

EXHIBIT J

Rosemary Snider

From: Dionne Robinson
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 12:50 PM
To: Rosemary Snider
Cc: Norka Constantine
Subject: FW: Meet and Confer, My Understanding for Adobe
Importance: High

From: David Healey [mailto:Healey@fr.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 12:30 PM
To: Josh Budwin; Michael Florey; Eolas
Cc: Adobe-Eolas; Stacci Mahadeo; Brenda A. Baginskie
Subject: RE: Meet and Confer, My Understanding for Adobe
Importance: High

1) We agreed that Eolas would supplement the joint interrogatory as to the impact of the Microsoft settlement on each Adobe product in one week, cleaning up defects Eolas pointed out in the definitions and question in the identification of the license and settlement and covenant not to sue, so the answer Eolas gives is something it can view as accurate, and Eolas' answer will be subject to that clean up (done through its objections).

2) We disagreed on Intellectual Ventures license and investment. I said for Adobe that if Eolas had something specific we would consider it. Eolas said they wanted the investment and the list of patents licensed. I told Eolas "no", but that we would confirm with Adobe. As of now, no one from Adobe has responded to my email, but I am not expecting Adobe to change position on this point.

3) I (for Adobe) told Eolas we would go with what Judge Davis ruled for web-analytics, but for any needed tweaks for Adobe based on particulars of the defendants' businesses and Adobe's business (which we expect could be easily resolved in light of Judge Davis' ruling). Adobe will not re-litigate what Judge Davis rules on in his order: Eolas said it is possible it might settle the dispute or the case with the defendants litigating this issue. Eolas said the June 29 hearing might go away.

My observation is that if the June 29 hearing does not happen, the parties will need to be aware that an expert report deadline could get reset fast, and likely should agree on a set of deadlines to avoid problems.

The issue of supplementing the damages interrogatory is being worked out as discovery concludes on this issue, and was taken out of the Local Rule 7 meet and confer.

The net is that the Intellectual Ventures discovery remains the one point of impasse after the exhaustion of the Local Rule 7 conference today.

If I have misunderstood let me know.

 This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized use or disclosure is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

IRS CIRCULAR 230 DISCLOSURE: Any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein. (FR08-i203d)

6/16/2011