

1 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP  
ROBERT A. VAN NEST - # 84065  
2 rvannest@kvn.com  
CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - # 184325  
3 canderson@kvn.com  
DANIEL PURCELL - # 191424  
4 dpurcell@kvn.com  
633 Battery Street  
5 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
Telephone: 415 391 5400  
6 Facsimile: 415 397 7188

KING & SPALDING LLP  
DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. - #112279  
fzimmer@kslaw.com  
CHERYL A. SABNIS - #224323  
csabnis@kslaw.com  
101 Second Street, Suite 2300  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: 415.318.1200  
Fax: 415.318.1300

7 KING & SPALDING LLP  
SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER  
8 (Pro Hac Vice)  
sweingaertner@kslaw.com  
9 ROBERT F. PERRY  
rperry@kslaw.com  
10 BRUCE W. BABER (Pro Hac Vice)  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
11 New York, NY 10036  
Tel: 212.556.2100  
12 Fax: 212.556.2222

IAN C. BALLON - #141819  
ballon@gtlaw.com  
HEATHER MEEKER - #172148  
meekerh@gtlaw.com  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
1900 University Avenue  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303  
Tel: 650.328.8500  
Fax: 650.328.8508

13 Attorneys for Defendant  
14 GOOGLE INC.

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
17 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

18 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,  
19 Plaintiff,  
20 v.  
21 GOOGLE INC.,  
22 Defendant.

Case No. 3:10-cv-03561 WHA

**GOOGLE'S RESPONSE TO THE  
COURT'S AUGUST 7, 2012 ORDER RE  
DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL  
RELATIONSHIPS WITH  
COMMENTATORS ON ISSUES IN THIS  
CASE**

Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Judge: Hon. William Alsup

1 On August 7, 2012, the Court issued an Order directing the parties and their counsel to file  
2 a statement “identifying all authors, journalists, commentators or bloggers who have reported or  
3 commented on any issues in this case and who have received money (other than normal  
4 subscription fees) from the party or its counsel during the pendency of this action.” Dkt. 1229.

#### 5 **STATEMENT**

6 Neither Google nor its counsel has paid an author, journalist, commentator or blogger to  
7 report or comment on any issues in this case. And neither Google nor its counsel has been  
8 involved in any *quid pro quo* in exchange for coverage of or articles about the issues in this case.

9 As the Court has recognized, a large volume of material was written in traditional  
10 publications and on the Internet about the case. Given the rise of self-publishing, individual  
11 blogs, and other fora for coverage and opinion, it is possible that any number of individuals or  
12 organizations, including those with indirect or attenuated financial connections with the parties,  
13 might have expressed views regarding this case. Rather than flooding the Court with long lists of  
14 such individuals or organizations who might have written something about the case, Google  
15 outlines below several general categories of individuals and organizations and requests the  
16 Court’s further guidance as to whether it would be useful for Google to provide more details or  
17 attempt to compile a more comprehensive list. Google does not believe that individuals or  
18 organizations within these categories were intended to be encompassed within the scope of the  
19 Court’s Order but Google brings them to the Court’s attention out of an abundance of caution.  
20 Neither Google nor its counsel has paid any individuals or organizations within these categories  
21 to report or comment on any issues in this case.

#### 22 **A. Universities and other non-profit entities**

23 For many years, Google has engaged in philanthropy in numerous areas including  
24 education and public interest issues. Accordingly, both before and after this litigation started,  
25 Google has openly and publicly donated money on a regular basis to a number of universities  
26 (*see, e.g.*, [http://research.google.com/university/reasons/focused\\_research\\_awards.html](http://research.google.com/university/reasons/focused_research_awards.html), attached  
27 hereto as Ex. A), and to non-profit organizations (*see, e.g.*,  
28

1 <http://www.google.com/publicpolicy/transparency.html>, attached hereto as Ex. B).

2  
3 At least some of those universities and entities have representatives who have elected to  
4 comment or opine on the issues in this litigation, even though Google did not pay any of those  
5 representatives to provide that commentary. Google began supporting and donating money to  
6 these organizations long before this case began, and none of those periodic donations was  
7 payment for commentary by representatives of those organizations on issues in this case. It  
8 would be extraordinarily difficult and perhaps impossible for Google to identify all individuals  
9 who have commented on the issues in this case and who are also affiliated with a university or  
10 non-profit organization to which Google has donated money.

11 **B. Organizations to which Google belongs or has made contributions**

12 For many years, Google has been a member of, or contributed to, numerous organizations,  
13 including political organizations and trade associations. Google has openly and publicly  
14 published for several years a list of such organizations on its U.S. Public Policy Transparency  
15 page (available at <http://www.google.com/publicpolicy/transparency.html>, and attached hereto as  
16 Ex. B). Google has not paid any of these organizations to comment on the issues in this case.  
17 This case, however, attracted significant media and industry attention and Google is aware that  
18 representatives of some of these organizations have elected to comment on the case. It would be  
19 extraordinarily difficult and perhaps impossible for Google to identify all individuals who have  
20 commented on the issues in the case and who are also affiliated with one of these organizations.

21 **C. Individuals who participate in Google's advertising programs and who also have  
22 elected to comment on the case**

23 Google derives revenue from its advertising programs, which benefit millions of  
24 advertisers, publishers and owners of individual websites. For example, under Google's AdSense  
25 program, Google pays publishers for ads displayed on their websites. It would be extraordinarily  
26 difficult and perhaps impossible for Google to identify individuals who received money from  
27 Google as part of the normal operations of Google's advertising programs and who have also  
28 commented on the issues in this case.

1           **D. Google employees, vendors or contractors who may have commented on the case**

2           Google employs tens of thousands of people and also hires many vendors (including  
3 outside counsel in this case) and independent contractors. Aside from Google employee or  
4 vendor statements expressly attributed to Google (such as Google public relations personnel  
5 responding to press queries about the lawsuit), these individuals were paid for other services  
6 performed, and were not paid to comment on the issues in this case. It would be extraordinarily  
7 difficult and perhaps impossible for Google to identify any and all such individuals who also  
8 happened to comment upon the instant lawsuit.

9           **E. Expert consultants**

10           Google retained expert consultants to opine on matters relevant to this litigation, both on a  
11 testifying and non-testifying basis. Google did not retain or pay any of these individuals to  
12 provide public commentary on the issues in this case beyond the testimony and opinions they  
13 rendered in this matter. Accordingly, Google does not understand these individuals to be within  
14 the intended scope of the Court's Order.

15           **F. Witnesses identified for trial**

16           As the Court is aware, there were numerous witnesses identified for trial, some of whom  
17 had affiliations with and received money from one or both of the parties to this case and who also  
18 elected to publicly comment on the case. In light of the fact that the identities of these witnesses  
19 are part of the record on appeal, Google does not understand these individuals to be within the  
20 intended scope of the Court's Order.

21  
22 Dated: August 17, 2012

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

23  
24 By:           /s/ Robert A. Van Nest            
          ROBERT A. VAN NEST

25           Attorneys for Defendant  
26           GOOGLE INC.