EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC., Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant, v. ALCATEL USA, Defendant/Counterclaim Plaintiff.	Civil Action No. 04-874-GMS
TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC., Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant, v. LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC., Defendant/Counterclaim Plaintiff.	Civil Action No. 04-875-GMS
TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC., Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant, v. CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., Defendant/Counterclaim Plaintiff.	Civil Action No. 04-876-GMS

EXPERT REPORT OF VINCENT C. JONES, PE, Ph.D. Re: U.S. RE36,633

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Adam W. Poff, Esquire hereby certify that on June 28, 2006, I caused the foregoing document to be served upon the following counsel of record as indicated below:

BY E-MAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

Steven J. Balick, Esquire
Ashby & Geddes
222 Delaware Avenue
Wilmington, DE 19801

BY E-MAIL ON JUNE 28, 2006 AND
BY FEDERAL EXPRESS ON JUNE 29, 2006

Donald R. Dunner, Esquire
Don O. Burley, Esquire
John M. Williamson, Esquire
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001

York M. Faulkner, Esquire
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
Two Freedom Square
11955 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190-5675

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP

/s/ Adam W. Poff
Adam W. Poff (No. 3990)
The Brandywine Building
1000 West Street, 17th Floor
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
(302) 571-6600
apoff@ycst.com
Attorneys for Alcatel USA, Inc.

EXHIBIT B

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

- x

TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC., : CERTIFIED COPY

Plaintiff/ :

Counterclaim Defendant, :

vs. : Civil Action

LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC., :

Defendant/ : No. 04-875-GMS

Counterclaim Plaintiff. :

- x

TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC., :

Plaintiff/ :

Counterclaim Defendant, :

vs. : Civil Action

CISCO SYSTEMS INC., : No. 04-876-GMS

Defendant/ :

Counterclaim Plaintiff. : CONFIDENTIAL

- x

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, August 15, 2006

Videotaped Deposition of VINCENT C. JONES, PH.D.,

human values.

Q. Dr. Jones, did you prepare an expert report in connection with this case?

A. Yes, I did.

MR. ANZALONE: Let me ask the reporter to mark as Exhibit Jones 001 expert report of Vincent C. Jones.

(Exhibit Jones 001 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. ANZALONE:

Q. Is Exhibit Jones 001 your expert report, Dr. Jones, other than the large number of exhibits?

A. It would appear to be, yes.

Q. Who prepared Exhibit Jones 001?

A. Exhibit Jones 001 reflects my thoughts on the validity of the patent.

Q. Did you prepare it on behalf of Lucent and Cisco as well as Alcatel?

A. Yes.

Q. Who retained you in connection with this case?

MS. MEHTA: Object as to form.

A. I was retained initially by Alcatel and subsequently by Lucent and Cisco Systems.

Q. When were you retained by Alcatel?

A. I don't remember. Over a year ago.

Q. And when were you then retained by Lucent and Cisco?

A. Fairly recently, as we -- when it was determined that -- to do a joint report.

Q. Okay. How -- can you date when you were retained by Lucent and Cisco any more specifically considering this report was filed on the 28th of June 2006?

MS. MEHTA: Object, vague.

A. Not -- not right now I couldn't. It was before we worked on the -- before I worked on the report with Cisco and Alcatel, or with Cisco and Lucent.

Q. Was it more than a month before you worked on the report?

A. I don't know. It was probably on the order of weeks to a month.

EXHIBIT C

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC., Plaintiff/ Counterclaim Defendant, vs. LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC., Defendant/ Counterclaim Plaintiff.	CERTIFIED COPY Civil Action No. 04-875-GMS
TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC., Plaintiff/ Counterclaim Defendant, vs. CISCO SYSTEMS INC., Defendant/ Counterclaim Plaintiff.	Civil Action No. 04-876-GMS CONFIDENTIAL

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, August 15, 2006

Videotaped Deposition of VINCENT C. JONES, PH.D.,

not trying -- this is not of any great moment.

MR. ANZALONE: No, I understand.

THE WITNESS: I do not believe I addressed it directly in the report.

BY MR. ANZALONE:

Q. Now, are you aware that in response to your report, Telcordia filed an expert report by Dr. Clark?

A. Yes, I'm aware of that.

Q. Did you review the expert report of Dr. Clark in connection with this case?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Did you review it on behalf of Lucent and Cisco?

MS. MEHTA: Objection, vague.

A. As far as I was concerned, everything I've been doing since then has been on behalf of all three.

Q. Do you understand that the parties had an opportunity to file reply reports in this case?

MR. CHERNY: Objection, vague.

A. I'm not -- reply reports to --

Q. Respond to the expert report of Dr. Clark.

A. I believe Dr. Clark did multiple expert reports. Which one are you referring to?

Q. I'm talking about the one -- his report in response to your invalidity and unenforceability report.

MS. MEHTA: I'm sorry, and the question is -- just -- we lost track of the question there.

BY MR. ANZALONE:

Q. Did you understand that the parties had an opportunity to file reply reports in this case.

MS. MEHTA: Objection, vague.

A. No.

Q. Were you asked to prepare a reply to the Dr. Clark report?

MS. MEHTA: I'm going to object to that to the extent that it seeks privileged information.

THE WITNESS: Can I answer it?

MS. MEHTA: If you had conversations with attorneys that were not the basis for a report that might be responsive to this, I'm going to instruct you not to answer the question with respect to those

conversations.

THE WITNESS: I haven't had conversations with anybody other than attorneys with regards to this case.

BY MR. ANZALONE:

Q. Do you have an -- you understand that you did not file a reply to Dr. Clark's report in this case.

A. That is correct.

Q. Do you know why? And just answer yes, no or I don't know.

A. Do I know why?

Q. Yes. Do you personally know why?

A. Do I personally know why I did not file a report in response.

Q. That's correct.

A. Yes, I know why.

Q. Okay. What is the reason you didn't file a reply report?

MS. MEHTA: And I'm going to caution you here, if this was information that you learned from an attorney, you can't reveal that. If you have

some other information that was not learned from an attorney, then you can answer that question.

A. I wasn't asked to generate a reply.

Q. Okay. Were you asked to prepare a report on whether either Lucent products or Cisco products infringe any of the claims of the '633 patent?

A. No.

Q. Do you know why you were not asked?

MS. MEHTA: Same caution. If there's any information that you may have learned from a lawyer, don't disclose that. Otherwise you can answer.

A. I have no idea.

Q. How many times have you had an opportunity to read through Exhibit Jones 001, your expert report?

MS. MEHTA: Objection, vague.

A. I'm not sure -- you know, when you say read through, do you mean just glance over it? Do you mean read it thoroughly?

Q. Read it thoroughly.

MS. MEHTA: Still vague.

A. As many as I wanted.