IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

| COOPER NOTIFICATION, INC., |) |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Plaintiff, |) Civil Action No. 09-865-JJF |
| v. |)) |
| TWITTER, INC., a Delaware corporation, EVERBRIDGE INC., a Delaware corporation, RAVE WIRELESS INC., a Delaware corporation, FEDERAL SIGNAL CORP., a Delaware corporation, |) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)))))) |
| Defendants |) |

PLAINTIFF COOPER NOTIFICATION, INC.'S REPLY TO COUNTERCLAIMS OF DEFENDANT RAVE WIRELESS INC.

Plaintiff Cooper Notification, Inc. ("Cooper") replies to the counterclaims set forth by

Defendant Rave Wireless Inc. ("Rave Wireless") in its Answer, Defenses, and Counterclaims to

Cooper's Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement ("Counterclaims") as follows:

- 1. The allegations of paragraph 41 are legal conclusions, and do not require a responsive pleading. To the extent a response is required, Cooper does not dispute that the counterclaims purport to seek a declaratory judgment.
- 2. The allegations of paragraph 42 are legal conclusions, and do not require a responsive pleading. To the extent a response is required, Cooper does not dispute that subject matter jurisdiction in this district is proper.
- 3. The allegations of paragraph 43 are legal conclusions, and do not require a responsive pleading. To the extent a response is required, Cooper does not dispute that personal jurisdiction in this district is proper.

- 4. The allegations of paragraph 44 are legal conclusions, and do not require a responsive pleading. To the extent a response is required, Cooper does not dispute that venue is proper in this district.
- 5. On information and belief, Rave Wireless is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 50 Speen Street, Suite 301, Framingham, Massachusetts 01701.
 - 6. The allegations of paragraph 46 are admitted.

COUNT I

- 7. The allegations of paragraph 47 are legal conclusions, and do not require a responsive pleading. To the extent a response is required, Cooper does not dispute that there is an actual controversy between Cooper and Rave Wireless regarding Rave Wireless' infringement of the '428 Patent.
- 8. The allegations of paragraph 48 are legal conclusions, and do not require a responsive pleading. To the extent a response is required, Cooper does not dispute that the counterclaim purports to seek a declaratory judgment.

COUNT II

- 9. The allegations of paragraph 49 are legal conclusions, and do not require a responsive pleading. To the extent a response is required, Cooper does not dispute that there is an actual controversy between Cooper and Rave Wireless regarding the validity of the '428 Patent, which is presumed to be valid.
- 10. The allegations of paragraph 50 are legal conclusions, and do not require a responsive pleading. To the extent a response is required, Cooper does not dispute that the counterclaim purports to seek a declaratory judgment.

COUNT III

11. Cooper denies the allegations of Paragraph 51 of the Counterclaims.

JURY DEMAND

12. The allegations of paragraph 52 are legal conclusions, and do not require a responsive pleading. To the extent a response is required, Cooper does not dispute that the counterclaim purports to seek a trial by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Cooper denies that Rave Wireless is entitled to any judgment or relief in its favor, including the relief sought in paragraphs A through E of the Prayer for Relief in the Defendant's Counterclaims.

POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP

OF COUNSEL

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

Dated: March 26, 2010

958800

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff Cooper Notification, Inc.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Philip A. Rovner, hereby certify that on March 26, 2010, the within document was filed with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF which will send notification of such filing(s) to the following; that the document was served on the following counsel as indicated; and that the document is available for viewing and downloading from CM/ECF.

BY CM-ECF AND E-MAIL

John G. Day, Esq.
Lauren E. Maguire, Esq.
Caroline Hong, Esq.
Ashby & Geddes
500 Delaware Avenue, 8th floor
P.O. Box 1150
Wilmington, DE 19899
jday@ashby-geddes.com
lmaguire@ashby-geddes.com
chong@ashby-geddes.com

Stamatios Stamoulis, Esq. Richard C. Weinblatt, Esq. Stamoulis & Weinblatt LLC Two Fox Point Centre 6 Denny Road, Suite 307 Wilmington, DE 19800 stamoulis@swdelaw.com weinblatt@swdelaw.com

Frederick L. Cottrell, III, Esq. Laura D. Hatcher, Esq. Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A. One Rodney Square 920 N. King Street Wilmington, DE 19801 Cottrell@rlf.com hatcher@rlf.com

John W. Shaw, Esq.
James L. Higgins, Esq.
Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor, LLP
The Brandywine Building
1000 West Street, 17th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801
jshaw@ycst.com
jhiggins@ycst.com

I hereby certify that on March 26, 2010 I have sent by E-mail the foregoing

document to the following non-registered participants:

Edward Cavazos, Esq.
Michael Chibib, Esq.
Joshua L. Tucker, Esq.
Bracewell & Giuliani LLP
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 2300
Austin, TX 78701
Edward.cavazos@bgllp.com
Michael.chibib@bgllp.com
Josh.tucker@bgllp.com

Lynn H. Pasahow, Esq.
J. David Hadden, Esq.
David D. Schumann, Esq.
Elizabeth J. White, Esq.
Phillip J. Haack, Esq.
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
lpasahow@fenwick.com
dhadden@fenwick.com
dschumann@fenwick.com
bwhite@fenwick.com
phaack@fenwick.com

Daniel W. McDonald, Esq.
Thomas J. Leach, Esq.
Merchant & Gould P.C.
3200 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
dmcdonald@merchantgould.com
tleach@merchantgould.com

/s/ Philip A. Rovner

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