Exhibit 3

DICKSTEINSHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street NW | Washington, DC 20006-5403
TEL (202) 420-2200 | FAX (202) 420-2201 | dicksteinshapiro.com

March 15, 2012

Via E-mail

David Perlson, Esq.
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111

Cortney S. Alexander, Esq.
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett &
Dunner, LLP
3500 SunTrust Plaza
303 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30308

Re: Defendants' Proposed Claim Terms to be Construed

Dear Counsel:

The Rule 16(b) Scheduling Order for this case makes clear that "the Court will construe no more than **ten (10) terms**." Order at 5 (emphasis in original). I/P Engine proposed 4 terms to be construed ("scanning a network", "informon", "relevance", and "combining"); defendants also included those four terms in their list. Defendants additionally identified more than 30 additional limitations for potential construction. I/P Engine believes that defendants' list of claim terms is unfocused, duplicative, reflects a lack of analysis, and fails to comply with the spirit of the Court's Scheduling Order. It is unreasonable for the parties to exchange constructions for more than 30 terms or phrases when the Court has expressly limited its construction to 10 terms. I/P Engine proposes that, in addition to the 4 terms that all parties have agreed upon for construction, defendants identify 6 additional claim limitations by no later than 5 p.m. EDT tomorrow, Friday, March 16, 2012.

We further note that defendants did not identify any limitations to be construed under Section 112(6), as expressly required by the Rule 16(b) Order, and thus defendants have waived any rights to seek any means-plus-function constructions.

We remain willing to meet and confer on these issues.

Best regards,

Charles J. Monterio Jr.
(202) 420-5167
MonterioC@dicksteinshapiro.com

CJM/

cc: Stephen E. Noona
David Bilsker
Kenneth W. Brothers
Jeffrey K. Sherwood
DeAnna Allen