** E-filed December 23, 2009 ** 1 **KEKER & VAN NEST LLP** ELLIOT R. PETERS - #158708 2 WENDY J. THURM - #163558 STEVEN P. RAGLAND - #221076 3 JOHN E. TRINIDAD - #250468 710 Sansome Street 4 San Francisco, CA 94111-1704 Telephone: (415) 391-5400 5 Facsimile: (415) 397-7188 epeters@kvn.com wthurm@kvn.com 6 sragland@kvn.com jtrinidad@kvn.com 7 8 Attorneys for Defendants MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP and THOMAS D. KOHLER 9 CLARK S. STONE - #202123 10 STEVEN M. LEVITAN - #148716 11 INCHAN A. KWON - #247614 HAYNES AND BOONE. LLP 2033 Gateway Place, Suite 400 12 San Jose, CA 95110 13 Telephone: (408) 392-9250 Facsimile: (408) 392-9262 14 clark.stone@haynesboone.com steve.levitan@haynesboone.com inchan.kwon@haynesboone.com 15 16 Attorneys for Plaintiff LANDMARK SCREENS, LLC 17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 19 SAN JOSE DIVISION 20 21 LANDMARK SCREENS, LLC, a Delaware Case No. 5:08-cv-2581 JF Limited Liability Company, 22 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] Plaintiff. **ORDER FOR IN CAMERA REVIEW OF** 23 **PRIVILEGED DOCUMENTS** AS AMENDED BY THE COURT v. Hon. Howard R. Lloyd 24 Judge: Courtroom 2. 5th Floor MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP, a 25 limited liability partnership; and THOMAS D. KOHLER, an individual, Docket No. 86 Re: 26 Defendants. 27 28 1 STIPULATION AND (PROPOSED) ORDER FOR IN CAMERA REVIEW OF PRIVILEGED DOCUMENTS 464279.02 Case No. 5:08-cv-2581 JF

1	This stipulation is entered into by and between Plaintiff Landmark Screens, LLC	
2	("Landmark") and Defendants Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP ("MLB") and Thomas D. Kohler	
3	("Kohler") as follows:	
4	WHEREAS, in a privilege log produced in a state court action and prepared by MLB's	
5	former counsel, MLB partners Michael Bloom and Thomas Kittredge were listed as recipients of	
6	three privileged documents (the "Disputed Documents");	
7	WHEREAS, in a privilege log produced in this federal court action, Michael Bloom and	
8	Thomas Kittredge were not listed as recipients of the Disputed Documents;	
9	WHEREAS, MLB's current counsel informed Landmark that the state court privilege log	
10	incorrectly listed Mr. Bloom and Mr. Kittredge as recipients of the Disputed Documents, and	
11	that such errors had been corrected in the federal court privilege log.	
12	WHEREAS, Landmark requested that the Disputed Documents be submitted for in	
13	camera review so that the recipients could be verified;	
14	WHEREAS, MLB agreed to submit the Disputed Documents for <i>in camera</i> review solely	
15	for the purpose of verifying the recipients of these documents, as stated in letters dated August	
16	11, 2009 and September 23, 2009;	
17	WHEREAS, on December 1, 2009, Landmark filed a Motion to Compel Production of	
18	Documents Withheld as Privileged, claiming in part that the Disputed Documents "indicate that	
19	MLB partners Michael Bloom and Thomas Kittredge, in-house counsel to MLB, were apprised	
20	of 'anticipated litigation' as early as April 11, 2005." Docket No. 86, at 7;	
21	WHEREAS the parties agree that the Court can efficiently and fairly resolve this dispute	
22	and thereby narrow the contested issues presented in Landmark's December 1, 2009 Motion to	
23	Compel;	
24	NOW THEREFORE, THE PARTIES HEREBY STIPULATE AND AGREE, through	
25	their respective counsel of record, that:	
26	(1) MLB shall be permitted to submit the Disputed Documents, bearing bates numbers	
27	MLBFED0002576, MLBFED0002577, and MLBFED0002578, to the Court ex parte for in	
28	camera review for the sole purpose of determining if Michael Bloom and/or Thomas Kittredge	
	2	
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR IN CAMERA REVIEW OF PRIVILEGED DOCUMENTS Case No. 5:08-cv-2581 JF	

1	are listed as recipients of the Disputed Documents;		
2	(2) The submission of the Disputed Documents for <i>in camera</i> review for this purpose		
3	shall be without prejudice to the Court's consideration of whether <i>in camera</i> review of the		
4	Disputed Documents may be necessary to resolve other disputes regarding the Disputed		
5	Documents, as described in Landmark's December 1, 2009 Motion to Compel; and		
6	(3) The submission of the Disputed Documents for <i>in camera</i> review shall not constitute		
7	the waiver of any privilege or protection afforded to the Disputed Documents.		
8			
9	IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
10			
11	Dated: December 22, 2009	KEKER & VAN NEST LLP	
12			
13			
14	By:	/s/ Wendy J. Thurm WENDY J. THURM	
15		Attorneys for Defendants MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP	
16		and THOMAS D. KOHLER	
17	Dated: December 22, 2009	HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP	
18			
19	By:	/s/ Clark S. Stone	
20		CLARK S. STONE Attorneys for Plaintiff	
21		LANDMARK SCREENS, LLC	
22		Filer's Attestation: Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X.B. regrinding non-	
23		filing signatories, Wendy J. Thurm hereby attests that concurrence in the filing of this	
24		Stipulation and [Proposed] Order has been obtained from Clark S. Stone.	
25			
26			
27			
28			
	2		
2	3 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR IN CAMERA REVIEW OF PRIVILEGED DOCUMENTS Case No. 5:08-cv-2581 JF		

464279.02

1	[PROPOSED] ORDER
2	
3	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	MLB shall submit the Disputed Documents to the court by December 28, 2009.
5	Dated:
6	
7	HON HOWALD R. LLOYD
8	HON HOWALD R. LLOYD United States Magistrate Judge
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 20	
20 21	
21	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	4
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR IN CAMERA REVIEW OF PRIVILEGED DOCUMENTS Case No. 5:08-cv-2581 JF

464279.02