

JUSTIN D. HEIDEMAN (USB No. 8897)

HEIDEMAN & ASSOCIATES

2696 North University Avenue, Suite 180

Provo, Utah 84604

Telephone: (801) 472-7742

Facsimile: (801) 374-1724

Email: jheideman@heidlaw.com

Attorney for RAPower-3, LLC, International Automated Systems, Inc.LTB1 and Neldon Johnson

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR
THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RAPOWER-3, LLC, INTERNATIONAL
AUTOMATED SYSTEMS, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA

Case No. 2:15-CV-0828 DN

Judge: Honorable David Nuffer

Defendants, RAPOWER-3, LLC; INTERNATIONAL AUTOMATED SYSTEMS, INC.; LTB1, LLC; and NELDON JOHNSON (collectively “Defendants”); by and through their attorney of record, Justin D. Heideman of the law firm of Heideman and Associates, and pursuant to DUCivR 7-1 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 45, request this Court quash or, in the alternative, modify the *Subpoena to Produce Documents, Information, or Objects or to Permit Inspection of Premises in a Civil Action* to Wells Fargo Bank, N.A..

The aforementioned Subpoena was issued on June 20, 2016 and production is required by July 22, 2016.

ARGUMENT

I. THIS COURT SHOULD QUASH THE SUBPOENA BECAUSE THE INFORMATION DEFENDANTS ARE COMMANDED TO PRODUCE ARE CONFIDENTIAL PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 45(D)(3)(B).

A court may quash or modify a subpoena that requires the disclosure of trade secrets or confidential research, development, or commercial information. See *Innovative Therapies, Inc. v. Meents*, 302 F.R.D. 364, 380 (D. Md. 2014). Rule 45(d)(3)(b) of The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure states, “[t]o protect a person subject to or affected by a subpoena, the court for the district where compliance is required may, on motion, quash or modify the subpoena if it requires: (i) disclosing a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information . . .” Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(d)(3)(b).

The 10th Circuit has defined a trade secret as “commercial information relating to business which is secret of value, and which the owner has treated confidentially.” See *R&D Business Sys. V. Xerox Corp.*, 152 F.R.D. 195, 197 (D. Colo. 1993). Furthermore, in making a determination on whether to quash or modify, “the court must balance the need for confidential information against the possible injury resulting from disclosure.” See *Fanjoy v. Calico Brands, Inc.*, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 55158 at 7. “If [the court finds] disclosure of confidential research is absolutely necessary to the litigation, then the subpoenaed party must comply but protection may be implemented to ameliorate potentially harmful effects.

In *Centurion Industries v. Warren Steurer and Associates*, 665 F.2d 323 (10th Cir. N.M. 1981), a subpoena was issued for computer software trade secrets so experts could adequately form an opinion regarding patent infringement and to rebut any assertions of non-infringement in

the action. The court held the information outweighed potential injury but issued a protective order protecting the trade secrets from those outside of the litigation. *Id.*

Here, the information requested by the Subpoena falls squarely within 45(d)(3)(b). The essence of the information requested is directly related to confidential and commercial communications and actions undertaken by Defendants. Similar to *Centurion*, the Subpoena requests information that if produced will expose sensitive financial information associated with Defendants' trade secrets and confidential information. Furthermore, disclosure by Defendants will expose confidential and commercial communications. However, unlike in *Centurion*, the requested documents are not directly related to understanding the issues in this case. Therefore, information involving the details of Defendants' business should receive a higher degree of protection than those documents in *Centurion*, and in *Centurion*, the documents were subject to a protective order.

Here, the documents requested contain highly sensitive and confidential information regarding the costs associated with business done by Defendants. The harm Defendants would suffer if the trade secrets were disclosed far outweighs the benefits received from such information. If this Court, however, finds the information "absolutely necessary to the litigation," Defendant should at least maintain the protective order of such disclosed information to protect the information from making its way outside the litigation. *Fanjoy*, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 55158 at 7; see also *Industries*, 665 F.2d 323.

Defendant requests that if this Court determines not to quash the Subpoena, that this Court modify the Subpoena to allow Defendants to produce the requested documents following

the July 27, 2016 hearing on the standard protective order. Because the information requested involves highly confidential as well trade secret information, Defendants believe that modification of the Subpoena, in the very least, is reasonable given the hearing on the standard protective order is only a few short weeks away.

II. PURSUANT TO THE STANDARD PROTECTIVE ORDER, DEFENDANTS SHOULD BE GRANTED ADDITIONAL TIME TO REVIEW AND DESIGNATE CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.

Even in the event this Court finds the costs and expenditures associated with the confidential, sensitive information are not protected by Rule 45(d)(3)(b), Defendants should be granted additional time to respond. Pursuant to Rule 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court has ordered the Standard Protective Order (“Protective Order”) which governs any designated record of information produced pursuant to required disclosures under any federal rule. Pursuant to the Protective Order, “Documents and things produced or furnished during the course of this action shall be designated as containing [Confidential Information] by placing on each page . . .].” Pursuant to this, if this Court denies quashing or modifying the Subpoenas, Defendants should be granted additional time, or at least until this Court holds a hearing on the Protective Order, to review and properly designate the documents and information in Defendants’ possession.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, Defendants request this Court quash or modify the Subpoena to allow production to occur after the hearing on the standard protective order and with enough time following such to provide accurate, complete responses.

DATED and SIGNED this 21st day of July, 2016.

HEIDEMAN & ASSOCIATES

/s/ Justin D. Heideman
JUSTIN D. HEIDEMAN
Attorney for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On this 21st day of July, 2016, I hereby certify a true and correct copy of the forgoing **MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA** was served on the following:

Party/Attorney	Method
<i>Former Attorneys for Defendants</i> James S. Judd Richard A. Van Wagoner Rodney R. Parker Samuel Alba Snow Christensen & Martineau 10 Exchange Place 11 th FL P.O. Box 45000 Salt Lake City, Utah 84145 Tele: (801) 521-9000 Email: jsj@scmlaw.com rvanwagoner@scmlaw.com rparker@scmlaw.com sa@scmlaw.com	Hand Delivery U.S. Mail, postage prepaid Overnight Mail Fax Transmission <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronic Filing Notice
<i>Attorney for Defendants</i> R. Gregory Shepard Roger Freeborn Donald S. Reay Reay Law PLLC 43 W 9000 S Ste B Sandy, Utah 84070 Tele: (801) 999-8529 Email: donald@reaylaw.com	Hand Delivery U.S. Mail, postage prepaid Overnight Mail Fax Transmission <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronic Filing Notice
<i>Pro Hac Vice Attorney for Plaintiff</i> Erin Healy Gallagher US Department of Justice (TAX) Tax Division P.O. Box 7238	Hand Delivery U.S. Mail, postage prepaid Overnight Mail Fax Transmission

Washington, DC 20044 Phone: (202) 353-2452 Email: erin.healygallagher@usdoj.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronic Filing Notice
<i>Pro Hac Vice Attorney for Plaintiff</i> Erin R. Hines US Department Justice Central Civil Trial Section RM 8921 555 4 th St NW Washington, DC 20001 Tele: (202) 514-6619 Email: erin.r.hines@usdoj.gov	Hand Delivery U.S. Mail, postage prepaid Overnight Mail Fax Transmission <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronic Filing Notice
<i>Attorney for Plaintiff</i> John K. Mangum US Attorney's Office (UT) Tele: (801) 325-3216 Email: john.mangum@usdoj.gov	Hand Delivery U.S. Mail, postage prepaid Overnight Mail Fax Transmission <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronic Filing Notice
<i>Pro Hac Vice Attorney for Plaintiff</i> Christopher R. Moran US Department of Justice (TAX) Tax Division PO Box 7238 Washington, DC 20044 Tele: (202) 307-0234 Email: christopher.r.moran@usdoj.gov	Hand Delivery U.S. Mail, postage prepaid Overnight Mail Fax Transmission <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronic Filing Notice

HEIDEMAN & ASSOCIATES

/s/ Samantha Fowlks

Suzanne Peterson, Legal Assistant