KRAMER DECLARATION EXHIBIT H

Case 5:04-cv-01497-RS Document 264-9 Filed 08/17/2005

Page 2 of 14

1	Mr. Friedman has knowledge of all aspects of the relationship between Digital Envoy and			
2	Google, as well as Digital Envoy's relationship with its other customers, and Digital Envoy's			
3	technology and its business affairs.			
4	2. Sanjay Parek			
5	Digital Envoy c/o Plaintiff's counsel only			
6	Mr. Parekh has knowledge of Digital Envoy's technology and its business affairs,			
7	including the relationship with Google and its other customers.			
8	3. Steven Schimmel Google			
9				
10	Mr. Schimmel has knowledge of the formation of the contract between Digital Envoy and			
11	Google, and other aspects of Google's business and technology.			
12	4. Sukhinder Singh Google			
13				
14	Mr. Singh has knowledge regarding Google's local search program, and other aspects of			
15	Google's business and technology.			
16	5. Jeffrey Dean Google			
17	Mr. Dean has knowledge of Google's technology.			
18	6. Georges Harik			
19	Google			
20	Mr. Harik has knowledge of Google's technology.			
21	7. Paul Bucheit			
22	Google			
23	Mr. Bucheit has knowledge of Google's technology.			
24	8. David Drummond			
25	Google			
26	Mr. Drummond has knowledge of the contract between Google and Digital Envoy, and			
27	other aspects of Google's business and technology.			
28				

	Case 5:04-c	v-01497-RS Document 264-9 Filed 08/17/2005 Page 4 of 14		
1	9.	Salar Kamangar Google		
3	Mr. Kamangar has knowledge of the AdWords program and pricing, and other aspects of			
4	Google's business and technology.			
5	10. Susan Wojcicki			
6	Google			
7	Ms. Wojcicki has knowledge of the AdWords program and pricing, the AdSense program			
8	and other aspects of Google's business and technology.			
9	11.	Joan Braddi Google		
10	Ms. Braddi has knowledge of Google's third party search program, and other aspects of			
11	Google's business and technology.			
12				
13	12.	Tim Armstrong Google		
14	Mr. Armstrong has knowledge of Google's advertising program, and other aspects of			
15	Google's business and technology.			
16 17	13.	Jonathan Rosenberg Google		
18	Mr. R	osenberg has knowledge of the development of Google's programs, and other		
19	aspects of Google's business and technology.			
20	14.	Cindy McCaffrey		
21		Google		
22	Ms. McCaffrey has knowledge of Google's corporate communications, and other aspects			
23 24	of Google's business and technology.			
25	15.	Omid Kordestani Google		
26	Mr. Kordestani has knowledge of the AdSense program, and other aspects of Google's			
27	business and technology.			
28				

	Case 5:04-0	cv-01497-RS	Document 264-9	Filed 08/17/2005	Page 5 of 14
1	16.	Matt Cutts Google			
2	Mr. (•	edge of Google's com	orata aommunicationa	and logation to her also
3	Mr. Cutts has knowledge of Google's corporate communications, geo-location technology				, geo-location technology
4	and other aspects of Google's business and technology.				
5 6	17.	Sergey Brin Google			
7	Mr. Brin has knowledge of Google's decisions regarding geo-location technology,				
8	AdSense, AdWords, and other aspects of Google's business and technology, its corporate				
9	communicati	ons and busines	ss policies and plans.	•	
10	18.	Larry Page Google			
11	Mr. D	·	des of Constant	1	
12	Mr. Page has knowledge of Google's decisions regarding geo-location technology,				
13	AdSense, AdWords, and other aspects of Google's business and technology, its corporate				
14	communications and business policies and plans.				
15 16	19.	Eric Schmidt Google			
17	Mr. Schmidt has knowledge of Google's decisions regarding geo-location technology,				location technology,
18	AdSense, AdWords, and other aspects of Google's business and technology, its corporate			gy, its corporate	
19	communications and business policies and plans.				
20	20.	Jeffery Donov	<i>r</i> an		
21		Google			
22	Mr. Donovan has knowledge of Google's corporate development and information				
23	pertaining to use of Digital Envoy's technology.				
24	21.	Leslie Yeh Google			
25	Me V		an of Congle's was of	Di-i4-1 F	1
26			ge of Google's use of		ology.
27	22.	Zhe (additiona Google	l portioin of name unk	nown)	
28			_		
- 11			-4-		

She has knowledge of Google's use of Digital Envoy's technology.

Mr. Ramasamy has knowledge of Google's use of Digital Envoy's technology.

Mr. Chau has knowledge of Google's use of Digital Envoy's technology.

Mr. Patel has knowledge of Google's use of Digital Envoy's technology.

Mr. Egnor has knowledge of Google's use of Digital Envoy's technology.

Mr. Benson has knowledge of Google's use of Digital Envoy's technology.

Mr. Berkowitz has knowledge of Google's business relationship with Ask Jeeves.

Mr. Lanzone has knowledge of Google's business relationship with Ask Jeeves.

Persons identified in documents produced or in depositions

Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(e)(1), Digital Envoy notifies Google that it will supplement this disclosure as appropriate, but specifically notes that such supplementation is only required where the person "has not otherwise been made known to the other parties during the discovery process or in writing." Digital Envoy has made a good faith effort to identify all of the persons with discoverable information in support of Digital Envoy's claims. Digital Envoy anticipates that

25

26

27

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

additional persons have discoverable information in support of Digital Envoy's claims and that some of them will be disclosed in documents produced or at depositions in this case. Digital Envoy will follow the guidance of Rule 26(e)(1) when determining whether further supplementation is necessary.

В. A copy of, or a description by category and location of, all documents, data compilations, and tangible things that are in the possession, custody or control of the party and that the disclosing party may use to support its claims or defenses, unless solely for impeachment.

RESPONSE:

- 1. The Agreement, as defined in the Complaint, with amendments.
- 2. Documents reflecting communications between the parties leading up to execution of the Agreement.
- 3. Other agreements between the parties, including communications pertaining thereto.
- 4. Documents reflecting communications between the parties regarding performance under the Agreement.
- 5. Documents reflecting performance under the Agreement.
- 6. Collected information on Google's business activities from public sources.
- 7. Digital Envoy web site information.
- 8. Google web site information.
- 9. Documents reflecting Digital Envoy's licensing of third parties for targeted advertising on their content web sites.
- 10. Documents reflecting Digital Envoy's licensing of advertising networks for targeted advertising on a partial revenue share basis.

All categories of documents in Digital Envoy's possession, custody or control are located either at Digital Envoy's office in Norcross, Georgia or at Digital Envoy's counsel's office in Atlanta, Georgia.

C.

7

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28

A compilation of any category of damages claimed by the disclosing party, making available for inspection and copying as under Rule 34 the documents or other evidentiary material, not privileged or protected from disclosure, on which such computation is based, including materials bearing on the nature and extent of injuries suffered.

RESPONSE:

1. Actual damages — recoverable under Counts I, II and IV.

Google's wrongful actions have caused Digital Envoy to suffer actual damages, including lost income, licensing and business opportunities. The extent of Digital Envoy's damages is unknown and this disclosure will be supplemented as appropriate after further discovery and investigation.

Digital Envoy further notes that the damages included in this category are on going and, in fact, Google has increased its activities bringing harm to Digital Envoy.

Much of the information required to determine Digital Envoy's actual damages is in the possession, custody or control of Google. Specifically, Google possesses, and Digital Envoy will obtain through discovery, the identity of third parties with whom Google has shared Digital Envoy's technology, or otherwise provided data contained therein. Google also possesses the nature and extent of use made by each of these third parties.

With this information, Digital Envoy intends to determine the amount of lost income through lost business opportunities, and otherwise determine the fair value of Google's wrongful use of Digital Envoy's technology. To the extent sufficient specificity of this category of damages cannot be achieved, Digital Envoy will claim recovery under the digorgement theories of recovery.

Many of the documents supporting this category are in Google's possession, custody or control and will be obtained through discovery. Additionally, Digital Envoy has identified documents in its possession which will support this category. Specifically, the documents

13

15

25

dentified in items 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 of A	Attachment C hereto	as containing documents which	cł
upport this category of damages.			

2. Disgorgement of Google's profits — recoverable under Counts I. II and IV

Digital Envoy contends that, under the causes of action identified, it is entitled to a judgment in the amount of Google's profits obtained through the wrongful use of Digital Envoy's technology. This damage category includes Google's total profit on any revenue producing act which includes Digital Envoy as a portion of the service provided by Google, as apportionment of a lesser amount attributed to Digital Envoy's technology is inappropriate.

The extent of Google's profits gained through the wrongful use of Digital Envoy's technology is currently unknown and will be supplemented as appropriate after further discovery and investigation. Google has the information in its possession, custody or control necessary to calculate the exact amount claimed in this category, and Digital Envoy anticipates collecting this information from Google

Digital Envoy further notes that the amounts included in this category are accumulating and, in fact, Google has increased its activities which result in an acceleration of recoverable amounts in this category.

In 2003, Google received \$144,411,000 in net revenues from placing advertisements on Google Network web sites. In the first quarter 2004, Google already received \$82,246,000 for the same thing. These revenues are net of money paid to the Google Network members as a share in the revenue generated by the advertisement. A large percentage of this revenue was from advertisements for which geographic targeting was enabled.

Google's profit on this revenue is substantial. In 2003, the cost of revenue was only 12.7% of the net revenue. In the first quarter of 2004, the cost of revenue was 13.7%.

9

12

11

1314

1516

17

18 19

20

2122

2324

2526

2728

From 2002 through first quarter 2004, Google's net revenue less the cost of revenue for advertising placed on Google Network web sites was \$207,915,000.

Digital Envoy's damages can be calculated by applying a percentage of revenues generated by advertisements in which geotargeting was enabled. Since Google promotes geographic targeting on its AdWords website and makes enablement obvious and easy when enrolling for the AdWords program, Digital Envoy expects this percentage to be significant.

The documents supporting this category are in Google's possession, custody or control.

To the extent Digital Envoy has any uniquely-sourced documents, they will have been identified and produced in previous responses.

3. Treble damages — recoverable under Count II

Digital Envoy contends it is entitled to treble damages under Count II. This will be a mathematical calculation using the damage amounts determined in items 1 and 2 herein. There are no documents other than previously identified supporting the determination of the amount of this category.

4. Return of money earned — recoverable under Count V

Digital Envoy contends that, under the Count V, it is entitled to a judgment in the amount of Google's earnings obtained through the wrongful use of Digital Envoy's technology. This damage category includes Google's total revenues from any act which includes Digital Envoy as a portion of the service provided by Google, as apportionment of a lesser amount attributed to Digital Envoy's technology is inappropriate.

The extent of Google's earnings gained through the wrongful use of Digital Envoy's technology is currently unknown and will be supplemented as appropriate after further discovery and investigation. Google has the information in its possession, custody or control necessary to

calculate the exact amount claimed in this category, and Digital Envoy anticipates collecting this information from Google

Digital Envoy further notes that the amounts included in this category are accumulating and, in fact, Google has increased its activities which result in recoverable amounts in this category.

The documents supporting this category are in Google's possession, custody or control.

To the extent Digital Envoy has any uniquely-sourced documents, they will have been identified and produced in previous responses.

5. Attorney's fees — recoverable under Counts II, III and IV

Digital Envoy contends it is entitled to recover its attorney's fees under the counts identified. The amount recoverable in this category will be on-going up to trial of this matter, and will be the proper subject of further discovery and disclosure as appropriate.

The documents supporting this category will be the fee bills and evidence of payment.

Digital Envoy will make such documents available as appropriate in this litigation.

6. Punitive damages — recoverable under Counts I and IV

Digital Envoy contends it is entitled to punitive damages under the counts identified. The amount recoverable in this category is to be determined by the enlightened conscience of the jury.

The documents supporting this category are in Google's possession, custody or control.

To the extent Digital Envoy has any uniquely-sourced documents, they will have been identified and produced in previous responses.

	Case 5	5:04-cv-01497-RS	Document 264-9	Filed 08/17/2005	Page 12 of 14	
1	D.				agreement under which	
2	any person carrying on an insurance business may be liable to satisfy part or all of a judgment which may be entered in the action or to indemnify or reimburse for					
3	payments made to satisfy the judgment.					
4		RESPONSE:				
5		None.				
6	DATE	D: August 4, 2004				
7		. Tragast 1, 2001	SHEDDARD	MULLIN, RICHTER	& H∆MPT∩N11b	
8			SILTI AKD,	WOLLIN, RICHTER	& HAWII TONLLY	
9			By /	5. / //		
10			· ———		CARDON TAL ENVOY, INC.	
11	1			711101110ys 101 D1G1	IND DIVVOI, INC.	
12						
13 14						
15						
16						
17						
8						
9						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
6						
27						
28			_			
	W02-SF:5	CC\61423939.1	-1	l - DIGITAL E	ENVOY, INC.'S RULE 26(a)(1) DISCLOSURES	

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

I am employed in the County of San Francisco; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action; my business address is Four Embarcadero Center, 17th Floor, San Francisco, California 94111.

On August 4, 2004, I served the following document(s) described as DIGITAL ENVOY, INC.'S RULE 26(a)(1) DISCLOSURES on the interested party(ies) in this action by placing true copies thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes and/or packages addressed as follows:

David H. Kramer David L. Lansky Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati 650 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, CA 94303-9300

- BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY: I served such envelope or package to be delivered on the same day to an authorized courier or driver authorized by the overnight service carrier to receive documents, in an envelope or package designated by the overnight service carrier.
- BY FACSIMILE: I served said document(s) to be transmitted by facsimile pursuant to Rule 2008 of the California Rules of Court. The telephone number of the sending facsimile machine was 415-434-3947. The name(s) and facsimile machine telephone number(s) of the person(s) served are set forth in the service list. The sending facsimile machine (or the machine used to forward the facsimile) issued a transmission report confirming that the transmission was complete and without error. Pursuant to Rule 2008(e), a copy of that report is attached to this declaration.
- FEDERAL: I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on August 4, 2004, at San Francisco, California.

Jil Whiteman

2526

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

27

Case 5:04xcvx01497-RS Document 264-9 Filed 08/17/2005 Page 14 of 14 P 1 CATION RESULT REPORT (AUG. 4.2x 5:46PM) * * *

TTI SF SHEPPARD MULLIN15 4154343947

FILE MODE OPTION ADDRESS (GROUP) RESULT PAGE

483 MEMORY TX ##111623#916504936811 OK P. 13/13

REASON FOR ERROR
E-1) HANG UP OR LINE FAIL
E-3) NO ANSWER

E-2) BUSY E-4) NO FACSIMILE CONNECTION



17th Floor | Four Emparcadero Center | San Francisco, CA 94111-4106 415-434-9100 office | 415-434-3947 fax | www.sheppardmullin.com

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

** THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION ALSO WILL BE MAILED **

Date: August 4, 2004

File Number: 05VA-111623

Total number of pages: (including 1-page cover sheet)

If all pages are not received, please call Sheppard Mullin at 415-434-9100, Ext. 3261

TO: Facsimile No. Telephone No.

David H. Kramer/David L. Lansky
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati

650-493-6811

650-493-9300

From:

P. Craig Cardon

Re:

Google, Inc. v. Digital Envoy, Inc.

United States District Court Northern District of California

San Jose Division

Case No. C 04 01497 RS