

1 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
BRUCE A. ERICSON #76342
2 DAVID L. ANDERSON #149604
JACOB R. SORENSEN #209134
3 MARC H. AXELBAUM #209855
50 Fremont Street
4 Post Office Box 7880
San Francisco, CA 94120-7880
5 Telephone: (415) 983-1000
Facsimile: (415) 983-1200
6 Email: bruce.ericson@pillsburylaw.com

7 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
DAVID W. CARPENTER (admitted *pro hac vice*)
8 DAVID L. LAWSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)
BRADFORD A. BERENSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)
9 EDWARD R. McNICHOLAS (admitted *pro hac vice*)
1501 K Street, N.W.
10 Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 736-8010
11 Facsimile: (202) 736-8711
Email: bberenson@sidley.com

12 Attorneys for Defendants
13 AT&T CORP. and AT&T INC.

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
17

18 TASH HEPTING, GREGORY HICKS,
19 CAROLYN JEWEL and ERIK KNUTZEN
on Behalf of Themselves and All Others
20 Similarly Situated,

21 Plaintiffs,

22 vs.

23 AT&T CORP., AT&T INC. and DOES 1-20,
24 inclusive,

25 Defendants.

No. C-06-0672-VRW

**DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO FILE
THEIR DEMONSTRATIVE
PRESENTATION FROM THE JUNE
23, 2006 HEARING UNDER SEAL**

26
27
28

1 Defendant **AT&T CORP.** and specially appearing defendant **AT&T INC.**¹ hereby
2 file this Response to Plaintiffs’ Administrative Motion to File the Demonstrative
3 Presentation Presented at the June 23, 2006 Hearing Under Seal (“Motion,” Dkt. 286).
4 Defendants do not oppose the Motion. Defendants are filing this Response to explain that
5 at defendants’ initiative the parties have begun to meet and confer in an attempt to agree to
6 a redacted version of the Demonstrative Presentation that plaintiffs can file publicly. *See*
7 Decl. of Jacob R. Sorensen In Supp. of Defs.’ Response to Pls.’ Mot. to File Demonstrative
8 Presentation Under Seal, filed herewith, ¶ 2. If the parties are able to agree to a suitably
9 redacted version of the Presentation, defendants will authorize plaintiffs to file it publicly.
10 *Id.*²

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 ¹ AT&T Inc. is joining this Response only because it has been named as a defendant in this
21 lawsuit. By joining this Response, AT&T Inc. does not concede that it is a proper party
to this lawsuit or that it is subject to personal jurisdiction in this Court.

22 ² In their Administrative Motion, plaintiffs contend that they “are awaiting a response to
23 the proposed protective order they have submitted to Defendants” Motion at 1-2.
24 The protective order is not relevant to the Motion. Because plaintiffs mention it in their
Motion, defendants note that it was defendants who wrote the initial draft, which hewed
25 closely to the Northern District’s form protective order. Defendants transmitted their
proposed order to plaintiffs shortly after the May 17, 2006 hearing in this action.
26 Defendants were unable to get a response from plaintiffs for several weeks. Plaintiffs
eventually did meet and confer with defendants, and transmitted to defendants a draft that
27 substantially altered not only defendants’ draft, but also several key elements of the
Court’s form order. If the parties are unable to resolve their disagreement on the
protective order through the meet-and-confer process – which is ongoing – they may
bring the matter to the Court’s attention.

28

