ORIGINAL LA DISTRICT COURT

Brent O. Hatch (5715) Mark F. James (5295) HATCH, JAMES & DODGE 10 West Broadway, Suite 400 Salt Lake City, Utah 84101 Telephone: (801) 363-6363 Facsimile: (801) 363-6666

Stuart H. Singer (admitted pro hac vice) BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP 401 East Las Olas Boulevard – Suite 1200

Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33301 Telephone: (954) 356-0011 Facsimile: (954) 356-0022

Attorneys for The SCO Group, Inc.

Robert Silver (admitted Fro Had vice)
Edward Normand (admitted pro hac vice)
BOIES, SCHILLER OF OFFICE NER LLP
333 Main Street
Armonk, New York, HOSEERK

Telephone: (914) 749-8200 Facsimile: (914) 749-8300

Stephen N. Zack (admitted pro hac vice) BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP Bank of America Tower – Suite 2800 100 Southeast Second Street Miami, Florida 33131

Telephone: (305) 539-8400 Facsimile: (305) 539-1307

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

THE SCO GROUP, INC.

Plaintiff/Counterclaim-Defendant,

v.

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION,

Defendant/Counterclaim-Plaintiff.

SCO'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO TAKE CERTAIN PROSPECTIVE DEPOSITIONS

Case No. 2:03CV0294DAK Honorable Dale A. Kimball Magistrate Judge Brooke C. Wells

Pursuant to Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff The SCO Group, Incorporated ("SCO"), requests the Court to grant SCO leave to take certain prospective depositions of Intel Corporation ("Intel"), The Open Group, Incorporated ("The Open Group") and Oracle Corporation ("Oracle").

SCO served Rule 30(b)(6) subpoenas (as well as document requests) on each of these corporations requiring them to appear for depositions scheduled for January 27, 2006. The corporations did not appear for their depositions and have not filed motions to quash or motions for protective order.

Considering the corporations' failure to produce a Rule 30(b)(6) witness on January 27, 2006 (today), SCO will file the appropriate motions to compel in the two jurisdictions from which the three subpoenas at issue were issued. In those motions, SCO intends to cite the precedent demonstrating that each of the three companies was given adequate notice and was obligated to produce a Rule 30(b)(6) witness on the noticed topics (and to produce documents in response to the requests therein) - or else should have filed a motion to quash or for protective order, which none of the three companies did.

Accordingly, SCO respectfully requests that, to the extent the district courts in the foregoing two jurisdictions grant SCO's motions to compel, this Court permit SCO then to take the Rule 30(b)(6) depositions of the foregoing three companies. If those companies were obligated to appear for deposition, but simply and improperly declined to do so, their refusal of course should not work to SCO's detriment with respect to the end of certain fact discovery on January 27, 2006. SCO proposes to inform this Court if the foregoing two jurisdictions issue such an order or orders, and thereby request the Court for leave to take the deposition or depositions at issue.

DATED this 27th day of January, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

CH, JAMES & DODGE, P.C.

Brent O. Hatch

Mark F. James

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP

Robert Silver

Stuart H. Singer

Stephen N. Zack

Edward Normand

Counsel for The SCO Group, Inc.

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Plaintiff, The SCO Group, Inc., hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion for Leave To Take Certain Prospective Depositions was served on Defendant IBM on the 27<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2006:

## By Facsimile and U.S. Mail:

David Marriott, Esq. Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP Worldwide Plaza 825 Eighth Avenue New York, New York 10019

Todd Shaughnessy, Esq. Snell & Wilmer LLP 1200 Gateway Tower West 15 West South Temple Salt Lake City, Utah 84101-1004

## By U.S. Mail:

Donald J. Rosenberg, Esq. 1133 Westchester Avenue White Plains, New York 10604