"The Apple iPod iTunes Anti-Trust Litigation"

Dog. 367

6

7

10 11

13

12

15

14

16 17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

## I, THOMAS R. MERRICK, declare as follows:

- I am an attorney duly licensed to practice before all of the courts of the State of California. I am an associate at the law firm of Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP, Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs in this action. I make this declaration on personal knowledge in support of Plaintiffs' motion for additional discovery pursuant to Rule 56(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 2. I have personal knowledge of the procedural history of this action, the scope of discovery Plaintiffs require in order to fully respond to Apple's summary judgment motion, and the reasons the discovery is necessary. I also have personal knowledge of the parties' meet and confer efforts.
- On December 28, 2009, Plaintiffs served their Second Set of Requests for Production 3. of Documents and Second Set of Interrogatories. Declaration of Paula M. Roach Pursuant to 56(f) of the Rules of Civil Procedure in Support of Plaintiffs' Opposition to Apple's Motion to Dismiss or, Alternatively, for Summary Judgment ("Roach Decl."), ¶13. On February 28, 2010, the Court directed the parties that discovery was open and reaffirmed that "Plaintiffs may proceed with discovery at this time." Dkt. No. 324 at 2; see also Roach Decl., ¶14.
- Despite its duty to produce responsive documents to all of the requests, Apple refused to do so until Plaintiffs specified which discovery was needed to respond to Apple's motion for summary judgment. On February 26, 2010, during a telephonic meet and confer, Apple stated that it was not going to respond to all of the requests in Plaintiffs' second set of discovery because it was still of the opinion that discovery should be stayed pending the Court's ruling on Apple's dispositive motion. Plaintiffs disagreed with this position but in an effort to move discovery forward expeditiously, identified the discovery requests for which responsive discovery was required to provide an adequate response.
- Apple has stated that production concerning these requests will be completed by the 5. end of May, 2010.
- On March 22, 2010, the day Plaintiffs filed their opposition to Apple's alternative 6. motion for summary judgment, Apple produced documents related to a subset of Plaintiffs' Rule DECL OF THOMAS R. MERRICK IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY PURSUANT TO RULE 56(F) - C-05-00037-JW(HRL)

30(b)(6) document requests served on April 9, 2009. Apple represented that this was the last batch of documents responsive to the subset of 30(b)(6) requests. However, on April 21, 2010, Plaintiffs received a production of an additional 147 pages of documents responsive to these requests.

- 7. Plaintiffs have completed review of the Rule 30(b)(6) production to date and have sought production of additional documents pursuant to the original requests, including information concerning Apple's understanding of how Harmony works technically; specifications, design documents and diagrams regarding those changes in FairPlay that broke Harmony; documents that describe the relationship between iTunes software updates and iPod firmware updates; documents that indicate how certain of Apple's observations concerning Harmony affected the FairPlay redesign; source code related to iTunes software updates 4.6 and 4.7; and source code related to iTunes software updates (other than 4.6 and 4.7) and iPod firmware updates that addressed the software that Apple describes as "hacks." On April 22, 2010, during a meet and confer, Apple indicated that it would consider producing some of this information related to the FairPlay redesign in iTunes 4.7. The parties continue to meet and confer on the issue. However, at this point, it is unclear when Apple's Rule 30(b)(6) related production will be complete.
- 8. On April 5, 2010, Apple produced nine additional amendments to the original contracts with the major labels in response to Plaintiffs' second set of requests, served on December 28, 2009. To date, Apple has not produced any additional communications with the labels concerning the contracts.
- 9. On April 8, 2010, Apple produced two contracts between Apple and Motorola in response to Plaintiffs' second set of requests, served on December 28, 2009.

10.				 	
	W-1-1				

1								
2								
3								
4	11. Attached	11. Attached hereto are true and correct copies of the following documents:						
5		Letter from Thomas Merrick to Robert Mittelstaedt, dated June 18, 2009 portions filed under seal];						
6	Exhibit B: I	Email between Paula Roach and David Kiernan, dated August 3, 2009; and						
7 8	Exhibit C: I	Letter from Thomas Merrick to David Kiernan, dated April 19, 2010 portions filed under seal].						
9	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the							
10	foregoing is true and co	orrect. Executed this 26th day of April, 2010, at San Diego, California.						
11								
12		s/ Thomas R. Merrick						
13		THOMAS R. MERRICK						
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								
	11							

28

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 26, 2010, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the e-mail addresses denoted on the attached Electronic Mail Notice List, and I hereby certify that I have mailed the foregoing document or paper via the United States Postal Service to the non-CM/ECF participants indicated on the attached Manual Notice List.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on April 26, 2010.

s/ Thomas R. Merrick

Thomas R. Merrick

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101-3301 Telephone: 619/231-1058 619/231-7423 (fax)

E-mail:

tmerrick@rgrdlaw.com

# Mailing Information for a Case 5:05-cv-00037-JW

### **Electronic Mail Notice List**

The following are those who are currently on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case.

- Francis Joseph Balint, Jr fbalint@bffb.com
- Michael D Braun service@braunlawgroup.com
- Michael D. Braun service@braunlawgroup.com,clc@braunlawgroup.com
- Todd David Carpenter tcarpenter@bffb.com
- Andrew S. Friedman rcreech@bffb.com,afriedman@bffb.com
- Alreen Haeggquist alreenh@zhlaw.com,judyj@zhlaw.com
- Roy A. Katriel rak@katriellaw.com,rk618@aol.com
- Thomas J. Kennedy tkennedy@murrayfrank.com
- David Craig Kiernan dkiernan@jonesday.com,lwong@jonesday.com
- Thomas Robert Merrick tmerrick@rgrdlaw.com,e\_file\_sd@rgrdlaw.com,e\_file\_sf@rgrdlaw.com
- Caroline Nason Mitchell cnmitchell@jonesday.com,mlandsborough@jonesday.com,ewallace@jonesday.com
- Robert Allan Mittelstaedt ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com,ybennett@jonesday.com
- Brian P Murray bmurray@murrayfrank.com
- Paula Michelle Roach proach@rgrdlaw.com,e\_file\_sd@rgrdlaw.com
- Elaine A. Ryan

eryan@bffb.com,pjohnson@bffb.com

- Jacqueline Sailer jsailer@murrayfrank.com
- Michael Tedder Scott michaelscott@jonesday.com,amhoward@jonesday.com
- Craig Ellsworth Stewart cestewart@jonesday.com,mlandsborough@jonesday.com
- John J. Stoia, Jr jstoia@rgrdlaw.com
- Bonny E. Sweeney bonnys@rgrdlaw.com,christinas@rgrdlaw.com,E\_file\_sd@rgrdlaw.com,proach@rgrdlaw.com
- Helen I. Zeldes helenz@zhlaw.com

### **Manual Notice List**

The following is the list of attorneys who are **not** on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case (who therefore require manual noticing). You may wish to use your mouse to select and copy this list into your word processing program in order to create notices or labels for these recipients.

• (No manual recipients)