

Exhibit 5

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
NORFOLK DIVISION**

I/P ENGINE, INC.,)	
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	Civ. Action No. 2:11-cv-512
)	
AOL, INC. et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

**PLAINTIFF I/P ENGINE, INC.’S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL
RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO
DEFENDANT GOOGLE, INC.’S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the agreement of the parties, I/P Engine, Inc. (“I/P Engine”) hereby supplements its responses and objections to Google, Inc.’s (“Google”) First Set of Interrogatories (“Interrogatories”). These responses are based on information reasonably available to I/P Engine at the present time. I/P Engine reserves the right to further supplement these responses when, and if, additional information becomes available. I/P Engine also reserves the right to object on any ground at any time to such other or supplemental Interrogatories Google may propound involving or relating to the subject matter of these Interrogatories.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

I/P Engine incorporates herein each of the general objections included in its Responses and Objections to Defendant Google, Inc.’s First Set of Interrogatories as if fully set forth herein.

award of lost profits damages, you identify each of your products you allege falls within the scope of any claim of the PATENTS-IN-SUIT and state the total sales annually in units and dollars from its introduction to the present, and if you contend you are entitled to an award of reasonable royalty damages, state what you assert to be a reasonable royalty to be paid by GOOGLE under 35 U.S.C. Section 284, including the complete factual bases on which you base your calculation of such royalty rate.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiff incorporates its general objections and specific objections. I/P Engine objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, Rule 26(b)(4)(B) immunity, or any other applicable privilege or immunity. I/P Engine further objects to this Interrogatory as premature because discovery in this matter has just begun, and further to the extent that it seeks expert opinion evidence, which will be provided in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of the Court, or the Court's scheduling orders. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine seeks compensatory damages, past and future, amounting to no less than reasonable royalties and prejudgment interest to compensate it for Google's infringement.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9:

For each of the PATENTS-IN-SUIT state the priority date PLAINTIFF claims for each claim and identify the portion(s) of the specification in any earlier application that support that priority date.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiff incorporates its general objections and specific objections. I/P Engine objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, Rule 26(b)(4)(B) immunity, or any other applicable privilege or immunity. I/P Engine objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks a legal conclusion. Subject to and without waiving its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

Each of the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are entitled to a priority date at least as early as the effective date of the '420 patent, i.e., December 3, 1998 (based on the filing date of the patent application, U.S. Patent Application No. 09/204,149, that issued as the '420 patent). Additionally, each of the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit may be entitled to an earlier effective date based on, without limitation, the filing of earlier related patent applications.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:

Plaintiff incorporates its general objections and specific objections. I/P Engine objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, Rule 26(b)(4)(B) immunity, or any other applicable privilege or immunity. I/P Engine objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks a legal conclusion. Subject to and without waiving its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

Each of the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are entitled to a priority date at least as early as the effective date of the '420 patent, i.e., December 3, 1998 (based on the filing date of the patent application, U.S. Patent Application No. 09/204,149, that issued as the '420 patent). Additionally, each of the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit may be entitled to an earlier effective date based on, without limitation, the filing of earlier related patent applications and documents produced by third parties. I/P Engine and third parties have produced documents

from which information responsive to this Interrogatory may be derived or ascertained pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* IPEL0000302-305; IPEL0000308-314; IPEL0000326-329; IPEL0000418-425; IPEL0000606-608; IPEL0000675-683; IPEL0001062-1063; IPEL0001212-1242; IPEL0001270-1273; IPEL0001326-1334; IPEL0001395-1399; IPEL0001422-1424; IPEL0001467-1482; IPEL0001557-1561; IPEL0001717-1732; IPEL0001924-1926; IPEL0001956-1960; LANG0001048-1051; LANG0001317-1339; LANG0001473-1479; LANG0006083-6097; LANG0007021-7028; IPE0000916-2504.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:

Plaintiff incorporates its general objections and specific objections. I/P Engine objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, Rule 26(b)(4)(B) immunity, or any other applicable privilege or immunity. I/P Engine objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks a legal conclusion. Subject to and without waiving its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

Each of the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are entitled to a priority date of December 3, 1998 (based on the filing date of the patent application, U.S. Patent Application No. 09/204,149, that issued as the '420 patent).

INTERROGATORY NO. 10:

IDENTIFY and describe in detail all the manners or techniques by which the PATENTS-IN-SUIT improved upon the PRIOR ART, added functionality that did not exist in the PRIOR ART, or provided a variation on or upgrade of the PRIOR ART, and for each such claimed improvement, added functionality, or variation or upgrade, state whether PLAINTIFF contends it

privilege or immunity. I/P Engine further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information not in I/P Engine's possession, custody or control. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine and/or third parties have produced documents from which information responsive to this Interrogatory may be derived or ascertained pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* LYCOS0000103-119.

Dated: May 11, 2012

By: /s/ Charles J. Monterio, Jr.

Jeffrey K. Sherwood

Frank C. Cimino, Jr.

Kenneth W. Brothers

DeAnna Allen

Charles J. Monterio, Jr.

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006

Telephone: (202) 420-2200

Facsimile: (202) 420-2201

Counsel for Plaintiff I/P Engine, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 11th day of May, 2012, the foregoing **PLAINTIFF I/P ENGINE, INC.'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANT GOOGLE, INC.'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES**, was served via email, on the following:

Stephen Edward Noona
Kaufman & Canoles, P.C.
150 W Main St
Suite 2100
Norfolk, VA 23510
senoona@kaufcan.com

David Bilsker
David Perlson
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
davidbilsker@quinnemanuel.com
davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com

Robert L. Burns
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP
Two Freedom Square
11955 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190
robert.burns@finnegan.com

Cortney S. Alexander
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP
3500 SunTrust Plaza
303 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 94111
cortney.alexander@finnegan.com

/s/ Armands Chagnon
Armands Chagnon