Exhibit 10

quinn emanuel trial lawyers | san francisco

50 California Street, 22nd Floor, San Francisco, California 94111-4788 | TEL: (415) 875-6600 FAX: (415) 875-6700

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NO. **(415) 875-6316**

WRITER'S INTERNET ADDRESS megkammerud@quinnemanuel.com

February 24, 2012

Charles Monterio Jr. Dickstein Shapiro LLP 1825 Eye Street NW Washington, DC 20006

Re: <u>I/P Engine</u>, Inc. v. AOL, Inc. et al.

Dear Charles:

I write to confirm our meet and confer telephone conference on February 21, 2012.

The parties have come to an agreement that Google will produce documents from nine custodians: Jeff Huber (limited to the time period before April 2011), Hal Varian, Jonathan Alferness, Bartholomew Furrow, Bryan Horling, Daniel Wright, Matt Kulick, Jonathan McPhie, and Rishi Khaitan. In order to seek production from any additional Google custodians, I/P Engine must petition the Court, upon a showing of distinct need.

Google is running test searches on the term ("Relevance score" or ("Relevance" and ("Inventory" or "Ads Coverage"))) and terms related to competitive products. We will report back the results of such tests and seek additional focus for terms as necessary.

We also will review I/P Engine's supplemental infringement contentions in relation to the terms listed in my February 13, 2012 letter that initially appeared to lack any link to this litigation. To the extent that terms appear relevant in relation to the supplemental infringement contentions, but remain too broad, we will confer with you about the best means of narrowing their scope and reaching an appropriate agreement. To the extent that terms still appear unrelated or tenuously related to this litigation, we will seek further clarification from you.

quinn emanuel urquhart & sullivan, Ilp

LOS ANGELES | 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90017-2543 | TeL (213) 443-3000 FAX (213) 443-3100 NEW YORK | 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor, New York, New York 10010-1601 | TeL (212) 849-7000 FAX (212) 849-7100 SILICON VALLEY | 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor, Redwood Shores, California 94065-2139 | TeL (650) 801-5000 FAX (650) 801-5100 CHICAGO | 500 W. Madison Street, Suite 2450, Chicago, Illinois 60661-2510 | TeL (312) 705-7400 FAX (312) 705-7401 LONDON | 16 Old Bailey, London EC4M 7EG, United Kingdom | TeL +44(0) 20 7653 2000 FAX +44(0) 20 7653 2100 TOKYO | NBF Hibiya Bldg., 25F, 1-1-7, Uchisaiwai-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-0011, Japan | TeL +81 3 5510 1711 FAX +81 3 5510 1712 MANNHEIM | Erzbergerstraße 5, 68165 Mannheim, Germany | TeL +49(0) 621 43298 6000 FAX +49(0) 621 43298 6100

You inquired about the production of Google license agreements. Google produced license agreements on February 10, 2012.

The parties agreed that Google will produce documents from only the seven prior AdWords litigations listed in Mr. Perlson's February 3, 2012 letter. Google already has produced all deposition transcripts from these cases from current and former Google employees regarding aspects of the technology similar to those accused in this case. Google also will produce non-infringement and damages expert reports from these cases as well as expert deposition transcripts concerning both liability and damages. In addition, Google will produce Google-specific portions of the Bright Response trial transcript. To the extent that Plaintiff identifies as relevant to this case other specific documents from these litigations, Google and I/P Engine will meet and confer in good faith concerning the production of such targeted documents, provided that any such request from I/P Engine would be specific and include justification for seeking the underlying materials.

In response to my February 8, 2012 letter regarding I/P Engine's privilege log, you stated that Smart Search Labs and I/P Engine are the same company and that Labrador Search Corporation and Innovate/Protect are the same company. You also stated that I/P Engine was in the process of preparing a letter responding to the other concerns articulated in our letter.

In regards to Google's subpoena to Hudson Bay, you stated that you would respond this week to Mr. Sohn's February 17, 2012 letter on that subject. You indicated a desire to avoid overlap in documents productions, and we agreed that we do not need to receive duplicate documents from different entities. You also confirmed that Hudson Bay never owned the patents-in-suit.

You stated that you and Mr. Brothers understood that the parties had an agreement to defer production of email. You said that you understood that the parties would participate in a future meet and confer on the subject. Specifically, you stated that I/P Engine had an expectation that all parties were searching documents and emails, but not producing emails at this time. You indicated that I/P Engine has produced documents associated with emails, but not the emails themselves. However, you confirmed that I/P Engine recently collected emails for review. We indicated we did not agree there was such an agreement not produce emails and would get back to you with our position on the issue.

The parties agreed that they remain at an impasse as to the sufficiency of I/P Engine's responses to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 9. You stated that you would address our concerns about I/P Engine's remaining interrogatory responses, as detailed in Ms. O'Brien's February 17, 2012 letter, by letter later this week.

As always, we remain willing to meet and confer to resolve any discovery issues, and hope that you similarly remain willing to work together on these issues in a timely and efficient manner.

Very truly yours,

Margaret P. Kammerud

Margaret P. K

01980.51928/4613115.1