

# EXHIBIT C

**Emily O'Brien**

---

**From:** Christin Cho [christin@dovellaw.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 12, 2009 6:20 PM  
**To:** David Perlson; Emily O'Brien; Google-Performance Pricing  
**Cc:** greg@dovellaw.com  
**Subject:** Google's interrogatory Response

David,

As you suggested in our call last Thursday, Plaintiff requests that Google supplement its responses to Performance Pricing's first set of interrogatories.

Interrogatory 1 requested that Google "Set forth in specific detail each fact, opinion, argument, inference, and Document that supports your contention that you have not infringed any claim of the '235 Patent (including the name, address, and telephone number of each person who has firsthand knowledge or possession of each such fact, opinion, and Document)."

In its response, Google "contends that to the extent the claims can be understood at this time, at least the following elements [a through s] of the independent and dependent claims of the '253 Patent are not present in aspects of Google AdWords that may be accused in this case." However, Google fails to set forth each fact, opinion, argument, or inference supporting that contention. Nor does it identify any persons with firsthand knowledge or possession of each such fact or opinion. Please confirm that Google will supplement its interrogatory response to set forth each of those facts, opinions, arguments, and inferences, as well as identify the persons with knowledge. Because, as discussed in the call, time is of the essence, Plaintiff believes that two weeks will be sufficient for Google's supplemental response. Please let me know if that time-frame is agreeable.

Thanks,

Christin Cho  
Dovel & Luner, LLP  
201 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 600  
Santa Monica, CA 90401  
310.656.7066