## Exhibit I

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

NETWORK-1 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC AND YOUTUBE, LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:14-CV-02396-PGG-SN

Case No. 1:14-CV-09558-PGG-SN

**Expert Rebuttal Report of Dr. Gregory K. Leonard** 

Confidential Outside Counsel Only Prosecution/Acquisition Bar Materials



\$13,091	2b
\$52,364	2c
\$150,000	2c
\$160,000	2c
\$653,395	2d
	\$150,000 \$160,000

## d. Additional Considerations

- 88. The above calculations provide a conservative estimate on the total cost to YouTube of a design-around that it would have been able to implement at the time of each hypothetical negotiation, and which therefore acts as an upper bound on what it would have been willing to pay during the hypothetical negotiation.
- 89. I understand that Network-1's experts (Mr. Kinrich and Dr. Mitzenmacher) have claimed that implementing the non-infringing alternative of moving Content ID components outside of the United States would not have been considered a viable alternative. Mr. Kinrich appears to assume that, in order to avoid infringement of the Patents-in-Suit, YouTube would have to move the entire Content ID process abroad. Mr. Kinrich asserts that moving servers abroad would result in a reduction in quality (e.g., latency, reliability, and other adverse issues)—though he does not evaluate the economic value of the claimed quality reduction. He then defers to Dr. Mitzenmacher's opinion that there "are likely significant resource and performance costs to this alternative," and that therefore this is not a viable alternative. As I discuss in the rebuttal section, Mr. Kinrich fails to consider, as an economic matter, the next-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>198</sup> Kinrich Report, ¶ 33.



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>197</sup> Kinrich Report, ¶ 33.