IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DRONE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

PARROT S.A., PARROT, INC.,

Defendants.

14cv0111
ELECTRONICALLY FILED

ORDER OF COURT RE: OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITION EXCERPTS (DOC. NOS. 326-329)

Presently before this Court are designations of excerpts from the following depositions: (1) September 10, 2014, 30(b)(6) deposition of Bruce Ding; (2) individual deposition of Bruce Ding on September 11, 2014; (3) individual deposition of Diane Lee on September 12, 2014; and (4) February 6, 2015 deposition of James Foley. The Parties have lodged objections to portions of the depositions of Ding (September 11, 2014), Lee, and Foley. There are no objections to Ding's September 10, 2014 deposition transcript. Counsel have provided the Court with unredacted copies of the transcripts of these depositions, which enables the Court to rule on the Parties' objections to deposition designations.

AND NOW, this 22nd day of April, 2015, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. Plaintiff's objection to the identified portion of Ding's September 11, 2014 deposition (Doc. No. 327), is **SUSTAINED** based upon this Court's prior rulings;

2. The following objections to designations of the September 12, 2015 deposition of Diane Lee (Doc. No. 328) are **SUSTAINED**:

   a. 12:22-13:8 (Plaintiff's counter-designation)

   b. 68:20-69:3;

   c. 69:15-19; 69:23-24; 70:7-8; 70:12-16; 71:2-14; 71:16-20; 71:22-23; 72:18-19; 72:21-73:8; 73:14-15; 73:17-75:1; 75:7-9; 75:11-12 and 15-17; 75:19-25;76:8-10; 76:12-13;

   d. 86:2-13; and

e. 105:20-106:14, 16,19-24 (Plaintiff's counter-designation); 107:6-17 (The Court encourages the Parties to stipulate as to the reason Lee is appearing via deposition)

3. As identified by the Parties, Defendants may not introduce any designated excerpts that are impacted by the Court's ruling on Plaintiff's Motion in Limine No. 1 (Doc. No. 287) unless given leave to do so by the Court.

4. The following objections to designations of the February 6, 2015 deposition of James Foley (Doc. No. 329-1) are **OVERRULED**:

   a. 7:9-8:2;

   b. 47:25-49:19 (excluding 48:12-13; 49:9-17);

   c. 49:20-50:14 (excluding 49:22; 50:5-9);

   d. 54:14-21;

   e. 60:24-61:7;

   f. 70:25-71:12 (excluding 71:3); and

   g. 86:3-18 (excluding 86:11)

5. If the depositions will be presented through video, the Parties shall edit the videotaped depositions in accordance with these rulings.

s/ Arthur J. Schwab
Arthur J. Schwab
United States District Judge

cc: All Registered ECF Counsel and Parties