

Exhibit 5:

October 1, 2010, letter from Joshua A. Glikin to Alan L. Sullivan

BOWIE & JENSEN, LLC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
6TH FLOOR 29 W. SUSQUEHANNA AVENUE
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204
HTTP://WWW.BOWIE-JENSEN.COM/
INFO@BOWIE-JENSEN.COM
(410) 583-2400
FAX (410) 583-2437

JOSHUA A. GLIKIN

GLIKIN@BOWIE-JENSEN.COM

October 1, 2010

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Alan L. Sullivan
Snell & Wilmer, LLP
15 West South Temple, Suite 1200
Beneficial Tower
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

RE: Public Engines, Inc. v. ReportSee, Inc.

Dear Alan:

This letter responds to your September 24, 2010, letter proposing to produce documents that were the subject of the Subpoenas by ReportSee, Inc., served on vSpring Capital, LLC, and Austin Ventures. We disagree with your contention that Public Engines properly limited its response to Request No. 2 of ReportSee's First Set of Document Requests. Public Engines' boilerplate objection to Request No. 2 is not valid or effective, and Public Engines cannot rely on it to arrogate to itself the decision about which documents are relevant and which are not, as it apparently did. Moreover, the explanation that you provided in your letter of the scope of self-imposed limitation that Public Engines placed on Request No. 2 was not provided in Public Engines' response to the document request itself. Public Engines cannot hide the ball about what it produced and what it did not, and then reveal the scope of its limitations only when a particular issue with its production is discovered.

Accordingly, please provide an explanation of the limitations that Public Engines placed on each of ReportSee's document requests, both the first set it served and the requests that currently are outstanding, so that ReportSee can determine whether and how to respond to each specified objection and limitation. This may explain, for example, some of the apparent shortcomings with Public Engines' original production, such as:

- Why Public Engines' first production contained a total of 287 documents, by our count, and of those, only about 200 were emails.
- With respect to the emails, the earliest email that even concerns or mentions SpotCrime is dated 06/02/2008, and the next earliest is date 03/24/2009. Paragraph 33 of Public Engines' Complaint alleges that Public Engines

Alan L. Sullivan
Page 2 of 2
October 1, 2010


discovered SpotCrime's scraping in the "Spring of 2008". It is difficult to believe that there would be *no* correspondence or other documents that relate to SpotCrime, save the cease & desist letter from Public Engines' counsel (dated June 16, 2008) and ReportSee's response to it, between June 2008 and March 2009.

- There are only a handful of responses from police agencies to the several emails that Public Engines sent providing scripted responses.

Please also supplement Public Engines' production in response to ReportSee's first document requests with documents that have been created since the original production. We have, for example, received documents that evidence correspondence between the San Jose Police Department and Public Engines, which relate to SpotCrime, that Public Engines has not produced. In fact, the most recent email that we possess from Public Engines is dated April 21, 2010.

With respect to ReportSee's Subpoenas on vSpring and Austin Ventures, we believe that your offer is a reasonable one. Accordingly, ReportSee withdraws its Subpoenas on vSpring and Austin Ventures, without prejudice to its right to serve new subpoenas on those entities if it deems necessary. Thank you for your offer and we look forward to receiving the documents that your letter offers to produce.

Sincerely,



Joshua A. Glikin

Enclosures

cc: Todd A. Shaughnessy
Betsy Haws
Jeffrey Hunt
David Reymann