

HONORABLE THOMAS O. RICE

J. CHRISTOPHER LYNCH, WSBA #17462
JEFFREY R. SMITH, WSBA #37460
RHETT V. BARNEY, WSBA #44764
LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: (509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979
Emails: chris@leehayes.com
jeffreys@leehayes.com
rhettb@leehayes.com

Counsel for Defendant Ryan Lamberson

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

ELF-MAN, LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RYAN LAMBERSON,

Defendant.

No. 2:13-CV-00395-TOR

DECLARATION OF J.
CHRISTOPHER LYNCH IN
SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT’S
MOTION TO COMPEL

Hearing: July 14, 2014
Time: 6:30 p.m.
Without Oral Argument

I, J. Christopher Lynch, declare as follows:

1. I am over 18 years of age and am competent to testify. I make this declaration based on my own personal knowledge. I am one of the attorneys for Defendant, Ryan Lamberson (hereinafter, “Mr. Lamberson”).

1 2. I certify that I have attempted in good faith to obtain the discovery
2 sought prior to bringing this Motion to Compel. I have spoken with counsel for
3 plaintiff Carl Crowell over the telephone and I have written multiple emails to Mr.
4 Crowell and Ms. VanderMay demanding the requested documents, all to no avail.
5 Plaintiff has shown no willingness to provide the documents, to debate the claimed
6 privilege, or even to provide the required privilege log under Fed. R. Civ. P.
7 26(b)(5)(A). Today, June 13, 2014, I spoke with attorney David Lowe of Seattle
8 who told me he may become attorney for Elf-Man, LLC in this case. I informed
9 him of the outstanding discovery and I was not informed that he had any authority
10 to provide the documents or privilege logs.

11 3. Attached as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the Second Set of
12 Requests for Production and the Responses Thereto, including a copy of the
13 envelope in which they were received. The Requests were served on April 22,
14 2014. The responses were received on May 30, 2014, as seen by the copy received
15 date stamp from my firm. The responses were postmarked May 28, 2014, as seen
16 by the postmark on the envelope.

17 4. On April 21, 2014, I wrote to counsel for plaintiff and informed her
18 that we had discovered the Gerephil Molina presentation about APMC (“the
19 APMC Presentation”) which is found at:

20 http://prezi.com/b_f7djco81ri/copy-of-themanako123/.

21 5. Because the APMC Presentation differs significantly from the
22 explanation of the relationship of the plaintiff to the investigators provided by

1 plaintiff in response to Request for Production No. 15, and because the APMC
2 Presentation indicates that APMC is not only the investigator, but the source of
3 funding and of the strategy and pleadings in this matter, and because the APMC
4 Presentation expressly references plaintiff's identified witness Mr. Macek, I
5 prepared the three targeted Requests for Production about APMC that are the
6 subject of this Motion to Compel.

7 6. My April 21, 2014, email to plaintiff's counsel forewarned her about
8 the three new requests for production. I specifically addressed the APMC
9 Presentation and how it leads to the conclusion there could be no privilege for
10 APMC correspondence. I requested counsel for plaintiff to provide an explanation
11 of privilege if there could be one. A copy of this email redacted to eliminate
12 confidential material is attached as Exhibit B.

13 7. I wrote once more on the subject on April 22, 2014, serving the
14 discovery and explaining why the requested material could not be privileged. We
15 invited a dialogue on it, telling counsel we assumed her silence to indicate
16 concurrence with our presumptions. A copy of this email redacted to eliminate
17 confidential material is attached as Exhibit C.

18 8. Plaintiff's counsel responded to me the next day on April 23, 2014,
19 refusing to address the issue of privilege and then foreshadowing the failure to
20 produce discovery we predicted would come. Here is a quote from her April 23,
21 2014 email on the point:

1 Please understand further that I am not at your beck and call and will
2 respond to communications from your office as my calendar and other
obligations permit.

3 With respect to additional discovery, the way this process works is
4 that you should serve discovery requests pursuant to the Federal Rules
5 of Civil Procedure and we will respond in a timely manner. To the
6 extent that you seek material that is not subject to discovery, please
7 expect us to file our objections. Any issues that cannot be resolved by
8 counsel will proceed to Judge Rice. You can, of course, continue to
try to circumvent this process but you will not succeed. We will
respond to your second request for production in the ordinary course
and following this process.

9 9. Then, as predicted, no documents were produced. Additionally,
10 although plaintiff's counsel indicated she would "respond in a timely manner" the
11 "responses" were not received until May 30, 2014. If plaintiff desired a sincere
12 discussion about the merits of its objections, it could have served the objections
13 upon receipt of the discovery, but plaintiff chose to wait until past the last minute,
14 again attempting to avoid an obligation to shine light on its cloaked investigators.

15 10. I noticed that the discovery responses received on May 30, 2014, bore
16 the May 28, 2014, postmark and that this was not consistent with the May 22,
17 2014, Certificate of Service. I knew from my experience that failure to timely
18 serve discovery is a waiver of objections in the Federal system, so I knew this
discrepancy was substantively important.

19 11. Consequently, on the date of receipt of these documents, I wrote to
20 counsel for plaintiff and offered her an opportunity to correct the Certificate of
21 Service, which seemed as if it must be in error, since causing something to be
22

1 served on May 22 would not result in a postmark of May 28. This email is attached
2 as Exhibit D.

3 12. Counsel for plaintiff replied on May 30, 2014, and provided some
4 hearsay that her assistant mailed the document as instructed on May 22, 2014, and
5 that the fault must lie with the post office. This email is attached as Exhibit E.

6 13. This explanation did not persuade me that the service was completed
7 on May 22. I checked other discovery mailed by plaintiff's counsel to my law firm.
8 My firm "copy receive stamps" incoming pleadings so I compared other pleadings
9 from plaintiff's counsel and found that none of them had an eight day delay from
10 the stated Certificate of Service to the delivery date. I also checked and discovered
11 that other discovery served by plaintiff had been simultaneously mailed and
12 emailed to my firm with a Certificate of Service showing both methods of service,
13 but this Second Set of Requests for Production had not been simultaneously
14 emailed as it was mailed; in fact, it had not been emailed at all. This made me more
15 suspicious that counsel for plaintiff might have wished that the responses were sent
16 on May 22, but likely they were not. It occurred to me that one way to reconcile
17 the discrepancy would be for the assistant that was the subject of the May 30
18 hearsay explanation to provide his or her own declaration as to the events of
19 May 22, so that the real circumstances of the service could be determined. I
20 responded on that same day, May 30, pointing out the concerns we had with
21 counsel's curt explanation that the fault lied with the post office. I noted the normal
22 time to obtain mail from her offices was not eight days, and I noted that this

1 discovery was not simultaneously emailed as other discovery had been. I requested
2 that a sworn Declaration from the un-named assistant would go a long way toward
3 us accepting the explanation as the truth. This email is attached at Exhibit F.

4 14. I assumed that the un-named assistant would either (i) be quite willing
5 to provide a detailed declaration (assuming the document was actually served on
6 May 22), or (ii) that the request would force the issue and expose that perhaps it
7 was not actually served on May 22, and the assistant would not be willing to
8 provide a detailed declaration to support Ms. VanderMay's purported May 22
9 Certificate of Service.

10 15. If the document had actually been served on May 22, then I expected
11 a declaration that included recollection of the attorney signing the document on
12 that date, the envelope being prepared and stamped on that date, some explanation
13 of how the firm's mail service worked, whether it was picked up by USPS or
14 dropped off at USPS, and at what time. I assumed if it had actually been served on
15 May 22 that this declaration would talk about the fate of other mail sent at the
16 same time from this firm – i.e. presumably, if this document took six days to get a
17 postmark, then others did too. In other words, I assumed there might be an
18 explanation of what other mail from the VanderMay firm from May 22, 2014, met
19 the same fate. Or if the fault were with a particular box or office, maybe there
20 would have been other users of the same USPS box or office that experienced the
21 fate of this six day delay. A six day delay in the mail could affect many people and
22 important matters such as bills and contracts and rent and the like and might even

1 be local news in Salem. But no such declaration of the un-named assistant was
2 provided.

3 16. On Monday, June 2, 2014, I received a telephone call from Carl
4 Crowell, who stated he was “non-appearing” counsel for Elf-Man, LLC. I spoke
5 with Mr. Crowell for 44 minutes. He told me that Ms. VanderMay was going to
6 withdraw from the matter and that he would attend to the urgent issues which he
7 asked me to identify for him. I identified the postmark discrepancy as one of the
8 urgent issues. I identified that a Declaration of the person who actually served the
9 document would be helpful in resolving the substantive discrepancy. Mr. Crowell
10 wrote me an email after the call on June 2, 2014, and asked for a copy of my letter
11 to counsel about the postmark issue “and I will see that it is addressed.”

12 17. On that same June 2, 2014, I replied to Mr. Crowell and provided my
13 correspondence with Ms. VanderMay on the postmark issue as he requested. A
14 copy of this email redacted to eliminate confidential material is attached as Exhibit
15 G. This email explained the substantive importance of the Certificate of Service
16 issue and demanded the discovery or the privilege logs:

17 The APMC discovery is important. Please review the “prezi”
18 presentation of Mr. Gerephil Molina of APMC Cebu about which we
19 became aware after counsel gave us the implausible explanation under
20 RFP #15. This 700 page expose seems to explain the back office of
21 these matters -- APMC doing the uploading, preparing the pleadings,
22 doing the discovery, all from Germany or the Philippines. None of
this can be privileged as plaintiff claims. And the May 22 Declaration
of Service vs the May 28 postmark is critical on this point. If the
objections are waived, then we expect the documents immediately. If
the objections are not waived, then we expect the privilege log

1 immediately and our first order of business will be our required LR 37
2 conference on the production.

3 Mr. Crowell has not again contacted me about the Elf-Man case to provide
4 any explanation of the postmark or to discuss production of the documents or the
5 privilege log. No Declaration of Ms. Vandermay's assistant has been provided.

6 18. Even though I had written to Mr. Crowell on June 2, 2014, Ms.
7 VanderMay replied to me on June 3, 2014:

8 Our office practice for outgoing mail is as follows: mail that is ready
9 by the time of our postal delivery is given to our mail carrier and mail
10 that is ready later in the day is taken to a mailbox by one of our office
11 staff. The location of the box varies depending upon what other
12 delivery assignments the staff person has on a particular day.

13 No declaration of the un-named assistant was provided, and no details about
14 the events (or non-events) of May 22 were provided, like what mailbox was used
15 and what other mail met the similar fate. The requested privilege log was also not
16 provided.

17 19. On that same date, June 3, 2014, Ms. VanderMay filed her Motion to
18 Withdraw citing ethical differences with "plaintiff's representatives." ECF No. 55
19 at page 2. Note that the identical language is used in the Motion to Withdraw in
20 The Thompsons Film case, Case No. 2:13-cv-00126-TOR, ECF No. 103 at page 2,
21 a case with an entirely different plaintiff. Who are these "plaintiff's
22 representatives" with whom plaintiff's counsel has its ethical differences? How
could any new lawyer take the case and not suffer the same ethical issues?

1 20. I remain unconvinced that the responses were served on May 22,
2 2014, despite Ms. VanderMay's Certificate of Service to the contrary.

3 21. Today, June 13, 2014, I spoke with attorney David Lowe of Seattle
4 who told me he may become attorney for Elf-Man, LLC in this case. We spoke for
5 66 minutes. Mr. Lowe told me that the deposition of Mr. Lamberson scheduled for
6 Thursday, June 19 would not happen because he could not make it. He also told me
7 that the Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) Deposition of Elf-Man, LLC would not happen on
8 Friday, June 20, 2014, because Elf-Man, LLC could not make it. A copy of the
9 30(b)(6) Notice is attached as Exhibit H.

10 22. I told Mr. Lowe it was no surprise that Elf-Man, LLC would not
11 attend the noted 30(b)(6) deposition, and it was no surprise that plaintiff never
12 noted Mr. Lamberson's deposition for the agreed June 19, 2014 date. It is no
13 surprise because plaintiff has no real desire to participate in the merits of this
14 matter, they are just pretending they wish to depose Mr. Lamberson and inspect his
15 machine. This case was filed more than 14 months ago. There has been no sincere
16 effort to take Mr. Lamberson's deposition, just a transparent request by plaintiff for
17 a "discovery plan" to stop defendant from discovery while plaintiff pretends to
18 want to take Mr. Lamberson's deposition. Recall the May 9, 2014, Discovery
19 Conference Ms. VanderMay initiated with the Court wherein plaintiff requested
20 that all discovery be stayed until plaintiff could depose Mr. Lamberson and inspect
21 his machine. Defendant submitted an *in camera* letter dated May 8, 2014,
22 explaining that Mr. Lamberson's employer required him to request time off work

DECLARATION OF
J. CHRISTOPHER LYNCH - 9

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 West Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: (509)324-9256 Fax: (509)323-8979

1 in advance, but that we had done that and had offered several days for deposition,
2 and that the parties had agreed to Thursday, June 19, 2014. Mr. Smith of my firm
3 explained this to the Court in that May 9, 2014 hearing, expressly mentioning the
4 Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) deposition of Elf-Man, LLC for the next date. Recall that
5 the Court denied the request to allow only plaintiff's discovery to go forward, and
6 the Court acknowledged that taking the 30(b)(6) at the same time made sense. Now
7 that plaintiff's "discovery plan" request has been denied by the court, it is no
8 surprise that plaintiff has fallen silent on its representations that efficient
9 administration of justice demands a prompt deposition of Mr. Lamberson. It is no
10 surprise that Mr. Lowe has represented to me that Elf-Man, LLC will not appear
11 for the noted deposition next Friday.

12 23. It appears plaintiff has an intractable problem: it has representatives
13 that are apparently trying to force plaintiff's counsel into actions the counsel
14 cannot undertake in good faith. Plaintiff has repeatedly failed to allow discovery
15 of the basic facts of the case, and I cannot imagine how these representatives will
16 ever "allow" such discovery in this "severed" case when there are lawsuits against
17 hundreds of people in our state alone based on the same inadmissible evidence of
18 an imperceptible bit harvested by an unlicensed investigator in another country
19 from an IP address but with no corroboration that any identifiable person sent the
20 imperceptible bit. For example, even if the Court were to grant our pending Motion
21 to Compel the deposition of the German investigators in Spokane, ECF No. 50, we
22 sincerely doubt the "plaintiff's representatives" would be cooperative about

DECLARATION OF
J. CHRISTOPHER LYNCH - 10

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 West Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: (509)324-9256 Fax: (509)323-8979

1 compliance with the Order, given the reluctance to date to comply with discovery
2 requests and the Court's Order, ECF No. 31, to explain the relationship with the
3 investigators. On behalf of Mr. Lamberson, we respectfully request that the Court
4 Order plaintiff to comply with discovery, award costs and attorneys fees. We also
5 respectfully request that plaintiff's case be dismissed with prejudice, and that Mr.
6 Lamberson be declared the prevailing party such that he can pursue costs,
7 attorney's fees and monetary sanctions under 17 U.S.C. §505, 28 U.S.C. §1927,
8 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 11.

9 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that
10 the foregoing is true and correct.

11
12 DATED this 13th day of June, 2014, in Spokane, Washington.

13 LEE & HAYES, PLLC

14
15 By: s/ J. Christopher Lynch

16 J. Christopher Lynch, WSBA #17462
17 601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
18 Spokane, WA 99201
19 Phone: (509) 324-9256
20 Fax: (509) 323-8979
21 Email: chris@leehayes.com

22
Counsel for Defendant Ryan Lamberson

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1
2 I hereby certify that on the 13th day of June, 2014, I caused to be
3 electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF
4 system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

5 Maureen C. VanderMay efile@vandermaylawfirm.com

6
7 LEE & HAYES, PLLC

8
9 By: s/ J. Christopher Lynch

10 J. Christopher Lynch, WSBA #17462
11 601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
12 Spokane, WA 99201
13 Phone: (509) 324-9256
14 Email: chris@leehayes.com

EXHIBIT A

1 Maureen C. VanderMay, WSBA No. 16742
The VanderMay Law Firm PC
2 2021 S. Jones Blvd.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
3 (702) 538-9300

RECEIVED

MAY 30 2014

LEE & HAYES, PLLC

4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

8 ELF-MAN, LLC,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 RYAN LAMBERSON,

12 Defendant.

Case No.: 2:13-CV-00395-TOR

PLAINTIFF ELF-MAN, LLC'S
RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT
LAMBERSON'S SECOND SET OF
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION TO
PLAINTIFF

13
14 Plaintiff, Elf-Man, LLC, by and through its counsel of record Maureen C.
15 VanderMay and The VanderMay Law Firm PC, responds to Defendant Ryan
16 Lamberson's Second Set of Requests for Production to Plaintiff.

17 **PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS**

18 Plaintiff, Elf-Man, LLC makes the following preliminary objections, whether
19 or not such objections are separately set forth in response to each request.

20 1. Plaintiff objects to each definition, instruction, and request to the
21 extent that it calls for the production of documents and information protected by
22 the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, or any other applicable
23 privilege. Plaintiff does not intend to produce any such documents or information
24 except as ordered by the Court, and does not waive any applicable privilege with
25

26 PLAINTIFF ELF-MAN, LLC'S
27 RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT
28 LAMBERSON'S SECOND SET OF
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION - Page 1

1 respect to any such documents or information that are inadvertently produced.

2 Plaintiff also reserves the right to redact documents that it produces to limit the
3 disclosure of such information.

4 2. Plaintiff objects to Defendant's Instructions, Definitions and Requests
5 to the extent that they seek to expand the scope of Plaintiff's obligations under the
6 controlling law, including the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

7 3. Plaintiff objects to the definition of "document" as overly broad and
8 unduly burdensome. Plaintiff will comply with this definition only to the extent
9 that it is reasonable and consistent with the requirements of the Federal Rules of
10 Civil Procedure.

11 4. Plaintiff objects to Defendant's Instructions, Definitions and Requests
12 to the extent that they seek information not in Plaintiff's possession, custody or
13 control.

14 5. Plaintiff objects to Defendant's Instructions, Definitions and Requests
15 to the extent that they seek information that has been previously produced by
16 Plaintiff.

17 6. Plaintiff objects to Defendant's Instructions, Definitions and Requests
18 to the extent that they seek information that may be obtained more easily and at a
19 lower cost through other discovery methods or from sources that are equally
20 accessible to Plaintiff and Defendant.

21 7. Plaintiff objects to Defendant's Instructions, Definitions and Requests
22 to the extent that they seek information that is not either relevant to the claims
23 asserted in this action or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of
24 admissible evidence.

25
26 PLAINTIFF ELF-MAN, LLC'S
27 RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT
28 LAMBERSON'S SECOND SET OF
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION - Page 2

1 8. Plaintiff reserves the right to supplement these responses as additional
2 information becomes available in this action, and to revise or correct these
3 responses as this action progresses.

4 **RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC REQUESTS**

5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29:** All correspondence (and
6 included attachments and links) of plaintiff company Elf-Man, LLC with (i.e. to
7 and from) APMC LLC regarding the investigation and prosecution of claims
8 against Mr. Lamberson.

9 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29:**

10 Plaintiff objects to this request on the ground that it is overly broad, not
11 likely to lead to discoverable evidence, and seeks material subject to the attorney-
12 client privilege and work product protections. Without waiving these objections,
13 Plaintiff responds to this request as follows: Defendant is aware from documents
14 previously produced in this action that Plaintiff, through its sales agent Vision
15 Films, Inc., has retained APMC LLC to manage its anti-piracy efforts, including
16 but not limited to this litigation. Plaintiff's communications with its agent that is
17 managing this litigation are privileged and not discoverable.

18 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 30:** All correspondence (and
19 included attachments and links) of Elf-Man, LLC's purported agent Vision Films,
20 Inc. with (i.e. to and from) APMC LLC regarding the investigation and
21 prosecution of claims against Mr. Lamberson.

22 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 30:**

23 Plaintiff objects to this request on the ground that it is overly broad, not
24 likely to lead to discoverable evidence, and seeks material subject to the attorney-
25

26 PLAINTIFF ELF-MAN, LLC'S
27 RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT
28 LAMBERSON'S SECOND SET OF
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION - Page 3

1 client privilege and work product protections. Without waiving these objections,
2 Plaintiff responds to this request as follows: Defendant is aware from documents
3 previously produced in this action that Plaintiff, through its sales agent Vision
4 Films, Inc., has retained APMC LLC to manage its anti-piracy efforts, including
5 but not limited to this litigation. Communications between Plaintiff's sales agent
6 and the agent that is managing this litigation are privileged and not discoverable.

7 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31:** All correspondence (and
8 included attachments and links) of plaintiff's counsel with (i.e. to and from)
9 APMC LLC regarding the investigation and prosecution of claims against Mr.
10 Lamberson.

11 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31:**

12 Plaintiff objects to this request on the ground that it is overly broad, not
13 likely to lead to discoverable evidence, and seeks material subject to the attorney-
14 client privilege and work product protections. Without waiving these objections,
15 Plaintiff responds to this request as follows: Defendant is aware from documents
16 previously produced in this action that Plaintiff, through its sales agent Vision
17 Films, Inc., has retained APMC LLC to manage its anti-piracy efforts, including
18 but not limited to this litigation. Plaintiff's counsel's communications with
19 Plaintiff's agent that is managing this litigation are privileged and not discoverable.

20 ////

21 ////

22 ////

23 ////

24 ////

25


26 PLAINTIFF ELF-MAN, LLC'S
27 RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT
28 LAMBERSON'S SECOND SET OF
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION - Page 4

1 Plaintiff agrees to supplement and amend the above responses as new
2 information becomes available.

3 DATED: May 22, 2014.

4 Respectfully submitted,

5 The VanderMay Law Firm PC

6
7 
8 Maureen C. VanderMay, WSBA 16742
9 elfmanwa@vandermaylawfirm.com
10 The VanderMay Law Firm PC
11 2021 S. Jones Blvd
12 Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
13 Of Attorneys for Plaintiff
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 PLAINTIFF ELF-MAN, LLC'S
27 RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT
28 LAMBERSON'S SECOND SET OF
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION - Page 5

The VanderMay Law Firm
2085 Commerical Street NE
Salem, Oregon 97301

PORTLAND OR 970

28 MAY 2014 PM 4 L



John Christopher Lynch
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201

99201062750



HONORABLE THOMAS O. RICE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

J. CHRISTOPHER LYNCH, WSBA #17462
JEFFREY R. SMITH, WSBA #37460
RHETT V. BARNEY, WSBA #44764
LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: (509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979
Emails: chris@leehayes.com
jeffreys@leehayes.com
rhettb@leehayes.com

Counsel for Defendant Ryan Lamberson

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

ELF-MAN, LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RYAN LAMBERSON,

Defendant.

No. 2:13-CV-0395-TOR

DEFENDANT LAMBERSON'S
SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION TO PLAINTIFF

Requesting Party: RYAN LAMBERSON. (Hereinafter DEFENDANT)
Attorney for Requesting Party: J. Christopher Lynch; Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Answering Party: Elf-Man, LLC (Hereinafter PLAINTIFF)
Attorney for Answering Party: Maureen VanderMay

DEFENDANT RYAN LAMBERSON'S
SECOND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION
TO PLAINTIFF- 1

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979

INSTRUCTIONS

1
2 1. Production is requested in the offices of LEE & HAYES, PLLC, 601
3 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 1400, Spokane, Washington 99201, counsel for Ryan
4 Lamberson, (“Defendant”), within 30 days of the date of service.

5 2. **Organization.** "Produce" means to provide responsive documents
6 as they are kept in the usual course of business or organized and labeled to
7 correspond with the categories in the request.

8 3. **Form of Production.** Pursuant to Rule 34(b)(2)(E), Federal Rules
9 of Civil Procedure, Defendant requests that electronic data be produced in its
10 native format. With regard to other documents not created or stored in electronic
11 format, all pages shall be consecutively numbered, and produced in native format.

12 To the extent the information exists in both hard copy and electronic form,
13 production is requested in each form ensuring that any metadata or embedded
14 data is maintained intact in the electronic production. These requests expressly
15 include any version, draft or edits made to the information or document
16 requested. If you ordinarily maintain the information you are producing in a way
17 that makes it searchable by electronic means, the information should not be
18 produced in a form that removes or signification degrades this feature.

19 Information shall be produced in a manner which preserves its sequential
20 relationship with other documents being produced and shall include the file
21 folder, folder tabs and other organizational or identification aids associated with
22 its file location. The specificity of any request or portion thereof shall not be
23 construed as reducing the scope of any more generalized request or portion
24 thereof.

25 4. **Destruction.** If any information responsive to one or more of the
26 following requests has been destroyed, lost or misplaced, you are to state when
27 and under what circumstances such document was destroyed, lost or misplaced.

28 5. **Continuing in Nature.** All requests shall be deemed continuing in
nature so as to require supplemental production if further documents are obtained
or discovered by Elf-Man, LLC (“Plaintiff”) between the time it responds to these

DEFENDANT RYAN LAMBERSON’S
SECOND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION
TO PLAINTIFF- 2

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979

1 requests and the time of trial. Such additional or supplemental information shall
2 be furnished to Defendant's attorneys within a reasonable time after it becomes
3 known or is obtained.

4 **DEFINITIONS**

5 1. The answer to each request for production shall include all
6 knowledge of Plaintiff that is within its custody, possession or control, including,
7 but not limited to, knowledge and documents in its custody, possession, or control
8 or that of associated, contractual, or related organizations or that of those under
9 common control, predecessors in interest, consultants, accountants, attorneys,
10 employees, and other agents. Where facts set forth in answer or portions thereof
11 are supplied upon information and belief rather than actual knowledge, Plaintiff
12 should so state and specifically describe or identify the source or sources of such
13 information and belief. Should Plaintiff be unable to answer any request for
14 production or portion thereof by either actual knowledge or upon information or
15 belief, describe the effort to obtain such information.

16 2. The terms "information", "document" and "data" also include
17 electronic data. Electronic data includes but is not limited to any electronically
18 stored data or magnetic or optical storage media as an "active" file or files
19 (readily readable by one or more computer applications or forensic software) and
20 "deleted" but recoverable electronic files on said media; any electronic file
21 fragments (files that have been deleted and partially overwritten with new data);
22 emails; chat logs; webpages; word processing files; databases stored in the
23 memory of computers; palm-top devices; magnetic disks (such as computer hard
24 drives and floppy disks; optical disks (such as DVDs and CDs); and flash
25 memory (such as "thumb" or "flash" drives); external drives; networks; and smart
26 phones.

27 3. "Identify," as used in these requests, means to describe and define
28 with particularity and precision.

29 4. "Person," as used in these requests, refers to any individual or entity,
30 such as a corporation, partnership, or other organization.

DEFENDANT RYAN LAMBERSON'S
SECOND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION
TO PLAINTIFF- 3

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979

1 5. "Correspondence" means any written communications including
2 letters, memoranda, emails, instant messages, text messages, or other written
3 communication.

4 6. If Plaintiff contends that the answer to any request is privileged in
5 whole or in part, or otherwise objects to any part of any request, or that an
6 identified document would be excluded from production to Plaintiff or Defendant
7 in discovery regardless of its relevance, state the reasons for each objection or
8 ground for exclusion, and identify by title, subject matter and date, the document
withheld, if any, and identify each person having knowledge of the factual basis,
if any, on which the privilege or other ground is asserted.

9 7. "You" means Plaintiff (and, for purposes of requests for production
10 of documents, your lawyers, accountants, agents, employees, investigators,
11 distributors, and producers).

12 8. "Defendant" shall mean Ryan Lamberson.

13 9. "APMC LLC" as used herein means (i) APMC, LLC, a California
14 LLC # 201111810070, and "APMC LLC" also includes (ii) APMC LLC's trade
15 name Anti-Piracy Management Company, (iii) APMC LLC's aka APMC, Inc.,
16 (iv) APMC's outsourced entity commonly known as BPO Cebu, located at
17 CEBU, 5th Flr. BigFoot Building, F. Ramos St., Lungsod ng Cebu, Philippines (v)
18 BPO Cebu's aka New Alchemy Limited, (vi) Crystal Bay Corporation, (vii)
19 Crystal Bay Corporation's aka Crystal Bay, Inc. (viii) and any other entity not
20 listed (because not yet known) but affiliated by ownership, directors, officers, or
21 contract with such entities as relates to the investigation and prosecution of claims
22 against Mr. Lamberson regarding
23 SHA1:33E6C4D563C276F29A7A48502C6640191DE3DD72
24
25
26
27
28

DEFENDANT RYAN LAMBERSON'S
SECOND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION
TO PLAINTIFF- 4

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29: All correspondence (and included attachments and links) of plaintiff company Elf-Man, LLC with (i.e. to and from) APMC LLC regarding the investigation and prosecution of claims against Mr. Lamberson.

RESPONSE:

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 30: All correspondence (and included attachments and links) of Elf-Man, LLC's purported agent Vision Films, Inc. with (i.e. to and from) APMC LLC regarding the investigation and prosecution of claims against Mr. Lamberson.

RESPONSE:

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31: All correspondence (and included attachments and links) of plaintiff's counsel with (i.e. to and from) APMC LLC regarding the investigation and prosecution of claims against Mr. Lamberson.

RESPONSE:

DEFENDANT RYAN LAMBERSON'S
SECOND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION
TO PLAINTIFF- 5

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979

1 DATED this 22nd day of April, 2014.

2
3 LEE & HAYES, PLLC

4
5
6 By: *s/ J. Christopher Lynch*

7 J. Christopher Lynch, WSBA #17462
8 Jeffrey R. Smith, WSBA #37460
9 Rhett V. Barney, WSBA #44764
10 601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
11 Spokane, WA 99201
12 Phone: (509) 324-9256
13 Fax: (509) 323-8979
14 Emails: chris@leehayes.com
jeffreys@leehayes.com
rhattb@leehayes.com

15
16 *Counsel for Defendant Ryan Lamberson*
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DEFENDANT RYAN LAMBERSON'S
SECOND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION
TO PLAINTIFF- 6

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ANSWERING PARTY TO COMPLETE:

I certify and declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that I have completed the above responses, know the contents thereof, and believe the same to be true. Except where I have specifically objected, I have provided true, correct, and complete copies or originals of all requested documents in my possession or control and all documents to which I have access.

The responses and objections comply with the requirements imposed by the Civil Rules and the local rules:

DATED: _____ CITY WHERE SIGNED: _____

Lawyer for Answering Party (Bar # _____)

DEFENDANT RYAN LAMBERSON'S
SECOND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION
TO PLAINTIFF- 7

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

I hereby certify that on the 22nd day of April, 2014, I caused to be mailed via First Class Mail as well as electronically served to the following:

Maureen C. VanderMay elfmanwa@vandermaylawfirm.com
The VanderMay Law Firm PC
2021 S. Jones Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89146

LEE & HAYES, PLLC

By: s/ J. Christopher Lynch
J. Christopher Lynch, WSBA #17462
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: (509) 324-9256
Email: chris@leehayes.com

DEFENDANT RYAN LAMBERSON'S
SECOND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION
TO PLAINTIFF- 8

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979

EXHIBIT B

From: Chris Lynch
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2014 3:09 PM
To: Chris Lynch; elfmanwa@vandermaylawfirm.com
Subject: [REDACTED]

Ms. VanderMay:

[REDACTED] Here is Mr. Molina's 700 page expose of APMC and its Philippines back office. We are surprised you are surprised, [REDACTED] Mr. Molina's explanation both appear to show that your firm may have been hired by APMC, not Elf-Man LLC. <http://prezi.com/au9es8zrsnm1/themanako123/>

Here are Mr. Lamberson's Amended Initial Disclosures to include Messrs Achache and Molina as witnesses (we already had Ms. Romanoff listed.) We have also provided these by USPS.

We also added two exhibits:

1. Mr. Molina's BPO Cebu explanation of APMC. Another of our favorite lines from Mr. Molina's explanation: "APMC stays in the background where they are invisible, but we [APMC] are the center (i.e. 'we make things happen.')
2. A list of the Vision Films movies uploaded to bittorrent by "Hero Master." Turns out the allegations at paragraph 45 of our Second Amended Answer, Affirmative Defenses and Counterclaims were just the tip of the iceberg. Not only did "Hero Master" initially seed *Elf-Man* and *Blood Money* before their public release, he/she also uploaded the majority of the Vision Films movies on the "APMC/Vision Films Schedule A" prior to their public release. So, it appears our suspicions are correct and coming to light: Vision Films uploads the movies and then Vision Films hires APMC to track and sue everyone who takes the bait. You said our allegations of "barratry" were scandalous, but it appears they are true.

We are still waiting for a revised explanation to the one provided regarding the relationship of the "investigators" to *Elf-Man*. Our letter dated April 16, 2014 in this regard is attached. You say we have presented "nothing" to support our claim, so maybe you missed the six numbered detailed points starting at number 3 on page 2 of the April 16 letter. Plus, now that we have Mr. Molina's BPO Cebu explanation, it seems your firm's April 14 explanation of the "paperless" engagements of Crystal Bay, Inc. (sic, actually Crystal Bay Corporation) and Mr. Macek must be inaccurate, especially since Mr. Molina's explanation indicates "the BPO Cebu office will be receiving these declarations from Daniel Macek." "These declarations" are the Declarations to Support Motions for Expedited Discovery – the ones Mr. Molina's explanation says are to be included in every case, but which are missing from the ED WA and WD WA *Elf-Man* cases. We think Elf-Man LLC is in a difficult position regarding the explanation provided the court, compared to Mr. Molina's explanation, especially since your firm will have to address the truth of the relationship in its reply brief re the

Noerr-Pennington issues (and the impending discovery.) We are prepared to move to submit Mr. Molina's entire explanation as a sur-reply.

Tomorrow, we will be sending a new set of discovery directed at the relationship/correspondence of APMC to the lawyers of record for the *Elf-Man* cases. If we understand Mr. Molina's explanation correctly, it appears that your law firm communicates directly with APMC's BPO Cebu. The corporate disclosure statement required by our court does not include any disclosure of APMC or BPO Cebu or Vision Films, so we cannot imagine how Elf-Man LLC could claim your law firm's communications with APMC and its BPO Cebu are privileged. Please be prepared that we will seek full discovery of your firm's communications (and the Crowell firm's communications) with APMC/BPO Cebu and its "legal team." If you have some explanation how these could be privileged communications, we would like to hear it now before we serve this discovery tomorrow.

Your client's house of cards has fallen. As Mr. Molina's explanation shows, APMC's entire business model is regrettably based on two faulty assumptions: (i) that capturing one uploaded packet from a swarm member equals evidence of infringement, even if uncorroborated, and (ii) that these single wispy captured packets can somehow be admissible evidence, despite the foreign un-licensed investigator's direct contingency interest in turning the data into a judgment. All of the rest – i.e. APMC's "sales team" trying to sell the data, APMC's litigation writing services from the Philippines, APMC's mistakes about the owners of the exclusive rights, APMC's lack of understanding of *Righthaven*, the sideline of South Dakota's delinquent Crystal Bay Corporation, etc. are just icing on the huge mess of a cake in which your client finds itself with the current state of our ongoing investigation.

We think Judge Rice will be quite interested in the truth of APMC's role in selling data and packaged defective lawsuits against thousands of innocent people. APMC's business model is not lawful, especially in the post-*Righthaven* world, and opacity about APMC's existence and its relationship to the supposed real party in interest does not make the situation any better.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] so please consider this information:

1. Mr. Lamberson didn't copy the work.
2. Your client has no admissible evidence that Mr. Lamberson copied anything. For example, we think the response to RFP #12 is a hoot: Apparently, Mr. Lamberson copied thousands of works from 11/25/12 to 12/23/12 – apparently, he volitionally sought and copied numerous works in German, and Dutch, and Mandarin, and French, and Korean, and Russian, and Spanish, and Italian, and Greek, and Japanese. Mr. Lamberson is an interesting person, but is not multi-lingual. We told you about Mr. Lamberson's computer in discovery, so it should come as no surprise that it lacks the storage capacity to handle even one day of the copying alleged in response to RFP #12 at an alleged rate of over 100Gb per day. Another amusing example, the geo-location of the PCAP data you gave us indicates the request by the "investigator" for the packet from the IP address associated with Mr. Lamberson shows that the investigator's request came from an office building in Amsterdam, and the list of works allegedly infringed includes "Netherlands Top 40." Mr. Lamberson loves music, but does not listen to the Netherlands Top 40 – but maybe the APMC person in Amsterdam does.
3. You don't know what was captured by the one-second upload – it might be the disclaimed portions of the work.
4. Vision Films appears to own the exclusive distribution rights – the right implicated by the investigator uploading the one bit. But the time to amend to add parties is passed.
5. Vision Films appears to be seeding its own work. Each (unknown, unpopular) work on Schedule A was uploaded by the same person (Hero Master) prior to its public release. We will undertake discovery as to this Hero Master once we see how Vision Films intends to comply with our first subpoena.

6. APMC is not “retaining” CBC under a paperless/termless relationship. The explanation makes no sense as our 4/16 letter demonstrates.
7. APMC may not have US licensed counsel preparing its pleadings.
8. APMC is selling testimony on a contingency that you say is “withdrawn” but without any explanation of what the relationship is or was.
9. We think the judge will force your client to present its witnesses in Spokane for deposition, and we cannot imagine the judge requiring us to pay these witnesses anything. Even if we never depose them, we cannot imagine how Messrs Patzer and/or Macek could ever offer any admissible evidence to our court when they do come to Spokane in the summer of 2015 for the jury trial.
10. Does your client(s) understand the risk of Fogerty v. Fantasy? We must admit we were a little worried at first when considering a money judgment against Elf-Man LLC that might not get paid, but now we see APMC behind the scenes. For example, we see APMC/New Alchemy has over 25 posted job listings in Cebu for technicians and administrative staff and the like, so it must have some resources to meet the inevitable defense attorneys fees and sanctions judgments it will face in this case.
11. Does your client(s) really want to undertake discovery on all of these entirely relevant points? I am certain you can sense our tenacity and that we have no reason to back down. [REDACTED] or we complete discovery, go to trial and win the fees. Why would your client choose the latter?
12. We could go on. If for some reason this “information” is not enough to help you formulate a settlement recommendation – just let us know and we can provide more.

We have tried to be patient as your law firm has avoided discovery and the merits of the lawsuit. But our patience is over. Mr. Lamberson is innocent and the canned Philippines lawsuit your client bought is not one that comports with the factual and legal investigatory requirements of Rule 11. Mr. Molina’s explanation exposes APMC’s entire suit-selling scam. Hero Master’s prolific but signature uploading exposes Vision Films’ reason for its APMC agreement. Elf-Man LLC may not have known of any of this, but someone did.

[REDACTED] unless you can explain how your client could possibly prevail, we intend to continue to engage in discovery to reveal the truth about this case.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thank you.

EXHIBIT C

From: Chris Lynch
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 3:27 PM
To: Chris Lynch; 'elfmanwa@vandermaylawfirm.com'
Subject: Second Set of Requests for Production

Counsel: Since we have not heard an explanation as to privilege as our mail below invites, we assume you agree that your communications with APMC LLC and its affiliates are not protected. Also, of course, the communications (if any) by Elf-Man LLC or Vision Films with APMC would not be protected. Consequently, we have prepared three new RFP's as to communications by Elf-Man LLC, its agents, and counsel with APMC (and including any of the entities like CBC that might have paperless, termless agreements with APMC) regarding the case against Mr. Lamberson.

APMC acting as witness, expert, salesman, client, lawyer, and collection agent might make sense in an efficient utopia on another continent, but here in the United States there are fundamental walls between these entities and for good reason, including the policy of the operative ruling in *Righthaven* and

[REDACTED]

We know APMC has some clever lawyers, but we doubt that it has any playbook explanations for this elaborate mess. APMC's model might work for its speculative invoicing program "pre-answer," but it was not designed to provide real evidence (or real discovery) for a real trial and there is no way now to torture the model into U.S. legal compliance.

We are interested in how your client intends to respond to the impending discovery. You may surprise us, and that would be welcome. But, we suspect the answers will require us to go back to the judge, requiring more time wasted trying to pull teeth to get your "client" to admit the truth, for example, that no one was actually "observed infringing." The fees expended to pull those teeth will come right back at your client(s).

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thank you.

EXHIBIT D

From: Chris Lynch
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2014 12:31 PM
To: 'elfmanwa@vandermaylawfirm.com'
Cc: Rhett Barney; Jeffrey Smith; Lauren Van Winkle; Julie Sampson
Subject: Declaration of Service

Counsel: We are in receipt of your response to our Second Set of requests for Production, received today by USPS.

We wanted to give you an opportunity to correct your Declaration of Service, under which you represent that the response was mailed Thursday May 22, when the postmark is Wednesday May 28, as seen on the attached photocopy of the envelope.

Please provide a correct Declaration of Service.

Thank you.

EXHIBIT E

From: elfmanwa@vandermaylawfirm.com [<mailto:elfmanwa@vandermaylawfirm.com>]

Sent: Friday, May 30, 2014 1:50 PM

To: Chris Lynch

Subject: Re: Declaration of Service

Chris, my office finalized the response on Thursday, May 22nd. I was in deposition that day and specifically instructed my assistant to be certain that the document went out in that day's mail from our Salem office. Upon reading your email I spoke with her and she confirmed that she recalled that conversation and that she did in fact get this out with our outgoing mail that day. I have, of course, no idea why the envelope arrived with the postmark that you describe. As far as I know, the problem lies with the USPS.

Maureen

- > Counsel: We are in receipt of your response to our Second Set of requests
- > for Production, received today by USPS.
- >
- > We wanted to give you an opportunity to correct your Declaration of
- > Service, under which you represent that the response was mailed Thursday
- > May 22, when the postmark is Wednesday May 28, as seen on the attached
- > photocopy of the envelope.
- >
- > Please provide a correct Declaration of Service.
- >
- > Thank you.
- >

EXHIBIT F

From: Chris Lynch
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2014 5:25 PM
To: 'elfmanwa@vandermaylawfirm.com'
Subject: RE: Declaration of Service

We see your explanation, but we do not agree that the problem “lies” with USPS.

Would you please provide a Declaration of this assistant as to these important points – who/when/where/how does your mail service work?

Every other pleading we have received from your office has arrived by email as well as USPS – but not this one.

Mail does not take eight days from Salem to Spokane – usually your mail arrives in 2 days, just like the postmark would indicate.

Apparently you have no personal knowledge that it was mailed 5/22, even though you have declared this to be the case. A sworn Declaration of the assistant would go a long way toward us accepting your explanation as the truth.

Also, please provide the required privilege log under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(5)(A) to support your claims of privilege/work-product. Then we can set our Rule 37 Conference.

Thank you.

From: elfmanwa@vandermaylawfirm.com [<mailto:elfmanwa@vandermaylawfirm.com>]
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2014 1:50 PM
To: Chris Lynch
Subject: Re: Declaration of Service

Chris, my office finalized the response on Thursday, May 22nd. I was in deposition that day and specifically instructed my assistant to be certain that the document went out in that day's mail from our Salem office. Upon reading your email I spoke with her and she confirmed that she recalled that conversation and that she did in fact get this out with our outgoing mail that day. I have, of course, no idea why the envelope arrived with the postmark that you describe. As far as I know, the problem lies with the USPS.

Maureen

- > Counsel: We are in receipt of your response to our Second Set of requests
- > for Production, received today by USPS.
- >
- > We wanted to give you an opportunity to correct your Declaration of
- > Service, under which you represent that the response was mailed Thursday
- > May 22, when the postmark is Wednesday May 28, as seen on the attached
- > photocopy of the envelope.

- >
- > Please provide a correct Declaration of Service.
- >
- > Thank you.
- >

EXHIBIT G

From: Chris Lynch
Sent: Monday, June 02, 2014 5:46 PM
To: Carl D Crowell
Cc: Jeffrey Smith; Rhett Barney; Julie Sampson; Lauren Van Winkle
Subject: RE: Elf-Man v. Lamberson -

I appreciate the time and consideration Carl. I am glad an experienced IP litigator is involved who presumably knows the significant risks under Fogerty v Fantasy that your client faces in pursuit of this case against an innocent person. We BEGGED Ms. VanderMay to take our client's deposition and to inspect his machine from the start of the case, but she never did. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] -- but instead she declined to inspect the machine (presumably hoping the court would accept your Count #3 of strict IP address liability), and she asked us to Answer which we did. As we mentioned, after the answer, [REDACTED]

Please see our Motion to Compel re Patzer and Macek and Mr. Smith's declaration about it. German nationals cannot lawfully be deposed by telephone or skype. As I mentioned, we do not see any way these witnesses could ever testify in our 2015 trial since the witnesses were engaged in detecting evidence to be submitted to court, and thus the witnesses would be subject to the Washington State Private Investigator regulations at RCW 18.165, and of course APMC is not so licensed or bonded. We suggest you or your new counsel review this statutory scheme and consider how it affects Patzer and Macek as witnesses and the admissibility of their testimony. If you also conclude they cannot testify, we may drop the request for the deposition.

As far as our claims that the RFP #15 explanation is implausible, we have presented the explanation to the court under seal in opposition to your 12b6 motion (showing the applicability of the sham litigation exception) and it is also before the court re our motion to compel the Germans to Spokane. I could show you more if you are interested -- my favorite part is where your co-counsel goes out of her way to avoid any relationship with Guardaley, going so far as to claim Crystal Bay Corporation was APMC's investigator, even though Mr. Macek's phone number is answered "Guardaley" and even though Crystal Bay Corporation is a delinquent company

with a bogus address and a bogus registered agent. How could a defunct South Dakota company have a German national "working for" it? We did a search on the other corporations with the identical address of CBC and found over 400 bogus companies, all founded by disbarred attorney David DeLoach. We sincerely doubt CBC has a "technical department" as mystery witness Darren Griffin claims to work for. So, yes we can tell you more about the implausibility of the relationships from our investigation, but since you are counsel for Elf-Man in Oregon, we assume you already know the truth and will be willing to inform us about it as the Court ordered Ms. VanderMay to do.

The APMC discovery is important. Please review the "prezi" presentation of Mr. Gerephil Molina of APMC Cebu about which we became aware after counsel gave us the implausible explanation under RFP #15. This 700 page expose seems to explain the back office of these matters -- APMC doing the uploading, preparing the pleadings, doing the discovery, all from Germany or the Philippines. None of this can be privileged as plaintiff claims. And the May 22 Declaration of Service vs the May 28 postmark is critical on this point. If the objections are waived, then we expect the documents immediately. if the objections are not waived, then we expect the privilege log immediately and our first order of business will be our required LR 37 conference on the production.

I would encourage your local counsel candidates to carefully read the file and the correspondence before agreeing to take this case.

As to "hero master," we appreciate your suggestion to ask for the IP address of the uploader. As we noted, we see a pattern of Vision Films works being introduced to bittorrent before the public release date (just like we see for the bogus reviews of these movies in Amazon before the release date.) This is in our Counterclaim.

The bottom line is pretty simple: Mr. Lamberson is innocent, and thus, in the end, he will win. we tried from the very first letter to get your client to do the right thing and examine the facts and dismiss him, but your client chose to bet on strict liability and then proceeded on a discovery path of hiding everything. We are seriously considering asking the court to require your client to post a bond to cover the fees through trial if it continues to litigate this matter.

We understand why your client (or APMC) would prefer not to provide discovery on its methods, but we hope your client and APMC understand that we will continue to work to confirm our suspicions despite counsel's recalcitrance,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The first item of business: how to reconcile a May 22 Declaration of Service with a May 28 postmark.

I am willing to keep a dialogue open on this case and to discuss any of the issues.

Thank you.

EXHIBIT H

HONORABLE THOMAS O. RICE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

J. CHRISTOPHER LYNCH, WSBA #17462
JEFFREY R. SMITH, WSBA #37460
RHETT V. BARNEY, WSBA #44764
LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: (509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979
Emails: chris@leehayes.com
jeffreys@leehayes.com
rhettb@leehayes.com

Counsel for Defendant Ryan Lamberson

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

ELF-MAN, LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RYAN LAMBERSON,

Defendant.

No. 2:13-CV-0395-TOR

NOTICE OF DEPOSITION OF ELF-MAN, LLC

Date: June 20, 2014

Time: 9:00 AM

Location: Lee & Hayes, pllc
601 W Riverside Ave
Ste 1400
Spokane, WA 99201

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6),
Defendant Ryan Lamberson shall take the deposition upon oral examination of

NOTICE OF DEPOSITION
OF ELF-MAN, LLC - 1

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979

1 Elf-Man, LLC, at 601 W Riverside Ave, Suite 1400, Spokane, WA 99201
2 commencing at 9:00 AM, on June 20, 2014. The deposition shall continue from
3 day to day thereafter until completed. The deposition will be conducted under
4 oath and transcribed by stenographic and/or videographic means. Elf-Man, LLC
5 will be examined upon the topics described in Section A, below, and is required
6 to designate and produce one or more officers, directors, managing agents, or
7 other persons to testify on its behalf.
8
9

10 Notice is further given that, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(2) and Fed. R.
11 Civ. P. 34, the deponent is required to produce at said deposition the documents
12 and tangible things identified in Section B herein.
13
14

15 **Section A. Subjects of Examination**

16 Elf-Man, LLC will be examined upon each of the following subjects, for each
17 of which Elf-Man, LLC is required to designate and produce one or more officers,
18 directors, managing agents or other persons to testify on its behalf:
19

20 1. Information and evidence regarding the allegations in paragraphs 18-19
21 of the First Amended Complaint.
22

23 2. Information and evidence regarding the allegations in paragraphs 22-26
24 of the First Amended Complaint.
25

26 3. Information and evidence regarding the allegations in paragraphs 81-83
27
28

NOTICE OF DEPOSITION
OF ELF-MAN, LLC - 2

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979

1 of the First Amended Complaint.

2 4. Information and evidence regarding the allegations in paragraph 113 of
3 the First Amended Complaint.

4
5 5. Information and evidence regarding the allegations in paragraphs 115-
6 149 of the First Amended Complaint.

7
8 6. Circumstances surrounding the execution of and compliance with the
9 Sales Agency Agreement between Elf-Man, LLC and Vision Films, Inc.

10
11 7. Circumstances surrounding the execution of and compliance with the
12 Anti-Internet Piracy Service Agreement between Vision Films, Inc and APMC,
13 Inc.

14
15 8. Elf-Man, LLC's corporate structure, including past and present officers,
16 directors, members, managers, and all other beneficial owners or other individuals
17 with a pecuniary interest in the outcome of Elf-Man, LLC's BitTorrent litigation
18 campaign;

19
20 9. Creation and operation of Elf-Man, LLC, including principal business
21 activities, initial capitalization, insurance, and day to day business operation.

22
23 10. Elf-Man, LLC's revenues derived from the authorized licensing and
24 distribution of *Elf-Man*.

25
26 11. Elf-Man, LLC's revenues derived from BitTorrent copyright litigation
27
28

NOTICE OF DEPOSITION
OF ELF-MAN, LLC - 3

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979

1 related to the work, including obligations by third parties to provide any such
2 monies.

3 12. Identity of all individuals with decision-making and settlement authority
4 related to Elf-Man, LLC's BitTorrent copyright infringement litigation.
5

6 13. Information related to Elf-Man, LLC's insurance policies and
7 indemnification agreements that may impact the parties in this litigation or
8 otherwise relate to Elf-Man, LLC's financial liability for adverse judgments.
9

10 **Section B. Request for Production of Documents and Tangible Things**
11

12 1. All agreements between Elf-Man, LLC and Vision Films, Inc. regarding
13 the work at issue in the instant suit, including all licenses, assignments, or other
14 agreements, however named, that affect the right of either signatory to exploit the
15 work in any manner.
16

17 2. All agreements between Elf-Man, LLC and any third party regarding
18 the work at issue in the instant suit, including all licenses, assignments or other
19 agreements, however named, that affect the right of any third party to exploit the
20 work.
21

22 3. All documents supporting Elf-Man, LLC's claims that Ryan Lamberson
23 has infringed upon its copyrights, as described in the First Amended Complaint in
24 this matter.
25
26
27
28

NOTICE OF DEPOSITION
OF ELF-MAN, LLC - 4

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979

1 4. All documents related to Elf-Man, LLC's decision to sue Ryan
2 Lamberson as the infringer of the work.

3
4 5. Elf-Man, LLC's Articles of Incorporation or Organization, however
5 named, as well as any by-laws, membership agreements, or other operating
6 agreements describing the management and control of Elf-Man, LLC.

7
8 DATED this 21st day of May, 2014.
9

10
11 LEE & HAYES, PLLC

12
13 By: *s/ J. Christopher Lynch*

14 J. Christopher Lynch, WSBA #17462

15 Jeffrey R. Smith, WSBA #37460

16 Rhett V. Barney, WSBA #44764

17 601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400

18 Spokane, WA 99201

19 Phone: (509) 324-9256

20 Fax: (509) 323-8979

21 Emails: chris@leehayes.com

22 jeffreys@leehayes.com

23 rhettb@leehayes.com

24
25
26
27
28
Counsel for Defendant Ryan Lamberson

NOTICE OF DEPOSITION
OF ELF-MAN, LLC - 5

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

I hereby certify that on the 21st day of May, 2014, I caused to be mailed via First Class Mail as well as electronically served the foregoing to the following:

Maureen C. VanderMay elfmanwa@vandermaylawfirm.com
The VanderMay Law Firm PC
2021 S. Jones Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89146

LEE & HAYES, PLLC

By: *s/ J. Christopher Lynch*

J. Christopher Lynch, WSBA #17462
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: (509) 324-9256
Email: chris@leehayes.com

NOTICE OF DEPOSITION
OF ELF-MAN, LLC - 6

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 324-9256
Fax: (509) 323-8979