

EXHIBIT K

DuaneMorris®

FIRM and AFFILIATE OFFICES

DONALD R. MCPHAIL
DIRECT DIAL: 202.776.7894
E-MAIL: drmcphail@duanemorris.com

www.duanemorris.com

December 7, 2006

VIA EMAIL

Adam P. Seitz
Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, MO 64108

NEW YORK
LONDON
LOS ANGELES
CHICAGO
HOUSTON
PHILADELPHIA
SAN DIEGO
SAN FRANCISCO
BOSTON
WASHINGTON, DC
LAS VEGAS
ATLANTA
MIAMI
PITTSBURGH
NEWARK
ALLENTOWN
WILMINGTON
HARRISBURG
PRINCETON
LAKE TAHOE

Re: *Sprint Communications Company L.P. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.
and Vonage America, Inc.*, Case No. 05-2433-JWL
Our Reference: Y2108-00079
Your Reference: SPRI.116441

Dear Adam,

We are writing in response to your letter of December 1, 2006, regarding alleged deficiencies in Vonage's discovery responses concerning Vonage's non-infringement and invalidity contentions. For at least the following reasons, Vonage contends that, to date, its responses have not been deficient.

First, you should recall from Vonage's written response that Vonage objected to Sprint's Interrogatories Nos. 5 and 7 on the grounds, *inter alia*, that these interrogatories were premature because they sought information which is or may be the subject of expert testimony. As you are no doubt aware, expert reports have not yet been exchanged in this matter, so Vonage still believes that Sprint's interrogatories remain premature at this time. Once expert reports have been exchanged, Vonage will supplement its written response, if necessary.

Second, you should recall that Vonage has produced at least two boxes of prior art documents. These prior art documents form, at least in part, the factual bases for Vonage's invalidity contentions and relevance of each to the various claims of the Asserted Patents should be self-explanatory.

Third, you should recall that Vonage has produced a number of technical documents describing the operation of aspects of the Vonage system, including those referenced in Sprint's infringement contentions. These technical documents form, at least in part, the factual bases for

DUANE MORRIS LLP

1667 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-1608

PHONE: 202.776.7800 FAX: 202.776.7801

Duane Morris

Adam P. Seitz
December 7, 2006
Page 2

Vonage's non-infringement contentions, as well as providing an explanation of why the Vonage system does not infringe any claim of the Asserted Patents.

Finally, as we have advised you previously, additional documents are presently being processed and will be produced to Sprint in a timely fashion. These documents include additional prior art documents which form, at least in part, the factual bases for Vonage's invalidity contentions and their relevance should be self-explanatory. These documents also include additional technical documents which form, at least in part, the factual bases for Vonage's non-infringement contentions as well as an explanation thereof.

We hope this puts to rest the issues raised in your letter of December 1. Should you have any remaining issues, we can address those when we meet and confer on Monday.

Very truly yours,



Donald R. McPhail

DRM/ego

cc: Patrick D. McPherson, Esq.
Barry Golob, Esq.