

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
Michael A. Jacobs, *admitted pro hac vice*  
Eric M. Acker, *admitted pro hac vice*  
Grant L. Kim, *admitted pro hac vice*  
425 Market Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2482  
Telephone: (415) 268-7000  
Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

ANDERSON & KARRENBURG  
Thomas R. Karrenberg, #3726  
Heather M. Sneddon, #9520  
50 West Broadway, Suite 700  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101  
Telephone: (801) 534-1700  
Facsimile: (801) 364-7697

*Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaim-Plaintiff Novell, Inc.*

---

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION**

---

THE SCO GROUP, INC., a Delaware  
corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

NOVELL, INC., a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

**NOVELL'S RULE 60(b) MOTION FOR  
RELIEF FROM FINAL JUDGMENT**

**(Oral Argument Requested)**

Case No. 2:04CV00139

Judge Ted Stewart

---

Defendant and Counterclaim-Plaintiff Novell, Inc., pursuant to Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, hereby moves the Court for relief from a portion of the District Court's November 20, 2008 Final Judgment. Specifically, Novell asks the Court to set aside the portion of the Final Judgment determining that Novell was not entitled to royalties from the 2003 Microsoft Agreement and the Other SCOsource Licenses entered into by The SCO Group, Inc. because those licenses did not constitute a license of the copyrights of the UNIX System V operating system ("SVRX License").

The basis for that portion of the Final Judgment was the District Court's earlier summary judgment ruling that the UNIX copyrights were owned by Novell, not SCO. Based on that ruling, the District Court found that the portion of the Microsoft Agreement and the Other SCOsource Licenses that purported to release SCO's claims for infringement of UNIX System V copyrights could not constitute an SVRX License because SCO did not own those copyrights and hence had no rights to release.

On August 24, 2009, however, the Tenth Circuit reversed the District Court's summary judgment ruling on copyright ownership and remanded that issue for trial. Thus, the District Court's Final Judgment rejecting Novell's claim for SVRX royalties is based on a ruling that has now been vacated. As such, Novell is entitled to relief from that judgment under Rule 60(b)(5), which authorizes relief from a judgment that "is based on an earlier judgment that has been reversed or vacated." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(5).

The grounds for this motion are more fully set forth in the accompanying memorandum in support, the declaration of Grant L. Kim, and the papers on file with the Court.

DATED: December 22, 2009

ANDERSON & KARRENBERG

By:           /s/ Heather M. Sneddon          

Thomas R. Karrenberg  
Heather M. Sneddon

-and-

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
Michael A. Jacobs, *admitted pro hac vice*  
Eric M. Acker, *admitted pro hac vice*  
Grant L. Kim, *admitted pro hac vice*  
*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaim-Plaintiff Novell, Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 22nd day of December, 2009, I caused a true and correct copy of **NOVELL'S RULE 60(b) MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM FINAL JUDGMENT** to be served to the following:

*Via CM/ECF:*

Brent O. Hatch  
Mark F. James  
HATCH JAMES & DODGE, P.C.  
10 West Broadway, Suite 400  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

Stuart H. Singer  
William T. Dzurilla  
Sashi Bach Boruchow  
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
401 East Las Olas Blvd., Suite 1200  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

David Boies  
Edward J. Normand  
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
333 Main Street  
Armonk, New York 10504

Devan V. Padmanabhan  
John J. Brogan  
DORSEY & WHITNEY, LLP  
50 South Sixth Street, Suite 1500  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

*Via U.S. Mail, postage prepaid:*

Stephen Neal Zack  
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
100 Southeast Second Street, Suite 2800  
Miami, Florida 33131

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Heather M. Sneddon