

EXHIBIT 2

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

Anascape, Ltd.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Microsoft Corp., and
Nintendo of America, Inc.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 9:06-cv-158-RC

JURY TRIAL REQUESTED

**ANASCAPE, LTD.’S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO
MICROSOFT CORP.’S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 15-19, 23 & 25)**

Pursuant to Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff Anascape, Ltd. (“Anascape”) serves these Objections and Responses to Defendant Microsoft Corp.’s (“Microsoft”) First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-26) as follows:

I.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

The following general objections are made to each and every interrogatory in addition to any specific objections that are raised in response to each interrogatory separately:

1. Anascape objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek information protected, privileged, or otherwise exempt from discovery pursuant to applicable state and federal statutes, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules, the Patent Rules, the Federal Rules of Evidence, or any other applicable rule, decision, or law. Specifically and without limitation, Anascape objects to the disclosure of any information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, party communications privilege, investigative privilege, consulting expert privilege, self-critical analysis privilege, or any other applicable

accusation ensued, and the terms of the resolution or settlement regarding the accusation, and the identity of all documents pertaining thereto.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the foregoing General Objections, Anascape objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or protective doctrine. Anascape also objects to this interrogatory as a premature contention interrogatory. Anascape further object to this interrogatory as vague and ambiguous with respect to the terms “established policy and/or marketing program.” To the extent this interrogatory calls for information that is the proper subject of expert testimony, Anascape objects that the interrogatory is premature.

Subject to and without waiving these specific objections and its general objections, Anascape responds as follows: Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 33(d), Anascape has produced document from which the answer to this interrogatory may be derived or ascertained.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:

Subject to and without waiving the specific objections and its general objections, Anascape responds as follows: Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 33(d), Anascape has produced document from which the answer to this interrogatory may be derived or ascertained at ANS0007792-7859, ANS0027671-27899, ANS0027948-28104, and ANS0043274-43279.

INTERROGATORY NO. 23:

Identify each controller sold or offered for sale in the United States since 1997 that Anascape contends does not infringe any claim of the ‘700 patent.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the foregoing General Objections, Anascape objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, and/or seek information that is not relevant to the issues in this lawsuit or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and calls for Anascape to speculate regarding the actions of unaffiliated nonparties.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:

Subject to and without waiving the specific objections and its general objections, Anascape responds as follows: There are numerous controllers sold or offered for sale in the United States since 1997 that do not infringe any claim of the '700 patent. For example, many computer mice, keyboards, and other genres of controllers do not infringe any claim of the '700 patent. In addition, there are numerous video game controllers sold or offered for sale in the United States since 1997 that do not infringe any claim of the '700 patent. For example, Microsoft has sold the following game controllers since June 31, 2000 that do not appear to infringe the '700 patent: Sidewinder Gamepad, Sidewinder Game Pad Pro, Sidewinder Plug & Play Game Pad, Sidewinder 3D Pro, Sidewinder Precision Pro, Sidewinder Force Feedback Pro, Sidewinder Precision 2, Sidewinder Force Feedback 2, Sidewinder Joystick, Sidewinder Force Feedback Wheel, Sidewinder Precision Racing Wheel, Sidewinder Strategic Commander, Sidewinder Game Voice, Sidewinder Freestyle Pro, Sidewinder Dual Strike, and Xbox 360 Wireless Racing Wheel. *See* Microsoft's Response to Interrogatory No. 5. In addition and upon information and belief, at least the following other controllers sold or offered for sale in the United States since 1997 do not infringe any claim of the '700 patent: Sony's Play Station controller, Nintendo's N64 controller, and Sega's Dreamcast controller.

DATED: January 24, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

McKOOL SMITH, P.C.

/s/ Anthony M. Garza
Sam Baxter
Lead Attorney
Texas State Bar No. 01938000
sbaxter@mckoolsmith.com
P.O. Box O
104 East Houston, Suite 300
Marshall, Texas 75670
Telephone: 903.923.9000
Facsimile: 903.923.9099

Theodore Stevenson, III
Texas State Bar No. 19196650
tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com
Anthony M. Garza
Texas State Bar No. 24050644
agarza@mckoolsmith.com
McKool Smith, P.C.
300 Crescent Court, Suite 1500
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 978-4000
Telecopier: (214) 978-4044

Robert M. Parker
Texas State Bar No. 15498000
rmparker@pbatyler.com
Robert Christopher Bunt
Texas State Bar No. 00787165
rcbunt@pbatyler.com
Charles Ainsworth
Texas State Bar No. 00783521
charley@pbatyler.com
Parker, Bunt & Ainsworth P.C.
100 E. Ferguson Street, Suite 1114
Tyler, Texas 75702
Telephone: (903) 531-3535
Telecopier: (903) 533-9687

**ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF
ANASCAPE, LTD.**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served on counsel of record via email on this 24th day of January, 2008.

/s/ Anthony M. Garza
Anthony M. Garza