

# EXHIBIT H

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP  
Claude M. Stern (Bar No. 96737)  
2 claudestern@quinnemanuel.com  
Evette Pennypacker (Bar No. 203515)  
3 evettepennypacker@quinnemanuel.com  
555 Twin Dolphin Dr., 5<sup>th</sup> floor  
4 Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
5 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

6 Joshua L. Sohn (Bar No. 250105)  
joshuasohn@quinnemanuel.com  
7 Sam S. Stake (Bar No. 257916)  
samstake@quinnemanuel.com  
8 50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111  
9 Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

10  
11 Attorneys for Defendant Fusion Garage PTE. Ltd

12  
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION  
15

16 INTERSERVE, INC. dba TECHCRUNCH, a  
Delaware corporation, and CRUNCHPAD,  
17 INC., a Delaware corporation,  
18 Plaintiffs,  
19 vs.  
20 FUSION GARAGE PTE. LTD, a Singapore  
company,  
21 Defendant.  
22

CASE NO. 09-cv-5812 RS  
**FUSION GARAGE PTE. LTD'S  
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO  
INTERROGATORY NOS. 1, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11,  
AND 12**  
**\*\*\*Exhibit A is Designated Highly  
Confidential – Attorney's Eyes Only\*\*\***

23  
24  
25 PROPOUNDING PARTY: PLAINTIFFS INTERSERVE, INC., dba TECHCRUNCH and  
CRUNCHPAD, INC.  
26 RESPONDING PARTY: DEFENDANT FUSION GARAGE PTE LTD.  
27 SET NO.: ONE  
28

1           6.       Fusion Garage further objects that this interrogatory is overbroad, vague and  
2 ambiguous.

3           7.       Fusion Garage objects to the definitions that this Interrogatory contains, including  
4 the definitions of the word “you” and “Identify.”

5           Subject to, and without waiving the foregoing objections, Fusion Garage provides the  
6 following information, which is a partial list, as it is already in the public domain: Dr. Bruce Lee  
7 and CSL Group.

8 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6**

9           Subject to the foregoing general and specific objections, and without waiving the same,  
10 Fusion Garage further responds as follows: *See Exhibit A.*

11 **INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

12           Identify all persons who have invested in your equity, debt, or other securities and the  
13 amounts each of them have invested.

14 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

15           Fusion Garage incorporates by reference the General Objections set forth above, as if fully  
16 stated herein. Fusion Garage further objects to this Interrogatory on the following grounds:

17           1.       Fusion Garage objects that this Interrogatory seeks the disclosure of private  
18 financial information.

19           2.       Fusion Garage objects that, because this Interrogatory uses the term “you” and the  
20 term “you” is defined to include Fusion Garage personnel, this interrogatory seeks information  
21 that would violate privacy rights and further seeks information that is neither relevant nor  
22 reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

23           3.       Fusion Garage objects to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is  
24 neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible information.

25           4.       Fusion Garage further objects that this interrogatory is overbroad, vague and  
26 ambiguous.

27           5.       Fusion Garage objects to the definitions that this Interrogatory contains, including  
28 the definitions of the word “you” and “Identify.”

1 Subject to, and without waiving the foregoing objections, Fusion Garage provides the  
2 following information, which is a partial list, as it is already in the public domain: Dr. Bruce Lee  
3 and CSL Group.

4 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

5 Subject to the foregoing general and specific objections, and without waiving the same,  
6 Fusion Garage further responds as follows:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Total Amount</u> <u>\$\$GD (approx.)</u>	<u>Date(s)</u> <u>(approx.)</u>
Robert Tan Kah Boon	\$ 3,465,000	January 2010 March 2010 May 2010
CSL Group	\$ 1,400,000	October/November 2009
Dr. Bruce Lee	\$ 50,000	March 2008
Raffles Technology	\$ 376,500	February 2008 September 2008 June 2009
Stamford	\$ 67,000	May 2008
Purple Ray	\$ 100,000	January 2010

19  
20 **INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

21 Identify all orders, pre-orders, sales, leases, and deliveries of the JooJoo devices.

22 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

23 Fusion Garage incorporates by reference the General Objections set forth above, as if fully  
24 stated herein. Fusion Garage further objects to this Interrogatory on the following grounds:

25 1. Fusion Garage objects that this Interrogatory seeks the disclosure of private and  
26 confidential customer and financial information.

27 2. Fusion Garage objects that, because this Interrogatory uses the term "you" and the  
28 term "you" is defined to include Fusion Garage personnel, this interrogatory seeks information

1 that would violate privacy rights and further seeks information that is neither relevant nor  
2 reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3         3.         This Interrogatory seeks trade secret and/or proprietary information but Plaintiffs  
4 have failed to comply with California Code of Civil Procedure § 2019.210. That code section  
5 provides that "before commencing discovery relating to the trade secret, the party alleging the  
6 misappropriation shall identify the trade secret with reasonable particularity." Cal. Civ. Proc. §  
7 2019.210; *see also Computer Economics, Inc. v. Gartner Group, Inc.*, 50 F. Supp. 2d 980, 992  
8 (S.D. Cal. 1999) (explaining the rationale behind § 2019.210). Plaintiffs have not identified its  
9 alleged trade secret(s) with the required particularity, or at all.

10         4.         Fusion Garage objects that Plaintiffs served this Interrogatory before it made any  
11 identification or disclosure of the alleged trade secret(s) at issue, much less an adequate  
12 identification. Accordingly, Plaintiffs commenced discovery relating to the trade secret(s)  
13 prematurely. Cal. Civ. Proc. § 2019.210.

14         5.         Fusion Garage objects to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is  
15 neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible information.

16         6.         Fusion Garage further objects that this interrogatory is overbroad, vague and  
17 ambiguous.

18         7.         Fusion Garage objects to the definitions that this Interrogatory contains, including  
19 the definitions of the word "Identify."

20 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

21         Subject to the foregoing general and specific objections, and without waiving the same,  
22 Fusion Garage further responds as follows: *See Exhibit A.*

23 **INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

24         State the revenues you have received from orders, pre-orders, sales, leases, and deliveries  
25 of the JooJoo devices.

26 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

27         1.         Fusion Garage objects that this Interrogatory seeks the disclosure of private and  
28 confidential financial information.

1  
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

2. Fusion Garage objects to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible information.

3. Fusion Garage objects to the definitions that this Interrogatory contains, including the definitions of the word "you."

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

Subject to the foregoing general and specific objections, and without waiving the same, Fusion Garage further responds as follows: *See Exhibit A.*

DATED: July 19, 2010

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP

By /s/ Evette Pennypacker  
Evette Pennypacker  
Attorneys for Defendant FUSION GARAGE  
PTE. LTD