

Exhibit 7

From: Soobert, Allan M. [allansoobert@paulhastings.com]
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2010 2:49 PM
To: Solo, Alex
Cc: MW v Apple; Mirror Worlds
Subject: RE: MW: Status of Disputes & Proposed Agreement

Alex,

I think that we're continuing to make progress. Let me respond to your points, in turn.

On Mirror Worlds' motion to compel and the questions regarding worldwide sales, Christian Platt provided our responses to you on Friday, July 23. We note that many of the questions should have been explored, if at all, during the depositions of Apple witnesses. Nevertheless, we have attempted to reasonably respond, as appropriate, in an effort to resolve this issue. In our view, all issues in Mirror Worlds' motion to compel have been addressed and that motion should be withdrawn. Please confirm.

Thank you for withdrawing your request for Steve Jobs. Apple will agree that the emails, videos and transcripts that Apple has produced are authentic business records, provided that all of the entities that you represent (i.e., not just Mirror Worlds, but also Mirror Worlds Technologies, Recognition Interface, Plainfield, Yale, and the individual inventors and witnesses) similarly agree their production documents are authentic business records. Please let us know if that is acceptable.

Before turning to the points on the parties' respective invalidity contentions, we note that you previously indicated that Mirror Worlds was willing to limit and identify the specific claims that Mirror Worlds plans to assert at trial, after you had a chance to review the parties summary judgment submissions. Mirror Worlds has now opposed Apple's motions for summary judgment, and should be in a position to do so. This would really help the parties to focus the case for trial, and thus, we request that Mirror Worlds identify the claims that it plans to assert at trial by Wednesday, July 28.

On points 1-4 for the respective invalidity contentions, please note that these points were proposed collectively, not individually, as part of our attempt to resolve the parties' respective disputes over contentions. Thus, we can only agree to point 1, if we reach agreement on the other points as well (which we are optimistic can be done.)

Nevertheless, and without having the benefit of knowing what specific claims Mirror Worlds plans to assert, the following are the specific references that Apple intends to rely on for the SDMS, Memoirs and Lucas-Workspace systems (subject, again, to Mirror Worlds' identification of specific asserted claims):

SDMS system references:

1. Richard Bolt, Spatial Data Management (1979).
2. MIT, "Spatial Data Management System," (DVD) (January 1980).
3. Richard A. Bolt, "Gaze-Orchestrated Dynamic Windows," ACM SIGGRAPH Computer Graphics, pp. 109-119, Volume 15, Issue 3 August 1981 (also published in International Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques, Proceedings of the 8th Annual Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques Dallas, Texas, August 3-7, 1981).

Memoirssystem references:

1. M.W. Lansdale, D.R. Young, & C.A. Bass, "Memoirs: A Personal Multimedia Information System" Published for the "People for Computers V" Proceedings of the Fifth Conference of the British Computer Society, Human-Computer Interaction Specialist Group, University of Nottingham 5-8 September 1989.
2. D. Young, MW Lansdale, and CA Bass., "Using HyperTalk as a Specification Tool and a Simulation Vehicle in the Development of a Personal Data Base System," in Simulation and the User Interface, Taylor Francis, 1990.
3. Lansdale et al., "Using memory for events in the design of personal filing systems," Int. J. Man-Machine Studies (1992)
4. Lansdale, "The Psychology of Personal Information Management," Applied Ergonomics, March 1988.

Lucas Workspace system references:

1. U.S. Patent No. 5,499,330

2. MAYA Video Demonstration pertaining to the CHI '94 Conference (APMW0076598, APMW0076599, and MD001043)
3. P. Lucas and L. Schneider, "Workscape: A Scriptable Document Management Environment," CHI '94 Conference Companion, pp. 9-10 (Apr 24-28, 1994).
4. J. M. Ballay, "Designing Workscape: An Interdisciplinary Experience," CHI '94 Conference, pp. 10-15 (Apr 24-28, 1994).
5. U.S. Patent Nos. Des. D395,297
6. U.S. Patent No. 6,151,610

On point 3, Apple intends to use the 10 identified references in addition to those identified in Apple's First Amended Invalidation Contentions (served on 5/11/2009) and the references above relating to the Memoirs, SDMS and Workscape systems.

On point 4, it is routine, in our view, to use such background art. Please confirm that you do not have an objection.

REDACTED

On the iPod Nano/Classic stipulation, we are working on a proposal and will get that to you shortly.

On Dr. Baecker, we did withdraw his initial declaration, in light of the issues you raised over the dates and purported lack of documentary support. Dr. Baecker, however, prepared a new declaration clarifying and (hopefully) resolving these issues, and included a document corroborating his statements. Please let us know if you have any additional concerns. While it is likely unnecessary, Dr. Baecker is also available for a short deposition on the declaration in New York on July 29, if you have any additional questions.

We look forward to your response, and putting these issues behind us.

Thanks,
Allan

REDACTED