

EXHIBIT I

Golob, Barry

From: Dennis, Teresa R. (SHB) [TDENNIS@shb.com] on behalf of Seitz, Adam P. (SHB) [ASEITZ@shb.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 5:32 PM
To: Golob, Barry; McPherson, Patrick D.; McPhail, Donald R.
Cc: Buresh, Eric A. (SHB); Webb, B. Trent (SHB); Reckers, Robert H. (SHB)
Subject: Sprint v. Vonage
Attachments: Ltr to Barry Golob.pdf

Counsel,

Attached please find correspondence relating to this case.

Thanks,

Adam P. Seitz
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON, L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108
o: 816.474.6550
f: 816.421.5547

<<Ltr to Barry Golob.pdf>>

Mail Gate made the following annotations on Wed Feb 21 2007 16:32:27

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.

February 21, 2007

Shook,
Hardy &
Bacon LLP
www.shb.com

SENT VIA EMAIL

Mr. Barry Golob
Duane Morris LLP
1667 K Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006-1608

Adam P. Seitz

2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City
Missouri 64108-2613
816.474.6550
816.559.2256 DD
816.421.5547 Fax
aseitz@shb.com

Re: *Sprint Communications Company L.P. v. Vonage Holdings Corp. et al.*
Case No: 05-2433-JWL
SHB File No: SPRI.116441

Dear Barry:


We are in receipt of your February 15, 2007 letter concerning perceived deficiencies in Sprint's document production. As an initial matter, we disagree with your contention that Sprint's production has been untimely and/or incomplete in any way. Sprint has made, and continues to make, significant document productions in this case, the first of which was provided as early as June 2006. The same cannot be said for Vonage's production.

As for the alleged document deficiencies, you identify over 87 specific topics in your nine (9) page letter and request that Sprint search for and produce all such documents by February 21. Given that this request falls on a holiday weekend, and that you have allotted only three (3) business days for Sprint to conduct this search and produce these documents, your request is, on its face, burdensome and oppressive. Contrary to your contention, these 87 additional topics have not been pending for over one year and, instead, constitute entirely new document requests. Accordingly, Sprint has no option but to provide responses and objections to each of those 87 topics. As these topics are drastically different from any existing request, Sprint is in the process of undertaking a search for these documents and will provide objections and responsive documents on a reasonable timeframe.

Additionally, many of the issues addressed in your February 15 letter are irrelevant to the issues in this litigation. Indeed, Sprint previously informed you that it is not aware of any executed agreement in which any patents were ever placed on Exhibit A of the Sprint/Cisco License Agreements. Sprint also previously informed you that it is not aware of any agreement with Cisco in which Exhibit B to the Sprint/Cisco License Agreement was executed by the parties. As such, many of your requests seem designed solely to burden and harass Sprint. In light of this fact, I would ask that you revise the topics requested in your February 15 letter accordingly.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,


Adam P. Seitz
APS/td

Geneva
Houston
Kansas City
London
Miami
Orange County
San Francisco
Tampa
Washington, D.C.