

# Exhibit 2

**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) 875-6344**

WRITER'S INTERNET ADDRESS  
**joshuasohn@quinnemanuel.com**

April 3, 2012

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

Re: I/P Engine, Inc. v. AOL, Inc. et al.: Claim Construction

Dear Charles:

I write in response to your letter of March 29, 2012 regarding claim construction. As Defendants have repeatedly stated, grouping together terms that provide a common claim construction issue is the most efficient and practical way to conduct the claim construction process. For this reason, construing groups of terms is commonly done in patent cases. Defendants disagree with your position that this technique is improper under the Court's Scheduling Order.

We also decline your proposal to reduce the terms in Defendants' list down to isolated words or phrases taken from larger terms. You propose to reduce all the terms in Defendants' Group #6 down to the single word "combining"; you propose to reduce all the terms in Group # 1 to "relevant and "relevance"; and you propose to reduce all the terms in Group #2 to "scanning a network" and "a scanning system for searching for information." Simply construing these isolated words or phrases is not an adequate substitute for construing the larger terms that contain them. Accordingly, Defendants must reject your proposal.

Regarding the term "informon", we acknowledge the parties' agreement that this term is singular and "informons" is plural. As for the use of the phrase "particular user" in Defendants' construction of "informon," Defendants have already explained that this phrase comes directly from the specification's own definition of "informon." *See* '420 Patent at 3:31-33 ("As used herein, the term 'informon' comprehends an information entity of potential or actual interest to a

**quinn emanuel urquhart & sullivan, llp**

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 | Erzbischofstraße 5, 68165 Mannheim, Germany | TEL +49(0) 621 43298 6000 FAX +49(0) 621 43298 6100

particular user.”)

Regarding the term “collaborative feedback data,” we agree that the parties’ proposed constructions are similar, but we decline your invitation to adopt Plaintiff’s wording in lieu of Defendants’.

We note that Plaintiff has still not responded to certain claim construction questions in Defendants’ prior correspondence. For instance, Plaintiff has still not provided its position on whether antecedent basis law applies to the term dyads in Defendants’ Group #7, such that the second term in each dyad must refer back to the first. We have been seeking Plaintiff’s position on this issue for nearly two weeks and have yet to receive any response. Please provide one.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Joshua L. Sohn

Joshua L. Sohn

01980.51928/4687682.1