1 2	BRETT J. WILLIAMSON (S.B. #145235 bwilliamson@omm.com GEOFFREY H. YOST (S.B. #159687)	JS-6		
3	gyost@omm.com O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP			
4	gyost@omm.com O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP 610 Newport Center Drive, 17 th Floor Newport Beach, CA 92660 Telephone: (949) 760, 9600			
5	Telephone: (949) 760-9600 Facsimile: (949) 823-6994			
6	WILLIAM C. NORVELL, JR. (pro hac)	vice)		
7	wcnorvell@bmpllp.com SCOTT D. MARRS (pro hac vice)			
8	smarrs@bmpllp.com BEIRNE, MAYNARD & PARSONS L.L.P. 1300 Post Oak Boulevard, Suite 2500			
9	Houston, TX 77056 Telephone: (713) 623-0887			
10	Facsimile: (713) 960-1527			
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterdefend Richard A. Williamson, on behalf of and	as		
12	Trustee for At Home Bondholders' Liquidating Trust			
13 14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
15	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
16	RICHARD A. WILLIAMSON, ON	Case No. CV11-02409 AHM (JEMx)		
17	BEHALF OF AND AS TRUSTEE FOR AT HOME BONDHOLDERS'	Case 110. C 111 02 109 111111 (UZIVIII)		
18	LIQUIDATING TRUST,	STIPULATED FINAL JUDGMENT Judge: Hon. A. Howard Matz		
19	Plaintiff,	Judge. Holl. A. Howard Watz		
20	V.			
21	CITRIX ONLINE, LLC, <i>et al.</i> , Defendants.			
22				
23	AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.			
24				
25				
26				
27 28				
20		STIPULATED FINAL JUDGMENT CV11-02409 AHM (JEMX)		
		CVII 02107 IIII(I (SEMIN)		

STIPULATED FINAL JUDGMENT

In the Court's September 4, 2012 Claim Construction Order (ECF No. 353) ("Markman Order"), the Court made the following rulings:

- (a) The "distributed learning control module" limitation in claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,155,840 ("the '840 patent") is a means-plus-function claim limitation with the following three functions: "(1) receiving communications transmitted between the presenter and the audience member computer systems, (2) relaying the communications to an intended receiving computer system, and (3) coordinating the operation of the streaming data module";
- (b) "there is no structure identified in the specification for the final step of 'coordinating' the operation of the streaming data module" and therefore "[t]he 'distributed learning control module' term is indefinite because the specification fails to disclose a corresponding structure";
- (c) the term "graphical display representative of a classroom" in independent claim 1 of the '840 patent means "a pictorial map illustrating an at least partially virtual space in which participants can interact, and that identifies the presenter(s) and the audience member(s) by their locations on the map"; and
- (d) the term "first graphical display comprising . . . a classroom region" in independent claim 17 of the '840 patent means "first graphical display comprising: . . . a display region for a pictorial map illustrating an at least partially virtual space in which participants can interact, and that identifies the presenter(s) and the audience member(s) by their locations on the map."

of the '840 patent, and reserve their right to assert such additional grounds in the event that the appellate court remands the case to the District Court or refuses to hear the merits of the appeal.

On October 22, 2012, the Court vacated all remaining deadlines pending the Court's decision on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration, and ordered the parties to submit a proposed form of judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 consistent with the terms of their stipulation. (ECF No. 472.)

On November 8, the Court denied Plaintiff's motion seeking reconsideration of the Court's claim construction rulings. (ECF No. 475.)

In accordance with the above, and good cause having been shown, the Court hereby enters Final Judgment in this matter as follows:

It is hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that:

- 1. FINAL JUDGMENT with respect to Plaintiff's claims of infringement of the '840 Patent against WebEx Communications, Inc., Cisco WebEx LLC, and Cisco Systems, Inc. (collectively, "Cisco") is entered against Plaintiff and in favor of Cisco, and Plaintiff shall take nothing of and from its claims of infringement of the '840 Patent against Cisco. All of Cisco's counterclaims are dismissed without prejudice, without waiving Cisco's right to reassert any or all of these claims in this action or another, including but not limited to in the event that the appellate court remands the case to the District Court or refuses to hear the merits of the appeal.
- 2. FINAL JUDGMENT with respect to Plaintiff's claims of infringement of the '840 Patent against Adobe Systems Incorporated ("Adobe") is entered against Plaintiff and in favor of Adobe, and Plaintiff shall take nothing of and from its claims of infringement of the '840 Patent against Adobe. All of Adobe's counterclaims are dismissed without prejudice, without waiving Adobe's right to reassert any or all of these

- claims in this action or another, including but not limited to in the event that the appellate court remands the case to the District Court or refuses to hear the merits of the appeal.
- 3. FINAL JUDGMENT with respect to Plaintiff's claims of infringement of the '840 Patent against Citrix Online, LLC and Citrix Systems, Inc. (collectively, "Citrix") is entered against Plaintiff and in favor of Citrix, and Plaintiff shall take nothing of and from its claims of infringement of the '840 Patent against Citrix. All of Citrix's counterclaims are dismissed without prejudice, without waiving Citrix's right to reassert any or all of these claims in this action or another, including but not limited to in the event that the appellate court remands the case to the District Court or refuses to hear the merits of the appeal.
- 4. FINAL JUDGMENT with respect to Plaintiff's claims of infringement of the '840 Patent against Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft") is entered against Plaintiff and in favor of Microsoft, and Plaintiff shall take nothing of and from its claims of infringement of the '840 Patent against Microsoft. All of Microsoft's counterclaims are dismissed without prejudice, without waiving Microsoft's right to reassert any or all of these claims in this action or another, including but not limited to in the event that the appellate court remands the case to the District Court or refuses to hear the merits of the appeal.
- 5. FINAL JUDGMENT with respect to Plaintiff's claims of infringement of the '840 Patent against International Business Machines

 Corporation ("IBM") is entered against Plaintiff and in favor of IBM, and Plaintiff shall take nothing of and from its claims of infringement of the '840 Patent against IBM. All of IBM's counterclaims are dismissed without prejudice, without waiving IBM's right to reassert

1	any or all of these claims in this action or another, including but not		
2	limited to in the event that the appellate court remands the case to the		
3	District Court or refuses to hear the merits of the appeal.		
4	6. The deadline for the parties to seek recovery of costs (including filing		
5	a Notice of Application and proposed Bill of Costs) and/or attorneys'		
6	fees is extended to thirty (30) days following issuance of the mandate		
7	in any appeal from this Final Judgment.		
8	7. Subject to paragraph 6, all claims between the parties have now been		
9	resolved. This is a final and appealable judgment.		
10			
11	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED.		
12	0 10 MKA		
13	Dated: November 26, 2012		
14	1,01		
15			
16	Hon. A. Howard Matz United States District Court Judge		
17	JS-6		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			

1 2	Dated:	November 26, 2012	/s/ Brett J. Williamson Brett J. Williamson
$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$			O'Melveny & Myers LLP
			William C. Norvell, Jr. Beirne, Maynard & Parsons, LLP
4			
5 6			Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterdefendant Richard A. Williamson, As Trustee And On Behalf Of At Home Bondholders' Liquidating Trust
7	D . 1	N 1 26 2012	
8	Dated:	November 26, 2012	/s/ Frank E. Scherkenbach
9			Frank E. Scherkenbach Fish & Richardson PC
10			Attorneys for Defendants and Counterclaimants Adobe Systems, Inc., Citrix Online LLC and
11			Citrix Systems, Inc., and Microsoft Corporation
12	Dated:	November 26, 2012	/s/ Douglas Kubehl
13			Douglas Kubehl Baker Botts L.L.P
14			Attorneys for Defendants and Counterclaimants
15			WebEx Communications, Inc., Cisco WebEx LLC, and Cisco Systems, Inc.
16	Dated:	November 26, 2012	/s/ Mark I Abate
17	Dated.	1101011001 20, 2012	Mark J. Abate
18			Gregory S. Bishop Goodwin Procter LLP
19			Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant International Business Machines Corporation
20			international Business Wachines Corporation
21			
22	Attestation Pursuant to L.R. 5-4.3.4(a)(2)		
23			
24	I, Brett J. Williamson, attest that all signatories listed and on whose behalf this filing is submitted concur in this filing's content and have authorized this filing.		
25	ining is sacinitied concur in this ming s content and have authorized this ming.		
26	Dated: November 26, 2012 /s/ Brett J. Williamson Brett J. Williamson		
27	Dieu J. Williamson		
28	OMM_US:71146136.1		