

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WAYMO LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

No. C 17-00939 WHA

**ORDER DENYING REQUEST  
FOR CLARIFICATION OF  
JUDGE CORLEY'S ORDER**

Incidental to their motion for relief from Judge Corley's order granting plaintiff Waymo LLC's motion to compel, defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., and Ottomotto LLC asked for clarification that, while Judge Corley's order requires production of Stroz Friedberg's due diligence report at this time, its rationale as to the "common interest" or "joint defense" exception is not necessarily dispositive of privilege assertions over other communications, separate and apart from the due diligence report, that occurred after April 11, 2016 (*see* Dkt. No. 575 at 5). This request does not bear on production of the due diligence report and should be directed first to Judge Corley, who remains in the best position to evaluate it, per her recent instructions regarding Uber's privilege log (*see* Dkt. No. 670 at 7-8). This order therefore **DENIES** the request without prejudice to its renewal before Judge Corley.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: June 21, 2017.

  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE