```
K8KZZHEACGM
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
3
      ELYSIUM HEALTH, INC.,
                     Plaintiff,
 4
5
                                                17 CV 7394 (LJL)
                 V.
                                                Telephone Conference
6
      CHROMADEX, INC.,
 7
                     Defendant.
8
                                               New York, N.Y.
9
                                                August 20, 2020
                                                9:31 a.m.
10
      Before:
11
                            HON. LEWIS J. LIMAN,
12
                                                District Judge
13
                                APPEARANCES
14
      FRANKFURT KURNIT KLEIN & SELZ PC
15
           Attorneys for Plaintiff
      BY: TIFFANY CATERINA
16
           CRAIG BRIAN WHITNEY
                  -and-
17
      KAPLAN HECKER & FINK LLP
      BY: JOHN CHARLES QUINN
18
      LTL ATTORNEYS LLP
19
           Attorneys for Defendant
      BY: JOEDAT H. TUFFAHA
20
           OMAR HANI TUFFAHA
           PRASHANTH CHENNAKESAVAN
21
22
23
24
25
```

(The Court and all parties appearing telephonically) 1 THE COURT: Good morning. This is Judge Liman. 2 3 Have you had a chance to give the parties the relevant 4 instructions? 5 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes, Judge. 6 THE COURT: Who do we have on for the plaintiff? 7 MR. J. TUFFAHA: Good morning, your Honor. This is Joedat Tuffaha. I'm here with my colleagues, Prashanth 8 9 Chennakesavan and Omar Tuffaha on behalf of ChromaDex, Inc. 10 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Tuffaha. Who do we have that will be speaking for defendant? 11 12 MR. WHITNEY: Good morning, your Honor. You have 13 Craig Whitney, from Frankfurt Kurnit, on behalf of Elysium. 14 With me is Tiffany Caterina from Frankfurt Kurnit, and John Quinn from Kaplan Hecker. 15 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Whitney. Good morning, 16 17 colleagues. 18 So, Mr. Tuffaha is here on your application with respect to discovery. Can you tell me where you stand with 19 20 respect to that? 21 MR. J. TUFFAHA: Yes, your Honor. 22 So, there are three issues identified in our motion to 23 Actually, on issue one, we had some recent 24 communications with opposing counsel, and related to the issue 25 of advertising, your Honor.

Specifically, I think at the core of our dispute related to discontinued advertising on certain platforms that Elysium used, including Facebook, we actually heard from opposing counsel on Tuesday evening that they have actually determined that they are able to search their archives for deleted ads, and we did have a bit of a back and forth, counsel proposed that we meet and confer regarding search terms so that we can go through those archives, which we're fine with; however, they conditioned that on reciprocity, and doing the same with respect to archives.

We objected to that, your Honor. Our client's ads have never been put at issue in any sort of meet-and-confer correspondence. There has never been any deficiency identified regarding our produced ads, so we do not believe it is appropriate to condition the search on reciprocity here. We are willing to, your Honor, pursue that solution.

There are other platforms, as well, your Honor, that Elysium advertised on, I believe Instagram, Twitter, there are web pages. So, we would ask that that saved, sort of, search for deleted advertisements be conducted as to those platforms, as well.

THE COURT: Okay. What's issue number two?

MR. J. TUFFAHA: Issue number two, your Honor, refers
to something called Zendesk. It's a database that holds
Elysium's customer communications. Those are communications to

customers and from customers. Elysium agreed to produce these prior to our initial document discovery cutoff back in February. When they were not produced, we reached out in March identifying the deficiency.

Opposing counsel, at that point, had indicated that there were some issues in terms of downloading that data, and subsequently notified us that, due to the pandemic and the issues they were dealing with regarding the data, they are now unable to retrieve that data because they would have to go into their office, and their offices are closed right now.

We think this is key to our case in the sense it's a false advertising case. So, communications from consumers clearly go to consumer confusion. Communications from Elysium would go to mens rea and intent, which is relevant to the materiality, it would be relevant to travel, damages, and attorney fees, if we can show some sort of intentionality. So, we do believe that these types of key things are critical to our case, given they should have been produced back in February.

We would need to find some solution here, and at a minimum, Elysium moved the Court for some sort of extension here, given the upcoming discovery deadline, because the alternative of them not producing anything --

THE COURT: Let me ask you about that. Isn't that issue readily addressed by me granting an extension of the

discovery deadline? Isn't that, in fact, the only thing that I could do, given the assertion that, based on the pandemic, Elysium can't recover the information?

MR. J. TUFFAHA: I think that's correct, your Honor. We certainly don't want to force anybody to go into their office during the pandemic. I'm here in LA. I know there are still restrictions. I don't know what the situation is in New York, but, again, we are sympathetic to the pandemic, and that would, I think, be at least one solution.

THE COURT: This will be a question for Elysium, also, but in your minds, what kind of an extension would you need with respect to the fact discovery or, put another way, after the date by which Elysium produces the information from Zendesk, how much time would you need to complete fact discovery?

MR. J. TUFFAHA: Yes, I think we would want to use that information, at least at the 30(b)(6) deposition, and potentially at the fact witness deposition, depending on what we find. So, I think, I think around 30 days would probably be sufficient.

THE COURT: Okay. You want to go to issue number three? Is issue number three still a live issue?

MR. J. TUFFAHA: Yes. Issue number three, your Honor, back in March, when we received the production, we noticed there were really low counts for key custodians of Elysium, and

these are senior executives who were responsible for advertising, marketing, and quality assurance, and we had some back and forth.

Subsequently, we've received some third-party discovery from PR in marketing entities, and Elysium manufactured it, and it did confirm there is a deficiency here.

We attached a few examples to our motion. There are several others that we have. For example, there is one vendor, Brew, who was a PR company that Elysium worked closely with. We have hundreds of communications between that PR firm and an individual named Chris Castro, who was a senior marketing executive at Elysium responsible for getting ad strategy for evaluating the truthfulness of that, including Victoria Davis, who is the head of advertising.

We also have, I think, around 189 emails between Brew and Davis, but we only received single emails in Elysium's production related to the communications with Brew. We attached a couple of examples that really go to the heart of our case.

One of our allegations is that Elysium marketed their product as being supported by clinical studies, when they have not conducted clinical studies. In the examples we test, we show these key marketing officials that I just described, including communicating with C-level executives, including the CEO, the COO, and the chief scientist, essentially indicating

concern regarding the fact that they have not conducted clinical studies, and finding ways to spin this with respect to any questions they receive in terms of interviews and from the press. So, this is just one issue that goes to the heart of our case, and there has been a clear deficiency.

There are other vendors, your Honor, including a company called Gen3, which does affiliate marketing. We have hundreds of emails between that firm and people who are senior marketing and acquisition executives. We actually received no communications in Elysium's production related to this firm.

So, we think it's the tip of the iceberg, because, unfortunately, we did subpoena about 19 entities, but only four responded, and we were unable to subpoena another seven. We were unable to serve them due to the pandemic.

So, we think that, based on the limited number of entities we have been able to get responses for, clearly, there is a deficiency here, and we think it was a macro issue with the productions. We're happy to discuss potential solutions to that, your Honor, but that issue is still live.

THE COURT: So, I understand from Elysium's letter that, at the time that you wrote to me, that was an issue that had not been the subject of meet-and-confers. I'm not sure what relief you're seeking from me now, or if you are seeking relief, but why shouldn't I just let the two of you meet and confer with respect to any deficiencies?

MR. J. TUFFAHA: I think that's fine, your Honor.

Just a couple points. We did meet and confer about this dating back to March. Elysium indicates we didn't meet and confer regarding the specific documents, but these documents are just examples. This, essentially, substantiates the concern that we expressed to Elysium back in March regarding the low custodial counts.

I think what would facilitate a meet-and-confer on this, your Honor, is, from a preservation perspective, that Elysium produce the whole notices that they sent to their custodians, and produce the number of documents that they collected, so we can make sure there is no spoliation issue here.

With respect to the document production itself, I think we would request that Elysium produce their search term reports, because we really think there is an issue here, given the discrepancy between third-party discovery and produced discovery.

THE COURT: First of all, that's not a request that you make in your letter. Would you be willing to do the reciprocal for Elysium and produce your whole notices and your hit reports?

MR. J. TUFFAHA: Your Honor, that would be fine. We would be fine doing that.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me turn to Elysium.

Maybe, Mr. Whitney, just to take the second issue of Zendesk first, maybe that's something we can just get off the table.

Is it correct that the only issues with respect to Zendesk is just your being able to access the information, because the office is closed due to the pandemic, and that this is something that I can address by granting an extension of discovery?

MR. WHITNEY: Thank you, your Honor.

Yes, that's the primary holdup. We just can't actually access it.

I would say that, the representation by opposing counsel, that these are the critical documents and these are essential to the case, is not really based on anything. It's very possible that, upon searching these documents, there will be no relevant documents in the production. I mean, this is just a repository of customer communication. There is no evidence, at this point, or reason to believe that any customer communication has anything to do with the at-issue statements in this case. So, I don't know why we would assume that these are somehow the critical documents, but, nevertheless, we agree to search and produce them, along with the other documents in this case, but, unfortunately, we, right now, are unable to.

Because of the unique nature of these documents, we can't export them the way we can normal documents. Despite

significant effort, we can't do it remotely because the mechanism keeps timing out when you try to do it remotely because of the nature of the unique file format.

So, we have access to the offices, and once they open, we should be able to produce anything that is responsive.

THE COURT: Is there an estimate as to when the offices will reopen, when you'll have access, whether it's for business purposes?

MR. WHITNEY: I'm not certain on that, your Honor. I think this is all a very fluid situation, as you're probably aware. So, I would have to consult with my client to see if they have any targeted reopening. Even in that regard, as we know, these things keep changing on a moment's notice. So, I just don't have a date for planned reopening when we can say this will definitely happen by that date.

THE COURT: So, I would like to extend the fact discovery deadline, and all corresponding deadlines after that, by a certain amount so that, hopefully, you don't need to come back to me.

Can you give me a date by which you would request that the discovery deadline be extended?

MR. WHITNEY: Well, if we could extend it another month or two to see if we can reopen at that point. I'm hesitant, your Honor, about the reopening, because I have no control over that. If COVID levels increase in New York, the

office might be closed for a more extended period of time.

I would submit that I think we can continue with this case without these documents, as these are not critical documents. I don't want to extend the case even longer than it already is, but I understand your Honor wants to try to come up with a solution. So, I would tentatively suggest we could postpone it for another few months with the hope that, if necessary, we would revisit that, or alternatively, your Honor, we can proceed without these documents for now, and whenever they become available, we'll make them available. If they turn out to be somehow more relevant than — or relevant and critical to this case, we can address it at that time, rather than holding up the whole case for documents that may ultimately not have a lot of significance to the underlying issues here.

approach. I'd like to move the case along, but I don't think
I'm in a position to weigh how important these documents are.
I have no way to credit your view, or ChromaDex's view, and I would like to avoid the situation where documents, of both sides have agreed will be produced, get produced late, and the depositions have to be retaken.

So, what I'm going to do is extend the discovery deadline by two months, and extend every other deadline after that by two months. I'm going to ask the parties to submit a

revised case management plan, implementing the two-month extension of deadlines. If a deadline falls on a weekend, then the deadline will be moved to the next business day.

Is that acceptable to you, Mr. Whitney?

MR. WHITNEY: Yes, that's fine, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that acceptable, also, to ChromaDex?

MR. J. TUFFAHA: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good. So that takes care of issue number two.

Issue number one, Mr. Whitney, I'll hear from you.

Just to throw something out for your consideration; if I order, as I've been inclined to do, you to produce documents, even from the social media platforms, and ChromaDex says that it's not going to do the reciprocal, I would probably look dimly on the argument by ChromaDex. I obviously hear both sides, but my instincts would be what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Let me hear from you, Mr. Whitney, on the issue before me, which is Elysium's obligations.

MR. WHITNEY: Yes, your Honor. I think your instincts on this are exactly correct.

I would like to clarify a few things that opposing counsel mentioned, just so your Honor understands what we're talking about more specifically.

When, Mr. Tuffaha says that they're in Elysium's

archives, that's not really accurate. What we're talking about here are documents that reside on a third-party platform, Facebook, that are not on Elysium's system.

The note that the parties had met and conferred on search parameters, on custodians, on sources, neither party agreed, before now, to produce from what is a Facebook ad manager. We are willing to do so and we told ChromaDex that we are, in light of this discussion, and which is also why we would have wanted to have a telephone conversation with them prior to this hearing, so that we didn't have to waste the Court's time with this, but the Facebook ad manager is not necessarily easy to search through it for what ChromaDex wants.

I'm not even sure -- there is no readily way to export the information that resides on Facebook's systems, so we would have to figure out how that would happen, or how you would search through videos, or what have you, for one sentence in a video that may or may not arguably be relevant. We would have to watch every video on the Facebook ad manager. With all this being said, I believe we can come up with a set of ground rules with ChromaDex.

We believe that ChromaDex, given that none of this was part of the required production that the parties had agreed to ahead of time, that ChromaDex do the same. I feel that, in doing so, you'll find that the parties will come up with much more reasonable parameters if both parties have to abide by

them, rather than it only falling on one party's obligation.

So, I think we can find a way to get it done, but I agree with your Honor, it needs to be done reciprocally, because this is not based off of a typical platform to produce from, and we need to find the right way to search and the right way to produce the documents within.

THE COURT: So, I'm just addressing Elysium's obligation right now. I gave you thoughts about what I would likely do with respect to ChromaDex, but none of that should be taken as a ruling that any obligation of Elysium would be reciprocal on ChromaDex. They're just muses.

With respect to Elysium, what is it that Elysium is willing to do without a court order?

MR. WHITNEY: Elysium, which we've told ChromaDex,
Elysium is willing to search through the Facebook ad manager,
which is Facebook's tool, and I think it also applies to
Instagram. For advertisements or statements that are the same
or substantially similar to the ones at issue here in this
case, with some framework of how that search can occur and how
those documents can be produced, we don't yet know how to
produce documents from this ad manager, so we need to discuss
that with ChromaDex, because it, again, resides on Facebook's
platform.

The video, I don't know how easily we can export it or download it. If we can take a screenshot of something, we can

do that, but we are willing to search for responsive ads that have been pled or relate to what has been pled.

Like I said, your Honor, I think we need to come up with some amount of guidelines as to how we can search for this, what the extent of the search would be. How do you search through videos and how we produce such materials, given the platform is not designed — it doesn't reside on Elysium's systems, so Facebook doesn't have control over it to produce in a readily—available format. So, we have to come up with some agreement as to how that would occur.

THE COURT: Are there other platforms that are relevant? I know the ChromaDex letter refers, really, exclusively, to the Facebook platform, but I think I heard Mr. Tuffaha mention other platforms.

MR. J. TUFFAHA: Your Honor, if I can turn to my colleague, Prashanth Chennakesavan, who has found some of the ads that were not produced, I think he can give your Honor a better idea in terms of what platforms are out there and what we're looking for.

You want to go ahead, Prashanth.

MR. CHENNAKESAVAN: This is Prashanth Chennakesavan on behalf of ChromaDex.

So, the focus of our correspondence with Elysium has been over discontinued advertising that Elysium places in the marketplace --

Are there platforms, other than the Facebook and Instagram platforms, that are relevant in terms of social

THE COURT: Can you just answer the question for me.

media?

MR. CHENNAKESAVAN: In terms of social media, we believe Elysium places advertorials and uses some kind of widget to point consumers to advertorials, which are articles written as advertisements on various web pages. There is also the elysiumhealth.com page itself, that we are aware of.

THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Whitney, did you know what can be done with respect to those platforms?

MR. WHITNEY: Not offhand, your Honor. This is the first we've really heard about wanting anything other than Facebook Ads Manager. So, again, I'm happy to look into it, but I can't speak definitively on this call, unfortunately.

THE COURT: Okay. So, what I'm going to do with respect to issue one, the one thing that has been raised to me is the Facebook platform, is that I'm going to deny the application for an order compelling production, based upon the representations from Elysium on this telephone call.

I'm going to direct the parties to meet and confer with respect to search methodology and with respect to production methodology.

I'm going to direct the parties to meet and confer with respect to two other things. One is, other platforms on

which responsive information might appear, including the Elysium web page. Also, to meet and confer with respect to any reciprocal obligation by ChromaDex.

If you still have disputes with respect to social media or information about web pages, I'm going to ask you to bring those issues to me altogether, so both ChromaDex issues and Elysium issues.

Can we go to issue number three?

MR. WHITNEY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Whitney, why don't you address issue number three. I think the question is, I gather, from what I hear from ChromaDex, that they believe that the right approach with respect to issue number three is meet and confer. They're now making the request to me that I order you to produce hit reports and document retention notices. On the notion that you would get the same thing from them, are you prepared to proceed that way?

MR. WHITNEY: Your Honor, again, given this is the first we've heard of this request, I would like to have the opportunity to speak with my client and colleagues about it, but more importantly, I think we can also speak with opposing counsel about this and come up with some reasonable solution.

The premise behind this request is flawed, your Honor, as we pointed out. The fact that they received more documents from third parties than they did from Elysium, with regard to

specific communications, is not surprising, given they requested all communications with third parties from the third parties. Elysium had negotiated some more narrow subject matter search, just relating to communications regarding this case search, statements that are at issue in this case. Elysium has collected hundreds of thousands of documents from search terms, produced thousands of documents.

The fact that the document production deadline was six months ago, the fact that now, six months later, they have identified all of these documents, I realize they're saying they're representative, but I haven't seen any others that they say Elysium did not produce, which they never identified to us beforehand, is hardly indicative of anything.

If anything, given the numbers, I think we did quite a thorough production. If you look at the documents themselves, two of them are emails that predate this case and relate to items about clinical studies that predate the studies that did occur that are at issue here, so they're not even relevant, much less indicative, of any kind of flawed search or spoliation or what have you.

So, I'd like to have the opportunity to look into this a little further and to speak with ChromaDex about this, if we can figure something out. The issues that have been teed up by ChromaDex are a little bit of straw man issues here, your Honor. This is not indicative of anything.

THE COURT: So, I don't know that that is true. I also don't know that, what ChromaDex has said, is true. So, I'm not going to credit either of you on that particularly.

I do know both parties have agreed that a meet and confer would be useful, and that I don't have the evidence in front of me that would give me a basis to really order anything, other than the parties meet and confer.

If it turns out that the document search was insufficient, and there is evidence of that, there is the 30(b)(6) depositions, or issues with respect to Elysium not doing something that it's required to do, then I'll address that.

So, with respect to issue number three, I'm going to direct you to meet and confer with respect to issue number three.

Mr. Tuffaha, is there anything else I should address today, or any response that you want to make to what I'm ordering? If you think I'm making error, now is the time to raise it.

MR. J. TUFFAHA: Your Honor, that's fine.

I would just object to the characterization of these documents from opposing counsel. He's mischaracterizing our allegations in our complaint. We alleged that Elysium had gone to market without any clinical studies, and represented the contrary to the public. Counsel is limiting this to one study

in 2017 where we alleged that they actually studied our client's ingredients, but this dates back to 2016 in our complaint. They've had no clinical studies. The documents that we have attached to our complaint showed effort to hide this fact.

These are only several examples, your Honor. We have other examples.

All our subpoenaed documents have also been served on Elysium. We raised the issue of the custodian back in March, so it's a bit curious that counsel is saying this is the first time that he's hearing about this. We think the examples that we've attached show, clearly, there is an issue.

We do respect your Honor's decision, and we'll meet and confer, including requesting search terms and that kind of stuff. It can come back to your Honor if we have any further evidence supporting our argument.

These are key, your Honor, key entities in shaping Elysium's advertising. This is a Lanham Act case. When you have hundreds of documents from a PR company, Brew, and we only get seven documents or, from another company, we have hundreds of documents, but zero were produced, I think it clearly shows there is a fundamental issue with Elysium's production.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Whitney, before you respond to that, let me tell you that you don't need to respond to it, because by the time I have to -- anything that was just said to

me would be particularly relevant to a decision that I would need to make, I would permit you to respond and, frankly, I might not even remember what Mr. Tuffaha just said to me. So, let me direct myself to what I'm ordering today.

Is there anything else that I need to address or any error? If so, now is the time.

MR. WHITNEY: No, your Honor, that's fine. I agree that any response in that regard is unnecessary here. So, yes, your Honor, thank you. Nothing further from us.

THE COURT: So, I ask you to submit the revised case management plan by Monday at 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Tuffaha, would you do that?

MR. J. TUFFAHA: Yes, your Honor, we'll do that.

THE COURT: Mr. Tuffaha, I will also ask you to order a copy of this transcript. It doesn't need to be on an expedited basis, but I would just like to have it available, and I'm sure other parties would like to have it available. That would be helpful for the Court.

Anything else from either of you? Mr. Tuffaha?

MR. J. TUFFAHA: No, your Honor. We appreciate your time.

THE COURT: Mr. Whitney?

MR. WHITNEY: No, your Honor. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, both. Stay safe and stay

healthy. * * *