

# EXHIBIT 23

**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 FIFTH 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, 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**

1. I/P Engine incorporates each of the general objections included in its Responses and Objections to Defendant Google, Inc.’s First Set of Interrogatories, Second Set of Interrogatories, Third Set of Interrogatories, Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Fifth Set of Interrogatories as if fully recited herein.

2. I/P Engine objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they purport to impose upon I/P Engine obligations exceeding those set forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of the Court and applicable case law.

### **RESPONSES AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS**

Statements made herein regarding I/P Engine's intention to provide information or documents responsive to any given Interrogatory do not necessarily indicate or imply the existence of any information or documents responsive thereto. Furthermore, any information provided or referred to herein is not deemed to be a waiver of I/P Engine's objections as to the authenticity, competency, relevancy, materiality, privilege or admissibility of evidence in this or any subsequent proceeding or trial in this or any other action for any purpose whatsoever. In addition, I/P Engine reserves the right to further supplement or amend its responses to the Interrogatories based upon information, documents, and things it receives during discovery or obtains upon further investigation.

Discovery and trial preparation in this matter have not been completed. I/P Engine is continuing its investigation to obtain information responsive to the Interrogatories. Therefore, all responses will be given without prejudice to I/P Engine's right to introduce documents or information discovered or deemed responsive subsequent to the date of these responses.

In gathering relevant and responsive information, I/P Engine has interpreted the Interrogatories utilizing ordinary meanings of words and has expended reasonable efforts to identify information that appears responsive. To the extent that the Interrogatories purport to seek information other than as so interpreted, I/P Engine objects on the ground that the Interrogatories are vague, ambiguous and overbroad.

I/P Engine's responses to the Interrogatories are without waiver or limitation of I/P Engine's right to object on the grounds of authenticity, competency, relevancy, materiality, privilege, admissibility as evidence for any purpose, or any other grounds to the use of any documents or information in any subsequent proceeding in, or the trial of, this or any other action.

I/P Engine's production, if any, of third party documents related to this litigation does not waive or limit I/P Engine's, or any other party's, right to object on the grounds of authenticity, competency, relevancy, materiality, privilege, admissibility as evidence for any purpose, or any other grounds to the use of any documents or information in any subsequent proceeding in, or the trial of, this or any other action. I/P Engine's producing of such documents also does not constitute an admission or representation that the information contained within the documents is known or reasonably available to I/P Engine. Additionally, I/P Engine does not have a legal right to obtain or demand further documents from any third party, or have an established relationship with any third party.

I/P Engine incorporates all of its Objections to Definitions and Instructions set forth above and in its Responses and Objections to Defendant Google, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories.

## **INTERROGATORIES**

### **INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

For each asserted claim of the PATENTS-IN-SUIT, describe in detail all facts RELATING TO its conception and reduction to practice, including but not limited to: IDENTIFYING the date of conception, the date of reduction to practice of its subject matter, all acts YOU contend represent diligence occurring between the dates of conception and reduction

to practice, each person involved in such conception, diligence and/or reduction to practice, where the invention was first reduced to practice, when, where, and to whom the invention was first disclosed, and IDENTIFYING each person, including third parties, who worked on the development of the alleged invention(s) described and claimed in the PATENTS-IN-SUIT, describing each person's role (e.g., producer, developer, tester, technician, researcher, etc.), the dates and places each such person assisted, supervised, or was otherwise so involved, and the identity of all documents evidencing conception, diligence and reduction to practice.

**RESPONSE:**

Plaintiff incorporates its general objections and specific objections. I/P Engine further 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. Subject to and without waiving its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine, under Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, will produce documents from which information responsive to this Interrogatory may be derived or ascertained.

**FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:**

Plaintiff incorporates its general objections and specific objections. I/P Engine further 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. Subject to and without waiving its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

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 further 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. Subject to and without waiving its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine's present contention is that the constructive reduction to practice date is 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). I/P Engine has no present contention as to when, where, and to whom the invention was first disclosed, nor any present contention as to acts that represent diligence between any date of conception and reduction to practice.

To the extent that it may be determined by I/P Engine, the individuals involved with conception, reduction to practice, and/or development are Ken Lang and Don Kosak, who are the two named inventors.

### **THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:**

Plaintiff incorporates its general objections and specific objections. I/P Engine further 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. Subject to and without waiving its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine's present contention is that the constructive reduction to practice date is 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).

After a reasonable investigation of available information including a review of the documents identified in Plaintiff's First Supplemental Response to Interrogatory No. 1 and discussions with named inventors Andrew K. Lang and Donald Kosak, Plaintiff is not aware of evidence sufficient to form a contention as to the conception of, or any reduction to practice activities related to, the patents-in-suit prior to December 3, 1998.

To the extent that it may be determined by I/P Engine, the individuals involved with conception, reduction to practice, and/or development are Ken Lang and Don Kosak, who are the two named inventors.

### **INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

IDENTIFY all patents, patent applications, publications, web sites, products, services, and methods, that predate November 19, 1998 and RELATE TO filtering information through content-based and collaborative filters<sup>1</sup> that were at any time known to PLAINTIFF, LYCOS,

---

<sup>1</sup> For avoidance of doubt, a patent, patent application, publication, web site, product, service, or method falls within the scope of Interrogatory No. 2 only if it employs at least one content-based filter and at least one collaborative filter.

WISEWIRE, any of the named inventors of the PATENTS-IN-SUIT, or anyone participating in the prosecution of the PATENTS-IN-SUIT or the agents of any of the foregoing, and when they became known.

**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 also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information not in I/P Engine's possession, custody or control. I/P Engine objects to the phrase "one content-based filter and at least one collaborative filter" in this Interrogatory as vague and unascertainable. Subject to and without waiving its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine, under Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, will produce documents from which information responsive to this Interrogatory may be derived or ascertained.

**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 also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information not in I/P Engine's possession, custody or control. I/P Engine objects to the phrase "one content-based filter and at least one collaborative filter" in this Interrogatory as vague and unascertainable. Subject to and without waiving its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:



I/P Engine is not aware of any patents, patent applications, publications, web sites, products, services or methods that anticipate or render obvious the claimed inventions of the patents-in-suit and predate November 19, 1998. I/P Engine is not aware of any patents, patent applications, publications, web sites, products, services or methods that relate to filtering information through at least one content-based filter and at least one collaborative filter as described in the patents-in-suit and predate November 19, 1998, except for U.S. Patent No. 5,867,799 to Lang et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,983,214 to Lang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,029,161 to Lang et al., and U.S. Patent No. 6,308,175 to Lang et al.

Further responding, I/P Engine identifies certain patents and publications that other parties have asserted relate to filtering information through at least one content-based filter and at least one collaborative filter and predate November 19, 1998. I/P Engine has received, in a Lycos third party production sent to I/P Engine by Google on December 22, 2011, a letter related to settlement discussions in a prior litigation in which defendant's counsel in that prior litigation asserted that U.S. Patent No. 5,724,567 to Rose et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,758,257 to Herz et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,754,939 to Herz et al. included filtering information through at least one content-based filter and at least one collaborative filter. I/P Engine has also received on January 24, 2012 in the current litigation Google's invalidity contentions, in which Google has asserted that the following references relate to "the concept of combining collaborative and content-based filters":

Marko Balabanovic et al., *Fab: Content-Based, Collaborative Recommendation*, Communications of the ACM (March 1997);

U.S. Patent No. 6,202,058 to Rose et al.;

Yezdezard Lashkari, *Feature Guided Automated Collaborative Filtering*, MIT Masters Thesis (1995);

U.S. Patent No. 5,835,087 to Herz et al.;

David Goldberg et al., *Using Collaborative Filtering to Weave an Information Tapestry*, Communications of the ACM (December 1992).

**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 also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information not in I/P Engine's possession, custody or control. I/P Engine objects to the phrase "one content-based filter and at least one collaborative filter" in this Interrogatory as vague and unascertainable. Subject to and without waiving its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine is not aware of any patents, patent applications, publications, web sites, products, services or methods that anticipate or render obvious the claimed inventions of the patents-in-suit and predate November 19, 1998. I/P Engine is not aware of any patents, patent applications, publications, web sites, products, services or methods that relate to filtering information through at least one content-based filter and at least one collaborative filter as described in the patents-in-suit and predate November 19, 1998, except for U.S. Patent No. 5,867,799 to Lang et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,983,214 to Lang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,029,161 to Lang et al., and U.S. Patent No. 6,308,175 to Lang et al.

Further responding, I/P Engine identifies certain patents and publications that other parties have asserted relate to filtering information through at least one content-based filter and at

least one collaborative filter and predate November 19, 1998. I/P Engine has received, in a Lycos third party production sent to I/P Engine by Google on December 22, 2011, a letter related to settlement discussions in a prior litigation in which defendant's counsel in that prior litigation asserted that U.S. Patent No. 5,724,567 to Rose et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,758,257 to Herz et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,754,939 to Herz et al. included filtering information through at least one content-based filter and at least one collaborative filter. I/P Engine has also received on January 24, 2012 in the current litigation Google's invalidity contentions, in which Google has asserted that the following references related to "the concept of combining collaborative and content-based filters":

Marko Balabanovic et al., *Fab: Content-Based, Collaborative Recommendation*, Communications of the ACM (March 1997);

U.S. Patent No. 6,202,058 to Rose et al.;

Yezdezard Lashkari, *Feature Guided Automated Collaborative Filtering*, MIT Masters Thesis (1995);

U.S. Patent No. 5,835,087 to Herz et al.;

David Goldberg et al., *Using Collaborative Filtering to Weave an Information Tapestry*, Communications of the ACM (December 1992).

Further, I/P Engine has since received the following additional prior art references identified by Defendants in this litigation:

"Feature-based and Clique-based User Models for Movie Selection: A Comparative Study" by Alspector et al.

"Architecting Personalized Delivery of Multimedia Information" by Loeb

U.S. Patent No. 5,794,237

U.S. Patent No. 5,855,015

U.S. Patent No. 5,724,567

U.S. Patent No. 6,006,218

U.S. Patent No. 6,421,675

U.S. Patent No. 5,963,940

U.S. Patent No. 6,185,558

U.S. Patent No. 6,006,222

U.S. Patent No. 6,421,675

“GroupLens: An Open Architecture for Collaborative Filtering of NetNews” by Resnick et al.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

Identify each secondary consideration PLAINTIFF will rely on to rebut a claim of obviousness and describe in detail why each secondary consideration demonstrates non-obviousness, and identify all documents and evidence that support any such theory.

**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 it seeks evidence of non-obviousness before Google has identified its obviousness claims and the bases therefore. I/P Engine further objects to this Interrogatory as premature 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, or anything other than I/P Engine's present contentions, which are subject to development as discovery proceeds.

**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 further objects to this Interrogatory as premature because it seeks evidence of non-obviousness before Google has identified its obviousness claims and the bases therefore. I/P Engine further objects to this Interrogatory as premature 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, or anything other than I/P Engine's present contentions, which are subject to development as discovery proceeds. Subject to and without waiving its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine served its Rebuttal Expert Report of Dr. Jaime Carbonell Regarding Validity of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,314,420 and 6,775,664 on August 30, 2012. I/P Engine hereby incorporates that report by reference and submits that its response to this Interrogatory may be derived from that report. I/P Engine reserves the right to amend and/or supplement its validity contentions if and when further information becomes available.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

Identify the level of skill of a person of ordinary skill in the art of the subject matter of the PATENTS-IN-SUIT as of their respective filing dates.

**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 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, or anything other than I/P Engine's present contentions, which are subject to development as discovery proceeds.

**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 further objects to this Interrogatory as premature 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, or anything other than I/P Engine's present contentions, which are subject to development as discovery proceeds. Subject to and without waiving its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine served its Rebuttal Expert Report of Dr. Jaime Carbonell Regarding Validity of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,314,420 and 6,775,664 on August 30, 2012. I/P Engine served its Expert Report of Ophir Frieder on Infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,314,420 and 6,775,664 on July 25, 2012. I/P Engine hereby incorporates those reports by reference and submits that its

response to this Interrogatory may be derived from those reports. I/P Engine reserves the right to amend and/or supplement its contentions if and when further information becomes available.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

Identify any product or software known to YOU that practices or practiced any claim of the PATENTS-IN-SUIT, or that YOU allege to be an embodiment of any invention claimed in the PATENTS-IN-SUIT, including without limitation products or software designed, programmed, owned, marketed, sold or licensed by PLAINTIFF, LYCOS, or WISEWIRE.

**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 also 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:

Defendant Google, Inc.'s products, methods and systems promoted under the names of Google AdWords, Google AdSense for Search, and Google Search. I/P Engine served its Preliminary Disclosures of Asserted Claims and Pre-Discovery Infringement Contentions as to Google, Inc. on November 7, 2011. I/P Engine hereby incorporates those Disclosures by reference and submits that its response to this Interrogatory may be derived from those disclosures. I/P Engine's pre-discovery contentions were based on known publicly available information, and are subject to change based on the Court's claim construction, discovery, additional evidence, and/or further investigation. I/P Engine reserves the right to amend and/or supplement its infringement contentions if and when further information becomes available.

Defendant IAC Search & Media, Inc.'s products, methods and systems promoted under the name of Ask.com Sponsored Listings, and its systems using Google, Inc.'s products, methods and systems promoted under the names of Google AdWords and Google AdSense for Search. I/P Engine served its Preliminary Disclosures of Asserted Claims and Pre-Discovery Infringement Contentions as to IAC Search & Media, Inc. on November 11, 2011. I/P Engine hereby incorporates those Disclosures by reference and submits that its response to this Interrogatory may be derived from those disclosures. I/P Engine's pre-discovery contentions were based on known publicly available information, and are subject to change based on the Court's claim construction, discovery, additional evidence, and/or further investigation. I/P Engine reserves the right to amend and/or supplement its infringement contentions if and when further information becomes available.

Defendant AOL, Inc.'s products, methods and systems promoted under the name AOL's Advertising.com Sponsored Listings, products, methods and systems promoted under the phrase AOL's white-label, modified version of Google AdWords, and its systems using Google, Inc.'s products, methods and systems promoted under the names of Google AdWords and Google AdSense for Search. I/P Engine served its Preliminary Disclosures of Asserted Claims and Pre-Discovery Infringement Contentions as to AOL, Inc. on November 11, 2011. I/P Engine hereby incorporates those Disclosures by reference and submits that its response to this Interrogatory may be derived from those disclosures. I/P Engine's pre-discovery contentions were based on known publicly available information, and are subject to change based on the Court's claim construction, discovery, additional evidence, and/or further investigation. I/P Engine reserves the right to amend and/or supplement its infringement contentions if and when further information becomes available.



Defendant Target Corporation's systems using Google, Inc.'s products, methods and systems promoted under the names of Google AdWords and Google AdSense for Search. I/P Engine served its Preliminary Disclosures of Asserted Claims and Pre-Discovery Infringement Contentions as to Target Corporation on November 11, 2011. I/P Engine hereby incorporates those Disclosures by reference and submits that its response to this Interrogatory may be derived from those disclosures. I/P Engine's pre-discovery contentions were based on known publicly available information, and are subject to change based on the Court's claim construction, discovery, additional evidence, and/or further investigation. I/P Engine reserves the right to amend and/or supplement its infringement contentions if and when further information becomes available.

Defendant Gannett Company, Inc.'s systems using Google, Inc.'s products, methods and systems promoted under the names of Google AdWords and Google AdSense for Search. I/P Engine served its Preliminary Disclosures of Asserted Claims and Pre-Discovery Infringement Contentions as to Gannett Company, Inc. on November 11, 2011. I/P Engine hereby incorporates those Disclosures by reference and submits that its response to this Interrogatory may be derived from those disclosures. I/P Engine's pre-discovery contentions were based on known publicly available information, and are subject to change based on the Court's claim construction, discovery, additional evidence, and/or further investigation. I/P Engine reserves the right to amend and/or supplement its infringement contentions if and when further information becomes available.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

Describe in detail all efforts to mark any product authorized or licensed under the PATENTS-IN-SUIT with the patent number of the PATENTS-IN-SUIT, including

IDENTIFYING the beginning and end dates of any such patent marking (including the beginning or end dates of any interruption in patent marking), the seller of such marked products, and the manner of marking for each marked product, such as the location of the patent marking and/or the manner of such patent marking.

**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 also 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 its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine, under Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, will produce documents from which information responsive to this Interrogatory may be derived or ascertained.

**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 also 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 its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine has produced documents from which information responsive to this Interrogatory may be derived or ascertained under Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* IPE0002511-2523.

**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 also 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 its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine has produced documents from which information responsive to this Interrogatory may be derived or ascertained under Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* IPE0002511-2523; IPE0032818; IPE0032819; IPE0032820; IPE0032821; IPE0032822; IPE0032823; IPE0032824; IPE0032825; IPE0032826; IPE0032827; IPE0032828; IPE0032829; IPE0032830; Confidential Videotaped Deposition of Alexander Berger, July 11, 2012; Confidential Videotaped Deposition of Alexander R. Berger as Innovate/Protect, Inc. and I/P Engine, Inc. 30(b)(6) Witness, July 25, 2012; Confidential Videotaped Deposition of Mark Blais as Lycos, Inc. 30(b)(6) Witness, July 31, 2012.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

For each claim of the PATENTS-IN-SUIT you contend is infringed, identify every one of GOOGLE's products that you allege infringes each such claim, provided a detailed explanation, with all evidence and reasons, how each product meets each element of every claim, whether such alleged infringement is literal or by equivalents, an explanation of how

35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 6 is satisfied for any element you contend is drafted in means plus function form, including without limitation identification of corresponding structures in the patent specification and the ACCUSED PRODUCTS and an explanation of how they are the same or equivalent; an explanation of whether such alleged infringement is direct (i.e., under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a)) or indirect (i.e., under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 (b) and (c)); and if indirect, an identification of each third party whose alleged infringement is direct, and identify all documents and evidence supporting any such contentions.

**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 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 served its Preliminary Disclosures of Asserted Claims and Pre-Discovery Infringement Contentions as to Google, Inc. on November 7, 2011. I/P Engine hereby incorporates those Disclosures by reference and submits that its response to this Interrogatory may be derived from those disclosures. I/P Engine's pre-discovery contentions were based on known publicly available information, and are subject to change based on the Court's claim construction, discovery, additional evidence, and/or further investigation. I/P Engine reserves the right to amend and/or supplement its infringement contentions if and when further information becomes available.

**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 further objects to this Interrogatory as premature 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 served its Preliminary Disclosures of Asserted Claims and Pre-Discovery Infringement Contentions as to Google, Inc. on November 7, 2011. I/P Engine hereby incorporates those Disclosures by reference and submits that its response to this Interrogatory may be derived from those disclosures. I/P Engine's pre-discovery contentions were based on known publicly available information, and are subject to change based on the Court's claim construction, discovery, additional evidence, and/or further investigation. I/P Engine reserves the right to amend and/or supplement its infringement contentions if and when further information becomes available. I/P Engine further states that, pursuant to the agreement of the parties, I/P Engine will supplement its preliminary infringement contentions on February 17, 2012.

**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 further objects to this Interrogatory as premature 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 served its Preliminary Disclosures of Asserted Claims and Pre-Discovery Infringement Contentions as to Google, Inc. on November 7, 2011.

I/P Engine served its Expert Report of Ophir Frieder on Infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,314,420 and 6,775,664 on July 25, 2012. I/P Engine Further served its Updated Expert Report of Ophir Frieder on Infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,314,420 and 6,775,664. I/P Engine hereby incorporates this report by reference and submits that its response to this Interrogatory may be derived from the report. I/P Engine reserves the right to amend and/or supplement its infringement contentions if and when further information becomes available.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

If you contend that you are entitled to any monetary recovery as a result of alleged INFRINGEMENT of the PATENTS-IN-SUIT by GOOGLE, state whether you contend that you are entitled to lost profits or a reasonable royalty, and state all facts, evidence, and reasons upon which you rely in support of your contention, such that if you contend you are entitled to an 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.

**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 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.

Further, I/P Engine served its Expert Report of Stephen L. Becker, Ph.D. on July 25, 2012. I/P

Engine hereby incorporates this report by reference and submits that its response to this Interrogatory may be derived from the report. I/P Engine reserves the right to amend and/or supplement its contentions if and when further information becomes available.

**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 was a non-obvious or unpredictable improvement, addition of functionality, variation or upgrade and why.

**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 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 its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine, under Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, will produce documents from which information responsive to this Interrogatory may be derived or ascertained.

**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 further objects to this Interrogatory as premature 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 its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine has 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* 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 further objects to this Interrogatory as premature 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 its foregoing objections, I/P Engine responds:

I/P Engine has 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* IPE0000916-2504. I/P Engine also served its Rebuttal Expert Report of Dr. Jaime Carbonell Regarding Validity of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,314,420 and 6,775,664 on August 30,

2012. I/P Engine hereby incorporates that report by reference and submits that its response to this Interrogatory may be derived from that report. I/P Engine reserves the right to amend and/or supplement its contentions if and when further information becomes available.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

IDENTIFY any and all persons to whom you, any owner, any assignee, and/or any exclusive licensee of the PATENTS-IN-SUIT have ever licensed, offered to license, or granted any rights under the PATENTS-IN-SUIT, or persons who have requested to license the PATENTS-IN-SUIT, and identify all DOCUMENTS related to any such license, offer, request, or other grant of rights.

**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 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, under Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, will produce documents from which information responsive to this Interrogatory may be derived or ascertained.

**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 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.

**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 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; IPE0032792-796; IPE0032797-817.

Dated: September 4, 2012

By: /s/ Charles J. Monterio, Jr.  
Jeffrey K. Sherwood  
Frank C. Cimino, Jr.  
Kenneth W. Brothers  
Dawn Rudenko Albert  
Charles J. Monterio, Jr.  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1825 Eye Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 420-2200  
Facsimile: (202) 420-2201

Donald C. Schultz  
W. Ryan Snow  
CRENSHAW, WARE & MARTIN PLC  
150 West Main Street  
Norfolk, VA 23510  
Telephone: (757) 623-3000  
Facsimile: (757) 623-5735

Counsel for Plaintiff I/P Engine, Inc.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 4th day of September, 2012, the foregoing **PLAINTIFF I/P ENGINE, INC.'S FIFTH 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](mailto:senoona@kaufcan.com)

David Bilsker  
David Perlson  
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
[davidbilsker@quinnemanuel.com](mailto:davidbilsker@quinnemanuel.com)  
[davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:cortney.alexander@finnegan.com)

/s/ Armands Chagnon  
Senior Paralegal