EXHIBIT A

rsonalized User Model LLP v. Google In

Doc. 291 Att. 1

EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT C

EXHIBIT D

EXHIBIT E

EXHIBIT F

EXHIBIT G

SNR DENTON

SNR Denton US LLP 101 JFK Parkway Short Hills, NJ 07078-2708 USA Christian E. Samay Partner christian.samay@snrdenton.com D +1 973 912 7180 T +1 973 912 7100 F +1 973 912 7199

snrdenton.com

June 1, 2011

VIA E-MAIL AND REGULAR MAIL

Andrea Pallios Roberts
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP
555 Twin Dolphin Drive
5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Re:

Personalized User Model LLP v. Google Inc.

C.A. No. 09-00525-LPS

Dear Andrea:

This letter responds to portions of your May 31, 2011 letter regarding the parties' meet and confer on various outstanding discovery issues. During the meet and confer PUM agreed to let Google know by today whether it would agree to produce communications relating to the scheduling of the 1/19/11 and 2/7/11 meetings, the subject matter discussed during those meetings, and PUM's preparation of its Fourth Supplemental Response to Interrogatory No. 1. As we explained during the meet and confer, we do not understand the Court's Order to require the production of these materials. Further, we do not agree with Google's "sword and shield" characterization of this issue. Per the Court's Order, Google was permitted to inquire as to what occurred during these meetings; and per the Court's Order PUM will produce Mr. Konig to discuss what occurred during these meetings. In PUM's view, no sword and shield issue remains. Rather, it seems that Google is being opportunistic — attempting to use this issue as a wedge to obtain a waiver of uncertain breadth and scope. PUM, therefore, will not produce the documentation requested in your 5/18/11 letter regarding this topic.

Your letter also requested confirmation that all documents shown to Messrs. Twersky and Konig during the 1/19/11 and 2/7/11 meetings have been produced. They have. Additionally, per your request, PUM will identify the documents, if any, on its privilege log that relate to conception/reduction.

PUM also indicated it would inform Google by today whether it would supplement its Responses to Google's Interrogatory Nos. 17-24 to cure the so-called deficiency of incorporation by reference. While PUM disagrees that its responses are in any way deficient, and that its incorporation of portions of its Response to Google Interrogatory No. 11 by reference is in any way improper, rather than waste the Court's time on this issue PUM will provide the requested supplementation either via the suggested compromise or otherwise. PUM, however, does not want to have to supplement again once PUM obtains the additional technical information requested from Google (*i.e.*, the source code, the completed interrogatory responses, and/or additional testimony via the requested 30(b)(6) deposition). PUM,

SNR DENTON

Andrea Pallios Roberts June 1, 2011 Page 2

therefore, will provide a date for completing such supplementation after Google provides the requested information.

PUM will addres the remainder of your May 31, 2011 letter via separate correspondence.

Very truly yours,

Christian E. Samay Christian E. Samay

aen Enclosure

EXHIBIT H

Personalized User Model's Privilege Log Personalized User Model LLC v. Google, Inc.

Section 25.5		Г			r '	
Privilege Basis	AC	AC		AC	Q	AC
Description	E-mail from attorney to client made in preparation AC and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from client to attorney made in preparation AC and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from attorney to client made in preparation and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from client to attorney made in preparation AC and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from client to attorney made in preparation AC and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mall from attorney to client made in preparation AC and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.
Date	1/18/2011	1/18/2011	1/18/2011	1/18/2011	1/30/2011	1/31/2011
20				Yochai Konig	Roy Twersky; Mark Nelson, Esq.; Jimmy Shin, Esq.; Jennifer Bennett, Esq.; Karen Jacobs Louden, Esq.	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.
To (Recipient)	Roy Twersky; Yochai Konig	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.; Roy Twersky	Roy Twersky; Yochai Konig	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.	Marc Friedman, Esq.	Yochai Konig; Mark Nelson, Esq.
From (Author)	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.	Yochai Konig	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.	Roy Twersky	Yochai Konig	Marc Feiedman, Esq.
PRIV#	PRIV 979	PRIV 980	PRIV 981	PRIV 982	PRIV 983	PRIV 984

Personalized User Model's Privilege Log Personalized User Model LLC v. Google, Inc.

Prívilege Basis	AC	AC	AC	AC	AC	AC	AC
Description	E-mail from attorney to client made in preparation AC and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from attorney to client made in preparation and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from attorney to client made in preparation and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from attorney to client made in preparation and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from attorney to client made in preparation and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from client to attorney made in preparation AC and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from attorney to client made in preparation and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.
Date	2/6/2011	2/6/2011	2/6/2011	2/8/2011	2/8/2011	2/8/2011	2/8/2011
20	Yochai Konig	Roy Twersky; Yochai Konig	Roy Twersky; Yochai Konig; Mark Nelson, Esq.				
To (Recipient)	Roy Twersky	Yochai Konig	Roy Twersky	Roy Twersky; Yochai Konig	Roy Twersky	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.; Roy Twersky	Roy Twersky; Yochai Konig
From (Author)	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.	Yochai Konig	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.
PRIV#	PRIV 985	PRIV 986	PRIV 987	PRIV 988	PRIV 989	PRIV 990	PRIV 991

Personalized User Model's Privilege Log Personalized User Model LLC v. Google, Inc.

Privilege Basis			,		
£ ."	AC	AC	Q Y	AC	AC
Describtion	E-mail from attorney to client made in preparation AC and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from attorney to client made in preparation AC and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from client to attorney made in preparation AC and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from attorney to client made in preparation AC and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.	E-mail from attorney to client made in preparation AC and reflecting the substance of a confidential communication regarding ongoing litigation.
Date	2/8/2011	2/8/2011	2/8/2011	2/8/2011	2/8/2011
၁၅					
To (Recipient)	Roy Twersky; Yochai Konig	Roy Twersky	Mark Nelson, Esq.; Mark Friedman, Esq.; Jimmy Shin, Esq.; Jennifer Bennett, Esq.; Yochai Konig	Roy Twersky; Yochai Konig	Roy Twersky
From (Author)	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.	PRIV 994 Roy Twersky	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.	Jennifer Bennett, Esq.
PRIV#	PRIV 992	PRIV 993	PRIV 994	PRIV 995	PRIV 996

EXHIBIT I

Andrea P Roberts

From:

Larson, Matthew P. [matthew.larson@snrdenton.com]

Sent:

Thursday, June 16, 2011 6:31 PM

To:

Andrea P Roberts

Cc:

Google-PUM; 'rhorwitz@potteranderson.com'; 'dmoore@potteranderson.com'; PUM

Subject:

RE: PUM v. Google

Andrea.

Your initial May 18, 2011 letter did not request "all communications ... that relate to conception," rather, Google requested the production of "any written communications with Konig or Twersky regarding scheduling the January 19 and February 7 meetings, the subject matters discussed at those meetings, and PUM's preparation of its Fourth Supplemental Response to Interrogatory No. 1." The privilege log provided, therefore, reflects all written, privileged communications subsequent to the December inventor depositions that relate to the January 19 and February 7 meetings and preparation of P.U.M.'s Fourth Supplemental Response to Interrogatory No. 1. This is consistent with PUM's June 1, 2011 letter (refusing to produce "communications relating to the scheduling of the 1/19/11 and 2/7/11 meetings, the subject matter discussed during those meetings, and PUM's preparation of its Fourth Supplemental Response to Interrogatory No. 1") referenced in your June 10, 2011 e-mail and these are the written communications reflected in P.U.M.'s June 20, 2011 privilege log. Please feel free to contact Christian Samay with any questions.

Regards, Matt

Matthew P. Larson SNR Denton US LLP D +1 650 798 0328 matthew.larson@snrdenton.com snrdenton.com x] -----

1530 Page Mill Road Suite 200 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1125

SNR Denton is the collective trade name for an international legal practice. This email may be confidential and protected by legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, disclosure, copying, distribution and use are prohibited; please notify us immediately and delete this copy from your system. Please see surdenton.com for Legal Notices, including IRS Circular 230 Notice.

From: Andrea P Roberts [mailto:andreaproberts@quinnemanuel.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 2:33 PM

To: Larson, Matthew P.; PUM

Cc: Google-PUM; 'rhorwitz@potteranderson.com'; 'dmoore@potteranderson.com'

Subject: PUM v. Google

Matt,

I write in response to your June 10, 2011 email below attaching PUM's log of privileged communications, which is attached hereto for your reference. Please confirm that this log reflects all communications subsequent to the December inventor depositions that relate to conception, the meetings with the inventors regarding same, and/or the changing of the interrogatory response and Mr. Twersky's testimony concerning conception, that have been withheld by PUM as privileged. (See A. Roberts 6/10/11 email; D. Perlson 6/9/11 email requesting same).

Thank you,

Andrea

1 . 42.12.11

Andrea Pallios Roberts Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP

555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor Redwood Shores, CA 94065 650-801-5023 Direct 650.801.5000 Main Office Number 650.801.5100 FAX andreaproberts@guinnemanuel.com www.guinnemanuel.com

NOTICE: The information contained in this e-mail message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the recipient(s) named above. This message may be an attorney-client communication and/or work product and as such is privileged and confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail, and delete the original message.

38 227 . . 1

From: Larson, Matthew P. [mailto:matthew.larson@snrdenton.com]

Sent: Friday, June 10, 2011 5:46 PM

To: Andrea P Roberts **Cc:** Google-PUM

Subject:

Dear Andrea:

P.U.M.'s log of all privileged communications withheld from production in response to the requests in your May 31, 2011 letter is attached.

Kind Regards, Matt

Matthew P. Larson SNR Denton US LLP D +1 650 798 0328 matthew.larson@snrdenton.com snrdenton.com ×

1530 Page Mill Road Suite 200 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1125

SNR Denton is the collective trade name for an international legal practice. This email may be confidential and protected by legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, disclosure, copying, distribution and use are prohibited; please notify us immediately and delete this copy from your system. Please see surdenton.com for Legal Notices, including IRS Circular 230 Notice.