

1 KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
 Paul Andre (State Bar No. 196585)
 2 pandre@kramerlevin.com
 Lisa Kobialka (State Bar No. 191404)
 3 lkobialka@kramerlevin.com
 James Hannah (State Bar No. 237978)
 4 jhannah@kramerlevin.com
 990 Marsh Road
 5 Menlo Park, CA 94025
 Telephone: (650) 752-1700
 6 Facsimile: (650) 752-1800
Attorneys for Plaintiff
 7 FINJAN, INC.

8 IRELL & MANELLA LLP
 Jonathan Kagan (State Bar No. 166039)
 9 jkagan@irell.com
 Joshua Glucoft (State Bar No. 301249)
 10 jglucoft@irell.com
 Casey Curran (State Bar No. 305210)
 11 ccurran@irell.com
 1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
 12 Los Angeles, CA 90067
 Telephone: (650) 752-1700
 13 Facsimile: (650) 752-1800

14 Rebecca Carson (State Bar No. 254105)
 rcarson@irell.com
 15 Kevin Wang (State Bar No. 318024)
 kwang@irell.com
 16 840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400
 Newport Beach, CA 92660
 17 Telephone: (949) 760-0991
 Facsimile: (949) 760-5200
 18 *Attorneys for Defendant*
 JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.

20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 21 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 22 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

23	FINJAN, INC.,)	Case No. 3:17-cv-05659-WHA
)	
24	Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
)	RE: DISCOVERY OF ELECTRONICALLY
25	v.)	STORED INFORMATION FOR PATENT
)	LITIGATION
26	JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.,)	
)	
27	Defendant.)	Hon. William H. Alsup
)	
28)	

1 Upon the stipulation of the parties, the Court ORDERS as follows:

2 1. This Order supplements all other discovery rules and orders. It streamlines
3 Electronically Stored Information (“ESI”) production to promote a “just, speedy, and inexpensive
4 determination of this action, as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 1.”

5 2. This Order may be modified in the Court’s discretion or by stipulation. The parties
6 shall jointly submit any proposed modifications within 30 days after the Federal Rule of Civil
7 Procedure 16 Conference.

8 3. As in all cases, costs may be shifted for disproportionate ESI production requests
9 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26. Likewise, a party’s nonresponsive or dilatory
10 discovery tactics are cost-shifting considerations.

11 4. A party’s meaningful compliance with this Order and efforts to promote efficiency
12 and reduce costs will be considered in cost-shifting determinations.

13 5. The parties are expected to comply with the District’s E-Discovery Guidelines
14 (“Guidelines”) and are encouraged to employ the District’s Model Stipulated Order Re: the
15 Discovery of Electronically Stored Information and Checklist for Rule 26(f) Meet and Confer
16 regarding Electronically Stored Information.

17 6. Information and documents not stored as attachments to an email, or as part of an
18 email archiving system, are subject to the general discovery requirements of Federal Rules of Civil
19 Procedure 26, 34, and 45, including internal documents, PowerPoint presentations, Wikis, and
20 similar information that may or may not be stored electronically. However, general production
21 requests under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 34 and 45 shall not include email or other forms
22 of electronic correspondence (collectively “email”). Instead, email production requests shall be
23 governed by the search term process outlined below.

24 7. Email production requests shall only be propounded for specific search terms (as
25 outlined below), rather than general discovery of a product or business.

26 8. Document production responsive to discovery requests pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P.
27 34 shall be phased to occur after Juniper has served its Invalidity Contentions.

28

- 1 a. Email production requests shall identify the custodian, search terms, and time
2 frame. The parties shall cooperate to identify the proper custodians, proper search
3 terms, and proper timeframe as set forth in the Guidelines.
- 4 b. Each requesting party shall limit its email production requests to a total of eight
5 custodians per producing party for all such requests. The parties may jointly agree
6 to modify this limit without the Court's leave. The Court shall consider contested
7 requests for additional custodians, upon showing a distinct need based on the size,
8 complexity, and issues of this specific case. Cost-shifting may be considered as
9 part of any such request.
- 10 c. Each requesting party shall limit its email production requests to a total of seven
11 search terms per custodian per party as set forth below, and also the other party's
12 name (*i.e.*, Finjan shall search for "Juniper" and Juniper shall search for "Finjan"
13 for the identified custodians). The parties may jointly agree to modify this limit
14 without the Court's leave. The Court shall consider contested requests for
15 additional search terms per custodian, upon showing a distinct need based on the
16 size, complexity, and issues of this specific case. The Court encourages the parties
17 to confer on a process to test the efficacy of the search terms. The search terms
18 shall be narrowly tailored to particular issues. Indiscriminate terms, such as the
19 producing company's name or its product name, are inappropriate unless combined
20 with narrowing search criteria that sufficiently reduce the risk of overproduction.
21 A conjunctive combination of multiple words or phrases (*e.g.*, "computer" and
22 "system") narrows the search and shall count as a single search term. A disjunctive
23 combination of multiple words or phrases (*e.g.*, "computer" or "system") broadens
24 the search, and thus each word or phrase shall count as a separate search term
25 unless they are variants, abbreviations, or acronyms of the same word. Use of
26 narrowing search criteria (*e.g.*, "and," "but not," "w/x") is encouraged to limit the
27 production and shall be considered when determining whether to shift costs for
28 disproportionate discovery. Should a party serve email production requests with

1 search terms beyond the limits agreed to by the parties or granted by the Court
2 pursuant to this paragraph, this shall be considered in determining whether any
3 party shall bear all reasonable costs caused by such additional discovery.

- 4 d. No later than 17 days after receiving an initial list of search terms for a custodian,
5 the producing party shall provide a hit count identifying the number of documents
6 each search term identified during the search. The requesting party may then
7 provide a modified list of search terms but may not change the identified custodian,
8 unless the hitcount for a particular custodian produces fewer than 100 total hits
9 across all terms, in which case the requesting party may change that particular
10 custodian not more than once and may not change more than 2 custodians total.
11 The producing party shall provide a hit count identifying the number of documents
12 that each modified search term identified during the search within 7 business days
13 after receiving the modified list of search terms. The receiving party shall thereafter
14 identify the final list of search terms for the custodian. The producing party shall
15 produce the identified emails in a reasonably diligent manner, but no later than 21
16 days after the requesting party provides the final list of search terms.¹

17 9. The parties have discussed their preservation obligations and needs and agree that
18 preservation of potentially relevant ESI will be reasonable and proportionate. To reduce the costs
19 and burdens of preservation and to ensure proper ESI is preserved, the parties agree that:

- 20 a. Each party will take reasonable steps to preserve all ESI that is relevant to the
21 claims and defenses in this litigation that was created or received on or after June
22 2014;
- 23 b. Each party will take reasonable steps to preserve, regardless of date, all ESI
24 concerning the Patents-in-Suit, any products or services related to the conception or
25

26
27 ¹ Notwithstanding this or any other provision, the parties reserve the right to object to and
28 withhold discovery on the grounds of, *inter alia*, relevance and privilege. See *FlowRider Surf,
Ltd. v. Pacific Surf Designs, Inc.*, 15cv1879-BEN (BLM), 2016 WL 65228071, at *7-8 (S.D. Cal.
Nov. 3, 2016).

1 reduction to practice of or covered by the Patents-in-Suit, and any products or
2 services accused of infringement in this action;

- 3 c. The parties will preserve ESI for a reasonable number of custodians per party; and
4 d. Among the sources of data the parties agree are not reasonably accessible, the
5 parties agree not to preserve the following: backup media not reasonably accessible
6 (including disaster recovery systems), digital voicemail, instant messaging, systems
7 no longer in use, and automatically saved versions of documents.

8 10. A party shall not be liable for the loss of electronically stored information that
9 should have been preserved in the anticipation or conduct of litigation, unless it is lost because the
10 party failed to take reasonable steps to preserve it and it cannot be restored or replaced through
11 additional discovery. Should the Court find prejudice to another party from the loss, the Court
12 may order measures no greater than necessary to cure the prejudice. Only where a party has acted
13 with the intent to deprive another party of the information's use in litigation may the Court
14 presume that the lost information was unfavorable to the party, instruct the jury that it may or must
15 presume that the information was unfavorable to the party, or dismiss the action or enter a default
16 judgment. No other remedies are available.

17 11. Documents will be produced in single-page TIFF format with full-text extraction
18 and database load files, with the exception that spreadsheets shall be produced in native format. If
19 there is no extractable text, the producing party shall perform Optical Character Recognition
20 ("OCR") on the document and provide the associated text file. All text files should be produced
21 as document level text files with a path to the text file included in the database load file; extracted
22 text/OCR should not be embedded in the load file itself. A party may make a reasonable request
23 to receive the document in its native format. Additionally, in the event that production of a
24 document in TIFF image file format would be impracticable, the producing party shall have the
25 option of producing such document in native format.

26 12. For emails, the following metadata shall be provided to the extent it exists and is
27 reasonably accessible: To, From, CC, BCC, Date Sent, Time Sent, Subject, Parent-child
28 relationships, Custodian.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.