EXHIBIT 5

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

---000---

BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM B. SHUBB, JUDGE

---000---

ICONFIND, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. Civ. S-09-00109

YAHOO, INC.,

Defendant.

---000---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2009

---000---

Reported by: KATHY L. SWINHART, CSR #10150

unless there's something else that --

MS. KASH: There is one more term that we could probably go through quickly.

MR. HAAN: Right.

THE COURT: Which is that?

MS. KASH: Network page.

THE COURT: Oh, network page, right.

MR. HAAN: Your Honor, if I could --

THE COURT: A page which is part of a network.

MR. HAAN: Your Honor, if I could make one more point about categorization label.

Once again, the specification says that category assignments can be sent to a search engine. So the invention does not have to include all the category assignments in the label in order to operate.

Yahoo's position was that the label itself must expressly indicate every category in order for the invention to operate. But if category assignments are communicated to a search engine as is discussed at column 6 and line 55, then the search engine already has those category assignments in its database. And if someone uses the search engine to find a particular page, it can use that information that the search engine has, and then it can use whatever category assignments are expressly included in the label.

THE COURT: Why do you think the Court needs to define

page?

2 MR. HAAN: We do not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You do not. Why does Yahoo think the Court needs to define page?

MR. HAAN: One thing I wanted to point out, Your Honor, was that Yahoo has changed its position halfway through the briefing on this term. In its opening brief, if we turn to page 20, it has offered its construction for the whole term "network page" including both words. In its response brief it offered its construction only for the term "page" and said that it agreed with IconFind's construction of the term "network."

It did not inform IconFind of this change in its position. Quite frankly we think it's unfair and also implicates new claims because the term "network page" together shows up in Claims 1, 30 and 31, and the term "page" by itself shows up in Claims 19, 22 and 28.

THE COURT: Okay. So, Ms. Kash, why do you think the Court needs to define page?

MS. KASH: Well, Your Honor, we think that you need to define page because the manner in which the plaintiff is asserting its patent against Yahoo, who uploads and assigns to the extent any categories are assigned to photographs, and Flickr as we discussed earlier today only applies user selected settings to uploaded photographs, not to an entire

network page.

And we did not seek to redefine page in and of itself. We were simply stating in our reply brief that we don't disagree as to what constitutes a network. We can all agree on what's a network. The issue here is what are you talking about when you say page? Because what the plaintiff wants to have happen is to expand this patent to cover things, simply a photograph, where a network page is what the categories this whole patent are being assigned to.

THE COURT: Did I get this backwards? Because it looks like you're the one asking to define as files, data and information presented when a network address is accessed including any text, audio, advertising, images, files, graphics or graphical user interface. Wouldn't that confuse the jury into thinking that an audio, an advertisement, an image or a graphic could be a page?

MS. KASH: What it is is anything that is -- there's a difference in this patent between the fact that -- there's very clear language that when something is being -- a category is assigned to the network page versus a category assigned to material on the page.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. KASH: They're arguing that the photograph itself, in and of itself constitutes -- can constitute a network page.

And we're saying no, no, no, the network page is the whole

thing. Everything that's found in an IP address, everything
that's located on that, that is the page and that that is not
something -- so that when you -- Yahoo does not categorize the
IP address itself. It doesn't do that. It doesn't categorize
all the stuff that's found at a network page or a web page,
however you want to define it in common Internet usage.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me ask you then, Mr. Haan, the patent uses the term "material on a page."

MR. HAAN: Right.

THE COURT: Is it your position that page could be an image which is found on a web page?

MR. HAAN: That the image itself constitutes a network page?

THE COURT: Yeah. Is that your position?

MR. HAAN: No, that's not our position.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HAAN: Our position is you assign the page based on the material that's on the page, but that doesn't necessarily include all files, data and information. If you look at a website, it may have the logo of a company. And if we include Yahoo's proposed construction and you look at it in the context of the claims, it says assigning said network page.

THE COURT: Well, we can get to the question of whether this is an infringement or not later on. But for

right now it seems that you're both in agreement that the image that's on a page is not a, quote, page, unquote. It's material on a page. And so we should simply define -- page doesn't need to be defined. It seems that we should just define network page in order to define what a network is.

Network page is a page on the Internet, a private corporate network, intranet, local area network or other network.

MR. HAAN: Yes. That's our position, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What's wrong with that since nobody is going to take the position that an image on a page is a page in and of itself?

MS. KASH: If that is an admission that we have from plaintiff and Your Honor is accepting of it, then network page is fine.

THE COURT: All right. Well, if you want to just -we can put it on the record. You do not claim that an image
which is on a page is a, quote, page, unquote, itself.

MR. HAAN: An image itself, in and of itself the image file is not a page.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. KASH: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HAAN: So I guess I don't understand what the construction of this term is. There is no construction?

THE COURT: No, there will be a construction. But I

```
1
      don't think we need to define the word "page" because
 2
      everybody understands what it means. It doesn't mean an
 3
      image, it means a page.
              MR. HAAN: Right.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: It's got a common definition, a web page
б
      or a network page.
 7
              MR. HAAN: Right.
8
              THE COURT: Right.
 9
              MS. KASH: Thank you, Your Honor.
10
              THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?
11
              MR. HAAN: Not unless Your Honor has any further
12
      questions.
13
              THE COURT: No. This is interesting. I've enjoyed
14
      the discussion.
15
              MS. KASH: Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: The matter is taken under submission.
16
17
                (Proceedings were concluded at 3:56 p.m.)
18
                                 ---000---
19
20
21
22
2.3
24
25
```

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. /s/ Kathy L. Swinhart KATHY L. SWINHART, CSR #10150