



Greensfelder, Hemker & Gale, P.C.
10 South Broadway
Suite 2000
St. Louis, MO 63102
T: 314-241-9090
F: 314-241-8624
www.greensfelder.com

12 Wolf Creek Drive
Suite 100
Belleville (Swanses), IL 62226

J. ANDREW WALKUP
DIRECT DIAL: (314) 516-2607
DIRECT FAX: (314) 345-1285
E-MAIL: aw@greensfelder.com

June 19, 2008

VIA FACSIMILE @ 281-483-7988

Mr. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Re: **i2 Global Communications, Inc. v. Protus IP Solutions, Inc.**
United States District Court Case No. CV06-0566 DDP (AJWx)

Greensfelder, Hemker & Gale, P.C.
10 South Broadway
Suite 2000
St. Louis, MO 63102
T: 314-241-9090
F: 314-241-8624
www.greensfelder.com

Dear Mr. Shields:

I am in receipt of your letter and voicemail of July 18, 2008. Let me assure you that we have a legitimate need to take your deposition, as we are confident you have information that is both relevant and essential in the above-referenced lawsuit.

To the extent you have a justifiable conflict with the scheduling of the deposition on July 14, 2008 at 9:30 a.m., I am willing to work with you to select a mutually agreeable alternative date or time provided you agree to accept service of a new subpoena. I do not anticipate that your deposition will last long; so if a different start time on July 14th would be more convenient, please let me know. Otherwise, please let me know the nature of your scheduling conflict and provide me with alternative dates and times. If you have counsel, and would prefer, please provide me with his or her name and contact information so that I can coordinate your deposition through your counsel.

I look forward to hearing from either you or your counsel regarding these arrangements.

Sincerely,

GREENSFELDER, HEMKER & GALE, P.C.

J. Andrew Walkup
J. Andrew Walkup

Comments: Notice the legalese claiming to to have a "legitimate need" or "confident" but never saying what it is they really want. This language is used for evasive purposes and is used to bamboozle the courts into believing that they don't need justification for anything they do. Next is the first indication of this attorney's attitude toward anyone not an attorney - he is demanding that I "justify" prior obligations I have. He is saying that no matter what obligations I have they are not as important as his subpoena. Then more legalese "willing to work... different date..." but only suggests a different start time. And then the real reason for the subpoena comes to light - the demand to force me to spend my family's money on a lawyer.

Sincerely,