EXHIBIT 10

From: John Lahad [jlahad@SusmanGodfrey.com]
Sent: Friday, April 18, 2014 1:51 PM
To: Andrea P Roberts
Cc: jrambin@capshawlaw.com; ederieux@capshawlaw.com; ccapshaw@capshawlaw.com; jw@wsfirm.com; claire@wsfirm.com; Alexander L. Kaplan; Max L. Tribble; Mark Mann; blake@themannfirm.com; atindel@andytindel.com; QE-Google-Rockstar
Subject: RE: Rockstar v. Google

Andrea,
Thanks for your email, and good chatting with you today. We disagree that the number of patents and claims is unreasonable at this stage in the litigation. As you mentioned, under the Court's model order – which has not been issued in this case – the earliest Rockstar would have to make an election is "by the date set for completion of claim construction discovery." Under the Court's current sample DCO, that's not until September. Google's only argument is burden, but that was explicitly taken into consideration by the Court in its model order, which intends to "streamline[] the issues in this case." Accordingly, to the extent Rockstar must limit claims, it will do so when ordered by the Court.

You add that Rockstar's infringement contentions "do not provide sufficient specificity to put Google on notice of what functionalities Rockstar contends infringes the asserted patents." Suffice it to say, we disagree. Per PR 3-1, Rockstar's infringement contentions name each instrumentality currently accused of infringement and provide ample evidence "identifying specifically where each element of each asserted claim is found within each Accused Instrumentality."

Happy to discuss.
Thanks,
John

John P. Lahad
Susman Godfrey L.L.P.
713-653-7859 (office)
713-725-3557 (mobile)
713-654-6666 (fax)