Netscape Communic	ations Corporation et al v. Federal	Insurance Compa	ny et al		Doc. 133	
	Case 5:06-cv-00198-JW  C	Ocument 133	Filed 04/12/2007	Page 1 of 4		
1	ABELSON   HERRON LLP					
2	Michael Bruce Abelson (St		39)			
	Leslie A. Pereira (State Bar No. 180222) 333 South Grand Ave, Suite 1550					
3	Los Angeles, California 9007					
4	Telephone: (213) 402-1900					
5	Facsimile: (213) 402-1901					
	BERGESON, LLP					
6	Hway-ling Hsu (State Bar No. 201329)					
7	303 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 500 San Jose, California 95110-2712					
8	Telephone: (408) 291-6200					
	Facsimile: (408) 297-6000					
9	Attorneys for Plaintiffs					
10	NETSCAPE COMMUNICAT	TIONS				
11	CORPORATION and AMER	ICA ONLINE, IN	JC.			
12	U	NITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT			
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – SAN JOSE DIVISION					
14						
15	NETSCAPE COMMUNICAT	TIONS	CASE NO. 5:06-C	V-00198 JW (PVT)		
	CORPORATION, et al.;					
16	Plaintiffs,		DECLARATION PEREIRA IN SUI			
17	,			POSITION TO ST.		
18	V.		PAUL'S MOTIO ADMISSION	N TO AMEND		
	    FEDERAL INSURANCE CO	MPANY. et al	ADMISSION			
19		, , , , , ,	Magistrate Judge P	atricia V. Trumbull		
20	Defendants.		Data: April 17 20	07		
21			Date: April 17, 200 Time: 10:00 a.m.	07		
			Dept.: 5			
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
	USDS CASE NO. C-06-00198 JW (	PVT)				
Abelson Herron up		/				
				Docket	s.Justia.com	
	11				1	

1

I, Leslie A. Pereira, declare as follows:

I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of California and before
 the bar of this Court. I am of counsel to the law firm of Abelson | Herron LLP and, in that
 capacity, I am counsel of record for Plaintiffs Netscape Communications Corporation and
 America Online, Inc. in this action. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein,
 except as to matters upon which I state are based upon information and belief. I could and would
 competently testify to the same.

8 2. On June 19, 2006, the Court held a case management conference. During that 9 conference, the parties jointly agreed and proposed that this coverage litigation proceed in two 10 phases. "Phase One" would include discovery and motion practice on the issue of whether St. 11 Paul had a duty to defend AOL and Netscape under its policy. As part of Phase One, the 12 parties' would file Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Re: Duty to Defend (the 13 'Cross-Motions"). Thereafter, "Phase Two" would proceed (if necessary) on the contingent 14 issues relating to the causes of action for breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing 15 and unfair business practices.

Immediately after the conference, and consistent with the parties' proposals made
 therein, the Court entered an order setting the hearing on the parties' Cross-Motions for
 November 20, 2006. For a variety of reasons, the hearing date was changed on multiple
 occasions. The parties' Cross-Motions are currently set to be heard on April 30, 2007.

4. Immediately after the June scheduling conference, the parties proceeded with
discovery pertinent to the issues to be raised in the Cross-Motions. In response to St. Paul's
discovery requests, Plaintiffs produced the following information during the summer of 2006:

23

24

• The deposition of former Netscape employee David Park, including all exhibits thereto [NET/SDL 0004457-0004863];

1

A settlement presentation prepared by the claimants' attorney, Joshua Rubin, in
the underlying SmartDownload litigations [NET/SDL 00011245-00011342] (the "Settlement
Presentation").

28

Abelson Herron up

1	5. The Settlement Presentation – produced to St. Paul	5. The Settlement Presentation – produced to St. Paul on June 22 – made numerous			
2	advertising-related allegations, including its repeated assertions that Netscape was partnered with				
3	an ad-serving company called "AdForce" and sent the claimants' private information collected				
4	by SmartDownload to AdForce.				
5	6. Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct c	opy of Plaintiffs' Supplemental			
6	Responses to St. Paul's Requests for Admission.				
7	7. Attached hereto as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct c	opy of Plaintiffs' Second			
8	Supplemental Responses to St. Paul's First Set of Interrogatories.				
9	8. In an effort to identify St. Paul's purported defense	s to coverage, and to narrow			
10	the issues that required briefing in the parties' Cross-Motions, Pla	intiffs served St. Paul with a			
11	set of nine requests for admission ("RFA") on July 24, 2006. Atta	ached hereto as Exhibit 3 is a			
12	2 true and correct copy of Plaintiff AOL's First Set of Requests for Admission to St. Paul.				
13	9. Attached hereto as Exhibit 4 is a true and correct c	opy of Plaintiff Netscape's			
14	First Set of Specially Prepared Interrogatories to St. Paul.				
15	10. Attached hereto as Exhibit 5 is a true and correct c	opy of St. Paul's Response to			
16	5 Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admission.				
17	11. Attached hereto as Exhibit 6 is a true and correct c	opy of St. Paul's Response to			
18	Netscape's First Set of Specially Prepared Interrogatories.				
19	12. Plaintiffs understood St. Paul's response to RFA N	o. 4 to mean that St. Paul			
20	would not defend against this coverage action on the ground that	the Online Activities Exclusion			
21	applied because the SmartDownload Claim involved "3rd party advertising."				
22	13. Throughout the fall, Plaintiffs took numerous depo	sitions of St. Paul's witnesses,			
23	including claim handlers Daniel Weiss and Dale Evensen, and un	derwriter Michelle Midwinter.			
24	In response to Plaintiffs' request that St. Paul designate a corporate representative to testify				
25	regarding its written discovery responses – including its RFA responses – St. Paul designated all				
26	three of these individuals. Plaintiffs took Ms. Midwinter's deposition in September, 2006, and				
27	took Mr. Weiss' and Mr. Evensen's depositions in October and November, 2006.				
28		F LESLIE A. PEREIRA IN SUPPORT OF OSITION TO ST. PAUL'S MOTION TO			

1	14. Attached hereto as Exhibit 7 is a true and correct copy of St. Paul's Supplemental					
2	Response to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admission.					
3	15. Attached hereto as Exhibit 8 is a true and correct copy of St. Paul's Supplemental					
4	Response to Netscape's First Set of Specially Prepared Interrogatories.					
5	16. At the time Plaintiffs deposed Mr. Weiss in October and November, 2006,					
6	Plaintiffs were not aware that St. Paul contended that the "3rd party advertising" prong of the					
7	Online Activities Exclusion barred coverage, or that Mr. Weiss had information in that regard.					
8	I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States of America that the					
9	foregoing is true and correct.					
10	Executed this 12th day of April 2007 at Los Angeles, California.					
11						
12	<u>/s/</u>					
13	Leslie A. Pereira					
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28 Abelson Herron up	USDS CASE NO. C-06-00198 JW (PVT) 3 DECLARATION OF LESLIE A. PEREIRA IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO ST. PAUL'S MOTION TO AMEND ADMISSION					