

Exhibit G

1 Scott R. Miller (State Bar No. 112656)
smiller@cblh.com
2 Keith D. Fraser (State Bar No. 216279)
kfraser@cblh.com
3 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
4 333 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2300
5 Los Angeles, California 90071
6 Telephone: (213) 787-2500; Fax: (213) 687-0498

7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs UNILOC
CORPORATION PTY LIMITED, UNILOC USA,
8 INC., and UNILOC (SINGAPORE) PRIVATE
9 LIMITED.

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION
12

13 UNILOC CORPORATION PTY
LIMITED, an Australian Proprietary
14 Limited Company, UNILOC USA,
15 INC., a Rhode Island Corporation, and
UNILOC (SINGAPORE) PRIVATE
16 LIMITED, a Singapore Corporation,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 vs.

19 XTREAMLOK, PTY, an Australian
Proprietary Limited Company; and
20 SYMANTEC CORPORATION, a
Delaware Corporation, and DOES 1
21 through 10, Inclusive,

22 Defendants.
23

Case No. **CV 08-03574 DOC (MLGx)**

**STIPULATION TO STAY CASE
PENDING ARBITRATION OF
PLAINTIFFS' BREACH OF
CONTRACT CAUSE OF ACTION**

[Proposed] Order Staying Case Pending
Arbitration lodged herewith]

Hearing Date: October 27, 2008
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Courtroom: 9D, Santa Ana
Judge: Hon. David O. Carter

1 WHEREAS on May 30, 2008, Plaintiffs (collectively referred to herein as
2 “Uniloc”) filed this instant action against Defendants XstreamLok, Pty.
3 (“XstreamLok”) and Symantec Corporation (“Symantec”) and asserted claims
4 against each Defendant for Breach of Contract, Patent Infringement, and Unfair
5 Competition;

6
7 WHEREAS on October 2, 2008, Defendants filed a motion to compel
8 arbitration of all of Uniloc’s claims pursuant to an arbitration clause set forth in a
9 License Agreement entered into between Uniloc and XstreamLok;

10
11 WHEREAS Uniloc filed an opposition to the motion contending that its
12 Patent Infringement and Unfair Competition claims were not subject to the
13 arbitration clause of the License Agreement;

14
15 WHEREAS the parties have agreed, pursuant to the terms of the License
16 Agreement, that this Court may determine the scope of the arbitration clause of the
17 License Agreement.

18
19 WHEREAS the parties now wish to resolve Defendants’ motion to compel
20 arbitration;

21
22 WHEREAS the parties have agreed to arbitrate Uniloc’s Breach of Contract
23 action pursuant to the terms of the License Agreement;

24
25 WHEREAS the parties have agreed that, because resolution of Uniloc’s
26 Breach of Contract action may have a material impact on the other claims raised in
27 the Complaint, this matter should be stayed pending arbitration of Uniloc’s Breach
28 of Contract action, and that, once the arbitration of that claim is concluded, this

1 matter may be re-activated so that this Court may address any remaining claims for
2 Patent Infringement and Unfair Competition;

3
4 WHEREAS the parties agree that, once the arbitration is concluded, this
5 Court may determine what, if any, impact the decision in the arbitration has on the
6 other claims raised in the Complaint, and this Stipulation is without prejudice to
7 assertions by the parties as to the impact of the arbitration on the claims and issues
8 not decided by the arbitrator, which may be determined by the Court upon
9 completion of the arbitration, in accordance with applicable law; and

10
11 WHEREAS the parties agree that at the conclusion of the arbitration, this
12 court will retain jurisdiction to decide Uniloc's claims for Patent Infringement and
13 Unfair Competition to the extent that either party contends any claims or issues
14 remain in accordance with applicable law;

15
16 WHEREFORE IT IS HEREBY AGREED AND STIPULATED that:

17
18 (1) Uniloc's Claims against Defendants for Breach of Contract are subject to
19 the arbitration clause of the License Agreement, and shall be submitted to
20 arbitration in accordance with the Uniloc/XtreamLok License Agreement and
21 applicable law;

22
23 (2) This action shall be stayed pending the arbitration of Uniloc's Breach of
24 Contract claims against Defendants; and

25
26 (3) This Court shall retain jurisdiction over Uniloc's Patent Infringement and
27 Unfair Competition Claims, and shall re-activate the matter upon application of the
28

1 parties upon completion of the arbitration to allow the continuation of the action as
2 to any claims and issues which either party may contend remain to be resolved in
3 accordance with applicable law.

4
5 **SO STIPULATED**

6
7 Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP

8
9 Dated: October 21, 2008

By: /s/ Scott R. Miller
Scott R. Miller
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

10
11
12
13 Dated: October 21, 2008

Latham & Watkins, LLP

14
15
16 By: /s/ Mark A. Flagel (w/permission)
Mark A. Flagel
Attorneys for Defendants
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28