

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
(SOUTHERN DIVISION)**

TECHNOLOGY PATENTS LLC,

*

*

Plaintiff,

*

*

v.

*

CIVIL ACTION NO: AW-07-3012

*

DEUTSCHE TELEKON AG, et al.,

*

*

Defendants.

*

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before this Court is Plaintiff's Motion and Proposed Order Requiring AT&T Mobility to Produce Its Agreements with Foreign Carriers and Related Document (Docket Item No. 1228) and Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Defendants T-Mobile USA and Sprint Nextel Corporation to Identify and Produce Their Agreements with Foreign Carriers and Related Documents, and Supporting Memorandum (Docket Item No. 1248)(Plaintiff's Motions). The Court has Reviewed Plaintiff's Motions and all memoranda related thereto. No hearing is deemed necessary. Local Rule 105.6 (D. Md.). For the following reasons, the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiff's Motions.

Plaintiff seeks Orders requiring Defendants AT&T Mobility, T-Mobile USA and Sprint Nextel Corporation (the "Defendants") to produce their agreements with foreign carriers. The Court is persuaded that the sought after agreements are discoverable despite the objections raised. While many foreign carriers have been dismissed from this case, the requested agreements are still reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding the claims and defenses between the remaining litigants. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26. The relevance of the existence and contents of these agreements is broader than the limited concerns

asserted regarding personal jurisdiction. Equally true, redacting the identities of the carriers severely dilutes the proffered justification compelling disclosure, that is, to allow reasonable inquiry to confirm or dispel Plaintiff's claims for infringement and the calculation of damages. See BMC Resources, Inc. v. Paymentech, L.P., 498 F. 3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2007); Rowe Int'l Corp. v. Ecast, Inc., 586 F. Supp. 2d 924 (N.D. Ill. 2008); DSU Medical Corp. v. JMS Co., Ltd., 471 F. 3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2006); and NTP Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd., 418 F. 3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005). For the aforementioned reasons, Plaintiff's Motions are hereby GRANTED. A separate Order shall be entered by the Court.

/s/
Charles B. Day
United States Magistrate Judge
October 13, 2009