

1 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP
 STUART L. GASNER - # 164675
 2 sgasner@kvn.com
 SIMONA A. AGNOLUCCI - # 246943
 3 sagnolucci@kvn.com
 KATHERINE M. LOVETT - # 276256
 4 klovett@kvn.com
 633 Battery Street
 5 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
 Telephone: 415 391 5400
 6 Facsimile: 415 397 7188

7 Attorneys for Defendants WALTER LIEW and
 USA PERFORMANCE TECHNOLOGY, INC.

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 10 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 WALTER LIEW, CHRISTINA LIEW, USA
 15 PERFORMANCE TECHNOLOGY, INC.,
 and ROBERT MAEGERLE,

16 Defendants.
 17

Case No. CR 11-0573-JSW (NC)

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
 ORDER RE FED. RULE CRIM. P. 17(C)
 SUBPOENA**

Place: Courtroom 11, 19th Floor
 Dept.: Hon. Jeffrey S. White

1 The undersigned, by and through their undersigned counsel, stipulate and agree as
2 follows:

3 1. On August 8, 2013, this Court granted Defendants' *Ex Parte* Application for a
4 Rule 17(c) Subpoena. Dkt. 410.

5 2. On August 12, 2013, Defendants served the Rule 17(c) subpoena issued by the
6 Court on E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company ("DuPont"), with a return date of September 2,
7 2013, twenty-one days from the date of service.

8 3. On August 27, 2013, counsel for DuPont and defense counsel met and conferred
9 about DuPont's efforts to locate documents responsive to the subpoena, and counsel for DuPont
10 indicated that DuPont would be unable to fully respond to the subpoena by the return date.
11 However, DuPont's counsel indicated that DuPont would be willing to produce documents on a
12 rolling basis in order to expedite the Court's, the Government's, and defense counsel's review of
13 documents responsive to the subpoena.

14 4. Defense counsel and counsel for DuPont have therefore agreed that DuPont should
15 be granted a three-week extension for its response to the subpoena until September 23, 2013, to
16 allow DuPont to further determine the expense and burden associated with producing the
17 categories of documents enumerated in the subpoena, including whether certain categories can be
18 modified to allow for expedited production. By September 23, defendants and DuPont will
19 update the Court regarding the status of DuPont's efforts and determine whether further
20 extensions of time are required.

21 5. Defendants and DuPont further stipulate DuPont may produce documents to the
22 Court that are responsive to the subpoena on a rolling basis in order to expedite the resolution of
23 the subpoena given the impending trial date in this case. DuPont agrees to produce to the Court
24 its initial set of documents responsive to the subpoena by September 13, 2013, subject to the entry
25 of a protective order providing for confidential treatment of documents produced by DuPont.

26 6. By entering into this stipulation, DuPont in no way waives, but rather expressly
27 reserves, its right to move to quash those categories of documents that it determines are overly
28

1 broad, would require an undue burden to locate and produce, or otherwise fail to satisfy the
2 standards set forth in *United States v. Nixon*.

3 7. Likewise, by entering into this stipulation, defendants in no way waive, but rather
4 expressly reserve, their right to move to compel DuPont’s compliance with the Rule 17(c)
5 subpoena.

6 8. Additionally, defense counsel and counsel for DuPont anticipate that the
7 production in response to the subpoena may be voluminous and therefore inquire as to the Court’s
8 preference for the method of receiving the documents. In lieu of an expressed preference by the
9 Court, DuPont intends to produce bates numbered copies of the documents to the Court in both
10 hard copy and electronic format.

11 **IT IS SO STIPULATED.**

12 Dated: September 10, 2013

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

14 By: /s/ Stuart L. Gasner

15 STUART L. GASNER
16 SIMONA A. AGNOLUCCI
KATHERINE M. LOVETT

17 Attorneys for Defendants WALTER LIEW and
USA PERFORMANCE TECHNOLOGY, INC.

18 Dated: September 10, 2013

GLYNN & FINLEY

20 By: /s/ Clement S. Glynn

21 CLEMENT GLYNN
22 MORGAN LOPEZ
Attorneys for E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS
23 AND COMPANY
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Based on the foregoing stipulation, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the September 2, 2013 deadline for DuPont's response to the Rule 17(c) subpoena is continued to September 23, 2013. Defendants and DuPont shall update the Court by no later than that date regarding the status of DuPont's response. DuPont may produce documents for the Court's review on a rolling basis in both hard copy and electronic format.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:

JEFFREY S. WHITE
United States District Judge