1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA		
3			
4) IN RE: TARGET CORPORATION) Case No. 14-MD-2522(PAM/JJK)		
5	CUSTOMER DATA SECURITY BREACH) LITIGATION)		
6))		
7)) St. Paul, Minnesota This Document Relates to) December 11, 2014		
8	All Actions) 11:02 a.m.		
9	 		
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE PAUL A. MAGNUSON		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE AND THE HONORABLE JEFFREY J. KEYES		
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
13	STATUS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS		
14	APPEARANCES:		
15	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:		
16	Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel: Zimmerman Reed, PLLP		
16 17	CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. BRIAN C. GUDMUNDSON, ESQ.		
-	CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. BRIAN C. GUDMUNDSON, ESQ. 1100 IDS Center 80 S. 8th Street		
17	CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. BRIAN C. GUDMUNDSON, ESQ. 1100 IDS Center 80 S. 8th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402		
17 18	CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. BRIAN C. GUDMUNDSON, ESQ. 1100 IDS Center 80 S. 8th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402 Chestnut Cambronne, PA KARL L. CAMBRONNE, ESQ.		
17 18 19	CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. BRIAN C. GUDMUNDSON, ESQ. 1100 IDS Center 80 S. 8th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402 Chestnut Cambronne, PA KARL L. CAMBRONNE, ESQ. 17 Washington Avenue North Suite 300		
17 18 19 20	CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. BRIAN C. GUDMUNDSON, ESQ. 1100 IDS Center 80 S. 8th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402 Chestnut Cambronne, PA KARL L. CAMBRONNE, ESQ. 17 Washington Avenue North		
17 18 19 20 21	CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. BRIAN C. GUDMUNDSON, ESQ. 1100 IDS Center 80 S. 8th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402 Chestnut Cambronne, PA KARL L. CAMBRONNE, ESQ. 17 Washington Avenue North Suite 300		
17 18 19 20 21 22	CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. BRIAN C. GUDMUNDSON, ESQ. 1100 IDS Center 80 S. 8th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402 Chestnut Cambronne, PA KARL L. CAMBRONNE, ESQ. 17 Washington Avenue North Suite 300 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401-2048 Official Court Reporter: JEANNE M. ANDERSON, RMR-RPR		

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
2	For the Plaintiffs:
3	Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel (Continued):
4	Heins Mills & Olson, PLC VINCENT J. ESADES, ESQ.
5 6	DAVID R. WOODWARD, ESQ. 310 Clifton Avenue Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403
7	
8	Milberg LLP ARIANA J. TADLER, ESQ. One Pennsylvania Plaza
9	New York, New York 10119
10	For the Plaintiffs: Stueve Siegel Hanson LLP
11	NORMAN E. SIEGEL, ESQ. 460 Nichols Road, Suite 200
12	Kansas City, Missouri 64112
13	Plaintiffs' Liaison Counsel:
14	Nichols Kaster, PLLP
15	E. MICHELLE DRAKE, ESQ. 80 S. 8th Street, Suite 4600
16	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2242
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):	
2	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:	
3		Faegre Baker Daniels LLP WENDY J. WILDUNG, ESQ. 90 S. 7th Street, Suite 2200
5		Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3901
6		Morrison & Foerster LLP DAVID F. MCDOWELL, ESQ.
7		707 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 600 Los Angeles, California 90017-3543
8		
9		Morrison & Foerster LLP HAROLD J. McELHINNY, ESQ.
10		425 Market Street San Francisco, California
11		94105-2482
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

IN OPEN COURT

2.2

THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: Okay, welcome back everybody. I will call a status conference.

Overnight we have received a couple of missiles.

One is that it is my understanding that the banks have decided not to replead, and that there will be an answer coming forward with respect to that with an Order.

MR. CAMBRONNE: Correct, Your Honor, that is exactly what we agreed to.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: The second thing is that the Special Litigation Committee, apparently, needs a little more time to do their work. And so that is set for March 16 for a report.

MS. WILDUNG: That is correct, Your Honor.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: That is just fine. I suspect that most of those people are old like me and they will be in the south, too. So, that is fine, we will get the -- we will set that up for the 16th of March and see what happens.

Okay. With that, Mr. Zimmerman?

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning, Your Honors. I am just going to give you a brief update on where things are on discovery, just so you can kind of keep track of the progress we are making. And I

1	think, once again, we are cooperating well and making lots	
2	of progress. And I will take you through the several items,	
3	and then we will bring someone else up to talk about where	
4	we are with ESI, which I think Judge Keyes has been working	
5	on, but I think we are close. But, we will talk about that	
6	at the end, as well.	
7	First off, Target has produced about 140 pages of	
8	documents and they are largely made up of documents that	
9	have been provided to the government investigators and we	
10	are in the process of reviewing it. And we are set up	
11	THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE JEFFREY KEYES: Did	
12	you say 140 pages?	
13	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Pages, that would be 37,000	
14	documents.	
15	THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE JEFFREY KEYES:	
16	Okay.	
17	MR. ZIMMERMAN: I said 140,000. Did I say	
18	THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: You said 140.	
19	THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE JEFFREY KEYES:	
20	You said 140.	
21	MR. ZIMMERMAN: What is the difference, Your	
22	Honor?	
23	THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: What all are	
24	we hiding here?	
25	MR. ZIMMERMAN: My wife says that when we go	

shopping.

2.2

37,000 documents, 140,000 pages -- beg your pardon. And we are in the process of reviewing it. We have got a protocol going. I won't bore you with the details, but it is going well. It always could be faster. We want more documents. We are going to be getting them, but that is where we are today.

We are reviewing privileged logs and we will have questions about the privileged logs. Always when you are getting documents you are getting some -- you are not getting some that are privileged. We are likely to have questions about that and that is ongoing.

We have been meeting and conferring regarding additional production and requests, and I think I can say we are cooperative and we are optimistic that we can narrow the potential for motion practice there. It is an ongoing issue, but we are moving forward.

And right now we have no reason to believe we have any motions to make, but we might. It is always, we want more, they want to give less. We fight about it pretty well. And at this point we are in that process of asking for more and waiting for answers to get the "more."

To say we reviewed all 140,000 pages so far would be wrong. We haven't. But, we are ready to accept more documents once we can get an agreement on what we are going

to get.

2.2

The ESI search terms and protocols we are going to talk about at the end, so let me just move then to depositions. Two depositions have in fact taken place of current and former employees of Target. And more notices are coming. They will probably be out next week, if not already. I am not positive. I think they are on their way out.

We have served subpoenas on several third parties, basically software providers and others with knowledge of the breach, and what happened post the breach, and why the breach occurred. And what was the response to the warnings.

One of those third parties has filed a motion to quash, and that is one of the antivirus companies. And that motion is pending in the Northern District of California and that is scheduled to be heard on December 19th, their motion to quash our subpoena of them.

We would ask that the Northern District transfer it to this Court, but that is going to be heard on the 19th.

There is another third-party financial company that is claiming privilege on all of their disclosures, or all of the materials we have asked. And we have been working with Target to resolve that issue. And Target has promised to provide us with a privileged log as opposed to this overall "we are not going to produce anything because

it is all privileged" and we are working that issue through.

2.2

In addition, we have issued subpoenas to several of the credit card companies. And these would be like the Mastercards, the Diners, the American Express and the Visa. And we are working both directly and indirectly with these companies and their Counsel to try and get cooperation with regard to the information we need from these credit card companies. We are making some progress and --

THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: What do you mean by indirectly?

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Through their general counsel or their litigation counsel, as opposed to directly, you know, to them.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: I see. Okay.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: So, we have some contacts that have worked with these major players, and so we are trying to go through, say, Boies Schiller who represents Amex, so we are working through Boies Schiller to get the access without having to go through the G.C.. That is all I mean.

All in all, Your Honor, I think we are really working hard on discovery. I think the cooperation and professionalism has been very good. We don't have anything pending before Judge Keyes at this time that I am aware of. I know that Judge Keyes entered an Order on December 2nd with regard to expert discovery. And that Order is a matter

of record, dated December 2nd, which was a stipulated order regarding the expert protocol. And other than questions from the Court, I would like the ESI people to kind of give you a picture, a snapshot of where we are on defining the ESI terms and where we are with regard to that process, which is essentially a search, a search vehicle. THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE JEFFREY KEYES: Okay, let me ask you one question before you sit down. got yesterday your Stipulated Order for Target to Answer the Amended Class Action Complaint on January 15th, 2015. is all set to go? MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes. We have agreed to that. that was also, the notion at the beginning where we said we were not going to -- the Financial Institutions are not moving to amend the Complaint to add any negligent misrepresentation. And so we have now fixed the answer date for the Master Amended Consolidated Complaint for January

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

15th. Thank you.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: Okay.

MS. TADLER: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: Good morning.

MS. TADLER: Ariana Tadler from Milberg. I have the privilege of serving as the point person for the discovery on the consumer side. I also have the privilege of being the ESI -- one of those folks. Thankfully, I am

very happy to be in that position having quite a bit of experience there.

2.2

A couple of things. As an overall umbrella for both cases, the Financial Institution Case and the Consumer Case, we have been working very extensively with Target's Counsel and that includes the counsel in both cases for purposes of establishing an appropriate search protocol.

You will recall, I think, two conferences ago, that counsel for Target had indicated that they were intending to apply search terms to the massive information that they were going to be preparing to produce to us. And we threw up a flag and just said: Time out, please. We would really like to engage in that process of having discussions, because we did not want search terms applied unilaterally.

We had extensive discussions, very fruitful discussions. And I am very pleased to say that this is a case where those discussions have led to where we are nearly at the establishment of a final protocol which will involve — will even represent the fact that we have participated in the evolution of those terms, we've helped guide and even broadened those terms to some extent, narrowed them to some extent, and also worked out a protocol that contemplates a QC process both on positive hits and negative hits. So, we are working towards that. We are close, but there are some

questions that we are still resolving, particularly because at the same time we are also speaking with the Defendants' Counsel about their responses and objections to the sets of document requests, and what some of those objections — how some of those objections might affect the production. So, you can't really do the search protocol alone without having resolved these issues. I would say, perhaps one of the most important issues there is the time frame for production.

2.2

And again on that issue, I think we are very, very close. On some, there will be a broader time range than others. We also have the expectation that there will be some preservation, but not production on a broader period for certain requests.

As Mr. Zimmerman pointed out earlier, we are working so collaboratively now with them, the conversations are good conversations. We have educated people on the phone on both sides. And so, we are very pleased about that.

I can also report on the fact that with respect to the Consumer Plaintiffs, we obviously have our own respective production responsibilities and we are in the process of meeting and conferring with Target's Counsel about those.

They had certain items that they very much wanted to speak to us about and we, of course, had responses and

objections to their requests. And those meet and confer discussions are ongoing. There is one to be scheduled.

2.2

I understand -- I think we all understand that Target is eager to have specific deadlines to get things done by. In my experience, it is important to make sure that you get through the process and that you do the process right.

The last thing we would want in a case of this size is to face a do-over. It is just not a place we would want to go. So, I think we are working in the right direction, and I think that in short order we will be able to have an agreement that works for everybody. So, I think that is pretty much all that I have for the Court. Thank you.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: Okay, thank you.

MR. GUDMUNDSON: Good morning, Your Honors. Brian Gudmundson on behalf of the Financial Institution

Plaintiffs. And I can report where we are with the Financial Institution Plaintiffs discovery and the ESI issues there. I can report that we do have an agreement on the search terms that the FI Plaintiffs will be using.

I connect with all the comments that have gone before about the collaborative nature of things. It was a very, very technical process, but one that was incredibly

done in good faith and very collaborative, and one that we did very well with our colleagues at Ropes & Gray.

2.2

With respect to the rest of the production, we are doing a joint hand collection, manual collection of paper and electronic documents in conjunction with ESI searches of email and some other things.

We are continuing to negotiate the objections and responses that we served on Target back in October. That process is ongoing, to be handled in relatively short order. I believe that we are limited to only a very few disputes at this time.

So, at the present moment nothing is hindering our progress, so we believe we will be moving forward pretty quickly; but if there is anything that comes up, I am sure we can handle that expeditiously, as well.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: Good, thank you. Ms. Wildung?

MS. WILDUNG: Thank you, Your Honor. I would like to add a few remarks to what Plaintiffs' Counsel said.

Talking very briefly about Target's affirmative discovery,

Target has sort of written discovery in both the Consumer and Financial Institution Cases. We have gotten a rolling production in the Consumer Cases. We are awaiting a meaningful production in the Financial Institution Cases.

As Counsel has reported, we finally have reached agreement

with the Financial Institution Plaintiffs on the search terms that they are going to use. So, we hope that production will start flowing in promptly.

2.2

And we have deposed three of the Consumer

Plaintiffs. We expect more discovery to go into higher gear

probably after the first of the year.

With regard to the discovery served upon Target,

Target has produced a large number of documents, has

responded to written responses for production. We are in

the process of working out objections, and we hope we will

reach agreement on that.

From Target's point of view, we do continue to be concerned about the length of time it has taken to get agreement on the electronic discovery protocol. Target proposed search terms to Plaintiffs' counsel back in, I think, early October.

We were never going to do anything until we had agreement, it has just taken us a long time. I am not suggesting any bad faith on anyone's part, but from Target's point of view, we know there is a lot of work to be done once we get the agreement on the protocol. And the longer it takes us to get agreement on the protocol, the further back it pushes the time period where Target can start working on the review of the electronic information.

We had had a deadline from the last conference

where parties were either going to reach agreement or submit letters on Monday of this last week -- I think it was Monday -- I'm sorry, some day this week in advance of this hearing. One of Plaintiffs' counsel had a family emergency, couldn't meet that deadline. We were fine with that.

2.2

But, I think it would be helpful to have another deadline, just to keep everybody moving forward. So, my suggestion is there is a date next week by which we will either reach an agreement on the electronic discovery protocol and search terms, or we will submit letters to Magistrate Judge Keyes and can get a decision on that. And Target thinks that would be helpful. So, unless the Court has any further questions, I am happy to answer, otherwise I thank you.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE JEFFREY KEYES: Can we get a response on that?

MS. TADLER: Your Honor, I don't foresee a problem solving these issues by December 19th which is a week from this Friday. I am the Plaintiffs' counsel that had a family emergency, so I am very grateful to Target's counsel for accommodating my situation.

But, I would ask one clarification that I hope the Court will appreciate. The fact that it has taken the amount of time that it has, to date, to work out this kind of protocol in a case of this size, this is not unusual. It

is demonstrative of the fact that the parties are really working on something to take into account the breadth of this case, the number of documents that could potentially be impacted, I think -- I know I can speak on behalf of the Consumer Plaintiffs and I would like to think that on this issue I can speak on behalf of the Financial Institution Plaintiffs, this is not a fishing expedition. We are working very diligently to get that which we need to prove our case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

We have used, no pun intended, targeted efforts to do this. And we also have the benefit of the information that was produced in the context of the initial disclosures to look at that information with some auditing solutions that exist today, so that as we worked and continue to work with Target's counsel on this search protocol, we have the benefit of knowing information and how the search terms originally were proposed and even how our broader terms would have worked out on that initial production.

So, for one who lives and breathes in this area of law, I can tell you we are on track. I don't foresee a problem about next Friday. In fact, I think everybody would prefer to have it done by next Friday because of the holidays coming. But, I want to assure you that in my experience, this is working the way it is supposed to work. And we have the benefit again of the prior series of

1 productions that have facilitated how those discussions and how tools can best be used in the world that exists today 2 3 for ESI. Thank you. 4 THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: Thank you. 5 suspect with that, let's just make the due date, Friday the 19th. 6 7 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE JEFFREY KEYES: And then you will come to me if you have any -- if it hasn't 8 9 been done, then I want to hear about it. 10 MS. TADLER: Sure. MR. ZIMMERMAN: The 19th, it is. 11 12 The next item on the agenda, I think it's been 13

The next item on the agenda, I think it's been discussed, which is the Financial Institution Cases status of pleadings, which is the no amendment. We are good on the Master Amended Consolidated Complaint and the due date of the answer on the 15th of January.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So, unless there is any questions on that, the third item is the Shareholder Derivative Cases. And I really am -- other than the Special Litigation Committee continuing it through March 16th, I have no further contact with that. I don't know if there is anything we need to discuss on the agenda.

So, that brings us, then, to future status conferences. There are two dates, January 27th at 11:00 and March 19th at 10:00. I wasn't sure if any of those were

1	in Ft. Myers or not
2	THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: No such luck.
3	MR. ZIMMERMAN: No such luck? Okay, then, I can
4	only beg so much.
5	THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: But, if you
6	decide you have to have a special meeting
7	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Maybe February. I think we have
8	an open date in February. Hope springs eternal. But, I
9	think those dates were set by the Court and
10	THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: I think this
11	is all for your benefit, because I think you are an Arizona
12	guy.
13	MR. ZIMMERMAN: I am. I am, but I like the ocean
14	too. That is all I have, Your Honor.
15	THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: Okay, anybody
16	else have anything? The room is very quiet.
17	Judge Boylan is down in the special proceedings
18	courtroom on the first floor. And if you would like to go
19	down there and see what a nice big courtroom looks like or
20	something, why I think he would appreciate it. Aside from
21	that, I really don't have anything else. Okay.
22	THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE KEYES: Thank you
23	all.
24	THE HONORABLE JUDGE PAUL MAGNUSON: Thank you
25	everybody.

1	ALL COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honors.
2	(Adjournment.)
3	
4	
5	
6	* * *
7	
8	I, Jeanne M. Anderson, certify that the foregoing
9	is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in
10	the above-entitled matter.
11	
12	
13	Certified by: <u>s/ Jeanne M. Anderson</u> Jeanne M. Anderson, RMR-RPR
14	Official Court Reporter
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	