

Mick Thomas

From: Randy Kauffman [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2018 6:50 PM
To: maggie@rischpisca.com
Cc: mchristian@mch-lawyer.com; Mick Thomas
Subject: Protective Order

Mr. Risch,

In your Order Denying Request For Relief From Protective Order, you stated: "The Protective Order was not entered because the information produced contained information relating to the wells unrelated to the Complainants." In the Protective Order you state: "Certain of the documents included in the information as maintained by Respondents containing similar confidential, trade secret and proprietary information regarding wells in which Complainants do not own a royalty interest. The Respondents therefore having moved and requested this Hearing Officer for a Protective Order, the Hearing Officer, for reasons set for in the Order Regarding Discovery entered contemporaneously herewith, hereby grants said Motion and orders the production of the information under the following protective parameters:"

According to your own words, the Order was entered because the information produced contained information unrelated to the complainants.

The records to verify gross production, disposition and market value should not be subject to a Protective Order. That information is not a trade secret or proprietary. Alta Mesa has now redacted information unrelated to our wells. We should be able to receive this information directly from Alta Mesa without going through this lengthy process.

Therefore, we reassert our request seeking relief from the Protective Order.

Thank you,

Randy & Thana Kauffman
Sent from my iPhone

Mr. Risch,

We renewed our request for the information with this above email on Thursday, August 2, 2018 at 9:05 am (well before the deadline). We would like to reschedule the conference that you were a no show for this morning for this Thursday, August 16, 2018 at 8:00 am.

Thank you,

Randy and Thana Kauffman