

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATHENS DIVISION**

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF )  
 BOARDS OF PHARMACY, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE )  
 UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA and )  
 FLYNN WARREN, JR., )  
 )  
 Defendants. )

---

CIVIL ACTION NO: 3:07-CV-84 (CDL)

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONSES TO FIRST REQUEST FOR  
ADMISSIONS, FIRST AMENDED INTERROGATORIES, AND FIRST REQUESTS  
FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND THINGS TO DEFENDANT THE BOARD  
OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA**

Pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 37 and Local Rule 37, Plaintiff National Association of Boards of Pharmacy (“NABP”) moves this Court to compel Defendant the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (“Board”) to fully respond to NABP’s First Request for Admissions, First Amended Interrogatories, and First Requests for Production of Documents and Things. In support thereof, NABP relies upon all filings of record in this case, the Memorandum of Law filed herewith, and the Board’s Responses to NABP’s First Request for Admissions, First Amended Interrogatories, and First Requests for Production, attached as Exhibits 1, 2, and 3 hereto.

By way of background, on September 5, 2007, pursuant to this Court’s Orders of August 21 and 27, 2007 permitting the parties to conduct limited discovery related solely to the jurisdictional issues raised in this case, NABP propounded nineteen Requests for Admission,

nineteen Interrogatories, and eleven Requests for Production of Documents and Things (collectively “Discovery Requests”) to the Board. In response, the Board produced very little. Specifically, the Board provided no substantive response to seventeen of nineteen Requests for Admission (Nos. 3-19), instead objecting to each on the grounds that the Request was “not related solely to subject matter jurisdiction but instead goes to the merits of the case in violation of the Court’s Orders of August 21 and August 27, 2007.” See Board’s Response to NABP’s First Request for Admissions, attached as Exhibit 1. The Board also produced essentially *no* documents in response to NABP’s eleven Requests for Production, and objected to ten of eleven (all except No. 10) Requests on the same “beyond the scope of jurisdictional discovery” basis. See Board’s Response to NABP’s First Requests for Production of Documents and Things, attached as Exhibit 2. Finally, the Board did not give *any* factual response to seven of nineteen Interrogatories (Nos. 5, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, and 18), and objected to sixteen of nineteen (all except Nos. 1, 3, and 19) on the same “beyond the scope of jurisdictional discovery” basis. See Board’s Responses to NABP’s First Amended Interrogatories, attached as Exhibit 3.

Upon receiving the Board’s “responses,” NABP immediately sent a letter to the Board on the evening of September 21, 2007. See NABP’s September 21, 2007 letter to the Board, attached as Exhibit 4. In its September 21st letter to the Board, NABP outlined why the Discovery Requests that it had propounded *were* relevant to the jurisdictional issues in this case. The relevant portion of NABP’s September 21st letter to the Board is quoted below in full:

All of the Requests to Produce, Requests for Admission, and Interrogatories that you have objected to as beyond the scope of jurisdictional discovery were drafted to procure evidence relating to at least the following issue: to what extent was the infringement in this case intentional? Given that there are two defendants in this case, this intent inquiry necessarily has two components: 1) to what extent was Warren’s conduct intentional; and 2) to what extent did others in the faculty/administration at the University of Georgia College of Pharmacy and/or the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia share in that intent (or,

conversely, were Warren's infringements the random and unauthorized acts of a "rogue" professor).

In short, this intent element falls within the scope of jurisdictional discovery because it applies to our analysis of whether the Copyright Remedy Clarification Act ("CRCA") constitutes appropriate Section 5 legislation under the Fourteenth Amendment as applied to the facts of this case. As you are aware, in analyzing whether the Patent Remedy Act ("PRA") constituted appropriate Section 5 legislation under the 14th Amendment, the Supreme Court in *Florida Prepaid* analyzed three separate issues: 1) the legislative history of the PRA; 2) the availability of state law remedies; and 3) whether the PRA swept too broadly (was not "congruent and proportional") because it applied to unintentional acts of patent infringement that, by virtue of their being unintentional, did not constitute "deprivations" of property without due process under *Daniels v. Williams*, 474 U.S. 327 (1986). *Fl. Prepaid Postsecondary Educ. Expense Bd. v. College Sav. Bank*, 527 U.S. 627, 636-45 (1999). The court explained its concern on the third point with reference to the legislative history of the PRA, which stated: "It is not always clear that with all the products that government buys, that anyone is really aware of the patent status of any particular invention or device or product." *Id.* at 645. While our position is that the CRCA is distinguishable from the PRA on all three counts, our discovery on the intent element goes mainly to the third. The discovery that we seek from the Board is calculated to lead to evidence that relates directly to this issue. We trust that this brief explanation, while by no means exhaustive, is sufficient to address your objection regarding the jurisdictional scope of NABP's Requests to Produce, Requests for Admission, and Interrogatories.


Apparently not satisfied with this explanation, the Board responded by letter on September 24, 2007, continuing to maintain that NABP's Discovery Requests asked for information beyond the scope of the Court's orders of August 21, 2007 and August 27, 2007. See the Board's September 24, 2007 letter, attached as Exhibit 5. NABP replied on September 26, 2007 providing even *more* support for its position on the matter. See NABP's September 26, 2007 letter to the Board, attached as Exhibit 6. The parties conducted a telephone conference to attempt to resolve their disagreement on September 27, 2007, but no resolution was achieved. Thus, NABP seeks an Order from this Court: 1) directing the Board to fully respond to NABP's Discovery Requests; 2) revising the discovery schedule to allow NABP ample time post-written-

discovery-responses to prepare to take necessary depositions; and 3) providing NABP such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

This 4th day of October, 2007.

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP  
Suite 3100, Promenade II  
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3592  
Phone: (404) 815-3500  
Fax: (404) 815-3509

Respectfully submitted,




J. Rodgers Lunsford II  
Georgia Bar No.: 461200  
rlunsford@sgrlaw.com  
Kerri A. Hochgesang  
Georgia Bar No.: 358448  
khochgesang@sgrlaw.com  
Devin H. Gordon  
Georgia Bar No.: 141256  
dgordon@sgrlaw.com  
Todd D. Williams  
Georgia Bar No.: 142379  
twilliams@sgrlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff The National  
Association of Boards of Pharmacy


**Local Rule 37 Certification**

Pursuant to Local Rule 37, I, J. Rodgers Lunsford, hereby certify that during the week of September 21, 2007 to September 27, 2007 I exchanged correspondence with counsel for Defendant the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, and on September 27, 2007, I conferred by telephone with counsel for Defendant the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, in good faith in an effort to secure the information sought by NABP's discovery without court action.

  
J. Rodgers Lunsford III

**Local Rule 5.1 Certification**

Pursuant to Local Rule 5.1, I, J. Rodgers Lunsford, hereby certify that the discovery documents filed as attachments to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Responses to First Request for Admissions, First Amended Interrogatories, and First Requests for Production of Documents and Things to Defendant the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia will be used in connection with the proceedings thereon.

  
J. Rodgers Lunsford III

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATHENS DIVISION**

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF )  
BOARDS OF PHARMACY, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )  
 )  
v. )  
 )  
THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE )  
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA and )  
FLYNN WARREN, JR., )  
 )  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

CIVIL ACTION NO: 3:07-CV-84 (CDL)

**PROPOSED ORDER**

The within and foregoing action having come on before the Court on Plaintiff's Motions to Compel, upon consideration, and good cause shown, Defendants, and each of them, shall be, and hereby are, ORDERED to fully respond to Plaintiff's First Request for Admissions, First Amended Interrogatories, and First Requests for Production of Documents and Things on or before November \_\_\_\_, 2007.

SO ORDERED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clay D. Land  
United States District, Judge

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATHENS DIVISION**

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF )  
BOARDS OF PHARMACY, )

Plaintiff, )

v. )

CIVIL ACTION NO: 3:07-CV-84 (CDL)

THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE )  
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA and )  
FLYNN WARREN, JR., )

Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that on this 4th day of October, 2007, the foregoing “Motion to Compel Responses to First Request for Admissions, First Amended Interrogatories, and First Requests for Production of Documents and Things to Defendant the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia” was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the Court’s ECF system which automatically generates a Notice of Electronic Filing of such Pleading to the following attorneys of record, and that a copy of the same has also been electronically transmitted to:

Alan E. Lubel  
Kevin A. Maxim  
TROUTMAN SANDERS, LLP  
600 Peachtree Street, Suite 5200  
Atlanta, GA 30308

Mary Josephine Volkert  
Office of the Attorney General  
40 Capitol Square, SW  
Atlanta, GA 30334

Attorneys for Defendant The Board  
of Regents of the University System  
of Georgia

Gary L. Seacrest  
John G. Haubenreich  
Annarita M. Busbee  
SEACREST, KARESH, TATE &  
BICKNESE, LLP  
56 Perimeter Center East  
Suite 450  
Atlanta, GA 30346

Attorneys for Defendant Flynn  
Warren, Jr.



J. Rodgers Lunsford III

LIT\1009334.2