

THE HONORABLE RICARDO S. MARTINEZ

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,

Defendant.

NO. 2:15-cv-00369-RSM

**STIPULATED MOTION AND ORDER
FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
PLAINTIFF’S RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:
May 12, 2022

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,

Defendant.

NO. 2:15-cv-00850-RSM

The above-captioned actions are for declaratory and injunctive relief under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, as amended, and the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 701 et seq. On April 29, 2022, Defendant filed a Motion for Summary Judgment (“Defendant’s Motion” or “Motion”), with a noting date of June 27, 2022. *See* Doc. 63. Under

1 Local Civil Rule 7(d), Plaintiff has until June 20, 2022, to file its response to Defendant’s Motion.
2 Given the broad scope of this matter, the numerous complex issues potentially subject to briefing,
3 and the breadth of Defendant’s Motion, its declarations, and exhibits, the parties stipulate to
4 Plaintiff’s request that the Court extend the deadline for Plaintiff to file its response an additional 32
5 days, up to and including July 22, 2022. Plaintiff anticipates that this will be its only request to
6 extend the deadline to file its response.¹ In support of this request, the parties state the following:

7 1. For the last two years, the parties have worked together to narrow the issues before
8 the Court and to resolve various matters without Court intervention. During that time, Defendant
9 shared with Plaintiff certain draft declarations regarding Defendant’s search efforts and draft *Vaughn*
10 indices. Plaintiff’s counsel provided detailed comments on those declarations and *Vaughn* indices
11 in multiple emails to Defendant’s counsel and comprehensive letters dated November 30, 2020,
12 December 11, 2020, January 13, 2021, March 9, 2021, July 28, 2021, September 22, 2021, and
13 November 10, 2021. In addition, Plaintiff’s counsel and Defendant’s counsel held several telephonic
14 conferences regarding Plaintiff’s counsel’s comments.

15 2. Defendant’s response to Plaintiff’s comments included several letters, material edits
16 to its search effort declarations, the release in full of additional records, and an expanded *Vaughn*
17 index. Defendant has represented that it withheld from production approximately 7,200 document
18 pages in part, and 38,200 document pages in full.

19 3. On April 29, 2022, Defendant filed its Motion and supporting papers, totaling 850
20 pages. Defendant claims exemptions from disclosure under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552(b)(2), (b)(3), (b)(4),
21 (b)(5), (b)(6), (b)(7)(A), (b)(7)(C), and (b)(7)(E). As part of its 5 U.S.C. §§ 552(b)(5) exemption
22 claims, Defendant withheld documents under the deliberative process privilege, the attorney-client
23 privilege, and the work product doctrine.

24 _____
25 ¹ Defendant also intends to make a request to extend its reply deadline to Plaintiff’s opposition. To ensure that an
26 extension request for the reply deadline is made only once, Defendant intends to wait until after Plaintiff has filed its
opposition to obtain a better estimate of the time needed to prepare its reply.

1 4. Defendant's Motion presents complex issues of fact and law regarding Defendant's
2 search efforts and exemption claims.

3 5. On April 29, 2022, Defendant also filed a Motion for Summary Judgment in the
4 parties' related FOIA matter. *See* Dkt. 2:15-cv-01605 RSM, Doc. 51.

5 6. Plaintiff requests additional time to fully evaluate Defendant's Motion, declarations,
6 and exhibits (including its *Vaughn* index) to prepare its response.

7 5. Accordingly, the parties stipulate to Plaintiff's request that the Court extend the
8 deadline for Plaintiff to file its response an additional 32 days, up to and including July 22, 2022.

9 DATED this 12th day of May, 2022.

10 **U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

CALFO EAKES LLP

11
12 By: s/ Stephen S. Ho
13 Stephen S. Ho
14 Trial Attorney, Tax Division
15 U.S. Department of Justice
16 Post Office Box 227
17 Washington, DC 20044
18 Tel: (202) 616-8994
19 Fax: (202) 514-6866
20 Email: stephen.s.ho@usdoj.gov

By: s/ Patricia A. Eakes
Patricia A. Eakes, WSBA #18888
1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2800
Seattle, WA 98101
Phone: (206) 407-2200
Email: pattye@calfoeakes.com

BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP

17 *Attorney for Defendant Internal Revenue*
18 *Service*

By: s/ Daniel A. Rosen
Daniel A. Rosen, NYBA #2790442
(*pro hac vice*)
452 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10018
Phone: (212) 626-4272
Email: daniel.rosen@bakermckenzie.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Microsoft Corporation

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED this 17th day of May, 2022.



RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Presented by:

CALFO EAKES LLP

By: *s/ Patricia A. Eakes*

Patricia A. Eakes, WSBA #18888
1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2800
Seattle, WA 98101
Phone: (206) 407-2200
Email: pattye@calfoeakes.com

BAKER & McKENZIE LLP

By: *s/ Daniel A. Rosen*

Daniel A. Rosen, NYBA #2790442
(*pro hac vice*)
452 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10018
Phone: (212) 626-4272
Email: daniel.rosen@bakermckenzie.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Microsoft Corporation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

By: *s/ Stephen S. Ho*

Stephen S. Ho
Trial Attorney, Tax Division

1 U.S. Department of Justice
2 Post Office Box 227
3 Washington, DC 20044
4 Tel: (202) 616-8994
5 Email: stephen.s.ho@usdoj.gov

6 *Attorney for Defendant Internal Revenue Service*
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26