1 2 3 4	Lewis E. Hudnell, III (CASBN 218736) Email: <u>lewis@colvinhudnell.com</u> <b>COLVIN HUDNELL LLP</b> 555 California Street, Suite 4925 San Francisco CA 94104 Telephone: 415-659-1866 Facsimile: 347.772.3034									
5 6	Winston O. Huff (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> ) <u>whuff@huffip.com</u> Deborah Jagai (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> ) diagai@huffip.com									
7 8	djagai@huffip.com W. O. HUFF & ASSOCIATES, PLLC 302 Market Street, Suite 450 Dallas, TX 75202 Telephone: 214 749 1220									
9	Telephone: 214.749.1220 Facsimile: 469.206.2173									
10	ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF TOUCHSCREEN GESTURES LLC									
11										
12	Renzo N. Rocchegiani <u>rrocchegiani@mckennalong.com</u>									
13	McKEŇNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 4435 Eastgate Mall Suite 400									
14	San Diego, CA 92121 Telephone: 202.496.7887									
15	Facsimile: 202.496.7756									
16	ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS LG ELECTRONICS, INC. AND LG ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM U.S.A., INC.									
17										
18										
19	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT									
20	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA									
21	SAN FF	RANCIS	CO							
22	TOUCHSCREEN GESTURES LLC,	)	No. 3:13-cv-(	03442-WHA						
23	Plaintiff,	)	STIPULATI	TON AND PROPOSED						
24	V.	)	ORDER REGARDING ELECTRONIC DISCOVERY			VERY				
25	LG ELECTRONICS INC., et al.,	) )								
26	Defendants.	ý								
27										
28	WHEREAS, pursuant to the Court's	Notice	Scheduling	Initial	Case	Management				
	PROPOSED ORDER REGARDING ELECTRONIC DISCOVERY	1		C.	ASE NO.	. 3:13-cv-03442-WHA				

1	Conference (Dkt. No. 38) and the parties' Joint Case Management Conference Statement, the					
2	parties have met and conferred and agreed upon a proposed order regarding electronic discovery					
3	in the above-captioned cases;					
4	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between counsel for the parties that, subject to the					
5	Court's approval, the attached [Proposed] Order Regarding Electronic Discovery shall govern					
6	electronic discovery in these actions.					
7						
8		Respectfully submitted,				
9		By: <u>/s/ Winston O. Huff</u> Lewis E. Hudnell, III (CASBN 218736)				
10		Email: <u>lewis@colvinhudnell.com</u> COLVIN HUDNELL LLP				
11		555 California Street, Suite 4925 San Francisco CA 94104 Telephone: 415-659-1866				
12		Facsimile: 347.772.3034				
13		Winston O. Huff (admitted <i>pro hac vice)</i> whuff@huffip.com				
14		Deborah Jagai (admitted pro hac vice)				
15		<u>djagai@huffip.com</u> W. O. HUFF & ASSOCIATES, PLLC 302 Market Street, Suite 450				
16		Dallas, Texas 75202 Telephone: 415-659-1866				
17		Facsimile: 469.206.2173				
18		ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF TOUCHSCREEN GESTURES LLC				
19						
20		By: <u>/s/ Renzo N. Rocchegiani</u> (by permission)				
21	1	Renzo N. Rocchegiani rrocchegiani@mckennalong.com				
22		McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 4435 Eastgate Mall Suite 400				
23	,	San Diego, CA 92121 Telephone: 202.496.7887				
24		Facsimile: 202.496.7756				
25		ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS LG ELECTRONICS, INC. AND				
26		LG ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM U.S.A., INC.				
27						
28						
	PROPOSED ORDER REGARDING ELECTRONIC DISCOVERY	2 CASE NO. 3:13-cv-03442-WHA				

1	ATTESTATION OF E-FILER					
2 3 4	In compliance with Local Rule 5-1(i), the undersigned ECF user whose identification and password are being used to file this document, hereby attests that all signatories have concurred in the filing of this document.					
5 6 7 8	<u>/s/ Winston O. Huff</u> Winston O. Huff					
° 9						
10	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE					
11	The undersigned certifies that on the 10th day of October, 2013, the foregoing document					
12	was filed with the Clerk of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, in					
13	compliance with Civil L. R. 5-1 and using the court's electronic case filing system (ECF), in					
14	compliance with Civil L. R. 5-5.					
15	/s/ Winston O. Huff					
16	Winston O. Huff					
17						
18 19						
19 20						
20						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
	PROPOSED ORDER REGARDING ELECTRONIC DISCOVERY 3 CASE NO. 3:13-cv-03442-WHA					

1 2

## [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING ELECTRONIC DISCOVERY

The Court ORDERS as follows:

This Order supplements all other discovery rules and orders. It streamlines
 Electronically Stored Information ("ESI") production to promote a "just, speedy, and
 inexpensive determination" of this action, as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 1.
 This Order may be modified for good cause.<sup>1</sup>

Costs will be shifted for disproportionate ESI production requests pursuant to
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26. Likewise, a party's nonresponsive or dilatory discovery
tactics will be cost-shifting considerations.

3. A party's meaningful compliance with this Order and efforts to promote
efficiency and reduce costs will be considered in cost-shifting determinations.

4. General ESI production requests under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 34 and
45 shall not include metadata absent a showing of good cause. However, if the parties produce
emails, fields showing the date and time that the document was sent and received, as well as the
complete distribution list, shall generally be included in the production.

5. General ESI production requests under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 34 and
45 shall not include email or other forms of electronic correspondence (collectively "email") or
custodial ESI, except with respect to documents described in Paragraph 7 below. As used
herein, "custodial ESI" refers to ESI that is in the possession of an individual custodian, rather
than in central repositories. To obtain email or custodial ESI beyond the documents described in
Paragraph 8 below, the parties must propound specific email or custodial ESI production
requests.

23

24

6. Email or custodial ESI production requests, if any, shall only be propounded for specific issues, rather than general discovery of a product or business.

25 7. Email or custodial ESI production requests, if any, shall be phased to occur after
 26 the parties have exchanged and reviewed (1) initial disclosures and disclosures as required by the

All limitations in this Order apply to Defendant Groups rather than to individual corporate
 entities, regardless of whether that is expressly stated elsewhere.

4

Patent Local Rules Order and Discovery Order in this case; (2) basic documentation about the Patents-in-Suit, the prior art, the design, development, operation, and marketing of the accused functionalities, and the relevant finances; and (3) documents about prior knowledge, communications, discussion with or between the parties, and documents relating to the Patentsin-Suit. While this provision does not require the production of such information, the Court encourages prompt and early production of this information to promote efficient and economical streamlining of the case.

8 8. Following the production of documents in Paragraph 7 above, parties may serve
9 email or custodial ESI production requests. Such requests, if any, shall identify the custodian,
10 search terms, and time frame. The parties shall cooperate to identify the proper custodians,
11 proper search terms and proper timeframe.

12 9. Each requesting party shall limit its email or custodial ESI production requests, if 13 any, to a total of seven custodians per producing party for all such requests. The parties may 14 jointly agree to modify this limit without the Court's leave. The Court shall consider contested 15 requests for up to five additional custodians per producing party, upon showing a distinct need 16 based on the size, complexity, and issues of this specific case. Should a party serve email or 17 custodial ESI production requests for additional custodians beyond the limits agreed to by the 18 parties or granted by the Court pursuant to this paragraph, the requesting party shall bear all 19 reasonable costs caused by such additional discovery.

20 10. Each requesting party shall limit its email or custodial ESI production requests, if 21 any, to a total of seven search terms per custodian per party. The parties may jointly agree to 22 modify this limit without the Court's leave. The Court shall consider contested requests for up 23 to five additional search terms per custodian, upon showing a distinct need based on the size, 24 complexity, and issues of this specific case. The search terms shall be narrowly tailored to 25 particular issues. Indiscriminate terms, such as the producing company's name or its product 26 name, are inappropriate unless combined with narrowing search criteria that sufficiently reduce 27 the risk of overproduction. A conjunctive combination of multiple words or phrases (e.g., 28 "computer" and "system") narrows the search and shall count as a single search term. A

5

1 disjunctive combination of multiple words or phrases (e.g., "computer" or "system") broadens 2 the search, and thus each word or phrase shall count as a separate search term unless they are 3 variants of the same word. Use of narrowing search criteria (e.g., "and," "but not," "w/x") is 4 encouraged to limit the production and shall be considered when determining whether to shift 5 costs for disproportionate discovery. Should a party serve email or custodial ESI production 6 requests with search terms beyond the limits agreed to by the parties or granted by the Court 7 pursuant to this paragraph, the requesting party shall bear all reasonable costs caused by such 8 additional discovery.

9 11. The receiving party shall not use ESI that the producing party asserts is attorney10 client privileged or work product protected to challenge the privilege or protection.

11 12. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d), the inadvertent production of a
privileged or work product protected ESI is not a waiver in the pending case or in any other
federal or state proceeding.

14 13. The mere production of ESI in a litigation as part of a mass production shall not
15 itself constitute a waiver for any purpose.

16 14. Production of ESI in accordance with this Order excludes data that is not 17 reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost (*e.g.*, backup tapes intended for disaster-18 recovery purposes; legacy data leftover from obsolete systems that cannot be retrieved on the 19 successor systems; deleted data remaining in fragmented form that requires some type of 20 forensic inspection to restore and retrieve it).

21 15. Notwithstanding any other provisions herein, metadata (as used herein to refer to 22 electronically stored information about a document that does not appear on the face of the 23 original document if emailed or printed), or any back-up materials (i.e., materials retained 24 primarily for back-up or disaster recovery purposes) need not be searched or produced absent a 25 Court order upon showing of good cause and neither the producing party nor the receiving party 26 need deviate from any practice it normally follows with regard to preservation of such materials 27 (e.g., regularly schedule deletion of voicemail, archiving electronic data without associated 28 metadata, recycling of back-up tapes conducted in the ordinary course of a party's business

6

PROPOSED ORDER REGARDING ELECTRONIC DISCOVERY

1 operation is permitted), except upon a showing of good cause. The following locations will not 2 be searched under any circumstances, and as such need not be preserved, absent a Court order 3 upon showing of good cause: personal digital assistants; mobile phones; voicemail and other 4 audio systems; instant messaging logs; video; residual, fragmented, damaged, permanently 5 deleted, and/or unallocated data; automated disaster recovery backup systems; and/or materials 6 retained in tape, disks (including floppy disk and optical disk), SAN, or similar formats primarily 7 for back-up or disaster recovery purposes, as well as archives stored on computer servers, 8 external hard drives, thumb drives, notebooks, or personal computer hard drives that are created 9 for disaster recovery purposes or not used as reference materials in the ordinary course of a 10 party's business operations. In addition, the parties agree that with respect to documents that 11 automatically "autosave," only the most recent version of such documents need be searched.

12 16. The producing party need not employ forensic data collection or tracking methods and technologies, but instead may make electronic copies for collection and processing purposes 13 14 using widely-accepted methods or methods described in manufacturers' and/or programmers' 15 instructions, help menus, websites, and the like (e.g., .pst's, .zip's, etc.), except when and to the 16 extent there is good cause to believe specific, material concerns about authenticity exist with 17 respect to specific documents and materials. If receiving party believes that there is such good 18 cause, then the producing party and the receiving party shall meet and confer in good faith to 19 determine the extent to which forensic and other data associated with the specific documents and 20 materials should be produced.

<sup>22</sup> IT IS SO ORDERED.

23

24

25

26

27

28

21

October 15, 2013. Dated:

Honorable William H. Alsup

7

PROPOSED ORDER REGARDING ELECTRONIC DISCOVERY