IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

SPARK NETWORK SERVICES, INC.,) Civil Action No. 07 CV 570
Plaintiff,) Civil Action No. 07 CV 570
V.) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
MATCH.COM, LP, eHARMONY.COM., INC. AND YAHOO!, INC.)
Defendants,)

SPARK NETWORKS SERVICES, INC.'S REPLY **TO COUNTERCLAIMS OF DEFENDANT, eHARMONY**

Spark Networks Services, Inc. ("Spark"), for its Answer to the Counterclaim of

eHarmony.com, states as follows:

THE PARTIES

eHarmony is a California corporation with its principal place of business in 1. Pasadena, California.

RESPONSE: Admitted

Upon information and belief, SNS is an Illinois corporation with its principal 2. place of business in Des Plaines, Illinois.

RESPONSE: Admitted.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The counterclaims are filed and these proceedings are instituted against SNS under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1, et. seq., and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

RESPONSE: Admitted. 4. This Court has original jurisdiction over the patent counterclaims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

RESPONSE: Admitted.

5. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400.

RESPONSE: Admitted.

6. There is an actual and justiciable controversy within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202 between eHamony and SNS with respect to whether the '467 patent is valid and has been directly or indirectly infringed by eHarmony, either literally or by virtue of the doctrine of equivalents, resulting in alleged liability for infringement thereof.

RESPONSE: Admitted (though Spark denies that the '467 patent is invalid or not infringed).

FIRST COUNTERCLAIM FOR AFFIRMATIVE RELIEF (Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity)

7. eHarmony realleges and incorporates paragraphs 1-6 of these Counterclaims as it fully set forth herein.

RESPONSE: Spark realleges and incorporates its responses to Paragraphs 1-6.

8. Each claim of the '467 patent is invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the conditions and requirements for patentability set forth in 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 112.

RESPONSE: Denied.

SECOND COUNTERCLAIM FOR AFFIRMATIVE RELIEF (Declaratory Judgment of Noninfringement)

9. eHarmony realleges and incorporates Paragraphs 1-8 of these Counterclaims as it fully set forth herein.

RESPONSE: Spark realleges and incorporates its responses to Paragraphs 1-8.

10. eHarmony has not infringed and is not now infringing any claim of the '467 patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

RESPONSE: Denied.

11. eHarmony has not and is not now inducing or contributing to the infringement of any claim of the '467 patent by others, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

RESPONSE: Denied.

/s/ Paul K. Vickrey

Paul K. Vickrey Raymond P. Niro, Jr. Frederick C. Laney NIRO, SCAVONE, HALLER & NIRO 181 West Madison Street, Suite 4600 Chicago, Illinois 60602 (312) 236-0733

Attorneys for Plaintiff, SPARK NETWORK SERVICES, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing **SPARK NETWORKS SERVICES, INC.'S REPLY TO COUNTERCLAIMS OF DEFENDANT, eHARMONY** was served upon the following parties on this 12th day of April, by electronic filing:

> Jason C. White Stephanie J. Felicetty William H. Frankel Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione NBC Tower - Suite 3600 455 North Cityfront Plaza Drive Chicago, IL 60611 (312) 321-4225 Attorneys for Yahoo!

Larry D. Carlson Kevin J. Meek Chad C. Walters John C. Nickelson Baker Botts L.L.P. 2001 Ross Avenue Dallas, Texas 75201 214-953-6525 Fax: 214-661-4525

Attorneys for Match.com

Chester Day Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP 1000 Marsh Road Menlo Park, CA 94025 650-614-7400 Fax 650-614-7401

Leif R. Sigmond, Jr. Jennifer M. Kurcz S. Richard Carden McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP 300 S. Wacker Drive Suite 3200 Chicago, IL 60606 312-913-0001 Attorneys for eHarmony

/s/ Paul K. Vickrey