

EXHIBIT F

quinn emanuel trial lawyers | san francisco

50 California Street, 22nd Floor, San Francisco, California 94111 | TEL: (415) 875-6600 FAX: (415) 875-6700

January 30, 2009

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Greg Dovel and Christin Cho
Dovel & Luner LLP
201 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 600
Santa Monica, CA 90401

Re: Performance Pricing, Inc. v. Google Inc. et al.

Dear Greg and Christin:

I write in reference to our continuing discussions regarding contention discovery issues in the above referenced matter and our meet and confer on January 27, 2009. We appreciate you taking the time to meet and confer with us on these issues, and believe we have made some progress toward an ultimate resolution.

In our call, we discussed Google's proposed compromise on these issues, suggested in my letter of January 15, 2009. You expressed concern that you would not receive all of the information you were interested in through a supplemental interrogatory response. You indicated that if you did receive information to your satisfaction in an interrogatory response, however, that it would not be necessary to go forward with the 30(b)(6) deposition you noticed on Google.

We also discussed Plaintiff's supplementation of its responses to contention interrogatories served by joint defendants and by Google. You agreed to look at supplementing Plaintiff's responses to these interrogatories. You stated, however, that in particular with the damages interrogatories, there may not be anything to supplement until after consultation with expert witness(es). You explained that even though Plaintiff may already have revenue and other damages-related documents that Google has produced, to the extent Plaintiff has not yet fully analyzed documents produced by Google or any other documents in its possession or control (for

quinn emanuel urquhart oliver & hedges, llp

LOS ANGELES | 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017 | TEL (213) 443-3000 FAX (213) 443-3100

NEW YORK | 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor, New York, NY 10010 | TEL (212) 849-7000 FAX (212) 849-7100

SILICON VALLEY | 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 560, Redwood Shores, CA 94065 | TEL (650) 801-5000 FAX (650) 801-5100

TOKYO | Akasaka Twin Tower Main Building, 6th Floor, 17-22 Akasaka 2-Chome, Minato-ku, 107-0052 | TEL +81 3 5561-1711 FAX +81 3 5561-1712

51307/27802621
LONDON | Ground Floor, 90 Long Acre, London England | TEL +44 (0) 20-7716-5866 FAX +44 (0) 20-7716-5867

example third party licenses), you believe Plaintiff is not required to supplement its interrogatories at this time to include the information in the documents or to provide any specific reference to such documents in its responses. We also understood that Plaintiff did not intend to provide any heavier burden on Google than it did on itself. Indeed, you were emphatic that you were not imposing any double standard. Thus, for example, we expect that Plaintiff does not expect a supplementation from Google that would require Google to marshal all its facts, documents, and evidence it may later rely on at this time (even if they may be in Google's possession, custody, or control), nor to provide all the facts, evidence, or opinions that Google or its experts may later rely on or provide in rebutting Plaintiff's claim of infringement. We went back and forth quite a bit on this issue to try to reach an understanding of Plaintiff's position so please let us know if we have misunderstood it.

Ultimately, we discussed the possibility of Google supplementing its response to Plaintiff's Interrogatory No. 1. As part of these efforts, Google would provide a non-final and non-binding draft of this interrogatory response to Plaintiff that provides further explanation of why Google contends that Plaintiff's Infringement Contentions do not demonstrate that the identified elements of the '253 Patent are present in the accused products. Plaintiff would then review to determine whether the response provides the type of information Plaintiff seeks. We can discuss this issue further as needed. We will work on supplementing this response in this manner, and anticipate having a draft to you in two weeks. If for any reason it appears that this supplementation will take longer, we will contact you with that information, and to discuss further as needed. I believe that Plaintiff indicated that it too could provide any supplemental responses in this same time frame. If this is not correct please let us know.

We also discussed the scope of joint defendants' Interrogatory No. 4. We indicated that we believe, as stated in my January 15 letter, that this interrogatory does require that Plaintiff provide its contentions as to whether any of the prior art identified in Defendants' contentions meet the elements of the asserted claims of the '253 Patent. You disagreed, but indicated this is an appropriate area of inquiry by Defendants. We suggest that Plaintiff provide a supplementation to this interrogatory to the extent it believes is appropriate and we can address Plaintiff's supplementation at the same time Plaintiff addresses Google's.

As always, we remain willing to meet and confer to resolve any discovery issues, and hope that you similarly remain willing to work together on these issues in a timely and efficient manner. If you believe that a live discussion to discuss these issues would be helpful, we are available at your convenience.

Cordially,

/s/ Emily C. O'Brien

Emily C. O'Brien
51307/2780262.1