2

7

11 12

10

14

13

16

15

18

17

19 20

21

22

23

25

24

27

26

I, Paula M. Roach, hereby declare as follows:

- I am an attorney duly licensed to practice before all the courts of the state of California. I am associated with the law firm of Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP, Co-Lead Class Counsel of record for Plaintiffs Melanie Tucker, Mariana Rosen, and Somtai Troy Charoensak in this action. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein, and, if called upon, I could and would competently testify thereto.
- 2. On October 27, 2010, Defendant Apple Inc. ("Apple") served 19 broad contention interrogatories and six accompanying requests for production of documents on each plaintiff. All of these requests require analysis of the facts and data produced by Apple.
- 3. As of October 27, in the three years of ongoing discovery, Apple had produced 97,316 pages of documents and little to no data requested by Plaintiffs' experts. Beginning on November 15, 2010, Apple began producing documents in massive quantities. Between November 15, 2010 and December 20, 2010, the last day for fact discovery, Apple produced 1,606,951 pages of documents plus data needed by Plaintiffs' experts. Over the last month, Plaintiffs also took the deposition of six fact witnesses. Plaintiffs responded to the interrogatories and document requests on December 20, 2010.
- 4. On December 21, Alexandra S. Bernay, an associate at my firm, sent Apple's counsel a letter informing him that Plaintiffs could not respond to the contention requests because Apple had produced massive quantities of documents over the last four weeks and the materials necessary for expert analysis were received by counsel the night before. Ms. Bernay stated that Plaintiffs were reviewing and analyzing Apple's large production and would provide responses to the contention requests in time for Apple to use them, if desired, in its reply in support of its upcoming motion for summary judgment.
- 5. On December 23, Ms. Bernay once again informed Apple's counsel that Plaintiffs were not refusing to respond to the contention discovery and would do so once review and analysis of Apple's production was completed.
- 6. On December 27, 2010, Apple filed a Motion to Compel Interrogatory Responses and Requests for Production along with a motion to shorten time for briefing and hearing on that motion. DEC OF PAULA M. ROACH IN SUPP OF PLTFS' OPP TO DEF'S ADMINISTRATIVE MTN TO SHORTEN TIME FOR BRIEFING & HEARING DEF'S MTN TO COMPEL - C-05-00037-JW(HRL)

- 7. Because Plaintiffs have already agreed to provide responses to Apple's contention requests well in advance of the deadline for Apple to file its reply in support of its motion for summary judgment, Apple cannot show any prejudice. *A fortiorari*, Apple cannot show any prejudice will result from briefing and hearing the motion in the ordinary course. Even if this Court granted Apple's motion to shorten time, the hearing date would be January 18, 2011, one day after Apple must file its motion for summary judgment. Apple cannot, therefore, claim any prejudice.
- 8. By contrast, if Apple's Motion to Shorten Time is granted, Plaintiffs will be forced to brief an opposition to the Motion to Compel over the holiday while Plaintiffs are reviewing Apple's massive production and also briefing their Motion for Class Certification (due to be filed on January 17, 2010). This prejudices Plaintiffs and rewards Apple for its bad conduct. If Apple wanted full responses to its contention interrogatories sooner, it could have complied with its discovery obligation months ago, as most of the over 1,000,000 pages of late document production was in response to requests that were served on Apple in 2009.
- 9. The current hearing date of February 1, 2011, allows Plaintiffs adequate time to brief their opposition to Apple's motion, review Apple's large document production, and brief their Motion for Class Certification. Additionally, hearing Apple's motion on January 18, 2011, as suggested by Apple, will not provide any added efficiencies because Apple's Motion for Protective Order is entirely unrelated to its Motion to Compel and Apple's Motion for Summary Judgment will have already been filed. Moreover, as Apple's counsel is located in San Francisco and has offices in Palo Alto, requiring Apple to attend an additional hearing in San Jose imposes no hardship on Apple.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 30th day of December, 2010, at San Diego, California.

s/ Paula M. Roach
PAULA M. ROACH

591495\_1

#### 

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on December 30, 2010, I authorized the electronic filing of 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 caused to be 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 December 30, 2010.

s/ Paula M. Roach
PAULA M. ROACH

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:proach@rgrdlaw.com

CAND-ECF- Page 1 of 2

#### 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

## • Alexandra Senya Bernay xanb@rgrdlaw.com

# • Michael D Braun service@braunlawgroup.com

#### • Michael D. Braun service@braunlawgroup.com,clc@braunlawgroup.com

## • Todd David Carpenter tcarpenter@bffb.com,pjohnson@bffb.com,rcreech@bffb.com

#### • Andrew S. Friedman khonecker@bffb.com,rcreech@bffb.com,afriedman@bffb.com

## • Alreen Haeggquist alreenh@zhlaw.com,judyj@zhlaw.com

## • Roy Arie 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

CAND-ECF- Page 2 of 2

- 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)