

1 JAMES A. DIBOISE, State Bar No. 83296 (jdiboise@wsgr.com)
 2 DAVID H. KRAMER, State Bar No. 168452 (dkramer@wsgr.com)
 3 COLLEEN BAL, State Bar No. 167637 (cbal@wsgr.com)
 4 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
 5 Professional Corporation
 650 Page Mill Road
 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050
 Telephone: (650) 493-9300
 Facsimile: (650) 565-5100

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 7 GOOGLE INC.

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 10 SAN JOSE DIVISION

12	GOOGLE INC., a Delaware corporation,)	CASE NO.: C-05-00598 JW (HRL)
13)	
14	Plaintiff,)	
15	v.)	DECLARATION OF DAVID H.
16)	KRAMER IN SUPPORT OF
17)	PLAINTIFF GOOGLE INC.'S
18	AFFINITY ENGINES, INC., a Delaware)	OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT
19	corporation,)	AFFINITY ENGINES, INC.'S
20)	MOTION TO DISMISS AND/OR
21	Defendant.)	STAY PROCEEDINGS
22)	
23)	Date: May 9, 2005
24)	Time: 9:00 a.m.
25)	Judge: Honorable James Ware
26)	Courtroom: 8, 4 th Floor

1 I, David H. Kramer, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice in the State of California and
3 before this Court. I am a member of Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, counsel for Plaintiff
4 Google Inc. (“Google”). I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein and, if called as
5 a witness, could and would testify competently thereto.

6 2. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the August 5, 2002
7 Employment, Confidential Information and Inventions Assignment Agreement between Orkut
8 Buyukkokten and Google.

9 3. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of a May 9, 2002 offer
10 letter and employment packet sent by Sergey Brin of Google to Orkut Buyukkokten.

11 4. In March 2004, counsel for AEI wrote to Google claiming that AEI owned the
12 inCircle code and that Buyukkokten had copied unspecified inCircle code into the code
13 implementing the Orkut.com service. Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of
14 a letter (without attachments) from G. Hopkins Guy, III, counsel for AEI, to Orkut Buyukkokten
15 and David Drummond, General Counsel of Google, dated March 8, 2004. Counsel for the
16 parties met twice (in March and April 2004) to discuss AEI’s concerns. At the very first
17 meeting, I specifically informed both Brian Samuels, then CEO of AEI, and Hopkins Guy, AEI’s
18 counsel, that “there were serious ownership issues” surrounding AEI’s claim to own Mr.
19 Buyukkokten’s work. I further stated at that meeting that this case was a *Sagent v. Acta*
20 situation, referring to a case Mr. Guy had handled against our firm. In that case, Mr. Guy
21 represented a defendant accused of trade secret misappropriation, and claimed that the defendant
22 actually owned the intellectual property at issue. My point in expressly referencing the case was
23 to make clear that Google, not AEI, owned the rights to the code at issue in this case. Ownership
24 aside, Google repeatedly offered to permit a neutral expert to compare the two programs and
25 show that no code copying had occurred. AEI rejected all such offers.

26 5. Attached hereto as Exhibit D is a true and correct copy of Affinity Engines, Inc.’s
27 Responses and Objections to Google Inc.’s First Set of Requests for Admissions, Request No.
28 28, served on March 4, 2005.

