

Exhibit E



WILLENKEN
WILLENKEN WILSON LOH & LIEB LLP

March 11, 2010

VIA E-MAIL AND U.S. MAIL

Enrico Schaefer, Esq.
Traverse Legal
810 Cottageview Drive, Suite G-20
Traverse City, MI 49684

Re: *Weather Underground v. Navigation Catalyst Systems, Inc.*

Dear Enrico:

I am writing to memorialize our meet and confer conference of March 9, 2010 regarding Plaintiff's responses to NCS's First Set of Interrogatories and First Set of Requests for Production. If any of the following does not comport with your understanding of what we discussed, please let me know immediately.

Plaintiff's Responses to NCS's First Set of Interrogatories

Verification

I confirmed that my office has now received the verification for the Responses to the First Set of Interrogatories. Thank you for sending that.

Response to Interrogatory No. 1

I understand from our conversation that Plaintiff does not have any information for a specific person who has called, e-mailed or communicated with Plaintiff in some way as a result of having seen or visited a website at a domain registered by NCS.

Response to Interrogatory Nos. 7-8

It is my understanding that you will supplement your responses to these interrogatories to identify responsive documents by Bates label. I agreed that, to the extent NCS refers to documents in response to interrogatories, NCS will also identify such documents with specificity.



Plaintiff's Response to Requests for Production

Response to Request Nos. 1-3, 6-14, 16, 28, 29, 35, 36, 38-40

I understand that your client's documents are being processed and that you anticipate producing them next week. Once I have seen what has been produced, we can meet and confer further to determine (i) what documents were not produced and (ii) whether NCS will insist on the production of such documents.

Response to Request Nos. 4-5, 18-20, 24-26, 30-33, 42, 43

Again, I understand from our conversation that you anticipate being able to produce these documents next week.

Response to Request No. 11

I understand that Plaintiff would be willing to produce documents that are responsive to this request either in terms of raw data or specific reports that it can generate. As I mentioned, one report that NCS seeks is a report indicating the number of visitors to Plaintiff's domain, by month, with a breakdown by location.

Response to Request No. 12, 27

It is my understanding that you will consult with your client regarding these requests and get back to me in writing.

Response to Request No. 15

It is my understanding that you are following up with your client to determine whether any responsive documents exist. When you get back to me regarding Request Nos. 12 and 27, please let me know about this request as well.

Response to Request No. 17

It is my understanding that you will be supplementing this response.

Response to Request No. 21

I have consulted with my client. My client can and will produce a spreadsheet showing the domain name, IP address, date and time of visitors to the Domain Names At Issue for whatever time period they have data for. I will let you know what time period that is. However, as I noted in my first letter and during our call, we expect some reciprocity. At a minimum, your client should be willing to produce IP data for the same time period so that we can determine whether there was an overlap of visitors.




Response to Request No. 34

I understand that Plaintiff will produce documents that show statistics on how traffic arrived at its domain (e.g., from search engine, from a third party site, from direct navigation, etc.).

If I misunderstood any of our conversation, please let me know immediately, as I assure you it was not intentional. Otherwise, I look forward to receiving Plaintiff's documents and concluding our meet and confer.

Very truly yours,



William A. Delgado