



1313 North Market Street
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899-0951
302 934 6000

www.potteranderson.com

David E. Moore
Partner
Attorney at Law
dmoore@potteranderson.com
302 984-6147 Direct Phone
302 658-1192 Fax

May 6, 2010

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

The Honorable Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.
United States District Court
844 King Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Re: *Personalized User Model LLP v. Google Inc., C.A. No. 09-00525-JJF*

Dear Judge Farnan:

I am writing on behalf of Google in response to PUM's May 5, 2010 letter (D.I. 43), concerning the Court's Rule 16 Scheduling Order (D.I. 32).

As Google noted in its April 24 correspondence, Plaintiff's informal letter-writing campaign to the Court is inappropriate. (D.I. 41). PUM's May 5 letter is particularly improper under Local Rule 7.1.5, which provides that motions for reargument are to be decided only on the motion and response, with no reply. Since PUM's original April 22, 2010 letter (D.I. 37) amounts to an informal motion for re-argument of the Court's Rule 16 Scheduling Order, its May 5 "reply" letter is in violation of the Local Rules. Google pointed out in its last letter that such a reply would violate Local Rule 7.1.5 (D.I. 41 at 1 n.1), but PUM ignored this.

While Google disagrees with the substance of PUM's May 5 letter, in lieu of providing another lengthy substantive response, Google respectfully requests that the Court ignore PUM's May 5 letter, and that it be stricken. Google's counsel is available at the Court's convenience should the Court wish to discuss the issue of bifurcation or PUM's correspondence.

Respectfully,

/s/ David E. Moore

David E. Moore

RLH/msb/965135/34638

cc: Clerk of the Court (By Hand Delivery) (w/enclosures)
Counsel of Record (By Electronic Filing) (w/enclosures)