



Texas Bar No. 19196650  
tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com  
Rosemary T. Snider  
Texas Bar No. 18796500  
rsnider@mckoolsmith.com  
Scott W. Hejny  
Texas State Bar No. 24038952  
shejny@mckoolsmith.com  
Jason D. Cassady  
Texas Bar No. 24045625  
jcassady@mckoolsmith.com  
J. Austin Curry  
Texas Bar No. 24059636  
acurry@mckoolsmith.com  
Phillip M. Aurentz  
Texas State Bar No. 24059404  
paurentz@mckoolsmith.com  
McKOOL SMITH, P.C.  
300 Crescent Court, Suite 1500  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: 214-978-4000  
Facsimile: 214-978-4044

Robert M. Parker  
Texas Bar No. 15498000  
Robert Christopher Bunt  
Texas Bar No. 00787165  
PARKER, BUNT & AINSWORTH, P.C.  
100 E. Ferguson, Suite 1114  
Tyler, Texas 75702  
Telephone: 903-531-3535  
Facsimile: 903-533-9687  
E-mail: rmparker@pbatyler.com  
E-mail: rcbunt@pbatyler.com

**Attorneys for Defendants Google and Match:**

Claude M. Stern, Lead Attorney  
Evette D. Pennypacker  
Todd M. Briggs  
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP  
555 Twin Dolphin Dr., 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: 650-801-5002

Facsimile: 650-801-5100  
claudestern@quinnemanuel.com  
evettepennypacker@quinnemanuel.com  
toddbriggs@quinnemanuel.com

Michael E. Jones  
Allen Gardner  
POTTER MINTON, PC  
110 N. College  
Tyler, Texas 75702  
Telephone: 903-597-8311  
Facsimile: 903-893-0846  
mikejones@potterminton.com  
allengardner@potterminton.com

## **II. STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION**

Plaintiff claims that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, and 1338(a) because this action arises under the patent laws of the United States, including 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.* Defendants claim that the Court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over this action. *See* Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Standing (Dkt. 452).

Venue and personal jurisdiction are not disputed in this case.

## **III. NATURE OF ACTION**

- **Bedrock’s Statement Regarding the Description of the Case**

This is a patent infringement lawsuit. Plaintiff Bedrock Computer Technologies LLC (“Bedrock”) alleges that Defendants Google and Match, directly infringe U.S. Patent No. 5,893,120 (“the ’120 patent” or “patent-in-suit”). Bedrock further alleges that Defendants’ infringement is and has been willful. Additionally, Bedrock alleges that Defendants infringe literally. Bedrock seeks both pre-verdict and post-verdict damages up to the time of judgment to compensate Bedrock for Defendants’ alleged acts of infringement, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty, as well as permanent injunctive relief against future acts of infringement by

Defendants. Bedrock also seeks treble damages, together with prejudgment and post judgment interests and costs, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 and attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.

Defendants deny that they have literally willfully or otherwise infringed the '120 patent and allege that the patent-in-suit is invalid.

Defendants counterclaim for a declaratory judgment of non-infringement and invalidity of the patent-in-suit. Bedrock denies Defendants' counterclaims.

- **Defendants' Statement Regarding the Description of the Case**

This is a patent infringement case wherein Plaintiff Bedrock has asserted that Google infringes claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 (the "asserted claims") of United States Patent No. 5,893,120 ("the '120 patent) and that Match infringes claims 1 and 2. Defendants contend that none of their products infringe the asserted claims of the '120 patent and that the asserted claims are invalid because they fail to meet one or more of the requirements for patentability. Defendants further allege that Bedrock does not have standing to sue for infringement of the '120 patent. Defendants also deny Bedrock's allegations of willful infringement and deny Bedrock's claim for damages. Defendants further allege that Bedrock's claim for damages is barred by the doctrine of laches.

#### **IV. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES**

- **Bedrock's Statement of Its Contentions**

By providing these Contentions, Bedrock does not concede that all of these issues are appropriate for trial. In addition, Bedrock does not waive any of its motions *in limine* or motions for summary judgment.

1. In this case, Bedrock contends that Defendants are directly infringing claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 of the '120 patent under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281-285 by making, using, offering for sale, selling, and/or importing various products and/or services in the United States,

without authority or license of Bedrock, including Linux kernel versions or software based on the following Linux kernel versions:<sup>1</sup> 2.4.22.x, 2.4.23.x, 2.4.24.x, 2.4.25.x, 2.4.26.x, 2.4.27.x, 2.4.28.x, 2.4.29.x, 2.4.30.x, 2.4.31.x, 2.4.32.x, 2.4.33.x, 2.4.37.x, 2.6.0.x, 2.6.1.x, 2.6.2.x, 2.6.3.x, 2.6.4.x, 2.6.5.x, 2.6.6.x, 2.6.7.x, 2.6.8.x, 2.6.9.x, 2.6.10.x, 2.6.11.x, 2.6.12.x, 2.6.13.x, 2.6.14.x, 2.6.15.x, 2.6.16.x, 2.6.17.x, 2.6.18.x, 2.6.19.x, 2.6.20.x, 2.6.21.x, 2.6.22.x, 2.6.23.x, 2.6.24.x, 2.6.25.x, 2.6.26.x, 2.6.27.x, 2.6.28.x, 2.6.29.x, 2.6.30.x, 2.6.31.x, 2.6.32.x, 2.6.33.x, 2.6.34.x, *et seq.*, and products and software with similar functionality that practice the inventions of the '120 patent.

2. Bedrock contends that the inventions of the '120 patent were conceived at least as early as November 2, 1996, and that diligence was used from that point forward to reduce the invention to practice by at least January 2, 1997. On this basis, Bedrock contends that the '120 patent is entitled to a priority date of at least as early as November 2, 1996.

3. Bedrock is the owner of all rights, title, and interest in and to the '120 patent at least as of March 26, 2009. Bedrock possesses all rights of recovery for past, present, and future infringement of the '120 patent.

4. Bedrock contends that it has been damaged by Defendants' conduct and seeks pre-verdict and post-verdict damages up to the time of judgment adequate to compensate for the infringement by Defendants, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty, together with prejudgment and post-judgment interest and costs as fixed by the Court.

5. Bedrock contends that Bedrock and all predecessors in interest have complied with 35 U.S.C. § 287.

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendants object in that not all defendants use all versions of Linux.

6. Bedrock contends that this case is exceptional and that Bedrock is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs (and consultant fees and costs) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.

7. Bedrock contends that Defendants' infringement is and has been willful and thus requests that the Court award to Bedrock enhanced damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284, as well as supplemental damages for any continuing post-verdict infringement up until entry of final judgment, and an accounting for damages if necessary.

8. Bedrock contends that they are entitled to a permanent injunction against Defendants. In the alternative, Bedrock contends that any denial of a permanent injunction should be conditioned on payment of reasonable royalties for future infringement, including during any stay of an injunction pending appeal.

9. Bedrock denies Defendants' defenses and declaratory judgment claims that the patent-in-suit is invalid, or not infringed by Defendants.

10. Bedrock denies that Defendants are entitled to costs, a declaration that this case is exceptional, and attorneys' fees.

11. Bedrock contends that jurisdiction is proper in this Court.

12. Bedrock contends that venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas.

13. Bedrock contends that Defendants make, use, offer for sale, sell, and/or import various products and/or services, without authority or license of Bedrock, in the United States, including Linux kernel versions or software based on the following Linux kernel versions: 2.4.22.x, 2.4.23.x, 2.4.24.x, 2.4.25.x, 2.4.26.x, 2.4.27.x, 2.4.28.x, 2.4.29.x, 2.4.30.x, 2.4.31.x, 2.4.32.x, 2.4.33.x, 2.4.37.x, 2.6.0.x, 2.6.1.x, 2.6.2.x, 2.6.3.x, 2.6.4.x, 2.6.5.x, 2.6.6.x,

2.6.7.x, 2.6.8.x, 2.6.9.x, 2.6.10.x, 2.6.11.x, 2.6.12.x, 2.6.13.x, 2.6.14.x, 2.6.15.x, 2.6.16.x, 2.6.17.x, 2.6.18.x, 2.6.19.x, 2.6.20.x, 2.6.21.x, 2.6.22.x, 2.6.23.x, 2.6.24.x, 2.6.25.x, 2.6.26.x, 2.6.27.x, 2.6.28.x, 2.6.29.x, 2.6.30.x, 2.6.31.x, 2.6.32.x, 2.6.33.x, 2.6.34.x, *et seq.*, and products with similar functionality.

- **Defendants' Statement of Their Contentions**

By providing these contentions, Defendants do not concede that all of these issues are appropriate for trial. In particular, Defendants do not waive any of their motions *in limine*, motions for summary judgment, or *Daubert* motions, which, if granted, would render some or all of these issues moot. Defendants' contentions in this case are detailed in their answers, affirmative defenses and counterclaims to Bedrock's Third Amended Complaint, and Defendants' invalidity contentions, all of which are incorporated herein by reference. In sum, Defendants contend the following:

1. Bedrock does not own, and therefore does not have standing to sue for infringement of the '120 patent.

2. Defendants do not directly infringe, and have not directly infringed, the asserted '120 patent claims.

3. The asserted claims of the '120 patent are invalid because they were anticipated and/or would have been obvious to one of skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention. The asserted claims are invalid for the reasons stated in Defendants' Invalidity Contentions and the expert report of Kevin Jeffay.

4. If Defendants are found to infringe the asserted claims of the '120 patent, and those claims are found to be valid, Bedrock is entitled to no more than the amount set forth in the Expert Report of Keith Ugone.

5. If Defendants are found to infringe the asserted claims of the '120 patent, Plaintiff's claims for damages are barred and/or unenforceable by the doctrine of laches.

6. If Defendants are found to infringe the asserted claims of the '120 patent, and those claims are found to be valid, Defendants' infringement was not willful.

7. Defendants are entitled to a declaratory judgment finding that Defendants are not directly or indirectly infringing, and have not directly or indirectly infringed, any claim of the '120 patent.

8. Defendants are entitled to a declaratory judgment finding that the claims of the '120 patent are invalid under one or more sections of Title 35 of the United States Code, including, without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103, and/or 112.

9. Defendants are entitled to a declaratory judgment finding that Bedrock does not own the '120 patent and does not have standing to sue for infringement of the '120 patent.<sup>2</sup>

## V. STIPULATIONS AND UNCONTESTED FACTS

The parties agree to the following stipulations and uncontested facts.

- **Bedrock's and Defendants' Statement of Uncontested Facts**

1. The '120 patent has an effective filing date of January 2, 1997 and was issued on April 6, 1999.

2. The '120 patent is entitled "Methods and Apparatus for Information Storage and Retrieval Using A Hashing Technique with External chaining and On-The-Fly Removal of Expired Data."

---

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff Bedrock objects that no Defendant has standing to request a declaratory judgment on this issue (as evidenced in Bedrock's Motion to Dismiss Google Inc.'s and Match.com, LLC's Counterclaims (DKT. NOS. 476 and 477)).



3. The '120 patent identifies Richard Michael Nemes of New York as the named inventor.

4. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division, in this case only.

5. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 of the '120 patent are at issue and asserted in this case against Google. Only claims 1 and 2 of the '120 patent are asserted against Match.

6. Bedrock filed its Original Complaint for Patent Infringement on June 16, 2009 ("Original Complaint").

7. Bedrock is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Texas with its principal place of business at 100 E. Ferguson Street, Suite 712, Tyler, Texas 75702.

8. Google is a Delaware corporation with its corporate headquarters and principal place of business at 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, California 94043.

9. Bedrock did not inform Google of the '120 patent before filing this lawsuit.

10. Match is a Delaware corporation with its corporate headquarters and principal place of business at 8300 Douglas Avenue, Suite 800, Dallas, Texas 75225.

11. Bedrock did not inform Match about the '120 patent before filing this lawsuit.

39. United States Patent No. 6,119,214 to Dirks is a patent granted on an patent application which was filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office prior to the conception date of the '120 Patent.

40. ROBERT L. KRUSE, DATA STRUCTURES AND PROGRAM DESIGN (2d ed. 1987), was publicly available prior to the conception date of the '120 Patent.

41. United States Patent No. 5,724,538 to Morris et al. is a patent granted on an patent application which was filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office prior to the conception date of the '120 Patent.

42. DONALD E. KNUTH, THE ART OF COMPUTER PROGRAMMING: VOL. 3 SORTING AND SEARCHING (Richard S. Varga & Michael A. Harrison eds., 1st ed. 1973), was publicly available prior to the conception date of the '120 Patent.

- **Bedrock's Objections to Defendants' Statement of Its Contentions**

1. Plaintiff Bedrock objects that no Defendant has standing to request a declaratory judgment on the ownership and standing (as evidenced in Bedrock's Motion to Dismiss Google Inc.'s and Match.com, LLC's Counterclaims (DKT. NOS. 476 and 477)).

- **Defendants' Objections to Bedrock's Statement of Its Contentions**

1. Defendants object to Bedrock's contention that the following Linux kernel versions are accused in this case: 2.4.22.x, 2.4.23.x, 2.4.24.x, 2.4.25.x, 2.4.26.x, 2.4.27.x, 2.4.28.x, 2.4.29.x, 2.4.30.x, 2.4.31.x, 2.4.32.x, 2.4.33.x, 2.4.37.x, 2.6.0.x, 2.6.1.x, 2.6.2.x, 2.6.3.x, 2.6.4.x, 2.6.5.x, 2.6.6.x, 2.6.7.x, 2.6.8.x, 2.6.9.x, 2.6.10.x, 2.6.11.x, 2.6.12.x, 2.6.13.x, 2.6.14.x, 2.6.15.x, 2.6.16.x, 2.6.17.x, 2.6.18.x, 2.6.19.x, 2.6.20.x, 2.6.21.x, 2.6.22.x, 2.6.23.x, 2.6.24.x, 2.6.25.x, 2.6.26.x, 2.6.27.x, 2.6.28.x, 2.6.29.x, 2.6.30.x, 2.6.31.x, 2.6.32.x, 2.6.33.x, 2.6.34.x, *et seq.*, and products and software with similar functionality that practice the inventions of the '120 patent. Bedrock has only accused Google of infringing claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 due to its use of Linux kernel versions 2.6.11, 2.6.18, and 2.6.26 on its servers, and Bedrock has only accused Match of infringing claims 1 and 2 due to its use of Linux kernel versions 2.6.9 and 2.6.18 on its servers.

2. Defendants object to Bedrock's contention that the inventions of the '120 patent were conceived at least as early as November 2, 1996, and that diligence was used from that point forward to reduce the invention to practice by at least January 2, 1997. Bedrock declined to provide this information during discovery to any of the defendants and first asserted this information in this pretrial order.<sup>3</sup> Bedrock also has not corroborated such a conception date or diligence.

3. Defendants object to Bedrock's contention that it owns the '120 patent and, therefore, has standing to sue and confer jurisdiction on this Court.

## **VI. CONTESTED ISSUES OF FACT AND LAW**

The Parties identify the following issues of fact that remain to be litigated. To the extent any issue of law discussed below is deemed to be an issue of fact, it is incorporated into this section. The Parties reserve the right to identify additional factual or legal issues that may arise, including issues raised in any motions *in limine*.

- **Bedrock's Statement of Contested Issues of Fact and Law**

By providing this Statement, Bedrock does not concede that all of these issues are appropriate for trial. In addition, Bedrock does not waive any of its pending motions.

1. Whether Defendants directly infringe claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 of the '120 patent.

2. Whether Defendants' infringement is willful.

---

<sup>3</sup> Bedrock disclosed the conception date of November 2, 1996 in at least the August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2010 deposition of Dr. Nemes and in Bedrock's January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2010 response to Google's First Set of Interrogatories.

3. Whether Bedrock is entitled to enhanced damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284, and, if so, the dollar amount of the enhancement.

4. Whether this case is an exceptional case pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285 and whether Bedrock is entitled to an award of attorneys' fees.

5. Whether Bedrock is entitled to damages to compensate for Defendants' infringement, and, if so, the dollar amount of pre-verdict and post-verdict damages to the time of judgment adequate to compensate for the infringement of the patent-in-suit, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

6. Whether Bedrock is entitled to costs, and, if so, the dollar amount of their costs.

7. Whether Bedrock is entitled to prejudgment and post-judgment interest, and, if so, the dollar amount of prejudgment and post-judgment interest.

8. Whether Bedrock is entitled to a permanent injunction against Defendants, requiring Defendants to refrain from directly infringing, contributing to, or inducing the infringement of the patent-in-suit in the United States.

9. Whether any denial of a permanent injunction should be conditioned on payment of reasonable royalties for future infringement, and if so, the royalty amount set for future infringement and a means or mechanism to account for future royalty payments, including during any stay of an injunction pending appeal.

10. Whether Defendants have proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the claims of the patent-in-suit are invalid because they are anticipated by Defendants' prior art references under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

11. Whether Defendants have proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the claims of the patent-in-suit are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Defendants' prior art references.

Any issues of fact that are determined to constitute issues of law are hereby designated as such, and vice versa. Bedrock also incorporates by reference the contested issues raised in its pending motions. *See* Section IX, *infra*.

- **Defendants' Statement of Contested Issues of Fact and Law**

(To the extent any issue of law is deemed to be an issue of fact, it is incorporated into this section).

1. Whether Bedrock owns and therefore has standing to sue for infringement of the '120 patent.

2. Whether Bedrock has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that each of Google's accused products literally and directly infringes the asserted claims of the '120 patent listed below:

- a. Claim 1
- b. Claim 2
- c. Claim 5d. Claim 6

3. Whether Bedrock has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that each of Match's accused products literally and directly infringes the asserted claims of the '120 patent listed below:

- a. Claim 1
- b. Claim 2

4. Whether Defendants have proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the asserted claims of the '120 patent are invalid because they are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102.

5. Whether Defendants have proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the asserted claims of the '120 patent are invalid because they would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. §103.

6.

7. If Defendants are found to have infringed the asserted claims of the '120 patent, and the asserted claims are found to be valid, the amount Bedrock has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to damages for that infringement.

8. If Defendants are found to have infringed the asserted claims of the '120 patent, and the asserted claims are found to be valid, whether Bedrock has proven by clear and convincing evidence that Defendants' infringement was willful.

9. Whether Defendants have proven that Defendants are entitled to a declaratory judgment finding that Defendants are not directly infringing, and have not directly infringed, any claims of the '120 patent.

10. Whether Defendants have proven that Defendants are entitled to a declaratory judgment finding that the claims of the '120 patent are invalid under one or more sections of Title 35 of the United States Code, including, without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103, and/or 112.

11. Whether Defendants have proven that Defendants are entitled to a declaratory judgment finding that Bedrock does not own the '120 patent and therefore does not have standing to sue for infringement of the '120 patent.<sup>4</sup>

12. Whether Bedrock has a failure of proof that it owns and therefore has standing to sue the Defendants for infringement of the '120 patent.

13. Whether each accused product of the Defendants infringes the asserted claims of the '120 patent.

14. Whether the asserted claims of the '120 Patent are valid.

15. If Defendants are found to infringe the asserted claims of the '120 patent, and those claims are found to be valid, Bedrock is entitled to no more than the amount set forth in the Expert Report of Keith Ugone.

16. If Defendants are found to infringe the asserted claims of the '120 patent, and those claims are found to be valid, Defendants' infringement was not willful and Bedrock is not entitled to enhanced damages of up to three times actual damages.

17. If Defendants are found to infringe the asserted claims of the '120 patent, and those claims are found to be valid, Bedrock is not entitled to prejudgment interest and costs.

18. Whether this is an exceptional case that entitles Defendants to attorneys' fees, costs and interest.

- **Bedrock's Statement Regarding Issues to Be Decided by the Court**

1. Bedrock reserves the right to object to the language and substance of any proposed instructions and questions on the issues of obviousness.

---

<sup>4</sup> Plaintiff Bedrock objects that no Defendant has standing to request a declaratory judgment on this issue (as evidenced in Bedrock's Motion to Dismiss Google Inc.'s and Match.com, LLC's Counterclaims (DKT. NOS. 476 and 477)).

2. Bedrock contends that all issues related to Bedrock's claim for injunctive relief require determination by the Court, should not be submitted to the jury, and the jury should not be advised of the defense.

- **Defendants' Statement Regarding Issues to Be Decided by the Court**

1. Whether Bedrock owns the '120 patent and, therefore, has standing to sue the Defendants for infringement of the '120 patent.

2. Whether Plaintiff's claim of damages is barred and/or unenforceable by the doctrine of laches.

## **VII. LIST OF WITNESSES**

- Bedrock's Witness List is attached as Exhibit A.
- Defendants' Witness Lists are attached as Exhibit B



## **VIII. DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS**

Pursuant to the Court's Order Granting Joint Motion to Amend Docket Control Order (Dkt. 556), the parties will exchange deposition designations on March 11, 2011. Rebuttal designations and objections to deposition designations will be exchanged on March 18, 2011. Objections to rebuttal deposition designations will be exchanged on March 22, 2011. The parties have attached deposition designations at Exhibit C and D as described below. The parties will supplement this pre-trial order to include additional designations as described in Exhibit E, G, I, and J below:

- Bedrock's Deposition Designations are attached as Exhibit C.
- Defendants' Deposition Designations are attached as Exhibit D.
- Bedrock's objections and rebuttal designations will be supplemented as Exhibits E and F, respectively.
- Defendants' objections and rebuttal designations will be supplemented as Exhibits G and H, respectively.
- Bedrock's objections to any rebuttal designations will be supplemented as Exhibit I.
- Defendants' objections to any rebuttal designations will be supplemented as Exhibit J.

The parties will meet and confer regarding their respective objections in order to strive to resolve all objections and issues prior to presenting them to the Court.

## **IX. LIST OF EXHIBITS**

Pursuant to the Court's Order Granting Joint Motion to Amend Docket Control Order (Dkt. 556), the parties will exchange trial exhibit lists on March 11, 2011, and will exchange pretrial objections, including objections to exhibit lists, on March 18, 2011. The parties have submitted exhibit lists as described in Exhibit K and L below. The parties will supplement this pre-trial order to include these exhibit lists and objections described below in Exhibits M and N.

- Bedrock’s Exhibit List is attached as Exhibit K.
- Defendants’ Exhibit List is attached as Exhibit L.
- Bedrock’s objections to Defendants’ Exhibit List will be supplemented as Exhibit M.
- Defendants’ objections to Plaintiff’s Exhibit List will be supplemented as Exhibit N.

**X. LIST OF PENDING MOTIONS**

Docket Number	Motion
462	Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 5,893,120 dated February 8, 2011
463	Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement of the ‘120 Patent dated February 8, 2011
553	Bedrock’s Motion to Dismiss Google Inc.’s and Match.com, LLC’s Counterclaims (DKT. NOS. 476 and 477)
558	Defendants’ Combined Daubert and Rule 26(A) Motion to Exclude the Expert Testimony of Dr. Mark Jones
559	Defendants’ Joint Motion to Exclude and/or Strike the Expert Report and Opinions of Roy Weinstein
567	MOTION for Relief from Trial in Observance of Passover Holiday by Google Inc., Match.Com LLC.
568	Unopposed MOTION from Trial in Observance of Passover Holidays by Bedrock Computer Technologies, LLC.

In addition, all parties’ motions *in limine* are to be filed on March 14, 2011 pursuant to the Docket Control Order dated February 3, 2010 (Dkt. 174).

**XI. PROBABLE LENGTH OF TRIAL**

Bedrock estimates the probable length of trial will be 6-7 days. Bedrock requests 11 hours per side for direct, cross, and rebuttal examination. Bedrock further requests 30 minutes per side for voir dire, 45 minutes for opening statements, and 1 hour for closing arguments.

Defendants Google and Match.com estimate the probable length of the first trial will be 7-8 court days. Google and Match.com request 15 hours per side for direct, cross and rebuttal

examination. Defendants further request 30 minutes per side for voir dire, 45 minutes for opening statements, and 1 hour for closing arguments.

## **XII. MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE LIMITATIONS**

The parties will confer concerning additional limitations and propose them in advance of the pre-trial conference.

## **XIII. CERTIFICATIONS**

The undersigned counsel for each of the parties to this action does hereby certify and acknowledge the following:

1. Full and complete disclosure has been made in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules, and the Court's orders;

2. The parties have complied with discovery limitations set forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules, and the Court's orders.<sup>5</sup> The parties have stipulated and moved this Court on various issues altering discovery limitations, which have all been approved by this Court;

3. Except as otherwise agreed or ordered, counsel for each party will provide the following certification when their respective exhibit lists are filed. Each exhibit in the List of Exhibits (excluding demonstratives):

(a) is in existence;

(b) will be numbered; and

(c) will be disclosed and shown to opposing counsel on March 16, 2011.

---

<sup>5</sup> This representation is subject to any matters addressed in pending motions and/or objections.

Dated: March 11, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

**McKOOL SMITH, P.C.**

/s/Doug A. Cawley

Douglas A. Cawley, Lead Attorney

Texas Bar No. 04035500

dcawley@mckoolsmith.com

Theodore Stevenson, III

Texas Bar No. 19196650

tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com

Rosemary T. Snider

Texas Bar No. 18796500

rsnider@mckoolsmith.com

Scott W. Hejny

Texas State Bar No. 24038952

shejny@mckoolsmith.com

Jason D. Cassady

Texas Bar No. 24045625

jcassady@mckoolsmith.com

J. Austin Curry

Texas Bar No. 24059636

acurry@mckoolsmith.com

Phillip M. Aurentz

Texas State Bar No. 24059404

paurentz@mckoolsmith.com

**McKOOL SMITH, P.C.**

300 Crescent Court, Suite 1500

Dallas, Texas 75201

Telephone: 214-978-4000

Facsimile: 214-978-4044

Sam F. Baxter

Texas Bar No. 01938000

**McKOOL SMITH, P.C.**

sbaxter@mckoolsmith.com

104 E. Houston Street, Suite 300

P.O. Box 0

Marshall, Texas 75670

Telephone: (903) 923-9000

Facsimile: (903) 923-9099

Robert M. Parker  
Texas Bar No. 15498000  
Robert Christopher Bunt  
Texas Bar No. 00787165  
**PARKER, BUNT & AINSWORTH, P.C.**  
100 E. Ferguson, Suite 1114  
Tyler, Texas 75702  
Telephone: 903-531-3535  
Facsimile: 903-533-9687  
E-mail: [rmparker@pbatyler.com](mailto:rmparker@pbatyler.com)  
E-mail: [rcbunt@pbatyler.com](mailto:rcbunt@pbatyler.com)

**ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF  
BEDROCK COMPUTER TECHNOLOGIES  
LLC**

DATED: March 11, 2011.

*/s/Claude M. Stern*

---

Claude M. Stern  
claudestern@quinnemanuel.com  
Evette D. Pennypacker  
evettepennypacker@quinnemanuel.com  
Todd M. Briggs  
toddbriggs@quinnemanuel.com  
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP  
555 Twin Dolphin Dr., 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: 650-801-5000  
Facsimile: 650-801-5100

Michael E. Jones  
mikejones@potterminton.com  
Texas State Bar No. 10929400  
POTTER MINTON, PC  
110 N. College  
Tyler, Texas 75702  
Telephone: (903) 597-8311  
Facsimile: (903) 593-0846

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT  
GOOGLE INC. AND MATCH.COM, INC.**

This Joint PreTrial Order is hereby approved