Exhibit A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN RE: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	)	CA 04-01592
	)	Boston, MA
PATENT LITIGATION	)	September 9, 2004
	)	

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARK L. WOLF
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
TELEPHONE CONFERENCE

APPEARANCES:

(As previously noted.)

JUDITH A. TWOMEY, RPR
Official Court Reporter
One Courthouse Way
Courtroom 10-Room 5200
Boston, MA 02210
(617)946-2577

saying that I'm attempting to resurrect their case. I'm talking about a pattern of misuse of a patent to obtain financial gain that is -- was improper. And, only now, after causing everyone to spend boat loads of money to try to preserve these licenses, Columbia has decided to change its mind about terminating licenses, evidently, although we're not even sure about that. But there is some pretty clear law that supports the proposition that those fees that were incurred can be recovered as damages, not merely as fees under these circumstances.

So those are the kinds of claims that we would be supplementing our complaint to assert.

THE COURT: Well, you'd have to move for leave to amend it, and then I'd have to decide if that's contested and, if it's contested, whether the interests of justice make it appropriate.

MR. WARE: Yes, I was only going to say it would be -- I think there's a somewhat different standard for supplementation as opposed to amending to bring to light facts that occurred after the filing of the original complaint. But, in any event, yes, that is certainly true. The existing complaint, however, does have a count in the complaint asking the court to determine that no royalties would be owed on the '275 patent because that patent is invalid.