

EXHIBIT 6
TO THE DECLARATION OF
JACOB T. VELTMAN

December 18, 2014

Via E-Mail

Aaron P. Allan
Glaser Weil Fink Howard Avchen & Shapiro LLP
10250 Constellation Blvd.
19th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Re: LegalZoom.com, Inc. v. Rocket Lawyer Incorporated – USDC Case No. 2:12-CV-09942 – Subpoena to Google

Dear Aaron:


Thank you for speaking with us today regarding your subpoenas in the above-referenced matter. We received your one-sided and inaccurate email purporting to summarize our call today. I am not going to spend time correcting your attempt to manufacture a record. I do note that the letter is accurate insofar as it reflects that you made no effort during the call to address Google's objections to your subpoena campaign or to seek a compromise in any way.

As we said on the call, we will put a proposal together to conclusively resolve this matter. We did not say we could do it today, as your email demands, but we will endeavor to do so.

We do not, however, understand your reference to "drafting a joint stipulation for purposes of moving to compel." You appear to be under the misimpression that a motion to compel or a motion for protective order would be litigated in the Central District of California. That is not consistent with Rule 45. Should you choose to move to compel against Michael Margolis, any motion would need to be brought in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington, where he resides, as that is the district where performance is demanded. Similarly, any motion to compel against Google Inc. must be brought in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

Sincerely,

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
Professional Corporation


Jacob Veltman