Exhibit A: HP PA-7100LC and Lee Article (*Accelerating Multimedia with Enhanced Microprocessors*)

***Exergen* Pleading Requirement**	**Support in Answer**
Who	Moussouris and Hansen (Answer at ¶¶49, 56-61, 64)
What	HP PA-7100 LC microprocessor (Answer at ¶¶52, 58, 62, 64) and the Lee Article (*Accelerating Multimedia with Enhanced Microprocessors*) (Answer at ¶¶54, 58, 62, 64)
When	Prior to the issue date of the '840, '061, and '318 Patents (Answer at ¶¶56, 57, 64)
Where	All rejections (Answer at ¶¶58-63) and claims 1, 2, 7, 10-14, and 22 of the '061 Patent (Answer at ¶63)
How	None of the references cited to the USPTO during the original examination of the '840, '061, and '318 Patents teach the key feature of the patent claims: dynamic partitioning. (Answer at ¶¶59-62).
Knowledge	Knowledge was alleged. (Answer at ¶49, 64).
Intent	Intent was alleged. (Answer at ¶49, 64).

Exhibit B: "Intel's Plans" and "Philips's Plans"

Exergen Pleading Requirement	Support in Answer
Who	Moussouris and Hansen
What	Intel's Plans, which included the Intel MMX instruction set (Answer at ¶¶66-154) and Philips's Plans (Answer at ¶66, 68)
When	August 15 and August 16, 1995 (Answer at ¶65)
Where	All rejections (Answer at ¶¶58-61, 66, 72)
How	None of the references cited to the USPTO during the original examination of the '840, '061, and '318 Patents teach the key feature of the patent claims: dynamic partitioning. (Answer at ¶¶59-62).
Knowledge	Knowledge was alleged. (Answer at ¶¶49, 68-70, 72).
Intent	Intent was alleged. (Answer at ¶¶49, 71, 72).

Exhibit C: Sun UltraSPARC and HP PA-RISC References[13]

Exergen Pleading Requirement	Support in Answer
Who	Hansen (Answer at ¶¶73-76, 79)
What	Sun UltraSPARC (Answer at ¶¶73, 75-79)
When	On or before November 7, 1995 (Answer at ¶73)
Where	All rejections (Answer at ¶¶58-61, 78)
How	None of the references cited to the USPTO during the original examination of the '840, '061, and '318 Patents teach the key feature of the patent claims: dynamic partitioning. (Answer at ¶¶59-62).
Knowledge	Knowledge was alleged. (Answer at ¶¶49,73).
Intent	Intent was alleged. (Answer at ¶¶49, 79).

[13] The HP PA-RISC References are covered in detail in Appendix A, and are therefore not repeated here.

Exhibit D: Improper Priority Claims[14]

Exergen Pleading Requirement	Support in Answer
Who	Moussouris, Hansen, and Cage (Answer at ¶¶166-167, 173-175, 178-181, 189)
What	Improper claim of priority (Answer at ¶¶166, 178-181, 189)
When	September 23, 2003 (Answer at ¶179)
Where	The '131, '217, '708, '367, 806, and '973 Patents (Answer at ¶189)
How	Broken chain of priority causes the PCT reference to act as an intervening prior art reference, invalidating the later references. (Answer at ¶¶176-177, 188-189)
Knowledge	Knowledge was alleged. (Answer at ¶¶131, 132, 189).
Intent	Intent was alleged. (Answer at ¶¶132, 166, 189).

[14] To remain consistent with MicroUnity's MTD in this case, these citations are to the relevant paragraphs in Qualcomm's Answer and Counterclaims in Case No. 2:10-cv-00091 (Dkt. 143). *See* MTD at 9.