

Nicholas Kurtz

From: Graham Syfert [syfert@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2010 6:24 PM

To: Jeffrey Weaver

Cc: Nicholas Kurtz

Subject: Re: Activity in Case 1:10-cv-00453-RMC ACHTE/NEUNTE BOLL KINO BETEILIGUNGS GMBH & CO KG v. DOES 1 - 4,577 Order on Motion to Quash

I don't represent any of these people. I don't care! You couldn't tell by the tone of my voice when we were on the phone? I care more about my punctuation and my research than the people using it.

I also don't understand why you believe talking to me is going to make a lick of difference, which is why I asked if the call was a courtesy call, because I didn't understand in the slightest why you were calling me. Seemed more like an intimidation tactic aimed at someone who really can't do shit about people who are buying and filing these forms I created because they can't afford an attorney. And on a side note, chances are very good that everyone who bought the forms has very little cash on hand, because most of them sought an attorney first and couldn't afford it. Once again, doesn't matter to me, none of them hired me or gave me any money over \$20. When I'm not defending cases, I squeeze cash out of poor people for a living just like you. I understand, and I don't care- not my clients, they didn't hire me.

Putting up a warning such as "DGW has advised me that they would be charging double for people who file these forms" wouldn't be a good business practice and would hurt form sales, so obviously I wasn't going to do that. Also, nothing would say that you all would be the opposing counsel, as the forms were created for general purpose, so that could be misleading.

Hell, at this rate, those forms will save you time and effort unless an attorney advises them that they can wait for the motion to dismiss to be heard and wait for local counsel to pursue them. Slim chance of that, seeing as these people couldn't afford attorneys in the first place.

I hope you all make a load of money, and if you had a job opening making \$200K a year, I'd take down my forms or put up whatever warning you wanted and join you in Virginia.

And, if I ever do end up representing any of these folks against you, I will be coming full bore, because it is my job. It seems as if you are taking this whole thing too personally and need somewhere to direct your energy. Call or e-mail someone who is actually in the case. If you're not going to invite me to join you, then lay off me taking advantage of the poorest chum that attracted you sharks in the first place.

In short, if you're not going to hire me, take a flying fuck and leave me alone about the forms- both of you. But, if ya'll want to keep up a correspondence about some other topic because you find it entertaining, I'll be happy to reply.

Hire me or eat shit.

Sincerely,

Graham

Nicholas Kurtz

From: Jeffrey Weaver
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2010 5:28 PM
To: gsyfert@affinitylawfirm.com
Cc: Nicholas Kurtz
Subject: FW: Activity in Case 1:10-cv-00453-RMC ACHTE/NEUNTE BOLL KINO BETEILIGUNGS GMBH & CO KG v. DOES 1 - 4,577 Order on Motion to Quash

Hello Graham-

It was a pleasure to speak with you earlier this week. We just wanted to give you a heads up that the judge is denying the motions filed by your clients (see below). I would check the docket too, of course, but she also entered an order requiring them to file a notice with their contact information by the end of October. Since I believe most of them mailed in their form motions, they probably aren't checking Pacer to see how the judge ruled or what additional filing she is requiring. As such, we thought you might want to let them know about the status and the need to follow up with the court.

Take care,

Best Regards,

Jeffrey W. Weaver



DUNLAP | GRUBB | WEAVER

www.dglegal.com

199 Liberty St. SW
Leesburg, VA 20175
Phone: (703) 777-7319 / (202) 316-8558
Fax: (703) 777-3656 / (202) 318-0242

This electronic message contains information from Dunlap, Grubb & Weaver and may be confidential or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient; any disclosure, copying, or use of the contents is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us and delete the message without copying or disclosing it. Attorneys in our firm are licensed to practice law in all of the state and federal courts of VA, MD, DC, FL, NY, NJ, Bankruptcy Courts, US Tax Court, TTAB, FAA and the US Supreme Court. [Subscribe to our IP newsletter.](#)

From: DCD_ECFNotice@dcd.uscourts.gov[SMTP:DCD_ECFNOTICE@DCD.USCOURTS.GOV]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2010 4:29:15 PM
To: DCD_ECFNotice@dcd.uscourts.gov
Subject: Activity in Case 1:10-cv-00453-RMC ACHTE/NEUNTE BOLL KINO BETEILIGUNGS GMBH & CO KG v. DOES 1 - 4,577 Order on Motion to Quash
Auto forwarded by a Rule

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.

*****NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS***** Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the free copy and 30 page limit do not apply.

U.S. District Court

District of Columbia

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 9/16/2010 at 4:29 PM and filed on 9/16/2010

Case Name: ACHTE/NEUNTE BOLL KINO BETEILIGUNGS GMBH & CO KG v. DOES 1 - 4,577
Case Number: [1:10-cv-00453-RMC](#)
Filer:
Document Number: No document attached

Docket Text:

MINUTE ORDER denying [43] Motion to Quash; denying [47] Motion to Quash; denying [49] Motion for Protective Order; denying [50] Motion to Quash; denying [52] Motion for Protective Order; denying [53] Motion to Quash; denying [55] Motion for Protective Order; denying [56] Motion to Quash; denying [58] Motion for Protective Order; denying [59] Motion to Quash; denying [61] Motion for Protective Order; denying [62] Motion to Quash; denying [64] Motion for Protective Order; denying [65] Motion to Quash; denying [68] Motion to Quash; denying [69] Motion to Quash; denying [70] Motion to Quash; denying [72] Motion to Quash; denying [73] Motion to Quash; denying [74] Motion to Quash; denying [80] Motion to Quash; denying [81] Motion to Quash; denying [83] Motion for Protective Order; denying [84] Motion to Quash; denying [86] Motion for Protective Order; denying [87] Motion to Quash; denying [88] Motion to Quash; denying [90] Motion for Protective Order for the reasons stated in [44] Memorandum Opinion. Signed by Judge Rosemary M. Collyer on 9/16/10. (KD)