

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DRONE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

14cv0111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

v.

PARROT S.A., PARROT, INC.,

Defendants.

**ORDER OF COURT RE: DEFENDANTS' EMERGENCY MOTION TO MODIFY THE
PROTECTIVE ORDER (DOC. NO. 64)**

Presently before this Court is Defendants' Emergency Motion to Modify the Protective Order, in which Defendants move this Court to enter a nine page proposed order that would limit the methods of production of source code material that must be produced to Plaintiff on or before August 13, 2014. Doc. No. 64-1. Defendants' Motion, in whole or in part, appears to be based upon Defense Counsel's belief that Plaintiff's counsel are incapable of completing routine discovery or conducting themselves in accordance with the confidentiality and other provisions designed to protect both parties during the process. The Motion is fully briefed and ripe for disposition. Doc. Nos. 64, 65, 67, and 69. The Court rejects Defendants' arguments and will deny Defendants' Motion, which appears to be another attempt to have the Court reconsider its prior Orders on discovery and/or add additional burdens to Plaintiff during discovery.

Based upon this Court's knowledge of the discovery practice in this case and the materials that must be provided to Plaintiff per this Court's prior rulings, the Court believes that the Protective Order in place adequately protects Defendants' business interests. *See e.g.* Doc. Nos. 48, 54, 07/08/14 Text Order, 07/11/2014 Text Order. The current Protective Order is the model Protective Order for patent cases in the United States District Court for the Western

District of Pennsylvania. The model order, which was developed through consultation amongst experienced patent attorneys and sitting judges who serve on the Local Patent Rules Advisory Committee, provides protections to the party who produces materials during discovery. Defense counsel, who attested in May, 2014, that they know and understand the Local Rules, including this Court's form Protective Order, have not demonstrated that there is anything unique about this case to justify a modification to the current Protective Order.

AND NOW, this 7th day of August, 2014, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Defendants' Emergency Motion to Modify the Protective Order (Doc. No. 64) is **DENIED**. All of this Court's previous Orders remain in effect, including this Court's Order that Defendants fully comply with this Court's July 1, 2014, Order by August 13, 2014. Doc. No. 63.

s/ Arthur J. Schwab
Arthur J. Schwab
United States District Judge

cc: All Registered ECF Counsel and Parties