

EXHIBIT 4

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 2:17-CV-513-JRG
v.	§	(LEAD CASE)
	§	
HUAWEI DEVICE USA INC., <i>et al.</i> ,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 2:17-CV-516-JRG
v.	§	(CONSOLIDATED CASE)
	§	
APPLE INC.,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO NOTICE OF SUBPOENA TO NEIL GILBERT SIEGEL

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45, Neil Gilbert Siegel serves these Objections and Responses to the September 27, 2018 Subpoena to Testify in a Civil Action (“Subpoena”) of AGIS Software Development, LLC (“AGIS”):

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Dr. Siegel makes the following general objections to the Notice, which are hereby incorporated by reference and made part of his Specific Responses and Objections to each topic for examination:

1. Dr. Siegel objects to the Notice to the extent it seeks to impose any requirements or obligations in addition to or different from those set forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of this Court, any applicable orders of this Court, or any stipulation or agreement by the parties to the above-captioned case.

2. Dr. Siegel objects to each deposition topic to the extent it calls for information that is protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or that is otherwise protected from disclosure under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Federal Rules of Evidence, the Local Rules of this Court, any applicable orders of this Court, and/or relevant statutory or case law. Any agreement to testify is made without waiver of, and with preservation of, the right to withhold any information subject to any such privilege or immunity or any information discovered to be subject to any such privilege or immunity during the course of the deposition. Inadvertent disclosure of any such information shall not be deemed a waiver of any privilege or immunity.

3. Dr. Siegel objects to each deposition topic to the extent it calls for information that is not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the above-captioned case.

4. Dr. Siegel objects to each deposition topic to the extent it seeks discovery that is not proportional to the needs of the case.

5. Dr. Siegel objects to each deposition topic to the extent it calls for the disclosure of confidential and/or proprietary information of any other individual or entity.

6. Dr. Siegel objects to each deposition topic to the extent it seeks information without a time limitation.

7. Dr. Siegel objects to each deposition topic to the extent it seeks discovery of information that is cumulative or duplicative of information requested in another deposition topic.

8. Dr. Siegel objects to every deposition topic to the extent it seeks information that is already in AGIS's possession, custody, or control; is obtainable by AGIS from a more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive source; or is otherwise cumulative or duplicative.

9. Dr. Siegel objects to every deposition topic to the extent it assumes facts or obligations contrary to evidence or otherwise unsupported by facts or application of law.

10. Dr. Siegel objects to every deposition topic to the extent it purports to attribute any special or unusual meaning to any terms or phrases.

SPECIFIC RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS

Topic No. 1:

The structure, operation, design, development, functionality, features, testing, and manufacture of FBCB2.

Response to Topic No. 1:

Dr. Siegel incorporates by reference his general objections. Dr. Siegel further objects to this topic as irrelevant to the extent it seeks information about the structure, operation, design, development, functionality, features, testing, and manufacture of FBCB2 after the alleged priority date of the patents asserted in the above-captioned litigation. Dr. Siegel further objects to this topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case for including an unbounded time period. Dr. Siegel further objects to this topic to the extent it requires disclosure of trade secrets, confidential business information, or classified government information.

Subject to and without waiving these objections, Dr. Siegel will testify regarding this topic.

Topic No. 2:

The dates and circumstances relating to the development of FBCB2, the location of the development of FBCB2, and the identity of Person(s) and Entity involved in the development of FBCB2.

Response to Topic No. 2:

Dr. Siegel incorporates by reference his general objections. Dr. Siegel further objects to this topic as irrelevant to the extent it seeks the dates and circumstances relating to the development of FBCB2, the location of the development of FBCB2, and the identity of any person or entity involved in the development of FBCB2 after the priority date of the patents asserted in the above-captioned litigation. Dr. Siegel further objects to this topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case for including an unbounded time period and for seeking the identity of every person and/or entity involved in the development of FBCB2. Dr. Siegel further objects to this request to the extent it requires disclosure of trade secrets, confidential business information, or classified government information.

Subject to and without waiving these objections, Dr. Siegel will testify regarding this topic.

Topic No. 3:

The dates and circumstances under which FBCB2 as first publicly announced, promoted, used, made available, offered for sale, sold, and/or imported, and the Person(s) and Entity involved in each activity

Response to Topic No. 3:

Dr. Siegel incorporates by reference his general objections. Dr. Siegel further objects to this request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it requests information about all people and entities involved in the public announcement, promotion, use, making available, offering for sale, and/or importing of FBCB2. Dr. Siegel further objects to this request to the

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.