

EXHIBIT J

THE EDMONDS LAW FIRM

John J. Edmonds
713.858.3320
johnedmonds@edmondslegal.com

January 19, 2009

Via email

Charles Verhoeven Quinn Emanuel 50 California St., Ste. 2200 San Francisco, CA 94111	Jason White Howrey 321 North Clark St., Ste. 3400 Chicago, IL 60654
---	--

Re: *Bright Response, LLC. v. Google Inc., et al.*, 2:07-CV-371 (CE)

Counsel:

This letter is further to the P.R. 3-3 invalidity contentions served by the defendants in the above referenced litigation on August 7, 2008.

As you are aware, the defendants in this case (as in any case under the Patent Rules of the Eastern District of Texas) have an obligation to diligently prepare and serve invalidity contentions compliant with Patent Rule 3-3 pursuant to the Court's Docket Control Order. BrightResponse assumes that the defendants diligently followed the Court's Patent Rules in preparing their P.R. 3-3 invalidity contentions – in particular with respect to alleged prior art that is owned or controlled by any of the defendants and alleged prior art that is in the public domain. The Court's Patent Rules "exist to further the goal of full, timely discovery and provide all parties with adequate notice and information with which to litigate their cases, not to create supposed loopholes through which parties may practice litigation by ambush." *Finisar v. Directv Group*, 424 F. Supp. 2d 896, 901 (E.D. Tex. 2006). To be clear, any attempt at this point to add any such alleged prior art to this case would be unfairly prejudicial to BrightResponse.

Sincerely,



John J. Edmonds