FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT Western District of Texas

2010 DEC -7 PM 2: 03

Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC Plaintiff,	CLERK US DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT COURT	
v.) SUBPOENA IN A CIVIL CASE) CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:09-CV-04436-CW) Northern District of California	
Apple Inc. Defendant,	A10mc932	SS

OPPOSED MOTION TO QUASH THE INDIVIDUAL SUBPOENA OF TIMOTHY G. NEWMAN AND BRIEF IN SUPPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

Larson, Newman & Abel, LLP (Larson Newman) and Mr. Timothy G. Newman hereby move the Court to quash the deposition subpoena issued to Mr. Newman by Apple Inc. under Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c)(3), or in the alternative, impose sanctions under Fed. R. Civ. P. 45 (c)(1).

On September 27, 2010, Apple Inc. served a Rule 30(b)(6) subpoena issued from this Court on the law firm Larson Newman. That subpoena commanded a representative of Larson Newman to appear for deposition on October 20, 2010. Larson Newman complied with the subpoena; however no one from Apple appeared to take the deposition. Four weeks later, Apple issued another subpoena for the individual deposition of Mr. Newman, a partner at Larson Newman. Larson Newman and Mr. Newman attempted to reach a compromise, but Apple insisted on moving forward with both subpoenas. The subpoena of Larson Newman has been satisfied. On December 7, the parties met and conferred on the matter. The parties are still at an impasse. For the reasons set forth below, Larson Newman and Mr. Newman move to quash Apple's subpoena of Mr. Newman.

II. FACTS

Apple has already taken up a substantial amount of Mr. Newman's and his partners' time. Apple has been unwilling to enter into the compromise solution proposed by Mr. Newman to

avoid additional burden. It is undisputed that the lawfirm and Mr. Newman are third parties to this action.

The following timeline sets forth the relevant events.

- September 27, 2010 Apple served a third-party Rule 30(b)(6) subpoena on
 Larson Newman including 15 broad deposition topics. In addition, Apple
 commanded document production pursuant to 33 expansive document requests.

 See Exhibit A.
- October 11, 2010 Larson Newman produced documents and served written objections. See Exhibit B.
- October 20, 2010 Movant Timothy Newman and his partner Jeffrey Abel appeared for deposition on the date and at the location commanded in the Rule 30(b)(6) subpoena. No one from Apple appeared. No one from Apple contacted Larson Newman on or prior to this date to propose alternate plans. See Declaration of Timothy G. Newman, Exhibit C.
- November 18, 2010 In response to Apple's inquires to reschedule, Mr. Newman indicated by letter that Larson Newman had fulfilled its obligations under the subpoena, and that Apple's continued demands were an unreasonable burden. In the interests of compromise, Mr. Newman offered to appear for a telephonic deposition. See Letter from Newman to Apple counsel Ryan Yagura, Exhibit D.
- November 18, 2010 After that letter was dictated but before it was sent, Apple served Mr. Newman with a subpoena commanding his personal deposition on December 13, 2010. See Exhibit D.
- November 19, 2010 In response to Mr. Newman's compromise offer, Apple indicated that it was proceeding under both subpoenas and insisted that Mr.
 Newman appear in person for deposition. See Letter from Glasser to Newman, Exhibit E.

Larson Newman fully satisfied its obligations under Apple's first subpoena. Failing to appear for the first deposition it subpoenaed, Apple's subsequent actions are a plain attempt to impose an unreasonable burden on a third party. Consequently, the Court should quash Apple's second subpoena of Mr. Newman.

III. RULE 45 PROTECTS THIRD PARTIES FROM UNDUE BURDEN OR EXPENSE

Mr. Newman is a third party to the action between Apple and Affinity Labs. Third parties are subject to special protections during discovery. Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c)(1); See, e.g., Bagwell v. Rival Consumer Sales Corp., 2006 WL 2883137 at *2 (W.D.Tex. September 19, 2006). That rule provides:

Avoiding Undue Burden or Expense; Sanctions. A party or attorney responsible for issuing and serving a subpoena must take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden or expense on a person subject to the subpoena. The issuing court must enforce this duty and impose an appropriate sanction — which may include lost earnings and reasonable attorney's fees — on a party or attorney who fails to comply.

Apple simply failed to adhere to its own schedule or even call to discuss arrangements for the first subpoena it issued to Larson Newman. In doing so, Apple now seeks to impose a multiple-day commitment, including time already expended, on Larson Newman. As an end-run around its error, Apple issued a second subpoena on Mr. Newman individually. Larson Newman already complied with Apple's Rule 30(b)(6) subpoena. Mr. Newman and Mr. Abel produced documents and appeared once already for deposition. *See* Declaration of Timothy G. Newman, Exhibit C. Apple's failure to show up for its first-subpoenaed deposition and issuance of a second subpoena constitutes an undue burden on Mr. Newman and Larson Newman. There is no dispute that Apple's failure to show is no fault of Mr. Newman's or Larson Newman. The Court may therefore impose an appropriate sanction on Apple. Rule 45(c)(1) specifies the minimum sanction – Mr. Newman and the firm's lost earning and attorney's fees – but quashing the subpoena entirely is more appropriate under the circumstances. Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c)(3)(A) (providing for quashing or modifying a subpoena if it subjects a person to undue burden).

IV. CONCLUSION

Larson Newman satisfied its obligations under Apple's Rule 30(b)(6) subpoena. Apple failed to appear pursuant to its own subpoena to depose a third party in this district, and now attempts to avoid the consequences of its failure by issuing another subpoena. Serving both subpoenas constitutes a burden above and beyond what the firm and Mr. Newman's obligations should be under Rule 45. As a result, Larson Newman and Mr. Newman respectfully request that the Court quash the subpoena of Mr. Newman under Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c)(3).

Dated:

<u>December 7, 2010</u>

Respectfully submitted,

BY:

H. Kenneth Prol

Texas Bar No. 24027757

LARSON NEWMAN & ABEL, LLP

5914 West Courtyard Drive, Ste. 200

Austin, Texas 78730

(512) 439-7100 (Phone)

(512) 439-7199 (Fax)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 7, 2010, the parties met and conferred and could not agree to resolve the issue over the subpoena of Mr. Newman. I further certify that on December 7, 2010, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served via courier on the following counsel of record as follows:

by: H. Kenneth Prol

Federal Express tracking no. 794189974728 to: Darin Glasser

O'Melveny & Myers LLP 610 Newport Center Drive, 17th Floor

Newport Beach, CA 92660 Phone: (949) 823-6952 Fax: (949) 823-6994

Email: dglasser@omm.com

Federal Express tracking no. 794187700430 to:

Nicholas Whilt, Esq.

O'Melveny & Myers LLP

400 South Hope Street

Los Angeles, CA 90071

Phone: (213) 430-7503 Fax: (213) 430-6407

Email: nwhilt@omm.com

ATTORNEY FOR APPLE, INC.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT Western District of Texas

-	Labs of Texas, LLC)		
F	Plaintiff,)		
v.))	CIVIL	DENA IN A CIVIL CASE ACTION NO. 4:09-CV-04436-CW rn District of California
Apple In)		
1	Defendant,)		
	PROPOS	EL) ORDI	ER
F	Having considered the facts and argum	ents	s in the C	PPOSED MOTION TO QUASH
		* * * 7		75.6.5.T. 1 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
THE IN	DIVIDUAL SUBPOENA OF TIMOT	НΥ	G. NEW	MAN and considering the motion to
be well-	taken, the Court HEREBY ORDERS	tha	ıt:	
7	Γhe Motion to Quash the Individual Su	lbpo	ena of T	imothy G. Newman IS GRANTED
and				•
I	FURTHER ORDERS that the deposit	ion	that is th	ne subject of the subpoena shall not
proceed.				
	SO ORE	ER	RED:	-
				U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Texas, Austin Division.
DATED	:			

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	nity Labs	. l. Tela	DEFENDANT						
affe	nery Lass	L' LIC	/ Opp	ile Ine.					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)					
,		,		LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, U ND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name	e, Address, and Telephone Numb	per)	Attorneys (If Knov	vn)					
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X"	in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP O	F PRINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff				
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases On Citizen of This State	PTF DEF 1 1 1 Incorporated or P of Business In Th					
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	☐ 2 ☐ 2 Incorporated and of Business In					
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	□ 3 □ 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6				
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box C	Only)	1 oreign country						
<u>CONTRACT</u>	l	RTS	FORFEITURE/PENALT		OTHER STATUTES				
 □ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property 	Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	PERSONAL INJUR 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractic 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION 510 Motions to Vacata Sentence Habeas Corpus: 533 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Ott 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	620 Other Food & Drug	PROPERTY RIGHTS	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes				
V ODICIN									
🕱 1 Original 🗍 2 Re	até Court	Appellate Court	Reopened an	ransferred from tother district pecify) 6 Multidist Litigation					
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Brief description of co		re filing (Do not cite jurisdict	tional statutes unless diversity):					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P	IS A CLASS ACTION	N DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	if demanded in complaint:				
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER					
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY OF RECORD						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		-			**************************************				
RECEIPT# A	MOUNT	APPLVING IEP	IIIDG	E MAC HI	DCF				

DUPLICATE

Court Name: TEXAS WESTERN

Division: 1

Receipt Number: 100008586

Cashier ID: tkatzen

Transaction Date: 12/07/2010 Payer Name: H. KENNETH PROL

MISCELLANEOUS PAPERS For: H. KENNETH PROL

Amount: \$39.00

CASH

Cr

Amt Tendered: \$39.00

Total Due:

\$39.00

Total Tendered: \$39.00

Change Amt: \$0.00

1:10-MC-932 SS; AFFINITY LABS OF

TEXAS LLC V. APPLE INC.