# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT DELAWARE

| ARENDI S.A.R.L., | )                        |
|------------------|--------------------------|
| Plaintiff,       | )<br>C.A. No. 13-919-JLH |
| v.               | )                        |
| GOOGLE LLC,      | )                        |
| Defendant        | )                        |

# LETTER TO THE HONORABLE JENNIFER L. HALL FROM DAVID E. MOORE REGARDING UPDATED DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS

#### OF COUNSEL:

Robert W. Unikel John Cotiguala Matt Lind PAUL HASTINGS LLP 71 South Wacker Drive, Suite 4500 Chicago, IL 60606 Tel: (312) 449-6000

Robert R. Laurenzi Chad J. Peterman PAUL HASTINGS LLP 200 Park Avenue New York, NY 10166 Tel: (212) 318-6000

Ginger D. Anders MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 601 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Suite 500E Washington, D.C. 20001 Tel: (202) 220-1100

Vincent Y. Ling MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 350 S. Grand Avenue, 50th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 Tel: (213) 683-9100

Dated: April 25, 2023

#### POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP

David E. Moore (#3983) Bindu A. Palapura (#5370) Andrew L. Brown (#6766) Hercules Plaza, 6th Floor 1313 N. Market Street Wilmington, DE 19801 Tel: (302) 984-6000 dmoore@potteranderson.com

dmoore@potteranderson.com bpalapura@potteranderson.com abrown@potteranderson.com

Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC



#### April 25, 2023

## Dear Judge Hall:

The parties have further streamlined the issues for resolution relating to the Anind Dey deposition designations, and so wish to provide the court with an updated joint submission reflecting their pending disputes. There are no longer any disputes with respect to the Miller designations or the Dey or Miller exhibits.

Accordingly, please find attached the updated Anind Dey deposition transcript, indicating Google's designations, Arendi's counter-designations, and the parties' objections and positions (Exhibit 1); and a spreadsheet listing the parties' current deposition designations, counter-designations, objections, and positions (Exhibit 2).

Notably, many, though not all, of the parties' objections are common across various deposition designations. To avoid burdening the Court with repetitive objections, the parties provide the following positions on those repeated objections:

### Google

• <u>Leading</u>: Arendi did not raise this objection at deposition, either by not raising any form objection or by not specifying a "leading" objection giving counsel the opportunity to correct any deficiency, and the questions were proper.

### **Arendi**

• <u>Leading</u>: Google's designations include leading questions that had a major impact on the testimony. Rule 611 is clear that leading questions can only be used with a witness who is adverse to or hostile to the questioning party. Mr. Dey is not adverse to Google, much less hostile. Arendi objected to Google's leading questions in the record, and they should be excluded as improper.

Respectfully,

/s/ David E. Moore

David E. Moore

DEM:nmt/10773066/12599.00040

#### **Enclosures**

cc: Clerk of the Court (via hand delivery)

Counsel of Record (via electronic mail)

