

1 take 45 days, and then something else might happen.
2 MR. BICE: All right. So I don't want to take up
3 the Court's time --
4 THE COURT: So what date?
5 MR. JONES: So that would be about July 15th or
6 thereabouts, but it's 45 days from the end of briefing.
7 THE COURT: 11, 16, 18 for a status check?
8 MR. BICE: I'm fine with that.
9 THE COURT: Which one?
10 MR. JONES: Oh. 11, 16, or 18?
11 THE COURT: You don't want to come on the 11th,
12 because they're coming.
13 MR. JONES: 16.
14 THE COURT: 16 sounds good.
15 MR. BICE: That'll be great, Your Honor.
16 THE COURT: So the stay is extended July 16th.
17 MR. BICE: Understood.
18 MR. JONES: We'll prepare a brief order, run it by
19 Mr. Bice, and we'll submit it.
20 THE COURT: Yep. Be lovely.
21 MR. BICE: Thank you, Your Honor.
22 THE PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 8:59 A.M.

23 * * * * *
24
25

CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

AFFIRMATION

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY.

**FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146**

Florence M. Hoyt
FLORENCE HOYT, TRANSCRIBER

5/22/13

DATE

Ann L. Johnson
CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **ORDR**

2
3
4
5 **EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**
6 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**
7

8 STEVEN JACOBS,

9 Plaintiff,

10 vs.

11 LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., et al.,

12 Defendants.
13

Case No.: A-10-627691-B

Dept. No.: XI

14 **ORDER SCHEDULING STATUS**
15 **CHECK**

16 **AND ALL RELATED CLAIMS**
17

18 TO: James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Todd L. Bice, Esq. and/or Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., attorneys for
19 Plaintiff

20 TO: J. Stephen Peek, Esq., Robert J. Cassity, Esq., J. Randall Jones, Esq. and/or Mark M.
21 Jones, Esq., attorneys for Defendants:
22

23 **YOU ARE HEREBY ORDERED TO APPEAR** in District Court, at 200 Lewis Avenue,
24 Las Vegas, Nevada, Department XI, on **June 11, 2013 at 8:30 a.m.** to give status regarding (1)
25 the scheduling of the jurisdictional hearing and (2) the proposed orders on Plaintiff Steven C.
26 Jacob's Motion to Return Remaining Documents from Advanced Discovery.

27 In addition to the documents and papers already submitted to chambers and/or filed with
28 the court, counsel may file any additional status report or memorandum to address the two issues

CMC
3

RECEIVED
MAY 30 2013
CLERK OF THE COURT

1 the Court wishes to discuss with the parties on June 11, 2013. Any additional filings must be
2 filed, served and courtesy copy provided to chambers by June 7, 2013 at 5:00 p.m.

3
4 Dated this 30th day of May 2013

5
6
7 

8 ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE


9
10
11
12 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

13 I hereby certify that on or about the date filed, I mailed a copy of the Order Scheduling
14 Status Check, or placed a copy in the attorney's folder, to:

15 James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Todd L. Bice, Esq. and Debra L. Spinelli, Esq. (Pisanelli Bice)
16 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

17 J. Stephen Peek, Esq. and Robert J. Cassity, Esq. (Holland & Hart)
18 *Attorneys for Defendants*

19 J. Randall Jones, Esq. and Mark M. Jones, Esq. (Kemp, Jones & Coulthard)
20 *Attorneys for Defendants*

21 
22 Maximilien D. Fétaz


CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **ORDR**

2 J. Randall Jones, Esq.

3 Nevada Bar No. 1927

4 rrj@kempjones.com

5 Mark M. Jones, Esq.

6 Nevada Bar No. 267

7 m.jones@kempjones.com

8 **KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP**

9 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway

10 Seventeenth Floor

11 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

12 Telephone: (702) 385-6000

13 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

14 *Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.*

15 J. Stephen Peek, Esq.

16 Nevada Bar No. 1759

17 speek@hollandhart.com

18 Robert J. Cassity, Esq.

19 Nevada Bar No. 9779

20 bcassity@hollandhart.com

21 **HOLLAND & HART LLP**

22 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor

23 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

24 Telephone: (702) 669-4600

25 Facsimile: (702) 669-4650

26 *Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp.*

27 *and Sands China, Ltd.*

28 **DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

19 **STEVEN C. JACOBS,**

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 **LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP.,** a Nevada
23 corporation; **SANDS CHINA LTD.,** a Cayman
24 Islands corporation; **SHELDON G.**
25 **ADELSON,** in his individual and
26 representative capacity; **DOES I-X;** and **ROE**
27 **CORPORATIONS I-X,**

28 Defendants.

29 **AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.**

CASE NO.: A627691-B

DEPT NO.: XI

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO EXTEND STAY OF
ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37
SANCTIONS PENDING
DEFENDANTS' PETITION FOR WRIT
OF PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS**

05-23-13P03:59 RCVD

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

FILE WITH
MASTER CALENDAR

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

On May 16, 2013, Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs and Defendants Las Vegas Sands Corp. and Sands China, LTD. ("SCL") (collectively "Defendants") came before this court on Defendants' Motion to Extend Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions Pending Defendants' Petition for Writ Prohibition for Mandamus ("Motion to Extend Stay"). Todd L. Bice, Esq., of the law firm PISANELLI BICE PLLC, appeared on behalf of Plaintiff. J. Stephen Peek, Esq., of the law firm HOLLAND & HART LLP, appeared telephonically on behalf of Defendants. J. Randall Jones, Esq., of the law firm KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP, appeared on behalf of SCL. The Court considered the papers filed on behalf of the parties and the oral argument of counsel, and good cause appearing therefor:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED as follows:

1. The Motion to Extend Stay is GRANTED, extending the stay granted by the Order, filed on May 13, 2013; and

2. The Court will conduct a Status Check on July 16, 2013 at 8:30 a.m. to consider the status of the stay.

DATED this 5th day of June, 2013.

District Court Judge

Submitted by:

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD

Approved as to form and content:

PISANELLI BICE PLLC

J. Randall Jones, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 1927
Mark M. Jones, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 267
Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 17th Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
Attorneys for Sands China Ltd.

Todd L. Bice, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 4534
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 9695
3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Ste. 800
Las Vegas, NV 89169
Attorneys for Plaintiff



CLERK OF THE COURT

1 J. Stephen Peek, Esq. (1759)
Robert J. Cassity, Esq. (9779)
2 Holland & Hart LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
3 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
(702) 669-4600
4 (702) 669-4650 – fax
speek@hollandhart.com
5 bcassity@hollandhart.com
6 *Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp.*
and Sands China, Ltd.
7
J. Randall Jones, Esq. (1927)
8 Mark M. Jones, Esq. (267)
Kemp Jones & Coulthard, LLP
9 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
10 (702) 385-6000
(702) 385-6001 – fax
11 m.jones@kempjones.com
12 Michael E. Lackey, Jr., Esq.
Mayer Brown LLP
13 1999 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C 20006
14 (202) 263-3300
mlackey@mayerbrown.com
15 *Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.*

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

18 STEVEN C. JACOBS,

19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., a Nevada
corporation; SANDS CHINA LTD., a Cayman
22 Islands corporation; SHELDON G. ADELSON,
in his individual and representative capacity;
23 DOES I-X; and ROE CORPORATIONS I-X,

24 Defendants.

25 AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

CASE NO.: A627691-B
DEPT NO.: XI

Date: n/a
Time: n/a

DEFENDANTS' JOINT STATUS
REPORT

27 ///

28 ///

1 Defendants Las Vegas Sands Corporation ("LVSC") and Sands China Limited ("SCL")
2 respectfully file the following Joint Status Report in advance of the status check scheduled by the
3 Court for June 18, 2013.

4 In its May 30, 2013 Order, the Court asked for a status report with respect to (1) the
5 scheduling of the jurisdictional hearing and (2) the competing proposed orders on Plaintiff's
6 Motion to Return Remaining Documents from Advanced Discovery ("Plaintiff's Motion to
7 Return Documents"). In short, on (1) SCL stands ready to proceed with the jurisdictional hearing
8 at the Court's convenience; as described below, Defendants believe that all discovery that is
9 necessary for that hearing has been accomplished. All that remains is for Plaintiff to identify the
10 jurisdictional theories on which he intends to proceed and the parties to brief those theories and
11 then designate witnesses and exhibits in light of any factual issues that remain. On (2),
12 Defendants have already provided the Court with their explanation of why they believe Plaintiff's
13 proposed order should not be entered. A copy of that submission is attached hereto as **Exhibit**
14 **"A"** for the Court's convenience. In addition, on June 12, 2013, Defendants filed the Surreply
15 that the Court allowed in its May 17, 2013 Order, and would urge the Court to reconsider its
16 decision on Plaintiff's Motion to Return Documents in light of that Surreply.

17 **I. Discovery Has Been Essentially Completed.**

18 Prior to April 12, 2013, LVSC and SCL had together produced close to 200,000 pages of
19 documents in response to the jurisdictional discovery the Court permitted in its March 8, 2012
20 Order. In its March 27, 2013 Order, the Court required SCL, in addition, to "search and produce
21 the records of all twenty (20) custodians" that Plaintiff had identified "for documents that are
22 relevant to jurisdictional discovery." When Defendants filed a writ petition to the Nevada
23 Supreme Court challenging various aspects of the March 27 Order, the Court stayed its order with
24 respect to documents in Macau, but declined to stay the Order to the extent that it required
25 production of documents on any of the electronic storage devices brought into the United States
26 that were referenced at the September 2012 sanctions hearing.

27 On April 12, 2013, Defendants produced an additional 1,733 documents (comprising over
28 13,000 pages) responsive to Plaintiff's jurisdictional discovery requests. Those documents were

1 produced from three sources: (1) the data transferred to the United States as referenced at the
2 September hearing; (2) documents maintained in Hong Kong and Singapore by four of the
3 identified custodians (SCL's three independent directors and one Marina Bay Sands employee);
4 and (3) documents identified through a search of the relevant custodians' files in Macau¹ that
5 were then electronically matched to documents that existed in the United States. All of these
6 documents were produced in unredacted form, because Macau's data privacy laws do not apply to
7 them. Defendants are in the process of preparing a log for thousands of documents that were
8 withheld from the April 12, 2013 production on privilege grounds.² That log should be ready
9 shortly. Some of the documents that were initially withheld will be declassified as a result of the
10 privilege review and others will be produced with privileged material redacted.

11 In addition to producing over 210,000 pages of documents, Defendants made four of their
12 senior officers (Messrs. Adelson, Leven, Goldstein and Kay) available for deposition. Plaintiff
13 deposed three of these executives for two days each.

14 Defendants' extensive document production and the depositions Plaintiff took give him
15 more than he needs to make whatever jurisdictional arguments he wants to make. As the Court is
16 aware, Defendants have filed two writ petitions, which the Nevada Supreme Court has accepted,
17 related to the Court's 2013 rulings. One, which is now fully briefed, involves a handful of
18 privileged documents that Justin Jones used to refresh his recollection about the timeline of events
19 before testifying at the September 2012 sanctions hearing. These documents are unrelated to any
20 jurisdictional issue. The second writ petition involves (among other things) whether Defendants
21 were properly required to produce unredacted documents from Macau pursuant to the Court's
22 December 18, 2012 and March 27, 2013 Orders. Defendants' reply in support of that writ is
23 currently due on June 20. Although Defendants' second writ petition does involve documents
24 that may be responsive to Plaintiff's jurisdictional discovery requests, Plaintiff has made no

25
26 ¹ SCL had identified those documents in Macau before the Court entered its stay, which enabled SCL to
27 avoid the dilemma of deciding whether to comply with the Court's Order by producing those documents in
unredacted form or to comply with Macau's data privacy laws by redacting personal information from
those documents.

28 ² One of the custodians whose data was searched was Luis Melo, who was formerly SCL's general
counsel.

1 showing that the personal data on the documents already produced in redacted form and the other
2 Macau documents that have not yet been produced as a result of this Court's stay order are both
3 relevant to a cognizable jurisdictional theory and non-cumulative.³ Accordingly, Plaintiff should
4 be able to proceed whether he has these documents or not.

5 Defendants also intend to file a writ petition with the Nevada Supreme Court if the Court
6 enters an order granting Plaintiff's Motion to Return Documents. Once again, Plaintiff has made
7 no showing that any of the privileged documents that are the subject of Plaintiff's Motion are both
8 relevant to a cognizable jurisdictional theory and non-cumulative in light of the thousands of
9 documents and other evidence that Plaintiff already has in his possession. Accordingly, there is
10 no reason to postpone the jurisdictional hearing until that issue is finally resolved.

11 Defendants are not aware of any other outstanding issues raised by Plaintiff's discovery
12 requests.⁴ As the Court will recall, SCL sought to take Jacobs' deposition before the evidentiary
13 hearing. The Court stated that the deposition could proceed, but only after all of the issues as to
14 what documents Jacobs and his counsel are entitled to review are resolved. Although SCL would
15 still like to take Jacobs' deposition before the hearing, it is willing to forego the opportunity to do
16 so if necessary to avoid further delays in scheduling the jurisdictional hearing.⁵

17 **II. SCL Is Ready To Proceed.**

18 SCL is ready to proceed with the jurisdictional hearing at the Court's convenience.
19 However, in advance of that hearing, Plaintiff should be required to provide an explanation of the
20 jurisdictional theories he intends to rely upon. Over the course of the past two years Plaintiff has
21 offered or alluded to a variety of different theories of general jurisdiction, including claiming (1)

22 ³ To date, Defendants have produced a total of 31,393 documents in response to Plaintiff's jurisdictional
23 requests for production. Of that total, 2,482 or roughly 8% were produced with personal data redacted in
order to comply with Macau's data privacy laws.

24 ⁴ Plaintiff has raised some issues regarding Defendants' confidentiality designations pursuant to the
25 Protective Order. As required by that Order, Defendants filed a motion on May 21, 2013 seeking
26 confirmation of disputed confidentiality designations Defendants made with respect to the second day of
the Adelson deposition. Defendants also conducted a review and de-designated approximately 12,000
27 documents that had previously been designated confidential. Plaintiff's counsel recently sent a letter
objecting to a handful of other designations; the parties will meet and confer about these designations, and
28 Defendants will file a motion to the extent that the parties cannot agree. However, these issues should not
affect the timing of the hearing.

⁵ SCL reserves the right to call Jacobs as a witness at the jurisdictional hearing.

1 that SCL is LVSC's alter ego, (2) that SCL's de facto executive headquarters is in Las Vegas, (3)
2 that LVSC acted as SCL's agent in carrying out specific tasks in Nevada, and (4) that LVSC acts
3 generally as SCL's agent and that LVSC's jurisdictional contacts can therefore be attributed to
4 SCL. Plaintiff has also raised a specific jurisdiction theory, arguing that the decision to terminate
5 him was made in Nevada and therefore the Court has specific jurisdiction over his breach of
6 contract claim against SCL.⁶

7 Before the parties and the Court invest further effort in preparing for a jurisdictional
8 hearing, Plaintiff should be required to state which of these theories he intends to pursue and
9 whether he has any additional jurisdictional theories. SCL believes that a number of these
10 theories (assuming Plaintiff still intends to pursue them) could be eliminated as a matter of law,
11 thus enabling the Court to streamline the evidentiary hearing. Furthermore, an identification of
12 Plaintiff's theories will enable the parties to more efficiently identify their witnesses and exhibits
13 prior to the hearing.

14 Accordingly, SCL urges the Court to set a briefing schedule under which (1) Plaintiff
15 would first identify the jurisdictional theories he intends to pursue and explain in general terms
16 the factual basis for his assertion that there is jurisdiction over SCL under those theories, (2) SCL
17 would then have an opportunity to move for summary judgment with respect to some or all of
18 those theories and, to the extent there are factual issues, to explain its view of the requirements

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25
26
27 ⁶ Plaintiff also advanced a theory of "transient" jurisdiction, which the Nevada Supreme Court directed this
28 Court to consider after it decides whether the Court has general jurisdiction over SCL. Because this theory
does not involve any factual issues, it will not be the subject of the evidentiary hearing.

Holland & Hart LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

1 Plaintiff must meet in order to prove his theories, and (3) the Court can then hear argument and
2 rule on the legal issues, narrowing (or eliminating) the factual issues to be presented at the
3 evidentiary hearing.

4 DATED June 14, 2013.



J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
Holland & Hart LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

*Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp. and Sands
China Ltd.*

J. Randall Jones, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 1927
Mark M. Jones, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 000267
Kemp Jones & Coulthard, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

Michael E. Lackey, Jr., Esq.
Mayer Brown LLP
1999 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C 20006

Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.


Holland & Hart LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Nev. R. Civ. P. 5(b), I certify that on June 14, 2013, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **DEFENDANTS' JOINT STATUS REPORT** via e-mail and by depositing same in the United States mail, first class postage fully prepaid to the persons and addresses listed below:

James J. Pisanelli, Esq.
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq.
Todd L. Bice, Esq.
Pisanelli & Bice
3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
214-2100
214-2101 – fax
jjp@pisanellibice.com
dls@pisanellibice.com
tlb@pisanellibice.com
kap@pisanellibice.com – staff
see@pisanellibice.com – staff

Attorney for Plaintiff


An Employee of Holland & Hart LLP

Dineen Bergsing

From: Dineen Bergsing
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 2:50 PM
To: James Pisanelli; Debra Spinelli; Todd Bice; 'Kimberly Peets'; Sarah Elsdon
Subject: LV Sands/Jacobs - Defendants' Joint Status Report
Attachments: 1100_001

Please see attached Defendants' Joint Status Report. A copy to follow by mail.

Dineen M. Bergsing

*Legal Assistant to J. Stephen Peek,
Philip J. Dabney, Justin C. Jones,
David J. Freeman and
Nicole E. Lovelock*
Holland & Hart LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
(702) 669-4600 - Main
(702) 222-2521 - Direct
(702) 669-4650 - Fax
dbergsing@hollandhart.com



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is confidential and may be privileged. If you believe that this email has been sent to you in error, please reply to the sender that you received the message in error; then please delete this e-mail. Thank you.

EXHIBIT A

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 1927
2 jrj@kempjones.com
Mark M. Jones, Esq.
3 Nevada Bar No. 267
m.jones@kempjones.com
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.

7 J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 1759
8 speek@hollandhart.com
Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
9 Nevada Bar No. 9779
bcassity@hollandhart.com
10 HOLLAND & HART LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
11 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
*Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp.
and Sands China, Ltd.*

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

15 STEVEN C. JACOBS,

16 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., a Nevada
18 corporation; SANDS CHINA LTD., a Cayman
19 Islands corporation; SHELDON G.
ADELSON, in his individual and
20 representative capacity; DOES I-X; and ROE
CORPORATIONS I-X,

21 Defendants.

22 AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

CASE NO.: A627691-B
DEPT NO.: XI


MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
PROPOSED DRAFT ORDER ON
PLAINTIFF STEVEN C. JACOBS'
MOTION TO RETURN REMAINING
DOCUMENTS FROM ADVANCED
DISCOVERY

24 Defendants LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP. ("LVS") and SANDS CHINA LTD. ("SCL")
25 (collectively, "Defendants"), by and through their undersigned counsel, submit this
26 Memorandum In Support of Proposed Draft Order on Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Motion to
27 Return Remaining Documents from Advanced Discovery. This Memorandum is provided
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

1 pursuant to the following memorandum of points and authorities, and the papers and pleadings
2 on file herein.

3 DATED this 24th day of May, 2013.

4 
5 J. Randall Jones, Esq.
6 Mark M. Jones, Esq.
7 Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
8 3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 17th Floor
9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
10 Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.

11 J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
12 Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
13 Holland & Hart LLP
14 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
15 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
16 Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp. and Sands China,
17 Ltd.

18 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

19 The purpose of this Memorandum is in furtherance of Defendants' cover letter to a
20 competing order submitted to the Court (and copied on Plaintiff's counsel) on May 23, 2013,
21 regarding Plaintiffs' Motion to Return Remaining Documents from Advanced Discovery. See
22 Cover Letter, dated May 23, 2013, and Proposed Order, attached hereto as Exhibits A and B,
23 respectively. The Proposed Order was a competing order to Plaintiff's proposed Order,
24 attached hereto as Exhibit C ("Plaintiff's Order"). After Defendants submitted the Cover Letter
25 and Proposed Order, Defendants received the Court's Journal Entry denying Defendants'
26 Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Reply in support of that motion, but allowing Defendants to file a
27 Surreply. The Defendants appreciate the opportunity to file a Surreply and will do so by the
28 deadline the Court set.

Although Defendants urge the Court to postpone entry of either the Proposed Order or
the Plaintiff's Order pending the filing of that Surreply, here, in brief, are the key reasons why
Defendants contend that the Plaintiff's Order should be revised -- even assuming that the Court
continues to adhere to its decision to grant Plaintiff's motion.

1 In ¶ 3 of Plaintiff's Order, Plaintiff states that all of the documents in question were
2 documents that "Jacobs authored, was a recipient of, or otherwise possessed in the course and
3 scope of his employment." Defendants submit that this is an inaccurate factual statement.
4 Defendants contend that Jacobs downloaded a large quantity of documents before he was
5 terminated and that he did not in fact possess those documents "in the course and scope of his
6 employment." In any event, this is a factual dispute that cannot be resolved on the current
7 record. On the other hand, ¶ 3 of Defendants' Proposed Order suggests a more neutral
8 treatment, providing that "[t]hese are documents that Jacobs either authored, was a recipient of,
9 or otherwise had access to during the period of his employment."

10 In ¶ 6 of Plaintiff's Order, Plaintiff has included a reference to the September 14,
11 2012, Order suggesting that the Court's ruling precluding Defendants from claiming that Jacobs
12 stole the documents for purposes of jurisdictional discovery and the evidentiary hearing on
13 jurisdiction is somehow relevant to the issue of Jacobs' right to use the privileged documents.
14 This was an issue first raised in Plaintiffs' Reply, in a footnote. Defendants submit that the
15 September 14 Order has no bearing on the current motion, particularly in light of the footnote in
16 the September 14 Order in which the Court specifically preserved Defendants' right to raise
17 other objections, including privilege. Accordingly, Defendants version of ¶ 6 in their Proposed
18 Order deletes that reference.

19 In ¶ 7 of Plaintiff's Order, Plaintiff seeks to re-characterize his own motion.
20 Defendants' Proposed Order recommends deleting that paragraph.


21 In ¶ 8 of Plaintiff's Order (which revises Plaintiff's ¶ 9), Defendants add the Court's
22 statement in its Journal Entry ruling on the motion that the Court "agrees that any privilege
23 related to these documents in fact belongs to Defendants." Plaintiff's Order omits that
24 statement.

25 Finally, Defendants' Proposed Order omits ¶11 from Plaintiff's Order, which is
26 confusing because his own proposed order says that the Court is not ruling on the question of
27 whether the documents are in fact privileged or whether there was a waiver. To the extent that ¶
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

1 It is intended as a ruling in Plaintiff's favor on the new argument raised in his Reply,
2 Defendants will respond to that argument in their Surreply.

3 DATED this 24th day of May, 2013.

4 
5 J. Randall Jones, Esq.
6 Mark M. Jones, Esq.
7 Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
8 3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 17th Floor
9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
10 Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.

11 J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
12 Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
13 Holland & Hart LLP
14 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
15 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
16 Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp. and Sands China,
17 Ltd.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Nev. R. Civ. P. 5(b), I certify that on May 24th, 2013, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED DRAFT ORDER ON PLAINTIFF STEVEN C. JACOBS' MOTION TO RETURN REMAINING DOCUMENTS FROM ADVANCED DISCOVERY** via e-mail and by depositing same in the United States mail, first class postage fully prepaid to the persons and addresses listed below:

James J. Pisanelli, Esq.
Todd L. Bice, Esq.
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq.
Jennifer L. Braster, Esq.
Pisanelli Bice
3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
jjp@pisanellibice.com
tlb@pisanellibice.com
dls@pisanellibice.com
jlb@pisanellibice.com
kap@pisanellibice.com – staff
sec@pisanellibice.com – staff
Attorney for Plaintiff



An employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard

EXHIBIT A

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

WILL KEMP
J. RANDALL JONES
MARK M. JONES
WILLIAM L. COULTHARD*
RICHARD F. SCOTT†
JENNIFER COLE DORSEY
SPENCER H. GUNNERSON

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP
WELLS FARGO TOWER
3800 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY
SEVENTEENTH FLOOR
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169
kjc@kempjones.com

KIRK R. HARRISON - Of Counsel

TELEPHONE
(702) 385-6000

FACSIMILE
(702) 385-6001
(702) 385-1234

MATTHEW S. CARTER†
CAROL L. HARRIS
MICHAEL J. GAYAN
ERIC M. PEPPERMAN
NATHANAE L. RULIS
MONA KAVEH†
JING ZHAO

May 23, 2013

*Also licensed in Idaho
†Also licensed in California

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Honorable Elizabeth Gonzalez

- Regional Justice Center, Department 11
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89115

Re: Jacobs v. Las Vegas Sands Corp. et al.
Case No. A-10-627691


*Proposed Competing Order Regarding Motion to Return Remaining
Documents from Advanced Discovery*

Dear Judge Gonzalez:

Plaintiff and Defendants were unable to come to an agreement as to the form and content of the proposed Order on Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Motion to Return Remaining Documents from Advanced Discovery. Enclosed is Defendants' competing proposed Order for consideration and execution by this Court.

Defendants were compelled to provide a competing Order based upon a number of issues which it will outline in a letter to the Court tomorrow. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



J. Randall Jones, Esq.

cc: James J. Pisanelli, Esq. (via email)
Todd L. Bice, Esq. (via email)
Jennifer L. Baster, Esq. (via email)

Encl.

EXHIBIT B

NEWMAN, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

1 **ORDER**

2 J. Randall Jones, Esq.

3 Nevada Bar No. 1927

4 iri@kempjones.com

5 Mark M. Jones, Esq.

6 Nevada Bar No. 267

7 m.jones@kempjones.com

8 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

9 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway

10 Seventeenth Floor

11 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

12 Telephone: (702) 385-6000

13 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

14 *Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.*

15 J. Stephen Peek, Esq.

16 Nevada Bar No. 1759

17 speek@hollandhart.com

18 Robert J. Cassity, Esq.

19 Nevada Bar No. 9779

20 bcassity@hollandhart.com

21 HOLLAND & HART LLP

22 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor

23 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

24 Telephone: (702) 669-4600

25 Facsimile: (702) 669-4650

26 *Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp.*

27 *and Sands China, Ltd.*

18 **DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

19 STEVEN C. JACOBS,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., a Nevada
23 corporation; SANDS CHINA LTD., a Cayman
24 Islands corporation; SHELDON G.
25 ADELSON, in his individual and
26 representative capacity; DOES I-X; and ROE
27 CORPORATIONS I-X,

28 Defendants.

CASE NO.: A627691-B

DEPT NO.: XI

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF STEVEN C.
JACOBS' MOTION TO RETURN
REMAINING DOCUMENTS FROM
ADVANCED DISCOVERY**

Hearing Date: April 12, 2013

Hearing Time: In Chambers

27 AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

NEWIT, JONES & COULIHAN, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kic@kempiones.com

1 Before this Court is Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' ("Jacobs") Motion to Return Remaining
2 Documents from Advanced Discovery (the "Motion"). The Court has considered all briefing
3 on the Motion, including the supplemental brief it ordered from Defendants. The Court being
4 fully informed, and good cause appearing therefor:

5 THE COURT HEREBY STATES as follows:

6 1. At issue are documents that Jacobs took with him when he was terminated on
7 July 23, 2010.

8 2. Amongst these documents were documents over which Defendants claim an
9 attorney-client or other form of privilege.

10 3. These are documents that Jacobs either authored, was a recipient of, or
11 otherwise had access to during the period of his employment.

12 4. Jacobs' present Motion does not seek to compel the Defendants to produce
13 anything. Rather, Jacobs seeks return of documents that were transferred to the Court's
14 approved electronic stored information ("ESI") vendor, Advanced Discovery, pursuant to a
15 Court-approved protocol.

16 5. Pursuant to a Court-approved protocol, Defendants' counsel were allowed to
17 review Jacobs' documents and have now identified approximately 11,000 of them as being
18 subject, in whole or in part, to some form of privilege, such as attorney-client, work product,
19 accounting or gaming.

20 6. Based upon these assertions of privilege, Defendants contend that Jacobs cannot
21 provide these documents to his counsel and cannot use them in the litigation even if they relate
22 to the claims, defenses or counterclaims asserted in this action.

23 7. The Defendants assert that all privileges belong to the Defendants' corporate
24 entities, not any of their executives, whether present or former. From this, they contend that
25 Jacobs does not have the power to waive any privileges.

26 8. The Court notes a split of authority as to who is the client under such
27 circumstances. *See Montgomery v. Etrepid Techs. LLC*, 548 F. Supp. 2d 1175 (D. Nev. 2008).

28

1 However, the Court agrees that any privilege related to these documents in fact belongs to
2 Defendants.

3 9. The Court does not need to address (at this time) the question of whether any of
4 the particular documents identified by the Defendants are subject to some privilege (a
5 contention which Jacobs disputes), or whether Defendants waived the privilege. Instead, the
6 question presently before this Court is whether Jacobs is among the class of persons legally
7 allowed to view those documents and use them in the prosecution of his claims and to rebut the
8 Defendants' affirmative defenses and counterclaim, as these were documents that the former
9 executive authored, received and/or had access to during his tenure.

10 10. Even assuming for the sake of argument that Defendants had valid claims of
11 privilege to assert to the documents as against outsiders, they have failed to sustain their
12 burden of demonstrating that Jacobs cannot review and use documents to which he had access
13 during the period of his employment in this litigation.

14 11. That does not mean, however, that at this time the Court is making any
15 determination as to any other use or access to sources of proof. Until further order, Jacobs may
16 not disseminate the documents in question beyond his legal team. And, all parties shall treat
17 the documents as confidential under the Stipulated Confidentiality Agreement and Protective
18 Order entered on March 22, 2012.

19 THEREFORE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as follows:

20 1. The Motion to Return Remaining Documents from Advanced Discovery is
21 GRANTED. When this Order becomes effective, Advanced Discovery shall release to Jacobs
22 and his counsel all documents contained on the various electronic storage devices received by
23 Advanced Discovery from Jacobs on or about May 18, 2012, and that have otherwise not been
24 previously released to Jacobs and his counsel.

25 2. Those documents listed on the Defendants' privilege log dated November 30,
26 2012, shall be treated as confidential under the Stipulated Confidentiality Agreement and
27 Protective Order entered on March 22, 2012 until further order from this Court.

28 ///

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

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

3. This Order is stayed for a period of ten days to allow Defendants to seek relief from the Nevada Supreme Court.

DATED: _____

THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

Submitted by:
KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD



J. Randall Jones, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 1927
Mark M. Jones, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 267
Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 17th Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
Attorneys for Sands China Ltd.

EXHIBIT C

1 **ORDR**

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027

2 JJP@pisanellibice.com

Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. No. 4534

3 TLB@pisanellibice.com

Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695

4 DLS@pisanellibice.com

PISANELLI BICE PLLC

5 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

6 Telephone: (702) 214-2100

Facsimile: (702) 214-2101

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs

8 **DISTRICT COURT**

9 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

10 STEVEN C. JACOBS,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., a Nevada
corporation; SANDS CHINA LTD., a
14 Cayman Islands corporation; DOES I
through X; and ROE CORPORATIONS
15 I through X,

16 Defendants.

17 **AND RELATED CLAIMS**

Case No.: A-10-627691

Dept. No.: XI

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF STEVEN C.
JACOBS' MOTION TO RETURN
REMAINING DOCUMENTS FROM
ADVANCED DISCOVERY**

Hearing Date: April 12, 2013

Hearing Time: In Chambers

19 Before this Court is Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' ("Jacobs") Motion to Return Remaining
20 Documents from Advanced Discovery (the "Motion"). The Court has considered all briefing on
21 the Motion, including the supplemental brief it ordered from Defendants. The Court being fully
22 informed, and good cause appearing therefor:

23 **THE COURT HEREBY STATES as follows:**

24 1. At issue are documents that Jacobs has had in his possession since before his
25 termination on July 23, 2010.

26 2. Amongst the documents that Jacobs possessed at the time of his termination were
27 documents over which Defendants claim an attorney-client or other form of privilege.
28

1 3. These are documents that Jacobs authored, was a recipient of, or otherwise
2 possessed in the course and scope of his employment.

3 4. Jacobs' present Motion does not seek to compel the Defendants to produce
4 anything. The documents at issue are all presently within his possession, custody and control.

5 5. Pursuant to a Court-approved protocol, Defendants' counsel were allowed to
6 review Jacobs' documents and have now identified approximately 11,000 of them as being
7 subject to some form of privilege, such as attorney-client, accounting or gaming.

8 6. Based upon these assertions of privilege, Defendants contend that even though the
9 documents are presently in Jacobs' possession, custody and control – the Court having previously
10 concluded as part of its Decision and Order dated September 14, 2012 that Defendants are
11 precluded from claiming that he stole the documents – they assert that Jacobs cannot provide
12 these documents to his counsel even if they relate to the claims, defenses or counterclaims
13 asserted in this action.

14 7. Jacobs' Motion, although styled as one seeking return of documents from the
15 Court's approved electronic stored information ("ESI") vendor, Advanced Discovery, more aptly
16 seeks to allow Jacobs' counsel to access these documents, which Jacobs has otherwise possessed
17 and had access to since before July 23, 2010.

18 8. The Defendants assert that all privileges belong to the Defendants' corporate
19 entities, not any of their executives, whether present or former. From this, they contend that
20 Jacobs does not have the power to waive any privileges.

21 9. The Court notes a split of authority as to who is the client under such
22 circumstances. *See Montgomery v. Etrepid Techs. LLC*, 548 F. Supp. 2d 1175 (D. Nev. 2008).
23 However, the facts of this case are different, and the Court disagrees with the Defendants'
24 framing of the issue.

25 10. The Court does not need to address (at this time) the question of whether any of
26 the particular documents identified by the Defendants are subject to some privilege (a contention
27 which Jacobs disputes), or whether Jacobs has the power to assert or waive any particular
28 privileges that may belong to the Defendants (a position which the Defendants' dispute). Instead,

1 the question presently before this Court is whether Jacobs, as a former executive who is currently
2 in possession, custody and control of the documents and was before his termination, is among the
3 class of persons legally allowed to view those documents and use them in the prosecution of his
4 claims and to rebut the Defendants' affirmative defenses and counterclaim, as these were
5 documents that the former executive authored, received and/or possessed, both during and after
6 his tenure.

7 11. The burden is upon the proponent of a privilege to substantiate the basis for the
8 privilege as well as to establish that there has been no waiver. *Granite Partners v. Bear, Stearns*
9 *& Co., Inc.*, 184 F.R.D. 49, 52 (S.D.N.Y. 1999) ("The party seeking to assert a claim of privilege
10 has the burden of demonstrating both that the privilege exists and that it has not been waived.").
11 Here, the Court finds that the Defendants have failed to sustain that burden with respect to the
12 documents in question, those documents presently being in Jacobs' custody since before his
13 termination on July 23, 2010.

14 12. In the Court's view, the question is not whether Jacobs has the power to waive any
15 privilege. The more appropriate question is whether Jacobs is within the sphere of persons
16 entitled to review information (assuming that it is privileged) that pertains to Jacobs' tenure that
17 he authored, received and/or possessed, and has retained since July 23, 2010.

18 13. Even assuming for the sake of argument that Defendants had valid claims of
19 privilege to assert to the documents as against outsiders, they have failed to sustain their burden
20 of demonstrating that they have privileges that would attach to the documents relative to Jacobs'
21 review and use of them in this litigation.

22 14. That does not mean, however, that at this time the Court is making any
23 determination as to any other use or access to sources of proof. Until further order, Jacobs may
24 not disseminate the documents in question beyond his legal team. And, all parties shall treat the
25 documents as confidential under the Stipulated Confidentiality Agreement and Protective Order
26 entered on March 22, 2012.

1 THEREFORE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as follows:

2 1. The Motion to Return Remaining Documents from Advanced Discovery is
3 GRANTED. When this Order becomes effective, Advanced Discovery shall release to Jacobs
4 and his counsel all documents contained on the various electronic storage devices received by
5 Advanced Discovery from Jacobs on or about May 18, 2012, and that have otherwise not been
6 previously released to Jacobs and his counsel.

7 2. Those documents listed on the Defendants' privilege log dated November 30,
8 2012, shall be treated as confidential under the Stipulated Confidentiality Agreement and
9 Protective Order entered on March 22, 2012 until further order from this Court.

10 3. This Order shall become effective ten (10) days from the date of its notice of entry.

11 DATED: _____

12
13 THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ
14 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

15 Respectfully submitted by:

16 PISANELLI BICE PLLC

17 By: _____
18 James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
19 Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534
20 Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
3883 Howard Hughes Pkwy, Suite 800
Las Vegas, NV 89169

21 Attorneys for Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


CLERK OF THE COURT

1 MEMO

2 James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027

3 JJP@pisanellibice.com

4 Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534

5 TLB@pisanellibice.com

6 Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695

7 DLS@pisanellibice.com

8 PISANELLI BICE PLLC

9 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800

10 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

11 Telephone: (702) 214-2100

12 Facsimile: (702) 214-2101

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs

14 DISTRICT COURT

15 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

16 STEVEN C. JACOBS,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., a Nevada
20 corporation; SANDS CHINA LTD., a
21 Cayman Islands corporation; DOES I
22 through X; and ROE CORPORATIONS
23 I through X,

24 Defendants.

25 AND RELATED CLAIMS

Case No.: A-10-627691

Dept. No.: XI

PLAINTIFF STEVEN C. JACOBS'
STATUS MEMORANDUM

Hearing Date: June 18, 2013

Hearing Time: 8:15 a.m.

26 I. INTRODUCTION

27 The Court's Order Scheduling Status Check dated May 30, 2013, requested status on two
28 express issues in advance of a status check now scheduled for June 18, 2013: (1) the scheduling
of the jurisdictional hearing, and (2) the proposed orders on Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' ("Jacobs")
Motion to Return Remaining Documents from Advanced Discovery (the "Motion"). If their
surreply¹ and proposed order on the Motion tell us anything, however, Defendants

¹ The Court graciously granted Defendants leave to file a surreply "to address the 'new' issues" related to waiver that they claimed Jacobs first raised in his Reply. Disregarding the Court's instructions, Defendants used the opportunity to file what is effectively their third opposition to the Motion, while not even addressing the issue of waiver until page 8 of the surreply brief.

1 Las Vegas Sands Corp. ("LVSC") and Sands China Ltd. ("Sands China") hope to use the hearing
2 as an avenue to reargue issues already decided in this case. Consistent with their disregard of
3 other court orders, they intend to ignore this Court's order denying oral argument on the Motion.
4 (See Ex. 1, Hr'g. Tr. dated Mar. 14, 2013, 15:12-13 ("So on this issue [of the Motion,] we're not
5 going to have any oral argument.")) To them, the status hearing is their last chance to deviate
6 from the "well-defined" record this Court wanted "for purposes of appellate review."
7 (See *id.*, 14:23-24.) This Court should decline the planned circumvention of its order.

8 II. DISCUSSION

9 A. The Scheduling of the Jurisdictional Hearing.

10 Jacobs intended to move this Court to immediately lift the stay given that LVSC and
11 Sands China have turned what was supposed to be a temporary stay pending a hearing on personal
12 jurisdiction into a twenty-two month reprieve. Jacobs previously submitted such a motion to the
13 Nevada Supreme Court. However, the Clerk's office rejected the motion insisting that any request
14 to lift the stay must be directed to this Court, not the Nevada Supreme Court, as it is this Court
15 that actually has imposed the stay.

16 The prejudice to Jacobs is clear and unnecessary given the fact that he has already
17 established – at a minimum – a *prima facie* case of jurisdiction over Sands China. (See, e.g.,
18 Ex. 2, Leven Dep. Vol. II, 396:14-19 (Leven admitting "[t]he plan—the—the arrangements for
19 carrying out the termination of Steve Jacobs was developed here [in Las Vegas, Nevada] and
20 executed there [in Macau]").) As a result, the proper course is for this Court to lift the stay and
21 allow Jacobs to prove his case, along with Sands China's personal jurisdiction by a preponderance
22 of the evidence at trial. See *Trump v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 109 Nev. 687, 692, 857 P.2d 740, 743
23 (1993) (explaining the two distinct means of resolving personal jurisdiction in Nevada, the "more
24 frequently utilized process" of which allows "a plaintiff [to] make a *prima facie* showing of
25 personal jurisdiction prior to trial and then prove jurisdiction by a preponderance of the evidence
26 at trial.").

1 Notwithstanding this Court's authority to immediately lift the stay, if it were inclined to
2 still hold a hearing on jurisdiction, Jacobs is prepared at this time to prove his alternative theories
3 of general, specific, and transient jurisdiction. Indeed, Jacobs looks forward to resolving this
4 farcical dispute as to Sands China's personal jurisdiction.

5 Of course, Defendants' conduct over the last twenty-two months will be at the forefront of
6 the Court's hearing. They have violated "numerous orders" "with an intent to prevent [Jacobs]
7 access to information discoverable for the jurisdictional proceedings." (Ex. 3, Dec. &
8 Order, 7:15-18.) Most recently, Sands China violated the Court's December 18, 2012, Order to
9 "produce all information within [its] possession that is relevant to the jurisdictional discovery."
10 (See Ex. 4, Hr'g. Tr. dated Feb. 28, 2013, 35:3-9.) As such, if and when this Court does hold an
11 evidentiary hearing, Jacobs will be entitled to an adverse inference as to all information not
12 produced by January 4, 2013. See NRS 47.250(3) (rebuttable presumption that "evidence
13 willfully suppressed would be adverse if produced."). With this understanding, Jacobs requests
14 that the jurisdictional hearing take place immediately.

15 **B. The Proposed Orders on Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Motion to Return**
16 **Remaining Documents from Advanced Discovery.**

17 It is no secret that Defendants plan to file yet another writ petition related to this Court's
18 granting of the Motion. Their present goal, then, is to position the record and this Court's final
19 order to better their odds. It is in opposition to that agenda and goal that Jacobs opposes all of the
20 changes that LVSC and Sands China hope to bury into the order. So that this Court has all of the
21 information needed to make a decision, Jacobs hereby provides a redline comparison of parties'
22 competing orders, attached hereto as Exhibit 5.

23 ***Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 6***

24 One of the biggest problems for Defendants in their anticipated writ petition on the Motion
25 is this Court's finding that Jacobs is entitled to use his documents in this litigation because "[he]
26 was in a position and in fact had access to the documents at issue during the period of his
27 employment" as Sands China's CEO. (Minute Order dated Apr. 12, 2013.) Hoping to alter that
28 reality, Defendants proposed language indicating (with zero factual basis or support) that "Jacobs

1 downloaded a large quantity of documents before² he was terminated and that he did not in fact
2 possess those documents in the course and scope of his employment." (Defs.' Memo., 3:4-6.)
3 Their request is as transparent as it is improper. They want to argue to the Nevada Supreme Court
4 that Jacobs somehow "stole" the documents at issue. But of course, they provide absolutely no
5 proof to substantiate their preferred fiction.

6 If this sounds familiar, it should. Defendants made this same stale and unsupported
7 argument unsuccessfully for almost two years. This Court resolved the issue by way of sanction
8 which "precluded [Defendants] from contesting that Jacobs' ESI (approx. 40 gigabytes) is not
9 rightfully in his possession." (Ex. 3, Dec. & Order dated Sept. 14, 2012, 9:1-3.)

10 But now Defendants claim the Court's sanctions order is "irrelevant" for purposes of this
11 dispute. (Defs.' Memo., 3:10-18.) They contend that the order "has no bearing on the current
12 [M]otion, particularly in light of the footnote in the September 14 Order in which the Court
13 specifically preserved Defendants' right to raise other objections, including privilege."
14 (*Id.*, 3:14-17.)

15 Of course Defendants want the sanction to have "no bearing" on this issue; they have been
16 trying to avoid the consequences of this Court's sanctions order since it was entered.
17 Unfortunately for Defendants, however, there are consequences for their actions in this case, and
18 one of those consequences is that they can no longer claim that Jacobs stole documents
19 before/after he was terminated. In any case, the Court necessarily found that "Jacobs was in a
20 position and in fact had access to the documents at issue during the period of his employment,"
21 and that language should rightly be included in the order.

22 ***Paragraphs 4 and 7***

23 Defendants' desired revisions to Paragraphs 4 and 7 are equally mischievous and
24 improper. Defendants want to characterize Jacobs' Motion as a motion to compel, or a motion to
25 return documents that were "inadvertently produced." (*See* Surreply, 3:9-11 ("if a party receives
26

27 ² In their surreply, Defendants claim that Jacobs downloaded the documents *after* his
28 termination. (Surreply, 2:8-10 ("After his termination as CEO of SCL in July 2010, Plaintiff
downloaded and took with him some 40 gigabytes of documents belonging to
Defendants. . . .").) Obviously, Defendants cannot keep their new story straight.

1 privileged documents that were inadvertently produced, RPC 4.4(b) requires the receiving party to
2 'promptly notify the sender.'") To do that, however, Defendants want to ignore, and want this
3 Court and the Nevada Supreme Court to ignore, the actual facts of this case. Namely, the fact that
4 Jacobs is currently in possession, custody, and control of the documents at issue, and has been
5 since before he was terminated on July 23, 2010. Indeed, Jacobs did not file a motion to compel
6 Defendants to produce documents in their possession, or to keep documents that Defendants
7 inadvertently produced to him during the course of this case; he filed a motion so that his counsel
8 could review documents that Jacobs has long possessed. (See Minute Order dated April 12,
9 2013.) This an important distinction, and one that needs to be clear in the record.

10 *Paragraphs 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13*

11 Defendants saved their most self-serving revisions for last. Realizing their position on
12 privilege – that Jacobs became an outsider the moment he was terminated – opens themselves up
13 to a wholesale waiver of that same privilege, Defendants try to readjust the debate. They propose
14 to change the facts of this case to make them fit with what they claim is the end-all be-all case of
15 analysis, *Montgomery v. eTreppid Techs. LLC*, 548 F. Supp. 2d 1175 (D. Nev. 2008). Yet, the
16 facts are not as fungible as LVSC and Sands China would need them to be. The facts here are
17 nothing like those in *Montgomery*, including the fact that Jacobs has been in open adverse
18 possession of these documents for nearly three years.

19 Their recent surreply exposes the self-inflicted problem they have created. Thus,
20 Defendants prefer to rewrite history with the pretend story that:

21 When SCL learned that Plaintiff had possession of corporate
22 documents, it promptly objected and demanded that he return them.
23 Plaintiff refused, and it took several months of negotiation and court
proceedings just for Defendants to gain access to the data.

24 (Surreply, 2:10-13.) Yet, their recollection of events is as selective as it is faulty.

25 Defendants first boldly (and falsely) proclaim that they "did not even learn that he had
26 taken possession of the documents at issue until nearly a year after his termination."
27 (Surreply, 9:9-10.) They have conveniently forgotten how they knew that Jacobs possessed
28 documents from his employment at Sands China within months (if not days) of his termination.

1 Indeed, on November 23, 2010, Sands China demanded that Jacobs immediately return
2 documents that he had "stolen" from Sands China, "including *but not limited to*" three
3 investigatory reports on Macau government officials and suspected triad affiliates. (Ex. 6, Glaser
4 Ltr. dated Nov. 23, 2010.) In response to this manufactured assertion, Jacobs' counsel confirmed
5 possession of a "multitude"³ of documents that he had both generated and received since
6 overseeing the Macau operations for LVSC. (Ex. 7, Campbell Ltr. dated Nov. 30, 2010.)

7 Jacobs agreed to return to original sets of the reports, but made clear that he was keeping
8 copies of his documents and planned to use them as evidence in this case. (Ex. 8, Campbell Ltr.
9 dated Jan. 11, 2011.) Sands China neither responded nor sought relief from this Court, as it
10 threatened it would. Instead, it waited until September 13, 2011, to supposedly promptly and
11 vigorously assert their rights. The facts continue to be a key problem for Defendants' arguments.

12 III. CONCLUSION

13 The Court should not permit Defendants to water down the final order out of the cynical
14 hope of bettering their arguments to the Nevada Supreme Court. The order drafted by Jacobs
15 mirrors the arguments raised in his Motion and Reply, upon which the Court relied in granting the
16 Motion. Accordingly, the Court should approve and sign the order proposed by Jacobs.

17 DATED this 14th day of June, 2013.

18 PISANELLI BICE PLLC

19 By: 

20 James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
21 Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534
22 Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
23 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800
24 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

25 Attorneys for Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs

26 ³ Defendants' claim in their surreply that Jacobs never told them that he possessed a
27 "multitude" of documents from his employment at Sands China is also false. In responding to
28 Sands China's outrageous accusation that Jacobs stole documents from the company, Jacobs'
counsel explained "that wrongfully terminated corporate executives are often – and properly – in
possession of a multitude of documents received during the course of their employment." (Ex. 7,
Campbell Ltr. dated Nov. 30, 2010.) The fact that Sands China only cared about recovering a
few, highly harmful reports at that time does not negate Jacobs' confirmation that he was in
possession of other, in fact a "multitude" of documents as well.

PISANELLI BICE PLLC
3883 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY, SUITE 800
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC, and that on this 14th day of June, 2013, I caused to be sent via e-mail and United States Mail, postage prepaid, true and correct copies of the above and foregoing **PLAINTIFF STEVEN C. JACOBS' STATUS MEMORANDUM ON JURISDICTIONAL DISCOVERY** properly addressed to the following:

J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
HOLLAND & HART
9555 Hillwood Drive, Second Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89134
speek@hollandhart.com
rcassity@hollandhart.com

Michael E. Lackey, Jr., Esq.
MAYER BROWN LLP
1999 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
mlackey@maverbrown.com

J. Randall Jones, Esq.
Mark M. Jones, Esq.
KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89169
r.jones@kempjones.com
m.jones@kempjones.com

Steve Morris, Esq.
Rosa Solis-Rainey, Esq.
MORRIS LAW GROUP
900 Bank of America Plaza
300 South Fourth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
sm@morrislawgroup.com
rsr@morrislawgroup.com


An employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC

EXHIBIT 1

TRAN

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
* * * * *

STEVEN JACOBS

Plaintiff

vs.

LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., et al.

Defendants

CASE NO. A-627691

DEPT. NO. XI

Transcript of
Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

HEARING ON DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2013

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

JAMES J. PISANELLI, ESQ.
TODD BICE, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

J. STEPHEN PEEK, ESQ.
MARK JONES, ESQ.

COURT RECORDER:

JILL HAWKINS
District Court

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript
produced by transcription service.

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 2013, 8:56 A.M.

2 (Court was called to order)

3 THE COURT: Can I ask a Sands-Jacobs question. Are
4 we arguing the motion for the return of the documents today,
5 or are we --

6 MR. MARK JONES: No, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Come on up.

8 MR. PEEK: We're just asking you -- we want oral
9 argument is all, and scheduling.

10 MR. BICE: Good morning, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Good morning.

12 So here's my question for you, Mr. Peek. Part of
13 the issues related to this motion is whether I am someday
14 going to make a determination as to an assertion by your
15 client of privilege related to those documents; right?

16 MR. PEEK: Yes.

17 THE COURT: How are you going to tee that issue up,
18 and how long is it going to take? Because that's sort of how
19 I'm going to decide when to set the motion for oral argument.

20 MR. BICE: The motion is set for --

21 THE COURT: I know when it's set.

22 MR. BICE: Okay.

23 MR. PEEK: The motion --

24 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Peek. These are
25 questions you didn't anticipate, aren't they?

1 occurs in litigation, there are certain waivers or limitations
2 with respect to those privileges.

3 MR. PEEK: So that the lawyers for that party would
4 be entitled to see the attorney-client privileged documents
5 under the stipulated protective order, as well as the client.

6 THE COURT: Which their client has already seen and
7 in fact dealt with as part of his job duties.

8 MR. PEEK: Just trying to understand, Your Honor,
9 how to frame the issue, not making my argument here today,
10 although I'm still going to respectfully request as part of my
11 supplemental briefing -- unless you're telling me, I'm denying
12 this with prejudice, don't bring it up to me again --

13 THE COURT: You can always --

14 MR. PEEK: -- I'm going to ask it in the
15 supplemental brief for oral argument. Because this is a very
16 important issue to us.

17 THE COURT: You can always ask over and over again.
18 You're not in the Second, where you never get a hearing and
19 it's highly unusual. But on this particular issue the parties
20 are going to be bound by their briefs. So I'm not going to
21 take oral argument.

22 MR. PEEK: Okay. I get it, Your Honor. And I --

23 THE COURT: Because I want the playing field to be
24 well defined for purposes of the appellate review.

25 MR. PEEK: Yes. So do we, Your Honor, want to --

1 THE COURT: Which is why we're not going to have
2 oral argument, because you guys are really good and creative
3 and sometimes create new issues during argument.

4 MR. PEEK: I don't know if we take that as a
5 compliment, Your Honor, or --

6 THE COURT: It's intended as a compliment.

7 MR. PEEK: Thank you.

8 THE COURT: But it makes my job as a judge who's
9 being reviewed on a regular basis by the appellate court
10 difficult.

11 MR. PEEK: I understand, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: So on this issue we're not going to have
13 any oral argument.

14 MR. PEEK: Your Honor, there was -- by the way,
15 there was an order, I believe, that -- from the 28th hearing
16 -- I don't think --

17 THE COURT: I was at the judicial college for the
18 last several days teaching, so I just got back yesterday. So
19 if it's in Max's pile, he's been trying to get time with me,
20 and we've been going through and I've been signing stacks, so
21 I may not have hit it if we have it. But I intend to get
22 through the rest of it today, the rest of the pile.

23 MR. PEEK: Doesn't sound like -- from what Mr. Bice
24 said, I don't think he's submitted it. We haven't seen it, so
25 I was just wondering if --

1 THE COURT: I was out of town, in Reno.
2 MR. BICE: Mr. Peek may be right that -- I just
3 talked to Mr. Jones. I think it's due tomorrow. It may be
4 that we did not send them drafts. I will -- as soon as I get
5 out of here --
6 THE COURT: Mr. Bice --
7 MR. BICE: I know.
8 THE COURT: -- you're being scolded.
9 MR. BICE: I know. As soon as I get back to the
10 office I'll make sure that they get it so they could look at
11 it today. Sorry about that. We have not --
12 THE COURT: I was in Reno, so --
13 MR. BICE: No. We would not send it over to you
14 without getting their input. So you don't have it. You don't
15 -- it's not that we sent it over to you without giving --
16 THE COURT: I'm not behind?
17 MR. BICE: No, you're not.
18 THE COURT: Okay.
19 MR. BICE: This is on us, not them or you.
20 THE COURT: Lovely.
21 MR. PEEK: Thank you, Your Honor.
22 THE PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 9:12 A.M.
23 * * * * *
24
25

CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

AFFIRMATION

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY.

FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

3/16/13

FLORENCE HOYT, TRANSCRIBER

DATE

EXHIBIT 2

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

STEVEN C. JACOBS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CASE NO. A-10-627691

LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., a
Nevada corporation; SANDS
CHINA LTD., a Cayman Islands
corporation; DOES I through
X; and ROE CORPORATIONS I
through X,

Defendants.

AND RELATED CLAIMS

VIDEOTAPE AND ORAL DEPOSITION OF MICHAEL LEVEN

VOLUME II

PAGES 268-456

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2013

REPORTED BY: CARRE LEWIS, CCR NO. 497

JOB NO. 173048

1 DEPOSITION OF MICHAEL LEVEN,
2 taken at 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800,
3 Las Vegas, Nevada, on Friday, February 1, 2013, at
4 11:24 a.m., before Carre Lewis, Certified Court
5 Reporter, in and for the State of Nevada.

6
7 APPEARANCES:

8 For the Plaintiff:

9 PISANELLI BICE, PLLC
10 BY: TODD BICE, ESQ.
11 BY: ERIC T. ALDRIAN, ESQ
12 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
14 (702) 214-2100
15 tlb@pisanellibice.com
16 see@pisanellibice.com
17 eta@pisanellibice.com

18 For Las Vegas Sands and Sands China Limited:

19 HOLLAND & HART LLP
20 BY: STEPHEN PEEK, ESQ.
21 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
22 Las Vegas, NV 89169
23 (702) 669-4600
24 speak@hollandandhart.com

25 For Sands China Limited:

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
20 BY: MARK JONES, ESQ.
21 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor
22 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
23 (702) 385-6000
24 m.jones@kempjones.com
25

1 APPEARANCES (continued):

2 For Sheldon Adelson, Las Vegas Sands:

3 LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP.

4 BY: IRA H. RAPHAELSON, ESQ.

5 GLOBAL GENERAL COUNSEL

6 3355 Las Vegas Boulevard South

7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

8 (702) 733-5503

9 ira.raphaelson2lasvegassands.com

10 The Videographer:

11 Litigation Services

12 By: Benjamin Russell

13 3770 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 300

14 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

15 (702) 314-7200

16 Also Present:

17 Steven Jacobs

I N D E X

WITNESS: MICHAEL LEVEN

EXAMINATION

PAGE

By Mr. Bice

278

1	Michael Leven		
2	Jacobs vs. Sands		
3	Friday, February 1, 2013		
4	Carre Lewis, CCR No. 497		
5	E X H I B I T S		
6	NUMBER		PAGE
7	Exhibit 11	E-Mail; LVS00235110	279
8	Exhibit 12	Steve Jacobs Offer Terms and Conditions; LVS00133027	285
9	Exhibit 13	E-Mail String; LVS00127168	286
10	Exhibit 14	E-Mail String; LVS00127504	291
11		- 507	
12	Exhibit 15	E-Mail String; LVS0012429	297
13	Exhibit 16	E-Mail String; LVS00141709	299
14		- 711	
15	Exhibit 17	E-Mail; LVS00122895	308
16	Exhibit 18	E-Mail String; LVS00131020	309
17	Exhibit 19	E-Mail and Attachment; LVS00117282 - 283	314
18	Exhibit 20	E-Mail String; LVS00113708	322
19	Exhibit 21	E-Mail String; LVS00112863	327
20	Exhibit 22	E-Mail; LVS00123649	328
21	Exhibit 23	E-Mail String; LVS00117303	330
22	Exhibit 24	E-Mail String; LVS00112588	331
23	Exhibit 25	E-Mail String; LVS00104216	336
24	Exhibit 26	E-Mail String; LVS00117292 - 293	340
25			

1	Michael Leven	
2	Jacobs vs. Sands	
3	Friday, February 1, 2013	
4	Carre Lewis, CCR No. 497	
5	E X H I B I T S	
6	NUMBER	PAGE
7	Exhibit 27 E-Mail String; LVS00117305 - 307	347
8	Exhibit 28 E-Mail String; LVS00233650 - 651	350
9	Exhibit 29 E-Mail String; LVS00112688 - 689	353
10	Exhibit 30 E-Mail String; LVS00113076	356
11	Exhibit 31 E-Mail String; LVS00122024	357
12	Exhibit 32 E-Mail String; LVS00233682 - 683	368
13	Exhibit 33 E-Mail String; LVS00131402 - 403	370
14	Exhibit 34 E-Mail; LVS00117328 - 330	374
15	Exhibit 35 E-Mail String; LVS00122018 - 020	375
16	Exhibit 36 E-Mail String; LVS00121248	378
17	Exhibit 37 E-Mail String; LVS00110311- 312	381
18	Exhibit 38 E-Mail; LVS00113093	386
19	Exhibit 39 E-Mail String; LVS00121990 - 995	389
20	Exhibit 40 E-Mail; LVS00133987 - 990	394
21	Exhibit 41 E-Mail; LVS00117331 - 332	396

1	Michael Leven	
2	Jacobs vs. Sands	
3	Friday, February 1, 2013	
4	Carre Lewis, CCR No. 497	
5	E X H I B I T S	
6	NUMBER	PAGE
7	Exhibit 42 E-Mail; LVS00131378	398
8	Exhibit 43 Announcement; LVS00144362	399
9	Exhibit 44 E-Mail String; LVS00131362	400
10	Exhibit 45 E-Mail; LVS00130400	403
11	Exhibit 46 E-Mail and Attachment; LVS00132344 - 348	404
12	Exhibit 47 E-Mail; LVS00145383 - 386	405
13	Exhibit 48 E-Mail String; LVS00131358	408
14	Exhibit 49 E-Mail String; LVS00121270 - 271	410
15	Exhibit 50 E-Mail String; LVS00117344 - 345	413
16	Exhibit 51 Notification of Termination with Cause	415
17	Exhibit 52 E-Mail; LVS00121378	423
18	Exhibit 53 E-Mail String; LVS00235406 - 407	425
19	Exhibit 54 E-Mail String; LVS00122441	430
20	Exhibit 55 E-Mail String; LVS00110709	431
21	Exhibit 56 E-Mail; LVS00153682	434
22	Exhibit 57 E-Mail String; SCL00114508 - 509	440
23		
24		
25		

1	Michael Leven		
2	Jacobs vs. Sands		
3	Friday, February 1, 2013		
4	Carre Lewis, CCR No. 497		
5	E X H I B I T S		
6	NUMBER		PAGE
7	Exhibit 58	E-Mail; SCO00114515	440
8	Exhibit 59	E-Mail; SCO00117227	441
9	Exhibit 60	E-Mail String; SCL00120910 - 911	441
10	Exhibit 61	8/24/10 Letter from Campbell & Williams	441
11			
12	Exhibit 62	E-Mail String; SCL00118633 - 634	448
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

INSTRUCTIONS NOT TO ANSWER.

	Page	Line
1		
2		
3	310	22
4	317	9
5	320	11
6	322	17
7	330	8
8	333	19
9	337	16
10	338	12
11	343	8
12	353	6
13	359	9
14	367	19
15	370	2
16	371	16
17	372	19
18	372	24
19	373	9
20	376	20
21	380	10
22	420	2
23	420	17
24	435	11
25	444	13
	444	18
	447	5

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2013;

2 11:24 A.M.

3 -oOo-

4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the beginning of
5 Videotape Number 1 in the deposition of Michael 11:24:10

6 Leven in the matter of Jacobs versus Las Vegas Sands
7 Corporation, held at Pisanelli Bice at 3883 Howard
8 Hughes Parkway, Suite 800, Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
9 on the 1st of February, 2013 at approximately

10 11:28 a.m. 11:24:33

11 The court reporter is Carre Lewis. I am
12 Benjamin Russell, the videographer, an employee of
13 Litigation Services.

14 This deposition is being videotaped at all
15 times unless specified to go off the record. 11:24:45

16 Would all present please identify
17 themselves, beginning with the witness

18 THE WITNESS: Michael Leven.

19 MR. PEEK: Stephen Peek representing Sands
20 China Limited and Las Vegas Sands Corp. 11:25:00

21 MR. JONES: Mark Jones on behalf of Sands
22 China Limited.

23 MR. RAFAELSON: Ira Rafaelson on behalf of
24 Las Vegas Sands Corp.

25 MR. ALDRIAN: Eric Aldrian on behalf of 11:25:05

1 (Exhibit 41 marked.)

2 BY MR. BICE:

3 Q. Showing you what's been marked as
4 Exhibit 41.

5 Have you reviewed this, Exhibit 41, 03:16:57
6 Mr. Leven?

7 A. Uh-huh.

8 Q. Do you have any reason to believe that you
9 did not receive this?

10 A. No. 03:17:02

11 Q. And Ron Reese is based here in Las Vegas,
12 correct?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. Okay. And is it true that the plan for
15 terminating Mr. Jacobs was being carried out here in 03:17:14
16 Las Vegas?

17 A. No. The plan -- the -- the arrangements
18 for carrying out the termination of Steve Jacobs was
19 developed here and executed there.

20 Q. Where -- 03:17:29

21 (Discussion held off the record.)

22 BY MR. BICE:

23 Q. The -- you say that the plan was -- let me
24 get your words right.

25 The arrangements for carrying out the 03:17:49

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

MR. JONES: Thank you.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record at
5:14 p.m.

(Deposition concluded at 5:14 p.m.)

-oOo-

CERTIFICATE OF DEPONENT

PAGE	LINE	CHANGE	REASON
------	------	--------	--------

* * * * *

I, Michael Leven, deponent herein, do hereby
certify and declare the within and foregoing
transcription to be my deposition in said action;
under penalty of perjury; that I have read,
corrected and do hereby affix my signature to said
deposition.

Michael Leven, Deponent

Date

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF NEVADA)
) SS:
COUNTY OF CLARK)

I, Carre Lewis, a duly commissioned and licensed Court Reporter, Clark County, State of Nevada, do hereby certify: That I reported the taking of the deposition of the witness, Michael Leven, commencing on Friday, February 1, 2013, at 11:24 a.m.


That prior to being examined, the witness was, by me, duly sworn to testify to the truth. That I thereafter transcribed my said shorthand notes into typewriting and that the typewritten transcript of said deposition is a complete, true and accurate transcription of said shorthand notes.

I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of an attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor a relative or employee of an attorney or counsel involved in said action, nor a person financially interested in the action.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand, in my office, in the County of Clark, State of Nevada, this 10th day of February 2013.

CARRE LEWIS, CCR NO. 497

EXHIBIT 3



CLERK OF THE COURT

1 FFCL

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

STEVEN JACOBS,

Plaintiff(s),

vs

LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP, ET AL,

Defendants.

Case No. 10 A 627691

Dept. No. XI

Date of Hearing: 09/10-12/12

DECISION AND ORDER

This matter having come on for an evidentiary hearing before the Honorable Elizabeth Gonzalez beginning on September 10, 2012 and continuing day to day, based upon the availability of the Court and Counsel, until its completion on September 12, 2012; Plaintiff Steven Jacobs ("Jacobs") being present in court and appearing by and through his attorney of record, James Pisanelli, Esq., Todd Bice, Esq., and Debra Spinelli, Esq. of the law firm of Pisanelli Bice; Defendant Las Vegas Sands appearing by and through its counsel J. Stephen Peek, Esq. of the law firm of Holland & Hart and counsel for purposes of this proceeding, Samuel Lionel, Esq. and Charles McCrea, Esq., of the law firm of Lionel Sawyer & Collins; Defendant Sands China appearing by and through its counsel J. Stephen Peek, Esq. of the law firm of Holland & Hart, Brad D. Brian, Esq., Henry Weissman, Esq., and John B. Owens, Esq. of the law firm of Munger Tolles & Olson and counsel for purposes of this proceeding, Samuel Lionel, Esq. and Charles McCrea, Esq., of the law firm of Lionel Sawyer & Collins; the Court having read and considered the pleadings filed by the parties and the transcripts of prior hearings; having reviewed the evidence admitted during the trial; and having heard and carefully considered the testimony of the witnesses called to testify; the Court having considered the oral and written arguments of counsel, and with the intent of deciding the limited issues before the Court related to lack of candor and nondisclosure of information to

1 the Court and appropriate sanctions pursuant to EDCR 7.60. The Court makes the following
2 findings of fact and conclusions of law:

3 I.
4 PROCEDURAL POSTURE

5 On August 26, 2011, the Nevada Supreme Court issued a stay of proceedings in this
6 matter pending the conduct of an evidentiary hearing and decision on jurisdictional issues
7 related to Sands China. The Court granted Jacobs request to conduct jurisdictional discovery
8 prior to the evidentiary hearing. The order granting the jurisdictional discovery was ultimately
9 entered on March 8, 2012.

10 II.
11 FINDINGS OF FACT¹

12 1. Prior to litigation, in approximately August 2010, a ghost image of hard drives
13 of computers used by Steve Jacobs in Macau² and copies of his outlook emails were transferred
14 by way of electronic storage devices (the "transferred data") to Michael Kostrinsky, Esq.,
15 Deputy General Counsel of Las Vegas Sands.³

16
17
18
19
20 ¹ Counsel for Las Vegas Sands objected on the basis of attorney client privilege to a majority of the
21 questions asked of the counsel who testified during the evidentiary hearing. Almost all of those
22 objections were sustained. While numerous directions not to answer on the basis of attorney client
23 privilege and the attorney work product were made by counsel for Las Vegas Sands, sustained by the
24 Court, and followed by the witnesses, sufficient information was presented through pleadings already in
25 the record and testimony of witnesses without the necessity of the Court drawing inferences related to
26 the assertion of those privileges. See generally, Francis v. Wynn, 127 NAO 60 (2011). The Court also
27 rejects Plaintiff's suggestion that adverse presumptions should be made by the Court as a result of the
28 failure of Las Vegas Sands to present explanatory evidence in its possession and declines to make any
presumptions which might arguably be applicable under NRS Chapter 47.

26 ² There is an issue that has been raised regarding the current location of those computers and hard
27 drives from which the ghost image was made. The Court does not in this Order address any issues
related to those items.

28 ³ According to a status report filed by Las Vegas Sands on July 6, 2012, there were other transfers of
electronically stored data. Based upon testimony elicited during the evidentiary hearing, counsel was
unaware of those transfers prior to the preparation and filing of the status report.

1 2. Kostrinsky requested this information in anticipation of litigation with Jacobs
2 after learning of receipt of a letter by then general counsel for Las Vegas Sands from Don
3 Campbell.

4 3. This transferred data was placed on a server at Las Vegas Sands and was
5 initially reviewed by Kostrinsky.

6 4. The attorneys for Sands China at the Glaser Weil firm were aware of the
7 existence of the transferred data on Kostrinsky's computer from shortly after their retention in
8 November 2010.

9 5. The transferred data was reviewed in Kostrinsky's office by attorneys from
10 Holland & Hart.

11 6. On April 22, 2011, in house counsel for Sands China, Anne Salt, participated in
12 the Rule 16 conference by videoconference and responded to inquiry by the Court related to
13 electronically stored information and confirmed preservation of the data.

14 7. At no time during the Rule 16 conference did Ms. Salt or anyone on behalf of
15 Sands China advise the Court of the potential impact of the Macau Personal Data Privacy Act
16 (MDPA) upon discovery in this litigation.

17 8. Following the Rule 16 conference with the Court, the parties filed a Joint Status
18 Report on April 22, 2011, in which they agreed that the initial disclosure of documents
19 pursuant to NRCP 16.1 would be made by Sands China and Las Vegas Sands prior to July 1,
20 2011. The MDPA is not mentioned in the Joint Status Report as potentially affecting
21 discovery in this litigation.

22 9. Following the Rule 16 conference, no production or other identification of the
23 information from the transferred data was made.

24 10. Beginning with the motion filed May 17, 2011, Sands China and Las Vegas
25 Sands raised the MDPA as a potential impediment (if not a bar) to production of certain
26 documents.
27
28

1 11. At a hearing on June 9, 2012, counsel for Sands China represented to the Court
2 that the documents subject to production were in Macau; were not allowed to leave Macau;
3 and, had to be reviewed by counsel for Sands China in Macau prior to requesting the Office of
4 Personal Data Protection in Macau for permission to release those documents for discovery
5 purposes in the United States.

6 12. At the time of the representation made on June 9, 2012, the transferred data had
7 already been copied; the copy removed from Macau; and reviewed in Las Vegas by
8 representatives of Las Vegas Sands.

9 13. The transferred data was stored on a Las Vegas Sands shared drive totaling 50 –
10 60 gigabytes of information.

11 14. Prior to July 2011, Las Vegas Sands had full and complete access to documents
12 in the possession of Sands China in Macau through a network to network connection.

13 15. Beginning in approximately July 2011, Las Vegas Sands access to Sands China
14 data changed as a result of corporate decision making.

15 16. Prior to the access change, significant amounts of data from Macau related to
16 Jacobs was transported to the United States and reviewed by in house counsel for Las Vegas
17 Sands and outside counsel, and placed on shared drives at Las Vegas Sands.

18 17. At no time did Las Vegas Sands or Sands China disclose the existence of this
19 data to the Court.⁴

20 18. At no time did Las Vegas Sands or Sands China provide a privilege log
21 identifying documents which it contended were protected by the MDPA which was discussed
22 by the Court on June 9, 2011.
23
24
25
26

27 ⁴ While Las Vegas Sands contends that a disclosure was made on June 9, 2011, this is inconsistent with
28 other actions and statements made to the Court including the June 27, 2012 status report, the June 28,
2012 hearing and the July 6, 2012 status report.

1 19. For the first time on June 27, 2012, in a written status report, Las Vegas Sands
2 and Sands China advised the Court that Las Vegas Sands was in possession of over 100,000
3 emails and other ESI that had been transferred "in error".

4 20. In the June 27, 2012 status report, Las Vegas Sands admits that it did not
5 disclose the existence of the transferred data because it wanted to review the Jacobs ESI.⁵

6 21. Any finding of fact stated hereinabove that is more appropriately deemed a
7 conclusion of law shall be so deemed.

8
9 **III.**
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

10 22. The MDPA and its impact upon production of documents related to discovery
11 has been an issue of serious contention between the parties in motion practice before this Court
12 since May 2011.

13 23. The MDPA has been an issue with regards to documents, which are the subject
14 of the jurisdictional discovery.

15 24. At no time prior to June 28, 2012, was the Court informed that a significant
16 amount of the ESI in the form of a ghost image relevant to this litigation had actually been
17 taken out of Macau in July or August of 2010 by way of a portable electronic device.

18 25. EDCR Rule 7.60 provides in pertinent part:

19 * * *

20
21 (b) The court may, after notice and an opportunity to be heard, impose upon an
22 attorney or a party any and all sanctions which may, under the facts of the case, be reasonable,
23 including the imposition of fines, costs or attorney's fees when an attorney or a party without
24 just cause:

25 * * *

26 (3) So multiplies the proceedings in a case as to increase costs unreasonably
27 and vexatiously.

28 ⁵ The Court notes that there have also been significant issues with the production of information from Jacobs. On appropriate motion the Court will deal with those issues.

1 26. As a result of the failure to disclose the existence of the transferred data, the
2 Court conducted needless hearings on the following dates which involved (at least in part) the
3 MDPA issues:

4 May 26, 2011

5 June 9, 2011

6 July 19, 2011

7 September 20, 2011⁶

8 October 4, 2011⁷

9 October 13, 2011

10 January 3, 2012

11 March 8, 2012

12 May 24, 2012

13 27. The Court concludes after hearing the testimony of witnesses that the 100,000
14 emails and other ESI were not transferred in error, but was purposefully brought into the
15 United States after a request by Las Vegas Sands for preservation purposes.

16 28. The transferred data is relevant to the evidentiary hearing related to jurisdiction,
17 which the Court intends to conduct.

18 29. The change in corporate policy regarding Las Vegas Sands access to Sands
19 China data made during the course of this ongoing litigation was made with an intent to
20 prevent the disclosure of the transferred data as well as other data.⁸

21 30. The Defendants concealed the existence of the transferred data from this Court.
22
23
24

25 ⁶ This hearing was conducted in a related case, A648484.

26 ⁷ This hearing was conducted in a related case, A648484.

27 ⁸ While the Court recognizes that several other legal proceedings related to certain allegations made by
28 Jacobs were commenced during the course of this litigation including subpoenas from the SEC and DOJ,
this does not excuse the failure to disclose the existence of the transferred data; the failure to identify the
transferred data on a privilege log, or the failure produce of the transferred data in this matter.

1 31. As the transferred data had already been reviewed by counsel, the failure to
2 disclose the existence of this transferred data to the Court caused repeated and unnecessary
3 motion practice before this Court.

4 32. The lack of disclosure appears to the Court to be an attempt by Defendants to
5 stall the discovery, and in particular, the jurisdictional discovery in these proceedings.

6 33. Given the number of occasions the MDPA and the production of ESI by
7 Defendants was discussed there can be no other conclusions than that the conduct was
8 repetitive and abusive.

9 34. The conduct however does not rise to the level of striking pleadings as exhibited
10 in the Foster v. Dingwall, 227 P.3d 1042 (Nev. 2010) or the entry of default as in Goodyear v.
11 Bahena, 235 P.3d 592 (Nev. 2010) cases.⁹

12 35. After evaluating the factors in Ribiero v. Young, 106 Nev. 88 (1990), the Court
13 finds:

14 a. There are varying degrees of willfulness demonstrated by the
15 Defendants and their agents in failing to disclose the transferred data to Plaintiff ranging from
16 careless nondisclosure to knowing, willful and intentional conduct with an intent to prevent the
17 Plaintiff access to information discoverable for the jurisdictional proceedings;¹⁰

18 b. There are varying degrees of willfulness demonstrated by the
19 Defendants and their agents ranging from careless nondisclosure to knowing, willful and
20 intentional conduct in concealing the existence of the transferred data and failing to disclose
21 the transferred data to the Court with an intent to prevent the Court ruling on the
22 discoverability for purposes of the jurisdictional proceedings;
23

24
25
26
27 ⁹ The Court recognizes no factors have been provided to guide in the evaluation of sanctions for conduct
in violation of EDCR 7.60, but utilizes cases interpreting Rule 37 violations as instructive.

28 ¹⁰ As a result of the stay, the court does not address the discoverability of the transferred data and the
effect of the conduct related to the entire case.

1 c. The repeated nature of Defendants and Defendants' agents conduct in
2 making inaccurate representations over a several month period is further evidence of the
3 intention to deceive the Court;

4 d. Based upon the evidence currently before the Court it does not appear
5 that any evidence has been irreparably lost;¹¹

6 e. There is a public policy to prevent further abuses and deter litigants from
7 concealing discoverable information and intentionally deceiving the Court in an attempt to
8 advance its claims; and

9 f. The delay and prejudice to the Plaintiff in preparing his case is
10 significant, however, a sanction less severe than striking claims, defenses or pleadings can be
11 fashioned to ameliorate the prejudice.

12 36. The Court after evaluation of the evidence and testimony, weighing the factors
13 and evaluating alternative sanctions determines that evidentiary and monetary sanctions are an
14 alternative less severe sanction to address the conduct that has occurred in this matter.

15 37. Any conclusion of law stated hereinabove that is more appropriately deemed a
16 finding of fact shall be so deemed.

17 IV.

18 ORDER

19 Therefore the Court makes the following order:

20 a. For purposes of jurisdictional discovery and the evidentiary hearing related to
21 jurisdiction, Las Vegas Sands and Sands China will be precluded from raising the MDPA as an
22 objection or as a defense to admission, disclosure or production of any documents.¹²

23
24
25
26 ¹¹ There is an issue that has been raised regarding the current location of those computers and hard drives
27 from which the ghost image was made. The Court does not in this Order address any issues related to
28 those items.

¹² This does not prevent the Defendants from raising any other appropriate objection or privilege.

1 b. For purposes of jurisdictional discovery and the evidentiary hearing related to
2 jurisdiction, Las Vegas Sands and Sands China are precluded from contesting that Jacobs ESI
3 (approx. 40 gigabytes) is not rightfully in his possession.¹³

4 c. Defendants will make a contribution of \$25,000 to the Legal Aid Center of
5 Southern Nevada.

6 d. Reasonable attorneys' fees of Plaintiff will be awarded upon filing an
7 appropriate motion for those fees incurred in conjunction with those portions of the hearings
8 related to the MDPA identified in paragraph 26.

9
10
11 Dated this 14th day of September, 2012

12
13 
14 ELIZABETH GONZALEZ
District Court Judge

15 Certificate of Service

16 I hereby certify that on or about the date filed, this document was copied through e-
17 mail, or a copy of this Order was placed in the attorney's folder in the Clerk's Office or mailed
18 to the proper person as follows:

19
20 J. Stephen Peek, Esq. (Holland & Hart)

21 Samuel Lionel, Esq. (Lionel Sawyer & Collins)

22 Brad D. Brian Esq. (Munger Tolles & Olson)

23 James J. Pisanelli, Esq. (Pisanelli Bice)

24
25 
26 Dan Kutinac

27
28 ¹³ This does not prevent the Defendants from raising any other appropriate objection or privilege.

EXHIBIT 4

ORIGINAL

Alvin L. Blum

CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

STEVEN JACOBS

Plaintiff

vs.

LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., et al..

Defendants

CASE NO. A-627691

DEPT. NO. XI

Transcript of
Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2013

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

JAMES J. PISANELLI, ESQ.
TODD BICE, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

J. STEPHEN PEEK, ESQ.
JON RANDALL JONES, ESQ.
MARK JONES, ESQ.
MICHAEL LACKEY, ESQ.

COURT RECORDER:

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

JILL HAWKINS
District Court

FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript
produced by transcription service.

RECEIVED

MAR 04 2013

CLERK OF THE COURT

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2013, 10:08 A.M.

2 (Court was called to order)

3 THE COURT: Okay. Are we ready? Mr. Pisanelli, are
4 you arguing today, or is Mr. Bice?

5 MR. PISANELLI: I am, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: All right. Please use regular people
7 language today.

8 MR. PISANELLI: I will. And if I slip, please feel
9 free to interrupt me, and I'll do my best to rephrase it.

10 For the record and for the audience, Your Honor,
11 James Pisanelli on behalf of the plaintiff, Steven Jacobs.

12 Your Honor, I'm going to be blunt. There is a lot
13 of reasons to be angry in this case. This case has been
14 corrupted. And when I say there's a lot of reasons to be
15 angry I don't mean personally, I mean virtually every
16 participant in this case, certainly Mr. Jacobs. His justice
17 is being denied. Through just simply the delay his justice is
18 being denied, his fair trial appears to be out of reach in
19 light of what we've seen. Your Honor has as much reason to be
20 angry as anyone. You've been given a mandate, an instruction
21 from the Supreme Court to conduct a hearing on jurisdictional
22 discovery, and the defendants' conduct in this case has gotten
23 in the way of you doing your job. Certainly Mr. Bice and I
24 have expressed some anger to you in the past, both in written
25 word and at this podium, to a degree at times when we were

1 email has not been redacted, so only individual names have
2 been redacted. So you could still -- to suggest that --

3 THE COURT: That is violative of my order, Mr.
4 Jones. And I don't really care that your client is in a bad
5 position with the Macau Government. Your client is the one
6 who decided to take the material out of Macau originally,
7 failed to disclose it to anyone in the court, and then as a
8 sanction for that conduct loses the ability in this case to
9 raise that as an issue. I'm not saying you don't have
10 problems in Macau. I certainly understand you may well have
11 problems in Macau with the Macau Government. I tried to
12 understand the letter you got from the Macau Government. I
13 read it three times. And I certainly understand they've
14 raised issues with you. But as a sanction for the
15 inappropriate conduct that's happened in this case, in this
16 case you've lost the ability to use that as a defense. I know
17 that there may be some balancing that I do when I'm looking at
18 appropriate sanctions under the Rule 37 standard as to why
19 your client may have chosen to use that method to violate my
20 order. And I'll balance that and I'll look at it and I'll
21 consider those issues. But they violated my order.

22 MR. RANDALL JONES: Well, Your Honor, again, I would
23 respectfully state that I was a part of that process, and
24 whether we were being obtuse -- I hope that I'm never obtuse
25 when I'm looking at a Court's transcript or order -- that when

1 MR. BICE: Thank you, Your Honor.

2 MR. PEEK: Thank you, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: And I really truly appreciate you
4 talking to the school children.

5 MR. PEEK: Thank you, Your Honor. It's our pleasure
6 -- it was my pleasure anyway.

7 THE PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 11:40 A.M.

8 * * * * *

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

AFFIRMATION

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY.

FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

3/1/13

FLORENCE HOYT, TRANSCRIBER

DATE

EXHIBIT 5

PISANELLI BICE PLLC
3883 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY, SUITE 800
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169

1 **ORDR**

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027

2 JJP@pisanellibice.com

Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. No. 4534

3 TLB@pisanellibice.com

Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695

4 DLS@pisanellibice.com

PISANELLI BICE PLLC

5 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

6 Telephone: (702) 214-2100

Facsimile: (702) 214-2101

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs

8 **DISTRICT COURT**

9 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

10 **STEVEN C. JACOBS,**

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., a Nevada
14 corporation; SANDS CHINA LTD., a
15 Cayman Islands corporation; DOES I
through X; and ROE CORPORATIONS
I through X,

16 Defendants.

17 **AND RELATED CLAIMS**

Case No.: A-10-627691

Dept. No.: XI

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF STEVEN C.
JACOBS' MOTION TO RETURN
REMAINING DOCUMENTS FROM
ADVANCED DISCOVERY**

Hearing Date: April 12, 2013

Hearing Time: In Chambers

19 Before this Court is Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' ("Jacobs") Motion to Return Remaining
20 Documents from Advanced Discovery (the "Motion"). The Court has considered all briefing on
21 the Motion, including the supplemental brief it ordered from Defendants. The Court being fully
22 informed, and good cause appearing therefor:

23 **THE COURT HEREBY STATES as follows:**

24 1. At issue are documents that Jacobs ~~took with him when~~ has had in his possession
25 ~~since before his he was terminated~~ termination on July 23, 2010.

26 2. Amongst these documents that Jacobs ~~possessed at the time of his termination~~
27 were documents over which Defendants claim an attorney-client or other form of privilege.

1 3. These are documents that Jacobs either authored, was a recipient offer, or
2 otherwise had access to possessed during the period of in the course and scope of his
3 employment.

4 4. Jacobs' present Motion does not seek to compel the Defendants to produce
5 anything. Rather, Jacobs seeks return of documents that were transferred to the Court's approved
6 electronic stored information ("ESI") vendor, Advanced Discovery, pursuant to a Court-approved
7 protocol. The documents at issue are all presently within his possession, custody and control.

8 5. Pursuant to a Court-approved protocol, Defendants' counsel were allowed to
9 review Jacobs' documents and have now identified approximately 11,000 of them as being
10 subject in whole or in part, to some form of privilege, such as attorney-client, work product,
11 accounting or gaming.

12 6. Based upon these assertions of privilege, Defendants contend that even though the
13 documents are presently in Jacobs' possession, custody and control the Court having previously
14 concluded as part of its Decision and Order dated September 14, 2012 that Defendants are
15 precluded from claiming that he stole the documents they assert that Jacobs cannot provide
16 these documents to his counsel and cannot use them in the litigation even if they relate to the
17 claims, defenses or counterclaims asserted in this action.

18 7. ~~Jacobs' Motion, although styled as one seeking return of documents from the~~
19 ~~Court's approved electronic stored information ("ESI") vendor, Advanced Discovery, more aptly~~
20 ~~seeks to allow Jacobs' counsel to access these documents, which Jacobs has otherwise possessed~~
21 ~~and had access to since before July 23, 2010.~~

22 § 7. The Defendants assert that all privileges belong to the Defendants' corporate
23 entities, not any of their executives, whether present or former. From this, they contend that
24 Jacobs does not have the power to waive any privileges.

25 § 8. The Court notes a split of authority as to who is the client under such
26 circumstances. *See Montgomery v. Etepid Techs. LLC*, 548 F. Supp. 2d 1175 (D. Nev. 2008).
27 However, the Court agrees that any privilege related to these documents in fact belongs to
28

1 ~~Defendants, facts of this case are different, and the Court disagrees with the Defendants' framing~~
2 ~~of the issue.~~

3 ~~10.9~~ The Court does not need to address (at this time) the question of whether any of
4 the particular documents identified by the Defendants are subject to some privilege (a contention
5 which Jacobs disputes), ~~or whether Defendants waived the privilege, or whether Jacobs has the~~
6 ~~power to assert or waive any particular privileges that may belong to the Defendants (a position~~
7 ~~which the Defendants dispute).~~ Instead, the question presently before this Court is whether
8 Jacobs, ~~as a former executive who is currently in possession, custody and control of the~~
9 ~~documents and was before his termination,~~ is among the class of persons legally allowed to view
10 those documents and use them in the prosecution of his claims and to rebut the Defendants'
11 affirmative defenses and counterclaim, as these were documents that the former executive
12 authored, received and/or had access to ~~possessed, both during and after his tenure.~~

13 ~~11.10~~ The burden is upon the proponent of a privilege to substantiate the basis for the
14 privilege as well as to establish that there has been no waiver. ~~Granite Partners v. Bear, Stearns~~
15 ~~& Co., Inc., 184 F.R.D. 49, 52 (S.D.N.Y. 1999) ("The party seeking to assert a claim of privilege~~
16 ~~has the burden of demonstrating both that the privilege exists and that it has not been waived").~~
17 Here, ~~the Court finds that the Defendants have failed to sustain that burden with respect to the~~
18 ~~documents in question, those documents presently being in Jacobs' custody since before his~~
19 ~~termination on July 23, 2010.~~

20 ~~12.~~ In the Court's view, the question is not whether Jacobs has the power to waive any
21 privilege. The more appropriate question is whether Jacobs is within the sphere of persons
22 entitled to review information (assuming that it is privileged) that pertains to Jacobs' tenure that
23 he authored, received and/or possessed, and has retained since July 23, 2010.

24 ~~13.11~~ Even assuming for the sake of argument that Defendants had valid claims of
25 privilege to assert to the documents as against outsiders, they have failed to sustain their burden
26 of demonstrating that ~~they have privileges that would attach to the documents relative to Jacobs'~~
27 cannot review and use documents to which he had access during the period of his employment of
28 them in this litigation.

PISANELLI BICE PLLC
3883 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY, SUITE 800
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169

1 ~~4.12~~ That does not mean, however, that at this time the Court is making any
2 determination as to any other use or access to sources of proof. Until further order, Jacobs may
3 not disseminate the documents in question beyond ~~that of~~ his legal team. And, all parties shall
4 treat the documents as confidential under the Stipulated Confidentiality Agreement and Protective
5 Order entered on March 22, 2012.

6
7
8 THEREFORE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as follows:

9 1. The Motion to Return Remaining Documents from Advanced Discovery is
10 GRANTED. When this Order becomes effective, Advanced Discovery shall release to Jacobs
11 and his counsel all documents contained on the various electronic storage devices received by
12 Advanced Discovery from Jacobs on or about May 18, 2012, and that have otherwise not been
13 previously released to Jacobs and his counsel.

14 2. Those documents listed on the Defendants' privilege log dated November 30,
15 2012, shall be treated as confidential under the Stipulated Confidentiality Agreement and
16 Protective Order entered on March 22, 2012 until further order from this Court.

17 ~~2.3~~ This Order is stayed for a period of ten days to allow Defendants to seek relief
18 from the Nevada Supreme Court.

19 DATED: _____
20

21 THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ
22 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

23 Respectfully submitted by:

Approved as to form by:

24 PISANELLI BICE PLLC

HOLLAND & HART

25 By: _____
26 James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
27 Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534
28 Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
3883 Howard Hughes Pkwy, Suite 800
Las Vegas, NV 89169

By: _____
J. Stephen Peek, Esq., Bar No. 1758
Robert J. Cassity, Esq., Bar No. 9779
9555 Hillwood Drive, Second Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89134

Attorneys for Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs

Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp,
and Sands China Ltd.

PISANELLI RICE PLLC
3883 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY, SUITE 800
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169

KEMP JONES & COULTHARD

By: J. Randall Jones, Esq., Bar No. 1927
Mark M. Jones, Esq., Bar No. 000267
3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 17th Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89169

Michael E. Lackey, Jr., Esq.,
admitted pro hac vice
MAYER BROWN LLP
1999 K. Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Attorneys for Sands China Ltd.

EXHIBIT 6

**Glaser Weil Fink Jacobs
Howard & Shapiro LLP**

10250 Constellation Blvd.
19th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
310.553.9000 TEL
310.556.2920 FAX

November 23, 2010

Direct Dial
(310) 282-0217
Email
Pglaser@glaserweil.com

VIA FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION AND U.S. MAIL

Donald Campbell, Esq.
Campbell & Williams
700 South Seventh Street
Las Vegas, NV 88101

Re: Las Vegas Sands Corp., et al. adv. Jacobs

Dear Mr. Campbell:

This law firm represents Sands China Ltd, together with its subsidiaries (the "Company"). While we will be responding in due course to what we believe, to be kind, an ill-advised complaint filed in the above referenced matter, we address here a matter of immediate concern to our client. We have reason to believe, based on conversations with existing and former employees and consultants for the Company, that Mr. Jacobs has stolen Company property including but not limited to three reports he, while working for the Company, received from Mr. Steve Vickers of International Risk Ltd.

We urge Mr. Jacobs to avoid the "I don't know what you're talking about" charade and return such reports (and any copies thereof) of which most if not all, have been watermarked. Of course, to the extent he has other Company property, such property must also be returned immediately. If we do not receive the reports within the next five (5) business days, we will be forced to seek Court intervention either in Las Vegas or Macau.

On a related matter, we hereby demand and advise Mr. Jacobs (and any consulting company with which he is or was associated) to retain all of his/their files and his wife's files related to the Company and Las Vegas Sands Corp. Also, we remind Mr. Jacobs and his wife to preserve (a) all electronic mail and information about electronic mail (including message contents, header information, and logs of electronic mail system usage including both personal and business electronic mail accounts); (b) all databases (including all records and fields and structural information in such databases); (c) all logs of activity on computer systems that may have been used to process or store electronic data; (d) all word processing files and file

Donald Campbell, Esq.
Campbell & Williams
November 23, 2010
Page 2

fragments; and (e) all other electronic data in each case relating to the Company or Las Vegas Sands Corp.


To minimize the risk of spoliation of relevant electronic documents, Mr. Jacobs (and any consulting company with which he is or was associated) and his wife should not modify or delete any electronic data files relating to the Company or Las Vegas Sands Corp. that are maintained on on-line storage and/or direct access storage devices unless a true and correct copy of each such electronic data file has been made and steps taken to ensure that such copy will be preserved and accessible.

Obviously, no one should alter or erase such electronic data and should not perform any other procedures (such as data compression and disc de-fragmentation or optimization routines) that may impact such data on any stand-alone computers and/or network workstations unless a true and correct copy has been made of such active files and of completely restored versions of such deleted electronic files and fragments and unless copies have been made of all directory listings (including hidden files) for all directories and subdirectories containing such files, and unless arrangements have been made to preserve copies.

Finally, any and all steps necessary to preserve relevant evidence created subsequent to this letter should be taken.

This letter is written without waiver of or prejudice to any and all of our client's rights and remedies.

Very truly yours,



Patricia Glaser
of GLASER, WEIL, FINK, JACOBS, HOWARD & SHAPIRO, LLP

PLG:jam

722356_2.DOC

III MERITAS LATENTIS VOKATIVE.

[illegible]

EXHIBIT 7



VIA FACSIMILE

November 30, 2010

Patricia Glaser, Esq.
Glaser Weil Fink Jacobs
Howard & Shapiro
10250 Constellation Blvd.
Los Angeles, California 90057

Re: *Jacobs v. Las Vegas Sands Corp., et al.*

Dear Ms. Glaser:

We are in receipt of your letter dated November 23, 2010, which was received shortly before the Thanksgiving Holiday. Before turning to the substance contained therein, let me begin by stating "nice to meet you, too."

Moving on . . . please be advised that my firm and I have been consumed in another piece of commercial litigation that has been proceeding on an expedited basis with a myriad of court hearings and deadlines throughout the month of November and continuing into December. You may confirm the existence and breakneck pace of the litigation about which I speak with your local counsel, Stephen Peek and Justin Jones, as they represent one of the parties in the action. As such, I have not had an opportunity to address the contents of your letter with my client, Mr. Jacobs. I do, however, anticipate being able to discuss this matter with him in detail early next week.

Meanwhile, you may assist us in avoiding your self-coined "I don't know what you're talking about" charade" by describing in more detail the "three reports" referenced in your letter. It has been our experience that wrongfully terminated corporate executives are often—and properly—in possession of a multitude of documents received during the ordinary course of their employment. Contrary to the allegations contained in your letter, that does not mean the documents were "stolen." Thus, in order to determine whether Mr. Jacobs possesses the reports you want "returned immediately," it would help to know exactly what you are talking about.

700 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101
PHONE: 702/398-8282
FAX: 702/398-0240

000691

PA2398

Patricia Glaser, Esq.
November 30, 2010
Page 2

Finally, insofar as Mr. Jacobs is in possession of any other documents or evidence related to Sands China, Ltd. and Las Vegas Sands, Corp. we have previously instructed him, as we instruct any client, to preserve all such materials in whatever form they exist.

This letter is written without waiver of or prejudice to any and all of our client's rights and remedies.

Very truly yours,

CAMPBELL & WILLIAMS


Donald J. Campbell, Esq.

DJC:mp

000692

PA2399

EXHIBIT 8



CAMPBELL
& WILLIAMS
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Via E-Mail
Patricia@glaserwell.com

January 11, 2011

Patricia Glaser
Glaser, Well, Fink, Jacobs, et al.
10250 Constellation Blvd., 19th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067

Re: *Jacobs v. Las Vegas Sands Corp.*

Dear Ms. Glaser:

I am in receipt of your e-mailed letter sent to us last Friday evening. As I am presently out of state, I wanted to get you a quick response.

The original materials forwarded to you were sent directly by Mr. Jacobs. There was no Huang Wah Keong report found by Mr. Jacobs in any files currently in his possession. This is not to say that a copy of such a report might not later be located, but Mr. Jacobs feels confident he has conducted a review which has been fairly exhaustive and, accordingly, thinks the likelihood of his possession of the same is remote.

Mr. Jacobs does, however, maintain possession of a copy of those original reports which he forwarded to your attention. Mr. Jacobs respectfully declines your request that he destroy them. Instead, it is his intention to preserve all such copies which are likely to be of evidentiary value in any future legal proceedings.

Sincerely yours,

CAMPBELL & WILLIAMS

Donald J. Campbell
Donald J. Campbell, Esq.
Dictated but not read to avoid delay

DJCmp

700 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101
PHONE 702/662-3322
FAX 702/662-3343

000703

PA2401

1 THE COURT: A document that talks about why Mr.
2 Jacobs was terminated. Remember how I have the who, what,
3 where, when, how --

4 MR. PEEK: I do.

5 THE COURT: -- but we can't ask about why?

6 MR. PISANELLI: And, Your Honor, if I can make the
7 record clear --

8 MR. PEEK: So we're just --

9 MR. PISANELLI: I'm sorry, Mr. Peek. Go ahead.

10 THE COURT: Wait. We've got to let Mr. Peek finish,
11 Mr. Pisanelli.

12 MR. PISANELLI: Yes.

13 MR. PEEK: Thank you. I wasn't because, Your Honor,
14 the -- that type of discovery of the who, what, where, when,
15 how has not been the subject matter of their request for
16 production. And we have search terms associated with those
17 requests for production. That's how we came up with the
18 search terms, was based upon the specific jurisdictional
19 discovery that you allowed in you March 8th order, not what
20 propounded but what you allowed. So --

21 THE COURT: So are you telling me that it's your
22 position that Luis Melo has nothing to do with any of the
23 requests for production that were served?

24 MR. PEEK: We are, Your Honor. We are telling you
25 that.

1 THE COURT: And you're telling me that Ian Bruce has
2 nothing to do with any of the --

3 MR. PEEK: We are -- with the discovery that you
4 permitted, Your Honor, we --

5 THE COURT: Then here -- here's what I'm going to
6 tell you. Run the searches and then list them on a privilege
7 log. And I am permitting you to raise the relevance issue
8 related to merits discovery as opposed to jurisdictional
9 discovery. But please understand, if I go through and do an
10 in-camera review and it's not something that's a how and it's
11 a repetitive process, there will be sanctions.

12 MR. PEEK: So you're allowing them now to do more
13 discovery on document production than what you allowed them to
14 do in your March 8th order. Because they --

15 THE COURT: I am requiring you to do the ESI search
16 related to the twenty custodians identified on the July 20th,
17 2011, letter and produce any information that is responsive to
18 the discovery requests --

19 MR. PEEK: Thank you.

20 THE COURT: -- and to withhold anything that goes
21 only to merits discovery.

22 MR. PEEK: We understand now, Your Honor.

23 MR. PISANELLI: And so the point the I was going to
24 make, Your Honor, is I get the impression, and maybe I'm
25 wrong, but I'm going to be careful here, that Mr. Peeks

1 remarks about our twenty custodians being merit based is to
2 create an improper impression that they are not also our
3 custodians for jurisdictional discovery, which I have already
4 said in this court so I'll repeat it again --

5 THE COURT: Mr. Pisanelli, I got that. Did you just
6 hear the part about --

7 MR. PISANELLI: I'm just making --

8 THE COURT: -- how I said you can hold the how stuff
9 -- or the why stuff, because I've talked about this over the
10 last several months --

11 MR. PISANELLI: Agreed.

12 THE COURT: -- repeatedly and I know it's a hard
13 path to negotiate. But jurisdictional discovery is not a
14 black-and-white issue especially in this case.

15 MR. PISANELLI: I agree.

16 THE COURT: And that's why we've had so many
17 conference calls and so much motion practice related to it.
18 And I do not fault you folks for that practice. I think it's
19 appropriate. I'm just trying to make sure that you run the
20 ESI search, okay.

21 MR. PISANELLI: And so the point -- the point I was
22 getting to, Your Honor, on the evidentiary hearing, if we --
23 would we be permitted to --

24 THE COURT: I can't throw these away. Sorry.

25 MR. PISANELLI: That's okay.

1 THE COURT: I can't throw your stuff away because I
2 set another hearing.

3 MR. PISANELLI: A Freudian slip.

4 THE COURT: I'm trying to get rid of you guys. Yes.
5 Keep going.

6 MR. PISANELLI: Assuming that this evidentiary
7 hearing will permit us to rebut the suggestion that, for
8 example, Mr. Melo's emails have nothing to do with
9 jurisdiction and if we can establish that they have been
10 improperly withheld that will be taken into consideration for
11 the sanctions under this motion. Because this is the
12 discovery we're waiting for by this case in this motion, and
13 that's what was supposed to have been produced on January 4th.

14 THE COURT: The custodian issue I think is a more
15 complicated issue, Mr. Pisanelli, and I don't know that you
16 will be in that position at this hearing. Part of the reason
17 is because, as we all know, ESI searches and review of
18 information is a time-consuming practice. And so I don't know
19 that we will be ready given the trial schedule that some of
20 you have with the Suen case to address the custodian issues at
21 the time of this evidentiary hearing. I will certainly listen
22 to them, but they are not the primary focus of my problem. My
23 problem -- my primary focus is going to be the improper
24 redactions which have resulted, you claim, in prejudice to
25 your clients and the examples you have given me relate to the

1 delays and the duplication of other discovery activities.

2 MR. PISANELLI: Can we have a response date for the
3 searches and production of these missed custodians?

4 MR. PEEK: Your Honor, we should look at Mr. Lackey
5 I think in the --

6 THE COURT: Okay. I'm now looking at you, Mr.
7 Lackey. How long you think you --

8 MR. LACKEY: Wow. Twenty custodians. I believe,
9 what, six of them have already been done, so it's fourteen
10 more custodians. Obviously, the more time the better, Your
11 Honor, since we don't have anything going here. But if we
12 could have six weeks, that -- would that fit with Your Honor's
13 idea?

14 THE COURT: Hold on a second. Six weeks should push
15 you to about April 12th.

16 MR. LACKEY: Let's see. The hearing's going to be
17 on May 13th --

18 THE COURT: Which is about a month before that.

19 MR. LACKEY: I would ask the Court's indulgence
20 since -- as much time as we could get. As you just said, it's
21 a lot of data.

22 THE COURT: Well, let's shoot for the April 12th.

23 MR. LACKEY: Okay.

24 THE COURT: I understand it is a large process. And
25 what I am trying to communicate to you is you've got to do the

1 ESI search to then make the determination as to whether it's
2 merits or jurisdictional. And if you don't do the ESI search,
3 then you're not going to know the answer, which is what
4 disturbed me the most about how the ESI search was run.

5 MR. LACKEY: Can I just respond for one moment, Your
6 Honor --

7 THE COURT: Yes.

8 MR. LACKEY: -- on that point? Tried to target the
9 custodians who are most reasonably likely to have the
10 information --

11 THE COURT: I saw that in your brief.

12 MR. LACKEY: -- and -- okay. And it's obviously --

13 THE COURT: I understand the process.

14 MR. LACKEY: If we are having trouble, Your Honor,
15 with that April 12th date, because I have no idea what the
16 volume is going to be --

17 THE COURT: I would rather hear about it sooner,
18 rather than later, Mr. Lackey. As they all tell you, I do all
19 the discovery in my cases for a reason, to try and control our
20 delays that are related to discovery issues. And if you
21 perceive there is a problem, I'd rather have a hearing about
22 it, a status conference, and try and get it set up to try and
23 identify the problems, whether it's going to impact other
24 things we have scheduled.

25 MR. LACKEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: And I'm going to again thank all of you
2 for the minutes you took to speak to the school children this
3 morning. And, you know, they come, and the presentations that
4 we do in Business Court really aren't very helpful for them,
5 but talking to you guys they do gain some information. I
6 think it makes it a helpful experience. So thank you very
7 much for taking that time and speaking to them.

8 MR. PEEK: Your Honor, is this --

9 MR. BICE: Your Honor, we do have -- sorry.

10 MR. PEEK: -- an order you want plaintiff to draft
11 and pass by us, or is the Court going to draft this order?

12 THE COURT: Sure. Draft it, Mr. Pisanelli. Send it
13 over to them to look at and --

14 'Bye, Mr. Jones. Have fun cross-examining your
15 expert witness, hopefully you'll get out of trial some day.

16 MR. RANDALL JONES: Thank you, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: I got done with mine, so I'm feeling
18 good about life.

19 MR. PEEK: Did you make a decision on it?

20 THE COURT: I issued a decision. It was in the
21 paper today. You should read about it.

22 MR. BICE: Your Honor, we have one --

23 MR. PEEK: I was busy preparing for this, Your
24 Honor.

25 MR. BICE: We have one sort of housekeeping matter

1 that I'm not --

2 THE COURT: Of course you do.

3 MR. BICE: We filed our reply -- or we submitted our
4 reply yesterday, and Max informed us and --

5 THE COURT: You've got to do better on your sealing
6 process. You need to read the rule from the --

7 MR. BICE: Here --

8 THE COURT: -- Nevada Supreme Court.

9 MR. BICE: But here's the thing. And here's the
10 problem. And I will and try and work this out with them, but
11 we -- we're done with the every document is designated as
12 confidential. We've told them that in correspondence. It
13 hasn't changed anything.

14 THE COURT: So there is a protocol that you're
15 supposed to use when you object to the designation of
16 confidential. You're supposed to file a motion and say, dear
17 Judge, we think they're bad, they're overusing the word
18 "confidential" --

19 MR. BICE: No, actually --

20 THE COURT: -- please make them do it differently.

21 MR. PEEK: They have a different view of that, Your
22 Honor, and --

23 MR. BICE: Our order -- actually, our order says the
24 opposite. Our order says that we are to point out to them
25 that they're abusing it and it's their burden to come to you.

1 MR. PEEK: And, Your Honor, we understand that
2 burden, and we'll come to you with that.

3 THE COURT: All right. I haven't read the order
4 recently. I'm sorry. I was using the more common version.

5 MR. BICE: That's all right.

6 MR. PEEK: But we'll come to you with a motion
7 practice on that, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Okay. But you've got to file the motion
9 to seal when you file the pleading.

10 MR. BICE: And every -- and that's why we objected
11 to this over a month ago and told them we were not going to
12 accept any more of these. And --

13 THE COURT: You've still got to file the motion to
14 seal if it's still identified as confidential.

15 MR. BICE: And that's the reason -- here's the
16 problem with that, Your Honor. That's why you don't have a
17 motion from them. This has been going on for two months
18 because --

19 THE COURT: Mr. Peek said he's going to give me a
20 motion now.

21 MR. BICE: Okay.

22 THE COURT: Maybe I'll get it. Anything else?

23 MR. BICE: We look -- we look forward to that.

24 THE COURT: I know you do. It's so nice of you all
25 to be so cooperative.

1 MR. BICE: Thank you, Your Honor.

2 MR. PEEK: Thank you, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: And I really truly appreciate you
4 talking to the school children.

5 MR. PEEK: Thank you, Your Honor. It's our pleasure
6 -- it was my pleasure anyway.

7 THE PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 11:40 A.M.

8 * * * * *

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

AFFIRMATION

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY.

FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146


Florence M. Hoyt

FLORENCE HOYT, TRANSCRIBER

3/1/13

DATE

Electronically Filed
03/06/2013 05:46:52 PM



CLERK OF THE COURT

RPLY

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
JJP@pisanellibice.com
Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534.
TLB@pisanellibice.com
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
DLS@pisanellibice.com
PISANELLI BICE PLLC
3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
Telephone: (702) 214-2100
Facsimile: (702) 214-2101

Attorneys for Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

STEVEN C. JACOBS,

Plaintiff,

v.

LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., a Nevada
corporation; **SANDS CHINA LTD.,** a
Cayman Islands corporation; **DOES I**
through **X;** and **ROE CORPORATIONS**
I through **X,**

Defendants.

AND RELATED CLAIMS

Case No.: A-10-627691
Dept. No.: XI

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S
RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37
SANCTIONS ON ORDER
SHORTENING TIME**

Date of Hearing: February 28, 2013

Time of Hearing: 10:00 a.m.

I. INTRODUCTION

Sands China Ltd. ("Sands China") claims that it is a victim. It says that Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs ("Jacobs") is trying to win this case by sanction because he has meritless claims. That is a telling assertion for Sands China and its parent, Las Vegas Sands Corp. ("LVSC") to make. If hiding evidence, purposefully erecting barriers to the truth coming out and deceiving the judiciary is the type of conduct Sands China and LVSC will undertake in defense of a supposedly meritless case, one can only fathom the things they would do to avoid what they think is a meritorious case.

PISANELLI BICE PLLC
3883 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY, SUITE 800
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169

1 Plainly, the party who recognizes the need to resort to such tactics exposes what they really know
2 about the merits.

3 The question for this Court is straightforward: Did Sands China comply with this Court's
4 order that it "produce all information within [its] possession that is relevant to the jurisdictional
5 discovery" by January 4, 2013? (Ex. 1, Hrg. Tr. dated Dec. 18, 2012, 24:15-17.) Sands China's
6 opposition confirms that it did not. Instead, it proffers 30 pages of excuses and
7 self-rationalization. Sands China claims that it had discretion to determine which documents to
8 search, and then which to produce because this Court did not really mean "all" when that is what
9 it ordered. It claims that even for the narrow class of documents it searched and then produced, it
10 had the discretion to redact them so as to make them useless because, yet again, the Court did not
11 mean what it said in its order.

12 There is no need to continue to pretend that Sands China intended to comply. It did not
13 and will not. It and LVSC have made the decision that the consequences of noncompliance are
14 preferable to those of actual compliance. Continuing to act as though its conduct is anything but
15 knowing and calculated in that regard only perpetuates the lack of forthright disclosure that this
16 Court has faced from these Defendants for over two years now.

17 II. ANALYSIS

18 There is no need to waste more paper in addressing each excuse Sands China offers in its
19 30 pages. The self-recognition by Sands China of the need to proffer so many excuses is, in and
20 of itself, compelling proof of its noncompliance. There is no need for drawn out excuses,
21 explanations and self-rationalization by someone complying with orders.

22 Indeed, all of the posturing only goes to underscore how Sands China's actions were a
23 knowing and calculated means of not complying. To begin, on the appointed day, January 4,
24 2013, Sands China produced a select number of documents, nearly every one of which is redacted
25 to the point of being unintelligible. When those documents were sought to be used at deposition,
26 even the Defendants' own witnesses conceded that they could not understand them and that they
27 were useless. No one could explain what they were about or how they related to jurisdiction.
28 Now, the best that Sands China can offer in trying to distract from this reality is that months after

PISANELLO RICE PLLC
3883 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY, SUITE 800
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169

1 the Court's final deadline, it located some of the same documents in the United States and thus
2 produce them in an unredacted form.¹

3 But of course, this only proves that all of the documents actually located in Macau which
4 this Court ordered produced, save and except those for which LVSC could find duplicates in the
5 United States, remain overly redacted to this very day. On top of that fact, Sands China knows
6 full well that this Court's order directing that it produce all responsive information no later than
7 January 4, was not an aspirational suggestion that Sands China produce what it wanted to by that
8 date. That order culminated from a long pattern of misconduct by these Defendants. When
9 setting that deadline, the Court specifically noted how they had repeatedly ignored and violated
10 orders and discovery obligations. The Court stated that it was setting a clear and unequivocal
11 deadline in an express order so that the Defendants could not later contend that there was no
12 written order being violated. The Court did not invite Sands China to continue to stall by
13 undertaking a document dump on January 4 with useless pieces of redacted paper so that it could
14 simply buy more time with assertions that it would someday get around to producing "some" of
15 the documents in an unredacted form. Its violation of the Court's order is knowing and
16 undeniable.

17 Sands China also tries to rationalize its conduct claiming that it had unlimited discretion in
18 choosing to limit its search to those of its choosing. In fact, it tries to blame Jacobs, claiming that
19 his counsel refused to cooperate in determining the appropriate custodians to search.² But
20 Sands China seems to have forgotten that it admitted that it knew otherwise at the December 18,
21 2012, hearing. There, Jacobs noted that his list of Macau custodians also applied to this
22 jurisdictional discovery. (See Ex. 4 to Motion, Sands China's Rpt. On Compliance, 4:22-23
23 (conceding that at the December 18, 2012, hearing, Sands China understood that Jacobs' list of

24
25 ¹ Of course, that begs the question of why those documents were not produced by LVSC if they
were already in the United States.

26 ² If this misdirection sounds familiar, it should. As the Court surely recalls, when the Defendants
27 got caught deceiving Jacobs and the Court as to how documents had been transported from Macau to
Las Vegas, they had the audacity to claim that it was Jacobs' fault that the truth was not told. They
28 asserted that if Jacobs had only asked the "right" questions, they would have been forced to tell the truth.
Sadly, the same sham excuse-making is repeating itself.

PISANELLI BICE PLLC
3883 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY, SUITE 800
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169

1 custodians applied to jurisdictional discovery.) This was the same day the Court ordered
2 Sands China to "produce all information within [its] possession," and was before Sands China had
3 even begun the process of searching for and producing documents from Macau. Sands China
4 knew full well who the listed custodians were. It made no request of this Court to excuse or limit
5 its ordered compliance from Jacobs' list. Of course it did not. It knew it was not going to comply,
6 so it wanted to be able to preserve one of its many planned excuses knowing that it would be
7 brought before the Court on a sanctions motion.

8 But Sands China's noncompliance does not stop there. Rather than just acknowledge that
9 it was not going to produce anything of substance by January 4, Sands China needed to create the
10 phony appearance that it produced documents so it flaunted this Court's September 14, 2012
11 sanctions order. There, this Court held that "Las Vegas Sands and Sands China will be precluded
12 from raising the M[P]DPA as an objection or as a defense to admission, disclosure or production
13 of any documents." (Ex. 2 to Motion, Sept. 14, 2012 Order, 8:20-23.) As a result, any redaction
14 purportedly pursuant to the MPDPA violates not only the Court's December 18 Order to produce
15 "all relevant information," but also the September 14 Order precluding its obstructionism through
16 the MPDPA.

17 Unable to dispute the actual terms of the September 14 Order, Sands China resorts to
18 claiming that the Court did not mean what it said. According to Sands China, it is still allowed to
19 withhold evidence under the MPDPA because it can redact any information that it wants to claim
20 is covered. Indeed, Sands China claims that this Court expressly approved of this conduct.
21 Hardly. As the transcript from the December 18, 2012, hearing demonstrates, moments after the
22 Court ordered it to produce all of its documents from Macau, counsel for Sands China posited:

23 As I understand it, Your Honor, you said we can still otherwise
24 comply with the law as we believe we should and they you
25 ultimately make the call as to whether or not we have appropriately
done that.

26 (Ex. 1, Hrg. Tr. dated Dec. 18, 2012, 27:15-18.) To which the Court responded: "I assume there
27 will be a motion if there is a substantial lack of information that is provided." (*Id.*, 27:20-21.)
28 The Court later clarified:

PISANELLI BICE PLLC
3883 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY, SUITE 800
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169

1 Well, Mr. Pisanelli, I've entered orders, I've now entered an order
2 that says on January 4 they're going to produce the information.
3 *They're either going to produce it or not.* And if they produce
4 information that you think is insufficient, you will then have a meet
and confer. And then if you believe they are in violation of my
orders, and I include that term as a multiple order, then you're going
to do something.

5 (*Id.*, 28:4-11 (emphasis added).) In other words, the Court did not say Sands China could make
6 redactions under the MPDPA; it said that if Sands China did not comply with its order, it
7 expected Jacobs to bring the present motion. Not coincidentally, that is precisely what Jacobs has
8 done.

9 And, Sands China's claims of a "misunderstanding" in this regard are disproven by its own
10 brief. According to Sands China, it also redacted all of the names and contact information for the
11 documents because it is not sufficiently "relevant" to this Court's jurisdictional hearing. But
12 tellingly, neither Sands China nor LVSC make those types of redactions to the documents that
13 were in the United States. If that is a legitimate basis for redaction, why did Sands China and
14 LVSC only come up with it when they were looking for an excuse to not produce documents from
15 Macau?

16 Obviously, Sands China knew all along that its redactions under the MPDPA were
17 precluded by this Court's September 14 Order. Thus, it recognized that it needed to manufacture
18 some other excuse for its redactions. Sands China and its counsel are very sophisticated. They
19 were not confused. If they honestly thought that this Court was allowing them to redact
20 documents under the MPDPA, they would have never resorted to the specious argument that the
21 Court intended to allow them to redact documents – and only the documents from Macau – on the
22 theory that the names and contact information of every document is "irrelevant." Frankly, the
23 Court would be hard pressed to find more compelling evidence of a knowing and calculated
24 violation than Sands China's very own backup argument.

25 Finally, and yet predictably, Sands China plays the money card. It actually asserts that its
26 noncompliance should be excused because the Defendants say (with no proof of course) that they
27 have spent "more than \$4 million to produce close to 200,000 pages of documents." (*See*
28 *Opp'n*, 2:15-16, 3:17-19.) Notably, the price keeps growing and growing. Just a few weeks ago,

PISANELLI BICE PLLC
3883 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY, SUITE 800
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169

1 the Defendants claimed that they had spent \$2.3 million to produce 148,000 pages. But of course,
2 as this Court knows, whatever the true amount of money the Defendants have spent has not been
3 expended to *produce* evidence. Those funds were used in advancing their long campaign of *not*
4 *producing* evidence.

5 If the increased amount of \$1.7 million was spent in the two weeks the Court gave Sands
6 China to produce documents from Macau, then it was plainly spent on the baseless redactions that
7 Sands China undertook in violation of this Court's order. This should hardly be a point of pride
8 for the Defendants. Instead, it confirms what Jacobs has said all along: These Defendants have
9 almost unlimited resources that they will devote to keep the truth from coming out. They can and
10 will spend far more money in their pursuit of making sure there is no compliance with this Court's
11 rulings than they will ever expend on actual compliance.³

12 At the end of the day, there can be no honest denial that Sands China's violations of this
13 Court's order as well as its sanctions ruling were knowing, calculated, and that it never intended to
14 comply. (See Ex. 2, Hrg. Tr. dated Feb. 8, 2013, 15:16-18 (the Court explaining that Sands
15 China's redactions to "the precise name of the person is a Macau Data Privacy Act issue. *I've*
16 *already said you can't rely on the Macau Data Privacy Act.*").) Indeed, Sands China admits as
17 much when it argues that the Court should reconsider its September 14 Order. It cites to *Societe*
18 *Nationale Industrielle Aerospatiale v. United States District Court*, 482 U.S. 522 (1987) and asks
19 this Court to revisit the multi-factor analysis to determine whether Sands China should really be
20 required to produce documents in this case, over the assertion of foreign secrecy laws.

21
22 ³ In what has become second nature, Sands China again asks this Court for a pat on the back with
23 respect to its 163-page Redaction Log. That Log, attached as Ex. M to Sands China's Opposition, provides
24 little information. What little information it does provide further exemplifies the game employed by both
25 Defendants to prevent any meaningful discovery. The Log contains several entries of documents to which
26 an LVSC employee is the author, recipient or copied on. (See, e.g., Appendix to Opp. at 0350, 0353,
27 0354.) However, Defendants have failed to explain why these documents were not produced by
28 January 4, 2013, or still have not been produced at all. Defendants simply state the process of locating
these documents in the United States is "still ongoing." (Opp'n, 20:2.) The deadline for production was
January 4, 2013. In any case, this is why Sands China claims Jacobs should have had to conduct a
meet-and-confer before filing the instant Motion; it wants to perpetually delay Jacobs from raising its
noncompliance with the Court. (See Ex. 2, Hrg. Tr. dated Feb. 8, 2013, 6:4-5 (the Court rejecting
Sands China's claim that Jacobs should have conducted a meet-and-confer because "[u]sually there aren't
2.34 conferences after I issue an order."))

PISANELIBICE PLLC
3883 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY, SUITE 800
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169

1 (Opp'n, 23:14-27:3.) However, the Court has already made that determination. And it did not do
2 so lightly. It did so after a lengthy evidentiary hearing where the Defendants' own witnesses
3 admitted to the Court that these laws posed no obstacle to the free flow of data until Sands China
4 and LVSC needed to find an excuse for not producing documents to Jacobs or to government
5 investigators in the United States.⁴ The Court thus ruled that "Las Vegas Sands and Sands China
6 will be precluded from raising the MDPA as an objection or defense to admission, disclosure or
7 production of any documents." This means that Sands China must produce all of its information
8 relevant to jurisdictional discovery, free of any redactions purportedly called for by the MPDPA.
9 Contrary to Sands China's way of thinking, a party cannot violate an express order and then
10 expect the Court to simply change the order to accommodate its knowing noncompliance.

11 III. CONCLUSION

12 Sands China never intended to comply with this Court's order or the January 4 deadline.
13 Its opposition confirms that fact. Sands China did not and will not comply because it has decided
14 that the consequences of noncompliance are preferable to those of complying. The majority of
15 LVSC's revenues come from Macau. Macau and the money it produces is the primary asset for
16 LVSC's majority shareholder, Sheldon Adelson. The simple fact is that maintaining the
17 money-generating machine that is Macau is far more important to Defendants and their Chairman
18 than this Court's rulings and orders will ever be. There is no amount of money this Court can ever
19 take away from them, whether by sanctions or entry of a judgment, that will persuade them to
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 ⁴ Indeed, one of the few documents recently produced by Sands China is an email string from
27 August of 2010 confirming the fact that the companies had set up a remote share drive for the data
28 providing access to it in Las Vegas. (Ex. 3; Ex. 4 (as produced on January 4, 2013.) Notably, this
document was not produced by LVSC as part of its production, even though it is from one of the
custodians it claims to have searched for jurisdictional discovery. And how convenient that the "Macau
Share Drive" suddenly became disconnected and disappeared just as soon as documents were going to
have to be produced in the United States which would have exposed what was really going on in Macau.

1 choose compliance over maintaining their secrets in Macau. They are not going to produce
2 documents in the United States that Jacobs can then use, or that could end up in the hands of
3 government investigators.

4 DATED this 27 day of February, 2013.

5 PISANELLI BICE PLLC

6 By: 
7

8 James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
9 Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534
10 Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
11 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800
12 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PISANELLI BICE PLLC
3883 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY, SUITE 800
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169

PISANELLI BICE PLLC
3883 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY, SUITE 800
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89169

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC, and that on this 27th day of February, 2013, I caused to be sent via e-mail and electronic service true and correct copies of the above and foregoing **PLAINTIFF'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS** properly addressed to the following:

J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
HOLLAND & HART
9555 Hillwood Drive, Second Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89134
speek@hollandhart.com
rcassity@hollandhart.com

Michael E. Lackey, Jr., Esq.
MAYER BROWN LLP
1999 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
mlackey@mayerbrown.com

J. Randall Jones, Esq.
Mark M. Jones, Esq.
KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89169
r.jones@kempjones.com
m.jones@kempjones.com

Steve Morris, Esq.
Rosa Solis-Rainey, Esq.
MORRIS LAW GROUP
900 Bank of America Plaza
300 South Fourth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
sm@morrislawgroup.com
rsr@morrislawgroup.com


An employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC

EXHIBIT 1

PA2238

Electronically Filed
01/03/2013 03:32:59 PM

TRAN

COPY

Ann L. Blum
CLERK OF THE COURT

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

STEVEN JACOBS

Plaintiff

vs.

LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., et al..

Defendants
.....

CASE NO. A-627691

DEPT. NO. XI

Transcript of
Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

HEARING ON MOTIONS FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER AND SANCTIONS

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2012

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

JAMES J. PISANELLI, ESQ.
DEBRA SPINELLI, ESQ.
TODD BICE, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

JON RANDALL JONES, ESQ.
J. STEPHEN PEEK, ESQ.
MARK JONES, ESQ.
MICHAEL LACKEY, ESQ.

COURT RECORDER:

JILL HAWKINS
District Court

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript
produced by transcription service.

CLERK OF THE COURT

RECEIVED
JAN 03 2013

33

PA2239

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2012, 8:06 A.M.

2 (Court was called to order)

3 THE COURT: Good morning. Which motion do you guys
4 want to handle first, the protective orders?

5 MR. MARK JONES: Your Honor, I have a housekeeping
6 issue, if I may, first.

7 THE COURT: Sure.

8 MR. MARK JONES: Spoke with Mr. Bice. Thank you.

9 Yesterday was the last day for the other side to
10 oppose Mr. Lackey's pro hac admission for his -- excuse me,
11 pro hac application for his admission into this case, and
12 there's no opposition. So Mr. Bice had asked if the Court -
13 if I may --

14 THE COURT: Any objection?

15 MR. BICE: No.

16 THE COURT: All right. Then you can approach. I'll
17 be happy to sign, Mr. Jones. Here you go.

18 All right. Now which motion do you guys want to
19 argue first?

20 MR. RANDALL JONES: Your Honor, in a sense I guess
21 they're sort of mixed together, but perhaps our --

22 THE COURT: Well, the protective order on the
23 videotape deposition is different than the sanctions and the
24 other protective order motion.

25 MR. RANDALL JONES: And I guess what I was thinking

1 better job than their predecessor, then guess what happens, we
2 have a new set of lawyers coming in.

3 I'm overlapping a little bit on the basis of the
4 motion.

5 THE COURT: I don't want to do the sanctions
6 motions, yet.

7 MR. PISANELLI: So I won't do that.

8 THE COURT: Thank you.

9 MR. PISANELLI: The point is very simply you never
10 told them not to produce it, and they didn't do it.

11 THE COURT: Thank you.

12 The motion for protective order is denied. I am
13 going to enter an order today that within two weeks of today,
14 which for ease of calculation because of the holiday we will
15 consider to be January 4th, Sands China will produce all
16 information within their possession that is relevant to the
17 jurisdictional discovery. That includes electronically stored
18 information. Within two weeks.

19 So I can go the motion for sanctions. The motion
20 for sanctions appears to be premature since I've not
21 previously entered an order requiring that certain information
22 that is electronically stored information in Macau be
23 provided. About two weeks from now you might want to renew
24 your motion if you don't get it.

25 Can I go to the motion for the protective order on

1 continue to do our best to try to comply with the Court's
2 orders as best we can. And that's -- and I hope the Court
3 does appreciate this is a complicated situation, and we -- I
4 can -- I'll just tell you again, Your Honor, we're trying to
5 make sure that we -- the lawyers and our client comply with
6 your discovery.

7 THE COURT: I understand.

8 MR. PEEK: Yeah. We need to have redactions as part
9 of that, as well, as that's -- I understood --

10 THE COURT: I didn't say you couldn't have
11 redactions.

12 MR. PEEK: That's what I thought.

13 THE COURT: I didn't say you couldn't have privilege
14 logs. I didn't say any of that, Mr. Peek.

15 MR. RANDALL JONES: As I understand it, Your Honor,
16 you said we can still otherwise comply with the law as we
17 believe we should and then you ultimately make the call as to
18 whether or not we have appropriately done that.

19 MR. PISANELLI: We will indeed --

20 THE COURT: I assume there will be a motion if there
21 is a substantial lack of information that is provided.

22 MR. PISANELLI: So, Your Honor, on this issue of the
23 Court order, we're saying it again. As part of your sanction
24 order you were very clear and you said that they're not hiding
25 behind that anymore.

1 THE COURT: I did.

2 MR. PISANELLI: And they're giving us a precursor
3 that they don't hear you, they just never hear you.

4 THE COURT: Well, Mr. Pisanelli, I've entered
5 orders, I've now entered an order that says on January 4th
6 they're going to produce the information. They're either
7 going to produced it or they're not. And if they produce
8 information that you think is insufficient, you will then have
9 a meet and confer. And then if you believe they are in
10 violation of my orders, and I include that term as a multiple
11 order, then you're going to do something.

12 MR. PISANELLI: I will. I want --

13 THE COURT: And then I'll have a hearing.

14 MR. PISANELLI: I will. I want to make this one
15 point, because you've made a statement that they have not yet
16 violated an order, and that's of concern to me.

17 THE COURT: Well, they've violated numerous orders.
18 They haven't violated an order that actually requires them to
19 produce information. I have said it, we discussed it at the
20 Rule 16 conference, I've had people tell me how they're
21 complying, I've had people tell me how they're complying
22 differently, I've had people tell me how they tried to comply
23 but now apparently they're in violation of law. I mean, I've
24 had a lot of things. But we've never actually entered a
25 written order that says, please produce the ESI that's in

1 on counsel.

2 All right. Goodbye.

3 MR. RANDALL JONES: Your Honor, just to clarify
4 that, with respect to a case-by-case basis. So if something
5 comes up at a deposition --

6 THE COURT: Here's the deal, Mr. Jones. I will tell
7 you that Kathy England I both in separate cases had occasions
8 where a specific attorney came across the table and threatened
9 us. From that point forward that person was on the camera, as
10 well, not just the deponent. And that was approved -- my
11 recollection, mine was approved by Discovery Commissioner
12 Biggar, Kathy's was approved by a magistrate. But that was
13 where the attorney was doing something other than, you know, a
14 facial expression or smirking. You know, you guys do that in
15 court all the time. What am I supposed to do? 'Eye.

16 MR. RANDALL JONES: Thank you, Your Honor.

17 THE PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 8:55 A.M.

18 * * * * *

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

AFFIRMATION

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY.

FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

Florence M. Hoyt

FLORENCE HOYT, TRANSCRIBER

12/30/12

DATE

EXHIBIT 2

PA2246

TRAN

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
* * * * *

STEVEN JACOBS

Plaintiff

vs.

LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., et al..

Defendants
.....

CASE NO. A-627691

DEPT. NO. XI

Transcript of
Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2012

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

JAMES J. PISANELLI, ESQ.
TODD BICE, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

J. STEPHEN PEEK, ESQ.
MARK JONES, ESQ.
MICHAEL LACKEY, ESQ.

COURT RECORDER:

JILL HAWKINS
District Court

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript
produced by transcription service.

PA2247

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2013, 8:36 A.M.

2 (Court was called to order)

3 THE COURT: Since I have Mr. Peek on the phone, is
4 he going to be arguing?

5 MR. JONES: Yes, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: All right. I need everybody to come up
7 here, because Mr. Peek's on the phone. Please identify
8 yourselves as you're walking up here. Bring whatever you want
9 to bring. Feel free to stand close. I'm not as sick as I was
10 so --

11 Mr. Pisanelli, nice to see back among the living.

12 MR. PISANELLI: Thank you, Your Honor. It's good to
13 be back.

14 THE COURT: Good press coverage yesterday. Who was
15 your mediator?

16 MR. PISANELLI: Just Stan Hall and I for weeks
17 working on it.

18 THE COURT: Wow. That's an amazing accomplishment.
19 Congratulations.

20 MR. PISANELLI: Thank you very much. appreciate it.

21 THE COURT: Mr. Peek, good morning.

22 MR. PEEK: Good morning, Your Honor. I hope you're
23 feeling better.

24 THE COURT: I am. Can everybody please identify
25 themselves starting with Mr. Jones.

1 against us because we can use this process to buy time. We're
2 a month in, Your Honor, since the date of your order to
3 comply.

4 THE COURT: Usually there aren't 2.34 conferences
5 after I issue an order. But that's a different issue.

6 MR. BICE: Okay. Fine.

7 THE COURT: I'm not dealing with that today. What
8 I'm dealing with today is does Mr. Jacobs get to have his
9 deposition taken during the jurisdictional process, and, if
10 so, what is the scope, and, if so, what does he get to have
11 before he has deposition taken. It's all I really want to
12 talk about. Because I know we have lots of other problems,
13 but I don't want to do that today.

14 MR. BICE: Understood. So let me then respond.
15 With respect to is he -- should he be subject to deposition at
16 all, you know, they -- again, they claim that I've waived that
17 issue.

18 THE COURT: No. I said he could be deposed a year
19 ago.

20 MR. BICE: Right. But what we were talking about at
21 that point in time was --

22 THE COURT: I know.

23 MR. BICE: -- ESI, how did he get his documents,
24 et cetera. If they want to claim -- and again, I actually
25 don't disagree with Mr. Jones on one aspect of this. He says

1 who I know are trying to do what they have to do under Macau
2 law, making the determination as to what U.S. counsel gets to
3 see, it appears that we are in violation of my order. I'm not
4 going to say anything else about it today, because I'm sure
5 somebody will work it out someday or bring a motion. But it
6 appears problematic to me given the sanction that I've issued.

7 MR. LACKEY: Your Honor, just one note. The
8 redaction that were, in our motion that we submitted on the
9 7th, I believe it was right around in there, notes there were
10 two bases, and one was the notion that the actual name of the
11 person is not relevant to jurisdiction. And in light of, you
12 know, that fact, as well, of what the issue is the interaction
13 under the jurisdictional theories between the two companies.
14 And so, you know, the precise name of the person wouldn't be
15 relevant to that issue. So there were actually two bases --

16 THE COURT: Yeah, but the precise name of the person
17 is a Macau Data Privacy Act issue. I've already said you
18 can't rely on the Macau Data Privacy Act. Relevance is not an
19 appropriate issue for which to withhold documents, period, end
20 of story.

21 All right. Now, before we go on the document issue
22 -- because I am really here on whether Mr. Jacobs gets to have
23 his deposition taken, is really all we're doing. I agree with
24 you, you get to take his deposition. My concern is a timing
25 issue. And it sounds like I have some other bridges to cross

1 MR. BICE: -- I thought that was an invitation to
2 just keep going, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Three times I interrupted you.
4 Anything else?

5 MR. BICE: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Sorry you can't do the deposition now,
7 but we'll get it scheduled soon.

8 MR. JONES: Thank you.

9 MR. PEEK: Your Honor, thank you for the time. And
10 I'd love to stay and listen to Mr. Ferrario, but I have much
11 better things to do.

12 THE PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 9:01 A.M.

13 * * * * *

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

AFFIRMATION

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY.

FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

2/10/13

FLORENCE HOYT, TRANSCRIBER

DATE

EXHIBIT 3

**SUBMITTED
UNDER
SEAL
PURSUANT
TO
CONFIDENTIALITY
ORDER**

EXHIBIT 4

**SUBMITTED
UNDER
SEAL
PURSUANT
TO
CONFIDENTIALITY
ORDER**

Electronically Filed
03/27/2013 04:37:37 PM


CLERK OF THE COURT

1 ORDR

2
3 **DISTRICT COURT**
4 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

5 STEVEN C. JACOBS,

6 Plaintiff,

7 v.

8 LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., a Nevada
9 corporation; SANDS CHINA LTD., a Cayman
10 Islands corporation; SHELDON G. ADELSON,
11 in his individual and representative capacity;
12 DOES I-X; and ROE CORPORATIONS I-X,

13 Defendants.

CASE NO.: A627691-B
DEPT NO.: XI

**ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF
STEVEN C. JACOBS' RENEWED
MOTION FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS
ON ORDER SHORTENING TIME**

Date: February 28, 2013

Time: 10:00 a.m.

14 AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

15 Presently before this Court is Steven C. Jacobs' Renewed Motion for NRCP 37
16 Sanctions on Order Shortening Time ("Renewed Motion"). James J. Pisanelli, Esq. and Todd
17 L. Bice, Esq. of the law firm PISANELLI BICE PLLC, appeared on behalf of Plaintiff Steven
18 C. Jacobs ("Jacobs"). J. Stephen Peck, Esq., of the law firm Holland & Hart LLP, appeared on
19 behalf of Defendants Las Vegas Sands Corp. ("LVSC") and Sands China Ltd. ("Sands
20 China"). J. Randall Jones, Esq. and Mark M. Jones, Esq., of the law firm Kemp Jones &
21 Coulthard, LLP, and Michael E. Lackey, Jr., of the law firm Mayer Brown LLP, appeared on
22 behalf of Defendant Sands China. The Court considered the papers on file and the oral
23 argument of counsel finds as follows:

24 1. On September 14, 2012, this Court entered its Sanctions Order. One of the
25 sanctions imposed is that neither Defendant is permitted to raise the Macau Personal Data
26 Protection Act ("MPDPA") as "an objection or as a defense to admission, disclosure or
27 production of any documents."
28

CLERK OF THE COURT

MAR 27 2013

RECEIVED

33

2. On December 18, 2012, this Court held a hearing and subsequently entered an order requiring Sands China to produce all information in its possession, custody or control that is relevant to jurisdictional discovery, including ESI, no later than January 4, 2013.

3. By January 4, 2013, Sands China produced what it maintains are all responsive documents. On January 8, 2013, Sands China filed a status report with this Court representing that it had complied with the Court's December 18 Order.

4. On February 8, 2013, Jacobs filed his Renewed Motion for Sanctions asserting that Sands China had not complied with the December 18, 2012 Order and the September 14, 2012 Sanctions Order.

BASED UPON THE FOREGOING, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that:

1. Jacobs has made a prima facie showing as to a violation of this Court's orders which warrants an evidentiary hearing;

2. Sands China violated this Court's September 14, 2012 order by redacting personal data from its January 4, 2013 document production based upon the MPDPA and, therefore, an evidentiary hearing on the Renewed Motion shall commence on May 13, 2013 at 1:00 p.m. to determine the degree of willfulness related to those redactions and the prejudice, if any, suffered by Jacobs; and,

2. By April 12, 2013, LVSC and Sands China shall search and produce the records of all twenty (20) custodians identified on Exhibit 6 to the Renewed Motion for documents that are relevant to jurisdictional discovery, which includes documents that are responsive to Plaintiff's discovery requests as permitted by this Court's March 8, 2012 Order. Following the search, and to the extent there are privilege issues with respect to those documents or the documents are responsive to merit-based discovery but not jurisdictional discovery, LVSC and Sands China may appropriately redact documents and provide a privilege log in compliance with Nevada law¹ for any and all documents withheld or redacted based upon privilege or

¹ For each communication or document, the party withholding a document shall

1 because the documents are only relevant to merits-based discovery. But as previously ordered,
2 LVSC and Sands China are precluded from redacting or withholding documents based upon the
3 MPDPA.

4 DATED: 27 March 2013

5
6 
7 ELIZABETH GONZALEZ
8 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 specifically identify the author (and their capacity) of the document; the date on which
26 the document was created; a brief summary of the subject matter of the document; if the
27 document is a communication -- the recipient, sender and all others (and their respective
28 capacities) provided with a copy of the document; other individuals with access to the
document (and their respective capacities); the type of document; the purpose for
creation of the document; and a detailed, specific explanation as to why the document is
privileged or otherwise immune from discovery.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I hereby certify that on or about the date filed, I mailed a copy of the ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF STEVEN C. JACOBS' RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS ON ORDER SHORTENING TIME, or placed a copy in the attorney's folder, to:

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Todd L. Bice, Esq. and Debra L. Spinelli, Esq. (Pisanelli Bice)
Attorneys for Plaintiff

J. Stephen Peek, Esq. and Robert J. Cassity, Esq. (Holland & Hart)
Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp. and Sands China, Ltd.

J. Randall Jones, Esq. and Mark M. Jones, Esq. (Kemp Jones & Coulthard)
Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.


Maximilien D. Fetz



CLERK OF THE COURT

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 1927
2 jrj@kempjones.com
Mark M. Jones, Esq.
3 Nevada Bar No. 267
m.jones@kempjones.com
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.

7 J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 1759
8 speek@hollandhart.com
Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
9 Nevada Bar No. 9779
bcassity@hollandhart.com
10 HOLLAND & HART LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
11 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp.
12 and Sands China, Ltd.

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

13 STEVEN C. JACOBS,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., a Nevada
17 corporation; SANDS CHINA LTD., a Cayman
18 Islands corporation; SHELDON G.
19 ADELSON, in his individual and
20 representative capacity; DOES I-X; and ROE
CORPORATIONS I-X,

21 Defendants.

22 AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

CASE NO.: A627691-B
DEPT NO.: XI

**MOTION FOR STAY OF ORDER
GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED
MOTION FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS
PENDING DEFENDANTS' PETITION
FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR
MANDAMUS**

**EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR
ORDER SHORTENING TIME AND
ORDER THEREON**

Date:
Time:

23
24 Defendants LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP. ("LVS") and SANDS CHINA LTD. ("SCL")
25 (collectively, "Defendants"), by and through their undersigned counsel, submit this Motion for
26 Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions Pending the
27 disposition of Defendants' Petition for Writ of Prohibition or Mandamus. Pursuant to E.D.C.R.
28

04-05-13P05:28 RCVD

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kic@kempjones.com

1 2.26, Defendants further move for an Order Shortening Time for the hearing on Defendants'
2 Motion for Stay.

3 This Motion is based upon the following memorandum of points and authorities, the
4 papers and pleadings on file herein, and any oral argument that the Court may allow.

5 DATED this 5TH day of April, 2013.

6
7 

8 J. Randall Jones, Esq.
9 Mark M. Jones, Esq.
10 Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 17th Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.

11 J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
12 Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
13 Holland & Hart LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
14 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp. and Sands China,
15 Ltd.

16 **EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME**

17 Defendants move the Court for an Order shortening the time for hearing on this Motion.
18 As set forth in the Declaration of J. Randall Jones, Esq. below, good cause exists to hear
19 Defendants' Motion for Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37
20 Sanctions Pending the filing with the Supreme Court ("Motion for Stay") on an order shortening
21 time.

22
23 On March 27, 2013, the Court entered an Order finding that SCL engaged in
24 sanctionable conduct by redacting personal data from certain discovery documents in
25 compliance with the Macau Personal Data Protection Act ("MPDPA"). In the Order, the Court
26 also scheduled a three-day evidentiary hearing commencing on May 13, 2013, to determine
27 SCL's degree of willfulness in making the redactions and to determine the prejudice, if any,
28

1 suffered by Jacobs as a result. Finally, the Order directed SCL to search and produce the
2 records of all 20 custodians identified on Exhibit 6 to Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37
3 Sanctions ("Renewed Motion") by April 12, 2013, and provide a log for documents withheld or
4 redacted based upon privilege or because the documents are only relevant to merits-based
5 discovery.

6
7 On April 5, 2013, Defendants filed a Petition for Writ of Prohibition or Mandamus in
8 the Nevada Supreme Court seeking, among other things, to vacate the Order to the extent that it
9 (1) compels SCL, on pain of sanctions, to choose between violating its obligations under the
10 MPDPA or violating this Court's order and thereby incur sanctions; (2) finds that SCL engaged
11 in sanctionable conduct by making the redactions; (3) schedules an evidentiary hearing to begin
12 on May 13, 2013; and (4) imposes greatly expanded discovery obligations on SCL.

13
14 If Defendants' Motion to Stay is heard in the normal course, SCL will face a Hobson's
15 choice because the Order expressly prohibits SCL from making redactions under the MPDPA
16 even though the Macanese government has specifically required it to do so. In addition,
17 Defendants will be required to incur the additional fees and costs of searching an estimated
18 100,000 documents related to 20 custodians, review each document, and then follow the
19 elaborate logging procedure the Court prescribed -- all by the April 12, 2013, deadline.


20
21 Under the current timeline, this must all occur before the Supreme Court can consider
22 the Defendants' writ petition seeking review of the order compelling that production. It is
23 imperative that this Motion be heard on order shortening time before that deadline arrives so
24 that Defendants are not forced to make that Hobson's choice. As the April 12, 2013, deadline

25 ///

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

1 will pass before this Court can hear this Motion to Stay in the normal course, Defendants
2 respectfully request that the Court set this Motion for hearing on its earliest available hearing
3 date **before April 12, 2013.**

4 DATED this 5th day of April, 2013.

5
6
7 
8 J. Randall Jones, Esq.
9 Mark M. Jones, Esq.
10 Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
11 3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy, 17th Floor
12 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
13 *Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.*

14 J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
15 Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
16 Holland & Hart LLP
17 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
18 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
19 *Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp. and Sands China,*
20 *Ltd.*

21 **DECLARATION OF J. RANDALL JONES, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF**
22 **EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME**

23 I, J. RANDALL JONES, ESQ., being duly sworn, state as follows:

24 1. I am one of the attorneys for Defendant Sands China Ltd. ("SCL") in this action.

25 I make this Declaration in support of Defendants' Ex Parte Application for an Order Shortening
26 Time for the hearing on the instant Motion to Stay. I have personal knowledge of the facts
27 stated herein, except those facts stated upon information and belief, and as to those facts, I
28 believe them to be true. I am competent to testify to the matters stated herein.

2. Good cause exists to hear Defendants' Motion on an order shortening time. On
March 27, 2013, the Court entered an Order (the "Order") compelling SCL to: (1) attend an
evidentiary hearing commencing on May 13, 2013, to determine SCL's degree of willfulness in
redacting personal data from its January 4, 2013 document production based upon the Macau

1 Personal Data Protection Act ("MPDPA"), as well as to determine the prejudice, if any, suffered
2 by Jacobs as a result, and (2) search and produce the records of all 20 custodians identified on
3 Exhibit 6 to Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions ("Renewed Motion") by April
4 12, 2013, and provide a log for any and all documents withheld or redacted based upon
5 privilege or because the documents are only relevant to merits-based discovery.

6
7 3. On April 5, 2013, Defendants filed a Petition for Writ of Prohibition or
8 Mandamus in the Nevada Supreme Court seeking, among other things, to vacate the Order to
9 the extent that it (1) compels SCL, on pain of sanctions, to choose between violating its
10 obligations under the MPDPA or violating this Court's order and thereby incur sanctions; (2)
11 finds that SCL engaged in sanctionable conduct by making the redactions; (3) schedules an
12 evidentiary hearing to begin on May 13, 2013; and (4) imposes greatly expanded discovery
13 obligations on SCL.

14
15 4. If this matter is set for hearing in the normal course, Defendants would be
16 obligated under the Order to incur substantial fees and costs to complete the process of
17 producing documents from 20 custodians and then to complete the logs of privilege and
18 "nonresponsive" documents (i.e., logging every document that "hit" on a search term but was
19 deemed nonresponsive). More importantly, the Court's March 27th Order also creates a
20 Hobson's choice for SCL because it specifically states that SCL to cannot make redactions
21 under the MPDPA even though the Macanese government has specifically required it to do so.
22 There is simply insufficient time for the Supreme Court to consider and decide the issues
23 presented by Defendants' writ petition before April 12, 2013. Therefore, it is imperative that
24 this Motion to Stay be heard on an order shortening time.


25
26 5. Defendants make this request for an order shortening time in good faith and not
27 for any improper purpose. Accordingly, Defendants respectfully request that this Motion to
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

1 Stay be heard on shortened time and set for hearing at the Court's earliest available hearing date
2 in advance of the April 12, 2013, production deadline.

3 6. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

4 Executed April ^{5TH}, 2013, in Las Vegas, Nevada.


5
6
7 
8 J. Randall Jones, Esq.

9 **ORDER SHORTENING TIME**

10 Having reviewed Defendants' Ex Parte Application for Order Shortening Time, and
11 good cause appearing,

12 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the **MOTION FOR STAY OF ORDER GRANTING**
13 **PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS PENDING**
14 **DEFENDANTS' PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS** shall be
15 heard on shortened time on the _____ day of _____, 2013, at the hour of
16 _____: _____ a.m./p.m. in Department XI of the Eighth Judicial District Court.

17 Dated this _____th day of _____, 2013.

18
19 Court held telephonic
20 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
21 Hearing on 4/9/13
22 
23
24
25
26
27
28

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR STAY OF ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS PENDING DEFENDANTS'
PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS**

I.

INTRODUCTION

On August 26, 2011, the Nevada Supreme Court issued a Writ of Mandamus directing this Court to "revisit the issue of personal jurisdiction" over SCL "by holding an evidentiary hearing and issuing findings regarding general jurisdiction." In discovery for the subsequent jurisdictional proceedings, Defendants have expended more than \$4 million, produced 200,000 pages of documents and submitted their Chairman and three senior LVSC executives for seven days of depositions by Plaintiff.

On March 27, 2013, this Court ordered SCL to return to its files for yet another comprehensive document search – this time covering 20 custodians. Not only will the search and the follow-up creation of the logs cost hundreds of thousands of dollars and yield tens of thousands of documents, but this Court has now clarified that Defendants must produce the documents without redacting them for privacy to comply with the MPDPA. The ruling leaves SCL with the Hobson's choice of complying with Macau law *or* this Court's order – all by April 12th – and forces Defendants to defend themselves in a sanctions hearing scheduled for May 13th.

Due to the gravity of these issues, Defendants have petitioned the Nevada Supreme Court to review and reverse the March 27th Order, including the sanctions hearing scheduled to begin on May 13 and the finding that SCL engaged in sanctionable conduct by making the redactions in compliance with the MPDPA. Defendants move this Court to stay its March 27th Order until the Supreme Court has had an opportunity to make a determination on Defendants' writ petition.

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kie@kempjones.com

II.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On December 18, 2012, this Court conducted a hearing to consider multiple motions filed by the parties, including Plaintiff's Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions, SCL's Motion for a Protective Order on Order Shortening Time, and Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Protective Order and Sanctions on Order Shortening Time. The Court denied SCL's motion and stated that it would enter an order directing SCL to produce within two weeks all information within its possession "relevant to jurisdictional discovery." 12/18/12 H'ring Tr., attached hereto as Exhibit A, at 24:12-18. SCL's counsel expressly noted that in complying with the order, SCL would still have to address the provisions of the MPDPA. *Id.* at 26:21-24. The Court responded that its ruling did not foreclose SCL from making redactions. *Id.* at 26:13-27:18.

Thereafter, and as outlined in Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions ("Opposition to Renewed Sanctions Motion"), incorporated herein by reference, the Defendants spent an additional \$1.3 million to comply with the Court's order. They recruited Macau lawyers to review documents, selected an additional vendor, identified relevant search terms and conditions, reviewed and redacted documents, conducted a privilege review, and ultimately produced unredacted copies that were located in the United States. *See* Opposition to Renewed Sanctions Motion, on file herein, 8:21-11:25. Defendants did not merely attempt to comply with the Court's December 18th Order, they went above and beyond its requirements. Nevertheless, Plaintiff renewed his sanctions motion and sought a default judgment for alleged violation of this Court's Order from the December 18th hearing.

On March 27, 2013, the Court entered an Order compelling Defendants to: (1) attend an evidentiary hearing commencing on May 13, 2013, to determine SCL's degree of willfulness in redacting personal data from its January 4, 2013 document production based upon the MPDPA

1 and to determine the prejudice, if any, suffered by Jacobs as a result, and (2) search and produce
2 the records of all 20 custodians identified on Exhibit 6 to Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP
3 37 Sanctions ("Renewed Motion") by April 12, 2013, providing a log of all documents withheld
4 or redacted based upon privilege or because the documents are only relevant to merits-based
5 discovery.

6
7 On April 5, 2013, Defendants petitioned the Nevada Supreme Court to, inter alia, (1)
8 vacate the order compelling SCL, on pain of sanctions, to choose between violating its
9 obligations under the MPDPA or this Court's order; (2) directing an evidentiary hearing to be
10 held on the question of sanctions on May 13, 2013; and (3) expanding the discovery obligations
11 imposed on SCL.

12 III.

13 ARGUMENT

14 A. Legal Standard

15 When evaluating a motion to stay pending the Nevada Supreme Court's review of a writ
16 petition, the District Court should consider the following factors: (1) whether the object of the
17 writ petition will be defeated if the stay is denied; (2) whether petitioner will suffer irreparable
18 or serious injury if the stay is denied; (3) whether the real party in interest will suffer irreparable
19 or serious injury if the stay is granted; and (4) whether the petitioner is likely to prevail on the
20 merits of the writ petition. *Hansen v. Dist. Ct.*, 116 Nev. 650, 657, 6 P.3d 982, 986 (2000) (the
21 factors set forth in NRAP 8(a) apply to writ petitions when the petitioner "seeks to challenge" a
22 decision "issued by the district court"). Each of these factors weighs in favor of a stay of the
23 Defendants' obligations under the Order and of the May 13, 2013, evidentiary hearing pending
24 the Nevada Supreme Court's disposition of the Defendants' writ petition.
25
26
27
28

///

B. The Objects of the Writ Petition Will Be Defeated and Defendants Will Suffer Irreparable Harm if the March 27th Order Is Not Stayed.

The primary purpose of Defendants' writ petition is to obtain Supreme Court review of this Court's rulings that (1) SCL cannot comply with the MPDPA when it produces documents from Macau by redacting personal data; (2) SCL engaged in sanctionable conduct when it made the redactions in its earlier production; (3) an evidentiary hearing will commence on May 13 to determine what sanctions should be imposed; and (4) SCL must continue to search for and produce documents even though Plaintiff has made no showing that further discovery is necessary to make his jurisdictional case.

If the March 27th Order is not stayed, SCL will be forced to choose between violating the requirements of the MPDPA or the requirements of this Court's order. Defendants will also be required to prepare for and defend themselves in the three-day sanctions hearing scheduled to begin on May 13. In addition, Defendants will incur the fees and other expenses of (1) continuing to search and produce documents of the 20 custodians by the production deadline of April 12, 2013, and (2) preparing the privilege log and the relevance log required by the Court. Accordingly, if a stay is not granted, the subject and purpose of Defendants' writ petition will be defeated long before it can be considered by the Nevada Supreme Court.

Defendants have already expended approximately \$4 million in solely jurisdictional discovery efforts to provide 200,000 pages of documents. To comply with the search and production of documents pertaining to the 20 custodians, Defendants must continue the temporary employment of numerous Macanese attorneys to search an estimated 100,000 documents – all prior to the review of many of the same documents by SCL's litigation counsel, at a cost which will certainly be in the hundreds of thousands and could cost substantially more. See Declaration of J. Randall Jones attached hereto as Exhibit B. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that those efforts will yield documents relevant to Jacobs' jurisdictional case. A stay

1 is necessary to allow the Nevada Supreme Court to consider whether this additional discovery is
2 consistent with its previous Writ of Mandamus before Defendants should be forced to incur
3 these additional, astronomical expenses.

4 More importantly, however, without a stay, SCL will be placed in the impossible
5 position of having to choose between adhering to the MPDPA's redaction requirement or
6 complying with this Court's order precluding SCL from redacting to protect personal data under
7 the MPDPA. It would defeat the purpose of the writ petition if SCL were required to make that
8 Hobson's choice of complying with this Court's order *or* Macau's data privacy laws. Only a
9 stay can save SCL from that irreparable harm while the Nevada Supreme Court considers the
10 writ petition.
11

12 Finally, should the Supreme Court determine that a finding of sanctionable conduct is in
13 error, Defendants have requested that the May 13th evidentiary hearing be vacated. Without a
14 stay of the May 13th evidentiary hearing pending a decision by the Supreme Court, this purpose
15 of Defendant's writ petition, too, will be defeated. Thus, a stay of the March 27th Order and the
16 May 13th evidentiary hearing is necessary to preserve the object and purposes of Defendants'
17 writ petition.
18

19 **C. Plaintiff Will Suffer No Harm if the District Court Grants a Stay.**

20 Unlike Defendants, who would be immensely and irreparably harmed if a stay were
21 denied, a stay of the March 27th Order will cause Plaintiff no harm at all. The deposition of
22 Plaintiff has been stayed, and there are currently no depositions or hearings set that require the
23 immediate production of the documents. While Defendants understand and agree that an
24 evidentiary hearing on the jurisdictional matter needs to occur soon – indeed, Defendants
25 welcome it – Plaintiff will not suffer any harm if a stay is granted to allow the Supreme Court to
26 first decide these important privilege and writ-compliance issues.
27
28

1 **D. Defendants Have Presented a Substantial Case on the Merits of These Important Legal**
2 **Questions.**

3 Although Defendants recognize that the Court believes it made the correct decision at
4 the February 28th hearing and do not presume to attempt to persuade the Court otherwise, there
5 is at least a reasonable probability that the Supreme Court will disagree with the Court's
6 analysis and issue the requested writ relief. In *Hansen*, the Nevada Supreme Court recognized
7 that "when moving for a stay pending an appeal or writ proceedings, a movant does not always
8 have to show a probability of success on the merits, [but] the movant must 'present a substantial
9 case on the merits when a serious legal question is involved and show that the balance of
10 equities weighs heavily in favor of granting the stay.'" 116 Nev. at 659, 6 P.3d at 987 (citation
11 omitted). Here, the balance of equities weigh decisively in favor of a stay, Defendants have
12 presented a substantial case on the merits, and the writ petition concerns an important question
13 of first impression regarding the friction between Macau's data privacy laws and the rules of
14 civil procedure.
15

16 This Court recognizes the significance of the conflict between the MPDPA and its
17 discovery order. At the February 28th hearing the Court noted, "I'm not saying you don't have
18 problems in Macau. I certainly understand you may well have problems in Macau with the
19 Macau Government." 02/28/13 H'ring Tr., Exhibit C, at 35:9-11. Thus, this Court recognizes
20 that the MPDPA constrains the scope and method of Defendants' production of documents and
21 the serious consequences of non-compliance.
22

23 As articulated in Defendants' writ petition, under the balancing test that must be applied
24 when a party invokes foreign data privacy rules, redactions are appropriate. By disallowing
25 them, this Court did not weigh the relevant factors including the importance of the documents to
26 the litigation, the availability of alternative means of securing the information, and the extent to
27 which noncompliance with the request would undermine important interests of the state where
28

1 the information is located. *See Societe Nationale Industrielle Aerospatiale v. United States*
2 *District Court*, 482 U.S. 522, 546 (1987). Instead, the Court focused exclusively on
3 Defendants' failure to explicitly advise the Court at an earlier point in time that Jacobs' ESI and
4 other data had been transferred to the U.S. *Aerospatiale* required a balancing of all of these
5 factors, and when balanced, they weigh in favor of Defendants' position.
6

7 The Petition also presents a serious question about the scope of discovery authorized by
8 the Nevada Supreme Court's August 26, 2011 Writ Order in this case – a question that only the
9 Nevada Supreme Court, as the issuing tribunal, can answer. Defendants maintain that this
10 Court has greatly exceeded the scope of its narrow authority on remand by continuing to order
11 discovery without requiring Plaintiff to demonstrate that he needs additional documents in order
12 to make viable jurisdictional arguments.
13

14 VI.

15 CONCLUSION

16 Because (1) the object of the Defendants' writ petition will be defeated if the Court does
17 not grant a stay of the March 27th Order; (2) Defendants will suffer irreparable harm if SCL is
18 required to produce documents without regard to the limitations of the MPDPA and participate
19 in the May 13th evidentiary hearing prior to the Supreme Court's disposition of the writ petition;
20 (3) Plaintiff will suffer no harm by a stay; and (4) Defendants have presented a substantial case
21 on the merits of these important legal questions, Defendants respectfully request that the Court
22

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///


27 ///

28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kic@kempjones.com

1 stay its March 27th Order and the May 13th sanctions hearing pending the Nevada Supreme
2 Court's decision on the writ petition.

3 DATED this 5th day of April, 2013

4
5
6 
7 J. Randall Jones, Esq.
8 Mark M. Jones, Esq.
9 Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
10 3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 17th Floor
11 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
12 *Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.*

13 J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
14 Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
15 Holland & Hart LLP
16 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
18 *Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp. and Sands China,*
19 *Ltd.*

KEMP JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjcc@kempjones.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Nev. R. Civ. P. 5(b), I certify that on April 5th, 2013, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **MOTION FOR STAY OF ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS PENDING DEFENDANTS' PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS and EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME AND ORDER THEREON** via e-mail and by depositing same in the United States mail, first class postage fully prepaid to the persons and addresses listed below:

James J. Pisanelli, Esq.
Todd L. Bice, Esq.
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq.
Jennifer L. Braster, Esq.
Pisanelli & Bice
3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
jjp@pisanellibice.com
tlb@pisanellibice.com
dls@pisanellibice.com
jlb@pisanellibice.com
kap@pisanellibice.com – staff
see@pisanellibice.com – staff
Attorney for Plaintiff


An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard

EXHIBIT A

Steven T. Blum

CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
* * * * *

STEVEN JACOBS

Plaintiff

vs.

LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., et al..

Defendants

CASE NO. A-627691

DEPT. NO. XI

Transcript of
Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

HEARING ON MOTIONS FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER AND SANCTIONS

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2012

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

JAMES J. PISANELLI, ESQ.
DEBRA SPINELLI, ESQ.
TODD BICE, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

JON RANDALL JONES, ESQ.
J. STEPHEN PEEK, ESQ.
MARK JONES, ESQ.
MICHAEL LACKEY, ESQ.

COURT RECORDER:

JILL HAWKINS
District Court

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript
produced by transcription service.

CLERK OF THE COURT

JAN 03 2013

RECEIVED

33

1 Then Patty Glaser came in this courtroom and she
2 said to Your Honor, we sent a team of lawyers to do it, that's
3 a fact. Remember, she was very emphatic. We had a little bit
4 of a confrontation at the time. That's a fact. She may have
5 even been pointing her finger at me when she said it. We
6 spent a lot of money, the client's money, we sent lawyers to
7 Macau to review documents in Macau. Your Honor that is
8 irreconcilable with what they're saying now. Patty Glaser and
9 Steve Ma say not only that they can and they will, but they
10 had reviewed Macau documents. And now the newest team comes
11 in and says, we're handcuffed and not permitted to.

12 THE COURT: Well, but you know they took -- you know
13 they reviewed Macau documents because Mr. Kostrinsky carried
14 them back.

15 MR. PISANELLI: That's part of my sanction motion.

16 THE COURT: I mean, we know.

17 MR. PISANELLI: So I'm beating this drum here
18 because it is just outrageous to me. I will wrap it up. I
19 understand your point. But it's outrageous that this company
20 would come in here and as soon as this group of lawyers takes
21 a turn, that admits something they're not supposed to,
22 produces a piece of paper the Sands management didn't want to
23 get out of their hands, my prediction is we're going to see a
24 new team here. Because every single time someone stands up
25 and tries or at least promises you that they'll start doing a

1 better job than their predecessor, then guess what happens, we
2 have a new set of lawyers coming in.

3 I'm overlapping a little bit on the basis of the
4 motion.

5 THE COURT: I don't want to do the sanctions
6 motions, yet.

7 MR. PISANELLI: So I won't do that.

8 THE COURT: Thank you.

9 MR. PISANELLI: The point is very simply you never
10 told them not to produce it, and they didn't do it.

11 THE COURT: Thank you.

12 The motion for protective order is denied. I am
13 going to enter an order today that within two weeks of today,
14 which for ease of calculation because of the holiday we will
15 consider to be January 4th, Sands China will produce all
16 information within their possession that is relevant to the
17 jurisdictional discovery. That includes electronically stored
18 information. Within two weeks.

19 So I can go the motion for sanctions. The motion
20 for sanctions appears to be premature since I've not
21 previously entered an order requiring that certain information
22 that is electronically stored information in Macau be
23 provided. About two weeks from now you might want to renew
24 your motion if you don't get it.

25 Can I go to the motion for the protective order on

1 the videotape.

2 MR. PEEK: Your Honor, can we have some
3 clarification?

4 THE COURT: Yes.

5 MR. PEEK: And here's the challenge that we have, is
6 you're telling us to produce all of the documents that are
7 responsive to the requests for production, and --

8 THE COURT: If a motion is renewed, Mr. Peek, and
9 there is an impediment to production which Sands China
10 believes relates to the Macau Data Privacy Act, when I make
11 determinations under Rule 37 I will take into account the
12 limitations that you believe exist related to the Macau Data
13 Privacy Act. But, believe me, given the past history of this
14 case there seems to be different treatment of the Macau Data
15 Privacy Act at different times.

16 MR. PEEK: Your Honor, I appreciate what we went
17 through in September. I appreciate what the Court's ruling
18 was. And I think Mr. Jones has certainly made it clear how
19 serious we take this. The motion for protective order
20 certainly goes to who are the custodians, what are the search
21 terms --

22 THE COURT: Your motion for protective order is
23 really broad. Your motion for protective order says, "For the
24 foregoing reasons Sands China urges the Court to enter an
25 order providing that SCL has no obligation to search the ESI

1 in Macau of custodians other than Jacobs or to use any more
2 expansive search terms on the Jacobs ESI in Macau that was
3 used to search the Jacobs's ESI that was transferred to the
4 United States in 2010."

5 The answer is no. Denied.

6 MR. PEEK: Okay. I'll let --

7 MR. PISANELLI: Your Honor, on the Rule 37 issue of
8 whether there's an order --

9 THE COURT: Hold on a second, Mr. Pisanelli. Let me
10 go back to Randall Jones.

11 MR. PISANELLI: Okay.

12 THE COURT: Not Jim Randall, Randall Jones.

13 MR. RANDALL JONES: Thank you, Your Honor. I do
14 want to make clear because of what was said there's never been
15 said and if it was misstated by me, then I want to make sure
16 it's clear on the record. It's never been our position that
17 our client can't look at the documents. The issue is whether
18 or not we can take certain information -- our client is
19 allowed to take certain information out of the country. And
20 so I just want to make sure that's clear on the record. Our
21 client can look at the documents, and our client's Macanese,
22 we've just found out, can look at the documents. And from
23 there it becomes more complicated. So I just want to make
24 sure that's clear to the Court.

25 We understand what you're saying, and we will

1 continue to do our best to try to comply with the Court's
2 orders as best we can. And that's -- and I hope the Court
3 does appreciate this is a complicated situation, and we -- I
4 can -- I'll just tell you again, Your Honor, we're trying to
5 make sure that we -- the lawyers and our client comply with
6 your discovery.

7 THE COURT: I understand.

8 MR. PEEK: Yeah. We need to have redactions as part
9 of that, as well, as that's -- I understood --

10 THE COURT: I didn't say you couldn't have
11 redactions.

12 MR. PEEK: That's what I thought.

13 THE COURT: I didn't say you couldn't have privilege
14 logs. I didn't say any of that, Mr. Peek.

15 MR. RANDALL JONES: As I understand it, Your Honor,
16 you said we can still otherwise comply with the law as we
17 believe we should and then you ultimately make the call as to
18 whether or not we have appropriately done that.

19 MR. PISANELLI: We will indeed --

20 THE COURT: I assume there will be a motion if there
21 is a substantial lack of information that is provided.

22 MR. PISANELLI: So, Your Honor, on this issue of the
23 Court order, we're saying it again. As part of your sanction
24 order you were very clear and you said that they're not hiding
25 behind that anymore.

EXHIBIT B

**DECLARATION OF J. RANDALL JONES, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS'
MOTION FOR STAY OF ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED MOTION
FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS PENDING DEFENDANTS' PETITION FOR WRIT OF
PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS**

I, J. Randall Jones, Esq. being duly sworn, state as follows:

1. I am one of the attorneys for Defendant Sands China Ltd. ("SCL") in this action. I make this Declaration in support of Defendants' Motion for Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions Pending Defendants' Petition for Writ of Prohibition or Mandamus. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein, except those facts stated upon information and belief, and as to those facts, I believe them to be true.
2. On March 27, 2013, this Court entered an Order (the "Order") scheduling a three-day sanctions hearing commencing on May 13, 2013 to determine (a) SCL's degree of willfulness in redacting personal data from its January 4, 2013 document production based on the Macau Personal Data Protection Act ("MPDPA"); and (b) the prejudice, if any, suffered by Plaintiff as a result.
3. The Order also directed SCL to search and produce the records of all 20 custodians identified on Exhibit 6 to Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions ("Renewed Motion") by April 12, 2013, and to provide a privilege log for any documents withheld or redacted based on privilege. Finally, the Order directed SCL to log any documents that SCL decides to withhold from production on the grounds that they are "responsive to merit-based discovery but not jurisdictional discovery."
4. On April 5, 2013, Defendants filed a Petition for Writ of Prohibition or Mandamus with the Nevada Supreme Court, seeking to vacate the Order. In particular, in the Petition, Defendants seek to vacate the Order to the extent that it (1) compels SCL to choose

between violating its obligations under the MPDPA and violating the terms of the Order; (2) finds that SCL engaged in sanctionable conduct by making the redactions required by the MPDPA; (3) schedules an evidentiary sanctions hearing to begin on May 13, 2013; and (4) imposes expanded discovery obligations on SCL.


5. If a stay is not granted, SCL will be forced to choose between violating MPDPA's redaction requirement or violating the Order precluding SCL from making such redactions. Defendants will also be obligated under the Order to incur substantial fees, costs and effort in connection with both the scheduled sanctions hearing and the additional discovery obligations.
6. With respect to the scheduled sanctions hearing, Defendants have already begun incurring costs in connection with the preparation for the hearing, and these costs will increase substantially as the scheduled date for the hearing draws nearer. Among other things, Plaintiff recently notified Defendants that he may bring before the Court certain discovery requests in connection with the sanctions hearing. In addition, if the three-day hearing as currently scheduled is conducted before the Writ is decided, Defendants' fees, costs and burdens will obviously escalate at a high rate, as Defendants must conduct pre-hearing motion practice, prepare for the hearing, draft pre-hearing and post-hearing memoranda and participate in the three-day hearing itself.
7. To date, Defendants have produced more than 200,000 pages of documents in response to jurisdictional discovery. With respect to the additional discovery ordered by the Court, Defendants have already incurred substantial costs, and will continue do so if a stay is not issued. Consistent with the Court's Order, SCL has run search terms against the electronic documents from the 20 custodians referred to above, one of whom served as

SCL's in-house counsel during the relevant period. Although the process is ongoing, declarant is informed and believes that more than 100,000 additional documents in Macau and the United States have thus far been identified that require review. Defendant is also informed and believes Defendants have employed 35 reviewers in Macau and 35 reviewers in the United States to undertake this process, at a cost of more than \$1.3 million thus far. Although Defendants have already undergone a substantial effort, and incurred significant costs, in working to meet the Court's April 12 deadline, the Defendants will be required to spend substantial fees, costs and effort to complete that process if this Motion is not granted.

8. The Order also requires SCL to prepare a privilege log for documents that SCL determines to be privileged. It is difficult to predict future efforts with precision, but in light of the large number of privileged documents to be logged, Defendants believe that this process will take weeks of work and the costs will be substantial, almost certainly hundreds of thousands of dollars. In addition, the Order requires Defendants to log documents that "hit" a search term but are determined not to be relevant to any jurisdictional issues. Although difficult to ascertain at this stage, Defendants estimate that this process will also take weeks of work and incur substantial costs, also in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. If the Nevada Supreme Court were to grant the Writ, much if not all of the fees, costs and effort associated with the preparation of the logs will have been wasted.
9. Defendants make their request for a Motion for the Stay of the Order in good faith and not for any improper purpose.

10. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed April 5, 2013 in Las Vegas, NV.



J. Randall Jones, Esq.

EXHIBIT C

TRAN

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
* * * * *

STEVEN JACOBS

Plaintiff

vs.

LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., et al..

Defendants
.....

CASE NO. A-627691

DEPT. NO. XI

**Transcript of
Proceedings**

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2013

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

JAMES J. PISANELLI, ESQ.
TODD BICE, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

J. STEPHEN PEEK, ESQ.
JON RANDALL JONES, ESQ.
MARK JONES, ESQ.
MICHAEL LACKEY, ESQ.

COURT RECORDER:

JILL HAWKINS
District Court

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript
produced by transcription service.

1 handled appropriately. That doesn't mean redactions under the
2 MDPa, which you have been precluded from doing anything with
3 respect to.

4 Now, I certainly understand that Sands China may
5 have obligations with the Macau Government. But because of
6 what's happened in that case, in this particular case you've
7 lost the ability to use that as a defense in any way, shape,
8 or form.

9 MR. RANDALL JONES: Well, Your Honor, my response to
10 that be -- and I hear what you just said and I know the Court
11 understands this, but I think it's necessary to make this
12 point on the record. My client is faced with the proverbial
13 Hobson's choice. It truly is. And in trying to make sure we
14 did not wilfully violate your order and complied with
15 discovery in good faith we did what we did. So the redactions
16 that are there do exist.

17 And, by the way, I would disagree with Mr.
18 Pisanelli's percentages. The way I calculate it is at most
19 10 percent of the documents produced have a redacted vein.
20 But then let's look beyond that. Mr. Pisanelli says that
21 these documents that are redacted are meaningless. He says
22 they are essentially a blank page. They are not a blank page,
23 Your Honor. There are several issues that go directly
24 contrary to that, and I want to talk about that in a couple of
25 respects. One is the subject matter, the substance of the

1 email has not been redacted, so only individual names have
2 been redacted. So you could still -- to suggest that --

3 THE COURT: That is violative of my order, Mr.
4 Jones. And I don't really care that your client is in a bad
5 position with the Macau Government. Your client is the one
6 who decided to take the material out of Macau originally,
7 failed to disclose it to anyone in the court, and then as a
8 sanction for that conduct loses the ability in this case to
9 raise that as an issue. I'm not saying you don't have
10 problems in Macau. I certainly understand you may well have
11 problems in Macau with the Macau Government. I tried to
12 understand the letter you got from the Macau Government. I
13 read it three times. And I certainly understand they've
14 raised issues with you. But as a sanction for the
15 inappropriate conduct that's happened in this case, in this
16 case you've lost the ability to use that as a defense. I know
17 that there may be some balancing that I do when I'm looking at
18 appropriate sanctions under the Rule 37 standard as to why
19 your client may have chosen to use that method to violate my
20 order. And I'll balance that and I'll look at it and I'll
21 consider those issues. But they violated my order.

22 MR. RANDALL JONES: Well, Your Honor, again, I would
23 respectfully state that I was a part of that process, and
24 whether we were being obtuse -- I hope that I'm never obtuse
25 when I'm looking at a Court's transcript or order -- that when

1 we talked about redactions as it related to those we certainly
2 didn't intend to wilfully violate your order. I will tell you
3 that, and you can take that for what it's worth coming from
4 me. We've appeared before you many times. I would not ever
5 tell a client to wilfully violate any court's order, and
6 certainly, Your Honor, I have great respect for you, I would
7 not ever suggest that a client of mine do that intentionally.
8 And that's just period. I would never do that. And I
9 certainly didn't think we were doing that at the time. We
10 were trying to thread a needle, I certainly agree we were
11 trying to do that, and we hope we have accomplished that. And
12 I understand what you just said.

13 Having said that, I would ask you to consider this.
14 With respect to this whole point about a blank page and the
15 information that they don't have, first of all, this goes back
16 to this issue of document dump. We have grossly overproduced
17 what could possibly be relevant, because we didn't want to
18 base it on relevance, and the jurisdictional discovery out of
19 a fear of the very kind of thing that's going on here, that
20 they would ask for the death penalty or some other extreme
21 sanction because they are trying to get, from our perspective,
22 not discovery, they're trying to get jurisdiction by tort or
23 essentially put us in a position because of some of the
24 history that's occurred in this case so that they could ask
25 you for the death penalty. And we know that's what happened.

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kje@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 1927
2 rrj@kempjones.com
Mark M. Jones, Esq.
3 Nevada Bar No. 267
m.jones@kempjones.com
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
5 Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
6 Telephone: (702) 385-6000
7 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

8 *Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.*

9 J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 1759
10 speek@hollandhart.com
Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
11 Nevada Bar No. 9779
bcassity@hollandhart.com
12 HOLLAND & HART LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
Telephone: (702) 669-4600
14 Facsimile: (702) 669-4650

15 *Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp.
and Sands China, Ltd.*

17 DISTRICT COURT

18 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

19 STEVEN C. JACOBS,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., a Nevada
corporation; SANDS CHINA LTD., a Cayman
23 Islands corporation; DOES I-X; and ROE
CORPORATIONS I-X,

24 Defendants.

25
26 AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

Electronically Filed
05/13/2013 12:03:21 PM



CLERK OF THE COURT

CASE NO.: A627691-B
DEPT NO.: XI

Date: April 9, 2013
Time: 1:00 p.m.

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART MOTION FOR
STAY OF ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED MOTION
FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS PENDING
DEFENDANTS' PETITION FOR WRIT
OF PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS**

28 05-01-13PC05:03 RCV0

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

1 On April 9, 2013, Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs ("Plaintiff") and Defendants LAS VEGAS
2 SANDS CORP. and SANDS CHINA LTD. ("SCL") (collectively "Defendants") appeared
3 telephonically before this Court on Defendants' Motion for Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's
4 Renewed Motion for NRC 37 Sanctions Pending Defendants' Petition for Writ of Prohibition
5 or Mandamus ("Motion to Stay"). Todd L. Bice, Esq., Jennifer L. Braster, Esq., and Eric
6 Aldrian, Esq. of the law firm PISANELLI BICE PLLC, appeared on behalf of Plaintiff. Robert
7 J. Cassity, Esq., of the law firm HOLLAND & HART LLP, appeared on behalf of Defendants.
8 J. Randall Jones, Esq. of the law firm KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP, appeared on
9 behalf of SCL. The Court considered the papers filed on behalf of the parties and the oral
10 argument of counsel, and good cause appearing therefor:

11 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED as follows:

12 1. The Motion to Stay is GRANTED IN PART, staying for 45 days, or until May
13 24, 2013, SCL's obligation to produce documents responsive to the Court-ordered jurisdictional
14 discovery from Macau that were not included on any electronic storage device brought to the
15 United States as referenced at the September 2012, sanctions hearing. In the event the Nevada
16 Supreme Court takes action on Defendants' Writ Petition within the 45-day stay period, the
17 Court is willing to consider an extension of the stay.

18 2. The Motion to Stay is DENIED IN PART as to the production of documents
19 responsive to the Court-ordered jurisdictional discovery on any electronic storage device
20 brought into the United States previously as referenced at the September 2012, sanctions
21 hearing. Documents discovered on said electronic storage devices must be produced in
22 accordance with this Court's March 27, 2013 Order.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kje@kempjones.com


1 3. The evidentiary hearing set for May 13, 2013 is continued until further notice by
2 the Court.

3 DATED May 10th, 2013.

4
5
6 
District Court Judge


7 Submitted by:

8 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD

9
10 
11 J. Randall Jones, Esq.
12 Nevada Bar No. 1927
13 Mark M. Jones, Esq.
14 Nevada Bar No. 267
15 Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
16 3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 17th Floor
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
18 Attorneys for Sands China Ltd.

19 Approved as to form and content:

20 PISANELLI BICE PLLC

21 
22 Todd L. Bice, Esq.
23 Nevada Bar No. 4534
24 Debra L. Spinelli, Esq.
25 Nevada Bar No. 9695
26 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Ste. 800
27 Las Vegas, NV 89169
28 Attorneys for Steven C. Jacobs


CLERK OF THE COURT

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 1927
2 jrj@kempjones.com
Mark M. Jones, Esq.
3 Nevada Bar No. 267
mmj@kempjones.com
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.

7 J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 1759
8 speek@hollandhart.com
Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
9 Nevada Bar No. 9779
bcassity@hollandhart.com
10 HOLLAND & HART LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
11 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
*Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp.
and Sands China, Ltd.*

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

13 STEVEN C. JACOBS,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., a Nevada
18 corporation; SANDS CHINA LTD., a Cayman
Islands corporation; SHELDON G.
19 ADELSON, in his individual and
representative capacity; DOES I-X; and ROE
20 CORPORATIONS I-X,

21 Defendants.

22 AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

CASE NO.: A627691-B
DEPT NO.: XI

**MOTION TO EXTEND STAY OF
ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37
SANCTIONS PENDING
DEFENDANTS' PETITION FOR WRIT
OF PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS**

**EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR
ORDER SHORTENING TIME AND
ORDER THEREON**

Date: 05/16/13
Time: 8:30am


24 Defendants LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP. ("LVS") and SANDS CHINA LTD. ("SCL")
25 (collectively, "Defendants"), by and through their undersigned counsel, submit this Motion to
26 Extend Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions Pending the
27 disposition of Defendants' Petition for Writ of Prohibition or Mandamus. Pursuant to E.D.C.R.

05-13-13P05:56 RCVD

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kje@kempjones.com

2.26, Defendants further move for an Order Shortening Time for the hearing on Defendants' Motion for Stay. This Motion is based upon the following memorandum of points and authorities, the papers and pleadings on file herein, and any oral argument that the Court may allow.

DATED this 13th day of May, 2013.


J. Randall Jones, Esq.
Mark M. Jones, Esq.
Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 17th Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.

J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
Holland & Hart LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp. and Sands China, Ltd.

EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME

Defendants move the Court for an Order shortening the time for hearing on this Motion. As set forth in the Declaration of J. Randall Jones, Esq. below, good cause exists to hear Defendants' Motion to Extend Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions Pending the disposition of Defendants' Petition for Writ of Prohibition or Mandamus ("Motion to Extend Stay") on an order shortening time.


On April 9, 2013, the Court granted in part Defendants' motion for a stay of its March 27, 2013 Order, staying SCL's obligation to produce certain documents for a period of 45 days or until May 24, 2013 and vacating the May 13, 2013 evidentiary hearing the Court had scheduled. On May 10, 2013, the Court signed a formal stay order (the "Stay Order") memorializing that ruling. At the April 9 hearing, the Court stated that, in the event the Nevada Supreme Court took action on Defendants' Writ Petition within the 45-day stay period, the

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

1 Court was willing to consider an extension of the stay. On April 19, 2013, the Nevada Supreme
2 Court took action on Defendants' Writ Petition by filing its Order Directing Answer.

3 If Defendants' Motion to Extend Stay were heard in the normal course, this Court's stay
4 of its order requiring SCL to produce additional documents from Macau would expire before
5 the Court had an opportunity to decide whether to extend it. That would subject SCL to
6 precisely the harm that it granted the stay to avoid. Because the May 24, 2013, deadline will
7 pass before this Court can hear this Motion to Extend Stay in the normal course, Defendants
8 respectfully request that the Court set this Motion for hearing on its earliest available hearing
9 date **before May 24, 2013.**

10 DATED this 13th day of May, 2013.

11
12 
13 J. Randall Jones, Esq.
14 Mark M. Jones, Esq.
15 Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
16 3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy, 17th Floor
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
18 Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.

19 J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
20 Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
21 Holland & Hart LLP
22 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
23 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
24 Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp. & Sands China, Ltd.

25 **DECLARATION OF J. RANDALL JONES, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF**
26 **EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME**

27 I, J. RANDALL JONES, ESQ., being duly sworn, state as follows:

28 1. I am one of the attorneys for Defendant Sands China Ltd. ("SCL") in this action.
I make this Declaration in support of Defendants' Ex Parte Application for an Order Shortening
Time for the hearing on the instant Motion to Extend Stay. I have personal knowledge of the
facts stated herein, except those facts stated upon information and belief, and as to those facts, I
believe them to be true. I am competent to testify to the matters stated herein.

2. Good cause exists to hear Defendants' Motion on an order shortening time. On April 9, 2013, the Court granted in part Defendants' motion for a stay of its March 27, 2013 Order, staying SCL's obligation to produce certain documents for a period of 45 days or until May 24, 2013 and vacating the May 13, 2013 evidentiary hearing the Court had scheduled. On May 10, 2013, the Court signed a formal stay order (the "Stay Order") memorializing that ruling. At the April 9 hearing, the Court stated that, in the event the Nevada Supreme Court took action on Defendants' Writ Petition within the 45-day stay period, the Court was willing to consider an extension of the stay. On April 19, 2013, the Nevada Supreme Court took action on Defendants' Writ Petition by filing its Order Directing Answer.


3. On April 19, 2013, the Nevada Supreme Court took action on Defendants' Writ Petition by filing its Order Directing Answer.

4. If this matter were set for hearing in the normal course, the Stay Order would expire on May 24, 2013 and that would subject SCL to precisely the harm that the Court granted the stay to avoid. Therefore, it is imperative that this Motion to Stay be heard on an order shortening time.

5. Defendants make this request for an order shortening time in good faith and not for any improper purpose. Accordingly, Defendants respectfully request that this Motion to Stay be heard on shortened time and set for hearing at the Court's earliest available hearing date in advance of the May 24, 2013, stay expiration.

6. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed May 13th, 2013, in Las Vegas, Nevada.


J. Randall Jones, Esq.

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

ORDER SHORTENING TIME

Having reviewed Defendants' Ex Parte Application for Order Shortening Time, and good cause appearing,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the MOTION TO EXTEND STAY OF ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS PENDING DEFENDANTS' PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR

MANDAMUS shall be heard on shortened time on the 16th day of May, 2013, at the hour of 8:30 : a.m. in Department XI of the Eighth Judicial District Court.

Dated this 14th day of May, 2013.


DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO EXTEND STAY OF ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS PENDING DEFENDANTS'
PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS**

On April 9, 2013, Defendants filed their Motion for Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions Pending Defendants' Petition for Writ of Prohibition or Mandamus (the "Original Motion"). Therein, Defendants outlined the procedural background pertaining to their request for stay, the legal standards, and the factors necessary to grant the requested stay. On April 9, 2013, the Court held a telephonic hearing on the matter and granted the Original Motion in part.

On May 10, 2013, the Court executed the order granting the Original Motion in part (the "Stay Order") staying for 45 days, or until May 24, 2013, SCL's obligation under the Court's March 27, 2013 Order to produce certain documents from Macau. Under the Stay Order, the Court also vacated the May 13, 2013, evidentiary hearing. Furthermore, in the event the Nevada Supreme Court took action on Defendants' Writ Petition within the 45-day stay period, the Court provided in the Stay Order that it would consider an extension of the stay.


On April 19, 2013, the Nevada Supreme Court took action on Defendants' Writ Petition by filing the Order Directing Answer (the "Supreme Court Order"). Therein, the Supreme Court stated that "it appears that petitioners have set forth issues of arguable merit and that they may have no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of the law." *See* Supreme Court Order, attached hereto as Exhibit A. The Supreme Court ordered Plaintiff to file and serve an answer within 30 days of the April 19, 2013, filing date. Defendants have been provided with 15 days from service of the answer to file and serve a reply. Given that the Supreme Court has taken action and accepted Defendants' Writ Petition, Defendants respectfully request that this Court extend the stay provided in the Stay Order until after the Supreme Court has made a determination on the subject Writ Petition.

Defendants incorporate by reference the legal standard and arguments presented in their Original Motion in support of this request to extend the stay. As briefed in the Original Motion, extending the stay is appropriate because (1) the object of the Defendants' Writ Petition would

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

1 be defeated if the Court did not extend the stay already provided in the Stay Order; (2)
2 Defendants would suffer irreparable harm if SCL were required to produce documents without
3 regard to the limitations of the MPDPA and participate in an evidentiary hearing prior to the
4 Supreme Court's disposition of the writ petition; (3) Plaintiff will suffer no harm by a stay; and
5 (4) Defendants have presented a substantial case on the merits of these important legal
6 questions. Therefore, Defendants respectfully request that the Court extend the stay provided in
7 the Stay Order until after the Supreme Court has made a determination on the Writ Petition.

8 DATED this 13th day of May, 2013.

9
10 
11 J. Randall Jones, Esq.
12 Mark M. Jones, Esq.
13 Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
14 3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 17th Floor
15 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
16 Attorneys for Sands China, Ltd.

17 J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
18 Robert J. Cassity, Esq.
19 Holland & Hart LLP
20 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
21 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
22 Attorneys for Las Vegas Sands Corp. and Sands China,
23 Ltd.
24
25
26
27
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
Seventeenth Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001
kjc@kempjones.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Nev. R. Civ. P. 5(b), I certify that on May th13, 2013, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **MOTION TO EXTEND STAY OF ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS PENDING DEFENDANTS' PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS and EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME AND ORDER THEREON** via e-mail and by depositing same in the United States mail, first class postage fully prepaid to the persons and addresses listed below:

James J. Pisanelli, Esq.
Todd L. Bice, Esq.
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq.
Jennifer L. Braster, Esq.
Pisanelli Bice
3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
jjp@pisanellibice.com
tlb@pisanellibice.com
dls@pisanellibice.com
jlb@pisanellibice.com
kap@pisanellibice.com – staff
see@pisanellibice.com – staff
Attorney for Plaintiff



An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard

EXHIBIT A

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., A NEVADA
CORPORATION; AND SANDS CHINA
LTD., A CAYMAN ISLANDS
CORPORATION,
Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
ELIZABETH GOFF GONZALEZ,
DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
STEVEN C. JACOBS,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 62944

FILED

APR 19 2013

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *[Signature]*
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DIRECTING ANSWER

This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order concluding that petitioners' redaction of personal data in produced documents violated a previous district court order. Having reviewed the petition, it appears that petitioners have set forth issues of arguable merit and that they may have no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of the law. Therefore, real party in interest, on behalf of respondents, shall have 30 days from the date of this order within which to file and serve an answer, including authorities, against issuance of the requested writ. Petitioners shall have 15 days from service of the answer to file and serve any reply.

It is so ORDERED.

[Signature], A.C.J.

SUPREME COURT
OF
NEVADA

(C) 1947A 

13-11586

cc: Hon. Elizabeth Goff Gonzalez, District Judge
Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
Holland & Hart LLP/Las Vegas
Morris Law Group
Pisanelli Bice, PLLC
Eighth District Court Clerk

Alvin D. Shuman

CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
* * * * *

STEVEN JACOBS

Plaintiff

vs.

LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., et al..

Defendants
.....

CASE NO. A-627691

DEPT. NO. XI

**Transcript of
Proceedings**

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

TELEPHONIC HEARING ON MOTION TO EXTEND STAY

THURSDAY, MAY 16, 2013

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

TODD BICE, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

J. STEPHEN PEEK, ESQ.
JON RANDALL JONES, ESQ.

MICHAEL LACKEY, ESQ.

COURT RECORDER:

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

JILL HAWKINS
District Court

FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript
produced by transcription service.

RECEIVED
MAY 22 2013
CLERK OF THE COURT

33

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 2013, 12:59 P.M.

2 (Court was called to order)

3 THE COURT: If we could come on up. All the way up.
4 Mr. Peek.

5 MR. PEEK: Yes, Your Honor, I'm here.

6 THE COURT: Thank you for being patient. Mr.
7 Eisenberg and Mr. Lenhard took longer than their 8/15 slot
8 typically allowed them. So I can get you on to your Newton
9 conference call, I'm going to ask you if you want to address
10 your motion to stay.

11 MR. PEEK: I thought that Mr. Jones and -- the Jones
12 Brothers were there to address the motion for stay

13 THE COURT: Well, only Randall Jones is here. Do
14 you want him to address the motion to stay?

15 MR. PEEK: Absolutely. I'm just here in attendance,
16 Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. PEEK: Obviously it's his motion, not mine.

19 THE COURT: Randall, it's your motion.

20 MR. JONES: Yes, Your Honor. Good morning.

21 In discussing this with Mr. Bice this morning I
22 suggested that with the timing of the briefing schedule with
23 the Supreme Court it'll be fully briefed by June 5th, and I
24 suggested that maybe we should ask you for a status check in
25 60 days. He --

1 THE COURT: That's what I told Max. I told May 60
2 days. Max said 45. I said 60. Is that what you said, 45?
3 MR. JONES: Max probably had -- well, Mr. Bice said
4 he's got I think a vacation or something, so --
5 MR. BICE: Yeah, I'm going to be gone. So I'd like
6 to do it 45 days.
7 THE COURT: You're going to vacation?
8 MR. BICE: Well, I'm hoping.
9 THE COURT: We'll do a status check in 45 days.
10 MR. BICE: No, 45 days from --
11 MR. JONES: From the 5th.
12 MR. BICE: -- when briefing is done.
13 THE COURT: Oh.
14 MR. JONES: June 5th. So it'd put us about mid
15 July.
16 THE COURT: Oh. That wasn't how I was going to do
17 it. Do you guys both want to do it that way?
18 MR. BICE: Well, I, of course, opposed his request,
19 but --
20 THE COURT: I understand.
21 MR. BICE: -- you've already indicated to me that --
22 THE COURT: I was going to extend --
23 MR. BICE: -- you were going to extend it, so --
24 THE COURT: -- if they ordered briefing. And they
25 did order briefing, and the briefing looks like it's going to

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SANDS CHINA LTD., a Cayman Islands
corporation,

Petitioner,

vs.

CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT COURT, THE
HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ,
DISTRICT JUDGE, DEPT. 11,

Respondents,

and

STEVEN C. JACOBS,

Real Party in Interest.

Electronically Filed
Case Number Mar: 23/2015 08:27 a.m.
Tracie K. Lindeman
District Court Clerk of Supreme Court
A627691-B

**APPENDIX TO
PETITION FOR WRIT OF
PROHIBITION OR
MANDAMUS
RE MARCH 6, 2015
SANCTIONS ORDER**

**Volume XII of XXXIII
(PA2160 – 2401)**

MORRIS LAW GROUP
Steve Morris, Bar No. 1543
Rosa Solis-Rainey, Bar No. 7921
900 Bank of America Plaza
300 South Fourth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
J. Randall Jones, Bar No. 1927
Mark M. Jones, Esq., Bar No. 267
3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy, 17th Fl.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

HOLLAND & HART LLP
J. Stephen Peek, Esq., Bar No. 1758
Robert J. Cassity, Esq., Bar No. 9779
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

Attorneys for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Nev. R. App. P. 25, I certify that I am an employee of MORRIS LAW GROUP; that, in accordance therewith, I caused a copy of the **APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS RE MARCH 6, 2015 SANCTIONS ORDER Volume XII of XXXIII (PA2160 – 2401)** to be served as indicated below, on the date and to the addressee(s) shown below:

VIA HAND DELIVERY (CD)

Judge Elizabeth Gonzalez
Eighth Judicial District Court of
Clark County, Nevada
Regional Justice Center
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155

Respondent

VIA ELECTRONIC SERVICE

James J. Pisanelli
Todd L. Bice
Debra Spinelli
Pisanelli Bice
400 S. 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, NV 89101

Attorneys for Steven C. Jacobs, Real Party in Interest

DATED this 20th day of March, 2015.

By: /s/ PATRICIA FERRUGIA

**APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR
MANDAMUS RE MARCH 6, 2015 SANCTIONS ORDER
CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
12/22/2010	Sands China Ltd's Motion to Dismiss including Salt Affidavit and Exs. E, F, and G	I	PA1 – 75
03/16/2011	First Amended Complaint	I	PA76 – 93
04/01/2011	Order Denying Defendants' Motions to Dismiss	I	PA94 – 95
05/06/2011	Petition for Writ of Mandamus, or in the Alternative, Writ of Prohibition (without exhibits)	I	PA96 – 140
05/17/2011	Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Writ Petition on OST(without exhibits)	I	PA141 –57
07/14/2011	Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Writ Petition on OST including Fleming Declaration	I	PA158 – 77
07/26/2011	Answer of Real Party in Interest Steven C. Jacobs to Petition for Writ of Mandamus, or in the Alternative, Writ of Prohibition (without exhibits)	I	PA178 – 209
08/10/2011	Petitioner's Reply in Support of Petition for Writ of Mandamus, or in the Alternative, Writ of Prohibition (without exhibits)	II	PA210 – 33
08/26/2011	Order Granting Petition for Writ of Mandamus	II	PA234 –37
09/21/2011	Plaintiff's Motion to Conduct Jurisdictional Discovery	II	PA238 – 46
09/26/2011	Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Conduct Jurisdictional Discovery on OST(without exhibits)	II	PA247 – 60

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
09/27/2011	Transcript: Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Conduct Jurisdictional Discovery	II	PA261 – 313
09/28/2011	Sands China Ltd.'s Motion in Limine to Exclude Documents Stolen by Jacobs in Connection with the November 21, 2011 Evidentiary Hearing re Personal Jurisdiction on OST(without exhibits)	II	PA314 – 52
10/06/2011	Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for Clarification of Jurisdictional Discovery Order on OST (without exhibits)	II	PA353 – 412
10/12/2011	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Opposition to Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for Clarification of Jurisdictional Discovery Order on OST(without exhibits)	II	PA413 – 23
10/13/2011	Transcript: Hearing on Sands China's Motion in Limine and Motion for Clarification of Order	III	PA424 – 531
12/09/2011	Notice of Entry of Order re November 22 Status Conference and related Order	III	PA532 – 38
03/08/2012	Order Regarding Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Motion to Conduct Jurisdictional Discovery and Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for Clarification	III	PA539 – 44
03/22/2012	Stipulated Confidentiality Agreement and Protective Order	III	PA545 – 60
05/24/2012	Transcript: Status Check	III	PA561 – 82
06/27/2012	Defendants' Joint Status Conference Statement	III	PA583 – 92
06/27/2012	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Status Memorandum on Jurisdictional Discovery	III	PA592A – 592S

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
06/28/2012	Transcript: Hearing to Set Time for Evidentiary Hearing	IV	PA593 – 633
07/06/2012	Defendants' Statement Regarding Data Transfers	IV	PA634 – 42
08/07/2012	Defendants' Statement Regarding Investigation by Macau Office of Personal Data Protection	IV	PA643 – 52
08/27/2012	Defendant's Statement Regarding Hearing on Sanctions	IV	PA653 – 84
08/27/2012	Appendix to Defendants' Statement Regarding Hearing on Sanctions and Ex. HH	IV	PA685 – 99
08/29/2012	Transcript: Telephone Conference	IV	PA700 – 20
08/29/2012	Transcript: Hearing on Defendants' Motion to Quash Subpoenas	IV	PA721 – 52
09/10/2012	Transcript: Court's Sanction Hearing – Day 1 – Monday, September 10, 2012	V	PA753 – 915
09/11/2012	Transcript: Court's Sanction Hearing – Day 2 – Volume I Tuesday, September 11, 2012	V	PA916 – 87
09/11/2012	Transcript: Court's Sanction Hearing – Day 2 – Volume II Tuesday, September 11, 2012	VI	PA988 – 1157
09/11/2012	Defendants Las Vegas Sands Corp.'s and Sands China Limited's Statement on Potential Sanctions	VI	PA1158 – 77
09/12/2012	Transcript: Court's Sanctions Hearing – Day 3 – Wednesday, September 12, 2012	VII	PA1178 – 1358
09/14/2012	Decision and Order	VII	PA1359 – 67
10/16/2012	Notice of Compliance with Decision and Order Entered 9-14-12	VII	PA1368 – 1373

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
11/21/2012	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions	VII	PA1374 – 91
11/27/2012	Defendants' Motion for a Protective Order on Order Shortening Time (without exhibits)	VII	PA1392 – 1415
12/04/2012	Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for a Protective Order on OST	VIII	PA1416 – 42
12/04/2012	Appendix of Exhibits to Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for a Protective Order on OST and Exs. F, G, M, W, Y, Z, AA	VIII	PA1443 – 1568
12/06/2012	Transcript: Hearing on Motion for Protective Order	VIII	PA1569 – 1627
12/12/2012	Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (without exhibits)	VIII	PA1628 – 62
12/18/2012	Transcript: Hearing on Motions for Protective Order and Sanctions	IX	PA1663 – 1700
01/08/2013	Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Report on Its Compliance with the Court's Ruling of December 18, 2012	IX	PA1701 – 61
01/17/2013	Notice of Entry of Order re: Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for Protective Order and related Order	IX	PA1762 – 68
02/08/2013	Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions on Order Shortening Time	X	PA1769 – 917
02/25/2013	Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions	XI	PA1918 – 48

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
02/25/2013	Appendix to Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions NOTE: EXHIBITS O AND P FILED UNDER SEAL (Bates PA2119-2159A Submitted Under Seal)	XI	PA1949 – 2159A
02/28/2013	Transcript: Hearing on Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions	XII	PA2160 – 228
03/06/2013	Reply In Support of Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions	XII	PA2229 – 56
03/27/2013	Order re Renewed Motion for Sanctions	XII	PA2257 – 60
04/09/2013	Motion for Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Sanctions Pending Defendants' Petition for Writ of Prohibition or Mandamus	XII	PA2261 – 92
05/13/2013	Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Motion for Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Sanctions	XII	PA2293 – 95
5/14/2013	Motion to Extend Stay of Order on Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Sanctions Pending Defendants' Petition	XII	PA2296 – 306
05/16/2013	Transcript: Telephonic Hearing on Motion to Extend Stay	XII	PA2307 –11
05/30/2013	Order Scheduling Status Check	XII	PA2312 – 13
06/05/2013	Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Extend Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Sanctions	XII	PA2314 – 15
06/14/2013	Defendants' Joint Status Report	XII	PA2316 – 41
06/14/2013	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Status Memorandum	XII	PA2342 – 401

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
06/19/2013	Order on Plaintiff Steven C. Jacob's Motion to Return Remaining Documents from Advanced Discovery	XIII	PA2402 – 06
06/21/2013	Emergency Petition for Writ of Prohibition or Mandamus to Protect Privileged Documents (Case No. 63444)	XIII	PA2407 – 49
07/11/2013	Minute Order re Stay	XIII	PA2450 – 51
08/21/2013	Order Extending Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions	XIII	PA2452 – 54
10/01/2013	Nevada Supreme Court Order Granting Stay	XIII	PA2455 – 56
11/05/2013	Order Extending (1) Stay of Order Granting Motion to Compel Documents Used by Witness to Refresh Recollection and (2) Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions	XIII	PA2457 – 60
03/26/2014	Order Extending Stay of Order Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Sanctions	XIII	PA2461 – 63
06/26/2014	Defendant Sands China, Ltd.'s Motion For Summary Judgment On Personal Jurisdiction (without exhibits)	XIII	PA2464 – 90
07/14/2014	Opposition to Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for Summary Judgment on Personal Jurisdiction and Countermotion for Summary Judgment (without exhibits)	XIII	PA2491 – 510

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
07/22/2014	Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Reply in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment and Opposition to Plaintiff's Counter-Motion For Summary Judgment	XIII	PA2511 – 33
07/24/2014	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Reply In Support of Countermotion For Summary Judgment	XIII	PA2534 – 627
08/07/2014	Order Denying Petition for Prohibition or Mandamus re March 27, 2013 Order	XIII	PA2628 – 40
08/14/2014	Transcript: Hearing on Motions	XIV	PA2641 – 86
08/15/2014	Order on Sands China's Motion for Summary Judgment on Personal Jurisdiction	XIV	PA2687 – 88
10/09/2014	Transcript: Hearing on Motion for Release of Documents from Advanced Discovery	XIV	PA2689 – 735
10/17/2014	SCL's Motion to Reconsider 3/27/13 Order (without exhibits)	XIV	PA2736 – 56
11/03/2014	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Opposition to SCL's Motion To Reconsider the Court's March 27,2013 Order	XIV	PA2757 – 67
11/17/2014	Reply in Support of Sands China Ltd.'s Motion to Reconsider the Court's March 27, 2013 Order	XIV	PA2768 – 76
12/02/2014	Transcript: Hearing on Motion to Reconsider	XIV	PA2777 – 807
12/11/2014	Transcript: Hearing on Motion for Partial Reconsideration of 11/05/2014 Order	XIV	PA2808 – 17
12/22/2014	Third Amended Complaint	XIV	PA2818 – 38

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
12/24/2014	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Motion to Set Evidentiary Hearing and Trial on Order Shortening Time	XIV	PA2839 – 48
01/06/2015	Transcript: Motions re Vickers Report and Plaintiff's Motion for Setting of Evidentiary Hearing	XV	PA2849 – 948
01/07/2015	Order Setting Evidentiary Hearing re 3-27-13 Order and NV Adv. Op. 61	XV	PA2949 – 50
01/07/2015	Order Setting Evidentiary Hearing	XV	PA2951 – 53
02/04/2015	Order Denying Defendants Limited Motion to Reconsider	XV	PA2954 – 56
02/06/2015	Sands China Ltd.'s Memo re Plaintiffs Renewed Motion for Sanctions	XV	PA2957 – 85
02/06/2015	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Brief on Sanctions For February 9, 2015 Evidentiary Hearing	XV	PA2986 – 3009
02/09/2015	Bench Brief re Service Issues	XV	PA3010 – 44
			PA3045 NUMBER UNUSED
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 98 - Decision and Order 9-14-12	XV	PA3046 – 54
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 301 – Pl's 1st RFP 12-23-2011	XV	PA3055 – 65
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 302 - SCL's Resp – 1st RFP 1-23-12	XV	PA3066 – 95
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 303 - SCL's 1st Supp Resp – 1st RP 4-13-12	XVI	PA3096 – 104
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 304 – SCL's 2nd Supp Resp – 1st RPF 1-28-13	XVI	PA3105 – 335
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 305 - SCL's 3rd Supp Resp – 1st RFP 2-7-13	XVII	PA3336 – 47
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 306 - SCL's 4th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 1-14-15	XVII	PA3348 – 472

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 307 – LVSC's Resp – 1st RFP 1-30-12	XVII	PA3473 – 504
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 308 - LVSC's Resp – 2nd RFP 3-2-12	XVII	PA3505 – 11
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 309 – LVSC's 1st Supp Resp – 1st RFP 4-13-12	XVII	PA3512 – 22
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 310 – LVSC's 2nd Supp Resp – 1st RFP 5-21-12	XVII	PA3523 –37
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 311 - LVSCs 3rd Supp Resp – 1st RFP 6-6-12	XVII	PA3538 – 51
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 312 – LVSC's 4th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 6-26-12	XVII	PA3552 – 76
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 313 - LVSC's 5th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 8-14-12	XVIII	PA3577 – 621
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 314 – LVSC's 6th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 9-4-12	XVIII	PA3622 – 50
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 315 – LVSC's 7th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 9-17-12	XVIII	PA3651 – 707
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 316 - LVSC- s 8th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 10-3-12	XVIII	PA3708 – 84
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 317 - LVSC's 9th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 11-20-12	XIX	PA3785 – 881
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 318 – LVSC's 10th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 12-05-12	XIX	PA3882 – 89
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 319 - Consent for Transfer of Personal Data – Sheldon Adelson	XIX	PA3890
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 320 - Consent for Transfer of Personal Data – Michael Leven	XIX	PA3891
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 321 - Consent for Transfer of Personal Data – Kenneth Kay	XIX	PA3892

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 322 - Consent for Transfer of Personal Data – Robert Goldstein	XIX	PA3893
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 351 – Offered – Declaration of David Fleming, 2/9/15	XIX	PA3894 – 96
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 352 - Raphaelson Travel Records	XIX	PA3897
02/09/2015	Memo of Sands China Ltd re Ex. 350 re Wynn Resorts v Okada	XIX	PA3898 – 973
			PA3974 NUMBER UNUSED
02/09/2015	Transcript: Evidentiary Hearing – Motion for Sanctions – Day 1	XX	PA3975 – 4160
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 96 - Declaration of David Fleming, 8/21/12	XX	PA4161 – 71
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 102 - Letter OPDP	XX	PA4172 – 76
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 194 - Jacobs Opposition to Sands China Ltd.'s Motion to Reconsider	XX	PA4177 – 212
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 213 - Letter from KJC to Pisanelli Bice	XX	PA4213 – 17
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 215 - Email Spinelli to Schneider	XX	PA4218 – 24
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 327 - SCL's Redaction Log dated 2-7-13	XXI	PA4225 – 387
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 345 - FTI Bid Estimate	XXI	PA4388 – 92
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 346 - Affidavit of David Fleming, 8/21/12	XXI	PA4393 – 98
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 348 - Affidavit of David Fleming - July, 2011	XXI	PA4399 – 402
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 353 - Email Jones to Spinelli	XXI	PA4403 – 05
02/10/2015	Transcript: Evidentiary Hearing – Motion for Sanctions – Day 2	XXII AND XXIII	PA4406 – 710

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 15 - Email re Adelson's Venetian Comments	XXIII	PA4711 – 12
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.16 - Email re Board of Director Meeting Information	XXIII	PA4713 – 15
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 23 - Email re Termination Notice	XXIII	PA4716 – 18
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 28 - Michael Leven Depo Ex.59	XXIII	PA4719
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 32 - Email re Cirque 12-15-09	XXIII	PA4720
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 38 - Email re Update	XXIII	PA4721 – 22
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 46 - Offered NA Email Leven to Schwartz	XXIII	PA4723
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 51 - Minutes of Audit Committee Mtg, Hong Kong	XXIII	PA4724 – 27
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 59 - Credit Committee Mtg. Minutes	XXIII	PA4728 – 32
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 60 – Ltr. VML to Jacobs re Termination	XXIII	PA4733 – 34
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 62 - Email re Update	XXIII	PA4735 – 36
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 76 - Email re Urgent	XXIII	PA4737
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 77 - Email Expenses Folio	XXIII	PA4738 – 39
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 205 – SCL's Minutes of Board Mtg.	XXIII	PA4740 – 44
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.323 - Email req to Jacobs for Proposed Consent	XXIII	PA4745 – 47
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 324 - Ltr Bice Denying Request for Plaintiffs Consent	XXIII	PA4748 – 49
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 328 – SCL's Supp Redaction Log 2-25-13	XXIII	PA4750

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 329 - SCL's 2nd Supp Redaction Log 1-5-15	XXIII and XXIV, XXV	PA4751 – 5262
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 338 – SCL's Relevancy Log 8-16-13 (SUBMITTED TO SUPREME COURT BY FTP)	XXV	PA5263 – 15465
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 341 - Macau Personal Data Protection Act, Aug., 2005	XXV	PA15466 – 86
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 350 - Offered - Briefing in Odaka v. Wynn	XXV	PA15487 – 92
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 354 - Email re Mgmt Announcement 9-4-09	XXV	PA15493
02/11/2015	Transcript: Evidentiary Hearing re Mot for Sanctions – Day 3	XXVI	PA15494 – 686
02/12/2015	Jacobs' Offer of Proof re Leven Deposition	XXVI	PA15687 – 732
02/12/2015	Transcript: Evidentiary Hrg re Mot. for Sanctions – Day 4	XXVII	PA15733 – 875
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 216 - Excerpt from SCL's Bates-Range Prod. Log	XXVII	PA15876
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 217 - Order re Transfer of Data	XXVII	PA15877 – 97
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 218 - Emails of Jason Ray	XXVII	PA15898
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 219 - Emails of Jason Ray	XXVII	PA15899 – 909
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 220 - Emails of Jason Ray	XXVII	PA15910
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 333 - OPDP Resp to Venetian Macau's Ltr 8-8-12	XXVII	PA15911 – 30
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 334 - Venetian Macau Ltr to OPDP 11-14-12	XXVII	PA15931 – 40
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 336 - Ltr OPDP in Resp to Venetian Macau	XXVII	PA15941 – 50

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 339 – SCL's Supp Relevancy Log 1-5-15 (SUBMITTED TO SUPREME COURT BY FTP)	XXVII	PA15951 – 42828
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 349 - Ltr OPDP to Venetian Macau 10-28-11	XXVII	PA42829 – 49
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 355 – Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions – Ex. 9	XXVII	PA42850 – 51
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.355A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00110407-08	XXVII	PA42852
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 356 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions – Ex.10	XXVII	PA42853
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.357 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex.11	XXVII	PA42854 – 55
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.357A Unredacted Replacement for SCL00102981-82	XXVII	PA42856
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.358 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex.12	XXVII	PA42857
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.359 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex.13	XXVII	PA42858 – 59
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 360 to Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions – Ex.14	XXVIII	PA42860 – 66
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 360A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00128160-66	XXVIII	PA42867
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 361 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex.15	XXVIII	PA42868 – 73
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 361A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL 00128205-10	XXVIII	PA42874 – PA42876-D
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 362 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex.16	XXVIII	PA42877 – PA42877-A

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 363 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 17	XXVIII	PA42878 – PA42879-B
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 364 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 18	XXVIII	PA42880
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 365 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 19	XXVIII	PA42881 – 83
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 365A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00128084-86	XXVIII	PA42884 – PA42884-B
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 366 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 20	XXVIII	PA42885 – 93
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 366A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00103289-297	XXVIII	PA42894 – PA42894-H
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 367 - Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 21	XXVIII	PA42895 – 96
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 367A Unredacted Replacement for SCL00128203-04	XXVIII	PA42897 – PA42898-A
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 368 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 22	XXVIII	PA42899
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 368A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00128059	XXVIII	PA42900
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 369 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 23	XXVIII	PA42901 – 02
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 369A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00118378-79	XXVIII	PA42903 – PA42903-A
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 370 - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00114508-09	XXVIII	PA42904 – 06

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 371 - Unredacted Replacement pursuant to consent for SCL00114515	XXVIII	PA42907
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 372 - Unredacted Replacement for SCL0017227	XXVIII	PA42908
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 373 - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00120910-11	XXVIII	PA42909 – 10
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 374 - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00118633-34	XXVIII	PA42911 – 12
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 375 – SCL Minutes of Audit Committee dated 5-10-10	XXVIII	PA42913 – 18
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 376 - SCL Credit Committee Minutes dated 8-4-10	XXVIII	PA42919 – 23
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 377 – SCL Minutes of Mtg of BOD dated 2-9-10 Produced by SCL	XXVIII	PA42924 – 33
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 378 – SCL Minutes of Mtg of BOD dated 2-9-10 Produced by LVSC	XXVIII	PA42934 – 45
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 379 - US Macau Data Production Report – LVSC	XXVIII and XXIX	PA42946 – 43124
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 380 - US Macau Data Production Report – SCL	XXIX	PA43125 – 38
			PA43139 – 71 NUMBERS UNUSED
03/02/2015	Plaintiff's Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law	XXIX	PA43172 – 201
03/02/2015	Transcript: Evidentiary Hearing – Motion for Sanctions – Day 5	XXX	PA43202 – 431
03/03/2015	Transcript: Evidentiary Hearing – Motion for Sanctions – Day 6 Closing Arguments	XXXI	PA43432 – 601

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
03/03/2015	Evidentiary Hearing – Court Exhibit 6, SCL Closing Argument Binder	XXXII	PA43602 – 789
03/06/2015	Decision and Order	XXXII	PA43790 – 830
03/09/2015	SCL's Proposed Findings of Fact And Conclusions of Law With Respect To Plaintiff's Renewed Motion For Sanctions	XXXIII	PA43831 – 54
03/11/2015	Motion to Stay Court's March 6 Decision and to Continue Evidentiary Hearing	XXXIII	PA43855 – 70
03/12/2015	Jacobs' Opposition to Motion to Stay 3-6-15 Decision and Continue Evidentiary Hearing	XXXIII	PA43871 – 77
03/13/2015	Transcript: Emergency Motion to Stay	XXXIII	PA43878 – 911

**APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR
MANDAMUS RE MARCH 6, 2015 SANCTIONS ORDER
ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
			PA3045 NUMBER UNUSED
			PA3974 NUMBER UNUSED
			PA43139 – 71 NUMBERS UNUSED
07/26/2011	Answer of Real Party in Interest Steven C. Jacobs to Petition for Writ of Mandamus, or in the Alternative, Writ of Prohibition (without exhibits)	I	PA178 – 209
12/04/2012	Appendix of Exhibits to Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for a Protective Order on OST and Exs. F, G, M, W, Y, Z, AA	VIII	PA1443 – 1568
02/25/2013	Appendix to Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions NOTE: EXHIBITS O AND P FILED UNDER SEAL (Bates PA2119-2159A Submitted Under Seal)	XI	PA1949 – 2159A
08/27/2012	Appendix to Defendants' Statement Regarding Hearing on Sanctions and Ex. HH	IV	PA685 – 99
02/09/2015	Bench Brief re Service Issues	XV	PA3010 – 45
09/14/2012	Decision and Order	VII	PA1359 – 67
03/06/2015	Decision and Order	XXXII	PA43790 – 830

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
12/04/2012	Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for a Protective Order on OST	VIII	PA1416 – 42
05/17/2011	Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Writ Petition on OST(without exhibits)	I	PA141 –57
07/14/2011	Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Writ Petition on OST including Fleming Declaration	I	PA158 – 77
09/26/2011	Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Conduct Jurisdictional Discovery on OST(without exhibits)	II	PA247 – 60
07/22/2014	Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Reply in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment and Opposition to Plaintiff's Counter-Motion For Summary Judgment	XIII	PA2511 – 33
01/08/2013	Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Report on Its Compliance with the Court's Ruling of December 18, 2012	IX	PA1701 – 61
06/26/2014	Defendant Sands China, Ltd.'s Motion For Summary Judgment On Personal Jurisdiction (without exhibits)	XIII	PA2464 – 90
06/27/2012	Defendants' Joint Status Conference Statement	III	PA583 – 92
06/14/2013	Defendants' Joint Status Report	XII	PA2316 – 41
09/11/2012	Defendants Las Vegas Sands Corp.'s and Sands China Limited's Statement on Potential Sanctions	VI	PA1158 – 77

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
11/27/2012	Defendants' Motion for a Protective Order on Order Shortening Time (without exhibits)	VII	PA1392 – 1415
12/12/2012	Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (without exhibits)	VIII	PA1628 – 62
02/25/2013	Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions	XI	PA1918 – 48
07/06/2012	Defendants' Statement Regarding Data Transfers	IV	PA634 – 42
08/27/2012	Defendant's Statement Regarding Hearing on Sanctions	IV	PA653 – 84
08/07/2012	Defendants' Statement Regarding Investigation by Macau Office of Personal Data Protection	IV	PA643 – 52
06/21/2013	Emergency Petition for Writ of Prohibition or Mandamus to Protect Privileged Documents (Case No. 63444)	XIII	PA2407 – 49
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 102 - Letter OPDP	XX	PA4172 – 76
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 15 - Email re Adelson's Venetian Comments	XXIII	PA4711 – 12
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 194 - Jacobs Opposition to Sands China Ltd.'s Motion to Reconsider	XX	PA4177 – 212
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 205 – SCL's Minutes of Board Mtg.	XXIII	PA4740 – 44
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 213 - Letter from KJC to Pisanelli Bice	XX	PA4213 – 17
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 215 - Email Spinelli to Schneider	XX	PA4218 – 24
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 216 - Excerpt from SCL's Bates-Range Prod. Log	XXVII	PA15876

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 217 - Order re Transfer of Data	XXVII	PA15877 – 97
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 218 - Emails of Jason Ray	XXVII	PA15898
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 219 - Emails of Jason Ray	XXVII	PA15899 – 909
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 220 - Emails of Jason Ray	XXVII	PA15910
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 23 - Email re Termination Notice	XXIII	PA4716 – 18
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 28 - Michael Leven Depo Ex.59	XXIII	PA4719
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 301 – Pl's 1st RFP 12-23-2011	XV	PA3055 – 65
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 302 - SCL's Resp – 1st RFP 1-23-12	XV	PA3066 – 95
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 303 - SCL's 1st Supp Resp – 1st RP 4-13-12	XVI	PA3096 – 104
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 304 – SCL's 2nd Supp Resp – 1st RPF 1-28-13	XVI	PA3105 – 335
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 305 - SCL's 3rd Supp Resp – 1st RFP 2-7-13	XVII	PA3336 – 47
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 306 - SCL's 4th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 1-14-15	XVII	PA3348 – 472
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 307 – LVSC's Resp – 1st RFP 1-30-12	XVII	PA3473 – 504
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 308 - LVSC's Resp – 2nd RFP 3-2-12	XVII	PA3505 – 11
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 309 – LVSC's 1st Supp Resp – 1st RFP 4-13-12	XVII	PA3512 – 22
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 310 – LVSC's 2nd Supp Resp – 1st RFP 5-21-12	XVII	PA3523 –37
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 311 - LVSCs 3rd Supp Resp – 1st RFP 6-6-12	XVII	PA3538 – 51

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 312 – LVSC's 4th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 6-26-12	XVII	PA3552 – 76
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 313 - LVSC's 5th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 8-14-12	XVIII	PA3577 – 621
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 314 – LVSC's 6th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 9-4-12	XVIII	PA3622 – 50
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 315 – LVSC's 7th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 9-17-12	XVIII	PA3651 – 707
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 316 - LVSC- s 8th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 10-3-12	XVIII	PA3708 – 84
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 317 - LVSC's 9th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 11-20-12	XIX	PA3785 – 881
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 318 – LVSC's 10th Supp Resp – 1st RFP 12-05-12	XIX	PA3882 – 89
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 319 - Consent for Transfer of Personal Data – Sheldon Adelson	XIX	PA3890
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 32 - Email re Cirque 12-15-09	XXIII	PA4720
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 320 - Consent for Transfer of Personal Data – Michael Leven	XIX	PA3891
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 321 - Consent for Transfer of Personal Data – Kenneth Kay	XIX	PA3892
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 322 - Consent for Transfer of Personal Data – Robert Goldstein	XIX	PA3893
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 324 - Ltr Bice Denying Request for Plaintiffs Consent	XXIII	PA4748 – 49
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 327 - SCL's Redaction Log dated 2-7-13	XXI	PA4225 – 387

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 328 – SCL's Supp Redaction Log 2-25-13	XXIII	PA4750
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 329 - SCL's 2nd Supp Redaction Log 1-5-15	XXIII and XXIV, XXV	PA4751 – 5262
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 333 - OPDP Resp to Venetian Macau's Ltr 8-8-12	XXVII	PA15911 – 30
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 334 - Venetian Macau Ltr to OPDP 11-14-12	XXVII	PA15931 – 40
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 336 - Ltr OPDP in Resp to Venetian Macau	XXVII	PA15941 – 50
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 338 – SCL's Relevancy Log 8-16-13 (SUBMITTED TO SUPREME COURT BY FTP)	XXV	PA5263 – 15465
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 339 – SCL's Supp Relevancy Log 1-5-15 (SUBMITTED TO SUPREME COURT BY FTP)	XXVII	PA15951 – 42828
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 341 - Macau Personal Data Protection Act, Aug., 2005	XXV	PA15466 – 86
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 345 - FTI Bid Estimate	XXI	PA4388 – 92
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 346 - Affidavit of David Fleming, 8/21/12	XXI	PA4393 – 98
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 348 - Affidavit of David Fleming - July, 2011	XXI	PA4399 – 402
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 349 - Ltr OPDP to Venetian Macau 10-28-11	XXVII	PA42829 – 49
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 350 - Offered - Briefing in <i>Odaka v. Wynn</i>	XXV	PA15487 – 92
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 351 – Offered – Declaration of David Fleming, 2/9/15	XIX	PA3894 – 96

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 352 - Raphaelson Travel Records	XIX	PA3897
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 353 - Email Jones to Spinelli	XXI	PA4403 – 05
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 354 - Email re Mgmt Announcement 9-4-09	XXV	PA15493
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 355 – Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions – Ex. 9	XXVII	PA42850 – 51
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 356 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions – Ex.10	XXVII	PA42853
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 360 to Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions – Ex.14	XXVIII	PA42860 – 66
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 360A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00128160-66	XXVIII	PA42867
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 361 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex.15	XXVIII	PA42868 – 73
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 361A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL 00128205-10	XXVIII	PA42874 – PA42876-D
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 362 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex.16	XXVIII	PA42877 – PA42877-A
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 363 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 17	XXVIII	PA42878 – PA42879-B
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 364 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 18	XXVIII	PA42880
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 365 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 19	XXVIII	PA42881 – 83

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 365A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00128084-86	XXVIII	PA42884 – PA42884-B
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 366 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 20	XXVIII	PA42885 – 93
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 366A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00103289-297	XXVIII	PA42894 – PA42894-H
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 367 - Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 21	XXVIII	PA42895 – 96
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 367A Unredacted Replacement for SCL00128203-04	XXVIII	PA42897 – PA42898-A
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 368 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 22	XXVIII	PA42899
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 368A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00128059	XXVIII	PA42900
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 369 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex. 23	XXVIII	PA42901 – 02
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 369A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00118378-79	XXVIII	PA42903 – PA42903-A
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 370 - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00114508-09	XXVIII	PA42904 – 06
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 371 - Unredacted Replacement pursuant to consent for SCL00114515	XXVIII	PA42907
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 372 - Unredacted Replacement for SCL0017227	XXVIII	PA42908
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 373 - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00120910-11	XXVIII	PA42909 – 10

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 374 - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00118633-34	XXVIII	PA42911 – 12
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 375 – SCL Minutes of Audit Committee dated 5-10-10	XXVIII	PA42913 – 18
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 376 - SCL Credit Committee Minutes dated 8-4-10	XXVIII	PA42919 – 23
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 377 – SCL Minutes of Mtg of BOD dated 2-9-10 Produced by SCL	XXVIII	PA42924 – 33
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 378 – SCL Minutes of Mtg of BOD dated 2-9-10 Produced by LVSC	XXVIII	PA42934 – 45
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 379 - US Macau Data Production Report – LVSC	XXVIII and XXIX	PA42946 – 43124
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 38 - Email re Update	XXIII	PA4721 – 22
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 380 - US Macau Data Production Report – SCL	XXIX	PA43125 – 38
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 46 - Offered NA Email Leven to Schwartz	XXIII	PA4723
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 51 - Minutes of Audit Committee Mtg, Hong Kong	XXIII	PA4724 – 27
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 59 - Credit Committee Mtg. Minutes	XXIII	PA4728 – 32
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 60 – Ltr. VML to Jacobs re Termination	XXIII	PA4733 – 34
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 62 - Email re Update	XXIII	PA4735 – 36
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 76 - Email re Urgent	XXIII	PA4737
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 77 - Email Expenses Folio	XXIII	PA4738 – 39
02/10/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 96 - Declaration of David Fleming, 8/21/12	XX	PA4161 – 71

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
02/09/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex. 98 - Decision and Order 9-14-12	XV	PA3046 – 54
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.16 - Email re Board of Director Meeting Information	XXIII	PA4713 – 15
02/11/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.323 - Email req to Jacobs for Proposed Consent	XXIII	PA4745 – 47
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.355A - Unredacted Replacement for SCL00110407-08	XXVII	PA42852
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.357 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex.11	XXVII	PA42854 – 55
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.357A Unredacted Replacement for SCL00102981-82	XXVII	PA42856
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.358 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex.12	XXVII	PA42857
03/02/2015	Evid. Hrg. Ex.359 - Pl's Renewed Motion for Sanctions, Ex.13	XXVII	PA42858 – 59
03/03/2015	Evidentiary Hearing – Court Exhibit 6, SCL Closing Argument Binder	XXXII	PA43602 – 789
03/16/2011	First Amended Complaint	I	PA76 – 93
02/12/2015	Jacobs' Offer of Proof re Leven Deposition	XXVI	PA15687 – 732
03/12/2015	Jacobs' Opposition to Motion to Stay 3-6-15 Decision and Continue Evidentiary Hearing	XXXIII	PA43871 – 77
02/09/2015	Memo of Sands China Ltd re Ex. 350 re <i>Wynn Resorts v. Okada</i>	XIX	PA3898 – 973
07/11/2013	Minute Order re Stay	XIII	PA2450 – 51
04/09/2013	Motion for Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Sanctions Pending Defendants' Petition for Writ of Prohibition or Mandamus	XII	PA2261 – 92

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
5/14/2013	Motion to Extend Stay of Order on Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Sanctions Pending Defendants' Petition	XII	PA2296 – 306
03/11/2015	Motion to Stay Court's March 6 Decision and to Continue Evidentiary Hearing	XXXIII	PA43855 – 70
10/01/2013	Nevada Supreme Court Order Granting Stay	XIII	PA2455 – 56
10/16/2012	Notice of Compliance with Decision and Order Entered 9-14-12	VII	PA1368 – 1373
12/09/2011	Notice of Entry of Order re November 22 Status Conference and related Order	III	PA532 – 38
01/17/2013	Notice of Entry of Order re: Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for Protective Order and related Order	IX	PA1762 – 68
07/14/2014	Opposition to Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for Summary Judgment on Personal Jurisdiction and Countermotion for Summary Judgment (without exhibits)	XIII	PA2491 – 510
02/04/2015	Order Denying Defendants Limited Motion to Reconsider	XV	PA2954 – 56
04/01/2011	Order Denying Defendants' Motions to Dismiss	I	PA94 – 95
08/07/2014	Order Denying Petition for Prohibition or Mandamus re March 27, 2013 Order	XIII	PA2628 – 40

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
11/05/2013	Order Extending (1) Stay of Order Granting Motion to Compel Documents Used by Witness to Refresh Recollection and (2) Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions	XIII	PA2457 – 60
08/21/2013	Order Extending Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions	XIII	PA2452 – 54
03/26/2014	Order Extending Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Sanctions	XIII	PA2461 – 63
06/05/2013	Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Extend Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Sanctions	XII	PA2314 – 15
05/13/2013	Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Motion for Stay of Order Granting Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Sanctions	XII	PA2293 – 95
08/26/2011	Order Granting Petition for Writ of Mandamus	II	PA234 –37
06/19/2013	Order on Plaintiff Steven C. Jacob's Motion to Return Remaining Documents from Advanced Discovery	XIII	PA2402 – 06
08/15/2014	Order on Sands China's Motion for Summary Judgment on Personal Jurisdiction	XIV	PA2687 – 88
03/27/2013	Order re Renewed Motion for Sanctions	XII	PA2257 – 60
03/08/2012	Order Regarding Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Motion to Conduct Jurisdictional Discovery and Defendant Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for Clarification	III	PA539 – 44

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
05/30/2013	Order Scheduling Status Check	XII	PA2312 – 13
01/07/2015	Order Setting Evidentiary Hearing	XV	PA2951 – 53
01/07/2015	Order Setting Evidentiary Hearing re 3-27-13 Order and NV Adv. Op. 61	XV	PA2949 – 50
05/06/2011	Petition for Writ of Mandamus, or in the Alternative, Writ of Prohibition (without exhibits)	I	PA96 – 140
08/10/2011	Petitioner's Reply in Support of Petition for Writ of Mandamus, or in the Alternative, Writ of Prohibition (without exhibits)	II	PA210 – 33
11/03/2014	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Opposition to SCL's Motion To Reconsider the Court's March 27,2013 Order	XIV	PA2757 – 67
02/06/2015	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Brief on Sanctions For February 9, 2015 Evidentiary Hearing	XV	PA2986 – 3009
11/21/2012	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions	VII	PA1374 – 91
12/24/2014	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Motion to Set Evidentiary Hearing and Trial on Order Shortening Time	XIV	PA2839 – 48
10/12/2011	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Opposition to Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for Clarification of Jurisdictional Discovery Order on OST(without exhibits)	II	PA413 – 23
07/24/2014	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Reply In Support of Countermotion For Summary Judgment	XIII	PA2534 – 627
06/14/2013	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Status Memorandum	XII	PA2342 – 401
06/27/2012	Plaintiff Steven C. Jacobs' Status Memorandum on Jurisdictional Discovery	III	PA592A – 592S

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
09/21/2011	Plaintiff's Motion to Conduct Jurisdictional Discovery	II	PA238 – 46
03/02/2015	Plaintiff's Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law	XXIX	PA43172 – 201
02/08/2013	Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions on Order Shortening Time	X	PA1769 – 917
03/06/2013	Reply In Support of Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions	XII	PA2229 – 56
11/17/2014	Reply in Support of Sands China Ltd.'s Motion to Reconsider the Court's March 27, 2013 Order	XIV	PA2768 – 76
02/06/2015	Sands China Ltd.'s Memo re Plaintiffs Renewed Motion for Sanctions	XV	PA2957 – 85
10/06/2011	Sands China Ltd.'s Motion for Clarification of Jurisdictional Discovery Order on OST (without exhibits)	II	PA353 – 412
09/28/2011	Sands China Ltd.'s Motion in Limine to Exclude Documents Stolen by Jacobs in Connection with the November 21, 2011 Evidentiary Hearing re Personal Jurisdiction on OST (without exhibits)	II	PA314 – 52
12/22/2010	Sands China Ltd's Motion to Dismiss including Salt Affidavit and Exs. E, F, and G	I	PA1 – 75
10/17/2014	SCL's Motion to Reconsider 3/27/13 Order (without exhibits)	XIV	PA2736 – 56
03/09/2015	SCL's Proposed Findings of Fact And Conclusions of Law With Respect To Plaintiff's Renewed Motion For Sanctions	XXXIII	PA43831 – 54

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
03/22/2012	Stipulated Confidentiality Agreement and Protective Order	III	PA545 – 60
12/22/2014	Third Amended Complaint	XIV	PA2818 – 38
05/16/2013	Transcript: Telephonic Hearing on Motion to Extend Stay	XII	PA2307 –11
09/10/2012	Transcript: Court's Sanction Hearing – Day 1 – Monday, September 10, 2012	V	PA753 – 915
09/11/2012	Transcript: Court's Sanction Hearing – Day 2 – Volume I Tuesday, September 11, 2012	V	PA916 – 87
09/11/2012	Transcript: Court's Sanction Hearing – Day 2 – Volume II Tuesday, September 11, 2012	VI	PA988 – 1157
09/12/2012	Transcript: Court's Sanctions Hearing – Day 3 – Wednesday, September 12, 2012	VII	PA1178 – 1358
03/13/2015	Transcript: Emergency Motion to Stay	XXXIII	PA43878 – 911
02/09/2015	Transcript: Evidentiary Hearing – Motion for Sanctions – Day 1	XX	PA3975 – 4160
02/10/2015	Transcript: Evidentiary Hearing – Motion for Sanctions – Day 2	XXII AND XXIII	PA4406 – 710
03/02/2015	Transcript: Evidentiary Hearing – Motion for Sanctions – Day 5	XXX	PA43202 – 431
03/03/2015	Transcript: Evidentiary Hearing – Motion for Sanctions – Day 6 Closing Arguments	XXXI	PA43432 – 601
02/11/2015	Transcript: Evidentiary Hearing re Mot for Sanctions – Day 3	XXVI	PA15494 – 686
02/12/2015	Transcript: Evidentiary Hearing re Motion for Sanctions – Day 4	XXVII	PA15733 – 875
08/29/2012	Transcript: Hearing on Defendants' Motion to Quash Subpoenas	IV	PA721 – 52

Date	Description	Vol. #	Page Nos.
12/11/2014	Transcript: Hearing on Motion for Partial Reconsideration of 11/05/2014 Order	XIV	PA2808 – 17
12/06/2012	Transcript: Hearing on Motion for Protective Order	VIII	PA1569 – 1627
10/09/2014	Transcript: Hearing on Motion for Release of Documents from Advanced Discovery	XIV	PA2689 – 735
12/02/2014	Transcript: Hearing on Motion to Reconsider	XIV	PA2777 – 807
08/14/2014	Transcript: Hearing on Motions	XIV	PA2641 – 86
12/18/2012	Transcript: Hearing on Motions for Protective Order and Sanctions	IX	PA1663 – 1700
09/27/2011	Transcript: Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Conduct Jurisdictional Discovery	II	PA261 – 313
02/28/2013	Transcript: Hearing on Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for NRCP 37 Sanctions	XII	PA2160 – 228
10/13/2011	Transcript: Hearing on Sands China's Motion in Limine and Motion for Clarification of Order	III	PA424 – 531
06/28/2012	Transcript: Hearing to Set Time for Evidentiary Hearing	IV	PA593 – 633
01/06/2015	Transcript: Motions re Vickers Report and Plaintiff's Motion for Setting of Evidentiary Hearing	XV	PA2849 – 948
05/24/2012	Transcript: Status Check	III	PA561 – 82
08/29/2012	Transcript: Telephone Conference	IV	PA700 – 20

Electronically Filed
03/04/2013 02:32:07 PM

ORIGINAL

Ann L. Schuman

CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

STEVEN JACOBS

Plaintiff

vs.

LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., et al..

Defendants
.....

CASE NO. A-627691

DEPT. NO. XI

**Transcript of
Proceedings**

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED MOTION FOR NRCP 37 SANCTIONS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2013

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

JAMES J. PISANELLI, ESQ.
TODD BICE, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

J. STEPHEN PEEK, ESQ.
JON RANDALL JONES, ESQ.
MARK JONES, ESQ.
MICHAEL LACKEY, ESQ.

COURT RECORDER:

JILL HAWKINS
District Court

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

FLORENCE HOYT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript
produced by transcription service.

RECEIVED

MAR 04 2013

CLERK OF THE COURT

PA2160

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2013, 10:08 A.M.

2 (Court was called to order)

3 THE COURT: Okay. Are we ready? Mr. Pisanelli, are
4 you arguing today, or is Mr. Bice?

5 MR. PISANELLI: I am, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: All right. Please use regular people
7 language today.

8 MR. PISANELLI: I will. And if I slip, please feel
9 free to interrupt me, and I'll do my best to rephrase it.

10 For the record and for the audience, Your Honor,
11 James Pisanelli on behalf of the plaintiff, Steven Jacobs.

12 Your Honor, I'm going to be blunt. There is a lot
13 of reasons to be angry in this case. This case has been
14 corrupted. And when I say there's a lot of reasons to be
15 angry I don't me personally, I mean virtually every
16 participant in this case, certainly Mr. Jacobs. His justice
17 is being denied. Through just simply the delay his justice is
18 being denied, his fair trial appears to be out of reach in
19 light of what we've seen. Your Honor has as much reason to be
20 angry as anyone. You've been given a mandate, an instruction
21 from the Supreme Court to conduct a hearing on jurisdictional
22 discovery, and the defendants' conduct in this case has gotten
23 in the way of you doing your job. Certainly Mr. Bice and I
24 have expressed some anger to you in the past, both in written
25 word and at this podium, to a degree at times when we were

1 both regretful and wished we could take it back and calm down
2 a little bit.

3 And I would even go so far as to say that the
4 defendants' counsel has enough reason to be angry, too. They
5 have been put in a challenging position, certainly
6 reputational capital has been spent on behalf of these
7 defendants. So we all have a lot of reason to be angry.

8 But today I believe and I hope is a new day, the
9 beginning of a new chapter in this case where we can just take
10 the anger and put it aside and focus on how we cure the poison
11 that has infected this case. Challenging, but not impossible.
12 Actually, I think we have a clear path, and the path has been
13 set forth by the defendants themselves. And what we do in
14 order to cure the poison that's in this case in my view is we
15 simply accept the reality of this case, where we find
16 ourselves, and the reality of these defendants and how they've
17 conducted themselves. We'll accept it. We know who they are,
18 we know what they want.

19 What I think we need to do to cure the poison, to
20 fix the corruption that has occurred in this case is simply
21 give these two defendants what they have so obviously been
22 asking of you for going on two-plus years now, and that is the
23 default judgment that they ultimately would rather have than
24 having the consequence of shining light on their company and
25 what's going on in particular in Macau.

1 So what we can't do is allow this to stand. If
2 there's anything we know from the rules of procedure, from the
3 rules of this court, from the rules of the Supreme Court, and
4 from the rules across the land is that parties that behave so
5 badly as the defendants in this case have cannot under any
6 circumstance benefit from that bad behavior. And so we have
7 options available to them -- to us to fix this problem; but
8 ignoring and simply accepting good enough, is what we hear
9 from the defendants today, is not going to cure the problem.

10 So how do we do it? Now, let me take a step back.
11 How do we know that what Las Vegas and Sands China is really
12 angling for in the end of the day is for you to simply do what
13 you need to do so that they don't actually have to stand trial
14 in this case on the merits. How do we know they'd rather
15 serve -- or just be defaulted?

16 First of all let's look at the history of this case
17 very, very briefly. And by history of this case I mean the
18 history of this defense table. That tells us a lot in and of
19 itself. We have had a series of some of the most experienced
20 and skilled and reputable lawyers come in and out of this
21 case, and we have one person who fits all of those
22 characteristics who has been a mainstay, and he's still in
23 this case. All of these lawyers have behaved identically one
24 after another, and they all have behaved identically in
25 relation to this discovery, which is out of their character,

1 out of their own reputation, and out of their own reputation
2 of their law firms. They have come in and acted
3 extraordinarily different than anything we have seen, I
4 personally have seen, from any of them in past dealings.

5 And so the question is why is that. And the answer
6 is very obvious. Every one of them has said to Your Honor in
7 either writing or standing at this podium in one form or
8 another the same exact thing Mr. Peek said when he was on that
9 stand. His words were "constrained," I was constrained, I did
10 what I could do. And I'm paraphrasing Mr. Peek. Take it in
11 context, out of context, that's the theme we've heard from
12 this collection of incredibly talented lawyers that are doing
13 things that they must know cannot and should not be done in
14 civil litigation ever. And they are all doing it, and the
15 reason they're doing it is their client. This is a client-
16 driven strategy, and these lawyers, my prediction, Your Honor,
17 we haven't seen the end of the revolving door of these
18 lawyers. They will either quit, I predict, or they will be
19 fired, I predict; but we will see other lawyers come in and
20 out when this strategy of Las Vegas Sands continues, that they
21 would rather suffer consequences than shine light as the
22 discovery rules require on their company.

23 So what we have here is not -- even as I have argued
24 to you before, this is not someone butting heads with you,
25 this is not somebody who is acting belligerent about their

1 power being greater than yours. This is someone making in my
2 view what it appears by all measures is a business choice, a
3 business choice of lesser evils. Point being there's nothing
4 that can come out of this courtroom by way of sanctions for
5 discovery or even a default judgment that is worse than the
6 consequences on this company of shining light on all of their
7 business practices, both Macau and here. They have made that
8 so crystal clear to us that my suggestion in order to cure the
9 poison in this case is to let them make that business choice.
10 They can say to Your Honor, as they're entitled to say, no,
11 we're not going to give our discovery, no, we're not going to
12 let you see who wrote emails to whom when, where and what it
13 was about, no, we're not going to give Steve Jacobs the
14 evidence he's entitled to prove every aspect of his case,
15 including damage, no, we won't do it. I would assert to Your
16 Honor they're entitled to say that. But there's consequences
17 to that choice, and today is the beginning of those
18 consequences, I hope.

19 So if there's anything we know about this group of
20 defendants is they're not shy. They're not shy about painting
21 themselves as victims, they're not shy about taking advantage
22 of any misstep along the way, and so we can't just simply say
23 that, you're transparent, Las Vegas Sands, it's time to end
24 this charade and enter a default against you; we have to
25 create a record. Because the Supreme Court will look at it

1 and they'll appeal, the defendants will, for as long as they
2 can.

3 So what do we need to do in order to create a
4 record? What do we need to look at in order to show that
5 there is yet another wave of wilful misconduct from these
6 defendants that justifies severe sanctions by way of default,
7 striking answers, striking defenses, and anything else Your
8 Honor deems appropriate?

9 First let's look at where we've been. Your Honor
10 may recall in November of last year, as we were approaching
11 the holiday season, we filed a Rule 37 motion for sanctions.
12 At that time, Your Honor, I'm not sure if you recall, but we
13 were 16 months into the jurisdictional discovery that you
14 ordered. And at the time we filed that motion, by my best
15 count and anyone on either team will correct me if I'm wrong,
16 these monolithic companies with resources that are endless had
17 produced all of 55 pages of documents after 16 months of
18 litigating, 16 months of discovery that you had ordered. And
19 so we had had enough, and we came to Your Honor with our first
20 Rule 37 motion.

21 Your Honor held a hearing on December 18, which was
22 the beginning of what brings us here today. Your Honor may
23 recall what you did at that hearing is you raised the stakes.
24 You raised the stakes. You did not want any ambiguity about
25 prior orders, which you did note that they had violated

1 several of them, but you wanted a clean record, you wanted a
2 clear record, you wanted a clear mandate and instruction to
3 these defendants, you have something to do and you have a date
4 by which you will do it. And your instruction could not have
5 been clearer. You said to these people, to these companies,
6 that on January 4th, two weeks later, quote, "Sands China will
7 produce all information within its possession that is relevant
8 to jurisdictional discovery."

9 Now, every single person in our audience can answer
10 the very simple question, what does it all mean.

11 THE COURT: You can change back to regular lawyer
12 talk now. You bored them so badly, Mr. Pisanelli.

13 MR. PISANELLI: Well, it's only getting better, so
14 too bad they missed it.

15 The point is this, Your Honor. "All" means all.
16 When we're talking about the 55 pages that Sands China had
17 produced at that point, all meant all. And that order, by the
18 way, of course, was preceded by your order of September 14th
19 in which you also made clear not only to the Sands China, who
20 was sitting on their 55-page production at the time, but you
21 also made it clear to both parties, quote, "Las Vegas Sands
22 and Sands China will be precluded from raising the MDPA as an
23 objection or as a defense to admission, disclosure, or
24 production of any documents," all documents produced, nothing
25 about the Macau Data Privacy Act is a defense anymore. You

1 could not have been clearer.

2 Your Honor, at the December 18th, as you may recall,
3 politically we approaching January 1st of this year, which in
4 the politics world was called the fiscal cliff. Everyone was
5 talking about the fiscal cliff during that time period. What
6 you did in this case, my interpretation, was you created this
7 discovery cliff for these defendants. You made it clear that
8 you'd had enough and that January 4th was their cliff day,
9 they can do what you've told them to do for the two years
10 preceding or suffer the consequences with their eyes wide open
11 and with no room for complaint, because you were so crystal
12 clear in your expectation of them.

13 And so we take a look now at what happened on
14 January 4th to determine what is in our record to determine
15 whether the beginning of the end of these defendants is
16 appropriate, that this wilful conduct has continued, and that
17 severe sanctions is now appropriate. Well, I don't think
18 anyone can fairly say anything other than that this group of
19 defendants took the dive, created -- they went right off the
20 cliff on January 4th and did nothing more than create a
21 charade on what they produced. They spent millions of
22 dollars, they say, congratulating themselves on the back, by
23 the way, in making sure that what it was that they produced to
24 us was meaningless and, more importantly, useless, useless to
25 Mr. Jacobs in this case, useless to anyone who might get their

1 hands on it, be it the government, the press, or anyone else
2 that these companies may sue for actually telling the truth
3 about what's going on in this company.

4 So here's the reality. This is the charade.
5 January 4th we find out -- and we find out much of this, by
6 the way, Your Honor, from the self-congratulatory memo that
7 they gave to you telling you and the world what a great job
8 they did over those two weeks. We know that of the twenty
9 custodians that they had been in possession of from us, a list
10 of twenty custodians, they chose six of them, six. They added
11 three of their own, but of the twenty that we gave to them
12 they chose only six to look for records.

13 Now, I don't know about anyone else, but "all" means
14 all. So six isn't all of twenty. Twenty is all of twenty.
15 If there were other people we were -- did not have enough
16 information about to put on that list of twenty, then I would
17 assert to Your Honor they had an obligation to put twenty-plus
18 on the list of custodians they were going to search records
19 for. But to take twenty and pull it back to six and say that
20 that is compliant, "all" doesn't mean all, "all" means a
21 fraction, apparently, in the world of Las Vegas Sands. They
22 were not so graceful, by the way, in their avoidance of some
23 of the most important people on that list, Luis Melo being one
24 of them, the Number Two person on the hit list, didn't seem to
25 make his way onto the list.

1 Now, what is their excuse? Not a shocker. Our
2 fault. My fault, Todd Bice's fault, Debbie Spinelli's fault,
3 we didn't tell them how to do their job, we didn't help them,
4 they say, in figuring out who these people are. That was
5 perhaps one of the most remarkable things that I saw in this
6 reply. And I tagged it. I had to tag it, because in their
7 reply they wrote, quote, "Plaintiff never --" "never" being
8 bolded and italicized, "Plaintiff never provided defendants
9 with a proposed list of custodians or search terms for
10 jurisdictional discovery."

11 Now, perhaps whoever wrote that brief wasn't
12 standing in this courtroom on December 18th when I
13 specifically said, standing at this podium, that we want
14 the custodians from the list from two years ago from Colby
15 Williams. I made it perfectly clear when they raised that
16 same defense in December. And, remarkably, even if the
17 person who wrote that brief was not in this courtroom on
18 December 18th, they only need to look at their own self-
19 congratulatory memo. The same people who just wrote that
20 quote to you in an opposition brief also wrote, "To be sure,
21 at the December 18th, 2012, hearing plaintiff asserted for the
22 first time that he had sent a letter more than two years ago
23 providing a last of relevant custodians." In two different
24 papers filed within days of each other they say, we didn't
25 know, and the other paper they say, we did know. The point of

1 it is of course they knew. They've always known the list.
2 They've had the list for two years.

3 But it doesn't end there. Even when you look at the
4 very few custodians they so conveniently selected, what do
5 they do with them? They conveniently selected which of our
6 requests for production that they wanted to search for. You
7 see on page 9 of our opening motion we set forth a very brief
8 schedule of every one of our requests and how many custodians
9 they actually searched. Some of them are as low as three,
10 some of them we were benefitted where they gave us all six.

11 THE COURT: One you have seven.

12 MR. PISANELLI: Seven. I don't see any of them that
13 had the entire nine, but some of them as little as three.

14 What is remarkable about this exercise, Your Honor,
15 and what certainly shows to all of us that this entire
16 campaign is wilful is we're talking about computer clicks
17 here; right? We have all spent a fortune on both
18 understanding and becoming experts, some of us more than
19 others, on ESI discovery using vendors, how you search, and
20 we're talking about computer clicks of what we're doing for a
21 particular custodian and which requests for production are
22 going to be searched for a custodian. If someone actually
23 doesn't want to go over what I have characterized as the
24 discovery cliff, wouldn't you think they'd just click them
25 all? Wouldn't you think they'd take the entire list of twenty

1 and make sure they searched for all of our requests for
2 production, and if at that point the plaintiffs haven't done
3 the defendants' job well enough by telling them what to do,
4 then at least they've got a better argument that they
5 shouldn't fly off the cliff and that Todd and I and Debbie
6 should do a better job of instructing them how to do their
7 discovery. But they didn't even do that. This doesn't even
8 come close to an argument that this is short of wilful. They
9 know what they're doing, and the reason they're doing it is
10 Mr. Peek's word he told us a while ago, they are and have been
11 and always will be constrained. Constrained by their client,
12 of course.

13 But it gets better. So we get about 5,000 pieces of
14 paper. We've attached 12 to 16, I don't know what they were,
15 in our motion to give you a flavor of what these redactions
16 were. The redactions come in two different categories. I
17 cannot decide which is more offensive, one or the other. The
18 first one is redactions on relevance. Your Honor expressed
19 your views on that last time we were before you, and I can
20 tell you, Your Honor, since you made it so perfectly clear to
21 the one person who stood before you and tried to make that an
22 argument, nothing's changed, nothing was corrected, no
23 relevance redactions were removed even from the time you were
24 so firm in your position about redactions on relevance.

25 The other, of course, was the Macau Data Privacy

1 Act. They redacted on Macau Data Privacy Act. I really can't
2 tell you, as I said, which one surprises me more. If it
3 weren't so disrespectful, it'd be funny.

4 So let me --

5 THE COURT: So you think the word "other" in
6 Footnote Number 12 of my September 14th, 2012, order might
7 mean not the Macau Data Privacy Act?

8 MR. PISANELLI: I think it means what you've said.
9 You've said if there was a -- this is a quote, "a true
10 privilege issue" is what you've said, then of course there can
11 be redactions and privilege logs and challenges, a true
12 privilege issue. There is nothing about the Macau Data
13 Privacy Act that creates a privilege. A constraint perhaps,
14 hurdle perhaps for someone who didn't already violate the
15 rules of this Court and were not already sanctioned stripping
16 them of the ability to do it. You were very clear of what the
17 redactions could be and what they could not be.

18 Now, Your Honor, I have all of these records here
19 for two reasons, one, as you were very clear last time we were
20 here, is you don't want to be looking at someone's computer
21 files to look at one. You said you like paper. Here it is.
22 Here they are. And here's the other reason we --

23 THE COURT: It's only because I just finished a six-
24 month trial where everything was electronic, and I would
25 rather look at paper now.

1 MR. PISANELLI: And I actually am the dinosaur in
2 our firm who likes paper, too. So --

3 But the point is this. This group of defendants
4 congratulated themselves because they said, look, even of the
5 12 or 15, whatever the number was, that were attached to our
6 exhibit they had replaced those, give or take four or five of
7 them. In other words, about 25 percent even in our sampling
8 they said they had gone back and replaced. They're actually
9 congratulating themselves that they got about 75 percent of it
10 right. They didn't, but that's their position.

11 The reason these are all here, Your Honor, is we
12 have 5,000 records. And we could play a game like we did as
13 kids with fanning out a deck of cards and just go pick one.
14 This is -- these were just examples. You can pick one after
15 another after another after another blindly, and you will see
16 the same inappropriate redactions that render this production
17 a waste of paper. They are unintelligible, as you have seen
18 from the deposition transcript of Mr. Leven. He laughed a
19 bit, was frustrated a bit, had no idea what this was. And I
20 got the impression, at least reading from the cold transcript
21 -- I think you get it -- that he thought Mr. Bice was trying
22 to trick him and he was nervous about it. He didn't even know
23 what these things were and couldn't make heads nor tails about
24 them. So let's not be so fast to congratulate ourselves that
25 25 percent failure rate is good enough to overcome this wilful

1 noncompliance issue.

2 But we have to make some other points here. When
3 they tell you that they have fixed some of them -- well, let
4 me take a step back. I apologize. I don't want to miss this
5 point about the Macau Data Privacy Act. I'll get to the
6 fixing of the redactions before I close.

7 They tell you, our mistake, we were confused when
8 Your Honor said -- this is their argument -- that we can't use
9 the Macau Data Privacy Act as a defense to production of a
10 document we didn't know that that would also strip us of the
11 ability to redact it basically down to a blank page and
12 produce it anyway, we thought we could still do that. As if
13 anyone in this courtroom is going to accept that there really
14 is a difference between holding a paper back and redacting it
15 down to zero information. There is certainly too much
16 experience and too much intelligence in this group to think
17 that you somehow would have allows the Macau Data Privacy Act
18 to be a basis for redaction down to zero when you said so
19 clearly that it was no longer a defense to disclosure or
20 production.

21 Now, they tell us in the fix here that, Your
22 Honor, we have gone back and replaced upwards of -- since
23 January 4th, long after the car fell off the cliff, they're
24 still breathing, apparently, and tell us that they have
25 produced about 2100 records -- pages of records that replaced

1 their redactions because they found them in the United States.
2 That admission to me was as shocking as anything we heard for
3 a few reasons. First of all, whether or not the document's in
4 the United States is irrelevant, as we've said, because you
5 can't use the Macau Data Privacy Act as a defense. But, most
6 importantly, Your Honor, if these documents were in the United
7 States, why didn't Las Vegas Sands produce them? We had
8 documents produced to us as replacement documents for the
9 Sands documents that were in the United States that were never
10 produced by the custodians prior to the custodians'
11 depositions. Mike Leven is an example. We deposed Mike
12 Leven, the same search terms -- and I think this applies to
13 Rob Goldstein, as well -- the same exact search terms that
14 they used in Macau they had to use in Las Vegas. So this
15 tells us that they had these records in Las Vegas, in Nevada,
16 but didn't produce them. They only produced them when they
17 got caught with their hand in the cookie jar approaching --
18 I'll mix my metaphors -- approaching the cliff and said, oh,
19 here's some documents we were withholding from you. If they
20 were in the United States, where have they been? We conducted
21 depositions without these records that they knew existed.

22 Let's be clear, by the way, that this 2100 or so
23 still leaves about 60 percent of this mess useless. Useless
24 because of relevance and the Macau Data Privacy Act.

25 And finally on this issue of fixing the problem, no

1 harm, no foul, as I said, we've been severely prejudiced by
2 taking these depositions, we still don't have the records, and
3 January 4th came and gone. We're now months in. Remember,
4 Your Honor told these counsel, no, no more of the meet and
5 confer game, we see what that means, meet and confer, okay,
6 we'll see if we can find something, here's something useless,
7 gotta have another meet and confer, we'll see if we can find
8 you something, here's something useless, wait, you can't file
9 a sanctions motion, gotta have another meet and confer. Your
10 Honor said that doesn't happen after an order, and so you put
11 an end to it. Isn't that what this late, after January 4th,
12 production is doing anyway? They're now replacing this with
13 documents that should have been produced 16 months ago and
14 saying that, this isn't wilful, we're doing our best and no
15 harm, no foul. Well, there's plenty of harm, and there's
16 plenty of foul.

17 So I violated my own promise to you, and I've
18 started to get angry. And let me back up now.

19 Sands China, Your Honor, is very, very clear in its
20 position, a light is not shining on their records, we are not
21 going to open the roof and let the sun shine in, they're not
22 even going to let a little flashlight come in there and let us
23 see these records that we're entitled to in this case. Las
24 Vegas Sands is no better, and they're equally culpable.
25 They're the ones orchestrating this whole thing. And, as

1 we've seen with the replacement documents, they've been
2 holding back documents that were supposed to be produced long
3 ago, as well. Fine. If they are so concerned about what the
4 world will see when these records are produced, then let's
5 just stop this charade. Let's get to a sanctions issue. If
6 Your Honor thinks it's necessary for an evidentiary hearing,
7 we invite it, let's have it.

8 THE COURT: Nevada Power says I have to have an
9 evidentiary hearing if they want me to.

10 MR. PISANELLI: If they want it, then we welcome it.
11 Your Honor, I would -- I'd tell you this. I think that the
12 pattern of behavior here has been so severe and so
13 disrespectful that despite we find ourselves in this case, in
14 the jurisdictional stage, I don't believe that that limit on
15 what we were supposed to do from a debate perspective strips
16 you of your authority to sanction parties for contempt. I
17 think you can go straight to the striking of an answer and
18 let's just have an evidentiary hearing. I know you're not
19 inclined to. My point is in you're empowered to.

20 THE COURT: I've got a limited stay that says
21 I'm only allowed to deal with jurisdictional issues at this
22 point --

23 MR. PISANELLI: I understand. My only point --

24 THE COURT: -- with respect to Sands China.

25 MR. PISANELLI: I understand. My only point is that

1 the violations have been so numerous and so wilful I believe
2 you still hold that power. I understand you're not inclined
3 to exercise all of it yet, but at a minimum I think we should
4 proceed immediately to an evidentiary hearing to strip this
5 Sands China of its defense and any other sanction that you
6 deem appropriate. Because as soon as we do, as soon as merits
7 is opened, mark my words, Your Honor, we're going to go
8 through this again, and we'll end up in a striking of the
9 answer evidentiary hearing against these parties. And it's
10 fine by them. They're spending millions upon millions of
11 dollars to hide records, not produce them. They're not
12 worried about what it is that's going to come out of this
13 courtroom, they're worried about keeping their companies
14 secret and away from public view. And all we ask as the
15 advocates for a plaintiff who's looking for his fair day in
16 this courtroom, let's give them what they want and let's get
17 right to these evidentiary hearings and be done with this
18 charade.

19 THE COURT: Thank you.

20 MR. PISANELLI: Thank you.

21 THE COURT: Mr. Randall Jones.

22 MR. RANDALL JONES: Good morning, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: And are you glad not to be talking about
24 pipe?

25 MR. RANDALL JONES: Well, Your Honor, I will be as

1 soon as I leave here. I have an expert witness on cross-
2 examination, and I have counsel who is covering for me this
3 morning while they're crossing him.

4 THE COURT: Oh. I thought you were dark today on
5 your trial.

6 MR. RANDALL JONES: We were dark yesterday, Your
7 Honor.

8 THE COURT: Oh. Okay.

9 MR. RANDALL JONES: But, Your Honor, I will say
10 this. In light of the -- and, by the way, I would this, as
11 well. I've known Mr. Pisanelli a long time, and I have had
12 many cases with him, and I will say this. He does not
13 disappoint. And I understand Your Honor may have certain
14 beliefs and opinions about what's gone on in this case, but I
15 will say that Mr. Pisanelli has I think made it clear from our
16 perspective that the real motive here is what they're looking
17 for is discovery by tort. They don't want the discovery that
18 they profess so greatly to have been abused by. They don't
19 want it. They -- I don't believe they've ever wanted it.

20 And, Your Honor, I want to go back, step back just
21 for moment and talk about what's going on here from our
22 perspective. And I know this has -- this case has a long
23 history that existed before me, and I know the Court -- and
24 I've read your prior orders and I've read the transcripts, and
25 I understand the Court was -- at least the impression I get is

1 the Court was quite upset. And I've been on both sides of
2 these types of issues in the past in front of Your Honor, but,
3 Judge, I want to focus on what we're talking about. There is
4 a massive amount of information, and from my perspective --
5 and, again, I've only been in this case since September or
6 October and I've been preoccupied with another trial, but I've
7 tried to keep as much up to speed with everything that's going
8 on, I've been trying to attend as many hearings as I can so
9 that I could keep up to speed.

10 I've been in large document production cases before.
11 For Mr. Pisanelli, who has been in those same kind of cases
12 himself before, to suggest that this is an easy process is
13 just false. It's just false. To try to collect this kind of
14 information is extremely difficult whether he wants to
15 acknowledge it or not. And in fact --

16 THE COURT: Mr. Jones, I've been trying to have this
17 information collected for a year and a half. So when I give a
18 two-week deadline to comply because I've run out of options in
19 getting people to comply with what I've asked for less
20 formally than in written orders, I'm frustrated.

21 MR. RANDALL JONES: I understand.

22 THE COURT: You can tell I'm frustrated in this
23 case. But there has to be a way that the jurisdictional
24 discovery and the information that has been subject to the ESI
25 protocol for almost two years should have been produced by

1 now.

2 MR. RANDALL JONES: Your Honor, I understand. And,
3 by the way, I understand your frustration, as well. I also
4 want you to take into account -- because, again, we're talking
5 about Rule 37 sanctions that they're requested. And, again, I
6 think it's now been laid out in the open what their real goal
7 here has been is, look, let's try to set this up, there's
8 clearly been difficulties, they have the defendants at a
9 disadvantage. We have a law we have to comply with as best we
10 can. That is a reality whether we like it, whether this Court
11 likes it, or certainly whether the plaintiffs like it or not.
12 That is a reality.

13 THE COURT: So you missed the argument at 8:30 about
14 -- where this issue came up on a different case involving
15 Macau? Not all defendants in litigation from Macau think the
16 Macau Data Privacy Act affects their discovery obligations.

17 MR. RANDALL JONES: Well, you know, maybe the
18 difference there and this case is we actually made inquiry of
19 the government office to ask them what their position would
20 be, and we got a written response that said, here's what the
21 rule is. And it was only --

22 THE COURT: You got a written response after six
23 months.

24 MR. RANDALL JONES: Your Honor, there's a difference
25 between delay and there are -- in fact, this Court made

1 rulings about the delay issues back in September, and I
2 understood the Court's frustration at that point about the
3 delays that occurred. But there's a difference between delay
4 and a wilful violation of order and the complete frustration
5 of the discovery process. And that's what we're talking about
6 from the plaintiff's perspective. They're saying the
7 discovery process has been completely frustrated, that there
8 is no going back, that you cannot remedy this, that we have
9 been so prejudiced that there is only option, the death
10 penalty.

11 THE COURT: Well, but under the stay I can't give
12 them that. Under any circumstances I could not give them
13 that, because I only have a limited stay that deals strictly
14 with jurisdictional issues.

15 MR. RANDALL JONES: And, Your Honor, I don't
16 disagree with that. But -- again, you're the Judge, but I --

17 THE COURT: I understand what they're saying, but I
18 can't do it.

19 MR. RANDALL JONES: The point is they essentially
20 make the argument that demonstrates our point. So here -- if
21 I may, the standard, as you know, is wilful noncompliance with
22 an order. And first of the order has to be clear and
23 explicit. So I understand your position is that, okay, on
24 January 4th you had that order, South China [sic], you had
25 that order. And, you know, I like Mr. Pisanelli's argument.

1 He giveth with one hand, then he taketh away. He says, I know
2 these lawyers and I know them to be ethical, good lawyers and
3 they wouldn't be doing this except for this particular
4 defendant that put them in this position and Mr. Peek said it
5 himself, I've been constrained. Well, we have been
6 constrained, Your Honor. We've been constrained by a law
7 in a jurisdiction where this company's principal place of
8 business is where they have told us in writing what we can
9 and cannot do. And so in good faith -- which is the other
10 aspect of Rule --

11 THE COURT: Rule 37.

12 MR. RANDALL JONES: -- thank you -- Rule 37
13 sanctions analysis is did we comply in good faith or did we do
14 our best to comply in good faith. And I want to talk about
15 that, because Mr. Pisanelli doesn't want to talk about that.
16 He gives you the general example, he'll give you a sort of a,
17 let me just talk about generally what we think they've done,
18 without actually talking about whether it actually caused a
19 problem.

20 So what I can tell you -- and I do take umbrage and
21 I try not to attack counsel, and I think that the plaintiff's
22 counsel has a history -- there have been a lot of cases where
23 they have come in and they don't try the merits of the case.
24 They try to villainize the opposing party and talk about the
25 party and the bad people they are, sometimes on subjects that

1 have nothing to do with the merits.

2 So I would like to talk for a moment about actually
3 happened here. We did have -- there's correspondence that
4 can't be denied. Let's talk about what was asked of us to do
5 and what we did to try to accomplish in good faith or not.
6 And that's your call. But I would respectfully suggest to you
7 that it was absolutely in good faith. And here's our
8 perspective on good faith.

9 Before we got involved in the case there was
10 correspondence to them that said, look, if we're going to
11 search jurisdictional discovery tell us who you think we need
12 to search. And I heard Mr. Pisanelli -- because they never
13 really tried to respond to that in their papers of saying why
14 they didn't talk to us. Well, he comes up today and says,
15 well, because you knew we -- we wanted all these twenty
16 different people. Well, Judge, you've said it yourself
17 several times and Mr. Pisanelli acknowledged, one of the few
18 things he will acknowledge about this case, is that there is a
19 limitation that has been imposed by the Supreme Court which
20 you have found to be in existence. That is jurisdictional
21 discovery first. They gave us a list of twenty people,
22 custodians, that had to do with merits discovery. By
23 definition those people are not as to this buzz word here
24 "relevant." But should they have thought those twenty people
25 were relevant, meaning are we going to find anything

1 meaningful -- you know, and this gets to another point.
2 They've used the term "document dump" several times in their
3 papers. So what is it, Judge? Did we give them too much
4 information, or not enough? They criticize us for not
5 searching more, but then they accuse us of presenting them
6 with a document dump. We offered to stipulate to many of
7 these jurisdictional issues almost a year ago, and they
8 declined. They declined.

9 THE COURT: That was last summer; right?

10 MR. RANDALL JONES: It was actually I believe last
11 spring, as I recall. And again, I'm not the best historian in
12 this case, so I'll defer to others. But that's my
13 recollection. But the point is that we offered to do that and
14 they declined. So --

15 THE COURT: That was the Munger Tolles slips; right?

16 MR. RANDALL JONES: That was. It was not --

17 THE COURT: Trying to remember the group.

18 MR. PEEK: It was March last year, Your Honor.

19 MR. MARK JONES: March 7, Your Honor.

20 MR. RANDALL JONES: So having --

21 THE COURT: Good job, Mr. Mark Jones.

22 MR. RANDALL JONES: Having said that, Your Honor,
23 the point is that that -- they talk about, we want to shine a
24 clear light on what they're doing here and we see their true
25 motive is that they don't want to ever give this information

1 up. Well, Your Honor, I'm here to tell you as counsel of
2 record and as an officer of this court who I hope has some
3 credibility with this Court that has never been any part of
4 our strategy since we have been involved. And I don't believe
5 for a second it was before. But they -- going back to
6 motives, why wouldn't they stipulate to multiple issues of
7 jurisdictional facts? Why wouldn't they? What is their
8 motivation for refusing to do that? We didn't say we were
9 going to stop them from doing other discovery. So you offer
10 to stipulate, they say no; but then they say, you gave us too
11 many documents but you didn't give us enough, you didn't
12 search enough people.

13 So we went and said, look, here are the people we
14 want to search -- actually, I shouldn't say that. We asked
15 them before the new firms got involved, and there's an email
16 that's never been refuted where Mark Jones was going to Macau
17 with Mr. Lackey, sent another email and said, look, we want to
18 make sure, are we searching enough; and that point alone,
19 Judge, is demonstrative of a lack of a wilful intent to
20 frustrate the process, especially as it relates to custodians.
21 So we said, hey, you want to tell us who else? They could
22 have easily sent in email back. That's all they had to do is
23 send an email back saying, we think all twenty are relevant to
24 the search of jurisdictional discovery. That's all it would
25 have taken. Now, would we have agreed with them? Who knows?

1 We may have, or we may have said, no, we need to get some
2 direction from the Court. They wilfully refused to cooperate.
3 And that has to be taken into account by this Court in making
4 this determination. If they don't cooperate in helping limit
5 or expand the people we're searching, as you know -- I believe
6 you are a student of the Sedona Principles -- as you know,
7 then when they don't do that we have an obligation in good
8 faith -- and this happens every day, every day in every case.
9 When you are tasked as a lawyer for your client you have to
10 make certain judgment calls as to what is appropriate.

11 THE COURT: So why on earth when you're doing the
12 searches with the ESI vendors do you use different custodians
13 for different purposes? Because typically you just run the
14 search for the custodians and the key words.

15 MR. RANDALL JONES: Well, you know, that's an irony
16 here that I think has been lost upon the plaintiffs, and I
17 hope I can make the Court aware of what went on there. We
18 looked at -- and this is I think referenced on page --
19 starting on page 16 of our opposition. We looked at their
20 written discovery on jurisdiction. Because, as you told them
21 many, many months ago, look, discovery is not just going to
22 happen because you want it to happen, you have to propound
23 discovery and you have to tell them what you want. So in good
24 faith we went and looked at that discovery and we said, okay,
25 based upon what they think is relevant, Judge, not what we

1 think is relevant, what they think is relevant that they put
2 to us in written discovery requests. We will then go and look
3 at the most appropriate custodians using the Sedona
4 Principles, because we don't want to be accused of a document
5 dump, and we looked the those custodians in connection with --
6 directly in connection with their written jurisdictional
7 discovery requests, and we came up with eight names, and we
8 started doing the searches. So, to answer your question,
9 Judge, this was not done at random.

10 And since we're on this subject, I want to come back
11 and point out this point Mr. Pisanelli made, because he either
12 doesn't understand it or he's just flat wrong. With respect
13 to the Las Vegas Sands discovery and nonredacted documents --
14 and he made the big point, the proof of the pudding here,
15 Judge, he says, is that they were wilfully withholding this
16 information, Las Vegas Sands obviously had this document or
17 else they couldn't have produced unredacted copies when they
18 got the redacted copies and compared them with what was
19 produced in the Sands China Limited production. Well, Judge,
20 again, a catch 22. Well, the reason, it's a real simple,
21 straightforward reason, there's nothing nefarious, there's
22 nothing improper, and in fact what it is is compliance with
23 our discovery obligations. After the production -- because
24 you've got to remember we don't know who the names are, we
25 could not get that information. So what we did in our

1 continuing discovery obligations, we went to look at our
2 production in Las Vegas Sands to compare it to what we got in
3 the Sands China production that was redacted. And the reason
4 we came up with new hits, because they were different
5 custodians, Your Honor. They're different custodians we
6 looked at in Sands China, so they're different emails.
7 They're all available. That was --

8 So here we are, they're seeking to punish us. It's
9 the old adage, no good deed goes unpunished. And I understand
10 that's stretching the Court's patience with respect to that
11 cliché in this circumstance, but that is in fact a reality,
12 Your Honor. What would they have us do? Would they have us
13 ignore our continuing obligation to produce information after
14 we had the redacted versions and not compare it against what
15 we had from Las Vegas? That would be a wilful violation, it
16 seems to me. And I will tell this Court in every case I've
17 ever had, especially large ESI-type cases, we will continue to
18 probably find information as time goes on it. Presumably the
19 volume will fall to smaller and smaller portions, but you
20 continue to find things. In a case of this magnitude with
21 this many documents it's impossible to get it right the first
22 time. So that is the nefarious motive behind our production
23 of the unredacted copies, continuing our continuing obligation
24 to supplement discovery. That's what we did wrong that they
25 would ask you to grant sanction for.

1 So, Your Honor, I would ask you to take that into
2 consideration in this whole process.

3 Now, with respect to the wilfulness, Judge, we went
4 to Macau. And in fact I'll tell the Court when Mr. Lackey and
5 my brother went to Macau the first time to look at those
6 documents there was a concern that if they, of-of-country
7 lawyers, looked at that stuff they could be subject to
8 criminal penalties themselves. This was information we went
9 after your order in September to try to make sure we did what
10 you wanted us to do. And, Your Honor, look, Mr. Pisanelli's
11 argument -- think about it. The only way he could make that
12 argument is if in fact we were so afraid of actually having
13 merits discovery that we would shoot ourselves in the head.
14 If we were bound and determined to do that, we wouldn't have
15 produced anything on the 4th of January, we wouldn't have
16 spent millions of dollars. And I can tell you I was in the
17 middle of trial and I was involved in that process at the same
18 time. This was late-night meetings, weekend meetings,
19 discussions, trying to make sure we complied with what you
20 wanted us to do on January 4th. And I'm telling you that as
21 an officer of the court, and you can take that for what you
22 think it's worth, Your Honor. But I can tell you here in open
23 court we were pulling out all the stops that we thought we
24 could pull to try to get this done so we would not be in
25 wilful violation of your order.

1 And that brings up another issue, and this is the
2 redaction issue. That is a troublesome issue, Your Honor.
3 There is no doubt about it. It is -- there's no question we
4 cited the place in the brief where it was referenced that
5 you'd said we could still do redactions.

6 THE COURT: Absolutely. My order says that.

7 MR. RANDALL JONES: And you mention it again even on
8 the 8th of February, where you said again, on page 19 of the
9 transcript, "No, Mr. Peek, you can do redactions," and you go
10 on to talk about that. "There is a privilege issue. I would
11 hope you would do redaction." The Court, "My concern is that
12 perhaps the redactions have been overused, but I'm not there
13 yet today, it's just a concern."

14 So, Your Honor, even after the production, based on
15 what you said -- and I wasn't there, but I've read it -- you
16 do have a concern about redactions. And, Your Honor, I'm here
17 to tell you I understand your concern.

18 THE COURT: Here's the footnote in the order, Mr.
19 Jones -- and this is why the redactions were of such concern
20 to me when I heard about them. But since it wasn't an issue I
21 was addressing that day, I simply said it was a concern. The
22 footnote says, "This does not prevent the defendants from
23 raising any other appropriate objection or privilege." And
24 that's what we've had discussions about redactions. I hope
25 that if there is a true privilege issue that it would be

1 handled appropriately. That doesn't mean redactions under the
2 MDPa, which you have been precluded from doing anything with
3 respect to.

4 Now, I certainly understand that Sands China may
5 have obligations with the Macau Government. But because of
6 what's happened in that case, in this particular case you've
7 lost the ability to use that as a defense in any way, shape,
8 or form.

9 MR. RANDALL JONES: Well, Your Honor, my response to
10 that be -- and I hear what you just said and I know the Court
11 understands this, but I think it's necessary to make this
12 point on the record. My client is faced with the proverbial
13 Hobson's choice. It truly is. And in trying to make sure we
14 did not wilfully violate your order and complied with
15 discovery in good faith we did what we did. So the redactions
16 that are there do exist.

17 And, by the way, I would disagree with Mr.
18 Pisanelli's percentages. The way I calculate it is at most
19 10 percent of the documents produced have a redacted vein.
20 But then let's look beyond that. Mr. Pisanelli says that
21 these documents that are redacted are meaningless. He says
22 they are essentially a blank page. They are not a blank page,
23 Your Honor. There are several issues that go directly
24 contrary to that, and I want to talk about that in a couple of
25 respects. One is the subject matter, the substance of the

1 email has not been redacted, so only individual names have
2 been redacted. So you could still -- to suggest that --

3 THE COURT: That is violative of my order, Mr.
4 Jones. And I don't really care that your client is in a bad
5 position with the Macau Government. Your client is the one
6 who decided to take the material out of Macau originally,
7 failed to disclose it to anyone in the court, and then as a
8 sanction for that conduct loses the ability in this case to
9 raise that as an issue. I'm not saying you don't have
10 problems in Macau. I certainly understand you may well have
11 problems in Macau with the Macau Government. I tried to
12 understand the letter you got from the Macau Government. I
13 read it three times. And I certainly understand they've
14 raised issues with you. But as a sanction for the
15 inappropriate conduct that's happened in this case, in this
16 case you've lost the ability to use that as a defense. I know
17 that there may be some balancing that I do when I'm looking at
18 appropriate sanctions under the Rule 37 standard as to why
19 your client may have chosen to use that method to violate my
20 order. And I'll balance that and I'll look at it and I'll
21 consider those issues. But they violated my order.

22 MR. RANDALL JONES: Well, Your Honor, again, I would
23 respectfully state that I was a part of that process, and
24 whether we were being obtuse -- I hope that I'm never obtuse
25 when I'm looking at a Court's transcript or order -- that when

1 we talked about redactions as it related to those we certainly
2 didn't intend to wilfully violate your order. I will tell you
3 that, and you can take that for what it's worth coming from
4 me. We've appeared before you many times. I would not ever
5 tell a client to wilfully violate any court's order, and
6 certainly, Your Honor, I have great respect for you, I would
7 not ever suggest that a client of mine do that intentionally.
8 And that's just period. I would never do that. And I
9 certainly didn't think we were doing that at the time. We
10 were trying to thread a needle, I certainly agree we were
11 trying to do that, and we hope we have accomplished that. And
12 I understand what you just said.

13 Having said that, I would ask you to consider this.
14 With respect to this whole point about a blank page and the
15 information that they don't have, first of all, this goes back
16 to this issue of document dump. We have grossly overproduced
17 what could possibly be relevant, because we didn't want to
18 base it on relevance, and the jurisdictional discovery out of
19 a fear of the very kind of thing that's going on here, that
20 they would ask for the death penalty or some other extreme
21 sanction because they are trying to get, from our perspective,
22 not discovery, they're trying to get jurisdiction by tort or
23 essentially put us in a position because of some of the
24 history that's occurred in this case so that they could ask
25 you for the death penalty. And we know that's what happened.

1 We heard it today. Mr. Pisanelli has now made it public what
2 we all suspected to be the case.

3 So then we have to go back and look at what was the
4 alleged harm assuming there was a violation of this Court's
5 order. The harm was they didn't get the exact name of a
6 person in an email. They got all the other information, they
7 got the date, they got a log that told them who the email was
8 from and who it was to. So from a jurisdictional standpoint
9 when you look at the subject you could see this came from this
10 company to that company or it was an internal email or it was
11 to a third party and here's what was discussed in that email.

12 So it would seem to me that -- we're talking about
13 wilful conduct -- they have not come forth and shown you
14 anyplace that -- in fact they did give you several examples of
15 these emails that have been redacted, and we came forward and
16 said, oh, guess what, we found the majority of them, we found
17 the duplicates in the Las Vegas Sands documents, and, by the
18 way, show us, Plaintiff, where any of these emails have
19 prejudiced you. In fact, Mr. Pisanelli said today, we didn't
20 get these emails for the depositions we took. I have yet to
21 hear him tell you how, verbally or in writing, that prejudiced
22 their ability in the deposition. And I suspect on reply he's
23 going to get up here and say, well, it's blank, or, it's
24 unintelligible, Mr. Leven -- and I wanted to get to that,
25 because they used Mr. Leven as their great example of how

1 these things are unintelligible even to one of these
2 custodians. Well, Your Honor, I would just ask this Court to
3 use -- think about this in the context of one of the stock
4 jury instructions that this Court gives to every jury that
5 ever -- civil jury that it ever swears in. Use your common-
6 sense, everyday experiences. So in context of Mr. Leven
7 seeing an email that is a subject matter he may have nothing
8 to do with in the company or the date that may have occurred
9 years before from one of the highest executives in the company
10 that whether it had the names on it or not, would you
11 reasonably expect that senior executive to know what that
12 email was culled out of hundreds of thousands of emails that
13 may have absolutely nothing to do with his daily business, and
14 even if it did, if it was something that occurred years before
15 on a minor matter, would you reasonably expect him to recall
16 what that email was about.

17 So from our perspective, Your Honor, this is
18 something -- nothing but a setup attempt by the plaintiffs
19 because they don't want to get into jurisdictional discovery.
20 This is perfect end run for them, hey, we've got them now,
21 they redacted and they didn't -- and then they produced stuff
22 even though they have a continuing obligation to produce after
23 the January 4th date, we've got them, let's go for the death
24 penalty. It makes clear -- you talk about motives being
25 apparent. Their motive is apparent. They can't even decide

1 what their jurisdictional legal arguments are.

2 And, you know, I'm going to quote my father, because
3 there's very few times that I recall this -- and it's a pretty
4 standard cliché that we've heard as lawyers, except my father
5 had an interesting twist on it that I've never heard from
6 anybody else. And my dad used to say, you know, when you
7 don't have the law you argue the facts, and when you don't
8 have the facts you argue the law --

9 THE COURT: Is that where Drake Delanoy got that
10 thing?

11 MR. RANDALL JONES: Well, actually, Your Honor, this
12 is a twist my father had on it that I always thought was most
13 appropriate, and when you don't have either one of them, you
14 drag a skunk around the courtroom.

15 THE COURT: That one I haven't heard before, Mr.
16 Jones. That's good.

17 MR. RANDALL JONES: And if that cliché ever applied,
18 this is the case.

19 So, Your Honor, Mr. Pisanelli I know gets to get up
20 here and he gets to make his reply and say all the reasons why
21 what I just told you is not true. The fact of the matter is
22 all you have to do is look at our brief and look at the
23 attachments to it, and every single thing Mr. Pisanelli just
24 told you in his opening remarks is refuted and does not rise
25 to the level of wilful misconduct. We had a good-faith belief

1 in the custodians we chose, we had a good-faith belief in the
2 language of your order with respect to July 4th [sic], and I
3 understand you disagree with that, but I'm telling you we
4 believed we had the right to do that, and we felt even more
5 reassured when we saw the language that you mentioned in your
6 -- at the hearing on February 8th. So --

7 And then I would add this last point, Your Honor.
8 Where have they demonstrated -- other than hyperbole and
9 vitriolic rhetoric, where have they demonstrated to you any
10 real actual harm to them other than delay? And the delay that
11 was occasioned was resolved on January 4th, with the exception
12 of our continuing obligations to supplement, which we did as
13 timely as we possibly could. And, again, other than rhetoric,
14 there's been no statement and no showing of any real prejudice
15 to the plaintiff as a result of our production and the manner
16 in which we produced it. Was it slow? Undeniably. In a
17 perfect world could we have done it better? Perhaps. But I
18 will tell you, Your Honor, and we have the affidavits and the
19 statement of counsel of what we did try to do to make sure we
20 did comply with what you wanted us to do, and we continue to
21 represent to you that we will continue to try as best we can
22 to respond to these discovery issues.

23 And, Your Honor, we see no reason, in spite of the
24 rhetoric and the hyperbole, that the jurisdictional hearing
25 cannot go forward. Until they can show you specifically why

1 any of these redactions will inhibit their ability to do the
2 hearing on jurisdictional discovery, then we think certainly
3 the burden is on them in a Rule 37 motion to show you exactly
4 how it's interfered with their ability to go forward. It may
5 have slowed it down, and there are certainly ways the Court
6 can address that. We thought you addressed that in September,
7 and then you gave us a deadline. And we thought we've
8 complied with that. And we understand your issue about the
9 redactions, but we don't see how, and we certainly don't
10 believe they've demonstrated how, that has inhibited or
11 interfered with their ability to go forward with the
12 jurisdictional motions, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Okay. Before you sit down pull the
14 motion at Tab 11.

15 MR. RANDALL JONES: Of our --

16 THE COURT: Their motion. It's an email with a
17 bunch of redactions. I want to ask you some questions.

18 MR. RANDALL JONES: Okay.

19 (Pause in the proceedings)

20 THE COURT: And you guys can huddle together if you
21 want, because this may be a group question, as opposed to a
22 Randall Jones question.

23 MR. RANDALL JONES: Well, let me see if can respond
24 to it, Your Honor, and I'll defer to counsel if they have any
25 other additional comment.

1 THE COURT: Okay. Here's my question. This is an
2 email -- and I'm not going to go too much into the substance
3 of it because it might have privacy issues, who knows. It
4 appears to be an email from Macau seeking direction on how to
5 proceed with a proposed solution to a problematic financial
6 transaction. That's what it appears to be. I can't tell
7 that, though; because, with the exception of the email address
8 that says, @venetian.com I don't have any other information as
9 to who it is, and somebody named David who's involved in this.
10 And the purpose of the jurisdictional discovery is to try and
11 determine what that connection was for some of those issues.
12 Or at least that's what I thought we were doing. So that's
13 why the redactions give me so much concern, Mr. Jones.

14 MR. RANDALL JONES: Well, and, Your Honor, I
15 understand your point. And, again, let me -- because,
16 candidly, I've been a little preoccupied with other things.

17 THE COURT: You're in trial, I know and I
18 understand.

19 MR. RANDALL JONES: Let me get with counsel.

20 (Pause in the proceedings)

21 MR. RANDALL JONES: Actually, Your Honor, Mr. Lackey
22 had the obvious answer and one I'd even spoke about before,
23 and I think that's -- that's our point on this issue.

24 THE COURT: Which is?

25 MR. RANDALL JONES: If you have -- if you have the

1 log under Tab M, I believe, of our documents, and I --
2 THE COURT: I'm there. Max just sent me there.
3 MR. RANDALL JONES: And --
4 THE COURT: And then go to document 102981 on the
5 log maybe?
6 MR. RANDALL JONES: Yes, Your Honor. The point
7 being is that it doesn't necessarily matter who the individual
8 was. When you know who the sender was and who the recipient
9 was that's the critical information you need to make a
10 jurisdictional decision based upon the point you made, there
11 -- the substance of that email is there. They're talking
12 about this repayment. So, again, does it make a difference
13 who the actual sender was if you know who the entity was that
14 was sending it and who the entity was that was receiving it?
15 THE COURT: Well, unfortunately for all of us, this
16 particular document is not on the log. I'm on page 13 of 163.
17 MR. RANDALL JONES: Let's see.
18 THE COURT: Unless, of course, the log isn't in
19 numerical order, which --
20 MR. RANDALL JONES: This may have been --
21 THE COURT: -- would make my life really hard.
22 (Pause in the proceedings)
23 MR. RANDALL JONES: Your Honor, let me --
24 THE COURT: And I picked this one totally at random,
25 Mr. Jones.

1 MR. RANDALL JONES: Oh, I understand, Your Honor.

2 MR. PEEK: Your Honor, it should be on the log.

3 MR. RANDALL JONES: Yeah, it should be on there.

4 THE COURT: Yeah. I'm not saying it shouldn't be,
5 I'm just saying it isn't on the log, because --

6 MR. PEEK: And what I'm also not sure of is whether
7 it may have also been produced in an unredacted form, too.

8 THE COURT: It may have been.

9 MR. RANDALL JONES: And that's the question, Your
10 Honor, I was having, is if it was produced in an unredacted
11 form because six of the -- or I think nine of the --

12 MR. PEEK: Of the 15.

13 MR. RANDALL JONES: -- of the 15 they submitted were
14 ultimately produced in unredacted form. So if it was produced
15 in unredacted form, it would not be on the log.

16 THE COURT: Mr. Bice, do you know? I'm on
17 Exhibit 11 to your motion. Was it produced in unredacted form
18 to the best of your knowledge? And I know I'm testing you.

19 MR. BICE: I don't know.

20 THE COURT: All right.

21 MR. BICE: But it wouldn't surprise me that --
22 because this log is created after this date, if you look at
23 the log date. They created this log on February 7th, so it
24 maybe that's why it's omitted. I don't know for sure.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Bice.

1 MR. BICE: Thank you.

2 THE COURT: All right. I'm done with my exercise in
3 futility, Mr. Jones. Thank you.

4 MR. RANDALL JONES: Thank you, Your Honor.

5 MR. PEEK: Your Honor, I just -- I only have a brief
6 statement to make. And I don't want to really say anything,
7 but because there were certain accusations that were made --

8 THE COURT: I didn't hear a single accusation about
9 you.

10 MR. PEEK: Well -- yeah. I just want to make sure
11 that by not --

12 THE COURT: I didn't hear a single accusation.

13 MR. PEEK: Good. Because I didn't want to say
14 anything on behalf Las Vegas Sands --

15 THE COURT: I'm just going to let you --

16 MR. PEEK: -- here because this is not directed at
17 me.

18 THE COURT: Go sit down.

19 MR. PEEK: Thank you.

20 THE COURT: Mr. Pisanelli.

21 MR. PISANELLI: One might question whether that
22 committee we just witnessed made our point on a document they
23 produced and they had a caucus and couldn't figure out what it
24 was, where you can find it, who sent it, who it went to, or if
25 it's on a log, and what it was supposed to tell us. Your

1 Honor picked out a good one in the sense that you can't tell
2 anything about it.

3 Now, Mr. Jones --

4 THE COURT: And it may relate to jurisdictional
5 issues because of the content of it.

6 MR. PISANELLI: Right. And here's the point about
7 Mr. Jones -- what he was dancing around was the issue of
8 relevance; right? He kept saying, all we need to know is
9 where it came from, you don't need to know the people, et
10 cetera. And my point is of course we do. We're talking about
11 jurisdiction here. We're talking about debates of whether
12 executives from Las Vegas have managerial control and
13 direction over the operations of that company or vice versa.
14 It couldn't be more relevant in a jurisdictional debate of who
15 these emails are coming to, who they're from, what they're
16 talking about, and how, if at all, this email reflects upon
17 the contacts that this company has with Las Vegas.

18 It's also important to point out, with due respect
19 to Mr. Jones, he spoke of many topics of which he just clearly
20 doesn't know what he was talking about. I don't believe for
21 one moment he's trying to mislead you, but he'd said some very
22 demonstrably false things. For instance, he tried to give you
23 the impression, Your Honor, that all we had to do is connect
24 the dots, that if we had this redacted email we could sit in
25 front of a witness for a deposition -- by the way, that had

1 already been conducted -- but we could sit with this
2 deposition that's been redacted look at the privilege log and
3 fill in the holes. What he doesn't apparently know is that
4 the privilege log doesn't give those names. The privilege log
5 gives Employee 1, Employee 2, designations of that sort, which
6 is no different than a blank piece of paper once again. We
7 never doubted for one minute that someone who is using a
8 venetian.com email address was a employee. That didn't tell
9 us anything that it's Employee 1 or Employee 2.

10 He also spoke about a topic of these custodians
11 which reflected a lack of knowledge, saying that these were
12 completely new custodians. Well, they're not new custodians,
13 Your Honor. The custodians for Las Vegas Sands, including Mr.
14 Leven and Mr. Goldstein were the custodians and used the same
15 exact search terms for LVS in their production. It wasn't
16 until they had to go back now and replace documents that we
17 see documents from existing custodians being produced for the
18 very first time after those gentlemen have already been
19 deposed. You notice Mr. Jones never answered that question to
20 you. Why was it that custodians that we had asked for that we
21 had deposed ended up producing documents only as replacement
22 documents to Sands China and not in Las Vegas Sands's original
23 production? And these are key emails. There was no answer,
24 because he doesn't have one.

25 There is also noticeable silence from Mr. Jones on

1 the point that I made about our list. He seemed to still be
2 embracing this concept that they didn't know, they didn't
3 know. I can read it to them again. I can read his own self-
4 congratulatory memo to you in January of this year where they
5 said they knew that I said from this podium I wanted the
6 twenty custodians in the letter from Colby Williams. Of
7 course they knew. And he also didn't tell you whether or not,
8 Your Honor, that they actually had researched those custodians
9 but just didn't produce them. I would ask Mr. Jones to stand
10 up right now and confirm for Your Honor whether his company
11 has researched and reviewed the emails from Louis Melo. I am
12 certain I know the answer to that question, but I would love
13 to hear from Las Vegas Sands or from Sands China of whether
14 they have researched Louis Melo's emails and why we don't have
15 any of them.

16 THE COURT: Mr. Pisanelli, please direct your
17 comments to me.

18 MR. PISANELLI: I'm sorry. That's true. I
19 apologize, Your Honor. But the point being, where is it, why
20 haven't they been searched, and where are the records?

21 He also speaks from a lack of knowledge about this
22 concept of a stipulation. He told you that his predecessor
23 counsel had offered to stipulate to all of this and we
24 rejected it because of our improper motive in this case. What
25 he doesn't know is that that stipulation was so self serving

1 as to be laughable, frankly, a stipulation with a few events
2 of contacts but not even touching upon how broad the contacts
3 were. And, contrary to what Mr. Jones said, it was in
4 substitution of discovery. That's why his predecessor counsel
5 wanted to do the stipulation in the first place, to keep us
6 from deposing their executives.

7 THE COURT: Well, and he thought the hearing would
8 be shorter.

9 MR. PISANELLI: I'm sorry?

10 THE COURT: And he said he thought the hearing would
11 be shorter.

12 MR. PISANELLI: Well, it would be shorter, sure, if
13 they gave us no facts that were useful to us and we weren't
14 entitled to any discovery. We probably would have had a
15 20-minute losing evidentiary hearing had we agreed to that.
16 So I can't blame them for offering it, but I do question how
17 they can criticize us for saying no. Put in our shoes, I have
18 no doubt every lawyer in this room would have made the same
19 choice.

20 Now, nothing unique at all about the defense, the
21 overriding theme that we see in the papers, the overriding
22 theme we heard in oral argument that our motive is to -- is
23 discovery or victory by tort. Every single litigant who is
24 caught violating rules who is facing sanctions says the same
25 exact thing. As creative and artful as Mr. Jones is, this one

1 is an old, tired excuse from every single litigant who isn't
2 playing by the rules, oh, Your Honor, they're afraid of the
3 merits. Well, if this team was so interested in the merits,
4 one would question why they just don't produce what it is they
5 have, why it is they just don't comply with your orders as
6 they're obligated to do.

7 Now, he also speaks completely out of school in what
8 he claimed to be an exception to his practice by attacking our
9 motives and our practice. What he doesn't know about any
10 other case where discovery sanctions were issued --

11 THE COURT: I don't want to talk about those other
12 cases that I was the settlement judge. I --

13 MR. PISANELLI: All I was going to say is that you
14 know all about the case.

15 THE COURT: I don't want to know about it --

16 MR. PISANELLI: That was the funny part about it.

17 THE COURT: -- because I was the settlement judge.

18 MR. PISANELLI: Fair enough. That's my point. He
19 doesn't know that you know all about it. So we'll leave it
20 alone.

21 The long short of it is, Your Honor, he tells you --
22 do you have that case tabbed? He tells you that, sure,
23 there's been some delay, no harm, no foul, Your Honor, what's
24 the big deal. I'll tell you what the big deal is. We have
25 been waiting now for two years. We have been struggling and

1 spending attorneys' fees, we've been wasting our time deposing
2 -- deposing principals not knowing that they're hiding
3 records. We now will have to duplicate those depositions
4 again because of this behavior.

5 Our Supreme Court told us in the Temora Trading case
6 versus Perry that, "Terminating sanctions are proper where the
7 normal adversary process has been halted due to an
8 unresponsive party, as diligent parties are entitled to be
9 protected against interminable delay and uncertainty and
10 resolution of illegal tactics." In other words, hiding
11 discovery, making a case go forward only to be duplicated
12 because of tactics of this sort is the exact type of discovery
13 -- I'm sorry, sanction that Rule 37 and the cases interpreting
14 it are intended to cover. They is nothing here about no harm,
15 no foul. We have at best, at best, a client that has known
16 what it has been doing, and it has done everything it can to
17 halt the process. It has unlimited funds. Sanctions,
18 monetary sanctions have been meaningless to it so far. All
19 that is left at this point, I believe, is an evidentiary
20 hearing to resolve -- an evidentiary hearing not to resolve
21 the jurisdiction, but an evidentiary hearing to resolve this
22 sanction motion in which this defense of lack of personal
23 jurisdiction on behalf of Sands China and any other sanctions
24 that you deem appropriate should be ordered. They lost. Just
25 like they lost the right to hide behind the Macau Data Privacy

1 Act, they lost the right to contest jurisdiction with the
2 manner in which they've conducted themselves.

3 THE COURT: Thanks.

4 I have a couple of concerns and I'm going to tell
5 you guys and we're going to address these in a different
6 hearing. The two concerns that I have are the redactions.
7 The redactions, especially the ones that have the word
8 "personal" on them, appear to be violative of my order. And
9 while there may be a very good business reason that has
10 generated that decision, it is still a violation of my order,
11 and I need to have a hearing related to that as to the degree
12 of wilfulness and the prejudice related to those redaction
13 issues.

14 With respect to the search and selection of the
15 custodian issues I am going to order that the custodians that
16 are identified in Exhibit 6 to the motion, which is the twenty
17 people in the letter, be searched, and that then if there are
18 true privilege issues, that you may do a redaction and a
19 privilege log. But other than that, you should produce the
20 information. I certainly understand if you believe an issue
21 does not go to jurisdictional discovery that there may be an
22 appropriate objection related to that particular production.
23 But it requires you to do the search. You can't do the search
24 until you -- you can't make the decision until you've done the
25 search of the documents.

1 So I'm going to have a hearing. And at my
2 evidentiary hearing I'm going to make a couple determinations.
3 I'm going to make a determination as to the degree of
4 wilfulness, I'm going to make a determination as to whether
5 there has been prejudice, and, if there has been prejudice,
6 the impact of the prejudice. And if I make a determination
7 that there has been prejudice, then I'm going to talk about an
8 appropriate sanction.

9 So under those circumstances when are you going to
10 be done with Suen case and ready to have such a hearing?

11 MR. PISANELLI: Suen is intended to go through
12 April.

13 MR. PEEK: Yeah. What -- we just talked to the
14 judge, Your Honor. We start the 25th, and we're scheduled
15 really for six weeks on his trial calendar.

16 THE COURT: Okay.

17 MR. PEEK: The case tried for six weeks previously.

18 THE COURT: I know. I'm -- you know, I'm just
19 frustrated. Not your fault. I have to resume the Planet
20 Hollywood case, the last part of it, the week of April 29th.
21 So would you guys be ready to go the week of May 13th on this
22 hearing?

23 MR. RANDALL JONES: What date, Your Honor?

24 THE COURT: The week of May 13th.

25 MR. RANDALL JONES: May 13th?

1 THE COURT: That week.

2 MR. RANDALL JONES: I have --

3 THE COURT: Because you'll be done in March. Judge
4 Johnson --

5 MR. RANDALL JONES: Oh, no, I'll be done.

6 THE COURT: -- says you're trial's going to be done
7 in March. And then they've got to try the Suen case and
8 they'll be done at the end of April. So if I can get you guys
9 in the week of May 13th, maybe I can make things work out.

10 MR. PEEK: Well, since this involves Mr. Jones, I
11 mean, that's his decision, Your Honor, on May 13th.

12 MR. RANDALL JONES: I --

13 MR. PEEK: I mean, I certainly want to be here for
14 that.

15 THE COURT: I'm not just --

16 MR. RANDALL JONES: Sooner the better.

17 THE COURT: I'm asking the entire group of people.

18 MR. RANDALL JONES: That's fine, Your Honor.

19 MR. PEEK: The question is Mr. Pisanelli.

20 THE COURT: He's looking. He settled the Whittemore
21 case, so now that opened up that --

22 MR. PEEK: He's got lots of time.

23 THE COURT: Because that trial was supposed to be
24 going then. And you settled the Newton case, or got the
25 Newton case resolved in Bankruptcy Court, so you --

1 MR. PEEK: No, I haven't gotten it resolved in
2 Bankruptcy Court, Your Honor. It's actually just as bad in --

3 THE COURT: I heard it's being sold, the Ranch is
4 being sold.

5 MR. PEEK: It is, Your Honor. But actually we have
6 motion to remand the non parties back to you being heard on
7 the 29th, so it's going to come back to you, I believe.

8 THE COURT: And then you'll ask me for a
9 preferential trial setting again because they're older.

10 MR. PEEK: I will based upon the age of the -- both
11 plaintiff and defendants, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Just let me know when something happens
13 that I need to react to.

14 MR. PEEK: I will, Your Honor.

15 MR. PISANELLI: That week works.

16 THE COURT: All right. So how long do you think
17 you're going to need for this hearing?

18 MR. PISANELLI: Two days.

19 THE COURT: Okay. What two days of that week would
20 you like to use?

21 MR. PEEK: Does the week start on the 13th? Is that
22 what you're saying, Your Honor? I just want to make sure.

23 THE COURT: The week starts on Monday, May 13th,
24 2013.

25 MR. PEEK: I would like Monday and Tuesday, Your

1 Honor.

2 THE COURT: Okay. The problem with that is I can't
3 start until 1:00 on Monday because I do my Business Court
4 settlement conferences on Monday mornings still. So if you
5 think you can get it done in a day and a half or if you think
6 you may need to go into Wednesday, that's fine, I'll just --
7 I've got to write the number of days down so I don't set
8 something at the same time.

9 MR. PEEK: Why don't we do Monday -- start Monday
10 afternoon and go through Wednesday, Your Honor?

11 THE COURT: Is that okay with you Mr. Pisanelli and
12 Mr. Bice? Yes, Judge, that's great.

13 MR. BICE: Yes, Judge, that's great.

14 THE COURT: Okay. So you're 5/13 through 5/15.

15 MR. PISANELLI: What did we just agree to?

16 MR. PEEK: Your Honor, may I ask for some
17 clarification here, because --

18 THE COURT: As much as you want, Mr. Peek.

19 MR. PEEK: Thank you. And this is probably more Mr.
20 Jones's clarifications. But do I understand on -- it says,
21 your redactions appear to violative of your order. Are you
22 then saying to us that the 25,000 pages that we produced, we
23 go back and take the redactions off, or that's the subject
24 matter of whether you believe there's a degree of wilfulness?

25 THE COURT: I will tell you what has happened in

1 other cases where I have identified problems with discovery
2 and set these evidentiary hearings. Some people go back and
3 do some work and then they can say, gosh, there's not so much
4 prejudice and a monetary sanction would be appropriate. And
5 then we have a discussion about whether that's true or not.
6 But that requires you to go back and do that work. I'm not
7 ordering you to do that.

8 MR. PEEK: That's -- that really was my question.

9 THE COURT: I'm --

10 MR. PEEK: Because I don't violative of another
11 order. Because I don't think I'm in violation of the first
12 order, but I don't want to be --

13 THE COURT: You and I have a difference of opinion
14 about --

15 MR. PEEK: We do.

16 THE COURT: -- that conversation. But with respect
17 to the custodians I've ordered you to do that.

18 MR. PEEK: Well, that's the next question that's
19 going to come up, is that now you're ordering us to search
20 twenty -- the twenty custodians on --

21 THE COURT: That were identified --

22 MR. PEEK: -- their merits discovery -- I just want
23 to make clear, the twenty custodians on their merits discovery
24 requests.

25 THE COURT: The twenty custodians identified on the

1 July 20th, 2011 --

2 MR. PEEK: Which is merits discovery.

3 THE COURT: I understand.

4 MR. PEEK: And you're saying that those should be
5 inclusive for jurisdictional discovery and we should search
6 those. And then I guess you will determine whether we should
7 or should not redact for personal data, names.

8 THE COURT: No. I've told you you can't redact for
9 personal data --

10 MR. PEEK: Okay. I just want to make sure. You're
11 saying --

12 THE COURT: -- but if you decide that because of
13 your risks in Macau you want to redact for personal data, then
14 I weigh that in my wilfulness balancing of issues.

15 MR. PEEK: Or we may come back to you and say in an
16 appropriate objection, appropriate motion or something, or we
17 just do. And then you weigh that on -- is that what I
18 understand?

19 THE COURT: What I'm trying to convey to you, and I
20 hope this is really clear is, I am not ordering you to produce
21 at this time documents responsive to the ESI search that you
22 do that would only relate to merits discovery. If you choose
23 to withhold those at this time, great. It's --

24 MR. PEEK: Choose to withhold those. What do you
25 mean "those"? I don't know what "those" is.