



On September 5, 2012, Defendants filed their Eighth Motion to Compel (Doc. No. 511), seeking three documents referenced in another document produced by Ceglia pursuant to previous motions to compel. On November 7, this Court granted in part Defendants' motion, ordering Ceglia to produce immediately one of the documents and directing Ceglia to pay attorneys' fees and costs associated with Defendants' pursuit of that document. Doc. No. 584. The Court directed Defendants to file a fee application detailing the fees and costs expended in this pursuit. *See id.* at 20-22. On November 19, as directed by the Court, Defendants filed their Fee Application and supporting declaration and exhibits (Doc. No. 599). In a Decision and Order dated May 9, 2013 (the "May 9 Order"), this Court granted Defendants' Fee Application in full, ordering that Ceglia pay Defendants \$3,747.68. Doc. No. 660. On May 23, Ceglia filed a Motion for Reconsideration, Correction, or Clarification of the Court's May 9 order (Doc. No. 667), requesting that the Court "reconsider, correct or clarify" the order "so that the record is clear and accurate" concerning the Order's terms. *Id.* at 2.

Ceglia's motion sets forth no basis for reconsideration of the substance of the May 9 Order, but only identifies an inadvertent typographical error: the conclusion of the May 9 Order states that it was issued "in accordance with the January 10, 2012 Decision and Order (Doc. No. 283)" (Doc. No. 660 at 11), instead of the Court's November 7, 2012 Decision and Order (Doc. No. 584). The May 9 Order properly identifies and addresses the relevant fee application under consideration—namely, Defendants' application for fees incurred in connection with the successful portion of their Eighth Motion to Compel. *See, e.g., id.* at 4 ("Defendants filed on November 19, 2012, Defendants' Fee Application in Connection With Their Eighth Motion to Compel (Doc. No. 599) . . . . Based on the following, Defendants' Fee Application is GRANTED."). Accordingly, the Court should simply amend its May 9 Order by correcting the

clause in the first sentence of its conclusion reading “in accordance with the January 10, 2012 Decision and Order (Doc. No. 283)” (Doc. No. 660 at 11), to read “in accordance with the November 7, 2012 Decision and Order (Doc. No. 584).”

Dated: New York, New York  
June 6, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Orin Snyder

Orin Snyder  
Alexander H. Southwell  
Matthew J. Benjamin  
Amanda M. Aycock  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
200 Park Avenue, 47th Floor  
New York, NY 10166-0193  
(212) 351-4000

Thomas H. Dupree, Jr.  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 955-8500

Terrance P. Flynn  
HARRIS BEACH PLLC  
726 Exchange Street  
Suite 1000  
Buffalo, NY 14210  
(716) 200-5120

*Attorneys for Defendants Mark Zuckerberg and Facebook, Inc.*