

EXHIBIT I

December 4, 2007

COPY

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Mr. Paul K. Vickrey
Niro, Savone, Haller & Niro
181 West Madison
Suite 4600
Chicago, IL 60602

Eric A. Sacks
Tel 312 923-2801
Fax 312 840-7201
esacks@jenner.com

Dear Paul:

Enclosed please find documents bearing production nos. FR00001 - FR00096 and FR00099-FR00114 responsive to your expedited discovery request of November 20, 2007. (The documents numbered FR00097 - FR00098 have been placed on a privilege log.) We will be producing privilege logs to you tomorrow. Fish & Richardson makes this production subject to its objections, including those listed in David Bradford's letter to you of November 27, 2007 and the concerns further elaborated here. Please note that several of the documents are designated as "Confidential Information" under the agreed-to protective order.

As to your first document request, we are producing all responsive documents that we could locate, following a reasonable search, that are not privileged or work product. A number of responsive documents are privileged and/or work product and for that reason will be listed on privilege logs. Those include communications in which Mr. Steele, acting as firm counsel, and/or Kathy Lutton assisting firm counsel, was advising Fish & Richardson on legal issues related to Mr. Harris's conduct in suing a firm client, Dell Computer, while still a partner in the law firm. While Mr. Harris participated in those communications, his communications were for the purpose of providing information to firm counsel to allow counsel to provide legal advice to Fish & Richardson in furtherance of their common interest in responding appropriately to circumstances in which a firm partner had sued a firm client. As a consequence, Mr. Harris's communications with Mr. Steele and other counsel at the firm for that purpose are protected by the attorney client privilege (including the common interest doctrine) and/or work product doctrine.

We note that a number of these privileged communications apparently were removed by Mr. Harris when he left the firm and have been shared by him with third parties and third-party representatives, in breach of Mr. Harris's fiduciary duty obligations under the common interest doctrine. Indeed, it is apparent that Mr. Harris wrongfully disclosed the content of certain of these privileged communications in his pleadings in this case. We reserve all rights with respect to Mr. Harris's conduct in disclosing these confidential communications. Fish & Richardson also reserves all rights and remedies with respect to any individual or entity with whom Harris improperly shared these communications.

Paul K. Vickrey
December 4, 2007
Page 2

Given that Mr. Harris was a participant in these communications and that he already has copies of many of them, we would be willing to discuss an appropriate procedure for both parties to use the documents in the litigation between Mr. Harris and Fish & Richardson. In fact, the documents are now evidence of Mr. Harris's breaches of his duty of loyalty. However, we are listing them on a privilege log at this time, to make clear our position that the documents are privileged and so as to avoid any suggestions that Mr. Harris had any right to waive that privilege, that Fish & Richardson has waived privilege, or that Fish & Richardson has waived any rights and claims arising out of Mr. Harris's prior wrongful disclosure of these communications. Fish & Richardson continues to object to the use of these privileged communications by any third party, including but not limited to Illinois Computer Research, LLC and Memory Control Enterprises, Inc.

Also responsive to your first document request are communications between Mr. Harris and representatives of a law firm client with whom Mr. Harris entered into licensing arrangements as to the '252 patent (he is well aware of the client's name). We have logged as privileged communications between Mr. Harris, in his capacity as attorney, and that client. We are producing in the enclosed sealed envelope responsive documents reflecting communications between Mr. Harris, in his business capacity as licensor, and that client. We have marked these documents "Confidential Information" under the Protective Order. We are producing these to you solely in your capacity as counsel to Mr. Harris.

To the extent that the firm's client retains a confidentiality interest in these documents that would be implicated by disclosure of the documents to persons other than Fish & Richardson or Mr. Harris (or their counsel), we do not waive that interest. Given your role as both counsel to Mr. Harris and counsel to parties other than Mr. Harris, we do not consent to your review of these documents in any capacity other than as counsel for Mr. Harris. Should you choose to open the envelope and review these or other confidential communications with Mr. Harris, as to which some other party has a confidentiality or privilege interest, including interests held by Fish & Richardson, please understand that you necessarily must do so at your own risk.

Your second request has two parts. First, it seeks the Fish & Richardson e-mail policy and related documents. We are producing responsive documents, which you will note have been stamped "Confidential Information" and are so designated under the Protective Order. The second part contains a request that you clarified in your letter to David Bradford dated November 29, 2007. The documents that you have now requested – a list containing the names of attorneys whose e-mail accounts were searched by firm management at any time and for any reason – seeks privileged communication and attorney work product. We also do not see how your request is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible information. We further note that collecting and logging those documents would be unduly burdensome and may invade privacy interests of the referenced Fish & Richardson attorneys. Accordingly, Fish & Richardson objects to the production of those documents and/or identification of these attorneys.

Paul K. Vickrey
December 4, 2007
Page 3

Your third request seeks documents related to what you have called an "investigation" of Mr. Harris. As you know, we object to your characterization of any activity by Fish & Richardson in the Spring 2007. In any event, many of the documents responsive to your request also are subject to your first document request and we incorporate Fish & Richardson's response and objections to that request here. All documents responsive to your third request in the possession of Fish & Richardson, located after a reasonable search, have been produced or logged, as appropriate.

Please let us know if you have any questions about our response. Of course, we are available to discuss any matter raised in this letter with you further. Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Eric A. Sacks
EAS:smjm

cc: David J. Bradford
Terrence J. Truax
Raymond P. Niro