

# Exhibit G

**Rebecca Borowitz**

---

**From:** Ted Normand  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 09, 2006 10:16 AM  
**To:** 'Shaughnessy, Todd'  
**Subject:** RE: Privilege Log for Documents Re-Claimed as Privileged

Todd --

Please confirm on your end when IBM plans to send us the privilege-log entries for the mid-January letter. As I have said clearly to you at least six times in the last six weeks, according to IBM (on threat of a charge of unethical conduct by its counsel if SCO were to file a motion based on anything other than the log), SCO needs those entries to prosecute its right to claim that IBM's re-claim of privilege is improper. If IBM continues to decline to produce a log on those documents, as it has refused to do for months, then SCO will file a motion and leave it to the Court to resolve whatever ethics issues get raised. Thanks.

Ted

---

**From:** Shaughnessy, Todd [mailto:tshaughnessy@swlaw.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 08, 2006 9:11 PM  
**To:** Ted Normand  
**Subject:** RE: Privilege Log for Documents Re-Claimed as Privileged

Ted,  
I believe (though I'm not positive) that the plan is to get you a fully-updated privilege log by the end of the week.

When can we expect SCO's updated log?

Todd

Snell & Wilmer L.L.P.  
15 West South Temple, Suite 1200  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101  
801.257.1937 (direct)  
801.257.1900 (general)  
801.257.1800 (fax)

This message and any attachments to it may contain privileged and confidential attorney client information and/or attorney work product. Please do not forward or distribute to anyone else.

---

**From:** Ted Normand [mailto:TNormand@BSFLLP.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 08, 2006 7:34 AM  
**To:** Shaughnessy, Todd  
**Subject:** Privilege Log for Documents Re-Claimed as Privileged

Todd --

Although we talked about a few things last night, I wanted to send this note to confirm that IBM is making an effort this week to send us a privilege log for (at least) the documents identified in the text of the mid-January letter to me regarding documents that IBM had claimed as privilege in depositions and otherwise in the previous months. As I have said before in requesting such a log, if IBM adheres to its position that SCO could not even file a motion to compel such documents on any basis other than the information

5/3/2006

about such documents provided in a privilege log, then IBM should produce such a privilege log. Regards,

Ted

5/3/2006