

# EXHIBIT 4

---

**From:** Klaus, Kelly  
**Sent:** Friday, July 02, 2010 10:30 AM  
**To:** 'Boxer, Jeffrey'  
**Cc:** Blavin, Jonathan  
**Subject:** RE: Arista v Lime Wire

Jeff:

One thing I forgot to mention, but that I hope is obvious: Lime Brokerage should be preserving any and all responsive documents. Since Lime Brokerage apparently collected documents already, this should not impose any burden. I want to be sure we have a clear record of this, given what you told us during our prior discussions about Lime Brokerage's document retention policies.

Thanks, and regards,  
Kelly

---

**From:** Klaus, Kelly  
**Sent:** Friday, July 02, 2010 10:04 AM  
**To:** 'Boxer, Jeffrey'  
**Cc:** Blavin, Jonathan  
**Subject:** Arista v Lime Wire

Hi Jeff:

I received your voice message, informing me that Lime Brokerage LLC and Lime Brokerage Holdings LLC ("Lime Brokerage") have elected not to seek to intervene or to participate as amicus curiae in connection with Plaintiffs' pending Motion for Preliminary Injunction, and that Lime Brokerage therefore will not be providing the discovery (documents and deposition) as per the Court's June 18, 2010 Order (Doc. No. 258). I am cancelling both my plans to be in New York for the deposition we had tentatively scheduled for July 7, as well as the court reporting service for the deposition.

Plaintiffs will be filing their reply brief in support of the Motion for Preliminary Injunction next Wednesday, July 7. We will inform the Court in that filing of Lime Brokerage's decision, and also let the Court know that there will be no Lime Brokerage filing in connection with that Motion.

I appreciate your informing me of Lime Brokerage's decision before the start of the holiday weekend. Have a good Fourth.

Regards,  
Kelly

**Kelly M. Klaus | Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP**  
355 South Grand Avenue | Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Tel: 213-683-9238 | Fax: 213-683-4038  
Kelly.Klaus@mto.com | [www.mto.com](http://www.mto.com)