

EXHIBIT B

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
3 SOUTHERN DIVISION

3 WEATHER UNDERGROUND,
4 INCORPORATED,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v

7 NAVIGATION CATALYST SYSTEMS,
8 INCORPORATED,

9 Defendant.

Case No. 09-CV-10756
U.S. Magistrate Judge
Virginia M. Morgan
Detroit, Michigan
May 12, 2010
10:59 a.m.

10 Ordered By:

ENRICO SCHAEFER, ESQ.

11 MOTION HEARING

12 APPEARANCES:

13 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

14 ANTHONY PATTI, ESQ. (P43729)
15 Hooper, Hathaway, Price, Beuche
16 & Wallace
17 126 S. Main Street
18 Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1903
19 734-662-4426

20 For the Defendants:

21 WILLIAM DELGADO, ESQ.
22 Willeken, Wilson, Loh & Lieb
23 707 Wilshire Boulevard
24 Suite 3850
25 Los Angeles, CA 90017
213-955-9240

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

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

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

17 MR. DELGADO: Okay.

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

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

1 concerns about gamesmanship.

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

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

10 MR. DELGADO: Okay.

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

12 MR. DELGADO: Okay.

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

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

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

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

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

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