From: Steve Sereboff < SSereboff@socalip.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 8:48 PM

**To:** Giunta, Rich; Kala Sarvaiya **Cc:** Hunt, Elisabeth; Rush, MacAulay

**Subject:** RE: RPX v AIT additional discovery [A213.L15F15]

Rich,

We are almost on the eve of the deadline for RPX's production. You seem to have some concern with burdens and relevance of Request No. 4. AIT filed its motion, including this exact Request No. 4, more than three weeks ago. RPX has had the PTAB's order and AIT's request for production for more than one week. Notably, in RPX's opposition to AIT's motion for additional discovery filed two weeks ago, RPX complained that some *other* requests were burdensome or irrelevant. Nothing about Request No. 4. RPX has clearly been dilatory, or has not taken this seriously. RPX needs to explain why it could not have raised these issues earlier.

Despite having had three weeks to consider the request for production, RPX has not explained why complying with the full scope of Request No. 4 is burdensome or encompassing irrelevant documents. Salesforce and RPX have a deep and close relationship which AIT expects will be shown through RPX's production of *all* requested documents. Thus, we see no reason for RPX to withhold anything as you suggest.

As with the delay in raising the issue, RPX has also failed to propose how Request No. 4 might be modified. Thus, AIT cannot even understand what you would do.

I am glad you felt comfortable emailing me about this issue. You and I can continue the dialog, though with RPX's deadline for production so close it seems futile. I am sure AIT would prefer that my firm spend its time on the true burden here – drafting the patent owner's preliminary responses.

I am always happy to discuss settlement. Perhaps you and I could discuss a settlement which provides adverse judgement in these cases against RPX, plus a private admission that Salesforce is the RPI.

/steve/

**From:** Rich Giunta [mailto:Rich.Giunta@WolfGreenfield.com]

Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 7:49 AM

**To:** Steve Sereboff; Kala Sarvaiya **Cc:** Elisabeth H. Hunt; MacAulay Rush

**Subject:** FW: RPX v AIT additional discovery [A213.L15F15]

Steve and Kala,

Your Request No. 4 seeks documents sufficient to show the names, dates, locations and times of any meetings or communications between Salesforce and RPX after the Salesforce Litigation began.

There is a category of communication that we assume you do not believe to be relevant to the RPI issue and that the Board did not contemplate in granting the request. In particular, RPX is a customer of Salesforce and uses Salesforce software to run its business. We assume that you are not requesting documents that show every meeting or communication between Salesforce as a software vendor and RPX as a user of Salesforce software (e.g., communications between RPX's IT staff and Salesforce customer support or sales, communications between RPX



purchasing personnel and Salesforce's billing personnel, etc.). It would be unnecessarily burdensome to RPX to identify every such communication that has no relevance to the RPI issue.

Please let us know if you agree that Request No. 4 does not seek documents showing meetings or communications between Salesforce as a software vendor and RPX as a user of Salesforce software.

Thanks, Rich

**From:** Steve Sereboff [mailto:SSereboff@socalip.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2015 3:27 PM **To:** PTAB Rich Giunta; PTAB Elisabeth Hunt **Cc:** Kala Sarvaiya; Anneliese Lomonaco

Subject: RPX v AIT additional discovery [A213.L15F15]

Rich and Elisabeth,

In accordance with the PTAB's order in Case IPR2015-01750, Case IPR2015-01751 and Case IPR2015-01752, Patent Owner's requests for production are attached. As a courtesy we have attached a Word version as well.

/Steven C. Sereboff/ ph +1 (805) 230-1356 mobile +1 (805) 279-0074 SoCal IP Law Group LLP

www.socalip.com

310 N. Westlake Blvd., Suite 120, Westlake Village, CA 91362 1332 Anacapa St., Suite 201, Santa Barbara, CA 93101 ssereboff@socalip.com

