

# EXHIBIT MM

1 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
2 JOSHUA A. JESSEN, SBN 222831  
3 JJessen@gibsondunn.com  
4 JEANA BISNAR MAUTE, SBN 290573  
5 JBisnarMaute@gibsondunn.com  
6 ASHLEY M. ROGERS, SBN 286252  
7 ARogers@gibsondunn.com  
8 1881 Page Mill Road  
9 Palo Alto, California 94304  
10 Telephone: (650) 849-5300  
11 Facsimile: (650) 849-5333

8 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
9 GAIL E. LEES, SBN 90363  
10 GLees@gibsondunn.com  
11 CHRISTOPHER CHORBA, SBN 216692  
12 CChorba@gibsondunn.com  
13 333 South Grand Avenue  
14 Los Angeles, California 90071  
15 Telephone: (213) 229-7000  
16 Facsimile: (213) 229-7520

13 Attorneys for Defendant  
14 FACEBOOK, INC.

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
17 OAKLAND DIVISION

18 MATTHEW CAMPBELL, MICHAEL  
19 HURLEY, and DAVID SHADPOUR,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 v.

22 FACEBOOK, INC.,

23 Defendant.

Case No. C 13-05996 PJH (MEJ)

**PUTATIVE CLASS ACTION**

**DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S  
SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES  
AND OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS'  
NARROWED SECOND SET OF  
INTERROGATORIES**

24  
25 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

26 SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER  
27  
28

1 Defendant Facebook, Inc. (“Defendant” or “Facebook”), by and through its attorneys, and  
2 pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Civil Rules of the U.S.  
3 District Court for the Northern District of California, the Court orders in this action, and the parties’  
4 agreements, provides the following second supplemental responses and objections to Plaintiffs’  
5 Narrowed Second Set of Interrogatories (the “Interrogatories”).

6 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

7 1. Facebook’s responses to the Interrogatories are made to the best of Facebook’s current  
8 knowledge, information, and belief. Facebook reserves the right to supplement or amend any of its  
9 responses should future investigation indicate that such supplementation or amendment is necessary.

10 2. Facebook’s responses to the Interrogatories are made solely for the purpose of and in  
11 relation to this action. Each response is given subject to all appropriate objections (including, but not  
12 limited to, objections concerning privilege, competency, relevancy, materiality, propriety, and  
13 admissibility). All objections are reserved and may be interposed at any time.

14 3. Facebook’s responses are premised on its understanding that Plaintiffs seek only that  
15 information that is within Facebook’s possession, custody, and control.

16 4. Facebook incorporates by reference each and every general objection set forth below  
17 into each and every specific response. From time to time, a specific response may repeat a general  
18 objection for emphasis or some other reason. The failure to include any general objection in any  
19 specific response shall not be interpreted as a waiver of any general objection to that response.

20 5. Nothing contained in these Responses and Objections or provided in response to the  
21 Interrogatories consists of, or should be construed as, an admission relating to the accuracy,  
22 relevance, existence, or nonexistence of any alleged facts or information referenced in any  
23 Interrogatory.

24 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

25 1. Facebook objects to each Interrogatory, including the Definitions and Instructions, to  
26 the extent that it purports to impose obligations beyond those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil  
27 Procedure, the Federal Rules of Evidence, the Local Civil Rules of the U.S. District Court for the  
28 Northern District of California, and any agreements between the parties.

1           2.       Facebook objects to each Interrogatory to the extent that it is not limited to the  
2 relevant time period, thus making the Interrogatory overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
3 relevant to the claims or defenses in this action. Unless otherwise specified in its responses, and  
4 pursuant to the agreement of the parties, Facebook's responses will be limited to information  
5 generated between April 1, 2010 and December 30, 2013.

6           3.       Facebook objects to each Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information unrelated  
7 and irrelevant to the claims or defenses in this litigation and not reasonably calculated to lead to the  
8 discovery of admissible evidence.

9           4.       Facebook objects to each Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome,  
10 particularly in view of Facebook's disproportionate cost necessary to investigate as weighed against  
11 Plaintiffs' need for the information. The Interrogatories seek broad and vaguely defined categories of  
12 materials that are not reasonably tailored to the subject matter of this action.

13           5.       Facebook objects to each Interrogatory to the extent that it purports to request the  
14 identification and disclosure of information or documents that were prepared in anticipation of  
15 litigation, constitute attorney work product, reveal privileged attorney-client communications, or are  
16 otherwise protected from disclosure under any applicable privileges, laws, or rules. Facebook hereby  
17 asserts all such applicable privileges and protections, and excludes privileged and protected  
18 information from its responses to each Interrogatory. *See generally* Fed. R. Evid. 502; Cal. Code  
19 Evid. § 954. Inadvertent production of any information or documents that are privileged or otherwise  
20 immune from discovery shall not constitute a waiver of any privilege or of any other ground for  
21 objecting to the discovery with respect to such information or documents or the subject matter  
22 thereof, or the right of Facebook to object to the use of any such information or documents or the  
23 subject matter thereof during these or any other proceedings. In the event of inadvertent disclosure  
24 of any information or inadvertent production or identification of documents or communications that  
25 are privileged or otherwise immune from discovery, Plaintiffs will return the information and  
26 documents to Facebook and will be precluded from disclosing or relying upon such information or  
27 documents in any way.

28           6.       Facebook objects to each and every Interrogatory to the extent that the information

1 sought by the Interrogatory is more appropriately pursued through another means of discovery, such  
2 as a request for production or deposition.

3 7. Facebook objects to each and every Interrogatory, Definition, and Instruction to the  
4 extent that it seeks information outside of Facebook's possession, custody, and control.

5 8. Facebook objects to each Interrogatory to the extent that it requests information  
6 protected by the right of privacy of Facebook and/or third parties, or information that is confidential,  
7 proprietary, or competitively sensitive.

8 9. Facebook objects to each Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks documents or  
9 information already in Plaintiffs' possession or available in the public domain. Such information is  
10 equally available to Plaintiffs.

11 10. Facebook objects to each Interrogatory on the ground and to the extent that it exceeds  
12 the bounds of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1), which provides that "a party may serve on  
13 any other party no more than 25 written interrogatories, including all discrete subparts."

#### 14 **OBJECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS**

15 1. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' definition of "Association" to the extent that it is  
16 vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Facebook further objects to the definition  
17 to the extent that Plaintiffs purport to use this defined term to seek materials that are not relevant to  
18 the claims and defenses in this action.

19 2. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' definition of "Association Type" or "(atype)" to the  
20 extent that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Facebook further objects  
21 to the definition to the extent that Plaintiffs purport to use this defined term to seek materials that are  
22 not relevant to the claims and defenses in this action.

23 3. Facebook generally objects to Plaintiffs' definitions of "Communication,"  
24 "Document(s)," "Electronic Media," "ESI," "Electronically Stored Information," "Identify," and  
25 "Metadata" to the extent that Plaintiffs purport to use these defined terms to request the identification  
26 and disclosure of documents that: (a) were prepared in anticipation of litigation; (b) constitute  
27 attorney work product; (c) reveal privileged attorney-client communications; or (d) are otherwise  
28 protected from disclosure under any applicable privileges, laws, and/or rules. Facebook further

1 objects to the extent that these definitions purport to impose obligations that go beyond the  
2 requirements of the Federal and Local Rules.

3 4. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' definition of "Destination Object" or "(id2)" to the  
4 extent that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Facebook further objects  
5 to the definition to the extent that Plaintiffs purport to use this defined term to seek materials that are  
6 not relevant to the claims and defenses in this action.

7 5. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' definition of "(id)" to the extent that it is vague,  
8 ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Facebook further objects to the definition to the  
9 extent that Plaintiffs purport to use this defined term to seek materials that are not relevant to the  
10 claims and defenses in this action.

11 6. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' definition of "Key -> Value Pair" to the extent that it is  
12 vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Facebook further objects to the definition  
13 to the extent that Plaintiffs purport to use this defined term to seek materials that are not relevant to  
14 the claims and defenses in this action.

15 7. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' definition of "Object" to the extent that it is vague,  
16 ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Facebook further objects to the definition to the  
17 extent that Plaintiffs purport to use this defined term to seek materials that are not relevant to the  
18 claims and defenses in this action.

19 8. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' definition of "Object type" or "(otype)" to the extent  
20 that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Facebook further objects to the  
21 definition to the extent that Plaintiffs purport to use this defined term to seek materials that are not  
22 relevant to the claims and defenses in this action.

23 9. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' definition and use of the term "Person" as vague,  
24 ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome to the extent that Plaintiffs intend to use this term  
25 to include "any natural person or any business, legal or governmental entity or association" over  
26 which Facebook exercises no control.

27 10. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' definition of "Process" to the extent that it is vague,  
28 ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Facebook further objects to the definition to the

1 extent that Plaintiffs purport to use this defined term to seek materials that are not relevant to the  
2 claims and defenses in this action.

3 11. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' definition of "Private Message(s)" to the extent that it  
4 is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Facebook further objects to the  
5 definition to the extent that Plaintiffs purport to use this defined term to seek materials that are not  
6 relevant to the claims and defenses in this action.

7 12. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' definitions of "Relate(s) to," "Related to" and  
8 "Relating to" on the ground that the definitions make the Interrogatories overly broad and unduly  
9 burdensome and impose obligations that go beyond the requirements of the Federal and Local Rules.  
10 Facebook shall construe these terms as commonly and ordinarily understood.

11 13. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' definition of "Source Object" or "(id1)" to the extent  
12 that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Facebook further objects to the  
13 definition to the extent that Plaintiffs purport to use this defined term to seek materials that are not  
14 relevant to the claims and defenses in this action.

15 14. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' definition and use of the terms "You," "Your," or  
16 "Facebook" as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome to the extent the terms are  
17 meant to include "directors, officers, employees, partners, members, representatives, agents  
18 (including attorneys, accountants, consultants, investment advisors or bankers), and any other person  
19 purporting to act on [Facebook, Inc.'s] behalf. . . . parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, predecessor  
20 entities, successor entities, divisions, departments, groups, acquired entities and/or related entities or  
21 any other entity acting or purporting to act on its behalf" over which Facebook exercises no control,  
22 and to the extent that Plaintiffs purport to use these terms to impose obligations that go beyond the  
23 requirements of the Federal and Local Rules.

24 **OBJECTIONS TO "RULES OF CONSTRUCTION" AND INSTRUCTIONS**

25 1. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' "Rules of Construction" and "Instructions" to the  
26 extent they impose obligations that go beyond the requirements of the Federal and Local Rules.

27 2. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' Instruction No. 2 to the extent that it is not limited to  
28 the relevant time period, thus making the Instruction overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not

1 relevant to the claims or defenses in this action. Unless otherwise specified in its responses, and  
2 pursuant to the agreement of the parties, Facebook's response will be limited to information  
3 generated between April 1, 2010 and December 30, 2013.

4 3. Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' Instruction No. 6 as ambiguous and unduly  
5 burdensome. Facebook further objects to the instruction to the extent it exceeds the requirements of  
6 the Federal and Local Rules.

7 **OBJECTION TO PURPORTED "RELEVANT TIME PERIOD"**

8 Facebook objects to Plaintiffs' proposed "Relevant Time Period" (September 26, 2006  
9 through the present) because it substantially exceeds the proposed class period identified in Plaintiffs'  
10 Consolidated Amended Complaint, does not reflect the time period that is relevant to Plaintiffs'  
11 claims in this action, and renders the Interrogatories overly broad, unduly burdensome, and irrelevant.  
12 Unless otherwise specified, and pursuant to the agreement of the parties, Facebook's Responses to  
13 these Interrogatories will be limited to information generated between April 1, 2010 and December  
14 30, 2013. Facebook otherwise objects to the remainder of Plaintiffs' statement regarding the  
15 "Relevant Time Period" to the extent that it purports to impose obligations beyond those imposed by  
16 the Federal and Local Rules.

17 **SPECIFIC RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS**

18 **INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

19 Identify all facts relating to the Processing of each Private Message sent or received by  
20 Plaintiffs containing a URL<sup>1</sup>, including, for each Private Message:

- 21 (A) all Objects that were created during the Processing of the Private Message, including  
22 the (id) and the Object Type for each Object, as well as any Key -> Value Pair(s)  
23 contained in each Object;

24  
25  
26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Each such Private Message has been identified by each Plaintiff in Exhibit 1 to his respective Objections and  
28 Responses to Defendant's First Set of Interrogatories.



- 1 (B) all Objects that were created specifically when the embedded URL was shared,  
2 including the (id) and the Object Type for each Object, as well as any Key -> Value  
3 Pair(s) contained in each Object;
- 4 (C) all Associations related to each Private Message, identified by the Source Object,  
5 Association Type, and Destination Object, as well as any Key -> Value Pair(s)  
6 contained in each Association;
- 7 (D) the database names and table names in which each Association and Object is stored;
- 8 (E) each application or feature in Facebook that uses the Objects or Associations created  
9 for each Private Message; and
- 10 (F) how each Object associated with the Private Message was used by Facebook.

11 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

12 Facebook restates and incorporates its Preliminary Statement, General Objections, Objections  
13 to “Rules of Construction,” Instructions, and Purported “Relevant Time Period” as though fully set  
14 forth in this Response. Facebook further objects to this Interrogatory on the following additional  
15 grounds:

16 (A) The Interrogatory is vague and ambiguous in its use of the terms and phrases  
17 “Processing”; “Private Message”; “Objects”; “(id)”; “Object Type”; “Key -> Value Pair(s)”; “Objects  
18 that were created specifically when the embedded URL was shared”; “Associations”; “Source  
19 Object”; “Association Type”; “Destination Object”; “database names and table names”; and  
20 “application or feature.”

21 (B) The Interrogatory is compound.

22 (C) The Interrogatory seeks information that is not relevant to the claims or defenses in  
23 this action to the extent it concerns practices other than those challenged in this action (the alleged  
24 increase in the Facebook “Like” count on a website when the URL for that website was contained in  
25 a message transmitted through Facebook’s Messages product during the class period).

26 (D) The Interrogatory is vague, unduly burdensome, and overly broad in that it purports to  
27 seek “all facts relating to the Processing of each Private Message sent or received by Plaintiffs  
28 containing a URL.”

1 (E) The Interrogatory seeks information that reflects trade secrets, confidential, and/or  
2 proprietary company information.

3 (F) The Interrogatory exceeds the bounds of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1),  
4 which provides that “a party may serve on any other party no more than 25 written interrogatories,  
5 including all discrete subparts.”

6 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing general and specific objections, and subject to  
7 the ongoing nature of discovery in this action, Facebook responds as follows:

8 Facebook refers Plaintiffs to Facebook’s Responses and Objections to Plaintiffs’ Interrogatory  
9 Nos. 2, 3, and 4. Facebook also will meet and confer with Plaintiffs’ counsel to determine the proper  
10 scope of this overly broad and ambiguous Interrogatory.

11 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

12 Facebook restates and incorporates its Preliminary Statement, General Objections, Objections  
13 to “Rules of Construction,” Instructions, and Purported “Relevant Time Period” as though fully set  
14 forth in this Response. Facebook further objects to this Interrogatory on the following additional  
15 grounds:

16 (A) The Interrogatory is vague and ambiguous in its use of the terms and phrases  
17 “Processing”; “Private Message”; “Objects”; “(id)”; “Object Type”; “Key -> Value Pair(s)”; “Objects  
18 that were created specifically when the embedded URL was shared”; “Associations”; “Source  
19 Object”; “Association Type”; “Destination Object”; “database names and table names”; and  
20 “application or feature.”

21 (B) The Interrogatory is compound.

22 (C) The Interrogatory seeks information that is not relevant to the claims or defenses in  
23 this action to the extent it concerns practices other than those challenged in this action (the alleged  
24 increase in the Facebook “Like” count on a website when the URL for that website was contained in  
25 a message transmitted through Facebook’s Messages product during the class period).

26 (D) The Interrogatory is vague, unduly burdensome, and overly broad in that it purports to  
27 seek “all facts relating to the Processing of each Private Message sent or received by Plaintiffs  
28 containing a URL.”

1 (E) The Interrogatory seeks information that reflects trade secrets, confidential, and/or  
2 proprietary company information.

3 (F) The Interrogatory exceeds the bounds of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1),  
4 which provides that “a party may serve on any other party no more than 25 written interrogatories,  
5 including all discrete subparts.”

6 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing general and specific objections, and subject to  
7 the ongoing nature of discovery in this action, Facebook responds as follows:

8 Facebook refers Plaintiffs to Facebook’s Responses and Objections to Plaintiffs’ Interrogatory  
9 Nos. 2, 3, and 4. Additionally, and pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,  
10 Facebook refers Plaintiffs to documents bearing production numbers FB000005502 through  
11 FB000006175, which contain information responsive to this Interrogatory for the messages identified  
12 in Plaintiffs’ letter of July 24, 2015 that could be located after a reasonable search and diligent  
13 inquiry. The chart attached as Exhibit 1 identifies the production numbers of the documents that  
14 correspond to the messages identified in Plaintiffs’ July 24, 2015 letter.

15 **SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

16 Facebook restates and incorporates its Preliminary Statement, General Objections, Objections  
17 to “Rules of Construction,” Instructions, and Purported “Relevant Time Period” as though fully set  
18 forth in this Response. Facebook further objects to this Interrogatory on the following additional  
19 grounds:

20 (A) The Interrogatory is vague and ambiguous in its use of the terms and phrases  
21 “Processing”; “Private Message”; “Objects”; “(id)”; “Object Type”; “Key -> Value Pair(s)”; “Objects  
22 that were created specifically when the embedded URL was shared”; “Associations”; “Source  
23 Object”; “Association Type”; “Destination Object”; “database names and table names”; and  
24 “application or feature.”

25 (B) The Interrogatory is compound.

26 (C) The Interrogatory seeks information that is not relevant to the claims or defenses in  
27 this action to the extent it concerns practices other than those challenged in this action (the alleged  
28

1 increase in the Facebook “Like” count on a website when the URL for that website was contained in  
2 a message transmitted through Facebook’s Messages product during the class period).

3 (D) The Interrogatory is vague, unduly burdensome, and overly broad in that it purports to  
4 seek “all facts relating to the Processing of each Private Message sent or received by Plaintiffs  
5 containing a URL.”

6 (E) The Interrogatory seeks information that reflects trade secrets, confidential, and/or  
7 proprietary company information.

8 (F) The Interrogatory exceeds the bounds of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1),  
9 which provides that “a party may serve on any other party no more than 25 written interrogatories,  
10 including all discrete subparts.”

11 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing general and specific objections, and subject to  
12 the ongoing nature of discovery in this action, Facebook responds as follows:

13 Facebook has conducted a reasonable inquiry for all “Objects” (as defined by Plaintiffs,  
14 explained further below) created at the time that Facebook received information resulting from the  
15 drafting or sending of the 19 messages (the “Subject Messages”) identified by Plaintiffs in their letter  
16 dated July 24, 2015 agreeing to narrow this Interrogatory. Below, Facebook identifies the responsive  
17 Objects, as well as other objects (more broadly defined), identified in the course of its inquiry. As  
18 will be explained further below, these objects were created *after* the URL or message information  
19 was received by and stored on a Facebook server, either before the sender sent the Subject Message  
20 or after it was sent to and received by Facebook.

21 [REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED]

23 [REDACTED]

24 [REDACTED]

25 [REDACTED]

26 [REDACTED]

27 [REDACTED]

28 [REDACTED]

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

[REDACTED]

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

[REDACTED]

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

[REDACTED]

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

[Redacted text block containing 28 numbered lines of content]



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

[Redacted text block containing 28 numbered lines of content, mostly obscured by black bars]

<sup>3</sup>

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

[REDACTED]

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

[REDACTED]

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

[Redacted text block covering lines 1 through 16]

DATED: October 28, 2015

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

By:                   /s/ Joshua A. Jessen                    
Joshua A. Jessen

Attorneys for Defendant FACEBOOK, INC.

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I, Jeana Bisnar Maute, declare as follows:

3 I am employed in the County of Santa Clara, State of California, I am over the age of eighteen  
4 years and am not a party to this action; my business address is 1881 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, CA  
94304-1211, in said County and State. On October 28, 2015, I served the following document(s):

5 **DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.’S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES**  
6 **AND OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS’ NARROWED SECOND SET OF**  
7 **INTERROGATORIES**

8 on the parties stated below, by the following means of service:

9 David F. Slade  
10 [dslade@cbplaw.com](mailto:dslade@cbplaw.com)  
11 James Allen Carney  
12 [acarney@cbplaw.com](mailto:acarney@cbplaw.com)  
13 Joseph Henry Bates, III  
14 Carney Bates & Pulliam, PLLC  
15 [hbates@cbplaw.com](mailto:hbates@cbplaw.com)

16 Melissa Ann Gardner  
17 [mgardner@lchb.com](mailto:mgardner@lchb.com)  
18 Nicholas Diamand  
19 [ndiamand@lchb.com](mailto:ndiamand@lchb.com)  
20 Rachel Geman  
21 [rgeman@lchb.com](mailto:rgeman@lchb.com)  
22 Michael W. Sobol  
23 Lief Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP  
24 [msobol@lchb.com](mailto:msobol@lchb.com)

- 25  **BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE:** On the above-mentioned date, based on a court order or  
26 an agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the  
27 documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification addresses as shown  
28 above.
- 29  I am employed in the office of Joshua A. Jessen and am a member of the bar of this court.
- 30  I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

31 Executed on October 28, 2015.

32 \_\_\_\_\_  
33 /s/ Jeana Bisnar Maute  
34 Jeana Bisnar Maute

**EXHIBIT A**

Message	██████████	██████████	██████████	██████████	██████████
1	FB000006666	FB000005575	FB000005528	FB000005502	██████████
2	FB000006691	FB000005577			
3	FB000006595	FB000005647	FB000005601	FB000005579	FB000012425
4	FB000006658	FB000005720	FB000005673	FB000005649	FB000011841
5	FB000006610	FB000005798	FB000005750	FB000005722	
6	FB000006642	FB000005800			
7	FB000006650	FB000005880	FB000005827	FB000005802	
10		FB000011876	FB000012993	FB000013201	FB000013572
68	FB000006707	FB000005882			
89	FB000006674	FB000005933	FB000005887	FB000005884	
93	FB000006634	FB000006005	FB000005958	FB000005935	
99	FB000006603	FB000006007			
113	FB000006682	FB000006085	FB000006038	FB000006009	
115		FB000012006			
123	FB000006618	FB000006088			
200	FB000006699	FB000006170	FB000006120	FB000006090	
410		FB000012557			
654	FB000006587	FB000006172	FB000012851	FB000013459	
482	FB000006626	FB000006174	FB000012543	FB000012512	

EXHIBIT A TO DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS' NARROWED SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES  
Case No. C 13-05996 PJH (MEJ)