

Exhibit A

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP

333 WEST WACKER DRIVE

SUITE 2600

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606

(312) 857-7070

FACSIMILE

(312) 857-7095

www.kelleydrye.com

DIRECT LINE: (312) 857-2501

EMAIL: cplater@kelleydrye.com

NEW YORK, NY
WASHINGTON, DC
TYSONS CORNER, VA
STAMFORD, CT
PARSIPPANY, NJ
BRUSSELS, BELGIUM
AFFILIATE OFFICES
MUMBAI, INDIA

March 2, 2007

VIA FACSIMILE

Ajay S. Krishnan
Keker & Van Nest LLP
710 Sansome Street
San Francisco, CA 94111

Re: Google Inc. v. American Blind and Wallpaper Factory, Inc.

Dear Ajay:


I am getting back to you on your request for our stipulation to the submission of the recent decision *Universal Comm. Sys. Inc. v. Lycos, Inc.*, 2007 WL 549111 (1st Cir. Feb. 23, 2007). Now that I have had a chance to review the decision, we cannot agree to stipulate to its submission because the case is not relevant for numerous reasons. First, the case dealt with Florida trademark dilution law – not the Lanham Act. Second, the decision the court reached on the trademark dilution count was not based on trademark use or even trademark law – it was decided on First Amendment grounds. Third, the case is factually distinguishable in that it was a nominative fair use case regarding a gripe site and it does not even address trademark use in that context; it only limitedly addresses commercial use. Fourth, Google never raised nominative fair use in its summary judgment papers.

Civil Local Rule 7.3(d) allows parties to “bring to the Court’s attention a *relevant* judicial opinion published after the date the opposition or reply was filed.” The *Universal* case is not relevant, so we cannot stipulate to its submission.

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

Ajay S. Krishnan
March 2, 2007
Page Two

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Car Plater".

Caroline C. Plater

CCP:ccp