

Exhibit 6:

October 28, 2010, electronic mail correspondence from Todd A. Shaughnessy  
to Joshua A. Glikin

---

**From:** tshaughnessy@swlaw.com  
**To:** Joshua A. Gilkin  
**Cc:** Sullivan, Alan; Haws, Betsy; 'Lambert, Mark'  
**Sent:** 10/28/2010 6:45PM  
**Subject:** Public Engines v. ReportSee

Josh,

The following responds to your recent letters and emails concerning various discovery matters:

1-- ReportSee's Second Set of Discovery Requests:

Interrogatory No. 12; Request No. 10: Public Engines' calculation of its damages will be provided in the form of its Rule 26(a)(2) expert disclosures. Public Engines will produce documents or a summary sufficient to show the time, personnel resources, and other expenses associated with ReportSee's scraping of Public Engines' data.

Request No. 12: Public Engines has produced its financial projections, which constitute its "business plans or projections", and also has also produced documents related to marketing and marketing plans. For this reason, I believe we have produced documents responsive to this Request. I am not sure what particular documents or types of documents you are claiming have not been produced, or what deficiencies you are claiming exist in the documents that have been produced. Please clarify.

Request No. 14: Public Engines has produced its financial statements for the periods of time requested. I am not sure what further financial documents you are seeking. Please let me know and I will follow up and see if we can get you what you need.

Request Nos. 17 and 18: Although Public Engines maintains some documents that show the number of users that access data on CrimeReports.com or those who sign up for email alerts, there are known inaccuracies in these figures. Public Engines will attempt to provide what information it can on this issue, with the understanding that Public Engines cannot guarantee it is complete or accurate.

Request No. 20: We fail to see how applications for state or federal funding could possibly have any relevance in this case. Public Engines has regular, informal communications or discussions about funding generally, and funding for particular police agencies, and to the extent you are seeking all such communications, providing them would be unnecessarily burdensome particularly in light of their lack of relevance, or marginal relevance, to any issue in this case. Notwithstanding, to resolve this issue Public Engines will produce documents related to those instances in which a public agency has requested that it provide a formal proposal or application for such funding.

Request No. 26: As indicated above, Public Engines has produced documents related to marketing and marketing plans which appears to address this Request, at least in part. We disagree that Public Engines' retention of public relations, marketing, or search engine optimization firms would have any relevance to any issues in this case. Notwithstanding, and in an effort to resolve this particular issue, Public Engines will provide copies of its contracts with any such firms.

2-- vSpring and Austin Ventures Subpoenas:

Attached are letters from vSpring and Austin Ventures with the written confirmation that we previously discussed.

The documents that Public Engines agreed to produce to resolve the issues related to the vSpring and Austin Ventures subpoenas were included in Public Engines last document production. I've asked Betsy to send you the bates ranges for these documents.

### 3-- ReportSee First Set of Discovery Requests:

I believe we previously have responded, at least in part, to some of the issues raised in your October 1, 2010 letter concerning Public Engines' responses to ReportSee's first document requests. Your letter does not refer to any particular requests for which documents were not produced. Moreover, I am not sure how we can explain to you the limits that Public Engines placed on its responses to each individual request -- we read each request and attempted to the best of our ability to explain what documents we were willing to produce and, I believe, produced all of those documents.

The simplest explanation for the volume of the documents that were produced is that we only produced documents responsive to the requests made. We did not do what ReportSee did when it responded to our document requests -- namely, copy tens of thousands of documents and produce them even though they are not responsive and even though they have nothing to do with any of the issues in this case.

Public Engines read ReportSee's requests, correctly we believe, as asking for the production of email correspondence on various topics that took place between any employee of Public Engines and any third party. Those requests did not call for the production of all internal emails on those topics, which may answer your question about the date of the first email you claim to have that mentions SpotCrime and the claimed absence of communications between June 2008 and March 2009 (which we have not confirmed).

In response to your question about why Public Engines only produced "a handful" of police agency responses to the various emails that it sent to its customers regarding ReportSee's conduct, the answer is that Public Engines did not receive any response to those emails from the vast majority of its customers. Public Engines undertook a reasonable search for those responses that it did receive, and we produced those documents.

Finally, Public Engines will supplement its prior production to include (a) responsive correspondence created by Public Engines since the prior production (if any), and (b) correspondence between Public Engines and the San Jose Police Department since the prior production. Additionally, if you have copies of correspondence between Public Engines and the San Jose Police Department that pre-date the prior production and were not produced, please forward them to me so that we can determine whether anything was missed and, if so, why.

### 4-- Public Engines' Depositions:

I have confirmed the availability of the Public Engines' witnesses for the dates you proposed. Specifically:  
David Brady, 11/10 at 1:00;  
30(b)(6), 11/11;  
Michael Hopkin, 11/12 at 9:00  
Ryan Lufkin, 11/12 (following the Hopkin deposition).

We will be representing each of these witnesses, including Mr. Brady, at the depositions. It will not be necessary for you to serve subpoenas on any of them, including Mr. Brady.

### 5-- ReportSee Depositions:

I need you to confirm as soon as possible the dates for the ReportSee witnesses we discussed and whether subpoenas will be required for any of them.

I believe these are all of the outstanding matters that you have raised. If you have questions about any of them, please let me know. Thanks.

Todd

Snell & Wilmer, L.L.P.  
15 West South Temple, Suite 1200  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101  
801.257.1937 (direct)  
801.257.1900 (general)  
801.257.1800 (fax)

The message and any attachments to it may contain privileged and confidential attorney client information and/or attorney work product. Please do not forward or distribute to anyone else.