EXHIBIT 37

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP DONN P. PICKETT (SBN 72257) GEOFFREY M. HOWARD (SBN 157468) HOLLY A. HOUSE (SBN 136045) ZACHARY J. ALINDER (SBN 209009) BREE HANN (SBN 215695) Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111-4067 Telephone: (415) 393-2000 Facsimile: (415) 393-2286 donn.pickett@bingham.com geoff.howard@bingham.com holly.house@bingham.com zachary.alinder@bingham.com bree.hann@bingham.com DORIAN DALEY (SBN 129049) JENNIFER GLOSS (SBN 154227) 500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 50p7 Redwood City, CA 94070 Telephone: (650) 506-4846 Facsimile: (650) 506-7114 dorian.daley@oracle.com jennifer.gloss@oracle.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle International Corp., Oracle EMEA Ltd., and Siebel Systems, Inc.	JONES DAY ROBERT A. MITTELSTAEDT (SBN 060359) JASON McDONELL (SBN 115084) ELAINE WALLACE (SBN 197882) 555 California Street, 26 th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 626-3939 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700 ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com jmcdonell@jonesday.com ewallace@jonesday.com JONES DAY THARAN GREGORY LANIER (SBN 138784) JANE L. FROYD (SBN 220776) 1755 Embarcadero Road Palo Alto, CA 94303 Telephone: (650) 739-3939 Facsimile: (650) 739-3900 tglanier@jonesday.com jfroyd@jonesday.com JONES DAY SCOTT W. COWAN (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) JOSHUA L. FUCHS (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) 717 Texas, Suite 3300 Houston, TX 77002 Telephone: (832) 239-3939 Facsimile: (832) 239-3600 swcowan@jonesday.com Attorneys for Defendants SAP AG, SAP America, Inc., and
18	TomorrowNow, Inc. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
19 20	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
21	OAKLAND DIVISION	
22	ORACLE USA, INC., et al.,	Case No. 07-CV-1658 PJH (EDL)
23	Plaintiffs, v.	STIPULATION RE ADMISSIBILITY OF TN DATABASES
2425	SAP AG, et al.,	
26	Defendants.	
27		
28		
		Case No. 07-CV-1658 PJH (EDL)

1	Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle International Corporation, Oracle EMEA Ltd., and		
2	Siebel Systems, Inc. ("Oracle") and Defendants SAP AG, SAP America, Inc., and		
3	TomorrowNow, Inc. ("TomorrowNow," and together with SAP AG and SAP America, Inc.,		
4	"Defendants," and all together with Oracle, the "Parties") jointly submit this stipulation		
5	regarding the admissibility of certain evidence in the above-referenced case (the "Action").		
6	The Parties hereby stipulate and agree as follows:		
7	1. In response to a number of Interrogatories served by Oracle, Defendants have		
8	relied on several databases used by TomorrowNow employees pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil		
9	Procedure 33(d) ("Rule 33(d)"), including databases known as SAS, BakTrak, dotProject and		
10	Pathfinder.		
11	2. Defendants have produced to Oracle the following Bates-labeled productions		
12	containing certain records from SAS on or about the dates indicated ("SAS Productions"): TN-		
13	OR00004202 – September 21, 2007; TN-OR00005145 – October 5, 2007; TN-OR00009556 –		
14	November 9, 2007; TN-OR00009569 – December 4, 2007; TN-OR00169313 – December 27,		
15	2007; TN-OR00871901 – February 14, 2008; TN-OR00871902 – February 14, 2008; TN-		
16	OR01823633 – June 11, 2008; TN-OR03727374 – January 20, 2009; TN-OR03775478 –		
17	February 13, 2009; TN-OR04446717 – March 4, 2009; TN-OR03727374 – March 6, 2009; TN-		
18	OR03775478 - March 6, 2009; and TN-OR04446719 - March 6, 2009.		
19	3. Defendants have produced to Oracle the following Bates-labeled productions		
20	containing certain records from BakTrak on or about the dates indicated ("BakTrak		
21	Productions"): TN-OR01005523 - March 12, 2008; TN-OR01818628 - May 1, 2008; and TN-		
22	OR06125330 – April 20, 2009.		
23	4. Defendants have produced to Oracle the following Bates-labeled productions		
24	containing certain records from dotProject on or about the dates indicated ("dotProject		
25	Productions"): TN-OR01361344 - March 26, 2008; and TN-OR06220764 - May 8, 2009.		
26	5. Defendants have produced to Oracle the following Bates-labeled productions		
27	containing certain records from Pathfinder on or about the dates indicated ("Pathfinder		
28	Productions"): TN-OR04498712 – March 25, 2009. 1 Case No. 07-CV-1658 PJH (EDL)		

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-37 Filed03/03/10 Page4 of 5

1	6. Defendants produced the SAS Productions, BakTrak Productions, dotProject		
2	Productions, and Pathfinder Productions (together, the "Native Database Productions") in native		
3	electronic form, and Defendants represent that the Native Database Productions provide Oracle		
4	with the same functionality, usability, and look and feel available to TomorrowNow employees		
5	using the original versions of such databases.		
6	7. For any screenshot, printout, or native electronic demonstration or presentation of		
7	any record, attachment, or other view or data contained in a Native Database Production offered		
8	by any Party in motion practice, trial, or any other proceeding or filing in the Action, and for		
9	which that Party can demonstrate the manner and method in which such screenshot, printout, or		
10	native electronic demonstration or presentation was generated from a Native Database		
11	Production ("Native Database Exhibit"), the Parties agree as follows:		
12	a. Native Database Exhibits shall be deemed authentic for the purposes of		
13	Federal Rules of Evidence ("FRE") 901;		
14	b. Any content of a Native Database Exhibit that does not on its face contain any		
15	objective indicia that such content is either a direct statement of a third party or a		
<mark>16</mark>	verbatim recital or paraphrasing of a statement of a third party, shall not be hearsay		
17	under FRE 801 and 802; and		
<mark>18</mark>	c. Non-hearsay content of Native Database Exhibits shall be admissible for the		
19	purpose of attempting to establish any fact requested by any Interrogatory served by		
20	Oracle for which Defendants rely on the underlying Native Database Production in		
21	their response pursuant to Rule 33(d).		
22	8. Any future production by Defendants of information copied from any version of		
23	SAS, BakTrak, dotProject, or Pathfinder ever used or maintained by TomorrowNow shall also be		
24	considered a Native Database Production for the purposes of this Stipulation.		
25	9. This Stipulation is in no way intended to limit the purposes for which SAS,		
26	BakTrak, dotProject, Pathfinder, the Native Database Productions, or Native Database Exhibits		
27	may be used or offered into evidence by any Party in the Action, and all Parties expressly reserve		
28	their rights with respect to the admissibility of any information from SAS, BakTrak, dotProject,		

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-37 Filed03/03/10 Page5 of 5

1	or Pathfinder for any purpose. Any statem	ents in this Stipulation regarding what specific	
2	evidence is agreed to be considered non-hearsay shall not be used as a basis to imply, infer or		
3	establish that any other offered evidence is either non-hearsay, hearsay or an exception to the		
4	hearsay rules.		
5	10. This Stipulation shall in no	way affect any Party's right under the Stipulated	
6	Protective Order to seek to clawback under a claim of privilege all or any portion of any Native		
7	Database Exhibits that may be offered into evidence for any purpose in this case.		
8	11. One of the conditions induc	ing Defendants into entering into this stipulation is	
9	Plaintiffs' agreement to enter into an substantially equivalent, parallel stipulation for similar		
10	types of documents and data from databases relating to Plaintiffs' day-to-day business operations		
1	that Plaintiffs have relied on under Rule 33(d) in responding to Defendants' interrogatories.		
12	Similarly, Defendants agree to enter into substantially equivalent, parallel stipulations for similar		
13	types of documents and data from other of their own databases relating to Defendants' day-to-		
14	day business operations that they rely on or will rely on under Rule 33(d). The exact terms and		
15	conditions of any such future stipulations shall be the subject of negotiation between the Parties,		
16	and if necessary, ultimate resolution by Judge Laporte.		
17	IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
18	•	BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP ,	
19		Amanal V	
20	DATED: October 30, 2009	By: Geoffrey M. Howard	
21		Attorneys for Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle International	
22		Corporation, Oracle EMEA, Ltd., and Siebel Systems, Inc.	
23			
24		JONES DAY	
25	DATED:, 2009	By: Tharan Gregory Lanier	
26		Attorneys for Defendants SAP AG, SAP America, Inc.,	
27		and TomorrowNow, Inc.	
28		3	