

1 PETER D. KEISLER  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 2 DANIEL G. BOGDEN  
 United States Attorney  
 District of Nevada  
 3 GREG ADDINGTON  
 Assistant United States Attorney  
 Nevada Bar 6875  
 4 100 West Liberty, Suite 600  
 Reno, Nevada 89501  
 5 VINCENT M. GARVEY  
 Deputy Branch Director  
 6 CARLOTTA P. WELLS  
 Senior Trial Counsel  
 7 Federal Programs Branch  
 Civil Division - Room 7150  
 8 U.S. Department of Justice  
 20 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
 9 P.O. Box 883  
 Washington, D.C. 20044

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

13 ETREPPID TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, a )  
 Nevada Limited Liability Company, )  
 14 Plaintiff, )  
 15 vs. )  
 16 DENNIS MONTGOMERY, )  
 THE MONTGOMERY FAMILY TRUST, )  
 17 DENNIS MONTGOMERY and BRENDA )  
 MONTGOMERY as Trustees of The )  
 18 Montgomery Family Trust, and )  
 DOES 1-20 )  
 19 Defendants. )

CV-N 06-0145 (BES)(VPC)

20 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
 DENNIS MONTGOMERY, and )  
 21 MONTGOMERY FAMILY TRUST, a )  
 California Trust, )  
 22 )  
 23 Counterclaimants and Third-Party Plaintiffs, )  
 24 vs. )  
 25 ETREPPID TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a )  
 California Corporation, )  
 26 WARREN TREPP, )  
 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE of the )  
 27 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
 DOES 1-10, )  
 28 Counterdefendants and Third-Party Defendants )

RESPONSE OF THE  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT  
OF DEFENSE TO PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO SEVER AND  
REMAND

1 The plaintiff in this removed case, eTreppid Technologies, LLC (eTreppid), seeks to  
2 sever the claims of the defendants and third-party plaintiffs, Dennis Montgomery and the  
3 Montgomery Family Trust (Montgomery), against the United States Department of Defense  
4 (DoD) and to remand the case to State Court. eTreppid does not have standing to argue that  
5 claims against an agency of the United States should be dismissed. Further, inasmuch as DoD, a  
6 third-party defendant, has not yet filed a response to Montgomery's counterclaim, eTreppid's  
7 motion is premature. For these reasons, the Court should not grant eTreppid's motion.  
8

### 9 **Background**

10 eTreppid filed a complaint in the State Court of Nevada, asserting a claim of entitlement  
11 to protect and recover trade secrets from Montgomery, a former employee, officer, and director  
12 of the company. On February 17, 2006, Montgomery filed a counter-complaint. The counter-  
13 complaint asserted that Montgomery's defense of the action would require him to discuss the  
14 nature of the work he had been performing on behalf of DoD while associated with eTreppid.  
15 Naming DoD as a counter-defendant, Montgomery claimed that in order to defend against  
16 eTreppid's claims of trade secret misappropriation, Montgomery "will be obligated to disclose  
17 the nature of the technology, the type of work he has performed on the government contracts  
18 using his technology versus that of eTreppid, and the capabilities of his technology . . . in  
19 performing work for certain government agencies." Counter-complaint, ¶ 24. Asserting that  
20 disclosures of information relating to the work performed on government contracts would violate  
21 his "secrecy contract," *id.*, Montgomery included a claim against DoD, seeking a declaration, in  
22 essence, that the disclosure of the information he believes is necessary to his defense will not  
23 constitute a violation of "the contract between Montgomery and the United States to maintain []  
24 secrets, and/or a declaration of immunity for Montgomery from the United States." *Id.* ¶ 26.

25 On March 20, 2006, the United States removed this action to federal district court. DoD  
26 recently requested an extension of time until June 23, 2006 to respond to the counter-complaint.  
27 In its second request for an extension, filed on May 5, 2006, the government noted that the  
28 claims against the United States Department of Defense seek a declaratory judgment that

1 Montgomery may disclose classified information implicating vital national security concerns.  
2 Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time for United States Department of Defense to File a  
3 Responsive Pleading and to Align Responsive Pleading Deadlines (Second EOT Motion) at 2.  
4 The motion further stated that the same claim has been articulated in another case pending in this  
5 Court, *Dennis Montgomery, et al. v. Etreppid Technologies, LLC, et al.*, No. 3:06-cv-00056-  
6 BES-VPC. *Id.* Because of the similarity of the claims against the government in the two cases,  
7 DoD “will file a similar response to the complaints in both cases as well as similar motions for  
8 protective orders, the latter of which will outline the necessity of protecting certain governmental  
9 information and the measures necessary to ensure that certain information that is harmful to the  
10 national security interests will not be disclosed, either inadvertently or otherwise.” *Id.* The  
11 Second EOT Motion further identified the government’s need for “adequate time to coordinate  
12 its interest in protecting national security information that may be at issue and to determine what  
13 steps it must take in defending against the counterclaims of defendants, including potentially  
14 asserting the military and state secrets privilege. Because the government continues to assess  
15 the risks involved in these two cases and is working to determine the precise steps that will be  
16 necessary to protect the information at issue in both cases, the United States requests that the  
17 deadlines in the two cases be aligned and that responsive pleadings will be filed by the  
18 government in both cases no later than June 23, 2006.” *Id.* at 2-3

### 19 **Argument**

#### 20 **1. eTreppid Does Not Have Standing to Raise Claims on Behalf of DoD**

21 In its motion to sever and remand, eTreppid argues that the claims against DoD, as  
22 articulated in Montgomery’s counter-complaint, should be dismissed for failure to state a claim  
23 under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). Motion to Sever and Remand at 3. The United  
24 States, however, having already been named a party to this litigation, is in the best position to  
25 determine how to protect its own interests. *See Smith v. Organization of Foster Families for*  
26 *Equality & Reform*, 431 U.S. 816, 842 (U.S. 1977) (“Ordinarily. . . a party would not have  
27 standing to assert the rights of another, himself a party in the litigation; the third party himself  
28

1 can decide how best to protect his interests). Further, because the interests of the government  
2 here involve whether information that may be classified may be intertwined with the private  
3 parties' trade secrets and copyright infringement claims, only the United States can determine  
4 the means by which its interests should be protected. As stated in the Second EOT Motion, the  
5 government is in the process of assessing its interest in protecting national security information  
6 that may be at issue and the measures necessary to defend against Montgomery's counterclaims,  
7 including potentially asserting the military and state secrets privilege. Because the analysis of  
8 whether disclosure of information in this case could damage national security interests is a  
9 quintessential government function, only DoD can assert arguments about the extent to which  
10 Montgomery claims against the government should be dismissed.

## 11 **2. eTreppid's Motion is Premature**

12 As noted above, DoD has requested additional time to file a response in this case, as well  
13 as in a related case involving the same parties and similar claims. The additional time is  
14 necessary in order for the government to determine the extent to which classified national  
15 security information may be intertwined with the claims and defenses of eTreppid and  
16 Montgomery. Second EOT Motion at 2. Once an assessment has been made about whether  
17 such information may be involved in this case, the government will determine the scope of the  
18 information that must be protected. At that point, the government will be in a position to outline  
19 for the Court and the parties the measures necessary to ensure that information that may be  
20 harmful to the national security interests will not be disclosed. *Id.*

21 By no later than June 23, 2006, the government will prepare and file a response to the  
22 counter-complaint and simultaneously move for an appropriate protective order regarding any  
23 classified information that may be at issue. Until the time that such papers are filed on the  
24 government's behalf, it would be premature for the Court to either sever Montgomery's claims  
25 against DoD or to remand this action to State Court. If in fact the claims and defenses of  
26 eTreppid and Montgomery will entail the resort to information that is classified for national  
27 security reasons, then the government must be involved in determining the means by which such  
28

1 information should be protected. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to sever Montgomery's  
2 claims against the United States, at least not at this juncture. Similarly, to the extent that  
3 classified, governmental information may be related to the claims and defenses of the private  
4 parties, this case should not be removed to State Court. The assessment of whether classified  
5 information is involved and the effect that determination would have on the claims and defenses  
6 of the private parties should be considered in the first instance by this Court, not the State Court.  
7 For these reasons, eTreppid's motion to sever and remand should not be granted.

8 **Conclusion**

9 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should not grant eTreppid's motion to sever  
10 Montgomery's claims against DoD or, in the alternative, to dismiss those claims and remand this  
11 case to State Court.

12 DATED: May 8, 2006

13 Respectfully submitted,

14  
15 PETER D. KEISLER  
Assistant Attorney General

16  
17 DANIEL G. BOGDEN  
United States Attorney  
District of Nevada

18  
19 GREG ADDINGTON  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Nevada Bar 6875  
20 100 West Liberty, Suite 600  
Reno, Nevada 89501

21  
22 VINCENT M. GARVEY  
Deputy Branch Director

23  
24 /s/ Carlotta P. Wells  
CARLOTTA P. WELLS  
25 Senior Trial Counsel  
Federal Programs Branch  
26 Civil Division - Room 7150  
U.S. Department of Justice  
27 20 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
P.O. Box 883  
28

1 Washington, D.C. 20044

2  
3 Counsel for Third-Party Defendant,  
United States Department of Defense

4  
5 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

6 I hereby certify that I am an employee in the office of the United States Department of  
7 Justice, Civil Division in Washington DC and I am of such age and discretion as to be competent  
8 to serve papers. On May 8, 2006, I served a copies of the RESPONSE OF THE UNITED  
9 STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO SEVER OR  
10 REMAND by placing said copies in postpaid envelopes addressed to the persons named below at  
11 the places and addresses stated below and by depositing said envelopes and contents in the  
12 United States mail at the United States Department of Justice, 20 Massachusetts Aveune,  
13 Washington D. C. 20001.

14  
15 Ronald J. Logar, Esq.  
16 Eric A. Pulver, Esq.  
LAW OFFICES OF LOGAR & PULVER, PC  
17 255 S. Arlington Avenue, Suite A  
Reno, NV 89501

18 Michael J. Flynn, Esq.  
19 Philip H. Stillman, Esq.  
FLYNN & STILLMAN  
20 224 Birmingham Drive, Suite 1A4  
Cardiff, CA 92007

21 Stephen J. Peek, Esq.  
22 Jerry M. Snyder, Esq.  
HALE LANE PEEK DENNISON AND HOWARD  
23 5441 Kietzke Lane, Second Floor  
Reno, NV 89511

1 David A. Jakopin, Esq.  
Jonathan D. Butler, Esq.  
2 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, L.L.P.  
2475 Hanover Street  
3 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1114

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

/s/ Carlotta P. Wells  
Carlotta P. Wells  
Senior Trial Counsel  
Federal Programs Branch, Civil Division  
United States Department of Justice