

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that I have served a copy of the foregoing on all parties, or their attorneys of record, in compliance with the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, this 16th day of September, 2009.

Via **CM/RRR # 91 7108213339365761 7855**

David P. Griffin

P.O. Box 1013

Johnson City, TX 78636

Via **Fascimile to (210) 734-0379**

John A. Heller

70 N.E. Loop 410, Suite 1100

San Antonio, Texas 78216

Via **Regular Mail**

Clark Richards

816 Congress Ave., Suite 1200

Austin, TX 78701


ROBIN SANDERS

OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFF'S DISCOVERY

Defendant objects to plaintiff's discovery in its entirety. It is impossible to ascertain the true nature of the discovery in light of the fact that plaintiff identifies them as interrogatories yet they actually consist of interrogatories and request for production of documents. Plaintiff has not properly propounded any form of discovery under the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. The rule numbers that plaintiff references do not correspond with state rules related to discovery requests. To the extent plaintiff makes reference to the federal rules, such reference is improper for discovery in a state lawsuit thus plaintiff fails to properly propound discovery to defendant. Because of all these irregularities, defendant is not obligated under the Rules to respond (or object) to the discovery sent by plaintiff.

Defendant objects to "Plaintiff's Interrogatories to Defendant" on the grounds that many such "interrogatories" seek the production of documents which are more properly made the subject of a properly propounded request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure.

Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents made confidential by common law, case law, statutes or the Texas Constitution.

Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information that may impact a criminal investigation or prosecution.

Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a).

Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a)

Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege as violating Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b).

Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the consulting expert exception as violating Rule 192.3(e).

Defendant objects to plaintiff's definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to place duties and requirements on defendant that exceed those required by the Rules in violation of Rule 192.3(a).

Defendant objects to the definition of "document" on the grounds that it is overly broad and exceeds the permissible scope of discovery permitted by the Rules in violation of Rule 192.3. Respondent further objects to the extent the definition includes documents that are neither relevant nor calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence and therefore the definition is in violation of Rule 192.3.

Defendant objects to the definition of "identify" and "identifying" on the grounds that it is overly broad and exceeds the permissible scope of discovery permitted by the Rules in violation of Rule 192.3(b).

**DEFENDANT RONDELLA HAWKINS'
RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES**

INTERROGATORY #1:

State your full name, any former names or aliases, address, date of birth, marital status and social security number.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information sought is neither relevant nor calculated to lead to relevant evidence as to any material issue in this lawsuit. Accordingly, the request is in violation of Rule 192.3 and it impermissibly invades the personal privacy rights of Defendant in violation of the common law of Texas, Rules 192.3 and 192.6, and the Texas Constitution. Seeking the Defendant's personal information such as date of birth, marital status, address and social security number is irrelevant to any cause of action pled against this individual, invasive of the individual's privacy interests and beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, defendant refers plaintiff to his Original Petition wherein he provides a name and address for responding defendant.

INTERROGATORY #2:

.s

State all addresses at which you have resided for the past ten year, and the dates thereof.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information sought is neither relevant nor calculated to lead to relevant evidence as to any material issue in this lawsuit. Accordingly, the request is in violation of Rule 192.3 and it impermissibly invades the personal privacy rights of Defendant in violation of the common law of Texas, Rules 192.3 and 192.6, and the Texas Constitution. Seeking the Defendant's personal information such as residential dates and locations is irrelevant to any cause of action pled against this individual, invasive of the individual's privacy interests and beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

INTERROGATORY #3:

If anyone investigated this matter for you including, but not limited to, medical experts, private investigators or insurance adjusters, please state their name(s) and address(es), and state whether such investigation was reduced to writing, and the substance of their investigation and findings.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous in violation of Rule 192.3 and defendant is therefore unable to respond. Plaintiff has not defined "matter" or

given any indication regarding what matter he is referencing. Especially in a suit against multiple defendants, it is particularly unclear what "matter" plaintiff may be inquiring about relative to this defendant.

Further, defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege as violating Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the consulting expert exception as violating Rule 192.3(e). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY #4:

If any investigators obtained any signed, recorded, transcribed or oral statement from any individual, identify the person who gave the statement and the present custodian of such statement. Identify each person interviewed concerning the incident. For each such person, state the date of the interview; the substance of the interview and if the interview was recorded and/or transcribed.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous in violation of Rule 192.3 and defendant is therefore unable to respond. Plaintiff has not defined "the incident" or given any indication regarding what incident he is referencing. Especially in a suit against multiple defendants, it is particularly unclear what "incident" plaintiff may be inquiring about relative to this defendant.

Further, defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege as violating Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the consulting expert exception as violating Rule 192.3(e). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #5:

Please furnish all reports that you personally have made to the board concerning Public Access Community Television (PACT) and this matter.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the request seeks documents irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects on the grounds that the request is overly broad and not reasonably limited in time, scope, and relation to the facts at issue in this lawsuit in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to the request on the grounds that the term "matter" is vague and ambiguous in violation of Rule 192.3 and defendant is therefore unable to respond. Plaintiff has not defined "this matter" or given any indication to what matter he refers. Especially in a suit against multiple defendants, it is particularly unclear what "matter" plaintiff may be inquiring about relative to this defendant.

Defendant objects on the additional grounds that she is a governmental official and performed all actions relating to her job in the course and scope of her job duties, not "personally."

Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY #6:

Please explain what you know about the reason for Garry Wilkison no longer being with Public Access Community Television (PACT).

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant nor calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence and is, therefore, outside the scope of permissible discovery in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects on the additional grounds that the request impermissibly invades the personal privacy rights of the responding defendant and Defendant Wilkison in violation of the common law of Texas, Rules 192.3 and 192.6, and the Texas Constitution. Plaintiff has not articulated any cause of action in which the details of Mr. Wilkison's separation from employment would be relevant or lead to the discovery of evidence. The responding defendant further objects on the grounds that this defendant was not the employer of Mr. Wilkison thus this request is more properly addressed to his employer, PACT.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #7:

Please furnish all documents from VSA Arts of Texas concerned with work for hire and/or freelance work with Public Access Community Television (PACT).

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the request it is overly broad and global, not properly limited in time, scope, and relation to the facts at issue in this lawsuit and on the grounds that the request seeks documents irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, all in violation of Rule 192.3. The responding defendant objects on the additional grounds that this defendant was not involved in the contracts or negotiations, if any, between VSA Arts of Texas and PACT thus this request is more properly addressed to PACT. Defendant further objects on the grounds that information regarding any relationship or business dealings between PACT and VSA Arts is confidential between the parties.

Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege as violating Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY #8:

Please explain why Public Access Television changed their name and reorganized on June 30, 2008.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in violation of Rule 192.3 and because it impermissibly invades the personal privacy rights of Defendant PACT in violation of the common law of Texas, Rules 192.3 and 192.6. Plaintiff has not articulated any cause of action in which the name change of Defendant PACT or its reorganization would be relevant or would lead to information relevant to any cause of action. Further, responding defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is more properly addressed to Defendant PACT.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #9:

Please produce a list and/or log of all employees employed by Public Access Community Television (PACT) from January 1, 2006 to present, including (their name, address, phone numbers and position of employment.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the request seeks documents irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, all in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it impermissibly invades the personal privacy rights of individuals not a party to this litigation in violation of the common law of Texas, Rules 192.3 and 192.6, and the Texas Constitution. Responding party objects on the additional grounds that she is not Defendant PACT and this request is more properly addressed to PACT.

Defendant objects to any requests for defendant to create documents not already in existence as such requests are unduly burdensome in violation of Rule 192.6(b). *See In re Colonial Pipeline Co.*, 968 S.W.2d 938, 942 (Tex. 1998); *McKinney v. National Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 772 S.W.2d 72,73 n.2 (Tex. 1989); *Smith v. O'Neal*, 850 S.W.2d 797, 799 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege as violating Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY #10:

Please produce a list and/or log of all donations and grants given to Public Access Community Television (PACT) from January 1, 2006 to present and their current location.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the request it seeks documents irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, all in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it impermissibly invades the personal privacy rights of individuals not a party to this litigation in violation of the common law of Texas, Rules 192.3 and 192.6, and the Texas Constitution. Responding party objects on the additional grounds that she is not Defendant PACT and this request is more properly addressed to PACT.

Defendant further objects to any requests for defendant to create documents not already in existence as such requests are unduly burdensome in violation of Rule 192.6(b). *See In re Colonial Pipeline Co.*, 968 S.W.2d 938, 942 (Tex. 1998); *McKinney v. National Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 772 S.W.2d 72, 73 n.2 (Tex. 1989); *Smith v. O'Neal*, 850 S.W.2d 797, 799 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dis!.] 1993, no writ). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or

documents covered by the attorney work product privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege as violating Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #11:

Please produce a list and/or log of all assets sold by Public Access Community Television (PACT) from January 1, 2006 to present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the request it seeks documents irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, all in violation of Rule 192.3. Responding party objects on the additional grounds that she is not Defendant PACT and this request is more properly addressed to PACT.

Defendant further objects to any requests for defendant to create documents not already in existence as such requests are unduly burdensome in violation of Rule 192.6(b). *See In re Colonial Pipeline Co.*, 968 S.W.2d 938, 942 (Tex. 1998); *McKinney v. National Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 772 S.W.2d 72, 73 n.2 (Tex. 1989); *Smith v. O'Neal*, 850 S.W.2d 797, 799 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege as violating Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #12:

Please produce a list and/or log of all donations that you have personally have given to Public Access Community Television (PACT) from January 1, 2006 to present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the request seeks documents irrelevant to any

material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, all in violation of Rule 192.3.

Defendant objects to this request on the additional grounds that she is a governmental official and all actions were taken in the course and scope of her job duties, not "personally."

Defendant further objects to any requests for defendant to create documents not already in existence as such requests are unduly burdensome in violation of Rule 192.6(b). *See In re Colonial Pipeline Co.*, 968 S.W.2d 938, 942 (Tex. 1998); *McKinney v. National Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 772 S.W.2d 72, 73 n.2 (Tex. 1989); *Smith v. O'Neal*, 850 S.W.2d 797, 799 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege as violating Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #13:

Please furnish all insurance documents and policies that Public Access Community Television (PACT) has had from the inception of its contract with the City of Austin to the present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, more properly propounded in a request for disclosure or a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the request is not reasonable limited in time or subject matters and that it seeks documents irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, all in violation of Rule 192.3.

Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #14:

Please furnish all data stored in Facil including back up copies that are kept off site from January 1, 2006 to present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure.

Defendant further objects on the grounds that the request is not reasonably limited in scope or subject matter and seeks documents irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, all in violation of Rule 192.3. Responding party objects on the additional grounds that she is not Defendant PACT and this request is more properly addressed to PACT.

Defendant also objects to the request on the grounds that it seeks information that is personal or confidential and involving non-parties. Defendant objects to this request to the extent that it seeks information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to the request to the extent that it seeks documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to the request to the extent that it seeks information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #15:

Please furnish all financial records for Public Access Community Television (PACT) from January 1,2006 to present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the request is not reasonably limited in scope or subject matter and seeks documents irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, all in violation of Rule 192.3.

Defendant also objects to the request on the grounds that it seeks information that is personal or confidential and involving non-parties. Defendant objects to this request to the extent that it seeks information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to the request to the extent that it seeks documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to the request to the extent that it seeks information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #16:

Supply a copy of any letter or documents sent by you, your attorney, representatives, employees, or any individual to the web hosting company known as Hostica.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the request is not reasonably limited in scope or subject matter and seeks documents irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, all in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague and fails to properly explain the meaning of "employee" or "representative," inasmuch as defendant is an individual and not a business entity. Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad in that it seeks documents sent by "any individual." Responding party objects on the additional grounds that she is not Defendant PACT and this request is more properly addressed to PACT.

Defendant also objects to the request on the grounds that it seeks information that is personal or confidential and involving non-parties. Defendant objects to this request to the extent that it seeks information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to the request to the extent that it seeks documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to the request to the extent that it seeks information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, Defendant Hawkins responds that she is in possession of no such documents.

INTERROGATORY #17:

Please list all parties including all attorneys, representatives, employees, or any individual associated for or with Public Access Community Television (PACT)

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the term "parties" is vague and ambiguous in violation of Rule 192.3. The term "parties" would commonly mean parties to the lawsuit; in which case the "parties" were set forth by Plaintiff in Plaintiffs Original Petition. To the extent plaintiff seeks to redefine "parties to include "attorneys, representatives, employees, or any individual associated for or with Public Access Community Television (PACT)" then the request is vague, ambiguous and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the request on the additional grounds that it is not reasonably limited in time, scope, and relation to the facts at issue in this lawsuit in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the additional grounds that she is not PACT and this request might more properly be addressed to PACT.

Defendant objects to this request to the extent that it seeks information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to the request to the extent that it seeks documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to the request to the extent that it seeks information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b).

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, responding defendant refers plaintiff to his Original Petition for identification of the parties to this lawsuit and to Defendant Hawkins' Response to Request for Disclosure.

INTERROGATORY #18:

Please furnish all information about the Avid Editing Systems at Public Access Community Television (PACT) who uses them, and the exact amount of funds spent by Public Access Community Television (PACT) for Avid equipment, accessories, or supplies.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and global, not properly limited in time, scope, and relation to the facts at issue in this lawsuit in violation of Rule 192.3. Responding defendant objects to this request on the additional grounds that she is not Defendant PACT and this request is more properly addressed to PACT.

Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #19:

Please furnish a complete list of all Public Access Community Television (PACT) Producers, their full legal names, address, and phone numbers.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks documents irrelevant to any

material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and global, not properly limited in time, scope, and relation to the facts at issue in this lawsuit in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it impermissibly invades the personal privacy rights of individuals not a party to this litigation in violation of the common law of Texas, Rules 192.3 and 192.6, and the Texas Constitution. Plaintiff has not articulated any cause of action in which personal information of non-parties would be relevant or would lead to information relevant to any cause of action as pled by the Plaintiff. Responding defendant objects to this request on the additional grounds that she is not Defendant PACT and this request is more properly addressed to PACT.

Defendant further objects to any requests for defendant to create documents not already in existence because such requests are unduly burdensome in violation of Rule 192.6(b). *See in re Colonial Pipeline Co.*, 968 S.W.2d 938, 942 (Tex. 1998); *McKinney v. National Union Fire ins. Co.*, 772 S.W.2d 72, 73 n.2 (Tex. 1989); *Smith v. O'Neal*, 850 S.W.2d 797, 799 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY #20:

Please explain what you know about the reason for Garry Wilkison being no longer employed with Public Access Community Television (PACT).

RESPONSE:

Defendant refers plaintiff to her response to request number 6 and incorporates those objections to request number 20 as if they were fully set forth. Defendant submits the additional objection that request number 20 is repetitive and objectionable and unduly burdensome for this reason.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #21:

Please supply all documentation concerning producer complaints about the actions of the management at Public Access Community Television (PACT) from January 1,2006 to present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks documents irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in

violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and global, not properly limited in scope and relation to the facts at issue in this lawsuit in violation of Rule 192.3.

Defendant further objects to any requests for defendant to create documents not already in existence because such requests are unduly burdensome in violation of Rule 192.6(b) and in violation of Rule 192.3(b). See *In re Colonial Pipeline Co.*, 968 S.W.2d 938, 942 (Tex. 1998); *McKinney v. National Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 772 S.W.2d 72, 73 n.2 (Tex. 1989); *Smith v. O'Neal*, 850 S.W.2d 797, 799 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY #22:

Please produce all information including details regarding Grande Communications walking away without paying the \$2,000,000.00 that was owed to Public Access Community Television (PACT) and the actions that have been taken, if any, from January 1,2006 to present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad and vague regarding "the actions that have been taken, if any." Defendant objects on the additional grounds that the request for "all information including details" is overbroad and unduly burdensome.

Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b) or that may compromise an on-going criminal investigation or prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #23:

Please furnish all audit reports concerning Time Warner Cable and the franchise agreement from January 1,2006 to present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the request seeks documents irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, all in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request. on the grounds that it impermissibly invades the privacy rights of an entity not a party to this litigation in violation of the common law of Texas, Rules 192.3 and 192.6, and the Texas Constitution.

Defendant further objects to any requests for defendant to create documents not already in existence and as such, is unduly burdensome in violation of Rule 192.6(b) and is not required by the Rules in violation of Rule 192.3(b). See *In re Colonial Pipeline Co.*, 968 S.W.2d 938, 942 (Tex. 1998); *McKinney v. National Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 772 S.W.2d 72, 73 n.2 (Tex. 1989); *Smith v. O'Neal*, 850 S.W.2d 797, 799 (Tex. App.~Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege as violating Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY #24:

Please furnish all information about INET. Who uses it? How often has it been used and the last time it was used.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and global, not properly limited in time, scope, and relation to the facts at issue in this lawsuit in violation of Rule 192.3. Responding defendant objects to this request on the additional grounds that she is not Defendant PACT and this request is more properly addressed to PACT.

Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in

anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #25:

Please furnish a complete list of all the equipment purchased for Channel 6, from January 1, 2006 to present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the request seeks documents irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, all in violation of Rule 192.3.

Defendant further objects to any requests for defendant to create documents not already in existence; such a request is unduly burdensome in violation of Rule 192.6(b). *See In re Colonial Pipeline Co.*, 968 S.W.2d 938, 942 (Tex. 1998); *McKinney v. National Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 772 S.W.2d 72, 73 n.2 (Tex. 1989); *Smith v. O'Neal*, 850 S.W.2d 797, 799 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege as violating Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege as violating Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #26:

Please furnish all equipment purchases for Public Access Community Television (PACT) from January 1, 2006 to present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and global, not properly limited in scope and relation to the facts at issue in this lawsuit in

violation of Rule 192.3. Responding defendant objects to this request on the additional grounds that she is not Defendant PACT and this request is more properly addressed to PACT.

Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #27:

Please furnish a complete list of all of the Public Access Community Television Producers, their full legal names, address, and phone numbers.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and global, not properly limited in scope and relation to the facts at issue in this lawsuit in violation of Rule 192.3. Responding defendant objects to this request on the additional grounds that it seeks to invade the personal privacy rights of individuals not parties to this litigation in violation of the common law of Texas, Rules 192.3 and 192.6, and the Texas Constitution. Seeking the Defendant's personal information such as residential dates and locations is irrelevant to any cause of action pled against this individual, invasive of the individual's privacy interests and beyond the scope of permissible discovery.

Defendant Hawkins objects to this request on the additional grounds that she is not Defendant PACT and this request is more properly addressed to PACT.

Defendant further objects to any requests for defendant to create documents not already in existence; such a request is unduly burdensome in violation of Rule 192.6(b). *See In re Colonial Pipeline Co.*, 968 S.W.2d 938, 942 (Tex. 1998); *McKinney v. National Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 772 S.W.2d 72, 73 n.2 (Tex. 1989); *Smith v. O'Neal*, 850 S.W.2d 797, 799 (Tex. App.-Houston [14¹⁰ Dist.] 1993, no writ). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that

are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #28:

Please supply all financial records with payments to Public Access Community Television (PACT) from January 1, 2006 to present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and global, not properly limited in scope and relation to the facts at issue in this lawsuit in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant Hawkins objects to this request on the additional grounds that she is not Defendant PACT and this request is more properly addressed to PACT.

Defendant further objects to any requests for defendant to create documents not already in existence; such a request is unduly burdensome in violation of Rule 192.6(b). *See In re Colonial Pipeline Co.*, 968 S.W.2d 938, 942 (Tex. 1998); *McKinney v. National Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 772 S.W.2d 72, 73 n.2 (Tex. 1989); *Smith v. O'Neal*, 850 S.W.2d 797, 799 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #29:

Please furnish all documentation explaining the financial contributions made to Public Access Community Television (PACT) from January 1,2006, to present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and global, not properly limited in scope and relation to the facts at issue in this lawsuit in violation of Rule 192.3. Responding defendant objects to this request on the additional grounds

that it seeks to invade the privacy rights of individuals and entities not parties to this litigation in violation of the common law of Texas, Rules 192.3 and 192.6, and the Texas Constitution. Defendant Hawkins objects to this request on the additional grounds that she is not Defendant PACT and this request is more properly addressed to PACT.

Defendant further objects to any requests for defendant to create documents not already in existence; such a request is unduly burdensome in violation of Rule 192.6(b). *See In re Colonial Pipeline Co.*, 968 S.W.2d 938, 942 (Tex. 1998); *McKinney v. National Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 772 S.W.2d 72, 73 n.2 (Tex. 1989); *Smith v. O'Neal*, 850 S.W.2d 797, 799 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY [SIC] #30:

Please furnish all building maintenance records for Public Access Community Television (PACT) during the time period of January 1, 2006, to present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this "interrogatory" on the grounds that it seeks the production of documents and is, therefore, a request for production under the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and global, not properly limited in scope and relation to the facts at issue in this lawsuit in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant Hawkins objects to this request on the additional grounds that she is not Defendant PACT and this request is more properly addressed to PACT.

Defendant further objects to any requests for defendant to create documents not already in existence; such a request is unduly burdensome in violation of Rule 192.6(b). *See In re Colonial Pipeline Co.*, 968 S.W.2d 938, 942 (Tex. 1998); *McKinney v. National Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 772 S.W.2d 72, 73 n.2 (Tex. 1989); *Smith v. O'Neal*, 850 S.W.2d 797, 799 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney work product privilege in violation Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents prepared by defendant or defense counsel in anticipation of litigation and covered by the investigative privilege in violation of Rule 192.5(a). Defendant objects to any request seeking information or documents covered by the attorney/client communication privilege in violation of Rule 192.3 and R.E. 503(b). Defendant objects to responding to any request seeking information or documents that are part of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Defendant objects to responding to

any request seeking information or documents that are confidential by law, privileged or the disclosure of which would violate the privacy or proprietary interests of an individual or entity.

INTERROGATORY #31:

Please explaining [sic] all the training that you have taken related to your present position and your ability to perform your current job from January 1, 2006, to present.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information irrelevant to any material issue in this lawsuit and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in violation of Rule 192.3. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and global, not properly limited in scope and relation to the facts at issue in this lawsuit in violation of Rule 192.3.

