

# Exhibit C

## Andrew Spangler

---

**From:** Andrew Spangler  
**Sent:** Monday, June 07, 2010 8:52 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Doan; Jennifer P. Ainsworth  
**Cc:** Andrew Spangler  
**Subject:** RE: Bright Response

Again you are missing the point. I know which order. The one that says David cannot view AEO documents. But it does not set out the actual Protective Order itself and what the bounds are. The Court also specifically mentions that Mr. Pridham may have access to particular information upon request from the parties. I asked for Yahoo's proposal on how to modify the Protective Order to be consistent with the Court's mandate. I did not receive a response and it has been over a week if my calculations are correct. I have made it very clear the two carve outs:

1. That Mr. Pridham can still work on stuff (i.e., expert reports) based SOLELY on the information he has already seen. We do not know how Mr. Pridham is able to forget what he has already seen
2. That Mr. Pridham be able to view financial documents.

That is what we will be seeking relief on. We are doing this as Yahoo has not proposed anything in light of the Court's Order.

We are filing no later than close of business Wednesday. That is less than 6 weeks from trial and we simply will not wait. If you want to file a competing version afterwards, or agree to what we file, you are welcome to do so but we will be filing. Yahoo chose to wait until the end of the case to even raise the issue. Bright Response needs immediate clarification and guidance from the Court and we will be seeking it. Period. If you wish to attack me or my client through emails or the briefing you are welcome to do so. But we will file. Period.

Regards,  
Andrew Spangler

---

**From:** Jennifer Doan [mailto:jdoan@haltomdoan.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 07, 2010 8:43 PM  
**To:** Andrew Spangler; Jennifer P. Ainsworth  
**Subject:** RE: Bright Response

The Court's order to which I refer is the order from last week. JD

---

**From:** Andrew Spangler [mailto:Andrew@spanglerlawpc.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 07, 2010 8:42 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Doan; Jennifer P. Ainsworth  
**Cc:** Andrew Spangler  
**Subject:** RE: Bright Response

You are completely missing the point. We are not violating the PO. We are seeking an amendment - as the Court expressly ordered - to set out what documents Mr. Pridham may/or may not see.

And to even mention violating a PO from Yahoo is ridiculous. The Court has expressly found - in open court and in orders - that Yahoo has repeatedly violated the PO. You may not have been involved in the case then but you may want to go back and look.

---

**From:** Jennifer Doan [mailto:jdoan@haltomdoan.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 07, 2010 8:39 PM

**To:** Andrew Spangler; Jennifer P. Ainsworth  
**Subject:** RE: Bright Response

your client may choose to violate the Court's order at your peril. JD

---

**From:** Andrew Spangler [mailto:Andrew@spanglerlawpc.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 07, 2010 8:28 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Doan; Jennifer P. Ainsworth  
**Cc:** Andrew Spangler  
**Subject:** RE: Bright Response

Jennifer,

With all due respect, we will be filing when I said. "Shortly" simply will not cut it. Moreover, as I expect you will not be the person making the modifications to the Protective Order, your co-counsel's inability to get a proposal to Bright Response so long after Judge Everingham's order and after Yahoo filed an "Emergency" motion is what is not appropriate.

Regards,

Andrew Spangler

---

**From:** Jennifer Doan [mailto:jdoan@haltomdoan.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 07, 2010 8:21 PM  
**To:** Andrew Spangler; Jennifer P. Ainsworth  
**Subject:** RE: Bright Response

Andrew:

I was out of town the majority of last week. Your allegations and comments are not appropriate.

We'll circulate a draft to you shortly and should have plenty of time to submit an order in accordance with Judge Everingham's ruling.

Jennifer

---

**From:** Andrew Spangler [mailto:Andrew@spanglerlawpc.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 07, 2010 7:33 PM  
**To:** Jennifer P. Ainsworth; Jennifer Doan  
**Cc:** Andrew Spangler  
**Subject:** Bright Response

Jennifer (and Jennifer),

You (Yahoo) asked for - and received - relief regarding modifying the Protective Order re Mr. Pridham. The Court specifically ordered us to get him a revised Protective Order. I have asked for one from you guys and have received nothing but radio silence. Timing is critical considering experts, upcoming deadlines, etc. Your failure to respond has greatly prejudiced Bright Response. As the Court has done in the past, when there is a dispute over a PO the parties just submit their competing versions. We will be submitting ours no later than COB on Wednesday but likely tomorrow. Our proposed modification will conform to the Court's order in that Mr. Pridham will see no non-technical information (most importantly newly produced source code) but that Mr. Pridham will be able to assist experts prepare reports to the extent he relies only on information reviewed before the Court entered its order. Moreover, we will be proposing that while Mr. Pridham will see no further technical documentation he will still be able to view financial information. Based

on the reasons underlying your request for modification, permitting him access to financial information will not impact your clients in any way.

Again, I do not understand the delay and will not wait any longer. The delay after all you have done and argued before the Court (specifically Yahoo) is intolerable. We will file and we will not wait. You are welcome to file a response and/or your competing version.

And our motion will request expedited relief in light of the deadlines and will flag for the Court your rush to get the relief and then your failure to even attempt to provide direction on what you desire and what you think a proper modification would be. It smacks of gamesmanship and this late in the case - less than two months before trial - cannot be condoned. I know it is not either of you but I will make clear to the Court what has taken place (or not taken place for that matter). Feel free to have Perlson or White try and stretch this out or delay. I will not allow it to prejudice my client. You understand the two issues we are raising and can proceed any way you see fit.

Kindest regards,  
Andrew Spangler