

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,
15 USA 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. On September 10, 2013, counsel for defendants Walter Liew and USA
15 Performance Technology, Inc. ("USAPTI") and counsel for DuPont filed a Stipulation and
16 [Proposed] Order re Fed. Rule Crim P.17(c) Subpoena (Dkt. 439) advising the Court as to the
17 status of DuPont's response to the subpoena. The parties to that stipulation also represented that
18 they would update the Court further on September 23, 2013. The Court signed this Order, as
19 modified, on September 23, 2013. Dkt. 451.

20 5. On September 13, 2013, counsel for Walter Liew and USAPTI met and conferred
21 further with counsel for DuPont. Counsel for DuPont represented that DuPont would produce to
22 the Court its first set of documents responsive to categories E.1 and E.2 of the subpoena upon the
23 entry of a mutually agreeable protective order. They also updated defendants regarding
24 procedures DuPont has implemented to collect and review documents potentially responsive to
25 the remaining categories set forth in the subpoena.

26 6. On September 16, 2013, the parties filed a Stipulation and [Proposed] Order re
27 Protection of Material Produced by E. I. Du Pont de Nemours and Company Pursuant to Rule
28

1 17(c) Subpoena. Dkt. 445. The following day, Magistrate Judge Cousins signed the protective
2 order and DuPont produced its first set of responsive documents. Dkt. 446.

3 7. Defendants and DuPont continue to work in good faith to identify and produce
4 documents in response to the subpoena. Pursuant to their most recent meet-and-confer
5 discussion, defense counsel and counsel for DuPont have agreed that DuPont will update
6 defendants again on September 27, 2013, regarding the status of DuPont's efforts. Accordingly,
7 defendants and DuPont stipulate that DuPont should be granted an extension until October 4,
8 2013, to allow DuPont to further: 1) collect and review documents; 2) determine the expense and
9 burden associated with producing the categories of documents enumerated in the subpoena; 3)
10 meet and confer with defense counsel regarding whether certain requests can be modified to
11 allow for expedited production. By October 4, defendants and DuPont will update the Court
12 regarding the status of DuPont's efforts and determine whether further extensions of time are
13 required.

14 8. By entering into this stipulation, DuPont in no way waives, but rather expressly
15 reserves, its right to move to quash those categories of documents that it determines are overly
16 broad, would require an undue burden to locate and produce, or otherwise fail to satisfy the
17 standards set forth in *United States v. Nixon*.

18 9. Likewise, by entering into this stipulation, defendants in no way waive, but rather
19 expressly reserve, their right to move to compel DuPont's compliance with the Rule 17(c)
20 subpoena.

21 10. Consistent with the expressed preference of the Court (Dkt. 451), DuPont will
22 produce bates numbered copies of the documents to the Court in electronic format.

23 **IT IS SO STIPULATED.**

24 Dated: September 23, 2014

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

25 By: /s/ Stuart L. Gasner

26 STUART L. GASNER
27 SIMONA A. AGNOLUCCI
KATHERINE M. LOVETT

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

1 Dated: September 23, 2014

GLYNN & FINLEY

3 By: /s/ Clement S. Glynn

4 CLEMENT GLYNN

MORGAN LOPEZ

5 Attorneys for E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS
AND COMPANY

7 ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

8
9 Based on the foregoing stipulation, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the deadline for
10 DuPont's response to the Rule 17(c) subpoena is continued to October 4, 2013. Defendants and
11 DuPont shall update the Court by no later than that date regarding the status of DuPont's
12 response.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14
15 Dated: September 24, 2013

16 

17 JEFFREY S. WHITE

United States District Judge