

# EXHIBIT V

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
NORFOLK DIVISION

I/P ENGINE, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

AOL, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:11-cv-512

**DEFENDANT GANNETT CO., INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO  
PLAINTIFF I/P ENGINE, INC.'S FIRST DAMAGES RULE 30(b)(6) NOTICE OF  
DEPOSITION**

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 30, Defendant Gannett Co., Inc. ("Gannett") hereby objects and responds in writing to Plaintiff's First Liability Rule 30(b)(6) Notice of Deposition of Gannett.

**GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

Gannett makes the following general objections to each and every definition, instruction, and interrogatory made in Plaintiff I/P Engine, Inc.'s ("I/P Engine") First Liability Rule 30(b)(6) Notice of Deposition of Gannett, dated April 2, 2012. Each of these objections is incorporated into the Specific Objections set forth below, whether or not separately set forth therein. By responding to any of the topics or failing to specifically refer to or specify any particular General Objection in response to a particular topic, Gannett does not waive any of

these General Objections, nor admit or concede the appropriateness of any purported topic or any assumptions contained therein.

1. Gannett objects to the date and location set in the notice for the deposition. Plaintiff has acknowledged that the date and location set in the notice are placeholders only.

2. Nothing in these responses should be construed as waiving rights or objections that might otherwise be available to Gannett nor should Gannett's responses to any of these topics be deemed an admission of relevancy, materiality, or admissibility in evidence of the topic or the response thereto.

3. Gannett objects to each topic to the extent that it seeks the disclosure of information protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work product doctrine or any other applicable privilege or protection as provided by law. Gannett will not produce such privileged or protected information, and any inadvertent disclosure of any privileged or protected information shall not be deemed a waiver of any privilege. Gannett will not be including on its privilege log information created after the filing date of this action.

4. Gannett objects to each topic, and to the definitions and instructions included therewith, to the extent it purports to impose upon Gannett obligations broader than, or inconsistent with, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the Local Rules and Orders of this Court.

5. Gannett objects to each topic to the extent that it seeks information not relevant to this litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Specifically, Gannett objects to each of the topics to the extent they seek information about products not accused of infringing the patents-in-issue.

6. Gannett objects to each topic to the extent that it is not reasonably limited in time or scope.

7. Gannett objects to each topic on the ground that it seeks information protected by privacy law and/or policy.

8. Gannett objects to each topic and to the definitions and instructions included therewith pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(2)(i) to the extent that they purport to require the disclosure of information that is more readily available and/or more appropriately obtainable through other means of discovery.

9. Gannett objects to each topic to the extent that such topic prematurely seeks the production of information and documents in advance of the dates set by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules, the Docket Control Order entered in this case, the Discovery Order entered in this case, and any other relevant discovery orders entered in this case.

10. Gannett objects to each topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks information about aspects of the accused technology that are not related to this case. The burden and expense associated with producing such information grossly outweighs its benefit and relevance.

11. Gannett objects to I/P Engine's definition of "Defendant Gannett Company, Inc." as overly broad and unduly burdensome, to the extent that includes related entities or divisions of Gannett, directors, officers, present and former employees, agents, representatives, and attorneys of such entities. Gannett will not respond concerning any defendant other than Gannett.

12. Gannett objects to each topic to the extent that the words and phrases used therein are vague, ambiguous, misleading and/or overbroad. Gannett specifically objects to the definitions of the terms "Ad Coverage," "Ad Depth," and "other search advertising systems."

13. Gannett responds to these topics based upon its current understanding and reserves the right to supplement its responses if any additional information is identified at a later time and to make any additional objections that may become apparent.

14. By responding to these topics, Gannett does not waive or intend to waive, but expressly reserves, all of its statements, reservations, and objections, both general and specific, set forth in these responses, even though Gannett may in some instances disclose information over the statements, reservations, and objections contained herein.

### **STATEMENT ON SUPPLEMENTATION**

Gannett's investigation in this action is ongoing, and Gannett reserves the right to rely on and introduce information in addition to any information provided in response to this notice at the trial of this matter or in other related proceedings. Responses to Plaintiff's topics are also limited by the vagueness and insufficiency of Plaintiff's infringement contentions.

### **TOPIC 1:**

The amount and percentage of Gannett's gross and net search advertising revenue derived from:

- a. Google AdWords;
- b. Google AdSense for Search;
- c. systems Gannett intends to rely upon as non-infringing alternatives; and
- d. other search advertising systems.

### **RESPONSE TO TOPIC 1:**

Gannett objects to this topic on the grounds that: (i) it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and oppressive on its face, including to the extent that it is not limited to the accused products; (ii) it seeks information that is not relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the

discovery of admissible evidence, including to the extent that it seeks information about "other search advertising systems"; (iii) it seeks information that is properly the subject of a contention interrogatory, not the subject of a request for a 30(b)(6) witness topic; and (iv) it is vague and ambiguous, particularly with respect to the terms "derived from" and "other search advertising systems."

Subject to its objections, Gannett will produce a corporate designee to testify generally regarding the revenues, costs and profits of its use of the accused aspects of Google AdSense for Search, to the extent that Gannett understands what is accused based on Plaintiff's infringement contentions, and to the extent tracked by Gannett.

**TOPIC 2:**

The actual, budgeted and projected sales/revenues (gross and net), profits and losses, incremental and marginal profits, and direct and overhead/allocated costs of Gannett's use of Google AdWords and Google AdSense for Search including, but not limited to, revenue per search calculations accounting for AdCoverage, AdDepth, click through rate, and cost per click.

**RESPONSE TO TOPIC 2:**

Gannett objects to this topic on the grounds that: (i) it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and oppressive on its face, including to the extent that it is not limited to the accused aspects of AdWords and AdSense for Search; (ii) it seeks information that is not relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; and (iii) it is vague and ambiguous, particularly with respect to the terms "Ad Coverage," "Ad Depth," "click through rate," and "cost per click."

Subject to its objections, Gannett will produce a corporate designee to testify generally regarding the revenues, costs and profits of its use of the accused aspects of Google AdSense for

Search, to the extent that Gannett understands what is accused based on Plaintiff's infringement contentions, and to the extent tracked by Gannett.

**TOPIC 3:**

Gannett's revenue sharing and profit sharing arrangements related to Google AdSense for Search or Google AdWords with co-defendant Google, Inc.

**RESPONSE TO TOPIC 3:**

Subject to its objections, Gannett will produce a corporate designee to testify generally on the topic of the revenue Gannett receives as an AdSense partner, to the extent known.

**TOPIC 4:**

The actual, budgeted and projected sales/revenues (gross and net), profits and losses, incremental and marginal profits, and direct and overhead/allocated costs of any non-infringing alternatives Gannett intends to rely upon to support a claim or defense.

**RESPONSE TO TOPIC 4:**

Gannett objects to this topic on the grounds that: (i) it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and oppressive on its face; (ii) it seeks information that is not relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; and (iii) it seeks information that is properly the subject of a contention interrogatory, not the subject of a request for a 30(b)(6) witness topic. Gannett also objects to this topic to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege or protection.

**TOPIC 5:**

Gannett's awareness of Google's pricing (including without limitation revenue sharing) strategies, Gannett's evaluations of competitor's prices and pricing strategies, and Gannett's understanding of Google's determination of prices to charge for allowing Gannett to use Google AdWords and Google AdSense for Search.

**RESPONSE TO TOPIC 5:**

Gannett objects to this topic on the grounds that: (i) it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and oppressive on its face; (ii) it seeks information that is not relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; (iii) it is vague and ambiguous, particularly with respect to the terms "strategies," "determination of prices," and "competitors"; and (iv) it seeks information outside the scope of Gannett's knowledge. Furthermore, this topic is based on the false premise that Google charges Gannett to use AdWords and AdSense for Search.

**TOPIC 6:**

Gannett's awareness of any comparisons and evaluations directed to the differences between the average revenue per search, gross and net revenue, ad search results quality, and conversion rates of Google AdWords and Google AdSense for Search, and of the non-infringing alternatives on which Gannett intends to rely upon to support a claim and defense.

**RESPONSE TO TOPIC 6:**

Gannett objects to this topic on the grounds that: (i) it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and oppressive on its face; (ii) it seeks information that is not relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; (iii) it is unintelligible, particularly as to the phrase "the differences between the average revenue per search, gross and



net revenue, ad search results quality, and conversion rates"; (iv) it seeks information that is properly the subject of a contention interrogatory, not the subject of a request for a 30(b)(6) witness topic; and (v) it seeks information outside the scope of Gannett's knowledge. Gannett also objects to this topic to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege or protection.

**TOPIC 7:**

Any license agreements and/or covenants not to sue known by Gannett that are related to Google AdWords or Google AdSense for Search including, but not limited to, Google's licensing policies and strategies for Google AdWords and Google AdSense for Search.

**RESPONSE TO TOPIC 7:**

Gannett objects to this topic on the grounds that: (i) it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and oppressive on its face; (ii) it seeks information that is not relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; (iii) it is vague and ambiguous, particularly with respect to the term "licensing policies and strategies"; and (iv) it seeks information outside the scope of Gannett's knowledge.

**TOPIC 8:**

Agreements to which Gannett is a party relating to search advertising patents or in which rights in search advertising technologies are granted.

**RESPONSE TO TOPIC 8:**

Gannett objects to this topic on the grounds that: (i) it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and oppressive on its face, particularly to the extent that it is not limited to the

accused products; (ii) it seeks information that is not relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; (iii) it is vague and ambiguous, particularly with respect to the terms "search advertising patents" and "search advertising technologies."

**TOPIC 9:**

Google's indemnification of Gannett in this action, including all communications relating to indemnification, related to Google AdWords and Google AdSense for Search.

**RESPONSE TO TOPIC 9:**

Gannett objects to this topic on the grounds that: (i) it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and oppressive on its face; and (ii) it seeks information that is not relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Gannett also objects to this topic to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege or protection.

**TOPIC 10:**

The complete and full factual basis for Gannett's assertion of paragraph 140 of its First Amended Answer asserting "Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the equitable doctrines of laches and estoppel."

**RESPONSE TO TOPIC 10:**

Gannett objects to this topic on the grounds that: (i) it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and oppressive on its face; and (ii) it seeks information that is properly the subject of a contention interrogatory, not the subject of a request for a 30(b)(6) witness topic. Gannett also objects to this topic to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client

privilege, the work product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege or protection.

**TOPIC 11:**

The complete and full factual basis for Gannett's assertion of paragraph 141 of its First Amended Answer asserting "Plaintiff's ability to recover damages is limited by the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 286-287."

**RESPONSE TO TOPIC 11:**

Gannett objects to this topic on the grounds that: (i) it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and oppressive on its face; and (ii) it seeks information that is properly the subject of a contention interrogatory, not the subject of a request for a 30(b)(6) witness topic. Gannett also objects to this topic to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege or protection.

Dated: April 23, 2012

By: /s/ David A. Perlson

David A. Perlson  
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN LLP  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

By: /s/ Stephen E. Noona

Stephen E. Noona  
KAUFMAN & CANOLES, P.C.  
150 West Main Street  
Post Office Box 3037  
Norfolk, VA 23514  
Telephone: (757) 624.3000  
Facsimile: (757) 624.3169

*Counsel for Defendant Gannett Co., Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that April 23, 2012, I will serve the foregoing by electronic mail to the following:

Jeffrey K. Sherwood  
Kenneth W. Brothers  
Charles J. Monterio, Jr.  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1825 Eye Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 420-2200  
Facsimile: (202) 420-2201  
sherwooddj@dicksteinshapiro.com  
brothersk@discksteinshapiro.com  
monterioc@dicksteinshapiro.com

*Counsel for Plaintiff I/P Engine, Inc.*

Stephen E. Noona  
Kaufman & Canoles, P.C.  
150 W. Main Street, Suite 2100  
Norfolk, VA 23510-1665

T (757) 624.3239  
F (757) 624.3169  
senoona@kaufcan.com

*Counsel for Defendants*

Dated: April 23, 2012

By: /s/ Jennifer Ghaussy  
Jennifer Ghaussy  
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN LLP  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
415-875-6600  
Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700