From:	Michael Matulewicz-Crowley
To:	Chris Ponder; Harper Batts; Zach Jacobs; Lai Yip; Christine E. Lehman; Scott Cole; Ariane Mann; Laura Carwile; Adam Adler; Courtland L. Reichman; Jennifer Estremera; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD
Cc:	LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent
Subject:	RE: Concurrent v. AMD et al./Meet & Confer re Plaintiffs" Rog Responses
Date:	Tuesday, March 17, 2026 4:00:25 PM
Attachments:	image001.png

Chris,
Your email still does not identify the relief you are seeking. As we explained on yesterday's call, Plaintiffs may move to strike portions of Defendants' contentions that violate the *Sotera* stipulation (Dkt. 78). Are Defendants filing a motion to not-strike? In any event, it is inefficient and a misuse of judicial and party resources to brief both whether Defendants' conduct was not a violation, in addition to briefing a motion to strike the portions of the contentions that are in fact in violation.

Further, today was the first we heard any mention of Defendants filing a motion at all—the parties have clearly not met and conferred on the motion (a motion that Defendants have still not explained).
We also see no basis for expedited briefing. Plaintiffs identified these issues nearly four weeks ago. There is no basis or need for expedited briefing.
While we cannot prevent Defendants from unilaterally filing a motion, we do not believe doing so would be an appropriate or efficient use of the Court's resources.

Best,
Michael
Michael Matulewicz-Crowley
Reichman Jorgensen Lehman & Feldberg LLP
650 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2320
New York, NY 10019
(332) 208-7170

From: Chris Ponder <cponder@sheppard.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 5:36 PM
To: Michael Matulewicz-Crowley <mmatulewicz-crowley@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Harper Batts <hbatts@sheppard.com>; Zach Jacobs <zjacobs@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Lai Yip <lyip@sheppard.com>; Christine E. Lehman <clehman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Scott Cole <scole@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Ariane Mann <amann@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Laura Carwile <lcarwile@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Adam Adler <aadler@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Courtland L. Reichman <creichman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Jennifer Estremera <jestremera@reichmanjorgensen.com>; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD <RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Cc: LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent <LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent@sheppard.com>
Subject: RE: Concurrent v. AMD et al./Meet & Confer re Plaintiffs' Rog Responses

CAUTION: EXTERNAL SENDER

Michael,

We discussed the *Sotera* dispute for quite some time yesterday. Plaintiffs clearly stated that, absent Defendants amending the invalidity contentions, that Plaintiffs will move to strike the invalidity contentions based on a violation of the *Sotera* stipulation. That clearly requires the Court to decide if the *Sotera* stipulation was violated.

We agree this should be presented as a regular motion, rather than a discovery dispute, as both sides agree this is an important issue that requires briefing, as opposed to a discovery dispute about production of documents, etc. We will move forward on this as a regular motion and request expedited briefing. Please let us know if Plaintiffs oppose expedited briefing and the basis for that opposition.

If you'd like to discuss these *Sotera* issues further, we are available this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon. But we can't delay given your premature raising of the *Sotera* issue with the PTAB without first seeking a determination by the district court where the stipulation is in effect.

Lastly, Defendants did not commit to providing amended contentions. We stated on the meet-and-confer that a *Sotera* stipulation is enforced by a district court, which decides whether a particular invalidity ground was or could have been raised in the instituted IPR. Defendants' further stipulation identified specific invalidity grounds disclosed in the invalidity contentions that would be covered by the *Sotera* stipulation if the associated IPR is instituted, which further streamlines the inquiry. Plaintiffs alleged that this identification was not enough because they alleged there are other portions of the invalidity contention (that Plaintiffs were unable or unwilling to identify) that they contend violate the *Sotera* stipulation. We stated we didn't understand what other portions there could be but offered to provide a redline of the invalidity contentions that would show the portions Defendants agree would be excluded by operation of the *Sotera* stipulation to resolve the dispute if Plaintiffs agreed to identify any other portions that they contend would be excluded by the *Sotera* stipulation. The idea was to tee up the dispute cleanly for the district court to decide and resolve the *Sotera* dispute. Plaintiffs did not agree that they would identify the other portions of the invalidity contentions that, if removed, would resolve the dispute such that it would no longer seek de-institution.

Regards,

Chris Ponder
Partner

1540 El Camino Real, Suite 120
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Direct +1.650.815.2676 | Office +1.650.815.2600
cponder@sheppard.com | Bio | LinkedIn | sheppard.com

From: Michael Matulewicz-Crowley <mmatulewicz-crowley@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 11:40 AM
To: Harper Batts <hbatts@sheppard.com>; Zach Jacobs <zjacobs@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Lai Yip <lyip@sheppard.com>; Christine E. Lehman <clehman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Scott Cole <scole@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Ariane Mann <amann@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Laura Carwile <lcarwile@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Adam Adler <aadler@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Courtland L. Reichman <creichman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Jennifer Estremera <jestremera@reichmanjorgensen.com>; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD <RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Cc: LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent <LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent@sheppard.com>
Subject: RE: Concurrent v. AMD et al./Meet & Confer re Plaintiffs' Rog Responses

Harper,

We are genuinely confused by your email. At no point during the meet and confer did the parties discuss raising the issue of a *Sotera* stipulation violation with Judge Tigar in the abstract. Instead, Defendants stated that they would provide proposed amended invalidity contentions to Plaintiffs for review. Are Defendants no longer planning on doing so?

We are also confused by the posture of Defendants' proposed discovery letter. What relief are Defendants seeking in the proposed discovery letter? Are Defendants seeking a ruling as to whether the stipulation was violated and nothing more? And is it now Defendants' position—contrary to what was stated yesterday—that disputes regarding striking portions of Defendants' invalidity contentions should be done via discovery dispute letter, as opposed to motion?

Best,
Michael
Michael Matulewicz-Crowley
Reichman Jorgensen Lehman & Feldberg LLP
650 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2320
New York, NY 10019
(332) 208-7170

From: Harper Batts <hbatts@sheppard.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 1:50 PM
To: Zach Jacobs <zjacobs@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Lai Yip <lyip@sheppard.com>; Michael Matulewicz-Crowley <mmatulewicz-crowley@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Christine E. Lehman <clehman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Scott Cole <scole@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Ariane Mann <amann@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Laura Carwile <lcarwile@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Adam Adler <aadler@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Courtland L. Reichman <creichman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Jennifer Estremera <jestremera@reichmanjorgensen.com>; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD <RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Cc: LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent <LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent@sheppard.com>
Subject: RE: Concurrent v. AMD et al./Meet & Confer re Plaintiffs' Rog Responses

CAUTION: EXTERNAL SENDER

Counsel,

As discussed on the meet and confer yesterday, the parties clearly have a disagreement about whether the Sotera stipulation filed in the district court was violated. During the meet and confer, Plaintiffs indicated that they intended to raise the issue with Judge Tigar absent an amendment of the invalidity contentions.

The parties are in agreement that Judge Tigar needs to make a ruling on whether the Sotera stipulation was violated. As such, we are preparing a joint discovery dispute letter submission that we will send to you so that Judge Tigar can promptly rule on this issue.

We believe that yesterday's meet and confer satisfied the meet and confer requirements for this dispute.

Regards,

Harper

Harper Batts
Partner

Sheppard

1540 El Camino Real, Suite 120
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Direct +1.650.815.2673 | Office +1.650.815.2600
hbatts@sheppard.com | Bio | LinkedIn | sheppard.com

From: Zach Jacobs <zjacobs@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2026 1:49 PM
To: Lai Yip <lyip@sheppard.com>; Michael Matulewicz-Crowley <mmatulewicz-crowley@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Christine E. Lehman <clehman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Scott Cole <scole@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Ariane Mann <amann@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Laura Carwile <lcarwile@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Adam Adler <aadler@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Courtland L. Reichman <creichman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Jennifer Estremera <jestremera@reichmanjorgensen.com>; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD <RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Cc: LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent <LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent@sheppard.com>
Subject: Re: Concurrent v. AMD et al./Meet & Confer re Plaintiffs' Rog Responses

Lai,

We are available to meet and confer on Monday at 11:00 a.m. PT.

Best,

Zach

Zach Jacobs | 202.894.7312 | **Reichman Jorgensen Lehman & Feldberg LLP**

From: Lai Yip <lyip@sheppard.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2026 1:53 PM
To: Zach Jacobs <zjacobs@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Michael Matulewicz-Crowley <mmatulewicz-crowley@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Christine E. Lehman <clehman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Scott Cole <scole@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Ariane Mann <amann@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Laura Carwile <lcarwile@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Adam Adler <aadler@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Courtland L. Reichman <creichman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Jennifer Estremera <jestremera@reichmanjorgensen.com>; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD <RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Cc: LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent <LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent@sheppard.com>
Subject: RE: Concurrent v. AMD et al./Meet & Confer re Plaintiffs' Rog Responses

CAUTION: EXTERNAL SENDER

Counsel,

Please let us know when you are available to meet and confer on Monday. Would 10:30 or 11 Pacific work on your end?

Regards,

Lai L. Yip
Partner

Sheppard

Four Embarcadero Center, 17th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-4109
Direct +1.415.774.3147 | Office +1.415.434.9100
lyip@sheppard.com | Bio | LinkedIn | sheppard.com

From: Zach Jacobs <zjacobs@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2026 7:32 AM
To: Lai Yip <lyip@sheppard.com>; Michael Matulewicz-Crowley <mmatulewicz-crowley@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Christine E. Lehman <clehman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Scott Cole <scole@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Ariane Mann <amann@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Laura Carwile <lcarwile@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Adam Adler <aadler@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Courtland L. Reichman <creichman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Jennifer Estremera <jestremera@reichmanjorgensen.com>; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD <RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Cc: LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent <LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent@sheppard.com>

Subject: Re: Concurrent v. AMD et al./Meet & Confer re Plaintiffs' Rog Responses

Lai,

Defendants' violation of their *Sotera* stipulations is a breach of commitments made to both the PTAB and the District Court. Defendants' recently filed, unilateral district court stipulation does not moot the issue; if anything, it underscores the *Sotera* violations. As previewed in our February 20 letter, we intend to move to strike Defendants' invalidity contentions unless Defendants promptly seek leave to amend to remove all grounds that contravene their *Sotera* commitments.

Given the significant overlap between the proceedings, we are not going to conduct duplicative meet-and-confers on the same issue. Your letter from March 9 responded to both the *Sotera* issues and invalidity contention deficiencies and was sent by counsel who appeared in both the IPR and District Court. Whenever we meet and confer, we expect counsel to attend who are authorized to address all of Defendants' positions regarding its invalidity contentions, including how certain grounds do not violate the *Sotera* stipulations.

Since you have declined to meet and confer on the invalidity contention issues, we can defer the meet and confer until Monday. We remain willing to meet and confer in good faith to resolve these deficiencies before seeking relief from the Court, and we hope Defendants will do the same.

Best,

Zach

Zach Jacobs | 202.894.7312 | **Reichman Jorgensen Lehman & Feldberg LLP**

From: Lai Yip <lyip@sheppard.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2026 7:53 PM
To: Zach Jacobs <zjacobs@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Michael Matulewicz-Crowley <mmatulewicz-crowley@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Christine E. Lehman <clehman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Scott Cole <scole@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Ariane Mann <amann@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Laura Carwile <lcarwile@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Adam Adler <aadler@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Courtland L. Reichman <creichman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Jennifer Estremera <jestremera@reichmanjorgensen.com>; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD <RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Cc: LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent <LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent@sheppard.com>
Subject: RE: Concurrent v. AMD et al./Meet & Confer re Plaintiffs' Rog Responses

CAUTION: EXTERNAL SENDER

Zach,

These district court issues (Plaintiffs' interrogatory responses and Defendants' invalidity contentions) should be addressed on the same call. We do not intend to meet and confer with you on a more recently raised issue (the invalidity contentions) without our issues regarding Plaintiffs' interrogatory responses being addressed first. A meet and confer on Plaintiffs' interrogatory responses is long overdue, and is something we previously asked you to be prepared to discuss. As noted below, the only reason it has not been discussed already is because the parties ran out of time.

We have provided you multiple times in our March 9 letter to choose from. If those times do not work for you to discuss both issues together (Plaintiffs' interrogatory responses and Defendants' invalidity contentions), then let us know what does work for you tomorrow, Friday, or Monday.

As Harper noted in his email, the meet and confer regarding the PTAB issues is being separately scheduled, and the *Sotera* stipulation issues will be addressed on that meet and confer.

Regards,

Lai L. Yip
Partner

Sheppard

Four Embarcadero Center, 17th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-4109
Direct +1.415.774.3147 | Office +1.415.434.9100
lyip@sheppard.com | Bio | LinkedIn | sheppard.com

From: Zach Jacobs <zjacobs@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2026 1:39 PM
To: Lai Yip <lyip@sheppard.com>; Michael Matulewicz-Crowley <mmatulewicz-crowley@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Christine E. Lehman <clehman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Scott Cole <scole@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Ariane Mann <amann@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Laura Carwile <lcarwile@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Adam Adler <aadler@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Courtland L. Reichman <creichman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Jennifer Estremera <jestremera@reichmanjorgensen.com>; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD <RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Cc: LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent <LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent@sheppard.com>
Subject: Re: Concurrent v. AMD et al./Meet & Confer re Plaintiffs' Rog Responses

Lai,

We remain available to discuss the deficiencies in your invalidity contentions, including the violation of the *Sotera* stipulations and the new stipulation filed March 10, tomorrow at 9:30

a.m. PT. This is a time which your side proposed. Please confirm this time still works and that there will be someone from your team available to discuss all of the issues responded to in your March 9 letter.

We are not prepared to discuss the interrogatory responses this week as they involve different team members and you only followed up about them yesterday evening. We are of course happy to schedule a mutually agreeable time to discuss them next week. We are figuring out some good options and will get back to you soon.

Best,

Zach

Zach Jacobs | 202.894.7312 | **Reichman Jorgensen Lehman & Feldberg LLP**

From: Lai Yip <lyip@sheppard.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2026 4:01 PM
To: Zach Jacobs <zjacobs@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Michael Matulewicz-Crowley <mmatulewicz-crowley@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Christine E. Lehman <clehman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Scott Cole <scole@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Ariane Mann <amann@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Laura Carwile <lcarwile@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Adam Adler <aadler@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Courtland L. Reichman <creichman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Jennifer Estremera <jestremera@reichmanjorgensen.com>; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD <RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Cc: LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent <LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent@sheppard.com>
Subject: RE: Concurrent v. AMD et al./Meet & Confer re Plaintiffs' Rog Responses

CAUTION: EXTERNAL SENDER

Zach,

The issue of Plaintiffs' interrogatory responses has been pending for a while, and the only reason we did not get to it previously is because the parties ran out of time (after discussing Defendants' interrogatory responses). You have already stated that your team is available for a meet and confer tomorrow at 9:30 a.m. Pacific to discuss district court issues (i.e., the invalidity contentions).

We can send an invite for 9:30 a.m. Pacific tomorrow to discuss Plaintiffs' interrogatory responses first (which has been pending longer), and then Defendants' invalidity contentions. If that time doesn't work for your team to discuss both of those issues, let us know other times tomorrow and Friday that do. We should have good availability both days.

Regards,

Lai L. Yip
Partner

Sheppard

Four Embarcadero Center, 17th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-4109
Direct +1.415.774.3147 | Office +1.415.434.9100
lyip@sheppard.com | Bio | LinkedIn | sheppard.com

From: Zach Jacobs <zjacobs@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2026 6:16 AM
To: Lai Yip <lyip@sheppard.com>; Michael Matulewicz-Crowley <mmatulewicz-crowley@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Christine E. Lehman <clehman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Scott Cole <scole@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Ariane Mann <amann@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Laura Carwile <lcarwile@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Adam Adler <aadler@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Courtland L. Reichman <creichman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Jennifer Estremera <jestremera@reichmanjorgensen.com>; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD <RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Cc: LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent <LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent@sheppard.com>
Subject: Re: Concurrent v. AMD et al./Meet & Confer re Plaintiffs' Rog Responses

Counsel,

We are still waiting to hear back from your side about Thursday at 9:30 a.m. PT. If your team is available, please confirm and send a meeting link.

In any event, we believe these issues should be discussed at a separate meeting. We will get back to you with our availability.

Best,

Zach

Zach Jacobs | 202.894.7312 | **Reichman Jorgensen Lehman & Feldberg LLP**

From: Lai Yip <lyip@sheppard.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 6:50 PM
To: Michael Matulewicz-Crowley <mmatulewicz-crowley@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Christine E. Lehman <clehman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Scott Cole <scole@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Ariane Mann <amann@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Laura Carwile <lcarwile@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Adam Adler <aadler@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Courtland L. Reichman <creichman@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Jennifer Estremera

<jestremera@reichmanjorgensen.com>; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD <RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Cc: LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent <LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent@sheppard.com>
Subject: Concurrent v. AMD et al./Meet & Confer re Plaintiffs' Rog Responses

CAUTION: EXTERNAL SENDER

Counsel,

As you know, when the parties met and conferred in February regarding discovery, due to time constraints, we did not get around to conferring regarding Plaintiffs' interrogatory responses.

Currently, the parties are planning to confer about issues relating to the invalidity contentions this Thursday at 9:30 a.m. Pacific. Please let us know if you would like to also confer about Plaintiffs' interrogatory responses at that time, or if you would like to select another time from the list of options in our March 9 letter.

Regards,

Lai L. Yip
Partner

Sheppard

Four Embarcadero Center, 17th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-4109
Direct +1.415.774.3147 | Office +1.415.434.9100
lyip@sheppard.com | Bio | LinkedIn | sheppard.com

Attention: This message is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments.
NOTICE: This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately via reply e-mail, and

then destroy all instances of this communication. Thank you.
NOTICE: This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately via reply e-mail, and then destroy all instances of this communication. Thank you.
NOTICE: This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately via reply e-mail, and then destroy all instances of this communication. Thank you.
NOTICE: This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately via reply e-mail, and then destroy all instances of this communication. Thank you.
NOTICE: This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately via reply e-mail, and then destroy all instances of this communication. Thank you.
NOTICE: This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately via reply e-mail, and then destroy all instances of this communication. Thank you.