

---

**From:** Arnold, Jeffery [mailto:JArnold@CantorColburn.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 09, 2016 4:25 PM  
**To:** Abramic, John  
**Cc:** Hagerty, Peter; Maxwell, Anne; Ryan, Andrew; Fox, Harold; Reister, Andrea (areister@cov.com); Sawyer, Michael (msawyer@cov.com); Dustin.Weeks@troutmansanders.com; Daniel.Ladow@troutmansanders.com  
**Subject:** RE: IPR2016-01111, -01112, and -01113

Dear John,

Petitioner interprets the email below as a service of interrogatories impermissibly seeking additional discovery in violation of the respective Boards' Orders of 31 August 2016 denying Patent Owners' respective motions for additional discovery. Petitioner in its oppositions to Patent Owners' motions explained in detail its position on additional discovery. Accordingly, Petitioner will not respond to the interrogatories.

Based upon the first paragraph of your email below, Patent Owners have a quarrel with a sentence in the Boards' Decision. Petitioner declines to comment on the sentence-at-issue. Any questions regarding the Orders should be addressed with the Boards.

Regards,

Jeff

Jeffery B. Arnold  
Partner



1180 Peachtree St., N.E. | Suite 2050 | Atlanta, GA 30309  
Work: 404-607-9991, ext. 2127 | Fax: 404-607-9981 | Mobile: 404-665-7311  
[jarnold@cantorcolburn.com](mailto:jarnold@cantorcolburn.com)  
[www.cantorcolburn.com](http://www.cantorcolburn.com)

HARTFORD WASHINGTON, D.C. ATLANTA HOUSTON DETROIT

---

**From:** Abramic, John [mailto:jabramic@Steptoe.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 08, 2016 10:51 AM  
**To:** Arnold, Jeffery  
**Cc:** Hagerty, Peter; Maxwell, Anne; Ryan, Andrew; Fox, Harold; Reister, Andrea (areister@cov.com); Sawyer, Michael

([msawyer@cov.com](mailto:msawyer@cov.com)); [Dustin.Weeks@troutmansanders.com](mailto:Dustin.Weeks@troutmansanders.com); [Daniel.Ladow@troutmansanders.com](mailto:Daniel.Ladow@troutmansanders.com)

**Subject:** IPR2016-01111, -01112, and -01113

Dear Jeffery,

The Board's recent decisions denying motions for additional discovery in the above-referenced IPR's contain the following statement: "With respect to Patent Owner's second and third Requests for Production, Petitioner represents that no responsive documents exist. Opp. 18." We believe that this statement regarding Petitioner's representation is incorrect.

Petitioner's response to category 2 of Patent Owners' requests states the following: "Notwithstanding this objection and the objections of category (1), and subject to them, no correspondence or communications directed to terms sheets or letters of intent exist. No common interest agreements or other agreements related to the Agreement prior to the execution of the "definitive agreement" identified in category (1) exist." We do not read Petitioner's response as representing that no responsive documents exist. For example, category 2 of Patent Owners' requests call for correspondence or communications related to the "definitive agreement." We do not read Petitioner's response as representing that there is no correspondence or communications between the parties that ultimately led to the executed definitive agreement, as this would be difficult, if not impossible, to imagine in practice.

Accordingly, we are seeking clarification regarding Petitioner's response to category 2 of Patent Owners' requests, and we ask that Petitioner provide answers to the following questions so that we may assess the accuracy of the Board's statement. We request your answers by 10:00 AM Eastern time on September 12, 2016, which should be achievable given the diligence you have previously done on these issues.

(1) Does Petitioner represent that no documents responsive to category 2 exist?

(2) Does any correspondence or communication related to the "definitive agreement" exist? For clarity, this category includes any correspondence or communication, prior to execution of the "definitive agreement," regarding the subject matter of the transaction memorialized in the "definitive agreement." Put another way, correspondence and communication leading up to the execution of the "definitive agreement" are related to the "definitive agreement" even though they occurred prior to execution.

(3) Do any drafts of the "definitive agreement" exist?

(4) Does any correspondence or communication related to any drafts of the "definitive agreement" exist?

Regards,

John L. Abramic | **Steptoe**

Partner

312 577 1264 | direct  
630 341 9128 | mobile  
312 577 1370 | fax

[jabramic@steptoe.com](mailto:jabramic@steptoe.com)

**Steptoe & Johnson LLP**  
115 South LaSalle Street Suite 3100  
Chicago, IL 60603  
[www.steptoe.com](http://www.steptoe.com)

This transmission, and any attached files, may contain information from the law firm of Cantor Colburn LLP which is confidential and/or legally privileged. Such information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom this transmission is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this transmitted information is strictly prohibited, that copies of this transmission and any attached files should be deleted from your disk directories immediately, and that any printed copies of this transmission or attached files should be returned to this firm. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us by telephone or e-mail immediately, and we will arrange for the return to Cantor Colburn LLP of any printed copies.