

EXHIBIT 4

From: Tom Fasone III

Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2011 12:15 PM

To: yeej@gtlaw.com

Cc: Eolas; John B. Campbell; Matt Rappaport; Josh Budwin; Don Gaiser; Stefano Milito; Vicki Merideth; dougmcswane@potterminton.com; allengardner@potterminton.com; mikejones@potterminton.com; masondl@gtlaw.com; joynerj@gtlaw.com; Bob Kramer

Subject: RE: Eolas/Frito-Lay: Discovery Issues

Attachments: Staples/Frito-Lay: Document Production and Custodial Documents

Jeffrey

In an effort to facilitate an efficient and effective informal meet and confer between the parties within the next few days, we have considered the points made in your email of Tuesday and provide the following responses:

(1) **happiness.lays.com** Eolas believes that the language of its PICs and the definitions set forth in its discovery mechanisms served to date cover "happiness.lays.com"; however, Eolas is certainly willing to discuss Frito-Lay's concerns during our meet and confer. Eolas plans to amend its most recent set of interrogatories and most recent 30(b)(6) notice to correct the clerical error such that "happiness.fritolay.com" is replaced with "happiness.lays.com" and will re-serve this discovery on Frito-Lay today. Although Eolas does not believe that it is necessary to do so, it will consider a request from Frito-Lay to amend the prior discovery mechanisms it has served to reflect "happiness.lays.com" and re-serve them. Eolas will be prepared to discuss whether such an effort makes sense during our meet and confer.

(2) **Depositions** Thank you for providing us with a general idea as to when Frito-Lay plans to make its witnesses available for deposition. With respect to Frito-Lay's request that Eolas narrow its request for deposition discovery, Eolas is only seeking the depositions of five (5) 30(b)(1) witnesses and each have been identified by Frito-Lay as persons with knowledge of relevant facts. As we discussed during our September 14 informal meet and confer, Eolas has no objection to Frito-Lay's witnesses serving as both 30(b)(1) and 30(b)(6) deponents, which should reduce the preparation and deposition time needed to complete Eolas' deposition discovery. Your request that Eolas identify the subject matters on which Eolas is seeking testimony from each of the five (5) witnesses, however, is problematic given that Eolas is relying on Frito-Lay's representation in its initial disclosures that each noticed witness has knowledge of facts that are relevant to the claims and defenses in this lawsuit and because Frito-Lay has not yet identified each witness' custodial documents within its document production. Eolas, however, is willing to discuss during our informal meet and confer any proposals that Frito-Lay may have to address its concerns regarding the scope of deposition discovery.

(3) **Custodial Information** In an effort to cooperate in good faith and run this issue to ground, after receiving your email of Tuesday we went back to our IT personnel a third time on the issue of custodial information. The custodial information provided by Frito-Lay remains unchanged from that which we communicated to your team during our September 14 meet and confer -- that 7,558 out of the total of 7,566 documents produced to date list Scott Thompson as the custodian and that none of the five (5) witnesses noticed for deposition (which have been identified as persons with knowledge in Frito-Lay's disclosures) are listed as custodians of any of Frito-Lay's documents. (See our e-mail of September 16, attached above). Further, our recollection of the parties' September 14 teleconference was that your team was going to look into this issue and advise as whether the documents for the witnesses Eolas has noticed for deposition have been collected and produced and, if so, provide the Bates numbers for their custodial documents. Eolas will be prepared to discuss this matter on our meet and confer.

(4) **Will Call Trial Witness Depositions** Thank you for agreeing to Eolas' proposal in this regard.

(5) **Interrogatory Responses/Document Production** Eolas certainly appreciates the fact that on June 15, 2011 Frito-Lay produced documents that it believes are responsive to Common Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 3, as advised in your e-mail of Tuesday; however, Frito-Lay has not supplemented its responses to Common Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 3 since July 9, 2010 (over one year ago). Thus, Frito-Lay's current interrogatory responses are stale in that they fail to identify its June 15, 2011 production and fail to identify any additional documents generated since its June 15, 2011 production that are responsive to these two common interrogatories. Further, the documents which Frito-Lay produced on June 15, 2011 only provide data through May 2011 and, thus, Frito-Lay should also supplement its document production and interrogatory responses to include the most current data available to it.

With respect to Interrogatory No. 4, Eolas would like to fully understand the bases for each of Frito-Lay's stated objections to providing the information sought for eight (8) of the sixteen (16) categories identified in Interrogatory No. 4. Eolas hopes that the parties can discuss and work to resolve these objections during our meet and confer.

Finally, as stated above with regard to Point (1), Eolas believes that the language set forth in its PICs and discovery mechanisms served to date cover "happiness.lays.com", but is willing to confer in good faith to resolve any concerns Frito-Lay may have regarding this issue.

As Eolas requested yesterday, please let us know when your team is available over the next couple of days to participate in an informal meet and confer on each of the foregoing issues.

Regards,

Tom

From: Tom Fasone III

Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2011 11:38 AM

To: yeej@gtlaw.com

Cc: Eolas; John B. Campbell; Matt Rappaport; Don Gaiser; Stefano Milito; Vicki Merideth; dougmcswane@potterminton.com; allengardner@potterminton.com; mikejones@potterminton.com; masondl@gtlaw.com; joynerj@gtlaw.com

Subject: RE: Eolas/Frito-Lay: Discovery Issues

Jeffrey

Thank you very much for your email.

We believe that an informal meet and confer within the next few days to attempt to work through the issues/responses raised in your email of today is necessary in light of the compressed schedule at hand. Eolas would very much like to avoid bothering Judge Davis with unnecessary discovery related motion practice but, at the same, will not forego the discovery to which it is entitled to prove up its case and prepare for trial.

Please let us know your team's availability for an informal meet and confer to occur within the next few days.

Regards,

Tom

From: yeej@gtlaw.com [mailto:yeej@gtlaw.com]

Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2011 11:15 AM

To: Tom Fasone III; joynerj@gtlaw.com

Cc: Eolas; John B. Campbell; Matt Rappaport; Don Gaiser; Stefano Milito; Vicki Merideth;

dougmcswane@potterminton.com; allengardner@potterminton.com; mikejones@potterminton.com; masondl@gtlaw.com

Subject: RE: Eolas/Frito-Lay: Discovery Issues

Tom,

Thanks for your email. Regarding item (1), as mentioned during our telephone conversation with you on Sep. 14, FritoLay believed it had produced relevant documents and thus far we are not aware of additional relevant non-privileged documents. In addition, you raised for the first time a website located at "happiness.fritolay.com" which had not been identified in the above-referenced action until Eolas's interrogatories served this month. During our Sep. 14 telephone conversation we stated that the website was not identified in Eolas' infringement contentions and we could not find that website. "happiness.lays.com" is identified for the first time in your email of Sep. 23. Even if Eolas had asserted a claim against the happiness.lays.com website, which it failed to do, Eolas has never asserted what feature, if any, of the website allegedly infringes Eolas's claimed invention. Therefore, even if Eolas had properly plead a claim against the website located at happiness.lays.com, Frito-Lay would not have knowledge of what relevant non-privileged documents, if any, to cull.

For item (2), tentatively, we have identified some witnesses and are still working on coordinating the schedule because of the number and diversity of the topics. It appears, at this time, the depositions may more likely take place in the third or fourth week of October in Dallas, Texas. In addition, we had discussed with Eolas over the summer that not all 30(b)(1) witnesses Eolas sought to depose would have information Eolas is seeking. Therefore, the parties agreed to avoid unnecessary burden on Frito-Lay by reducing the number of depositions. To that end, please let us know the categories of information Eolas seeks to receive from all the 30(b)(1) witnesses so that we can coordinate on the necessary depositions and avoid undue burden and disruption on Frito-Lay's business operation.

With respect to item (3), we have confirmed that the CDs we produced contained Concordance Opticon DAT and LOG file and Summation iBlaze LST file which contain the custodian identification in the "Custodian Field." If you have used these load files to properly load the data and still encounter errors, please provide the name of the tool and version you use, and the name of the field where you found the custodian names so we can investigate further.

For item (4), we are agreeable to the proposal that only those individuals whom the parties plan to present as trial witnesses be presented for deposition. This item also relates to item (2). We believe this item will be resolved as we resolve item (2).

For item (5), regarding Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 3, as you noted in your e-mail of September 9 and we reiterated in our email of September 13, Frito-Lay supplemented its responses to these interrogatories by producing additional documents (FL-EOLAS0019027-0019102) under Fed. R. Civ. Pro., Rule 33 on June 15, 2011. With respect to Interrogatory No. 4, we stated in our September 14 email that we are confused by your statement in your Sep. 9 e-mail that Frito-Lay's response only addressed 8 of the 16 technologies identified by Eolas. Frito-Lay's response to this interrogatory provided information with respect to AJAX, JavaScript, Java/JavaFX, Flash, Quicktime, HTML5, WebM, and H.264 and objected to the remainder because they are, *inter alia*, vague, ambiguous and undefined. As mentioned above, Eolas never identified "happiness.fritolay.com" or "happiness.lays.com" in its infringement contentions. Therefore, Eolas' interrogatories did not request information about those websites so we are at a loss to understand why Eolas is requesting Frito-Lay to supplement its responses when it was never requested to provide it in the interrogatories.

Let us know if you have further questions.

Regards,

Jeffrey Yee

Greenberg Traurig LLP | 2450 Colorado Avenue | Suite 400 East | Santa Monica, CA 90404

Tel 310.586.3846 | Fax 310.586.1346

yeej@gtlaw.com | www.gtlaw.com



From: Tom Fasone III [mailto:tfasone@McKoolSmith.com]
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2011 7:15 AM
To: Yee, Jeffrey (Assoc-LA-IP-Tech); Joyner, Jeff K. (Shld-LA-IP-Tech)
Cc: Eolas; John B. Campbell; Matt Rappaport; Don Gaiser; Stefano Milito; Vicki Merideth; dougmcswane@potterminton.com; allengardner@potterminton.com; mikejones@potterminton.com
Subject: Eolas/Frito-Lay: Discovery Issues

Gentlemen

I write to follow up on last week's teleconference on various outstanding discovery matters.

Please advise as to each of the following issues:

- (1) When Eolas may expect to receive Frito-Lay's supplemental document production (including relevant documents for *happiness.lays.com*);
- (2) Proposed dates for all outstanding 30b1 and 30b6 deposition notices served to date;
- (3) The identification of custodial documents by Bates numbers for the 30b1 witnesses noticed to date to the extent that they already have been produced to Eolas or a proposed date for production of the custodial documents for each of the 30b1 witnesses noticed to date;
- (4) A response to Eolas' proposal regarding the depositions of "will call" trial witnesses (as outlined in prior correspondence to you and discussed during our September 14 teleconference); and
- (5) A proposed date for supplementation of Frito-Lay's interrogatory responses (to address deficiencies outlined in our September 9 correspondence and discussed during our September 14 teleconference, and, to the extent necessary, to provide complete supplemental responses that address *happiness.lays.com*).

As you know, the parties agreed to a November 9, 2011 Fact Discovery deadline. Given the amount of discovery which must be completed prior to that deadline, we would very much appreciate your prompt attention to these matters.

As always, we are available to discuss these matters via telephone should you care to do so -- (214) 978-4927.

Regards,

Tom

-----Original Message-----

From: Tom Fasone III
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2011 6:42 AM
To: yeej@gtlaw.com; dougmcswane@potterminton.com; joynerj@gtlaw.com; allengardner@potterminton.com; mikejones@potterminton.com
Cc: Eolas; Josh Budwin; Gretchen Curran; John B. Campbell; Don Gaiser; Stefano Milito; Vicki Merideth
Subject: Staples/Frito-Lay: Document Production and Custodial Documents

Gentleman

As we indicated that we would, we went back to the document production we received to date from Frito-Lay and confirmed what we reported during our call -- which is that a single custodian is listed for almost the entirety of the production. None of the five 30b1 witnesses that Eolas has noticed to date: Kevin Johnson, Greg Scott, Ryan Baxter, Richard Blazeovich and Gannon Jones are listed as custodians of any of the documents Eolas has received.

Further, we ran a search of the metadata of the document production received to date and determined that Frito-Lay has not produced any relevant and non-privileged e-mail correspondence. We would kindly ask that you please confer with your client contact(s) about the lack of e-mail correspondence within the production to Eolas and advise as to your findings.

Thank you,

Tom

From: Tom Fasone III
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2011 12:09 PM
To: yeej@gtlaw.com; dougmcswane@potterminton.com; joynerj@gtlaw.com; allengardner@potterminton.com; mikejones@potterminton.com
Cc: Eolas; Josh Budwin; Gretchen Curran; John B. Campbell; Don Gaiser; Stefano Milito
Subject: RE: Eolas/Frito Lay: Request for Informal Meet and Confer on Deficient Interrogatory Responses/Discovery Matters

Gentleman

Thank you for making yourselves available yesterday for a teleconference to discuss outstanding discovery issues and a gameplan for completing discovery within the parties' agreed schedule for completing fact discovery in this matter. We certainly appreciate your willingness to cooperate in this regard.

As you work through the issues we discussed yesterday, please feel free to call us to further confer should the need arise.

Regards,

Tom

-----Original Message-----

From: Tom Fasone III
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2011 7:41 PM
To: yeej@gtlaw.com
Cc: dougmcswane@potterminton.com; Eolas; allengardner@potterminton.com; mikejones@potterminton.com; Josh Budwin; Gretchen Curran; John B. Campbell; Don Gaiser; joynerj@gtlaw.com
Subject: RE: Eolas/Frito Lay: Request for Informal Meet and Confer on Deficient Interrogatory Responses/Discovery Matters

Jeffrey

Thank you very much for your email of this evening. We appreciate you getting back to us on the various discovery matters Eolas has raised over the past several days.

With respect to the deficiencies in Frito-Lay's response to Common Interrogatory No. 4, we kindly ask that you consider the language of the interrogatory again as it clearly requests information concerning 16 technologies/software types as specified in items (a)-(p). Should Frito-Lay still have concerns as to the scope of Common Interrogatory No. 4, we will be prepared to discuss this matter during tomorrow's 4 p.m. CT conference.

Thank you for letting us know that the depositions of Frito-Lay's witnesses will be held in Dallas rather than at Greenberg's Santa Monica office. Eolas very much appreciates being able to conduct the depositions of Frito-Lay's witnesses in Dallas. Although we don't believe it is necessary, we are more than happy to re-serve the deposition notices to comport with the location provided in your email of this evening. Please advise as to your preference in this regard.

Finally, given the number of discovery issues which must be addressed within a relatively compressed schedule, we would very much like to proceed with our 4 p.m. CT conference call tomorrow. We look to speaking with you then.

Regards,

Tom

From: yeej@gtlaw.com [yeej@gtlaw.com]
 Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2011 6:59 PM
 To: Tom Fasone III; joynerj@gtlaw.com
 Cc: dougmcswane@potterminton.com; Eolas; allengardner@potterminton.com; mikejones@potterminton.com; Josh Budwin; Gretchen Curran; John B. Campbell; Don Gaiser
 Subject: RE: Eolas/Frito Lay: Request for Informal Meet and Confer on Deficient Interrogatory Responses/Discovery Matters

Tom,

This responds to your e-mails of Sep. 2, 8 and 9 regarding Frito-Lay's responses to Eolas' interrogatories, production of documents and scheduling of depositions.

Regarding Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 3, as you noted in your e-mail of Sep. 9, Frito-Lay supplemented its responses to these interrogatories by producing additional documents (FL-EOLAS0019027-0019102) under Fed. R.

Civ. Pro., Rule 33 on June 15, 2011. With respect to Interrogatory No.

4, we are confused by your statement in your Sep. 9 e-mail that Frito-Lay's response only addressed 8 of the 16 technologies identified by Eolas. Interrogatory No. 4 did not specifically identify 16 technologies and, therefore, we are at loss to understand why Eolas believes that Frito-Lay should supplement its response to that interrogatory.

In response to your e-mail of Sep. 8 regarding Frito-Lay's production of documents, Frito-Lay has produced and will continue to produce relevant non-privileged documents, if any, pursuant to the discovery rules.

We are in the process identifying the Rule 30(b)(6) witness(es) and the witnesses' availability (Rules 30(b)(6) and 30(b)(1)) in response to your e-mail of Sep. 2 and the notices we recently received

(three Rule

30(b)(6) deposition notices and Rule 30(b)(1) notices of depositions of Kevin Johnson, Greg Scott, Ryan Baxter, Richard Blazeovich and Gannon Jones). As a general matter, the deposition(s) of Frito-Lay individuals located in Plano, Texas should take place in Greenberg Traurig' offices in Dallas, Texas, not in California. Once we have identified witnesses and confirmed availability, we will coordinate with Eolas to schedule the appropriate deposition(s).

We believe that we have addressed each of the issues you have raised in your e-mail but remain available to discuss these issues on tomorrow's call if you have questions.

In addition, please be prepared to discuss Eolas' availability for depositions.

Thanks.

Jeffrey Yee

Greenberg Traurig LLP | 2450 Colorado Avenue | Suite 400 East | Santa Monica, CA 90404 Tel 310.586.3846 | Fax 310.586.1346

yeej@gtlaw.com | www.gtlaw.com

Greenberg Traurig

USA LAW FIRM OF THE YEAR, CHAMBERS GLOBAL AWARDS 2007 Please consider the environment before printing this email

Tax Advice Disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS under Circular 230, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments), unless otherwise specifically stated, was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (1) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (2) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any matters addressed herein.

The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information. It is intended only for the use of the person(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. To reply to our email administrator directly, please send an email to <mailto:postmaster@gtlaw.com>.

From: Tom Fasone III [<mailto:tfasone@McKoolSmith.com>]

Sent: Friday, September 09, 2011 9:25 AM

To: Joyner, Jeff K. (Shld-LA-IP-Tech); Yee, Jeffrey (Assoc-LA-IP-Tech)

Cc: dougmcswane@potterminton.com; Eolas; allengardner@potterminton.com;

mikejones@potterminton.com; Josh Budwin; Gretchen Curran; John B.

Campbell; Don Gaiser

Subject: Eolas/Frito Lay: Request for Informal Meet and Confer on Deficient Interrogatory Responses/Discovery Matters

Gentlemen

I understand that you are working with your co-defendants to prepare a response to Eolas' proposed Docket Control Order and to propose a schedule for completing fact and expert discovery of Frito Lay given that the parties' efforts to settle were unsuccessful. Eolas certainly appreciates Frito Lay's efforts to prepare and propose such a schedule; however, given that the Court has set an early February 2011 trial date and that there are numerous major intervening holidays between now and the current trial date, Eolas strongly believes that counsel for the parties needs to open a dialogue on discovery matters now rather than wait to reach an agreement on a final proposed Docket Control Order.

Of the pending discovery issues that Eolas would like to discuss with Frito Lay are its current responses to Eolas' Common and Specific Interrogatories. We have analyzed Frito Lay's interrogatory responses to date and have determined that there are various deficiencies that Eolas would like addressed as soon as practicable. By way of example, and not by way of limitation, Frito Lay's most recent responses to Eolas' First Set of Common Interrogatories (Nos. 1-5) are dated July 9, 2010 -- over 14 months ago. Further, in certain instances, Frito Lay has responded to the First Set of Common Interrogatories by pointing to a "representative sample of reports" rather than providing a complete textual response and/or providing Bates numbers of all of the responsive documents within Frito Lay's production from which one could obtain complete information sought by the particular interrogatory (see, e.g., Responses to Common Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 3). In other instances, Frito Lay fails to address each component of the interrogatory in its current response (see, e.g., Response to Common Interrogatory No. 4, which only addresses eight of the 16 technologies identified by Eolas).

Please let us know your availability next week for an informal meet and confer to discuss deposition discovery, document production supplementation, interrogatory supplementation, expert submissions, and scheduling related to each of these matters.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Tom

-----Original Message-----

<http://www.gtlaw.com/>