

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
12 17 PM 11:03  
JAMES H.  
HAYES-WHITTINGTON  
CLERK

ELOUISE PEPION COBELL, et al., )  
 )  
Plaintiffs, )  
 )  
v. )  
 )  
GALE NORTON, Secretary of the Interior, et al., )  
 )  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Case No. 1:96CV01285  
(Judge Lamberth)

**DEFENDANTS' OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE  
OF RULE 30(b)(6) DEPOSITION OF ELECTRONIC DATA SYSTEMS CORP.**

The Secretary of the Interior, the Assistant Secretary - Indian Affairs, and the Secretary of the Treasury ("Defendants") submit the following objections to Plaintiffs' December 9, 2002, notice of Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) deposition of Electronic Data Systems Corp. ("EDS"):

Rule 30(b)(6) requires the deposing party to "describe with reasonable particularity" the matters on which examination is required. Plaintiffs' Notice of Deposition does not do so. The Notice states:

The subject area [sic] of this deposition are: (1) The nature and scope of EDS's involvement in trust reform activities related to the Individual Indian Money Trust, (2) the "As-Is" Project; (3) the "To-Be" Project and (4) any additional information regarding the IIM trust.

Because of the vague and general description of the matters to be examined, EDS is thereby inhibited in its ability to prepare sufficiently for the deposition.

In addition to each of the four enumerated "subject areas" of the deposition being objectionable for the reasons stated above, especially objectionable is subject area "4," which is "any additional information regarding the IIM trust," which is not only overly broad and vague, but ambiguous.


Defendants' designated witness, EDS employee James G. Pauli, is probably the most knowledgeable EDS employee concerning the general subject matters stated in the Notice of Deposition. However, given Plaintiffs' failure to comply with Rule 30(b)(6), Defendants object to being bound by Mr. Pauli's testimony, and further reserve the right to object to specific areas of questioning where the witness did not have sufficient notice of the subject matter to be able to prepare.

Finally, given the improperly described scope of the deposition and because Defendants did not serve the notice until after 6:00 p.m. on December 9, 2002 on the Department of Justice, Defendants further object to being bound by Mr. Pauli's testimony, and further reserve the right to object to specific areas of questioning where the witness did not have sufficient time to be able to prepare.

December 18, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT D. McCALLUM, JR.  
Assistant Attorney General  
STUART E. SCHIFFER  
Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
J. CHRISTOPHER KOHN  
Director



SANDRA P. SPOONER

D.C. Bar No. 261495

Deputy Director

JOHN T. STEMPLEWICZ

Senior Trial Counsel

JOHN R. KRESSE

Trial Attorney

D.C. Bar No. 430094

Commercial Litigation Branch

Civil Division

P.O. Box 875

Ben Franklin Station

Washington, D.C. 20044-0875

(202) 514-7194

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I declare under penalty of perjury that, on December 18, 2002, I served the foregoing *Defendants' Objections to Plaintiffs' Notice of Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition of Electronic Data Systems Corp.* by facsimile, in accordance with their written request of October 31, 2001 upon:

Keith Harper, Esq.  
Native American Rights Fund  
1712 N Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-2976  
202-822-0068

Dennis M Gingold, Esq.  
Mark Brown, Esq.  
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Ninth Floor  
Washington, DC 20004  
202-318-2372

and by U.S. Mail upon:


Elliott Levitas, Esq.  
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800  
Atlanta, GA 30309-4530

and by U.S. Mail and by facsimile upon:

Alan L. Balaran, Esq.  
Special Master  
1717 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
12th Floor  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-986-8477

and by hand delivery upon:

Joseph S. Kieffer, III, Esq.  
Special Master-Monitor  
420 7th Street, NW  
Apt 705  
Washington, DC 20004  
202-478-1958



Sean P. Schmergel