

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CONCORD MUSIC GROUP, INC., et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
ANTHROPIC PBC,
Defendant.

Case No. 24-cv-03811-EKL (SVK)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DEFERRING IN PART DISCOVERY
DISPUTE RE PRODUCTION OF
BITTORRENT DOCUMENTS**

Re: Dkt. No. 420

Before the Court is the Parties' Joint Submission setting forth a dispute as to whether Defendant Anthropic PBC (Anthropic) is obligated to produce documents relating to its use of the BitTorrent protocol to acquire books that contain Works-in-Suit. Dkt. 420. Underlying this dispute is Plaintiffs' pending motion to amend its complaint to specifically cover copyright violations arising from the use of BitTorrent. *See* Dkt. 411 (Pl. Mot. for Leave to File SAC). Both sides propose compromises to resolve the discovery dispute. Dkt. 420 at 5, 10. The Court determines that this matter may be resolved without oral argument. Civ. L.R. 7-1(b).

In light of the pending motion to amend, which necessarily impacts the scope of relevant and proportional discovery responses in this case, even as to existing requests for documents, and each side's proposed compromise, the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

No later than September 11, 2025, Anthropic will produce the unredacted briefs from the class certification and summary judgment motions in *Bartz v. Anthropic PBC*, No. 24-cv-05417-WHA (*Bartz*) (other than information designated under the Protective Order by *Bartz* Plaintiffs that reflects personal identification information) and produce the raw text, extracted text and metadata from LibGen and PiLiMi data sets. Additionally, Anthropic will serve a verified supplemental response to Interrogatory No. 6.

Plaintiffs' broader proposal for all documents and communications regarding Anthropic's

1 consideration of or actual use of the BitTorrent protocol, including the proffered compromise that
2 Anthropic produce the discovery on this topic produced in the *Bartz* case, is **DEFERRED** pending
3 a ruling on Plaintiffs’ motion to amend. Plaintiff’s may renew this request **within five days** of a
4 ruling on their motion to amend.

5
6 **SO ORDERED.**

7 Dated: September 8, 2025

8
9 
10 _____
11 SUSAN VAN KEULEN
12 United States Magistrate Judge

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
United States District Court
Northern District of California