

MANAGEMENT DISCUSSION SECTION

Operator: Good morning. My name is Jackie and I will be your conference operator today. At this time I would like to welcome everyone to the InterDigital Conference Call. All lines have been placed on mute to prevent any background noise. After the speakers remarks there will be a question and answer session. [Operator Instructions]. Thank you. Ms. Point, you may begin your conference.

Janet Point, Senior Director of Investor Relations

All right. Thank you Jackie. Good morning everyone and welcome to our call to discuss the resolution of the 2G dispute with Nokia that we announced yesterday. On the call today, Bill Merritt, our President and Chief Executive Officer will offer his perspective on this event and provide some additional information as to the award and what this positive resolution means for the company going forward. Rich Fagan, our CFO is here with us as well to be available for the question and answer session at the end. As always I am available after this call for any follow-up questions that you may have.

Before we begin our remarks today, I need to remind you that in this call we will be making forward-looking statements regarding our current beliefs and expectations as to the benefits of the agreement with Nokia, our ability to secure a 3G agreement with Nokia, the impact of the Nokia agreement on Samsung, use of cash received from Nokia, the likelihood of additional license agreements in '06, our ability to achieve the goal of deriving revenue from every 3G terminal units sold, our plans to enhance our modem offering as well as expand beyond that offering, management of our finances, and plans to deliver shareholder value. Actual outcomes could differ materially from those expressed in any such forward-looking statements due to a variety of factors including those mentioned in this call as well as those set forth in the company's most recent Form 10-K and in this morning's press release and related Form 8-K filing. With that I will turn it over to Bill.

William J. Merritt, President and Chief Executive Officer

Thank you Janet and good morning to everyone. We were very happy to announce yesterday the resolution of our 2G licensing dispute with Nokia. While getting our \$253 million may have been a long time coming it was well versed to wait. I wanted to cover a few things on the call this morning. First, I'll review the terms of what is a very good deal for the company. Next I'll explain why it made sense to lease some issues unresolved. Last, I will give you my views on what lies ahead for InterDigital.

As to the deal itself, it is fairly straightforward. Nokia has agreed to pay InterDigital \$253 million by today, April 28, 2006. In exchange for that payment Nokia will have a paid up license for 2G terminal units and infrastructure and be released from an infringement liability for the sales of 3G handsets and infrastructure up through April 26, 2006. Because Nokia sales – 3G sales to-date have been modest the royalties associated with those sales will also be modest. The parties also agreed to terminate the existing patent license agreement. That means that Nokia sales of 3G products after April 26, 2006, which are expected to grow substantially this year along with the entire 3G market are unlicensed under our patent.

Nokia has also agreed to withdraw its challenge in the case in the United Kingdom dealing with 3 InterDigital TDMA related patents. In exchange we agreed not to assert the 3 patents involved in

InterDigital Communications**Corp.**
Company▲IDCC
Ticker▲Business Update Call
Event Type▲Apr. 28, 2006
Date▲

that case as well as non-UK counterparts to those patents against Nokia. As a practical matter those patents are either already expired or will expire in the near future. Under the agreement Nokia will also have a paid-up license for IS-95 products but not CDMA2000 products, which are the only type of CDMA products actually being shipped in any meaningful quantities today. So, that's the deal in a nutshell and it is a very, very good deal for InterDigital. Obviously, a payment of \$253 million is significant. With this payment our patent licensing program has now generated over 1 billion in cash. Also the fact that Nokia paid these for 2G products consistently with the rates set forth in the Arbitration Award and in line with our prior projections, reflect positively on our ability to achieved our desired end result. The fact that we will be paid the amount, we have previously indicated demonstrate what we have the financial strength and resolve to negotiate in a firm, but reasonable manner and wait for the right deal.

Now, I appreciate that some of you wanted to a 3G resolution with Nokia as part of the deal. Of course the 3G deal on the right times would have been applied. However, the opposite is also true. As we have said many times before the total value of 3G licensing is based on the rates we get not how fast we do the deal. Quantities of 3G products being shipped are expected to continue to grow and become a significant part of the market as the decade unfolds. The waiting to get the right deal is far better than rushing to get a deal down today at a lower rate. So, instead of trying to conclude a less than optimal deal today what we did was wipe this slate clean with regards to 3G issue by terminating the original patent license agreement. In doing so I can assure you that we did not forego any leverage. In fact, I think we are in a far better position going forward. So, with the Nokia 2G issue behind us, what's next? Make no mistake based upon the strength of our patent portfolio I believe that we will get a 3G deal done with Nokia on terms that makes sense to us. Moreover, I believe that the positive momentum that we had in licensing discussions with other 3G manufacturers worldwide will lead to additional deals this year.

In addition, we have an active development program brining advanced 3G solutions to the market that we can offer to customers in a complementary manner with our patent portfolio. This combination of continued success in patent licensing, new product offerings, and continued growth of our patent portfolio will drive the achievement of our goal of deriving revenue from every 3G terminal units sold.

In addition, we believe the resolution with Nokia could help to facilitate discussions with Samsung. As we previously noted, Nokia paid royalties at the rates consistent with those specified in the arbitration award. This gives even more credence to the validity of that award. Since we believe Samsung has bound by the same terms as Nokia including the arbitration award, Nokia's decision to pay should hopefully assist Samsung in reaching a similar conclusion. If not, we can allow the arbitration – the Samsung arbitration process in which the hearing was completed in January to take its natural course.

As for the use of the cash being paid by Nokia, we have a very good internal process for evaluating investment opportunities. We recently announced the \$100 million authorization to repurchase shares. We also expanded our resources committed to our corporate development efforts and we are continuing to see good opportunities for us, both with regard to patent portfolio acquisitions and technology and product acquisitions. For example, we believe we can increase our share value by enhancing our 3G modem offering, so expect us to make moves in that area. We also believe that it makes sense for us to expand our vision beyond just the modem offering to other aspects of what is being called the converged device. Over the next quarter or so, we will continue to consider a number of options and should be in a position in the near future to address some of those opportunities in greater detail. The bottom line in all this is obviously focusing on making investments that can deliver the greatest value to shareholders, and to do so in a dispassionate financially driven manner. So as part of our analysis also expect us to consider an expansion of our stock repurchase program as well as other means of delivering value to our shareholders.

InterDigital Communications**Corp.**
*Company▲*IDCC
*Ticker▲*Business Update Call
*Event Type▲*Apr. 28, 2006
Date▲

In closing, I want to thank the many at InterDigital who helped us to remain steadfast and see this matter to conclusion. In particular, let me thank our Board of Directors for their unwavering belief in our position. Let me also thank a number of key individuals among them Bruce Bernstein, who now runs our Patent Operations, Ron Shulman at Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati; Mark Flanagan at WilmerHale, and Dan Davidson [ph] at Ritz Zenback [ph] and [indiscernible], you all served the company very well.

Lastly, let me extend a word of thanks to the InterDigital family both present and past who over the years have created and continue to create new and exciting technologies for the digital wireless market. It's their dedication and inventive spirit that helps define current and future generations of wireless technologies and to drive this company. Indeed, even while the two Nokia 2G issue took up much time within the organization over the past 3 years, our folks kept their focus on 3G and moves us forward. With that let me open it for questions.

Janet Point, Senior Director of Investor Relations

Okay, Jackie, if you could start the Q&A session.

QUESTION AND ANSWER SECTION

Operator: [Operator Instructions]. Your first question comes from Amit Kapur.

<Q – Preetesh Munshi>: Yeah, hi, this is Preetesh Munshi for Amit Kapur, Piper Jaffray. Just a couple of quick questions, can you talk a little more about the process for negotiating the 3G licensing with the Nokia? And also what was the impact of Nokia already having paid you to develop some of those Tdd with related patent, under that prior development work does Nokia get to use those patents royalty free in the future?

<A – William Merritt>: Okay, as far as the process going forward we are now sort of back into the environment of a very normal process for InterDigital which is basically, you know, just working through the patent issues and then working through the economic issues. That's the process that we know well, we do well in. As I indicated during the remarks well, we don't have anymore of the overhang of the current license agreement, which while serving us well had created some other issues for us and that's now behind us. So I think we are in a very good, comfortable known position moving forward with them. So we are happy about that. As far as the Tdd development agreement there were patents that were – some patents that were developed in that program that Nokia paid for as far the development, those are related to 2 Tdd technologies and so they would have rights under those patents.

<Q – Preetesh Munshi>: Okay, thanks. And what IDCC resources of this kind of free up to pursue for new license agreements with others, meaning how much management time was spent on this issue last quarter, over, just like going forward, talk a little bit about that?

<A – William Merritt>: You know, certainly the effort took a lot of time of, sort of, the higher levels of management here because it was a big issue and we're working through that. But in the meantime we have lots of other people working on licensing who frankly were involved in this and they were out there doing what you expect to go out visiting the folks in kind of US, in Korea and Japan and other places. So, we will free up some resources but actually that number of people that are working on this project was fairly limited.

<Q – Preetesh Munshi>: Okay. And one last question, what options do you have to account for this payment?

<A – Richard Fagan>: This is Rich Fagan. As I indicated we believe it all be recognized in 2006. We're working our way through. How much gets recognized in any particular quarter and making sure that we clearly understand what line it falls on in the P&L as well. So, we hope to have that clarified in the near term.

<Q – Preetesh Munshi>: Okay. Great. Thank you.

<A>: Thank you.

Operator: Your next question comes from John Buckner [ph].

<A – Janet Point>: John Buckerke [ph].

<Q>: Hey, thank you Janet. Well, I was wondering that there might have been a Buckner on the call.

<A – Janet Point>: That might help just in case.

InterDigital Communications

Corp.
Company▲IDCC
Ticker▲Business Update Call
Event Type▲Apr. 28, 2006
Date▲

<Q>: I was wondering if you all can review for us the status to date on 3G, you know all categories of 3G licensing – the license agreements that you have in place today for 3G. Then I have got a follow up?

<A>: You know, at this point at a high level we cover about 35% to 40% of the 3G market and that's including both WCDMA and CMDA2000. You know, as far as coverage on license agreement we probably have dozen or so licensees making payments on their sales, looking at bigger for those, its obviously LG, but there is lot of other folks, NEC, Toshiba, Sanyo, Sharp, HTC, Quanta, RIMA [ph]. So, there is a good number of folks out there that provide us royalties on their sales, and actually the fact that we have a large number of licensees allowed in any one quarter, NECs for example. Shipments come up short. HTC shipments did make up for that. So what you are seeing is sort of a steadily increasing contribution for 3G royalties into the net revenue of the company. So we have very good coverage today. I know it's still early in the market. Some folks have asked us how does this compare to where you were with 2G. We are sort of way ahead of where we were in 2G. So I am real happy with where we are positioned right now with our 3G licensing program.

<Q>: I know you all did a lot of early work in the Tdd area. Is the strategy when you are doing the 3G license agreements the ENTS-related license agreements, do they cover both FDD and Tdd or do you partition – you know is your license comprehensive or is it sort of partitioned out?

<A>: It is comprehensive.

<Q>: And then I am just wondering is there any – it sort of seems like the Ericsson case was a bellwether case if you will for the 2G licensing for you. Is there any pending litigation right now in the 3G arena that you think could serve sort of a comparable role in your 3G licensing campaign?

<A>: Well we have 2 cases ongoing with Nokia on 3G. And those cases are not resolved as a part of the settlement as you would expect because we didn't resolve the 3G issues, that's just one in the UK and one in the US. And John you are right. Those are the types of things that can create sort of an additional timetable for the parties that need to consider and working through the patent issues. The case in Delaware was filed a little over a year ago. The UK case I guess is in the same general timeframe. So those cases are moving forward, and I do think provide some impetus to the parties to move forward on the discussions.

<Q>: Okay, and then finally, do you have any design wins that you can talk about on your UMTS modem or any of the GD deals solutions you have?

<A>: We have 3 or 4 design wins, you have, for example, with Infineon we have the Layer 2-3, released 4 protocol stack, and then we recently upgraded that license to include the release 5 protocol stack with fill ups. We have the HSDPA coprocessor which is a Layer 1 design which we signed that deal about 6 months or so ago. And then with General Dynamics that is a complete R4 modem design Layer 1-2 and 3. So we are in a – we have got a good start on the product programs. As I indicated this morning it's currently in area where we are looking to expand our operations.

<Q>: Excellent, thank you very much.

<A>: Thanks John.

Operator: Your next question comes from Tom Carpenter [Hilliard Lyons].

<Q – Thomas Carpenter>: Hey, good morning Bill, good morning Rich, good morning Janet.

InterDigital Communications

Corp.
Company▲IDCC
Ticker▲Business Update Call
Event Type▲Apr. 28, 2006
Date▲

<A>: Hey Tom.

<Q – Thomas Carpenter>: Hey, congratulations on putting this to bed.

<A>: Thanks.

<Q – Thomas Carpenter>: Now that Nokia is on license after today for 3G I would assume that you guys have a different kind of leverage than you had before. And there is another company in San Diego whose 3G agreement with Nokia expires in April 2007. Can you talk about is there any type of timeframe or is that process you guys have with Nokia to go through this to resolve this and a reasonable timeframe so this doesn't dried out a couple of years?

<A>: There is no established timetable. But I also don't think it's something, you know from my view that drags out for a long time. And the reasons, which I think are as follows. One, you know Nokia's sales of 3G devices are going to start to really ramp, they really did not have a lot of sales up until really this year. So now – and that was the nice thing about sort of cutting it off where we did – we sort of cut it off to the point where we had de minimus sales in the past, and now you are starting to see more volumes. And they are financially focused company, and they will see that that's a liability that can build up for them over time and they are not going to let that – I don't think they are going to let that get out of hand. As I mentioned that John Hughes of [ph] [indiscernible] the fact that we have litigations ongoing with them, and we left those unresolved which to some respect is a good thing because it does create a timetable external to the parties that can force or at least create some incentives to drive resolutions of this. And I think that you know Nokia as well is probably – you know I think there was a comment from one of the reports that says that they are looking to sort of try to keep tidying up their houses with respect to patents, and certainly the patents issues with us is one of the things they are going to need to deal with. So I think there is a lot of things in place Tom that make this an issue that should get resolved in a reasonable timeframe. You know what that turns out to be, we don't know. But I am hopeful that it's one of these you know multi, multi year type payment.

<Q – Thomas Carpenter>: Excellent. There is another follow up question I had it's that, since you guys released the news yesterday, have you been in communication with Samsung about the potential impact that this has on them, and if – do they want to wait for the arbitration decision or just sit down and address all these issues, getting out of the way without incurring any additional legal expenses?

<A – William Merritt>: Yeah, we'll certainly let people know that this happens because I think it does as I said today, it provides some significant influence. Samsung couple of years ago agreed that they would pay what Nokia pay and up until this point Nokia had not paid and so that was maybe part of this, it was a corporate issue that they would be unlike, well Nokia has now paid, and so hopefully that that gets that process moving. But again, there is another situation where if that doesn't – if that's not what happens you have a legal process that's already underway there that will bring it to resolution. So, but as with all these things we would much prefer to negotiate a resolution, then have an arbitrator tell us the party for the tips.

<Q – Thomas Carpenter>: Sure. And just a point of a clarification, on the call today you said you expect to sign additional 3G deals or get additional 3G deals done this year. I think in one of the prior calls you mentioned that you expect to sign additional 3G agreements with other top 6 manufacturers besides LG this year, is that still the case?

<A – William Merritt>: That's still the – that's the goal of the corporation. As you know Tommy we model the company. That's where the value is. So while we sort of focus that well points in the value chain with respect to licensing, there is a particular emphasis on the topic.

<Q – Thomas Carpenter>: Okay, and just a quick question on cash. At the end of the fourth quarter you guys had \$2, roughly \$2 per share in cash. I think from LG and HTC you got – received an additional \$2 per share in the first quarter. You are going to receive the Nokia cash soon, that's a little bit over \$4 per share and if you get Samsung down, I think the amounts you talked about in the past are roughly \$2 per share. So, that is at today's level, I think that's about a third of your alls market cap. That would be around 600 million. You talked about some of the uses of the cash. With that type of cash if – my first choice if you guys defined compelling projects or patent or products investments that would generate the kind of returns you guys now do for the past couple of years. But, if you get what you have this \$7, \$8, \$9, \$10 per share in cash is it – would you guys also consider a special one-time dividend considering the fact that Wall Street doesn't always give companies credit for that type of cash on their balance sheet.

<A>: I think as I indicated before and I think we are required to keep all options on the table and it basically works as great to the funnel [ph]. You look at what do I need to run the company today and than what I am external acquisitions opportunities that would return greater than the cost of capital return to the investors. And if I have got something that makes a lot of senses let me pursue that and than if there isn't some external opportunities and in that shape than you have to look at your other options which is either a stock buyback or a dividend and which of those you choose depends on couple of factors. One of which is whether you believe the stock is under valued, over valued or fairly valued. And one other things we are trying to do here and except trying – but I think we do very well analysis. This is a very sort of financially driven this cash and analysis. We don't do things because it's the cool thing to do. We do it because it's a right thing to do. And so, be assured that all, that's it, point all the options are on the table.

<Q – Thomas Carpenter>: Okay. And than a quick question for Rick, I know he is going to answer because he is a great guy. He is actually telling me to read the 10-K. Hey, Rich, are you using the repurchase authority up to now?

<A – Richard Fagan>: We will, as you know we have a call scheduled for next week in which case we will be updating were we are, what's the status of repurchase activity is at that time.

<Q – Thomas Carpenter>: And I was thinking today would be an excellent time to go ahead and address that topic. Okay. Thanks guys a lot, I will let someone else get in.

<A>: Thanks.

<A>: Hey, thanks Tom.

<A>: Thanks Tom.

Operator: Your next question comes from Steven Shapiro [Intrepid Investors].

<Q – Steven Shapiro>: Yeah, hi. Just a couple of question for you, the first is, on – this agreement is likely to have any near term impact on operating expenses?

<A>: While certainly the fact that these – one of the litigations is resolved as part of this, so that any cost associated with that go way. As I said we didn't have a tremendous amount of internal and even external – the cost of acting negotiating the deal was not that significant, but certainly any cost associated with that go away. So, I don't think that the deal itself – tomorrow our cost structure changes a whole lot, we have some external fees that go down.

<Q – Steven Shapiro>: Got you. Okay. The second question is I am just wondering if this is – I know this isn't a quantitative question or qualitative question but, or do you sense as you went through this settlement process with Nokia a change in attitude on their part. I mean should you –

InterDigital Communications

Corp.
Company▲IDCC
Ticker▲Business Update Call
Event Type▲Apr. 28, 2006
Date▲

would you describe this or do you feel that there is been fundamental change in their attitude with respect to their willingness to negotiate the 3G deal or should we really think of this is more very specifically limited to what was going on the arbitrations with respect to 2G and really not read anything into this in terms of their desire or interest in coming to a peaceful 3G agreement?

<A>: I think, consistent with lot of the other negotiations that we have, as we work through the negotiations as and we mentioned it on the call this morning – I think people do realize two things about the company. One is that we all are very – that we have a tremendous result on this. And that you can throw as many lawyers as you want against us and we are not going to be faced by that. And I think at some point people begin to realize that and say okay, maybe we need to just negotiate that because the other paths isn't really working, or it maybe at a point of diminishing. I think people also recognize that we have – as we've thought this as. I think it's very important for us to be very firm – we have a strong resolve in the firm. But I also think that what is successful for us is showing flexibility. And so what you have even with this deal is us being flexible and coming up as a solution, which wasn't simply a pay out under the award but some other tweaks to that. And I think that everyone we've dealt with along the way, I think Nokia is included in that, appreciates the fact that we are flexible. And so I think we leave this particular negotiation in a good position with them. I think that we are, as I said before, in a good shape on 3G. I think that the negotiations with them should be sort of standard solvent negotiations that we've had. And we'll say. But I think that they have witnessed sort of first-hand that we are not a company that's going to back down.

<Q – Steven Shapiro>: Okay. And the third question, last question, you mentioned in your prepared statements that you thought that terminating the current agreements effectively as of right now increased your leverage. Perhaps you could just focus on that a little bit, i.e. if in fact you are wrong about their interest or steadiness [ph] on the 3G side and this does end up back in court. Now that there is no agreement does that now puts you in a position, a, I assume that you guys believe that as of the 27th I guess of April Nokia is in fact in violation with your patents. If, you know, you do end up in quarter at that point now that you are knock down by an arbitration process, could you ask for an injunction, could you be awarded kind of the damages and could you go through what that kind of a process would look like and in what way terminating the agreement now does in fact enhance your leverage?

<A – William Merritt>: Sure, I mean a couple of things. The current agreement obviously was one under which they were licensed and their royalty payments were contingent. And as we saw in that, you know, the prior process on 2G even when we resolved or satisfied the contingency there was another process they had to go through, so there was sort of a long distance between where they were and when they would have to pay, all right. And if I take the – and with lots of sort of possibly ambiguities and disputes in along that path, right. So I think by getting the agreement out of the way you take away that sort of contractual overhang and put it back in sort of the normal situation which is someone is unlicensed, they are exposed for the whatever penalties are associated with being on license. And we do have current litigations that are underway with them on the 3G issues, which will help resolve this. So I think that that's a different environment. That's a cleaner environment. And I think and it's – one were – I think that they recognized that we've done reasonably well in that environment before, so I think it's a good place for us to be in.

<Q – Steven Shapiro>: Got you. Okay, and then just my final question, it's probably – I am just wondering, you know, did your talks or discussions with Nokia have any point in that process to the Nokia-Qualcomm ongoing patent disputes come up or did they in anyway play a part in Nokia's when it was to sit down with you guys?

<A – William Merritt>: No, there was just a discussion between us on the issues they dealt with us is which is – what I would expect from them to get all the stuff, doing all the Qualcomm, they're respectful with that – of those discussions with Qualcomm and didn't share that with us.

<Q – Steven Shapiro>: Thanks very much.

<A – William Merritt>: Okay, thanks.

Operator: Your next question comes from Frank Marsala [First Albany Capital].

<Q – Frank Marsala>: Good morning everybody, congratulations.

<A – William Merritt>: Hi Frank.

<Q – Frank Marsala>: Just a couple of questions here, most of what I was going to say was answered but, you know, Bill does this make life easier for you in other negotiations? I mean beside for –aside from management time what does this do for you, I mean really claiming this slight, what does it really do for you in other negotiations? Is this I mean in the equipment world, sometimes you have a deal that you could sign and bring it to someone and say look at this, the deal we have signed. But does that really do, is this really do that for you?

<A – William Merritt>: You know, on 3G licensing I think it's what it does for us, and we will talk about sort of different answers. Certainly 3G licensing with Nokia as we have gone through I think it creates the right environment for the parties to move forward and get that done. We are out from our need today, the current agreement and sort of the issues that that created. With respect to other parties on 3G licensing, you know, those discussions have been going along very long. And I think the importance of the sort of the Nokia resolution even though it's not a 3G resolution, it continues to make people understand that we do not – again while we are a fair company, we offer very fair rates. We had tremendous result. And that is very, very important in licensing negotiations. And you haven't headed that group up for a long time, I can tell you that when people know that you are not going to blink, and that you are going to stay with it, and you are going to work the issue until it is gone, that is somewhat of 90% of the issue because you know I think, to a large extent, the industry understands our patent position. People know that we have done a lot of patents. We've got a lot of patents covering new standards. We continue to get more patents both with respect to the current standards as to patent issues then with respect to future standards. So we were at – we are forced to be reckoned with from a patent perspective and now they also understand that you know financially and sort of organizationally we are going to stick with this. So I think this event continues to sort of drive that very accurate perception of the company, which is we are going to get compensations for these patents from everyone.

<Q – Frank Marsala>: As you have talked to these people who are out there, as you look around the world, do you think there are other 2G opportunities that could play out for the rest of this year, not that – that's a long-term thing but you think there is other stuff on the table that you can take advantage of now that this has been put to bed?

<A>: I mean there is still some folks out there that run license for 2G, and we will continue to pursue those. But sort of my focus and Bruce Bernstein's focus is really on 3G going forward. That's really the – we think the more important taking you with 2G, you know you are dealing with, from our perspective a patent portfolio, that sound like it will run round the edges. So 3G is more important for us. I think that the other thing that we will do and certainly this resolution with Nokia helps us do is not only that the help drive some of the 3G licensing sort of continued in growing the fact of the company. It allows us to clean up some of the 2G sets, here is the biggest producer of 2G, they have now paid that you should say. But it also gives us some additional cash to invest in our technology solutions, which are getting a lot of respect in the market. And that whole – you know one of the real important things we tried to do here since last year is bring real synergy between those patent operations and the product operations. And you know the payments from

Nokia gives us a lot more flexibility there. So and that can help a whole lot in getting not only technology deals but also lot of getting patents done.

<Q – Frank Marsala>: So, last question is – what are you going to do when you market wake up in the middle of the night now that this is not something you have to think about any longer?

<A>: Not wake up.

<A>: I am sorry, not wake up, and actually get through the night.

<Q – Frank Marsala>: Well, hopefully you have a good weekend then, right.

<A>: Fair enough.

<Q – Frank Marsala>: Okay. Congratulations again. Thanks guys.

Operator: Your next question comes from Bill Mastoris [ph].

<Q>: Good morning and hallelujah. Congratulations.

<A>: Thanks Bill.

<Q>: What about Samsung, maybe I missed it. Could you carry...?

<A>: Yeah, we did. With respect to Samsung Bill what we said in the prepared remarks is that – a number of years ago Samsung elected to basically have the same kind of visitors Nokia for 2G. And so at this since – and that would include the awards, the arbitration awards and they in fact basically interpreted the Nokia contract which Samsung has now down by. So you know we think that with Nokia now having paid Samsung should be looking at that and say well, that doesn't mean this arbitration award really is what it – as it is. And maybe that encourages them to get down the same path as Nokia. If not, we have a legal process its underway with Samsung. The arbitration hearing was in January. So, we would get a decision out of that and then move forward on that. But hopefully this creates the right environment where we can create a negotiated resolution with Samsung, so those are always better.

<Q>: And what amount is that?

<A>: The projections we gave with respect to Samsung were I think were around 25.

<A>: Its what we had talked about Bill, before it was originally and said that for 2002 was 22 million to 27 million. And then we thought on 2003 we could possibly record revenue of around 20. So, but we thought they based on the awards and the fact that they wouldn't get a prepayment obligation that are – those potentially could be up and that was just 2002 and 2003. So, you could see the order magnitude there is a pretty meaningful numbers and we hope to be updating those as well as we get to go into the future here.

<Q>: Okay. Well, thank you very much.

<A>: Thanks Bill.

<A>: Thanks Bill.

Operator: [Operator Instructions]. Your next question comes from Joseph Kowalsky [ph].

<Q>: And my congratulations and sighs of relief with everybody elses. Hello?

<A>: Thank you.

<A>: Thanks.

<Q>: Oh, thank you. I want to make sure I was on there.

<A>: Carry on.

<Q>: You mentioned in article where Nokia was talking about tiding up the toes and when I saw that article as if they were talking about there historical issues and there was also a comment that I read it said they are going to be much more rigorous or vigorous in these defense of patent issues in the future. I am not sure how much more rigorous they can be, but I just wondered how that – is that meant anything to you or do you think its just puffing with regards to the fact that they had to pay this money.

<A>: I read that its actually going the other way from the sense that thought that they were going to be more aggressive in respect of licensing of their portfolio. And that is someone how – as is Nokia is going to be in the position of licensing how there portfolio or one of things you got to do when you are that position, you have actually have to show a tremendous respect for IPR and therefore to the extent they get people that you owe money till you need to pay them on and take the licenses under there patent. I kind of read it that way, but I think it was a street.com article. So, it's exactly, yeah, they are going to be.

<Q>: Okay.

Operator: This concludes today's conference call. You may now disconnect.

Disclaimer

The information herein is based on sources we believe to be reliable but is not guaranteed by us and does not purport to be a complete or error-free statement or summary of the available data. As such, we do not warrant, endorse or guarantee the completeness, accuracy, integrity, or timeliness of the information. You must evaluate, and bear all risks associated with, the use of any information provided hereunder, including any reliance on the accuracy, completeness, safety or usefulness of such information. This information is not intended to be used as the primary basis of investment decisions. It should not be construed as advice designed to meet the particular investment needs of any investor. This report is published solely for information purposes, and is not to be construed as financial or other advice or as an offer to sell or the solicitation of an offer to buy any security in any state where such an offer or solicitation would be illegal. Any information expressed herein on this date is subject to change without notice. Any opinions or assertions contained in this information do not represent the opinions or beliefs of FactSet CallStreet, LLC. FactSet CallStreet, LLC, or one or more of its employees, including the writer of this report, may have a position in any of the securities discussed herein.

THE INFORMATION PROVIDED TO YOU HEREUNDER IS PROVIDED "AS IS," AND TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT PERMITTED BY APPLICABLE LAW, FactSet CallStreet, LLC AND ITS LICENSORS, BUSINESS ASSOCIATES AND SUPPLIERS DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME, EXPRESS, IMPLIED AND STATUTORY, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY, FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, ACCURACY, COMPLETENESS, AND NON-INFRINGEMENT. TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT PERMITTED BY APPLICABLE LAW, NEITHER FACTSET CALLSTREET, LLC NOR ITS OFFICERS, MEMBERS, DIRECTORS, PARTNERS, AFFILIATES, BUSINESS ASSOCIATES, LICENSORS OR SUPPLIERS WILL BE LIABLE FOR ANY INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, SPECIAL, CONSEQUENTIAL OR PUNITIVE DAMAGES, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION DAMAGES FOR LOST PROFITS OR REVENUES, GOODWILL, WORK STOPPAGE, SECURITY BREACHES, VIRUSES, COMPUTER FAILURE OR MALFUNCTION, USE, DATA OR OTHER INTANGIBLE LOSSES OR COMMERCIAL DAMAGES, EVEN IF ANY OF SUCH PARTIES IS ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH LOSSES, ARISING UNDER OR IN CONNECTION WITH THE INFORMATION PROVIDED HEREIN OR ANY OTHER SUBJECT MATTER HEREOF.

The contents and appearance of this report are Copyrighted FactSet CallStreet, LLC 2005. CallStreet and FactSet CallStreet, LLC are trademarks and service marks of FactSet CallStreet, LLC. All other trademarks mentioned are trademarks of their respective companies. All rights reserved.