

Exhibit A

Redacted Version of Document to be Sealed

From: [John S. LeRoy](#)
To: [Chris Stewart](#); [Liz Ranks](#); [Conrad Gosen](#); neowireless@caldwellcc.com
Cc: DL_Nissan-Neo@jenner.com; dla-toyota-neowireless@us.dlapiper.com; FCA-Neo@Venable.com; MercedesNeoWireless@hoganlovells.com; [SERVICE] [GM/Neo](#); [Service-Honda/Neo](#); [SERVICE] [Tesla/Neo](#); quadrozzi@youngpc.com; VW-Neo@sternekessler.com; FMCL0315L@brookskushman.com; pmodi@jenner.com
Subject: RE: In re Neo Wireless - MDL-wide Discovery Issues
Date: Friday, October 6, 2023 7:57:10 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Chris,

With respect to [REDACTED] Defendants might consider a stipulation broadly stating that Neo is not withholding *any communications* (including any and all charts, assessments, valuations, summaries, PowerPoints, emails, spreadsheets, etc.) [REDACTED] We will address that possibility on our end, but until you receive something on behalf of all Defendants, you should respond *fully* to Defendants' motion assuming there is no resolution.

With respect to [REDACTED] for reasons already stated in Defendants' motion. The facts of those cases are highly distinguishable for obvious reasons. Those cases support Defendants, not Neo.

Thanks,

John

John LeRoy
Co-Chair of IP Litigation
D: 248.226.2754 | M: 586.295.9690
jleroy@brookskushman.com
[LinkedIn](#) | [Bio](#)

[REDACTED]
Brooks Kushman P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075
brookskushman.com

FUELED BY RELATIONSHIPS

This email may contain and/or attach privileged attorney-client communications and/or attorney work product.

From: Chris Stewart <cstewart@caldwellcc.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 5, 2023 6:53 PM
To: John S. LeRoy <jleroy@brookskushman.com>; Liz Ranks <ranks@fr.com>; Conrad Gosen <gosen@fr.com>; neowireless@caldwellcc.com
Cc: DL_Nissan-Neo@jenner.com; dla-toyota-neowireless@us.dlapiper.com; FCA-Neo@Venable.com; MercedesNeoWireless@hoganlovells.com; [SERVICE] GM/Neo <SERVICEGMNeo@fr.com>; Service-Honda/Neo <Service-Honda/Neo@fr.com>; [SERVICE] Tesla/Neo <SERVICETeslaNeo@fr.com>; quadrozzi@youngpc.com; VW-Neo@sternekessler.com; FMCL0315L@brookskushman.com; pmodi@jenner.com
Subject: RE: In re Neo Wireless - MDL-wide Discovery Issues

John,

I didn't [REDACTED] The [REDACTED] [REDACTED] as I made clear below. Which is why I was confused by the language in your motion suggesting this was just one of several things we were withholding. So by explaining that we're going to produce them, I was mooted all that remained of the dispute, with the sole exception of the separate and distinct discussion of a [REDACTED]

On the [REDACTED], you're learning more about it for the first time because you didn't ask any further questions about it or ask to confer further in the two weeks between the hearing and filing your motion. But [REDACTED]. So now you know that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] With that in mind, and setting aside [REDACTED], can you clarify—do you agree that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] are at least work product? In other words, is the only dispute [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

To be clear, we disagree with your motion on [REDACTED]. There is no requirement that [REDACTED] as your motion suggests. You cited a case where those happened to be the facts, but it's not the rule. [REDACTED]

And in any case, [REDACTED] does not require application of the common interest doctrine. Your motion cited an NDCA case [REDACTED] [REDACTED] but that is definitely not the standard in EDMI. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

We'll explain all this to the Court if it's still in dispute, but please let me know what is in dispute now that you have more information, and if you'd like to discuss further by phone.

Thanks,
Chris

Chris Stewart | Caldwell Cassady Curry PC
214.888.4846

From: John S. LeRoy <jleroy@brookskushman.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 5, 2023 1:04 PM
To: Chris Stewart <cstewart@caldwellcc.com>; Liz Ranks <ranks@fr.com>; Conrad Gosen <gosen@fr.com>; neowireless@caldwellcc.com
Cc: DL_Nissan-Neo@jenner.com; dla-toyota-neowireless@us.dlapiper.com; FCA-Neo@Venable.com; MercedesNeoWireless@hoganlovells.com; [SERVICE] GM/Neo <SERVICEGMNeo@fr.com>; Service-Honda/Neo <Service-Honda/Neo@fr.com>; [SERVICE] Tesla/Neo <SERVICETeslaNeo@fr.com>; quadrozzi@youngpc.com; VW-Neo@sternekessler.com; FMCL0315L@brookskushman.com; pmodi@jenner.com
Subject: RE: In re Neo Wireless - MDL-wide Discovery Issues

Chris,

Defendants' motion requests more than [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

This is the first I have heard of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] To the extent there is any doubt, Defendants expect [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] You assert [REDACTED] "are clearly
privileged and work product." But [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thanks,

John

John LeRoy

Co-Chair of IP Litigation
D: 248.226.2754 | M: 586.295.9690
jleroy@brookskushman.com
[LinkedIn](#) | [Bio](#)



Brooks Kushman P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075
brookskushman.com

FUELED BY RELATIONSHIPS

This email may contain and/or attach privileged attorney-client communications and/or attorney work product.

From: Chris Stewart <cstewart@caldwellcc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 4, 2023 4:27 PM
To: John S. LeRoy <jleroy@brookskushman.com>; Liz Ranks <ranks@fr.com>; Conrad Gosen <gosen@fr.com>; neowireless@caldwellcc.com
Cc: DL_Nissan-Neo@jenner.com; dla-toyota-neowireless@us.dlapiper.com; FCA-Neo@Venable.com; MercedesNeoWireless@hoganlovells.com; [SERVICE] GM/Neo <SERVICEGMNeo@fr.com>; Service-Honda/Neo <Service-Honda/Neo@fr.com>; [SERVICE] Tesla/Neo <SERVICETeslaNeo@fr.com>; quadrozzi@youngpc.com; VW-Neo@sternekessler.com; FMCL0315L@brookskushman.com; pmodi@jenner.com
Subject: RE: In re Neo Wireless - MDL-wide Discovery Issues

John,

We've reviewed defendants' motion to compel. It asks for a number of things we already agreed to provide (back on 9/12 in my email below), and mischaracterizes or misunderstands [REDACTED]

On the [REDACTED], all we said we [REDACTED]. But at any rate, having looked into it more, we'll just produce them [REDACTED]. We don't agree that they are relevant or will ultimately be admissible, and the Court didn't seem inclined to think so either. But we'll produce them to moot this dispute.

Regarding [REDACTED] I wish you would have asked us to clarify in the two weeks between the hearing and your motion (and I'm pretty sure

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.