTHING ELSE WE NEED TO COVER?

24

1	MS. MANIFOLD: NOT ON THE PLAINTIFF'S SIDE. THANK
2	YOU.
3	MS. LE MOINE: NOT ON THE DEFENSE SIDE EITHER.
4	THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
5	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WE'LL SEND OUT A WE'LL
6	SEND OUT A QUICK ELECTRONIC ORDER ON THIS.
7	THANK YOU FOLKS FOR YOUR TIME TODAY. AND GOOD LUCK
8	IN YOUR DISCUSSIONS.
9	WE'RE DONE.
10	MS. MANIFOLD: THANK YOU.
11	MS. LE MOINE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
12	(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED 2:37 P.M.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2		
2	3	

1	
2	CERTIFICATE
3	
4	I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT
5	TRANSCRIPT FROM THE ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF THE
6	PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.
7	
8	
9	
LO	/S/ DOROTHY BABYKIN 6/9/14
L1	
L2	FEDERALLY CERTIFIED TRANSCRIBER DATED
L3	DOROTHY BABYKIN
L 4	
L 5	
L6	
L 7	
L 8	
L 9	
20	
21	
22	