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

BEDROCK COMPUTER	§	
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	CASE NO. 6:09 CV 269
vs.	§	
	§	Jury Trial Demanded
SOFTLAYER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,	§	
et al.	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT SOFTLAYER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER, AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES, AND COUNTERCLAIMS

Plaintiff Bedrock Computer Technologies LLC ("Bedrock") files this Reply to Defendant Softlayer Technologies, Inc.'s First Amended Answer, Affirmative Defenses, and Counterclaims, served on September 17, 2009 (Dkt. No. 82). All allegations not expressly admitted are denied. The first set of paragraphs marked 1-21 of Softlayer's Answer do not require a response.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

- 1. Bedrock incorporates by reference the allegations in its Complaint for Patent Infringement in response to each and every of Softlayer's Affirmative Defenses.
- 2. Bedrock denies all allegations contained in Paragraph 1 of Softlayer's Affirmative Defenses.
- 3. Bedrock denies all allegations contained in Paragraph 2 of Softlayer's Affirmative Defenses.

- 4. Bedrock denies all allegations contained in Paragraph 3 of Softlayer's Affirmative Defenses.
- 5. Bedrock denies all allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of Softlayer's Affirmative Defenses.
- 6. Bedrock denies all allegations contained in Paragraph 5 of Softlayer's Affirmative Defenses.
- 7. Bedrock denies all allegations contained in Paragraph 6 of Softlayer's Affirmative Defenses.
- 8. Bedrock denies all allegations contained in Paragraph 7 of Softlayer's Affirmative Defenses.

RESPONSE TO COUNTERCLAIMS

- 10. Bedrock incorporates by reference the allegations in its Complaint for Patent Infringement in response to each and every of Softlayer's Counterclaims.
- 11. Bedrock admits that this Court has jurisdiction as alleged in Paragraph 1 of Softlayer's Counterclaims, but denies that Softlayer is entitled to any relief requested.
- 12. Bedrock admits the this Court has subject matter jurisdiction as alleged in Paragraph 2 of Softlayer's Counterclaims, but denies that Softlayer is entitled to any relief requested.
 - 13. Bedrock admits the allegations of Paragraph 3.
 - 14. Bedrock admits the allegations of Paragraph 4.
- 15. With respect to Paragraph 5, Bedrock admits that an actual and justiciable controversy exists between Bedrock and Softlayer with respect to the validity and infringement of the '120 patent. Bedrock denies that there is an actual and justiciable controversy with respect

to the enforceability of the '120 patent because Softlayer has not alleged any fact or theory upon which the '120 patent can be adjudged unenforceable.

16. Bedrock denies the allegations of Paragraph 6.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Bedrock incorporates by reference the Prayer for Relief set forth in Bedrock's Complaint for Patent Infringement. Bedrock denies that Softlayer is entitled to any relief.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Bedrock hereby demands that all issues be determined by jury.

DATED: October 5, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

McKOOL SMITH, P.C.

<u>_/s/ Sam F. Baxter_</u>

Sam F. Baxter, Lead Attorney

Texas Bar No. 01938000

McKOOL SMITH, P.C.

sbaxter@mckoolsmith.com

104 E. Houston Street, Suite 300

P.O. Box O

Marshall, Texas 75670

Telephone: (903) 923-9000

Facsimile: (903) 923-9099

Douglas A. Cawley

Texas Bar No. 04035500

dcawley@mckoolsmith.com

Theodore Stevenson, III

Texas Bar No. 19196650

tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com

J. Austin Curry

Texas Bar No. 24059636

acurry@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 PLAINTIFF **BEDROCK COMPUTER TECHNOLOGIES**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was filed electronically in compliance with Local Rule CV-5(a). As such, this document was served on all counsel who have consented to electronic service on this, the 5th day of October, 2009. Local Rule CV-53(a)(3)(A).

/s/ Austin Curry
Austin Curry