## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

LG ELECTRONICS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

**ORDER** 

v.

QUANTA COMPUTER INC. and QUANTA COMPUTER USA, INC.,

07-cv-361-bbc

Defendants.

On April 2, 2008, this court held a recorded telephonic motion hearing to discuss and resolve the pending discovery motions (dkts. 77, 87, 114, 117 and 122). Both sides were represented by counsel.

With regard to the substantive discovery motions, after discussion with both sides and for reasons stated on the record, I denied without prejudice plaintiff's motion to compel (dkt. 77) and defendants' motion to compel (dkt. 87). Based on the information exchanged before the hearing and the parties' agreements at the hearing, there currently is nothing for the court to order the parties to do. In the event the parties need additional court input, they should file new motions promptly and we will get back on the telephone.

With regard to defendant's motion to quash the subpoena on the Kellogg Huber law firm, I granted plaintiff's motion to strike (dkt. 122) because Rule 45(c)(3) does not allow this court to quash another court's subpoena. For the same reason, I denied defendants' motion to quash (dkt. 114). I also declined to enter a protective order in favor of defendant (dkt. 117) because defendant does not have a direct stake in the instant dispute. As I made clear, however, the

Kellogg Huber law firm and QSI are obliged by the protective order entered in case number 06-

C-462-C in this court to resist disclosure of the subpoenaed information. Protective orders in

patent lawsuits will only remain effective so long as courts are willing to enforce them. However

much LG needs or wants the information the Kellogg Huber law firm has obtained from QSI in

the 06-C-462-C lawsuit, allowing Kellogg Huber to provide this information in this fashion

would violate QSI's reasonable expectation of confidentiality to which the parties agreed in the

protective order in the previous lawsuit.

Entered this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of April, 2008.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER

Magistrate Judge

2