

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3
4 THOUGHT, INC.,
5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 ORACLE CORPORATION, et al.,
8 Defendants.

Case No. [12-cv-05601-WHO](#) (MEJ)

DISCOVERY ORDER

Re: Dkt. No. 109

9
10 The Court is in receipt of the parties' joint discovery dispute letter, filed July 30, 2014.
11 Dkt. No. 109. The dispute concerns Oracle's objections to 39 of Thought Inc.'s 87 requests for
12 production of documents and 4 of Thought's 18 interrogatories. Upon review of the parties'
13 positions, the Court finds that Thought's requests appear to be overbroad and Oracle would be
14 unduly burdened if required to produce all documents in response. However, the parties do not
15 address specific requests and have not provided the requests for the Court's review. Further,
16 based on the parties' attestation, it appears that Oracle is willing to meet and confer on the full
17 scope of Thought's requests as they relate to Thought's list of accused products. Accordingly, the
18 Court hereby ORDERS the parties to further meet and confer in person to determine if they are
19 able to narrow the scope of Thought's requests and agree upon a more limited production.
20 Thought is advised that the Court is unlikely to require further production if its requests remain
21 overbroad, such as requiring source code for Oracle's application and database products where
22 Oracle has produced other documents and source code that provide the necessary information for
23 its case.

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25
26 Dated: July 31, 2014

27
28 

MARIA-ELENA JAMES
United States Magistrate Judge