

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**IN RE PAPST LICENSING GMBH & CO.  
KG LITIGATION**

**This Document Relates To:  
Casio v. Papst, 06-1751**

**Misc. Action No. 07-493 (RMC);  
MDL Docket No. 1880**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION DENYING PAPST'S OBJECTIONS TO MAGISTRATE  
JUDGE'S MAY 31, 2007 ORDER**

Papst Licensing GMBH & Co. KG ("Papst") objects to the May 31, 2007 order of the Magistrate Judge requiring Papst to respond to the initial discovery propounded by Casio America Inc., formerly known as Casio, Inc., ("Casio USA")—without objections concerning attorney client privilege, consulting expert privilege, attorney work product protections, objections based on confidentiality, and objections based on relevance — due to Papst's failure to comply with the district court's order requiring Papst to respond to Casio USA's initial discovery requests. As explained below, the objections will be denied.

**I. FACTS**

Papst's objections arise from the earlier stages of this case before it was approved as Multi-District Litigation ("MDL") and transferred to the undersigned. Casio USA filed its complaint against Papst on October 16, 2007. Papst filed an answer and counterclaim, adding Casio Computer Company, Ltd. ("Casio Japan") as a defendant on January 2, 2007. The district court to whom the

case was assigned set an initial scheduling conference for February 1, 2007, and then postponed the conference until March 20, 2007.

Under the Local Rules, parties are required to hold a Rule 26(f) conference twenty-one days before the initial scheduling conference. *See* LCvR 16.2; *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f). The Local Rule provides that a party may move to extend the deadline for holding a Rule 26(f) conference if a defendant has not been served or appeared in the case. Papst did not move to extend the deadline for the Rule 26(f) conference despite the fact that it had not then served Casio Japan.

Counsel for Papst and counsel for Casio USA conducted a telephone conference on March 2, 2007. Casio USA understood and intended this teleconference to be the Rule 26(f) conference; all required topics were discussed. Papst takes the position that the March 2, 2007, teleconference was not a proper Rule 26(f) conference because Papst had not yet served Casio Japan. As a result, Casio Japan was not represented during the phone call.<sup>1</sup>

On March 6, 2007, Papst filed a motion to continue the initial scheduling conference. Casio USA opposed the motion, challenging Papst's statement that it would take up to four months to serve Casio Japan under the Hague Convention, but also noting that if the Judge granted the motion, Casio USA requested that discovery continue. *Casio Am., Inc. v. Papst Licensing GMBH & Co. KG*, No. 06-1751, Casio's Resp. Dkt. #13 at 2. Casio USA explained:

It is black letter law that once a 26(f) conference takes place, discovery can begin. This is applicable whether or not all parties have been served. Casio [USA] and Papst have had their Rule 26(f) conference, and pursuant to Rule 26, discovery should begin.

*Id.* Casio USA also explained that it already had served interrogatories and document requests on

---

<sup>1</sup> Papst served Casio Japan through the Hague Convention on March 13, 2007. Thereafter, counsel for Casio USA began joint representation of Casio USA and Casio Japan.

Papst on March 2, 2007, after it completed its Rule 26(f) conference with Papst. *Id.* at 3. In its Reply, Papst first argued that the March 2, 2007 telephone call did “not satisfy Local Rule 16.3(a) because not all Defendants participated.” *See id.*, Papst’s Reply Dkt. #14 at 2.<sup>2</sup> Second, Papst contended that “[p]roceeding with a discovery plan now, when Casio Japan has not yet been served and counsel for Casio U.S. will not and apparently cannot speak for Casio U.S. [sic], will waste the time and resources of the Court and parties.” *Id.* Papst’s third argument was that Casio U.S. was “attempting to gain tactical advantage in discovery by claiming to have conducted a good faith Rule 26(f) conference on March 2, and immediately thereafter serving written discovery on Papst Licensing, when the phone call was missing *the* critical Defendant’s counsel.” *Id.*

With this completely briefed argument before it, in a Minute Entry Order dated March 13, 2007, the Court entered its “Order granting the Motions to Continue; the Initial Scheduling Conference is hereby continued until May 14, 2007, at 10:15 a.m.; no further continuances will be granted; discovery between Plaintiff and Defendant *is to proceed.*” *Casio Am., Inc. v. Papst Licensing GMBH & Co. KG*, No. 06-1751, Minute Order filed Mar. 13, 2007 (emphasis added).

Papst alleges that it believed that the court’s order that discovery was “to proceed” meant that all three parties, Casio USA, Casio Japan, and Papst, should proceed with a Rule 26(f) conference before Papst was required to respond to the Casio USA interrogatories and document requests. Casio USA understood the Minute Order to mean that the time for response to its

---

<sup>2</sup> Papst particularly complained that “[e]ven simple questions such as Casio Japan’s electronic data and e-mail systems went unanswered.” *Id.* This Court has subsequently stricken all of Papst’s initial discovery requests to Casio USA as overbroad, unduly burdensome, not likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence, and propounded in bad faith, including its highly complex “simple questions” concerning information technology for each and every Casio company around the world. *See First Order Regarding Casio/Papst Discovery Dkt. #77.*

discovery requests began to run on March 2 when Casio USA served them upon Papst and that Papst's responses therefore were due on April 2, 2007. As is clear from its own argument to the Court, counsel for Papst acknowledged that they had received the Casio USA discovery requests on March 2, 2007. Despite the direct Order of the Court, and its clear knowledge of the outstanding discovery, Papst failed to respond by April 2.

On April 20, 2007, Casio USA moved to compel responses, and Papst opposed. The district court referred the motion to compel to the Magistrate Judge. The Magistrate Judge heard oral argument on May 31, 2007, and granted Casio USA's motion to compel from the bench, noting:

[T]he court reviewed the motion, the opposition and the reply . . . . Having done so, the Court will grant the motion, largely for the reasons offered by the Movant, both orally and in writing.

More specifically, the Court finds that what Papst urges upon the Court is a novel way of counting the number of days in which a party must serve responses to written discovery requests. The Court uses the term, quote, "novel," close quote, because there is simply no authority which supports this method of calculating the deadline.

The rules make plain when it is that a party is to serve responses to written discovery requests. There was no motion for enlargement of time filed by Papst. Papst did not seek any clarification of the due date in the meet and confer report that counsel, along with opposing counsel, filed in this matter, and appears to have unilaterally taken the position that because Papst was displeased with the manner in which the Rule 26(f) meeting or conference was conducted that the responses to the written discovery requests would be withheld.

Tr. of May 31, 2007 hearing at 25. She ordered "that complete responses — that is *without objections*, which have been waived by the failure to respond in a timely fashion — be served within 10 calendar days of today's date." *Id.* at 27 (emphasis added). As a sanction, the Magistrate Judge also imposed on Papst the costs to Casio USA, including reasonable attorney's fees, of moving to

compel. *Id.*

On June 6, 2007, Papst filed a Request for Clarification, seeking clarification whether Papst was deemed to have waived the attorney client privilege, consulting expert privilege, attorney work product protections, objections based on confidentiality, and objections based on relevance. *Casio*, No. 06-1751, Dkt. #35. On June 7, 2007, Casio USA filed a response maintaining that all privileges had been waived, but agreeing to maintain the confidentiality of documents produced. *Id.*, Dkt. #37. On June 27, 2007, the Magistrate Judge summarily denied the Request for Clarification “for the reasons offered by [Casio].” *Id.*, June 27, 2007 Minute Order.

Prior to the Magistrate Judge’s ruling on June 27, Papst had timely filed before the district court its objections to and motion to reconsider the Magistrate Judge’s May 31, 2007 order. *Casio*, No. 06-1751, Dkt. #43, filed 6/14/07. Papst refiled that same motion, without change or update, in this MDL. *See* Papst’s Objections to and Mot. to Reconsider the Magistrate Judge’s May 31, 2007 Order Dkt. #43. Casio USA then responded. *See* Casio’s Resp. Dkt.#49. Papst replied, *see* Papst’s Reply Dkt. #44, and Casio USA supplemented its response, *see* Casio’s Supp. Resp. Dkt. #63.

## II. LEGAL STANDARDS

Papst objects to the Magistrate Judge’s Order under Local Civil Rule 72.2(b). Papst’s Objections Dkt. #43 at 1 (citing LCvR 72.2(b) (“any party may file written objections to a magistrate judge's ruling . . . within 10 days after being served with the order”)). Under Local Rule 72.2(c), “Upon consideration of objections filed in accordance with this Rule, a district judge may modify or set aside any portion of a magistrate judge's order under this Rule found to be *clearly erroneous or contrary to law.*” LCvR 72.2(c) (emphasis added). The comment to Rule 72.2 indicates, “The

# 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.