

Exhibit 13

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

INTEL CORPORATION, et al.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	Civil No. 6:06-cv-551
v.	§	
	§	
COMMONWEALTH SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH ORGANISATION,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	
<hr/>		
MICROSOFT CORP., et al.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	Civil No. 6:06-cv-549
v.	§	
	§	
COMMONWEALTH SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH ORGANISATION,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	
<hr/>		
COMMONWEALTH SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH ORGANISATION,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	Civil No. 6:06-cv-550
v.	§	
	§	
TOSHIBA AMERICA INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC., et al.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is Defendants¹ Motion for Leave to Supplement in Light of Reexamination (6:06-cv-549, Docket No. 507; 6:06-cv-550, Docket No. 579; 6:06-cv-551, Docket No 460). For

¹ For ease of reference, all parties other than CSIRO will be referred to as "Defendants."

the reasons set forth below Defendants' motion is **DENIED**.

BACKGROUND

These three actions involve U.S. Patent No. 5,487,069 (the "'069 Patent"). The patent teaches the creation of certain Wireless Local Area Networks ("WLANs"). Before these three cases were filed, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization ("CSIRO") sued Buffalo Technology (USA), Inc., and Buffalo, Inc. (collectively the "Buffalo case") in this Court on February 2, 2005. All issues of liability and invalidity were decided in the Buffalo case, appealed, and remanded on October 27, 2008 for a jury trial on various discreet issues. The next two cases were filed in May 2005 as declaratory judgment actions against CSIRO in the Northern District of California and subsequently transferred to this Court. Finally, CSIRO filed another patent infringement suit against multiple defendants in December 2006.

In all of the cases, except the Buffalo case, discovery and dispositive motions were ordered coordinated. *See e.g.*, Discovery Order, 6:06-cv-551-LED, Docket No. 144. Defendants also entered into a Common Interest and Information Sharing Agreement as of September 15, 2004, which they have relied upon to extend privilege to communications between Defendants and similarly situated non-parties within the industry. *See* Defendants' Joint Response to CSIRO's Motion to Compel, 6:06-cv-551-LED, Docket No. 307 at 7. On December 23, 2008 the four cases were consolidated for trial on April 13, 2009 for all liability and equitable issues. *See* Memorandum Opinion and Order, 6:06-cv-551-LED, Docket No. 377. On December 22, 2008 Defendants filed for reexamination of the '069 Patent. The Patent and Trademark Office issued its decision granting reexamination on February 20, 2009. Based on this, Defendants now move to supplement their 1) Motion for Summary Judgment of No Willful Infringement; 2) Opposition to CSIRO's Motion for

Summary Judgment Regarding Defendants' Defense of Inequitable Conduct; and 3) Expert Report of John Goolkasian dealing with inequitable conduct. Defendants filed their motion on March 13, 2009.

APPLICABLE LAW

The late supplementation of briefs and the amendment of expert reports are governed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b) and this Court's local rules. Local Rule CV-7(f) provides that following the specified time for filing briefs, "[a]bsent leave of court, no further submissions on [a] motion are allowed." Additionally, Rule 16(b) provides that a scheduling order "may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent." In determining "good cause" the following factors are relevant: "(1) the explanation for the failure to timely move for leave to amend; (2) the importance of the amendment; (3) potential prejudice in allowing the amendment; and (4) the availability of a continuance to cure such prejudice." *Sw. Bell Tel. Co. v. City of El Paso*, 346 F.3d 541, 546 (5th Cir. 2003).

ANALYSIS

Defendants contend that the late supplementation of their motions and reports is justified by the recent PTO decision to reexamine the '069 patent. This explanation fails for several reasons. First, as CSIRO points out, most of the prior art relied upon in the reexamination application has been available since discovery in the Buffalo case. Defendants provide no explanation for their delay in seeking reexamination four years after the first '069 patent case was filed. On May 11, 2007, the Court set all three of these cases on its April 13, 2009 trial docket. *See e.g.*, 6:06-cv-551-LED, Docket No. 145. With two years notice of the trial date in these cases, Defendants do not explain why they waited until just months before the trial setting before moving for reexamination. Further,

the Court can find no reason for Defendants' near-one-month delay in filing this motion following the granting of reexamination given that the discovery period had ended, the dispositive motion deadline had passed, and the jury trial was looming. Given these considerations, this factor weighs heavily against allowing supplementation.

Defendants argue that the amendments are highly relevant to the issues of willfulness and inequitable conduct. They cite no authority in their motion, but argue in the supplemented text itself that the fact of reexamination is valuable and probative. The one case that Defendants cite to suggest the relevance of the *fact* of reexamination, instead expresses that the *outcome* of reexamination is probative to an inequitable conduct analysis. See *Molins PLC v. Textron, Inc.*, 48 F.3d 1172, 1179 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (“We have held that the *result* of a PTO proceeding that assesses patentability in light of information not originally disclosed can be of strong probative value in determining whether the undisclosed information was material.”) (emphasis added). Defendants have failed to show, through their briefing or otherwise, that the fact that a reexamination application was granted is probative to either willfulness or inequitable conduct. Because the evidence and analysis is of questionable admissibility and relevance, the second factor weighs against supplementation.

Furthermore, without any conclusions of the PTO to rely upon, evidence that the PTO is currently reexamining the patent may work to unduly alleviate Defendants' “clear and convincing” burden for both invalidity and willfulness in front of the jury. See FED. R. EVID. 403; *Procter & Gamble Co. v. Kraft Foods Global, Inc.*, 549 F.3d 842, 848 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (“[A] requestor's burden to show that a reexamination order should issue from the PTO is unrelated to a defendant's burden to prove invalidity by clear and convincing evidence at trial.”). This potential prejudice coupled with proximity of the amendments to trial would work a substantial burden on CSIRO. Thus, the third

factor weighs against supplementation.

Finally, because of the considerable expense and time that all parties have placed into holding a jury trial on April 13, and considering that this trial date has been scheduled since May 2007, there is no opportunity for a continuance to allow for evidence of questionable probative value. The final factor weighs against supplementation.

CONCLUSION

For the aforementioned reasons Defendants' Motion to Supplement is **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 9th day of April, 2009.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Leonard Davis', written over a horizontal line.

LEONARD DAVIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Exhibit 14

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

LEADER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware corporation,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	C.A. No. 08-862-JJF
)	
v.)	
)	
FACEBOOK, INC., a Delaware corporation,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

**PLAINTIFF LEADER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S FIRST SET OF
INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC. (NOS. 1-13)**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33 and Local Rule 5.4, Plaintiff Leader Technologies, Inc. ("Leader") hereby requests that Defendant Facebook, Inc. ("Facebook") answer the following interrogatories in writing and under oath, in accordance with the following Definitions and Instructions within thirty (30) days after the service of these interrogatories. These interrogatories request all information and items within the knowledge of Facebook, its agents, representatives, persons acting on its behalf and attorneys.

These interrogatories are continuing in nature and Facebook shall promptly serve upon Leader supplemental answers in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(e) and the Local Rules of the District of Delaware as Facebook acquires additional knowledge or information responsive to these interrogatories.

DEFINITIONS

1. The terms "Plaintiff" and "Leader" shall mean Plaintiff Leader Technologies, Inc., its present and former directors, officers, employees, parent organization(s), subsidiary organization(s), predecessors in interest, successors in interest, divisions, servants, agents,

attorneys, consultants, partners, associates, investigators, representatives, accountants, financial advisors, distributors and any other person acting on its behalf, pursuant to its authority or subject to its control.

2. The terms "you," "your," "Facebook," and "Defendant" shall mean Defendant Facebook, Inc. ("Facebook"), its present and former directors, officers, employees, parent organization(s), subsidiary organization(s) including ConnectU, Inc., predecessors in interest, successors in interest, divisions, servants, agents, attorneys, consultants, partners, associates, investigators, representatives, accountants, financial advisors, distributors and any other person acting on its behalf, pursuant to its authority or subject to its control.

3. The term "Facebook Website" shall mean the Facebook services and network currently located at www.facebook.com and formerly located at www.thefacebook.com (including any directly associated current or former domains), and all functionalities, components, programs, and modules (both software and hardware) currently or formerly built, used, or made available by Facebook. "Facebook Website" includes, but is not limited to, all components and information necessary to currently or formerly build, use, and make available Facebook Marketplace, Facebook Flyers, Facebook Platform, Facebook Platform Applications (including, but not limited to Facebook Video, Facebook Notes, Facebook Mobile, Facebook Posted Items, Facebook Photos, Facebook Events, Facebook Gifts, Facebook Groups, Discussion Boards, Discography, Music Player, Translations, Wall, Reviews, Facebook Exporter for iPhoto and Facebook Toolbar for Firefox), Facebook Mobile Services, Facebook Connect, Facebook Pages, Share Service, Share Link, Facebook Ads, Facebook Beacon, Social Ads, and any other tools which facilitate Site Content or User Content. For purposes of clarification and not limitation, these terms shall have at least the same meaning as used in Facebook's Privacy Policy

located at www.facebook.com/policy.php (effective as of November 26, 2008), Terms of Use located at www.facebook.com/terms.php (revised on September 23, 2008), and Product Overview FAQ located at www.facebook.com/press/faq.php (accessed on December 17, 2008).

4. The terms “person(s)” and “entit(y, ies)” shall mean, without limitation, any natural person, or association, firm, partnership, corporation or any other form of legal entity, unless the context indicates otherwise.

5. The term “third party” means any person or entity other than Leader or Facebook.

6. The term “Action” refers to Civil Action No. 08-862 filed in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware on November 19, 2008 styled Leader Technologies, Inc. v. Facebook, Inc.

7. The term “Leader Complaint” refers to the Complaint filed by Leader in the Action. (D.I. 1)

8. The term “Facebook Amended Answer” shall mean Facebook’s First Amended Answer to Complaint for Patent Infringement; Affirmative Defenses; and Counterclaims filed by Facebook in the Action. (D.I. 12)

9. The terms “761 Patent” and “Patent-in-Suit” shall mean United States Patent No. 7,139,761 entitled “Dynamic Association of Electronically Stored Information with Iterative Workflow Changes,” the application leading to this patent and any related patent application, including any WIPO, EPO or other foreign counterpart application or patents, any continuations, continuations in part, divisionals, reissues, reexaminations, extensions or parents thereof.

10. The term “document” shall mean all “writings” and “recordings” as those terms are defined in Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(a) and Fed. R. Evid. 1001 as well as any writing or recording of any type, whether written, printed, transcribed, recorded (mechanically or electronically) or

reproduced by hand, including, but not limited to, all letters, correspondence, facsimiles, e-mail, telegrams, transcriptions and records of telephone conversations, memoranda, notes, records, reports, statements, minutes, communications, slide presentations, microfilm, microfiche, tape recordings, videotapes, photographs, studies, policy manuals and statements, books, plans, analyses, computer records, runs, programs, software and any code(s) necessary to comprehend the same, test results, notebooks, diaries, agreements, contracts, purchase orders, invoices, advertisements, marketing materials, offer letters, beta site testing agreements, third party or joint development agreements, bills, statements and any other written, printed, typed, recorded or graphic matter, however produced or recorded, including copies and drafts of same, and any handwritten or typewritten notes of any kind thereon or attached thereto. The term "document" shall also include all technical documents, source code, specifications, schematics, flow charts, artwork, drawing, pictures, pictorial representations, formulas, troubleshooting guides, service bulletins, technical bulletins, production specification sheets, white papers, operator manuals, operation manuals, instruction manuals and all other documents sufficient to show the operation of any aspects or elements of your products which includes all past and present releases, revisions, versions and upgrades.

11. The term "communication" shall mean every manner or method of disclosure, transfer or exchange of information, whether orally or by document, and whether face to face, by telephone, mail, e-mail, facsimile, personal delivery or through another medium, including, but not limited to, discussions, conversations, negotiations, conferences, meetings, speeches, memoranda, letters, correspondence, notes, statements or questions.

12. As applied to a document, the word "identify" means to state the type of document, the names of the individuals to whom the document or a copy thereof was addressed

or sent, a summary of the subject matter of the document, the number of pages of the document, the present location of the document and the name and address of the custodian of the document.

13. As applied to a product, the word "identify" means to state the name of the product, a brief description of the product, the product number (if any) and any other means of identification.

14. As applied to an individual, the word "identify" means to state the individual's full name, present or last known address and telephone number, present or last known position and business affiliation, and present or last known business or residence address.

15. As applied to an event, the word "identify" means to provide the date of the event, a description of the event, the location of the event and the individual or organizational entities participating in the event.

16. The terms "concerning" and "concern" mean constituting, relating to, mentioning, discussing, evidencing, involving, depicting, describing, listing, consisting of, forming the basis of, commenting on, supporting, analyzing, forwarding, demonstrating, referring to, connected with, relying upon or in any way related to the indicated person, entity, event, document or product.

17. The terms "relating to," "relate to," "refer to" and "referring to" mean referring to, alluding to, responding to, concerning, connected with, commenting on, in respect of, about, regarding, discussing, showing, identifying, describing, mentioning, reflecting, analyzing, comprising, constituting, evidencing, supporting, refuting, contradicting, memorializing, pertaining to, bearing upon or illuminating the subject matter into which inquiry is made.

18. The words "and" and "or" shall be construed conjunctively or disjunctively in a manner making the request inclusive rather than exclusive.

19. The singular of any word or phrase shall include the plural of such word or phrase, and the plural of any word or phrase shall include the singular of such word or phrase.

20. The term "all" shall mean "any and all" and the term "any" shall mean "any and all."

INSTRUCTIONS

A. In answering the following interrogatories, furnish all information available to Defendant, including information in the possession of its subsidiaries, officers, directors, attorneys, agents, employees, associates, and investigators; not merely information of the personal knowledge of the person answering these interrogatories.

B. If you cannot answer the following interrogatories fully and completely, after exercising due diligence to secure the information to do so, please so state and answer each such interrogatory to the fullest extent possible and specify the portion of each interrogatory that you claim to be unable to answer fully and completely. Please state the facts upon which you rely to support your contention that you are unable to answer the interrogatory fully and completely and state what knowledge, information or belief you have concerning the unanswered portion of each such interrogatory. These interrogatories shall be continuous in nature, and pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P 26(e) and the Local Rules of the District of Delaware, you are under the continuing obligation to promptly serve supplemental and/or amended responses to the interrogatories.

C. If you contend that any information requested is privileged or otherwise excludable from discovery, you are requested to describe any such information in sufficient detail for identification purposes and to state the basis for the asserted privilege or grounds for exclusion. If you contend that any responsive document is privileged, in whole or in part, or otherwise excludable from discovery, set forth the following information: (1) the author(s) of the

document, (2) a statement of the grounds upon which the claim of privilege is based, (3) the location of the document requested, (4) each person to whom the document was addressed, (5) each person who received copies of the document or were otherwise advised of its contents, and (6) a general description of the subject matter of the document.

D. If a document, including source code, once existed and has subsequently been lost, destroyed or is otherwise missing, please identify the document and state the details concerning the loss or destruction of such document.

E. Objection will be made at the time of any trial or hearing to any attempt to introduce evidence which is directly sought by these interrogatories and to which no disclosure has been made.

INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

Identify each component, module, and functionality incorporated in the Facebook Website, the date the component, module, and functionality was created, the date the component, module, and functionality was incorporated in the Facebook Website, the person or persons responsible for creating, developing, designing, programming and/or coding, in whole or in part, the component, module, and functionality and the factual details of the creation, development, design, programming and/or coding of the component, module, and functionality.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

For each component, module, and functionality identified in your response to Interrogatory No. 1, identify and describe in detail any launch or relaunch of any new or updated version of the identified component, module, and functionality including, but not limited to, the date the launch or relaunch of the new or updated version of the identified component, module,

and functionality was incorporated in the Facebook Website, the reason for the launch or relaunch of the new or updated version of the identified component, module, and functionality, the person or persons involved in the decision to launch or relaunch the new or updated version of the identified component, module, and functionality, the person or persons responsible for creating, developing, designing, programming and/or coding, in whole or in part, the new or updated version of the identified component, module, and functionality and the factual details of the creation, development, design, programming and/or coding of the new or updated version of the identified component, module, and functionality.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

Describe in detail the complete factual basis for the First Affirmative Defense pled in the Facebook Amended Answer that “Facebook is not infringing and has not infringed any claim of the ‘761 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents” and identify the persons most knowledgeable about, and all documents and things relating to, such defense.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4:

Describe in detail the complete factual basis for the Second Affirmative Defense pled in the Facebook Amended Answer that “each claim of the ‘761 patent is invalid for failure to meet one or more of the contentions of patentability specified in 35 U.S.C. §§ 101-103 and/or 112” and identify the persons most knowledgeable about, and all documents and things relating to, such defense.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5:

Describe in detail the complete factual basis for the Fourth Affirmative Defense pled in the Facebook Amended Answer that “LTI’s claims are barred by the doctrine of laches” and

identify the persons most knowledgeable about, and all documents and things relating to, such defense.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6:

Describe in detail the complete factual basis for the Sixth Affirmative Defense pled in the Facebook Amended Answer that “prosecution history estoppel and/or prosecution disclaimer precludes any finding of infringement” and identify the persons most knowledgeable about, and all documents and things relating to, such defense.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

Describe in detail the complete factual basis for the Seventh Affirmative Defense pled in the Facebook Amended Answer that “pre-lawsuit claims for damages are barred, in whole or in part, for failure to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 287” and identify the persons most knowledgeable about, and all documents and things relating to, such defense.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8:

Describe in detail the complete factual basis for Facebook’s contention that this is an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9:

Describe in detail, including but not limited to identification of any and all supporting documents, the factual circumstances surrounding your first becoming aware of the Patent-in-Suit or the application that resulted in the Patent-in-Suit, what actions you took upon becoming aware of the Patent-in-Suit or application, the identity of all persons with knowledge of such facts and circumstances, and identify all documents relating to such facts and circumstances.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10:

Describe in detail each type of product, activity, event or occurrence that generates revenue for Facebook, including but not limited to information relating to the first instances where such product, activity, event or occurrence generated revenue for Facebook.

INTERROGATORY NO. 11:

On a monthly, quarterly, annual or other periodic basis, identify the gross and net revenues and gross and net profits generated by Facebook and identify the costs and expenses incurred by Facebook in generating such revenues and profits.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12:

Identify all licenses between Facebook and any third party relating to any patents, proprietary technology or know-how owned by Facebook and identify revenue generated as a result of each license identified.

INTERROGATORY NO. 13:


Identify all licenses between Facebook and any third party relating to any patents, proprietary technology or know-how owned by the third party and incorporated into the Facebook Website or otherwise used by Facebook and identify all payments made by Facebook pursuant to such licenses.

POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP

OF COUNSEL:

Paul J. André
King & Spalding, LLC
333 Twin Dolphin Drive
Suite 400
Redwood City, California 94065-6109
(650) 590-7100

Dated: February 20, 2009
904145

By: 
Philip A. Rovner (#3215)
Hercules Plaza
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 984-6000
provner@potteranderson.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff
Leader Technologies, Inc.*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Philip A. Rovner, hereby certify that on February 20, 2009, true and correct copies of the within document were served on the following counsel of record, at the addresses and in the manner indicated:

BY HAND DELIVERY AND E-MAIL

Thomas P. Preston, Esq.
Steven L. Caponi, Esq.
Blank Rome LLP
1201 Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
Preston-T@blankrome.com
caponi@blankrome.com

BY E-MAIL

Heidi L. Keefe, Esq.
Mark R. Weinstein, Esq.
Craig W. Clark, Esq.
Melissa H. Keyes, Esq.
White & Case LLP
3000 El Camino Real
5 Palo Alto Square, 9th Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306
hkeefe@whitecase.com; mweinstein@whitecase.com
cclark@whitecase.com; mkeyes@whitecase.com



Philip A. Rovner (#3215)
Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP
Hercules Plaza
P. O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 984-6000
provner@potteranderson.com

Exhibit 15

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

LEADER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a)	
Delaware corporation,)	
)	Civil Action No. 08-862-JJF/LPS
Plaintiff-Counterdefendant,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
FACEBOOK, INC.,)	
a Delaware corporation,)	
)	
Defendant-Counterclaimant.)	

**PLAINTIFF LEADER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S FOURTH SET OF
INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC. (NO. 18)**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33 and Local Rule 5.4, Plaintiff Leader Technologies, Inc. ("Leader") hereby requests that Defendant Facebook, Inc. ("Facebook") answer the following interrogatories in writing and under oath, in accordance with the following Definitions and Instructions within thirty (30) days after the service of these interrogatories. These interrogatories request all information and items within the knowledge of Facebook, its agents, representatives, persons acting on its behalf and attorneys.

These interrogatories are continuing in nature and Facebook shall promptly serve upon Leader supplemental answers in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(e) and the Local Rules of the District of Delaware as Facebook acquires additional knowledge or information responsive to these interrogatories.

DEFINITIONS

1. The terms "Plaintiff" and "Leader" shall mean Plaintiff Leader Technologies, Inc., its present and former directors, officers, employees, parent organization(s), subsidiary organization(s), predecessors in interest, successors in interest, divisions, servants, agents,

attorneys, consultants, partners, associates, investigators, representatives, accountants, financial advisors, distributors and any other person acting on its behalf, pursuant to its authority or subject to its control.

2. The terms “you,” “your,” “Facebook,” and “Defendant” shall mean Defendant Facebook, Inc. (“Facebook”), its present and former directors, officers, employees, parent organization(s), subsidiary organization(s) including ConnectU, Inc., predecessors in interest, successors in interest, divisions, servants, agents, attorneys, consultants, partners, associates, investigators, representatives, accountants, financial advisors, distributors and any other person acting on its behalf, pursuant to its authority or subject to its control.

3. The terms “761 Patent” and “invention” shall mean United States Patent No. 7,139,761 entitled “Dynamic Association of Electronically Stored Information with Iterative Workflow Changes,” the application leading to this patent and any related patent application, including any WIPO, EPO or other foreign counterpart application or patents, any continuations, continuations in part, divisionals, reissues, reexaminations, extensions or parents thereof.

4. The words “and” and “or” shall be construed conjunctively or disjunctively in a manner making the request inclusive rather than exclusive.

5. The singular of any word or phrase shall include the plural of such word or phrase, and the plural of any word or phrase shall include the singular of such word or phrase.

6. The term “all” shall mean “any and all” and the term “any” shall mean “any and all.”

INSTRUCTIONS

A. In answering the following interrogatories, furnish all information available to Defendant, including information in the possession of its subsidiaries, officers, directors,

attorneys, agents, employees, associates, and investigators; not merely information of the personal knowledge of the person answering these interrogatories.

B. If you cannot answer the following interrogatories fully and completely, after exercising due diligence to secure the information to do so, please so state and answer each such interrogatory to the fullest extent possible and specify the portion of each interrogatory that you claim to be unable to answer fully and completely. Please state the facts upon which you rely to support your contention that you are unable to answer the interrogatory fully and completely and state what knowledge, information or belief you have concerning the unanswered portion of each such interrogatory. These interrogatories shall be continuous in nature, and pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P 26(e) and the Local Rules of the District of Delaware, you are under the continuing obligation to promptly serve supplemental and/or amended responses to the interrogatories.

C. If you contend that any information requested is privileged or otherwise excludable from discovery, you are requested to describe any such information in sufficient detail for identification purposes and to state the basis for the asserted privilege or grounds for exclusion. If you contend that any responsive document is privileged, in whole or in part, or otherwise excludable from discovery, set forth the following information: (1) the author(s) of the document, (2) a statement of the grounds upon which the claim of privilege is based, (3) the location of the document requested, (4) each person to whom the document was addressed, (5) each person who received copies of the document or were otherwise advised of its contents, and (6) a general description of the subject matter of the document.

D. If a document, including source code, once existed and has subsequently been lost, destroyed or is otherwise missing, please identify the document and state the details concerning the loss or destruction of such document.

Objection will be made at the time of any trial or hearing to any attempt to introduce evidence which is directly sought by these interrogatories and to which no disclosure has been made.

INTERROGATORIES


INTERROGATORY NO. 18:

For Facebook's contention that each of Leader's asserted claims are invalid because they lack novelty and/or are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103, provide a chart or charts that specifically identify where each limitation of each asserted claim of the '761 Patent is found in each and every prior art reference upon which Facebook intends to rely and a complete description of why and how each limitation of each claim is allegedly anticipated and/or rendered obvious by such prior art.

POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP

OF COUNSEL:

Paul J. Andre
Lisa Kobialka
KING & SPALDING LLP
333 Twin Dolphin Drive
Suite 400
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
(650) 590-0700

By: 
Philip A. Rover (#3215)
Hercules Plaza
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 984-6000
provner@potteranderson.com

Dated: September 28, 2009
935205

*Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterdefendant
Leader Technologies, Inc.*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Philip A. Rovner, hereby certify that on September 28, 2009, true and correct copies of the within document were served on the following counsel of record, at the addresses and in the manner indicated:

BY EMAIL AND FIRST CLASS MAIL

Thomas P. Preston, Esq.
Steven L. Caponi, Esq.
Blank Rome LLP
1201 Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
Preston-T@blankrome.com
caponi@blankrome.com

Heidi L. Keefe, Esq.
Mark R. Weinstein, Esq.
Cooley Godward Kronish LLP
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
hkeefe@cooley.com
mweinstein@cooley.com



Philip A. Rovner (#3215)
Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP
Hercules Plaza
P. O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 984-6000
provner@potteranderson.com

Exhibit 16

**THIS EXHIBIT HAS BEEN
REDACTED IN ITS ENTIRETY**

Exhibit 17

**THIS EXHIBIT HAS BEEN
REDACTED IN ITS ENTIRETY**