

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

---

United States of America, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Google LLC,

Defendant.

---

Case No. 1:20-cv-03010-APM

HON. AMIT P. MEHTA

---

State of Colorado, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Google LLC,

Defendant.

---

Case No. 1:20-cv-03715-APM

HON. AMIT P. MEHTA

**JOINT STATUS REPORT**

In accordance with the Court's Minute Order dated June 29, 2021, the parties in *United States v. Google LLC* and *State of Colorado v. Google LLC* submit the following Joint Status Report summarizing the state of discovery and identifying any issues between the parties, and the parties' respective positions, that will be raised at the status hearing scheduled for July 30, 2021.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with the Court's Minute Order dated July 12, 2021, Google will submit under separate cover a discovery dispute between Google and a third party that is ripe for resolution at the hearing scheduled for July 30, 2021.

**I. Case No. 1:20-cv-03010**

**A. Google's Discovery of Plaintiffs**

A summary of Google's First Set of Requests for Production and prior document productions made by Plaintiffs are set forth in the parties' earlier Joint Status Reports, including their reports dated February 23 (ECF No. 111), March 26 (ECF No. 124), April 23 (ECF No. 131), May 24 (ECF No. 135), and June 24 (ECF No. 149). On July 9, Plaintiffs produced to Google correspondence with subpoena recipients regarding the legal claims against Google in this litigation.

**B. Plaintiffs' Discovery of Google**

A summary of Plaintiffs' First and Second Sets of Requests for Production and the document productions made by Google prior to May 24 are set forth in the parties' earlier Joint Status Reports, including their reports dated February 23 (ECF No. 111), March 26 (ECF No. 124), April 23 (ECF No. 131), May 24 (ECF No. 135), and June 24 (ECF No. 149). Google produced additional documents in response to Plaintiffs' First and Second Requests for Production on June 30, July 19 and July 22. Together these productions included approximately 227,000 documents. Plaintiffs served their Third Set of Requests for Production on June 21, and Google served its responses and objections on July 21. On July 20, Google produced to Plaintiffs correspondence from outside counsel with third-party subpoena recipients.

Pursuant to the Court's instruction at the June 29 status conference, the parties have met and conferred and exchanged correspondence regarding the production, distribution, and use of Google employees' self-assessments and performance reviews. The parties have reached agreement on the production of these materials. The parties continue to negotiate the procedures to be followed after these documents are used in depositions. The parties anticipate reaching

resolution on this issue shortly. If the parties cannot reach resolution on this issue, the parties will raise any disputed issues with the Court.

**C. The Parties' Discovery of Third-Parties**

A summary of the third-party discovery requests issued by the parties prior to May 24 is set forth in the parties' earlier Joint Status Reports, including their reports dated February 23 (ECF No. 111), March 26 (ECF No. 124), April 23 (ECF No. 131), May 24 (ECF No. 135), and June 24 (ECF No. 149). The parties have issued document subpoenas to approximately 82 third parties in total. The parties anticipate that they will continue to issue additional document subpoenas as discovery progresses.

**II. Case No. 1:20-cv-03715**

**A. Google's Discovery of Plaintiff States**

A summary of Google's First Set of Requests for Production and the document productions made by Plaintiffs to date are set forth in the parties' earlier Joint Status Reports, including their reports dated March 26 (ECF No. 124), April 23 (ECF No. 131), May 24 (ECF No. 135), and June 24 (ECF No. 149).

**B. Plaintiff States' Discovery of Google**

A summary of Plaintiff States' First Set of Requests for Production and the parties' meet and confer discussions are set forth in the parties' earlier Joint Status Reports, including their reports dated March 26 (ECF No. 124), April 23 (ECF No. 131), May 24 (ECF No. 135), and June 24 (ECF No. 149). Google has continued to produce to Plaintiff States the documents and data produced to the U.S. Department of Justice and its co-plaintiffs in Case No. 1:20-cv-03010.

Since the last status conference on June 29, the parties have continued to meet and confer regarding Plaintiff States' data requests. On July 14, Plaintiff States and Google submitted a joint

status report updating the Court on their progress with respect to Plaintiff States' data requests. Although the parties have made progress on the data requests, some disputed issues remain. The parties have set forth in Sections III and IV their respective positions regarding these issues.

### **C. The Parties' Discovery of Third Parties**

The parties have issued document subpoenas to approximately 82 third parties. All third parties that have received a subpoena from Plaintiff States have received a cross-subpoena from Google. Similarly, all third parties that have received a subpoena from Google have received a cross-subpoena from Plaintiff States. Both parties anticipate that they will continue to issue additional document subpoenas as discovery progresses.

### **III. The Plaintiffs States' Position Statement**

The Plaintiff States' Complaint alleges that "Google throttles consumer traffic to specialized vertical providers" as a means of maintaining its search-related monopolies. Compl. ¶ 57, No. 20-cv-03715, ECF No. 3 ("Compl."). Specialized vertical providers, such as familiar companies like Expedia or Yelp, do not provide general search services but they do pose a unique threat to Google. This is because these companies offer additional functionalities, such as the ability to buy an airline ticket or make a restaurant reservation, which might lead consumers to stop going to Google search on their way to completing a transaction. However, as a result of the anticompetitive conduct alleged in Plaintiff States' Complaint, "consumers do not as readily bypass general search by going directly to a specialized vertical provider's website in the way they could in a more competitive marketplace." Compl. ¶ 172. Providing such an alternative route is one way in which specialized vertical providers "could become more valuable partners for general search engines, which could strengthen such Google competitors and weaken barriers to expansion or entry in search-related markets." Compl. ¶ 38. The emphasis on the specialized

vertical providers is one way that the Plaintiff States' Complaint, as this Court recognized, "builds on and expands the theories of liability from those" contained within the complaint filed by the Department of Justice. Tr. of Dec. 18, 2020 Status Conference at 12:13-4.

Thus, the journeys that consumers take—from the entry of keywords into Google search to the moment they complete their transactions (or decide not to complete one)—are critical to the Plaintiff States' case. For example, the pending data that has been requested would allow Plaintiff States to determine how users journey from Google search to other Google owned and operated properties and/or to other third-party websites. Understanding what users (1) search for; (2) see in response to those searches (*e.g.*, advertisements and organic links); (3) click on; and (4) subsequently search for, is critical to Plaintiff States' case. These data are needed to analyze the effects of Google's discriminatory conduct against specialized vertical providers and to define the distinct market alleged by Plaintiff States. Google understands this need because Google itself analyzes such journeys as part of its ordinary commercial activities, and Google's own economists will likely review such data to challenge the Plaintiff States' contentions.

Despite Google's enormous resources<sup>2</sup> and its role as a company designed to "organize the world's information," *see* <https://blog.google/products/search/information-sources-google-search/>, Google has repeatedly failed to meet its own commitments to provide Plaintiff States with the data they need to move forward.

Importantly, and as Google has recognized, *see* July 14, 2021 Joint Status Report, ECF No. 158, the current process is in part a preliminary one, designed to provide the Plaintiff States

---

<sup>2</sup> On the morning of July 27, Google's market cap stood at \$1.79 trillion, *see* <https://www.bing.com/search?q=google+market+cap&cvid=338cabe1f87a4921ad62d60eb6dfc00f&aqs=edge.0.69i59j0l6.2840j0j4&FORM=ANAB01&PC=U531>.

with an adequate enough understanding of Google's data resources to conduct the kind of analyses of users' journeys that Google itself conducts.

And time is running out. Plaintiff States served the pending preliminary data requests as part of its First Requests for Production ("First RFPs") in February, and the parties have held at least twelve detailed meet and confers since April 14. Yet as of today, Google has failed to fully shoulder its discovery obligations.<sup>3</sup> And that poses a long-term threat. Expert reports are due in April 2022, which is less than nine months away. Between now and then, (1) Google needs to finish providing the preliminary data and related documents, (2) Plaintiff States will submit their full-fledged data requests, (3) Google will need to produce the data, and then (4) the economists will need to complete their analyses and prepare their expert reports.

This is already a tall order but one that can be accomplished if the Court directs Google to complete its preliminary production of data and related documents by August 27 (as detailed more specifically below) and plan now to have the resources available to speedily process the full-fledged requests, which the Plaintiff States hope to serve by the end of September, assuming Google completes its preliminary production by August 27.

The Plaintiff States know of no objective reason that Google cannot move quickly if it wishes to do so. For Plaintiff States to formulate full-fledged data requests, Google must stop delaying and establish deadlines that it will actually meet in order to produce the following data and related documents without undue further delay.

Plaintiff States detail below the leading examples of Google's failures.

---

<sup>3</sup> As part of its efforts to nail down its understanding of Google's data, the Plaintiff have noticed a 30(b)(6) deposition for September 14 to understand, inter alia, what data sets Google uses to analyze user journeys.

**A. Google's has unreasonably delayed in producing a meaningful sessions data sample.**

First, and most importantly, Google has resisted producing a meaningful sample of its sessions data for several months. Sessions data include the sequence of searches that users make. For example, this data can determine if a set of users searched for “hotels in Denver,” clicked on Google’s Hotel Unit, then later searched for “Hotels in Denver Expedia,” and finally reached an online travel agency by clicking through on a particular type of advertisement or organic link. All of this is relevant to Plaintiff States’ claims that Google has raised costs to specialized vertical providers.<sup>4</sup>

On June 2, after the sessions data sample had been discussed on several meet and confers,<sup>5</sup> Plaintiff States proposed a methodology that Google could use to generate the sessions data sample. Several weeks later, on June 23, Google asserted that it needed two to three weeks to conduct a manual review to assess whether Plaintiff States’ proposed sampling methodology would adequately protect user privacy, in its view.<sup>6</sup> Google also noted that it would determine by mid-July whether it needs to collect sessions data manually (which would cause further delay), as opposed to through an automated process. Email from F. Rubinstein to J. Conrad, June 23, 2021.

---

<sup>4</sup> Both the Plaintiff States and Google are working carefully to ensure that no individual user will ever be able to be identified.

<sup>5</sup> Prior to June 2, the sessions data sample was discussed during meet and confers on April 14, May 11, and May 21.

<sup>6</sup> Plaintiff States do not concede this manual review process was necessary, particularly since Google failed to respond with adequate specificity to Plaintiff States’ request for a description of how the process was conducted.

However, Google did not complete its manual review within two to three weeks, as promised; it only agreed to use Plaintiff States' proposed sampling methodology yesterday, July 26. Moreover, Google did not determine by mid-July whether it needs to collect sessions data manually, as promised; as of today, July 27, Google is still investigating the timing for production. There is no deadline in place.

**B. Google has failed to conduct a reasonable search for data dictionaries, which are both useful for understanding sample sessions data (once produced) and will inform Plaintiff States' full-fledged data request.**

Plaintiff States have also requested that Google produce data dictionaries for its sessions data. Data dictionaries serve as documentation of the organization and structure of data sets, which include the size, definition of variables, and general description of the data sets. Such documents are critical for our economic experts to understand the data Google maintains in the ordinary course of business, both to inform Plaintiff States' full-fledged data request and also as a matter of fairness—Google's own economic experts will no doubt be thoroughly informed about Google's data.

After Google failed to produce any documents that could reasonably substitute for data dictionaries, Plaintiff States identified and shared with Google selected data dictionaries that Google produced during the Federal Trade Commission's investigation. *See* Letter from J. Conrad to F. Rubinstein at 2, June 13, 2021. Because Google does in fact maintain data dictionaries in the ordinary course of business (contrary to its prior representations), Plaintiff States reasserted their request for responsive documents. Although Google produced five documents (in total) in response to Plaintiff States' request for updated versions of the data dictionaries produced to the FTC, it has not responded to a request that it conduct a reasonable search for other responsive documents. As a result, Plaintiff States have been left without documents describing Google's sessions data for several months.



**C. Google has unreasonably delayed in producing launch reports, which are needed before Plaintiff States can serve certain full-fledged data requests.**

Google routinely prepares launch reports that describe the changes it makes to its search engine results page and related experiments it conducts, for example, when it tries out a new feature. These reports are critically important because Plaintiff States plan to use the reports to identify important Google changes that their expert economists will analyze, which will inform certain full-fledged data requests they intend to make. On July 9, after discussing launch reports during five meet and confers,<sup>7</sup> Google stated that it would try to produce most launch reports by the end of July. Letter from F. Rubinstein to J. Conrad at 2, July 9, 2021. Yet despite this commitment, Google informed Plaintiff States on July 22 that the production of launch reports has been delayed and most reports will not be produced until mid-August or the end of August. These types of delays have been indicative of this process.

**D. Google has unreasonably delayed in producing aggregated search data.**

Separately, Plaintiff States' First RFPs served on February 24 contain several requests (Request Nos. 36-38) for more aggregated search data. These RFPs seek specific metrics related to users' journeys on Google search (*e.g.*, queries, clicks on organic links, ads, and SERP features) for different types of queries, including queries related to Google's verticals and specific brands, such as specialized vertical providers—topics central to Plaintiff States' case theories. On June 8, after discussing these data requests during four meet and confers,<sup>8</sup> Google

---

<sup>7</sup> Prior to July 9, launch reports were discussed during meet and confers on June 10, June 14, June 17, June 22, and June 28.

<sup>8</sup> Prior to June 8, Request No. 36 was discussed during meet and confers on April 14, May 11, May 21, and June 3, and Request Nos. 37 and 38 were discussed during meet and confers on April 14, May 5, May 11, and May 21.

informed us that it anticipated completing collection of the data by mid-July with delivery of hard drives to follow. Letter from F. Rubinstein to J. Conrad at 2, June 8, 2021.

Google, however, failed to meet its promised production schedule. On July 21, Google informed Plaintiff States that it did not expect to produce data responsive to Request Nos. 37 and 38 until the middle of August. Letter from F. Rubinstein to J. Conrad at 1, July 21, 2021. For Request No. 36, Google stated during the July 22 meet and confer that it will likely produce much of the requested data by the end of July or early August, but not variables relating to Google's verticals. And Google could not provide a date by which it would produce these variables, which are critically important to Plaintiff States' case. The reason for this delay is obvious: Google admitted on July 12 that it had not yet even identified data sources that may be needed to respond to Plaintiff States' requests regarding Google's verticals. As of today, Google has not committed to produce these data at any time certain.

\* \* \*

To ensure that Plaintiff States begin receiving data promptly and avoid any other delays, Plaintiff States request the Court order that Google (1) provide production schedules for the outstanding data requests and related documents by August 2, (2) begin producing responsive data and documents by no later than August 13, and (3) complete production of these materials by no later than August 27.

#### **IV. Google's Position Statement**

The parties have not reached an impasse on any of Plaintiffs' requests and Google has agreed to fulfill nearly all of Plaintiffs' requests by the end of August. Contrary to the Colorado Plaintiffs' ("Plaintiffs") submission, Google is not delaying production or withholding data responsive to Plaintiffs' questions that it has at its fingertips. The countless requests for data and information that Plaintiffs make on a weekly basis are complex and Google has worked tirelessly

to obtain (and has produced much) responsive information. While Plaintiffs now take issue with the pace of some of Google's responses, the fact is that every one of the data requests Plaintiffs now raise has required Google to create a bespoke technical solution to answer. For example, a number of the requests required Google's engineers to write special scripts to compile the requested data.

Over the past three months, Google has produced reams of documents and massive amounts of data, all while entertaining scores of follow-on informal requests from Plaintiffs. Google has engaged in near-weekly (sometimes bi-weekly), lengthy discussions with Plaintiffs, during which Google has attempted to answer every question posed. Google has also provided dozens of pages of written correspondence on these topics, again in an effort to answer Plaintiffs' many inquiries. Responding to these types of requests, and the inevitable follow up-questions, takes considerable time and requires information from multiple sources.

Plaintiffs argue that Google has delayed producing documents or data responsive to (i) Plaintiffs' Request No. 15 (launch reports); (ii) Request 33 (sessions logs and data dictionaries); (iii) Request 36 (search query and ad data); and (iv) Requests 37-38 (search and ads data for queries for 74 "Selected Brands"). Google has been consistently engaged with Plaintiffs to agree on the scope and parameters of Google's productions in response to these requests and has kept Plaintiffs apprised of its progress through the parties' many calls and lengthy written correspondence. Google has not "delayed"—rather, Google has worked diligently to create custom technical solutions to respond to each request, and building those solutions has taken time. Google has already begun producing documents and data responsive to these requests, and for the requests where the parties have agreed on scope, anticipates substantially completing its production in August.

Google provides more detailed responses to each of Plaintiffs' issues below.

**A. Google's Response to RFP 15 (Search and Search Ads Launch Reports)**

Plaintiffs' Request 15 relates to Google's Search and Search Ads "launch reports." Each Search and Search Ads launch report describes a specific product design change and includes information to be considered in deciding whether to launch the change. Google has agreed to produce to Plaintiffs *all* launch reports relating to search and search advertising going back to 2010. This effort requires Google to extract and review tens of thousands of documents. Google made an initial production of launch reports on July 22, 2021, and Google anticipates completing a rolling production of the launch reports by end of August.

Plaintiffs are dissatisfied with the pace of Google's production, but Google has been working diligently to resolve technical issues associated with extracting, reviewing, and producing these reports. Extracting the launch reports from Google's internal, custom-built database is not a simple matter. Google had to enlist engineering resources to build a bespoke technical solution to extract the reports en masse. Even after the tool was built, certain sets of launch reports caused errors and required additional trouble-shooting. Google has kept Plaintiffs apprised of these issues, and with its collection and review now well underway, expects to complete production by the end of August.

**B. Google's Response to RFP 33 (Sessions Logs Sampling Methodology; Data Dictionaries)**

Plaintiffs' RFP 33 asks for all data in a "sessions data log" for three different days. The "sessions logs" reflect data on individual user searches. The logs are massive. A single day of session logs is over [REDACTED] per day worldwide (about [REDACTED] [REDACTED]) and the U.S. portion is [REDACTED]. Sessions logs are not maintained in a human-readable format - [REDACTED]. Even after being translated into a technically human-

readable format, the logs are complex and difficult to parse.

Google objected to Plaintiffs' request on both burden and privacy grounds (due to the sensitive nature of user query data). In the parties' *first* meet and confer in April regarding data requests, Google proposed that Plaintiffs articulate the specific information they were seeking, which would allow Google to collect and produce only that specific information from the sessions logs—rather than producing the voluminous sessions logs themselves. Plaintiffs declined, insisting that they did not know enough information to be able to specify the information they were seeking in their request. Plaintiffs have since requested data dictionaries, data samples, and have asked highly technical follow-on questions over the past months. Google has attempted to answer every single request while at the same time responding to Plaintiffs' data RFPs 36-38 (see the next section) that have required writing new computer scripts and generating information that it does not maintain in the ordinary course of business.

In short, Plaintiffs made the requests for sessions logs data without understanding what the sessions logs are. Plaintiffs' bottom-up approach was bound to result in an iterative process. To date, Plaintiffs still have not identified the specific information from the sessions logs they seek. Instead, they are trying to digest and analyze the entire beach by asking Google to describe every grain of sand on it, and then asking questions about those answers. By way of example, Plaintiffs have followed up on their request for sample sessions logs with iterations of questions:

- After receiving a listing of the over [REDACTED] fields in the sessions logs, Plaintiffs asked Google to identify every one of the fields [REDACTED]. After consulting with multiple people on the logs teams, Google explained that it could not answer that question with precision given the [REDACTED] fields, and the most reliable information in

response to Plaintiffs' questions is the sample itself (which Google already provided).<sup>9</sup>

- Plaintiffs asked Google to provide the "proto" files associated with the sample sessions logs.<sup>10</sup> Google provided over [REDACTED] of these files. Google also answered numerous other questions about the structure and contents of the logs.

With respect to the specific purported delays Plaintiffs identified in their notice of disputed issues—regarding data dictionaries and sessions logs sampling—Google has produced the documents it could locate and has agreed to proceed with the production of a 5% sample of sessions logs. As detailed below, Google has already responded to Plaintiffs' iterative requests with either the information requested or an agreement to produce it—again, there is no dispute requiring Court intervention.

### **1. Data Dictionaries**

Plaintiffs asked for a "Data Dictionary" explaining all the fields in a sessions log. Google explained that it did not have a comprehensive data dictionary due to the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in the sessions logs, nor did it have centrally stored documents defining the sessions log fields. On June 13, 2021, Plaintiffs identified a few documents that discussed sessions logs (documents that Google had produced to Plaintiffs 16 months earlier) and asked Google to provide updated or similar versions of those previously produced documents. In response to this request, Google investigated and confirmed that no updated versions existed. Then, on June 21, Plaintiffs asked Google to search for documents that might provide

---

<sup>9</sup> [REDACTED] can add fields to be logged in sessions logs at any time; those fields are not removed even if the field is no longer used or the data are not kept.

<sup>10</sup> Google stores most of its data, including logs, in a compact, fast format called protocol buffers (protobufs for short). Protobufs are structured as messages which contain fields, which can be numeric, text, or another message. Fields can also have metadata attached, such as data policy annotations. Protobufs are defined by "proto files", which can be used to generate interfaces for programs to access protobuf data.

an explanation of the variables in the sessions logs or live experiments. Google conducted a reasonable search and produced additional responsive documents within three weeks of this request. Plaintiffs then asked Google to produce additional documents that were linked in the documents Google provided, and Google produced those within one week. Plaintiffs also asked for a list of all the “fields” in the sessions logs. Google generated a list of the approximately [REDACTED] fields that could be in a sessions log and provided it. As Google has responded to every one of Plaintiffs’ follow up requests regarding “Data Dictionaries,” Google does not understand there to be a dispute.

## **2. Sessions Logs Sampling**

Plaintiffs asked for a “sample” of sessions logs and Google agreed to provide 270 sample sessions containing queries within the categories of search “verticals” Plaintiffs identified as relevant to their claims. Google also explained that it would need to manually review the sample to address privacy concerns and exclude any sessions where an individual user could be identified based on the searches in the session. After enlisting an engineer to write a script to download and process the 270 sessions, and after reviewing each, Google provided the sample on June 18, 2021. As expected, the sample sessions data have generated extensive additional follow up questions that required Google to do more custom engineering work and research to answer.

After Google began working on the 270-session sample, Plaintiffs then informed Google that they “anticipated” that the sample would be “inadequate” (to assess what, Plaintiffs did not say) and demanded that Google also provide a 5% sample of sessions logs from several days. That sample will likely mean producing millions of search sessions for each day requested. The parties then spent weeks discussing a methodology to redact or remove sessions that could identify a specific user. Since a 5% sample is too large to review manually, Google

had to design an experiment to test Plaintiffs' proposed methodology for privacy concerns. That process is now complete, and Google has agreed to Plaintiffs' proposal. Google is now assessing how long it will take to extract and process the data into a human-readable format on a much larger scale than the original 270-session sample.

### **C. Google's Response to RFP 36 (Search Sessions Logs Data)**

Request 36 is a voluminous and very complex data request that requires Google to write custom code to collect information from the relevant data sources. Plaintiffs have also continued to add to this request. In connection with RFP 36, Plaintiffs have raised concerns regarding the identification and collection/production of data. We address these issues below.

Plaintiffs' Request 36 added 52 fields to a data request that DOJ had served two months earlier. Whereas DOJ's request was based on a data response that Google had provided during DOJ's investigation, Plaintiffs' 52 additional fields were entirely new; thus, Google did not have existing code written to respond to it and had to spend time manually reviewing the log data in order to see which variables could be provided in response to RFP 36 (and 37-38). On June 2, 2021, Plaintiffs added another 16 fields to this request. Google agreed to provide that information as well. Google is currently burning a hard drive with the [REDACTED] terabytes of data for its initial response to this request.

In response to recent discussions with Plaintiffs, Google has worked to identify additional data sources outside of the sessions logs on specific "search verticals" such as flights, hotels, and shopping, and preserve any such data that is responsive to RFP 36. These verticals [REDACTED] [REDACTED], and have necessitated time-consuming diligence [REDACTED]. To date, Google has not identified any information responsive to RFP 36 that is not in the sessions logs or that is not otherwise being maintained in the ordinary course of business for the period covered by RFP 36. To the extent that Google's investigation identifies



additional data responsive to RFP 36, Google anticipates supplementing its original data production.

**D. Google's Response to RFP 37 and 38**

Plaintiffs' Request 37 asked for 68 different categories of information whenever 74 different "Selected Brands" appear in the search query (37) or on the search page (38). Request 38 asked Google to identify "all searches" that met any of four criteria for all 74 Selected Brands, asked Google to "us[e] reasonable efforts to combine variants (e.g., stemmings, misspellings, singular or plural forms, etc.)" and asked Google to then produce all the data for Request 37, broken down by device type. As with RFP 36, RFPs 37-38 have required Google to write new code to respond to these requests—Google does not have this information available in the form requested by Plaintiffs. Google is currently engaged in drafting and quality checking the new code, and anticipates producing the responsive data by the middle of August.

Dated: July 27, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

By: /s/ John E. Schmidtlein  
John E. Schmidtlein (D.C. Bar No. 441261)  
Benjamin M. Greenblum (D.C. Bar No. 979786)  
Colette T. Connor (D.C. Bar No. 991533)  
725 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: 202-434-5000  
jschmidtlein@wc.com  
bgreenblum@wc.com  
cconnor@wc.com

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI P.C.  
Susan A. Creighton (D.C. Bar No. 978486)  
Franklin M. Rubinstein (D.C. Bar No. 476674)  
1700 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel: 202-973-8800  
screighton@wsgr.com  
frubinstein@wsgr.com

ROPES & GRAY LLP  
Mark S. Popofsky (D.C. Bar No. 454213)  
2099 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel: 202-508-4624  
Mark.Popofsky@ropesgray.com

*Counsel for Defendant Google LLC*

By: /s/ Kenneth M. Dintzer  
Kenneth M. Dintzer  
Jesús M. Alvarado-Rivera  
U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division  
Technology & Digital Platforms Section  
450 Fifth Street NW, Suite 7100  
Washington, DC 20530  
Kenneth.Dintzer2@usdoj.gov  
*Counsel for Plaintiff United States*

By: /s/ Jonathan R. Carter  
Leslie Rutledge, Attorney General  
Johnathan R. Carter, Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of Arkansas  
323 Center Street, Suite 200  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201  
Johnathan.Carter@arkansasag.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Arkansas*

By: /s/ Adam Miller  
Rob Bonta, Attorney General  
Ryan J. McCauley, Deputy Attorney General  
Adam Miller, Deputy Attorney General  
Paula Blizzard, Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
Kathleen Foote, Senior Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General,  
California Department of Justice  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
Suite 11000  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Adam.Miller@doj.ca.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of California*

By: /s/ Lee Istrail  
Ashley Moody, Attorney General  
R. Scott Palmer, Interim Co-Director, Antitrust Division  
Nicholas D. Niemiec, Assistant Attorney General  
Lee Istrail, Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of Florida  
PL-01 The Capitol  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399  
Lee.Istrail@myfloridalegal.com  
Scott.Palmer@myfloridalegal.com

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Florida*

By: /s/Daniel Walsh  
Christopher Carr, Attorney General  
Margaret Eckrote, Deputy Attorney General  
Daniel Walsh, Senior Assistant Attorney General  
Dale Margolin Cecka, Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of Georgia  
40 Capitol Square, SW  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334-1300  
dcecka@law.georgia.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Georgia*

By: /s/ Scott L. Barnhart  
Theodore Edward Rokita, Attorney General Scott  
L. Barnhart, Chief Counsel and Director,  
Consumer Protection Division  
Matthew Michaloski, Deputy Attorney General  
Erica Sullivan, Deputy Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of Indiana  
Indiana Government Center South, Fifth Floor  
302 West Washington Street  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204  
Scott.Barnhart@atg.in.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Indiana*

By: /s/ Philip R. Heleringer  
Daniel Cameron, Attorney General  
J. Christian Lewis, Executive Director of  
Consumer Protection  
Philip R. Heleringer, Deputy Executive Director of  
Consumer Protection  
Jonathan E. Farmer, Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General, Commonwealth of  
Kentucky  
1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200  
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601  
Phone: 502-696-5647  
philip.heleringer@ky.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Commonwealth of Kentucky*

By: /s/ Stacie L. Deblieux  
Jeff Landry, Attorney General  
Stacie L. Deblieux, Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of Louisiana  
Public Protection Division  
1885 North Third St.  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802  
Deblieuxs@ag.louisiana.gov  
*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Louisiana*

By: /s/ Wisam E. Naoum  
Dana Nessel, Attorney General  
Wisam E. Naoum, Assistant Attorney General  
Michigan Department of Attorney General  
P.O. Box 30736  
Lansing, MI 48909  
NaoumW1@michigan.gov  
*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Michigan*

By: /s/ Kimberley G. Biagioli  
Kimberley G. Biagioli  
Assistant Attorney General  
Missouri Attorney General's Office  
615 E. 13th Street, Suite 401  
Kansas City, MO 64106  
Kimberley.Biagioli@ago.mo.gov  
*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Missouri*

By: /s/ Hart Martin  
Lynn Fitch, Attorney General  
Hart Martin, Special Assistant Attorney General  
Crystal Utley Secoy, Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of  
Mississippi  
P.O. Box 220  
Jackson, Mississippi 39205  
Hart.Martin@ago.ms.gov  
*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Mississippi*

By: /s/ Mark Mattioli

Austin Knudsen, Attorney General  
Mark Mattioli, Chief, Office of Consumer  
Protection  
Office of the Attorney General, State of Montana  
P.O. Box 200151  
555 Fuller Avenue, 2nd Floor  
Helena, MT 59620-0151  
mmattioli@mt.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Montana*

By: /s/ Rebecca M. Hartner

Rebecca M. Hartner, Assistant Attorney General  
Alan Wilson, Attorney General  
W. Jeffrey Young, Chief Deputy Attorney General  
C. Havird Jones, Jr., Senior Assistant Deputy  
Attorney General  
Mary Frances Jowers, Assistant Deputy Attorney  
General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of South  
Carolina  
1000 Assembly Street  
Rembert C. Dennis Building  
P.O. Box 11549  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1549  
RHartner@scag.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of South Carolina*

By: /s/ Bret Fulkerson

Bret Fulkerson  
Office of the Attorney General, Antitrust Division  
300 West 15th Street  
Austin, Texas 78701  
Bret.Fulkerson@oag.texas.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Texas*

By: /s/ Gwendolyn J. Lindsay Cooley

Joshua L. Kaul, Attorney General  
Gwendolyn J. Lindsay Cooley, Assistant Attorney  
General  
Wisconsin Department of Justice  
17 W. Main St.  
Madison, WI 53701  
Gwendolyn.Cooley@Wisconsin.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Wisconsin*

By: /s/ Jonathan B. Sallet

Jonathan B. Sallet, Special Assistant  
Attorney General (D.C. Bar No. 336198)  
Steven Kaufmann, Deputy Attorney General  
(D.C. Bar No. 1022365 *inactive*)  
Diane R. Hazel, First Assistant Attorney  
General (D.C. Bar No. 1011531 *inactive*)  
Colorado Office of the Attorney General  
1300 Broadway, 7th Floor  
Denver, CO 80203  
Tel: 720-508-6000  
Jon.Sallet@coag.gov  
Steve.Kaufmann@coag.gov  
Diane.Hazel@coag.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Colorado*

Joseph Conrad  
Office of the Attorney General of Nebraska  
Consumer Protection Division  
2115 State Capitol Building  
Lincoln, NE 68509  
402-471-3840  
joseph.conrad@nebraska.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Nebraska*

Brunn W. (Beau) Roysden III, Solicitor  
General  
Michael S. Catlett, Deputy Solicitor General  
Dana R. Vogel, Unit Chief Counsel  
Christopher M. Sloom, Assistant Attorney  
General  
Arizona Office of the Attorney General  
2005 North Central Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
Tel: (602) 542-3725  
Dana.Vogel@azag.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Arizona*

Max Merrick Miller  
Attorney General's Office for the State of  
Iowa  
1305 East Walnut Street, 2nd Floor  
Des Moines, IA 50319  
(515) 281-5926  
Max.Miller@ag.iowa.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Iowa*

Elinor R. Hoffmann  
John D. Castiglione  
Morgan J. Feder  
Office of the Attorney General of New York  
28 Liberty Street, 21st Floor  
New York, NY 10005  
212-416-8513  
elinor.hoffmann@ag.ny.gov  
john.castiglione@ag.ny.gov  
morgan.feder@ag.ny.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff New York*

Jonathan R. Marx  
Jessica Vance Sutton  
North Carolina Department of Justice  
114 W. Edenton St.  
Raleigh, NC 27603  
919-716-6000  
Jmarx@Ncdoj.Gov  
jsutton2@ncdoj.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff North Carolina*

J. David McDowell  
Jeanette Pascale  
Christopher Dunbar  
Office of The Attorney General & Reporter  
P.O. Box 20207  
Nashville, TN 37202  
615-741-3519  
david.mcdowell@ag.tn.gov  
jenna.pascale@ag.tn.gov  
chris.dunbar@ag.tn.gov



*Counsel for Plaintiff Tennessee*

Tara Pincock  
Attorney General's Office Utah  
160 E 300 S, Ste 5th Floor  
PO Box 140874  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114  
801-366-0305  
tpincock@agutah.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Utah*

Jeff Pickett  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
jeff.pickett@alaska.gov  
State of Alaska, Department of Law  
Office of the Attorney General  
1031 W. Fourth Avenue, Suite 200  
Anchorage, Alaska 99501  
Tel: (907) 269-5100

*Counsel for Plaintiff Alaska*

Nicole Demers  
State of Connecticut Office of the Attorney  
General  
165 Capitol Avenue, Ste 5000  
Hartford, CT 06106  
860-808-5202  
nicole.demers@ct.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Connecticut*

Michael Andrew Undorf  
Delaware Department of Justice  
Fraud and Consumer Protection Division  
820 N. French St., 5th Floor  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
302-577-8924  
michael.undorf@delaware.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Delaware*

Catherine A. Jackson (D.C. Bar No.  
1005415)  
Elizabeth Gentry Arthur  
David Brunfeld  
Office of the Attorney General for the  
District of Columbia  
400 6th Street NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
202-724-6514  
catherine.jackson@dc.gov  
elizabeth.arthur@dc.gov  
david.brunfeld@dc.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff District of Columbia*

Leevin Taitano Camacho, Attorney General  
Fred Nishihira, Chief, Consumer Protection  
Division  
Benjamin Bernard Paholke, Assistant  
Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General of Guam  
590 S. Marine Corps Drive, Suite 901  
Tamuning, Guam 96913  
Tel: (671)-475-3324  
bpaholke@oagguam.org

*Counsel for Plaintiff Guam*

Rodney I. Kimura  
Office of the Attorney General of Hawaii  
Commerce & Economic Development  
425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
808-586-1180  
rodney.i.kimura@hawaii.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Hawaii*

Brett DeLange  
Office of the Idaho Attorney General  
Consumer Protection Division  
954 W. State St., 2nd Fl.  
PO Box 83720  
Boise, ID 83720-0010  
208-334-4114  
brett.delange@ag.idaho.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Idaho*

Erin L. Shencopp  
Blake Harrop  
Joseph Chervin  
Office of the Attorney General of Illinois  
100 W. Randolph St.  
Chicago, IL 60601  
312-793-3891  
eshencopp@atg.state.il.us  
bharrop@atg.state.il.us  
jchervin@atg.state.il.us

*Counsel for Plaintiff Illinois*

Lynette R. Bakker  
Office of the Attorney General of Kansas  
Consumer Protection & Antitrust  
120 S.W. 10th Avenue, Ste 2nd Floor  
Topeka, KS 66612-1597  
785-368-8451  
lynette.bakker@ag.ks.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Kansas*

Christina M. Moylan  
Office of the Attorney General of Maine  
6 State House Station  
Augusta, ME 04333-0006  
207-626-8838  
christina.moylan@maine.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Maine*

Schonette J. Walker  
Assistant Attorney General  
Deputy Chief, Antitrust Division  
Office of the Attorney General  
swalker@oag.state.md.us

Gary Honick  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
200 St. Paul Place, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Baltimore, MD 21202

410-576-6480  
ghonick@oag.state.md.us

*Counsel for Plaintiff Maryland*

Matthew B. Frank, Assistant Attorney  
General Antitrust Division  
William T. Matlack, Assistant Attorney  
General  
Chief, Antitrust Division  
Michael B. MacKenzie, Assistant Attorney  
General  
Deputy Chief, Antitrust Division  
Office of the Attorney General  
One Ashburton Place, 18th Fl.  
Boston, MA 02108  
Tel: (617) 727-2200  
Matthew.Frank@mass.gov  
William.Matlack@mass.gov  
Michael.Mackenzie@mass.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Massachusetts*

Justin Moor, Assistant Attorney General  
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 1400  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2130  
(651) 757-1060  
justin.moor@ag.state.mn.us

*Counsel for Plaintiff Minnesota*

Marie W.L. Martin  
Michelle Christine Newman  
Lucas J. Tucker  
Nevada Office of the Attorney General  
Bureau of Consumer Protection  
100 N. Carson Street  
Carson City, NV 89701  
775-624-1244  
mwmartin@ag.nv.gov  
mnewman@ag.nv.gov  
ltucker@ag.nv.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Nevada*

Brandon Garod  
Office of Attorney General of New  
Hampshire  
33 Capitol Street  
Concord, NH 03301  
603-271-1217  
brandon.h.garod@doj.nh.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff New Hampshire*

Robert Holup  
New Jersey Attorney General's Office  
124 Halsey Street, 5th Floor  
Newark, NJ 07102  
239-822-6123  
robert.holup@law.njoag.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff New Jersey*

Mark F. Swanson  
Cholla Khoury  
New Mexico Office of the Attorney General  
408 Galisteo St.  
Santa Fe, NM 87504  
Tel: 505.490.4885  
mswanson@nmag.gov  
ckhoury@nmag.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff New Mexico*

Parrell D. Grossman  
Director  
Elin S. Alm  
Assistant Attorney General  
Consumer Protection & Antitrust Division  
Office of the Attorney General  
1050 E. Interstate Ave., Suite 200  
Bismarck, ND 58503  
701-328-5570  
pgrossman@nd.gov  
ealm@nd.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff North Dakota*

Beth Ann Finnerty  
Mark Kittel  
Jennifer Pratt  
Office of The Attorney General of Ohio,  
Antitrust Section  
30 E Broad Street, 26<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-466-4328  
beth.finnerty@ohioattorneygeneral.gov  
mark.kittel@ohioattorneygeneral.gov  
jennifer.pratt@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Ohio*

Caleb J. Smith Assistant Attorney General  
Consumer Protection Unit  
Office of the Oklahoma Attorney General  
313 NE 21st St  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
Tel: (405) 522-1014  
Caleb.Smith@oag.ok.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Oklahoma*

Cheryl Hiemstra  
Oregon Department of Justice  
1162 Court St NE  
Salem, OR 97301  
503-934-4400  
cheryl.hiemstra@doj.state.or.us

*Counsel for Plaintiff Oregon*

Tracy W. Wertz  
Joseph S. Betsko  
Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General  
Strawberry Square  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
Tel: (717) 787-4530  
jbetsko@attorneygeneral.gov  
twertz@attorneygeneral.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Pennsylvania*

Johan M. Rosa Rodríguez  
Assistant Attorney General Antitrust  
Division  
Puerto Rico Department of Justice  
PO Box 9020192  
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00902-0192  
Tel: (787) 721-2900, ext. 1201  
jorosa@justicia.pr.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Puerto Rico*

David Marzilli  
Rhode Island Office of the Attorney General  
150 South Main Street  
Providence, RI 02903  
Tel: (401) 274-4400  
dmarzilli@riag.ri.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Rhode Island*

Yvette K. Lafrentz  
Office of The Attorney General of  
South Dakota  
1302 E. Hwy 14, Suite 1  
Pierre, SD 57501  
605-773-3215  
yvette.lafrentz@state.sd.us

*Counsel for Plaintiff South Dakota*

Ryan G. Kriger  
Office of The Attorney General of  
Vermont  
109 State St.  
Montpelier, VT 05609  
802-828-3170  
ryan.kriger@vermont.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Vermont*

Sarah Oxenham Allen  
Tyler Timothy Henry  
Office of the Attorney General of Virginia  
Antitrust Unit/Consumer Protection Section  
202 N. 9th Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
804-786-6557  
soallen@oag.state.va.us  
thenry@oag.state.va.us

*Counsel for Plaintiff Virginia*

Amy Hanson  
Washington State Attorney General  
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-464-5419  
amy.hanson@atg.wa.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Washington*

Douglas Lee Davis  
Tanya L. Godfrey  
Office of Attorney General, State of West  
Virginia  
P.O. Box 1789  
812 Quarrier Street, 1st Floor  
Charleston, WV 25326  
304-558-8986  
doug.davis@wvago.gov  
tanya.l.godfrey@wvago.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff West Virginia*

Benjamin Mark Burningham  
Amy Pauli  
Wyoming Attorney General's Office  
2320 Capitol Avenue  
Kendrick Building  
Cheyenne, WY 82002  
(307) 777-6397  
ben.burningham@wyo.gov  
amy.pauli@wyo.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Wyoming*