

# **EXHIBIT 2**



Morgan Pietz &lt;morganpietz@gmail.com&gt;

---

**Extention of time in 14-cv-0223; 14-cv-0257; 14-cv-0263**2 messages

---

**Jon Hoppe** <JHoppe@mhhhlawfirm.com>

Wed, Apr 9, 2014 at 2:21 PM

To: morganpietz@gmail.com

Dear Morgan,

Will you consent to an extension of time to file a response to your Motion to Intervene and Motion for an Order to Show Cause in the above captioned cases? My client is seeking a 10 day extension, the purpose of which is to have enough time to properly review the 200+ pages of exhibits you've filed, discuss these exhibits with IPP and compile and translate necessary documents from German to English. Please let me know whether your client opposes.

Very truly yours,

Jon A. Hoppe, Esquire  
Maddox, Hoppe, Hoofnagle & Hafey, L.L.C.  
1401 Mercantile Lane #105  
Largo, Maryland 20774  
(301) 341-2580 (ph.)  
(301) 341-5727 (fax)

---

The information contained in this electronic message is attorney privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone at the number printed above and return the original to the sender at the address printed above via electronic mail. Thank you.

---

**Morgan Pietz** <morganpietz@gmail.com>

Wed, Apr 9, 2014 at 3:20 PM

To: Jon Hoppe &lt;JHoppe@mhhhlawfirm.com&gt;

Cc: "John C. Lowe" &lt;johnlowe@johnlowepc.com&gt;, "Fox, Benjamin J." &lt;bfox@mofo.com&gt;, "John D. Seiver" &lt;johnseiver@dwt.com&gt;

Jon,

As to the Motion for An OSC, which is on the merits, no objection to the 10-day extension you request. I am pleased to hear you will be conferring with IPP about all this. Getting their official response as to their relationship with Guardaley, Excipio, and 'just whose software is being used in these cases anyway?' is worth the wait, in my view.

As to the Motion to Intervene, Consolidate and Stay, I am not inclined to consent to an extension as things

stand today. Particularly in view of the correspondence between you and Verizon that Verizon's outside counsel Mr. Fox (cc'd here) copied me on earlier today, wherein you expressed a view that subpoena returns should be made until the court actually enters a stay order, I think that the Motion to Intervene, Consolidate and Stay needs to move forward in expeditious fashion.

All of your factual compiling and German translations really goes the merits, doesn't it, rather than the procedural issues addressed in the Motion to Intervene, Consolidate and Stay? I think it actually makes sense to put your merits response out a little longer, to let the court act on the procedural motion first, and then we can see what Judge or Judges will be deciding all this, and with what mandate, before you respond on the merits. As always with me, I would stipulate to a corresponding extension of the Rule 4(m) deadline commensurate with any delay caused on this account.

So the bottom line is I would say yes to a 10-day extension on the merits motion, with a suggestion that maybe a 30-day extension on that one might even be a better idea, but no as to an extension on the procedural motion. If I am missing something here, please let me know and I could perhaps be persuaded to reconsider. If you want to prepare a proposed stipulation along the lines of what I suggested, please send me a draft and I'll review and respond in short order.

Best regards,  
Morgan

P.S. in the interest of saving time and getting everyone on the same page, I am copying Comcast's outside counsel John Seiver on this email, and also my local counsel in Maryland John Lowe.

[Quoted text hidden]

--