Overture Services, Inc. v. Google Inc. Do Case 3:02-cv-01991-JSW Document 113-6 Filed 01/29/2004 Page 1 of 5

**EXHIBIT E** 

C	ase 3:02-cv-01991-JSW Document 113	-6 Filed 01/29/2004	Page 2 of 5			
1 2 3 4 5	BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE JACK C. BERENZWEIG (Admitted Pro Hac V WILLIAM H. FRANKEL (Admitted Pro Hac V JASON C. WHITE (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) CHARLES M. MCMAHON (Admitted Pro Hac NBC Tower - Suite 3600 455 North Cityfront Plaza Drive Chicago, Illinois 60611 Telephone: (312) 321-4200 Facsimile: (312) 321-4299	rice)				
6 7	Attorneys For Plaintiff OVERTURE SERVICES, INC.					
8 9 10 11 12	KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP JOHN W. KEKER - #49092 JON B. STREETER - #101970 DARALYN J. DURIE - #169825 MICHAEL S. KWUN - #198945 710 Sansome Street San Francisco, CA 94111-1704 Telephone: (415) 391-5400 Facsimile: (415) 397-7188					
13 14	Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.					
15 16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
17 18	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION					
19 20 21	OVERTURE SERVICES, INC., a Delaware corporation, Plaintiff,	Case No. C 02-01991 C JOINT CASE MANA STATEMENT AND C	GEMENT			
22 23	v. GOOGLE INC., a California corporation, Defendant.	Judge: H	Hon. Charles R. Breyer			
24 25 26	On Optober 21, 2002, the Court external		ogle's destline for			
26 27 28	On October 21, 2002, the Court entered a stipulated order staying Google's deadline for serving Preliminary Invalidity Contentions pursuant to Patent L.R. 3-3, as well as the other deadlines set					
	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT CASE NO. C 02-01991 CRB ADR					

by the Patent Local Rules, pending resolution by a Magistrate Judge of Google's motion for an
 extension of time. The stipulated order further provided, "Within ten court days of the date of the order
 by the Magistrate Judge resolving Google's motion, the parties shall file with the Court a joint case
 management statement addressing any scheduling modifications that may be necessary in light of the
 Magistrate Judge's order."

6 Magistrate Judge Laporte heard argument on Google's motion on December 18, 2002. The 7 Magistrate Judge ordered that, among other things, Overture should serve revised versions of its 8 Preliminary Infringement contentions in part by January 14, 2003 and in part by January 31, 2003, and 9 that Google should serve its Preliminary Infringement Contentions by February 14, 2003. The 10 Magistrate Judge also entered a minute order later that day stating that Google's motion had been 11 granted. As directed by the Magistrate Judge, the parties met and conferred and reached an agreement 12 as to form for a written order, and counsel for Google submitted the order to the Magistrate Judge by 13 electronic mail on December 19, 2002, and by messenger on December 20, 2002. The written order 14 has not yet entered, but the parties expect that it will enter shortly in the form agreed upon by the

15 parties.

Based on the dates in Magistrate Judge Laporte's ruling, the parties hereby jointly propose the
following modifications to the case management schedule in this case:

Event	Patent L.R.	Old Date	New Date
Last Day for Simultaneous Exchange of Proposed	4-1	11/14/02	3/3/03
Terms and Claim Elements for Construction and/or			
Governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 6			
Last Day for Simultaneous Exchange of Preliminary	4-2	12/4/02	3/24/03
Claim Constructions and Extrinsic Evidence			
Last Day for Parties to File Joint Claim Construction	4-3	12/30/02	4/15/03
and Prehearing Statement			
Last Day to Take Discovery Relating to Claim	4-4	1/29/03	5/15/03
Construction			
Last Day for Overture to File Opening Claim	4-5	2/13/03	5/30/03
Construction Brief and Supporting Evidence			
Last Day for Google to File Responsive Claim	4-5	2/27/03	6/13/03
Construction Brief and Supporting Evidence			
Last Day for Overture to File Reply Claim	4-5	3/10/03	6/24/03
Construction Brief and Rebuttal Evidence			

28

Event	Pater	nt L.R.	Old Date	New Dat	
Technology Tutorial for Court and Cl Construction Prehearing Conference	aim		3/24/03	On or aft 7/8/03	
Claim Construction Hearing	4	6	3/25/03	On or aft 7/9/03	
If Magistrate Judge Laporte re	vises the order agreed up	on by the	e parties prior to	o signing it, a	
if the changes necessitate further modifications to the case management schedule, the parties will submit					
a further joint case management schedule. Dated: January 3, 2003 BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE					
Dated. Sandary 5, 2005				I L	
	By: <u>s/ Charles M.</u> CHARLES	McMah	on		
	Attorneys for	Plaintiff			
Deta h. Lancer 2, 2002	OVERTUR				
Dated: January 3, 2003	KEKER &	VAN NE	51, LLP		
	By: <u>s/ Michael S</u>	. Kwun			
	MICHAEL Attorneys fo	r Defend			
	GOOGLE I	INC.			
Good cause appearing, the fore	going modifications to the	ne case m	anagement scho	edule in this	
case are hereby adopted by the Court.					
IT IS SO ORDERED.					
Dated: January 7, 2003					
	D. //				
			ES R. BREYEI		
	THE HON.		ES R. BREYEI DISTRICT JUD		
	THE HON.				
	THE HON.				
	THE HON.				

C	ase 3:02-cv-01991-JSW	Document 113-6	Filed 01/29/2004	Page 5 of 5				
1	I hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from Charles							
2	M. McMahon.			I D				
3	Dated: January 3, 2003	KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP						
4								
5		By:	s <u>/ Michael S. Kwun</u> MICHAEL S. KWUN					
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16 17								
17								
10								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								
28								
			4 CEMENT STATEMENT					
	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT CASE NO. C 02-01991 CRB ADR							