

EXHIBIT F

From: Helen Trotta [HTrotta@mdpcelaw.com]
Sent: Monday, June 07, 2010 2:17 PM
To: Ott, Carter
Cc: Jeffrey Carton
Subject: Ventura v. SCEA
Attachments: 20100607170333449.pdf

Dear Mr. Ott:

Please see attached letter from Jeff Carton. Thank you.

Helen Trotta
Legal Assistant
Meiselman, Denlea, Packman,
Carton & Eberz P.C.
1311 Mamaroneck Avenue
White Plains, New York 10605
Tel: (914) 517.5075
htrotta@mdpcelaw.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic message is intended to be viewed only by the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited without our prior permission. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, or if you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail and delete the original message and any copies of it from your computer system.

MEISELMAN, DENLEA, PACKMAN,
CARTON & EBERZ P.C.
Attorneys at Law

1311 MAMARONECK AVENUE
WHITE PLAINS, NY 10605
TEL: (914) 517-5000
FAX: (914) 517-5055
jcarton@mdpcelaw.com

JEFFREY I. CARTON
MEMBER OF THE FIRM

June 7, 2010

VIA EMAIL

Carter W. Ott, Esq.
DLA Piper LLP
555 Mission Street
Suite 2400
San Francisco, California 94105-2933

Dear Carter:

This letter responds to your emails of Sunday evening (6/6/10) at 6:17 p.m. and to that of today at 2:22 p.m. Your continued reference to a "false posting on [my] firm's website" misleadingly suggests that my firm somehow played a role in this false posting, a fact which should be obvious to you is untrue. As I explained when we spoke yesterday, my firm had no part whatsoever in the posting. As you can readily deduce, the website was hacked and an unauthorized post was made. In that regard, I take serious exception to your decision yesterday to copy every lawyer at my firm on your email. You could only have done so for the purposes of trying to embarrass us, as the vast majority of the lawyers to whom you copied your email have never been associated with the pending litigation and do not appear anywhere on the pleading. Rest assured that if this is how you intend to comport yourself going forward, we will have little choice but to copy every attorney at DLA Piper on our future exchanges.

With respect to your requests of today's date, you are in no position to inquire as to the information we are collecting regarding the posting. As an initial matter, any inquiries our firm may have received regarding the posting would certainly fall within the ambit of the attorney-client privilege and/or of our work product, if not also constitute an impermissible invasion of consumers' privacy. While we have every interest in identifying the perpetrator of this act (and are employing third parties at considerable expense to do so), we have no intention of sharing any additional information with you at this time. Indeed, a criminal indictment for criminal impersonation may well be in the offing and you and your Firm have no place in that dialogue.

Finally, with respect to your feigned misunderstanding as to why we might believe Sony could be responsible for this posting, I can remark only that Sony's interest in attempting to discredit the very law firm which first filed an action against it regarding the disabling of the OS feature (litigation which has now taken on an

MEISELMAN, DENLEA, PACKMAN,
CARTON & EBERZ P.C.

Carter W. Ott, Esq.
DLA Piper LLP
June 7, 2010

international interest), would not be beyond the realm of possibility. While I certainly hope that is not the case, it would be imprudent to rule out any such possibilities at this time.

I trust that you will now constrain yourself to litigating the issues in the action.

Very truly yours,

MEISELMAN, DENLEA, PACKMAN,
CARTON & EBERZ P.C.


Jeffrey Carton

JIC/ht
00230879.WPD