

Exhibit D

LAW OFFICES
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

725 TWELFTH STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005-5901

(202) 434-5000

FAX (202) 434-5029

EDWARD BENNETT WILLIAMS (1920-1988)
PAUL R. CONNOLLY (1922-1978)

MELISSA B. COLLINS
(202) 434-5916
mcollins@wc.com

CPRO 1:14-cv-03396-LCO-DJA DOCUMENT 189-4 EXHIBIT LIST 4/8/21 5:15

March 5, 2021

VIA E-mail

Amy E. Hayden
Russ August & Kabat LLP
12424 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
ahayden@raklaw.com

**Re: *Network-1 Technologies, Inc. v. Google LLC, et al., Nos.*
1:14-cv-2396-PGG-SN & 1:14-cv-9558-PGG-SN (S.D.N.Y.)**

Dear Amy:

I write in response to your March 3, 2021 letter. Defendants have not “re-open[ed]” discovery. Defendants have supplemented their responses to interrogatories and are in the process of supplementing their responses to requests for production, propounded by Network-1 during the discovery period, in accordance with Defendants’ on-going obligations under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(e). *See, e.g., Lujan v. Cabana Mgmt., Inc.*, 284 F.R.D. 50, 68 (E.D.N.Y. 2012) (“The obligation to amend prior disclosures and discovery responses continues even after the conclusion of discovery.”). Neither leave of the Court nor permission from Network-1 is required, and your unsupported assertion that Defendants’ discovery supplementations “are not a part of these cases” carries no legal weight.

In the spirit of cooperation, Defendants also have indicated that, should *Plaintiff* want to take additional discovery on this topic, Defendants would not oppose a request for additional 30(b)(6) deposition testimony, provided that it is limited reasonably limited in time and scope to address Defendants’ supplementation.

Sincerely,

/s/ *Melissa B. Collins*

Melissa B. Collins