

FILED

July 21, 2022

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

To: United States District Court for the Western District of Texas
U.S. District Clerk's Office
800 Franklin Ave., Room 380
Waco, Texas 76701

BY: CV
DEPUTY

From: Dr. John Reumann
10230 111th Avenue NE
Kirkland WA 98033

Subject: Motion to quash the subpoena served to John Reuman on 7/13/2022 in
6:20-CV-01152-ADA, Daedalus Blue LLC vs. Microsoft Corporation by Microsoft's agent, Orrick,
Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP, 701 5th Ave Suite 5600 ,Seattle, WA 98104-7097

Date: 7/18/2022

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby formally request that the subpoena served to John Reumann on 7/13/2022 in case
6:20-CV-01152-ADA authored by Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP be quashed. The subpoena
fails as follows:

(i) The subpoena does not allow proper time for compliance. It allows only 13 days from
the date of service to complete the search of all "things" and "documents" and
"communications" covering a period of 17 years. The ordered work will take several
weeks to complete.

(ii) The notice period for appearance for a deposition is too short, only 16 days, which is
not sufficient for scheduling my calendar and commitments. Furthermore, this timing
does not align with my quarterly employment commitments as our business quarter
(Q2/FY23) ends on July 31st 2022, requiring a lot of effort both before quarter close and
quarter start.

(iii) The subpoena subjects me to an undue burden of having to search for things that
most likely do not exist without giving me specifics as to what is required. The scope
spans 17 years of documents, documentations, and things. The subpoena must provide
a list of specific, named documents sought in this discovery process. It is not reasonable
that I engage in a document fishing expedition on behalf of the defendant.

I believe that all of the information necessary for this lawsuit is contained within the patent
document and any and all information that can be retrieved from IBM corporation where I
worked (on IBM's premises) during the time period of the invention. There is no reason to

extend the scope of this lawsuit to other premises unnecessarily since I have no interest in the disputed invention.

Upon reaching out to Microsoft's agent, Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, on 7/15/2022 by phone, I was told that I should expect to spend an entire workday at the deposition scheduled for 7/29/2022. This is unreasonable as testimony that would take more than 15 minutes is no longer factual, but instead expert testimony. The basic facts of this case are well understood.

This work is being ordered without proper compensation. I specifically asked Don Daybell, an employee of Microsoft's agent, Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP, who himself is named in the subpoena, on 7/15/2022 at 9:31am how much work without compensation on behalf of his client is reasonable. Don Daybell, stated that spending many hours without pay was his expectation for my collaboration. He said that he would spend many hours of unpaid work if he were in my position. When I asked if he or any other employee of his firm would be compensated for any effort in connection with the above named case during the deposition, he answered that he or any other employee of his firm present at the deposition would receive remuneration. I believe that I also have the right to be treated fairly, especially since I do not have any interest in this case. The only interested parties are conducting this lawsuit purely for commercial purposes.

Please consider my request to quash this subpoena.

Sincerely,

 7/18/2022

John Reumann

Attachments:

- A) A photocopy of the objection to the subpoena served to me that I submitted to Microsoft's agent Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP.
- B) A photocopy of the subpoena served by Microsoft's agent Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP.