

**STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
COUNTY OF SANTA FE  
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**

**STATE OF NEW MEXICO**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**D-101-CR-2024-00013**

**ALEXANDER RAE BALDWIN,**

**Defendant.**

**AMENDED ORDER DENYING BOWLES LAW FIRM MOTION TO  
QUASH SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM**

1. The Court has jurisdiction over the parties and this matter.
2. This Order amends and replaces the June 10, 2024 Order Denying in Part Bowles Law Firm Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum.
3. The State sent Mr. Bowles a Subpoena Duces Tecum on April 24, 2024 requesting the following:
  - a. All documentation regarding communications between any employee or contract employee or agent of the Bowles Law Firm and Alexander Rae Baldwin, any attorneys or other employees of the Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart, & Sullivan Law Firm, any attorneys acting on behalf of Mr. Baldwin, and any representatives of Mr. Baldwin or Mr. Baldwin's counsel. This documentation includes but is not limited to any notes, messages, e-mail, text messages, recordings, and any other forms of correspondence.
4. Mr. Bowles moved to quash the subpoena claiming that the subpoenaed information is privileged and protected under the common interest rule, also known as the joint defense privilege.
5. The State indicated in their Response "to streamline the request the State is willing to amend its request to all communications between Mr. Bowles, anyone at his office and Mr. Baldwin or any representative of Mr. Baldwin to communications related to text messages between Thell Reed, Hannah Gutierrez and Mr. Bowles as well as a phone call made by Mr. Baldwin to Mr. Bowles' office on December 1, 2021."

6. Mr. Bowles indicated in his May 20, 2024 Reply that he intends to comply with the subpoena as streamlined by the State and provide information relating to the communication between Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Bowles' law office on December 1, 2021.
7. Mr. Bowles states he does not intend to waive his objections under the common interest/joint defense privilege through his compliance.
8. Because the parties appear to have come to an agreement regarding the subpoenaed information, and because Mr. Bowles has indicated an intent to "make [a] good faith effort," to identify and provide communications to the State. The motion to quash subpoena is **DENIED** as moot.

Therefore, this Court **ORDERS, ADJUDGES, and DECREES**, the Motion to Quash the Subpoena is **DENIED** as moot.

It is so ordered.

  
Judge Marlowe Sommer  
Division VIII