

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

LAM RESEARCH CORPORATION,
Plaintiff,
v.
SCHUNK SEMICONDUCTOR, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [03-cv-01335-EMC](#) (JCS)

DISCOVERY ORDER

Re: Dkt. No. 344

The parties filed a join letter, Dkt. No. 344, in which Plaintiff Lam Research Corporation (“Lam”) seeks to quash the notice of deposition of its CEO, Martin Anstice (“Anstice”). As Defendant Xycarb Ceramics, Inc. (“Xycarb”) has not shown that (1) proposed deponent Anstice “has unique first-hand, non-repetitive knowledge of the facts at issue in the case,” *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd*, 282 F.R.D. 259, 263 (N.D. Cal. 2012), or that (2) Xycarb “has exhausted other less intrusive discovery methods,” *id.*, Lam’s motion to quash the proposed “apex” deposition of Martin Anstice is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 5, 2014



JOSEPH C. SPERO
United States Magistrate Judge