

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

SYNOPSYS, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
ATOPTECH, INC,
Defendant.

Case No. 13-cv-02965-MMC (DMR)

**ORDER REQUESTING
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
REGARDING THE DEPOSITION OF
STEVEN MEIER**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 775, 782

On June 27, 2016, Synopsys filed a unilateral discovery letter moving to quash the deposition subpoena of Mr. Steven Meier and moving for a protective order, purportedly on behalf of Synopsys and Meier. [Docket No. 775 at 1.] The court ordered that Meier’s deposition not go forward until the court resolved the issue, and requested ATopTech’s position. [Docket No. 776.] ATopTech responded that Meier had voluntarily agreed to sit for his deposition and had actually selected the June 28, 2016 date that his deposition was originally noticed for. [Docket No. 782 at 1.]

In light of this seemingly conflicting information, the parties are instructed to file a joint letter by July 7, 2016. Each side is allotted 100 words to answer the following questions:

- 1) Does Synopsys’s counsel represent Mr. Meier?
- 2) Does Mr. Meier object to the deposition subpoena?
- 3) Did Mr. Meier voluntarily agree to sit for his deposition on the date noticed by ATopTech?

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 1, 2016



Donna M. Ryu
United States Magistrate Judge