EXHIBIT L

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

WEATHER UNDERGROUND, INCORPORATED,	Case No. 09-CV-10756
	U.S. Magistrate Judge Virginia M. Morgan
Plaintiff,	Detroit, Michigan
	May 12, 2010
v	10:59 a.m.
NAVIGATION CATALYST SYSTEMS, INCORPORATED,	
Defendant.	
Ordered By:	ENRICO SCHAEFER, ESQ.

MOTION HEARING

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:	ENRICO SCHAEFER, ESQ. (P43506) BRIAN HALL, ESQ. (P70865) Traverse Legal 810 Cottageview Drive Suite G-20 Traverse City, MI 49684 231-932-0411
	ANTHONY PATTI, ESQ. (P43729) Hooper, Hathaway, Price, Beuche & Wallace 126 S. Main Street Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1903 734-662-4426
For the Defendants:	WILLIAM DELGADO, ESQ. Willeken, Wilson, Loh & Lieb 707 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 3850 Los Angeles, CA 90017 213-955-9240

corporate expenditures for Firstlook, and Basic Fusion, and Connexus and things like receipts for coffee for the break room and things like that, then -- then we do have to come back to this question of control which this is not the first time they've raised this argument. It was raised at the dismissal, at the motion to dismiss and they basically made this argument to Judge Battani how these -- how these are all interrelated and there should be conspiracy jurisdiction and all this. And Judge Battani's response was, to basically dismiss three of the companies and only leave in NCS.

But again from a practical perspective, the question is just you know, what is the breadth of their request. Is it really a narrow request directed to relevant evidence? If it is, we will produce it, there's no question irrespective of the company.

THE COURT: Okay. You're going to produce them.

MR. DELGADO: Okay.

THE COURT: I -- I -- I don't really understand quite frankly why Judge Battani dismissed all of the companies at the beginning of the case. And maybe she'll reconsider that as it goes through.

But your defendants' responses earlier that they didn't have any company -- any employees and somehow this seemed to have been done by magic or maybe avatars. I -- I did not find particularly forthcoming. I do share some of the plaintiff's

concerns about gamesmanship.

I don't like the multiple hats. I don't like the documents coming from one company at one time, another company another time and yet you're claiming they're not sufficiently related to go forward.

So cut the crap. I'm not going to hear it anymore. Answer on behalf of all related companies. And if your guy continues to set up a bunch of extra companies, then you'll answer for them too.

MR. DELGADO: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay, we're done with this discussion.

MR. DELGADO: Okay.

MR. SCHAEFER: Okay. Your Honor, the next -- the next issue is employees. We did ask for in our interrogatories for them to identify --

THE COURT: But you can't ask for all corporate expenditures.

MR. SCHAEFER: We'll get to -- yes. We'll deal with those specific issues --

THE COURT: I don't want to see that either.

MR. SCHAEFER: Okay. Your Honor, with regard to the employees they've identified that we asked for all people who work --

THE COURT: Are you talking -- what are you talking about now?