

1 Susan S.Q. Kalra (SBN: 167940)
 susan@M-iplaw.com
 2 303 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 600
 Redwood City, CA 94065
 3 Tel: 408-236-6640
 4 Fax: 408-236-6641

5 William Ramey
 wramey@rameyfirm.com
 6 Ramey & Schwaller, LLP
 5020 Montrose Blvd., Suite 800
 7 Houston, Texas 77006
 8 Tel: 713-426-3923
 Fax: 832-900-4941

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff

Michael A. Berta (SBN: 194650)
 michael.bertha@arnoldporter.com
 ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP
 Three Embarcadero Center
 10th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94111-4024
 Tel: 415-471-3277

Nicholas H. Lee (SBN: 259588)
 nicholas.lee@arnoldporter.com
 ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP
 777 South Figueroa Street
 44th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90017-5844
 Tel: 213-243-4156

Attorneys for Defendant

(ADDITIONAL COUNSEL IN SIGNATURE BLOCKS)

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 TRAXCELL TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
 17
 18 Plaintiff,
 19 vs.
 20 GOOGLE LLC,
 21 Defendant.

Case No.: 22-cv-04807-JSC

~~[STIPULATED]~~ ORDER RE: DISCOVERY OF ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION FOR PATENT LITIGATION

1 Upon the stipulation of the parties, the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

2 1. This Order supplements all other discovery rules and orders. It streamlines
3 Electronically Stored Information (“ESI”) production to promote a “just, speedy, and inexpensive
4 determination of this action, as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 1.”

5 2. This Order may be modified in the Court’s discretion or by stipulation. The parties
6 concurrently submit a proposed stipulated order regarding discovery of electronically stored
7 information.

8 3. As in all cases, costs may be shifted for disproportionate ESI production requests
9 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26. Likewise, a party’s nonresponsive or dilatory
10 discovery tactics are cost-shifting considerations.

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

13 5. The parties agree to comply with the District’s E-Discovery Guidelines
14 (“Guidelines”) and have employed the District’s Model Stipulated Order Re: the Discovery of
15 Electronically Stored Information and Checklist for Rule 26(f) Meet and Confer regarding
16 Electronically Stored Information.

17 6. General ESI production requests under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 34 and 45
18 shall not include email or other forms of electronic correspondence (collectively “email”). To obtain
19 email parties must propound specific email production requests.

20 7. Email production requests shall only be propounded for specific issues, rather than
21 general discovery of a product or business.

22 8. Email production requests shall be phased to occur after the parties have exchanged
23 initial disclosures and basic documentation about the patents, the prior art, the accused
24 instrumentalities, and the relevant finances. While this provision does not require the production of
25 such information, the Court encourages prompt and early production of this information to promote
26 efficient and economical streamlining of the case.

1 9. Email production requests shall identify the custodian, search terms, and time frame.
2 The parties shall cooperate to identify the proper custodians, proper search terms and proper
3 timeframe as set forth in the Guidelines.

4 10. Each requesting party shall limit its email production requests to a total of five
5 custodians per producing party for all such requests. The parties may jointly agree to modify this
6 limit without the Court’s leave. The Court shall consider contested requests for additional
7 custodians, upon showing a distinct need based on the size, complexity, and issues of this specific
8 case. Cost-shifting may be considered as part of any such request.

9 11. Each requesting party shall limit its email production requests to a total of five
10 search terms per custodian per party. The parties may jointly agree to modify this limit without the
11 Court’s leave. The Court shall consider contested requests for additional search terms per
12 custodian, upon showing a distinct need based on the size, complexity, and issues of this specific
13 case. The Court encourages the parties to confer on a process to test the efficacy of the search terms.
14 The search terms shall be narrowly tailored to particular issues. Indiscriminate terms, such as the
15 producing company’s name or its product name, are inappropriate unless combined with narrowing
16 search criteria that sufficiently reduce the risk of overproduction. A conjunctive combination of
17 multiple words or phrases (*e.g.*, “computer” and “system”) narrows the search and shall count as a
18 single search term. A disjunctive combination of multiple words or phrases (*e.g.*, “computer” or
19 “system”) broadens the search, and thus each word or phrase shall count as a separate search term
20 unless they are variants of the same word. Use of narrowing search criteria (*e.g.*, “and,” “but not,”
21 “w/x”) is encouraged to limit the production and shall be considered when determining whether to
22 shift costs for disproportionate discovery. Should a party serve email production requests with
23 search terms beyond the limits agreed to by the parties or granted by the Court pursuant to this
24 paragraph, this shall be considered in determining whether any party shall bear all reasonable costs
25 caused by such additional discovery.

1 12. Nothing in this Order prevents the parties from agreeing to use technology assisted
2 review and other techniques insofar as their use improves the efficacy of discovery. Such topics
3 should be discussed pursuant to the District’s E-Discovery Guidelines.
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

1 **IT IS SO STIPULATED**, through Counsel of Record.

2
3 Dated: November 16, 2022

/s/ William Ramey

Susan S.Q. Kalra (SBN: 167940)
susan@M-iplaw.com
303 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 600
Redwood City, CA 94065
Tel: 408-236-6640
Fax: 408-236-6641

William Ramey
wramey@rameyfirm.com
Ramey & Schwaller, LLP
5020 Montrose Blvd., Suite 800
Houston, Texas 77006
Tel: 713-426-3923
Fax: 832-900-4941

Attorneys for Plaintiff

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 Dated: November 16, 2022

/s/ David A. Caine

Michael A. Berta (SBN:194650)
michael.bera@arnoldporter.com
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
10th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-4024
Tel: 415-471-3277

Nicholas H. Lee (SBN: 259588)
nicholas.lee@arnoldporter.com
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP
777 South Figueroa Street
44th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5844
Tel: 213-243-4156

David A. Caine (SBN: 218074)
Assad H. Rajani (SBN: 251143)
david.caine@arnoldporter.com
assad.rajani@arnoldporter.com
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP
3000 El Camino Real
Five Palo Alto Square, Suite 500

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

Palo Alto, CA 94306
Tel: 650-319-4500

Attorneys for Defendant

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

IT IS ORDERED that the foregoing Agreement is approved.

Dated: November 16, 2022

~~UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT~~ ~~JUDGE~~

