

From: Aaron Pirouznia
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2025 2:58 PM
To: Tatum, Christian
Cc: Stratasys-MWE; ddacus@dacusfirm.com; Andrea L. Fair; Claire A. Henry; Shelly Prim; FR Service-Bambu Lab/Stratasys
Subject: RE: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

[REDACTED]

Christian,


I write to follow up on my April 16 email regarding Stratasys's deficient document production. As further explained below, Stratasys's production remains deficient, prejudicing Bambu. Indeed, Stratasys has yet to produce any documents at all on the prior art Stratasys products that Bambu identified with specificity in its January 30, 2025 invalidity contentions. Moreover, on our April 17, 2025 meet and confer, Stratasys was unable to provide any details of the scope of its document search or the dates by which it will supplement its production.

Starting with Stratasys's most recent production from April 21, 2025, we note that the production merely comprised a few license agreements, a single IP and publication agreement, and documents related to the MakerBot/UltiMaker corporate reorganization. As we discussed on the April 17, 2025 meet and confer, we would have expected Stratasys to have already produce documents relating to:

1. the Stratasys products that Defendants have identified as prior art in invalidity contentions served almost three months ago;
2. any Stratasys products or planned products that practice or previously practiced the asserted patents;
3. the named inventor's documents;
4. the documents relating to the MakerBot/UltiMaker deal; and
5. licenses and related correspondence.

Though Stratasys recently produced some documents responsive to categories 4 and 5, its production remains deficient. As a non-exhaustive example, we understand that MakerBot is the purported original assignee for multiple patents that Stratasys asserts in this case (i.e., U.S. Pat. Nos. 9,168,698; 10,556,381; 10,569,466; 11,167,464; 8,562,324; and 8,747,097). We further understand that Stratasys acquired MakerBot in 2013 and owns 46.5% of the new entity formed by the merger of UltiMaker and MakerBot in August 2022. Given this acquisition, we expect that Stratasys still has possession, custody, and control over MakerBot's documents related to the asserted patents in this case. These include, without limitation:

1. Documents that evidence the operation, capabilities, and public availability of the prior art, especially systems identified in Bambu's invalidity contentions;
 2. Named inventor files, notebooks, and documents relevant to the conception or reduction to practice of the alleged inventions;
 3. MakerBot activities and policies related to open-source initiatives; and
 4. Any other documents related to MakerBot/UltiMaker corporate reorganization, including those that inform any treatment of patent rights or valuation.
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]



Defendants request that Stratasys produce at least the documents identified in Defendants' subpoena to MakerBot based on a search of its and MakerBot's repositories. Should Stratasys refute that it has possession, custody, or control of such documents within its repositories or those of MakerBot, please provide Stratasys's position in writing.

Much like this MakerBot/UltiMaker example, the remaining categories of documents—even those where at least some responsive documents have been produced (like licenses)—remain deficient. Please confirm that Stratasys is working to produce responsive documents for the remaining categories outlined above.

To that end, on the recent meet and confer, you mentioned that your search efforts are ongoing, but you did not provide any details. Please let us know when we can expect your next production and what it will contain. To the extent that your next production does not include the categories of documents referenced in this email, please specify when we can expect documents for each of the above categories.

Finally, Stratasys did not provide its position on whether it will search for documents related to Defendants' open-source requests. We have repeatedly explained why these documents are relevant to our defenses and provided supplemental initial disclosures regarding the same, but Stratasys did not commit to searching for any responsive documents, despite not providing a basis for its failure to do so. Nor did Stratasys supplement its response to Defendants' open-source interrogatories. Please let us know whether Stratasys will search for documents responsive to Defendants' open-source requests and supplement the corresponding interrogatories, or whether the parties have reached an impasse warranting a motion to compel.

As we have been discussing these issues for many weeks now, we expect a response from Stratasys within the next week. If that is not possible, please state why and provide your availability to meet and confer.

Thanks,
Aaron

Aaron P. Pirouznia
Principal ■ Fish & Richardson P.C.

T: 214 292 4073 | pirouznia@fr.com | [Bio](#)

From: Aaron Pirouznia <pirouznia@fr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2025 5:18 PM

To: Tatum, Christian <ctatum@mwe.com>

Cc: Stratasys-MWE <Stratasys-MWE@mwe.com>; ddacus@dacusfirm.com; Andrea L. Fair <andrea@millerfairhenry.com>; Claire A. Henry <claire@millerfairhenry.com>; Shelly Prim <Prim@fr.com>; FR Service-Bambu Lab/Stratasys <FRServiceBambuLabStratasys@fr.com>

Subject: RE: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

Christian,

I'm glad you brought up the April 11 production. Like Stratasys's prior productions, the April 11 production consists almost entirely of public documents. Indeed, just like Stratasys's last production, the April 11 production contains only a single document with any confidentiality designation—bringing the grand total of confidential Stratasys documents up to two.

You complain about what Bambu had not produced until March 27, yet you cannot deny that Bambu has produced **hundreds of confidential source code files** and **1,514 confidential documents**, while Stratasys has produced **only two confidential documents**. Nor can you deny that the November 29, 2024 Additional Disclosure deadline “was not merely the date that discovery begins” and thus Stratasys “should have begun collecting and producing documents before the Additional Disclosures deadline,” yet failed to do so. *Maxell Ltd. v. Apple Inc.*, No. 5:19-CV-00036-RWS, 2019 WL 7905454, at *2 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 13, 2019).

Your excuse that Bambu had not previously raised a deficiency regarding Stratasys's prior art systems is unmoving as well. Bambu identified these prior art systems in its January 30, 2025 Invalidity Contentions, and the local rules do not require any further action for Stratasys to know that such documents are relevant to Bambu's defenses and thus subject to the disclosure requirements of the Discovery Order.

Finally, your position regarding Bambu's open-source defense is also untenable. As you are well aware, the Discovery Order requires Stratasys to produce all documents relevant to the claims and defenses “[w]ithout awaiting a discovery request.” Dkt. 35 at ¶3. Bambu's supplemental initial disclosures explained why the contributions to open-source software made by Stratasys and others “may have resulted in the Asserted Patents being licensed under an open-source license”—irrespective of whether Stratasys's infringement contentions identified any open source code. Stratasys's open source licenses are also relevant to its claims, including the proper value of the asserted patents and technology at issue. As such, the propriety of Bambu's discovery requests is not dependent on its ability to identify “any of Bambu's accused functionality ‘present in open-source software,’” as you now demand.

We look forward to discussing these issues further tomorrow.

Best regards,
Aaron

Aaron P. Pirouznia

Principal ■ Fish & Richardson P.C.

T: 214 292 4073 | pirouznia@fr.com | [Bio](#)

From: Tatum, Christian <ctatum@mwe.com>

Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2025 6:06 PM

To: Aaron Pirouznia <pirouznia@fr.com>

Cc: Stratasys-MWE <Stratasys-MWE@mwe.com>; ddacus@dacusfirm.com; Andrea L. Fair <andrea@millerfairhenry.com>; Claire A. Henry <claire@millerfairhenry.com>; Shelly Prim <Prim@fr.com>; FR Service-Bambu Lab/Stratasys <FRServiceBambuLabStratasys@fr.com>

Subject: RE: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

Aaron,

We note that your March 28th email never requested a response. Rather, you indicated you would “follow up once [your] review is complete” regarding Stratasys's additional production of documents. In any event, as you are now

aware, Stratasys produced its next batch of documents in the evening of April 11th. Consistent with Stratasys's rolling document production efforts, we expect another production of internal documents this week and more to follow in subsequent weeks.

Additionally, your focus on confidential documents as the relevant barometer is perplexing given that it is Bambu, not Stratasys, that are the accused infringers in this case and are expected to produce the vast majority of confidential technical documents and damages information. *See, e.g., Seagen Inc. v. Daiichi Sankyo Co.*, 546 F. Supp. 3d 515, 530 (E.D. Tex. 2021) (recognizing that "[i]n patent infringement cases, the bulk of the relevant evidence usually comes from the accused infringer") (quoting *In re Genentech, Inc.*, 566 F.3d 1338, 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2009)). As Stratasys has repeatedly noted, Bambu has failed to do so. Indeed, Bambu had failed to produce any confidential technical documents until a 163-document production on March 27th (which was deficient in its own right as noted in our April 4th correspondence).

Your supplement regarding Bambu's "open-source" theory (served on April 8th) is premised on the unsubstantiated position that "to the extent Stratasys accuses functionality present in open-source software, such functionality may be licensed pursuant to open-source licenses." However, you already have Stratasys's infringement contentions, and you should already know if Stratasys has accused Bambu functionality present in open-source software. In view of Stratasys's infringement contentions, is any of Bambu's accused functionality "present in open-source software"? If so, please identify the functionality and corresponding open-source software that is implicated. If Bambu is not able to provide this information, Bambu's requests related to "open-source software" appear to be nothing more than a fishing expedition, and there is nothing more that Stratasys can provide to Bambu based on the current set of claims and defenses in the case.

Regarding Stratasys's prior art systems (your April 11th email is the first time Bambu has asserted a deficiency with respect to these) and the remainder of your inaccurate critiques of Stratasys's search efforts and productions, let's discuss these issues at 2:00pm CT on Thursday, when we will also be addressing Defendants' various discovery deficiencies.

Regards,
Christian

CHRISTIAN TATUM

Associate

McDermott Will & Emery LLP 300 Colorado Street, Suite 2200, Austin, TX 78701

Tel +1 512 298 4614 **Email** ctatum@mwe.com

Website | **vCard** | **LinkedIn**

From: Aaron Pirouznia <pirouznia@fr.com>

Sent: Friday, April 11, 2025 2:37 PM

To: Tatum, Christian <ctatum@mwe.com>

Cc: Stratasys-MWE <Stratasys-MWE@mwe.com>; ddacus@dacusfirm.com; Andrea L. Fair <andrea@millerfairhenry.com>; Claire A. Henry <claire@millerfairhenry.com>; Shelly Prim <Prim@fr.com>; FR Service-Bambu Lab/Stratasys <FRServiceBambuLabStratasys@fr.com>

Subject: RE: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

[External Email]

Christian,

I'm following up on my email from March 28, which you never responded to.

Stratasys's document production remains deficient. Indeed, Stratasys has not produced any documents since March 28, and that production once again consisted almost entirely of public materials that Stratasys collected months ago. For example, 922 of the 948 documents are press releases, only 39 of the documents were collected this year, and only one document was designated confidential. Worse, that one document is the **only confidential document** that Stratasys has produced to date.

As Stratasys requested, Bambu supplemented its initial disclosures regarding its defenses. Yet Stratasys still has not provided any documents related to the open-source software at issue.

Bambu's January 30, 2025 invalidity contentions also put Stratasys on notice of the relevant Stratasys prior art systems at issue in this case, yet over two months later, Stratasys still has not produced a single document regarding these systems.

And as explained on our meet and confer back in February and in my correspondence from March, Stratasys has not even confirmed it has searched for clearly relevant documents—including, for example, the documents of the **formerly employed inventors of the asserted patents**.

Please respond by April 16 and provide a date certain by which Bambu can expect a substantive document production and details of Stratasys's search efforts. Otherwise provide your availability to meet and confer. As a reminder, I requested this information in my correspondence from March 14, 2025, yet Stratasys never responded. If Stratasys continues to ignore its discovery obligations and Bambu's requests, we will be forced to bring this issue to the Court's attention.

Thanks,
Aaron

Aaron P. Pirouznia

Principal ■ Fish & Richardson P.C.

T: 214 292 4073 | pirouznia@fr.com | [Bio](#)

From: Aaron Pirouznia <pirouznia@fr.com>

Sent: Friday, March 28, 2025 5:03 PM

To: Tatum, Christian <ctatum@mwe.com>

Cc: Stratasys-MWE <Stratasys-MWE@mwe.com>; ddacus@dacusfirm.com; Andrea L. Fair <andrea@millerfairhenry.com>; Claire A. Henry <claire@millerfairhenry.com>; Shelly Prim <Prim@fr.com>; FR Service-Bambu Lab/Stratasys <FRServiceBambuLabStratasys@fr.com>

Subject: RE: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

Christian,

We disagree with your characterization of Stratasys's productions to date.

At the outset, you do not dispute that Stratasys had only produced 55 documents from the Additional Disclosure Deadline of November 29, 2024 until Stratasys's March 20, 2025 production—a period of 111 days.

That recent production from March 20, 2025 is equally as troubling. While it contains 940 documents, nearly all of those appear to be PDFs of publicly available webpages. 914 of the documents have a creation date in July 2024 or earlier, suggesting that Stratasys has been in possession of these documents since before its Additional Disclosure Deadline but only produced them recently. Even under a framework of rolling production, the local rules require Stratasys to promptly produce documents that have already been collected and these should have been produced earlier.

Most fundamentally, we remain concerned that Stratasys does not appear to have undertaken any serious effort to collect and produce internal documents. We recognize that Stratasys has made another production today, which is currently being ingested but appears to be only 3,543 pages. We will follow up once our review is complete and sincerely hope that this latest production is more substantive than the prior ones. If Stratasys believes that it has no responsive internal documents that it is required to produce in this case other than the documents produced today, please so state in writing and let us know your availability to meet and confer on this issue.

We also disagree with your characterization of the prior meet and confer. We did not recognize that any of Bambu's requests as overbroad or recognize a need to provide more narrowly tailored requests. Instead, we explained the information sought and identified representative documents that we expected Stratasys to locate after a reasonably diligent search. It was clear from the call that Stratasys had not even begun such a diligent search, as it could not even identify any of the document repositories it had identified or the search efforts already taken for unquestionably relevant materials such as the documents of the inventors.

Regarding your request that we supplement our initial disclosures, we disagree that such a supplement is necessary to open the doors of discovery into our potential defenses. Nevertheless, in an attempt to moot this dispute, we agree to provide supplementary disclosures.

Finally, please see attached for correspondence detailing the deficiencies we have identified so far in Stratasys's interrogatory responses.

Best regards,
Aaron

Aaron P. Pirouznia

Principal ■ Fish & Richardson P.C.

T: 214 292 4073 | pirouznia@fr.com | [Bio](#)

From: Tatum, Christian <ctatum@mwe.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 26, 2025 1:08 PM

To: Aaron Pirouznia <pirouznia@fr.com>

Cc: Stratasys-MWE <Stratasys-MWE@mwe.com>; ddacus@dacusfirm.com; Andrea L. Fair <andrea@millerfairhenry.com>; Claire A. Henry <claire@millerfairhenry.com>; Shelly Prim <Prim@fr.com>; FR Service-Bambu Lab/Stratasys <FRServiceBambuLabStratasys@fr.com>

Subject: RE: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

Aaron,

I write in relation to your March 14th Letter. As discussed during our February 28th meet and confer, Stratasys has met its discovery obligations and continues to produce additional responsive documents on a rolling basis. In addition to the supplemental document production provided on March 20th, we expect to serve another document production later this week. As we explained during the meet and confer, additional document productions will occur on a rolling basis as appropriate.

Additionally, as you recognized during our meet and confer, many of Defendants' requests for production are overbroad, making search efforts unduly burdensome (e.g., RFP Nos. 13, 15, 39, 45). You agreed to follow up with more narrowly tailored requests (e.g., by limiting the temporal and/or subject matter scope of such requests). Nearly a month has passed, and you have not followed up.

Furthermore, for other requests (e.g., RFP No. 68) we told you that they have no relevance to the pled claims or defenses in this case. You indicated that such requests may be relevant to defenses that Defendants may choose to

assert in the future. You further stated that Defendants would consider answering the complaint or otherwise providing additional information on such defenses. Again, it is nearly a month later, and Defendants have neither answered nor provided any additional information. We note that Defendants have also propounded multiple interrogatories—as well as third-party requests for production and deposition topics—related to open-source software, which are also irrelevant to this case. If Defendants contend that such requests are relevant, we need some understanding as to how. By **April 2nd**, please supplement your initial disclosures to comply with Paragraph 1(c) of the Court’s Discovery Order by setting out “the legal theories and, in general, the factual bases of [Defendants’] claims or defenses.” To the extent Defendants fail to do so, we will understand that such requests have no relevance to any issue in this case.

Regards,
Christian

CHRISTIAN TATUM
Associate

McDermott Will & Emery LLP 300 Colorado Street, Suite 2200, Austin, TX 78701

Tel +1 512 298 4614 **Email** ctatum@mwe.com

Website | [vCard](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

From: Aaron Pirouznia <pirouznia@fr.com>

Sent: Friday, March 14, 2025 11:53 AM

To: Tatum, Christian <ctatum@mwe.com>

Cc: Stratasys-MWE <Stratasys-MWE@mwe.com>; ddacus@dacusfirm.com; Andrea L. Fair <andrea@millerfairhenry.com>; Claire A. Henry <claire@millerfairhenry.com>; Shelly Prim <Prim@fr.com>; FR Service-Bambu Lab/Stratasys <FRServiceBambuLabStratasys@fr.com>

Subject: RE: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

[External Email]

Counsel,

Please see the attached correspondence regarding Stratasys’s deficient document production.

Thanks,
Aaron

Aaron P. Pirouznia

Principal ■ Fish & Richardson P.C.

T: 214 292 4073 | pirouznia@fr.com | [Bio](#)

From: Tatum, Christian <ctatum@mwe.com>

Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 5:16 PM

To: Aaron Pirouznia <pirouznia@fr.com>; Shelly Prim <Prim@fr.com>; FR Service-Bambu Lab/Stratasys <FRServiceBambuLabStratasys@fr.com>

Cc: Stratasys-MWE <Stratasys-MWE@mwe.com>; ddacus@dacusfirm.com; Andrea L. Fair <andrea@millerfairhenry.com>; Claire A. Henry <claire@millerfairhenry.com>

Subject: RE: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

Aaron,

I can confirm that 2-3 pm on February 28th works for us. I will send you an invite for that time.

Regards,
Christian

CHRISTIAN TATUM
Associate

McDermott Will & Emery LLP 300 Colorado Street, Suite 2200, Austin, TX 78701

Tel +1 512 298 4614 **Email** ctatum@mwe.com

Website | [vCard](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

From: Aaron Pirouznia <pirouznia@fr.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:45 PM
To: Tatum, Christian <ctatum@mwe.com>; Shelly Prim <Prim@fr.com>; FR Service-Bambu Lab/Stratasys <FRServiceBambuLabStratasys@fr.com>
Cc: Stratasys-MWE <Stratasys-MWE@mwe.com>; ddacus@dacusfirm.com; Andrea L. Fair <andrea@millerfairhenry.com>; Claire A. Henry <claire@millerfairhenry.com>
Subject: RE: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

[External Email]

Hi Christian,

Just wanted to confirm this so I can get it on my calendar. Do you want us to send an invite?

Thanks,
Aaron

From: Aaron Pirouznia
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 4:05 PM
To: 'Tatum, Christian' <ctatum@mwe.com>; Shelly Prim <Prim@fr.com>; FR Service-Bambu Lab/Stratasys <FRServiceBambuLabStratasys@fr.com>
Cc: Stratasys-MWE <Stratasys-MWE@mwe.com>; ddacus@dacusfirm.com; Andrea L. Fair <andrea@millerfairhenry.com>; Claire A. Henry <claire@millerfairhenry.com>
Subject: RE: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

Hi Christian,

2-3 pm on February 28 works for us.

Thanks,
Aaron

From: Tatum, Christian <ctatum@mwe.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 7:18 PM
To: Aaron Pirouznia <pirouznia@fr.com>; Shelly Prim <Prim@fr.com>; FR Service-Bambu Lab/Stratasys <FRServiceBambuLabStratasys@fr.com>
Cc: Stratasys-MWE <Stratasys-MWE@mwe.com>; ddacus@dacusfirm.com; Andrea L. Fair <andrea@millerfairhenry.com>; Claire A. Henry <claire@millerfairhenry.com>
Subject: RE: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

[This email originated outside of F&R.]

Aaron,

In relation to the above-referenced matter, attached for service please find Plaintiff Stratasys, Inc.'s correspondence regarding Defendants' document production deficiencies. Counsel for Plaintiff is available to meet and confer regarding the issues raised in Defendants' February 10th correspondence, as well as the issues raised in Plaintiff's attached letter, at 2-3pm or 4-5pm on February 27th or 28th. Please let us know if one of those times works for Defendants.

Regards,
Christian

CHRISTIAN TATUM
Associate

McDermott Will & Emery LLP 300 Colorado Street, Suite 2200, Austin, TX 78701

Tel +1 512 298 4614 **Email** ctatum@mwe.com

Website | **vCard** | **LinkedIn**

From: Aaron Pirouznia <pirouznia@fr.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 10:19 AM

To: Shelly Prim <Prim@fr.com>; Stratasys-MWE <Stratasys-MWE@mwe.com>; ddacus@dacusfirm.com; Andrea L. Fair <andrea@millerfairhenry.com>; Claire A. Henry <claire@millerfairhenry.com>

Cc: FR Service-Bambu Lab/Stratasys <FRServiceBambuLabStratasys@fr.com>

Subject: RE: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

Some people who received this message don't often get email from pirouznia@fr.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Counsel,

We have not heard back on your availability to meet and confer. Please respond.

Thank you,
Aaron

Aaron P. Pirouznia

Principal ■ Fish & Richardson P.C.

T: 214 292 4073 | pirouznia@fr.com | [Bio](#)

From: Shelly Prim <Prim@fr.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 9:13 AM

To: Stratasys-MWE@mwe.com; ddacus@dacusfirm.com; Andrea L. Fair <andrea@millerfairhenry.com>; Claire A. Henry <claire@millerfairhenry.com>

Cc: FR Service-Bambu Lab/Stratasys <FRServiceBambuLabStratasys@fr.com>

Subject: FW: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

On behalf of Mr. Pirouznia,

Please find the attached correspondence for your review.

Regards.



Shelly L. Prim

Litigation Paralegal to Carl E. Bruce, Ricardo J. Bonilla, Lance E. Wyatt, Jr., Rae Crisler, Aaron Pirouznia, and Nan Lan
1717 Main Street | Suite 5000 | Dallas, TX 75201

direct: (214) 760-6152 | main: (214) 747-5070 | facsimile: (214) 747-2091 | prim@fr.com | www.fr.com |

From: Shelly Prim

Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 3:51 PM

To: 'kmeek@mwe.com' <kmeek@mwe.com>

Cc: Aaron Pirouznia (pirouznia@fr.com) <pirouznia@fr.com>; Brandon Avers <avers@fr.com>

Subject: Case No. 2:24-cv-00644-JRG (E.D. Tex.); Stratasys, Inc. v. Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd.

On behalf of Mr. Pirouznia,

Please find the attached correspondence for your review.

Regards.



Shelly L. Prim

Litigation Paralegal to Carl E. Bruce, Ricardo J. Bonilla, Lance E. Wyatt, Jr., Rae Crisler, Aaron Pirouznia, and Nan Lan
1717 Main Street | Suite 5000 | Dallas, TX 75201

direct: (214) 760-6152 | main: (214) 747-5070 | facsimile: (214) 747-2091 | prim@fr.com | www.fr.com |

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized use or disclosure is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

This message is a PRIVATE communication. This message and all attachments are a private communication sent by a law firm and may be confidential or protected by privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the information contained in or attached to this message is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender of the delivery error by replying to this message, and then delete it from your system. Our [Privacy Policy](#) explains how we may use your personal information or data and any personal information or data provided or made available to us. Thank you.

Please visit <http://www.mwe.com/> for more information about our Firm.

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized use or disclosure is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized use or disclosure is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized use or disclosure is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

