

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.  
Alan L. Sullivan (3152)  
Todd M. Shaughnessy (6651)  
Amy F. Sorenson (8947)  
15 West South Temple, Suite 1200  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101  
Telephone: (801) 257-1900  
Facsimile: (801) 257-1800

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP  
Evan R. Chesler (admitted pro hac vice)  
David R. Marriott (7572)  
Worldwide Plaza  
825 Eighth Avenue  
New York, New York 10019  
Telephone: (212) 474-1000  
Facsimile: (212) 474-3700

*Attorneys for Defendant/Counterclaim-Plaintiff  
International Business Machines Corporation*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH**

THE SCO GROUP, INC.,  
Plaintiff/Counterclaim-Defendant,  
v.  
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES  
CORPORATION,  
Defendant/Counterclaim-Plaintiff.

**STIPULATION AND JOINT MOTION  
FOR AN ADDENDUM TO THE  
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Civil No.: 2:03CV-0294 DAK

Honorable Dale A. Kimball

Magistrate Judge Brooke C. Wells

The parties, by and through their counsel of record, hereby stipulate and jointly move the Court as follows:

1. On September 15, 2003, The SCO Group, Inc. (“SCO”) and International Business Machines Corporation (“IBM”) agreed to the terms of a stipulated protective order (the “Protective Order”).

2. In the course of fact discovery in this action, certain non-parties have objected to the production of documents on the ground that the Protective Order contains no mechanism to limit access to certain documents which they describe as highly confidential to the parties’ outside counsel and independent experts only.

3. In order to resolve this objection, and to allow for the timely production of such documents by non-parties, counsel for SCO and IBM have agreed that the Protective Order should be amended to provide for the designation and production by non-parties, where appropriate, of such documents as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL -- OUTSIDE COUNSEL ONLY”.

4. Accordingly, the parties hereby stipulate and agree that the Protective Order should be amended as follows: If, in the course of this action, a disclosing non-party discloses information that, in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(7), the disclosing non-party in good faith contends should not be disclosed to in-house counsel, in-house representatives or in-house experts otherwise entitled to view confidential information pursuant to this Protective Order, such disclosing non-party may designate such information as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL -- OUTSIDE COUNSEL ONLY”. Information so designated by a non-party may not be disclosed to a party’s in-house counsel, in-house experts, or any of its officers, directors, or employees. HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL information shall be governed by the Protective Order and used only for the purposes of this action and not for any other purpose or

function, including without limitation any business, patent prosecution, competitive or governmental purpose or function. No person who prosecutes patents relating to the technology claimed in any patents in suit shall have access to HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL information.

5. Filing under seal; notice of challenge to designation. If any information produced by a non-party and designated as CONFIDENTIAL or HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL is filed with the Clerk of the Court in this litigation, information so designated shall be filed under seal in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph 6 of the Protective Order. If any party or non-party files a motion challenging the CONFIDENTIAL or HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL designation of information produced by a non-party and filed with the Court, the party responsible for filing the information designated as CONFIDENTIAL or HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL with the Court shall provide notice to the producing non-party of such challenge.

6. Notice of use of non-party materials in open court. In order to provide a producing non-party with an opportunity to seek protection against public disclosure, if a party wishes to introduce into evidence on direct examination any document produced by a non-party and designated CONFIDENTIAL or HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL -- OUTSIDE COUNSEL ONLY, the party shall provide five days prior notice of that intent to the producing non-party by email, telephone or facsimile. If a party intends to use such a document produced by a non-party for purposes of cross-examination, it shall provide five days prior notice of that intent to the extent practicable, and if such notice is not practicable, shall provide as much prior notice of such intent as is practicable, also by email, telephone, or facsimile.

7. All other provisions of the Protective Order shall remain in full force and effect.

The parties respectfully request that the Court enter an Addendum to the Protective Order reflecting the foregoing in the form submitted herewith.

DATED this 12th day of April, 2006.

Snell & Wilmer L.L.P.

/s/Amy F. Sorenson

Alan L. Sullivan

Todd M. Shaughnessy

Amy F. Sorenson

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP

Evan R. Chesler

David R. Marriott

DATED this 12th day of April, 2006.

HATCH, JAMES & DODGE, P.C.

Brent O. Hatch

Mark F. James

By: /s/Brent O. Hatch

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

*(signed copy of document bearing signature of Brent O. Hatch is being maintained in the office of Snell & Wilmer)*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 12th day of April, 2006, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was sent by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, to the following:

Brent O. Hatch  
Mark F. James  
HATCH, JAMES & DODGE, P.C.  
10 West Broadway, Suite 400  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

Robert Silver  
Edward Normand  
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
333 Main Street  
Armonk, New York 10504

Stephen N. Zack  
Mark J. Heise  
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
100 Southeast Second Street, Suite 2800  
Miami, Florida 33131

/s/Amy F. Sorenson