

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

WIRELESS RECOGNITION)
TECHNOLOGIES LLC,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 A9.COM, INC.,)
 AMAZON.COM, INC.,)
 GOOGLE, INC.,)
 NOKIA, INC.)
 and)
 RICOH INNOVATIONS, INC.)
)
 Defendants.)
)

C.A. No. 2:10-cv-00364-TJW-CE

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

WIRELESS RECOGNITION)
TECHNOLOGIES LLC,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 NOKIA CORPORATION, and)
 RICOH COMPANY, LTD)
)
 Defendants.)
)

C.A. No. 2:10-cv-00365-TJW

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

WIRELESS RECOGNITION)
TECHNOLOGIES LLC,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 A9.COM, INC.,)
 AMAZON.COM, INC.,)
 GOOGLE, INC.,)
 NOKIA, INC.)
 and)
 RICOH INNOVATIONS, INC.)
)

C.A. No. 2:10-cv-00577-TJW-CE

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

<i>Defendants.</i>)	
<hr/>		
WIRELESS RECOGNITION TECHNOLOGIES LLC,)))	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>)	
v.)	C.A. No. 2:10-cv-00578-TJW-CE
NOKIA CORPORATION, and RICOH COMPANY, LTD)))	
<i>Defendants.</i>)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
)	

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

I hereby certify that on July 14, 2011, the undersigned conferred with Dan Shvodian, counsel for A9.com, Inc., Amazon.com, Inc., and Google, Inc.; Allison Altersohn, counsel for Nokia, Inc.; Mark Rowland, counsel for Ricoh Innovations, Inc. and Ricoh Company, Ltd.; and Michael Smith, counsel for all defendants except Ricoh Innovations, Inc. and Ricoh Company, Ltd. Defense counsels’ position was that because trial was over two years away, there was no need to address consolidation for all purposes. Plaintiffs disagree and believe that court and party resources are conserved by consolidation for all purposes. Discussions conclusively ended in an impasse leaving an open issue for the court to decide.

/s/ Cameron H. Tousi

/s/ William E. Davis, III
