

John E. Flaherty
jflaherty@mccarter.com
Cynthia S. Betz
cbetz@mccarter.com
McCarter & English, LLP
100 Mulberry Street
4 Gateway Center
Newark, NJ 07102
T: 973-622-4444

Drew Koning (*pro-hac vice*)
drew@kzllp.com
Blake Zollar (*pro-hac vice*)
blake@kzllp.com
Koning Zollar LLP
169 Saxony Road, STE 115
Encinitas, CA 92024
T: 858.252.3234
F: 858.252.3238

Erik Dykema
erik@kzllp.com
Koning Zollar LLP
4 Manheim Road
Essex Fells, New Jersey 07021
T: 858.252.3234
F: 858.252.3238

Shaun Paisley (*pro-hac vice*)
shaun@kzllp.com
Koning Zollar LLP
470 James Street, Suite 007
New Haven, CT 06513
T: 203.951.1213
F: 858.252.3238

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF
OANDA Corporation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

OANDA Corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

GAIN Capital Holdings, Inc.;
GAIN Capital Group, LLC.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 3:20-cv-5784

Judge: Hon. Douglas E. Arpert

Motion Day: June 5, 2023

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

FILED UNDER SEAL

OANDA'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF DATA
FROM GAIN'S JIRA SYSTEM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 2

A. THE PARTIES ENGAGE IN INITIAL DISCOVERY, WITH OANDA SEEKING ACCESS TO GAIN’S SOURCE CODE AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS TO UNDERSTAND THE DESIGN, FUNCTION, AND OPERATION OF THE ACCUSED PRODUCTS 2

B. OANDA MEETS AND CONFERS WITH GAIN IN AN EFFORT TO FILL NOW-CONFIRMED GAPS IN GAIN’S TECHNICAL DOCUMENT PRODUCTION 4

C. AFTER FURTHER MEET AND CONFER EFFORTS, GAIN CONTINUES TO REFUSE TO PRODUCE JIRA DATA WITHOUT OANDA FOOTING THE BILL 7

III. GAIN SHOULD BE COMPELLED TO PRODUCE DATA FROM JIRA 11

A. DATA FROM JIRA IS RELEVANT AND PROPORTIONAL TO THE NEEDS OF THE CASE 11

B. JIRA DATA IS REASONABLY ACCESSIBLE 12

C. THERE IS NO BASIS FOR COST-SHIFTING EVEN IF THE COURT WERE TO DETERMINE THAT JIRA IS NOT REASONABLY ACCESSIBLE 15

IV. CONCLUSION 18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Chen-Oster v. Goldman, Sachs & Co.</i> , 285 F.R.D. 294 (S.D.N.Y. 2012)	13
<i>Cvent, Inc. v. RainFocus, Inc.</i> , No. 2:17-cv-00230-RJS-DBP, 2019 WL 7837157 (D. Utah Apr. 4, 2019)	14
<i>Goshawk Dedicated Ltd. v. Am. Viatical Servs., LLC</i> , No. 1:05-CV-2343, 2007 WL 3492762 (N.D. Ga. Nov. 5, 2007).....	15
<i>Gregory v. Gregory</i> , No. 2:15-cv-0320 (WHW)(CLW), 2016 WL 6122456 (D.N.J. Oct. 18, 2016)	12, 15
<i>High 5 Games, LLC v. Marks</i> , No. 2:13-cv-07161-JMV-MF, 2019 WL 1499769 (D.N.J. Apr. 5, 2019)	12
<i>High Point SARL v. Sprint Nextel Corp.</i> , No. 09-2269, 2011 WL 4526770 (D. Kan. Sept. 28, 2011).....	15
<i>InfoDeli, LLC v. W. Robidoux, Inc.</i> , No. 4:15-CV-00364-BCW, 2016 WL 6915315 (W.D. Mo. Oct. 13, 2016).....	14
<i>Juster Acquisition Co. v. N. Hudson Sewerage Auth.</i> , No. 12-3427 JLL, 2013 WL 541972 (D.N.J. Feb. 11, 2013).....	16, 17
<i>Mosaid Techs. Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. CIV.A01-CV-4340(WJM), 2004 WL 2550309 (D.N.J. Oct. 1, 2004)	12
<i>RealPage, Inc. v. Enter. Risk Control, LLC</i> , No. 4:16-CV-00737, 2017 WL 1165688 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 29, 2017)	14
<i>Synopsys, Inc. v. ATopTech, Inc.</i> , No. 13-cv-02965-MMC (DMR), 2015 WL 2393667 (N.D. Cal. May 18, 2015).....	14
<i>Zubulake v. UBS Warburg LLC</i> , 216 F.R.D. 280 (S.D.N.Y.2003) (<i>Zubulake III</i>).....	15, 16
<i>Zubulake v. UBS Warburg LLC</i> , 217 F.R.D. 309 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) (<i>Zubulake I</i>)	8, 13
Other Authorities	
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26	11, 12

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff OANDA files this motion to compel Defendant GAIN to produce data from JIRA, which is an issue tracking and project management software program employed by GAIN during the period relevant to this lawsuit. According to deposition testimony from GAIN's software engineer, David Leach, and other documents produced by GAIN, GAIN employees have used JIRA [REDACTED] [REDACTED] during the relevant period. In addition, JIRA is the software tool GAIN has used to track when particular versions of the accused products were deployed or retired (i.e., in use or not in use). JIRA thus contains material technical information, including information relevant to understanding the design and function of GAIN's accused products, as well as when particular versions of the software were deployed.

Notwithstanding the direct relevance of this information, GAIN has refused to produce any data from JIRA, principally on the alleged ground that JIRA is "not reasonably accessible" within the meaning of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(2)(B) and the ESI Order in this case. GAIN's position is that it would need to employ a vendor to extract and produce relevant data from JIRA in readable format using a third-party software platform, at a cost of approximately \$14,500, and that this renders JIRA inaccessible under the ESI Order. Based on this reasoning, GAIN has stated that it is willing to produce JIRA data but will do so only if OANDA foots the bill for production.

OANDA, however, is entitled to this data without having to pay for it. Unlike sources that are traditionally considered inaccessible, such as backups for disaster recovery or fragmented data, JIRA is an active database, from which documents can be searched, retrieved, and produced, as numerous cases involving JIRA discovery disputes confirm. And while GAIN may consider running searches in JIRA too burdensome, there are other methods to produce the relevant data

that have been proposed by OANDA, including providing OANDA with a complete copy of the database (such as through providing read-only access or a complete copy via XML export), an approach that has been endorsed by federal courts. GAIN, however, has rejected these alternatives, claiming that providing OANDA access in this way would compromise private customer information, and taking the position that even the highest levels of protection provided by the Stipulated Confidentiality Order do not for some reason address that concern. While GAIN's preferred method of production of JIRA data might require paying a vendor, that is not a sufficient basis for finding JIRA inaccessible, particularly when GAIN has refused to produce via other available, less costly production methods.

Finally, even if a searchable software platform that is in current, daily use by GAIN employees could be deemed "not reasonably accessible," there is still no basis for requiring OANDA to reimburse GAIN for the costs of production. The factors that are considered in a cost-shifting analysis all weigh in favor of maintaining the traditional approach to discovery costs: that the producing party pays.

OANDA's Motion should be granted.

II. BACKGROUND

A. The Parties Engage In Initial Discovery, With OANDA Seeking Access to GAIN's Source Code And Technical Documents To Understand The Design, Function, and Operation of the Accused Products.

In this lawsuit, OANDA alleges that its competitor GAIN's foreign exchange trading technologies infringe two of OANDA's patents, U.S. Patents No. 7,146,336 (the '336 Patent) and No. 8,392,311 (the '311 Patent). These patents claim systems and methods for online currency trading that improve upon prior art online currency trading.

OANDA propounded its First Set of Requests for Production of Documents ("RFP(s)") on June 2, 2021, the first day it could do so under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f). (Paisley

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.