

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

LEADER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a  
Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff and Counterdefendant,

v.

FACEBOOK, INC., a Delaware  
corporation,

Defendant and Counterclaimant.

Civil Action No. 1:08-cv-00862-JJF

**EXHIBITS 1, 3 AND 4 TO**

**DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S  
CONFIDENTIAL LETTER TO THE HONORABLE LEONARD P. STARK  
PURSUANT TO COURT ORDER OF MARCH 8, 2010**

OF COUNSEL:

Heidi L. Keefe (*pro hac vice*)  
Mark R. Weinstein (*pro hac vice*)  
Melissa H. Keyes (*pro hac vice*)  
**COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP**  
5 Palo Alto Square  
3000 El Camino Real  
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155

Dated: March 9, 2010

**BLANK ROME LLP**  
Steven L. Caponi (DE Bar #3484)  
1201 N. Market Street, Suite 800  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
302-425-6400  
Fax: 302-425-6464

*Attorneys for Defendant and  
Counterclaimant Facebook, Inc.*

# EXHIBIT 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

LEADER TECHNOLOGIES,	)	
INC.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	C.A. No. 08-862-JJF-LPS
v.	)	
	)	
FACEBOOK, INC., a	)	
Delaware corporation,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

Wednesday, December 23, 2009  
11:00 a.m.  
Teleconference

844 King Street  
Wilmington, Delaware

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE LEONARD P. STARK  
United States District Court Magistrate

APPEARANCES:

POTTER, ANDERSON & CORROON, LLP  
BY: PHILIP A. ROVNER, ESQ.

-and-

KING & SPAULDING  
BY: PAUL ANDRE, ESQ.

Counsel for Plaintiff

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

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

BLANK ROME, LLP  
BY: STEVEN L. CAPONI, ESQ.

-and-

COOLEY, GODWARD & KRONISH, LLP  
BY: HEIDI L. KEEFE, ESQ.  
BY: JEFFREY NORBERG, ESQ.

Counsel for Defendant

1 Well, I'm prepared to rule on this  
2 one. And having weighed the competing arguments,  
3 I am persuaded that Facebook is entitled to some  
4 relief on this issue, and specifically I am going  
5 to order that Leader provide fully functioning  
6 copies of the Leader to Leader, and I guess  
7 Leader to Leader Enterprise social networking  
8 products.

9 I'm looking specifically at  
10 Facebook's Request for Production Number 65 and  
11 66, which are attached as Exhibit 18 to Docket  
12 Entry 182.

13 So with respect to 65 and 66, I'm  
14 overruling Leader's objections and I'm granting  
15 the motion to compel of Facebook. I do believe  
16 that while the burden of proving competition in  
17 connection with the request for an injunction and  
18 other types of damages or damages relief, while  
19 that burden is on Leader, a defendant here,  
20 Facebook, has a right to defend itself, not  
21 solely by arguing that the plaintiff has failed  
22 to meet its burden, but also by, if it can,  
23 proactively proving that the two companies, in  
24 this case, are not competitors.

1                   And I think that Facebook is  
2                   entitled to access fully functioning access to  
3                   the product that is the basis for the contention  
4                   of Leader that the companies are competitors.  
5                   Facebook's entitled to access to that product to  
6                   determine if it may have a basis for arguing  
7                   through the product that the two companies are  
8                   not competitors.

9                   At this point, I'm denying the  
10                  request for relief under Production Request  
11                  Number 67, which seeks a copy of the complete  
12                  source code for Leader to Leader. I do recall  
13                  fairly well the back and forth over many weeks or  
14                  months and phone calls that we had which led  
15                  ultimately to the production of the entire source  
16                  code of Facebook to Leader.

17                  And it may turn out that Facebook  
18                  will persuade me that they need access to the  
19                  entirety of Leader's source code. But seeing as  
20                  Facebook has not yet even had access to a fully  
21                  functioning version of the product, seeing as I'm  
22                  sure Leader will view the source code as the most  
23                  important commercial property, and seeing as I  
24                  think, I would want a very strong showing before

1 I'm going to provide access to the source code  
2 just as I required when Leader was seeking  
3 Facebook's source code, I just don't think that  
4 showing has or can be made at this point given  
5 that Facebook has not even had a moment to access  
6 fully functioning access to the product to the  
7 Leader product.

8 So that's my ruling on that issue.

9 We should talk about the timing for  
10 when Leader can provide the fully functioning  
11 product. Mr. Andre, given the holidays, you want  
12 to suggest a date by which you could do this?

13 MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, I will  
14 endeavor to do all the issues you brought up by  
15 January 15th, if that's acceptable.

16 THE COURT: That is acceptable. So  
17 you'll do that by January 15th.

18 I believe that addresses all the  
19 issues raised in the letters.

20 Is that correct, Ms. Keefe?

21 MS. KEEFE: It does, Your Honor. I  
22 had one other question, if you don't mind.

23 THE COURT: Just one second.  
24 Mr. Andre, were there any other issues in the

1 letters that you think have not been addressed?

2 MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor. I think  
3 everything has been addressed.

4 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Keefe.

5 MS. KEEFE: The simple question, I  
6 think Your Honor still has two motions pending  
7 before Your Honor, and I just wanted to know if  
8 we could anticipate a ruling on those or a  
9 hearing if you needed one.

10 THE COURT: The answer is, yes, I'm  
11 going to rule on those motions right now.

12 MS. KEEFE: Thank you.

13 THE COURT: Okay. So the two  
14 pending motions are Facebook's motion to stay  
15 pending re-examination and Facebook's motion for  
16 leave to amend its responsive pleading to add a  
17 counterclaim for false marking. And I am going  
18 to give you my rulings on both of those motions  
19 right now.

20 First, on the motion to stay pending  
21 re-examination, I am denying Facebook's motion to  
22 stay. Facebook, as we know, seeks a stay until  
23 the conclusion of a pending ex parte and inter  
24 parte's re-examinations by the PTO of Leader's



EXHIBIT 2  
FILED SEPARATELY UNDER SEAL

## EXHIBIT 3



Mark R. Weinstein  
(650) 843-5007  
mweinstein@cooley.com

VIA EMAIL JHANNAH@KSLAW.COM

January 27, 2010

James Hannah  
King & Spalding  
333 Twin Dolphin Drive  
Suite 400  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065

**RE: Leader Technologies, Inc. v. Facebook, Inc.**

Dear James:

On January 25, 2010, I accessed the Leader2Leader product with the username provided by LTI's January 15, 2010 letter in order to analyze whether or not it practices the '761 patent. As you know, whether the Leader2Leader product practices the patent is highly relevant to both LTI's claims that it is a competitor of Facebook as well as to Facebook's false marking counterclaim.

However, upon viewing the Leader2Leader product, it became immediately apparent that simply having access to the product itself will be insufficient to conduct this analysis. For instance, in order to determine whether Leader2Leader actually "updat[es] the stored metadata" based on a change of a user from a first context to a second context, we would need to be able to see whether the metadata is updated in such an instance. This is impossible to view as a mere user of the Leader2Leader service.

Thus, Facebook would require that all of the source code for Leader2Leader be made available in order to complete a meaningful review. As you are aware, Judge Stark left the issue as to whether LTI would produce this code open in the December 23 Order, pending Facebook's access to the Leader2Leader product.

Please let us know by Friday, January 29, 2010 whether LTI will produce the source code without Facebook needing to seek additional recourse from the Court.

Sincerely,

Cooley Godward Kronish LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark R. Weinstein", written over a white background.

Mark R. Weinstein

1160997 v1/SF

## EXHIBIT 4

# KING & SPALDING

King & Spalding LLP  
333 Twin Dolphin Drive  
Suite 400  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Tel: (650) 590-0700  
Fax: (650) 590-1900  
www.kslaw.com

James Hannah  
Associate  
Direct Dial: 650-590-0726  
Direct Fax: 650-590-1900  
jhannah@kslaw.com

February 1, 2010

## VIA E-MAIL

Mark R. Weinstein  
Cooley Godward Kronish LLP  
(650) 843-5007  
mweinstein@cooley.com

**Re: Leader Technologies, Inc. v. Facebook, Inc.**

Dear Mark,


We write in response to your letter dated January 27, 2010, in which you request access to the Leader2Leader product source code. Facebook's only stated reason for requesting Leader's source code is to verify that Facebook and Leader are competitors in the marketplace. *See* December 23, 2009 Hearing Transcript, pgs. 52-62; *See* Facebook's Letter From Caponi to Judge Stark, dated December 21, 2009, pg. 3.

We have already provided you with ample documentation demonstrating competition between Facebook and Leader. For example, we provided you access to the Leader2Leader product, along with thousands of pages of technical and marketing material describing, in detail, the features, benefits, and operation of Leader2Leader. Furthermore, you will have the opportunity to depose Leader's witnesses on this topic. From this material you can easily determine the nature of the competition between Facebook and Leader. There is no conceivable reason why source code of the Leader2Leader product has any bearing on whether Leader and Facebook are competitors. Furthermore, and as stated during the December 23, 2009 hearing with Judge Stark, we have no intention of relying on the Leader2Leader product source code, and therefore it will not be at issue.

Mark Weinstein  
February 1, 2010  
Page 2

Because of the foregoing reasons we will not at this time grant you access to the Leader2Leader source code because access to the source code serves no purpose other than opening the door to an impermissible attempt at a product-to-product comparison. If you are able to provide reasons why the source code is relevant to this case we will of course take that into consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "James Hannah", written over a light blue background.

James Hannah

JH:ks