

# EXHIBIT O

**From:** Brody, Michael L.  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2012 1:15 PM  
**To:** 'Hankel, Aaron E. (SHB)'; Starr, Bart (SHB); Webb, B. Trent (SHB); Reckers, Robert H. (SHB)  
**Cc:** Bloch, David S.; Padmanabhan, Krishnan; Winn, James; Sharifi, Pejman F.; 'jfowler@foulston.com'; Herndon, Lynn C. (SHB)  
**Subject:** RE: Today's call

Thanks for the thought, Aaron, but as a general matter, it is not Cox's practice to voluntarily subject its subsidiaries to jurisdiction in venues where they are not present, as, I suppose, was implicit in our motion to dismiss CCI. We would think that a venue that is the corporate home of all of the affected parties, which will probably see more patent filings than any other venue in the country this year, and which can draw on the public record of the work done in the prior cases would be a pretty good choice for disposition of this controversy. Still, we will take your suggestion to the client and let you know if our views change as a consequence.

**From:** Hankel, Aaron E. (SHB) [mailto:AHANKEL@shb.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2012 1:00 PM  
**To:** Brody, Michael L.; Starr, Bart (SHB); Webb, B. Trent (SHB); Reckers, Robert H. (SHB)  
**Cc:** Bloch, David S.; Padmanabhan, Krishnan; Winn, James; Sharifi, Pejman F.; 'jfowler@foulston.com'; Herndon, Lynn C. (SHB)  
**Subject:** RE: Today's call

Mike,

We also appreciate your efforts to work through our disagreements without contested motion practice. Your email generally tracks our position, although the wording might be a bit off.

As for your stated preference to have this dispute “adjudicated in a single proceeding,” have you given any thought to intervention under Rule 24? For all the reasons we have discussed, we of course do not think it necessary. But it is an option at your disposal—or, in your words, another “clear path to finality.” And, frankly, it is a much better option than transferring this case to a distant forum having no meaningful connection to the case.

Thanks.

Aaron

**From:** Brody, Michael L. [mailto:MBrody@winston.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2012 12:06 PM  
**To:** Hankel, Aaron E. (SHB); Starr, Bart (SHB); Webb, B. Trent (SHB); Reckers, Robert H. (SHB)  
**Cc:** Bloch, David S.; Padmanabhan, Krishnan; Winn, James; Sharifi, Pejman F.; 'jfowler@foulston.com'  
**Subject:** Today's call

Aaron –

Just wanted to confirm our understanding of where we left things:

As to CCI, it is Sprint's position that it wants relief against CCI in this case, and that it believes there is jurisdiction over CCI in Kansas. We disagree as to the latter point, but will consider the points you raised and proceed accordingly in responding to your amended complaint.

As to the local Cox entities that are not party to this case, but sell allegedly infringing telecom services or own or operate allegedly infringing devices, our understanding is that (a) it is not Sprint's intent to limit this case to the alleged infringement which you contend occurs in Kansas, (b) Sprint believes that it can receive all of the nationwide relief to which it may be entitled by pursuing CCI and CoxComm, (c) Sprint wants to reserve its rights as to the unnamed entities pending discovery and is not prepared to make a legally binding commitment not to sue the unnamed entities at this point in the proceeding, and (d) Sprint is not agreeable to transfer this case to Delaware, where all Cox entities can be joined.

Let me know if I have misunderstood your position in any way. Thanks for taking the time to talk this through. We appreciate your willingness to engage in an effort to get clarity on these issues and to try to find a mutually agreeable posture for adjudication of this case. Let me emphasize once again that Cox has no objection to and affirmatively prefers having this dispute adjudicated in a single proceeding that will be dispositive of and binding on both Sprint and all relevant Cox parties as to Sprint's claims. Let me also confirm that we believe that can be accomplished in Delaware and would have no objection to transferring the case to that jurisdiction and to adding all relevant entities. Understanding that Sprint is not agreeable to that option, and in the absence of any other clear path to finality, we will consider whether Cox wishes to seek transfer to Delaware and seek such relief as we deem appropriate.

Mike

**Michael L. Brody**

**Partner**

Winston & Strawn LLP  
35 W. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60601-9703

D: +1 (312) 558-6385

F: +1 (312) 558-5700

[Bio](#) | [VCard](#) | [Email](#) | [www.winston.com](http://www.winston.com)

The contents of this message may be privileged and confidential. Therefore, if this

message has been received in error, please delete it without reading it. Your receipt of this message is not intended to waive any applicable privilege. Please do not disseminate this message without the permission of the author.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\* Any tax advice contained in this email was not intended to be used, and cannot be used, by you (or any other taxpayer) to avoid penalties under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended.

Mail Gate made the following annotations on Thu Apr 05 2012 12:59:22

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This e-mail message including attachments, if any, is intended for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.