

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
CENTRAL DIVISION**

<b>TODD JANSON, et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiffs,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>Case No. 10-04018-CV-C-NKL</b>
	)	
<b>LEGALZOOM.COM, INC.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendant.</b>	)	

**DEFENDANT LEGALZOOM.COM, INC.’S  
OBJECTIONS AND COUNTER-DESIGNATIONS TO  
PLAINTIFFS’ DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY**

Defendant LegalZoom.com, Inc. (“LegalZoom”) hereby asserts its objections and counter-designations to the Plaintiffs’ designation of deposition testimony.

**Counter-Designations**

LegalZoom’s counter-designations are offered to preserve to LegalZoom the right to offer the testimony at trial; however, by counter-designating this testimony, LegalZoom is not at this time offering the testimony as evidence in this case, nor is it agreeing that the testimony is admissible at trial. LegalZoom reserves the right to object to the admission of this, or any, proffered testimony at trial. Plaintiffs have designated portions of the transcript that include objections and counsel dialogue. Given the lack of clarity in designations, LegalZoom will seek more specific designations before the transcript is read into evidence.

**General Objections**

LegalZoom preserves and incorporates herein its objections as set forth in the respective deposition passages. LegalZoom submits the following specific objections and counter-designations.

<b>Deposition of Jennifer Loo</b>		
<b>Plaintiffs' Designations</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Objections</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Counter-Designations</b>
06:1-06:12		7:6-7:19
10:11-10:22		
11:23-11:25		
12:3-12:23		
13:10-13:25		
15:4-15:8		14:19-15:3
15:14-17:6		
17:9-19:25		
20:10-21:25		
22:1-22:25		
23:1-23:25		
24:1-24:25		
25:1-26:25		
27:1-27:25		
28:1-28:25		
29:1-29:25		
30:1-32:25		
33:1-33:25		
34:1-34:25		
35:1-35:25		
36:1-37:25		
38:1-38:18		
39:1-42:25		
43:1-45:2		
45:8-48:25		
49:1-49:25		
50:1-50:25		
51:1-51:25		

52:1-52:25		
53:1-53:25		
54:1-54:25		
55:1-55:25		
56:1-56:25		
57:21-58:25		
59:1-59:25		
60:1-60:25		
61:1-62:13		
63:19-64:17		

<b>Deposition of Adam Thomas</b>		
<b>Plaintiffs' Designations</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Objections</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Counter-Designations</b>
07:1-07:10		
13:8-13:20		12:24-13:7; 13:21-15:2
15:10-17:12	Relevance (15:19-17:1)	
18:16-22:4		
22:15-27:11		27:12-19; 28:10-17
30:12-32:10		
32:25-34:7		34:8-34:18
35:8-37:25	Relevance (37:3-25) (LegalZoom has been granted summary judgment on claims against patent and trademark products)	
39:2-40:8	Relevance	
41:19-42:2	Relevance; legal conclusion	
42:16-44:13	Relevance (all); legal conclusion (42:16-20)	
44:16-45:10	Relevance	
45:13-46:25	Relevance	
47:1-54:17	Relevance	

54:23-59:17	Relevance	
60:9-60:21	Relevance	
61:8-62:25	Relevance	
63:1-63:25	Relevance	
64:1-64:25	Relevance	
65:1-65:25	Relevance	
66:1-67:9	Relevance	
67:19-67:25	Relevance	
68:1-68:25	Relevance	
69:1-70:25	Relevance	71:1-71:15
71:16-71:25	Relevance	
72:1-72:25	Relevance	
73:1-73:25	Relevance	
74:1-74:25	Relevance	
75:1-80:25	Relevance	
81:1-82:25	Relevance	
83:1-83:25	Relevance	
84:1-84:25	Relevance	
85:1-85:25	Relevance	
86:1-87:22	Relevance	87:23-87:24
88:1-88:25	Relevance	
89:1-89:25	Relevance	
90:1-91:16	Relevance	

<b>Deposition of Brian P. Y. Liu</b>		
<b>Plaintiffs' Designations</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Objections</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Counter-Designations</b>
07:7-07:20		
09:7-11:8		
11:18-12:20		
14:16-14:17		

16:3-17:25	Relevance (LegalZoom has been granted summary judgment on claims against patent and trademark products)	
18:1-32:25	Relevance (18:1-23:21; 24:9-31:13; 31:14-32:25); Legal conclusion (30:7-31:13)	
33:1-34:19	Vague and ambiguous (34:14-19)	
35:1-35:16	Vague and ambiguous (35:1-7)	
36:5-39:15	Relevance	
45:20-58:25	Relevance (49:25-56:1; 58:19-25)	
59:1-63:11	Relevance	
73:7-73:15		
73:23-76:4		
77:20-80:3		
80:14-86:11		
86:25-89:1		
90:9-100:20	Compound (95:16-96:1), Argumentative, Prejudice, improper comment (99:15-100:4)	
102:5-102:15		
103:19-105:8	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading (103:19-104:23) (LegalZoom's advertisements are irrelevant to determining how the LegalZoom website actually operates, are prejudicial, and may confuse and mislead the jury)	
105:20-106:1		

106:15-106:25	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading	
108:6-109:4		Errata Page (108:13)
109:7-109:15		
109:22-109:23	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading; Compound; Legal Conclusion	
110:1-110:11	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading	
112:11-112:22	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading	
113:8-120:12	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading; Vague and ambiguous (120:8-18)	
120:15-121:16	Outside the scope of notice, argumentative (121:11-16)	
121:21-121:25	Lack of foundation	
122:4-122:5	Lack of foundation	
122:8-122:16	Lack of foundation	
123:9-123:20	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading	
124:5-124:16	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading	
125:5-126:16	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading	
127:15-128:2	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading	
128:17-130:19 131:1-135:9 135:20-136:5 138:24-140:22	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading	
141:9-141:12	Relevance, improper designation of attorney colloquy	

142:11-145:16 146:1-147:18	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading	
148:8-152:20	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading (148:25-152:20)	
153:4-154:4 154:8-157:9	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading (all); Vague and ambiguous (154:2-15); mischaracterization, lack of foundation (155:22- 156:1); mischaracterization, lack of foundation, asked and answered, argumentative (156:18:22)	178:25-179:21
158:4-158:6 158:10-158:22 159:1-159:9 159:13-159:14 159:17-160:2	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading (all); vague and ambiguous, lack of foundation, asked and answered	178:25-179:21
160:20-160:23 161:4-166:10 166:20-171:8	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading; improper designation of attorney colloquy (170:18:23)	
174:17-178:8	Relevance, Prejudice, Confusing and Misleading	

<b>Deposition of Jake Varghese</b>		
<b>Plaintiffs' Designations</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Objections</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Counter-Designations</b>
7:21-8:4		7:10-7:20
9:12-10:14		10:15-12:6
13:3-14:5		
14:12-15:14		
17:16-21:15		15:20-17:15; 21:16-22:16

22:17-23:11		
23:18-23:25		
26:13-27:4		
27:19-29:10		
31:5-33:11	Lack of foundation	30:9-31:4
33:17-39:15		
39:23-40:4		
41:20-43:14		
44:13-44:25		
45:6-45:22		45:1-45:5
46:7-46:12		
46:19-46:25		
47:12-47:22		
48:9-48:6		
48:21-48:23		
49:1-49:3		
49:7-49:25		
50:7-50:12		
50:19-50:20		
50:24-51:4		
52:23-52:25		
53:10-57:24		
59:12-60:4		
60:10-61:20		
62:8-66:2		
66:16-73:12		
73:18-75:23		75:24-76:8
77:8-84:8		
85:18-90:3		
90:7-92:6		
92:10-92:13		92:14-92:18



93:10-93:17		93:18-94:2
94:3-95:21		
96:13-96:22		
97:1-100:5		
100:14-102:12		102:13-102:23
102:24-103:13		
105:18-110:10		110:11-111:25
112:1-112:17		
112:20-113:16		
113:24-117:11		
117:15-129:13		
132:15-134:6 135:2-138:13		130:13-132:14; 134:7-135:1

<b>Deposition of Nelly Jacobo</b>		
<b>Plaintiffs' Designations</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Objections</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Counter-Designations</b>
9:24-10:15 12:15-13:8		10:19-13:8
14:1-14:5		
15:1-15:5		
15:16-16:4		
16:23-16:25		
17:1-17:10		78:12-79:2
17:14-18:4		18:5-18:18
19:6-20:10		
21:5-22:15		
26:16-26:15		
27:2-30:4		
30:11-16		
30:19-25		
31:1-33:1		
33:8-33:23		

34:15-22		
35:5-35:17 35:21-36:10		35:18-20; 36:11-14
36:20-40:16		
40:19-41:6		
41:13-42:8	Legal conclusion	
42:20-55:14		55:15-25
56:1-56:15		56:16-25
57:1-58:3		
58:8-58:22		59:7-60:8
60:24-61:11		
62:11-64:16		
64:24-66:16		
66:20-67:19		
67:21-69:9		
69:18-72:5		
72:8-72:9		
72:12-20		
73:2-74:5		
74:15-18		
75:11-76:11		
76:14-78:7		78:12-79:2

<b>Deposition of Edward R. Hartman (8/3/10)</b>		
<b>Plaintiffs' Designations</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Objections</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Counter-Designations</b>
7:6-8:5		
10:9-11:20		
15:2-16:8		
16:18-19:6		Errata Page (17:10)
22:2-22:7		
23:1-23:20		
25:1-25:12		

26:23-27:1		
28:18-28:21		
30:5-31:23		
35:11-36:19		
37:13-38:5		
38:14-38:17 39:3-39:4	Attorney-client privilege; legal conclusion	
40:17-40:23		
41:6-42:4		
52:3-61:22		61:23-65:15
70:25-74:17		
75:3-75:8		
75:15-76:6		
78:17-79:15	Vague and ambiguous; mischaracterizes testimony; no answer designated (79:11-15)	
80:8-80:16		
81:6-82:5		
83:5-84:3		
84:9-88:5	Relevance; no question designated (84:9-10)	
88:25-89:3	Relevance	89:8-90:13
90:16-90:25	Relevance	
92:10-93:9	Relevance	93:10-93:17
93:18-95:15	Relevance (93:18-95:1)	
98:16-99:17		
114:13-115:21	Asked and answered (115:15-116:3)	
115:24-116:18		
121:5-121:16	Vague and Ambiguous (121:10-16)	121:25-122:2
122:9-123:11		
124:4-124:8		

127:18-128:18		
129:20-130:5		130:6-131:11
132:14-132:19		
138:19-138:21		
140:17-141:23		
149:3-150:18	Lack of foundation: vague and ambiguous; mischaracterizes testimony; no answer designated	
155:2-156:9		

<b>Deposition of Edward R. Hartman (2/16/11)</b>		
<b>Plaintiffs' Designations</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Objections</b>	<b>LegalZoom's Counter-Designations</b>
7:8-7:9		
7:22-8:10		
13:4-14:10		
34:18-36:10		
50:2-55:2		

For the foregoing reasons, Defendant LegalZoom.com, Inc. requests the Plaintiffs' designations be stricken in part and/or counter-designations of LegalZoom's be presented.

Respectfully submitted,

**BRYAN CAVE LLP**

By: s/ James T. Wicks

Robert M. Thompson MO #38156

James T. Wicks MO #60409

One Kansas City Place

1200 Main Street, Suite 3500

Kansas City, MO 64105

Tel.: (816) 374-3200

Fax: (816) 374-3300

John Michael Clear MO #25834

Michael G. Biggers MO #24694

James R. Wyrsh MO #53197

One Metropolitan Square – Suite 3600

211 North Broadway

St. Louis, MO 63102

Tel.: (314) 259-2000

Fax: (314) 259-2020

*Attorneys for LegalZoom.com, Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on July 29, 2011, I electronically filed the above and foregoing with the clerk of court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notice of electronic filing to all counsel of record.

s/ James T. Wicks