AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION

BLUEBERRY SOFTWARE INC.)
Claimant, v. PARAMETRIC TECHNOLOGY CORP.	 AAA No: 54 180 Y 01325 06 Case Manager: Hannah R. Cook Arbitrator: Kathryn J. Humphrey
Respondent.)))

Blueberry's Reply to Parametric's Supplemental Response Introduction

Parametric makes two points in it's response to Blueberry's supplemental submission. Point number one (1) makes the case for applying judgment according to FRCP rules (b) (6) and FRCP 56 and restates Parametric's logic regarding Fraudulent Concealment. Point number two (2) attempts to trivialize Blueberry's inability to proceed with its audit, characterizing it as a partnership disagreement. Both of these points are in error.

1. Parametric's claims for applying FRCP rules 12(b)(6) and 56.

In Section one (1) of Parametric's response, they claim that they are entitled to Judgment under FRCP 12(b) (6) and FRCP 56. In fact, Parametric is not entitled to Judgment under either of these FRCP rules. Parametric's arguments all relate to being in a court of law governed by the FRCP rules. Arbitration is not a court of law governed by FRCP rules.

If Arbortext had wanted and expected the FRCP to control any dispute between the parties, as drafters of the contract, they should never have required Arbitration. But they did. Therefore, this proceeding is governed by the AAA rules. Matters under

Arbitration are NOT covered by the FRCP. Parametric cited NO case to support its major argument that Rules 12 (b) (6) and 56 may be applied to matters in Arbitration. If Arbitrators were meant to address dispositive motions, there would be either rules to address these circumstances in the AAA rules themselves or a reference, perhaps to use the FRCP "when necessary." That is not the case.

2. Parametric's characterization of Blueberry's evidence submissions.

In Section two (2) of Parametric's response, Parametric implies that Blueberry was asked by this Arbitrator to submit an Order of the Court that precluded Blueberry from conducting an Audit of Arbortext. This is inaccurate. In the April 4, 2007 conference call, Blueberry made it clear to both the Arbitrator and Parametric's Counsel that no such Court Order existed. Blueberry stated that it was precluded from performing an Audit because Arbortext put pressure on a former Blueberry partner and the Court Appointed Receiver to force Blueberry to accept a buyout and not perform an Audit. Parametric also states that Blueberry did not submit any communication or direction from the Court. However, it is clear from the previously submitted Exhibits that the Receiver, Dick Blair was actively communicating with the Court and sought direction from the Court. Additionally, the Exhibits show that the Receiver also demanded at one point, despite permission from the Judge to proceed with the Audit, that Blueberry stop the Audit until the matter could be revisited yet again with Judge Jensen.

This was not merely a partnership disagreement, as Parametric characterizes it, but a concerted effort, initiated and sustained by Arbortext for over a year, to use a Court appointed Receiver to force a buyout upon Blueberry against its wishes in an effort to prevent an Audit and afterwards, to prevent the possibility of Arbitration. Even after the

first draft of the Audit Report was released in January of 2005, before the Final Report was issued in March of 2005, Arbortext still tried to get Blueberry to accept a buyout and once again brought the matter up with the Receiver, Dick Blair [EXHIBIT 1].

Afterwards, Blueberry had to engage in discussions over a period of several months with the Receiver, Blueberry's ex-partner and his attorney and explain and reiterate it's stance as to why Blueberry did not want to accept a buyout.

Parametric states that Blueberry did not have to perform an Audit and should have proceeded to Arbitration in a timely manner. Blueberry could not take any action without the tacit approval of the Receiver who reported to Judge Jensen. Blueberry is still in the Court's jurisdiction and is required to report the results of this Arbitration to the Receiver and the Court.

As for the issue of Fraudulent Concealment, Blueberry has presented ample evidence, which Parametric either chooses to ignore or mischaracterize. The existence of the Arbortext product Intermarket is a fact which reasonable minds cannot differ on. Yet Arbortext, and now Parametric, still continue to deny its existence, to conceal it. The evidence that the License Key Database does not in any way correspond to the Royalty Report or the Sales Database is also a fact which reasonable minds cannot differ on. These facts were discovered in February of this year in the Working Papers of Mark Robinson of Plante & Moran and presented by Blueberry to the Arbitrator and to Parametric.

Additionally, in January of 2006, nine months before Blueberry filed for Arbitration, Blueberry began to receive royalties from Parametric for a product called "Arbortext Architect". Parametric has previously stated that there were product name

changes on the Royalty Reports they issued, however this particular product's name has not changed and Blueberry never received any royalties for this product previously.

When Blueberry began to examine this product, after receiving royalties for it from Parametric, it was clear that Blueberry's technology was indeed involved. This Covered Product was concealed from Blueberry for nearly six years and only discovered by Blueberry in January of 2006 [EXHIBIT 2—Royalty Report from Parametric].

Conclusion

The contract between Arbortext/Parametric and Blueberry requires that

Arbitration under the American Arbitration Association rules shall be the forum to settle
disputes. When Blueberry initially filed for Arbitration, it was with the understanding
that as Discovery was performed, there would be the possibility of adding to the claim.

While it is true that Blueberry only later introduced Fraudulent Concealment to its claim,
it was because some Discovery had occurred and Parametric had introduced its "Motion
to Dismiss." It is unfortunate that these matters could not have been resolved prior to
Parametric's acquisition of Arbortext however, this is due solely to Arbortext's failure to
honor the contract clause that required Blueberry to be informed before an Acquisition
took place. Blueberry requests that Parametric's Motion to Dismiss be denied and that
this matter proceed to a full Arbitration hearing.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: May 3, 2007

Mary/Tarantino

Blueberry Software, Inc.

P.O. Box 271235

Concord, CA 94527

(925) 798-4376



1876 NORTH CALIFORNIA BOULEVARD. SUITE 200 WAENUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596-4137 925-937-3800 925-943,1108 FAX www.mmblow.com

> RICHARD G. BLAIR doiair@mmblaw.com

January 2, 2005

VIA FACSIMILE

Steven Beigel 995 Court Lane Concord, CA 94518 Kevin Dwan 7244 Wilton Avenue Sebastopol, CA 95472

Re:

Blueberry Software Receivership

Our File No. 9512-001

Dear Steve and Kevin:

Attached is a transcription of a voicemail which David Peralta left today. I subsequently called him and briefly confirmed the voicemail.

I've also had a brief conversation with Claudia Rast, and she advises that there is a need for further audit work, and that the work may be completed by the end of next week.

Hopefully, we will be in a position, by the following week, to begin to make some judgments regarding the result of the audit and the wisdom of negotiating a buy-out with Arbortext. Obviously, a quantification of the results of the audit comes first.

Have a Happy New Year.

Very truly yours,

MORGAN MILLER BLAIR

RICHARD G. BLAIR

RGB:sn Encl.

cc:

Lawrence Bernheim w/encl.

Kenneth Pritikin w/encl. Claudia Rast, Esq. w/encl.

MMB: 9512-001:384585:1

Exhibit 1
Page 1 of 2 pages



MEMORANDUM

TO:

FILE/RGB

9512-001

VM FROM:

DAVE PERALTA

DATE:

January 2, 2005

RE:

Beigel v. Dwan Receivership

SUBJECT:

ARBORTEXT

Hi Dick, this is Dave Peralta from Arbortext. It's Tuesday the 28th. I understand your office is closed but hope you had a good Christmas holiday and hope you enjoy the New Year holiday as well. I'm in today, tomorrow and Thursday, so if you do pick up messages or if you're in, feel free to give me a call.

I was phoning you for, I guess, to kind of tell you where we're at in terms of the Blueberry arrangement. I mean, as it stands right now the audit has been completed for about a month now. They issued us a preliminary report just for feedback. They sent it to us and the Blueberry's attorney and I sent some small feedback back to the auditor. But in general, they basically indicated that everything had been done properly assuming the certain interpretation of the Agreement and they indicated that if two areas were interpreted differently, basically how you handle our E-3 revenue, and how you handle maintenance revenue, then additional royalties may be due. I think and our attorneys think that the two areas of interpretation are quite clear and cortainly they haven't been disputed by Blueberry in the past so, from all I can ascertain the audit report was clean. So that leaves us in terms of the future, and we're at the point where we're gonna move to a new technology provided, to provide us what we need for the Blueberry code. And, we're gonna, I guess I'm interested in discussing with you, kinda one last chance to buy out Blueberry as we'd previously proposed to avoid any ill feelings or, you know, distraction on both sides going forward. But, absent our very near term decision on their part to accept a reasonable proposal, we're just gonna move forward and I think in relatively short order, their royalties stream will start to diminish. So if you could, please give me a call to discuss and I guess we can talk through how we might be successful in moving forward amicably. Thanks, Dick. My number is: 734-327-6859. Take care.

돚	
Д	8
Proyatity	8

PKG-7106-F. Abortest Architect PKG-7106-F. Arbortest Architect PKG-7106-F. Arbortest Architect PKG-7106-F. Arbortest Architect PKG-7106-F. Arbortest Architect DKG-7106-F. Arbortest Architect
urbovisor Architect Arborleat Architect
Arbortext Architect
Anborest Archiect Arborest Archiect
ITEM DESCREPTION Arbortext Publishing Engine - 1 Yr Term
TEM DESCRIPTION Adotext Publishing Engine

	3	I, the undersigned, certify and declare as follows:			
	4 5	I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of eighteen years. I am not a party to this action. I am employed in the county where the delivery described below occurs and my business address is 1300 Clay Street, Suite 1000, Oakland, California 94612.			
	6	Oı	n the date indicated below, I caused to	to be served the following document(s):	
	. 7	BLUEBERRY'S REPLY TO PARAMETRIC'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE			
	8	·			
	9	On the following party(ies) in this action:			
	10 A. Michael Palizzi, Esq. Hannah R. Co			Hannah R. Cook	
K. Spano, Esq.		Esq. infield, Paddock & Stone, PLC	American Arbitration Association-Northeast Case Management Center		
	12 150 West Jefferson, Ste. 2500 95		Jefferson, Ste. 2500	950 Warren Avenue East Providence, RI 02914	
•	13	,	645 (direct)	Toll Free: 866-293-4053	
	1 / 11		Direct Dial: (401) 431-4708 Facsimile: (401) 435-6529		
	15				
	16	As follows	s:		
	17		BY MAIL (CCP §§ 1013A, et seq.)	•	
ί,	I am readily familiar with the practice of my employer for the col correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service, by placed, in a sealed envelope, postage prepaid, in the designated station the same day delivered to the United States Postal Service. I served			Inited States Postal Service, by which correspondence is repaid, in the designated station for outgoing mail, and is	
	20		the same day delivered to the United states this practice.	States Postal Service. I served such envelopes following	
	21		BY HAND DELIVERY/PERSONAL SERVICE (CCP §§ 1011, et seq.) I caused said envelopes to be personally served.		
	22 23		BY EXPRESS SERVICE (CCP §§ 1913 (c)(d), et seq.) I caused said envelopes to be deposited with an express service carrier or Express Mail in accordance with the carrier's designated practice.		
	24	BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION BY MARY TARANTINO			
	25 26	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing			
	27	is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on May 3, 2007 at Oakland, California.			
LAW OFFICES			Lynne Anderson		
& HUGHES L	LP (\POS)				
SUITE 1000	0	PROOF OF SERVICE			
OAKLAND, CA S					

PROOF OF SERVICE

1