

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

<b>FUNCTION MEDIA, L.L.C.,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	§	<b>Civil Action No. 2007-CV-279</b>
	§	
<b>vs.</b>	§	
	§	
<b>GOOGLE, INC. AND YAHOO, INC.,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Defendants.</b>	§	<b>JURY TRIAL DEMANDED</b>

**MOTION TO ENFORCE OPINION REGARDING GOOGLE’S EXPERT MICHAEL  
WAGNER**

Function Media brings this short Motion out of concern that Google intends to have its expert Mr. Wagner testify to certain opinions outside the scope of what this Court has permitted him to testify to regarding the Carl Meyer agreement. As this Court is well aware, it has limited Mr. Wagner to testify only about the terms of the Carl Meyer agreement on their face. Google has indicated that it nevertheless still intends to rely on the Carl Meyer agreement as the “baseline” agreement and the starting point for the hypothetical negotiation.

It is impossible for Mr. Wagner to use the Meyer agreement in this manner, however, as his analysis depends on testimony and reliance on issues that this Court already has excluded – namely, Mr. Wagner’s conversations with Mr. Ben Lee and his conversations with Mr. Lanning about the circumstances of the agreement, the technology at issue, whether Google uses that technology, and whether the Accused Products practice the technology in the patents. Without such facts, Mr. Wagner cannot compare the Meyer agreement to the patents-in-suit, as he does throughout his report. As this Court is well aware, Function Media attempted to inquire about the details and circumstances of this Agreement, but Mr. Chen repeatedly answered “I don’t

know.” And when asked about the technology at issue, Mr. Chen was only able to read from the agreement itself.

Indeed, Mr. Wagner makes clear in his report that his use of the Meyer agreement as a baseline is predicated on the testimony of Mr. Lee and Mr. Lanning about the importance of the technology to Google, whether a design-around was available to Google, and whether the agreement was under threat of litigation, among other things. *See* Exh. 1, Wagner Report ¶¶ 44-47. *See also id.* ¶¶ 152, 153, 159, 172, 188, 195, 196, 245, 249 (comparing the scope and circumstances of the Meyer agreement with those of the patents-in-suit).

At his deposition, Mr. Wagner likewise testified that he relied on Mr. Lee and Mr. Lanning for his opinions on the Meyer agreement. *See* Exh. 2, Wagner Depo. 140:19-22 (“Q. How would you know, for example, the technology involved in the Meyer license? A. Oh, **that one I asked to talk not to someone at Google, but to Google's technical expert, Mr. Lanning.**”); *id.* 142:9-143:4 (“Q. Did you talk to Mr. Lee about the Meyer agreement? A. Yes. Q. You relied on that conversation with Mr. Lee? A. I did to the extent it is quoted in my report. What did Mr. Lee tell you about the Meyer agreement? A. He told me that, number one, it was arm's length. Q. Did you probe about that? A. No. I accepted what he told me to be true. **He told me that it was core technology to Google, that it had broader application to Google than the patents in suit that I was attempting to value.** I believe that he testified that Google did its normal practice of insisting on a lump sum in the agreement rather than a running royalty rate. And without looking at my report, if I quoted him for something else, that's all I remember.”); *see also id.* 143:11-144:4 (relying on Mr. Lee for whether the agreement was in anticipation of litigation).

Thus, Google should not be able to use the Meyer agreement to compare it to the patents-in-suit, which necessarily entails a judgment about the scope, technology, and circumstances of the Meyer agreement that far exceed the terms of the agreement itself.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Max L. Tribble, Jr.*

---

Max L. Tribble, Jr.  
State Bar No. 20213950  
Email: [mtribble@susmangodfrey.com](mailto:mtribble@susmangodfrey.com)  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1000 Louisiana, Suite 5100  
Houston, Texas, 77002  
Telephone: (713) 651-9366  
Facsimile: (713) 654-6666

Lead Attorney for Plaintiff

OF COUNSEL:

Joseph S. Grinstein  
State Bar No. 24002188  
Aimée Robert  
State Bar No. 24046729  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100  
Houston, Texas 77002-5096  
Telephone: (713) 651-9366  
Fax: (713) 654-6666  
[jgrinstein@susmangodfrey.com](mailto:jgrinstein@susmangodfrey.com)  
[arobert@susmangodfrey.com](mailto:arobert@susmangodfrey.com)

Jeremy Brandon  
State Bar No. 24040563  
Warren T. Burns  
State Bar No. 24053119  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
901 Main Street, Suite 5100  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3775  
Telephone: (214) 754-1900  
Fax: (214) 754-1933  
[jbrandon@susmangodfrey.com](mailto:jbrandon@susmangodfrey.com)

wburns@susmangodfrey.com

Justin A. Nelson  
State Bar No. 24034766  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3800  
Seattle, Washington 98101-3000  
Telephone: (206) 516-3880  
Fax: (206) 516-3883  
jnelson@susmangodfrey.com

Robert Christopher Bunt  
State Bar No. 00787165  
Charles Ainsworth  
PARKER, BUNT & AINSWORTH, P.C.  
100 East Ferguson, Suite 1114  
Tyler, Texas 75702  
Telephone: (903) 531-3535  
Fax: (903) 533-9687  
[rcbunt@pbatyler.com](mailto:rcbunt@pbatyler.com)  
[charley@pbatyler.com](mailto:charley@pbatyler.com)

S. Calvin Capshaw  
State Bar No. 037839000  
Elizabeth L. DeRieux  
State Bar No. 05770585  
D. Jeffrey Rambin  
CAPSHAW DERIEUX, LLP  
Energy Centre  
1127 Judson Road, Suite 220  
P.O. Box 3999 (75606-3999)  
Longview, Texas 75601-5157  
Telephone: (903) 236-9800  
Fax: (903) 236-8787  
[ccapshaw@capshawlaw.com](mailto:ccapshaw@capshawlaw.com)  
[ederieux@capshawlaw.com](mailto:ederieux@capshawlaw.com)  
[jrambin@capshawlaw.com](mailto:jrambin@capshawlaw.com)

Otis Carroll  
State Bar No. 03895700  
Collin Maloney  
State Bar No. 00794219  
IRELAND, CARROLL & KELLEY, P.C.  
6101 S. Broadway, Suite 500  
Tyler, Texas 75703  
Telephone: (903) 561-1600  
Fax: (903) 581-1071

otiscarroll@icklawn.com  
cmaloney@icklawn.com

**CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE**

Counsel for plaintiff conferred with counsel for Google on Plaintiff's Motion to Enforce Opinion Regarding Google's Expert Michael Wagner via e-mail on January 18, 2010 at 4:12 p.m. and Google is opposed to the motion.

/s/ Justin A. Nelson

Justin A. Nelson

**CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORIZATION TO FILE UNDER SEAL**

This is to certify that even though this motion is not filed under seal the exhibits should be filed under seal because they contain material covered by the protective order approved and entered in this case on February 25, 2009.

/s/ Max L. Tribble, Jr.

Max. L. Tribble, Jr.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument has been served on the counsel of record, this 23rd day of January, 2010, by email and by agreement.

/s/ Max L. Tribble, Jr.

Max. L. Tribble, Jr.