1 2 3	DOUGLAS E. LUMISH, Bar No. 183863 doug.lumish@lw.com RICHARD G. FRENKEL, Bar No. 204133 rick.frenkel@lw.com LISA K. NGUYEN, Bar No. 244280							
4 5	lisa.nguyen@lw.com SHONEY A.H. BLAKE, Bar. No. 264981 shoney.blake@lw.com NATASA PAJIC, Bar. No. 268144	FILED						
6 7 8	natasa.pajic@lw.com LATHAM & WATKINS LLP 140 Scott Drive Menlo Park, CA 94025 Telephone: (650) 328-4600 Facsimile: (650) 463-2600	APR 0 2 2014 RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
9 10 11	KYLE A. VIRGIEN, Bar No. 278747 kyle.virgien@lw.com LATHAM & WATKINS LLP 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000 San Francisco, CA 94111-6538 Telephone: (415) 391-0600 Facsimile: (415) 395-8095	THE PARTY OF THE P						
13 14	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant WHATSAPP INC.							
15 16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION							
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	WHATSAPP INC., Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant, v. INTERCARRIER COMMUNICATIONS LLC, Defendant and Counter-Plaintiff.	PROPOSED STIPULATED ORDER RE: DISCOVERY OF ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION Judge: Hon. Jon S. Tigar Filing Date: April 1, 2014 Trial Date: None set						
24 25 26 27 28		ective counsel of record, stipulate that the following ically-Stored Information ("ESI") in this case,						

I. PURPOSE

This Order will govern discovery of electronically stored information ("ESI") in this case as a supplement to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court's Guidelines for the Discovery of Electronically Stored Information, the Court's January 22, 2014, Scheduling Order (the "Scheduling Order"), and any other applicable orders and rules.

II. COOPERATION

The Parties are aware of the importance the Court places on cooperation and commit to cooperate in good faith throughout the matter consistent with this Court's Guidelines for the Discovery of ESI.

III. LIAISON

The parties have identified liaisons to each other who are and will be knowledgeable about and responsible for discussing their respective ESI. Each e-discovery liaison will be, or have access to those who are, knowledgeable about the technical aspects of e-discovery, including the location, nature, accessibility, format, collection, search methodologies, and production of ESI in this matter. The parties will rely on the liaisons, as needed, to confer about ESI and to help resolve disputes without court intervention.

IV. PRESERVATION

The parties have discussed their preservation obligations and needs and agree that preservation of potentially relevant ESI will be reasonable and proportionate. To reduce the costs and burdens of preservation and to ensure proper ESI is preserved, the parties agree that:

1. Materials retained in tape, floppy disk, optical disk, or similar formats primarily for back-up or disaster recovery purposes should be considered not reasonably accessible under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B) and, accordingly, should not be subject to production unless specific facts demonstrate a particular need for such evidence that justifies the burden of retrieval. Archives stored on computer servers, external hard drives, notebooks, or personal computer hard drives that are created for disaster recovery purposes and not used as reference materials in the ordinary course of a Party's business operations need not be searched or produced absent good cause, and further subject to the producing Party's claim of undue burden or cost. No Party need

deviate from the practices it normally exercises with regard to preservation of such "tape, floppy disk, optical disk, or similar formats primarily for back-up or disaster recovery purposes" that it does not otherwise exercise when not in anticipation of litigation (e.g., recycling of back-up tapes is permitted).

- 2. Voicemail messages, random access memory, instant messages and chats, WhatsApp messages, information from mobile phones, smart phones, or PDAs that is not duplicative of data stored on servers or other reasonably accessible sources, and dynamic fields of databases or log files that are not stored or retained in the ordinary course of business should be considered not reasonably accessible under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B) and, accordingly, need not be searched and should not be subject to production absent a showing of good cause by the requesting Party based upon specific facts that demonstrate a particular need for such evidence that justifies the burden of retrieval and further subject to the producing Party's claim of undue burden or cost.
- 3. If responsive documents are located on a centralized server or network, the producing Party shall not be required to search for additional copies of such responsive documents that may be located on a personal computer, or that are otherwise in the possession, of individual employees absent a showing of good cause that the production of such additional copies is necessary. No Party need deviate from the practices it normally exercises with regard to preservation of such "additional copies" that it does not otherwise exercise when not in anticipation of litigation (e.g., recycling of back-up tapes is permitted).
- 4. The Parties have agreed that certain limitations on the production of emails are appropriate in this case. The limitations concerning the production of emails are addressed in Section VII.

V. SEARCH

The parties agree that in responding to an initial Fed. R. Civ. P. 34 request, or earlier if appropriate, they will meet and confer about methods to search ESI in order to identify ESI that is subject to production in discovery and filter out ESI that is not subject to discovery.

VI. PRODUCTION FORMATS

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

The parties agree that each of their document productions when made shall comply with the following requirements:

1. Searchable Documents

i. If a document is searchable in its native format, the producing Party will produce it in a searchable form.

2. Hard Copy Documents

- i. OCR will be provided with images of hard copy documents to the extent such OCR data is in the possession of the producing Party or its counsel; provided, however, that the producing Party is not required to OCR hard copy documents as part of its document production.
- ii. If documents are OCR'd, document level TXT files will be provided (one TXT file for each document).
- iii. The documents should be logically unitized to preserve page breaks between documents and otherwise allow separate documents to be identified.

3. Electronic Documents

- i. Electronic documents will be produced with extracted text.
- ii. The extracted text shall be in document text level files, rather than embedded text files, and the extracted text will not be in the database load file.

4. Text-searchable or OCR Format

- i. To the extent a producing Party provides electronically-produced files in text-searchable or OCR format, the receiving Party accepts the searchable portion of the files "as is," and the producing Party accepts no liability as to the accuracy of searches conducted in such files.
- ii. If there are any Chinese, Japanese, or Korean type of characters, Unicode(UTF-8) formatted extracted text files will be provided.

1	5.	Digit	Digital Image Files	
2		i.	Scanning should be single-page black-and-white TIFF images (group iv /	
3			300 dpi). Therefore, whether an electronic document is imaged or a paper	
4			document is imaged, both will be the same format.	
5		ii.	PDF files will be produced with document level text files, instead of	
6			embedded text.	
7		iii.	Files shall be produced with a load file containing the following	
8			information in the following mutually agreed upon manner:	
9			1. Beginning Document Bates Number. NOTE: The Bates numbers	
10			will have sufficient leading zeros (at least 7) and no spaces or	
11			symbols (e.g., WA0000001);	
12			2. Ending Document Bates Number;	
13			3. Beginning Attachment Bates Number; and	
14			4. Ending Attachment Bates Number.	
15	6.	Colo	r Images	
16		i.	The producing party may produce color documents as black and white	
17			documents with the option to obtain color documents from the producing	
18			party if the receiving party specifically requests color copies of the	
19			documents and upon a showing of good cause by the requesting party. For	
20			the avoidance of doubt, good cause includes, but is not limited to, the	
21			following: (a) the documents include schematics, diagrams, graphs,	
22			charts, etc.; (b) the documents are unclear or illegible; or (c) the color	
2:3			version of the document serves to differentiate the information presented	
24			in the document.	
25		ii.	Nothing in this provision precludes a party from voluntarily producing any	
2.6			document in color.	
27	7.	Nativ	Native Files	
28		i.	If any documents are produced in native format, a database load file will	

11			
1		be provided that includes a NATIVE FILE field path.	
2		Native files should be produced in a separate folder (e.g., NATIVES\001	
3		and NATIVES\002) if possible.	
4		i. Excel spreadsheets and other file types not readily reduced to usable PDF	
5		or TIFF format may be produced in native format. The Parties each	
6		reserve the right to request that each Excel spreadsheet be produced in	
7		native form.	
8		Should any party request any other document be produced in its native	
9		electronic format, the Parties agree to meet and confer in good faith to	
10		determine whether production of the document is reasonably necessary	
11		and appropriate.	
12	8.	oad Files	
13		At a minimum, DAT and OPT load files shall be provided, including for	
14		PDF files.	
15		. Concordance delimiters for the DAT file are preferred. No comma	
16		delimiters should be used.	
17	9.	aper and PDF Copies of Native Electronic Documents	
18		To the extent that a Party prepares paper or PDF (or the equivalent) copies	
19		of any electronic documents produced in their native format for any	
20		purpose, including, but not limited to, copies for use and review by	
21		counsel, copies to provide to expert witnesses, court filings, pleadings,	
22		expert reports, or deposition or trial exhibits, the Bates number and the	
23		applicable confidentiality designation must be replicated on each page of	
24		the paper copies.	
25	10.	Additional Metadata Fields	
26		With respect to any emails, at least the To\From\cc\Subject\Sent Date	
27		fields shall be provided.	
28	The Parties reserve the ability to request that additional metadata fields be set forth or		

VII. PRODUCTION OF EMAILS

5

4

1. 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"). To

provided for certain specified electronic documents upon review of the other Party's

6

2. Email production requests shall only be propounded for specific issues, rather

7

than general discovery of a product or business.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

obtain email parties must propound specific email production requests.

- Email production requests shall be phased to occur after the parties have exchanged initial disclosures and Technical Document Productions as set forth in Section VIII below. 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.
- 4. Email production requests shall identify the custodian, search terms, and time frame. The parties shall cooperate to identify the proper custodians, proper search terms and proper timeframe.
- 5. ICC's email production requests are limited to a total of five (5) WhatsApp custodians for all such requests. WhatsApp's email production requests are limited to five (5) ICC, Acacia Research Corp, and/or TeleCommunication Systems Inc. custodians for all such requests. The parties may jointly agree to modify this limit without the Court's leave. The Court shall consider contested requests for up to five (5) additional custodians per producing party, upon showing a distinct need based on the size, complexity, and issues of this specific case. Should a party serve email production requests for additional custodians beyond the limits agreed to by the parties or granted by the Court pursuant to this paragraph, the requesting party shall bear all reasonable costs caused by such additional discovery.

Each requesting party shall limit its email production requests to a total of ten search terms per custodian per party. The parties may jointly agree to modify this limit without the Court's leave. The Court shall consider contested requests for up to five additional search terms per custodian, upon showing a distinct need based on the size, complexity, and issues of this specific case. The search terms shall be narrowly tailored to particular issues. Indiscriminate terms, such as the producing company's name or its product name, are inappropriate unless combined with narrowing search criteria that sufficiently reduce the risk of overproduction. A conjunctive combination of multiple words or phrases (e.g., "computer" and "system") narrows the search and shall count as a single search term. A disjunctive combination of multiple words or phrases (e.g., "computer" or "system") broadens the search, and thus each word or phrase shall count as a separate search term unless they are variants of the same word. Use of narrowing search criteria (e.g., "and," "but not," "w/x") is encouraged to limit the production and shall be considered when determining whether to shift costs for disproportionate discovery. Should a party serve email production requests with search terms beyond the limits agreed to by the parties or granted by the Court pursuant to this paragraph, the requesting party shall bear all reasonable costs caused by such additional discovery

VIII. [INTENTIONALLY OMITTED]

IX. DOCUMENTS PROTECTED FROM DISCOVERY

- 1. Pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 502(d), the production of a privileged or work-product-protected document, whether inadvertent or otherwise, is not a waiver of privilege or protection from discovery in this case or in any other federal or state proceeding. For example, the mere production of privileged or work-product-protected documents in this case as part of a mass production is not itself a waiver in this case or in any other federal or state proceeding.
- 2. Communications involving trial counsel that post-date the filing of the complaint in the Virginia action, captioned *Intercarrier Communications LLC v. WhatsApp Inc.*, Case No. 3:12-CV-00776-JAG (E.D. Va.) need not be placed on a privilege log. Communications may be identified on a privilege log by category, rather than individually, if appropriate.

X. SOURCE CODE

This Stipulation does not govern the format for production of source code, which shall be produced pursuant to the relevant provisions of the Protective Order.

XI. METHODOLOGY

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

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 using widely-accepted methods or methods described in manufacturers' and/or programmers' instructions, help menus, websites, and the like (e.g., .pst's, .zip's, etc.), except when and to the extent there is good cause to believe specific, material concerns about authenticity exist with respect to specific documents and materials. If receiving party believes that there is such good cause, then the producing party and the receiving party shall meet and confer in good faith to determine the extent to which forensic and other data associated with the specific documents and materials should be produced.

XII. MODIFICATION

This Stipulated Order may be modified by a Stipulated Order of the parties or by the Court for good cause shown.

IT IS SO STIPULATED, through Counsel of Record.

	Dated: April 1, 2014	By: <u>/s/ Richard G. Frenkel</u>
25		Richard G. Frenkel
		Counsel for WhatsApp Inc.
26		
0.7	Dated: April 1, 2014	By: /s/ Kimberly Kennedy
27		Kimberly Kennedy
28		Counsel for Intercarrier Communications LLC

1	
2	- defendance de la constitución
3	
4	
5	-
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	and the state of t
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	-
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

IT IS ORDERED that the forgoing Agreement is approved.

Dated: 4/2/14

HON. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE JON S. TIGAR

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SILICON VALLEY

ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO CIVIL L.R. 5–1(I) RE E-FILING ON BEHALF OF MULTIPLE SIGNATORIES

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5–1, I, Richard G. Frenkel, hereby attest concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the signatory listed above.

Dated: April 1, 2014

By: /s/ Richard G. Frenkel
Richard G. Frenkel
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
Counsel for WhatsApp Inc.