

# **EXHIBIT P**

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC., )

Plaintiff, )

v. )

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT )  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC., )  
IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and )  
A9.COM, INC., )

Defendants. )

Case No. 2:07-cv-432 (LED)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DISCOVERY ORDER**

After review of the pleaded claims and defenses in this action and in furtherance of the management of the Court's docket under Fed. R. Civ. P. 16, the Court enters the following Discovery Order:

1. **Disclosures.** On or by June 20, 2008 and without awaiting a discovery request, each party shall disclose to every other party the following information:
  - A. the correct names of the parties to the lawsuit;
  - B. the name, address, and telephone number of any potential parties;
  - C. the legal theories and, in general, the factual bases of the disclosing party's claims or defenses (the disclosing party need not marshal all evidence that may be offered at trial);
  - D. the name, address, and telephone number of persons having knowledge of relevant facts, a brief statement of each identified person's connection with the case, and a brief, fair summary of the substance of the information known by such person;
  - E. any indemnity and insuring agreements under which any person or entity may be liable to satisfy part or all of a judgment entered in this action or to indemnify or reimburse for payments made to satisfy the judgment;
  - F. any settlement agreements relevant to the subject matter of this action;
  - G. any statement of any party to the litigation;
  
2. **Additional Disclosures.** Each party shall provide to every other party the following information:
  - A. the disclosures required by the Court's Patent Rules in accordance with the deadlines set forth in said rules and the Court's Docket Control Order;

- B. to the extent that any party pleads a claim for relief or defensive matter other than those addressed in the Patent Rules<sup>1</sup>, on or by October 21, 2008, and without awaiting a discovery request, a copy of all documents, data compilations and tangible things in the possession, custody, or control of the party that are relevant to those additionally pleaded claims or defenses involved in this action. By written agreement of all parties, alternative forms of disclosure may be provided in lieu of paper copies. For example, the parties may agree to exchange images of documents electronically or by means of computer disk; or the parties may agree to review and copy disclosure materials at the offices of the attorneys representing the parties instead of requiring each side to furnish paper copies of the disclosure materials; and
  - C. on or by October 21, 2008, a complete computation of any category of damages claimed by any party to the action, wherein Plaintiff shall specify as to each Defendant the categories of damages that it seeks in regard to that Defendant, and making available for inspection and copying (See Local Rule CV-34), the documents or other evidentiary materials on which such computation is based, including materials bearing on the nature and extent of injuries suffered; and those documents and authorizations described in Local Rule CV-34.
  - D. The parties have discussed the electronic production of electronically-stored and hard copy information. The parties have agreed to further meet and confer regarding the format of document production in advance thereof, including the format for the production of electronically-stored information.
3. **Testifying Experts.** By the date provided in the Docket Control Order, each party shall disclose to the other party or parties:
- A. the expert's name, address, and telephone number;
  - B. the subject matter on which the expert will testify;
  - C. the general substance of the expert's mental impressions and opinions and a brief summary of the basis for them, or if the expert is not retained by, employed by, or otherwise subject to the control of the disclosing party, documents reflecting such information;
  - D. if the expert is retained by, employed by, or otherwise subject to the control of the disclosing party;
    - (1) the final versions of their expert reports, materials relied upon, and their invoices for work performed; and
    - (2) the expert's current resume and bibliography.
  - E. Testifying experts' draft reports, notes, and communications with counsel will not be subject to discovery, except to the extent relied upon by the expert in the final version of his or her report(s). The foregoing does not otherwise restrict discovery by oral deposition, and does not obligate any party to retain draft reports.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Patent Rules are Appendix M to the Local Rules, which are available on the Court's website at [www.txed.uscourts.gov](http://www.txed.uscourts.gov).

4. **Discovery Limitations.** Discovery is limited in this case to the disclosures described in Paragraphs 1 through 3, together with the following:
- A. **Interrogatories:** Plaintiff may serve up to 20 common interrogatories as to all Defendants, and an additional 10 interrogatories separately on each Defendant. Defendants may collectively serve up to 20 common interrogatories on Plaintiff, and each Defendant may serve separately up to 10 additional interrogatories on Plaintiff.
  - B. **Requests for Admission:** Plaintiff may serve up to 50 common requests for admission as to all Defendants, and an additional 30 requests for admission separately on each Defendant. Defendants may collectively serve up to 50 common requests for admission on Plaintiff, and each Defendant may serve separately up to 30 additional requests for admission on Plaintiff. There is no limit on the number of requests for admission the parties may serve to establish the authenticity of documents. Requests for admission directed to document authentication shall be clearly denoted as such and shall be served separately from any requests for admission subject to the numerical limitations stated above.
  - C. **Depositions of Parties and Third-Parties:** The parties agree to a limit of 30 fact depositions per side (presumptively no more than eight against each Defendant). The parties further agree that expert depositions will not count toward these limits. The parties further agree that depositions taken pursuant to FRCP 30(b)(6) will count towards the 30 deposition limit. The parties further agree that individual and 30(b)(6) depositions of third parties shall also count towards the 30 fact deposition limit. The parties reserve the right to revisit the issue of the number and length of depositions as discovery progresses. If any party requests more than 7 hours for a particular deposition or if any side seeks more than 30 depositions, the parties agree to meet and confer in good faith to attempt to resolve the issue without intervention by the Court.
  - D. **Depositions of Experts:** Plaintiff shall be entitled to a total of three expert witnesses on issues for which Plaintiff has the burden of proof. Each Defendant shall be entitled to a total of two expert witnesses individually, and the defendants shall collectively share up to a total of three group experts on issues for which Defendants have the burden of proof. Depositions of Defendant's expert witnesses shall be limited to 7 hours per witness per report. Depositions of Plaintiff's experts also shall be limited to 7 hours per witness per report, unless their report addresses issues relating to multiple defendants. If so, the parties agree that 7 hours per Plaintiff's expert may be insufficient to address issues relating to each defendant. As such, the parties agree to meet and confer regarding additional hours for any such deposition. The parties' ability to seek additional deposition hours of expert(s) shall not be prejudiced in any way by this subparagraph.
  - E. **Document Subpoenas on Third-Parties:** The parties may serve as many document subpoenas on third-parties, and as many depositions on written questions of custodians of business records of third-parties, as needed. However, oral depositions of third-parties are included in the calculation of the 30 fact

deposition limit set forth above in subparagraph C.

For the purposes of this Order, "side" means a party or a group of parties with a common interest.

5. **Privileged Information.** There is no duty to disclose privileged documents or information. However, the parties are directed to meet and confer concerning privileged documents or information after the Scheduling Conference. By the date provided in the Docket Control Order, the parties shall exchange privilege logs identifying the documents or information and the basis for any disputed claim of privilege in a manner that, without revealing information itself privileged or protected, will enable the other parties to assess the applicability of the privilege or protection. The parties agree that only documents created prior to September 27, 2007 need be identified on the privilege log. A party may move the Court for an order compelling the production of any privileged documents or information identified on any other party's privilege log. If such a motion is made, the party asserting privilege shall file with the Court within thirty (30) days of the filing of the motion to compel any proof in the form of declarations or affidavits to support their assertions of privilege, along with the documents over which privilege is asserted for *in camera* inspection. If the parties have no disputes concerning privileged documents or information, then the parties shall inform the Court of that fact by the date provided in the Docket Control Order.
6. **Pre-trial Disclosures.** By the date provided in the Docket Control Order, each party shall provide to every other party the following disclosures regarding the evidence that the disclosing party intends to present at trial:
  - A. The name and, if not previously provided, the address and telephone number, of each witness, separately identifying those whom the party expects to present at trial and those whom the party may call if the need arises.
  - B. The designation of those witnesses whose testimony is expected to be presented by means of a deposition and, if not taken stenographically, a transcript of the pertinent portions of the deposition testimony.
  - C. An appropriate identification of each document or other exhibit, including summaries of other evidence, separately identifying those which the party expects to offer and those which the party may offer if the need arises.

By the date provided in the Docket Control Order, a party may serve and file a list disclosing (1) any objections to the use under Rule 32(a) of a deposition designated by another party under subparagraph "B." above; and (2) any objections, together with the grounds therefor, that may be made to the admissibility of materials identified under subparagraph "C." above. Objections not so disclosed, other than objections under Rules 402 and 403 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, shall be deemed waived unless excused by the Court for good cause shown.

7. **Signature.** The disclosures required by this order shall be made in writing and signed by the party or counsel and shall constitute a certification that, to the best of the signer's

knowledge, information and belief, such disclosure is complete and correct as of the time it is made.

8. **Exchange of Disclosures.** If feasible, counsel shall meet to exchange disclosures required by this order; otherwise, such disclosures shall be served as provided by Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.
9. **Notification of the Court.** The parties shall promptly file a notice with the Court that the disclosures required under this order have taken place.
10. **Duty to Supplement.** After disclosure is made pursuant to this order, each party is under a duty to supplement or correct its disclosures immediately if the party obtains information on the basis of which it knows that the information disclosed was either incomplete or incorrect when made, or is no longer complete or true.
11. **Protective Orders.** The parties intend to submit an agreed-upon Protective Order or their competing versions by June 13, 2008.
12. **Discovery Disputes.** Counsel are directed to contact the chambers of the undersigned for any "hotline" disputes before contacting the Discovery Hotline provided by Local Rule CV-26(f). If the undersigned is not available, the parties shall proceed in accordance with Local Rule CV-26(f).
14. **Discovery Conferences.** Within 72 hours of the Court setting any discovery motion for hearing, each party's lead trial counsel and local counsel shall meet and confer in person by telephone in an effort to resolve the dispute without Court intervention. Counsel shall promptly notify the Court of the results of the meeting. Attendance by proxy is not permitted. Unless excused by the Court, lead counsel shall attend any discovery hearing set by the Court.
14. **No Excuses.** A party is not excused from the requirements of this Discovery Order because it has not fully completed its investigation of the case, or because it challenges the sufficiency of another party's disclosures, or because another party has not made its disclosures. Absent court order to the contrary, a party is not excused from disclosure because there are pending motions to dismiss, to remand or to change venue. Parties asserting the defense of qualified immunity may submit a motion to limit disclosure to those materials necessary to decide the issue of qualified immunity.
15. **Courtesy Paper Copies.** In cases pending before this Court, the parties are exempt from complying with Local Rule CV-5 which requires that paper copies be provided to the presiding judge's chambers if a document exceeds five pages in length. Paper copies will not be accepted by this Court unless specifically requested or as provided below.
16. **Hearing Notebooks.** With the exception of *Markman* notebooks required in the Docket Control Order, hearing notebooks are no longer required or requested. However, the Court may request hearing notebooks in specific instances.

17. **Requests for Production.** Because documents relevant to any claim or defense are to be produced pursuant to the patent rules and paragraphs one and two of this order, requests for production are unnecessary. However, should a party believe that certain relevant documents have not been produced, that party may request said documents by letter.

The Court will entertain a motion to compel documents without the necessity of a movant propounding formal requests for production.

Dated: May 8, 2008

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 9th day of May, 2008.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 312



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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC., IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and A9.COM, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-cv-432 (LED)

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**Agreed Docket Control Order**

DATE DUE	ACTION
4/12/2010	9:00 a.m. JURY TRIAL as reached at the United States District Court, 100 E. Houston, Room 125, Marshall, Texas 75670.
4/6/2010	9:00 a.m. JURY SELECTION at the United States District Court, 100 E. Houston, Room 125, Marshall, Texas 75670.
3/18/2010	PRETRIAL CONFERENCE at the United States District Court, 211 W. Ferguson, Tyler, Texas. All pending motions will be heard. Lead trial counsel must attend the pretrial conference.
3/16/2010	Parties to file estimates of the amount of time they request at jury selection and trial for (1) voir dire, (2) opening statements, (3) direct and cross examinations, and (4) closing arguments.
3/15/2010	Pretrial Objections due.
3/11/2010	The parties are directed to confer and advise the Court on or before 3:00 o'clock p.m. the day before the pre-trial conference which paragraphs are agreed to and those that need to be addressed at the pre-trial conference.
2/26/2010	Objections to Rebuttal Deposition Testimony due.
2/25/2010	Motions in Limine due.
2/12/2010	Rebuttal Designations and Objections to Deposition Testimony due. Cross examination line and page numbers to be included. In video depositions, each party is responsible for preparation of the final edited video in accordance with their parties' designations and the Court's rulings on objections.
1/22/2010	Pretrial Disclosures due. Video and Stenographic Deposition Designations due. Each party who proposes to offer deposition testimony shall file a disclosure identifying the

	line and page numbers to be offered. In video depositions, each party is responsible for preparation of the final edited video in accordance with their parties' designations and the Court's rulings on objections.
1/12/2010	Joint Pretrial Order, Joint Proposed Jury Instructions with citation to authority, and Form of the Verdict for jury trials. Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law with citation to authority for bench trials. Notice of Request for Daily Transcript or Real Time Reporting of Court Proceedings. If a daily transcript or real time reporting of court proceedings is requested for trial or hearings, the party or parties making said request shall file a notice with the Court and email the Court Reporter, Shea Sloan, at shea_sloan@txed.uscourts.gov.
1/8/2010	Parties to Identify Rebuttal Trial Witnesses.
12/10/2009	Last Day for Response to Dispositive Motions (including Daubert motions). Responses to dispositive motions filed prior to the dispositive motion deadline, including Daubert Motions, shall be due in accordance with Local Rule CV-7(e).
11/12/2009	Last Day for Dispositive Motions from all parties and any other motions that may require a hearing (including Daubert motions); Motion for Summary Judgment shall comply with Local Rule CV56. Answer to Amended Pleadings (after Markman Hearing) due.
12/4/2009	Parties to Identify Trial Witnesses
10/23/2009	Amend Pleadings (after Markman Hearing). It is not necessary to file a Motion for Leave to Amend before the deadline to amend pleadings. It is necessary to file a Motion for Leave to Amend after the deadline. However, except as provided in Patent Rule 3-6, if the amendment would effect preliminary or final infringement contentions or preliminary or final invalidity contentions, a motion must be made pursuant to Patent Rule 3-7 irrespective of whether the amendment is made prior to this deadline.
10/16/2009	Discovery Deadline. This date is the last day to complete discovery.
9/18/2009	Parties designate responsive expert witnesses (non-construction issues). Expert witness reports due. Refer to Local Rules for required information.
8/17/2009	Parties with burden of proof designate expert witnesses (non-construction issues). Expert witness reports due. Refer to Local Rules for required information.
8/12/2009	Comply with P.R.3-7- Furnishing documents and privilege logs pertaining to willful infringement.
6/18/2009	Comply with P.R. 4-6- Markman Hearing at 9:00 a.m. at the United States District Court, 211 West Ferguson, 2nd Floor, Courtroom of Judge John D. Love, Tyler, Texas.
6/11/2009	Reply to Motion for Summary Judgment of Indefiniteness due. The filing party is to provide the Court with 2 binders containing their brief and exhibits appropriately tabbed. If a technical advisor has been appointed the moving party is to provide their brief on disk or CD along with a hard copy, tabbed and bound in notebook format with exhibits to the advisor. Briefing shall comply with Local Rules CV-7 and 56 and Patent Rule 4-5(e). Motions to extend page limits will only be granted in exceptional

	circumstances.
6/11/2009	Comply with P.R. 4-5(d)- Chart due. Parties shall jointly submit a claim construction chart on computer disk in WordPerfect format or in such other format as the Court may direct in accordance with P.R. 4-5(d).
6/8/2009	Parties to file a notice with the Court stating the estimated amount of time requested for the Markman Hearing. The Court will notify the parties if it is unable to accommodate this request.
6/6/2009	Comply with P.R. 4-5(c)- Reply brief and supporting evidence due re response to claim construction. The filing party is to provide the Court with 2 binders containing their reply brief and exhibits appropriately tabbed. If a technical advisor has been appointed the moving party is to provide their brief on disk or CD along with a hard copy, tabbed and bound in notebook format with exhibits to the advisor.
5/21/2009	Response to Motion for Summary Judgment on Indefiniteness due. The filing party is to provide the Court with 2 binders containing their brief and exhibits appropriately tabbed. If a technical advisor has been appointed the moving party is to provide their brief on disk or CD along with a hard copy, tabbed and bound in notebook format with exhibits to the advisor. Briefing shall comply with Local Rules CV-7 and 56 and Patent Rule 4-5(e). Motions to extend page limits will only be granted in exceptional circumstances.
5/15/2009	Responsive brief and supporting evidence due to party claiming patent infringement. The filing party is to provide the Court with 2 binders containing their Markman brief and exhibits appropriately tabbed. If a technical advisor has been appointed the moving party is to provide their Markman brief on disk or CD along with a hard copy, tabbed and bound in notebook format with exhibits to the advisor.
4/30/2009	Motion for Summary Judgment on Indefiniteness due. The moving party is to provide the Court with 2 binders containing their brief and exhibits appropriately tabbed. If a technical advisor has been appointed the moving party is to provide their brief on disk or CD along with a hard copy, tabbed and bound in notebook format with exhibits to the advisor. Briefing shall comply with Local Rules CV-7 and 56 and Patent Rule 4-5(e). Motions to extend page limits will only be granted in exceptional circumstances.
4/15/2009	Comply with P.R. 4-5(a)- The party claiming patent infringement shall serve and file an opening brief and any evidence supporting its claim construction. The filing party is to provide the Court with 2 binders containing their Markman brief and exhibits appropriately tabbed. If a technical advisor has been appointed the moving party is to provide their Markman brief on disk or CD along with a hard copy, tabbed and bound in notebook format with exhibits to the advisor. Briefing shall comply with Local Rules CV-7 and 56 and Patent Rule 4-5(e). Motions to extend page limits will only be granted in exceptional circumstances.
3/12/2009	Tutorials due. Deadline for parties, if they desire, to provide Court with

	tutorials concerning technology involved in patent. If a technical advisor has been appointed, each party that provides a tutorial shall provide a copy to the advisor.
2/26/2009	Discovery Deadline - Claim Construction Issues. This date is the last day to complete discovery on claim construction issues.
1/30/2009	Respond to Amended Pleadings.
1/30/2009	Proposed Technical Advisors due. Parties to provide name, address, phone number, and curriculum vitae for up to three agreed technical advisors and information regarding the nominees' availability for Markman hearing or a statement that they could not reach an agreement as to any potential technical advisor. If the parties cannot agree on a technical advisor, they shall not submit any proposed technical advisors to the Court.
1/30/2009	Comply with P.R. 4-3- Filing of Joint Claim Construction and Pre-hearing Statement.
1/16/2009	Defendant shall assert any counterclaims. After this deadline, leave of Court must be obtained to assert any counterclaims. Add any inequitable conduct allegations to pleadings. It is not necessary to file a motion for leave to add inequitable conduct allegations to pleadings prior to this date. Thereafter, it is necessary to obtain leave of Court to add inequitable conduct allegations to pleadings.
1/16/2009	Amended Pleadings (pre-claim construction) due from all parties. It is not necessary to file a Motion for Leave to Amend before the deadline to amend pleadings. It is necessary to file a Motion for Leave to Amend after the deadline. However, if the amendment would affect infringement contentions or invalidity contentions, a motion must be made pursuant to Patent Rule 3-7 irrespective of whether the amendment is made prior to this deadline.
12/5/2008	Comply with P.R. 4-2- Exchange of Preliminary Claim Constructions and Extrinsic Evidence. Privilege Logs to be exchanged by parties (or a letter to the Court stating that there are no disputes as to claims of privileged documents).
10/30/2008	Comply with P.R. 4-1- Exchange Proposed Terms and Claim Elements for Construction.
7/14/2008	Comply with P.R. 3-3 and 3-4- Invalidity Contentions due. Thereafter, it is necessary to obtain leave of Court to add and/or amend invalidity contentions, pursuant to Patent Rule 3-6. Defendant shall join additional parties. It is not necessary to file a motion to join additional parties prior to this date. Thereafter, it is necessary to obtain leave of Court to join additional parties.
5/19/2008	Parties submit the name of a mediator.
5/14/2008	Comply with P.R. 3-1 and P.R. 3-2- Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions due. Thereafter, it is necessary to obtain leave of Court to add and/or amend infringement contentions, pursuant to Patent Rule 3-6. Plaintiff shall join additional parties. It is not necessary to file a motion to join additional parties prior to this date. Thereafter, it is necessary to obtain leave of Court to join additional parties. Plaintiff shall add new patents

	and/or claims for patents-in-suit. It is not necessary to file a motion to add additional patents or claims prior to this date. Thereafter, it is necessary to obtain leave of Court to add patents or claims.
--	---

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 14th day of May, 2008.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 318

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC., IAC  
SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and A9.COM,  
INC.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:07-cv-432 (LED/JDL)

JURY DEMANDED

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc.'s Agreed Amended Motion for Leave to Amend Plaintiff's Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions regarding Defendants Microsoft Corporation and IAC Search & Media, Inc. and Motion for Extension for Defendants to Comply with Patent Rules 3-3 and 3-4. After careful consideration, the Court concludes that the Motion should be GRANTED.

It is therefore ORDERED that Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc.'s Agreed Amended Motion for Leave to Amend Plaintiff's Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions regarding Defendants Microsoft Corporation and IAC Search & Media, Inc. is GRANTED. It is further ORDERED that Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc. may serve its First Amended Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions upon Defendants in this matter. It is further ORDERED that the Motion for Extension for Defendants to Comply with

EXHIBIT             
PAGE 319

Patent Rules 3-3 and 3-4 is GRANTED. Defendants are hereby granted an extension to July 30, 2008 to comply with Patent Rules 3-3 and 3-4.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 9th day of June, 2008.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 320



EXHIBIT

*A*

PAGE

321

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	CASE NO. 2:07-cv-432 (LED)
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC,	)	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION,	)	
YAHOO! INC., IAC SEARCH &	)	
MEDIA, INC., A9.COM, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER**

ON THIS 16 day of June, 2008, the Court considered the Joint Motion to Extend Deadlines for Filing Protective Order and Serving Initial Disclosures filed by Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc. and Defendants Google Inc., AOL LLC, Microsoft Corporation, YAHOO! Inc., IAC Search & Media, Inc. and A9. Com, Inc. After considering the motion, the Court is of the opinion that it is meritorious. It is therefore:

ORDERED that the new deadline for filing a Protective Order is June 27, 2008 and the new deadline for serving initial disclosures is June 27, 2008.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 16th day of June, 2008.

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 JOHN D. LOVE  
 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT   P    
PAGE   333

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC.,  
IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and  
A9.COM, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-cv-432 (LED/JDL)

**ORDER GRANTING THE JOINT MOTION FOR AN ADDITIONAL EXTENSION OF  
TIME TO FILE A JOINT, PROPOSED PROTECTIVE ORDER  
OR COMPETING VERSIONS THEREOF**

Performance Pricing, Inc. ("Plaintiff") and Google Inc., AOL, LLC, Microsoft Corporation, Yahoo! Inc., IAC Search & Media, Inc., and A9.Com, Inc. ("Defendants") filed their joint motion and asked the Court to further extend the deadline to provide the Court with a proposed protective order, or competing versions thereof, until and through July 8, 2008. Upon consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that said Motion shall be in all things granted, and it is further ORDERED that the deadline for Plaintiff and Defendants to file their proposed protective order, or competing versions thereof, shall be extended until and through July 8, 2008.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 30th day of June, 2008.

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 335

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC.,  
IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and  
A9.COM, INC.

Case No. 2:07-cv-432 (LED/JDL)

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' JOINT UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR AN  
ADDITIONAL EXTENSION OF TIME  
TO COMPLY WITH PATENT RULES 3-3 AND 3-4**

Defendants Google Inc., AOL, LLC, Microsoft Corporation, Yahoo! Inc., IAC Search & Media, Inc., and A9.Com, Inc. ("Defendants") filed their joint unopposed motion and asked the Court to further extend the deadline to comply with PR 3-3 and 3-4 up to an including August 6, 2008. Such motion is GRANTED.

It is therefore ORDERED that Defendants Google Inc., AOL, LLC, Microsoft Corporation, Yahoo! Inc., IAC Search & Media, Inc., and A9.Com, Inc. have until and through August 6, 2008 to comply with Patent Rules 3-3 and 3-4.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 29th day of July, 2008.

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 337

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,	)	
a Texas corporation;	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 2:07-cv-432-LED-JDL
	)	
GOOGLE INC., a Delaware corporation;	)	
AOL LLC, a Delaware limited liability	)	
company;	)	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington	)	
corporation;	)	
YAHOO! INC., a Delaware corporation;	)	
IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., a Delaware	)	
corporation;	)	
A9.COM, INC., a Delaware corporation;	)	
	)	(JURY)
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER GRANTING THE JOINT MOTION TO  
EXTEND DEADLINE FOR EXCHANGE OF PROPOSED TERMS AND  
CLAIM ELEMENTS FOR CONSTRUCTION UNDER PATENT RULE 4-1**

Performance Pricing, Inc. ("Plaintiff") and Google Inc., AOL, LLC, Microsoft Corporation, Yahoo! Inc., IAC Search & Media, Inc., and A9.Com, Inc. ("Defendants") filed their joint motion and asked the Court to extend the deadline to Exchange Proposed Terms and Claim Elements for Construction under P.R. 4-1 through and until November 3, 2008. Upon consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that said Motion shall be in all things granted, and it is further ORDERED that the deadline for Plaintiff and Defendants to Exchange Proposed Terms and Claim Elements for Construction under P.R. 4-1 shall be extended until and through November 3, 2008. So ORDERED and SIGNED this 31st day of October, 2008.

EXHIBIT             
PAGE 338

*John D. Love*  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE



EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 339

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC., )

Plaintiff, )

v. )

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, )  
MICROSOFT CORPORATION, )  
YAHOO! INC., IAC SEARCH & )  
MEDIA, INC., A9.COM, INC., )

Defendants. )

CASE NO. 2:07-cv-432 (LED)

**ORDER**

On this day, the Court considered the Joint Motion to Extend Deadlines for Exchange of Preliminary Claim Constructions and Extrinsic Evidence filed by Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc. and Defendants Google Inc., AOL LLC, Microsoft Corporation, YAHOO! Inc., and IAC Search & Media, Inc. After considering the motion, the Court is of the opinion that it is meritorious. It is therefore:

ORDERED that the new deadline for serving preliminary claim constructions and identification of extrinsic evidence is December 12, 2008.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 5th day of December, 2008.

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 370

EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 341

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC.,  
IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and  
A9.COM, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-CV-432 (LED)

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINE FOR EXCHANGE OF  
PRELIMINARY CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS AND EXTRINSIC EVIDENCE**

On this day, the Court considered the Joint Motion to Extend Deadline for Exchange of Preliminary Claim Constructions and Extrinsic Evidence filed by Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc. and Defendants Google Inc., AOL LLC, Microsoft Corporation, Yahoo! Inc., and IAC Search & Media, Inc. After considering the motion, the Court is of the opinion that it is meritorious. It is therefore:

ORDERED that the new deadline for serving preliminary claim constructions and identification of extrinsic evidence is December 23, 2008.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 12th day of December, 2008.

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT \_\_\_\_\_  
PAGE 343 \_\_\_\_\_

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC.,  
IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and  
A9.COM, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-CV-432 (LED)

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINE FOR FIRST ROUND  
OF MEDIATION**

On this day, the Court considered the Joint Motion to Extend Deadline for First Round of Mediation filed by Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc. and Defendants Google Inc., AOL LLC, Microsoft Corporation, Yahoo! Inc., and IAC Search & Media, Inc. After considering the motion, the Court is of the opinion that it is meritorious. It is therefore:

ORDERED that the new deadline for the first round of mediation is May 15, 2009.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 17th day of December, 2008.

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE



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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC.,  
IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and  
A9.COM, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-CV-432 (LED)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION TO AMEND THE DOCKET CONTROL  
ORDER REGARDING THE P.R. 4-3 DEADLINE**

On this day, the Court considered the Joint Motion to Amend the Docket Control Order Regarding the P.R. 4-3 Deadline filed by Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc. and Defendants Google Inc., AOL LLC, Microsoft Corporation, Yahoo! Inc., and IAC Search & Media, Inc. After considering the motion, the Court is of the opinion that it is meritorious. It is therefore:

ORDERED that the new deadline for the parties to file their P.R. 4-3 Joint Claim Construction and Pre-hearing Statement is February 10, 2009.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 27th day of January, 2009.

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE



EXHIBIT             
PAGE 347

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC.,  
IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and  
A9.COM, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-CV-432 (LED)

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF DEADLINE  
TO PROVIDE PROPOSED TECHNICAL ADVISORS**

Having considered the parties' Joint Motion for Extension of Deadline to Provide Proposed Technical Advisors, the Court hereby GRANTS said Motion. It is therefore

ORDERED that the deadline for the parties to provide the name, address, phone number, and curriculum vitae for three (3) agreed technical advisors and information regarding the nominees' availability for Markman hearing or a statement that they could not reach an agreement as to any potential technical advisor is extended until and through February 13, 2009.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 2nd day of February, 2009.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT             
PAGE 349

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC.,  
IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and  
A9.COM, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-CV-432 (LED)

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL EXTENSION OF TIME  
REGARDING THE PARTIES' P.R. 4-3 DEADLINE**

On this day, the Court considered the Joint Motion for Additional Extension of Time Regarding the Parties' P.R. 4-3 Deadline filed by Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc. and Defendants Google Inc., AOL LLC, Microsoft Corporation, Yahoo! Inc., and IAC Search & Media, Inc. After considering the motion, the Court is of the opinion that it is meritorious. It is therefore:

ORDERED that the new deadline for the parties to file their P.R. 4-3 Joint Claim Construction and Pre-hearing Statement is February 12, 2009.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 11th day of February, 2009.

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

{A07\7854\0004\W0385546.1}  
sf-2617079

EXHIBIT             
PAGE 350

EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 351

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC.,  
IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and  
A9.COM, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-CV-432 (LED)

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**ORDER GRANTING SECOND JOINT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF DEADLINE  
TO PROVIDE PROPOSED TECHNICAL ADVISORS**

Having considered the parties' Second Joint Motion for Extension of Deadline to Provide Proposed Technical Advisors, the Court hereby GRANTS said Motion. It is therefore

ORDERED that the deadline for the parties to provide the name, address, phone number, and curriculum vitae for three (3) agreed technical advisors and information regarding the nominees' availability for Markman hearing or a statement that they could not reach an agreement as to any potential technical advisor is extended until and through February 27, 2009.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 17th day of February, 2009.

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT             
PAGE 353

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC.,  
IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and  
A9.COM, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-cv-432 (LED)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF DEADLINE  
TO PROVIDE PROPOSED TECHNICAL ADVISORS**

Having considered the parties' Joint Motion for Extension of Deadline to Provide Proposed Technical Advisors, the Court hereby GRANTS said Motion. It is therefore

ORDERED that the deadline for the parties to provide the name, address, phone number, and curriculum vitae for up to three (3) agreed technical advisors and information regarding the nominees' availability for Markman hearing or a statement that they could not reach an agreement as to any potential technical advisor is extended until and through March 13, 2009.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 3rd day of March, 2009.

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT             
PAGE 354



EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 355

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC.,  
IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and  
A9.COM, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-CV-432 (LED)

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF DEADLINE  
TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL TUTORIALS**

Having considered the parties' Joint Motion for Extension of Deadline to Provide Proposed Technical Tutorials, the Court hereby GRANTS said Motion. It is therefore

ORDERED that the deadline for the parties to provide technical tutorials is extended until and through March 26, 2009.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 4th day of March, 2009.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT           P            
PAGE           357

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	CASE NO. 2:07-cv-432 (LED)
	)	
v.	)	
	)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC,	)	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION,	)	
YAHOO! INC., IAC SEARCH &	)	
MEDIA, INC., A9.COM, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF  
DEADLINE TO SUBMIT TECHNOLOGY TUTORIALS**

The Joint Motion for Extension of Deadline to Submit Technology Tutorials is GRANTED.

It is hereby

ORDERED that the deadline for the parties to provide technical tutorials to the Court is extended until and through April 2, 2009.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 25th day of March, 2009.

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 JOHN D. LOVE  
 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 359

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC., IAC  
SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and A9.COM,  
INC.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2-07-cv-432 (LED)

JURY DEMANDED

**ORDER**

Came on for consideration Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc.'s Agreed Motion for Extension of Time for Parties to Submit Technology Tutorials to the Court and the Court is of the opinion that the Motion should be GRANTED.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that Plaintiff's Agreed Motion for Extension of Time for Parties to Submit Technology Tutorials to the Court is GRANTED and the deadline for submission of technology tutorials is extended up to and including April 3, 2009.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 3rd day of April, 2009.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT           P            
PAGE           360



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC.; AOL LLC; MICROSOFT  
CORP.; YAHOO! INC.; AND IAC SEARCH  
& MEDIA, INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2-07CV-432-LED  
(Eastern District of Texas)

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINE FOR FIRST ROUND  
OF MEDIATION**

On this day, the Court considered the Joint Motion to Extend Deadline for First Round of Mediation filed by Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc. and Defendants Google Inc., AOL LLC, Microsoft Corporation, and Yahoo! Inc. After considering the motion, the Court is of the opinion that it is meritorious. It is therefore:

ORDERED that the new deadline for the first round of mediation is July 31, 2009.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 18th day of May, 2009.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT \_\_\_\_\_  
PAGE 362 \_\_\_\_\_



EXHIBIT           P            
PAGE           363

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC., IAC  
SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and A9.COM,  
INC.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:07-cv-432 (LED/JDL)

JURY DEMANDED

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc.'s Agreed Motion for Extension of Certain Deadlines and Page Limits. After careful consideration, the Court concludes that the Motion should be GRANTED.

It is therefore ORDERED that Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc.'s Agreed Motion for Extension of Certain Deadlines and Page Limits is GRANTED. It is further ORDERED that Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc. may file its Reply Claim Construction Brief on or before June 8, 2009 and may have an additional eight (8) pages in which to file their Reply Claim Construction Brief for a total of eighteen (18) pages.

It is further ORDERED that Defendants may file a Sur-Reply Claim Construction Brief on or before June 12, such brief not to exceed 10 pages.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 8th day of June, 2009.

EXHIBIT \_\_\_\_\_  
PAGE \_\_\_\_\_

1

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

364

EXHIBIT             
PAGE 365

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC.; AOL LLC; MICROSOFT  
CORP.; YAHOO! INC.; AND IAC SEARCH  
& MEDIA, INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2-07CV-432-LED  
(Eastern District of Texas)

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINE FOR FIRST ROUND  
OF MEDIATION**

On this day, the Court considered the Joint Motion to Extend Deadline for First Round of Mediation filed by Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc. and Defendants Google Inc., AOL LLC, and Microsoft Corporation. After considering the motion, the Court is of the opinion that it is meritorious. It is therefore:

ORDERED that the new deadline for the first round of mediation is August 13, 2009.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 12th day of June, 2009.

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 367

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC.; AOL LLC; MICROSOFT  
CORP.; YAHOO! INC.; AND IAC SEARCH  
& MEDIA, INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2-07CV-432-LED  
(Eastern District of Texas)

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINE FOR PATENT RULE  
4-5(d) FILING**

On this day, the Court considered the Joint Motion to Extend Deadline for Patent Rule 4-5(d) Filing filed by Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc. and Defendants Google Inc., AOL LLC, and Microsoft Corporation. After considering the motion, the Court is of the opinion that it is meritorious. It is therefore:

ORDERED that the new deadline for the parties to comply with Patent Rule 4-5(d) is June 12, 2009.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 12th day of June, 2009.

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT             
PAGE            368

EXHIBIT     P      
PAGE     369

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC.; AOL LLC; MICROSOFT  
CORP.; YAHOO! INC.; AND IAC SEARCH  
& MEDIA, INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2-07CV-432-LED  
(Eastern District of Texas)

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINES FOR EXPERT  
DISCLOSURES, DISCOVERY AND DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS**

On this day, the Court considered the Joint Motion to Extend Deadlines for Expert Disclosures, Discovery and Dispositive Motions filed by Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc. and Defendants Google Inc., AOL LLC, and Microsoft Corporation. After considering the motion, the Court is of the opinion that it is meritorious. It is therefore ORDERED that the:

Deadline for parties with the burden of proof to designate expert witnesses, and that expert reports are due, is September 18, 2009;

Deadline to designate responsive expert witnesses, and that are expert reports due, is October 30, 2009;

Discovery deadline is November 13, 2009;

Last day to file dispositive motions (including Daubert) is November 20, 2009; and

Last day to respond to dispositive motions (including Daubert) is December 18, 2009.



So ORDERED and SIGNED this 22nd day of June, 2009.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT   P    
PAGE   371

EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 372

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., AOL LLC, MICROSOFT  
CORPORATION, YAHOO! INC.,  
IAC SEARCH & MEDIA, INC., and  
A9.COM, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-cv-432 (LED)

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

ORDER

Came on for consideration Plaintiff Performance Pricing, Inc.'s Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time to Submit Further Limited Claim Construction Briefing and the Court is of the opinion that the Motion should be GRANTED. It is therefore:

ORDERED that the new deadline for Plaintiff to submit the further limited claim construction briefing under section 4 (pp. 4-5) of the Court's July 15, 2009 Order is Wednesday, July 22, 2009, and the new deadline for Defendants to submit its response is Tuesday, July 28, 2009.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 17th day of July, 2009.

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT     P      
PAGE     325

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

PERFORMANCE PRICING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC. and AOL LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-cv-432 (LED)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS GOOGLE INC. AND AOL LLC'S UNOPPOSED  
MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT THEIR SUPPLEMENTAL  
RESPONSE BRIEF ON CLAIM CONSTRUCTION**

Before the Court is Defendants Google Inc. and AOL LLC's (collectively, "Defendants") Unopposed Motion for an Extension of Time to Submit to Submit Their Supplemental Response Brief on Claim Construction as ordered by the Court in section 4 (pp. 4-5) of the Court's Order issued on July 15, 2009 (Docket No. 218) ("Order"). The Court finds that the motion should be GRANTED. Therefore, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that the deadline for Defendants to submit a supplemental response brief on claim constructing is extended to Thursday, July 30, 2009.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 29th day of July, 2009.

  
JOHN D. LOVE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

EXHIBIT 4  
PAGE 376