

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
JACKSONVILLE DIVISION

PARKERVISION, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 3:11-cv-719-J-37-TEM

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED,

Counterclaim Plaintiff,

v.

PARKERVISION, INC., and
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

*Counterclaim
Defendants.*

SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF JOSEPH E. LASHER

I, Joseph E. Lasher, declare pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 that:

1. I am an attorney admitted pro hac vice before this Court and an associate of the law firm of Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP, counsel for defendant Qualcomm Incorporated in this action.

2. I make this supplemental declaration in support of Qualcomm's Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Qualcomm's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction against Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox LLP.

3. Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of a letter from Alex Rogers to Michael Ray, dated August 16, 2011.

4. Attached hereto as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of a letter from Michael Ray to Alex Rogers, dated August 25, 2011.

5. Attached hereto as Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of a letter from David Greenwald to David Wells, dated October 18, 2011.

6. Attached hereto as Exhibit 4 is a true and correct copy of a letter from David Wells to David Greenwald, dated October 24, 2011.

7. Attached hereto as Exhibit 5 is a true and correct copy of a letter from David Greenwald to David Wells, dated October 27, 2011.

8. Attached hereto as Exhibit 6 is a true and correct copy of a web page entitled "Sterne Kessler: Services: Litigation & Appeals," available at <http://www.skf.com/services.php?ServiceID=14> (last accessed December 5, 2011).

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on December 7, 2011



Joseph E. Lasher

Exhibit 1



5775 Morehouse Drive, San Diego, California 92121-2779

Alexander H. Rogers
Senior Vice President
Legal Counsel
arogers@qualcomm.com
(858) 651-5861
Fax: (858) 845-1249

VIA FACSIMILE AND FEDERAL EXPRESS

August 16, 2011

Michael B. Ray, Esq.
Sterne Kessler Goldstein Fox
1100 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005
(Facsimile: 202-371-2540)

Dear Mike,

I was very disappointed to receive your call on August 1, 2011, informing me that your firm ("SKGF") wishes to withdraw from representing us in the ongoing, confidential matters you are currently handling. I am writing to confirm my statement to you during that call that Qualcomm does not consent to SKGF's withdrawal from those matters. The confidential matters SKGF is handling for Qualcomm are ongoing and not close to completion. Particularly in light of their present posture, withdrawal would be highly prejudicial to Qualcomm for the foreseeable future, as would be the loss of the opportunity to draw in the future upon the knowledge we have helped you and your colleagues develop through your work on the several matters on which we have retained you over the course of the past year. As I stated in our call, we view this as a long-term relationship. In the past, with respect to prosecution matters, Qualcomm and SKGF had a relationship that lasted many years.

I am also concerned that the timing and nature of your request suggest it may be motivated by SKGF's desire to assist Parkervision in its recently filed patent infringement suit against Qualcomm (the "Florida Action"). That suit charges Qualcomm with infringement of seven patents that SKGF prosecuted on behalf of Parkervision, a corporation that your partner, Robert Sterne, has long served as a director. We note that any assistance SKGF provides to Parkervision or its attorneys in suing Qualcomm, a current SKGF client, would, in our view, conflict with SKGF's duty of loyalty to Qualcomm. *See* Fl. Rules of Prof. Conduct 4-1.7 and commentary ("Ordinarily, a lawyer may not act as an advocate against a client the lawyer represents in some other matter, even if the other matter is wholly unrelated."); Ca. Rules of Prof. Conduct 3-310(c); D.C. Rules of Prof. Conduct 1.7. If your recent request to withdraw from the



Page 2

ongoing matters you are handling for Qualcomm is influenced by SKGF's desire to serve Parkervision in this lawsuit or other action against Qualcomm, the request is improper. *E.g.*, D.C. Legal Ethics Committee Op. 272 (1997) ("we also strongly agree that the important values of client loyalty and confidence of the public in the bar preclude an interpretation of the rules that would enable a lawyer or law firm to abandon a client during an active representation in anticipation of pursuing another, perhaps more lucrative, conflicting representation.").

Because of our concerns in these regards, we are asking SKGF:

(i) to state whether any present or former SKGF attorney or patent agent has devoted any time to advising or assisting Parkervision or its counsel, including Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbank & Gilchrist, and Smith Hulsey & Busey, in any way in connection with the analysis, preparation, filing, or litigation of the Florida action, and, if so, who those SKGF individuals are and how many hours they have devoted to such efforts;

(ii) to confirm that no present or former SKGF attorney or patent agent will devote any time in the future to advising or assisting Parkervision or its counsel in any way in connection with the analysis, preparation, filing or litigation of the Florida action;

(iii) to identify all the present or former SKGF attorneys or patent agents who assisted Parkervision in the prosecution of the Parkervision patents-in-suit (or any related patents), and to indicate whether those attorneys or patent agents had recorded time in connection with any Qualcomm matter prior to or during their work for Parkervision in prosecuting those patents;

(iv) to state whether any SKGF attorneys or patent agents who assisted Parkervision in the prosecution of the patents-in-suit (or any related patents) were in possession of any information concerning Qualcomm products prior to or during their work for Parkervision in prosecuting those patents;

(v) to state whether Robert Sterne participated in Parkervision board discussions concerning the initiation of the Florida Action, and whether he recused himself from any vote on the same;

(vi) to state whether SKGF possesses shares of Parkervision; and



Page 3

(vii) to state whether SKGF is entitled to a share of any recoveries from enforcement of the patents-in-suit in the Florida Action.

We believe that we are entitled to this information, in accordance with D.C. Rule of Prof. Conduct 1.4(a) and (b). Please let us know by the end of next week.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alex Rogers". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Alex Rogers
Senior Vice President, Legal Counsel
QUALCOMM Incorporated

Exhibit 2



MICHAEL B. RAY
DIRECTOR
(202) 772-8569
MRAY@SKGF.COM

August 25, 2011

Alexander H. Rogers, Esquire
Senior Vice President, Legal Counsel
Qualcomm Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-2779

Via Email
arogers@qualcomm.com
(Confirmation copy via Federal Express)

Dear Alex:

I write in response to your letter of August 16, 2011. We value our relationship with Qualcomm, and I can report to you as follows.

Sterne, Kessler will continue to work on and complete the on-going matters that it is currently handling for Qualcomm and will not seek to terminate its representation of Qualcomm. The terms of our continued work for you will remain unchanged and will be as outlined in my August 6, 2010, letter to you and in my September 28, 2010, letter to John Scott ("Representation Letters").

With respect to the litigation recently brought by ParkerVision against Qualcomm, we recognize that we have on-going attorney-client relationships with both ParkerVision and Qualcomm. We further recognize that the terms of the Representation Letters do not provide consent for Sterne Kessler to represent clients adverse to Qualcomm in litigation, if the firm is concurrently representing Qualcomm.

Accordingly, Sterne Kessler will not enter its appearance or otherwise act as counsel for ParkerVision in the pending Florida matter or any related litigation between Qualcomm and ParkerVision. We will not advise ParkerVision or its litigation counsel regarding the Florida matter or any other litigation with Qualcomm. These commitments will remain in place so long as Qualcomm remains a firm client.

As you note, it is a matter of record that Sterne Kessler prosecuted the patents in suit in the Florida matter. Our firm therefore may be called upon by either party in that litigation to provide relevant documents, information or testimony regarding our past work on such patents. We view such a role to be consistent with our ethical obligations. In addition, we may act on behalf of ParkerVision or other clients in non-litigation matters concerning Qualcomm as authorized by the advance waivers in the Representation Letters.


I wish to assure you that Sterne Kessler is not a stockholder in ParkerVision and has no financial stake in the outcome of the Florida matter. Beyond that, our obligations of

Alexander H. Rogers, Esquire
August 25, 2011
Page 2

confidentiality under District of Columbia Rule of Professional Conduct 1.6 make it improper for us to respond further to the inquiries contained in your letter.

We look forward to working with you to complete the outstanding projects for which you have engaged us. New assignments from Qualcomm, like any new assignment from an existing client, will continue to be subject to conflicts checking, other applicable ethical requirements and firm intake policies.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "MBR", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael B. Ray

MBR/agj
1408161_1.DOCX

Exhibit 3

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP

WORLDWIDE PLAZA
825 EIGHTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10019-7475

TELEPHONE: (212) 474-1000
FACSIMILE: (212) 474-3700

CITYPOINT
ONE ROPEMAKER STREET
LONDON EC2Y 9HR
TELEPHONE: 44-20-7453-1000
FACSIMILE: 44-20-7860-1150

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

(212) 474-1922

THOMAS E. DUNN
MARK I. GREENE
SARKIS JEBEJIAN
DAVID R. MARRIOTT
MICHAEL A. PASKIN
ANDREW J. PITTS
MICHAEL T. REYNOLDS
ANTONY L. RYAN
GEORGE E. ZOBITZ
GEORGE A. STEPANAKIS
DARIN P. MCATEE
GARY A. BORNSTEIN
TIMOTHY G. CAMERON
KARIN A. DEMASI
LIZABETHANN R. EISEN
DAVID S. FINKELSTEIN
DAVID GREENWALD
RACHEL G. SKAISTIS
PAUL H. ZUMBRO
JOEL F. HEROLD
ERIC W. HILFERS
GEORGE F. SCHOEN
ERIK R. TAVZEL

CRAIG F. ARCELLA
TEENA-ANN V. SANKOORIKAL
ANDREW R. THOMPSON
DAMIEN R. ZOUBEK
LAUREN ANGELILLI
TATIANA LAPUSHCHIK
ERIC L. SCHIELE
ALYSSA K. CAPLES
JENNIFER S. CONWAY
MINH VAN NGO
KEVIN J. ORSINI
MATTHEW MORREALE

SPECIAL COUNSEL
SAMUEL C. BUTLER
GEORGE J. GILLESPIE, III

OF COUNSEL
PAUL C. SAUNDERS

ALLEN FINKELSON
STUART W. GOLD
JOHN W. WHITE
EVAN R. CHESLER
MICHAEL L. SCHLER
RICHARD LEVIN
KRIS F. HEINZELMAN
B. ROBBINS KIESSLING
ROGER D. TURNER
PHILIP A. GELSTON
RORY O. MILLSON
RICHARD W. CLARY
WILLIAM P. ROGERS, JR.
JAMES D. COOPER
STEPHEN L. GORDON
DANIEL L. MOSLEY
PETER S. WILSON
JAMES C. VARDELL, III
ROBERT H. BARON
KEVIN J. GREHAN
STEPHEN S. MADSEN
C. ALLEN PARKER
MARC S. ROSENBERG

SUSAN WEBSTER
DAVID MERCADO
ROWAN D. WILSON
CHRISTINE A. VARNEY
PETER T. BARBUR
SANDRA C. GOLDSTEIN
THOMAS G. RAFFERTY
MICHAEL S. GOLDMAN
RICHARD HALL
JULIE A. NORTH
ANDREW W. NEEDHAM
STEPHEN L. BURNS
KEITH R. HUMMEL
DANIEL SLIFKIN
JEFFREY A. SMITH
ROBERT I. TOWNSEND, III
WILLIAM J. WHELAN, III
SCOTT A. BARSHAY
PHILIP J. BOECKMAN
ROGER G. BROOKS
WILLIAM V. FOGG
FAIZA J. SAEED
RICHARD J. STARK

October 18, 2011

ParkerVision v. Qualcomm
Sterne Kessler

Dear Messrs. Mason and Wells:

We write in response to your October 14, 2011 letter, informing Qualcomm that Sterne Kessler is withdrawing from its representation of Qualcomm. We disagree very strongly with your assertion that Sterne Kessler's work on one of the two ongoing opinion projects for which Qualcomm retained Sterne Kessler last year is complete. As your client will appreciate, opinion work by its very nature requires continuing availability to assist the client in pending/future litigation after the opinions are rendered. And in one of the two ongoing matters, Sterne Kessler has not even completed its opinion, even though Qualcomm devoted substantial resources to educating Sterne Kessler attorneys about the subject matter of the relevant patent. Accordingly, neither of the two engagements your letter references has concluded.


Your letter seems to complain that Sterne Kessler was somehow victimized by Qualcomm's initiation of legal action to protect its legal rights, and that it was misled by Mr. Rogers's comment that Qualcomm had viewed its relationship with Sterne Kessler as long term. Qualcomm did intend to have a long-term relationship with Sterne Kessler. Mr. Rogers made that clear when Mr. Ray first called in early August to terminate Sterne Kessler's attorney-client relationship with Qualcomm, an effort Mr. Ray backed away from after Mr. Rogers pointed out to him in his August 16 letter that such a termination would violate the "hot potato" rule. That relationship would have indeed lasted longer had Sterne Kessler not taken action to harm its own client, Qualcomm, in violation of its duty of loyalty, and had it not also refused to provide satisfactory answers to questions that still remain unanswered, in violation of that firm's duty of candor.

But your letter raises still another question: does Sterne Kessler intend to assist ParkerVision in any way in its litigation against Qualcomm? In the absence of an

unequivocal disavowal of any intent to assist ParkerVision in its litigation with Qualcomm, we will seek to enjoin Sterne Kessler from providing such assistance to ParkerVision. We fail to see how a current client's decision to seek legal redress for prior and, to date, undisputed breaches of fiduciary duty by its law firm, can justify that firm in not only dropping that client, but actively assisting the very client (here, ParkerVision) that the "hot potato" rule would forbid assisting.

Without agreeing that Sterne Kessler's withdrawal is ethically "obligat[ed]," we hereby request the immediate return of all documents and copies thereof (including electronic copies) relating to its various representations of Qualcomm. We are concerned that Sterne Kessler's retention of that material while it continues to represent ParkerVision could compromise the duty of confidentiality that Sterne Kessler owes Qualcomm regardless of whether Qualcomm is a present or former client of that firm.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Greenwald", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

David Greenwald

Thomas B. Mason
Zuckerman Spaeder LLP
1800 M Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20036-5802

David M. Wells
Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A.
225 Water Street, Suite 1750
Jacksonville, FL 32202-5185

Exhibit 4



GUNSTER

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Our File Number: 33786.00001
Writer's Direct Dial Number: 904-350-7170
Writer's E-Mail Address: dwells@gunster.com

October 24, 2011

David Greenwald, Esq.
Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP
Worldwide Plaza
825 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY, 10019-7475

Re: **ParkerVision, Inc. v. Qualcomm Incorporated,**
Case No.: 3:11-CV-719-J-37-JBT,
U.S.D.C., Middle District of Florida ("Lawsuit")

Dear Mr. Greenwald:

We represent Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox P.L.L.C. ("SKGF") relating to the Lawsuit. Please direct all further communications regarding this matter to me.

I am responding to your letter of October 18, 2011. Qualcomm's actions in suing SKGF asserting that SKGF engaged in inequitable and other wrongful conduct requires SKGF to defend itself. SKGF stands by its letter of October 14, 2011 and will address Qualcomm's claims in its defense of the Lawsuit.

SKGF is not representing ParkerVision, Inc. ("ParkerVision") with respect to the patent infringement claims that ParkerVision is prosecuting against Qualcomm, nor regarding Parker Vision's defense of the counter-claim Qualcomm filed against ParkerVision. Qualcomm chose to sue SKGF as part of the Lawsuit between it and ParkerVision. It is unfortunate that Qualcomm has taken this action. SKGF, as is its right, will defend itself in the Lawsuit and will do so vigorously and in an ethical manner.

SKGF is in the process of gathering its files relating to its past representation of Qualcomm, and we will be in touch later this week to discuss logistics and process for making those files available to Qualcomm.

Sincerely,

David M. Wells

DMW/lah

Exhibit 5

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP

WORLDWIDE PLAZA
825 EIGHTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10019-7475

TELEPHONE: (212) 474-1000
FACSIMILE: (212) 474-3700

CITYPOINT
ONE ROPEMAKER STREET
LONDON EC2Y 9HR
TELEPHONE: 44-20-7453-1000
FACSIMILE: 44-20-7860-1150

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

(212) 474-1922

THOMAS E. DUNN
MARK I. GREENE
SARKIS JEBEJIAN
DAVID R. MARRIOTT
MICHAEL A. PASKIN
ANDREW J. PITTS
MICHAEL T. REYNOLDS
ANTONY L. RYAN
GEORGE E. ZOBITZ
GEORGE A. STEPHANAKIS
DARIN P. MCATEE
GARY A. BORNSTEIN
TIMOTHY G. CAMERON
KARIN A. DEMASI
LIZABETHANN R. EISEN
DAVID S. FINKELSTEIN
DAVID GREENWALD
RACHEL G. SKAISTIS
PAUL H. ZUMBRO
JOEL F. HEROLD
ERIC W. HILFERS
GEORGE F. SCHOEN
ERIK R. TAVZEL

CRAIG F. ARCELLA
TEENA-ANN V. SANKOORIKAL
ANDREW R. THOMPSON
DAMIEN R. ZOUBEK
LAUREN ANGELILLI
TATIANA LAPUSHCHIK
ERIC L. SCHIELE
ALYSSA K. CAPLES
JENNIFER S. CONWAY
MINH VAN NGO
KEVIN J. ORSINI
MATTHEW MORREALE

SPECIAL COUNSEL
SAMUEL C. BUTLER
GEORGE J. GILLESPIE, III

OF COUNSEL
PAUL C. SAUNDERS

ALLEN FINKELSON
STUART W. GOLD
JOHN W. WHITE
EVAN R. CHESLER
MICHAEL L. SCHLER
RICHARD LEVIN
KRIS F. HEINZELMAN
B. ROBBINS KIESSLING
ROGER D. TURNER
PHILIP A. GELSTON
RORY O. MILLSON
RICHARD W. CLARY
WILLIAM P. ROGERS, JR.
JAMES D. COOPER
STEPHEN L. GORDON
DANIEL L. MOSLEY
PETER S. WILSON
JAMES C. VARDELL, III
ROBERT H. BARON
KEVIN J. GREHAN
STEPHEN S. MADSEN
C. ALLEN PARKER
MARC S. ROSENBERG

SUSAN WEBSTER
DAVID MERCADO
ROWAN D. WILSON
CHRISTINE A. VARNEY
PETER T. BARBUR
SANDRA C. GOLDSTEIN
THOMAS G. RAFFERTY
MICHAEL S. GOLDMAN
RICHARD HALL
JULIE A. NORTH
ANDREW W. NEEDHAM
STEPHEN L. BURNS
KEITH R. HUMMEL
DANIEL SLIFKIN
JEFFREY A. SMITH
ROBERT I. TOWNSEND, III
WILLIAM J. WHELAN, III
SCOTT A. BARSHAY
PHILIP J. BOECKMAN
ROGER G. BROOKS
WILLIAM V. FOGG
FAIZA J. SAEED
RICHARD J. STARK

October 27, 2011

ParkerVision v. Qualcomm
Sterne Kessler

Dear Mr. Wells:

Thank you for your October 25 letter. Unfortunately, the letter does not answer many of the questions Qualcomm has been asking Sterne Kessler for some time now and raises some new ones. Sterne Kessler's steadfast silence gives us no choice but to conclude that it has breached its ethical obligations to Qualcomm. If we are mistaken, we simply do not understand why Sterne Kessler does not promptly clear up the record. I appreciate that you are new to this matter, but Qualcomm needs complete answers to its questions in very short order.

In particular, in your October 25 letter, you state only that "SKGF is not representing ParkerVision with respect to the patent infringement claims that ParkerVision is prosecuting against Qualcomm, nor regarding ParkerVision's defense of the counterclaim Qualcomm filed against ParkerVision." In my October 18 letter, I had asked whether "Sterne Kessler intend[s] to assist ParkerVision in any way in its litigation against Qualcomm?" Your letter is silent about Sterne Kessler's future intention to assist ParkerVision in the pending action, and about whether Sterne Kessler considers itself, by virtue of its recent withdrawal from representation of Qualcomm, free to provide such assistance in the future. I also cannot tell from your letter whether you understand "representation" to mean something narrower than "assistance." I had asked about "assistance" because any assistance by Sterne Kessler, including behind-the-scenes assistance, would be subject to the ethical principles regulating conflicts of interest, and enjoined under those principles. Your response seems to be carefully worded to avoid answering whether Sterne Kessler believes it now has the right in the Florida litigation to assist ParkerVision in the broadest sense.

I also note that Qualcomm has still not received answers to many of the questions Alex Rogers posed to Michael Ray on August 16, including, notably, "whether

any present or former SKGF attorney or patent agent has devoted any time to advising or assisting ParkerVision or its counsel . . . in any way in connection with the analysis, preparation, filing, or litigation of the Florida act, and, if so, who those SKGF individuals are and how many hours they devoted to such efforts.”

Please provide us with responses to these and the other unanswered questions in Alex Rogers’s August 16 letter before November 3.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Greenwald", written in a cursive style.

David Greenwald

David M. Wells
Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A.
225 Water Street, Suite 1750
Jacksonville, FL 32202-5185

Exhibit 6



skgf services

litigation & appeals

Choosing the right trial team is a critical decision in any litigation, but it's particularly important in a patent lawsuit because of the inherent complexity of the subject matter. Here's why Sterne Kessler is the right choice:

We've worked in your industry so we understand your business.

With 50 PhDs on staff—and scientific and engineering credentials wide and deep enough to staff the faculty of a science-oriented university—SKGF can grasp even the most complex technology and scientific issues. In an ongoing effort to keep our bench of technical expertise on the leading edge, we're always actively recruiting “the best and the brightest” attorneys and agents specifically for their industry experience.

We know the law.

We're specialists and recognized experts in intellectual property law—that's all we do. With 30 years of experience dealing with the full gamut of intellectual property issues—and successfully litigating hundreds of cases—we have developed and honed proprietary processes that allow us to quickly understand your technology, the patent law issues affecting your case and determine cost-effective ways to handle it.

Our process works.

SKGF understands the importance of putting the case together properly from the very beginning—the value of due diligence and thorough research upfront, including the nuances that can make or break a case.

Early on, we work with you to determine your definition of victory. This is essential in developing the most effective strategy to achieve your goals. We understand that litigation is expensive and can exact significant costs on your business. So whether you're the plaintiff or defendant, we try to minimize the disruption to your operation.

Our team seeks out those employees of your company who can best provide the details of your story, including information about your technology, business, philosophy and position in the market. This helps us identify the themes, possible witnesses and essential documents we'll need—and how to gain access to them. We also work with your organization to develop a task-based budget that reflects what we learned during our early case assessment and incorporates the most effective tactics to accomplish your strategic goals. At every stage of the process, we remain focused and responsive to your needs.

We're not afraid to go to trial—and have proved our ability to litigate effectively time and again.

Our bench is deep, so we have the capacity to staff a patent litigation of any size. We assign only seasoned trial attorneys to handle your case—litigators with extensive experience appearing before juries in federal district courts across the country. Having a litigation team with the demonstrated ability to successfully try cases can lead to early settlement on favorable terms and, if necessary, help to ensure the best possible representation at trial.

The majority of our litigators have a dual skill set: the ability to combine a thorough understanding of the disputed intellectual property with a sophisticated knowledge of patent law and practical trial skills. This allows them to provide critical insights into the substantive patent issues present in your case.

We look at every litigation opportunity as a long-term relationship.

Which explains why so many of our clients have been with us for decades. Take Reebok, for example, for whom we have handled more than 50 cases since 1987 and secured very favorable results.

For more information about our practice, please reference the litigation handbook, below.



Contact

David K.S. Cornwell

Director

Mark Fox Evens

Director

H. Keeto Sabharwal

Director

© 2011 Sterne Kessler