# **EXHIBIT 7**

150 Spear Street, Suite 1800

Stewart H. Foreman (CSB #61149) Daniel T. Bernhard (CSB #104229)

FREELAND COOPÈR & FOREMAN LLP

150 Spear Street, Suite 1800 San Francisco, California 94105

Telephone: (415) 541-0200 Facsimile: (415) 495-4332

Email: foreman@freelandlaw.com bernhard@freelandlaw.com

Attorneys for Defendants Todd Dunning and Dunning Enterprise, Inc.



### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

# FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### SAN JOSE DIVISION

EBAY, INC.,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

California 94105

Francisco, 16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff,

v.

DIGITAL POINT SOLUTIONS, INC., SHAWN HOGAN, KESSLER'S FLYING CIRCUS, THUNDERWOOD HOLDINGS, INC., TODD DUNNING, DUNNING ENTERPRISE, INC., BRIAN DUNNING, BRIANDUNNING.COM, AND DOES 1-20,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV-08-4052 JF

DEFENDANT DUNNING ENTERPRISE, INC.'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS

PROPOUNDING PARTY: PLAINTIFF EBAY INC.

RESPONDING PARTY: DEFENDANT DUNNING ENTERPRISE, INC.

SET NUMBER: ONE

Defendant Dunning Enterprise, Inc. ("Defendant") hereby submits the following objections and responses to the Request for Admissions Set One propounded by Plaintiff Ebay, Inc. ("Plaintiff").

DEFENDANT DUNNING ENTERPRISE, INC.'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS, CASE NO.: CV-08-4052 JF

# 3 4

# 5 6

# 7 8

# 9 10

# 11

# 12

# 

California 941

Francisco, Ca 91,021

18

20

19

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

## **GENERAL STATEMENT**

Todd Dunning has invoked his privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Since Mr. Dunning is the sole shareholder and sole authorized representative of Defendant, and the only person who can verify discovery responses on behalf of Defendant, Defendant cannot provide any verified responses without compromising Mr. Dunning's right against self-incrimination

Should Mr. Dunning determine that there is no longer the threat of potential criminal prosecution and elect to withdraw his privilege against self-incrimination in the future, Defendant expressly reserves the right to supplement its responses.

Furthermore, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has seized all documents and computers, disk drives, hard drives, cell phones and servers containing information potentially related to this matter. Assistant United States Attorney Kyle F. Waldinger in charge of this investigation has refused all requests to provide defendants with a copy of the material seized by the FBI. Those items and records may contain information responsive to the requests below, but those items and records are not in the possession, custody or control of defendants.

This Defendant does not admit any of these requests and holds Plaintiff to its burden of proof related to each and every one of them.

# **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1:**

Admit that Dunning Enterprise conducted business with eBay prior to May 14, 2007.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

///

10

11

12

1

2

3

4

20

25

26

27

28

#### **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2:**

Admit that Dunning Enterprise conducted business with eBay during at least some portion of 2006.

# **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2:**

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

# **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3:**

Admit that Dunning Enterprise conducted business with eBay during at least some portion of 2005.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

# **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4:**

Admit that Dunning Enterprise conducted business with eBay during at least some portion of 2004.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, *Lefkowitz v. Turley*, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

# **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5:**

California 941

<u>§</u>16 Franci 17 18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

2003.

20

19

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

# **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5:**

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

Admit that Dunning Enterprise conducted business with eBay during at least some portion of

# **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6:**

Admit that Dunning Enterprise participated in an eBay Affiliate Marketing Program or programs.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

# **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 7:**

Admit that, while participating in an eBay Affiliate Marketing Program or programs, Dunning Enterprise utilized software programs and/or code that caused some Users' computers to access an eBay website without the User's knowledge.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 7:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

# **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 8:**

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Admit that, while participating in an eBay Affiliate Marketing Program or programs, Dunning Enterprise utilized software programs and/or code that caused some Users' computers to access an eBay web server without the User's knowledge.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 8:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

# **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:**

Admit that, while participating in an eBay Affiliate Marketing Program or programs, Dunning Enterprise utilized software programs and/or code that redirected a User to an eBay website without the User knowingly clicking on an Advertisement Link.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

### **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10:**

Admit that, while participating in an eBay Affiliate Marketing Program or programs, Dunning Enterprise utilized software programs and/or code that redirected a User to an eBay web server without the User knowingly clicking on an Advertisement Link.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

<sub>ල</sub> 13

14

15

Francisco, (

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

California 94]

ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

## **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

Admit that, while participating in an eBay Affiliate Marketing Program or programs, Dunning Enterprise utilized software programs and/or code that performed Cookie Stuffing.

# **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

# **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

Admit that Dunning Enterprise used methods, techniques and/or technological measures to avoid detection by eBay of certain aspects of how Dunning Enterprise interacted with eBay's Affiliate Marketing Program or programs.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

# **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

Admit that Dunning Enterprise used methods, techniques and/or technological measures to avoid detection by Commission Junction of certain aspects of how Dunning Enterprise interacted with eBay's Affiliate Marketing Program or programs.

#### RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Francisco, (

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

## **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

Admit that Dunning Enterprise utilized methods, techniques and/or technological measures to avoid detection by eBay of Cookie Stuffing caused by Dunning Enterprise.

## **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

#### **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:**

Admit that Dunning Enterprise utilized methods, techniques and/or technological measures to avoid detection by Commission Junction of Cookie Stuffing caused by Dunning Enterprise.

# **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:**

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

# **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:**

Admit that, while participating in an eBay Affiliate Marketing Program or programs, Dunning Enterprise utilized software and/or code to determine the geographic location of a User.

### RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the

1

4

6

5

8

7

10

9

11

12

California 94105, 13

Francisco, ( 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

#### **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17:**

Admit that, while participating in an eBay Affiliate Marketing Program or programs, Dunning Enterprise utilized software and/or code to determine whether a User was located in San Jose, CA.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

#### **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:**

Admit that, while participating in an eBay Affiliate Marketing Program or programs, Dunning Enterprise utilized software and/or code to determine whether a User was located in Santa Barbara, CA.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

# REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

Admit that, while participating in an eBay Affiliate Marketing Program or programs, Dunning Enterprise utilized software and/or code that would disable or not engage Dunning Enterprise's Cookie Stuffing technology if a User's computer was located in San Jose, CA.

### **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:**

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

<u>ģ</u>16

Franci 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

14

ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

#### **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 20:**

Admit that, while participating in an eBay Affiliate Marketing Program or programs, Dunning Enterprise utilized software and/or code that would disable or not engage Dunning Enterprise's Cookie Stuffing technology if a User's computer was located in Santa Barbara, CA.

California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the

## RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 20:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

#### **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 21:**

Admit that Dunning Enterprise received commissions from eBay, whether directly or through Commission Junction, that were based, in whole or in part, on Users whose computers were directed to eBay's website without the User's knowledge.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 21:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

#### **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 22:**

Admit that Dunning Enterprise received commissions from eBay, whether directly or through Commission Junction, that were based, in whole or in part, on Users who had never actually clicked on a Dunning Enterprise-sponsored eBay advertisement link.

#### RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 22:

/// 28

<sub>2</sub> 13 50 Spear Street, Suite 1800 California 94] Francisco, 16

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

#### **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 23:**

Admit that Dunning Enterprise received commissions from eBay, whether directly or through Commission Junction, that were based, in whole or in part, Cookie Stuffing caused by Dunning Enterprise.

#### RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 23:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous.

#### REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 24:

Admit that Dunning Enterprise engaged in Cookie Stuffing with the intent to defraud eBay.

#### RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 24:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of the California Constitution, and California Evidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on the ground that this request is vague, ambiguous, and constitutes a legal conclusion.

#### REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 25:

Admit that Dunning Enterprise defrauded eBay.

#### RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 25:

Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that it violates Mr. Dunning's privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Lefkowitz v.

Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973), Federal	Rules of Evidence Rule 501, Article 1, Section 15 of t	he
California Constitution, and California Ev	vidence Code section 940. Defendant further objects on t	he
ground that this request is vague, ambiguou	ous, and constitutes a legal conclusion.	
Dated: February <u>26</u> , 2009	FREELAND COOPER & FOREMAN LLP	
	By: Stewart H. Foreman Attorneys for Defendants Todd Dunning a Dunning Enterprise, Inc.	nd

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

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within action; my business address is 150 Spear Street, Suite 1800, San Francisco, California 94105.

On February 26, 2009, I served the foregoing document described as follows:

# Defendant Dunning Enterprise, Inc.'s Responses to Plaintiff's Requests for Admissions

by placing a true and correct copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed to the party(ies) of record whose name(s) and address(es) appear below:

#### SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

- X [BY MAIL CCP § 1013a] I caused such sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid to be placed in the United States mail at San Francisco, California, for collection and mailing to the office of addressee(s) on the date shown herein following ordinary business practice.
  - [HAND-DELIVERY/Personal/Messenger CCP § 1011] I caused such envelope to be hand-delivered by a courier, who personally delivered such envelope to the office of the addressee(s) on the date herein.
  - [BY FACSIMILE CCP § 1013(e)] I caused such document(s) to be transmitted via facsimile electronic equipment transmission on the party(ies), whose name(s), address(es) and fax number(s) are listed above, on the date stated herein and at the time set forth on the attached transmission reported indicating that the facsimile transmission was complete and without error.
  - [BY FEDEX (Overnight Delivery) CCP § 1013(c)] I caused such envelope to be delivered to the Federal Express Office in San Francisco, California, with whom we have a direct billing account, to be delivered on the next business day.
  - [BY E-MAIL or ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION]. Based on a court order or agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the email addresses listed above. I did not receive within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.
- \_\_ [STATE] I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.
- X [FEDERAL] Service was made under the direction of a member of the bar of this Court who is admitted to practice and is not a party to this cause.

Executed on February 26, 2009, at San Francisco, California.

Joyce E. Johnson

1

# 150 Spear Street, Suite 1800

San Francisco, California 94105

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

2	Leo Presiado
- 1	
I	RUS, MILIBAND & SMITH
3	Von Karman Towers
- 1	2211 Michelson Drive, 7th Floor
4	Irvine, CA 92612
•	
	Telephone: (949) 752-7100
5	Facsimile: (949) 252-1514
	Attorneys for <b>Defendants Brian Dunning</b>
6	
v	and Thunderwood Holdings, Inc.

Seyamack Kouretchian COAST LAW GROUP 169 Saxony Road, Suite 204 Encinitas, CA 92024 Attorneys for Defendants Shawn Hogan and Digital Point Solutions, Inc.

David Eberhart O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP Embarcadero Center West 2 Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111 Attorneys for Plaintiff eBay, Inc. Telephone: 415-984-8700 Facsimile: 415-984-8701

Patrick K. McClellan Von Karman Towers 2211 Michelson Drive, 7th Floor Irvine, CA 92612 Attorney for Kessler's Flying Circus