

# EXHIBIT 9

4145,2  
DUNN

1 Stewart H. Foreman (CSB #61149)  
Daniel T. Bernhard (CSB #104229)  
2 FREELAND COOPER & FOREMAN LLP  
150 Spear Street, Suite 1800  
3 San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: (415) 541-0200  
4 Facsimile: (415) 495-4332  
Email: foreman@freelandlaw.com  
5 bernhard@freelandlaw.com

6 Attorneys for Defendants Todd Dunning  
and Dunning Enterprise, Inc.

7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10 SAN JOSE DIVISION

11  
12 EBAY, INC.,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 DIGITAL POINT SOLUTIONS, INC., SHAWN  
16 HOGAN, KESSLER'S FLYING CIRCUS,  
THUNDERWOOD HOLDINGS, INC., TODD  
17 DUNNING, DUNNING ENTERPRISE, INC.,  
BRIAN DUNNING, BRIANDUNNING.COM,  
18 AND DOES 1-20,

19 Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV-08-4052 JF

**DEFENDANT TODD DUNNING'S  
RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST  
SET OF REQUESTS FOR  
PRODUCTION**

20 PROPOUNDING PARTY:

PLAINTIFF EBAY INC.

21 RESPONDING PARTY:

DEFENDANT TODD DUNNING

22 SET NUMBER:

ONE

1 Defendant Todd Dunning ("Defendant") hereby submits the following objections  
2 and responses to the Request for Production of Documents Set One propounded by Plaintiff Ebay, Inc.  
3 ("Plaintiff").

4 GENERAL STATEMENT

5 Defendant has invoked his privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth  
6 Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of  
7 Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code  
8 section 940. Should Defendant determine that there is no longer the threat of potential criminal  
9 prosecution and elect to withdraw his privilege against self-incrimination in the future, Defendant  
10 expressly reserves the right to supplement his responses.

11 Furthermore, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has seized all documents and computers,  
12 disk drives, hard drives, cell phones and servers containing information potentially related to this  
13 matter. Assistant United States Attorney Kyle F. Waldinger in charge of this investigation has refused  
14 all requests to provide defendants with a copy of the material seized by the FBI. Those items and  
15 records may contain information responsive to the requests below, but those items and records are not  
16 in the possession, custody or control of defendants.

17 At the time of making Defendant's initial disclosures, Defendant produced all documents  
18 relevant to this case that are in his possession, custody and control. Commission Junction, Inc. has  
19 also produced documents in the related state action *Commission Junction, Inc. v. Thunderwood*  
20 *Holdings, Inc., et al.*, Superior Court, Orange County, Case No. 30-2008 00101025 that may include  
21 documents responsive to this request, but such documents are subject to a Confidentiality Order.

22 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

23 All documents relating to eBay, including all agreements, terms of service and terms and  
24 conditions.

25 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

26 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
27 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
28 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California

1 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
2 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
3 further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of  
4 this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant  
5 further objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents the  
6 disclosure of which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine.  
7 Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it seeks production of trade secrets or  
8 other confidential information.

9 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:

10 All documents relating to, or Communications with, eBay or any current or former employee  
11 of eBay.

12 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:

13 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
14 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
15 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
16 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
17 this request is duplicative, vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive.  
18 Defendant further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject  
19 matter of this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.  
20 Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents  
21 the disclosure of which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine.  
22 Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it seeks production of trade secrets or  
23 other confidential information.

24 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:

25 All documents relating to payment of commissions or other revenue obtained by Todd  
26 Dunning through participation in, interaction with or manipulation of eBay's Affiliate Marketing  
27 Program.

28 ///

1     RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:

2             Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
 3 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
 4 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
 5 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
 6 the this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
 7 further objects on the grounds that that the term "manipulation" is vague, argumentative and  
 8 conclusory. Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request  
 9 seeks documents the disclosure of which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work  
 10 product doctrine. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's  
 11 right to privacy, and seeks production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

12     REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:

13             All documents relating to eBay's Affiliate Marketing Program, including, but no limited to, all  
 14 methods and technologies used by Todd Dunning to obtain revenue from, manipulate or otherwise  
 15 interact with, eBay's Affiliate Marketing Program, including, but not limited to, all software, source  
 16 code, Javascript, and HTML code.

17     RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:

18             Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
 19 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
 20 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
 21 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
 22 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
 23 further objects on the grounds that that the term "manipulate" is vague, argumentative and conclusory.  
 24 Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents  
 25 the disclosure of which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine.  
 26 Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy,  
 27 and seeks production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

28     ///

1 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:

2 All documents relating to advertisements for eBay used, or purported to be used, on any  
3 website or ad network that directed or referred Users to eBay as part of eBay's Affiliate Marketing  
4 Program.

5 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:

6 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
7 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
8 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
9 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
10 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
11 further objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents the  
12 disclosure of which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine.  
13 Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it seeks production of trade secrets or  
14 other confidential information.

15 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:

16 All documents reflecting the number of Users who allegedly clicked on an advertisement for  
17 eBay used, or purported to be used, by Todd Dunning to direct or refer Users to eBay as part of eBay's  
18 Affiliate Marketing Program.

19 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:

20 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
21 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
22 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
23 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
24 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
25 further objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents the  
26 disclosure of which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine.  
27 Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it seeks production of trade secrets or  
28 other confidential information.

1 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:

2 All documents relating to methods or techniques intended to, or causing, a User's browser to  
 3 load any eBay webpage, webpage content or data therefrom.

4 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:

5 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
 6 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
 7 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
 8 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
 9 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
 10 further objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents the  
 11 disclosure of which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine.  
 12 Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy,  
 13 and seeks production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

14 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:

15 All documents sufficient to identify all advertising networks, advertising syndication services  
 16 or websites used or purportedly used by Todd Dunning to advertise or promote eBay or to interact in  
 17 any way with eBay or eBay's Affiliate Marketing Programs.

18 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:

19 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
 20 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
 21 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
 22 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
 23 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
 24 further objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents the  
 25 disclosure of which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine.  
 26 Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy,  
 27 and seeks production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

28 ///

1 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:

2 All documents sufficient to identify all Affiliate Marketing Programs, not including eBay's  
3 Affiliate Marketing Program, with whom Todd Dunning obtained revenue or otherwise interacted.

4 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:

5 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
6 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
7 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
8 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
9 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
10 further objects that to the extent this request seeks documents related to programs other than eBay's  
11 Affiliate Marketing Program, the request is neither relevant to the subject matter of this action, nor  
12 reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further objects to  
13 this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents the disclosure of which  
14 might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine. Defendant further objects  
15 to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy, and seeks production of trade  
16 secrets or other confidential information.

17 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:

18 All documents relating to and/or describing methods and techniques used by any other  
19 Affiliate Marketing Program that Todd Dunning interacted with, participated in or manipulated.

20 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:

21 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
22 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
23 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
24 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
25 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
26 further objects on the grounds that that the term "manipulated" is vague, argumentative and  
27 conclusory. Defendant further objects that to the extent this request seeks documents related to  
28 programs other than eBay's Affiliate Marketing Program, the request is neither relevant to the subject



1 matter of this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.  
2 Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents  
3 the disclosure of which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine.  
4 Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy,  
5 and seeks production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

6 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:

7 All documents sufficient to identify the source of any technology, technique or methods used  
8 by Todd Dunning to participate in, manipulate or interact with the eBay Affiliate Marketing Program,  
9 or any other Affiliate Marketing Program.

10 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:

11 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
12 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
13 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
14 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
15 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
16 further objects on the grounds that that the term "manipulate" is vague, argumentative and conclusory.  
17 Defendant further objects that to the extent this request seeks documents related to programs other  
18 than eBay's Affiliate Marketing Program, the request is neither relevant to the subject matter of this  
19 action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further  
20 objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents the disclosure of  
21 which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine. Defendant further  
22 objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy, and seeks production  
23 of trade secrets or other confidential information.

24 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:

25 All documents sufficient to identify any individuals, groups, books, manuals or other materials  
26 consulted by Todd Dunning while developing any technology, technique or method used by Todd  
27 Dunning to participate in, manipulate or interact with the eBay Affiliate Marketing Program, or any  
28 other Affiliate Marketing Program.

1 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:

2 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
 3 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
 4 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
 5 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
 6 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
 7 further objects on the grounds that that the term "manipulate" is vague, argumentative and conclusory.  
 8 Defendant further objects that to the extent this request seeks documents related to programs other  
 9 than eBay's Affiliate Marketing Program, the request is neither relevant to the subject matter of this  
 10 action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further  
 11 objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents the disclosure of  
 12 which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine. Defendant further  
 13 objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy, seeks production of  
 14 trade secrets or other confidential information.

15 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:

16 All documents relating to Commission Junction, including all agreements, terms of service and  
 17 terms and conditions.

18 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:

19 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
 20 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
 21 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
 22 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
 23 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
 24 further objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents the  
 25 disclosure of which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine.  
 26 Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it seeks production of trade secrets or  
 27 other confidential information.

28 ///

1 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:

2 All documents relating to, or Communications with, Commission Junction or any current or  
3 former employee of Commission Junction.

4 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:

5 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
6 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
7 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
8 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
9 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
10 further objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents the  
11 disclosure of which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine.  
12 Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it seeks production of trade secrets or  
13 other confidential information.

14 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:

15 All documents relating to, or Communications with, Digital Point Solutions, Inc., Kessler's  
16 Flying Circus, Thunderwood Holdings, Inc., Dunning Enterprise, Inc., or briandunning.com.

17 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:

18 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
19 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
20 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
21 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
22 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
23 further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of  
24 this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant  
25 further objects to this request on the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents the  
26 disclosure of which might violate the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine.  
27 Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy,  
28 seeks production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

1 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:

2 All Communications with Brian Dunning or Shawn Hogan.

3 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:

4 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
 5 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
 6 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
 7 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
 8 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
 9 further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of  
 10 this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant  
 11 further objects to this request on the ground that it violates privacy rights of Defendant and third  
 12 parties, and seeks production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

13 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:

14 All documents relating to, or Communications with, Rachael Hughes, or any companies or  
 15 entities owned, controlled, affiliated with or used by Rachael Hughes, relating to eBay's Affiliate  
 16 Marketing Program including, but not limited to, any agreements with Rachael Hughes and company  
 17 and any technology transferred to or from Rachael Hughes and company.

18 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:

19 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
 20 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
 21 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
 22 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
 23 this request is vague and ambiguous, and Plaintiff has failed to identify the person or entity Rachel  
 24 Hughes. Defendant further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the  
 25 subject matter of this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:

2 All documents sufficient to describe all phone numbers, email addresses, web pages, instant  
3 messenger or mail accounts and social network accounts maintained, formerly maintained or  
4 registered to Todd Dunning.

5 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:

6 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
7 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
8 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
9 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
10 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
11 further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of  
12 this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant  
13 further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy, and seeks  
14 production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

15 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:

16 Documents sufficient to identify any Aliases used by Todd Dunning in any Internet Forum at  
17 or within which Todd Dunning discussed any aspect of their participation in, manipulation of or  
18 interaction with eBay's Affiliate Marketing Program, or any other Affiliate Marketing Programs,  
19 including, but not limited to, forums such as blogs, listservs, Usenet newsgroups or chat rooms.

20 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:

21 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
22 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
23 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
24 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
25 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
26 further objects that to the extent this request seeks documents related to programs other than eBay's  
27 Affiliate Marketing Program, the request is neither relevant to the subject matter of this action, nor  
28 reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further objects on

1 the grounds that that the term "manipulation" is vague, argumentative and conclusory. Defendant  
 2 further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy, and seeks  
 3 production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

4 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:

5 Documents sufficient to identify any Internet Forum at or within which Todd Dunning  
 6 discussed any aspect of his participation in, manipulation of or interaction with eBay's Affiliate  
 7 Marketing Programs, or any other Affiliate Marketing Programs, including, but not limited to, forums  
 8 such as blogs, listservs, Usenet newsgroups or chat rooms.

9 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:

10 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
 11 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
 12 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
 13 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
 14 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
 15 further objects on the grounds that that the term "manipulation" is vague, argumentative and  
 16 conclusory. Defendant further objects that to the extent this request seeks documents related to  
 17 programs other than eBay's Affiliate Marketing Program, the request is neither relevant to the subject  
 18 matter of this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.  
 19 Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy,  
 20 seeks production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

21 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:

22 Documents sufficient to identify all internet service providers (ISPs) and IP addresses used by  
 23 Todd Dunning.

24 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:

25 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
 26 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
 27 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
 28 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that

1 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
2 further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of  
3 this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant  
4 further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy, seeks  
5 production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

6 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:

7 Documents sufficient to identify all computers, servers, electronic data storage and hosting  
8 companies, entities, or facilities used by Todd Dunning.

9 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:

10 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
11 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
12 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
13 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
14 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
15 further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of  
16 this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant  
17 further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy, seeks  
18 production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

19 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:

20 Documents sufficient to identify any entity used or hired to maintain or restore electronic data  
21 or systems relating to Todd Dunning's participation in, manipulation of or interaction with eBay's  
22 Affiliate Marketing Program.

23 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:

24 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
25 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
26 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
27 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
28 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant

1 further objects on the grounds that that the term "manipulation" is vague, argumentative and  
2 conclusory. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to  
3 privacy, seeks production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

4 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:

5 Documents sufficient to identify software used to clean, reformat or erase hard-drives used by  
6 Todd Dunning, or any equipment owned, used or maintained by Todd Dunning.

7 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:

8 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
9 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
10 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
11 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
12 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
13 further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of  
14 this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant  
15 further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy, seeks  
16 production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

17 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:

18 All documents sufficient to identify all business entities or fictitious business names currently  
19 or formerly maintained by Todd Dunning.

20 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:

21 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
22 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
23 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
24 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
25 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
26 further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of  
27 this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

28 ///



1 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26:

2 All documents filed by Todd Dunning with any Secretary of State.

3 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26:

4 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
5 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
6 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
7 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
8 this request is overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant further objects that this  
9 request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of this action, nor reasonably  
10 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

11 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 27:

12 Documents sufficient to show the structure and organization of all companies or other entities  
13 owned or controlled by Todd Dunning that were involved in or interacted with any Affiliate  
14 Marketing Program.

15 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 27:

16 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
17 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
18 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
19 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
20 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
21 further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of  
22 this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

23 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 28:

24 Documents sufficient to identify all employees, contractors or temporary employees of Todd  
25 Dunning, their dates of employment, duties, salary and any other compensation.

26 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 28:

27 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
28 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414

1 U.S. 70, 77 (1973); Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
 2 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
 3 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
 4 further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of  
 5 this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant  
 6 further objects to this request on the ground that it violates privacy rights of third parties, seeks  
 7 production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

8 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29:

9 All documents sufficient to identify all assets and financial accounts (including those outside  
 10 of the United States) maintained or formerly maintained by Todd Dunning.

11 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29:

12 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
 13 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
 14 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
 15 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that  
 16 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
 17 further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of  
 18 this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant  
 19 further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy and seeks  
 20 confidential financial information.

21 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 30:

22 Documents constituting Todd Dunning's individual tax returns for the years 2003 to the  
 23 present.

24 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 30:

25 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
 26 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
 27 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
 28 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that

1 this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
2 further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of  
3 this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant  
4 further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy, and seeks  
5 privileged financial information, *see e.g.*, California Revenue and Taxation Code section 19542.

6 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31:

7 All documents relating to the transfer or assumption of any liability by Todd Dunning.

8 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31:

9 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
10 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
11 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
12 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects to this request on  
13 the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents the disclosure of which might violate the  
14 attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine. Defendant further objects on the ground  
15 that this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant  
16 further objects that this request seeks documents which are neither relevant to the subject matter of  
17 this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant  
18 further objects to this request on the ground that it violates Defendant's right to privacy, and seeks  
19 production of trade secrets or other confidential information.

20 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 32:

21 All documents relating to any insurance policies relevant to this action.

22 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 32:

23 Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Defendant's privilege against  
24 self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414  
25 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California  
26 Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects to this request on  
27 the grounds that, as phrased, the request seeks documents the disclosure of which might violate the

28 ///

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

Dated: February 26, 2009

FREELAND COOPER & FOREMAN LLP

By: Stewart H. Foreman  
Stewart H. Foreman  
Attorneys for Defendants Todd Dunning and  
Dunning Enterprises, Inc.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within action; my business address is 150 Spear Street, Suite 1800, San Francisco, California 94105.

On February 26, 2009, I served the foregoing document described as follows:

**Defendant Todd Dunning's Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production**

by placing a true and correct copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed to the party(ies) of record whose name(s) and address(es) appear below:

**SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST**

X [BY MAIL - CCP § 1013a] I caused such sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid to be placed in the United States mail at San Francisco, California, for collection and mailing to the office of addressee(s) on the date shown herein following ordinary business practice.

— [HAND-DELIVERY/Personal/Messenger - CCP § 1011] I caused such envelope to be hand-delivered by a courier, who personally delivered such envelope to the office of the addressee(s) on the date herein.

— [BY FACSIMILE - CCP § 1013(e)] - I caused such document(s) to be transmitted via facsimile electronic equipment transmission on the party(ies), whose name(s), address(es) and fax number(s) are listed above, on the date stated herein and at the time set forth on the attached transmission reported indicating that the facsimile transmission was complete and without error.


— [BY FEDEX (Overnight Delivery) - CCP § 1013(c)] I caused such envelope to be delivered to the Federal Express Office in San Francisco, California, with whom we have a direct billing account, to be delivered on the next business day.

— [BY E-MAIL or ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION] . Based on a court order or agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the email addresses listed above. I did not receive within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

— [STATE] I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

X [FEDERAL] Service was made under the direction of a member of the bar of this Court who is admitted to practice and is not a party to this cause.

Executed on February 26, 2009, at San Francisco, California.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joyce E. Johnson

FREELAND COUFER & FOREMAN LLP  
150 Spear Street, Suite 1800  
San Francisco, California 94105

ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

Leo Presiado  
RUS, MILIBAND & SMITH  
Von Karman Towers  
2211 Michelson Drive, 7th Floor  
Irvine, CA 92612  
Telephone: (949) 752-7100  
Facsimile: (949) 252-1514  
Attorneys for **Defendants Brian Dunning  
and Thunderwood Holdings, Inc.**

Seyamack Kouretchian  
COAST LAW GROUP  
169 Saxony Road, Suite 204  
Encinitas, CA 92024  
Attorneys for Defendants Shawn Hogan and  
Digital Point Solutions, Inc.

David Eberhart  
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
Embarcadero Center West  
2 Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Attorneys for Plaintiff eBay, Inc.  
Telephone: 415-984-8700  
Facsimile: 415-984-8701

Patrick K. McClellan  
Von Karman Towers  
2211 Michelson Drive, 7th Floor  
Irvine, CA 92612  
Attorney for Kessler's Flying Circus