

Exhibit A

[Print](#) | [Close Window](#)

Subject: RE: Second Amended Complaint - courtesy copy
From: "Scott Jerger" <scott@fieldjerger.com>
Date: Mon, Oct 22, 2007 11:16 am
To: <victoria@vkhall-law.com>

Victoria:

Have the appendixes changed at all from the First Amended Complaint?

Scott

Scott Jerger
Field Jerger LLP
610 SW Alder, Suite 910
Portland, Oregon 97205
503.542.2015 (phone)
503.225.0276 (fax)
503.516.7127 (mobile)

From: victoria@vkhall-law.com [<mailto:victoria@vkhall-law.com>]
Sent: Friday, October 19, 2007 5:00 PM
To: Scott Jerger
Subject: Second Amended Complaint - courtesy copy

Scott,

Two versions of the Second Amended Complaint will be filed in our motion for leave to file the amended complaint. I have sent both versions. Listed below are the differences, for your reference.

The first version contains the cybersquatting claim. We believe we have to make certain arguments for the record on appeal, and so for this reason, we have this claim in the Second Amended Complaint. The first version will have an "A" in the footnote block at lower right. The second version removes the cause of action for cybersquatting, and has a "B" in the footnote block at lower right.

Specifically, the following is in the Version A, and is removed from the Version B.

First page: Reference to Trademark Laws in the title block.

Footnote block: Reference to Trademark Laws. The letter "A" in the lower right corner. ("B" appears in Version B.)

Count Seven for Cybersquatting

Prayer for Relief, Section H through M, and a reference to 15 U.S.C. Sec. 1117 in Section U.

You have until Oct. 26 to let us know whether you will object, or not, to either version, based on Rule 15.

Regards,

Victoria