Mizera v. Google

Ddc. 21

5

7

9

12

11

1314

16

15

17

1819

20

21

22

2324

25

2627

28

- I, David J. Silbert, declare that the following is true:
- 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice in the State of California and before this Court. I am a partner in the law firm of Keker & Van Nest, LLP, counsel for defendant Google, Inc. ("Google") in these coordinated actions. I make this declaration of my own personal knowledge, and if called to do so, I would testify to these facts under oath.
- 2. On February 5, 2004, a group of plaintiffs sued Google and other major "pay-per-click" advertising companies in the Circuit Court in Miller County Arkansas (the "Arkansas action"). A true and correct copy of the Second Amended Complaint in the Arkansas action is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 3. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of the complaint that Click Defense filed against Google on June 24, 2005.
- 4. Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of the complaint that Steve Mizera filed against Google on July 15, 2005.
- 5. The parties in the Arkansas action have litigated a variety of issues at the trialand appellate-court levels in both state and federal court. In or around January 2006, after nearly a year of litigation, Google and the plaintiffs agreed to engage in discussions to attempt to settle the case.
- 6. In February 2006, the parties held a two-day mediation before the Hon. Layn R. Phillips. Judge Phillips is a retired United States District Judge and a former United States Attorney, and is a highly regarded mediator.
- 7. Through the settlement process that Judge Phillips oversaw, the parties ultimately signed a confidential settlement agreement. While the details of that agreement are still confidential, its principal terms include the creation of a nationwide settlement class, the establishment of a settlement fund with a total value of up to \$90 million, and the resolution of all class members' claims against Google relating to "click-fraud" or other invalid clicks on payper-click advertisements.
- 8. A hearing on AIT's motion to intervene is currently scheduled for March 14, 2006, and a hearing on the preliminary approval of the settlement is currently set for April 3,

2006. Attached hereto as Exhibit D is a true and correct copy of the Arkansas Court's scheduling orders setting those hearings.

- 9. Numerous discovery activities are underway in this action, including AIT's, Mizera's and Click Defense's responses to document requests, which are due in several weeks. Unless the parties resolve their disputes, they may also need to move in the next few weeks for the entry of a protective order, and possibly for other relief as well.
- 10. On March 9, 2006, I telephoned Darren Kaplan, counsel for plaintiffs in this action. I asked Mr. Kaplan if plaintiffs would stipulate to stay the current proceedings pending the approval of the Arkansas settlement. Mr. Kaplan declined to so stipulate.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on March 9, 2005 in San Francisco, California.

/s/ David Silbert \_\_\_ DAVID J. SILBERT