

Ruling on Confirmatory Discovery: Defendant's Attorney Must Be Present During Collection of ESI

May 5, 2010

During a recent telephone conference regarding a discovery dispute in *Roffe v. Eagle Rock Energy GP*, *et al.*, C.A. No. 5258-VCL (Del. Ch. Apr. 8, 2010), Vice Chancellor Laster ruled from the bench that confirmatory discovery—like formal discovery—requires the defendant's attorney to be physically present during the collection of electronically stored information from his/her client; self-collection by the client is not permitted.

On February 9, a class action and derivative lawsuit was filed by a public unitholder of Eagle Rock Energy Partners, L.P. (Eagle Rock) in the Court of Chancery of the State of Delaware against the partnership, the partnership's general partner, Eagle Rock Energy GP, L.P. (GP), and certain affiliates of GP. The complaint alleged, among other things, that (1) the previously announced proposed recapitalization transactions are unfair to the partnership's public unitholders, (2) the preliminary proxy statement filed on January 14 in connection with the proposed recapitalization transactions contains material misstatements and omissions, and (3) the defendants breached their fiduciary duties to the partnership's public unitholders in connection with the proposed recapitalization transactions. During confirmatory discovery, a dispute arose regarding collection of emails from the Conflicts Committee, which consisted of three members of the Eagle Rock board of directors.

Defense counsel informed the court that two of the three members had self-collected and foldered documents relevant to the transaction at issue. Counsel argued that it would be unnecessary to collect from the third committee member because he was simply copied on all the same emails sent and received by the other two members. Counsel stated that, aside from being redundant, it would be costly and burdensome to collect records from the third member, who was located in an area of the country remote from Delaware (Tulsa, Oklahoma) and had a habit of keeping emails related to the matter on his personal computer interspersed with personal and other business emails.

Vice Chancellor Laster ruled that confirmatory discovery is discovery, and that attorneys may not rely upon a defendant to search his/her own email. The Vice Chancellor held that attorneys appearing before the Court of Chancery have an affirmative obligation to go wherever the electronically stored information is located, to be physically present to ensure that the collection is done properly, and to collect relevant documents even if located on a personal computer.

With regard to preservation, the Vice Chancellor expressed concern as to whether adequate measures had been taken to ensure that relevant electronic information had been properly preserved. The Vice

Chancellor recommended (but did not require) that defense counsel take additional steps to image the computer drives in question, perform forensic checks, and conduct searches, to make sure that relevant data had not been lost. He further advised counsel to check auto-delete settings during the course of the collection process.

Vice Chancellor Laster's comments make clear that a perfunctory approach to confirmatory discovery will not suffice in Court of Chancery proceedings, and that the court will not tolerate "lackadaisical" and "unsatisfactory" discovery practices, including the self-collection of electronically stored information by defendants outside the presence of an attorney. Confirmatory discovery requires the same due diligence as any discovery process, and failure by parties to comply with proper discovery requirements could jeopardize proposed settlements by causing the court to reject them outright or to enforce requests for formal discovery.

If you have any questions or would like more information on any of the issues discussed in this LawFlash, please contact any of the following Morgan Lewis attorneys:

New York Denise E. Backhouse	212.309.6364	dbackhouse@morganlewis.com
Philadelphia Stephanie A. "Tess" Blair Jacquelyn A. Caridad Colm Connolly Scott A. Milner	215.963.5161 215.963.5275 215.963.4841 215.963.5016	sblair@morganlewis.com jcaridad@morganlewis.com cconnolly@morganlewis.com smilner@morganlewis.com
Princeton George W. McClellan	609.919.6650	gmcclellan@morganlewis.com
San Francisco Renée T. Lawson	415.442.1443	rlawson@morganlewis.com
Washington, D.C. Matthew Verga	202.739.5886	mverga@morganlewis.com

About Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

With 22 offices in the United States, Europe, and Asia, Morgan Lewis provides comprehensive transactional, litigation, labor and employment, regulatory, and intellectual property legal services to clients of all sizes—from global Fortune 100 companies to just-conceived startups—across all major industries. Our international team of attorneys, patent agents, employee benefits advisors, regulatory scientists, and other specialists—more than 3,000 professionals total—serves clients from locations in Beijing, Boston, Brussels, Chicago, Dallas, Frankfurt, Harrisburg, Houston, Irvine, London, Los Angeles, Miami, Minneapolis, New York, Palo Alto, Paris, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Princeton, San Francisco, Tokyo, and Washington, D.C. For more information about Morgan Lewis or its practices, please visit us online at www.morganlewis.com.

This LawFlash is provided as a general informational service to clients and friends of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP. It should not be construed as, and does not constitute, legal advice on any specific matter, nor does this message create an attorney-client relationship. These materials may be considered **Attorney Advertising** in some states.

Please note that the prior results discussed in the material do not guarantee similar outcomes.

© 2010 Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP. All Rights Reserved.