From: **Kyle Moring** [redacted]
Subject: Re: Cause No. 44437 — Clean Exhibit Review and Conferral – September 18 exhibit conferral and arrival
Date: September 17, 2026 at 4:01 PM
To: Lea Ream LReam@dtrglaw.com
Cc: Austin Beck abeck@dtrglaw.com, Marla Dial mdial@dtrglaw.com

Good afternoon,

Yes. I will bring matching printed exhibit sets for the Court and the City, along with my own copy. Each proposed exhibit will have a Plaintiff's Exhibit sticker on its first source page, using the designation in the matching offer list, with the remaining pages of that item kept together.

My understanding of the Court's direction was to prepare a condensed presentation focused on the relevant correspondence without unnecessary trailing email threads. The offer list identifies excerpts and selected pages, and I will have the retained full sources available for reference.

The bookmarks and matching offer list identify the proposed items within the combined electronic PDFs. Please identify the particular exhibit designations you believe require further separation and the specific omitted portions you believe are necessary for context, so I can review those concerns before our cc

Thank you. I will see you at the courthouse at 8:15 a.m. tomorrow.

With gratitude,

Kyle Douglas Moring

On Sep 17, 2026, at 3:55 PM, Lea Ream <LReam@dtrglaw.com> wrote:

Mr. Moring,

The exhibit stickers are usually included on the exhibits provided to the opposing party so that we can ensure we are talking about the same exhibits.

With that said, I am reviewing documents you sent and bookmarked. I have noticed that some are still grouped together and that at least some are not complete documents.

Are you planning on bringing copies of the exhibits with exhibit stickers for the court and for the City tomorrow?

Regards,
Lea A. Ream

From: Kyle Moring <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2026 1:35 PM
To: Lea Ream <LReam@dtrglaw.com>
Cc: Austin Beck <abeck@dtrglaw.com>; Marla Dial <mdial@dtrglaw.com>
Subject: Re: Cause No. 44437 — Clean Exhibit Review and Conferral – September 18 exhibit conferral and arrival

Good afternoon,

Thank you. I will meet you at the courthouse at 8:15 a.m. tomorrow to discuss exhibit agreements and objections.

The electronic PDFs were the clean source copies provided for review, accompanied by the matching offer list. I am preparing the hearing copies with a Plaintiff's Exhibit sticker on the first actual source page of each separately ide

Please clarify the particular marking issue you identified and any different designation format you understand the Court to have required, so I can address that before the hearing.

With gratitude,

Kyle Douglas Moring

On Sep 17, 2026, at 1:06 PM, Lea Ream <LReam@dtrglaw.com> wrote:

Mr. Moring,

Thank you for your email. We are still in the process of reviewing and evaluating your updated exhibits which were provided on Tuesday and that you added to on Wedr

I think your suggestion that we meet at the courthouse to confer at 8:15 tomorrow is a good idea.

I would note that the exhibits should be marked in the manner that the judge ordered at the last hearing. The proposed exhibits you have provided electronically on Tues ordered.

Thank you and see you tomorrow.

Regards,
Lea A. Ream
DTRG

From: Kyle Moring <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2026 12:08 PM
To: Lea Ream <LReam@dtrglaw.com>; Austin Beck <abeck@dtrglaw.com>
Cc: Marla Dial <mdial@dtrglaw.com>
Subject: Re: Cause No. 44437 — Clean Exhibit Review and Conferral – September 18 exhibit conferral and arrival

Good afternoon,

I am following up regarding exhibit agreements and objections before tomorrow's hearing, including the later proposed additions N(a), N(b), F(n), and I(r).

Please let me know whether the City will agree to authenticity or admission of any proposed exhibits. For any objections, please identify the exhibit designation, the particular page or portion if applicable, and the ground for us use the time before the hearing efficiently.

I plan to arrive at the courthouse between 8:00 and 8:15 a.m. tomorrow and will be available to confer before the case is called. I am also available for a brief telephone conference today. Please let me know your preference.

With gratitude,

Kyle Douglas Moring

On Sep 15, 2026, at 11:00 AM, Marla Dial <mdial@dtrglaw.com> wrote:

Received – the attachments open.

Kind regards,

Marla Dial
Paralegal

Davidson Troilo Ream & Garza
<image001.jpg>
601 Northwest Loop 410 #100,
San Antonio, TX 78216
Main (210)349-6484
Fax (210) 349-0041
Direct (210) 442-2320
Cell [redacted]
mdial@dtrglaw.com
www.dtrglaw.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information in this e-mail may be confidential and/or privileged, as identified above. Whether or not designated, this e-mail is intended to be reviewed by only the individual or individuals na authorized representative of the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination or copying of this e-mail or the information contained herein may be prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, phone, and then permanently delete this e-mail from your system.

From: Kyle Moring <[redacted]>
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2026 10:17 AM
To: Lea Ream <LReam@dtrglaw.com>; Austin Beck <abeck@dtrglaw.com>
Cc: Marla Dial <mdial@dtrglaw.com>
Subject: Re: Cause No. 44437 — Clean Exhibit Review and Conferral – Email 3 of 3

Good morning,

Attached are the remaining three PDFs:

1. **44437_Moring_Matching_Offer_List_20260915.pdf** – 11 pages.
2. **44437_Moring_Screenshots_and_Prepared_Comparisons_20260915.pdf** – 6 pages.
3. **44437_Moring_Exhibit_AB_e_May_Correspondence_20260915.pdf** – 3 pages.

The offer list's new page 11 identifies AB(e), corresponding to filed AB-003–AB-005 and the discovery motion's Attachment 2, and maps the other motion attachments to existing proposed exhibits. The existing 128

These complete the five-file review package described in Email 1. Please confirm that both source parts, the matching offer list, the screenshots/comparisons PDF and AB(e) open successfully, and let me know your a

With gratitude,

Kyle Douglas Moring

[redacted]

On Sep 15, 2026, at 10:15 AM, Kyle Moring <[redacted]> wrote:

Good morning,

Attached is **44437_Moring_Clean_Source_Exhibits_Part_2_Pages_077-128_20260915.pdf**, the second portion of the clean source packet: 52 pages covering original packet pages 77–128, beginning with p

The matching offer list uses the original packet pages. For example, this file's first physical page is original packet page 77. No exhibit crosses the division between the two files. The proposed labels and filed

The matching offer list, six-page screenshots/comparisons PDF and separate three-page AB(e) correspondence follow in Email 3.

With gratitude,

Kyle Douglas Moring

[redacted]

<44437_Moring_Clean_Source_Exhibits_Part_2_Pages_077-128_20260915.pdf>

On Sep 15, 2026, at 10:14 AM, Kyle Moring <[redacted]> wrote:

Good morning,

As discussed during our September 11 conference, I have prepared source copies without my added hearing-copy headers and footers. Each document has a separate proposed exhibit designation keyed letters distinguish individual documents for review and separate offers; they remain subject to the Court's labeling direction and do not replace the filed page references.

I am sending five PDFs as direct attachments in three emails to keep each message smaller:

1. **This email:** 44437_Moring_Clean_Source_Exhibits_Part_1_Pages_001-076_20260915.pdf – 76 pages, covering original packet pages 1–76.
2. **Email 2:** 44437_Moring_Clean_Source_Exhibits_Part_2_Pages_077-128_20260915.pdf – 52 pages, covering original packet pages 77–128.
3. **Email 3:** 44437_Moring_Matching_Offer_List_20260915.pdf – 11 pages; 44437_Moring_Screenshots_and_Prepared_Comparisons_20260915.pdf – 6 pages; and 44437_Moring_Exhibit_AE 3 pages.

Together, the two source PDFs contain 66 separately bookmarked proposed exhibits. The additional PDF contains two personal Finder screenshots and four prepared comparisons, separately identified correspondence, there are 73 proposed items in all. The source packet was split between exhibits; no exhibit crosses the split. The offer list's "Print pages" still refer to the original 128-page packet. Exc identified, and complete source documents remain available for any necessary context.

The separate three-page AB(e) reproduces the May 7–12 correspondence at filed AB-003–AB-005 and Attachment 2 of my September 15 discovery motion. It was not in the earlier 128-page selection. references the motion's other attachments; the proposed discovery requests remain with the motion. The existing 128-page source packet and its page references are unchanged.

The four comparisons retain the text, figures and qualifications filed in Exhibit E, page 13; Exhibit V, page 4; and Exhibit AD, pages 1–2, with presentation reformatted. The Finder screenshots corresp previously cropped lower portion restored; their preview and date fields are unchanged. I also plan to file a short supplemental notice with the matching offer list explaining the proposed designations.

As discussed on September 11, I request a follow-up conference after your review to identify exhibit agreements and specific objections before the September 18 hearing. Please let me know your avail Thursday, September 17, by telephone or Teams. For any objection, please identify the proposed exhibit, page and specific ground, including whether additional source context would address the conce be helpful.

After all three emails arrive, please confirm that all five PDFs open successfully.

With gratitude,

Kyle Douglas Moring

Kyle Douglas Moring

[redacted]

<44437_Moring_Clean_Source_Exhibits_Part_1_Pages_001-076_20260915.pdf>