

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 the managing directors of the various offices, some of the
2 plaintiffs' intermediate supervisors, I believe it has all the
3 HR people.

4 THE COURT: How many people are in plaintiffs' list?

5 MS. WIPPER: 47.

6 THE COURT: Is that a difference of 11, or is it a
7 bigger difference because you don't want some of their 36 or
8 whatever?

9 MR. ANDERS: I have a difference of 12, your Honor.
10 They had removed four people from our list of 36. They added
11 18 and then very recently took two more people off, so it's a
12 net --

13 THE COURT: Who are the 12 that are now in dispute?
14 I've got your respective custodian lists in front of me.

15 MR. ANDERS: Your Honor, I can tell you the 12 in
16 dispute right now.

17 THE COURT: OK.

18 MR. ANDERS: If you look at plaintiffs' ESI protocol.

19 THE COURT: Yes.

20 MR. ANDERS: Well, my version is a redline version
21 which is page 11, but if you look at the section which lists
22 their custodians --

23 THE COURT: Yes.

24 MR. ANDERS: -- from Scott Bedowin down, who I believe
25 is number -- I think he's number 30 on mine.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 THE COURT: Got it.

2 MR. ANDERS: So from him down, with the exception of
3 Merrill Freund and Lance Breisen, those people are all new
4 people.

5 THE COURT: All right. Two questions: Mark Hass,
6 former CEO, when did he leave?

7 MS. WIPPER: 2009.

8 THE COURT: So we're talking about a year-plus. Well,
9 to the extent that some of these are managing directors in what
10 I guess are branch offices -- Seattle, Atlanta, Boston,
11 Detroit, Chicago maybe -- any objection to them?

12 MR. ANDERS: I guess, your Honor, my concern would be,
13 and what I had said to plaintiffs' counsel, was the database
14 with the 3.2 million documents --

15 THE COURT: Do you have any idea as to how many would
16 be added if these 12 were tossed in?

17 MR. ANDERS: We have not collected those, so I don't
18 know what their size is. One of the things we have encountered
19 with this case is because of the extent to which email is used,
20 the email accounts individually were a lot larger than we have
21 anticipated in the past.

22 THE COURT: But once you do some screening of them,
23 you'll reduce it down.

24 MR. ANDERS: Understood.

25 THE COURT: Unless somebody can give me an argument --
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 and I know there is some argument that I saw somewhere in
2 somebody's letter, about the three or four people from Winter &
3 Associates, but for the internal MSL people, I'm not sure what
4 difference it makes.

5 MS. WIPPER: Your Honor, if I could address that, the
6 Winter & Associates is part of MSL Group that was folded in as
7 part of the reorganization.

8 THE COURT: When were they folded in?

9 MS. WIPPER: 2008/2009. We have been in contact with
10 employees of Winter & Associates, and we believe that they are
11 subject to similar policies and practices and --

12 THE COURT: As of when they were folded in?

13 MS. WIPPER: Correct.

14 THE COURT: And they are also public relations --

15 MS. WIPPER: Correct.

16 THE COURT: -- staff?

17 MS. WIPPER: Correct. They are not named plaintiffs

18 but they are --

19 THE COURT: Can your named plaintiffs represent these
20 people?

21 MS. WIPPER: They're part of MSL Group, and from the
22 organizational charts that we have --

23 THE COURT: If they are part of MSL Group, then it
24 seems to me you should not be looking at them separately. And
25 I am certainly concerned with somebody who has the title of

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 general counsel.

2 So either they're the same as everybody else once the
3 reorg hit, in which case I don't see why you're targeting these
4 folks specifically, or they're different, in which case I'm not
5 sure you've got a plaintiff with standing. What am I missing?

6 MS. WIPPER: They're part of the MSL Group, they share
7 an office with MSL in L.A.

8 THE COURT: At this point I'm denying the three people
9 from Winter. So that gets our group of difference down to
10 nine. What do you all want to do about it?

11 MR. ANDERS: Your Honor, I would request that of the
12 people that we had proposed, that we discuss, or plaintiffs
13 suggest, people that could be removed. I would like to try to
14 keep the database as close to the size it is now without --

15 THE COURT: In other words, is the 3.2 million you've
16 referred to before or after the deduping?

17 MR. ANDERS: It's after deduping and deNISTing.

18 MS. CHAVEY: Your Honor, if I could also address a
19 number on my list, it's number 41, which is Don Lee the
20 managing director of PBJS Chicago?

21 THE COURT: What is PBJS?

22 MS. CHAVEY: PBJS is part of MSL Group but it is not a
23 PR agency; it's a very eclectic kind of media company, and it
24 operates separately and it is not part of the public relations
25 business of MSL Group.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 THE COURT: Why do you want Mr. Lee, Ms. Wipper?

2 MS. WIPPER: Because he is part of MSL Group. And
3 he's -- we were never told by defendants that they were not a
4 PR agency. We have asked --

5 THE COURT: Now you have been told they are different
6 from the rest. Do you still want Mr. Lee?

7 MS. WIPPER: Yes. And I would propose that --

8 THE COURT: All right, you're not getting Lee.

9 MS. WIPPER: OK.

10 THE COURT: Let's narrow this list.

11 MS. WIPPER: Can we reconsider Winter & Associates
12 because the organization --

13 THE COURT: No, no, not at this point without further
14 evidence as to why your plaintiffs have standing to deal with
15 this other than if Mr. Tsokanos and others in senior management
16 of MSL were discriminating against women during this period, in
17 which case it doesn't matter what Winter was doing.

18 MS. WIPPER: Well, I have an org chart right here that
19 shows that Winter & Associates reports right into Jim Tsokanos.

20 THE COURT: OK. So what?

21 MS. WIPPER: So they're part of the leadership team
22 that are making the decisions.

23 THE COURT: I don't know what a leadership team is in
24 this capacity.

25 MS. WIPPER: It says leadership team at the top of the
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 organization chart.

2 THE COURT: Let me see the chart.

3 I'm missing this. Where is Winter on here?

4 MS. WIPPER: It's in the box at the bottom. I think
5 it's sort of in the middle.

6 THE COURT: Well, it's various people who report to
7 Masini, et cetera.

8 MS. WIPPER: No, it reports through that top layer to
9 Jim, if you see --

10 THE COURT: Yes, it reports to Masini, and Masini
11 reports to Tsokanos. So does Canada and various other things.
12 So what?

13 OK, denied at this time without prejudice to renewal
14 at some later point.

15 MR. ANDERS: Your Honor, I guess, going down the list,
16 the first person that I guess I would take issue with, based on
17 how we're doing this is, Scott Bedowin. He's an SVP of Global
18 Consumer Marketing, not at that MD or HR type level that we
19 were considering, so I think he should come out.

20 THE COURT: OK, what's his role?

21 MS. WIPPER: Your Honor, defendants have decided to
22 put in the immediate supervisors of our plaintiffs. We didn't
23 request that. What we have done is put in comparators to our
24 plaintiffs, and we had a plaintiff who was --

25 THE COURT: If he is a comparator -- and this is email
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 searches that apparently are going to be run across everybody's
2 email -- you're going to get a lot of stuff from so-called
3 comparators that isn't relevant, it doesn't make sense to do it
4 as a uniform group. If you want to say that you've got certain
5 comparators who you want different searches run on, that's a
6 different story. It doesn't make sense to pull all their
7 material in because they're a comparator at the same level.

8 MS. WIPPER: We would agree to that.

9 THE COURT: All right, my 12:00 o'clock call has
10 called in. I have lunch at 1:00. I'm hoping this won't take
11 long. Do you all want to just sit here or do you want to go
12 into the jury room and maybe work out some of these issues?
13 Go, lawyers and consultants, as needed, into the jury room. Do
14 not leave there. We will come get you after I deal with this
15 call.

16 (Recess)

17 THE COURT: OK, it's somewhere between 12:40 and
18 12:45. We're back on the record after my other conference.

19 What progress have you made? Or perhaps the other way
20 of looking at it is: What is it in the 15 minutes we have left
21 before lunch that you want me to rule on or give you advice on
22 with respect to the ESI protocol?

23 MR. ANDERS: Your Honor, we spent the bulk of the time
24 talking about the custodian list. We have identified five
25 custodians that are, I think, more on the either comparator

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 category or secondary category where I think your Honor
2 suggested that maybe those email accounts get filtered prior to
3 being put into the database -- that's what we were trying to
4 understand -- but we have identified five where at least
5 plaintiffs would be willing to apply some type of keyword
6 search in the filtering to them first.

7 THE COURT: All right.

8 Ms. Wipper?

9 MS. WIPPER: With respect to the custodians, I believe
10 that the parties would be able to work it out. What we would
11 like to hear from the Court is your view on the differences
12 between the two protocols. Our protocol is --

13 THE COURT: I have no idea.

14 MS. WIPPER: OK.

15 THE COURT: When you send me 50 pages each, late at
16 night and/or the morning of, when you knew this conference was
17 scheduled for quite some time, there's a limit, and it was not
18 done as a redline or anything else as to where your differences
19 are. So you tell me what it would be most helpful for you, for
20 the ten minutes or so we have left, to rule on or advise on,
21 and I'll deal with it.

22 MR. ANDERS: Your Honor, I think that the key issue is
23 how we use predictive coding, and that's where there's
24 probably -- that's why we have our experts here, our vendors.

25 The way defendant MSL proposes using the predictive
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 coding process would be as follows: We start with an initial
2 random sample, with a confidence level of 95 percent, with an
3 interval of plus or minus 2 percent. With the 3.2 million
4 document database, that random sample is 2,399 documents. We
5 have gone through those preliminarily. I had associates go
6 through those; I just finished going through it last night.

7 Of that 2,399 --

8 THE COURT: Just to stop you right there, my
9 understanding of predictive coding is that the coding, as
10 painful as it is, should be done by a very senior attorney,
11 meaning partner level or very senior associate, not the usual
12 team of umpteen lower associates with a lower billing rates.

13 MR. ANDERS: That's why I reviewed it, your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Well, as "reviewed it" as every one of the
15 coding decisions or spot-checked it?

16 MR. ANDERS: No, where I am right now is I have gone
17 through every one that was marked as relevant, I went through
18 400 so far that have been coded as not relevant, and I intend
19 to go through all of those but I first looked at the ones that
20 were relevant.

21 THE COURT: At the end of the process, you're going to
22 have done every single one of the --

23 MR. ANDERS: Yes.

24 THE COURT: Then I'm not sure why your client paid for
25 someone else to do it first, but that's not my problem, that's

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 their problem.

2 OK, continue.

3 MR. ANDERS: So far 36 were deemed relevant. Of the
4 400 not relevant I have reviewed, they were clearly not
5 relevant. So right now the baseline is .015 percent of that
6 random sample was relevant. If you translate that to the
7 entire database, that's 48,000 documents.

8 After we did a random sample, then what we have done
9 at the same time is we have applied keywords and we have taken
10 the results of those keywords and sample-coded. So, for
11 example, if there's a keyword "reorganization," we may have
12 reviewed the top 200 random hits. We did that across the
13 board.

14 Also, to respond to several of plaintiffs' targeted
15 document requests, we ran targeted searches across the
16 database. That's what we have already produced, about a
17 thousand pages of documents. So we have that coding that's in
18 there.

19 Plaintiffs' counsel, they have sent us now three
20 different revisions of keywords. What I have proposed to
21 plaintiffs' counsel is, I'll give you the hit lists. I've
22 already given them two sets of hit lists; we have another set
23 to give them, I'll review -- or we'll review 3,000 of those
24 hits, you tell us how you want us to review it but pick the
25 hits, we'll review any of the top 200 in these ten categories,

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC

CONFERENCE

1 you tell us how to review it. We'll give them those results as
2 well.

3 Once that initial coding part is done, we'll let the
4 system go out, it will do a sample of, you know, train itself,
5 we'll get the results. Our proposal was to review, one, a
6 random sample of the results that come back as well as certain
7 judgmental sampling, share those results with plaintiff, they
8 can make their suggestions on how certain things should be
9 coded.

10 We have also identified six different categories that
11 documents can be coded towards. I think plaintiffs have asked
12 for us to do eight or nine. We can figure that out. Go
13 through that iterative process twice. At that point -- and
14 this is where sort of the proportionality and cost-limiting
15 comes in -- after we've gone through the iterative process
16 twice or if we have to go through another time, have the
17 computer give us the documents in rank order. And we have
18 agreed or proposed reviewing the top 40,000 rank documents.
19 And we arrived at that 40,000 document number -- we estimate it
20 will cost approximately \$200,000 using a five-dollar a document
21 cost estimate, it will cost 200,000 to review the 40,000.

22 When you take that 200,000 in review costs and you
23 couple it with our vendor costs, we're looking at a total spend
24 of approximately 550,000. We understand that plaintiffs take
25 issue with some of our vendor costs -- we can dispute that --

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 but even just looking at the \$200,000 attorney fee review cost,
2 we think that that is a more than appropriate amount to spend
3 to see what we get. We have never told plaintiffs that we're
4 going to do this and this is all that you get. Our view is,
5 let's see what this yields us first, we think these are the
6 most relevant people, this is a sophisticated and excellent way
7 to find the cream of the crop, if you will. And after that
8 process is done, we'll be in a much better position to argue
9 and debate whether or not the incremental value of searching
10 another custodian is going to be worth the cost. And that's
11 essentially our view.

12 THE COURT: Let me hear from Ms. Wipper.

13 MS. WIPPER: Your Honor, we disagree with defense
14 counsel's position that the only issue is predictive coding,
15 because that kind of skips over a lot of other issues that --

16 THE COURT: Well, let's deal with the predictive
17 coding piece. I understand, from what little I have skimmed of
18 your proposal and theirs, that they're sort of only looking at
19 an email archive and you want lots of other steps looked at.

20 But assume that that other piece gets resolved,
21 meaning where they have to look, and maybe their 3.2 million
22 database will double or go up to whatever, but what's wrong
23 with the predictive coding methodology they have proposed,
24 which also sounds like it's being run on a fairly transparent
25 and cooperative basis?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 MS. WIPPER: Well, the main issue is cost because --

2 THE COURT: No, but where? In other words --

3 MS. WIPPER: It's impacting the methodology.

4 THE COURT: Well, the question becomes the review.

5 And my understanding of the way this works is by the time that
6 the system spits this out, and whether it's the top 40,000 or
7 whether the break point is 50,000 documents or 30,000, that
8 90-something percent of the relevant documents are going to be
9 found in the top hits, and that the costs of reviewing the rest
10 is not worth the candle in most cases.

11 Now, where that line gets drawn is something that I
12 can't decide until I've seen the results. In other words, when
13 one sees the results, as I understand it from this method, one
14 can see a sharp drop-off at a certain point, at which you then
15 still sample the documents that are not going to be reviewed,
16 and that's part of this whole iterative process.

17 If you are seeing that the top 40,000 documents give
18 you 90 percent of the responsive documents, and it's going to
19 cost a million dollars to go to the next hundred thousand
20 documents for eyes-on review, to get another 5 percent, it's
21 probably not worth it. If it's worth it to go to the top
22 50,000 because that's where the cliff line seems to be, that's
23 what people are going to have to do.

24 It also may be that once privilege is determined, that
25 they will let you -- the rest of this is so likely to be junk,

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 that you want, under an attorneys'-eyes-only or some process,
2 an informal basis, you want to look at the documents that go
3 from 40,000 to 80,000, you can look at them and if you tell
4 them, you know, gee, having looked at it, there's a lot of good
5 stuff here, then there's some problem with the process.

6 I'm not saying 40,000 is the cutoff -- I can't really
7 determine that -- and I invite both sides' experts to tell me
8 if I've gotten this wrong but I've sat through a lot of
9 training sessions on this, wherever that cliff is, that where
10 is where the break should be. So if that was the only problem
11 you had with that part of the predictive coding process, then
12 it sounds like you all can go down this road, all of this,
13 without prejudice to additional search as may be necessary and
14 additional processes as may be necessary.

15 So is that the only problem, Ms. Wipper, or is there
16 anything more?

17 MS. WIPPER: No, there's a dispute about the scope of
18 relevancy. What happened --

19 THE COURT: I've ruled on that. That's what we spent
20 the morning doing.

21 MS. WIPPER: OK.

22 THE COURT: So whatever rulings I gave on that are
23 going to apply to the emails as well. So any positions they
24 were taking in the ESI protocol are now going to have to be
25 revised, based on what I have done this morning, and similarly

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 on your side.

2 MS. WIPPER: OK, and also I'd like to respond to
3 defense counsel's description of their proposal. I'd like DOAR
4 to respond and give you an overview, if we may, on our proposal
5 on predictive coding.

6 THE COURT: All right, though I guess I'd like to know
7 where it differs.

8 MS. WIPPER: Well, it's actually a direct response to
9 their proposal.

10 THE COURT: OK.

11 MS. WIPPER: So who am I going to hear from?

12 MR. NEALE: Paul Neale, your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Mr. Neale?

14 MR. NEALE: I actually think you pointed to exactly
15 the issue. We have not taken issue with the use of predictive
16 coding or, frankly, with the confidence levels that they have
17 proposed except for the fact that it proposes a limit -- the
18 ultimate result of 40,000 documents before we have seen any of
19 the results coming out of the system.

20 THE COURT: I've already said -- and I want to make
21 sure that defense counsel realizes it -- I'm not buying your
22 40,000 as a pig in a poke. I understand the concept, but where
23 that line will be drawn -- whether it's 40,000, 50,000, 60,000,
24 20,000 -- is going to depend on what the statistics show for
25 the results.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 MR. ANDERS: I guess, your Honor, that's why I stood
2 up before, because I wanted to ask you something. I understand
3 that that cliff line may be at 80,000 documents. The reason
4 why we picked the 40,000 is what we're trying to do is also
5 incorporate the cost element. We picked 200,000 as what we
6 think --

7 THE COURT: Proportionality requires consideration of
8 results as well as costs. And if stopping at 40,000 is going
9 to leave a tremendous number of likely highly responsive
10 documents unproduced, it doesn't work. Plus, of course once
11 you have the predictive coding run, the cost after that is how
12 much you're doing an eyes-on review of. And once you've weeded
13 out the privilege documents -- and I assume you either have the
14 502(d) order or you will be providing one for me to sign off
15 on, because I think in a case of this size, if you're not
16 agreeing to one, you're committing malpractice -- how much
17 money you spend thereafter is a result of how much you want to
18 know what's in the documents or, putting it perhaps a different
19 way, CYA. If the first 60,000 are clearly showing that they're
20 highly relevant but you're running out of money after 40,000,
21 don't review the other 20,000. That's up to you.

22 MR. ANDERS: We've considered that, your Honor, and I
23 think the attorney-eyes-only type of agreement or designation
24 may be appropriate here, because one of the concerns we have
25 is, some of the plaintiffs are now working for competitors. To

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 the extent that they're seeing --

2 THE COURT: This is not a case where I assume, other
3 than on anecdotal, that there is going to be much need for the
4 individual plaintiffs to look at the documents. I'm sure you
5 can all work that out.

6 Now, unfortunately it's 1:00 o'clock. I'm happy to
7 have you come back. I've got a 2:00 o'clock, and there may be
8 a 3:30 from people who forgot to show up this morning and were
9 told to try to get their act together and get here this
10 afternoon. You can come back this afternoon, you can come back
11 in a day or two. I think we have made some good progress, and
12 I know that you're coming from further away than usual, so I'd
13 like to make the most use of your time.

14 What's your pleasure? You want to come back at 3:30
15 in the afternoon and use the time from now to then? You can
16 use the jury room.

17 MR. ANDERS: Maybe, your Honor. The only reason why I
18 say that is, tomorrow I am leaving the country for a week for a
19 family vacation, so I'm out of pocket for a week; I'll have
20 some email but not a lot. So, again, I don't want to impose on
21 everybody else, but that's my scheduling issue, so I'm not sure
22 how much we'll get done within the next week.

23 THE COURT: That's why I'm suggesting you maximize --
24 I don't know what time your flight home is -- well, you're in
25 Morristown.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 MR. ANDERS: Today's fine for me, your Honor.

2 THE COURT: You're fine for today. If everybody wants
3 to stay -- you just spent an hour talking about custodians and
4 made some progress -- there's a certain benefit, I think, in
5 keeping you hostage because it avoids the delay between phone
6 calls, et cetera, et cetera. So if you want to take an hour
7 for lunch, be all back at 2:00 o'clock, you can use the jury
8 room.

9 MR. ANDERS: That's perfect.

10 THE COURT: And as soon as whatever is going on with
11 my afternoon conferences gives me time to see you, we'll deal
12 with you, but you're not leaving until you've checked out with
13 me.

14 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, your Honor.

15 THE COURT: OK. Enjoy lunch, but get back, use the
16 cafeteria on the eighth floor or whatever else, but don't waste
17 half the afternoon by having a nice lunch.

18 MR. ANDERS: Understood.

19 (Recess)

20 THE COURT: We are back on the record for part two of
21 Da Silva Moore et al. against Publicis.

22 What progress have you been able to make on the ESI
23 protocols or, more importantly, which of the issues you've
24 talked about would you like a court ruling or guidance on?
25 Whatever you have agreed upon we will memorialize in some other

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 way.

2 MR. ANDERS: I think we made a lot of progress, your
3 Honor. It may be easier just to say where we are.

4 On the list of custodians, we have identified eight
5 custodians that the plaintiff would like us to add, five where
6 they would be willing to first apply some level of filtering to
7 their results, and then we would either manually review or
8 possibly add those results into the database. We're going to
9 go back and just confer with our clients and those individuals;
10 there may be certain sensitivities about the particular people
11 but we at least have been able to further narrow the custodians
12 on the overall concept of predictive coding. We had a lot of
13 conversation and discussion about that; I think we're in
14 agreement on the process.

15 The process is going to be generally as we discussed
16 it before, but what we're going to do is, I think, have more of
17 the iterative reviews, and what we're going to try to do is
18 hopefully be able to do those iterative reviews until we find
19 the cliff that your Honor was referring to.

20 My only concern, and what I want to work into the
21 agreement, is if these iterative reviews are taking longer than
22 anticipated and the costs are mounting, having some mechanism
23 in the agreement where there can be a point where we either
24 discuss it or raise it with your Honor, that, look, we have
25 reviewed 60,000 so far, this is what's coming back, the end

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 doesn't seem to be in sight and we've spent X amount, just
2 having something in the agreement to address that possibility.

3 THE COURT: I have no problem with you all putting in
4 the agreement that you're going to cooperate and work in good
5 faith. But if things aren't working out because of expense or
6 results not being what either of you hoped for or whatever,
7 that it can be revisited with the Court, the caveat to that is
8 obviously once you go down a certain route, it's going to be
9 very expensive to completely abandon that and say we're now
10 going to do something completely different, so that's probably
11 not something you'll be able to do.

12 Tweaking it, in terms of adding another custodian late
13 or doing a further iteration where you change a search term or
14 better train the computer with some more documents, I don't
15 have a problem with that occurring or the converse of that,
16 with the defendant coming in and saying, you know, we've
17 already spent twice what we thought we were going to spend,
18 we've made enough progress that the next X percent search that
19 that the plaintiff wants us to do is not worth the candle.
20 That's what I said this morning as well.

21 All right, what else?

22 MS. WIPPER: We would add to that, plaintiffs would
23 propose if we get to that point, that defendants don't do a
24 manual review and just turn over the documents.

25 THE COURT: All right, that's an argument you can make
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 later on, that, OK, this system kicked out all of this. But
2 usually the sampling is in lieu of that, which is to say that
3 if you get to a certain cliff and you have reviewed -- I'll use
4 defendants' number from before -- 40,000 and the next 50,000
5 are considered not likely to be relevant and you run a sample,
6 statistical or random or whatever, of that balance, you say,
7 OK, we looked at another thousand documents and found one that
8 really was relevant, that's probably the end of the ballgame.

9 On the other hand, if you run a thousand and you find
10 a hundred that are relevant, that may mean that more work has
11 to be done in one way or another. And I'm not meaning to fully
12 prescribe any, which your experts sitting behind you can
13 probably do better, on what is your 95 percent confidence level
14 or any of that stuff, but at some point it doesn't mean that
15 because predictive coding spits it out as having a 1 percent
16 chance of relevance, that I'm going to say, OK, the defendant
17 has to forego manual review but produce all of it, as opposed
18 to, you'll do a sampling and see if it really is mostly junk.

19 Understood?

20 MR. ANDERS: Understood.

21 THE COURT: On both sides?

22 MR. ANDERS: It makes sense, your Honor. I guess the
23 way we had initially tried to craft the proposal was by putting
24 up front the dollar figure that we thought was appropriate.

25 THE COURT: That's somewhat meaningless. And,

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 frankly, it then gets into fights about "if you didn't get to
2 Recommind and you went to XYZ company, that piece of it would
3 be 25 percent cheaper and that shouldn't be attributable to us
4 and your associates at Jackson Lewis are paid too much per
5 hour, that shouldn't be attributable to us." I will look at
6 proportionality, but I'm not telling you that there is a
7 particular number that's better than another on how much work
8 you've got to do.

9 MR. ANDERS: I understand. That came across clear.

10 I just want to make sure that I understand what you're
11 saying, is if, as we're going through this iterative review, we
12 reach a point -- and I don't know what point is -- in terms of
13 cost, where even if the computer is saying there is X percent
14 relevance still out there, that we're not foreclosed from
15 making the proportionality argument at that point.

16 THE COURT: That is correct.

17 MR. ANDERS: OK.

18 The other thing we had discussed, your Honor, were
19 those sources that would not be reviewed through predictive
20 coding. For those sources, we have agreed to do targeted
21 searches of some of them; for others, we need to find more
22 information about what information is actually housed there,
23 but I think we were able to work through some of these other
24 sources, shared drives --

25 THE COURT: This is the material that's on page 2 and
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 3 of plaintiffs' proposal, I assume?

2 MR. ANDERS: Yes, your Honor.

3 THE COURT: I'm not asking you to give me much more
4 detail on that as long as there is agreement so that you're
5 moving forward without the need of further court help on it.

6 MR. ANDERS: There is, your Honor. We're moving
7 forward on that.

8 MS. WIPPER: There are two points that we wanted to
9 raise. The first one was concerning the time period for the
10 emails.

11 Earlier today defense counsel said that their email
12 archive went back to 2008. There is also a separate email
13 that's available from a legacy system that's stored in home
14 directories or shared folders. So we would propose that for
15 pay discrimination issues, that we would apply the longer
16 period to 2 --

17 THE COURT: For pay discrimination, we're not doing an
18 electronic search. You're getting that from the personnel
19 material and the material you got on payroll. It's unlikely
20 that email is going to find anything, and if it is, frankly,
21 it's going to find it in the post-2008 period that's in the --
22 I'll call it the master database, the archive system, that they
23 have established. So I don't see that as being necessary,
24 certainly not in any immediate wave.

25 On all of this, I'm not foreclosing you, as you

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 develop information from the documents produced or from
2 depositions, from saying that you have learned something new,
3 but if there is a smoking gun email that says, you know, I'm
4 the president of the company and it is our policy to pay women
5 less than men, I guarantee you that will get repeated in the
6 newer system. And for that needle in a haystack, I'm not going
7 to have them bring up an additional search.

8 What else?

9 MS. WIPPER: I would just add to that much. They
10 haven't produced the payroll data yet.

11 THE COURT: We talked about all of that this morning.
12 I'm not revisiting things. It's been a long enough day.

13 MS. WIPPER: I just wanted, before we move from
14 predictive coding, I also want to address the issue codes, what
15 we agreed to do, because there's a dispute about the
16 definitions that plaintiffs proposed. We're going to try to
17 deal with that in the coding process; and it's possible, if we
18 can't agree, that we would need the Court's assistance.

19 THE COURT: I'm sure I'll be seeing you again soon.

20 MS. WIPPER: OK.

21 MR. ANDERS: I believe that was it, your Honor. I
22 think we were going to talk about some time frames. I think at
23 least with the ESI protocol, my plan is probably the night
24 before I leave to at least get emails out on questions about
25 parts of the systems and then as soon as I return, if not while

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 I'm away a little bit, try to redraft the protocol to address
2 what we discussed today.

3 THE COURT: I know every lawyer thinks they're
4 indispensable and I'm not pulling the "Jackson Lewis is a big
5 firm and you're all fungible," but is there not another person
6 who may be less email savvy or computer savvy than you, such as
7 Ms. Chavey, for example, who can follow up, along with the
8 folks from Recommind and plaintiffs' counsel, and not lose an
9 entire week because you're on vacation?

10 MS. CHAVEY: Of course, your Honor.

11 THE COURT: And I happen to know, it may not be on
12 this case, if it's a true e-discovery dispute, I happen to know
13 your Florida e-discovery counsel very well --

14 MR. ANDERS: He knows a little bit.

15 THE COURT: You can bring Mr. Losey into the mix if
16 need be.

17 MR. ANDERS: OK, understood.

18 THE COURT: What else?

19 MS. CHAVEY: Your Honor, I know your Honor said you
20 weren't going to reconsider what was addressed this morning,
21 but I did look, during the break, about the issue about
22 Mr. Tsokanos in complaints that had been made against him. I
23 think on plaintiffs' counsel's representation that their
24 understanding was there had been a complaint in 2005, you
25 ordered us to provide that. There was not a complaint in 2005.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 There was something earlier than that. And I just wanted to --

2 THE COURT: How early?

3 MS. CHAVEY: 2003.

4 THE COURT: But that was the Atlanta --

5 MS. CHAVEY: It was in Atlanta.

6 THE COURT: Produce it. Obviously it's discrete and
7 can be found.

8 Before I lose track, for the paper discovery we talked
9 about this morning, how soon can you complete that? One week,
10 two weeks, six years? Come on.

11 MS. CHAVEY: Your Honor, we would need at least 30
12 days.

13 THE COURT: I don't know how you're going to do that
14 in 30 days, finishing e-discovery protocol that's not going to
15 be finalized for more than a week despite me getting other
16 people involved while Mr. Anders is away, run the ESI, go
17 through iterations and meet a June 30 discovery deadline with
18 depositions and everything else. I think you're being a little
19 generous there. So one more chance. Working harder, faster,
20 et cetera, how soon can you do it?

21 MS. CHAVEY: Well, one issue, your Honor, for example,
22 is with the personnel action notices. We understand the order
23 to require us to work with the plaintiffs to come up with a
24 statistically significant sample. That in and of itself is
25 going to take a while and then there's going to be the

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 searching for the notices, so there is time that needs to be
2 built in in order for that to occur.

3 THE COURT: Can you live with 30 days, Ms. Wipper? If
4 not, tell me what you can live with.

5 MS. WIPPER: We have a deposition scheduled with
6 defense witnesses starting the end of this month.

7 THE COURT: With all due respect, if you want to keep
8 to that schedule, you're going to be deposing them without
9 documents.

10 MS. WIPPER: Correct.

11 THE COURT: And let's all be clear on the way I run
12 this, which is, if you want to take early depositions to learn
13 things, that's fine; you don't get to redepose somebody whose
14 deposition was finished because you get documents later that
15 you knew you didn't have, as opposed to when they say, OK,
16 we've completed our document ESI production and you take a
17 deposition and then a week after the deposition they say look
18 what we found in the warehouse somewhere; then you may get
19 another deposition. So if you want to take a deposition at the
20 end of the month, that's fine, but let's say I push them to get
21 you something in two weeks, which means you both have to be
22 very fast on how you're running the statistical significant
23 determination, you're going to have to review it before the
24 deposition, it's not likely to happen.

25 MS. WIPPER: I would propose three weeks. We work
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 with statisticians regularly so we can have the sample done or
2 our proposed --

3 THE COURT: That sounds like a viable compromise.

4 So that is three weeks from today, which is
5 January 25th, subject to somebody, by written agreement or by
6 applying to the Court for more time, we'll go from there.

7 OK, other than a date for you all to come back and
8 probably a date for you to complete the ESI protocol to ensure
9 that your feet are held to the fire, is there anything else we
10 need to do on discovery today?

11 MS. WIPPER: I just wanted to address one point from
12 earlier today and just get clarification from the Court. On
13 the cutoff date for the production, you said February 2011 for
14 the HR complaints. I'm wondering if that's a global cutoff
15 date. We have a plaintiff that left the company after that
16 date, Carol Pearlman --

17 THE COURT: Is she in the original complaint or the
18 amended complaint?

19 MS. WIPPER: She's an opt-in plaintiff.

20 THE COURT: When did she opt in?

21 MS. WIPPER: I don't know off the top of my head.
22 Probably months ago.

23 THE COURT: The amended complaint is dated April 14th.
24 Was it before or after?

25 MS. WIPPER: No, it was after that.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 THE COURT: You've got to have some way of dealing
2 with this. So I'm inclined to either leave it at the February
3 date or maybe to push it to April 14th of 2011, other than when
4 we get to privilege issues, I'm not going to require them to
5 log almost anything post initial complaint.

6 MS. WIPPER: We would propose the amended complaint
7 date as the cutoff.

8 THE COURT: So we're adding a month and a half or
9 something. Problem, agreement?

10 MS. CHAVEY: Well, it seems appropriate to limit it to
11 and cut it off at the date of the initial complaint. The fact
12 that Carol Pearlman opted into the April Pay Act claim later
13 doesn't seem to affect the Court's ruling that the date would
14 be February.

15 THE COURT: All right, let's leave it where it was
16 originally.

17 What else?

18 MR. ANDERS: Your Honor, I just want to make sure I
19 heard correctly: Did you give a definite date for when the ESI
20 protocol must be completed?

21 THE COURT: No. Give me a proposal. A week after you
22 come back or a/k/a two weeks from today?

23 MR. ANDERS: That would be perfect.

24 THE COURT: Agreeable?

25 MS. WIPPER: Sure. And you want a joint proposal,

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 your Honor?

2 THE COURT: Yes. And if you can't agree, I want it as
3 a single document with paragraph 3, whatever paragraph 3 is
4 about, 3(a) plaintiffs' proposal, 3(b) defendants' proposal,
5 and then a cover letter from each of you explaining, to the
6 extent it's not immediately obvious, what it is you're
7 disagreeing on. So that's January 18th.

8 OK, next, date for our next court conference, what's
9 your pleasure?

10 MS. WIPPER: How about a week after the ESI protocol?

11 THE COURT: Well, I think that's probably going to be
12 early unless you think there are ESI protocol problems, only in
13 the sense that the document production out of what I'll call
14 this morning's production is due the 25th. On the other
15 hand --

16 MS. CHAVEY: Your Honor, what about February 2nd?

17 THE COURT: That's LegalTech week. Yes, by Thursday
18 that's OK. February 2nd at 9:30.

19 Now, the other thing: When is it you plan to move for
20 class certification?

21 MS. WIPPER: I believe it's in the schedule, your
22 Honor.

23 THE COURT: I don't think it is but I'm willing to be
24 educated.

25 MS. CHAVEY: Your Honor, it is in the scheduling order
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 but it is due on or before April 1st of 2013.

2 THE COURT: Frankly, that makes no sense to me. I
3 know you convinced Judge Sullivan to do that. It won't be the
4 first time I've overruled the district judge; it's a strange
5 world that we live in.

6 Yeah, I understand the purpose of getting past the
7 expert period, but if you make the motion on April 1, it won't
8 be fully briefed until the summer of 2013, it won't be decided
9 until the fall of 2013 or January 2014. You can't really do
10 summary judgment or anything substantive until the class either
11 has or hasn't been certified. And then if either a class or an
12 FLSA collective action is certified or the appropriate other
13 term for a collective action is approved, you've got to go
14 through 30 days to draft the notice, 60 days or 90 days for
15 people to opt in, you are assuring -- and this is something
16 plaintiffs should be thinking about even more than the
17 defendants -- you're assuring no merits resolution of this,
18 assuming a class of any sort, class or collective is approved,
19 until 2014 or '15. That hardly seems to be in plaintiffs'
20 interests. And I'm not sure that on the FLSA collective
21 action -- you've got discrimination claims -- that's one type
22 of motion -- and to the extent you've got FLSA and New York
23 Labor Law claims, that's a much more discrete area, it seems to
24 me. And leaving all of that until the very end, particularly
25 since FLSA requires opt-in plaintiffs, and my recollection but

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 you all tell me if I'm wrong, is that there is no stopping of
2 the statute of limitations until they opt in?

3 MS. WIPPER: Correct.

4 THE COURT: So if this case, which began in early
5 2011, if it's not certified until 2014 or '15 for collective
6 action issues, the whole period between now and then, when you
7 will assume that if there was anything bad going on at the
8 defendants, they will have cleaned up their act during the
9 course of this lawsuit -- and I'm not saying I know there was
10 anything bad or good going on -- you're assuring that the FLSA
11 in particular, even with a six-year statute of limitations on
12 the state claims, is going to be almost a nullity or it's going
13 to be a totally different lawsuit, that most of the period
14 within the statute of limitations is going to be a period on
15 which there has been no discovery.

16 Does it make sense -- not that I want more work for
17 Judge Sullivan or myself -- to do something differently for the
18 FLSA New York Labor Law than the Title 7 and related
19 discrimination claims?

20 MS. WIPPER: Well, your Honor, I think it depends on
21 the discovery because we have the burden and we have been
22 spending an enormous amount of time trying to get discovery in
23 this case for many, many months. So, today, as I stand here
24 today, I can't say for sure we will be prepared to file
25 something until we have the discovery.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC

CONFERENCE

1 THE COURT: On the FLSA and New York Labor Law?

2 MS. WIPPER: We need the payroll data.

3 THE COURT: Well, you basically have that, I thought,
4 subject to the cleanup -- and I'm not revisiting what I ordered
5 this morning. So that you're going to have by the end of this
6 month. Whatever work your experts need to do, I don't see
7 waiting until April 1st of 2013, and, frankly -- and I'm not
8 trying to help the defendants -- if I were them, I'd oppose
9 certification at that point if for no other reason than that
10 most of the period within the statute of limitations will be a
11 period where there hasn't been discovery. And if we stick to
12 the schedule, because you got Judge Sullivan to approve it and
13 I decide not to stick my neck out and overrule him, so to
14 speak, I'm not reopening discovery. You can bet on that. Once
15 discovery closes, it is done, because nobody wanted bifurcation
16 the second time today because 99 percent of it was held to be
17 relevant either way. Think about it and maybe in February,
18 too, we can revisit that issue.

19 MS. WIPPER: OK.

20 THE COURT: I guess the last issue, although I
21 suspect -- I don't know what I suspect. I generally at first
22 or early conferences raise the 636(c) issue. I don't remember
23 raising it at our prior conference because they were on a sort
24 of emergency basis, et cetera. But I remind both sides that
25 pursuant to 28, U.S. Code, Section 636(c), if all parties

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 consent, then the case can be in front of me for all purposes,
2 including the jury trial you've asked for here and any appeals
3 to the Second Circuit, they're the same from a magistrate
4 judge, consented trial or motion decision, as it would be in
5 front of a district judge, and it's up to all of you and our
6 missing friends from Publicis.

7 So by the February 2 conference, obviously a decision
8 to keep thinking about it keeps your options open, but it also
9 keeps one side or the other -- whoever is in favor of it now
10 and the other one is not so sure, by two months later, that
11 position may reverse. So the sooner you all decide, you
12 decide, I'll ask you to tell me where you are at the February 2
13 conference and we'll go from there.

14 And finally -- perhaps my second "finally" but
15 finally, the jurisdictional discovery and all that against
16 Publicis, is anything happening in that area? I don't want
17 them to prejudice them from not being here but I don't know
18 that the quietness with respect to that, as opposed to
19 everything going on here, is the result of nothing going on or
20 is the result of there not being the same problems.

21 MS. WIPPER: Well, we served discovery on October 19th
22 on Publicis Groupe according to the schedule, and on MSL. They
23 asked for a month extension to respond. We gave that to them
24 and they produced documents, some documents, Publicis Groupe,
25 and responded with objections on the 21st. We're probably

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 going to have to have a meet-and-confer with them concerning
2 some of their objections and their responses, but right now we
3 don't foresee any disputes at this time.

4 THE COURT: Well, you've got a March 12th cutoff. The
5 earliest I'm likely to want to deal with that, since it seems
6 like you all are going slowly, is at the February 2 conference.
7 That's going to leave you very little time if there are
8 problems, to get them resolved and get whatever depositions or
9 whatever are going to occur post the paper/ESI side of
10 discovery. So don't lose sight of it. Let's have Publicis
11 here at the next conference, even if there is complete
12 agreement that everything they have been doing is fine.

13 The other thing is, you all can figure out how to do
14 this when we're going to have megaconferences like this. I
15 certainly prefer everyone to be present in person. If it gets
16 to the point where you know in advance there's one minor issue
17 and one of the local counsel, more local, will be here and the
18 other is from San Francisco, for example, while the airlines
19 need all the help they can get, it's not my job to feather
20 their covers, so if you want to show up telephonically, ask for
21 permission to do that, which, as I say, will be granted if you
22 really think the conference is going to be the typical half
23 hour discovery conference and not the 500 pages of letters,
24 et cetera, et cetera, like we had today. You do not need to
25 ask permission for your e-discovery consultants to attend. If

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 there are any ESI issues, and assuming you're willing to pay
2 the freight for them, I am not only delighted to see them but
3 they're usually a valuable addition.

4 I think that covers everything. I guess I'll just
5 say, my rules provide that if things start going much more
6 smoothly and two business days before the next conference we
7 decide you really are getting along swimmingly and you worked
8 things out and things should just be put off a few weeks, you
9 can make that application, either by a joint phone call to my
10 secretary or by a fax, requesting that, and nine times out of
11 ten those requests are granted. They're not granted when they
12 come in at 5:00 o'clock the night before and the Court suspects
13 that somebody's already on an airplane. And they're not
14 granted unless they're on consent, meaning if one side says I
15 don't need the conference but the other side is frothing at the
16 mouth because they're being frustrated, we're obviously going
17 to have a conference.

18 Any questions?

19 MS. CHAVEY: No, your Honor.

20 THE COURT: All right, the transcript, as usual,
21 constitutes the Court's order. And I think I may have said
22 this once before -- and somebody certainly took up the process
23 and therefore knows the process -- but I'll say it this last
24 time, I may not say it again in the future: Pursuant to 28,
25 U.S. Code, Section 636 and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 6

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

1214KDASC CONFERENCE

1 and 72, any party aggrieved by a ruling at one of these
2 discovery conferences has 14 calendar days to bring their
3 objections to Judge Sullivan. The 14 days starts running
4 immediately when you attend any in-person or telephonic
5 conference and hear my ruling accordingly, regardless of how
6 long it takes me to obtain the transcript from the reporter.
7 And failure to file objections within that 14-day period
8 constitutes a waiver for all further purposes in the case,
9 including any appellate purposes.

10 With that, I'll require both sides to purchase the
11 transcript from the reporter and with that, we are adjourned.
12 Have a good flight back, or drive back, to everyone going in
13 different places. Have a good vacation --

14 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, your Honor.

15 THE COURT: -- and happy new year. See you all in a
16 month.

17 MS. CHAVEY: Thank you, your Honor.

18 MS. WIPPER: Thank you, your Honor.

19 MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

20 * * *

21

22

23

24

25

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
(212) 805-0300