UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FUJIFILM CORPORATION, Midtown West, 7-3, Akasaka 9-chome Minato-ku, Tokyo 107-0052 Japan, FUJIFILM U.S.A., INC. 200 Summit Lake Drive, Floor 2 Valhalla, NY 10595, Plaintiffs, v. PAPST LICENSING GmbH & Co., KG Bahnhofstrasse 33 78112 St. Georgen, Germany, Defendant.	Civil Action No. 07-CV-01118

PRAECIPE

Plaintiffs Fujifilm Corporation ("Fujifilm Japan") and Fujifilm U.S.A., Inc. ("Fujifilm U.S.A.") (collectively, "Fujifilm") file this Praecipe to correct a typographical error in the Complaint filed on June 21, 2007 in the above-captioned action. More specifically, the undersigned counsel for Fujifilm inadvertently omitted a word from paragraph 12 on page 3 of Complaint filed yesterday. A corrected copy of page 3 of the Complaint is attached hereto.

A copy of this Praecipe will be served on Defendant along with the Summons and Complaint.

Dated: June 22, 2007

HOGAN & HARTSON LLP

/s/ Steven. J. Routh

Steven J. Routh (#376068)
Sten A. Jensen (#443300)
555 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: (202) 637-6465
Telecopier: (202) 637-5910
E-Mail: sjrouth@hhlaw.com
sajensen@hhlaw.com

Of counsel:

William H. Wright
1999 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 1400
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 785-4670
Telecopier: (310) 785-4601
E-Mail: whwright@hhlaw.com

John R. Inge (#413383)
Shinjuku Center Building
46th Floor
25-1 Nishi-Shinjuku 1-Chome
Shinjuku-ku Tokyo, 163-0646
Japan
E-Mail: jringe@hhlaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS
FUJIFILM CORPORATION AND
FUJIFILM U.S.A., INC.

10. Papst Licensing has specifically accused Fujifilm products of infringing the '399 patent and the '449 patent. For example, in a letter dated March 31, 2006 Papst Licensing accused the Fujifilm FinePix E550 and other unnamed digital cameras of infringing both of the patents-in-suit. Papst Licensing has repeated its accusations of infringement on numerous occasions since that time.

11. Fujifilm has presented Papst Licensing with a detailed analysis of why Fujifilm products do not infringe the '399 patent or the '449 patent. Fujifilm has explained why its products do not infringe the patents-in-suit to Papst Licensing on multiple occasions, including in meetings in July and November 2006, and by letter in September 2006.

12. Notwithstanding the clear evidence that Fujifilm products do not infringe the patents-in-suit, Papst Licensing has continued to demand that Fujifilm pay Papst Licensing royalties for use of the '399 and '449 patents.

13. Fujifilm has refused to take a license to these patents on the ground that no such license is needed because Fujifilm's digital camera products clearly and objectively do not infringe the '399 and '449 patents.

Jurisdiction and Venue

14. This action arises under the Declaratory Judgment Act and the patent laws of the United States. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202; Title 35 U.S.C. §§ 100 *et seq*.

15. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.

16. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Papst Licensing pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 293.

17. Venue in this judicial district is proper under at least 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c) and (d) and 35 U.S.C. § 293.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Praecipe and the attachment thereto will be served upon the following named defendant together with the Summons and Complaint:

PAPST LICENSING GmbH & Co., KG
Bahnhofstrasse 33
78112 St. Georgen, Germany

/s/ Sten Jensen
Sten Jensen