1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 11 12 SYMANTEC CORPORATION, a Delaware CASE NO. CV-11-03146-WHA Corporation, 13 <del>(PROPOSED)</del> ORDER REGARDING Plaintiff, DISCOVERY HEARING 14 v. 15 JOHNS CREEK SOFTWARE, INC., a 16 Georgia Corporation, STEPHEN CHEATHAM, an individual, and DOES 1-10, 17 Defendants. 18 19 Based on a discovery letter brief submitted by plaintiff Symantec Corporation 20 ("Symantec"), the Court held a hearing on April 4, 2012, and ORDERS as follows: 21 1. The Court previously ordered Defendants Johns Creek Software, Inc. and Stephen 22 Cheatham (collectively, "Defendants") to produce "a list of all domain names registered or 23 controlled by Defendants that contain a Symantec trademark and all information regarding any 24 efforts to transfer or sell same, as requested in Symantec's Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 5, and all 25 associated documents, as requested in Symantec's Request for Production Nos. 3-13 and 15, by 26 noon on Friday, February 24, 2012." See Feb. 23, 2012 Order (Dkt. No. 77) (the "Feb. 2012 27 Order"). Defendants are HEREBY ORDERED to conduct additional inquiry into, and searches

28

for, the above-referenced categories of information and documents ordered to be produced in the

1	Feb. 2012 Order, and to produce, by noon PST on Wednesday, April 11, 2012, (a) an updated list
2	of all domain names encompassed by the Feb. 2012 Order, and (b) all documents and
3	information responsive to Symantec's Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 5 and Request for Production
4	Nos. 3-13 and 15.
5	2. Defendants are HEREBY ORDERED to produce, on or before April 18, 2012, a
6	single Excel spreadsheet containing all information regarding Defendants' sales of Symantec
7	products requested in Symantec's Interrogatory No. 2. The spreadsheet's columns shall
8	correspond to each item of information requested in Symantec's Interrogatory No. 2.
9	3. Symantec is hereby granted permission from the Court to contact any of
10	Defendants' customers in any manner Symantec chooses, including by informal means or
11	through service of discovery subpoenas. While Symantec shall not make any disparaging
12	comments about Defendants during any discussions with Defendants' customers, Symantec is
13	permitted to discuss the existence of the present lawsuit, as well as the non-confidential facts and
14	allegations at issue in this lawsuit.
15	IT IS SO ORDERED.
16	Dated: April 9, 2012.
17	Honorable William H. Alsup United States District Judge
18	Submitted by:
19	/s/ Jennifer L. Barry Jennifer L. Barry
20	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
21	Attorneys for Plaintiff SYMANTEC CORPORATION
22	STWANTEC COR ORATION
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28