

EXHIBIT F

From: Jane L Froyd [jfroyd@JonesDay.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2011 12:10 PM
To: Alinder, Zachary J.
Cc: 'Gregory Castanias'; Howard, Geoff; 'Jacqueline K. S. Lee'; Chin, Lisa; 'Rachel L. Rawson'; Brundage, Robert A.; 'Greg Lanier'
Subject: Re: Edits to Defendants' Supersedeas Bond
Attachments: SVI_93013_1_SAP - Stipulated Motion for Approval of Security.DOC; WS_BinaryComparison_#74284923v1_ACTIVE_ - Edits to Defendants' Supersedeas Bond-#74284923v2_ACTIVE_ - Edits to Defendants' Supersedeas Bond.doc; #74284923v2_ACTIVE_ - Edits to Defendants' Supersedeas Bond.DOC

Zac,

Thank you for providing Oracle's comments. We note however, that these comments are neither substantive in nature nor aimed at making Oracle more secure in its judgment. For example, the fact that the bond form lists all three plaintiffs rather than simply OIC is irrelevant as to whether the bond adequately secures Oracle. This is also true of your second and third comments. Regarding the additional paragraph that you added, all of the sureties are qualified under Rule 65.1, if they were not Oracle could separately object. And as for the Court's ability to award judgment, this is something that she already possesses and it does not need to be specifically added to the bond form.

Given the non-substantive nature of Oracle's comments, and the fact that 10 separate surety companies would have to sign-off on any changes made to the bond form (impractical given the timing), Defendants still plan to file the current bond form with the Court tomorrow. If Oracle is willing to stipulate to this bond form, we will submit a stipulated motion for approval of the bond, and have attached a draft motion for your review. If not, please provide us with the specific substantive reasons why Oracle does not believe that the bond form adequately secures the judgment in this case or otherwise does not comply with the Court's Order and applicable rules.

Regards,

Jane



Jane L. Froyd

1755 Embarcadero Road • Palo Alto, CA 94303
DIRECT 650.739.3937 • **FAX** 650.739.3900 • **E-MAIL** jfroyd@jonesday.com

From: "Alinder, Zachary J." <zachary.alinder@bingham.com>
To: "Jane L Froyd" <jfroyd@JonesDay.com>
Cc: "Gregory Castanias" <gcastanias@JonesDay.com>, "Howard, Geoff" <geoff.howard@bingham.com>, "Jacqueline K. S. Lee" <jkslee@JonesDay.com>, "Chin, Lisa" <lisa.chin@bingham.com>, "Rachel L. Rawson" <rlrawson@JonesDay.com>, "Brundage, Robert A." <robert.brundage@bingham.com>, "Greg Lanier" <tglanier@JonesDay.com>
Date: 05/18/2011 11:33 PM
Subject: Edits to Defendants' Supersedeas Bond

5/20/2011

Jane,

Attached are redline and clean versions of SAP's proposed bond format with minor proposed revisions from Oracle.

For ease of review, the revisions are as follows:

(1) In the initial paragraph, we've removed Oracle USA and Siebel Systems, and added OIC's successors and assignees. Oracle USA and Siebel Systems did not receive the \$1.3. billion judgment -- only OIC did and only OIC can execute on that judgment.

(2) The first "NOW, THEREFORE," paragraph was unclear and was missing at least one word in the final sentence after "said". We attempted to add the missing language and to make the paragraph clear. We did not alter the paragraph substantively.

(3) We added FRCP 65.1 to the lead-in to Paragraph 6 because it is also applicable and also provides that the surety shall submit to jurisdiction of the district court. We also changed "as surety" to "each Surety" since the former language was unclear.

(4) We added a new paragraph at the end to provide two additional points -- (a) we've added language that the Surety meets the qualifications of Civil Local Rule 65.1 (describing the qualifications of sureties), which I assume you agree that they must meet, and (b) we've added the ability for the Court to order judgment and award execution on the surety's obligation, in the event that the surety either defaults or refuses to obey a court order regarding payment. This language is not only standard, but also, the fact that there are numerous sureties involved, each with its own financial outlook, makes this minor addition even more important than for a typical bond.

We expect that these minor revisions will meet with your approval. If you disagree with any of them, we are available to meet and confer. Oracle hopes that the Parties will be able to present a stipulated motion for approval of the bond to the Court.

Best regards,
Zac

Zachary J. Alinder
Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center | San Francisco, CA 94111
T (415) 393-2226 | F (415) 393-2286
zachary.alinder@ingham.com

Confidentiality Notice: The information in this e-mail (including attachments, if any) is considered confidential and is intended only for the recipient(s) listed above. Any review, use, disclosure, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited except by or on behalf of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by reply email, delete this email, and do not disclose its contents to anyone.

Bingham McCutchen LLP Circular 230 Notice: To ensure compliance with IRS requirements, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used by any taxpayer, for the purpose of avoiding any federal

5/20/2011

tax penalties. Any legal advice expressed in this message is being delivered to you solely for your use in connection with the matters addressed herein and may not be relied upon by any other person or entity or used for any other purpose without our prior written consent.

=====

This e-mail (including any attachments) may contain information that is private, confidential, or protected by attorney-client or other privilege. If you received this e-mail in error, please delete it from your system without copying it and notify sender by reply e-mail, so that our records can be corrected.

=====