

Exhibit 906

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 10-24063-CIV-MORENO

MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,)
Plaintiff / Counterclaim Defendant,)
v.)
MICROSOFT CORPORATION,)
Defendant / Counterclaim Plaintiff.)

**PLAINTIFF MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.'S UPDATED PROPOSED
CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT**

Motorola Mobility, Inc. (“Motorola Mobility”) submits the attached chart identifying its updated proposed constructions of the claim limitations of the patents-in-suit for which the parties seek construction by the Court.

Motorola Mobility’s provides this submission without waiver of or prejudice to its right to amend or supplement as a result of further analysis, ongoing discovery, and in response to amendment or supplementation of constructions proposed by Microsoft Corporation (“Microsoft”). In particular, Motorola Mobility may amend its constructions to narrow the gap between its constructions and Microsoft’s to allow for resolution of as many claim construction disputes as possible prior to the submission of the parties’ claim construction briefs.

Dated: June 3, 2011

By: /s/ Leslie M. Spencer

Jesse J. Jenner
Steven Pepe
Khue V. Hoang
Leslie M. Spencer
Ropes & Gray LLP
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020
Telephone: (212) 596-9000

Norman H. Beamer
Mark D. Rowland
Gabrielle E. Higgins
Ropes & Gray LLP
1900 University Avenue, 6th Floor
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Telephone: (650) 617-4000

Kevin J. Post
Megan F. Raymond
Ropes & Gray LLP
One Metro Center
700 12th Street NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 508-4600

Edward M. Mullins
Hal M. Lucas
Astigarraga Davis Mullins & Grossman, P.A.
701 Brickell Avenue
16th Floor
Miami, FL 33131
Telephone: (305) 372-8282

Attorneys for Plaintiff / Counterclaim Defendant
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 3, 2011, copies of the foregoing Plaintiff Motorola Mobility, Inc.'s Updated Proposed Claim Constructions For The Patents-In-Suit were served by e-mail upon the counsel of record included in the attached Service List.

/s/Leslie M. Spencer
Leslie M. Spencer

SERVICE LIST

Motorola Mobility, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp., Case No. 1:10-cv-24063-MORENO

Roberto Martinez, Esq.
Curtis Miner, Esq.
COLSON HICKS EIDSON
255 Alhambra Circle, Penthouse
Coral Gables, FL 33134
Tel: (305) 476-7400
Email: curt@colson.com
bob@colson.com

*Attorneys for Defendant /
Counterclaim Plaintiff*
MICROSOFT CORPORATION

Of Counsel:

David T. Pritikin
Richard A. Cederoth
Douglas I. Lewis
John W. McBride
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
One South Dearborn
Chicago, IL 60603
Tel: (312) 853-7000
Email: dpritikin@sidley.com
rcederoth@sidley.com
dilewis@sidley.com
jmcbri01@sidley.com

Brian R. Nester
Kevin C. Wheeler
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 736-8000
Email: bnester@sidley.com
kwheeler@sidley.com

Motorola Patent No. 5,764,899

Claim Term/ Identified By	Claims	Motorola Proposed Construction
Microsoft proposed term: A system for communicating reply data with a communication unit comprising	1	The preamble is not limiting and should be construed according to its plain and ordinary meaning.
Microsoft proposed term: a host server, in communication with the communication server	1	A computer or a program that operates as an e-mail post office, which can exchange data with the communication server
Microsoft proposed term: email; e-mail	1, 15,18	This element requires no construction and should be accorded its plain and ordinary meaning. If this element is construed, it should be given the following meaning: "electronic mail"
Microsoft proposed term: "forwarding" / "forward" / "forwards" / "forwarded"	1, 14, 16, 17	This element requires no construction and should be accorded its plain and ordinary meaning. If this element is construed, it should be given the following meaning: "Forwarding from one computer or program to another"
Microsoft proposed term: a determination is made whether to forward the optimized reply or a replica reply	14	This element requires no construction and should be accorded its plain and ordinary meaning. If this element is construed, it should be given the following meaning: "the communication server decides whether to forward the optimized reply or the replica reply."