

# EXHIBIT M

1 Volume I Pages 1 - 157

2 Exhibits 1 - 20

3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

4 EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

5 NORFOLK DIVISION

6 \*\*\*\*\*

7 I/P ENGINE, INC., \*

8 Plaintiff, \* Civil Action No.

9 Vs. \* 2:11-cv-512

10 AOL, INC., et al., \*

11 Defendants. \*

12 \*\*\*\*\*

13

14 AUDIO/VISUAL DEPOSITION of LYCOS, INC.,

15 by and through its designee MARK BLAIS

16 Tuesday, July 31, 2012 at 9:00 a.m.

17 Goulston & Storrs

18 50 Rowes Wharf, 7th Floor

19 Boston, Massachusetts

20

21 ----- Jacqueline P. Shields, RPR, CSR -----

22

23

24 Job No. CS409539

1 A. I don't recall what they were.

2 Q. Why did Lycos offer a lump sum amount to  
3 license the '799 and '214 patents?

4 A. If I remember correctly -- sorry.

5 MS. ALBERT: Objection. Misconstrues.

6 A. If I remember, we may have offered them two  
7 scenarios, one a lump sum and part for the past and  
8 running royalty going forward. I know we did two  
9 models, I just don't recall specifically whether we  
10 offered both or not.

11 Q. At the time did Lycos have a preference for  
12 one of the two models?

13 MS. ALBERT: Objection. Vague.

14 A. There were some preferences for a running  
15 royalty to create a revenue stream, but it wasn't  
16 strong.

17 Q. How about in 2006, do you know if Lycos had  
18 any preferences in licensing out its patents for a  
19 lump sum versus a running royalty?

20 MS. ALBERT: Objection. Vague.

21 A. I wouldn't say there was really any  
22 preferences.

23 Q. And similarly, do you know if Lycos had any  
24 preference in licensing out its patents in 2005 as