

Exhibit 8

From: Taylor, Jeremy
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 12:10 PM
To: Enrique Iturralde
Cc: Fred Fabricant; Vincent Rubino; Amy Park; jtruelove@mckoolsmith.com; AGIS; DL Lyft AGIS; EXT Dacus, Deron (Dell)
Subject: RE: AGIS--stipulated stay

Thank you Enrique. I don't believe you confirmed whether or not AGIS would agree to a stay in your earlier email. Is AGIS unwilling to stipulate to a stay in this case in light of Judge Payne's report and recommendation to dismiss this case for improper venue? If so, please explain why AGIS opposes a stay in this situation.

If AGIS is refusing to agree to a stay, please confirm when on Monday morning AGIS's lead and local counsel would be available to meet and confer on this issue.

Jeremy J. Taylor | Baker Botts L.L.P.
office 415.291.6202 | mobile 510.688.0999

From: Enrique Iturralde <eiturralde@fabricantllp.com>
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 10:55 AM
To: Taylor, Jeremy <jeremy.taylor@bakerbotts.com>
Cc: Fred Fabricant <ffabricant@fabricantllp.com>; Vincent Rubino <vrubino@fabricantllp.com>; Amy Park <apark@fabricantllp.com>; jtruelove@mckoolsmith.com; AGIS <AGIS@fabricantllp.com>; DL Lyft AGIS <DLLyftAGIS@BakerBotts.com>; EXT Dacus, Deron (Dell) <ddacus@dacusfirm.com>
Subject: Re: AGIS--stipulated stay

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Jeremy,

AGIS will proceed as set forth in my earlier email.

AGIS lead and local are traveling and unavailable today. They can be available Monday morning.

Regards,
Enrique

From: Taylor, Jeremy <jeremy.taylor@bakerbotts.com>
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 12:38 AM
To: Enrique Iturralde <eiturralde@fabricantllp.com>
Cc: Fred Fabricant <ffabricant@fabricantllp.com>; Vincent Rubino <vrubino@fabricantllp.com>; Amy Park <apark@fabricantllp.com>; jtruelove@mckoolsmith.com <jtruelove@mckoolsmith.com>; AGIS <AGIS@fabricantllp.com>; DL Lyft AGIS <DLLyftAGIS@BakerBotts.com>; EXT Dacus, Deron (Dell)

<ddacus@dacusfirm.com>

Subject: Re: AGIS--stipulated stay

Enrique,

As you know, discovery closed over a week ago. Learning now that AGIS did not produce relevant documents during the discovery period not only prejudices Lyft's ability to defend itself, but also confirms that AGIS failed to comply with its discovery obligations in this case. Your offer to produce these materials AFTER close of discovery confirms the problems raised in my email and does nothing to ameliorate the harm that has already occurred.

Ordinarily, upon learning of these discovery deficiencies we would move the Court for appropriate relief to address the prejudice, which cannot be fully cured by producing documents after the close of discovery. However, as I noted in my previous email, because Judge Payne has recommended this case be dismissed for improper venue, if AGIS will agree to stipulate to stay the case with respect to Lyft, we need not bother the Court with a motion raising these deficiencies.

As requested, please confirm if AGIS will agree to a stay of the case, and if not, please confirm a time tomorrow, Nov. 12, for lead and local counsel to meet and confer on the issue.

Thanks,
Jeremy

Jeremy J. Taylor | Baker Botts L.L.P.
office [415.291.6202](tel:415.291.6202) | mobile [510.688.0999](tel:510.688.0999)

On Nov 11, 2021, at 7:16 PM, Enrique Iturralde <eiturralde@fabricantllp.com> wrote:

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Jeremy,

After Ms. Beyer's deposition, counsel for Lyft requested that we go back and collect "meeting minutes." We collected the paper versions of "meeting minutes" identified by Ms. Beyer during her deposition, and produced them before the close of fact discovery. As you can see, there's nothing relevant to any claims/defenses in those "meeting minutes." I don't know what else you're looking for, but there's nothing else titled or referenced as "meeting minutes."

I was present at today's deposition of Ms. Clark. Lyft's counsel spent approximately two hours on the record asking questions about document retention and locations of documents. The general takeaway from Ms. Clark's deposition is that AGIS Inc. systematically retains its code and documents, including in version control, as you acknowledge in your email.

Ms. Clark testified that all LifeRing manuals were saved on the SVN repository, which was made available for inspection on the LifeRing source code review machine. In similar fashion, Lyft produced technical documents on its source code review machine, and we requested them for printing. However, Lyft waited until November 3 (the last day of discovery) to send its counsel to inspect the LifeRing source code review machine, and Lyft's counsel did not request any printouts of any LifeRing code or documents. As a courtesy, we will print the technical documentation requested, including the LifeRing 6 manual identified in your email, and we will produce it.

Ms. Clark also testified that she had some testing spreadsheets related to LifeRing testing. She testified that these spreadsheets were her notes. Lyft did not serve a document subpoena on Ms. Clark, and Lyft's subpoena to AGIS, Inc. did not request testing documents. Again, as a courtesy, we will collect Ms. Clark's testing spreadsheets and produce any that have not been produced already.

I believe this addresses all the issues in your email, but please let me know if I missed anything. Of course, if there are additional requests after later depositions, we would remain willing take up those requests/questions then.

Regards,
Enrique

From: Taylor, Jeremy <jeremy.taylor@bakerbotts.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2021 8:26 PM
To: Fred Fabricant <ffabricant@fabricantllp.com>; Vincent Rubino <vrubino@fabricantllp.com>; Enrique Iturralde <eiturralde@fabricantllp.com>; Amy Park <apark@fabricantllp.com>; jtruelove@mckoolsmith.com <jtruelove@mckoolsmith.com>
Cc: AGIS <AGIS@fabricantllp.com>; DL Lyft AGIS <DLLyftAGIS@BakerBotts.com>; EXT Dacus, Deron (Dell) <ddacus@dacusfirm.com>
Subject: AGIS--stipulated stay

Counsel,

It is becoming apparent that widespread discovery deficiencies exist in AGIS's document production and discovery responses. Prior to Ms. Clark's deposition earlier today, we were aware of certain deficiencies, but the broad extent of these deficiencies is becoming more clear in light of recent testimony.

For example, prior to Ms. Clark's deposition, we had requested production of AGIS, Inc.'s board meeting minutes and were assured that these had been produced. Counsel went as far as identifying a specific documents alleged to be the missing meeting minutes, but Ms. Beyer confirmed in her deposition that the identified documents were not the missing meeting minutes and that the missing meeting minutes had not even been requested from her by AGIS's counsel. Despite repeated correspondence and assurances that the requested meeting minutes would be produced on the final day of discovery, Nov. 3, AGIS has still not produced a complete set of the missing meeting minutes.

In Ms. Clark's deposition earlier today, further discovery deficiencies were identified. For example, Ms. Clark testified that AGIS, Inc. updates its user manuals to reflect version changes, and confirmed that AGIS, Inc. updated its user manual for LifeRing 6.0, which was released earlier this year. AGIS has not produced the user manual for LifeRing 6.0, and it appears AGIS has not produced any manuals related to AGIS, Inc.'s LifeRing products that have been created since 2017. As another example, Ms. Clark testified that she creates and locally stores testing spreadsheets, and that AGIS, Inc. creates and maintains testing spreadsheets for all formal releases (e.g., release 6.0). Lyft has been unable to locate any such testing spreadsheets created after 2017.

In light of what appears to be growing evidence of systemic failures to adequately collect and/or preserve documents by AGIS, Lyft believes it would be appropriate to reopen discovery and adjust the case schedule to address these deficiencies. However, in light of Judge Payne's recent Order recommending dismissal of this lawsuit for improper venue, Lyft would agree to a stipulated stay of all deadlines pertaining to Lyft in the case and address these issues at a later time, if needed.

Please confirm by tomorrow, Nov. 12, if AGIS will agree to a stipulated stay of all deadlines in this case against Lyft while the Parties await Judge Gilstrap's decision on Judge Payne's Report and Recommendation. If AGIS is not willing to stay Lyft's deadlines in light of the Report and

Recommendation, please provide a time tomorrow for lead and local counsel to meet and confer on the issue.

Thanks,
Jeremy

Jeremy J. Taylor | Baker Botts L.L.P.

office 415.291.6202 | mobile 510.688.0999

Confidentiality Notice:

The information contained in this email and any attachments is intended only for the recipient[s] listed above and may be privileged and confidential. Any dissemination, copying, or use of or reliance upon such information by or to anyone other than the recipient[s] listed above is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately at the email address above and destroy any and all copies of this message.