

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIALOOP AI LABS INC,
Plaintiff,

v.

ANNA GATTI, et al.,
Defendants.Case No. [15-cv-00798-HSG](#) (DMR)**ORDER RE JOINT DISCOVERY
LETTER**

Re: Dkt. No. 172

United States District Court
Northern District of California

12 The court has received the parties' August 17, 2015 joint letter regarding numerous
13 discovery disputes. [Docket No. 172 (Joint Letter).] Plaintiff Loop AI, Inc. did not provide full
14 argument on several of the disputes. Instead, as to one of the disputes, Plaintiff requested leave to
15 fully brief its position on a protective order, and attached an exhibit containing its redline of
16 changes to Defendants' proposed protective order, along with one page of annotations explaining
17 certain edits, essentially granting itself additional pages of argument. (Joint Letter Ex. B.) The
18 court previously ordered the parties to follow the structure and limits of its joint letter process
19 because it requires the parties to focus on the most important issues, and to make appropriate
20 compromises. [Docket No. 165.] The court is concerned that Plaintiff continues to disregard this
21 guidance. Nevertheless, in the interest of moving the case forward, the court will accept Plaintiff's
22 exhibit, and grants Defendants leave to respond to Plaintiff's arguments in a similar format. By no
23 later than August 31, 2015, Defendants shall file a response to Plaintiff's annotated arguments
24 regarding the proposed protective order. Defendants' response may not exceed one page.

25 Plaintiff also requested leave to fully brief its disputes with third-party Russell Reynolds
26 Associates ("RRA") regarding Plaintiff's subpoena duces tecum to RRA. In the alternative,
27 Plaintiff asks the court to incorporate by reference its motion to compel filed in the Southern
28 District of New York (SDNY) (Case 15-mc-00211). (Joint Letter 6 n.17.) The court has reviewed

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
28

Plaintiff's memorandum of law in support of its motion to compel filed in SDNY (Docket No. 2) and RRA's opposition thereto (Docket No. 12). The court finds that these filings may be helpful to resolving the present disputes about the RRA subpoena and will incorporate them into the joint letter, as Plaintiff requests. The court notes that Plaintiff's motion to compel is somewhat general. RRA's opposition contains detailed, specific arguments supporting its objections to each document request, as well as proposed compromises. The court believes that it may benefit from a reply submission by Plaintiff, but only if it is similarly detailed and specific. Therefore, by August 28, 2015, RRA shall file a statement indicating whether it has changed its positions on any of the objections briefed in its July 20, 2015 opposition to the motion to compel and explaining the basis for any such changes. Such statement shall not exceed two pages. RRA shall also lodge chambers copies of the documents filed at Docket No. 12 in SDNY (including all supporting evidence) by August 28, 2015.

By September 2, 2015, Plaintiff shall file a reply to RRA's arguments in the July 20, 2015 opposition and August 28, 2015 update. Plaintiff's reply shall not exceed three pages. Plaintiff shall also lodge chambers copies of the documents filed at Docket Nos. 1-3 in SDNY (including all supporting evidence) by September 2, 2015.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 25, 2015

