

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION

Eolas Technologies Incorporated,

*Plaintiff,*

vs.

No. 6:09-cv-00446-LED (filed Oct. 6, 2009)

Adobe Systems Inc.; Amazon.com, Inc.; Apple  
Inc.; CDW Corp.; Citigroup Inc.; eBay Inc.;  
Frito-Lay, Inc.; The Go Daddy Group, Inc.;  
Google Inc.; J.C. Penney Corporation, Inc.;  
JPMorgan Chase & Co.; New Frontier Media,  
Inc.; Office Depot, Inc.; Perot Systems Corp.;  
Playboy Enterprises International, Inc.; Rent-A-  
Center, Inc.; Staples, Inc.; Sun Microsystems,  
Inc.; Texas Instruments Inc.; Yahoo! Inc.; and  
YouTube, LLC,

*Defendants.*

Adobe Systems Inc.; Amazon.com, Inc.; Apple  
Inc.; CDW LLC; eBay Inc.; Frito-Lay, Inc.; The  
Go Daddy Group, Inc.; Google Inc.; J.C. Penney  
Corporation, Inc.; JPMorgan Chase & Co.; New  
Frontier Media, Inc.; Office Depot, Inc.; Perot  
Systems Corp.; Playboy Enterprises  
International, Inc.; Rent-A-Center, Inc.; Staples,  
Inc.; Oracle America, Inc. f/k/a Sun  
Microsystems, Inc.; Texas Instruments Inc.;  
Yahoo! Inc.; and YouTube, LLC,

*Counterclaimants,*

vs.

Eolas Technologies Incorporated,

*Counterdefendant.*

**DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF  
INDEFINITENESS [DOCKET NO. 568]**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

A. The following claims are indefinite under *IPXL*: '906 claims 6–8 and 13–14, and '985 claims 28–31 ..... 1

B. If § 112, ¶ 6 does not apply, then the following claims are indefinite because they use purely functional language: claims 6–8 and 13–14 of the '906 patent, and claims 16–31 and 40–43 of the '985 patent ..... 3

C. If § 112, ¶ 6 applies, then the following claims are indefinite under *Aristocrat*: claims 6–8 and 13–14 of the '906 patent, and claims 16–31 and 40–43 of the '985 patent ..... 4

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Am. Med. Sys., Inc. v. Laser Peripherals, LLC</i> , 712 F. Supp. 2d 885 (D. Minn. 2010).....	4
<i>Ariba, Inc. v. Emptoris, Inc.</i> , No. 07-90, 2008 WL 3482521 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 7, 2008) (Clark, J.).....	1, 2, 3
<i>Aristocrat Techs. Australia PTY Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> , 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	4
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.</i> , 599 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010), <i>reh’g denied</i> , 605 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2010), <i>petition for cert. filed</i> , 79 U.S.L.W. 3228 (U.S. Sept. 23, 2010) (No. 10-426) .....	4
<i>Ex Parte Miyazaki</i> , 89 U.S.P.Q.2d 1207 (BPAI 2008).....	4
<i>Ex Parte Rodriguez</i> , 92 U.S.P.Q.2d 1395 (BPAI 2009).....	4
<i>Fantasy Sports Props. v. Sportsline.com, Inc.</i> , 287 F.3d 1108 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	1
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	1
<i>Fonar Corp. v. Gen. Elec. Co.</i> , 107 F.3d 1543 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	4
<i>Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. M-I LLC</i> , 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	4
<i>Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Co. v. Walker</i> , 329 U.S. 1 (1946).....	3
<i>In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.</i> , ___ F.3d ___, No. 2009-1450, 2011 WL 607381 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 18, 2011) .....	1, 3
<i>IPXL Holdings, LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 430 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	1, 2, 3
<i>Personalized Media Commc’ns, LLC v. ITC</i> , 161 F.3d 696 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	4

### Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 .....	4
35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 .....	3, 4

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6..... 3, 4

## EXHIBITS<sup>1</sup>

- Ex. J: Letter from plaintiff stating that “it will no longer assert the following claims against any Defendant in the above-captioned matter: U.S. Patent No. 5,838,906: Claims 12 and 14; U.S. Patent No. 7,599,985: Claims 29, 30 and 31” (Feb. 18, 2011)
- Ex. K: Letter from plaintiff stating that “claims 24 and 28 are claims in which the software-related limitations are satisfied solely by software plug-ins or the executable application.” (Feb. 11, 2011)
- Ex. L: Plaintiff’s infringement contentions for the ’985 patent against Adobe Systems Inc., one of the few “software” defendants in the case (Mar. 5, 2010)
- Ex. M: Plaintiff’s infringement contentions for the ’906 patent against Perot Systems Corp., one of the many “website” defendants in the case (Mar. 5, 2010)

---

<sup>1</sup> Exhibits A to I were attached to Defendants’ opening brief (Feb. 4, 2011) [Docket No. 568].

## REPLY

The Court should grant partial summary judgment of indefiniteness with respect to claims 6–8 and 13–14<sup>2</sup> of the '906 patent and claims 16–31 and 40–43 of the '985 patent.

**A. The following claims are indefinite under IPXL: '906 claims 6–8 and 13–14, and '985 claims 28–31**

Last week the Federal Circuit reaffirmed the rule that a claim is indefinite if it covers both an apparatus and a method of use. *See In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.*, \_\_\_ F.3d \_\_\_, No. 2009-1450, 2011 WL 607381, at \*9 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 18, 2011) (relying on *IPXL Holdings, LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 430 F.3d 1377, 1384 (Fed. Cir. 2005)). In *Katz*, the Federal Circuit held that “[the asserted claims] create confusion as to when direct infringement occurs because they are directed both to systems and to actions performed by ‘individual callers.’ [The asserted] claims therefore fall squarely within the rationale of *IPXL* and are indefinite.” *Id.* The holding in *Katz* directly supports Defendants’ indefiniteness argument. *See Mot.* at 5–6.

Eolas is incorrect that “Defendants argue that the active language used in claims 6–8 of the '906 patent (*‘for causing’*) and claim 28 of the '985 patent (*‘operable to’*) import *method* steps into *apparatus* claims.” Opp’n at 3.<sup>3</sup> To be clear, Defendants’ argument is not based on the use of “for causing” or “operable to,” but on method steps in separate “wherein” clauses, as in *Katz* and *Ariba*. *See Mot.* at 5–6. Defendants recognize that claims that describe the *capabilities* or *function* of an apparatus are not prohibited by *IPXL* or *Katz*. Thus most of Eolas’s brief is wasted trying to defeat an argument that Defendants are not making. *See Opp’n* at 2–5.<sup>4</sup>

The method steps in claim 28 of the '985 patent do not describe the *capabilities* or

---

<sup>2</sup> Eolas is no longer asserting claims 12 and 14 of the '906 patent, *see Ex. J*, so Defendants hereby withdraw without prejudice their motion for summary judgment that those claims are insolubly ambiguous about whether the “additional instructions” must reside on the “network server” or the “client workstation,” thus shortening Defendants’ opening brief from 13 pages to 11 pages. *See Mot.* at 1–3.

<sup>3</sup> Unless stated otherwise, all emphasis in quotes throughout this brief has been added.

<sup>4</sup> Two of the cases cited by Eolas do not even address invalidity at all: *Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.*, 626 F.3d 1197, 1205 (Fed. Cir. 2010) and *Fantasy Sports Props. v. Sportsline.com, Inc.*, 287 F.3d 1108, 1117–18 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

*function* of the claimed apparatus. The claimed apparatus is an “executable application,” as Eolas recently emphasized in a letter to Defendants: “[C]laims 24 and 28 are claims in which the software-related limitations are satisfied *solely* by software plug-ins or the *executable application*.” Ex. K. For example, Eolas has accused Adobe Acrobat of being an “executable application.” See Ex. L at 202–03. But all of the method steps in claim 28 must be performed by a separate “*browser*,” not the claimed “executable application.” See Fact No. 4 (“is utilized by the browser to identify and locate,” “is automatically invoked by the browser,” etc.). Claim 28 violates the rule of *IPXL* because it is unclear whether infringement would occur upon making/using/selling the accused “executable application” (e.g., Adobe Acrobat) or only after the separate “*browser*” has used the executable application to perform the claimed method steps: “The problem is that one of the key elements of [the claim] is a method step that is conducted by some person or system *other* than the claimed device.” *Ariba, Inc. v. Emptoris, Inc.*, No. 07-90, 2008 WL 3482521, at \*7 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 7, 2008) (Clark, J.) (granting summary judgment of indefiniteness). Eolas tries to distinguish *Ariba* on the basis that “human action was explicitly required by the language of the claims,” Opp’n at 5–6, but the quote above from *Ariba* shows that the holding did not turn on whether there was “human action,” but rather whether “a method step . . . is conducted by some person *or system other* than the claimed device.”

Claim 6 of the ’906 patent violates the rule of *IPXL* for similar reasons. The claimed apparatus is “[a] computer program product,” but all of the method steps in claim 6 must be performed by a “browser.” See Fact No. 3 (“utilized by said browser to identify and locate,” “is parsed by said browser to automatically invoke,” etc.). Eolas has asserted that a website is a “computer program product.” See, e.g., Ex. M at 107 (“Perot Systems’ website comprises a computer program product”). Claim 6 violates the rule of *IPXL* because it is unclear whether infringement would occur upon making/using/selling the accused website, or only after the separate “browser” has used the website to perform the claimed method steps. Indeed, most of the 21 defendants in this case *only* operate websites; they do not make or sell browsers. Again, “[t]he problem is that one of the key elements of [the claim] is a method step that is conducted

by some person or system *other* than the claimed device.” *Ariba*, 2008 WL 3482521, at \*7.

In short, the method steps to be performed by the *browser* do not describe the capabilities or function of the alleged “executable application” in claim 28 of the ’985 patent (e.g., Adobe Acrobat), or the alleged “computer program product” in claim 6 of the ’906 patent (e.g., a website). But at the same time, the steps performed by the browser cannot be ignored. Indeed, the parties have agreed that the “identify and locate” step in every claim is “performed *by the browser*.” Ex. F at 3. Furthermore, the Summary of the Invention declares that “[t]he present invention provides a *method* for running embedded program objects in a computer network environment,” Ex. B at 6:50–:52, and the specification states that the flowcharts in Figures 7–8 illustrate “the *method* of the present invention,” Ex. B at 13:63–:64. Figure 8A, for example, provides a flowchart of the steps taken by the *browser* to “automatically invoke” the executable application. Finally, the applicants emphasized the importance of the steps performed by the browser to secure allowance of all their claims. For example, during prosecution, the applicants repeatedly overcame prior-art rejections by pointing to the the “automatically invoking” step performed by the *browser*. See Defendants’ Claim Construction Brief at 7–8 & n.6 [Docket No. 569]. For all of these reasons, it is unclear whether infringement would occur upon making/using/selling the accused apparatus (e.g., Adobe Acrobat or a website), or only after a browser has performed the claimed method steps that were essential to patentability. That is precisely the type of confusion that resulted in the indefiniteness rulings in *IPXL* and *Katz*.

**B. If § 112, ¶ 6 does not apply, then the following claims are indefinite because they use purely functional language: claims 6–8 and 13–14 of the ’906 patent, and claims 16–31 and 40–43 of the ’985 patent**

In response to Defendants’ arguments about indefiniteness due to functional claiming, Eolas cites 18 cases, but only seven of those cases actually considered an indefiniteness argument under § 112, ¶ 2 based on functional claiming.<sup>5</sup> Four of those cases (*Halliburton*,

---

<sup>5</sup> Eolas’s brief spends almost four pages arguing why § 112, ¶ 6 should not apply. See Opp’n at 6–9. That is a claim construction issue that the parties addressed in their claim construction briefs, see Docket Nos. 537, 569, 581, so Defendants will not address those arguments here. Eolas’s four-page argument on § 112, ¶ 6 appears to be an inappropriate attempt to circumvent the Court’s page limits on claim construction briefs. See Docket No. 249 (“Motions to extend

(Footnote continued)



*Aristocrat, Miyazaki, and Rodriguez*) found claims indefinite, as discussed in Defendants’ opening brief. *See* Mot. at 9–11. The other three cases are distinguishable because they did not consider anything like the broad functional language at issue in this case (“enabling,” “in order to cause,” “operable to cause,” and “for causing”).<sup>6</sup> *See* Fact Nos. 8–14. The functional language here makes it impossible to discern what is actually being claimed. For example, Eolas asserts that independent claims 24 and 28 of the ’985 patent “are satisfied *solely* by software plug-ins or the executable application,” while independent claims 20 and 40 of the ’985 patent “are satisfied *solely* by server software.” *See* Ex. K. Yet every claim includes numerous limitations concerning a *browser* application, and as noted above it was on the basis of those browser limitations that the claims were allowed during prosecution. Thus it is indefinite what these claims cover. These claims suffer from “the overbreadth inherent in open-ended functional claims . . . which effectively purport to cover any and all means so long as they perform the recited functions.” *Halliburton*, 514 F.3d at 1256 n.7.

C. **If § 112, ¶ 6 applies, then the following claims are indefinite under *Aristocrat*: claims 6–8 and 13–14 of the ’906 patent, and claims 16–31 and 40–43 of the ’985 patent**

In response to Defendants’ arguments concerning *Aristocrat Technologies Australia PTY Ltd. v. International Game Technology*, 521 F.3d 1328, 1332–38 (Fed. Cir. 2008), Eolas merely states that “the corresponding structure for these claims is found in the patents’ specifications.” *Opp’n* at 10. Tellingly, Eolas’s brief does not say where the relevant algorithm is found. Neither does Exhibit A to the Joint Claim Construction Statement. *See, e.g.*, Ex. H at 7, Nos. 4–5. Thus if § 112, ¶ 6 applies, it is clear these claims are indefinite under *Aristocrat*.

---

page limits will only be granted in exceptional circumstances.”). Eolas’s brief also cites a case about the “best mode” requirement under § 112, ¶ 1, but that is not the same as the “definiteness” requirement under § 112, ¶ 2. *See Fonar Corp. v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, 107 F.3d 1543, 1548–50 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (upholding jury verdict of no “best mode” violation).

<sup>6</sup> *See Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.*, 599 F.3d 1325, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (“not interfering substantially”), *reh’g denied*, 605 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (Plager, J., dissenting), *petition for cert. filed*, 79 U.S.L.W. 3228 (U.S. Sept. 23, 2010) (No. 10-426); *Personalized Media Commc’ns, LLC v. ITC*, 161 F.3d 696, 705–07 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (“digital detector”); *Am. Med. Sys., Inc. v. Laser Peripherals, LLC*, 712 F. Supp. 2d 885, 910–12 (D. Minn. 2010) (“greater than about 90%” and “at least 90%”).

DATED: February 24, 2011

By: /s/ Jason W. Wolff

---

David J. Healey  
<[Healey@fr.com](mailto:Healey@fr.com)>  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
1 Houston Center  
1221 McKinney Street, Suite 2800  
Houston, TX 77010  
Telephone: (713) 654-5300  
Facsimile: (713) 652-0109

OF COUNSEL:

Frank E. Scherkenbach  
<[Scherkenbach@fr.com](mailto:Scherkenbach@fr.com)>  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
One Marina Park Drive  
Boston, MA 02110-1878  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

Jason W. Wolff  
<[Wolff@fr.com](mailto:Wolff@fr.com)>  
Joseph P. Reid (*pro hac vice*)  
<[Reid@fr.com](mailto:Reid@fr.com)>  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
12390 El Camino Real  
San Diego, CA 92130  
Telephone: (858) 678-5070  
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Adobe Systems Inc.*

By: /s/ Edward Reines

---

Edward Reines

<[edward.reines@weil.com](mailto:edward.reines@weil.com)>

Andrew Perito

<[andrew.perito@weil.com](mailto:andrew.perito@weil.com)>

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

201 Redwood Shores Parkway

Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Telephone: (650) 802-3000

Facsimile: (650) 802-3100

Otis W. Carroll, Jr. (Bar No. 03895700)

<[fedserv@ickl.com](mailto:fedserv@ickl.com)>

Deborah J. Race (Bar No. 16448700)

<[drace@ickl.com](mailto:drace@ickl.com)>

IRELAND CARROLL & KELLEY

6101 S. Broadway, Suite 500

Tyler, TX 75703

Telephone: (903) 561-1600

Facsimile: (903) 581-1071

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Amazon.com, Inc.*

By: /s/ Richard A. Cederoth

---

David T. Pritikin (*pro hac vice*)  
<[dpitkin@sidley.com](mailto:dpitkin@sidley.com)>  
Richard A. Cederoth (*pro hac vice*)  
<[rcederoth@sidley.com](mailto:rcederoth@sidley.com)>  
Shubham Mukherjee (*pro hac vice*)  
<[smukherjee@sidley.com](mailto:smukherjee@sidley.com)>  
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
One South Dearborn Street  
Chicago, IL 60603  
Telephone: (312) 853-7000  
Facsimile: (312) 853-7036

Teague I. Donahey (*pro hac vice*)  
<[tdonahey@sidley.com](mailto:tdonahey@sidley.com)>  
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
555 California Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 772-1200  
Facsimile: (415) 772-7400

Theodore W. Chandler (*pro hac vice*)  
<[tchandler@sidley.com](mailto:tchandler@sidley.com)>  
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
555 West Fifth Street, Suite 4000  
Los Angeles, CA 90013  
Telephone: (213) 896-6000  
Facsimile: (213) 896-6600

Aaron R. Bleharski (*pro hac vice*)  
<[ableharski@sidley.com](mailto:ableharski@sidley.com)>  
Duy D. Nguyen (*pro hac vice*)  
<[ddnguyen@sidley.com](mailto:ddnguyen@sidley.com)>  
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
1001 Page Mill Road, Building 1  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
Telephone: (650) 565-7000  
Facsimile: (650) 565-7100

Eric M. Albritton (Bar No. 00790215)  
<[ema@emafirm.com](mailto:ema@emafirm.com)>  
ALBRITTON LAW FIRM  
P.O. Box 2649  
Longview, TX 75606  
Telephone: (903) 757-8449  
Facsimile: (903) 758-7397

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Apple Inc.*

By: /s/ Thomas L. Duston

---

Thomas L. Duston  
<[tduston@marshallip.com](mailto:tduston@marshallip.com)>  
Anthony S. Gabrielson  
<[agabrielson@marshallip.com](mailto:agabrielson@marshallip.com)>  
Scott A. Sanderson (*pro hac vice*)  
<[ssanderson@marshallip.com](mailto:ssanderson@marshallip.com)>  
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
6300 Willis Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606-6357  
Telephone: (312) 474-6300  
Facsimile: (312) 474-0448

Eric H. Findlay (Bar No. 00789886)  
<[efindlay@findlaycraft.com](mailto:efindlay@findlaycraft.com)>  
Brian Craft (Bar No. 04972020)  
<[bcraft@findlaycraft.com](mailto:bcraft@findlaycraft.com)>  
FINDLAY CRAFT, LLP  
6760 Old Jacksonville Highway  
Suite 101  
Tyler, TX 75703  
Telephone: (903) 534-1100  
Facsimile: (903) 534-1137

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant CDW LLC*

By: /s/ M. Scott Fuller

---

Edwin R. DeYoung (Bar No. 05673000)  
<[edeyoung@lockelord.com](mailto:edeyoung@lockelord.com)>

Roy W. Hardin (Bar No. 08968300)  
<[rhardin@lockelord.com](mailto:rhardin@lockelord.com)>

Roger Brian Cowie (Bar No. 00783886)  
<[rcowie@lockelord.com](mailto:rcowie@lockelord.com)>

M. Scott Fuller (Bar No. 24036607)  
<[sfuller@lockelord.com](mailto:sfuller@lockelord.com)>

Galyn Gafford (Bar No. 24040938)  
<[ggafford@lockelord.com](mailto:ggafford@lockelord.com)>

LOCKE LORD BISSELL & LIDDELL LLP  
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2200  
Dallas, TX 75201-6776  
Telephone: (214) 740-8000  
Facsimile: (214) 740-8800

Alexas D. Skucas (*pro hac vice*)  
<[askucas@kslaw.com](mailto:askucas@kslaw.com)>

KING & SPALDING LLP  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036-4003  
Telephone: (212) 556-2100  
Facsimile: (212) 556-2222

Eric L. Sophir (*pro hac vice*)  
<[esophir@kslaw.com](mailto:esophir@kslaw.com)>

KING & SPALDING LLP  
1700 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20006-4707  
Telephone: (202) 626-8980  
Facsimile: (202) 626-3737

*Attorneys for Defendant Citigroup Inc.*

By: /s/ Edward Reines

---

Edward Reines

<[edward.reines@weil.com](mailto:edward.reines@weil.com)>

Andrew Perito

<[andrew.perito@weil.com](mailto:andrew.perito@weil.com)>

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

201 Redwood Shores Parkway

Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Telephone: (650) 802-3000

Facsimile: (650) 802-3100

Otis W. Carroll, Jr. (Bar No. 03895700)

<[fedserv@icklaw.com](mailto:fedserv@icklaw.com)>

Deborah J. Race (Bar No. 16448700)

<[drace@icklaw.com](mailto:drace@icklaw.com)>

IRELAND CARROLL & KELLEY

6101 S. Broadway, Suite 500

Tyler, TX 75703

Telephone: (903) 561-1600

Facsimile: (903) 581-1071

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant eBay Inc.*

By: /s/ Jeffrey F. Yee

---

Jeffrey K. Joyner (*pro hac vice*)

<[joynerj@gtlaw.com](mailto:joynerj@gtlaw.com)>

Jeffrey F. Yee (*pro hac vice*)

<[yeej@gtlaw.com](mailto:yeej@gtlaw.com)>

GREENBERG TRAUIG LLP

2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E

Santa Monica, CA 90404

Telephone: (310) 586-7700

Facsimile: (310) 586-7800

Christopher M. Joe (Bar No. 00787770)

<[chrisjoe@bjciplaw.com](mailto:chrisjoe@bjciplaw.com)>

Brian Carpenter (Bar No. 03840600)

<[brian.carpenterb@bjciplaw.com](mailto:brian.carpenterb@bjciplaw.com)>

Eric W. Buether (Bar No. 03316880)

<[eric.buethere@bjciplaw.com](mailto:eric.buethere@bjciplaw.com)>

BUETHER JOE & CARPENTER, LLC

1700 Pacific, Suite 2390

Dallas, TX 75201

Telephone: (214) 466-1270

Facsimile: (214) 635-1842

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Frito-Lay, Inc.*



By: /s/ Neil J. McNabnay

---

Thomas M. Melsheimer (Bar No.  
13922550)

<[txm@fr.com](mailto:txm@fr.com)>

Neil J. McNabnay (Bar No. 24002583)

<[njm@fr.com](mailto:njm@fr.com)>

Carl E. Bruce (Bar No. 24036278)

<[ceb@fr.com](mailto:ceb@fr.com)>

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

1717 Main Street, Suite 5000

Dallas, TX 75201

Telephone: (214) 747-5070

Facsimile: (214) 747-2091

Proshanto Mukherji (*pro hac vice*)

<[pvm@fr.com](mailto:pvm@fr.com)>

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

One Marina Park Drive

Boston, MA 02110-1878

Telephone: (617) 542-5070

Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant The Go Daddy Group,  
Inc.*

By: /s/ Scott T. Weingaertner

---

Scott T. Weingaertner (*pro hac vice*)

<[sweingaertner@kslaw.com](mailto:sweingaertner@kslaw.com)>

Robert F. Perry (*pro hac vice*)

<[rperry@kslaw.com](mailto:rperry@kslaw.com)>

Allison H. Altersohn (*pro hac vice*)

<[aaltersohn@kslaw.com](mailto:aaltersohn@kslaw.com)>

Christopher C. Carnaval (*pro hac vice*)

<[ccarnaval@kslaw.com](mailto:ccarnaval@kslaw.com)>

Mark H. Francis (*pro hac vice*)

<[mfrancis@kslaw.com](mailto:mfrancis@kslaw.com)>

KING & SPALDING LLP

1185 Avenue of the Americas

New York, NY 10036-4003

Telephone: (212) 556-2100

Facsimile: (212) 556-2222

Michael E. Jones (Bar No. 10929400)

<[mikejones@potterminton.com](mailto:mikejones@potterminton.com)>

Allen F. Gardner (Bar No. 24043679)

<[allengardner@potterminton.com](mailto:allengardner@potterminton.com)>

POTTER MINTON

A Professional Corporation

110 N. College, Suite 500

Tyler, TX 75702

Telephone: (903) 597-8311

Facsimile: (903) 593-0846

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Google Inc.*

By: /s/ Jeffrey F. Yee

---

Jeffrey K. Joyner (*pro hac vice*)

<[joynerj@gtlaw.com](mailto:joynerj@gtlaw.com)>

Jeffrey F. Yee (*pro hac vice*)

<[yeej@gtlaw.com](mailto:yeej@gtlaw.com)>

GREENBERG TRAUERIG LLP

2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E

Santa Monica, CA 90404

Telephone: (310) 586-7700

Facsimile: (310) 586-7800

Christopher M. Joe (Bar No. 00787770)

<[chrisjoe@bjciplaw.com](mailto:chrisjoe@bjciplaw.com)>

Brian Carpenter (Bar No. 03840600)

<[brian.carpenterb@bjciplaw.com](mailto:brian.carpenterb@bjciplaw.com)>

Eric W. Buether (Bar No. 03316880)

<[eric.buethere@bjciplaw.com](mailto:eric.buethere@bjciplaw.com)>

BUETHER JOE & CARPENTER, LLC

1700 Pacific, Suite 2390

Dallas, TX 75201

Telephone: (214) 466-1270

Facsimile: (214) 635-1842

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant J.C. Penney Corporation,  
Inc.*

By: /s/ Stephen K. Shahida

---

Stephen K. Shahida (*pro hac vice*)

<[sshahida@mwe.com](mailto:sshahida@mwe.com)>

David O. Crump (*pro hac vice*)

<[dcrump@mwe.com](mailto:dcrump@mwe.com)>

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

600 13th Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20005-3096

Telephone: (202) 756-8327

Facsimile: (202) 756-8087

Trey Yarbrough (Bar No. 22133500)

<[trey@yw-lawfirm.com](mailto:trey@yw-lawfirm.com)>

Debra Elaine Gunter (Bar No. 24012752)

<[debby@yw-lawfirm.com](mailto:debby@yw-lawfirm.com)>

YARBROUGH WILCOX, PLLC

100 E. Ferguson Street

Suite 1015

Tyler, TX 75702

Telephone: (903) 595-3111

Facsimile: (903) 595-0191

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant JPMorgan Chase & Co.*

By: /s/ Michael Simons

---

Michael Simons (Bar No. 24008042)

<[msimons@akingump.com](mailto:msimons@akingump.com)>

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

300 West 6th Street, Suite 2100

Austin, TX 78701

Telephone: (512) 499-6253

Facsimile: (512) 499-6290

*Attorney for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant New Frontier Media, Inc.*

By: /s/ Suzanne M. Wallman

---

Kenneth J. Jurek

<[kjurek@mwe.com](mailto:kjurek@mwe.com)>

Suzanne M. Wallman

<[swallman@mwe.com](mailto:swallman@mwe.com)>

Brett E. Bachtell

<[bbachtell@mwe.com](mailto:bbachtell@mwe.com)>

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

227 West Monroe Street

Chicago, IL 60606

Telephone: (312) 372-2000

Facsimile: (312) 984-7700

J. Thad Heartfield (Bar No. 09346800)

<[thad@jth-law.com](mailto:thad@jth-law.com)>

THE HEARTFIELD LAW FIRM

2195 Dowlen Road

Beaumont, TX 77706

Telephone: (409) 866-3318

Facsimile: (409) 866-5789

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Office Depot, Inc.*

By: /s/ Scott F. Partridge

---

Scott F. Partridge (Bar No. 00786940)  
<[scott.partridge@bakerbotts.com](mailto:scott.partridge@bakerbotts.com)>

Roger J. Fulghum (Bar No. 00790724)  
<[roger.fulghum@bakerbotts.com](mailto:roger.fulghum@bakerbotts.com)>

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

One Shell Plaza

910 Louisiana

Houston, TX 77002-4995

Telephone: (713) 229-1234

Facsimile: (713) 229-1522

Kevin J. Meek (Bar No. 13899600)

<[kevin.meek@bakerbotts.com](mailto:kevin.meek@bakerbotts.com)>

Paula D. Heyman (Bar No. 24027075)

<[paula.heyman@bakerbotts.com](mailto:paula.heyman@bakerbotts.com)>

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

1500 San Jacinto Center

Austin, TX 78701-4075

Telephone: (512) 322-2500

Facsimile: (512) 322-2501

Vernon E. Evans (Bar No. 24069688)

<[vernon.evans@bakerbotts.com](mailto:vernon.evans@bakerbotts.com)>

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

2001 Ross Avenue

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

Telephone: (214) 953-6500

Facsimile: (214) 953-6503

Shannon Dacus (Bar No. 00791004)

<[Shannond@rameyflock.com](mailto:Shannond@rameyflock.com)>

RAMEY & FLOCK, P.C.

100 East Ferguson, Suite 500

Tyler, TX 75702

Telephone: (903) 597-3301

Facsimile: (903) 597-2413

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Perot Systems Corp.*

By: /s/ Gentry C. McLean

---

David B. Weaver (Bar No. 00798576)  
<[dweaver@velaw.com](mailto:dweaver@velaw.com)>  
Avelyn M. Ross (Bar No. 24027871)  
<[aross@velaw.com](mailto:aross@velaw.com)>  
Gentry C. McLean (Bar No. 24046403)  
<[gmclean@velaw.com](mailto:gmclean@velaw.com)>  
John A. Fedock (Bar No. 24059737)  
<[jfedock@velaw.com](mailto:jfedock@velaw.com)>  
VINSON & ELKINS LLP  
2801 Via Fortuna, Suite 100  
Austin, TX 78746-7568  
Tel: (512) 542-8400  
Fax: (512) 236-3218

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Playboy Enterprises  
International, Inc.*

By: /s/ Jeffrey F. Yee

---

Jeffrey K. Joyner (*pro hac vice*)  
<[joynerj@gtlaw.com](mailto:joynerj@gtlaw.com)>  
Jeffrey F. Yee (*pro hac vice*)  
<[yeej@gtlaw.com](mailto:yeej@gtlaw.com)>  
GREENBERG TRAUIG LLP  
2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E  
Santa Monica, CA 90404  
Telephone: (310) 586-7700  
Facsimile: (310) 586-7800  
  
Christopher M. Joe (Bar No. 00787770)  
<[chrisjoe@bjciplaw.com](mailto:chrisjoe@bjciplaw.com)>  
Brian Carpenter (Bar No. 03840600)  
<[brian.carpenterb@bjciplaw.com](mailto:brian.carpenterb@bjciplaw.com)>  
Eric W. Buether (Bar No. 03316880)  
<[eric.buethere@bjciplaw.com](mailto:eric.buethere@bjciplaw.com)>  
BUETHER JOE & CARPENTER, LLC  
1700 Pacific, Suite 2390  
Dallas, TX 75201  
Telephone: (214) 466-1270  
Facsimile: (214) 635-1842

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Rent-A-Center, Inc.*

By: /s/ Kate Hutchins

---

Mark G. Matuschak (*pro hac vice*)  
<[mark.matuschak@wilmerhale.com](mailto:mark.matuschak@wilmerhale.com)>

Donald R. Steinberg (*pro hac vice*)  
<[donald.steinberg@wilmerhale.com](mailto:donald.steinberg@wilmerhale.com)>

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND  
DORR LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
Telephone: (617) 526-6000  
Facsimile: (617) 526-5000

Kate Hutchins (*pro hac vice*)  
<[kate.hutchins@wilmerhale.com](mailto:kate.hutchins@wilmerhale.com)>

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND  
DORR LLP  
399 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10011  
Telephone: (212) 230-8800  
Facsimile: (212) 230-8888

Daniel V. Williams, (*pro hac vice*)  
<[daniel.williams@wilmerhale.com](mailto:daniel.williams@wilmerhale.com)>

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND  
DORR LLP  
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 663-6000  
Facsimile: (202) 663-6363

Michael E. Richardson (Bar No. 24002838)  
<[mrichardson@brsfirm.com](mailto:mrichardson@brsfirm.com)>

BECK REDDEN & SECREST  
1221 McKinney, Suite 4500  
Houston, TX 77010  
Telephone: (713) 951-6284  
Facsimile: (713) 951-3720

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Staples, Inc.*



By: /s/ Mark D. Fowler

---

Mark D. Fowler (*pro hac vice*)

<[mark.fowler@dlapiper.com](mailto:mark.fowler@dlapiper.com)>

DLA PIPER US LLP

2000 University Avenue

East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2215

Telephone: (650) 833-2000

Facsimile: (650) 833-2001

Kathryn B. Riley (*pro hac vice*)

<[kathryn.riley@dlapiper.com](mailto:kathryn.riley@dlapiper.com)>

DLA PIPER US LLP

401 B Street, Suite 1700

San Diego, CA 92101

Telephone: (619) 699-2700

Facsimile: (619) 764-6692

Eric H. Findlay (Bar No. 00789886)

<[efindlay@findlaycraft.com](mailto:efindlay@findlaycraft.com)>

FINDLAY CRAFT, LLP

6760 Old Jacksonville Highway

Suite 101

Tyler, TX 75703

Telephone: (903) 534-1100

Facsimile: (903) 534-1137

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Oracle America, Inc.  
(formerly known as Sun Microsystems,  
Inc.)*

By: /s/ Carl R. Roth

---

Carl R. Roth (Bar No. 17312000)  
<[cr@rothfirm.com](mailto:cr@rothfirm.com)>  
Brendan C. Roth (Bar No. 24040132)  
<[br@rothfirm.com](mailto:br@rothfirm.com)>  
Amanda A. Abraham (Bar No. 24055077)  
<[aa@rothfirm.com](mailto:aa@rothfirm.com)>  
THE ROTH LAW FIRM, P.C.  
115 N. Wellington, Suite 200  
Marshall, TX 75670  
Telephone: (903) 935-1665  
Facsimile: (903) 935-1797

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Texas Instruments  
Incorporated*

By: /s/ Edward Reines

---

Edward Reines  
<[edward.reines@weil.com](mailto:edward.reines@weil.com)>  
Andrew Perito  
<[andrew.perito@weil.com](mailto:andrew.perito@weil.com)>  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 802-3000  
Facsimile: (650) 802-3100

Otis W. Carroll, Jr. (Bar No. 03895700)  
<[fedserv@icklawn.com](mailto:fedserv@icklawn.com)>  
Deborah J. Race (Bar No. 16448700)  
<[drace@icklawn.com](mailto:drace@icklawn.com)>  
IRELAND CARROLL & KELLEY  
6101 S. Broadway, Suite 500  
Tyler, TX 75703  
Telephone: (903) 561-1600  
Facsimile: (903) 581-1071

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Yahoo! Inc.*

By: /s/ Scott T. Weingaertner

---

Scott T. Weingaertner (*pro hac vice*)

<[sweingaertner@kslaw.com](mailto:sweingaertner@kslaw.com)>

Robert F. Perry (*pro hac vice*)

<[rperry@kslaw.com](mailto:rperry@kslaw.com)>

Allison H. Altersohn (*pro hac vice*)

<[aaltersohn@kslaw.com](mailto:aaltersohn@kslaw.com)>

Christopher C. Carnaval (*pro hac vice*)

<[ccarnaval@kslaw.com](mailto:ccarnaval@kslaw.com)>

Mark H. Francis (*pro hac vice*)

<[mfrancis@kslaw.com](mailto:mfrancis@kslaw.com)>

KING & SPALDING LLP

1185 Avenue of the Americas

New York, NY 10036-4003

Telephone: (212) 556-2100

Facsimile: (212) 556-2222

Michael E. Jones (Bar No. 10929400)

<[mikejones@potterminton.com](mailto:mikejones@potterminton.com)>

Allen F. Gardner (Bar No. 24043679)

<[allengardner@potterminton.com](mailto:allengardner@potterminton.com)>

POTTER MINTON

A Professional Corporation

110 N. College, Suite 500

Tyler, TX 75702

Telephone: (903) 597-8311

Facsimile: (903) 593-0846

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant YouTube, LLC*

**SIGNATURE ATTESTATION**

I hereby certify that concurrence in the service of this document has been obtained from each of the other signatories shown above.

/s/ Shubham Mukherjee  
Attorney for one of the Defendants

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system per Local Rule CV-5(a)(3) on February 24, 2011.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Shubham Mukherjee  
Attorney for one of the Defendants