

# **EXHIBIT O**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____	)	
HÅKAN LANS,	)	Case No. 97-2523 (JGP)
	)	Case No. 97-2526 (JGP)
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
GATEWAY 2000, INC., and DELL	)	
COMPUTER CORP.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	
UNIBOARD AKTIEBOLAG,	)	Case No. 99-3153 (JGP)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b>DECLARATION OF DR. BERTIL</b>
	)	<b>GRENNBERG SUPPORTING</b>
v.	)	<b>MOTION OF HÅKAN LANS AND</b>
	)	<b>UNIBOARD AKTIEBOLAG FOR</b>
ACER AMERICA CORP., et al.,	)	<b>RECONSIDERATION OF THE</b>
	)	<b>COURTS SEPTEMBER 6, 2001</b>
Defendants.	)	<b>ORDER CONCERNING</b>
_____	)	<b>ATTORNEY FEES</b>

I, Dr. Bertil Grennberg, declare as follows:

1. I currently reside in, and am a citizen of, Sweden and have been asked to submit this affidavit regarding factual issues related to the above captioned matter. Unless otherwise indicated below, the averments contained in this affidavit are based on my personal knowledge. I make this affidavit in support of the motion of Håkan Lans and Uniboard Aktiebolag for reconsideration of the Courts September 6, 2001 Order concerning attorney fees.

2. I have a doctorate degree in physics and, until my retirement, I was a patent attorney with the firm Albihns Patentbyrå ("Albihns") of Stockholm, Sweden. One of my clients during my tenure at Albihns was Dr. Håkan Lans.

3. I, along with Dr. Rechtsanwalt Pietzcker, represented Dr. Lans in a German proceeding against Hitachi involving European Patent 0 023 217 (German Patent 30 63 711). It is my understanding that that patent is the European counterpart to United States Patent No. 4,303,986 (“the ‘986 patent”) that is the subject of this litigation.

4. Dr. Lans owned the European patent and he began investigating whether Hitachi was infringing it. Normally, I would have advised Dr. Lans to assign the patent to a limited company before undertaking any action that might result in litigation. However, Dr. Lans had secured an investor to fund any potential litigation so the only risk personally to Dr. Lans was that the patent might be declared invalid.

5. Dr. Lans’s investigation of Hitachi caused Hitachi to initiate an invalidity proceeding in Germany. Unfortunately, halfway through the process against Hitachi, the investor that Dr. Lans had secured to fund the litigation went bankrupt. The financial failure of the investor caused numerous difficulties in defending the action but we continued and reached a satisfactory settlement with Hitachi.

6. I understand that Mr. Mastriani claims that Dr. Lans insisted on commencing litigation in the U.S. in his own name rather than in the name of his company Uniboard. This is completely inconsistent with every conversation I have had with Dr. Lans over many years. The Hitachi litigation made Dr. Lans adamant that he would not initiate litigation in his own name.

7. I understand that Mr. Mastriani claims that he and I were at a meeting where we discussed the ownership of the ‘986 patent. I have met with Mr. Mastriani only once, at a date before any litigation regarding the ‘986 patent was started. He and Dr. Lans came to our office at Albihns in Stockholm. I explained to Mr. Mastriani the facts and legal issues that arose in the

German litigation and gave my opinion as to the merits of Hitachi's claim. I have no memory of any discussion on ownership of the patent at that meeting.

8. I understand that on February 17, 1997, Dr. Lans sent a fax to Mr. Mastriani which stated that Dr. Lans had signed a document that I had sent him to record the transfer of the '86 patent from him to Uniboard. Dr. Lans also stated that he returned the form to me so that I could forward it to Mr. Mastriani. At the time that the fax was written, I was working at AlbiHns where I certainly would have had access to an appropriate form to record an assignment of the patent from Dr. Lans to his company, Uniboard. I do not remember sending Dr. Lans such a form, or whether I forwarded such a form to Mr. Mastriani, but that does not mean that I did not do so. It would have been a small, routine office matter for me so it is not surprising that I would not recall it, especially since I was not involved in the proposed litigation.

9. I also understand that Mr. Mastriani claims to have called me regarding the February 17, 1997, fax from Dr. Lans. I have absolutely no recollection of such a telephone call. Furthermore, if we had discussed the ownership of the '86 patent during such a call, I would have very strongly urged Mastriani not to initiate litigation in Dr. Lans's personal capacity but instead to transfer the patent to some form of limited liability entity. It is likely that I would remember such a phone call if it had occurred.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing facts are true and correct.

Executed on this 16th day of March 2005, in Uppsala, Sweden.

  
Dr. Bertil Grennberg