1,

1		
2		
3	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
4	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
5		
6		
7	KIMBERLY YORDY,	
8	Plaintiff,	NO. C12-0229 TEH
9	v.	ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S
10	PLIMUS, INC.,	<u>MOTION FOR CLASS</u> <u>CERTIFICATION</u>
11	Defendant.	
12		
13	With good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that on or before October	
14	2013, Plaintiff shall file a supplemental brief that identifies each Unlimited Download	
15	Website ("UDW") she claims was involved in Plimus's alleged scheme, citations to any	
16	evidence of the allegedly false statements that appeared on each site, and citations to any	
17	evidence that Plimus worked on advertising or marketing for that site.	
18	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall come prepared to address the	
19	following questions at the October 7, 2013 hearing, and to provide citations to the record in	
20	their responses where appropriate:	
21		
22	Questions for Plaintiff	
23	1. If the advertising content underlying the complaint were created by a Plimus	
24	affiliate marketer, or by each UDW itself, under what theories of liability can your claims	
25	against Plimus proceed?	
26	2. Why should the Court consider evidence that was not provided during	
27	discovery and was only submitted with your reply papers?	
28		
		Dockets.Justi

3. How did you obtain the screenshot exhibits attached to your moving and reply papers, and how do you purport to authenticate them?

Questions for Defendant

4. What is relationship between Plimus, the affiliate marketers, and the vendors, and why shouldn't Plimus be liable for the conduct of the affiliate marketers and vendors?

5. You contest only the authenticity of the screenshot exhibits Plaintiff submitted on reply, and not those submitted with her motion papers. What makes the screenshots submitted on reply any less reliable than those submitted with the moving papers?

IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: 09/25/13

THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT