UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 16-3714-GW (AGRx)	Date	December 16, 2016
Title	The California Institute of Technology v. Broadcom Limited, et al.		

Present: The Honorable	Alicia G. Rosenberg, United States Magistrate Judge	
Marine Pogosyan	CS 12/16/2016	
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:	Attorneys Present for Defendants:
Todd M. Briggs James R. Asperger	James M. Dowd Mark Selwyn

Proceedings: **RE DISCOVERY CONFERENCE**

At the parties' request, the court conducted a discovery conference. The parties filed a joint agenda. (Dkt. No. 80.)

For the reasons discussed on the record, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Counsel shall meet and confer regarding the source code portion of the proposed protective order and ESI order on or before December 19, 2016.

    a. If counsel cannot reach agreement on the source code portion, counsel shall promptly contact the Court Clerk, Marine Pogosyan, to request a telephonic hearing.

    b. Defendants shall produce the source code and source code files for the accused products on or before December 23, 2016.

2. Counsel shall meet and confer regarding the remaining provisions of the protective order and ESI order on or before January 5, 2017.

    a. If counsel cannot reach agreement, then on or before January 11, 2017, the parties shall file a joint proposed protective order and joint proposed ESI order. For any disputed paragraph, the joint proposed order shall contain first the alternative paragraph proposed by Plaintiff and then the alternative paragraph proposed by Defendants. Also on January 11, 2017, each side may file a concise brief on the disputed issues not to exceed 15 pages. The court will notify the parties if it requires a hearing.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 16-3714-GW (AGRx)	Date	December 16, 2016
Title	The California Institute of Technology v. Broadcom Limited, et al.		

b. On or before January 11, 2017, defense counsel shall advise Plaintiff's counsel of the estimated date by which Defendants will complete production of the rest of the seven categories of documents that were identified as a priority by the Plaintiff, including but not limited to technical specifications for the accused products.

3. The parties agreed that Plaintiff shall complete production of the document and transcripts from *California Institute of Technology v. Hughes Communs. Inc.*, CV 13-7245 MRP, on or before December 23, 2016.

4. The parties agreed that Broadcom shall serve supplemental responses to Interrogatory Nos. 2, 4, 5 and 6 on or before December 23, 2016. Apple and Cypress shall serve supplemental responses to Interrogatory Nos. 2, 4, 5 and 6 on or before January 20, 2017.

5. After discussion with counsel, the court has determined that Caltech's Rule 30(b)(6) notices to Defendants are not yet ripe for adjudication by the court.

1 : 30

Initials of Preparer mp