1	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	IRWIN, FRITCHIE, URQUHART & MOORE BY: QUENTIN URQUHART, JR., ESQUIRE
2		400 POYDRAS STREET NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130
3		JONES WALKER
4 5		BY: GARY J. RUSSO, ESQUIRE 600 JEFFERSON STREET, SUITE 1600 LAFAYETTE, LA 70501
6		CROWELL & MORING
7		BY: KATHLEEN T. SOOY, ESQUIRE TRACY A. ROMAN, ESQUIRE
8		1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004
9		MORRISON FORESTER BY: PENELOPE PREOVOLOS, ESQUIRE
10		HEATHER A. MOSER, ESQUIRE 425 MARKET STREET
11		SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
12	ALCO PRECENT	DDIAN GEDANGE EGOUEDE
13	ALSO PRESENT:	BRIAN STRANGE, ESQUIRE JAMES DUGAN, ESQUIRE RONNIE PENTON, ESQUIRE
14		DOUGLAS MOORE, ESQUIRE
15		LAWRENCE CENTOLA, ESQUIRE DAVID CIALKOWSKI, ESQUIRE
16		ANITA JASKOT, ESQUIRE
17		E. KIRK WOOD, ESQUIRE TIMOTHY BLOOD, ESQUIRE
18		PETER CAMBS, ESQUIRE
19		DANIEL GERMAIN, ESQUIRE TIM ENGELMEYER, ESQUIRE
20		MAX MARX, ESQUIRE
21		JOEL SCHWARTZ, ESQUIRE PATRICK WARNER, ESQUIRE
22		FRANK PISCITELLI, ESQUIRE GARY DOUGLAS, ESQUIRE
24		VIRGINIA ANELLO, ESQUIRE
25		MICHAEL ECUYER, ESQUIRE J. ANDREW MEYER, ESQUIRE

1	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: CATHY PEPPER, CRR, RMR, CCR 500 POYDRAS STREET, ROOM B406		
2	NEW ORLEANS LA 70130 (504) 589-7779		
3	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY. TRANSCRIPT	Γ	
4	PRODUCED BY COMPUTER.		
5			
6			
7	INDEX		
8			
9	AGENDA PAGE		
LO			
L1	INTRODUCTION OF COUNSEL	4	
L2	FILING OF ADDITIONAL COMPLAINTS 7		
L3	MASTER COMPLAINT	1	
L 4	SCOPE OF DISCOVERY	1	
L 5	AMENDMENT OF THE PLEADINGS	3	
L 6	FILING RESPONSIVE PLEADINGS OR INITIAL MOTIONS 1	7	
L 7	TIMING AND SCOPE OF DISCOVERY	0	
L 8	DESIGNATING LIAISON COUNSEL ON THE DEFENSE SIDE 3	9	
L 9	DATE OF NEXT STATUS CONFERENCE IS FRIDAY, MARCH 12TH, 42	2	
20	AT 9:30		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

this question, there will be discovery on the arbitration issue as well.

THE COURT: What kind of discovery would you have an arbitration issue?

MR. BICKFORD: Well, if, in fact, the arbitration -THE COURT: Wouldn't that be a --

MR. BICKFORD: -- is unconscionable under the terms of the law; in other words, if, in fact, where the arbitration --

THE COURT: Wouldn't that be a legal issue, not a factual issue? I'm trying to get some understanding of what kind of discovery you would need on that.

MR. BICKFORD: For instance, I don't know what agreements -- AT&T and Apple have a monopoly with regard to the iPhone. I don't know what kind of joint agreements they have between themselves which may abrogate the arbitration, itself. I don't know what kind of agreements they have or memos that go back and forth with regard to arbitration. I don't know how they communicated in the arbitration clause to individual consumers, whether or not that was done electronically, whether or not it was done five days after people bought the phone already. A lot of the agreements --

THE COURT: I don't know enough about this, but you buy one of these phones, you sign some sort of agreement? Do you get an agreement?

MR. BICKFORD: No, it's done electronically.

THE COURT: Every time I go on the Internet to do anything, I've got to say "I accept," and you accept, and God knows what you're accepting when you accept something, but everybody just says "I accept" now, I guess, if you want to get through the web page.

MR. BICKFORD: But I can buy the phone at an Apple store and then go and sign up with AT&T separately.

THE COURT: What I'm saying, one way or another, you're signing up for some agreement. It's in the agreement. Whatever it is, it is. I just don't understand what kind of discovery you're going to need on that. It seems to me they could tee that up as a legal issue. Once they tee it up and you file your opposition, you'll show there is a need for some limited discovery. I can't envision it now, but maybe you're right.

MR. BICKFORD: There has been extensive discovery, for instance, in the Eleventh Circuit in a similar AT&T arbitration issue granted by the Court there because there are conscionability issues with regard to the arbitration clause, how it's communicated to people, where it is, how it affects people, whether they have the opportunity, whether or not it's binding, whether or not it is, in fact, an agreement that they have in place that I have a choice of, given the consumer product I'm buying.

So there is a variety of issues that need to be discovered with regard to the case. As I said, whether or not

2.0

there are other legal agreements that go between the two companies in terms of the way they set this up -- because Apple does not have an arbitration agreement contained in their contracts. AT&T claims they do, in certain cases. Do they have it for all the people here? Do they not? It is something that is going to raise a number of factual issues in order to brief.

I've looked at the law. The laws that the courts have looked at in arbitration cases are heavily fact-dependent in terms of whether or not the arbitration agreement is unconscionable in terms of how it's applied to individual consumers.

That's part of the track of discovery. The other part of the track of discovery becomes, you know, in terms of -- so that we're not wasting a half a year and not doing any discovery is going forward in terms of class certification issues as well as issues on the merits.

THE COURT: Let me hear from the other side.

MR. RUSSO: Your Honor, on behalf of ATTM, you have actually articulated our position in what we've suggested to Scott earlier. We actually thought we had made some progress in that regard. Our suggestion, Your Honor, is allow us to file our motion to enforce the arbitration clause. We'll meet and confer with the plaintiffs to talk about discovery. Because we're not suggesting right now that there is absolutely no way any discovery is going to be conducted, but we'd like to hear what

2.0

they have to say. They'll see our briefs. They can review them. We'll meet and confer, and if we can't agree, we'll come back to Your Honor for some direction on that point.

Rather than have that discussion now, we would like to get our motion filed, have our discussion with them and see if there really is an issue. There may not be one.

MR. BICKFORD: Which is why we asked the Court for the briefing schedule on these issues with regard to the scope and need for discovery, because I think that there are several complicated issues that we would like to apprise the Court of more fully. We think we can do --

THE COURT: How much time do you want to do that? That's probably a good suggestion.

MR. BICKFORD: I think there is a suggested time schedule that we put in the our brief, which is essentially mid-February basis, we both file briefs simultaneously with the Court and then some time shortly thereafter, we file replies to each side's brief so that the issue is laid out before the Court, and then at a monthly status conference, the Court, having had a chance to review it, we can either argue our positions or the Court could ask us questions with regards to its concerns about them.

MR. RUSSO: Your Honor, our only concern with that is we have not suggested there is not going to be any discovery, but we hope to get the pleadings amended, see what the issues are,

determine what motions we need to file. At which point, we sit down and confer with plaintiffs on what discovery is necessary.

THE COURT: I kind of sense that you all know what the issues are now from what's been filed. This is not that complicated a case in terms of what's alleged here. It's a pretty simple, straightforward case. It's alleged that the defendants misrepresented some feature of this phone when they marketed it.

I think you know what the issues are. You said it was all fully disclosed. It's not a complicated case to me.

We've got all of these lawyers here, but it boils down to, it seems to me, a pretty simple, straightforward -- there may be some difficult legal issues, like arbitration and some of these other issues, but the case, itself, seems pretty basic and simple to me.

MR. URQUHART: Your Honor, if I could just be heard just briefly at this point, and I'm going to have Ms. Preovolos address it specifically. I believe there are some factual issues that are worth getting clarified early before we go down the discovery path, and I'll let Ms. Preovolos --

THE COURT: Well, then, it seems to fit with what Mr. Bickford is suggesting is that each side get, I think he's asking for about 30 days from now to file briefs on these various issues, to lay out your positions, and certainly I would encourage you all to meet and talk to each other, to see to what

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Cathy Pepper, Certified Realtime Reporter, Registered
Merit Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, Certified Court
Reporter of the State of Louisiana, Official Court Reporter for
the United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana,
do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct
transcript, to the best of my ability and understanding, from the
record of the proceedings in the above-entitled and numbered
matter.

s/Cathy Pepper

Cathy Pepper, CRR, RMR, CCR
Official Court Reporter
United States District Court