

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
For the Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Northern District of California

San Francisco Division

INTEGRAL DEVELOPMENT CORP,

No. C 12-06575 JSW (LB)

Plaintiff,

**ORDER REGARDING THE PARTIES'
EIGHTH JOINT LETTER BRIEF
DATED NOVEMBER 8, 2013**

v.

VIRAL TOLAT,

[Re: ECF No. 188]

Defendant.

The court denies Integral's discovery motion. As Dr. Tolat's counsel at Farella Braun + Martel point out, they have complied with the court's directives concerning the independent expert's forensic review of the media at issue. Integral's suggestion that Farella review 190,000 documents for privilege is not what the court intended previously. The point was to identify anything that might contain Integral's information, and that has been done. The point was not to create an exercise in logging Dr. Tolat's personal files that demonstrably have nothing to do with Integral. The point of an independent expert was to give confidence in the process, which has been accomplished.

As to the return of the wiped Motorola Xoom, Integral raised that issue of ownership apparently for the first time on October 18, 2013. It is not a discovery issue. To the extent that Integral says it is because it wants to analyze the device, Integral already has AccessData's report on the Xoom. For these and the other reasons identified by Dr. Tolat in the joint letter brief, the motion is denied.

Integral also filed 71 pages of attachments to the letter brief. Going forward, Integral may

1 submit no more than 12 pages. If it wants to submit more, it must identify what it wants to submit
2 and describe why it needs to.

3 This disposes of ECF No. 188.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: November 12, 2013



LAUREL BEELER
United States Magistrate Judge

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28