

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
6 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
7

8 MAXIMILIAN KLEIN, et al.,  
9 Plaintiffs,  
10 v.  
11 FACEBOOK, INC.,  
12 Defendant.

Case No. [20-cv-08570-LHK](#) (VKD)

**ORDER PARTIALLY RESOLVING  
AUGUST 20, 2021 DISCOVERY  
DISPUTE RE DEPOSITION  
PROTOCOL**

Re: Dkt. No. 132

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

13  
14 The parties ask the Court to resolve several disputes concerning the conduct of depositions  
15 in this case. Dkt. No. 132. The Court held a hearing on these disputes on August 31, 2021. Dkt.  
16 Nos. 144, 146. Thereafter, the Court issued an interim order requiring the parties to confer further  
17 and to make a further submission regarding several issues relating to the depositions of current and  
18 former Facebook employees. Dkt. No. 145. This order resolves two remaining disputes  
19 concerning the conduct of depositions.

20 **1. Remote v. in person depositions**

21 The parties disagree regarding whether there should be a presumption that depositions will  
22 be conducted by remote means. Dkt. No. 132 at 5-6. Facebook advocates for such a presumption;  
23 plaintiffs oppose it. *Id.*

24 The Court declines to set a presumption of remote depositions. However, while public  
25 health conditions and travel restrictions make it difficult or impossible for depositions to be  
26 conducted safely in person, the Court encourages the parties to conduct depositions by remote  
27 means. The presiding judge has set deadlines for the completion of discovery, and the parties are  
28 well-advised not to delay taking depositions in the hope that circumstances will eventually permit

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 normal litigation to proceed. If the parties cannot agree regarding the means for taking a particular  
2 deposition, they must submit the issue to the Court for resolution using the discovery dispute  
3 resolution procedure.


4 **2. Presence of counsel in same room as deponent**

5 The parties disagree regarding whether counsel defending a deposition should be able to be  
6 in the same room as the witness during an otherwise remote deposition. Dkt. No. 132 at 6-7.  
7 Plaintiffs ask for an order excluding defending counsel unless opposing counsel is also present.  
8 Facebook argue there is no need to exclude defending counsel. *Id.*

9 The Court agrees with Facebook that there is no justification here for excluding counsel  
10 defending the witness from being physically present in the same room as the witness, and the  
11 Court adopts Facebook’s proposal. The Court expects all counsel to behave ethically and  
12 professionally. In particular, defending counsel must avoid improper coaching or other  
13 communication with the witness. Any party may ask the Court to revisit this issue if  
14 circumstances warrant.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated: September 13, 2021

17  
18   
19 VIRGINIA K. DEMARCHI  
20 United States Magistrate Judge  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28