SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF AJAY S. KRISHNAN IN SUPPORT OF GOOGLE INC.'S MOTION TO COMPEL COUNTER-PLAINTIFF ABWF TO SATISFY ITS OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY OBLIGATIONS CASE NO. C 03-5340-JF (RS)

2

3 4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12.

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

I, Ajay S. Krishnan, declare as follows:

I am associated with the firm of Keker & Van Nest LLP, counsel for Plaintiff and 1. Counter-Defendant Google Inc., and am admitted to practice before this Court. I make this declaration in support of Google's Motion to Compel Counter-Plaintiff American Blind & Wallpaper Factory, Inc. ("ABWF") to Satisfy Its Outstanding Discovery Obligations. Unless otherwise stated, I know the facts stated herein of my personal knowledge and if called as a witness, I would testify competently thereto.

List of Exhibits

- 2. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of American Blind & Wallpaper Factory, Inc.'s Initial Disclosures Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26, dated April 27, 2005.
- 3. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of pages from the deposition of Scot M. Powers, taken on July 11, 2006. Google has under separate cover requested that this document be filed under seal.
- Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of pages from the 4. deposition of Joseph Charno, taken on July 21, 2006. Google has under separate cover requested that this document be filed under seal.
- 5. Attached hereto as Exhibit D is a true and correct copy of pages from the deposition of Jeffrey A. Alderman, taken on August 4, 2006.

Issue A—The Online Customer Satisfaction Survey

6. On October 3, 2006, the day before the deadline for filing the reply brief, I received from ABWF two CDs containing newly produced documents. The cover letter, from ABWF counsel Caroline Plater, indicated that the CDs contained those copies of the weekly spreadsheets, derived from the Online Customer Satisfaction Survey, that had not been destroyed. The cover letter also indicated that the CDs contained specially created Excel Spreadsheets that contained all of the raw data from the Online Customer Satisfaction Survey.

Issue D—Follow-up Deposition of Jeffrey Alderman

7. In a letter to me, dated September 19, 2006, Ms. Plater stated that Mr. Alderman

had relied on certain Commission Junction materials (which numbered roughly 100 pages), 11
pages of recently produced documents, and Coremetrics reports to provide his 30(b)(6)
testimony on the issue of the May/June 2006 affiliate-bidding experiment conducted at ABWF.
On information and belief, ABWF produced roughly 35,000 pages of Coremetrics reports. In a
responsive letter on September 21, 2006, I asked Ms. Plater to identify which Coremetrics
reports Mr. Alderman had relied on. I asked again in a September 25, 2006 phone call with Ms.
Plater. ABWF has never provided a response to that question.

Issue H—The "American Wallpaper Survey" Documents

- 8. Prior to his leaving ABWF in May of 2006, Steve Katzman had been designated by ABWF as its 30(b)(6) witness on all topics noticed by Google.
- 9. Counsel for ABWF has represented at various points during this litigation that Steve Katzman, Joe Charno, and Bill Smith no longer work at ABWF. Additionally, each of them has so testified during subpoenaed depositions. Katzman, Charno, and Smith are three of the five ABWF employees identified in ABWF's initial disclosures as individuals with relevant knowledge.

Issue J—The Manner of ABWF's Production

10. I have reviewed ABWF's initial production of roughly 3000 documents. That production contains cease-and-desist correspondence, litigation files, email correspondence between Google and ABWF, correspondence between ABWF and other search engines, and other types of documents. But these documents are not in neat categories. Each of the types of documents listed above occur at numerous different locations within the production. I did not find any dividers or labels between individual documents. I could not determine why the documents were kept in this order. In the cease-and-desist correspondence and in the litigation files it is difficult (and sometimes impossible) to tell where one matter ends and the next matter begins.

I state under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States of American that the foregoing statements are true and correct. Executed October 4, 2006, at San Francisco,