1	TONY WEST Assistant Attorney General		
2			
3	JOSHUA B. EATON (CA Bar No. 196887) Attorney for the United States, Acting Under Authority Conferred by 28 U.S.C. §515		
4	JOANN M. SWANSON (CA Bar No. 88143) Chief, Civil Division		
5	SARA WINSLOW (DC Bar No. 457643) JULIE A. ARBUCKLE (CA Bar No. 193425)		
6	THOMAS R. GREEN (CA Bar No. 203480)		
7	Assistant United States Attorneys 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Englishmen Galifornia 04102		
8	San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-6925 (Winslow)		
9	(415) 436-7102 (Arbuckle) (415) 436-7314 (Green)		
10	Facsimile: (415) 436-6748 sara.winslow@usdoj.gov		
11	JOYCE R. BRANDA PATRICIA R. DAVIS		
12	RENÉE S. ORLEANS		
13	KIMBERLY I. FRIDAY Attorneys		
14	Civil Division United States Department of Justice		
15	P.O. Box 261 Ben Franklin Station		
16	Washington, D.C. 20044 Telephone: (202) 514-4504		
17	Facsimile: (202) 305-4117 renee.orleans@usdoj.gov		
18	Attorneys for the United States of America		
19	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
20	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
21	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
22	UNITED STATES ex rel. STROM,	) No. C 05-3004 CRB (JSC)	
23	Plaintiffs,	) STIPULATION REGARDING	
24	v.	) WITHHELD AND REDACTED ) DOCUMENTS; [PROPOSED] ORDER	
25	SCIOS, INC. and JOHNSON & JOHNSON,		
26			
27	Defendants.	)	
28			
	STIPULATION REGARDING WITHHELD AND REDACTED DOCUMENTS, No. C 05-3004 CRB (JSC)		
		Doc	

WHEREAS Plaintiffs, the United States of America and Relator Joe Strom, and Defendants, Scios, Inc. and Johnson & Johnson, (collectively the "Parties") through their undersigned counsel, have been continuing to meet and confer regarding the remaining discovery disputes in this case, including, but not limited to:

(1) Whether Defendants Scios, Inc. and Johnson & Johnson ("Defendants") should be required to withdraw their assertions of the work product protection and attorney-client privilege over communications between Jane Moffitt (Scios, Inc.'s VP of Regulatory Affairs) and other employees and contractors, and over documents prepared, reviewed, sent, or received by Jane Moffitt, and produce all documents withheld on these grounds. The United States recently 10 learned that Ms. Moffitt did not have active California Bar membership while she worked at 11 Scios, and thus was not engaged in the practice of law for the purpose of invoking the attorney-12 client privilege. Defendants dispute the consequence of such a determination because they contend the attorney-client privilege applies if the client reasonably believes that the confidential 13 communication was with an attorney. The United States disputes Defendants' contention that 14 they or their employees and agents could have reasonably believed that Ms. Moffitt was 15 16 providing legal counsel to them.

(2) Whether Defendants should be required to produce in un-redacted form the "to/from/cc/bc/subject and date" lines in emails and email chains embedded in the text of emails otherwise identified as protected by the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine; and

(3) Whether Defendants should be required to produce all portions of emails and other documents redacted or withheld that their counsel received, but do not expressly request or relay legal advice.

23 (4) Defendants contend they have produced over 9 million pages of documents in the 24 course of discovery in this matter, and identified thousands of documents over which it has asserted claims of attorney-client privilege and work product protection. Defendants contend the 25 26 burden of re-reviewing documents in the manner and to the extent sought by the government 27 would be excessively burdensome.

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

17

18

19

20

21

22

IN ORDER TO RESOLVE ALL OF THESE DISPUTES, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED

STIPULATION REGARDING WITHHELD AND REDACTED DOCUMENTS, No. C 05-3004 CRB (JSC)

AND AGREED by the Parties, through their undersigned counsel of record, that:

(1) Defendants agree to withdraw their assertions of the work product protection and attorney-client privilege over communications between Jane Moffitt and other employees and contractors that were withheld solely based on Ms. Moffitt's participation as counsel, and documents prepared, reviewed, sent, or received by Jane Moffitt that were withheld solely based on Ms. Moffitt's participation as counsel. Further, Defendants will produce all documents withheld on these grounds, and will not lodge an objection to the admissibility of communications or documents based on an assertion that Ms. Moffitt was acting as an attorney (though retain the right to assert objections on other grounds).

(2) Plaintiffs agree not to argue that Defendants' production of these documents
 constitutes a subject matter waiver as to communications or documents over which Defendants
 assert a privilege or protection independent of Ms. Moffitt's participation – i.e. communications
 or documents otherwise privileged due to another attorney's participation.

(3) Plaintiffs further agree that they will not seek further reconsideration of this Court's decision that Scios' communications with Dr. Raymond Lipicky during the March 2002
telephone call are privileged, provided another attorney participated in such communications, and such showing shall be made to the government by declarations.

(4) In lieu of amending their privilege logs to include the to, from, cc, bc, subject, and dates of all emails Defendants have redacted, Defendants will produce all emails and email chains without redacting this information for any email embedded in an email chain otherwise claimed as privileged. In the course of this un-redaction, Defendants also will review the content of such emails and email chains to confirm that such chains are properly claimed as privileged and, to the extent such communications are not properly protected by the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine, Defendants will produce them to Plaintiffs.

(5) Defendants agree to re-review all emails and other documents identified by
Defendants' privilege logs as "subject to ongoing legal and regulatory review," "pending legal
review," "awaiting legal review," "submitted to attorney," or "sent for legal review" to confirm
that communications are properly claimed as privileged and, to the extent such communications

STIPULATION REGARDING WITHHELD AND REDACTED DOCUMENTS, No. C 05-3004 CRB (JSC)

1

2

are not properly protected by the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine, Defendants will produce them to Plaintiffs, subject to redaction of any portions of such emails and documents that expressly request or relay legal advice, or that constitute the work product of an attorney other than Jane Moffitt.

(6) Defendants agree that all of the documents that may be produced pursuant to this Stipulation are authentic pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 901 in that they are what they purport to be, and that they will not challenge the authenticity of such documents in this action.

(7) All of the document productions that may be made pursuant to this Stipulation will be made as soon as possible, and no later than December 1, 2011. If any additional discovery issues arise regarding the productions pursuant to this Stipulation, the United States shall have three weeks after the date all productions are complete to meet and confer with Defendants regarding such issues and to provide its portion of any joint discovery letter(s) to the Court relating to such issues. Defendants will then have seven days to provide their responsive portion, and the parties will have an additional seven days to make any final revisions and file the joint letter(s).

(8) Based on the foregoing, the United States will not file the joint letter it sentDefendants regarding the discovery disputes described above.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Respectfully submitted, TONY WEST Assistant Attorney General JOSHUA B. EATON Attorney for the United States, Acting Under Authority Conferred by 28 U.S.C. §515 Dated: October 19, 2011 By: /S/SARA WINSLOW JULIE A. ARBUCKLE THOMAS R. GREEN Assistant United States Attorneys Dated: October 19, 2011 By: JOYCE R. BRANDA PATRICIA R. DAVIS **RENÉE S. ORLEANS** KIMBERLY I. FRIDAY Civil Division, U.S. Department of Justice Attorneys for the United States STIPULATION REGARDING WITHHELD AND REDACTED DOCUMENTS, No. C 05-3004 CRB (JSC)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	2 LAW OFFICES OF MATTH 3 Dated: October 19, 2011 By: /S/ 4 MARCELLA AUERBACH, 5 Pro Hac Vice MATTHEW B. PAVONE, F Attorneys for <i>Qui Tam</i> Plain 6 QUINN EMANUEL URQU LLP	Esq. Esq. tiff Joe Strom HART & SULLIVAN,		
8	CHRISTOPHER TAYBACI	K, Esq.		
9 10	9   ASHLEY MARTABANO, F     10   Attorneys for Defendants Sc     Johnson & Johnson Inc.	esq. ios, Inc. and		
11				
12	12	[PROPOSED] ORDER		
13	Pursuant to stipulation, IT IS SO ORDERED.			
14	JACOUELINE SCOTT CORLE	Y		
15	United States Magistrate Judge	United States Magistrate Judge		
16 17				
18				
19				
20	20			
21	21			
22	22			
23	23			
24	24			
25				
26				
27				
28	28			
	STIPULATION REGARDING WITHHELD AND REDACTED DOCUMENTS, No. C 05-3004 CRB (JSC)			