

Exhibit F

(Rule 30(b)(6) Notices of Deposition to Defendants)

to

TimeBase's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion
for Summary Judgment of No Invalidity

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| TIMEBASE PTY LTD., |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | File No. 07-CV-1687 (JNE/JJG) |
| vs. |) | |
| |) | TIMEBASE’S NOTICE OF DEPOSITION |
| THE THOMSON CORPORATION, WEST |) | OF THE THOMSON CORPORATION |
| PUBLISHING CORPORATION, AND WEST |) | PURSUANT TO RULE 30(b)(6) |
| SERVICES, INC. |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

TimeBase will depose defendant The Thomson Corporation (“Thomson”) pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 30(b)(6) at the offices of Gray, Plant, Mooty, Mooty & Bennett, P.A., 500 IDS Center, 80 South Eighth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402, beginning at 9:30 a.m. on July 12, 2010 (or at any other mutually convenient time and location) and continuing from day-to-day until completed. The deposition will be taken by stenographic means and may be videotaped as well.

As provided by Rule 30(b)(6), Fed.R.Civ.P., Thomson must designate one or more officers, directors, managing agents or other persons who consent to testify upon its behalf and who have knowledge of, and are adequately prepared to testify about the topics set forth below.

DEFINITIONS

“Accused” includes the products and services identified in TimeBase’s Second Amended Complaint and in TimeBase’s Supplemental Infringement Claim Chart with exhibits.

When TimeBase says “for example” or “including” in a topic, it is illustrating the topic, not limiting or restricting it.

TOPICS

1. Communications and meetings with TimeBase or its representatives or agents including, for example, BMG and Jon Klemens.
2. Information possessed or obtained about TimeBase from any source, including third parties.
3. Knowledge of TimeBase's intellectual property including the patents asserted in this litigation.
4. Any analysis of TimeBase's intellectual property, including any advice, opinions, studies or communications regarding the infringement, validity, or enforceability of the patents asserted in this litigation.
5. Facts relevant to willful infringement, and any actions taken in response to steps taken to avoid infringement.
6. Any attempts to design around the patents in suit, including any consideration of alternative(s) to any accused products or services.
7. The basis for filing any request to reexamine the patents in suit, and the selection of document(s) submitted with such requests.
8. The design and operation of each accused product or service.
9. The facts supporting the defendants' contentions of non-infringement and invalidity.
10. The physical location of and configuration of databases used with any accused product or service, and the division and storage approach to data held in them.
11. The differences between versioned and non-versioned databases.

12. The buy-versus-develop analysis during the design and development of each accused product or service.

13. A description and explanation of Magellan, OSR, OSR II, Bermuda, Novus, Ampex, Xanadu, Xena, Statmark, ELVIS, DEPTH, Stable table, CP record, RC record, KCITEi record and FINDORIG record, and seven field mark-up or query.

14. The earliest date when each accused product or service was available to a customer or user.

15. The patenting activities relevant to any accused product or service, including 7,085,755, and any applications including Mr. Spencer or Ms. Agard as an inventor.

16. The accused products and services that are accessible through WestlawNext.

17. Licenses, contracts or other agreements entered into or acquired that are relevant to the design, development or use of any accused product or service, including the identification of the relevant documents and parties involved, and including the Shasta license and any other licenses.

18. Filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

19. Acquisitions, investments in, licenses with, or purchases of assets or companies relevant to the design, development or use of any accused product or service, for example, NetScan, including the identification of the asset or company, and the cost.

20. The revenues and profits related to or produced by the accused products or services, including from customers or users outside the United States.

21. Any analysis of the percentage of customer use or revenue or anticipated use or revenue related to any accused product or service broken down on a feature by feature basis.

22. Forecasts, projections, estimates, strategic plans or the like relevant to the accused products or services, including anticipated costs, profits and benefits of any kind.
23. Any analysis, including but not limited to any surveys, of customer demand or customer use related to any accused product or service.
24. Contracts with customers or users, for example, El Paso, Fresno County or Tarrant County, including customers or users outside the United States.
25. Communications with customers or users, or potential customers or users, including customers or users outside the United States.
26. The identities of customers for or users of the accused products or services, including customers or users outside the United States.
27. Marketing and advertising activities and communications relevant to the accused products and services.
28. The pricing strategy, pricing plans, subscriptions, bundles, and discounts for the accused products and services.
29. An explanation of master brands, features, product brands and sunsets.
30. Activities designed to distinguish any accused product or service from services offered by competitors, such as Lexis.
31. Facts bearing on the timing and content of a hypothetical negotiation to determine a reasonable royalty, for example, as discussed in TimeBase's response to the defendants' Interrogatory 4.
32. Facts relevant to the amount of damages should the defendant be found liable for infringement.

33. Knowledge of the references cited in Thomson's original and supplemental prior art statements, including when the defendant learned of any of the references.
34. The level of ordinary skill in the art for the patents asserted in this litigation.
35. The factual basis for the answer and affirmative defenses, including the steps or structure in any accused product or service that is a basis for non-infringement.
36. Contacts with SAIC or Timothy Arnold-Moore.
37. The documents produced by Thomson, including the search for and collection of documents in response to TimeBase's requests.
38. Thomson's responses to TimeBase's interrogatories, including all aspects of subscription, revenue and usage based figures provided including formulas collection methodology and accuracy.
39. The organization and types of documents maintained by the defendant, either electronically or in paper form, that specify the design, construction and use of the accused products and services, and the databases used with them, including DTDs, schemas, software specifications and the like.
40. Communications with, benefits offered or provided to, or payments offered or made to witnesses, deponents, any potential witness or potential deponent, including Mr. Schnelle, Ms. Lessing, or Mr. Arnold-Moore.

/s/ Joseph N. Hosteny
Joseph N. Hosteny
Arthur A. Gasey
Niro, Haller & Niro
181 West Madison Street, Suite 4600
Chicago, IL 60602
Telephone: 312-236-0733
Fax: 312-236-3137
Email: hosteny@nshn.com
Email: gasey@nshn.com

Michael R. Cunningham
Attorney No. 20424
GRAY, PLANT, MOOTY,
MOOTY & BENNETT, P.A.
500 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Telephone: (612) 632-3000
Fax: (612) 632-4444
michael.cunningham@gmplaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that **TIMEBASE'S NOTICE OF DEPOSITION OF THE THOMSON CORPORATION PURSUANT TO RULE 30(b)(6)** was served on May 20, 2010 upon Thomson's counsel, listed below, by email and first-class mail to:

Mindy Sooter; MSooter@faegre.com
Terry Beyl; TBeyl@faegre.com
Katherine S. Razavi; krazavi@faegre.com
Kevin P. Wagner; KWagner@faegre.com
David Gross; DGross@faegre.com
Calvin L. Litsey; CLitsey@faegre.com
Theodore M. Budd; TBudd@faegre.com
Faegre & Benson LLP
2200 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Phone: 612-766-7000
Fax: 612-766-1600

Attorneys for Thomson Corporation

/s/ Joseph N. Hosteny_____

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| TIMEBASE PTY LTD., |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | File No. 07-CV-1687 (JNE/JJG) |
| vs. |) | |
| |) | TIMEBASE’S NOTICE OF DEPOSITION |
| THE THOMSON CORPORATION, WEST |) | OF WEST PUBLISHING CORPORATION |
| PUBLISHING CORPORATION, AND WEST |) | PURSUANT TO RULE 30(b)(6) |
| SERVICES, INC. |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

TimeBase will depose defendant West Publishing Corporation (“West Publishing”) pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 30(b)(6) at the offices of Gray, Plant, Mooty, Mooty & Bennett, P.A., 500 IDS Center, 80 South Eighth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402, beginning at 9:30 a.m. on July 14, 2010 (or at any other mutually convenient time and location) and continuing from day-to-day until completed. The deposition will be taken by stenographic means and may be videotaped as well.

As provided by Rule 30(b)(6), Fed.R.Civ.P., West Publishing must designate one or more officers, directors, managing agents or other persons who consent to testify upon its behalf and who have knowledge of, and are adequately prepared to testify about the topics set forth below.

DEFINITIONS

“Accused” includes the products and services identified in TimeBase’s Second Amended Complaint and in TimeBase’s Supplemental Infringement Claim Chart with exhibits.

When TimeBase says “for example” or “including” in a topic, it is illustrating the topic, not limiting or restricting it.

TOPICS

1. Communications and meetings with TimeBase or its representatives or agents including, for example, BMG and Jon Klemens.
2. Information possessed or obtained about TimeBase from any source, including third parties.
3. Knowledge of TimeBase's intellectual property including the patents asserted in this litigation.
4. Any analysis of TimeBase's intellectual property, including any advice, opinions, studies or communications regarding the infringement, validity, or enforceability of the patents asserted in this litigation.
5. Facts relevant to willful infringement, and any actions taken in response to steps taken to avoid infringement.
6. Any attempts to design around the patents in suit, including any consideration of alternative(s) to any accused products or services.
7. The basis for filing any request to reexamine the patents in suit, and the selection of document(s) submitted with such requests.
8. The design and operation of each accused product or service.
9. The facts supporting the defendants' contentions of non-infringement and invalidity.
10. The physical location of and configuration of databases used with any accused product or service, and the division and storage approach to data held in them.
11. The differences between versioned and non-versioned databases.

12. The buy-versus-develop analysis during the design and development of each accused product or service.

13. A description and explanation of Magellan, OSR, OSR II, Bermuda, Novus, Ampex, Xanadu, Xena, Statmark, ELVIS, DEPTH, Stable table, CP record, RC record, KCITEi record and FINDORIG record, and seven field mark-up or query.

14. The earliest date when each accused product or service was available to a customer or user.

15. The patenting activities relevant to any accused product or service, including 7,085,755, and any applications including Mr. Spencer or Ms. Agard as an inventor.

16. The accused products and services that are accessible through WestlawNext.

17. Licenses, contracts or other agreements entered into or acquired that are relevant to the design, development or use of any accused product or service, including the identification of the relevant documents and parties involved, and including the Shasta license and any other licenses.

18. Filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

19. Acquisitions, investments in, licenses with, or purchases of assets or companies relevant to the design, development or use of any accused product or service, for example, NetScan, including the identification of the asset or company, and the cost.

20. The revenues and profits related to or produced by the accused products or services, including from customers or users outside the United States.

21. Any analysis of the percentage of customer use or revenue or anticipated use or revenue related to any accused product or service broken down on a feature by feature basis.

22. Forecasts, projections, estimates, strategic plans or the like relevant to the accused products or services, including anticipated costs, profits and benefits of any kind.
23. Any analysis, including but not limited to any surveys, of customer demand or customer use related to any accused product or service.
24. Contracts with customers or users, for example, El Paso, Fresno County or Tarrant County, including customers or users outside the United States.
25. Communications with customers or users, or potential customers or users, including customers or users outside the United States.
26. The identities of customers for or users of the accused products or services, including customers or users outside the United States.
27. Marketing and advertising activities and communications relevant to the accused products and services.
28. The pricing strategy, pricing plans, subscriptions, bundles, and discounts for the accused products and services.
29. An explanation of master brands, features, product brands and sunsets.
30. Activities designed to distinguish any accused product or service from services offered by competitors, such as Lexis.
31. Facts bearing on the timing and content of a hypothetical negotiation to determine a reasonable royalty, for example, as discussed in TimeBase's response to the defendants' Interrogatory 4.
32. Facts relevant to the amount of damages should the defendant be found liable for infringement.

33. Knowledge of the references cited in West Publishing's original and supplemental prior art statements, including when the defendant learned of any of the references.

34. The level of ordinary skill in the art for the patents asserted in this litigation.

35. The factual basis for the answer and affirmative defenses, including the steps or structure in any accused product or service that is a basis for non-infringement.

36. Contacts with SAIC or Timothy Arnold-Moore.

37. The documents produced by West Publishing, including the search for and collection of documents in response to TimeBase's requests.

38. West Publishing's responses to TimeBase's interrogatories, including all aspects of subscription, revenue and usage based figures provided including formulas collection methodology and accuracy.

39. The organization and types of documents maintained by the defendant, either electronically or in paper form, that specify the design, construction and use of the accused products and services, and the databases used with them, including DTDs, schemas, software specifications and the like.

40. Communications with, benefits offered or provided to, or payments offered or made to witnesses, deponents, any potential witness or potential deponent, including Mr. Schnelle, Ms. Lessing, or Mr. Arnold-Moore.

/s/ Joseph N. Hosteny _____

Joseph N. Hosteny

Arthur A. Gasey

Niro, Haller & Niro

181 West Madison Street, Suite 4600

Chicago, IL 60602

Telephone: 312-236-0733

Fax: 312-236-3137

Email: hosteny@nshn.com

Email: gasey@nshn.com

Michael R. Cunningham
Attorney No. 20424
GRAY, PLANT, MOOTY,
MOOTY & BENNETT, P.A.
500 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Telephone: (612) 632-3000
Fax: (612) 632-4444
michael.cunningham@gmplaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that **TIMEBASE'S NOTICE OF DEPOSITION OF WEST PUBLISHING CORPORATION PURSUANT TO RULE 30(b)(6)** was served on May 20, 2010 upon West Publishing's counsel, listed below, by email and first-class mail to:

Mindy Sooter; MSooter@faegre.com
Terry Beyl; TBeyl@faegre.com
Katherine S. Razavi; krazavi@faegre.com
Kevin P. Wagner; KWagner@faegre.com
David Gross; DGross@faegre.com
Calvin L. Litsey; CLitsey@faegre.com
Theodore M. Budd; TBudd@faegre.com
Faegre & Benson LLP
2200 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Phone: 612-766-7000
Fax: 612-766-1600

Attorneys for West Publishing Corporation

/s/ Joseph N. Hosteny_____

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| TIMEBASE PTY LTD., |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | File No. 07-CV-1687 (JNE/JJG) |
| vs. |) | |
| |) | |
| THE THOMSON CORPORATION, WEST |) | TIMEBASE’S NOTICE OF DEPOSITION |
| PUBLISHING CORPORATION, AND WEST |) | OF WEST SERVICES, INC. PURSUANT |
| SERVICES, INC. |) | TO RULE 30(b)(6) |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

TimeBase will depose defendant West Services, Inc. (“West Services”) pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 30(b)(6) at the offices of Gray, Plant, Mooty, Mooty & Bennett, P.A., 500 IDS Center, 80 South Eighth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402, beginning at 9:30 a.m. on July 16, 2010 (or at any other mutually convenient time and location) and continuing from day-to-day until completed. The deposition will be taken by stenographic means and may be videotaped as well.

As provided by Rule 30(b)(6), Fed.R.Civ.P., West Services must designate one or more officers, directors, managing agents or other persons who consent to testify upon its behalf and who have knowledge of, and are adequately prepared to testify about the topics set forth below.

DEFINITIONS

“Accused” includes the products and services identified in TimeBase’s Second Amended Complaint and in TimeBase’s Supplemental Infringement Claim Chart with exhibits.

When TimeBase says “for example” or “including” in a topic, it is illustrating the topic, not limiting or restricting it.

TOPICS

1. Communications and meetings with TimeBase or its representatives or agents including, for example, BMG and Jon Klemens.
2. Information possessed or obtained about TimeBase from any source, including third parties.
3. Knowledge of TimeBase's intellectual property including the patents asserted in this litigation.
4. Any analysis of TimeBase's intellectual property, including any advice, opinions, studies or communications regarding the infringement, validity, or enforceability of the patents asserted in this litigation.
5. Facts relevant to willful infringement, and any actions taken in response to steps taken to avoid infringement.
6. Any attempts to design around the patents in suit, including any consideration of alternative(s) to any accused products or services.
7. The basis for filing any request to reexamine the patents in suit, and the selection of document(s) submitted with such requests.
8. The design and operation of each accused product or service.
9. The facts supporting the defendants' contentions of non-infringement and invalidity.
10. The physical location of and configuration of databases used with any accused product or service, and the division and storage approach to data held in them.
11. The differences between versioned and non-versioned databases.

12. The buy-versus-develop analysis during the design and development of each accused product or service.

13. A description and explanation of Magellan, OSR, OSR II, Bermuda, Novus, Ampex, Xanadu, Xena, Statmark, ELVIS, DEPTH, Stable table, CP record, RC record, KCITEi record and FINDORIG record, and seven field mark-up or query.

14. The earliest date when each accused product or service was available to a customer or user.

15. The patenting activities relevant to any accused product or service, including 7,085,755, and any applications including Mr. Spencer or Ms. Agard as an inventor.

16. The accused products and services that are accessible through WestlawNext.

17. Licenses, contracts or other agreements entered into or acquired that are relevant to the design, development or use of any accused product or service, including the identification of the relevant documents and parties involved, and including the Shasta license and any other licenses.

18. Filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

19. Acquisitions, investments in, licenses with, or purchases of assets or companies relevant to the design, development or use of any accused product or service, for example, NetScan, including the identification of the asset or company, and the cost.

20. The revenues and profits related to or produced by the accused products or services, including from customers or users outside the United States.

21. Any analysis of the percentage of customer use or revenue or anticipated use or revenue related to any accused product or service broken down on a feature by feature basis.

22. Forecasts, projections, estimates, strategic plans or the like relevant to the accused products or services, including anticipated costs, profits and benefits of any kind.
23. Any analysis, including but not limited to any surveys, of customer demand or customer use related to any accused product or service.
24. Contracts with customers or users, for example, El Paso, Fresno County or Tarrant County, including customers or users outside the United States.
25. Communications with customers or users, or potential customers or users, including customers or users outside the United States.
26. The identities of customers for or users of the accused products or services, including customers or users outside the United States.
27. Marketing and advertising activities and communications relevant to the accused products and services.
28. The pricing strategy, pricing plans, subscriptions, bundles, and discounts for the accused products and services.
29. Activities designed to distinguish any accused product or service from services offered by competitors, such as Lexis.
30. An explanation of master brands, features, product brands and sunsets.
31. Facts bearing on the timing and content of a hypothetical negotiation to determine a reasonable royalty, for example, as discussed in TimeBase's response to the defendants' Interrogatory 4.
32. Facts relevant to the amount of damages should the defendant be found liable for infringement.

33. Knowledge of the references cited in West Services' original and supplemental prior art statements, including when the defendant learned of any of the references.
34. The level of ordinary skill in the art for the patents asserted in this litigation.
35. The factual basis for the answer and affirmative defenses, including the steps or structure in any accused product or service that is a basis for non-infringement.
36. Contacts with SAIC or Timothy Arnold-Moore.
37. The documents produced by West Services, including the search for and collection of documents in response to TimeBase's requests.
38. West Services responses to TimeBase's interrogatories, including all aspects of subscription, revenue and usage based figures provided including formulas collection methodology and accuracy.
39. The organization and types of documents maintained by the defendant, either electronically or in paper form, that specify the design, construction and use of the accused products and services, and the databases used with them, including DTDs, schemas, software specifications and the like.
40. Communications with, benefits offered or provided to, or payments offered or made to witnesses, deponents, or any potential witness or potential deponent, including Mr. Schnelle, Ms. Lessing, or Mr. Arnold-Moore.

/s/ Joseph N. Hosteny
Joseph N. Hosteny
Arthur A. Gasey
Niro, Haller & Niro
181 West Madison Street, Suite 4600
Chicago, IL 60602
Telephone: 312-236-0733
Fax: 312-236-3137

Email: hosteny@nshn.com

Email: gasey@nshn.com

Michael R. Cunningham
Attorney No. 20424
GRAY, PLANT, MOOTY,
MOOTY & BENNETT, P.A.
500 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Telephone: (612) 632-3000
Fax: (612) 632-4444
michael.cunningham@gmplaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that **TIMEBASE'S NOTICE OF DEPOSITION OF WEST SERVICES, INC. PURSUANT TO RULE 30(b)(6)** was served on May 20, 2010 upon West Services' counsel, listed below, by email and first-class mail to:

Mindy Sooter; MSooter@faegre.com
Terry Beyl; TBeyl@faegre.com
Katherine S. Razavi; krazavi@faegre.com
Kevin P. Wagner; KWagner@faegre.com
David Gross; DGross@faegre.com
Calvin L. Litsey; CLitsey@faegre.com
Theodore M. Budd; TBudd@faegre.com
Faegre & Benson LLP
2200 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Phone: 612-766-7000
Fax: 612-766-1600

Attorneys for West Services, Inc.

/s/ Joseph N. Hosteny_____