1 2 3 4	COOLEY LLP MICHAEL G. RHODES (116127) (rhodesmg@ LEO P. NORTON (216282) (lnorton@cooley.cd 4401 Eastgate Mall San Diego, CA 92121-1909 Telephone: (858) 550-6000 Facsimile: (858) 550-6420		
5	COOLEY LLP PETER J. WILLSEY (admitted pro hac vice)		
6	(pwillsey@cooley.com) 777 6th Street, N.W.		
7 8	Washington, D.C. 20001 Telephone: (202) 842-7800 Facsimile: (202) 842-7899		
9	Attorneys for Defendant		
10	Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
13	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
14			
15	In re Google AdWords Litigation	Case No. 08-cv-03369 JW HRL	
16			
17 18		UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF TO MODIFY CASE MANAGEMENT SCHEDULE	
19		[Civil L.R. 7-11, 16-2(d)]	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
COOLEY LLP Attorneys At Law San Diego		UNOPPOSED MOTION TO MODIFY CASE MANAGEMENT SCHEDULE CASE NO. 08-CV-03369 JW HRL	

I. INTRODUCTION

The parties respectfully request a 90-day extension of the current case management 2 deadlines. The primary reason for the requested extension is that defendant Google Inc. has 3 4 voluntarily agreed to supplement its document production regarding certain historical webpages and certain data relating to the named plaintiffs' advertisements. The information was not 5 previously produced because it is not reasonably accessible in Google's databases. Google will 6 nevertheless undertake the substantial burden to obtain the information from its raw data logs. 7 This information is not readily accessible and may take Google several weeks to obtain and 8 9 produce. A brief extension will allow the noticed party depositions and expert discovery to occur with the benefit of these documents. A brief extension will also accommodate the parties' 10 continued meet-and-confer efforts regarding their respective discovery disputes and any limited 11 remaining discovery. The parties agree that absent unforeseen and extraordinary circumstances, 12 they will not seek any further extensions of the class certification case management deadlines. 13

14

1

II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

This consolidated action is a nationwide putative class action under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiffs assert claims for alleged violation of California Business and Professions Code sections 17200 and 17500 relating to Google's AdWords program for advertisers. Plaintiffs allege that Google has harmed plaintiffs and the putative class by charging them for clicks on advertisements that Google placed on parked domains and error webpages.

20

A. Consolidation and Initial Discovery.

By orders dated February 25, 2009, the Court consolidated four related class actions under the above caption, appointed interim lead class counsel, and bifurcated class and merits discovery. On April 24, 2009, plaintiffs filed their consolidated complaint. On May 18, 2009, Google filed its answer to the consolidated complaint.

The parties then promptly commenced discovery. The parties exchanged initial disclosures on June 11, 2009. Plaintiffs served document requests on Google on May 27, 2009, to which Google responded on July 13, 2009. Google also served document requests and interrogatories on plaintiffs on July 13, 2009. Plaintiffs served responses and objections to

1.

1 Google's document requests and interrogatories on September 18, 2009.

During this time, the parties negotiated (1) a document production protocol governing the format of the parties' document production; (2) a Stipulated Protective Order, entered by the Court on August 31, 2009, and (3) a Stipulated Expert Witness Discovery Order, filed with the Court on August 31, 2009, but not yet entered by the Court.

In response to plaintiffs' document requests, Google commenced a rolling production of
documents in November 2009, with additional productions occurring in December 2009, January
2010, March 2010, and April 2010, amounting to more than 775,000 images as of April 2, 2010.
Plaintiffs made a document production of their own in December 2010.

10

B. Adding and Dropping of New Named Plaintiffs and Related Discovery.

Plaintiff Bolaji Olabode was added as a named plaintiff to the consolidated action by stipulation and order dated October 2, 2009. Plaintiff Olabode was later dropped as a party after he died, and plaintiffs West Coast Cameras, Inc. and Richard Oesterling were added in his place by order dated February 17, 2010. Pursuant to that order, plaintiffs filed an amended complaint on February 22, 2010, and Google filed an amended answer on March 4, 2010. Also on March 4, 2010, plaintiffs supplemented their initial disclosures and plaintiffs West Coast Cameras, Inc. and Richard Oesterling responded to Google's written discovery.

- 18
- 19

C. Informal Resolution of Discovery Disputes, Supplementation, Additional Discovery, and Depositions.

In March 2010, Google raised various issues with plaintiffs' responses to Google's first
set of interrogatories. After meeting and conferring, plaintiffs agreed to supplement their
responses, which they did in April 2010. Certain of the plaintiffs also voluntarily supplemented
their responses to Google's requests for production. Plaintiffs also voluntarily supplemented their
document production in May 2010.

On May 7 and 12, 2010, plaintiffs raised certain issues with Google's document production. The parties met and conferred over the next several weeks in an effort to resolve certain of those issues without Court intervention. Google agreed to voluntarily supplement its production as to certain requests, and accordingly made a supplemental production on May 24, 2010, bringing the total images Google has produced to date to more than 780,000.

From February 2010 to May 2010, plaintiffs propounded five sets of interrogatories totaling 51 interrogatories and a second set of document requests comprised of one additional document request. As of June 18, 2010, Google has served responses to each of plaintiffs' five sets of interrogatories and second set of document requests. In April 2010 and continuing through the present, plaintiffs have raised issues with certain of Google's responses. After meeting and conferring, Google agreed to supplement certain interrogatories. Google last served supplemental responses on June 17, 2010.

9 The parties have noticed the depositions of eight fact witnesses—each of the six named 10 plaintiffs and two Google witnesses (Google 30(b)(6) deposition and deposition of Google 11 employee Jonathan Alferness). Absent modification of the current case management schedule, 12 the depositions are presently set to begin on June 30, 2010 and continue through July 16, 2010. 13 Without a brief extension, depositions of these fact witnesses would likely occur without the 14 benefit of the certain historical webpages and certain data regarding plaintiffs' advertisements 15 placed on parked domains and error webpages that Google will produce in the weeks ahead.

16

17

1

D. Prior and Current Case Management Schedules.

On September 17, 2009, the Court ordered the following case management schedule:

18 19	May 24, 2010	Deadline to complete class certification discovery, including expert discovery
20	July 9, 2010	Deadline for filing the motion for class certification
	August 27, 2010	Completion of all briefing on the motion for class certification
21	September 20, 2010	Hearing on the motion for class certification
22		

Given the scope of discovery and Google's rolling production of documents through March 2010, and the need to perform additional discovery by the parties, the parties agreed to modify the case management schedule. The parties moved the Court accordingly, and on March 9, 2010, the Court ordered the following modified case management schedule:

28

27

July 19, 2010

discovery

Deadline to complete class certification discovery, including expert

September 3, 2010	Deadline for filing the motion for class certification		
October 22, 2010	Completion of all briefing on the motion for class certification		
November 15, 2010	Hearing on the motion for class certification		
schedule to allow a 3	date expert discovery, the parties agreed to modify the case management 0-day expert discovery period after the close of fact discovery. The parties therwise change the schedule. On April 26, 2010, the Court ordered the		
following case manag	gement schedule:		
July 19, 2010	Deadline to complete fact class certification discovery; deadline to exchange initial expert reports		
August 19, 2010	Deadline for any rebuttal expert reports to be exchanged and to complete all expert class certification discovery		
September 3, 2010	Deadline for filing the motion for class certification		
October 22, 2010	Completion of all briefing on the motion for class certification		
November 15, 2010	Hearing on the motion for class certification		
	Management Schedule Should Be Modified to Extend Al By A Period of Approximately 90 Days		
The parties ha	ave been able to resolve their discovery disputes without burdening the Court		
with discovery motio	ons. Recently, to resolve various discovery disputes, Google has agreed t		
supplement its document production regarding certain historical webpages and certain data			
relating to the named	l plaintiffs' advertisements placed on parked domains and errors web pages		
The information was	not previously produced because it is not reasonably accessible in Google'		
databases. Google v	vill nevertheless undertake the substantial burden to obtain the informatio		

from its raw data logs. But doing so will take time, and require substantial engineering time and computer hours. Google estimates that it could take several weeks to obtain the requested information. The parties agree that the currently scheduled depositions and contemplated expert discovery should take place after the supplemental production. Also, a brief extension will allow the parties additional time to attempt to resolve any outstanding discovery disputes and complete any limited remaining discovery. Accordingly, the parties request a 90-day extension of the current case management schedule.

COOLEY LLP Attorneys At Law San Diego

1	The proposed modified dates are as follows:			
2 3 4	July 26, 2010	Deadline for Google to complete supplemental production of documental regarding certain historical webpages and certain data relating to the named plaintiffs' advertisements placed on parked domains and errors web pages		ges and certain data relating to the
5	August 9, 2010 – September 17, 2010	Period during which parties will conduct fact depositions		
6 7	October 4, 2010	Deadline to complete fact class certification discovery; deadline to exchange initial expert reports		
8	November 19, 2010	Deadline for any rebuttal expert reports to be exchanged and to complete all expert class certification discovery		
9	December 17, 2010	Deadline for filing the motion for class certification		
10	January 28, 2011	Completion of all briefing on the motion for class certification		
11	February 28, 2011	Hearing on the motion for class certification		
12	The parties have met and conferred regarding this motion, and plaintiffs do not oppose it.			
13	The parties respectfully request that the Court enter the proposed order submitted concurrently			
14	herewith. The parties agree that absent unforeseen and extraordinary circumstances, they will not			
15	seek any further extensions of the class certification case management deadlines.			
16	IV. CONCLUSION			
17	For each of the reasons stated above, Google respectfully requests that the Court grant its			
18	unopposed motion for administrative relief.			
19	Dated: June 23, 2010		COOLEY L	
20			PETER J. W	G. RHODES (116127) /ILLSEY (admitted pro hac vice)
21			LEO P. NOI	RTON (216282)
22			/s/ Leo P. Norto	
23			Attorneys fo GOOGLE IN	
24			Email: Inorto	on@cooley.com
25	677175 /SD			
26				
27				
28				
Cooley LLP Attorneys At Law San Diego			5.	UNOPPOSED MOTION TO MODIFY CASE MANAGEMENT SCHEDULE CASE NO. 08-CV-03369 JW HRL

1 2 3 4 5 6	COOLEY LLP MICHAEL G. RHODES (116127) (rhodesmg@ LEO P. NORTON (216282) (lnorton@cooley.co 4401 Eastgate Mall San Diego, CA 92121-1909 Telephone: (858) 550-6000 Facsimile: (858) 550-6420 COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP PETER J. WILLSEY (admitted pro hac vice) (pwillsey@cooley.com) 777 6th Street, N.W.	cooley.com) om)	
7 8	Washington, D.C. 20001 Telephone: (202) 842-7800 Facsimile: (202) 842-7899		
9 10	Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
13	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
14			
15	In re Google AdWords Litigation	Case No. 08-cv-03369 JW HRL	
16			
17		CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP Attorneys At Law San Diego		CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE Case No. 08-cv-03369 JW HRL	

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
2	I hereby certify that on June 23, 2010, I filed the foregoing UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF TO MODIFY CASE MANAGEMENT SCHEDULE with the		
3	Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, will following attorneys of record at the following list	nich will send notification of such filing to the ted email addresses.	
4			
5	 Willem F. Jonckheer wjonckheer@schubert-reed.com 		
6	Kimberly Ann Kralowec		
7	kkralowec@schubertlawfirm.comLeo Patrick Norton		
-	lnorton@cooley.com,kjones@cooley.com	n	
8	Michael Graham Rhodes		
9	rhodesmg@cooley.comGuido Saveri		
10	guido@saveri.com,william@saveri.com	cadio@saveri.com	
	• Dustin Lamm Schubert		
11	 <u>dschubert@schubertlawfirm.com</u> Reginald Von Terrell 		
12	Reggiet2@aol.com		
13	Robert C. Schubert		
15	rschubert@schubertlawfirm.com		
14	 Claudia Edith Canales cc@kbklawyers.com 		
15			
16	I also hereby certify that I am personally and rea	dily familiar with the business practice of Cooley	
17	Godward Kronish LLP for collection and proces United States Postal Service, and I caused such be placed in the United States Postal Service at	envelope(s) with postage thereon fully prepaid to	
18		KATHLEEN C. CHAVEZ	
19	ROBERT FOOTE MATTHEW J. HERMAN	CHAVEZ LAW FIRM P.C.	
	CRAIG MIELKE	28 North First St.	
-20	FOOTE, MEYERS, MIELKE & FLOWERS,	Suite 2	
· 21	LLC 28 North First St., Suite 2	Geneva, IL 60134	
22	Geneva, IL 60134		
23	PETER L. CURRIE	BRIAN S. KABATECK	
24	THE LAW FIRM OF PETER L. CURRIE,	KABATECK BROWN KELLNER LLP 644 South Figueroa Street	
25	P.C. 536 Wing Lane	Los Angeles, CA 90017	
26	St. Charles, IL 60174		
27			
28			
Cooley Godward Kronish LLP		CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE CASE NO. 08-CV-03369 JW HRL	
Attorneys At Law San Diego			

.

1	PETER A. LAGORIO		TERRY GRC
2	LAW OFFICE OF PETER A. LAGORIO 63 Atlantic Avenue		ADAM C. BI MONIQUE A
3	Boston, MA 02110		GROSS BEL 180 Montgon
5			Suite 2200 San Francisco
6		1.5	
7			M
8		and the second second	1/1/10
9		· · · ·	Marcie Araujo COOLEY GO
10			4401 Eastgate San Diego, Ca
11			Telephone: (8 FAX: (858) 5:
12			Email: marau
13			
14	605531 v3/SD		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP Attorneys At Law San Diego		2	2.

TERRY GROSS ADAM C. BELSKY MONIQUE ALONSO GROSS BELSKY ALONSO LLP 180 Montgomery Street Suite 2200 San Francisco, CA 94104

hei a

Mărcie Araujo COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP 4401 Eastgate Mall San Diego, CA 92121-1909 Telephone: (858) 550-6000 FAX: (858) 550-6420 Email: maraujo@cooley.com