EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

	NORTHERN	DISTRICT OF _	CALI	FORNIA
FACEB	OOK, INC., a Delaware corporation, Plaintiff, v.	[NOTE:	f action	C-09-05842-JF is pending in district other than ce, state district under case
and JOH LLC; H	I FISHER; PHILIP POREMBSKI; RYAN SHIN IN DOES 1-25, individuals; and CHOKO SYST ARM, INC.; PP WEB SERVICES LLC; iMEDI E SERVICES LLC; and JOHN DOES 26-50, ions,	TEMS		•
	Defendants.			
	SUBPOENA TO PRODUC OR TO PERMIT INSP			
то:	Sheriff John McGinness Sacramento County Sheriff Departme 711 G Street, Sacramento, CA 95814	nt		
electror	duction: YOU ARE COMMANDED to produ nically stored information, or objects, and pe A attached hereto. Also see Exhibit B, I	ermit their inspection,	copying t	testing, or sampling of the material: See
PLACE			-	DATE AND TIME
	Sacramento Sheriff's Department			July 9, 2010
posses	nection of Premises: YOU ARE COMMAND sed or controlled by you at the time, date, a re, survey, photograph, test, or sample the p	and location set forth b	elow, so	that the requesting party may inspect,
PLACE				DATE AND TIME
				<u> </u>
The pro	ovisions of Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c), relating to to your duty to respond to this subpoena a	your protection as a p	erson sul	bject to a subpoena, and Rule 45(d) and (e), of not doing so, are attached.
DATE:				
	CLERK OF COURT	OR) Colle
	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk		/	Attorney's signature Joseph P. Cutler

AO 88 (Rev. 12/07) Subpoena in a Civil Case The name, address, e-mail, and telephone number of the attorney representing (name of party)			
Plaintiff Facebook, Inc.	, who issues or requests this		
subpoena, are:			
Joseph P. Cutler, Perkins Coie LLP, 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800, Seattle, WA 9 (206) 359-6104; email: jcutler@perkinscoie.com	8101		

EXHIBIT A

- 1. Access to the computer described in Sacramento Sherriff Report Number 2010-93641, which was previously owned by Philip Porembski and PP Web Services. ("Subject Computer"). The Subject Computer will be returned to the Sacramento Sheriff's department upon completion of imaging of the hard drive pursuant to the "Order Granting Plaintiff Facebook's Administrative Request For Leave to Conduct Discovery Prior to Rule 26 Conference", which is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
- 2. A copy of Sacramento Sheriff Report Number 2010-93641 and all other information or documents related to the Report or recovery of the Subject Computer.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45 (c), (d), and (e) (Effective 12/1/07)

- (c) Protecting a Person Subject to a Subpoena.
- (1) Avoiding Undue Burden or Expense; Sanctions. A party or attorney responsible for issuing and serving a subpoena must take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden or expense on a person subject to the subpoena. The issuing court must enforce this duty and impose an appropriate sanction which may include lost earnings and reasonable attorney's fees on a party or attorney who fails to comply.
 - (2) Command to Produce Materials or Permit Inspection.
- (A) Appearance Not Required. A person commanded to produce documents, electronically stored information, or tangible things, or to permit the inspection of premises, need not appear in person at the place of production or inspection unless also commanded to appear for a deposition, hearing, or trial.
- (B) Objections. A person commanded to produce documents or tangible things or to permit inspection may serve on the party or attorney designated in the subpouna a written objection to inspecting, copying, testing or sampling any or all of the materials or to inspecting the premises or to producing electronically stored information in the form or forms requested. The objection must be served before the earlier of the time specified for compliance or 14 days after the subpoena is served. If an objection is made, the following rules apply:
- (i) At any time, on notice to the commanded person, the serving party may move the issuing court for an order compelling production or inspection.
- (ii) These acts may be required only as directed in the order, and the order must protect a person who is neither a party nor a party's officer from significant expense resulting from compliance.
- (3) Quashing or Medifying a Subpoena.
- (A) When Required. On timely motion, the issuing court must quash or modify a subpoena that:
 - (i) falls to allow a reasonable time to comply;
- (ii) requires a person who is neither a party nor a party's officer to travel more than 100 miles from where that person resides, is employed, or regularly transacts business in person—except that, subject to Rule 45(c)(3)(B)(iii), the person may be commanded to attend a trial by traveling from any such place within the state where the trial is held;
- (III) requires disclosure of privileged or other protected matter, if no exception or waiver applies; or
 - (ly) subjects a person to undue burden.
- (B) When Permitted. To protect a person subject to or affected by a subpoena, the Issuing court may, on motion, quash or modify the subpoena if it requires:
- (1) disclosing a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information:
- (II) disclosing an unretained expert's opinion or information that does not describe specific occurrences in dispute and results from the expert's study that was not requested by a party; or
- (III) a person who is neither a party nor a party's officer to incur substantial expense to travel more than 100 miles to attend trial.
- (C) Specifying Conditions as an Alternative. In the circumstances described in Rule 45(c)(3)(B), the court may, instead of quashing or modifying a subpoena, order appearance or production under specified conditions if the serving party:
- (i) shows a substantial need for the testimony or material that cannot be otherwise met without undue hardship; and
- (ii) ensures that the subpoenaed person will be reasonably compensated.

- (d) Dutles in Responding to a Subpoena.
- (1) Producing Documents or Electronically Stored Information.

 These procedures apply to producing documents or electronically stored information:
- (A) Documents. A person responding to a subpoena to produce documents must produce them as they are kept in the ordinary course of business or must organize and label them to correspond to the categories in the demand.
- (B) Form for Producing Electronically Stored Information Not Specified. If a subpoena does not specify a form for producing electronically stored information, the person responding must produce it in a form or forms in which it is ordinarily maintained or in a reasonably usable form or forms.
- (C) Electronically Stored Information Produced in Only One Form. The person responding need not produce the same electronically stored information in more than one form.
- (D) Inaccessible Electronically Stared Information. The person responding need not provide discovery of electronically stored information from sources that the person identifies as not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost. On motion to compel discovery or for a protective order, the person responding must show that the information is not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost. If that showing is made, the court may nonetheless order discovery from such sources if the requesting party shows good cause, considering the limitations of Rule 26(b)(2)(C). The court may specify conditions for the discovery.
 - (2) Claiming Privilege or Protection.
- (A) Information Withheld. A person withholding subpoensed information under a claim that it is privileged or subject to protection as trial-preparation material must:
 - (i) expressly make the claim; and
- (ii) describe the nature of the withheld documents, communications, or tangible things in a manner that, without revealing information itself privileged or protected, will enable the parties to assess the claim.
- (B) Information Produced. If information produced in response to a subpoena is subject to a claim of privilege or of protection as trial-preparation material, the person making the claim may notify any party that received the information of the claim and the basis for it. After being notified, a party must promptly return, sequester, or destroy the specified information and any copies it has; must not use or disclose the information until the claim is resolved; must take reasonable steps to retrieve the information if the party disclosed it before being notified; and may promptly present the information to the court under seal for a determination of the claim. The person who produced the information must preserve the information until the claim is resolved.
- (e) Contempt. The issuing court may hold in contempt a person who, having been served, fails without adequate excuse to obey the subpoena. A nonparty's failure to obey must be excused if the subpoena purports to require the nonparty to attend or produce at a place outside the limits of Rule 45(e)(3)(A)(ii).

EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

FACEBOOK, INC.,) Case No.: C 09-05842 JF (PVT)
Plaintiff, v.	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF FACEBOOK'S ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO CONDUCT DISCOVERY PRIOR TO RULE 26
JEREMI FISHER, ET AL.,) CONFERENCE
Defendants.) [Docket No. 53]

Pursuant to Local Rule 7-11, plaintiff Facebook, Inc. moves for leave to conduct discovery prior to the Rule 26 conference. ("plaintiff" or "Facebook"). Specifically, plaintiff Facebook moves to authorize issuance of a subpoena to take possession of an abandoned computer laptop previously owned by defendants Porembski and PP Web Services as well as police reports and witness statements related to the recovery of the computer laptop.

Defendants had previously stipulated to injunctive relief. See, e.g., Stipulated Order and Preliminary Injunction entered on January 6, 2010 (by plaintiff and defendants Jeremi Fisher and Choko Systems LLC) (Docket No. 29); Stipulated Order and Preliminary Injunction entered on January 6, 2010 (by plaintiff and defendants Ryan Shimeall and iMedia Online Services LLC) (Docket No. 30); and Stipulated Order and Preliminary Injunction entered on January 8, 2010 (by plaintiff and defendants Philip Porembski and PP Web Services LLC) (Docket No. 33). However, defendants failed to answer, or otherwise respond to, the operative complaint and plaintiff Facebook

Case5:09-cv-05842-JF Document56 Filed06/14/10 Page2 of 3

later obtained default against the defendants. Clerk's Notice of Entry of Default dated April 26, 2010 (as to all defendants) (Docket No. 51). In addition, defendants have not opposed, or otherwise responded to, this motion.

Having reviewed the papers and considered the arguments of counsel,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff Facebook's motion for leave to conduct discovery prior to the Rule 26 conference is granted.

Here, plaintiff Facebook has shown good cause to conduct discovery prior to the Rule 26 conference. The need for the expedited discovery outweighs any prejudice to defendants. As an initial matter, the clerk entered default against all the defendants in the above-captioned action after they failed to answer, or otherwise respond to, the operative complaint. And the laptop computer was allegedly abandoned by defendants Porembski and PP Web Services LLC. Finally, plaintiff Facebook served this motion on all defendants and no response has been filed whatsoever.

Pursuant to Rules 34 and 45, plaintiff Facebook may engage an independent third party to make a mirror image of the hard drive of the laptop computer (either on-site at the Sacramento Sheriff's Department or at the offices the independent third party) and promptly return the original laptop computer to the custody of the Sacramento Sheriff's Department. Fed. R. Civ. P. 34 (request to inspect or copy electronically stored information). The independent third party may then provide the mirror image of the hard drive of the laptop computer to plaintiff Facebook.

Plaintiff Facebook may also conduct other third-party discovery, including issuing a subpoena for police reports and witness statements related to the recovery of the aforementioned laptop computer and conducting a deposition of the witness who located the abandoned laptop computer.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 14, 2010

PATRICIA V. TRUMBULL United States Magistrate Judge

ORDER, page 3