

Hon. Marsha J. Pechman

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

INTERVAL LICENSING LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

AOL, INC.; APPLE, INC.; eBAY, INC.;
FACEBOOK, INC.; GOOGLE INC.;
NETFLIX, INC.; OFFICE DEPOT, INC.;
OFFICEMAX INC.; STAPLES, INC.;
YAHOO! INC.; AND YOUTUBE, LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-cv-01385-MJP

JOINT STATUS REPORT

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), Local Rule CR 16, and this Court's September 27, 2010 Order (Doc. # 25), the parties hereto submit the following Report of Parties' Planning Meeting:

1. Nature and Complexity of Case: Interval Licensing LLC ("Interval" or "Plaintiff") has asserted four patents – United States Patent Nos. 6,263,507; 6,034,652; 6,788,314; and 6,757,682 – against eleven defendants: Each defendant is alleged to have infringed at least one of the patents, and Interval alleges that each patent is infringed by multiple defendants. Defendants

1 have filed motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim and for improper joinder. The motions
2 are noted for November 12, 2010.

3 Plaintiff's Contention: This case is a patent infringement action of moderate complexity
4 that involves four patents. Although the case involves eleven defendants, that by itself
5 does not increase the complexity of the case for any particular Defendant. Moreover,
6 Interval believes that many of the accused products operate in similar fashion across
7 Defendants. In addition, it is premature for Defendants to speculate about the number of
8 asserted claims given that the schedule under this Court's Standing Order for Patent Cases
9 requires Interval to serve its disclosure of asserted claims and infringement contentions
10 within 10 days of entry of the scheduling order. *See* Doc. # 26. Interval informed
11 Defendants at the Rule 26(f) conference that it would provide detailed infringement
12 contentions by claim and patent pursuant to this Court's Standing Order for Patent Cases,
13 Docket Number 26. Furthermore, Interval informed Defendants that it would be prepared
14 to serve these infringement contentions by November 18, the earliest date the
15 infringement contentions would be due under this Court's Standing Order entered in this
16 case.
17

18
19 Defendants' Contention: This is not an average patent case, nor is it of "moderate
20 complexity." Plaintiff has asserted that eleven separate defendants infringe up to four
21 patents each. There are currently 197 separate claims at issue. Adding to the complexity,
22 as set forth in the pending motions to dismiss, Plaintiff has not yet identified how many
23 different products and/or services of each defendant it is accusing and what the basis for
24 the accusations are. While Defendants asked Plaintiff at the Rule 26(f) conference to
25 provide this information to help create the discovery plan and proposed schedule, Plaintiff
26 refused. If discovery proceeds in view of Plaintiff's complaint, the discovery burden on
27
28

1 Defendants will be significant because Plaintiff's complaint places no reasonable
 2 limitations on the scope of its infringement allegations. In addition, particularly if the
 3 Court does not sever the action, Interval's inclusion of eleven unique defendants greatly
 4 increases the complexity of the case for each Defendant because, in order to streamline the
 5 case for the Court as much as possible, Defendants will be under the significant added
 6 burden of having to coordinate responses for 11 separate entities for matters such as claim
 7 construction.
 8

9 2. ADR Method: The parties believe that a party appointed mediator as described in
 10 Local Rule 39.1(b)(3) should be the initial method of alternative dispute resolution.

11 3. ADR Scheduling: Plaintiff believes that non-binding mediation should take place
 12 within 30 days after the *Markman* hearing. Defendants believe that non-binding mediation
 13 should take place within 30 days after this Court issues its claim construction order, at which
 14 point the Court's adopted claim construction should facilitate settlement discussions.
 15

16 4. Deadline to Join Additional Parties: The parties propose March 4, 2011.

17 5. Proposed Discovery Plan:

18 (A) FRCP 26(f) and Local Rule CR 16 Conference: a telephonic meeting was
 19 held on October 25, 2010, and was attended by:
 20

PARTY	NAME	FIRM
Interval	Max Tribble	Susman Godfrey, LLP
Interval	Justin Nelson	Susman Godfrey, LLP
eBay, Staples, Netflix, Office Depot	Chris Carraway	Klarquist Sparkman, LLP
eBay, Staples, Netflix, Office Depot	Kristin Cleveland	Klarquist Sparkman, LLP
Apple	David Almeling	O'Melveny & Myers LLP
Apple	Brian Berliner	O'Melveny & Myers LLP
Google, YouTube	Warren Heit	White & Case LLP

1	Google, YouTube	John Handy	White & Case LLP
2	Google, YouTube, AOL	Shannon Jost	Stokes Lawrence, PS
	Facebook	Mark Weinstein	Cooley LLP
3	Facebook	Christen Dubois	Cooley LLP
	Facebook	Liz Stameshkin	Cooley LLP
4	OfficeMax	Kevin Baumgardner	Corr Cronin Michelson
			Baumgardner & Preece
5	OfficeMax	John S. Letchinger	Wildman, Harrold,
			Allen & Dixon LLP
6	AOL	Cortney Alexander	Finnegan LLP
7	AOL	Elliot Cook	Finnegan LLP
	Yahoo!	Mark Walters	Frommer Lawrence &
8			Haug LLP
9	Yahoo!	Matthew Kreeger	Morrison & Foerster
			LLP

10

11 FRCP 26(a)(I) Initial Disclosures: As required by the Court's orders, the

12 parties served Initial Disclosures on November 1, 2010.

13 (B) Plaintiff's Contention: Discovery will be required on issues related to

14 infringement, enforceability, validity, and damages. Interval believes that

15 discovery should not be conducted in phases, and believes that delaying

16 discovery concerning damages until after the *Markman* hearing would

17 discourage early settlement and simply lead to delay of the trial.

18

19 Defendants' Contention: Given the complexity of the case created by

20 Plaintiff, including eleven defendants, four patents, and almost 200 claims,

21 Defendants request that the Court phase discovery with the initial focus

22 being on claim construction and liability discovery. Specifically, discovery

23 solely related to damages issues should be postponed until after the

24 *Markman* hearing. In order to facilitate settlement, Defendants would be

25 willing to provide summary sales information, but all other discovery

26 related solely to damages should be postponed to allow the parties to focus

27

28

1 on claim construction and liability discovery before the *Markman* hearing.
2 As for subjects of discovery, Defendants generally are likely to need
3 discovery related to claim construction, invalidity, inequitable conduct,
4 patent ownership, development of the alleged inventions, potential prior
5 art, Plaintiff's and inventors' knowledge of prior art, Plaintiff's awareness
6 of Defendants' activities (laches/estoppel), pre-filing investigations,
7 licensing, and alleged notices of infringement. The actual scope of liability
8 discovery is somewhat uncertain because the insufficiency of the
9 Complaint discussed in the pending motions to dismiss has prevented
10 Defendants from knowing the scope of accused products and services.
11

12 (C) The parties agree to meet and confer in good faith concerning any changes
13 to be made in the limitations on discovery imposed under the Federal and
14 Local Civil Rules within one week after Interval serves infringement
15 contentions or an amended complaint. Until then, the parties agree that the
16 limitations on discovery imposed under the Federal and Local Civil Rules
17 apply, and also agree that they will not initiate discovery until two weeks
18 after the earlier of service of the infringement contentions or an amended
19 complaint.
20

21 (D) The parties agree to meet and confer in good faith regarding any limitations
22 on discovery pursuant to the timeframe discussed in 5.C, above.
23

24 (E) The parties request that the Court enter a protective order, to be negotiated
25 between the parties before the beginning of discovery.
26

27 6. Date by Which Remainder of Discovery Can Be Completed: The parties did not
28 reach agreement on the date by which the remainder of discovery can be completed.

1 (A) Plaintiff's Contention: Interval respectfully requests that the Court adhere
2 to the "Standing Order for Patent Cases," Docket Number 26. Interval
3 believes that (i) fact discovery can be completed by October 17, 2011,
4 assuming that the Court holds a claim construction hearing in or around
5 May 2011; (ii) a *Markman* hearing should be held the week of May 9, 2011
6 (approximately six months from the estimated date of the issuance of the
7 scheduling order) (iii) opening expert reports should be due 30 days after
8 the Court issues an order construing the claims; (iv) rebuttal expert reports
9 should be due 30 days after service of opening expert reports; and (v) close
10 of expert discovery 30 days after rebuttal expert reports are served, but not
11 later than December 16, 2011. In addition, Interval respectfully suggests
12 that the Court clarify whether non-infringement contentions are due with
13 the Defendants' invalidity contentions, pursuant to LR 121. Defendants'
14 proposed schedule incorporates needless delay into the discovery process.
15 For example, Defendants have criticized Interval for not providing
16 information on asserted claims, and yet they propose that infringement
17 contentions not be due until two months from now. Interval is fully
18 prepared to meet the deadlines in the Court's Standing Patent Order, which
19 requires that infringement contentions be served within 10 days of the
20 issuance of the scheduling order. *See* Doc. # 26. In addition, Defendants'
21 proposed schedule gives them three months to serve preliminary invalidity
22 and non-infringement contentions (which is significantly longer than the 21
23 day difference in this Court's Standing Order). The Defendants' proposed
24 schedule also significantly protracts the claim construction process.
25
26
27
28

1 Contrary to Defendants' suggestion, the Local Patent Rules are not limited
2 to cases where a single patent is asserted. Instead, "[t]hese rules apply to
3 all civil actions filed in or transferred to this Court which allege
4 infringement of a utility patent or which seek a declaratory judgment that a
5 utility patent is not infringed, is invalid or is unenforceable." (LPR 101).
6 Defendants' proposed schedule would eviscerate the purpose of the Local
7 Patent Rules, which "are designed to streamline the pre-trial and claim
8 construction process, and generally to reduce the cost of patent litigation."
9 *Id.* Although this Court has discretion to modify the deadlines, Interval
10 respectfully submits that a case involving sophisticated parties, experienced
11 counsel, and four patents does not warrant departure from the standard
12 rules. For example, the case in this district *Amazon.com, Inc. v. Discovery*
13 *Communications, Inc.*, 2:09-cv-681-RSL also involved four patents and yet
14 the court entered a scheduling order with deadlines comparable to those in
15 the Local Patent Rules. *See* Doc. # 1 (Complaint identifying the four
16 patents); Doc. # 24 (scheduling order).

17
18
19 (B) Defendants' Contention: This case is complex. Plaintiff
20 sued eleven separate defendants and has not identified the accused products
21 or which of the nearly 200 claims it is asserting. As such, this case cannot
22 be force-fit into the standard default schedule that Plaintiff proposes. For
23 example, Defendants' burden in developing their invalidity contentions is
24 significantly greater than the ordinary case due to the number of asserted
25 patents and the lack of information regarding Plaintiff's allegations.
26 Similarly, the file histories of the four asserted patents are particularly
27
28

lengthy and complex. And, discovery will almost certainly take more time given that there are nineteen named inventors, almost all of them outside of this District. Defendants also note that the *Amazon.com, Inc. v. Discovery Communications, Inc.*, 2:09-cv-681-RSL case cited by Plaintiff involved a single defendant, a single accused product, and closely related patents - and thus cannot be viewed as comparable to this case. *See* Doc. # 1.

Defendants propose the following schedule, which is necessary to allow the Defendants to conduct a sufficient investigation and defense. Defendants' proposed schedule sets deadlines for the Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions, Disclosure of Preliminary Invalidity Contentions, and *Markman*-related dates that provide the Court the opportunity to address Defendants' pending motions without prejudicing Defendants' ability to prepare their case.

Event	Defendants' Proposed Schedule
Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions	12/10/10
Disclosure of Preliminary Invalidity Contentions	3/11/11 (three months after Plaintiff's Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions)
Terms for Construction	5/25/11
Preliminary Claim Chart	7/14/11
Claim Construction-related Expert Report Deadline (if necessary)	7/21/11
Claim Construction Rebuttal Expert Report Deadline (if necessary)	8/4/11
Joint Claim Chart and Prehearing Statement	8/15/11
Opening Briefs	9/7/11
Response Briefs	10/5/11
<i>Markman</i> Hearing	Week of 10/24/11
Deadline for early Mediation	30 days after <i>Markman</i>

	Order
Close of Fact Discovery	12/19/11
Opening Expert Reports (Burden of Proof)	1/20/12
Rebuttal Expert Reports	2/24/12
Completion of Discovery	4/27/12
Deadline for Filing Dispositive Motions	6/1/12
Case Ready for Trial	8/30/12

7. Magistrate Judge: Interval consents that a full-time Magistrate Judge may conduct all proceedings. At least one Defendant does not consent.

8. Bifurcation:

(A) Plaintiff's Contention: Interval opposes bifurcation and phasing, and believes that any bifurcation and phasing would needlessly increase the cost and length of discovery and the trial

(B) Defendants' Contention: As set forth above, Defendants propose that discovery be phased, with discovery related solely to damages being postponed until after the *Markman* hearing. Defendants also believe that liability and damages should be bifurcated for discovery and trial. Given the complexity of the case as discussed above, Defendants will have the burden to invalidate a large number of claims in multiple patents, and defend against a presently unknown number of accused products. Therefore, bifurcation will make the case more manageable and efficient by preserving party resources and the resources of this Court absent a finding of liability.

9. Pre-Trial Statements and Orders: The parties were not able to agree on ways to shorten or simplify the Pre-Trial Statements or Pre-Trial Order at this time. The parties agree that Pre-Trial Statements and Orders called for by Local Rules CR 16(e), (h), (i), and (l), and 16.1 should not be dispensed with in whole or in part.

1 10. Suggestions for Shortening or Simplifying the Case: The parties agreed to discuss
2 at a future date limitations on asserted claims and on the number of prior art references in the
3 interest of efficiency.

4 Plaintiff's Contention: Interval believes that it is premature to limit the number of
5 asserted claims before infringement contentions and invalidity contentions are served, and also
6 believes that any narrowing of claims is without prejudice.

7 Defendants' Contention: Defendants believe that the most reasonable way to simplify this
8 case is for Plaintiff to limit the number of asserted claims for litigation to a manageable number
9 before the claim construction process begins. Thus, Defendants believe that Plaintiff should be
10 required to select, at least 4 months before the *Markman* hearing, no more than 20 claims to
11 litigate going forward. Plaintiff should be prohibited from changing the selection without leave
12 of Court upon a showing of good cause. Defendants also believe that with bifurcation of liability
13 and damages, the case can be simplified by reasonably limiting the types of information
14 discoverable in the liability phase.

15 11. Trial Date: The parties were not able to agree on the date by which the case will be
16 ready for trial.

17 Plaintiff's Contention: Interval believes that the case will be ready for trial by no later
18 than February 13, 2012.

19 Defendants' Contention: As set forth in paragraph 6(B) above, Defendants believe that,
20 given the complexity of the case, including the number of defendants and patents, this is not the
21 typical patent case and will require more time to litigate to trial. Defendants propose that the case
22 will be ready for trial by August 30, 2012.

23 12. Jury Trial: Plaintiff has requested a jury trial on all non-equitable issues.

24 13. Trial Days: The parties were not able to agree on the number of trial days.

1 (A) Plaintiff's Contention: Interval believes that between 10-15 trial days are needed to
2 complete the trial.

3 (B) Defendants' Contention: Defendants believe that if separate trials were undertaken
4 for each defendant, each trial might require 7-10 trial days, although this number could be higher
5 depending on the number of accused products. If all defendants are included in one trial, the
6 combined trial could require 20-30 trial days.
7

8 14. The names, addresses and telephone numbers of all trial counsel:

PARTY	COUNSEL
INTERVAL LICENSING	Justin A. Nelson Edgar Sargent Matthew R. Berry SUSMAN GODFREY LLP 1201 Third Ave., Ste. 3800 Seattle, WA 98101 Phone: (206) 516-3880
	Max L. Tribble, Jr. SUSMAN GODFREY LLP 1000 Louisiana Street, Ste. 5100 Houston, TX 77002 Phone: (713) 651-9366
	Michael F. Heim Leslie V. Payne Nathan J. Davis Eric Enger HEIM PAYNE & CHORUSH 600 Travis, Suite 6710 Houston, TX 77002 Phone: (713) 221-2000
AOL INC.	Shannon M. Jost Scott A. W. Johnson Aneelah Afzali STOKES LAWRENCE, P.S. 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4000 Seattle, WA 98104-3179 Phone: (206) 626-6000

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Gerald F. Ivey - (202) 408-4110
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4413

Robert L. Burns - (571) 203-2736
Elliot C. Cook - (571) 203-2738
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
Two Freedom Square
11955 Freedom Drive
Reston, Virginia 20190-5675

Cortney S. Alexander - (404) 653-6409
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
3500 SunTrust Plaza
303 Peachtree Street NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30308-3263

EBAY, INC.,
NETFLIX, INC.,
OFFICE DEPOT,
INC., STAPLES,
INC.

Chris Carraway
John Vandenberg
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN
One World Trade Center
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, OR 97204
Phone: (503) 595-5300

Christopher Wion
Arthur Harrigan, Jr.
DANIELSON HARRIGAN LEYH & TOLLEFSON
LLP
999 Third Avenue, Suite 4400
Seattle, WA 98104
Phone: (206) 623-1700

APPLE, INC.

Scott Wilsdon
Jeremy Roller
YARMUTH WILSDON CALFO PLLC
818 Stewart Street, Suite 1400
Seattle, WA 98101
Phone: (206) 516-3800

George Riley - (415) 984-8741
David Almeling - (415) 984-8959
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor
San Francisco, Ca 94111-3823

Brian Berliner - (213) 430-7424
Neil Yang - (213) 430-8227
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071

GOOGLE INC.
YOUTUBE, LLC

Shannon M. Jost
Scott A. W. Johnson
Aneelah Afzali
STOKES LAWRENCE, P.S.
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4000
Seattle, WA 98104-3179
Phone: (206) 626-6000

Kevin X. McGann - (212) 819-8312
Dimitrios T. Drivas - (212) 819-8286
John Handy - (212) 819-8790
Aaron Chase - (212) 819-2516
WHITE & CASE LLP
1155 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-2787

Warren S. Heit - (650) 213-0321
Wendi Schepler - (650) 213-0323
WHITE & CASE LLP
3000 El Camino Real
Building 5, 9th Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306

OFFICEMAX

Kevin Baumgardner
Steven W. Fogg
CORR CRONIN MICHELSON BAUMGARDNER &
PREECE
1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 3900
Seattle, WA 98154
Phone: (206) 274-8669

John S. Letchinger - (312) 201-2698
Douglas S. Rupert - (312) 201-2720
WILDMAN, HARROLD, ALLEN & DIXON LLP
225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 2800
Chicago, IL 60606

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Jeffrey D. Neumeyer
OFFICEMAX INCORPORATED
1111 West Jefferson Street, Suite 510
Boise, ID 83702
Phone: (208) 388-4177

YAHOO! INC.

Mark P. Walters - (206) 336-5690
Dario A. Machleidt - (206) 336-5690
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
1191 Second Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98101

Francis Ho
Richard S.J. Hung
Michael Jacobs
Matthew Kreeger
Eric W. Ow
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2482
Phone: (415) 268-7000

FACEBOOK, INC.

Christopher B. Durbin
COOLEY LLP
719 Second Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98104-1732
Phone: (206) 452-8700

Michael G. Rhodes
COOLEY LLP
101 California St., 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-5800
Phone: (415) 493-2000

Heidi L. Keefe
Mark R. Weinstein
Christen M.R. Dubois
Elizabeth L. Stameshkin
COOLEY LLP
3175 Hanover St.
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130
Phone: (650) 843-5000

1 15. Service: Defendants have been duly served with the complaint, and proofs of
2 service have been filed.

3 16. Scheduling Conference:

4 Plaintiff's Contention: Defendants have changed their minds twice on whether they
5 would request a scheduling conference, including most recently two business days before this
6 report was due. Plaintiff does not believe a scheduling conference is necessary, but has tried to
7 work with Defendants on a date. At the Rule 26(f) conference – when all of the issues in this
8 report were discussed – Defendants stated that they would request a scheduling conference.
9 Plaintiff asked Defendants if they would join in a call to the Court to determine if there was
10 availability the week of November 8. Defendants then changed their mind, and told Plaintiff that
11 it was not requesting a scheduling conference. On Thursday, November 4, however, Defendants
12 changed their mind once again, and indicated that they would request a scheduling conference.
13 Plaintiff informed Defendants that due to an impending fact discovery cutoff of December 10 in
14 another case with international depositions, late November and early December were especially
15 bad. Plaintiff is available at any point before Thanksgiving, although November 17 and 18 are
16 not preferable. Plaintiff has no objection to the Defendants' preferred date of November 23, but
17 does not believe it is necessary to wait until the motions to dismiss and sever are fully briefed. If
18 the Court is not available on November 23, Plaintiff believes that the scheduling conference
19 should be held sooner rather than later.
20
21
22

23 Defendants' Contention: Given the significant disputes identified above, Defendants
24 believe that a scheduling conference may be helpful. While Defendants earlier thought that a
25 scheduling conference might not be necessary, the need for one became evident after receiving
26 Plaintiff's draft Joint Status Report, which showed more significant disputes on scheduling and
27 other issues than previously thought. Plaintiff's counsel has indicated that they will be traveling
28

1 for some of November and the first half of December due to an impending fact discovery cutoff
2 in another case, and are available for a scheduling conference on November 8-12, 15, 16, 19, 22,
3 and 23. Defendants are available on November 23, December 2-3, 14 and 16. Defendants
4 request that the conference occur after the pending motions to dismiss and sever are fully briefed
5 (November 12), as those motions will likely significantly impact the issues in the scheduling
6 order. Thus, Defendants request that the Court hold a scheduling conference on November 23, if
7 possible.
8

9 17. Tutorial: The parties agree to consider whether a tutorial may be helpful, and the
10 format of any such tutorial.

11 18. Neutral Expert: At this point, the parties do not believe that a neutral expert is
12 necessary in this case.
13

14 Dated: November 8, 2010

/s/Justin A. Nelson

Justin A. Nelson
WA Bar No. 31864
E-Mail: jnelson@susmangodfrey.com
Matthew R. Berry
WA Bar No. 37364
E-Mail: mberry@susmangodfrey.com
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
1201 Third Ave, Suite 3800
Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone: (206) 516-3880
Facsimile: (206) 516-3883

Max L. Tribble, Jr.
E-Mail: mtribble@susmangodfrey.com
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100
Houston, Texas 77002
Telephone: (713) 651-9366
Facsimile: (713) 654-6666

Michael F. Heim
E-mail: mheim@hpcllp.com
Eric J. Enger

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

E-mail: eenger@hpcllp.com
Nathan J. Davis
E-mail: ndavis@hpcllp.com
HEIM, PAYNE & CHORUSH, L.L.P.
600 Travis, Suite 6710
Houston, Texas 77002
Telephone: (713) 221-2000
Facsimile: (713) 221-2021

Attorneys for INTERVAL LICENSING LLC

/s/ Shannon M. Jost (with permission)
Shannon M. Jost (WSBA #32511)
Scott A.W. Johnson (WSBA #15543)
Aneelah Afzali (WSBA #34552)
STOKES LAWRENCE, P.S.
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4000
Seattle, WA 98104
Tel: 206.626-6000
Fax: 206.464-1496

Admitted Pro Hac Vice
Gerald F. Ivey
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT &
DUNNER, LLP
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4413
Tel: 202.408.4000
Fax: 202.408.4400

Robert L. Burns
Elliot C. Cook
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT &
DUNNER, LLP
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4413
Tel: 571.203.2700
Fax: 202.408.4400

Cortney S. Alexander
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT &
DUNNER, LLP
3500 SunTrust Plaza
303 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30308-3263
Tel: 404.653.6400
Fax: 404.653.6444

Attorneys for AOL INC.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

/s/ Heidi L. Keefe (with permission)
Heidi L. Keefe (*pro hac vice*)
COOLEY LLP
Christopher B. Durbin (WSBA #41159)
719 Second Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98104
Tel: (206) 452-8700
Fax: (206) 452-8800
Email: cdurbin@cooley.com

Admitted Pro Hac Vice
Michael G. Rhodes
101 California St., 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-5800
Tel: (415) 693-2000
Fax: (415) 693-2222

Heidi L. Keefe
Mark R. Weinstein
Christen M.R. Dubois
Elizabeth L. Stameshkin
3175 Hanover St.
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130
Tel: (650) 843-5000
Fax: (650) 849-7400

Attorneys for Defendant FACEBOOK, INC.

/s/ Shannon M. Jost (with permission)
Shannon M. Jost (WSBA #32511)
Scott A.W. Johnson (WSBA #15543)
Aneelah Afzali (WSBA #34552)
STOKES LAWRENCE, P.S.
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4000
Seattle, WA 98104
Tel: 206.626-6000
Fax: 206.464-1496

Kevin X. McGann - (212) 819-8312
Dimitrios T. Drivas - (212) 819-8286
John Handy - (212) 819-8790
Aaron Chase - (212) 819-2516
WHITE & CASE LLP
1155 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-2787

Warren S. Heit - (650) 213-0321
Wendi Schepler - (650) 213-0323
WHITE & CASE LLP

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

3000 El Camino Real
Building 5, 9th Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306

*Attorneys for Defendants GOOGLE INC. AND
YOUTUBE, LLC*

/s/ Mark P. Walters (with permission)

Mark P. Walters (WSBA #30819)
Dario A. Machleidt (WSBA #41860)
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
1191 Second Avenue Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98101
Tel: 206-336-5684
Fax: 212-588-0500
mwalters@flhlaw.com
dmachleidt@flhlaw.com

and

Admitted Pro Hac Vice

Michael A. Jacobs
Matthew I. Kreeger
Richard S.J. Hung
Francis Ho
Eric W. Ow
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105-2482
Tel: 415-268-7000
Fax: 415-268-7522

Attorneys for Defendant YAHOO! INC.

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

By: /s/ Brian M. Berliner (with permission)

Brian M. Berliner, CA Bar No. 156732 (*pro hac vice*)
Neil L. Yang, CA Bar No. 262719 (*pro hac vice*)
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: 213.430.6000
Facsimile: 213.430.6407
Email: bberliner@omm.com; nyang@omm.com

George A. Riley, CA Bar No. 118304 (*pro hac vice*)
David S. Almeling, CA Bar No. 235449 (*pro hac vice*)
Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3823

1 Telephone: 415.984.8700
2 Facsimile: 415.984.8701
3 Email: griley@omm.com; dalmeling@omm.com

4 YARMUTH WILSDON CALFO PLLC

5 By: /s/ Jeremy E. Roller (with permission)
6 Scott T. Wilsdon, WSBA No. 20608
7 Jeremy E. Roller, WSBA No. 32021
8 818 Stewart Street, Suite 1400
9 Seattle, WA 98101
10 Telephone: 206.516.3800
11 Facsimile: 206.516.3888
12 Email: wilsdon@yarmuth.com; jroller@yarmuth.com

13 *Attorneys for Defendant Apple Inc.*

14 By: /s/ J. Christopher Carraway (with permission)
15 J. Christopher Carraway, WSBA NO. 37944
16 John D. Vandenberg, WSBA NO. 38445
17 121 S.W. Salmon Street, Suite 1600
18 Portland, Oregon 97204
19 Telephone: (503) 595-5300
20 Facsimile: (503) 595-5301
21 E-mail: chris.carraway@klarquist.com
22 john.vandenberg@klarquist.com

23 *Attorneys for Defendants eBay Inc., Netflix, Inc.,
24 Office Depot, Inc., and Staples, Inc.*

25 CORR CRONIN MICHELSON
26 BAUMGARDNER & PREECE LLP

27 /s/ Kevin C. Baumgardner (with permission)
28 Kevin C. Baumgardner, WSBA No. 14263
Steven W. Fogg, WSBA No. 23528
Jeffrey D. Neumeyer, WSBA No. 35183
OfficeMax Incorporated
1111 West Jefferson Street, Suite 510
Boise, Idaho 83702
Phone: 208-388-4177
Fax: 630-647-3864
Email: jeffneumeyer@officemax.com

John S. Letchinger (pro hac vice)
Douglas S. Rupert (pro hac vice)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP
225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 2800
Chicago, IL 60606
Phone: 312-201-2698
Email: letchinger@wildman.com
Email: rupert@wildman.com

Attorneys for Defendant OfficeMax Incorporated

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on November 8, 2010, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following counsel of record:

Attorneys for AOL Inc.

Aneelah Afzali	aneelah.afzali@stokeslaw.com
Scott Johnson	scott.johnson@stokeslaw.com
Shannon Jost	shannon.jost@stokeslaw.com
Gerald F. Ivey	gerald.ivey@finnegan.com
Robert L. Burns	robert.burns@finnegan.com
Cortney S. Alexander	cortney.alexander@finnegan.com
Elliot C. Cook	elliott.cook@finnegan.com

Attorneys for Apple, Inc.

David Almeling	dalmeling@omm.com
Brian Berliner	bberliner@omm.com
George Riley	griley@omm.com
Jeremy Roller	jroller@yarmuth.com
Scott Wilsdon	wilsdon@yarmuth.com
Neil Yang	nyang@omm.com

Attorneys for eBay, Inc., Netflix, Inc., and Staples, Inc.

Chris Carraway	chris.carraway@klarquist.com
John Vandenberg	john.vandenberg@klarquist.com

Attorneys for Facebook, Inc.

Christen Dubois	cdubois@cooley.com
Heidi Keefe	hkeefe@cooley.com
Michael Rhodes	mrhodes@cooley.com
Elizabeth Stameshkin	lstameshkin@cooley.com
Mark Weinstein	mweinstein@cooley.com
Chris Durbin	cdurbin@cooley.com

Attorneys for Google, Inc. and YouTube, LLC

Aneelah Afzali	aneelah.afzali@stokeslaw.com
Aaron Chase	achase@whitecase.com
Dimitrios Drivas	ddrivas@whitecase.com
John Handy	jhandy@whitecase.com
Warren Heit	wheit@whitecase.com
Kevin McGann	kmcgann@whitecase.com
Scott Johnson	scott.johnson@stokeslaw.com
Shannon Jost	shannon.jost@stokeslaw.com

1 **Attorneys for Office Depot, Inc.**

2 Chris Carraway
3 John Vandenberg

chris.carraway@klarquist.com
john.vandenberg@klarquist.com

4 **Attorneys for OfficeMax, Inc.**

5 Kevin Baumgardner
6 Steven Fogg
7 John Letchinger
8 Douglas Rupert

kbaumgardner@corrchronin.com
sfogg@corrchronin.com
letchinger@wildman.com
rupert@wildman.com

9 **Attorneys for Yahoo! Inc.**

10 Francis Ho
11 Richard S.J. Hung
12 Michael Jacobs
13 Matthew Kreeger
14 Dario Machleidt
15 Eric Ow
16 Mark Walters

fho@mofo.com
rhung@mofo.com
mjacobs@mofo.com
mkreeger@mofo.com
dmachleidt@flhlaw.com
eow@mofo.com
mwalters@flhlaw.com

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
By: /s/ Justin A. Nelson
Justin A. Nelson