EXHIBIT A

Capital Reporting Company Hearing 12-28-2009

1 IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, MARSHALL DIVISION -----: PA ADVISORS, Plaintiff, : Civil Docket No. : 2:07-cv-00480-RRR vs. GOOGLE, INC., et al., : Defendant. : -----: Washington, D.C. Monday, December 28, 2009 The above-entitled matter came on for Pretrial Conference, pursuant to Notice. BEFORE: HONORABLE RANDALL R. RADER, Judge

Capital Reporting Company Hearing 12-28-2009

0	
14	16
1 basically that requires entering a search query.	1 Is it a drafting problem, you think, in your
2 Claim 45 does not have any similar requirement	2 Claim 1 that has more than one user?
3 and is also performed by the Defendant.	3 MR. FENSTER: Well, the method and the system
4 JUDGE RADER: Let me look at Claim 45 for a	4 can certainly be drafted to require only a single user,
5 second, if I may. Okay. I looked at that.	5 evidence of Claim 45. This Claim 1 could have been
6 As for Claim 1, Mr. Fenster, I happened to look	6 drafted that way by instead of saying providing by a
7 at a federal circuit case today entitled BMC Resources v.	7 user, receiving from a user.
8 Paymentech. It requires all the steps of any claim that	8 JUDGE RADER: Yes. The Paymentech makes
9 is purported to be in French to be performed by a single	that
10 user.	9 point itself, I think.
11 How would you surmount Paymentech for Claim	10 MR. FENSTER: Yes.
1?	11 JUDGE RADER: Well, all right. Is there
12 MR. FENSTER: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor,	12 anything further, Mr. Fenster? I don't want to cut off
13 there is I am familiar with the case law and generally	13 your commentary here.
14 the law does require that all steps be performed by a	14 MR. FENSTER: So in early 2000, Google and
15 single party, but they are they require all	Yahoo
16 substantive steps and there is case law that has been	15 started personalizing Google before Yahoo and the we
17 developed, as well, where there is an insubstantial step.	16 have the various accused products of asserting infringing
18 For example, the provision of a browser.	17 Claims 1 and 45 and various dependent claims, as well.
19 JUDGE RADER: Is there such a thing as a	18 This is a willfulness case. The patent was
20 substantial or essential or other more important	19 provided early on to Google and so that will be part of
21 limitation than other limitations in the claim?	20 the case and I can answer any other questions, but I'll
22 MR. FENSTER: Your Honor, I think that what the	21 leave it there for now.
15	17
15	17
15 1 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of	17 1 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case
1 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of	1 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr.
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay.
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the essence of this method is provided. All of the 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing Google. I'll just start and Yahoo can fill in, if that's
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the essence of this method is provided. All of the computational aspects of this method are performed by 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing Google. I'll just start and Yahoo can fill in, if that's okay.
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the essence of this method is provided. All of the computational aspects of this method are performed by the 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing Google. I'll just start and Yahoo can fill in, if that's okay. JUDGE RADER: We'll give them their own
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the essence of this method is provided. All of the computational aspects of this method are performed by the Defendant. 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing Google. I'll just start and Yahoo can fill in, if that's okay. JUDGE RADER: We'll give them their own separate
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the essence of this method is provided. All of the computational aspects of this method are performed by the Defendant. The only thing that is provided by the user is 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing Google. I'll just start and Yahoo can fill in, if that's okay. JUDGE RADER: We'll give them their own separate time, Mr. Verhoeven, but you go ahead for now.
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the essence of this method is provided. All of the computational aspects of this method are performed by the Defendant. The only thing that is provided by the user is the search request. The that is, the user has to 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing Google. I'll just start and Yahoo can fill in, if that's okay. JUDGE RADER: We'll give them their own separate time, Mr. Verhoeven, but you go ahead for now. MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you. We'll keep this
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the essence of this method is provided. All of the computational aspects of this method are performed by the Defendant. The only thing that is provided by the user is the search request. The that is, the user has to 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing Google. I'll just start and Yahoo can fill in, if that's okay. JUDGE RADER: We'll give them their own separate time, Mr. VERHOEVEN: Thank you. We'll keep this MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank yoi. We'll we'll
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the essence of this method is provided. All of the computational aspects of this method are performed by the Defendant. The only thing that is provided by the user is the search request. The that is, the user has to provide JUDGE RADER: But if that's a limitation of the 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing Google. I'll just start and Yahoo can fill in, if that's okay. JUDGE RADER: We'll give them their own separate time, Mr. Verhoeven, but you go ahead for now. MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you. We'll keep this really brief. The 065 patent is very bear with me here. I'm
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the essence of this method is provided. All of the computational aspects of this method are performed by the Defendant. The only thing that is provided by the user is the search request. The that is, the user has to provide JUDGE RADER: But if that's a limitation of the claim, it would have to be satisfied. Am I right, Mr. 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing Google. I'll just start and Yahoo can fill in, if that's okay. JUDGE RADER: We'll give them their own separate time, Mr. Verhoeven, but you go ahead for now. MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you. We'll keep this really brief. The 065 patent is very bear with me here. I'm dealing with my computer. Has gotten very detailed
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the essence of this method is provided. All of the computational aspects of this method are performed by the Defendant. The only thing that is provided by the user is the search request. The that is, the user has to provide JUDGE RADER: But if that's a limitation of the claim, it would have to be satisfied. Am I right, Mr. Fenster? 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing Google. I'll just start and Yahoo can fill in, if that's okay. JUDGE RADER: We'll give them their own separate time, Mr. Verhoeven, but you go ahead for now. MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you. We'll keep this really brief. The 065 patent is very bear with me here. I'm dealing with my computer. Has gotten very detailed claims, Your Honor, and it appears to us when we
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the essence of this method is provided. All of the computational aspects of this method are performed by the Defendant. The only thing that is provided by the user is the search request. The that is, the user has to provide JUDGE RADER: But if that's a limitation of the claim, it would have to be satisfied. Am I right, Mr. Fenster? MR. FENSTER: Yes, Your Honor. 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing Google. I'll just start and Yahoo can fill in, if that's okay. JUDGE RADER: We'll give them their own separate time, Mr. Verhoeven, but you go ahead for now. MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you. We'll keep this really brief. The 065 patent is very bear with me here. I'm dealing with my computer. Has gotten very detailed claims, Your Honor, and it appears to us when we analyze
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the essence of this method is provided. All of the computational aspects of this method are performed by the Defendant. The only thing that is provided by the user is the search request. The that is, the user has to provide JUDGE RADER: But if that's a limitation of the claim, it would have to be satisfied. Am I right, Mr. Fenster? MR. FENSTER: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE RADER: I I noticed that in the 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing Google. I'll just start and Yahoo can fill in, if that's okay. JUDGE RADER: We'll give them their own separate time, Mr. Verhoeven, but you go ahead for now. MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you. We'll keep this really brief. The 065 patent is very bear with me here. I'm dealing with my computer. Has gotten very detailed claims, Your Honor, and it appears to us when we analyze the patent that the innovation, the alleged innovation
 case law requires is that all of the essential steps of the method be performed by a single actor. JUDGE RADER: Now I'm aware that Japanese law makes a distinction between essential claim elements and inessential claim elements. I'm not aware that U.S. law does that. Am I missing something? MR. FENSTER: I I think that what the case law provides in the U.S. is that all of the the essence of this method is provided. All of the computational aspects of this method are performed by the Defendant. The only thing that is provided by the user is the search request. The that is, the user has to provide JUDGE RADER: But if that's a limitation of the claim, it would have to be satisfied. Am I right, Mr. Fenster? MR. FENSTER: Yes, Your Honor. 	 Fenster. That gives me an overview of of your case and let's move on. I'm not sure whether to acknowledge Google or Yahoo first. Would you two help me make that decision? MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure, Your Honor. This is Mr. Verhoeven JUDGE RADER: Okay. MR. VERHOEVEN: right here, representing Google. I'll just start and Yahoo can fill in, if that's okay. JUDGE RADER: We'll give them their own separate time, Mr. Verhoeven, but you go ahead for now. MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you. We'll keep this really brief. The 065 patent is very bear with me here. I'm dealing with my computer. Has gotten very detailed claims, Your Honor, and it appears to us when we analyze

(866) 448 - DEPO www.CapitalReportingCompany.com © 2009