

1 DAVID T. BIDERMAN, Bar No. 101577  
 JUDITH B. GITTERMAN, Bar No. 115661  
 2 M. CHRISTOPHER JHANG, Bar No. 211463  
**PERKINS COIE LLP**  
 3 180 Townsend Street, 3rd Floor  
 San Francisco, CA 94107-1909  
 4 Telephone: (415) 344-7000  
 Facsimile: (415) 344-7050  
 5 Email: [DBiderman@perkinscoie.com](mailto:DBiderman@perkinscoie.com)  
 Email: [JGitterman@perkinscoie.com](mailto:JGitterman@perkinscoie.com)  
 6 Email: [CJhang@perkinscoie.com](mailto:CJhang@perkinscoie.com)

7 Attorneys for Defendant Google Inc.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION**

CLRB HANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC d/b/a  
 INDUSTRIAL PRINTING, and HOWARD  
 STERN, on behalf of themselves and all others  
 similarly situated,  
  
 Plaintiffs,  
  
 v.  
 GOOGLE, INC.,  
  
 Defendant.

CASE NO. C O5-03649 JW

**DECLARATION OF M.  
 CHRISTOPHER JHANG IN SUPPORT  
 OF DEFENDANT GOOGLE INC.'S  
 RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS'  
 MOTION TO ENLARGE TIME**

1 I, M. Christopher Jhang, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in all of the courts of the State of  
3 California and this Court, and am an attorney with the law firm of Perkins Coie LLP, attorneys  
4 of record herein for defendant Google Inc. (“Google”). I have personal knowledge of the facts  
5 set forth below except as to those matters stated on information and belief, and as to those  
6 matters, I believe them to be true. If called upon to testify, I could and would testify competently  
7 as to the matters set forth therein.

8 2. Pursuant to an agreement between the parties, the deposition of plaintiff Howard  
9 Stern is scheduled to occur on August 16, 2006, at 11:00 a.m., in New York, and the deposition  
10 of Brett Hanson, the representative for plaintiff CLRB Hanson Industries, is scheduled to occur  
11 on August 18, 2006, at 9:30 a.m., in New York.

12 3. On August 2, 2006, I responded to an email from plaintiffs’ counsel, Michele  
13 Raphael, claiming that Google had not complied with paragraph 2 of the Court’s June 27, 2006  
14 Order Following Case Management Conference (“Order”), which provides that Google shall  
15 submit a sworn statement that it has turned over all documents describing the terms and  
16 conditions of the AdWords agreement. I informed Ms. Raphael that Google has satisfied this  
17 requirement through the filing of its declaration, its amended declaration, and its production of  
18 documents to plaintiffs. I further informed Mr. Raphael that Google has produced all documents  
19 called for under the Order and that it has satisfied its document production obligations. Attached  
20 hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of this email exchange.

21 4. I am informed and believe that, immediately following the issuance of the Order,  
22 Google searched its archives and retrieved all versions of the AdWords Frequently Asked  
23 Questions (“FAQs”), from July 2002 to present, which appeared on the AdWords website, in  
24 order to provide a thorough and responsive document production to plaintiffs.

25 5. On August 3, 2006, I received an email from Ms. Raphael stating, among other  
26 things, that plaintiffs were going to seek a continuance of the partial summary judgment hearing  
27 date. There was no statement in this email of when plaintiffs intended to file their motion to

1 enlarge time. On the following day, August 4, 2006, I informed Ms. Raphael by email that the  
2 lead attorney for Google was out of the country and on a plane, and that I would respond to her  
3 email “early next week.” Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of this email  
4 exchange.

5 6. On the following Tuesday, August 8, 2006, plaintiffs filed their motion before I  
6 had responded to Ms. Raphael’s email and without making any attempt to obtain a stipulation  
7 with Google for their requested time change. On that same day, I sent Ms. Raphael an email  
8 informing her that Google would have stipulated to the continuance of the hearing date and I  
9 requested that plaintiffs withdraw their motion and prepare a stipulation and proposed order to  
10 file with the Court in its place. Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of my  
11 August 8, 2006 email to Ms. Raphael.

12 7. On August 9, 2006, I received an email response from Ms. Raphael wherein she  
13 refused to withdraw plaintiffs’ motion and indicated that plaintiffs would enter into a stipulation  
14 only if it included plaintiffs’ discovery complaints and matters that were either previously  
15 decided by this Court or unrelated to plaintiffs’ continuance request. Attached hereto as Exhibit  
16 D is a true and correct copy of Ms. Raphael’s August 9, 2006 email.

17 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United  
18 States that the foregoing is true and correct.

19 Executed this 11th day of August, 2006, at San Francisco, California.

20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 /S/  
22 M. Christopher Jhang

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28