

EXHIBIT 9

From: Andrea P Roberts
Sent: Thursday, July 03, 2014 3:27 PM
To: Amanda Bonn
Cc: QE-Google-Rockstar; Max L. Tribble; Justin A. Nelson; Alexander L. Kaplan; Shawn Blackburn; John Lahad; Parker Folse; claire@wsfirm.com; jw@wsfirm.com; ccapshaw@capshawlaw.com; Elizabeth DeRieux; Jeff Rambin; Mark Mann; atindel@andytindel.com; blake@themannfirm.com; John Dolan; Cyndi Obuz; Stacy Schulze
Subject: RE: Rockstar v. Google: Expert Disclosures

Amanda,

Initially, we are still reviewing Rockstar's disclosure of experts. We have a few follow up questions in that regard:

Jay Bhatia - Can you please confirm that the listed cases on his CV cover all of his work in the last four years? It is not clear from the title of that section of his CV. Please also confirm that he does not have any publications in the last 8 years, and is not an inventor or applicant in any patents or patent applications.

Kevin Almeroth – Can you please confirm that he is not an inventor or applicant on any patents or patent applications?

Vivek Shinde – Can you please confirm that he has no publications in the last 8 years, and that he is not an inventor or applicant in any patents or patent applications?

Additionally, Dai and Shinde both reside outside of the U.S. As you know, pursuant to paragraph 21 of the Protective Order “[n]o DESIGNATED MATERIAL may leave the territorial boundaries of the United States of America. Without limitation, this prohibition extends to DESIGNATED MATERIAL (including copies) in physical and electronic form. The viewing of DESIGNATED MATERIAL through electronic means outside the territorial limits of the United States of America is similarly prohibited.” Given Dai and Shinde’s residences, we are concerned about potential violations of the Protective Order. Can you please explain how Rockstar anticipates ensuring compliance with this provision of the Protective Order for these two consultants that do not reside in the U.S.?

As for the request to have Jay Bhatia review source code on July 9-11, 2014, Google is diligently collecting the relevant source code to make it available for inspection, but it will not be available for inspection by July 9. The deadline for Google to substantially complete its document production is September 16. While Google is endeavoring to make the relevant source code available for inspection before that, it will not be available by July 9. We will let Rockstar know when it is available for inspection as soon as it is. We currently anticipate that, when ready, it will be made available for inspection in Quinn Emanuel’s LA office.

With respect to the source code that Rockstar expects Google to produce, please explain why Rockstar believes that “all source code relating to functionalities identified in Plaintiffs’ infringement contentions, including but not limited to source code relating to AdWords, AdSense, Ad Server (release software), GWS (Google Web Server), GFE (Google Front End), Google Search Request and Google Search Response Objections, Google and Double-Click cookies, and search ranking, and any other source code relating to functionalities identified in Plaintiffs’ infringement contentions” is relevant? There is no basis for Rockstar to demand “all” code in these broad categories. We are collecting the source code for the functionalities accused of infringement based on our understanding of what is accused as best we can. However, as we have been telling Rockstar since April,

Rockstar's infringement contentions do not put Google on sufficient notice of what is actually accused. Thus, it would be beneficial to both parties if Rockstar would supplement its infringement contentions to provide more specificity; Google would then know which source code to make available for inspection, and that source code would be made available for inspection by Rockstar without the need for lengthy and costly correspondence between the parties regarding what should be produced.

As for the review computers, I can confirm that they each have 8 GB of memory. For the review tools, please provide us with a CD or DVD containing the software tools Rockstar is requesting, as required by paragraph 11(b) of the Protective Order. You can direct the delivery of the CD or DVD(s) to Lance Yang in our LA office.

Thanks,
Andrea

Andrea Pallios Roberts

Of Counsel,

Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP

555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor

Redwood Shores, CA 94065

650-801-5023 Direct

650.801.5000 Main Office Number

650.801.5100 FAX

andreaproberts@quinnemanuel.com

www.quinnemanuel.com

NOTICE: The information contained in this e-mail message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the recipient(s) named above. This message may be an attorney-client communication and/or work product and as such is privileged and confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail, and delete the original message.

From: Amanda Bonn [mailto:abonn@SusmanGodfrey.com]

Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 5:35 PM

To: Andrea P Roberts

Cc: QE-Google-Rockstar; Max L. Tribble; Justin A. Nelson; Alexander L. Kaplan; Shawn Blackburn; John Lahad; Parker Folse; claire@wsfirm.com; jw@wsfirm.com; ccapshaw@capshawlaw.com; Elizabeth DeRieux; Jeff Rambin; Mark Mann; atindel@andytindel.com; blake@themannfirm.com; John Dolan; Cyndi Obuz; Stacy Schulze

Subject: RE: Rockstar v. Google: Expert Disclosures

Andrea,

We have not received a response to our inquiry on Friday regarding source code. We intend to have Jay Bhatia—whom we disclosed on Friday and who previously has been approved to review Google source code in other matters—review source code on July 9-11, 2014. Please confirm that you will make the following available on those dates pursuant to the Protective Order:

Source Code: We expect Google to produce all source code relating to functionalities identified in Plaintiffs' infringement contentions, including but not limited to source code relating to AdWords, AdSense, Ad Server (release software), GWS (Google Web Server), GFE (Google Front End), Google Search Request and Google Search Response Objections, Google and Double-Click cookies, and search ranking, and any other source code relating to functionalities identified in Plaintiffs' infringement contentions.

Review Computers: We expect that source code review stations will be based on MS Windows operating system and that the stations should have sufficient memory (8GB+ each) to conduct search effectively. We also expect the following tools to be installed, all of which have cost-free licenses and can be downloaded from the below URLs: