Case 2:21-cv-00186-JRG-RSP Document 215 Filed 09/22/22 Page 1 of 10 PageID #: 10228

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

JAWBONE INNOVATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

NO. 2:21-CV-0186-JRG-RSP

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., ET AL.

Defendants.

DEFENDANTS SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. AND SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF GREGORY BURNETT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	3
II.	ARGUMENT	3
III.	CONCLUSION	6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Drexel Chem. Co. v. Fluorchemika Corp., LLC,</i> 2013 WL 12253042 (W.D. Tenn. May 6, 2013)2
Kleppinger v. Texas Dep't of Transp., 283 F.R.D. 330 (S.D. Tex. 2012)
O'Connor v. Cory, 2018 WL 5016291 (N.D. Tex. Oct. 16, 2018)1
<i>Off. Comm. of Unsecured Creditors of Exeter Holdings, Ltd. v. Haltman,</i> 2016 WL 1180194 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 25, 2016)
United States ex rel Woodard v. Davita, Inc., No. 1:05-CV-227, 2011 WL 13199233 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 26, 2011)1
Other Authorities
Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(a)(2)(A)(ii)

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants ("Samsung") request an order compelling three (3) additional hours of deposition testimony of witness Gregory Burnett. Dr. Burnett provided testimony on September 7 and, in his individual capacity as an inventor of the Asserted Patents and in his capacity as Plaintiff's 30(b)(6) designee for twenty two (22) topics. During the first day of Dr. Burnett's deposition, it became clear that he had not performed a reasonable search for documents responsive to his subpoena, and after that day, Defendants requested he do so, and bring such documents to his second day of his deposition. Defendants' request, however, was ignored, and additional responsive documents were not produced until after his deposition was complete. Although the parties met and conferred on this issue on September 16, Plaintiff has refused to make Dr. Burnett available for any additional deposition time. Samsung therefore seeks an order compelling Plaintiff to provide additional deposition time as outlined below.

II. ARGUMENT

A natural person may be deposed again with leave of court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(a)(2)(A)(ii). While the party seeking to depose a witness who has already been deposed must seek leave of court, the "court must grant such leave unless it would be unreasonable to do so." *United States ex rel Woodard v. Davita, Inc.*, No. 1:05-CV-227, 2011 WL 13199233, at *2 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 26, 2011). Courts use the "good cause" standard to determine whether to reopen or retake a deposition. *See O'Connor v. Cory*, 2018 WL 5016291, at *2 (N.D. Tex. Oct. 16, 2018); *Kleppinger v. Texas Dep't of Transp.*, 283 F.R.D. 330, 335-36 & n.7 (S.D. Tex. 2012). Courts have allowed parties to reopen depositions for good cause when "new information comes to light that creates the need for further questioning." *O'Connor*, 2018 WL 5016291, at *2 (citation omitted). "New information can include. . . the production of new documents." *Id.* (citation omitted); *see also Kleppinger*, 283 F.R.D. at 334-35 (ordering reopening of deposition where a

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

relevant document was produced after the deposition); *Off. Comm. of Unsecured Creditors of Exeter Holdings, Ltd. v. Haltman*, 2016 WL 1180194, at *3-*4 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 25, 2016) (permitting additional deposition time to address documents produced after the witness's original deposition); *Drexel Chem. Co. v. Fluorchemika Corp., LLC*, 2013 WL 12253042, at *2 (W.D. Tenn. May 6, 2013) (ordering deposition reopened where relevant documents were produced after initial deposition, even though documents were not intentionally withheld).

Here, Plaintiff and Dr. Burnett produced additional documents responsive to Samsung's subpoena after the deposition concluded. Indeed, *the day after* Samsung completed Dr. Burnett's deposition, Plaintiff produced

		-

During the parties' meet and confer, Plaintiff argued additional deposition time was not warranted because Samsung had the opportunity to question Dr. Burnett about the substance of

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET A L A R M



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.