

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

PersonalWeb: (1) After months of refusing to direct its lawyers at Stubbs Alderton to turn over responsive documents, PersonalWeb only last week purportedly did so. (See Declaration of Todd R. Gregorian ("Gregorian Decl."), Ex. A at 3.) But PersonalWeb still refuses to take responsibility for the collection process, leaving it to Amazon to try to negotiate with Stubbs. (Exs. B-D.)¹

- (2) Stubbs refuses to discuss what paper and electronic files it maintains for PersonalWeb; only that its search is still ongoing and that it plans to complete production by January 20. (Ex. C at 3.) For electronic documents, Stubbs still has apparently only run full keyword searches for "PersonalWeb" and variants not including "Pweb." Stubbs offered to consider additional electronic search terms, but then it shut down discussion of Amazon's proposals. (Ex. C at 9 "Priority Categories".) Now, on the eve of the hearing, PersonalWeb and Stubbs both report that Stubbs has run a subset of Amazon's proposed search terms against an undisclosed data set. (Id. at 3; Ex. A at 1.) Amazon maintains that Stubbs must turn over the seven priority categories that Amazon identified previously for the Stubbs collection. (See Dkt. 823 at 1 n.2.)
- (3) Stubbs Alderton now admits to withholding documents that it claims "belong" to other firm clients like the PersonalWeb insider-investors. Stubbs originally promised to provide information about this issue before December 14th hearing, (see Ex. D at 1, 5), but now it refuses to identify on behalf of which entities it is withholding documents, explain how it is making judgment calls about which of its joint clients "own" each document, provide a log of the withheld documents, or even just disclose their number. (See Ex. C at 2-4.) At a recent conference of counsel, Mr. Sherman became animated and shut down discussion of this issue. (Id. at 8.) He then went on vacation, promising that Mr. Gersh would address open questions in his absence. (Id. at 5.) But Mr. Gersh then claimed to have no information about this issue. (Id. at 2.) Given that the entities are closelyrelated and share principals, and Stubbs Alderton apparently represented them jointly and also when they were on opposite sides of certain transactions, this seems to be a shell game.

¹ For its own collection, PersonalWeb has represented that approximately 3,700 documents it had previously withheld based on the waived privilege claims (i.e., the "privilege screen" documents) remain to be reviewed, but that it intends to complete production by January 20. PersonalWeb has also received certain hard drives from Stubbs Alderton (Ex. J at 1) that it has reported that it does not plan to search because it believes them to be duplicative of its collection from Mr. Weiss. PersonalWeb has represented its forensic consultant would verify this belief, but has not provided any information about the consultant's methods or results



(4) Stubbs Alderton has agreed to remove its arbitrary July 2021 date limit. It now plans to search for documents only through September 15, 2022, because it claims that after that date it was "prohibit[ed]" from communicating with its "former client." (*Id.* at 2.) To the contrary, Stubbs still represents PersonalWeb at the Federal Circuit, including filing a substantive letter brief for PersonalWeb after its new proposed date cutoff. (Case No. 21-1858, Dkt. 71.)

(5) The PersonalWeb documents that Stubbs Alderton has already produced are fraught with technical issues, such as missing page images, missing pages out of a multi-page document, missing attachments to emails, and no load file or document metadata. Amazon raised these issues with both PersonalWeb and Stubbs Alderton weeks ago, and neither party has addressed them.

PersonalWeb insider-investors (Claria/ECA/Brilliant Digital/Monto): (1) By comparing productions across parties, Amazon determined that the PersonalWeb investors had failed to produce certain documents. This led to a further discovery that they had failed to produce other responsive documents as well, including incriminating emails showing that they had colluded with PersonalWeb to modify the secured loan agreements shortly before they foreclosed. Specifically, just *days* before the PersonalWeb investors filed the receivership action, they amended the agreements to identify PersonalWeb's patent infringement suits as collateral for the loans. (Exs. E, and F-H.) The PersonalWeb investors have thus far totally failed to explain why these documents were not captured by their searches and produced previously. (Ex. I.)

(2) This failure makes it even more important that the Court order Claria and ECA to search and produce all email accounts that Mr. Markiles used to conduct their business. As discussed above, Stubbs Alderton has not searched for those documents, and is withholding any that it locates in the PersonalWeb search based on criteria that it refused to disclose to Amazon. Amazon has also searched the PersonalWeb productions made since the date of the last status update. Due to the technical issues and lack of metadata, Amazon cannot be certain, but as best it can tell, Exhibits 3, 9, 22, and 25 to the Lavin Declaration (Dkt. 810-1) remain absent from the production.²

² Claria and ECA's remaining argument is their misdirection that this Court would lack jurisdiction to consider an alter ego *claim* in a complaint filed against them. (*See* Dkts. 801 & 825.) The Court clearly has jurisdiction to order discovery from a nonparty to aid in enforcement of a judgment. *See Em Ltd. v. Rep. of Argentina*, 695 F.3d 201, 209 (2d Cir. 2012), *aff'd*, *Rep. of Argentina v. NML Capital Ltd.* 573 U.S. 134 (2014). And this Court has already held correctly that there is "a



