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## EXHIBIT C



MR. PETERMAN: They are trying to prevent
Mr. Kidder from responding to that new theory that --
the court: I am on the same page. Let me just
see what slides -- do you want to confer with the other side about which slides are -- should be handed up?

MR. Peterman: I have a copy of everything that they objected to.

May I approach?
THE COURT: Yes. Thank you. All right. Just give me a minute to take a look at these.

This is everything -- these are just the ones that are objected to?

MR. PETERMAN: Those are the ones that are objected to, Your Honor. And then also, there's an exhibit that we would like to introduce, same issue, that they -- that they've objected to as well.
the court: An exhibit that you want to
introduce into evidence?
mr. peterman: yes.
the court: Okay. All right. Why don't you
hand that up as well.
So they're objecting to like 40 of your slides?
MR. PETERMAN: Yes.
the court: All right. Well, okay, we're not
going to get this done in the next five minutes.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Well, Your Honor, if I may.

Some of these, I understood, that they replaced last night, so...

MR. Peterman: Well, no, that's not correct.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Pursuant to our meet and
confer.
THE COURT: Okay. Everybody, let's slow down because we're going to -- I don't want to get off with a start this morning where we're muddling up the record. So let's, everybody, sit down. We'll just go and we can talk about it while everybody is having a seat.

All right. The first page is DDX-10.018. What's plaintiff's objection to this?

MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, for these and the next few slides, the calculation that's performed here was not done by Mr. Kidder in his report. He did a different extended views calculation comparing revenues basis between the different entities without doing it as a function of each license amount.

And when we conferred about this last night, Google sent replacement slides doing it with a manner in which Mr. Kidder had actually disclosed in his report. We said that we didn't object to those.

So I don't know if they're insisting on doing it this way, but this isn't the way in which -- he didn't
present it in the slides that are in front of you, versus the way that he presented it in his expert report.

THE COURT: Okay. Where in the record is his report that opines on this issue that we're talking about right now? What page so we can take a look at it on a break?

MR. PETERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. So do you have his reports there?

THE COURT: No. No one has ever presented them to us, the slides. We have hunted and found most of them on the docket.

MR. PETERMAN: Okay. Give me a moment, Your Honor.

MS. SRINIVASAN: I have a copy for the Court, Your Honor.

MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, I have one copy of both of his reports. I can get a second copy.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. That's great.
So counsel just handed up the expert report of Douglas Kidder, October 20, 2020, and a supplemental expert report of Mr. Kidder, August 26, 2022.

What pages should I look at to see if this has been previously disclosed?

MR. PETERMAN: Yeah. So, Your Honor, in the second report, the 2022 report, paragraphs 152 to 160 is
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where Mr. Kidder goes through the revenue-based comparison.
the court: Okay. And then -- so we'll look at that on a break. And then what -- is it the same argument for how many of these slides?

MS. SRINIVASAN: Through the first testimonial slide. So the next eight slides, through 10.026. They're all the same issue.

THE COURT: Okay.
Mr. Peterman: And, Your Honor, I will state
that it doesn't appear that Arendi disagrees that
Mr. Kidder came up with the scale revenue number. So for that we'll look at the top of Slide 25 . There's a scale revenue number for Apple, Samsung, Microsoft, and InNova.

Doesn't appear that Arendi disagrees with those numbers, because I think no matter which way you do the calculation, you wind up with those same numbers. It's really just a question of presentation.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. We will take a look at that. All right. It's 8:30 now. So we'll bring the jury out and then we'll deal with this. I want to make sure we get started on time because we told them all to get here early today.

MR. PETERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Ms. Garfinkel, can we
that date when he didn't opine on it, that's an undisclosed opinion.

They have it in the record from their fact witnesses, but he chose not to ask them at the time he issued two reports on this.

THE COURT: All right. So stand by. Let me read these slides before I hear from Google.

Counsel.
MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, Mr. Kidder chose to focus on different aspects of the case when there was more accused products at issue and --

Mr. Kidder chose to focus on different aspects of the case when there were additional products at issue. As of April 21st when Arendi changed to narrow its theory to STS only, Mr. Kidder relooked at issues and looked at issues for the first time with an STS-only basis.

Now he feels that his testimony regarding the maintenance release is important for his STS-only opinion. This is the first time that he's been able to make an STS-only opinion.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, if I may on that.
THE COURT: Just give me a second.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Sure.
THE COURT: Let me just ask everyone about
Slide 32, 33, and 34. This appears just to be testimony
check and see if everybody is here.
Sounds like we are missing one juror. So let's continue on.

Okay. Then we've got objection to 10.032?
MS. SRINIVASAN: That's right, Your Honor. As to the next three slides, 32, 33, 34, those are undisclosed opinions from Mr. Kidder's report. He does disclose December 2017. And I think he was instructed to use that date. There's nothing in his report about maintenance releases or source code being published around that time. He just said he was instructed to use that date.

And now they're using testimony -- he had the opportunity to ask why that was, but now they're using testimony as to the basis for using that date, which Mr. Kidder didn't disclose in his report.

He has one line in his report that says he was instructed to use December 2017 as the date when STS was enabled, that's it. There's no reference to maintenance releases, source code, any of the things that are being added here.

So we don't object to him obviously relying on the December 2017 date, which has always been part of his analysis for the other apps, and then for Google Chrome. But for him to be utilizing the reason that they selected 1140
that we've heard at trial. So is there any particular reason why we can't put this up on the screen?

MS. SRINIVASAN: Well, for Mr. -- I mean, if Mr. Kidder is going to say he has understanding about why STS -- why he's using that December 2017 date, that is not in his opinion. He did -- in his report, paragraph 175, he said he was asked to consider a date of December 2017 as the date of first infringement when STS was enabled Android 8. That's all he says.

So our objection is that if he's going to get up there and say, I understand it was released on that date because that's when the maintenance release was, that's when the source code was published -- he doesn't have any basis for that. He was instructed to use the date. We understand that.

But now they're trying to use, you know, things that he didn't develop. He didn't ask why that date was chosen. And it's not correct that he didn't analyze an STS-only world. That's the subject of his supplemental report from 2022. He specifically considered a scenario in which only STS was accused. He opined on a damages number, that's the damages number he's presenting today.

So he had the opportunity to ask why that date, and he didn't. And so we object to him using testimony from the proceeding to try to add detail, well, as to why
that date was appropriate
THE COURT: Wait. Let me just ask you about what you just said. You're saying this 2022 report, there's a scenario where he analyzed that STS, but not Contact Detectors and Quick Action was accused?

MS. SRINIVASAN: Yes.
THE COURT: Where is that?
MS. SRINIVASAN: That's in Paragraph 30 and
175. In Paragraph 30, he says, "I have also been asked to consider an alternative scenario in which only STS is found to be properly accused of infringement such that the hypothetical negotiation would have taken place around December 5, 2017."

THE COURT: Give me a minute.
So Counsel, did or did he not analyze what the royalty would be -- or respond to Mr. Weinstein's calculation? You know what I'm asking.

MR. PETERMAN: Yes, yes.
THE COURT: Tell me what I'm asking, and then tell me the answer.

MR. PETERMAN: There's two issues here.
Mr. Kidder did put forth an STS calculation under
Mr. Kidder's own model. And Mr. Kidder's own model is really not dependent on the number of units. He did not have the opportunity to present an STS under
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accused devices and downloads would be smaller, and would therefore result in a greater downward adjustment for extensive used relative to Microsoft, Samsung, and Apple." And he offers a damages, a lump sum payment damages number of $\$ 500,000$, which based on the slides, I understand, is the number he's going to be sponsoring today.

And then in the Exhibit 5 to the report, you can see -- in the Exhibit 5.0, to the supplemental reports, he can see that he has listed all the downloads for 2017 and 2018 for all of the apps.

And at that time, he was responding to Mr. Weinstein's report that was STS only for the 12 of the 13 apps. That he went ahead and assumed, what if it was STS only for everything.

The $\$ 500,000$ that he came up with in his September ' 22 report is what he's presenting today. It's the same analysis he planned for that, and that's why it's already disclosed in his report. It's not something that he didn't foresee coming.

That's -- the December 2017 date forward, for all applications, that is what he opined about in 2020 -in this 2022 report; assuming that there would be only STS accused, no Content Data Detectors, no CQSA.

He's responding to and providing an opinion about an STS-only scenario.

Mr. Weinstein's new model. And that's really the
distinction here.
Mr. Weinstein's new model depends totally on
units. On cross-examination he admitted if the units were wrong, the numbers were wrong. And that was squarely not in front of Mr. Kidder in his 2022 report.

THE COURT: Okay. That was what I was asking, and I appreciate the answer.

Counsel?
MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, Mr. Weinstein's
model never changed. It has always been based on units. And Mr. Kidder's responsive report is -- knew exactly what Mr. Weinstein was disclosing.

In Paragraph 175 of his supplemental report, he says he's been asked to consider -- and he's always had a different model. He has a revenue-based model -- now, it does apportion based on a number of installed units, and we'll get to that.

But he's always had that model. Mr. Weinstein always had a download-based model. But in Paragraph 175, you can see -- and in the tables -- Paragraph 175, he said, "I was asked to consider a scenario in which the data of first alleged infringement was no earlier than December 5, 2017, when STS was enabled to Android."

He says, "Under this scenario, the base of

MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, Mr. Kidder --
THE COURT: So we've got multiple things going on here. So we've kind of moved on from what we were talking about with respect to these three slides. So...

MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, with -- yeah, with respect to those three slides, I think the issue is that he was instructed to look at a December 2017 hypothetical negotiation date for this alternative STS-only scenario. And that's fine that he was instructed to use that.

Well, now he wants to say this is the reason that date was chosen, there was a source code release, there as maintenance release. That's not in his report. There's nothing about that in there, even though he does say he relies on this December report.

THE COURT: Right. But we've got two things going on here that he's going to testify about. He's going to testify about his own opinion, and he's also going to testify about his reaction to your expert's opinion. And so maybe that doesn't change what his own opinion is, but certainly I think he should be allowed to testify about his reaction to Arendi's opinion.

And these three slides, I don't have a problem with. Let's keep going.

Actually, let me ask Ms. Garfinkel, do we have
all the jurors here?

Let's have Google call its next witness.
MS. ROBERTS: Your Honor, Google calls
Dr. Edward Fox.
THE CLERK: Please approach.
Please state and spell your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Edward Fox Edward, E-D-W-A-R-D, $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{X}$.

EDWARD FOX, having been called as a witness, being first duly sworn under oath or affirmed, testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.
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\begin{aligned}
& \text { All right. Let's take a break from this, and } \\
& \text { we will take it up later. } \\
& \text { Bring the jury in. } \\
& \text { THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor. } \\
& \text { (The jury enters the courtroom at } 8: 44 \text { a.m.) } \\
& \text { THE COURT: Please have a seat. } \\
& \text { Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. } \\
& \text { Please be seated. } \\
& \text { Welcome back. I hope everyone had a restful } \\
& \text { weekend. We are going to continue today with the } \\
& \text { testimony. }
\end{aligned}
$$ Frankston, who of the one of the two inventors of spreadsheets, and as my undergraduate advisor, I had a person named J.C.R. Licklider. He is often called the grandfather of the Internet because of his work leading to funding of the first Internet activities. Also, one on the founders in the field of hemorrhage computer tracks. So I had a wonderful mentor when I was undergraduate student at MIT in the electro-engineering department.

Q. And did you obtain a degree from MIT?
A. I finished my bachelors of science in 1972. I spent six years in South Carolina. My wife, who then was going to Harvard, had a wonderful job there, so I went to join her. And I spent a year teaching at a two-year college, and then I spent six years in a steel joist manufacturing plant running and developing software systems.

I decided at that point that I had done all I could do and I wanted to pursue the field of information retrieval -- search engines, finding things -- then I started doing my bachelors thesis at MIT. So I picked Cornell University, where the world leader of the father of information retrieval was there so I could work with him. So I start in 1978 at Cornell university. I finished my master's in 1981 and my PhD in 1983.

# DIRECT EXAMINATION. <br> MS. ROBERTS: Your Honor, may I approach with 

 binders?> THE COURT: Yes, please.

BY MS. ROBERTS:
Q. Good morning.
A. Good morning.
Q. Would you please introduce yourself to the jury.
A. Good morning. My name is Edward Fox. I live in Blacksburg, Virginia with my wife of 51 years, and we've raised four children and occasionally have our four grandchildren visit us.
Q. Did you prepare some demonstratives to assist with your testimony today?
A. I did. I have an hour-long, a little bit shorter than some of the classes I teach.
Q. Can you please describe your educational background to the jury.
A. In 1965, I started taking courses at Columbia University and Stevens Institute of Technology. In 1967, I started at MIT, where I began as a math major. I wanted to work with computers. They didn't have a computer science program back then. And so when the
electro-engineering department decided to offer a computer science elective, I switched to electro-engineering. And Fox - Direct
Q. Can you describe your professional background for the jury?
A. So tomorrow I finish the last class of my 40 th year at Virginia Tech as a faculty member in computer science, and then I proceed with grading all of their student projects. There's twenty-two teams that I'm working with this semester in a Capstone computer science course.

Along the way, I've served as a volunteer on a number of different editorial boards. One of boards I was elected to is the Computing Research Association board, which represents the computer research community for the whole U.S. In addition to that, I've, over the years, participated and helped assessing submissions and so forth at hundreds of conferences and workshops.

And at Virginia Tech, I won a number of awards. One for teaching innovation, one for service, and most recently one as a commercialization champion because I worked with a lot of students filing different preliminary and patent applications, including one that's been issued so far.

I've also working with my students and my colleagues. I've done a lot of publications of all different types and have been fortunate to travel all around the world giving talks. If you add all the numbers that are listed there, it's well over 1100. So many different things I've been

Because of that, the Association for Computing, IEEE, one of the professional societies, has designated me as a fellow, as has ACM, the other big computer society that I joined in 1967. ACM has also added me to the Academy for Information Retrieval, which is the leaders in the field of information retrieval.
Q. Are you being compensated for your work on this case?
A. Yes. I'm being compensated on an hourly basis.
Q. Do you have a financial interest in the outcome of this matter?
A. No.

MS. ROBERTS: Your Honor, I'd like to tender Dr. Fox as an expert in the art.

MR. LAHAD: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Dr. Fox is accepted as
an expert.
BY MS. ROBERTS:
Q. Dr. Fox, what were you asked to do in this case?
A. I was asked to provide my expert opinion concerning
the validity of the asserted claims of the 843 patent and
as to the possible benefit of Arendi's inventions over the
prior art methods that existed.
Q. Can you please explain to the jury what work you did to reach your opinions.
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Fox - Direct
and whose thesis I studied as well.
Q. What opinions did you reach?
A. So my opinion is that the asserted claims of the '843 patent are invalid. And I base this on two things. First, is that they were anticipated by the CyberDesk system. In other words, Anind Dey did it first. Also, they were obvious in light of three prior art systems. For example, Apple makes this obvious through its data detectors. And the three systems I considered are CyberDesk, Apple Data Detectors, and very common thing we all are familiar with, Microsoft Word, but back in 1997. Q. Can you give the jury a high level overview of the basis for your opinion?
A. Yes. There were four points that I wanted to make about this. The first is that Arendi admits that the so-called shortcut elements of the asserted claims were well known in the prior art. And we'll talk about what those are. But just to quickly summarize what they are, they're listed here.

The first is that analyzing text to find types of information. The second is providing an input device for a user command to act on identified information. The third is receiving from it an input device, a command to act on identified information. The fourth is causing a search for the identified information to find the
A. I did a lot of work starting in 2019 up until this -up until this morning. I studied the ' 843 patent and its asserted claims. I studied what's called the file history or the prosecution history, which is a big binder that I have sitting in front of me, which is all of the documentation from the time the patent was filed until it was issued.

In that, I noted there's a passage that points to Arendi's Petition for Accelerated Examination Support that it filed during the prosecution of the ' 356 patent, which happens to share the same specification as the ' 843 patent that we are considering in this litigation.

As I do with my students, I studied the prior art up to the period of 1997 because I like them to know what happened years ago. I also studied specific pieces of prior art describing prior art systems. I studied the deposition transcripts. We've heard testimony here from Anind Dey, James Miller, and Atle Hedloy.

I traveled to California just as COVID was getting started -- just made it out in time -- and inspected two PowerBook systems, which we've heard about that James Miller talked about and that he purchased and put software on, so that I would understand the systems as they stood from Apple Data Detectors. I also interviewed Mike Pinkerton, who was a student at the same time as Anind Dey
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## Fox - Direct

associated information. And the fifth is performing action, at least -- using at least part of the found second information. These are all the pieces of this so-called shortcut.
Q. What is the second important point supporting your opinion?
A. The second point is that the ' 843 patent's
requirement to put instructions all in one program was a very obvious choice and one of very few available design choices. This makes clear and obvious argument, which makes the patent invalid. But there's more; there's two more points.
Q. All right. Can you tell us what the third important point is?
A. The third point is that Arendi's principal argument to the Patent Office that allowed it to get the patent was that the prior art used instructions to set up the input device and receive the user commands that were separate from the document editing program. Arendi's invention required the instructions for those actions to be fully inside the first computer program.
Q. What is the fourth important point supporting your opinion?
A. In spite of that, Arendi is now arguing that Google's products are covered by the ' 843 patent's claims. You
heard last week from the experts who built the system

## mentioned in the summary of your opinions, CyberDesk.

that Google's products use instructions that are separate from the document editing program.

Arendi's arguments contradict its statements to the Patent Office. If we apply these new arguments, then the ' 843 patent claims cover the prior art CyberDesk and Apple Data Detectors systems, and, therefore, make the patent invalid.
Q. So let's delve into those specific four points. What do you mean that Arendi admitted that the shortcut
elements were well known in the prior art? What are the shortcut elements?
A. So we've looked repeatedly at the ' 843 Claim 23. We've seen it organized in different ways. To make it simple for our discussion, I've decided to break it up into eight parts, and I've labeled them A through H just to make it easy to refer to those things.

On the right-hand side, so we can clearly go through each one of these and see what's at issue, I've identified a checklist. If you look at the checklist, we see checked off in green are six of the eight things. Those are the ones that I refer to as the shortcut elements. This is all about connecting two things with a shortcut; that's what this is all about.
Q. So let's talk about the first prior art system you
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audiences over a long period of time demonstrations of the system.

So this is like the class that I'm grading this week.
I've had them give multiple presentations. I've interviewed the teams to ask what they're doing. I've had them turn in reports, different versions of their reports, and so that's how I've learned what the systems that they're building are all about. Very similar things here. A lot of evidence.
Q. Did the PTO review the full scope of materials about the CyberDesk system that you reviewed before the PTO issued the ' 843 patent?
A. It's my understanding the Patent Office looks at publications of patents; they don't look at systems. You're the ones who get to look at systems. So they didn't have all this other information that I had available, we've all here heard it at this Court in this litigation.
Q. Did the CyberDesk system disclose the shortcut elements?
A. Yes. They certainly did, and we can go through lots of examples to illustrate that.
Q. Why don't you walk us through the examples shown on this slide, 14?
A. So one of things we heard was one of the first

What is the CyberDesk system?
A. I'm going to recall to what's called "critical date." Things before that clearly are prior art.

So the CyberDesk system was a system developed as we heard last week in the testimony from Anind Dey starting in the fall of 1996, well before the critical date. It was developed. It was improved. New features were added. By the time of the second instantiation, which was well before the critical date, it had all the features that talked to claims of the ' 843 patent.
Q. What materials did you consider to understand how the CyberDesk system operated in the relevant time period? A. So there -- to me, there's a preponderance of the evidence supporting CyberDesk system. There are five publications before the critical date. We've heard more than an hour of testimony from its inventor, Anind Dey, which teaches us all kinds of things that were not clear in those publications.

We heard from Anind Dey that he set up a website at Georgia Tech, which you can still go to and look at and see the things that are listed there, that describes all the work with the CyberDesk system. We also heard from him that he ran what were called presentations and demo days at Georgia Tech. He gave to a large number of

## Fox - Direct

versions of CyberDesk system, and we saw this picture on the right-hand side taken from a conference paper. The CHI conference is the big event in the world of human computer interaction. I went to the 1999 CHI conference and gave a tutorial there. It's so big, I didn't want to go back. I don't like big things like that. But it's the way to go if you're in that field.

So in 1997, Anind Dey gave a presentation, and in the presentation, he talked about CyberDesk. There was also a paper in the proceedings, and taken from that paper we see on the left some of the wording exactly from that paper.

On the right-hand side, we see one of the figures from that paper. We've been through this by way of his testimony. I don't want to take a lot of your time, but just want to remind us what is said here.

So just sort of in short, what happens on the right-hand side is we have a web browser that, at that point in time was Netscape. Now we have Edge and Safari and other things. But in that browser window, there are sub-windows, parts of this that we see here. The top two are about the main part of the CyberDesk system. The one on the left is a service that is lets people do things. They can write messages and so forth.

In this particular example, we see a message being displayed. And in the top right, we see this input device
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that we're talking about here. In this case, it's called the Acton button. You see a number of choices that people can make. So the system is making suggestions of things that they might want to do with first information coming from the document editing program.

And on the bottom side, we see a couple of actions and the screens that represent those actions that deal with searching and doing different things. So if we just read through -- and its all color coded to match this -we begin with highlighting Gregory Abowd, which the system is smart enough to figure out is a name. It's converting that name to Abowd, Gregory, so it knows you can switch first and last names when you're putting it in a different order.

We see in the top right a number of things that we can do. And the two that are highlighted in blue and green correspond to the blue and green we see in the text. So that, after we've highlighted this, the system causes the Acton button bar to suggest some actions that are shown with the arrow A, so if we pop up that window, we have those options.

The green says, one suggestion is to look up the name in an available contact manager, which is B. So we see in the bottom left, the contact manager with his name. We can look at that up and get information based on the name.

## Fox - Direct
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architecture, the structure, the way the system is built. It lets us look under the hood and see what's going on. And it tells us kind of the steps that are gone through: First we display, then we convert. The system then makes a suggestion. The system then takes from the user their choice, accepts it, and does some actions with it.

So these are sort of the main parts of what's going on. There are components inside the system that implement all of this -- the locator, the Intellibutton, the Acton button, and a set of services are all parts of what's going on here. We see on the left-hand side corresponding to our is to story the particular service that we're concerned with, a mail reader. We will learn later that that is not the only kind of service we can start with. We can start with services where we can do editing in the particular application. We see on the right-hand side, again, corresponding just to this particular story, a number of applications and things we can do that correspond to what we saw on the Acton button. So lots of different services. That's one of the nice things about CyberDesk is it can do a lot of different things. So this specific example is to corresponding to what we saw, but the architecture is more general and it can do more things.
Q. Are there any other ways that CyberDesk disclosed

Also, Anind decides -- discovers that he doesn't have Gregory's phone number, so he decides to follow another suggestion and initiates a search using the switchboard web service C. So if he picks the blue option to the Acton button window, he goes off this particular system to another program elsewhere in the web, the switchboard service, which returns the second information that relates to the first information, we see Abowd, Gregory D. We get his middle name. We see his address. We see his phone number. So we picked up all this extra information, and the action displays this for us.

So this is just kind of a reminder, and if we
interpret this based on what we heard, that we're teaching all the shortcut elements. And to make this clear, to remind us of those things A through $H$ that I pointed out before, in the bottom right of the screen, you see in red I ticked off $A, B, C, D, F$ and $H$. So that is the six shortcut elements out of the eight that we are concerned with.
Q. Can we go to the next slide, and can you explain to the jury what this shows.
A. Sure. So also from this CHI ' 97 paper, we saw on the left-hand side the text that we've gone through that's from that paper. Another figure in the paper, Figure 3, is shown here on the right-hand side. This represents the 1160 shortcut elements?
A. So if -- what wasn't clear from looking at that particular example from the left-hand side it said mail reader, and one was wondering if this actually could corresponds with the Court's claim construction of a document and a first computer program, we can see from the testimony that we heard last week from Anind Dey, the question was: "So, for example, when you were talking about an e-mail, when it could pull text from an e-mail, was it possible that a user could be working in an e-mail when the text was selected for the CyberDesk to work?" And the answer is, "Absolutely."

So this teaches us that the first computer program could be a first computer program according to the Court's construction. It doesn't have to be a mail reader; you can go with editing tools as he said. I wouldn't have known if I just looked at the publication. I had to hear from him to understand that.
Q. Are there any other ways that CyberDesk disclosed the shortcut elements?
A. Yes. When we looked at the 843 patent, we see that one of the things it talks about is a kind of letter functionality where you can also take the information and put it into a letter. So here we see from testimony, again, that we heard last week, a question and answer,
which I'll read just to make this clear: "Did you ever come up with a version of CyberDesk that allowed the user actually to automatically insert any of the text that was found by CyberDesk?"

And the answer includes: "Absolutely, absolutely. The example that comes to my mind is a text editor." So we see that we can insert text into the working document according to his testimony. Again, this wasn't clear from just looking at the publication.

We also see that we've checked off some of the elements that we see in the bottom right there in this red box.
Q. Are there any on any other ways that CyberDesk disclosed the shortcut elements?
A. So I mentioned that Anind Dey, he explained that he set up a website, and in the web site, he described a system with a lot more detail than appears in any of the publications. When we look at the publications, it mentions numbers of things that were services, but here we actually see a list of the services that were included here.

And we see in the highlighted section a number of things that were given an address, in particular they allow us to retrieve a map. Among the options we see here for retrieving a map, in the bottom right there's one
called MapQuest, which is something I sometimes use along with google Map and Apple Map.

Also, if we go to the very top where the first yellow thing here is, and if we read the fine print, there's another one about doing a search for e-mail address. So lots of examples of kinds of things that you can search for that were explained by way of the CyberDesk system through this particular page on the website.
Q. If we could go to the next slide, could you explain to the jury why you included this slide in the presentation?
A. So we heard from Dr. Smedley about looking up an address and finding information and going to a map. So I just wanted to remind us that this is what we saw in the CyberDesk system as well.
Q. And can we go to the next slide and can you explain to the jury the network services you've identified here?
A. Yes. So also in this long list of services that you could do with the CyberDesk system, there were a number here highlight in yellow. This is the same list we saw before, but I've highlighted a few others. It's very small print. We see three things here. The first and the third have to do with words, looking up words in
dictionaries. A lot of my students can't spell very well, so I encourage them to pick good words and so on. So
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Atle Hedloy, working through his attorneys, filed work with the Patent Office. And in the file history, when I looked through that, I saw a reference on the bottom of one of the pages, and I'll read what it says here: "Applicant notes" -- that's Arendi or Atle Hedloy -- "that application Serial Number 12/841302, also before the examiner, and the prior art references analyzed in the accelerated examination support document, or AESD, of July 22, 2010, are of particular interest in relation to the present application."

So Arendi is pointing to the Patent Office that they should look specifically at this document to understand the ' 843 patent.
Q. All right. You mentioned the file history. Can you just remind the jury of what the file history is?
A. I think one of these books here is that. I think this big one here.
Q. If you look at DTX-2.
A. Okay. So this big thing, read through all of this several times. It includes the original submission. It includes interesting pages like the things that the Patent Office was given but didn't look at. Lots of interesting things here.

MR. LAHAD: Your Honor, I object to that.
THE WITNESS: Excuse me?
the court: That objection is sustained. You
can disregard the last portion of the answer. So
disregard -- disregard all of answer.
BY MS. ROBERTS:
Q. If you could just hold up the binder for the jury so they can see what you are referring to.

Thank you.
So what did Arendi say about the prior art references in the AESD?
A. So in the AESD, if one looks into that, which I think is another one of these binders. Yes. So this is another big binder. This is the AESD document that I looked at. And if I look into the table of contents, at the beginning part, I see there's a reference to Page 114. And if I go to Page 114, which is, I think, on the next slide, we see part of what Arendi told the Patent Office.

So I'll read the highlighted sections on this page: "The Dey reference describes a tool called CyberDesk. CyberDesk is a framework that supports the automatic integration of various software applications. In another example, the user highlights a name in the e-mail message, and CyberDesk offers various options that are specific to the name, e.g., look up the name in a contact manager."

So if we just think about the things that are listed here -- and, again, I should point out that Atle Hedloy in
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the critical date. And as I mentioned before, I went to California and spent a day working with Apple devices to understand Apple Data Detectors and try that myself.

Since he had gone to the trouble of buying a computer and putting the software that he kept from years before onto it. So I wanted to see how this worked.
Q. Did the PTO have all of the materials that you considered regarding Apple Data Detectors available to it before the PTO issued the 843 patent?
A. No. It's my understanding the Patent Office just looks at publications and patents. They don't look at this other kind of information.
Q. Did Apple Data Detectors disclose the shortcut elements?
A. Yes. And I'll show you this in a few slides, just to kind of remind us from these videos. So the first of these video presentations slides shows us the Wall Street Journal article, looked at in a browser on a computer system. We see highlighted in yellow, the whole article.

And if you recall from the video, there was a flash because the computer very quickly went through and analyzed the entire publication in this Wall Street Journal article and picked out what we now call "named entities," things, names, addresses, and so forth.

So Frank Casanova, the person who was giving the
the first day of the trial testified specifically that this came from applicant to the Patent Office. If we look at those things, we see in the bottom right-hand side, again, I've checked off the six shortcut elements that are confirmed by the statement from Arendi.
Q. Let's turn to another system that you mentioned earlier, Apple Data Detectors. What is Apple Data Detectors?
A. So if we go back to our timeline, we see that before the critical date, there were -- we see at sort of the bottom section there, there were two demonstrations to very large public audiences about Apple Data Detectors. We saw the videos last week. Big shows, lot of people there, public disclosure of their exciting invention.

So this is the beginning part of our discussion with regard to Apple Data Detectors.
Q. What materials did you consider to understand how Apple Data Detectors operated in the relevant time period? A. So we heard last week from Jim Miller, his testimony. I went through his deposition and studied that in detail. You've seen a part of that. As part of his deposition, we saw the two videos: One at the Macworld conference in San Francisco, and one at the Macworld conference in Boston. So we saw both of those demonstrating that.

There were a number of publications I studied before

## Fox - Direct

demonstration, was explaining this. And then he went on to say, as we see in the next slide, that the system, because of this flash of analysis, picked up those things and gives the user a number of choices of things that they can do with this.

Because its kind of fuzzy to read this at a distance, on the right-hand side, I put in Jim Manzi's information just so we can see this. So Jim Manzi, we have his e-mail address and his phone number. So we see from the analysis of this, that this pop-up menu or contextual menu is shown on the screen for the user, and it gives the user five choices of things to do. Browse, and it gives the web address that it picked up for the wall Street Journal article and its website. You see at the bottom a phone number that it picked up, the phone number as well.

We see second place, and then it has the block for Jim Manzi and his address out of quote, "experiences," in Now Contact, which is a contact book you put this and store this information in.

We can send mail to manzi@lotus.com, so we can email a message. And then highlighted in black there, a little bit harder to read, is write a letter to manzi@lotus.com. The post office wouldn't appreciate getting a letter addressed with manzi@lotus.com on the envelope, so the system goes through and does a search -- go to the next
slide -- looks up this e-mail address in a contact book, in an address book, for the entry that we see here. And it finds that information and picks up this second information, additional information it learned based on just using the e-mail address.

And given that information -- if we go to the next slide -- and you can see this "write a letter" functionality, very similar to what we see in the ' 843 patent, where it's popped up -- when we were processing the document, and it's populated that document with text. To make it clear, I put this on the right-hand side.

So we started off with manzi@lotus.com. It found additional information. It found his company, found his address, it figured out his first name, and put all this stuff into the "write a letter."

So it did all this stuff to provide a shortcut to help us do things more efficiently.
Q. And on the bottom of that slide, I see the letters in the red box. Can you remind the jury of what that means?
A. Yes. So again we see the six shortcut elements are ticked off: A, B, C, D, F, and H. So we've seen multiple times that these things are taught.
Q. Did Arendi address Apple Data Detectors with the Patent Office?
A. Yes. In this same AESD document that we talked about
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the six things we've gone through repeatedly from both the prior art and their descriptions, as well as from Arendi's own statements.

So we're definitely sure, lots of evidence to confirm the shortcut elements are being taught.
Q. In light of your discussion of what was available in the prior art, what was new and nonobvious in the 843 patent?
A. In order to get a patent, one must say something new. That is, new and nonobvious. So Arendi has explained that Elements $E$ and $G$, the things shown here in green, are the things that were new and nonobvious. That was how it was able to get its patent.
Q. When you say that this is what Arendi explained, what do you mean by that?
A. So if we go back to this AESD document that was given to the Patent Office by Arendi, we see more discussion in the sections about CyberDesk and ADD. So I will read the description here that goes to the CyberDesk. This is what Arendi told the Patent Office about CyberDesk so that they would understand Arendi's view of what CyberDesk is.
"Among other things, the Dey reference does not disclose contact information handing implemented by a document editing program. For example, Dey does not disclose analyzing selected textual information by the
before, we go to the table of contents, we see entry on Page -- referring to Page 111. And if we go to the next slide, we'll see Page 111, which is a summary of the discussion that Arendi gave to the Patent Office about the Apple Data Detectors system.
Q. What did Arendi say to the Patent Office about the Apple Data Detectors system in the AESD?
A. So I will read the highlighted section here. "ADD starts when a user highlights text in a word processing document. ADD then analyzes the text to determine whether it recognizes some portion of that text, as for an example, an e-mail address or web address. The user can use a contextual menu to initiate an action that is related to the recognized data."

So this is a summary of what we've talked about as the shortcut elements that we see again. I've ticked those off on the bottom right-hand side.

If you recall from the first day of this trial, Atle Hedloy confirmed that this was given to the Patent Office.
Q. Now, how did your analysis of the shortcut elements of the prior art and Arendi's discussions of it impact your overall analysis?
A. So if we go to the next slide, we get reminded of the Claim 23 elements. And we see in this particular case, that the six shortcut elements are ticked off. These are

## Fox - Direct

document editing program as required by the claims. CyberDesk itself analyzes text highlighted by the user, and CyberDesk is separate from any document editing programs. Indeed CyberDesk is the framework that integrates various applications."

So it's telling us about CyberDesk, but noted here with big red highlight section here is the word "separate." That's the main distinction that it's given with regard to the CyberDesk system, to distinguish the ' 843 from CyberDesk.

And, again, we heard on day one of this litigation, Atle Hedloy testified that this was given to the Patent Office.
Q. Did Arendi make any similar statements about Apple Data Detectors to the Patent Office in the AESD?
A. Yes. So also in this document, we go to the red section, I read part of it, that continues on with more about Apple Data Detectors. "Among other things, ADD does not disclose analyzing selected textual information by the document editing program as required by the claims. Also, ADD does not disclose providing an input device configured by the document editing program as required by the claims. Instead, ADD itself is a part of the operating system, and it analyzes the selected textual information and configures any input device. As ADD is a part of the
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operating system which is separate from the document editing program, ADD does not meet the limitations of the claims."

So again, we see the word "separate." This is the big distinction that's being drawn. We also saw that -it's explained that it's part of the operating system. Just remind to us from last week when we talked about the Android operating system.

We also notice that was testified to by Atle Hedloy on the first day of the trial, as I show in the bottom right side.
Q. If we can go to the next slide, can you explain to the jury what this image is supposed to show?
A. Yes. So having started working with computers in 1965, I have a built lots of systems and taught my students to build lots of systems. Sometimes they build small things, sometimes they build big things. Some of the bigger systems we build get so big it's really hard to learn them, so we split them up.

So many of the things I built since the 1980s are distributed systems.

So it was well known in the $\quad 80$ s and earlier, that the two ways to build software are to make a big thing or to have a lot of pieces and fit them together. So then we get the approaches that were used, Approach 1 and

So Approach 1 is to build something and add additional features and stick it in that. And systems like Microsoft Word are examples of the way that happens. But nowadays, especially -- and certainly back even in the ' 80 s and the early '90s, many of us would build things that ran on multiple computers and talked to each other and utilized the Internet and the web and all that kind of stuff. So we split things up into different pieces.

And when we did that, it was like in mathematics where you factor something out. Something you're going to use a lot, you put it off in one side, and other things make use of it. This is the tool I showed you.
Q. And the one where you factor things out that you just described, is that Approach Number 2 on this slide?
A. That's right. I'm calling that Approach Number 2.
Q. If we can turn on the next slide, can you explain this image to the jury?
A. So what we heard from the AESD is that Arendi argued that its method was Approach Number 1. In the ' 843 patent, it took Microsoft Word and put extra things into that. So that shortcut capability was built into that particular program. And that's what it claimed.

And when it distinguished in the AESD other work and said that they made things separate, which is Approach
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according to Dr. Smedley we heard last week.
Q. Now, let's go back to the summary of your opinions.

Can you please explain the basis for your opinion that the CyberDesk system anticipated the asserted claims? A. Yes. So what I've explained is that the CyberDesk system anticipates, and also later on we'll talk about the obviousness argument.

But let's go to the next slide and talk about what anticipation means. I'm not really very good at bowling. It's very rare that I get a strike, but that's what anticipation is like. You have one ball and you knock it all down.

So CyberDesk taught it; did it before. It anticipates. That's the terminology.

The other kind of thing which is more likely for me if I'm lucky to do this, is to get a spare to have a few balls that together knock things down.

So the obviousness arguments are like having a spare. Q. Can we go to the next slide, and can you explain to the jury why you included this slide?
A. So I'm using this slide as a reminder just because it's good for us to keep remembering this particular thing that was taught at the big CHI conference in 1997. There is more that goes on besides what is described here, but it helps us to just have a picture to refresh our memory
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and to have some text to refresh our memory.
So keeping this in mind, then we will go to the next slide and explain in detail about the anticipation case. So I wanted to just remind us about that.

So if we go to the next slide, we can sort of walk our way through how the CyberDesk system anticipates all of the elements of Claim 23.
Q. All right. Can you go ahead and walk the jury through that anticipation analysis?
A. So I won't go through all the same detail we heard
from Dr. Smedley, but I will go through each of these elements.

The first one, A, talks about the non-transitory computer readable medium. So on the website for CyberDesk, there's an option for you to get a single version, standalone version of the CyberDesk system.

So you can go there and download the whole thing. And then you can load it into your browser. You put in a HTML page. It brings in all these, what are called "applets."

And so now you have your browser, as we saw in that window. The browser has all these parts of it, everything is running inside the browser. The browser is a program, and these applets are a part of that. They're running in that situation.

We saw before, from the website and from the demonstration, lots of things can be searched for. So many different things can be searched for. So this gives us Element Number C.

It found that name, that highlighted name. So it retrieved it. So that's also covered. That's Element D.

And then we saw it provides an input device. So part of this program shows us an input device, the Acton button bar with a bunch of different options. So it's providing an input device. It's configured by this browser with all this stuff, CyberDesk running in it. So it is configured by the first computer program.

And what this Acton button does is covered in F. And there's a bunch of stuff here. It can do a search to -for at least using -- at least part of the first information, whether it's using the name. So that's part of the first information. To find second information, it's calling for options to go off and find additional information given that first information. Find other things that relate to that name, to Gregory Abowd.

And it's -- the type or types of the second information are dependent at least in part of the type or types of first information. So we have a name and we're going to find things that depend on a name. So we get street addresses, and we get phone numbers, we get other

So this is one way to think of it, according to the Court's construction, the browser with all the applets, all running in it, is self-contained, set of instructions to do tasks.

So we have our computer system. We've loaded it from outside, from another place, a non-transitory medium, and it's now running in a computer. And this whole thing is the first computer program. So that's the first part.

Part $B$ is displaying the document electronically using the first computer program. Browsers display things. They display programs where you can make edits, as we heard from Anind Dey. So we see the -- in the top left of that picture that I showed you before, document. So this teaches us Element B.

Elements C is while the document is being displayed, doing analysis of the document information and finding first information, that we saw Gregory Abowd -- was the first information that was highlight there. So that's the first information. And it's being analyzed in a computer process. That's part of what CyberDesk does behind the scenes. It's doing this analysis. Very smart system to do all kinds of things like that.

And it can recognize a lot of different kinds of information. So we have the plurality of types of information that can be searched for.
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kind of things that we saw in the demonstration.
And then the last thing is, setting this up to take an action. So $F$ is setting up this button to do all this stuff. So we clearly covered all of that.

G is the step that actually does something with this button. So the user clicks on something, and we saw the user clicking on different things, getting different results and actions. One of those was going to the second computer program called "Switchboard," which is running somewhere else in this -- I think it's a separate program. It picks up the information, picks up the street address and phone number and so forth for Gregory Abowd. So it's getting additional information to find the second information that's related to the search term to the name. So that gives us Element $G$.

And Element H, if searching finds any second information related to the search term performing the action using at least part of the second information. So we saw in the window we popped up this Switchboard that showed us all this extra information. So the action is displaying all that information to us.

So CyberDesk anticipated the claims of the '843 Claim 23, as we said. We can check off all these boxes. And furthermore, if we want to, we can look at Elements E and G, and say that Dr. Smedley also told us that that
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would be covered by what he said was being claimed.

2
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analysis?
A. So using Dr. Smedley's argument, we can see that another way to think of the CyberDesk system teaching this, is by looking at the different applets. And we see in the picture on the next slide, shown off in yellow is a content page which has -- if you look really in the fine print, you see Andy Wood is the -- is in this to find information. And there's additional information about that.

And you see on the bottom, there's a little button that says "New Contact." So to explain this, and Claim 33 says "Providing a prompt for updating the information source to include the first information." This whole display is a prompt, as is the new command button there. And we have confirmation of this that was taught by Anind Dey.

And a user could add a new contact as well. And he says correct. So this also teaches us Claim 30 .
Q. And so just to be clear, what's your conclusion with respect to whether the CyberDesk system anticipates Claim 30 ?
A. Yes. As we just said, it anticipates Claim 30. And I went through in detail and pointed out how Claim 23 is
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entry that says Apple Data Detectors home page. So CyberDesk is pointing us to look at Apple Data Detectors. So just following that, we would be motivated to make a combination of those two different things.

The other part of the screen on the bottom right we see a screen from Apple Data Detectors. And if we look in the picture there, we see that this is clearly a word processing document. In the top in parentheses it also says WP for word processing.

So apple Data Detectors tells us to think about word processors and clearly that would lead us to something like Microsoft Word. At that time, it was Word '97.
Q. What is the first combination that, in your opinion, makes the asserted claims obvious?
A. So we heard about two systems, CyberDesk and ADD. We've seen CyberDesk points to ADD. So that would motivate us to want to combine those things, and that's one of the combinations.
Q. Can we go to the next slide and can you explain this slide to the jury.
A. Yes. So we start off with CyberDesk, and we want to combine and add in $A D D$ and its functionality. So we've heard before, in going through for the CyberDesk system, which of the element are checked off. If there was any question about element number $H$, then we can show that
Q. Turning back to the summary of your opinions, let's move on to obviousness.

Why would a person of ordinary skill in the art be motivated to combine the prior art systems that you are relying on for this opinion?
A. So for something to be obvious, you have to be motivated to make the combination. So if we go to the next slide, we'll see that in addition to many other reasons for wanting to be motivated to make the combinations that we're talking about, that were explicit instructions in the documentation that were available that would guide us to do that.

So if we look at the description on the left-hand side of that CyberDesk, we see three different things. In the top sort of center, we see a list of desktop services that were supported by CyberDesk. Highlighted in yellow is one that says, "Simple Notepad." Simple Notepad is a word processing document.

So if one thinks of word processing documents, one would think of Microsoft Word. So we pointed to, by way of that, to think about Microsoft Word.

Also, we can see in the bottom left and top right, in publication -- some of the publications that describe CyberDesk, we see in the references there's an explicit
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this was supported by $\operatorname{ADD}$ as an additional combination.
So if we look at the example here of the question mark, just in case there's any doubt about the CyberDesk teaching element $H$.

So if we go to the next slide, we get reminded of Apple Data Detectors "Write a Letter" functionality. Again, this is working with word processing things and making insertions in them and so forth. So this reminds us, and we saw this earlier, so this confirms that with ADD, we also have element $H$.
Q. What is your conclusion, then, with respect to the combination of the CyberDesk system with the Apple Data Detectors system?
A. So before I had a question mark in the bottom one, now I have a red check mark to show that's also checked off if we added ADD.

I also wanted to remind us, because there's a lot of important terminology in this patent. I have gone through this and explained it, and we've talked about this and it's been testified about, but the word "document" is a very important one. So I just wanted to point out that clearly we're seeing editable documents in our examples. Q. Are there any other combinations that, in your opinion, render the asserted claims obvious?
A. So we looked at CyberDesk plus ADD. We can reverse
it and look at ADD plus CyberDesk, to be symmetrical. So if we go to the next slide, we see -- and this reminds us that we've had the shortcut elements being taught by ADD. We checked those six things off.

So if we go to the next slide, we see that if we make a combination -- I tried to put checklist here to make it even more clear. ADD has the six things there, and we know that CyberDesk has all eight things there. I went through them one by one to show that. We also have Dr. Smedley's argument that those two things would have been filled in.

So combining these two, put the checklist together, we have all of the limitations taught by this obvious connection.
Q. Did you consider whether the CyberDesk system and the Apple Data Detectors system would render Claim 30 obvious? A. Yes. So Claim 30 gives us the additional requirement of providing a prompt for updating the information source to include the first information.

So we hear two examples here, and I showed this earlier, Anind Dey, in response to the question: "And a user could add new contact as well?" He says, "Correct." And you see here, in the example in the bottom right, this window where you can click on the button that says "new contact."
showing?
A. So when I was working with the PowerBooks that we see here in court, we heard about last week, there were several pictures taken, as $I$ was working through this, just to understand how the system works.

So regarding Claim 30, it's very clear from these three different pictures how this would work. So the picture on the top left has a word processing document called -- in the program called Notepad, which is an editing program, or document editing program. We see in the top right of the screen there a document. And I've highlighted "testone@apple.com." So that's the first information that's been highlighted.

And the system, as a result, puts up this pop-up menu which we see there, a long list of things that I can do, one of which is highlighted in red, says "Add e-mail address to e-mail address book." And then it says -repeats the first information that I've highlighted, "testone.apple.com."

So when I click on that, I get to another display, which I show a photograph for in the bottom center of this. And reading what it says there, "What user name should be associated with this e-mail address?" So the e-mail address is testone@apple.com. I say, Well, let's

CyberDesk plus Word, and the second one we see on the next slide is Apple Data Detectors plus Word.
Q. When was Microsoft Word '97 publicly available?
A. The alpha version that did all the same stuff was available 1996, became available from Microsoft early in 1997. Copyright comes from 1997.
Q. What is the basis for your opinion that the combination of the CyberDesk system and Microsoft Word '97 and a combination of Apple Data Detectors and Microsoft Word ' 97 would render the asserted claims obvious?
A. To save us time, I put them all in one slide. This goes for CyberDesk and also for Apple Data Detectors. Both of them, we've learned repeatedly, they practice the shortcut elements. They cover the six things that are checked off in green.

The question we've been discussing is about the other two elements, Elements $E$ and $G$. So I put a question mark there to see how can we show, how do we learn, how do we understand that it's obvious that these things would have been taught by this combination.

So if we go to the next slide, we get reminded of this picture we've seen before. I have Approach Number 1, which is the one that we've been hearing about from Arendi. And back in the day when I used Microsoft Word '97, and I wanted to make sure that I didn't spell things
wrong, because that's not very good as a professor, I could use the spellcheck capabilities that was built into this.

Much earlier, when I first started with computers, the computers were much smaller. We couldn't do as much in them. So I used a separate program called Spell, which did spell checking. It was much more convenient in Word '97 to have it built into the word processor.

So Approach 1 is an example of Microsoft Word with something built into it. Remember this is different from Approach 2, where we have CyberDesk and Apple Data Detectors following this separation approach, factoring these out.
Q. So can we go to the next slide and can you tell the jury what you are showing here?
A. So obviousness combinations mean combining things and it doesn't mean that you take this bunch of software and this bunch of software and cram them together. It means that you can take functionality, the ideas, the methodology of something and put it into something else.

So if we take this CyberDesk shortcut functionality, which they programmed, move it into other programming packages, add it into Word -- it's easy to put stuff into Word back in the day. So if you take the shortcut functionality, you put this into the Microsoft Word
system, that combination would teach us all the elements.
Q. And if we go to the next slide, can you explain that to the jury.
A. The same kind of thing, we have Apple Data Detectors, and we take the key functionality, this shortcut
functionality we've talked about, and we add that into Microsoft Word. And again, this combination, very much like what was done in the ' 843 patent, would teach us this. This was an obvious thing to do. You have two approaches, make combinations, and this would make it obvious.
Q. So what is your opinion with respect to combining CyberDesk system or Apple Data Detectors, the Apple Data Detectors system with Microsoft Word '97?
A. So we saw before, for both CyberDesk and ADD, that they taught us the six shortcut elements. In this combination with Word, where it's all built into that, clearly we satisfy all of these other elements, these elements checked off in blue. So we've made obvious the claim elements of the Claim 23.
Q. Let's turn back to the summary of your opinions on the next slide. And can you please recap for the jury what your opinions on invalidity are.
A. So my opinion is that the asserted claims of the ' 843 patent are invalid. They were anticipated by the the invention." It's true that there are licenses to the ' 843 patent, but they all came as a result of settlements. And if a license comes as a result of settlement, it doesn't count as a secondary considerations. So that one doesn't apply.

The other three that are listed here talk about invention. It's important to understand the terminology. The invention --

MR. LAHAD: Sorry, Your Honor. Can I have a sidebar, please.

THE COURT: Yes.
(Whereupon, the following discussion is held at sidebar.)

THE COURT: Can we go off the record one
second.
(Off the record.)
THE COURT: Okay. Counsel.
MR. LAHAD: Yes. I would object to that testimony, Your Honor. The witness said that if a license is a settlement license, you can't consider it as
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Number 1, he is not a lawyer. I don't think that's the law. And so he's given the jury this notion that -- some kind of legal opinion that you can't consider it or that license, as a result of settlements, are entitled to less weight.

So I would object to that. I'd ask for an instruction -- or at least an instruction to the jury to strike that testimony.
the court: Let me review the testimony. One
minute.
Counsel?
ms. Roberts: Dr. Fox is explaining his
understanding as he went through the secondary
considerations. What he just said on the stand is in his rebuttal report. This being raised now is a bit of a surprise. Experts are allowed to get an understanding of the law so they can do their analysis.

THE COURT: Okay. Standby for a second. I'm going to grab a copy of his rebuttal report. Can you check where that is in his report.

MS. ROBERTS: It's Paragraph 514.
THE COURT: Okay. So we have testimony from
the expert on the stand that licenses as part of the settlement negotiations don't count. That's a different
A. Yes. My understanding of these is that they all refer to the invention. And here the invention is what's being claimed, the ' 843 claim elements that we've heard about.

There's referral to this as sort of the nexus of what the invention is, is my recollection of the terminology. So from what we've heard and what I've explained is that other people had the invention first. And that other people built systems that were being used. So any long-felt need wasn't satisfied by the invention, but by other people's work. And any praise that was given, was not of this particular invention that's being claimed, but of other people's work.

And the last point here is "Products incorporating invention achieved commercial success attributable to invention."

So when I studied the deposition, of Atle Hedloy, I heard the testimony. We see on the next slide, my understanding is that there was no commercial success. The question, "You do not personally consider the one button contact manager to have been a commercial success,
thing than saying that it negates their utility. So I'm going to ask the jury to strike -- I'm going to strike and ask the jury to disregard the portion of the testimony that licenses that result from settlement negotiations don't count.

MR. UNIKEL: I mean, may there be a follow-up
question?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. LAHAD: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Whereupon, the discussion at sidebar
concludes.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury,
I'm going to ask you to disregard the portion of the
testimony that states as follows: If a license comes as a
result of settlement, it doesn't have a secondary
consideration. You should disregard that portion of the testimony.
BY MS. ROBERTS:
Q. Dr. Fox, in your consideration of this
seventh factor, whether others have licenses to use the invention, did you consider the licenses in this case to have utility as a secondary consideration of nonobviousness?
A. I considered that. In my perspective, they don't
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do you?" And the answer is, "Not particularly."
Q. Dr. Fox, you mentioned earlier in your testimony that you were also asked to consider the benefit of the asserted claims over the prior art methods, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did you reach an opinion on that issue?
A. Yes. Two things are identified here. The one element that Arendi emphasized was putting shortcut tools inside a word processing or spreadsheet program. So that's the first point.

The second point is for Google, who wanted separate instructions, Arendi's claims were of low value.

MS. Roberts: Thank you. I will pass the
witness.
THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel.
Cross-examination.
MR. LAHAD: Yes, Your Honor. Before I begin, could I please have a sidebar.

THE COURT: Yes.
(Whereupon, the following discussion is held at sidebar.)

MR. LAHAD: Sorry, Your Honor.
THE COURT: What's on your mind?
MR. LAHAD: Yes. Thank you.

The witness repeatedly testified about what was
or was not considered by the Patent Office, what could and could not be considered by the Patent Office. He's not an expert in Patent Office procedure. He's not a patent attorney. There's no foundation he has any familiarity with the MPEP or anything like that. And so I think given the testimony of what could and could not be submitted, what was and was not submitted, I think he's opened the door to the IPR evidence. So he's saying we could not have put this -- Google could not have put -- or this art was not available to the Patent Office. I think those statements open the door to the IPR proceedings evidence of the IPR proceedings.

At the very least, I think we need some kind of curative instruction that this witness is not an expert in patent prosecution, patent procedure, the MPEP, or the like.

THE COURT: Counsel?
MS. ROBERTS: The witness -- first of all, he only was asked questions about what was considered before the patent was issued, only as to the CyberDesk system and the Apple Data Detectors system. And there's no dispute that the Patent Office does not consider systems. So he didn't say anything incorrect. He didn't say anything to open the door to IPR estoppel. That happened long after
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MR. LAHAD: Correct.
THE COURT: Counsel?
MS. ROBERTS: So the testimony was: What did
you consider about the CyberDesk system and about the Apple Data Detectors system and was all of this information available to the Patent Office?

THE COURT: All right. Let me take a look at the transcript.

MS. ROBERTS: Your Honor, and the testimony one of the things he considered was testimony about both Dr. Dey and Dr. Miller, which was not available to the Patent Office.

THE COURT: All right. Let me take a look at the transcript.

MR. UNIKEL: Your Honor, would you like us to stay here?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. LAHAD: Your Honor, if it's helpful, do you want to make sure we are looking at the same thing? There are our instances $I$ was focusing, 9:00, 18 seconds. I have it on the transcript. If you'd like, he testified: Did the PTO -- let me step back.

Question: Did the PTO review the full scope of materials about the CyberDesk system that you reviewed before the PTO issued the $\quad 843$ patent?

MR. LAHAD: He held up what was a portion of the prior art and said "the prosecution history" and said "Well, the Patent Office didn't look at this," or couldn't look at it. He mentioned the FCE website and said he couldn't submit that to the Patent Office. Number 1, that's incorrect, given the nature of the publications.

And I think, Your Honor, that opens the door to Google or anybody else could have submitted those same materials to the Patent Office as part of the submission in some kind of post-grant review. I think the door is opened.

THE COURT: So to the extent this is rearguing the issues we've already discussed numerous times of IPR estoppel, there wasn't an objection. The request for a curative instruction is overruled.

Was there testimony that talked about the
inability of prior art systems to be disclosed to the Patent Office?

MR. LAHAD: Yes.
THE COURT: And that, in your view, would be an incorrect statement of the law?

MR. LAHAD: You can --
THE COURT: Because you can submit systems as
part of the original patent prosecution?
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Answer: It's my understanding the Patent Office looks at publications of patents. They don't look at systems. You're the ones who get to look at systems. So they didn't have all this other information I had available.

We all heard it at this Court in this litigation.

MS. ROBERTS: Your Honor, there was no objection, no opportunity to --

THE COURT: Here's what I'm going to say, there was no objection at the time. So the possibilities are that we can let you cross-examine this witness on this issue. We could have a follow-up question from Google right now to clear this up at this moment.

Either way, I don't think it opens the door to the IPR. That's out. But we can deal with it one of those other two ways.

MR. LAHAD: I will cross him on it, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Great.
(Whereupon, the discussion at sidebar
concludes.)

MR. LAHAD: Your Honor, may I approach?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. LAHAD: Thank you.

May I, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Please proceed.
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. LAHAD:
Q. Good morning, Dr. Fox. How are you?
A. Good morning. Well, thanks. How are you?
Q. I'm hanging in there. My name is John Lahad. We've not met before. I've got some questions for you this morning. If I could direct your attention to -- it's Slide 4 in the slide deck that I have. Just want to do some table setting for us this morning. You are not here to provide an opinion on non-infringement, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. You are not here to explain to us how the products accused of infringement work, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. You did not speak with any of the Google engineers in preparing your opinions for trial, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You were not provided with any materials describing the functionality of Google's accused products, correct?
A. Correct
Q. So the jury should not somehow mistake your testimony for evidence about why the accused products do not infringe, correct?
A. I didn't testify at all about infringement issues,
yes.
Q. So the jury should not rely on anything you said at all in determining infringement or non-infringement, correct?
A. What the jury should do, and -- I have no idea. I mean, they're supposed to do a good job. So I can't really speak of that. That's not a thing I'm aware of.
Q. You're here for validity, correct?
A. My assignment was, as we see listed here, to do those two things.
Q. And this case is not the first time you've been retained by Google to present expert testimony on Google's behalf, correct?
A. I've been to two trials out of four trials I've attended where $I$ was the non-infringement expert for Google.
Q. But the extent of your prior retention by Google goes well beyond those trials, right?
A. I have been retained on other cases, which often didn't go anywhere.
Q. Google has retained you as an expert witness in no less than ten cases, correct?
A. I don't remember the count, but I've worked with many different defendants and plaintiffs.
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Q. You were retained to give testimony on behalf of Google, correct?
A. I was testifying to give my expert in opinion in cases that related to Google, yes.
Q. On behalf of Google, right? Not on behalf of the law firms, on behalf of Google. The law firms weren't the parties in trial; it was Google in trial, right?
A. In the case in which Google was being accused, yes.
Q. Okay. So after Uniloc, you've got Arendi versus Google, which is this case, right?
A. I'm trying to find where you are.
Q. I'm on the first page of Exhibit $C$ about halfway down. It says case: "Arendi versus Google." Would it be helpful if we put it on the screen for you, sir, with Your Honor's permission?
A. Which page are you on?
Q. I'm on the first page?

THE COURT: Counsel, can I have a copy of the binder, please?

MR. LAHAD: Yes.
the witness: I don't think we're looking at the same thing.

MR. LAHAD: I'm with opposing counsel, Your Honor. Sort of highlighting.

THE WITNESS: I think the version you gave me
is out of order. The first page on my copy has something in the bottom that it says, section E. If I go to the second sheet, it starts with A. So I think you gave it to me in the wrong order.

MR. LAHAD: Your Honor, may I approach to check the binder?

THE COURT: Yes.
THE WITNESS: See, this is the first page, but
that's not the first page because it's E. So the pages are out of order.

MR. LAHAD: I apologize. There was one sheet
that was out of order, Your Honor.
BY MR. LAHAD:
Q. All right. So there's the -- are we on the same page
now?
A. I think so.
Q. Literally?
A. I think so.
Q. Okay. So we had the first case is impact engine.

And then the second case was that Eolas case, right?
A. Second one was Uniloc.
Q. I'm sorry, sir, could you repeat that?
A. The first on this page was impact engine.
Q. Yeah, Impact Engine, then Uniloc, then Arendi, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And there's the ELS at the bottom of that page right
there for Case Number 4, right?
A. Yes. You skipped a few others, but, yes.
Q. Well, those others weren't Google cases, right?
A. That's right. They were among the other defendants

I've worked with.
Q. Yeah. I want to focus on the Google defendant.
A. Okay.
Q. Next page, there's the Bright Response case, middle of the page.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. All right. So that's five. And then if you go couple pages later, on some other cases, it's D.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. There's another Impact Engine entry there. That's the same as the one before, right?
A. Yeah. I think I've cleaned this up in a newer copy.
Q. Right. On the next page, there's a Bright Smart Corp versus Google case that you were retained for, right?
A. Yes. In the middle of the page, yes.
Q. On the last page there's Rockstar Consortium versus Google, right? Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes. It's the second, third-from-the-last page, yes.
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A. Because they were, yes.
Q. Not one time did you say, "Hey, you know what? This patent is valid," right?
A. I'm careful in picking cases so that I understand what the situation is, yes.
Q. Likewise, when you were the non-infringement expert on behalf of Google, in each case, you found that there was no infringement, correct?
A. Once again, I'm always careful picking my cases, yes.
Q. Not one time have you said that a patent asserted against Google was infringed, correct?
A. In the patent infringement cases, that's correct.
Q. And of course, you wouldn't mind being retained by Google or its lawyers in future cases, correct?

MS. ROBERTS: Objection; argumentative.
MR. LAHAD: Goes to bias, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Overruled.
BY MR. LAHAD:
Q. I'm sorry, sir, I didn't get your answer.
A. It depends on my health. I'm getting older, so I can't do as much.
Q. An opinion that a patent is valid and infringed or valid and/or infringed, that wouldn't help insofar as getting hired by Google again, would it?
A. I have no idea. I'm a world expert in search
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## systems, so I always give an honest opinion.

Q. For a certain hourly rate, right?
A. That's a result of my work, yes.
Q. And your rate for testifying today is about $\$ 600$ an
hour, correct?
A. Today it is, yes.
Q. If I could have Slide 8 .

Dr. Fox, you went through this slide with your lawyer.

Do you recall that, sir.
A. Yes. This was the second of the four points I was making, yes.
Q. Right. You say, Putting -- "To put instructions all
in one program was an obvious choice, and one of very few available design choices."

Those are your words, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. That's not the Court's construction is it?
A. No. This is my opinion.
Q. Well, this notion that the -- you're describing in this slide the requirement of the 843 patent, correct?
A. I think you are misreading this. What it says is,
"The ' 843 patent's requirement to put instructions all in one program." So that's what the ' 843 patent says.
Q. Yeah, but --

Fox -
courtroom -- let me step back.
Were you in the courtroom last week when I was chatting with Dr. Rinard?
A. I was here the whole time except for Mr. Weinstein's discussion. So, yes, I have been here the whole week.
Q. And you were in the courtroom when I was asking Dr. Rinard about combining computer programs, and he was having trouble figuring out how you would do it.

Do you recall that?
MS. ROBERTS: Objection. Mischaracterizes
testimony.
THE COURT: That objection is sustained.
Please rephrase.
BY MR. LAHAD:
Q. Well, were you in the courtroom when I was asking questions of Dr. Rinard about combining code from different programs into one program.
Do you recall that?
A. I was here during the entire discussion.
Q. Yeah. And according to my colleagues, I don't remember this, I made some kind of gesture about slapping on the back of -- slapping one program on the back of the other program.

Do you recall that at all?
A. I don't remember that, no.
A. My comment was that this was an obvious choice.
Q. Yeah. But you are using the word "requirement,"
right? Requirement is like a -- that's a claim
limitation. If a patent requires something, that's in the claims, isn't it?
A. This is my understanding of what the patent's claim elements tells us. This is what they teach.
Q. But your selection of words, your understanding has to give way to the Court's construction, correct?
A. I follow the Court's construction as carefully and as thoroughly as I could possibly do so.
Q. You followed the Court's construction thoroughly and carefully, and then you just ignored it and used your own words on this slide, correct?
A. I'm explaining my opinion. I don't understand what you're --
Q. Yeah. You were explaining your opinion in your words, right?
A. That's certainly something I am supposed to do, yes.
Q. And not the context of claims or Court's construction right?
A. Certainly, this is all in the context of the
litigation.
Q. You talk about putting instructions in -- all in one program was an obvious choice. You were in the

1212
Q. Okay. So you don't -- he and I were having trouble communicating or connecting about the relative ease with which you could combine two programs, but as I understand it, in your view, it would be obvious, correct?
A. I'm not sure. I lost what you were saying would be obvious, what were you referring to?
Q. Combining computer programs into one program.
A. In the examples I've given of making combinations, they were obvious. Not every combination of things is obvious. It depends on the situation.
Q. Well, that's not what you said here. You said, "The requirement to put instructions all in one program was an obvious choice." You didn't say, "Sometimes it's obvious; sometimes it's not obvious."

I just want to know if we can rely on this statement.
A. You just told me about combining different things. This statement is about putting instructions in one program. Those are two different issues. So I think you're confusing the two things.
Q. You're --
A. I can't answer one relative to the other without them being fit together sensibly.
Q. Are you differentiating between instructions and code?
A. My understanding of what you said, I mean, if you
want to repeat it, I'd be happy to hear that. But my
understanding was that you were talking about combining two different programs. And that's not what this says here. This is saying putting instructions in a program. Q. Okay. So you're differentiating between instructions for a program and two different programs, right? Is that what I'm hearing?
A. When I made the obviousness argument, I said, "to take the functionality and to put it into something." I put instructions in a program. Putting instructions in a program is a clear thing to do. When we write programs, we put them in a program. So this statement is sort of trivial kind of thing.

Combining two different things is a different matter. So I think you are confusing the two issues.
Q. Let's go to the next slide. This is -- well, let me step back. We agreed earlier that you are not here to opine on whether Google infringes, right?
A. That was not part of my assignment, no.
Q. So on this slide, when you talk about Arendi's position, right, you're talking about that's -- that this is Google's view of Arendi's argument, correct? This notion of instructions being separate from the document editing program?
A. What I'm saying here is the same thing that appeared
products use instructions separate from the document editing program, right?
A. That is what the expert who built the software systems explained last week that I heard.
Q. Right. And just so we're on the same page, you understand that Arendi is disputing Google's characterization of Arendi's argument, right?
A. Yes, of course.
Q. Okay. So in order to get to this slide, you would have to adopt Google's view of Arendi's argument, correct?
A. I'm just articulating what I heard last week.
Q. Right. These are not your opinions. You're just kind of echoing what you heard last week, right?
A. That particular bullet is a repetition of what I heard last week, what we all heard last week.
Q. And, again, you have not performed any kind of analysis, because it wasn't your assignment, about whether or not this is true, right?
A. That's not been my assignment, no.
Q. Okay.
A. I'm just repeating what $I$ heard in court. We all heard it here.
Q. And then you say, "Applying Arendi's argument" -again, that's Google's characterization of Arendi's argument, right?
in the AESD. There's a specific wording there that talks about separate. I'm just repeating Arendi's own statement to the Patent Office here.
Q. Can we go to the next slide.

You say, "Arendi is now arguing that Google's products are covered by the ' 843 patent claims," right?
A. That's what I heard last week.
Q. And then you say, "Google's products use instructions separate from the document editing program," right?
A. That's what I heard last week.
Q. This notion of Google's products using instructions that are separate from the document editing program, that's Google's view of Arendi's argument for non -- for infringement, right?
A. I heard testimony that supports that statement last week. I don't quite understand what you're distinguishing.
Q. Well, no, this bullet point right here, "Google's products use instructions separate from the document editing program," that's not Arendi's view of its position, right? You understand that that's -- those are Google's words being used to describe Arendi's position, right?
A. As I said, I heard that last week.
Q. Okay. It's Google that is saying that the infringing
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A. No, actually, the next point is that Arendi's two statements, the statements by Dr. Smedley and the statements in the AESD, are contradicting each other. That's my understanding from studying those things.
Q. Well, if the jury finds that Arendi is right and Google's characterization of its own technology is wrong, then the ' 843 patent claims are not invalid, correct?
A. Can you say that one more time.
Q. Sure.
A. I didn't quite follow it.
Q. If the jury finds that Arendi is right and Google's characterization of Google's technology is wrong, then the ' 843 patent claims are not invalid, correct?
A. No. No, no. I gave clear evidence that the patent is invalid, the claims are invalid, many, many different arguments from many different sources. That's just one additional argument that one might use.
Q. Well, if the jury rejects the notion -- strike that.

If the jury rejects Google's and your
characterization of what Arendi argued to the Patent
Office, the ' 843 patent is not invalid, correct?
A. That is one of many arguments about the patents being invalid. If that particular situation arose, then that last point wouldn't apply, but the rest of my discussion certainly applies
Q. All right. So just, again, so we're on the same page, if the jury rejects the first part of your third bullet, rejects your characterization of Arendi's arguments, then the rest of it is wrong?
A. Yes. This is one of the many arguments for invalidity, and the logic here says that if we apply that argument, which I've pointed out is contradictory based on the evidence from Arendi, then we reach this particular conclusion.
Q. Now, I want to go back to the previous slide. Okay. I found the right question to go with this slide. At the time Arendi made these statements to the

Patent Office, Arendi did not have benefit of the Court's construction, correct?
A. The Court's construction came well after the patent was issued.
Q. Right. So --
A. So, yes.
Q. Didn't have benefit of the Court's construction, right?
A. Sure.
Q. Now, you discussed about what was submitted, what could have been submitted to the Patent Office, and you held up the file history.

Do you recall that?
A. Yes. There's a document sitting here that is the file history that I studied many times.
Q. And you understand that that's not the entirety of the file history, right?
A. My definition of file history is that it's the document from the time that a file -- that a patent is filed until it's issued. That's what I think of as file history, and that's what I referred to, and that's what this document is.
Q. Well, but you understand that the file history for the ' 843 patent is not -- how many pages is that? 400 or so, 300 ?
A. It's a big book certainly.
Q. Yeah, it's about that thick, two and a half inches?
A. Yeah. I don't think the pages -- actually, it's 488 maybe.
Q. So let's call it 500 pages. But you held up 500 pages. You understand the actual file history in this case is over 31,000 pages, correct?

MS. ROBERTS: Objection. May I have a sidebar?
THE COURT: Let me see counsel at sidebar.
(Whereupon, the following discussion is held at sidebar.)

THE COURT: Where are we going with this?
Fox-Cross
Mr. Boles.
BY MR. LAHAD:
Q. You are familiar with, of course, the layout of the
patent, Dr. Fox, right? patent, Dr. Fox, right?
A. That's right. I've done lots of work with patents.
Q. All right. There's a section called "cited
references" on a patent, right?
A. Yeah. It's not shown here. This is other publications.
Q. It starts right here.
A. References cited, yes.
Q. Right.

MR. LAHAD: And there's one reference here that goes onto the next page, Mr. Boles.
A. There are eight more pages, right.
Q. Eight more pages of references cited, right?
A. That's right.
Q. And you understand if you take all those pages of the references cited, it's a lot more than 500 pages, correct?
A. So I'm not aware of the file history referring to all the references and their content. If you say, so, I mean, if that's part of what should be considered in the file history, but I've never seen it in any of the documents I've worked with.
Q. Well, I mean, you testified a few times about what
the Patent Office saw and didn't see and could and could not see, but, I mean, you understand that there are eight pages of cited references on the face of the patent, right?
A. Right. So when I do file patents, I'm disclosing related work. I send the Patent Office copies of those things. But I've never seen, in what I think the file history, all of the text of those things included.
Q. So you're --
A. Certainly, they could be. I would guess that would be...
Q. Okay. So your view is that, as you understand it, the file history does not include all the references cited on the face of the patent?
A. No, no. What I'm saying is the file history I have seen in cases such as this book, is this document, not the -- all the things pointed to in the references. So if that's what you said should be considered the file history, then that's fine.
Q. Well, I mean, as part of your work, you have to figure out what was in front of the Patent Office, what was disclosed to the Patent Office, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So, you know, step one is looking at the cited references, right?

30 -some works about hypertext, which reads on this. And I looked through testimony of some friends. I looked through the long list of things. It's a very long list.
Q. Did you review all of these documents?
A. No. I looked through the list, and I remembered many of them because I worked in the field and I knew many of them already.
Q. But you didn't review all of the documents?
A. I didn't review all those documents. That would have taken months and months, no. I don't think -- I don't know of any expert who has ever done that.
Q. Well, you don't know what other experts do; you know what you do, right?
A. I said, I don't know of any other experts who would have done that.
Q. But we're here to talk about what you did, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So you did not review all of these documents, right?
A. That's right.
Q. And you didn't ask Google or its lawyers, Well, hey, I've got this binder right here, it's about 500 pages, why don't I -- why aren't these documents -- or why isn't all this other stuff in the file history, as you understand?
A. So I read this entire thing, which is what the Patent
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A. If they didn't talk about it, then they probably didn't consider it's very relevant.
Q. Well, you don't know that; that's just a guess.
A. That's the assumption.
Q. That is a big old assumption, isn't it?
A. I have the record of what they said and what they wrote to Arendi. That's what --
Q. Where did you get that record?
A. The file history?
Q. Yeah.
A. I was given it by the attorneys.
Q. You were given it by google's lawyers?
A. Yes.
Q. You didn't go off and get it on your own?
A. I didn't see a reason to have to do that.

THE COURT: Counsel, I think at this point in time we are going to take our morning break.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we have scheduled a 15-minute break. It may be a little bit longer because there are some matters that I need to talk to the attorneys about. We will take the jury out. Thank you.
(The jury exits the courtroom at 10:45 a.m.)
the court: Please have a seat, ladies and gentlemen.

So in terms of triaging what the court needs to
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sacerdoti as a rebuttal expert on validity. And I don't deal with to make sure I dealt with everything at the appropriate time --

You may step down, Doctor.
It seems to me that there's a reasonable chance Mr. Kidder will be taking the stand before we go to lunch. Does that sound accurate and probable?

MR. PETERMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Yes.
the court: Okay. So I need to deal with these objections to the demonstratives, and what I'd like to do before I hear any additional argument on them is to go back and read the expert reports and then that way I will be in a better position to put into context counsel's arguments about what is and isn't new. So that's what I'm going to do during this break. And it may take me some additional time, and then we'll have some arguments about that before we have Dr. Fox retake the stand and finish his cross-examination.

I anticipate that Mr. Kidder's testimony and cross-examination will go past lunch. After that, does Arendi know -- you don't have to tell me if you don't know or don't want to -- how the rest of the afternoon is going to go in terms of your rebuttal case?

MS. SRINIVASAN: We anticipate calling Dr. Earl
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form. I think that's the universe -- there were some additional issues that came up. But I think that's reflective of what we have.

In the jury instructions, we would probably like the opportunity to be heard on that because there were a few material changes that came in last night.

THE COURT: Okay. And is it correct that the main issues with respect to the jury instructions have to do with how the jury is going to be instructed on the license and how the jury should be instructed on the prior art?

MS. SRINIVASAN: And with respect to willfulness. There is a -- there was a change there. There's disputed provisions based on the law about what instruction should be given.
the court: Okay. Those, I think I can resolve without hearing argument. Let me hear from counsel for Google. Anything that we've missed in what we are going over?

MR. UNIKEL: No. I think there's really those three principal instructions, the verdict form, and then it's just finishing the witnesses with the cross-examination.

There is -- at the close of case, there will be the need to at least preserve the Rule 50A motions. I
know how long his testimony will be, but he would be our expected sole rebuttal witness.

THE COURT: So Mr. Weinstein is not retaking the stand?

MS. SRINIVASAN: No.
the court: Okay. And then we will have
cross-examination of that expert. So that puts us in an interesting position about how we get to the end of the day. Let me hear what each side's position is on that.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Well, Your Honor, and I don't mean this to be negative to the other side or anything, but we thought we had reached kind of closure on jury instructions and we got a red line last night with additional changes in the evening. So I know there was a new joint instruction submitted late last night to the Court. And so there are open issues there that still need to be addressed as with the verdict form, some of which we are responding to or have been working on responding to overnight because there were some issues --

THE COURT: Were there new issues with respect to the verdict form after the one that was filed yesterday? Because I think the Court will be in a position to resolve those pretty quickly today.

MS. SRINIVASAN: I don't think for the verdict
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imagine we can do that briefly, as we did before. So I don't imagine that will take a lot of time, but that is something we will have to do on the record.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. LING: Your Honor, may I be heard?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. LING: There are some miscellaneous other issues as well in the jury instructions that the parties have flagged. Google would like the opportunity to make our objections on the record insofar as the Court would like the law.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand.
MR. LING: Thank you.
THE COURT: We are not going to do that right this second though.
Okay. We've got some things we need to work on then. It sounds like we can do some of this shortly after the lunch break today. I guess by my calculations -well, let me hear your best estimates based on what you've heard from the other side about when we're going to be done today if we don't spend a long time arguing about the jury instructions.

MR. UNIKEL: Again, I don't know how long the cross-examination is planned for. So we have about, I'd say, 45 to 50 minutes with Mr. Kidder. I don't know how
long Mr. Sacerdoti is going to testify. I would expect that my cross-examination of him would be somewhere between 30 and 40 minutes, maximum. So again, assuming we can work out the other things and breaks --

THE COURT: Counsel, what's your estimate? I guess what I'm asking is this: Are we going to be done with testimony before $3: 00$ today?

MS. SRINIVASAN: I think it's -- we will probably be about $3: 00$ or after 3:00. I don't see us being well ahead of $3: 00$ to finish the testimony, given that we have the cross-examination ongoing of Dr. Fox. We have Mr. Kidder's affirmative testimony. So let's say that's 45 minutes, plus the remainder of the cross, another hour and a half. Mr. Kidder's cross-examination takes us probably in excess of two hours. And then Dr. Sacerdoti's direct and cross is probably close to two hours, an hour and 45 minutes. So I see us being probably around the 3:00 threshold.

THE COURT: Do you agree with that?
MR. UNIKEL: It sounds about right. I suppose
the other issue is how long it will take for the Court to read the jury instructions.

THE COURT: Right. So this is what I'm
thinking about. Please have a seat.
So if I read the jury instructions -- I'd like

2
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numbers don't match the expert report because we've changed the accused functionalities?

MR. PETERMAN: Yes, Your Honor, it's a
different -- it's a different revenue base.
THE COURT: Okay. And how about Arendi? Do you have any dispute about -- I know you dispute that it's the same methodology, but the mathematical calculation itself, are you disputing?

MS. SRINIVASAN: No. Just that the way he did it in the report, putting aside the revenue base, Google's revenue, which has changed, but the actual manner in which they calculated Google's royalty at the percentage above is different from what he did in his report.
the court: Okay. All right. I understand that objection. That objection is going to be overruled. These slides can all come in. I read the report closely. I -- I don't think we can say that the methodology has changed.

That should take us through 26. I already ruled that 32,33 , and 34 can come in. I want to talk about 35. I don't know what this 30.2 million number is.

Can you explain that to me?
MR. Peterman: Yes, Your Honor. The only dispute with the slides that look like this is the text on the left-hand side where we say, "No evidence of commonly
to read the jury instructions at the same time as closing. And I don't think it benefits anyone to go ahead with that today and have the closings tomorrow.

So if I did that starting at 3:00, for example, now we're talking about almost to 4:00, and then we've got the closings. That puts us to 5:00. Everybody is going to have to come back tomorrow anyway. I don't think I can keep the jury past 6:00, even if I thought it was a good idea, which I don't.

So I think at this point in time, given where we are today, sitting here right now, I think we're going to do the jury instructions in the morning and then the closings in the morning.

So in light of that, I'm going to proceed on the break right now with that in mind. We will have to get the jury instructions straightened out, but some of that might be able to be done after we send the jury home for the day.

Okay? All right. We will be in recess.
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: Okay. Counsel. We took a look at the damages expert reports to give us some context about what's going on here. Can I ask counsel for Google, so these numbers on DDX slide 20 where it says, "Google's royalty $X$ percentage above," is the reason why those

Just to level set, every application with Chrome was 2017, 2018. That was the playing field in his supplemental report. He had the opportunity if he wanted to raise this argument that there was a lack of evidence about what applications or -- were installed on devices with Android 8. He did not. Of course, he himself utilized those installations.

So that is an opinion that, if he's intending
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installed devices with Android and STS." I believe that's the only dispute. Just to answer Your Honor's question, what the actual pie chart represents is that what damage base is left under Mr. Weinstein's calculation once you remove the August to December downloads.

And then if you saw other slides, you know, that then take more off the pie chart, it's just taking off the damage base, you know, as Mr. Kidder questions the assumptions and methodology that Mr. Weinstein employed.
the court: Okay. Counsel, any objection about this text?

MS. SRINIVASAN: We objected to the text
because, again, even though Mr. Kidder had the opportunity for virtually all the applications to raise some question about lack of evidence of how Arendi installed devices were on Android 8 with STS, that was never raised in his reports.
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THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, any objection about
.
to offer today, would be new. And, again, all of the other applications minus Chrome were in this world of STS only at the time that he served his you supplemental report. So if he was going to make that critique -- he has many other critiques of Mr. Weinstein -- this is not one of them. This is a new opinion that he wants to offer today.

THE COURT: Okay. Well --
MS. SRINIVASAN: And counsel provided us last night with modified slides -- I don't object to the number -- without this text in them, but this text they have in every single slide that contains this pie chart. And if the idea is that he's going to testify or opine that there's a lack of evidence there, that's not contained in his report, and he had every opportunity to make that argument.

THE COURT: All right. But in my view, that's a factual argument. And we're putting that question to the jury about what these numbers are based on the record as I understand it, which by the way, I reviewed very closely over the weekend. So that objection to that slide is going to be overruled.

What do we have on $30(\mathrm{a})$ ? What's the objection there.

MS. SRINIVASAN: All right. Your Honor, we did

So we do -- we don't object to using a slide like this as long as we are not showing to the jury information that suggests there are all these other revenues basis we're in. We think that should at least --

THE COURT: Understood. So I think what I hear you saying is, there's going to be this big number, and they are going to make an argument like, sir, we've heard about what you did in the Apple case, and aren't you trying to do the same thing here.

Is that what you're worried about?
MS. SRINIVASAN: That is a concern, and also that how do we explain why we're looking at 2017 and 2018 now without getting into issues like the Court's summary judgment ruling that narrowed what was at issue. So I don't know fully how they intend to use it. It was the subject of our conference. I don't object to showing numbers that reflect 2017, 2018 and what's at issue, but the concern I have is the question the jury will have if they start seeing things dating back to the 2012, and, obviously, we don't want to be talking about prior orders or rulings.

THE COURT: Right. Understood.
Counsel?
MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, I'd like to propose a solution. On April 21, counsel for Arendi produced to
propose a suggestion that it be limited to the time
periods that are now at issue rather than putting all of the prior numbers before the jury. I don't know for what purpose that is to put something in there that there's going to be a discussion about how the base was bigger before. Because my understanding that was something we were told not to do.

So I think if we're going to be using any
exhibits from reports on either side for the experts, we should attempt to redact out anything that is not about the universe that's before the jury, which is 2017, 2018.

THE COURT: So I think what I hear you saying
is you think that this would be prejudicial for the jury to see something that's not still being argued?

MS. SRINIVASAN: Yes, Your Honor. It shows --
THE COURT: Even though this was the chart that was used by your expert.

MS. SRINIVASAN: This is from his original report; it's not the supplemental report chart. But they're using things that goes back even prior to summary judgment in this case. It's not just about something that has to do with -- or the summary judgment ruling. It's not just something that has to do with the narrowing with respect to Chrome. Now we're talking about Nexus devices, things that have long since not been part of the case.
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us a new exhibit that we had marked at DTX-1148. That exhibit includes the numbers that Mr. Weinstein relied on.

My understanding is that counsel, even though they produced it on April 21, has an objection to us actually using this as an exhibit in evidence here. These -- you know, this exhibit that they produced is the only reflection of the units that Mr. Weinstein actually relied upon for his calculation. We believe it is appropriately placed into evidence.

My understanding is that they're concerned
because, in what they produced to us, they still left some other numbers on it. They certainly could have produced an even more truncated version of this if they were concerned about getting this in front of the jury.

So, you know, if Your Honor will allow this DTX-1148 to be admitted into evidence or used as a demonstrative, we could use this. And I think it takes care of a lot of the concerns that counsel has raised.

MS. SRINIVASAN: We don't have an objection to using it. But, again, it's not something we produced. It's from his 2022 expert report. The highlighting that's on there, could that be redacted? Because again, those are the things that were being removed. So the remainder of the exhibit, we don't have an issue with.
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highlighting, or you want to redact what's highlighted?
MS. SRINIVASAN: Redact what's highlighted. Because again, we didn't produce this. We didn't make this. This is what existed in the report as of 2022. We don't have an objection to using it, but if it's going to show something that's not longer at issue, that's going to create the same question as to why is Chrome in there prior to 2017 when we are only talking about 2017?
the court: Yeah. I get it. Here's what I was thinking when I saw this was, I wasn't understanding why we needed to use the page that has the Pixel 1 on there.

Is there some reason we need to show the jury that?

MR. PETERMAN: I think it's important to show the jury because it also notes all the sources that Mr. Weinstein used. So, you know, we can certainly show a version of this that has Pixel 1 lined out. I would point out that this is what Arendi produced to us on April 21. They're the ones who put the highlighting in. They didn't produce a version of this exhibit that excised the Pixel 1 line and excised different -- the Chrome and...

And if they had produced a different version of this to us on April 21, that's something that we certainly could have used. It's not up to us to amend their exhibit. And so that's the position that we have here.
not the sources. I could be mistaken.
MS. SRINIVASAN: There's one that had the
sources that was the comparative one with Mr. Kidder that had the sources that had all of the accused app downloads for 2018.

THE COURT: Which was that for the record?
MS. SRINIVASAN: Let me get the number from Mr. Weinstein.

MR. Peterman: I believe that one had
Mr. Weinstein and then it had Mr. Kidder saying that Mr. Kidder agreed with Mr. Weinstein. So that would not be something we would be interested in using.

MS. SRINIVASAN: It's PDX-4-37 was the demonstrative that used with Mr. Weinstein.

THE COURT: Do you want to take a second and see what that is?

MR. PETERMAN: Yes.
Two things, Your Honor, that demonstrative -and perhaps we can put it up -- has a comparison of Mr. Weinstein and Mr. Kidder. And they used that to make a point that Mr. Kidder agrees with Mr. Weinstein.

It also, based on what I saw, that's the just
the apps. It doesn't have that devices.
THE COURT: Right. I guess I'm wondering why we need the -- well, as I'm talking, I understand.

But if Your Honor is more comfortable with Pixel line being taken out in order to put this into evidence, Google certainly is willing to do that.
the court: Well, you're going to have to refresh my recollection. How did Mr. Weinstein get this? We saw this evidence before. Was that admitted into evidence? Or we had these numbers?

MS. SRINIVASAN: We used it as a demonstrative with his testimony. We -- this is an exhibit to his report. Traditionally, we don't move that into evidence, the exhibits. But it is from the report that he originally issued. We provided it so that it was clear that he was using the same numbers minus what he was removing.

THE COURT: Did the demonstrative he used have the sources on there?

MS. SRINIVASAN: Yeah, it did. It had the -the -- what is now DTX-581, Bates labels ending 156349.

THE COURT: So I think -- we'll get to the apps in a second, because I have some different ideas about that. But with respect to the page that talks about the Pixel, can you just use his demonstrative?

MR. Peterman: Your Honor, I don't believe his demonstrative actually included the sources. I believe they created a demonstrative that only had the numbers and
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MR. PETERMAN: Again --
THE COURT: Let me make sure. Let me just
paraphrase what I think you're saying. Is that
Mr. Weinstein said he relied on certain numbers, and you want to be able to show the jury where those numbers came from.

MR. PETERMAN: Exactly, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And this is a prior statement that he made when he was on the stand.

MR. Peterman: Yes. And this is the last exhibit -- last set of exhibits that was produced to us on April 21 that Arendi used for Mr. Weinstein's testimony.

THE COURT: And can you confirm here today that you're not going to be making some argument about, look at this big number and now he's only asking for some small number?

MR. PETERMAN: I can absolutely confirm that, certainly, on direct. I would say I can't control what they do on cross. But we are not intending to make reference to all these other numbers in connection.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to rule that you can use this as a demonstrative. I'm not going to admit it into evidence. I think it's -- I get what you're saying about how you got it with the highlighting on it, but we're all just trying to do the best we can here in

## for 2017 to 2018 at this point?

MS. SRINIVASAN: It was presented as a

Any other questions about my ruling?
MS. SRINIVASAN: No, Your Honor.
MR. PETERMAN: And, Your Honor, is that ruling
for both the apps and for the --
the court: Yes.
MR. PEtERMAN: -- Pixel devices?
the court: Yes.
MR. PETERMAN: All right. Just one thing that
we are concerned about just from an evidentiary basis, to the extent that there is any further appeal work in this case is actually having underlying unit value that's understood and could be subject to challenge. And so that's --

THE COURT: I see what you are saying. So you want to have this inserted into evidence for that?

MR. PETERMAN: Correct, Your Honor. And we're certainly willing to redact. If I can lean on Mr. Spence here to make a redacted version of this where we take out the Pixel line and take out the highlighted.

THE COURT: So the difference between these two pages, because I agreed with counsel that I have some concerns about the Chrome number. And we have no document that's been put into evidence about the Chrome downloads
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MR. PETERMAN: Yes. Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. And so put that up. That
can go in. They object to the highlighting being
introduced into evidence, but if you want to walk through it with your witness and highlight as we go, that's okay.

MR. PETERMAN: Okay.
THE COURT: Does that make sense?
MR. PETERMAN: Yes. And then so -- and then
what's the ruling on whether this can be put into evidence?

THE COURT: This is going to be put into evidence without highlighting.

MR. PETERMAN: Okay. All right. That's fine. Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. SRINIVASAN: That's fine, Your Honor.
the court: What's the next objection?
MR. PETERMAN: I believe the next one would be 40 .

MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, now that we have resolved that with respect to the exhibit, I think -- if I understood Google counsel to say that, if they did that, that would resolve the needing to use 38 and 39 ? I'm not trying to speak for them.

MR. PEterman: Yeah.
MS. SRINIVASAN: That's what I heard. So is
demonstrative. We did attempt to have an exhibit that would be moved into evidence summarizing those numbers, which counsel objected to, so that didn't happen before his testimony. But the demonstrative that was presented with Mr. Weinstein at PDX-4.

THE COURT: Okay. How's about --
MS. SRINIVASAN: PDX-4-3-31 had those app
installations for everything, including Chrome.
THE COURT: Here's what we're going to do. This is creative thinking on the spot. We had a copy of this exhibit that was going to be in evidence before the changes, right? That you put in your -- that will be admitted into evidence, and if you want to go through with the witness and highlight to make a demonstrative that has highlighting on that, you can do that.

Does that make sense?
MR. PETERMAN: I'm not sure I completely
understand Your Honor's solution.
THE COURT: So the solution is, we had an exhibit that was part of the case. Before the case changed, everybody was going to agree that that exhibit was going to go into evidence. And it had these numbers on it. It's exactly 1148 without the highlighting, right?

1244 that correct?

MR. PETERMAN: We would take out 38 and 39 and replace with the unhighlighted exhibit.

THE COURT: Great.
MS. SRINIVASAN: All right.
THE COURT: So does that resolve 40? No, 40 is something different.

MR. PETERMAN: Correct. 40, Your Honor, this is, you know, this comes directly from admitted Exhibit DTX-581, which was the number of app downloads. And this is simply Mr. Kidder taking the number of app downloads for Chrome, Calendar, Gmail, and Sheets, and, you know, just a demonstrative as to how many were downloaded from 2015 to 2018.

THE COURT: Counsel?
MS. SRINIVASAN: Yeah. I guess I just, again,
we were trying to figure out what the universe of information we were showing to the jury, so I don't know for what purpose they want to show downloads that predated 2017?

THE COURT: What's the thinking?
MR. PETERMAN: I think this also helps to
confirm the fact that Mr. Weinstein was incorrect in the units that he used. Particularly, if you look at the difference between 2016 and 2017, his testimony is that he
only -- he believes that that data only included Android 8 or 9, and I think Mr. Kidder is prepared to testify that this data does not lead to that conclusion. In fact, it leads to the opposite conclusion, that you would expect 2017 to be much lower than 2016 if only Android 8 was propounded 2017.
the court: What do you think about what he just said?

Counsel?
MS. SRINIVASAN: That is an undisclosed
opinion. If the idea is he's going to get up there now and now say, "Well, can you infer from past years."

THE COURT: I agree with that. That's what comes out.

MR. Peterman: But, Your Honor, this is in response to Mr . Weinstein's new opinion that $\$ 45$ million is the appropriate damage amount. This was -- we have not had a chance to respond to that yet. And this is only in rebuttal to Mr. Weinstein's $\$ 45$ million number, which was undisputably disclosed for the first time on April 21.

THE COURT: Yeah. But I think what I'm
concerned about here is that this has got numbers on it, and that numbers have power. And you're asking the jury to make an inference about what trends show from 2015 to 2018. I just don't think it's borne out by the testimony

MR. PETERMAN: Oh, they're in his report. If you look at Kidder 2022, Exhibit 5. I'm going to have to take you a few places, Your Honor. If you look at 2022, Exhibit 5. You'll see he has numbers for 2017, 2018, and then Chrome going back to --

THE COURT: Chrome, right?
MR. PETERMAN: -- to 2012. But, Your Honor, if we look at Kidder Exhibit 12, 2020, his first report, you see he has numbers for the apps going back to -- in various stages, going back to 2012, and so --

THE COURT: Where?
MR. PETERMAN: Sorry?
THE COURT: Where.
MR. Peterman: This is Exhibit 12 in Kidder's
2020 report, his first report.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor?
THE COURT: Just wait a second. I'm trying to find -- I don't see Exhibit 12. I'm seeing A, B, C, D.

MR. PETERMAN: So, Your Honor, I don't know if you are looking at the --

THE COURT: I must be looking at the wrong thing. Yep.

MR. PETERMAN: So if you look at the first line, you see it has Calendar, and there's data going back to 2012 .

And so I think I've heard Mr. Weinstein say on the stand it would be overinflated. I think your expert is free to say that it's overinflated. But as to putting numbers and asking the jury to infer by how much it's overinflated, I don't know that that's fair game at this point.

MR. Peterman: Your Honor, this is certainly
not going to be used regarding the overinflation point. This is going to be used solely for the point that Mr. Weinstein said 2017 only included downloads of Android 8 or 9 .

And we know the data itself includes downloads of all versions of Android. And if Mr. Weinstein was correct that 2017 was only Android 8, and Android 8 was released in August. So one would expect the number for 2017 to be a lot lower than the number in 2016 if you were only counting downloads from August onwards.

And again, for 2018, if you were only counting downloads from August onwards for 2017, the 2017 number would be much lower than the 2018 number. And I think that's borne out by the data, and that's the point that Mr. Kidder is prepared to make.

THE COURT: Where are these numbers for 2015, 2016, 2017, for Calendar and Gmail in his report?
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THE COURT: All right. Counsel, we've got numbers in here graphing out numbers.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Yeah. Yeah. So this 2020 is before summary judgment in this case. What happened in the supplemental report is that Mr. Kidder looked at 2017 and 2018 for Gmail, for Calendar, for Sheets because that's what was in the case. He offered no opinion that you could infer from prior download data that the numbers were inflated.
This is totally new, and frankly, it's not supported by anything their fact witnesses have said, nor anything he has quoted in his report. It is very clear that, after summary judgment, after this 2020 report was issued, the universe for these apps, Calendar, Gmail, Sheets, was 2017, 2018. If he wanted to offer the opinion in 2022 that you could go back and infer something from prior application data, he could have, but he didn't. And this is entirely -- what counsel has described is a new opinion, no support for him to now come on the stand and say that. And he had a full opportunity to do it, because what was at issue in his supplemental report? 2017, 2018.

THE COURT: All right. Stand by for one
minute.
This document's going to be out. I'll sustain
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the objection. Let's move on to the next one.
MR. PETERMAN: Next one, Your Honor, is I
believe that they, Arendi, objects to us using testimony from Mr. Weinstein that Mr. Kidder was in the courtroom for.

THE COURT: Yes, I've looked at these. So 41, 42, 43, 44. This is similar to what I ruled on earlier.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Yes. Your Honor, with respect to 41 , if he wants to rebut it, that's okay. 42 to 44 , the idea that there was a slow rollout after December 2017, again, all those 12 out of 13 applications were at issue for 2017 and 2018. In his ' 22 report, you won't find any mention about a slow rollout. He said it was enabled and that he was instructed to use

December 2017 as a date.
So those three slides are -- the idea that
there was some slow rollout or it shouldn't even be 2017, it really happened later in 2018, never disclosed in his 2022 report, which was, again, for the 12 out of 13 apps, about STS, 2017 and 2018. So if he's going to offer new opinion on this now, he had a prior opportunity to do that in his 2022 report.

THE COURT: I understand your argument on that.
The objection on those slides is overruled. I carefully reviewed the reports; $I$ think this is all fair game.

MR. PETERMAN: Sure, Your Honor, we will revise the title.

THE COURT: And then --
MR. PETERMAN: Down to the last one, Your
Honor.
THE COURT: 63. What's your objection?
MS. SRINIVASAN: Yeah, the objection there was about the delayed release of STS for 11 months. That is not an opinion that he offered in his reports. And it's -- there's no opinion about a delayed release. Again, he said he used December 2017 as his date for the STS release. In the hypothetical negotiation, he applied that for all of the apps. And there's nothing in there about delayed release, quantifying that delayed release as being 11 months. You're not going to find that anywhere in his 2022 report, even though, if he wanted to make that opinion with respect to all those apps that are solely about the STS functionality, he could have done it. It is not in there.

THE COURT: Counsel?
MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, prior to April 21st, apps prior to December -- December 2017 were at issue here. And so if Mr. Kidder was not looking at it from the perspective of Mr. Weinstein's new opinion for an 11-month

MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, I believe 47, 48,
49, 53, 54, 55, 56, those all go to the same way as your earlier ruling, because the only issue was the text.
the court: Yep. Agreed.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Agreed.
THE COURT: And then 59 looks similar to
something I already ruled on?
MS. SRINIVASAN: Agreed.
THE COURT: 61?
MR. Peterman: Yes, Your Honor. My
understanding is that there is an objection to the title here, possibly. I think the point here, and this is covered in Mr. Kidder's report, is that if you exclude the apps on the samsung devices, the royalties go down by approximately 42 percent. And Kidder raised this in Paragraph 154 of his 2022 report. And so we think it's disclosed, and we don't understand the objection.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Okay. We don't have an
objection in talking about his 42 percent calculation, but he can't be talking about Samsung already giving royalties that apply to Google, obviously, because that's a legal opinion. He can't do that. And that's the issue and concern that I raised.

THE COURT: All right. Seems like this one we ought to be able to resolve. Can we just change the
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rollout.
THE COURT: So that has to do with Chrome, but she's right --

MR. PETERMAN: Yes.
THE COURT: -- about the other apps, right?
MR. PETERMAN: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. PETERMAN: The whole negotiation does -hypothetical negotiation takes place in December 2017 as opposed to 2012 .

THE COURT: Right. Okay. The objection on this one is going to be overruled. Of course you're free to discuss with him on cross regarding the situation we're in.

MR. PETERMAN: That's it, Your Honor. We appreciate it.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me just see if I have anything else I wanted to talk to you about before we bring the jury back in.

Just for purposes of the record, I just wanted to put on the record that my rulings on this and related issues reflect my finding that Dr. Weinstein's opinion on the stand was a different opinion than what he gave in his supplemental report. And the way I'm looking at it is this: He relied on a number of accused app installations,
but during trial, after the jury was selected but before we began testimony, what the accused apps were changed.

And so my view is that Google gets to rebut what I view as a new opinion. Arendi has pointed out that Mr. Kidder had his own opinion about what the lump sum payment would be if only the STS functionality were accused. That was his opinion. He didn't have an opportunity to respond to testimony from Mr. Weinstein regarding a royalty base that included only Chrome units with STS functionality because that was not
Mr. Weinstein's opinion at that time.
I don't think that Google was required to put on a contingency expert report about what Mr. Kidder's opinion would be if Mr. Weinstein changed his opinion because Arendi dropped a chunk of accused products. We will leave it at that.

Okay. Let's finish up the cross-examination.
Can you put the witness back on the stand.
Ms. Garfinkel, let's bring out the jury.
(The jury enters the courtroom at 12:22 p.m.)
THE CLERK: Your Honor, the jury.
THE COURT: Please be seated. Thanks for your patience.

Doctor, I will remind you, you are still under oath. Let's proceed.

## MR. LAHAD: May I?

THE COURT: Yes. Thank you
MR. LAHAD: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. LAHAD :
Q. Dr. Fox, before the break, we were talking about the file history in front of you.

Do you recall that?
A. I do.
Q. And you mentioned that you got that file history from Google's lawyers, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And I asked you whether or not you pulled a copy of it down from the PTO, the Patent Office yourself.

Do you recall that?
A. I don't know if you asked me that, but I didn't do that.
Q. And you didn't see a reason to do that?
A. No.
Q. You also mentioned that you didn't review each of the documents on the face of the patent, correct?
A. I guess you are referring to the 8-page list; is that what you are referring to?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. No. I didn't review all of those. I went through and looked at the list and considered each of them, but I
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Fox - Cross
A. A number of those are related to CyberDesk. That's true.
Q. Yes. And let's show you a demonstrative that Mr. Boles has prepared for us. On the right -- excuse me -- on the left is DTX-8, which you will recall is one of Dr. Dey's exhibits. I believe it's his CV, correct?
A. Could you point specifically to what you are referring to? There's a lot of stuff on this screen. Q. I'm referring to the left side of the screen. This is a list of CyberDesk references, right? It says "CyberDesk and Related Papers."
A. This looks like what's on the website. Is that what you're referring to?
Q. Well, it's DTX -- we can't really see it on the screen, but it's Defendant's Exhibit 8. Do you see that? A. I see it on the screen in front of me, yes.
Q. And that's a list of CyberDesk papers, right?
A. It is one list of CyberDesk papers.
Q. What I've done is match up with these numbers -sorry -- one thing that Mr. Boles has done is match up the references when using these numbers. I've got $1,2,3$ through 7 on this side, on the left side, and they correspond with the seven papers identified on the face of the patent. Do you see that?
A. They seem to correspond. Yes, I see that.
2. Okay. So the patent examiner had before it during prosecution at least seven references related to
CyberDesk, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And issued the patent nonetheless, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, as I understand it, you are relying on the

CyberDesk system, air quotes, to prove anticipation, correct?
A. Yes. That's the basis for the anticipation argument,
yes.
Q. You are using the CyberDesk system as part of
combinations to show obviousness, correct?
A. That's also true.
Q. You've never used the CyberDesk system, have you?
A. I have not.
Q. In fact, that's impossible because the CyberDesk
system no longer exists, correct?
A. Right. This was done more than two decades ago, yes.
Q. Yes. So we saw it was done more than two decades ago with -- in part by the gentleman we heard from, Dr. Dey, right?
A. He testified to his work on the system, yes.
Q. He talked about going to some conferences, right, and showing it off?
A. He presented papers at conferences, a big conference in the field of human computer interactions.
Q. Wrote a bunch of papers on it, presented it at
conferences, and didn't keep a copy of it?
A. He did this as a graduate student. He did a better job than most of my students do in keeping up things. He has a website with a lot of details on it, but I don't have -- most people don't keep things for decades.
Q. This was his graduate student work, right?
A. It was part of his graduate work. His thesis actually was on a different topic. This was part of his research.
Q. I mean, this is what -- he's getting a master's or a Ph.D., what he's trying to do as his career, right? It's not just some kind of stuff on the side, woodworking beekeeping. This was his career, intended career, right?
A. He did more than most people would do at the time
with regard to documenting in the system, yes.
Q. But he didn't keep a copy of it, did he?
A. He didn't give us evidence of keeping a copy, no.
Q. He didn't keep a copy of it, did he?
A. As far as I know.
Q. Did you try to find a copy?
A. I was told there was not a copy.
Q. So you didn't try to find one. You are like, hey,
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existing for this are sufficient evidence for most people in the field.
Q. Yeah. We're not there yet.

I'm just asking you about -- I mean, you are -- like I said, you've written extensively on digital libraries and storage, right?
A. If you look at my house and my lab, you will see all kinds of old junk that probably still doesn't work, even though I've kept it.
Q. And if you really wanted to keep a copy of something, you would take into consideration, for example, that the media would decay or -- right?
A. It's enormously expensive to try to reconstruct things and move them. Unfortunately, our society has not done a very good job of financing this kind of thing. There's very little support for doing that kind of work, especially after you've left an institution.

MR. LAHAD: If I could have -- I think it's Slide 13, Mr. Boles, from Dr. Fox's presentation. Yes. Thank you.

## BY MR. LAHAD :

Q. This is your slide describing what you say you relied on to understand CyberDesk system, air quotes, right?
A. It's a summary, yes.
Q. You would agree that the, quote-unquote, system that

part of his public disclosure of the system.

you're relying on is -- when the evidence of the system that you're relying on is some kind of, like, Frankenstein, a little from here, a little from there, a little bit of demonstration, some engineer testimony and some publications; is that fair?
A. No.
Q. Well, you're using more than one piece of information to describe a CyberDesk system, correct?
A. Just if -- as if I took a picture of you from many different angles, those would be different parts of evidence at the moment, yes. We need lots of information to understand something as complicated as CyberDesk.
Q. Well, let's talk about this evidence or this
information. Demonstrations, those are just documents showing how they work, right?
A. Demonstrations are not documents. They are
presentations in a public audience that demonstrate public disclosure.
Q. Well, the demonstrations we're using that you're relying on in this case, it's not -- you're not looking at videos of CyberDesk or anything like that. It's just testimony regarding demonstrations, right?
A. I'm sorry.

I'm relying on the fact that he gave public
demonstrations in large numbers to public audiences as
did you ask when was it no longer in existence?
A. I read Anind Dey's testimony. He explained that. I thought that was sufficient information.
Q. He explained when it went missing?
A. He said it went missing. He said it wasn't there. He didn't say when.
Q. He wasn't asked when.
A. I don't recall whether he was asked or not, but he said, from my recollection, that it wasn't there.
Q. Well, fortunately we have a transcript of what he said. Do you recall reading that transcript?
A. I do.
Q. Do you recall anything about -- anything in that
transcript about when CyberDesk went missing?
A. I don't recall such, no.
Q. And the documents that were submitted to the Patent Office regarding CyberDesk, they reference the website, right?
A. I think so.
Q. Okay. So the examiner could, looking at those documents, be apprised of the website containing this information, right?
A. I guess that's possible.
Q. It's also possible -- and the website contained some of these demonstrations, correct?
Q. The FCE website, that, too, is a collection of documents, correct?
A. It's a web page and it has links to different things. Documents -- depends on your terminology, whether they include links or not. It is an active site. It points to different things making connections. So it's hard to flatten the web to turn into documents. The web is a linked collection of information. So it's hard to just put it -- pack it into something. It has a different kind of existence, hypertext in the web, we're all familiar with, is much more than just documents. It's a whole collection, network of connections.
Q. It's not like there's a working version of the quote-unquote system on the website, is there?
A. It was a pointer to a self-contained version that is mentioned on the website, which doesn't exist anymore.
Q. Yeah. When did it go missing?
A. I don't know.
Q. Didn't ask?
A. No, I didn't ask.
Q. Was Dr. Dey -- sorry. Go ahead.
A. I was told it was an existing system, so I didn't go investigate further, as I've already said.
Q. Did you ask -- well, if it was an existing system, 1264
A. The website discusses a number of scenarios which were used for demonstrations. And a demonstration's different when you give it in person than if you look at some screens, as my testimony is different from the slides that we've shown.
Q. Your testimony is different from the slides that you've shown?
A. Yeah. I'm saying more words than just what are on the screen.
Q. Same concepts though, right?
A. When I give a demonstration, I answer people's questions, $I$ chose different kinds of things. So it's a different entity than just a presentation in terms of slides.
Q. You agree that the capabilities disclosed in these publications on the face of the CyberDesk, on the face of the ' 843 patent, you agree that those publications don't anticipate the patent, correct?
A. It's the system that I'm arguing is anticipating.
Q. Right.
A. Not the publications.
Q. In your view, publications themselves do not anticipate the ' 843 patent, correct?
A. My discussion is about the system and that's my argument. I didn't consider whether the publications

## anticipate it

Q. You didn't consider whether the publications anticipate it?
A. I didn't look at publication by publication and say, "Does this one cover everything?" As far as I was concerned, my charge was to look at the system as a whole, which is what I did.
2. Okay. So you weren't asked to just look at the publications and see if they anticipated?
A. I considered whether the system anticipated. The system includes more than the publications, so it's much better to look at the whole than look at the pieces.
Q. Well, I hear you. My question is very simple. You were not asked whether the publications on CyberDesk anticipate the ' 843 patent, correct? You were not asked -- that was not part of your assignment, right? A. I don't recall that being my assignment. I'm not sure, but I don't recall that being my assignment.

I don't think it's necessary. I think the system is the right way.
Q. I hear you. We're going to talk about the system a little bit more. But your testimony to this jury is you don't recall what your assignment was, or rather -- let me strike that.

You don't recall whether or not -- looking at
anticipation by the CyberDesk publications only, you don't recall whether that was part of your assignment?
A. There might be some statement in my report that says something, but $I$ don't remember at this time.
Q. It wasn't part of your assignment because the CyberDesk publications do not anticipate the ' 843 patent, correct?
A. I didn't make that assessment. If I remember -- I can't remember whether I made that assessment, but I can't think at this moment whether that's the case or not. I'd have to investigate more. It wasn't necessary because I looked at the bigger picture.
Q. Well, investigate what? You have the documents, right, and the patent, and Court's constructions. What more do you need?
A. When those -- it's something bigger -- covers something, I don't see a reason to be discussing why whether a piece of it also is sufficient.
Q. Well, I know that wasn't your assignment. I get that. But can you do it for me now? Can you just give me an answer on whether the CyberDesk publications anticipate the ' 843 patent? Yes or no?
A. There were parts of my argument that I made use of Anind Dey's testimony where it was not clear from some of the publications whether certain things were taught. So
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in that regard, I used his testimony to make clear what I understood from the publications.

So if we're using strict terminology and making sure everything is specifically there, then the anticipation argument is much more complicated. And I didn't think it was necessary. Certainly the anticipation argument, if we switch to obviousness, it would have been obvious from the publications, I believe.
Q. You also -- hold on now. You are not relying on CyberDesk publications alone to show obviousness, are you? You're relying on the system, right?
A. You asked for my assessment now thinking of things, publications. If I were to think of the publications, as you just asked me to do, and try to say whether it made obvious the claims of the ' 843 patent, I think that's the case.
Q. Okay.
A. But I have to do a bit more thinking to make sure about that. I believe that's the case.
Q. Okay. Same thing for anticipation. Go.
A. I think I've already answered this. I think I've said that there were things in the publications that were not so clear. And it was useful to have Anind Dey's testimony to make those things clear, so that it was an anticipation situation.

## Fox - Cross

Q. Got it. So, documents alone, not so clear.

Accordingly, documents alone cannot anticipate by clear and convincing evidence, correct?
A. I'm trying to make an off-the-cuff answer to your question. That sounds possible, but again, I don't think it was necessary to even consider that.
Q. Of course because the conclusion would have been no anticipation, right?
A. (No audible response.)
Q. I'm sorry. Did you answer, sir?
A. You didn't ask a question; you made a statement.
Q. No. It was a question, comma, right: Because the conclusion would have been no anticipation comma right, question mark?
A. I didn't hear the last part. So could you repeat the question?
Q. Sure. You didn't feel that it was necessary to do the analysis because the conclusion would have been that there would be no anticipation, correct?
A. No. I didn't do the analysis because I had the conclusion from looking at the system, and it wasn't necessary to look at a subset of the evidence and decide whether the subset of the evidence would also produce the conclusion I had for the system.
Q. All right. So the sole basis for your anticipation
opinion is this phantom CyberDesk system that no longer exists, except in the memory and some writings of memory of Dr. Dey and some writings, correct?
A. Most of the systems from prior years are documented less well than this particular system was documented. I had clear and convincing evidence that this system did what it did at the -- in the second instantiation before the critical date and anticipated the 843 claims.
Q. So on one hand you're telling me this is a well-documented system, better than others, I had what I needed. And on the other hand you're saying, I can't tell from the documents, things aren't clear from the documents. Is that what we're hearing today?
A. Documents that are listed here as publications are on the right-hand side of this particular screen which describes four different sources of evidence. The combination of that information from all those different sources, just like I explain with my students in class, I've done interviews of them, I've looked at reports, I've looked at presentations, that's how I understand the system and can assign them grades in the next week.

So the preponderance of the evidence is the combination of all these things.
Q. What did you learn from Dr. Dey's testimony about CyberDesk that wasn't in these documents?
A. I couldn't be sure whether the Reader was something that could be editable. When we deal with e-mail systems, a person of skill in the art would know that e-mail is something which you can forward and make edits to. It wasn't crystal clear from that particular description in this very short document and this particular screen.
Q. And Reader is understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time to be just that, Reader. Read it, read only, can't edit, right?
A. Reader presumes that can you read something. That's right.
Q. But not write to it, correct?
A. Doesn't necessarily say that you can write to it, no.
Q. I'm sorry. Say it again.
A. It doesn't indicate that you can write to it, no.
Q. Okay. So despite the fact that Reader does not indicate that you can write to it, you are relying on the testimony of Dr. Dey to say, oh, yeah, when I said Reader, I meant full document editing. Is that your testimony? A. No. That's not what he said. He was asked if the first program was something that could be edited, and he said, yes, this is something you could write to. He didn't say the figure was misstated. He talked and gave us additional information in his testimony about how the system worked.
A. I mean, if you recall, in my testimony there were a number of slides where I had Dr. Dey's testimony. And I explained that they filled in and clarified what $I$ was concerned with. So those are examples of what I learned through Dr. Dey's testimony. It's a long, long
deposition. I went through the whole thing. And we heard a section of it last week that explained lots of things and went through carefully and explained how the claims were taught by this system.
Q. Okay. Give me an example, please, of something you learned about CyberDesk from Dr. Dey's testimony that wasn't in the documents.
A. Okay. So one of the things that I learned was that the -- what's referred to as the document editing program in some ways or the first computer program was something where you could do editing in the CHI 97 paper, when we looked at the screen there, we saw on the screen was from an e-mail message and Figure 3 it described Mail Reader. So readers are not typically things where you're sure that you can do editing, but he explained in his testimony, described that that indeed could be edited. So that's something that was not clear from that publication.
Q. So your testimony is that when you look at Reader, it's ambiguous as to whether or not something is editable, the document is editable?
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So the system works by combining two different things, a first program and a second one. And there are many different first programs that can be used, as he explained.
Q. And you have no trouble relying on the uncorroborated testimony of Dr. Dey to prove invalidity by clear and convincing evidence?
A. He's the creator of the system, and the system has been described as handling lots of different first programs. And he gave an example, and he explained that was the case. And if we look at the FCE website, the thing that we see in the second column over there, you see there are lots of different programs that are mentioned there. I pointed out and another slide of mine pointed out said Notepad was one of the desktop services. So there's a lot of evidence that supports what he said, and I believe it. He's a highly distinguished person. He's a dean --
Q. Dean at the University of Washington computer science school, right?
A. No, no. There's a different department for computer science. He's in the iSchool, the Information School. It's a different part of the campus and not the one that you were talking about the other day.
Q. And you would agree -- so let me get this straight.
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Again, on one hand, you are saying CyberDesk, well documented, more than normal, and there's no proof, no evidence other than Dr. Dey's testimony about documents being editable?
A. I don't find that strange. I've tried in some of my older systems to get them, to bring them back to life, and it's really a hard thing to do.
Q. On one hand, you mentioned it's -- strike that.

On one hand, you mentioned that CyberDesk was well documented, above average, but in the publications that we've seen, there's nothing in there about editable text so you have to go rely on Dr. Dey's uncorroborated testimony.

That's your position, correct?
A. I think I've already said that the website talks about a number of different services, including Notepad, so that's another bit of documentation. Not in the publications, but on the website.
Q. Well, again, as we agreed earlier the publication do refer to the website right?
A. That's true.
2. Yeah. So a person of ordinary skill in the art person, like the patent examiner, could look at the publications, see, hey, there's a website -- in fact, actually, let's pull it up.

## Fox - Cross

A. It wasn't clear from the other places that I looked at. He made it very clear.
Q. Similarly --

MR. LAHAD: You can take that down, Mr. Boles.
BY MR. LAHAD :
Q. Similarly, you're relying on a collection of materials to show what ADD did and when it did it, correct?
A. Yes. I had a similar slide to the one you showed with regard to CyberDesk pointing out the different sources of evidence that were used, including the videos that we all saw last week.
Q. I want to talk about those videos and the laptops. You understand that those laptops, those didn't come -let me step back.

You had a portion of your direct testimony where you purported to use the actual ADD functionality, right?
A. Yes. So there's laptops sitting on the desk over there that I referred to.
Q. Yes, you know, these --
A. And what I used -- can I finish?
Q. Yeah -- sorry. Go ahead.
A. So on the laptop, was a program called IAD. If we remember, Miller's testimony, he explained that ADD was the software system that was built, and a productized

DTX-14. And just go straight to the bottom paragraph.
Thank you.
BY MR. LAHAD:
Q. There's the website, the CyberDesk website in DTX-14, correct?

Read the title of the document, please.
A. It says, "A demo version of CyberDesk is available at," and then it gives the website.
Q. Right?
A. "Video accompanying the paper summarizes CyberDesk and shows more sample scenarios. Code samples are
available at" -- and it gives another address.
Q. Okay. And so you testified earlier there's reference to Notepad in the documents, correct?
A. On the website.
Q. Okay. On the website. And so let me ask you this question: What did you get out of Dr. Dey's testimony about how CyberDesk works that's not in the documents or the website pointed to by the documents?
A. So the example I gave before is that he confirmed that one could edit in the first computer program, essentially.
Q. And there's a question about that from the documents and the website?

## Fox - Cross <br> version of this was IAD. So that's what I was actually

 using on the system.Q. You understand that these PowerBooks, those didn't come from Apple, right?
A. Well, they were manufactured by Apple.
Q. Well, no, you recall Mr. Miller's testimony that he found and purchased them?
A. As I said, they were manufactured by Apple.
Q. Yeah.
A. He purchased them later, yes, I understood that.
Q. Right.

No questioning from Google's lawyers about where and when he came to have these laptops, right? Didn't hear anything like that, did we?
A. We had his testimony where he talked about doing that, in his deposition, which we all heard last week. Q. Well, you recall that he said that he set up these MAC Books about four or five years ago in that deposition. Do you recall that?
A. Actually, they're PowerBooks. He said he purchased them and he set them up. He had the old software, and he installed that. That's what he said if I recall in his deposition.
Q. We don't know where that software came from, do we?
A. He was under oath when he testified to that.
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Q. We don't know where that software came from, do we?
A. Well, if you look on the machine and you run it, it
has information about that, but I don't recall the
details.
Q. He wasn't asked details during his deposition, was he?
A. His deposition was quite long. We only heard a small portion of it.
Q. And we didn't hear how he came to get the software,
did we?
A. I don't recall if there were other questions in his deposition that was originally taken. We didn't hear that last week.
Q. You understand that Mr. Miller put together these laptops in 2013 or 2014, right? That's when he put these laptops together; you understand that, right?
A. I haven't done the arithmetic to figure out when he did the deposition and when he obtained them, how many years ago. But if you say that.
Q. I mean, this is going to be easy, I hope. 2019 minus five years is, 2014?
A. Sounds right, yes.
Q. All right. So assuming that, he put these laptops together in 2014, right?
A. Yes. That's what the arithmetic tells us.

2

## Fox - Cross

A. Jim Miller is the person that --
Q. Oh, I'm sorry. I get that messed up. Thank you very much. Let me step back.

We heard deposition testimony from Dr. Dey -- again, let me step back. I'm sorry.

One of your obviousness combinations is CyberDesk plus Microsoft Word 97, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. We didn't hear any testimony from Dr. Dey about combining CyberDesk with Microsoft Word 97, did we?
A. No, we didn't.
Q. Counsel for Google was asking him questions for, as you said, well over an hour. We didn't hear any questions about whether or not it would be appropriate to combine CyberDesk with Word 97, correct?
A. He made clear that he was not hired as an expert witness; he was hired as a fact witness. So my job is the one to make the obviousness arguments. That's not the job of a fact witness as far as I understand. That's my interpretation.
Q. Yeah. But one of your opinions is that someone -- a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine CyberDesk and Word 97, right?
A. That's part of the argument of obviousness.
Q. At no point during his deposition was Dr. Dey asked,
Q. So the devices that you're relying on to show invalidity are not from the late '90s, they're from 2013 and 2014, correct?
A. No. The machines are from the 190 s and the software is from the 90 s .
Q. We don't know that, do we?
A. We have his testimony as far as that's concerned.
Q. You are -- as part of your opinions, you're combining CyberDesk and ADD plus Word, right?
A. So my obviousness arguments were categorized. And I had those three systems in four different combinations.
Q. Let me step back. Did you make any attempt to verify the vintage of what was going on, on these laptops?
A. What do you mean by "vintage"?
Q. Did you make any effort to verify that the software and programs and hardware and everything that these laptops purport to be, did you make any attempt to independently verify the accuracy of what they're represented to be?
A. I looked at the machines, and I saw the date of production. I looked at the running system. I looked at the screens and the copyright notices and other kinds of things, so I did some work about that, yes.
Q. Of course, the creator of $A D D$ was deposed in this case, right, Dr. Dey, right?

## Fox - Cross

"Hey, would you have been motivated to combine CyberDesk with Microsoft Word 97?"
A. That's a true statement as far as I know.
Q. Same thing with ADD. You're relying on ADD plus Microsoft Word 97 to show obviousness, right?
A. That's one of obviousness cases, yes.
Q. And we heard from Mr. Miller, and at no point during that deposition did we hear any questioning about whether or not he would be motivated to combine ADD with Word 97, correct?
A. I don't recall him being asked that, no.
Q. Nothing about that in either of those depositions, correct?
A. I don't recall either of that, yes.
Q. If the jury finds that there is no motivation to combine the systems you allege to be combined, then the claims are not obvious, correct?
A. So I presented four different obviousness arguments. Are you talking about all four of those?
Q. Well, you presented CyberDesk plus ADD, right?
A. Yes.
Q. If there's no motivation -- step back. Strike that. If the jury finds there's no motivation to combine CyberDesk with ADD, no obviousness, correct?
A. If the jury were to disregard the direct pointer from

CyberDesk to ADD -
Q. Dr. Fox, I'm on limited time could you answer my
question, please?
A. Could you repeat it?
Q. Sure. If the jury finds that there was no motivation to combine CyberDesk plus ADD, there is no obviousness, correct?
A. For that of the four cases, that would be the situation, yes.
Q. And same thing for the combination of ADD plus

CyberDesk, right? If the jury finds there's no motivation to combine in that direction, there's no obviousness, correct?
A. If, in spite of evidence, they find there is no
additional motivation to combine, then that's what they decide.
Q. And if the jury finds there is no motivation to
combine CyberDesk with Word 97, no obviousness, correct?
A. If the jury decides that, they make a decision.
Q. Say that again, please?
A. Again, if the jury makes a decision, then they make a decision.
Q. Well, if their decision is that there is no
motivation to combine, then there's no obviousness, right?
A. If they make that decision, yes.
2. If the jury finds there's no motivation to combine

ADD plus Word 97, there is no obviousness, correct?
A. Yes. The jury is empowered to make these decisions, yes.
Q. All right. So using your bowling ball analogy, if
there is no motivation to combine, that's a gutter ball, right?
A. That's the situation for the obviousness, but you didn't give one for the anticipation.
Q. Well, there's no motivation to combine in the context of anticipation, right?
A. That stands on its own. You don't need the obviousness.
Q. No motivation to combine means gutter ball for obviousness, right?
A. Yes. You don't get a second attempt if you can't combine the things, certainly.
Q. In response to one of my questions, you said, "Well, if you took a bunch of different pictures of me."

Do you recall that?
A. I recall testifying to that, I'm not sure if you asked the question.
Q. That happens a lot. A picture of me or a set of pictures of me, that's not a system, is it?
A. Pictures are documentation of something.
Q. Pictures are documentation of something, but it's not a system, right?
A. No. The system is the software that is running that we've heard all kind of evidence about.

MR. LAHAD: Thank you, Your Honor. No further questions.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.
Redirect?
MS. ROBERTS: No redirect, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Please have a seat.
You may step down.
MS. ROBERTS: May Dr. Fox be excused?
THE COURT: Yes.
Okay. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we will take our lunch break. I'm just double checking to make sure that we have your lunches here, and we do. So we will take you out right now.
(The jury exits the courtroom at 1:04 p.m.)
THE COURT: All right. Please be seated. I'm going to take lunch as well and work on the jury instructions. I can tell you this. I have a proposed version of the verdict form that we'll put up and that rules on disputing proposals with the jury instructions. We are mostly done.

I did have a question that had to do with the

## competing prior art proposals, understanding Arendi's

 point that Google had already agreed to proposals. And I will take that into account. But $I$ was wondering why we're disputing what the relevant date is for some of this prior art. Does it even matter given the evidence we've heard? We had an argument about a 97 date versus a '98 date. Can we get that worked out?MS. SRINIVASAN: We can try to confer about it maybe over lunch, but we have the ' 97 date, which was the operative date that had been used in the jury instructions until yesterday. So I think that's probably something we should talk about. We got it back last night with the addition of -- with the other date as well.
the court: I don't think I was focused on the -- the dates of this prior art as it was coming into evidence because I didn't understand that to be a particular dispute. But my recollection is that, regardless of which date we used, the '97 or '98 date, there wasn't really a dispute. But if you can all confer on that, that would be helpful. That would streamline.

MR. LING: That was our understanding as well, Your Honor. So we weren't really focused on that until we were preparing for the -- our case in chief. And so there is no evidence of an earlier invention date, so we don't really think there should be a dispute.

THE COURT: Not having had the ten-year history
that you all have with this case, I don't know how we came up with what we came up with. So understanding that I could be opening up a can of worms with anything I do, you all know better about this than I do. So why don't you take a look at that and also take a look at version of the Federal Circuit Bar Association Model Jury Instructions where there is no dispute about dates, because I think we might be able to maybe crib some language from that could help with us. Okay? We will be in lunch recess.
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: All right. Please be seated.
MR. UNIKEL: Your Honor, may I ask a 10 -second
question?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. UNIKEL: I know both parties have to
reserve enough time for closings, and I was wondering if we can get some count from the court as to --

THE COURT: That's what I'm working on right now. So for today, I'm charging as of this minute, an hour 18 to Arendi, and hour 12 to Google. So the time --
I won't charge the time before the jury came out to either
side as it took a significant amount of time reviewing
expert reports in chambers so that I could rule on
Arendi's objections. I won't charge that time to Arendi,

Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Very good.
MS. SRINIVASAN: We will have to hear direct,
but I suspect we will try to do that.
MR. PETERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Understood. All right. Let's
bring the jury out.
(The jury enters the courtroom at 2:20 p.m.)
THE CLERK: Your Honor, the jury.
THE COURT: Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen.
Have a seat.
Lets have Google call its next witness.
MR. PETERMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
Google calls Mr. Douglas Kidder to the stand.
THE COURT: Please approach, sir.
MR. PETERMAN: May I approach?
THE COURT: Yes.
THE CLERK: Please state and spell your name
for the record.
THE WITNESS: Douglas Kidder, D-O-U-G-L-A-S, $K-I-D-D-E-R$.

DOUGLAS KIDDER, having been called as a witness, being first duly sworn under oath or affirmed, testified as follows:
took the bench but before we brought the jury back out.
So I think that's fair to both sides because I didn't
charge additional time to Arendi, which I could have spent on the bench reviewing expert reports to see if they were inconsistent. That's the way that worked out.

So based on that, by my rough calculation, it looks like Google is at 12:26 -- no, sorry, Arendi is at 12:26. Google is at 10:41.

Does that sound right to everyone?
MR. UNIKEL: I believe so, Your Honor.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Sounds right, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. So that means we have
to reserve an hour for closings, that Arendi's got a
little bit over an hour left for examinations. And Google's got a couple hours more than that, almost.

Okay. Are we ready to bring the jury out?
MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, just to note, this
is Mr. Kidder's testimony. There will be two segments within his direct where we'll need to close the courtroom talking because we're talking about other settlement agreements.

THE COURT: Okay. How about cross? Can we keep it modulated?

MS. SRINIVASAN: We will try to do that, Your
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THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. PETERMAN:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Kidder.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Would you please introduce yourself to the jury.
A. Sure. My name is Doug Kidder.
Q. What is your area of professional expertise?
A. I'm a damages expert. I calculate damages in cases such as this.
Q. And did you prepare some slides to accompany your testimony today?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. What is your professional expertise as is relevant to this case?
A. So I'm a managing partner with a small firm that we, basically, do damages calculations. I have about 25 years experience working with intellectual property matters. I've bought and sold my own businesses before, and I've testified in over 70 cases, over 30 of which involved patents.
Q. And what experience do you have in licensing
practices?
A. So in the course of my career, I figure I've read
comes with the territory.
Q. And can you give the jury a little bit of
understanding of your educational background and other accomplishments?
A. Sure. So it's not on here that I graduated from

Milford Miller High School, Baltimore County, and went to
Amherst College, and then went to UC Berkeley for a
master's of science.
Q. And what about your professional affiliations?
A. I was Adjunct Professor at Golden Gate University,
which is a local college in the San Francisco area. And I
was teaching a course on damages in their school of accounting there. And I'm also a member of a couple of societies that people like me tend to join.
Q. Mr. Kidder, your firm is being compensated for the
time that you've spent working on this case, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And will the outcome of this trial have any impact on your compensation?
A. No, it will not.

MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, we tender Mr. Kidder as an expert in the valuation of intellectual property, calculation of patent damages, and licensing.

MS. SRINIVASAN: No objection.
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request wrong?
A. Because it's completely out of scale with what they've settled for in other cases. So you can see, I just put together a quick graphic here showing that, you know, Arendi's asking for $\$ 45$ million. They settled for
$\square \square$ and $\square \square$ And as I'll describe later, the license that would be extended to Google is for a far shorter period of time for a far shorter extent of accused use. One would expect the payments to scale with the amount of accused products.
Q. So Mr. Weinstein is making a 45 and a half million dollar damage calculation for Google.

What demand did he make the Apple litigation?

$\square$

Q. Mr. Kidder, we are going to go through your opinions in a step-by-step manner, but let's get back to some of
Q. Mr. Kidder, what were you asked to do in this case?
A. I was asked to calculate damages, assuming that the ' 843 patent is valid and infringed. So I take that as an assumption. So I was asked to calculate damages, and also reply to the opinions that were expressed by
Mr. Weinstein, essentially my counterpart, on Arendi's side.
Q. Mr. Kidder, if the ' 843 patent is valid and
infringed, what is your opinion on the appropriate measure of damages that Google would owe Arendi?
A. It is $\$ 500,000$. It is -- you know, it's not the $\$ 45$ million that Mr. Weinstein calculated.
Q. Now, Mr. --

MR. PETERMAN: Now, at this time, Your Honor, we actually do need to seal the courtroom.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Garfinkel, seal the courtroom.
(The following discussion is held under seal: THE COURT: The courtroom has been sealed. MR. PETERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
by Mr. PETERMAN:
Q. Mr. Kidder, on a high level, why is Arendi's damages
the basics first.
Will you tell the jury what evidence you reviewed in order to form your opinions here?
A. Sure. It is very similar to what Mr. Weinstein looked at. I started by reviewing the ' 843 patent, and I looked at the existing licenses. And there are four up there you should probably recognize by now: Samsung, Microsoft, Microsoft Mobility, Apple. And then the fifth license with InNova, which you've heard a little bit about. I also reviewed the financial records that were produced by Google in this matter, some limited financials from Arendi, and other evidence, just e-mails, web searches, documents, kind of a catch-all.
Q. Mr. Kidder, what is your understanding of the products that are accused here? Start with the devices first.
A. So the accused devices here Pixel 2, Pixel 3 family of devices that were sold with Android 8 with STS on them. So there were some devices sold prior to that, that didn't have Android STS, but it's only those that were sold after December 5, 2017.
Q. And with respect to the apps, what is your understanding of the accused apps in this case?
A. Again, there are 12 apps here, and I think you've seen this list previously. So it's any app that was

## downloaded from Google between December 5, 2017, when

 Android 8 with STS was enabled, to November 10, 2018, when the patent expired. So it's the accused apps here are all the ones downloaded from that period.Q. Mr. Kidder, what were Google's revenues for the apps that are accused in this case?
A. So the total revenues here for the accused devices, the Pixel 2 and 3 in that time frame, is $\square \square$ And the accused apps, which is the apps that were downloaded, again, between December 5, 2017, and
November 5, 2018, it's about $\square$, leaving you with a total of about in accused revenue here.
Q. And what is the basic measure of damages that you applied in this patent case?
A. So the -- you should recognize this slide from

Mr. Weinstein's. We're all doing the same thing here,
which is that the measured damages is a reasonable royalty
for the use made of the invention by the infringer.
Q. Mr. Weinstein mentioned Georgia-Pacific Factors, did
you also use those?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And in addition to the 14 factors that are listed here, is there a 15 th factor that you also applied?
A. Yes, there is. So the 15 th factor is really this
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was asserting that Google was infringing on a patent that it had. And so inNova, Google paid inNova. So it's -- in the jargon, it's in-licensing versus out-licensing. This is Google taking a license to something.
Q. So how much was paid for each of these settlement and license agreements?
A. So again, these are numbers that I think we're generally familiar with. $\square \square \square \square \square$ An And InNova received $\$ 625,000$
from Google.
Q. Now, in front of you in the binder, there is a tab that's marked DTX-499.

Do you see that?
A. Sorry. Yes, I do.
Q. Take a second to refresh yourself with the document, and the first question is, what is the document?
A. So this document is the license between inNova and Google.
Q. And is this the inNova agreement that you just referenced?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Did you rely upon this inNova agreement as part of the opinions you are relying on in this case?
A. Yes.
notion of a hypothetical negotiation, which I thought Mr. Weinstein did a good job explaining the basic idea of the Georgia-Pacific analysis and the hypothetical negotiation, this idea that the parties sit down around the time that infringement began and negotiate the license. And the question is, what's the opinion as to what that license amount would be.
Q. And in general, how did you apply the Georgia-Pacific factors here?
A. So the Georgia-Pacific analysis is, basically, you start, it's like valuing real estate or valuing a car. The first thing you do is you look for comparable
transactions. What did people actually pay for this property or similar properties. And then you adjust it up or down for various differences between comparables and the property that you're trying to evaluate.
Q. So what did you determine in this case were comparable licenses?
A. So there were four licenses I viewed as comparable. There was a settlement agreement with Apple, settlement agreement with Samsung, settlement agreement with Microsoft, and the settlement agreement with inNova.

Now, the inNova one is a little different. I mean, you've heard about Apple, Samsung, and Microsoft
repeatedly. The inNova one was a license in which inNova
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MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, we move DTX-499, the inNova license, into evidence.

MS. SRINIVASAN: No objection.
the court: It's admitted.
(Exhibit DTX-499 is admitted into evidence.)
by MR. PETERMAN:
Q. Now, Mr. Kidder, why is it in your opinion that inNova is a comparable license?
A. So it's comparable in the sense -- in sort of two senses. There's economic comparability, and then this is a license for, turns out to be just three patents. There is one that was asserted against Google, an inNova license, just two other patents. So it's relatively simple.

There are a lot of licenses you see that are broad portfolio licenses that one company may take a license from another for a hundred different patents. And that's, in an economic sense, not comparable to what we're looking at here.

It's also comparable from a technology perspective in that it licensed a similar patent. The patent is similar technologically to the ' 843 patent.
Q. And how do you know its technologically comparable?
A. I relied on the opinion of Dr. Martin Rinard for that.

 to revenue.

Why did you approach this as looking at revenue as opposed to units?
A. Well, so the problem with units is that they're different things, right, and, you know, the Apple units and the Samsung units being phones and tablets, they're sort of the same thing. But when you move over to Microsoft and you start trying to equate one unit of Microsoft office, which, in and of itself, you wonder how to count the units there. Is that one unit, or is that -Word plus Excel plus PowerPoint plus Outlook -- is it four unita?

So "unit" becomes kind of this funny and sort of indeterminate number. But if you look at revenues, revenues are what the company's received from selling their products. And that's what profits are made off of. And then at the end of the day, what I'm talking about is money, so I focused on revenues.
Q. And how did you determine the revenue numbers that you have here for Apple, Samsung, and Microsoft?
A. It was a combination of evidence that was provided by Arendi and also just public -- you know, you go and you do searches and you try to understand to the best extent you can, you know, how much Microsoft made selling Office over those nine years.

Kidder - Direct
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Q. Now, what's the next step in your analysis, Mr. Kidder?
A. We11, you compare that to Google's revenue, which we just saw before. And you can see that Google's revenue is very much smaller than the accused revenue for $\square$


 $\square$ And I did not do any scaling for inNova because that's Google on Google. So that would leave you with $\$ 625,000$.

1 \&. So, Mr. Kidder, how do the number of patents at issue in this current litigation compare to the number of patents at issue in the other litigations?
A. So what I did here -. so the short answer is, there's only one patent here; there are multiple patents in the other litigations. And what I've done here is I've just prepared a chart in which you can see -- excuse me -under -- in the columns under each of those license names is the number of patents.


Google got a license to three patents plus seven patent applications.

So they're all sort of bigger things than just the ' 843 patent.
Q. So, Mr. Kidder, why did you feel it was important to point this out to the jury?
A. Well, it's, you know, it's a comparable in the sense that, you know, all of these licenses are to the ' 843 patent, but all of the licenses also included other stuff that has to have some value.
Q. Going back to your house analogy, what effect does
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$\$ 45$ million has got to be attributable to the other patents that Samsung, $\square$ received a Iicense to.
Q. Now, what about the license terms, meaning, the length of the license? How do those compare between the license matter in the Google case versus the licenses in those other cases?
A. So Apple, Samsung, and Microsoft all got licenses for approximately 9.7 years. That was the amount of time they had before the patents all expired. And in the inNova license, Google got a license to patents that lasted for about 12.4 years. And in this case, Arendi is accusing Google of using its patents for an II-month term.

So in this case, the license term for Google is vastly shorter than the license terms for the other patents -- excuse me -- the other agreements. Q. And what effect does the shorter duration for the Google license have in your opinions?
A. It would tend to reduce it.
Q. How much of a downward effect?
A. Well, it's hard to, again, put an exact number on it for a couple of reasons. There doesn't tend to be a linear relationship between the length -- the term of the Iicense and the amount paid.

And secondarily, this is partly also covered by
the number of patents have on your conclusions?
A. It would reduce it from the starting point. So if you scale it by revenue, you get numbers in blue at the top. But you also recognize that Google is getting a license to fewer things. So you - that suggests a downward adjustment.
Q. Do you have a precise amount of downward adjustment that you are applying?
A. No, I don't. And the reason for that is that patents can have widely different values.


- The only thing you can be sure of is that the additional patents are worth something.
Q. Now, did Mr. Weinstein account for additional patents in his analysis?
A. No, he did not.
Q. Do you believe this failure to account for additional patents was an error?
A. I do.
Q. Why is that?
A. Because, basically, it inflates his opinion. It accords no value to it, and yet there had to have been some value. So some part of his calculation of
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scaling for revenue because the revenues I looked at were over the entire term. It has some downward affect, but it's not a dramatic effect.
Q. So I see a lot of red arrows here.

What does this mean for your opinion?
A. Well, what it means is that you would start with the numbers in blue up there, which are the scaled revenue numbers, and you would adjust them downward for the number of licensed patents and the shorter term.
Q. Are there any considerations that would increase the numbers upwards?
A. Yes.
Q. What consideration is that?
A. That's the concept of known, valid, and infringed. And, again, Mr. Weinstein described this a little bit, so I won't belabor the point. But in this hypothetical negotiation between Arendi and Google around the date when Google first starts using this technology, the assumption is that the patent is valid and the patent is infringed. And this is not a situation that you see in a sort of a nonhypothetical negotiation license in the sense that in, not all, but in many negotiations, the licensee says, "Well, I'm not sure your patents are valid. I'm not sure I infringed, " and that sort of gives them some leverage to negotiate downward on the amount they want to pay.
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Q. So, Mr. Kidder, considering all these different factors, what is your opinion as to the amount of a reasonable royalty, assuming that Google is found to infringe the ' 843 patent and it's also found valid?
A. Well, my conclusion, as I stated earlier, is $\$ 500,000$.
Q. And how did you arrive at $\$ 500,000$ given all the information you presented to the jury?
A. Well, what I did was that I very much followed what you're seeing on the screen here, and then sat back and thought about, well, as a damages expert, what I'm trying to do here is, I'm thinking about validity and infringement. I'm trying to be as conservative as possible. I'm trying to step back and give Arendi as much credit as I think it might be due in a hypothetical negotiation. And I think about where this might come out.

And when I looked at the evidence, to me, the licenses that were most similar here to what we're dealing with Google are the Apple and Samsung licenses. Right.

Microsoft is a different thing. Microsoft, they're licensing it for use in Office, which there's no sort of equivalent comparable product at Google. So the two that are clearest to me are Apple and Samsung. And I believe I've been very conservative in the $\$ 500,000$ opinion.

MR. PETERMAN: Thank you. Mr. Spencer, you can
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going to use it for demonstrative purposes rather than for admission.

THE COURT: All right. Let me see counsel at sidebar briefly.
(Whereupon, the following discussion is held at sidebar.)

THE COURT: Counsel, my recollection is that I said that this exhibit could be admitted to the extent he wants to highlight it, and he can make that into a demonstrative.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Objection withdrawn.
MR. PETERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Whereupon, the discussion at sidebar concludes.)

MR. PETERMAN: We move to admit DTX-1148 into evidence.

MS. SRINIVASAN: No objection.
THE COURT: It's admitted.
(Exhibit DTX-1148 is admitted into evidence.)
BY MR. PETERMAN:
Q. Mr. Kidder, what's being reflected here on the first page of this exhibit?
A. So this is the total number of count of devices for Pixel 1, Pixel 2, Pixel 3. And you can see the sources

Your Honor, we can open the courtroom for this next section.

THE COURT: Thank you. Let's unseal the
courtroom.
(Whereupon, the sealed discussion concludes.)

By MR. PETERMAN :
Q. Mr. Kidder, in your binder you have Exhibit DTX-1148.
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What is this document?
A. This was an exhibit that was attached to

Mr. Weinstein's report, maybe it's two separate exhibits, but they were exhibits to Mr . Weinstein report.
Q. And did you rely upon this document in forming your opinions with respect to this case?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. In general, what are the contents of the exhibit?
A. So what's in the exhibit is, basically, it's a count by Mr. Weinstein of the total number of units of accused products and between 2012 and 2018 with a lot of blanks.

MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, we move to admit
DTX-1148.
MS. SRINIVASAN: My understanding was we were
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down at the bottom come from a couple of Google documents and deposition of Sai Marri.
Q. And who is Sai Marri?
A. He's a Google employee that was the individual who produced these documents.
Q. And did you review this deposition of Mr. Marri?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And is it your understanding that some of the numbers here within this exhibit are no longer accused?
A. Yes, that's correct; this is an older version.
Q. And what numbers need to be removed?
A. So you need to take out the entire row that says, "Pixel 1." I'm hoping that we can do that graphically. Is there a way to sort of highlight that? Oh, look at that. Okay. Great.

And my memory is that the Pixel 2 started selling a little before -- I think it started selling in October 2017. So part of the Pixel 2 number, 926, 349, is also -- I wouldn't erase the whole thing, but recognize not all of that is currently accused.
Q. And to be clear whose exhibit is this?
A. This is Mr. Weinstein's.
Q. And let's go to the next page of this exhibit. What's being reflected here in the second page of DTX-1148?
A. So this is Mr. Weinstein's count of the accused app downloads by year. And you can see, again, there's some sources down the bottom that have GOOG-something, and those are documents that were produced by Google in this case.
Q. And did you review those documents?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Now, what entries did Mr. Weinstein remove from this exhibit in connection with his opinions in this case?
A. Well, the current opinion, if you see Row 6 there, it says, "News," so please remove all of News because that's no longer accused. And then you remove all of the numbers for Chrome up through 2016. That's the first row.

And then you would remove part of the 2017 figures for Chrome, that 105,609. Again, the accused infringement starts in December of 2017 , so most of that 105 million units in 2017 occurred before December, so you remove a good chunk of that as well.
Q. And in the opinions that you formed regarding Mr. Weinstein's analysis, did you use the numbers based off of the updated modifications that you just made on the stand?
A. Yes. So this led me to understand what he was accusing, and I used that to calculate the revenues for the appropriate time period.
by Mr. PETERMAN :
Q. Now, were you in Court for Mr. Weinstein's testimony?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And you come to a very different conclusion with respect to damages than Mr . Weinstein did; is that correct?
A. Yes. I think that's a fair statement.
Q. What were the major errors that you've identified in his analysis?
A. So there are a number of them. And I will just, you know, without reading the cover slide, I'll take you through the six major errors that $I$ saw in his analysis. The first one is -- I just call it the wrong number of units.
Q. Explain what you mean by "the wrong number of units."
A. Sure. There are a couple of parts to that. But the first thing to start with is this -- as he told you, he started his count of the number of units on August 21, 2017, when Android 8 was released. But the testimony I heard was that STS was not enabled in Android 8 until December 5, 2017. And in between those two periods, there's 149 million app downloads and .9 million or 900,000 devices sold that were sold or downloaded without STS enabled.
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with maintenance release 1 .
Q. Was there additional testimony?
A. Yes. Mr. Toki, who is also a Google engineer, said that the source code would have been published around December 2017. Again, the evidence seems that while Android 8 was released in August, STS was not enabled until December.
Q. Did you also consider testimony from Mr. Choc?
A. Yes. Mr. Choc verified that Android 8, or O-MR1, released in December 2017.
Q. Are there other errors with the unit count?
A. Yes.
Q. What are those errors?
A. So we've been talking about particularly the apps, and the question is -- well, not the question -- but what Mr. Weinstein did was he assumed that an app that was downloaded, let's assume in middle of December, December 15, 2017. He assumed that an app downloaded in December of 2017 would be downloaded onto a device that had STS. Well, that would require that device be running not only Android 8, but it's got to be running Android 8 with maintenance release 1 on it.
Q. Now, what data did Mr. Weinstein rely upon for his analysis?
A. So this is DTX-581, which I'm assuming is in this
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Q. Yes, it is
A. Good guess, huh? There it is.
Q. Now, did you also review DTX-581 as part of your analysis?
A. Yes. It's the underlying data provided by Google that led to the unit count that Mr. Weinstein relied upon.
Q. And what did Mr. Weinstein understand with respect to
the data in DTX-581 for the year 2017 and 2018?
A. Well, what he testified to was he understood them to
be specifically for Android 8 or 9 . That that's what his number was.
Q. Was Mr. Weinstein correct?
A. No, absolutely not.
Q. How do you know that?
A. Well, the most definitive source of that was a
deposition of Sai Marri which he reviewed, and Mr. Marri was specifically asked whether downloads -- the download counts in this document for the time period of 2018 were just for Android 8 or 9 or whether they were from all versions of Android and Mr. Marri said, no, they are from all versions of Android.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, can we have a
sidebar?
THE COURT: Yes.
devices.
The point here is that Mr . Weinstein, on the stand, referred to the phantom interrogatory that he relied upon in support of his opinion. It's very clear that Mr. Weinstein was aware of the Marri deposition. He cites it in his "materials considered" as part of his report and this evidence regarding Mr. Marri's deposition directly counters the position Mr. Weinstein took on the stand.

THE COURT: He is talking on the stand about the Pixel devices?

MR. PETERMAN: No, he is talking about the deposition of Mr. Marri in connection with the Android downloads.

THE COURT: All right. Stand by.
We're going to allow him to testify about this. And we've reviewed the testimony of Mr . Weinstein over the weekend, and he testified that he understood these numbers to come from interrogatory response. We've had no interrogatory response identified, but the jury has heard evidence about where he says these numbers came from.

I do think that Google ought to be able to rebut that, but I don't want to hear any new opinions from him about those numbers beyond just the fact of where they came from.
(Whereupon, the following discussion is held at sidebar.)

MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, this is
undisclosed opinion for Mr. Kidder. His reliance on Mr. Marri's testimony -- by the way, Mr. Marri was deposed in 2019. He could not have disclosed this opinion in 2022 if he had the opinion that somehow the units in these installed downloaded numbers were overstated, but he didn't because he uses those numbers himself. Never disclosed an opinion like this in his prior -- we are talking about a spreadsheet was available to him that he cites in his report.

This is something that is now being raised for the first time from Mr. Kidder, that he has a reason to believe that those numbers are overstated because of the operating system. That is not what -- he did not disclose that opinion in his report.

THE COURT: Let me make sure we are all on the same page. So does Mr. Kidder have in his expert report any reliance on the testimony of Mr. Marri?

MR. PETERMAN: Mr. Kidder does list depositions as part of "materials considered" and the deposition of Sai Marri is, I think, part of -- it's cited in a couple different places and his report with respect to the Pixel
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MR. PETERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. Our point is that the numbers, the data that Mr. Weinstein relied upon included all versions of Android, not just 8 or 9, so Mr. Weinstein's analysis is unreliable on that basis.

THE COURT: That's where it will end.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Mr. Kidder is not a technical expert. He is not here to give an opinion about non-infringing units. Again, not in his report. So if he's talking just about the numbers, that's one thing. If he is going to offer an opinion it is overstated by any amount, that's not disclosed.

THE COURT: He is allowed to offer an opinion it is overstated by some amount. That is fair and within the scope of the other opinions he's rendered in his expert report. And I also think it's fair, given the situation that we're in right now; we had changes, as I mentioned on the last break, to what Dr. Smedley's opinion was. So it sounds like we will be talking in general terms and that's fine.

MS. SRINIVASAN: For a point of clarification, if we are going to be doing this, we will want to use exhibits from Mr. Kidder's expert reports, which per our conversation this morning, if we are going to use that as a demonstrative, we only show 2017, 2018 because he's, you know, using the same units we are going to demonstrate

that he -- to rebut his position now that they are not reliable or overstated.

THE COURT: I understand you may want to do
that. If there are objections to the exhibits, we will deal with those at the time.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. PETERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's continue.
(Whereupon, the discussion at sidebar
concludes.)
by MR. PETERMAN :
Q. Mr. Kidder, the deposition of Mr. Marri that you referred to, was that the same deposition that was cited on the face of DTX-1148, Mr. Weinstein's Supplemental Reply exhibit?
A. I am pretty sure it was. I think it was the December 2019 deposition.
Q. And did you rely on Mr. Marri's December 2019
deposition as part of your opinions in this case?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. What does -- the testimony from Mr. Marri, how does that impact your opinions here?
A. It doesn't affect my affirmative opinion, but it affects my view of Mr. Weinstein's opinion in that

Mr. Marri confirmed that, in fact, those downloads were for more than just Android 8 or 9 .
Q. What does that mean for Mr. Weinstein's analysis that he presented last week?
A. Well, it means that his counts of downloads, the many of those downloads are actually not infringing, or there is no evidence of what portion of those downloads are on a device that has STS on it.
Q. Besides Mr. Marri's deposition testimony, is there any other evidence that confirms that the data in DTX-0581 for 2017 and 2018 is for all Android versions, not just Android 8 and Android 9?
A. Sure. So I don't know if you have a version -- okay. That's fine. So --
Q. I'm sorry.

MR. PETERMAN: Mr. Spence, if you can pull up the Excel spreadsheet.

```
the wItNeSS: Great. Okay.
```

by Mr. PETERMAN :
Q. First of all, can you tell the jury what we're looking at here?
A. Sure. This is DTX-581.
Q. What is this again?
A. Sorry. This is DTX-581. This is the data that was provided by Google that Mr. Weinstein used to count the

## Kidder - Direct

estimate of the number of downloads after August of 2017 was he just took the number of days in the year after August 21, 2017, divided into 365, and multiplied by this number up here. So he just sort of assumed. He's prorated it, technically.

And recognize in 2017 that the -- and his accusation is only four months. Okay. So he took about a third of the units for Chrome in 2017.

Now, if the number of units -- if this was just Android 8 or 9, then you would expect to see, for example, the 2018 number, because that's 11 months. You would expect to see that as more than what he had. If you scroll down to row -- looks like 21 maybe -- you will see 2018.com.Android -- yes. That one.

What you see is a total number of downloads in 2018 is actually 80 million. So that's over 11 months. And 105 million he had to prorate. He to four months. It makes no sense that the four months of data would be bigger than the eight months of data. And we can go through more examples but, basically, it's -- there's absolutely no doubt that this data is for all versions of Android.
Q. Just -- let's just do one more example.

MR. PETERMAN: If you would look at Calendar from 2017 versus 2018. I believe it's Row 46, Mr. Spence.

Filed d9/08/23 Page $50^{\circ}$ dff $1444^{\circ}$ PageID \#: 62375

## THE WITNESS: So row -- there we

com.google.Android.Calendar. So that's the Calendar app. And again, Column C, you can see that there are -- without the columns, it's hard -- but it looks like it's 29 million. I think that's right. So 29 million downloads in 2017. And if you -- thank you.

If you go down to the row for 2018 , it's -- I have it right here. Sorry. It's 27 million. So you've actually got slightly less. But again, over an 11-month time period, this is all versions of Android. This isn't just Android 8 and 9.
by mR. PEtERMAN :
2. So what conclusions do you draw from your analysis of this document and the testimony that you also relied upon regarding Mr. Weinstein's count?
A. That Mr. Weinstein has counted a number of devices that he's accused of infringing that were not infringing. They were not running on devices with Android 8 or 9 or 8 with MR1 or 9 .

MR. PETERMAN: Go to slide 41, Mr. Spence.
BY MR. PETERMAN :
Q. And you were in the courtroom when Mr. Weinstein
provided this testimony about this claim here?
A. Yes. We agree. He understands that if it includes
downloads on versions other than 8 or 9 , then his numbers
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A. Yes, I do.
Q. And what was Mr. Choc's testimony there?
A. So he said -- so Mr. Lahad asked: So he's pretty much -- he's off by pretty much the whole thing; is that what you're saying?

Mr. Choc answered: Yes. This is my understanding of the slow ramp-up process for Android. And the estimate Mr. Choc gave would be probably 95 percent wrong. This is a rounding error. This isn't like a couple of ones might have gone down, hit some device other than Android 8 or 9 . It's, in Mr. Choc's opinion, the vast majority of them.
Q. Now, Mr. Kidder, what does all this information you've just relayed to the jury have on your ultimate opinions here?
A. It means that Mr. Weinstein's opinion is just completely unreliable. It's based on an absolutely incorrect count of the number of apps. You need to recall that in his testimony the apps provided the vast majority of his damages number.
Q. Now, Mr. Weinstein used, as part of his justification, that you used the same numbers that he did. How do you respond to that?
A. It was -- I was surprised. So just by way of background, understand how this process works a little bit.

## are too high

Q. Now, Mr. Kidder, you heard from a number of Google witnesses as to the length of time that it took to roll out Android 8 with STS, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is your understanding of the length of time that that all took?
A. So my understanding is that for Mr. Elbouchikhi, he testified that, you know, with a typical Android release, the rollout takes three to six months. In other words, it takes a while for it to get adopted. It's not, you know, it doesn't come out and then all of a sudden everybody has got Android 8 MR1 running on their phone.
Q. What about testimony from Mr. Choc?
A. Similarly, Mr. Choc testified it takes quite a long time, potentially never happening to users' phone -- I'm one of those users. I see the update and I get scared and I don't do it. Right? So I'm not running the latest version.
Q. Could Arendi or Mr. Weinstein have asked Google for more detailed information if Mr. Weinstein needed it?
A. I would assume so, yes.
Q. Do you recall when Mr. Lahad, on cross-examination asked Mr. Choc the question regarding how far off Mr. Weinstein's numbers were?

In this case, or in all cases -- so here
Mr. Weinstein issued a report and said: Here's what I think damages are. And I was retained to similarly offer an opinion on damages, but also reply to Mr. Weinstein's report.

So my reply came about a month after I had his report. One of the things I do when I'm looking at another expert's report is $I$ just check the math, see if there are any math errors. And so I went through and I -because the data didn't naturally fall into those buckets, he had to do some allocation and apportioning, I asked my team to check the numbers. And I did not find that he made math errors. But that's what he showed on the screen, was my check of his work.
Q. So is it an incorrect assumption to say that you signed off on his work?
A. Well, I signed off on his math, but I did not sign off on the underlying concept of what was accused there. Q. Now, the next error that you had identified in your slide deck was the 4 X multiplier. Would you explain to the jury what you mean by this?
A. Sure. So the 4 X multiplier, if you recall,

Mr. Weinstein testified that he had conversations with
Mr. Hedloy, which Mr. Hedloy said that there was a chance
of losing before trial, there's a chance of losing at
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## trial, and there was a chance of losing of appeal. So

Mr. Weinstein said, well, that means that for the
Microsoft case, that there was a 1 -in-8 chance of winning And so -- but he conservatively -- instead of multiplying by 8 , he conservatively multiplied by 4 .
Q. Do you believe that was the correct thing to do,
given the testimony?
A. No. So I was sitting in court on the first day when Mr. Hedloy testified. And what Mr. Hedloy testified to -relative to the Microsoft agreement, was that even if we went through the litigation and won, which we thought we would of course -- so this is a very different statement from: We have a 1 -in-8 chance of winning and you need to multiply that number by 4 . This is Mr. Hedloy saying: We thought we were going to win that litigation.
Q. So how does that statement from Mr. Hedloy contradict the analysis that Mr . Weinstein did?
A. Well, what it says is that Mr. Weinstein's basis for the 4 X multiplier, I mean, it's -- it contradicts the basis for the 4 X multiplier.
Q. Now, can you explain to the jury what impact the 4 X
multiplier has on Mr. Weinstein opinions?
A. Sure. You know, so we've already taken out the devices and apps, it's about a third of them that are between August and December. That took about a third of
kidder - Direct

his damages out. If you take out the 4 X multiplier, then the 30.2 million, most of that goes away as well. The next slide should show that.

Yeah. So the multiplier is 22.65 million of the remaining 30. If you take out that 22.65 , you are left with 7.55 million from -- again, this is Mr. Weinstein's calculation. I've just taken out a couple of what I believe to be clear errors -- you're down to
$\$ 7.55$ million.
Q. Do you believe that $\$ 7.55$ million is an accurate number?
A. No. Because it includes Mr. Weinstein's royalty on, in particular, the apps, all of the apps that are downloaded, even the ones that are not running on devices with Android 8 with STS

MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, for this next
section, we do need to seal the courtroom again. THE COURT: All right. Let's seal the courtroom, please.
(The following discussion is held under seal:

By MR. PETERMAN:
$\square \square$
$\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$



Kidder - Direct
all -- as I said, I've read a lot of licenses. 15 percent is just -- that's an unreasonably high percentage.
$\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$ $\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$ $\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$ $\square \square$
$\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$
 $\square \square$
 $\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$ $\square \square \square \square$
 $\square$

MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, we can unseal the
courtroom for the remainder of Mr. Kidder's direct.
THE COURT: Let's unseal the courtroom.
(Whereupon, the sealed discussion concludes.)
by Mr. PETERMAN:

-     - 

$\square \square \square \square$
apps, again, just using Mr. Weinstein's calculations and methodology.
Q. Now, the next area you mentioned was a royalty per app error.

What do you mean here?
A. So again, refresher from last week, Mr. Weinstein's analysis. Remember how he gets to his per app royalty. He says the royalty per device is 48 cents. And then he divides that by five to get to a ten cent royalty per app. And there are sort of two problems with that. The first one of which is that dividing by five has never made any sense to me. There are 12 accused apps in this case. If you divide by 12 instead of by five. Right. You get to a number that's four cents and not ten cents. So that has a huge impact.
Q. Now, what does the ten cent per app royalty that

Mr. Weinstein claims is appropriate mean in terms of an actual percentage of royalty?
A. So Mr. Weinstein calculated that each app generates

- of revenue for Google. And he's applying a
ten cent per unit royalty. So of the $\square$ in revenue that's generated by Google for an app, he's taking ten cents of it as a royalty. So he's taking 15 percent of the total. And if you look at that 15 percent, first of

$\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$
$\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$ $\square \square$ $\square$ $\square$
Q. In your experience reviewing hundreds of licenses, how common is it for a license agreement to cover a different company without mentioning that separate company by name in the agreement?
A. It's pretty typical.
Q. Can you provide examples of how this would be done? A. Well, you know, typically, a licensee will want to make sure that its customers can use their products without being accused of patent infringement or that the
supplier can provide a component without being accused.

So the licenses very frequently have language in them saying, "Not only do I have a license, but suppliers, customers" -- but, you know, they don't list them out, because, of course, customers and suppliers can change.
Q. Is Google a supplier of Samsung as it pertains of operating systems and apps?
A. Yes. It's my understanding that Google provides

Samsung Android.
Q. And do customers of Samsung use Google apps on Samsung phones?
A. I'm sorry. Customers of?
Q. Of Samsung use Google apps on Samsung phones?
A. Yes. My son has a Samsung phone, and used Google Chrome on it.
Q. Mr. Kidder, the last major error you identified was non-infringing alternatives. Will you please explain to the jury what that is.
A. So let's put this in the context of damages because I think you've heard about it in the context of technology. So from the context of damages, you think about hypothetical negotiation. And in this hypothetical negotiation Arendi wants $\$ 45$ million. And Google can, if they want to use that technology, they absolutely have to negotiate a settlement agreement or a license. But if

## Kidder - Direct

identify non-infringing alternatives. That is different from saying the court has determined they are
non-infringing alternatives. There is no basis for him to be introducing an opinion based on Court order.

THE COURT: All right. Let's take a look at his report and see what he says.

MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, it's Paragraph 147. 2022 report.

THE COURT: So the distinction here is the fact that the Court adjudged Linkify and Smart Linkify as being non-infringing. I don't think the Court adjudged they were non-infringing alternatives.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I'll ask the jury to disregard -I'm going to ask the jury to disregard the last answer. We will have you ask a different question.

Do you need anything else from the Court?
MS. SRINIVASAN: No.
MR. PETERMAN: May I ask if the Court adjudged Linkify and Smart Linkify as non-infringing?

MS. SRINIVASAN: He shouldn't ask about the Court's opinion at all. He doesn't need to say the Court rendered a decision on it. If we go to that path, we will open the door to all kinds of prior rulings. In the ordinary course, the damages expert says: In my opinion,
they have something else they can do that would avoid them having to take a license, that's a non-infringing alternative and it exerts pressure on the hypothetical negotiation, like why would I pay you that much. I can just do this.
Q. On the -- I think it was the next slide. What other areas did Mr. Weinstein fail to consider?
A. So Mr. Weinstein failed to consider Linkify and Smart Linkify, which had been judged by the court to be non-infringing alternatives. They're essentially similar technology. And he also failed --

MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, sidebar. THE COURT: Yes.
(Whereupon, the following discussion is held at sidebar.)

THE COURT: I think I understand the basis for the objection.

MR. PETERMAN: It's in his report --
THE COURT: That the Court has adjudged those to be non-infringing alternatives.

MR. PETERMAN: Identified as non-infringing alternative.

THE COURT: Counsel?
MS. SRINIVASAN: Damages experts always
these are non-infringing alternatives, relying on the technical opinion that's been rendered. So I don't see any need for him to be talking about any Court opinion.

THE COURT: I tend to agree with Arendi on this one. Did we have testimony from one of the infringement folks about Linkify and Smart Linkify?

MR. PETERMAN: They identified Linkify and Dr. Rinard identified Linkify and Smart Linkify as non-infringing alternatives.

THE COURT: Is there any reason why he can't ask that in this way?

MS. SRINIVASAN: No. As long as we are not talking about Court's orders or Court opinions.

THE COURT: That's fair. That's the ruling. (Whereupon, the discussion at sidebar concludes.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you should disregard the last answer by the witness.
by Mr. Peterman :
Q. Mr. Kidder, did you rely upon any experts in this case regarding whether or not Linkify or Smart Linkify were non-infringing alternatives?
A. Yes.
Q. Which expert did you rely upon?
A. Dr. Rinard.
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## 2. On the slide here, you have the last point being

 "Delay release of STS by 11 months."What does that mean?
A. Well, we know that STS was -- that they decided in August 2017 that it wasn't ready to roll out. They delayed it and implemented four months later in December. And when faced with a $\$ 45$ million request, Google had the option of saying, "Well, we'll just delay this release for 11 months until November, and then the patent expired and no harm, no foul."

MS. SRINIVASAN: Objection, Your Honor,
sidebar.
(Whereupon, the following discussion is held at sidebar.)

THE COURT: It is pretty clearly seems to be undisclosed opinion.

Do you disagree with that?
MR. PETERMAN: I do have -- this was one slide we discussed it this morning. It is only relevant now because of the change of Mr. Weinstein's opinion. Only looking at the last 11 months means this is a new hypothetical negotiation date.

Mr. Kidder is not offering affirmative opinion on non-infringing alternative he said Mr. Weinstein failed

## Kidder - Direct

Can I ask him: Could Google have delayed the rolling out of STS for 11 months in a hypothetical negotiation?

MS. SRINIVASAN: No, Your Honor. That is -first of all, there is no factual support -- if he is going to render an opinion about what could have been done -- hypothetical negotiation still involves book of wisdom looking at what actual facts are in the records.

The clear implication they did rely on the forthcoming expiration of patent to delay rollout, he has no basis for that.

THE COURT: So the reason for my ruling to not let him testify about this is I just recently rereviewed his supplemental expert report this morning during a break, and he did talk about what the negotiation would be if it had occurred in 2017 with his own damages model.

And I would have thought if he wanted to say that one of the options was to wait to roll it out, that he would have done that. I didn't see that that's something he said they could have done.

I understand that you are taking issue with their damages model at this point in time. But that's still something that I would have expected to be in his report. So that last answer is going to be stricken.

MR. PETERMAN: May I ask a question: Did
to consider. So that's context of which all this comes in.

MS. SRINIVASAN: His testimony that they chose to forego rolling out their STS because of having the threat of having to pay $\$ 45$ million is totally undisclosed. There is zero fact evidence that came in to support that statement. It is way beyond talking about non-infringing alternative. He is asserting Google made a conscious decision.

THE COURT: All right. Let me --
MS. SRINIVASAN: His reference to damages
model, $\$ 45$ million implication is there was a decision to not have to do that and pay a license instead to wait 11 months. There's been no testimony about a decision to wait or 11 months, frankly, on the record at all.

THE COURT: Let me review the response
So my ruling is as follows: You are welcome to bring in -- the prior response will be stricken. You are welcome to bring in testimony about the rollout beginning when it began. But he can't testify that there was an option for Google to delay rolling out the STS until the patent was expired.

MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, this is in the
context of hypothetical negotiation of what Google could have done.

## Kidder - Direct
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Mr. Weinstein consider whether Google could have waited 11 months to roll out STS?

THE COURT: You can ask that question. You will take the answer that you get
(Whereupon, the discussion at sidebar concludes.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you should disregard the witness's answer to the last question.

By MR. PETERMAN:
Q. Did Mr. Weinstein fail to consider Linkify and Smart Linkify as non-infringing alternatives?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. We've gone through the various errors that you've identified in Mr. Weinstein opinion. Will you just sum them up for the jury?
A. Sure. And I won't go through this entire list, but these are the six errors we just stepped our way through, starting with wrong number of units, four times multiplier, et cetera. And my point is, when you correct these errors, what you get to is -- that $\$ 45$ million is entirely unreliable.
Q. And again, what is your final opinion with respect to the appropriate measure of damages if the patent is found valid and infringed?

installed on devices with Android 8 with STS, and your
A. It is $\$ 500,000$, not the $\$ 45$ million that

Mr . Weinstein calculated.
MR. PETERMAN: Thank you. I pass the witness.
the court: Thank you.
Counsel.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, may I approach to
hand the witness the binder?
THE COURT: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MS. SRINIVASAN:
Q. All right. Good afternoon, Mr. Kidder. My name is

Kalpana Srinivasan. We have not met before.
In the start of your testimony, you made a point of
emphasizing that you looked at the revenue rather than
focusing on units, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you did your own analysis, you provided an
affirmative opinion about what you think the reasonable royalty is in this case, correct?
A. Yes.
2. Okay. So I want to drill down a little bit about how you got there. Let's pull up your DDX slides and go to Number 9 .

So you were looking at the revenue for the apps
you mean the accused devices and the accused apps, what's at issue in this case. That's right, Mr. Kidder, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you say -- and I'd like to talk about how you got to this number for the accused apps.

Now, to do that, you started by looking at all the revenue associated with the various apps at issue in this case; is that right?
A. Yes, that's fair.
Q. And then you took it down to a specific number to reflect the revenue for the accused applications in this case, correct?
A. Well, I took it down to anything that might have been accused under Mr. Weinstein's theory with a start date of December 1st, 2017, that's correct.
Q. All right. If you could look at your supplemental Exhibit 5.2. That's from your expert report in this case, from August of 2022. And you prepared that report, Mr. Kidder, correct?
A. Yes, I prepared the supplemental report. I'm sorry. I'm just -- did you put a little yellow sticky on it for me?
Q. I did not. But it's in the Exhibit 5.2 that's attached to the back of it.
A. I'm not far off. Hang on a second.
start date is December 5, 2017, to November 10, 2018,
correct?
A. So, yes, and what I did was I just apportioned revenue after December 5, 2017.
Q. You apportioned revenue. You didn't want to include in your base all revenue that might be associated with an application. You wanted to narrow in on the revenue
related to the accused applications in this case, the applications accused of using STS, correct?
A. Yes. As the accusations were laid out in

Mr. Weinstein's report.
Q. All right. So let's look at slide Number 10. And that has your revenue numbers for the accused products and the accused --

MS. SRINIVASAN: I'm sorry, Your Honor. We
need to seal the courtroom.
THE COURT: Let's seal the courtroom.
MR. PETERMAN: Seal the courtroom, yes.
(The following discussion is held under seal:
THE COURT: The courtroom has been sealed.
By MS. SRINIVASAN:
Q. All right. Back to DDX-10.10. This is your slide of the Google revenue for the accused products. And by that,

## Kidder - Cross

Q. Okay.
A. Sorry. The supplemental I labeled them side A, 5B, do you mean 5B?
Q. Side two on your supplemental report. Do you have that? On your report dated August 2022.
A. I apologize. I have my August 26, 2022 report. Oh, I'm sorry. Hang on a second. I was back into Mr. Weinstein's. I apologize. Okay. Now I'm at 5.2, yes.
Q. Okay. And that -- you prepared that supplement to the report, correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. All right. Now, I want you to just focus on Gmail, Gmail in 2018. What was the total amount of revenue that you found there?
A. For 2018, it was -- sorry hang on a second. No, for a portion of Android was $\square$
$\square$
MS. SRINIVASAN: And, Your Honor, to aid the witness, I have a demonstrative of this exhibit that he prepared with some redactions that I'd like to be able to use and publish to use as a demonstrative.

```
THE COURT: Any objection?
```

MR. PETERMAN: Not as counsel has presented it to me.

Filed $d 9 / 08 / 23$ Page $56^{*} 6 \not \psi^{\sim} 144^{\circ}$ PageID \#: 62381
the court: Okay. Let's proceed.
with you that it was apportionment based on time, which is

BY MS. SRINIVASAN:
Q. All right.

MS. SRINIVASAN: If you could bring up,
Mr. Boles, the Kidder supplement 5.2 demonstrative. And I
just want you to focus on the Gmail number, Mr. Boles,
when you bring that up.
BY MS. SRINIVASAN:
Q. Okay. So, Mr. Kidder, you said it was $\square \square$
for the Android. Let's go to the Gmail line item .but you started with a bigger number?
A. Yes, that's correct. I started -- well, I started with all of the Gmail revenues for 2018 for ios and Android.
Q. And to get down to that number, for revenue, you looked at the number of downloads that were for Android versus the number of downloads that were for ios, correct?
A. Yeah. I guess it's -- it's funny because, since
they're all annual numbers, it's all based on apportioning
the year, but it's the same idea, yes.
Q. Well, it's not just based on apportioning the year.

You apportioned it based on the app downloads that were
for Android versus everything else, correct?
A. I'm sorry. I'm not quite understanding. I agree

2
3
4
Q. And the way that you got there, you looked at this number that is listed there, 67 million and change for the Android app downloads for 2018 , correct?
A. Yes. That's what that number is.
Q. And so that's how you were able to do an apportionment, take all this revenue and focus in on what was at issue in this case, correct?
A. This was divided between Android. We made making sure we weren't getting iOS downloads in there, yes.
Q. Well, let's look at where that 67 million number that you used to try to narrow the revenue came from. If you could turn to your Exhibit 5 of your -- in your supplemental report?
A. This is 5.0?
Q. 5.0 .
A. Yep.
Q. Now, that exhibit shows the accused U.S. app device installations.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Mr. Boles, I think you could bring that up as the first -- there you go.

BY MS. SRINIVASAN:
Q. Do you see that?
A. Yes. Sorry. I'm good.
Q. And if you look at Gmail, which is what we had just been looking at --
how you get to the app downloads for Android for that portion of the year.
Q. And you've relied on the app downloads for Android to come up with a percentage of the total revenue that you allocated for Android, correct?
A. Maybe we're talking past each other. There's no -there's no distinction between the apportioning -- I'm trying to figure out how to phrase this.

As we saw earlier, the number of downloads were
provided just for the year. So I didn't have a way to say, I know exactly how many were downloaded on these
days, so what we did was we used a percentage of the year, just like Mr. Weinstein did, to calculate the number of downloads. And that's mathematically the same. It's just apportioning based on time across the year. So maybe it's a distinction without a difference.
Q. My question was a little different, but I appreciate your answer. To get from -- to go from 231 to 119, to take 52 percent of the total revenue to figure out the revenue dedicated to Android, you looked at the downloads for Android versus the downloads for other devices?
A. I'm sorry. I understand your point. So, yes, we know that in 2018, 52 percent of all downloads were on Android devices as opposed to iOS devices.

Kidder - Cross
A. Sure
Q. -- for 2018. 67 million downloads. That's what you used to apportion the revenue, correct?
A. Yes. That's based on a -- the fraction of the year that would be represented by January 1st through November, I guess -- is it 5th? 8th? -- 2018.
Q. And that's how you were able to feel confident that when you're looking at revenue, you're trying to isolate what is relevant to this case by looking at the downloads related to the accused applications in this case, correct? A. Yes. To the Android portion of it, correct.
Q. Now, this list here, you see these sources at the bottom? You can see the top of the exhibit, "Accused U.S. App Device Installs." You're talking here about the applications that are using the STS feature, correct? A. This is actually the device downloads that were accused by Mr. Weinstein, so we are, basically, following his math there.
Q. You aren't just following his math. You are using it to apportion revenue, Mr. Kidder.
A. No, I agree with that. It's all based on time and prorated.
Q. Now, you mentioned Mr. Weinstein, but I'm looking at this exhibit. I don't see a reference to Mr. Weinstein here. Do you see one?
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## A. No, there's no reference to Mr. Weinstein.

Q. Okay. Instead, there's a reference to two sources,
and those are Google documents?
A. Yes. That's correct. And the bottom one there is

DTX-581.
Q. And that's the exhibit we looked at during your
direct examination?
A. That's correct.
Q. And I heard you say, I think, that this was something Mr. Weinstein looked at, Mr. Weinstein relied on, I was there to do a math check. But your own apportionment of revenue, you relied on the same document, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, you have these figures here of the downloads from 2017 and 2018 for each of the apps. And you know that Mr. Weinstein also looked at downloads -application downloads for all of these applications in 2017 and 2018, you're aware of that?
A. Right. Yes. He looked at the entirety of 2017, 2018, and prorated.
Q. Well, if you could look at Mr. Weinstein's
supplemental 4B report. I'm sorry. The supplemental report, Exhibit 4B.

And let me know when you're there.
A. Yes, I'm there.

## Q. Okay. So -- and I want you to look at that.

MS. SRINIVASAN: I'm going to put up his -that as a demonstrative, Mr. Boles. There we go.
BY MS. SRINIVASAN:
Q. And that is Mr. Weinstein's, the downloads that he presented in connection with each of the accused applications, correct?
A. Not quite.
Q. Is there something there that you dispute?
A. Yes. You removed the Chrome line from that.
Q. For purposes of our -- okay. That's fair. We're going to come back to Chrome. Good catch, Mr. Kidder. Aside from Chrome, the other applications, those are the download figures that he included in his analysis, correct?
A. No.
Q. The download figures from 2017 and 2018 he, included this in his report as accused app installations?
A. Again, the Row 6 there, News, was not part of his calculation.
Q. All right. That's --

MS. SRINIVASAN: Mr. Boles, can you remove 6 , please.
BY MS. SRINIVASAN:
Q. So other than that, the other apps reflect the

MS. SRINIVASAN: So let's move, Mr. Boles, to Slide 4.
BY MS. SRINIVASAN:
Q. So, not surprisingly, your numbers as to the installation of the accused applications, the numbers are not going to be the same because he has a longer time period than yourself; is that fair?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. But you're both relying on the same underlying data to begin with, correct?
A. Yes. That was the data that was produced by Google. Absolutely.
Q. And you're not -- there's no issue about the data being different. You're just -- the number of days that you each used to calculate the downloads is not -- is different. That's what's different?
A. Yes. Absolutely.
Q. Okay. And you were right to put a little pin in Chrome, because that wasn't on the last tab we looked at. So we're going to come to that now.

I'd like you to look at your opening report. That
should be in your binder, Exhibit 5
A. The opening you said, right?
Q. Yes. Your opening report. Exhibit 5
ms. SRINIVASAN: And, Mr. Boles, if you could
put that up at slide 7 .

## by ms. SRINIVASAN:

Q. In your opening report --
A. Sorry. Hang on a second.
Q. I'll wait for you to get there.
A. Thank you. I appreciate that.
Q. Sure. And your analysis in 2020 -- I'm just focusing on Chrome now.
A. That's good to make that point.
Q. Yeah. In 2020, you prepared this exhibit, and you didn't calculate Chrome or put in installations for Chrome for any other years but 2017 and 2018; is that fair, Mr. Kidder?
A. Yes. In this particular version, that's correct.
Q. Well, that's the version you served. That's the
version that was attached to your expert report
A. In the opening expert report, yes.
Q. Okay. So you isolated 2017 and 2018 for Chrome.
A. Um-hmm.
Q. And those are the total -- those are the total number of installations of the accused applications -- accused
chrome application using STS that you relied on, correct?
A. Yes. Using the same, you know, prorating by the
number of days in the year methodology.
Q. All right. And Mr. Weinstein also looked at how -the number of downloads for the accused Chrome application, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And as to 2018, you would expect that his number would be identical to yours, right?
A. Yes, I would expect so.
Q. Okay. And let's look at that.

MS. SRINIVASAN: We have a comparison there Mr. Boles, at PDX-7-25 -- sorry, 7-26. So for 2018, it's going to be identical, and that is the number that Mr. Weinstein also offered.

For 2017, it's not going to be identical for the same reason that you started your first date of infringement in December and he started his first date of infringement in August.

So you agree with that Mr. Kidder?
A. Yeah, I'm sorry. I got caught up in trying to follow the math, but yes.
Q. I mean, effectively, you're working from the same number of installations and downloads for the accused application, the accused Chrome application here, and you
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products, et cetera.
Q. That didn't change the source material that you were relying on. At the end of the day, you were looking at what Google provided to make your determination.
A. That's absolutely right. My point is that this report was focused on a different set of accused functionalities, of which STS was one.
Q. Now, Mr. Kidder, you are an expert for Google, right?
A. I have been retained by Google's attorneys in this
case, yes.
Q. Fair to say that you have unlimited access to Google as an expert in this case?
A. No. I don't think that's fair to say.
Q. Well, you have access to anybody that you would need to talk to for purposes of preparing your analysis, fair? A. I don't think that's quite fair. It's not that easy, no.
Q. Well, did you ask anybody about this download data? Did you raise any questions about it when you received it? A. No. Because we had Mr. Marri's deposition that clarified what it was for us, that it was all versions of Android.
Q. You didn't go to anybody within Google to ask whether there was better data that existed for your purposes, right?
A. No. That's correct. I took this data that had been produce.
Q. And I think your counsel asked you on direct if Arendi could have asked for better data. Do you recall that question?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, as between Arendi and Google, you'd agree with me that Google has better access to its own data, correct?
A. Yes. I think Google has better access to its own
data than Arendi does.
Q. And I heard you on direct reference Mr. Choc and his testimony last week about the download data.

Were you here when he indicated that he didn't know if there was any better data available within Google? Did you hear that testimony?
A. I think I read that, yes.
Q. And likewise, that he didn't really go talk to anybody in the Google Play Store to find out if there was additional or different data he should be looking at or you should be looking at related to the Google Android installations for the accused applications.

Do you recall that testimony?
A. Not really, but I'm not debating your
characterization of it.
Q. Well, in fairness, you didn't go talk to anybody at

## Kidder - Cross

A. Yes. That's correct.
Q. And that did not prompt you to ask questions about the source data that you relied on for your apportionment analysis?
A. No. The source data -- it was clear what the source data was. It was all versions of Android.
Q. Now, by the way, for this 2020 report, you were
focused on Chrome as to STS only, correct? I mean, when we look looking at these numbers here for 2017, 2018?
A. Sorry. In the 2020 report? I honestly don't recall why we were looking at Chrome just for 2017.
Q. Well, you would agree with me that you didn't provide data for downloads prior to 2017 as to Chrome in this 2020 report?
A. No, I disagree with that.
Q. For -- in this report?
A. I'm pretty sure. I can go back and look.

So if you go to Exhibit 12 of the 2020 report, it's got downloads for Chrome back to 2012.
Q. And for purposes of looking at your Exhibit 5, which is the accused apps, in your 2020 report, you looked only at 2017 and 2018?
A. In Exhibit 5. In Exhibit 12, which is also labeled "Accused U.S. App Device Installs," it goes back to 2012.
Q. Well, at least one of your analyses was focused on a

Google Play to ask them about whether or not they had different data related to downloading -- download data for the accused applications in this case? You didn't do that?
A. No, I did not.
Q. And, in fact, you didn't go talk to Mr. Marri about it. I know you read his deposition, but you didn't go ask him to say: Is this data that's in this source document, is there other data that I should be looking at when I apportion revenue? You didn't do that?
A. No, I didn't. I was just trying to figure out what that question would even look like. But, no, I didn't do that.
Q. You don't know what that question would look like because you didn't have a reason to think you needed to ask it? Is it a fair way to say it, Mr. Kidder?
A. Well, because at that time, it was a much more complex overlapping, sort of intertwined set of release dates. And it was a much more complicated case. And when it boiled down to STS only, then some issues sort of popped out that I hadn't caught previously.
Q. Well, you issued a report in 2022 that was focused on STS. And we're looking here at a time in which you looked at Chrome data for 2017 and 2018, during the period when STS was released, correct?
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scenario in which STS was the infringing function in the Chrome application, correct? You would agree with that?
A. I honestly don't recall why we did Exhibit 5, but that sounds right. It was relatively complex back then. Q. All right. I want to go back to Slide 10 from your demonstratives. And we've talked a little bit about how you apportioned to get down to that revenue that is related to the accused applications in this case using STS. We talked about that already, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Now I want to talk about where you started from. The pool of revenue that you started from. You got that revenue information from Google, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. Well, let's look at some of those revenue numbers that you relied on in your analysis. Here's one at PX-37 for Chrome. Actually, before we do that, do you have in your binder, if you look at the back tabs, PX-37? A. Probably. Yeah. It's yellow. 37 you said?
Q. Yeah.
A. I may need some help. I see one that's labeled 77 and I see a PX-61. Yeah.
Q. Okay. If you look at the tab marked "Natives."
A. I see. Yes.
Q. Okay. Then you will see there -- after the second

1360

Filed d9/08/23 Page $60^{\circ} \mathbf{6 f f} 144^{\circ p}$ PageID \#: 62385
yellow slip sheet, you will see --
A. You are looking for $P X-37$, you said?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay. Yes. I've got that.
Q. Are you with me there?
A. Yes.
Q. And is this revenue data that you relied on in the course of preparing your opinions in this case?
A. I believe it is. I can't remember the Bates numbers precisely.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, we move to admit
PX-37.
MR. PETERMAN: Is there a citation you can
point us to, to make sure this is exactly what he relied upon?

MS. SRINIVASAN: Do you need his report? He
just said that he did rely on revenue data.
THE COURT: Let me see counsel at sidebar.
(Whereupon, the following discussion is held at
sidebar.)
THE COURT: Do we need to take a minute to
confirm?
MR. Peterman: Your Honor, he said he wasn't
sure if this was the revenue number. We need to make sure

Kidder - Cross
in coming up with your revenue apportionment, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you got that revenue information from Google. To be clear, this is the form in which it came to you, this spreadsheet?
A. That is correct.
Q. You didn't get any backup for this, right?
A. What do you mean by "backup"? I got a spreadsheet with the numbers.
Q. Just this for Chrome?
A. Yes.
Q. And you don't have any understanding of how Google makes money off of its accused apps, do you?
A. Not off of Chrome, no.
Q. How about the other apps?
A. Yeah. I was reviewing in the course of the last few days, just reviewing things, and the Gmail revenue appears to come from advertising.
Q. Okay. In the course of preparing your report for this case, you didn't dig into how Google generates revenue from its applications, fair?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. You relied on these summaries that you got from Google to come up with your numbers, correct?
A. That is correct.
this is the correct one. Obviously counsel can have him look at his report.

THE COURT: Why don't you take a minute and
confer.
MS. SRINIVASAN: This is internal Google
revenue data that he used. I don't know what their
objection would be to their own revenue numbers.
THE COURT: I want him to confirm that whatever
data he relied on is the same exhibit you are trying to admit. This should take 30 seconds.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Okay.
(Whereupon, the discussion at sidebar concludes.)

MR. PETERMAN: No objection.
THE COURT: It's admitted.
(Exhibit PX-37 is admitted into evidence.)
MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, we want to make sure
that this is kept under seal. It is Google's financial information.

MS. SRINIVASAN: We are presently under seal, and no objection to that remaining under seal.

THE COURT: That's fine. Let's proceed.
BY MS. SRINIVASAN:
Q. All right. Okay. So, Mr. Kidder, this is the, as an example, the revenue information you looked at for Chrome

## Kidder - Cross

Q. So if I ask you now: What is the Chrome revenue number based on that we're seeing up here, you can't answer that for me?
A. No, I can't.
Q. In fact, the number for 2018 is but you can't tell us why that is?
A. I think Mr. Marri was asked about that in his deposition, and I don't actually recall. It had something to do with accounting.
Q. During your direct examination -- I know it was bit tongue-in-cheek, you referred to yourself as a math nerd. And I'm just wondering when you get, you know, numbers like this going from, you know, $\square$ to $\square$ $\square$, did it not make you want to dig in and figure out what's going on there?
A. So, first of all, these are -- these are not in thousands. So it's And this looked to me like a product that they were, like, $\square$ Mr. Marri testified to.
Q. Okay. But you didn't ask anybody when you got this spreadsheet?
A. You know, I think that's correct. We noted
$\square$ and were curious about it, but I think that was cleared up in Mr. Marri deposition.
Q. And you had three other people in your team looking
at these numbers with you, auditing numbers, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. But none of this flagged for them such that you went back and looked at the backup to see exactly why the Chrome revenue does this?
A. No. As I said, I think it was addressed in

Mr. Marri's deposition. Those are questions that Arendi asked.
Q. Arendi's questions about it.
A. Yes.
Q. Not your questions?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Let's -- I'd like to look at one more of these, PX-37.

MS. SRINIVASAN: And, Mr. Boles, just hang
tight for a minute.
BY MS. SRINIVASAN:
Q. If you could look, Mr. Kidder, at your exhibits
there.
A. Sure. And I'm sorry. PX-37 is what we are looking
at, it's a different one?
Q. PX-36. Thank you.
A. Yes, I've got that.
Q. Okay. And is this revenue information that you

## Kidder - Cross

a minute?
THE COURT: Yes.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Sidebar.
(Whereupon, the following discussion is held at
sidebar.)
MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, Google had moved in limine to prevent -- well, I guess really to prevent Mr. Weinstein from testifying about Google app-related revenue.

The witness has just said that he noted that some of the way in which they accounted for Gmail revenue was through advertising, and I would like to explore that with him. I want to make sure there is no ruling on the Court has issued on limine.

One issue I would like to ask about is their public filings that show they are looking at advertising revenue when they talk about these Google properties.

MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, I think that's inappropriate. There is a MIL with respect to the larger Google advertising. There is no tie that's been made between Gmail and larger Google advertising.

The testimony in the record is specifically with respect to the Gmail app and the revenue numbers that have been provided here. I don't think we have an
A. It looks like it, yes.

PX-36.
MR. PETERMAN: One second, Your Honor.
No objection.
the court: It's admitted.
(Exhibit PX-36 is admitted into evidence.)
BY MS. SRINIVASAN:
Q. Okay. We can put that up now.

All right. And so this is the data -- again, you got a spreadsheet from Google. You used that to come up with your revenue numbers, right?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And for some of these, $\square$ But you didn't ask any
questions of Google about where this data came from, did you?
A. No, I did not.
Q. And you used it in coming up with that number that you showed us in your direct examination that all of the accused app-related revenue was $\square$, correct?
A. That's correct. I relied on data that Arendi
requested from Google and Google produced.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, may I approach for

## Kidder - Cross

objection to the Gmail app revenue numbers. Specifically anything beyond what is the subject of the MIL.

THE COURT: All right. Let's let the jury take their afternoon break, and we will take this one under advisement.

In the meantime, I want to alert Arendi counsel that I won't charge you for the times we spent at sidebar, but you are running out of time to put on your validity case. I don't know how much more of this you want to get into it.

MS. SRINIVASAN: He said it. I don't want to ask if it's going to violate the limine.
(Whereupon, the discussion at sidebar concludes.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we are going to take the afternoon break, give you a chance to stretch, use the restroom if you need to. We will take approximately a ten-minute break.

Ms. Garfinkel.
(The jury exits the courtroom at $4: 20 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. )
THE COURT: All right. Counsel, we will be in recess. I will remain on the bench. Feel free to move about the cabin. But I'm going to take a look at the pending objection.
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
the court: All right. Let's go back on the record. Can I see counsel at sidebar.
(Whereupon, the following occurred at sidebar:
THE COURT: So I went back and looked at the testimony. There was an answer from the witness that he had reviewed things and that the Gmail revenue appears to come from advertising. There can be limited follow-up questioning about that as long as it's in compliance with the Court's ruling on the motion in limine.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Meaning, that if I asked him about Google's own representations about advertising connected to Gmail and Google properties is that in bounds, out of bounds?

THE COURT: I don't know if he's reviewed
Google's representations about that.
Counsel, do you have any views on this?
MR. Peterman: I don't think he's reviewed those. We think it gets close to asking about Google's overall advertising revenue, things that are not tied to the apps have the -- I believe the testimony is specific to the apps.

We are okay with questioning on that, but
broader I think is really subject to sort of the agreed-upon MIL, not to talk about the size of Google revenues, overall wealth and the MIL with the Court. They
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related to the browser and then other Google properties like Gmail, Google Maps, and YouTube. This advertising revenue feature is tied to those Google properties. It's not a company-wide global corporate advertising revenue figure.

MR. PETERMAN: First of all, I think YouTube is not accused here. Are you intending to ask about these specific numbers or any number?

MS. SRINIVASAN: To ask if he considered this revenue that was related to the Google property and whether he knows if it's included in the revenue that he relied on for this case.

MR. PETERMAN: Google property is not
synonymous with the 12 apps on Android or nine at issue. We think that goes beyond the bounds of what's under the MIL.
the court: Why don't you show me a copy of what you intend to ask him. Why don't you all sit down while I take this under consideration.
(Whereupon, the discussion at sidebar concludes.)
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: Counsel, I'm ready to see you at sidebar.
can't put any specific number on advertising.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Well, they have revenue
figures that are tied to Google properties, like Google Chrome, Search and Google Gmail and Google Maps, so it's not global advertising revenue, it's what they describe as Google properties, like the apps at issue.

I want to know if he looked at it at least because he's talking about now that he looked at one application revenue figure that he thinks advertising may be relevant to. But as I took it from his testimony he didn't consider or doesn't know if it was reflected in the revenue that he looked at for every other app.

THE COURT: It's fair. She asked him if he looked into other numbers, is it not?

MR. Peterman: Your Honor, with respect to the accused apps at issue, I don't know if the numbers counsel is referring to are --

MR. UNIKEL: I argued the MIL on --
THE COURT: We will stick with the rule. You are welcome to confer with counsel.

Why don't you take a look at what she proposes to ask him.

MS. SRINIVASAN: There is specific disclosure
around Google property search properties revenue from traffic generated by search distribution partners, that's

Kidder - Cross
(Whereupon, the following discussion is held at sidebar.)

MR. BELGAM: Your Honor, Mr. Kidder is still here, so we might need the noise machine or we could ask him to leave.

THE COURT: You can turn on the machine. That thing is very effective.

False alarm. Give us one more minute.
(Whereupon, the discussion at sidebar concludes.)
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: All right, Counsel, I'm ready.
(Whereupon, the following discussion is held at sidebar.)

THE COURT: Okay. My ruling is that counsel for Arendi can ask questions about this. You will not show this exhibit to the jury. This exhibit will not be admitted into evidence.

You can ask him if he took these things under consideration. You have to stick with the answer that you get.

MR. PETERMAN: Your Honor, we object to the extent she is allowed to mention the number. This was not raised in the MIL discussion. We had a very long
discussion about MIL. Counsel for Arendi could have raised it during the argument. This was not produced during discovery. This was not shown to Mr. Kidder or any other witness during deposition.

We respect Your Honor's decision, but the
numbers themselves are very harmful, very, and
particularly at issue in the MIL we don't believe they should come in. He's going to answer that he didn't consider this.

THE COURT: Okay. All of your points are
taken. I did review the transcript of the motion in
limine. I believe this is fair game.
Your expert testified about appropriate numbers
based on revenues. She wants to cross him on whether his revenue numbers are correct and the word "revenues" is on this page. She can ask about it.

You have to take the answer you get from him.
MR. UNIKEL: Does that mean she can ask about
the numbers themselves?
THE COURT: Counsel.
MR. PETERMAN: Two things, Your Honor. This document is not limited to the apps at issue in this case. Numbers themselves are something that was specifically the subject of the MIL the court ruled that numbers regarding overall advertising cannot be asked about included

MS. SRINIVASAN: This is a global advertising
number.
THE COURT: It is global.
MS. SRINIVASAN: It is not global. They didn't
want corporate advertising global advertising for the
company. He's relied on documents that are not kept in the ordinary course as to revenue. He doesn't know how they were prepared. He was handed them by Google. It is fair game to ask. He could have gone and looked at the SEC filings.

THE COURT: So the problem, Counsel, that
counsel just raised is that these numbers are not limited to the apps in this case, so why is that appropriate?

MS. SRINIVASAN: They don't keep that in the ordinary course. So they have generated a number for revenues. He doesn't know how they did it. They are relying on that and ignoring other relevant financial information. They don't have an explanation.

THE COURT: Counsel, standby. Standby.
When I initially made the ruling, I had
understood that we were crossing. As I'm looking at this, this very clearly, on its face, relates to things that are not accused in this case.

Do you disagree with that?

## Kidder - Cross

MS. SRINIVASAN: No. It's not been admitted yet.

PX-61 that we would have questioned Mr. Kidder about Google SEC statements that talk specifically as to advertising revenue related to Google properties including Gmail, Google Maps, Google Play, YouTube, and as well as traffic revenue from traffic generated by Google browsers at Page 28.

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, would you put on the record your view about whether or not this -- what these numbers correspond to.

MR. Peterman: Yes. Our view is the numbers that are in PX-61 relate to many properties beyond the specific 12 accused apps in the case and Google Pixel devices that are part of this.

We believe it is subject to the MIL that the Court ruled on regarding larger advertising numbers and believe that the Court is appropriately keeping these numbers out of the case.

THE COURT: All right. Let's bring the jury in.
(Whereupon, the discussion at sidebar concludes.)
the court: For the record. The ruling at sidebar relied on Federal Rule of Evidence 403, as well as

the Court's prior ruling on the motion in limine.
Let's get the witness back on the stand.
Ms. Garfinkel, let's bring the jury back in.
the clerk: Yes, Your Honor.
(The jury enters the courtroom at 4:48 p.m.)
the clerk: Your Honor, the jury.
the Court: Please have a seat.
Let's continue with cross-examination.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Thank you.
BY MS. SRINIVASAN:
Q. Mr. Kidder, before the break, I had asked you about
the revenue information that you relied on in preparing
your opinions, and your testimony was that that was data
that you got from Google, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you make any effort to go look at Google's public securities filings or any publicly available information about how Google earns revenue?
A. Not in the context of this case, no.
Q. Did you make an effort to determine the different
revenue streams that Google earns related to the accused applications?
A. No.
Q. You testified earlier that you had considered advertising in connection with Gmail.

Kidder - Cross the accused applications, correct?
A. Yeah. As I said, I accepted them at face value, didn't try to understand the components.
2. You testified earlier that it's not so easy to get information from Google.

That was your testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. But you, in fact, have worked with Google quite
frequently, correct?
A. I have done other cases with Google, yes.
Q. And fair to say it's not just one or two cases where you have served as an expert testifying for Google?
A. No. I think over 16 years, it's been more than one or two, yes.
Q. And I know you have before you your CV. And in the interest of time, I'm not going to go through each of those engagements, but I have a demonstrative that reflects what's in your CV. You see those, those are references to the litigation experience that come from your CV, your resume, from your August 2022 report.
Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And does that reflect the instances and cases in which you testified as a damages expert for Google over

Did you look at how advertising revenue might have impacted the revenue numbers you received from Google in this case?
A. Just by understanding that the Gmail revenues
included advertising revenues.
Q. But for the remainder of the applications that you analyzed that form that application revenue number, your understanding is that the rest of those did not take into account advertising, correct?
A. No, it's not correct. I just didn't know what was in the rest of those.
Q. And you didn't ask, to be fair?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. Is you didn't ask anybody at Google, should the
numbers that I get reflect the benefits from advertising revenue that Google gets in connection with those applications, correct?

MR. PETERMAN: Objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?
BY MS. SRINIVASAN:
Q. Sure. In the course of doing your analysis, you got these revenue numbers, you didn't ask anybody at Google whether those numbers reflected the benefit that Google
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A. Over the past, I think, 16 years, I think that's correct.
Q. And that is almost ten times that you've served for Google in that capacity, correct?
A. I have been retained by attorneys for Google, yes.
Q. And you've offered testimony as to damages in each of those cases, correct?
A. That is correct.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Pass the witness.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION

## by Mr. PETERMAN :

Q. Mr. Kidder, just a few follow-up questions.

What date did you first understand that Arendi was accusing the STS functionality only of infringement? A. Whatever the late Friday night was before trial started.
Q. And what date did you first learn that Arendi was alleging a $\$ 45.5$ million damage number in this case?
A. At the same time frame, like, 10:00 at night or something like that on the Friday before trial started. Q. That was after the day the jury was impaneled? A. Yes.

MR. PETERMAN: Mr. Boles, can you bring up PDX-7-3, please.

## BY MR. PETERMAN

Q. Will you explain to the jury why your numbers and

Mr. Weinstein's numbers in PDX-7-3 are the same?
A. Because we matched his methodology.
Q. Is it your opinion that the numbers here overstate the downloads to Android 8 with STS or Android 9?

MS. SRINIVASAN: Objection. Leading.
the court: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Yes. These are all -- this is
just an apportionment of all downloads for -- sorry, this isn't an apportionment for 2018. This is most of 2018, but it doesn't -- there's no specificity as to which version of Android were downloaded to. It's just downloaded to Android, as we saw the tab in that prior sheet.
by MR. PETERMAN :
Q. And what is the impact of this overstatement on your $\$ 500,000$ damages calculation?
A. It doesn't make too much difference, actually. So if
you remember, I'm looking at revenues. And most of revenues come from the devices. And there's $\square$ out of that came from the apps. So, you know, even if I took away the entirety of the apps revenue, it wouldn't make a substantive difference in my opinion.
Q. And what is the impact of this overstatement on

## Sacerdoti - Direct

MR. PETERMAN: Thank you. Just checking. I wasn't sure.

THE COURT: Thank you.
(Whereupon, the sealed discussion concludes.)

THE CLERK: Please state spell your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: It's Earl Sacerdoti, E-A-R-L,
$S-A-C-E-R-D-O-T-I$.
THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.

EARL SACERDOTI, having been called as a witness, being first duly sworn under oath or affirmed, testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

MR. LAHAD: Your Honor, may I approach? THE COURT: Please.

BY MR. LAHAD:
Q. Good afternoon, sir. Could you please introduce yourself to the Court and the jury.
A. Yeah. Good afternoon. My name is Earl Sacerdoti.
Q. Why are you here today, sir?
A. I'm here to testify regarding the validity of the
A. It's significant. Because, I mean, most of his damages opinion relies on app counts and multiplying the app counts by ten cents.

MR. PETERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kidder. No further questions.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.
You may step down, sir.
MR. PETERMAN: May Mr. Kidder be released, Your
Honor?
THE COURT: Yes, he may.
THE COURT: Does Google have any additional
witnesses to call?
MR. UNIKEL: Google rests its case, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you very much.
MS. SRINIVASAN: And, Your Honor, we might have some motions to raise outside the presence of the jury. I think we can do that at the end of the day if the court agrees with that.

THE COURT: That's fine.
Would Arendi like to present a rebuttal case?
MR. LAHAD: Yes, Your Honor. We have a
rebuttal witness, Dr. Earl Sacerdoti, please.
MR. PETERMAN: Is the room unsealed as of yet?
THE COURT: The courtroom should be unsealed.
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' 843 patent.
Q. I believe you have some slides for us today; is that true?
A. I do.
Q. These are they, correct?
A. This is the first one.
Q. We are on the clock today, Doctor, so we're going to be going through these pretty quickly. But before we get into your -- let me ask you this: What is, generally, your opinion that you are going to give today?
A. My opinion is that the currently validated '843 remains valid.
Q. Before we get into that, tell me about yourself. Where were you from?
A. I'm from Northern California, been out there for about 52 years.
Q. Where did you go to school?
A. Did my undergraduate work at Yale, my graduate work in computer science at Stanford.
Q. You have an MS and a PhD from Stanford; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. How long have you been -- let's call it working in computers or working with computers?
A. Well, a bit longer than Dr. Fox who testified this
morning. I wrote my first company computer program in 1963.
Q. And can you give the jury a flavor of some of your experience involving computers and computer science since then?
A. Yeah, I've done a range of things. I was working at SRI, Stanford Research Institute, nonprofit research institute at Stanford for about ten years. Got the entrepreneurial itch and founded a number of companies, one called Machine Intelligence that was trying to
commercialize machine vision and robotics. And we spun out of there another company that -- an initial product understanding natural language questions against a database. That product became $Q$ and $A$, which was the first product of a company we spun out of Machine Intelligence called Symantec, which you may have heard of. Q. What did you do for Apple?
A. After consulting for Apple for a while, they hired me on as a full-time employee to establish a group, basically to coordinate their $R \& D$ efforts. This was in the middle '90s, and believe it or not, they'd been around for 15 years and they'd never had what's called a product roadmap, a plan of which products are going to come out which order, what software is going to be in what hardware and stuff. So that was the job I took on there.
flavor about the technology you've invented?
A. Yeah. I've done a range of things. The first couple patents I did were in the area of data visualization and an interactive system for building these kind of visualizations. With some colleagues, I built a portfolio of patents around consumer-selected advertising in virtual worlds. So if you had an avatar and you put a Nike Swish on your chest, you could get paid for that as other people saw it and interacted with you.

And then and I also have a patent in applying machine learning to predicting which homes in a given local area are most likely to go on the market and sell in the next year.

MR. LAHAD: Your Honor, I'd offer Dr. Sacerdoti
as an expert in computer science and programming?
MR. UNIKEL: No objection, Your Honor.
the court: He's qualified.
MR. LAHAD: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. LAHAD :
Q. In forming your opinions, sir, what materials did you review?
A. I kind of looked at all the stuff you've been talking about all week; the patent itself, it's file history,
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prior art and paste them together and check off the things that are in the middle. All of these things in this day after New Years confetti of the floor slide are intended to indicate how the various terms in the claim elements are used over and over again.

And if I talk about first computer program in one of the elements, I have to be talking about the same first computer program in all the others. So what Dr. Fox didn't do, for example, this morning was when he said, "Okay, I can check off this line here," he didn't go back and see if the way he checked off that line connected using the same other elements, other terms consistently throughout all the different elements. And in my understanding of how to interpret a claim, that has to be done.
Q. What are you showing us here with this slide?
A. So the approach that I took was to kind of take the kind of analysis that's suggested by my New Year's party slide and give myself a sequence of questions that I to have to say, "yes" to for something to possibly practice the patent, that is, you know, kind of do the invention.

And so first question is, "Was an editable document displayed by the first computer program? If so, does analyzing the information identify multiple types meeting the Court's construction?" And so on and so on and so on.

## There's a whole set of questions that $I$ ask in sequence,

 and if I can go through that and get to the end, then I know that I have a candidate for something that might practice the patent. And I'll go back and look at it in more detail.Q. And Dr. Fox provided his opinions with respect to anticipation and obviousness this morning. And is there any portion of Dr. Fox's opinion that you agree with?
A. Is there any portion of it that I agree with? Well, I don't agree with his bottom line conclusions. I'm sure if we looked, there would be parts of it I agree with.
Q. Let me ask you that. Do you agree with any of Dr. Fox's opinion on the validity of the patent?
A. I don't.
Q. And is it true with respect to anticipation and obviousness?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Can you -- the Court will instruct the jury on the law, but can you give us just a brief recap of anticipation and obviousness?
A. Yeah. As I understand it. I'm not a lawyer; that's not where my expertise lies. But anticipation, as we've heard several times, is when a single prior art, a piece of prior art, a document or a system, if you can prove out that the system existed -- does everything. Practices Sacerdoti - Direct
Q. Let's start talking about some of the Dr. Fox's opinions and some of the grounds for invalidity. Let's start with anticipation by CyberDesk. Of course, you disagree that CyberDesk anticipates the ' 843 patent, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So tell me, what's CyberDesk missing?
A. Well, one thing that it's missing, we can see here from the -- this is the Chi paper that we've heard a lot about over the last week. The diagram that shows how CyberDesk works, shows as its example the input coming from a mail reader. It's a mail reader, not a full mail client. It means it's reading your mail. That means what it's reading is not an editable document under the Court's construction; therefore, it's not a document. If it's not a document, then my cascading list of questions kind of gets a "no" right at the very top. And consequently, CyberDesk cannot invalidate the 843 patent, cannot anticipate the ' 843 patent.
Q. You were in the courtroom last week when we heard the testimony of Dr. Dey, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you recall he gave some testimony about editable documents in CyberDesk. Do you recall that?
A. Yes, I do.
every element of the claim and does so in the way that the claim is arranged. If that is the case, if that can be proven, then it practices the claim.
Q. What about obviousness?
A. With respect to obviousness, you can combine multiple references. You can't combine them willy-nilly, though. You have to ask yourself the question, would a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, have had the motivation to do so? You know, would they have said, "Oh, it would be a good way, a idea to put these things together," for some reason. And that has to be done, importantly, not in hindsight. The game here isn't, oh, I see this patent. So let me look around at what art was available at the time and see if I can take a piece here and there and copy what the patent did.

The idea is, would you see those things and be
motivated to make the invention. So it's like would you be motivated to put all these things together and end up with the invention, not just see the invention and then make art that copies it.

So if you're trying to build the invention from reading the claims, that's hindsight. You have to imagine that somebody hasn't seen those claims yet, hasn't seen the invention, and they're motivated to build it on their own.

## Sacerdoti - Direct

1392
Q. And candidly, that testimony is inconsistent with your opinion. You'd agree with that?
A. Yes, I would.
Q. So are you ignoring or disagreeing with Dr. Dey's testimony?
A. No. I'm sure he believes what he said. And it's a question of looking at all the evidence. We have contemporaneous evidence like that picture we just showed from the CHI paper that says at that point in time, at least his best example, wasn't editable text.

And Dr. Dey from 20 years later, remembered that at some point in the CyberDesk project, which took years, some work was done before the CHI paper. A lot of it was done after the CHI paper. He recalled that at some point it was an editable document, but he didn't recall -- in the deposition transcripts that I've read, he didn't recall when.
Q. So fair to say you're putting more weight on the contemporaneous documents that we saw rather than uncorroborated testimony of Dr. Dey?
A. Yeah. That's a good way to put it.

> MR. UNIKEL: Objection. Leading.
> THE COURT: Overruled.

BY MR. LAHAD :
Q. So what are you showing us here with respect to

## CyberDesk, sir?

A. This is demonstrating that, under my analysis, it's
pretty clear that CyberDesk doesn't anticipate the ' 843 patent.
Q. Because there's no document?
A. Because there's first -- there's no document, that's correct.
Q. You were in the courtroom this afternoon when -- or this morning, rather, when Dr. Fox testified about

CyberDesk's browser.
Do you recall that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And all the applets being in the browser?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you think about that opinion with respect to anticipation by CyberDesk?
A. That what he showed us this morning also demonstrated
that CyberDesk doesn't anticipate. This was a good
example of him not applying the kind of approach that I'd suggest. Yeah
Q. Let's talk about Claim 30. Does CyberDesk anticipate Claim 30?
A. It does not.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, as we've heard several times, the dependent
A. ADD, if you remember, was the system for dynamically integrating programs that Apple Computer developed. This was a multi-year project. Started in their R\&D group. And the papers about it discuss a kind of cheat by gel collaboration between the $R \& D$ and the product group trying out different things and doing what one of the authors called "a dance" to try out features and put them in and out and user test them, and come down with a tight system that would support Apple's user's.
Q. What's ADD missing from the claims?
A. Well, ADD doesn't have a first computer program that sets up the input device. ADD was created by modifying the operating system so that it would watch what the applications were doing and be able to provide the kind of integration that they wanted without having to go in to modify every application, which would be unpleasant for all Apple's developers.
Q. Doctor, if I could direct your attention to your notebook and have you turn to Page -- or the tab at DTX-192.
A. Sorry. I'm having trouble finding it.
Q. So am I. Let's move on.

So remind us, what's missing from ADD?
A. So what's missing from $A D D$ is an input device that's set up by the first computer program because the only
claim depends on an independent claim. And if the independent claim isn't practiced, then the claim that depends on it will also not be practiced. So because Claim 23 didn't anticipate Claim 30, which depends on Claim 23, can't anticipate either.
Q. And does this apply to the obviousness argument that we're going to talk about in a second?
A. It does.
Q. So if Claim 23 is not rendered obvious, then Claim 30 is not rendered obvious, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. So we can cross that one off.

Let's put a bow on it. What's your independent
opinion on whether CyberDesk anticipates the asserted claims of ' 843 patent?
A. CyberDesk does not anticipate the asserted claims of the 843 patent.
Q. Let's move to some of the combinations. Now, you understand that the CyberDesk system is the only ground of invalidity that Dr. Fox asserts anticipates?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And he's got a few combinations. Let's talk about the combinations. First, let's talk about ADD and CyberDesk. Very briefly, remind the jury what is or what was ADD?
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input device there, the menu, is set up, like I said, by the operating system.
Q. What sets up ADD, then, the input device in ADD?
A. The input device is set up by the operating system, by the code that was added to the operating system to support ADD.
Q. Okay. Well, let's -- you're my witness, but let me cross-examine you for a little bit. You were in the courtroom last week when Dr. Smedley and the rest of the witnesses testified about infringement?
A. I was here for some of it. I wasn't here for the protected parts of the testimony.
Q. And -- but you were here for the portions that discuss this notion of the application being serviced by functionality provided by the Java API framework. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And the allegation was that the Java API framework was part of the operating system. Do you recall that?
A. I do.
Q. Okay.

MR. UNIKEL: Objection, Your Honor. Sidebar, please.
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## (Whereupon, the following discussion is held at

sidebar.)
the court: Okay. What's the basis?
MR. UNIKEL: Your Honor, objection. This is
outside the scope of the expert report. He's a validity expert. He's not an infringement expert. If he is about to give infringement opinion about how our system does or does not work, it would be infringement opinion. He can talk about how Apple Data Detectors works, talk about Dr. Fox's opinion that if Arendi's position is right what would that mean for the invalidity case. He cannot offer opinions on how our system work does or doesn't do.

## THE COURT: Counsel?

MR. LAHAD: I agree. He is not going to talk
about that.
THE COURT: Great.
MR. UNIKEL: Great. We are in agreement.
Thank you.
THE COURT: There wasn't a pending question,
jury.
Let's continue.
(Whereupon, the discussion at sidebar concludes.)

MR. LAHAD: Thank you, Your Honor.

## BY MR. LAHAD

Q. My question to you is, how is this any different than what we heard last week?
A. Remind me back one question. What -- oh, the -- the Infringement discussion.
Q. The Java API framework?
A. Yeah. The Apple Data Detectors documentation clearly indicates that the communication here is done through what are call Apple Events, which are messages that are sent from one piece of system to another. The message would be a piece of a data structure that gets built up by one program and that data structure is then transmitted to another program. It's quite different from linking from one piece of code to another during execution, which is -was my understanding of what Dr. Smedley was, basically, accusing Google of doing, linking as opposed to sending messages.
Q. Is there a call from, for example, Notepad or a text editor in the Apple product to ADD?
A. No. There's no call in that sense. The programs aren't linked together. They don't behave in execution like one big program.
Q. So they're not joined together temporarily like Mr. Elbouchikhi said?
A. That's correct.
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MR. UNIKEL: Objection, your Honor. Leading the witness.

THE COURT: Overruled.
BY MR. LAHAD:
Q. So what are you showing us here?
A. What I'm showing us here is, if there is no input device set up by the first computer program, that fails my fourth question, and so that helps me determine that Apple Data Detectors does not practice the ' 843 patent claims.
Q. Right. So but Dr. Fox is not asserting that
anticipation by Apple Data Detectors is asserting the obviousness by the combination of CyberDesk and ADD, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So what is your opinion with respect to whether or not the combination of CyberDesk and ADD renders the claim obvious?
A. That combination also does not render the claims obvious. If neither of the prior art systems practices one of these steps, then the combination couldn't either. Q. What about a motivation to combine? Would a person of ordinary skill in the art be motivated to combine Cyberdesk and ADD?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Why not?
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A. Well, the two systems are both trying to work on integrating computer programs dynamically as the user was doing stuff. But they were following very different objectives, and they're kind of going in opposite directions. Apple's system was designed to be something that was going to be actually added to the commercial operating system and needed to be attractive to their developer community because a lot of the value in Apple's computers was the software that would run on them. They couldn't keep their developers happy, they couldn't keep selling hardware.

CyberDesk, by contrast, was a research project that was looking -- as opposed to Apple, which was trying to narrow the kinds of options they gave to users so the user wouldn't have no think about it much and could do it really quick.

What CyberDesk was looking at was kind of blowing out the menu, looking at way more kinds of options over time. So they were looking at things like where am I on the campus when I'm asking this question or when I'm using this program? What does my face look like when I'm using the computer? It's a research project. So they were looking at finding other ways to determine the context and figure out what options to offer to the user.

[^1]Case 1:13-cv-00919çefot - Dioctument 605-3

## bigger menus, if you will, or bigger kinds of choices.

 The other was a commercial effort, which required changing the operating system, was looking for the smallest increment to take advantage, make real value to their end users. Different motivations, different directions, they were headed altogether. It's hard to understand why you would combine them.Q. So what's your opinion regarding whether CyberDesk and ADD or ADD plus CyberDesk renders the claims obvious?
A. My opinion is that the combination of those two
systems would not render the ' 843 patent claims obvious.
Q. Let's move on to the combination of CyberDesk and Microsoft Word 97.

What's your opinion on whether that combination renders the claims obvious?
A. My opinion is that combination, likewise, does not render the claims obvious.
Q. So what's missing from the combination of CyberDesk and Microsoft Word 97?
A. Well, I haven't seen anything in the documentation from Microsoft Word that would suggest that it analyzes information in the document to determine if the information is one or more types as the court has construed, the kind of types that it's looking for, namely, contact information or identifying information.
1
so a system that, as Dr. Fox had suggested this morning, that pulls aspects from CyberDesk, wouldn't do so either.
Q. Well, do you agree that there's a motivation to combine CyberDesk and Word 97?
A. I pretty strongly disagree with that. There's good evidence that such a motivation does not exist.
Q. You think the CyberDesk guys would agree with you?
A. I do.
Q. Why do you say that?
A. Well, I've read their papers and they say it.
Q. Let's go to DTX-10, please, which is in your notebook.
A. I have that one.
Q. Excellent.

MR. LAHAD: If we can have DTX-10 on the screen, please, Mr. Boles.

BY MR. LAHAD :
Q. Can you direct us to the portion of this document on which you are relying?
A. Yeah. If you go down to the second paragraph in the introduction. There we go.

Let me read out that first sentence there: "Our approach to integration is a tightly integrated suite of tools that take advantage of known services" -- oh, excuse
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Q. Are you familiar with the concept of teaching away?
A. Yes.
Q. What's teaching away?
A. Teaching away is a lawyerly kind of term for saying that a piece of prior art suggests that you shouldn't do what the patent does.
Q. Does this document teach away from the combination from CyberDesk and Microsoft Word 97?
A. Yes, it does. It's saying taking Microsoft Word approach tightly integrated is not the direction that we should be going in.
Q. Thank you.

So let's wrap it up. What is your opinion on whether there is a motivation to combine CyberDesk and Microsoft Word?
A. In my opinion, there is not a motivation to
combine --
Q. And does that --
A. CyberDesk Microsoft Word.
Q. I'm sorry, Doctor.

And does that render the claims obvious?
A. Yes, it does -- sorry. That does not render the claims obvious.
Q. Thank you.

Let's go to the last one, ADA and Microsoft Word.
Q. This is one of the documents that you relied on in

Does that combination render claims obvious in your view?
A. It does not.
Q. Why not?
A. Generally, the same kind of argument. Apple Data Detectors was very explicitly looking at a way to integrate programs from the user's point of view dynamically, and not -- again, not require changing the individual apps, not making the developers go in and change their code in order to product the integration. That was kind of the whole thrust of what they were doing as well.
Q. Do you think there's motivation to combine the two references?
A. There isn't.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, again, as I said, they were aiming in opposite directions. Microsoft Word is trying to keep a closed system around the Office suite of products that call each other or send messages to each other. And Apple Data Detectors was trying to allow all programs to participate in this integration process dynamically in run time. Q. Let me direct your attention to your binder at DTX-9-54. I think it's the last tab.

Do you recognize DTX-954?
A. I do.
forming your opinion regarding validity, correct?
A. It is.

MR. LAHAD: Your Honor, I offer DTX-954.
MR. UNIKEL: No objection, Your Honor.
the court: It's admitted.
MR. LAHAD: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Exhibit DTX-954 is admitted into evidence.)
BY MR. LAHAD :
Q. I want to direct your attention to Page 8 of 11 at the bottom.

MR. LAHAD: And that paragraph right there
Mr. Boles that starts with -- let me step back.
BY MR. LAHAD :
Q. If we go to the front of this document, it says, "An overview of LiveDoc."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What is LiveDoc?
A. LiveDoc was a research project that was done using Apple Data Detectors kind of as a basis and standing on its shoulders. One of problems that Apple was finding with Apple Data Detectors was kind of the use of these menus was a little clunky. And they were looking at ways to make it kind of faster and easier for the user, and
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But we were still concerned about acquiring
developers to change their applications to gain access to LiveDoc's capabilities. Again, from Apple's perspective, we don't want to make our developers have to recode something just because we have a cool new feature. And that's what they said and it makes sense.

We know from experience that developers are justifiably reluctant to change their applications just to implement a new feature provided by the toolbox. So we experimented with some alternatives that we hoped would ease this restriction.
Q. Would the -- would you have to change the application, in this case Microsoft Word, to include the Apple Data Detectors functionality?
A. Well, no. With respect to Apple Data Detectors, the InNova system you would not. It would work with any application.
Q. So what does this say about -- what does this say with respect to teaching away as to ADD and Word '97?
A. Again, the ADD folks, we're looking at ways to not make -- not have to make the programs explicitly link with one another, in direct contrast with Microsoft Word '97's approach, which was to directly link to the other programs. So directly link, try to avoid directly linking, teaching a way.

Case 1:13-cv-00919-JETG - Disctument 605-3
Q. And so let's wrap it up. What is your view as to whether or not the claims of the 843 patent are obvious in light of the combination of ADD and Word '97?
A. My opinion is that they are not -- that combination does not render the ' 843 patent obvious.
Q. Let's briefly touch on secondary considerations of nonobviousness. I will focus on the licensing one. Why is licensing relevant or how is licensing relevant to obviousness or nonobviousness?
A. Well, these secondary considerations, ones that aren't technical, they're just other considerations. Doesn't mean they're not important. They are both secondary, which means they don't have to do with the technical stuff, per se. But if someone is paying for a license, they've got to be paying for something that they believe is valuable. And something that was obvious, you wouldn't think to pay for it, right? It's obvious.

So the fact that other firms paid for licenses for the $\quad 843$ patent suggests that there is something innovative there, there is something that was worth it to them to have a right to practice that patent in their products.

MR. LAHAD: Pass the witness, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you.

Cross-examination?

MR. UNIKEL: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. UNIKEL:
Q. Good afternoon, sir.
A. Good afternoon. It's nice to see you in person. You look much better than when you are a 1 -inch square on my computer screen at the deposition.
Q. Thank you. I will try to be brief. I know it's a late in the day.

Sir, like all the experts in this case, you are being paid for your hourly service, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. You are being paid at the rate of $\$ 550$ an hour; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. When we spoke, you and I spoke, I think you just mentioned, in October of 2020 , correct?
A. I don't remember the date, but I'll take your word for it.
Q. As of that date, you had told me that you had already made in excess of $\$ 200,000$ from Arendi at that point in time. Do you recall that?
A. No, I don't.
Q. I'll show him his --

Sir, as of October 2020, do you believe that you have
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A. That's correct
Q. And you looked at the patent in this case in connection with validity analysis, correct?
A. A few times, yes
Q. And you're aware that the earlier U.S. filing date that is claimed by these patents is November $10,-1998$; is that right?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Sir, if I may --

MR. UNIKEL: And if I may impose on Mr. Boles to put up one of your slides, PDX-5-16, please. Sorry. I think we may be --

Thank you very much.

## BY MR. UNIKEL:

Q. Sir, am I correct that this is sort of the sequence of questions that you used to perform your analysis? A. It's not the entirety of performing my analysis. This was kind of a summary description of what I did. It's -- how do I say this? What this doesn't do, which I insist on doing to myself, is to incorporate the exact claim language and the terms as construed by the court. I'm always -- when I'm doing this work, I have to --
Q. Sir, I want to make sure we get out of this, so I'm going to ask you some specific questions. If you could give me some specific answers, it will help us to get

## home

A. I'm sorry. I'm happy to do so.
Q. Sir, this particular claim language that you took the jury through, this is not the actual claim language of the patent, correct?
A. That was the point I was trying to make.
Q. This is how you personally think about the claims, as you say in the title of this slide, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you've created these questions that you believe correlate to the elements of the claims, but this is not the actual claim language; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And as I think you took us through, you went through these questions and you answered yes or no, and then that told you whether you could move on to the next question; is that right?
A. Generally speaking, that's right.

When I get to the bottom, that doesn't mean, okay, I don't do anymore analysis, that just means, okay, this is worth analyzing. This is now looking close.
Q. And, sir, when it comes to CyberDesk, you agree that

Dr. Dey knows more about how the CyberDesk system works than you do, correct?
A. You'd have to tell me what the CyberDesk system is
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My recollection of what's on the website pages has something like a simple Notepad or there's some adjective that suggests that it's not a complete notepad program.
Q. So you recall that on the desktop services, there was mention of a simple Notepad; is that correct?
A. Again, I would want to look at that document. I
don't -- as I say, I'm older than Dr. Fox. I don't necessarily trust my memory any more than I would trust Dr. Dey's memory. I would like to look at that document and we can see what -- you know, we can see what the contemporaneous document shows us rather that my recollection --
Q. Sir, sitting here today, you don't whether or not the desktop services on the CyberDesk website included a reference to the simple Notepad; is that what you're telling me?
A. I am saying I don't recall. I believe there was a reference to a simple Notepad.
2. And, sir, you have no reason to dispute Dr. Dey's testimony concerning when he posted individual items on the CyberDesk website, correct?
A. Please repeat that.
Q. Yes. You have no reason to dispute Dr. Dey's testimony concerning when he posted individual items to his website, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And, sir, you are aware of the Future Computing Environment's CyberDesk website from Georgia Tech, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, as part of the work on this case, you personally went to that website, clicked on some of its hyperlinks to retrieve versions of some of the materials that are on that website concerning CyberDesk; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did you see, for example, the list of network
services and desktop services that CyberDesk actually allowed to be used?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And did you see Mr. Fox earlier today -- Dr. Fox -included some excerpts from that referring to, for example, a Notepad that was referred to in the desktop services that were integrated?
A. I think we need to look at that slide. I'm not sure that it was identified -- Dr. Dey, in his testimony, I believe called -- said there was a Notepad at some point.
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A. I don't recall a whole lot of testimony regarding when individual items were placed on that website, other than some of the papers that he was preparing for publication.
Q. And you have no reason to dispute Dr. Dey's testimony about that, correct?
A. Regarding those dates for those papers, no.
Q. And sir, you -- I think you opined that the reason you don't think that CyberDesk anticipates is because the Mail Reader does not allow editing of documents, correct? That was what you testified to a few moments ago.
A. I believe I said that was "a" reason. I didn't say it was "the" reason.
Q. You provided that reason in this Court, correct, that you don't believe that the Mail Reader allowed you to work on editable documents; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you concluded from the title "Mail Reader" that it did not allow editing of the document, of the e-mail that's shown in the CyberDesk screenshots, correct?
A. From that and other contemporaneous evidence on the website as well.
Q. And so you watched the testimony of Anind Dey with the jury, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think you told your counsel that Dr. Dey's was, in fact, inconsistent with your conclusion about Mail Reader; is that right?
A. No. I don't believe I said that. Maybe I did, but I don't believe I did.
Q. Do you recall your counsel asked whether or not

Dr. Dey's testimony about the use of a text editor was inconsistent with your view about Mail Reader?
A. Again, I'm at a loss here. You're talking about a text editor or are we talking about a Mail Reader?
Q. I'm just asking you, sir --
A. A text editor doesn't say anything about a mail
reader.
Q. Sir, do you recall about 20 minutes ago that your counsel asked you expressly whether or not your opinion was inconsistent with the testimony of Dr. Dey?
A. Yes, I do. I understood that as referring to the entirety of his testimony, not to any specific statement within it.
Q. And you agreed that your opinion is inconsistent with
the testimony of Dr. Dey, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Sir, let me ask you a bit about Microsoft Word. As part of your work in this case, you looked at how Mr. Hedloy created the prototype for his products,
correct?
A. I looked at a few instances of the prototypes of his product. I didn't see -- I didn't look at how he created it. I looked at what he created.
Q. Well, in fact, didn't you state in your report that Mr. Hedloy used Microsoft's Visual Basic Scripting to create the macros that he used for the prototypes; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And so the jury understands, a macro is a feature of Microsoft Word that lets a developer put instructions into a command inside of Microsoft Word, correct?
A. I don't know that I would use the word "inside," but in general, that's correct. I don't know what it means to be inside.
Q. And a Microsoft Word macro is designed to be used with Microsoft Word the program, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And Visual Basic is a particular language that was developed and offered by Microsoft for people to program into their various applications, correct?
A. I believe it was developed by Microsoft. It was kind of a second-generation macro language that they used with a number of their Office Suite products.
Q. That allowed people like Mr. Hedloy to build program

## Sacerdoti - Cross

Q. In fact, in your view, that was a well-known feature of Microsoft Word, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Sir, I believe you expressed the opinion that one of the distinctions between the Apple Data Detectors functionality and the patented functionality was that Apple Data Detectors used the operating system to set up the input device; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you feel that that is a distinction that meant that the first computer program was not, in fact, setting up the input device?
A. Yes.
Q. Sir, let me ask you, by the way, you pointed out an article -- your DTX-10?

MR. UNIKEL: Can we bring that up, please? Yes. Defense -- sorry. Apologize.
BY MR. UNIKEL:
Q. With your counsel -- you recall looking at this with your counsel?
A. Yes.
Q. You recall you've highlighted a certain -- a few sentences at the beginning of this Paragraph in CHI 97 correct?
A. Yes.
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Q. So this article is from March of 1997 that you were
quoting from, correct?
A. That's when it was -- that's when the contents was.
Q. Yes. And that's what the publication shows --
A. Yes.
Q. -- as far as the date?
A. Yes.
Q. And I believe you highlighted the first two
sentences; is that right?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. And if I'm reading it correctly, you said -- you quoted, "One approach to integration is a tightly integrated suite of tools that take advantage of known services. This approach, available in many commercial personal productivity products, is unsatisfactory for two reasons."

You quoted that language, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And so you acknowledge that there was one approach to the integration of services to put those services inside a particular program, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And it's your view that CyberDesk took a different approach; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's your view that CyberDesk separated the
instructions and did not put them inside a single computer program, correct?
A. Depends -- that depends on how you view the CyberDesk architecture.
Q. Do you believe that CyberDesk put all of the
instructions into a single computer program under any interpretation of the architecture?
A. Yes.
Q. What is the interpretation of the architecture that leads you to believe that CyberDesk actually put the instructions into a single program?
A. The CyberDesk documents -- this one probably does somewhere, but rather than looking through it, let me just talk about it in general.

The CyberDesk documentation indicates that the
CyberDesk system was implemented in a prototype fashion as a collection of what are called Java applets. Those are little chunks of code that are not actually separately runnable programs, that, when loaded into a web browser -and, as they described in the documentation, the web browser served as a model of a desktop.

So they were kind of making believe that the browser screen was the desktop and exploring the integration of these various applications within that desktop. And the

## Sacerdoti - Redirect

applets were operating within the environment of the browser program.
Q. Thank you, sir.

MR. UNIKEL: I have no further questions.
THE COURT: Any redirect?
MR. LAHAD: Tiny.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. LAHAD:
Q. Doctor, in that last scenario that counsel was talking to you about, when the browser is the first computer program, does that show any kind of anticipation by CyberDesk?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, as I have been showing with my waterfall slide and my New Year's Day party slide, you've got to see all the elements practiced within -- with one system for it to anticipate. We haven't seen that, even under the interpretation that the browser is the one first computer program.
Q. That's, like as you testified earlier, because
there's no second computer program, no second information; is that correct?

MR. UNIKEL: Objection. Sidebar, please.

CyberDesk with the browser program, correct?
A. Yes. When CyberDesk was running, all of these
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(Whereupon, the following discussion is held at sidebar.)

MR. UNIKEL: That was not his testimony
earlier. That would be a new opinion rendered on redirect. It does not answer my question. That was only about the document element, the only expression he expressed on direct. It did not meet the document element, not that there was lack of a second computer program.

THE COURT: Counsel?
MR. LAHAD: I think he testified in the context of if the browser applets running in the browser, why is there no anticipation. He referenced the elements of the slide that weren't met.

MR. UNIKEL: I don't believe he did offer that
opinion. If he did, I would have a follow-up question to clarify something.

MR. LAHAD: I am happy to move to withdraw the question.

THE COURT: Let's do that.
MR. UNIKEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. LAHAD: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Whereupon, the discussion at sidebar
concludes.)

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we have one more phase of this trial to go, and that's the phase where I give you the jury instructions and you hear the closing arguments from the attorneys. It's now almost 6:00 at night on Monday. So it doesn't make a lot of sense for us to start that process tonight because it's going to take approximately two to three hours.

So what I'm going to ask is for you all to appear tomorrow morning at 9:30. We should be ready to go with the jury instructions, and then we'll hear from counsel with their closing arguments. We should have the case to you for your deliberations by lunch. And I understand that we will be providing you lunch tomorrow as well.

Just to remind everyone, until you retire to jury room after the closing arguments to deliberate on the case, you are simply not to talk about the case with each other. Do not do any research or investigate the case on your own, and don't form any opinion about the case until after we've heard the jury instructions and the closing arguments. Okay?

You may be excused for the evening. We will see you tomorrow at $9: 30$.
(The jury exits the courtroom at 5:53 p.m.)

## BY MR. LAHAD

Q. There were some questions about money.

Have you been retained by Arendi before as an expert witness?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Do you hope to be retained by Arendi in the future as an expert witness?
A. I'm hoping this is my last time on the stand. I'm turning 75 next month. I'm done.
Q. So you don't want to be retained by anybody in the future, correct?
A. That's a fair way to put it, yes.
Q. There was some talk about macros. At any point during his testimony, did you hear Dr. Fox say anything about macros?
A. I don't remember I don't recall anything that he said about macros, no.

MR. LAHAD: No further questions, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Does Arendi have any other rebuttal witnesses?

MR. LAHAD: No other rebuttal witnesses, Your Honor.

May the witness be excused?
THE COURT: Yes, he may. Please step down.

THE COURT: Please have a seat. Okay, folks, let's spend a little time, if we could, just talking about the jury instructions before we -- let's take a five-minute break. We will be in recess.
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: All right. Please be seated.
MR. UNIKEL: Your Honor, may I ask a quick
question?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. UNIKEL: For 50A motions, how would you like us to do those today? Do we just obviously want to make sure we don't waive them?

THE COURT: Why don't you have everybody come up and put everything on the record that you want to say.

So we had defendant rest, so let's hear from plaintiff.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Yes, we have two 50A motions.
MR. LAHAD: Your Honor, we move under Rule 50A for judgment as a matter of law regarding invalidity. The issue on which defendant bears the burden. There is legally insufficient evidence for a jury to find any invalidity through anticipation of obviousness.

Dr. Fox did not present sufficient, legally sufficient evidence of anticipation of obviousness. There were significant shortcomings in his evidence of
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## anticipation with respect to CyberDesk, did not prove by

clear and convincing evidence that CyberDesk disclosed document, as construed by the court, among other deficient claim limitations.

Likewise, Dr. Fox did not show obviousness by any combinations that he raised, ADD and CyberDesk, CyberDesk and ADD, and those two technologies or systems, combined with Microsoft Word '97.

In particular, Dr. Fox failed to show any kind of motivation to combine those references with each other. And accordingly, we think there's legally insufficient evidence of anticipation and obviousness.

Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. So the Court will
reserve decision on that, and we'll submit it to the jury subject to the Court's later deciding the legal questions raised by your motions.

Go ahead. Did you have another one?
MR. ARD: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. We've got another one.
MS. SRINIVASAN: And I stand corrected. I said
two. We have three, but we will be quick.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ARD: Your Honor, on the Samsung license,
we think the contract is unambiguously sort of in our

THE COURT: All right.
Did the -- in your view, did the court not
already rule on the IPR estoppel issue? I know I said that the Court would reconsider to the extent that defendant's only evidence of the CyberDesk system consisted of a prior art publication or patent. That's not my recollection of the evidence that came in.

Are you asking for reconsideration of that or this is just you're going to be preserving your ability to raise this in a JMOL motion?

MR. ARD: Well, certainly the latter, I
suppose. But as to the former -- that we're preserving it -- but as to the former, I think there are two distinct questions, one is whether they can present evidence of the system, and the second is whether the noncumulative aspect of the evidence, the system that they've presented is germane to the invalidity theory.

So if all of their sort of grounds for invalidity are contained in the written publications they presented, we think that's estopped. That's under Judge Stark's summary judgment order in this case.

THE COURT: All right. Your position is noted for the record.

Let me ask counsel for Google if somebody wants
favor for the reasons we discussed previously. I think it's Docket 220. I don't need to belabor the point.

If it's ambiguous, we don't think that they
have submitted any extrinsic evidence to support their position, so we think that summary judgment would be sort of warranted on that aspect as well.

The case that we would cite for that was cited in our joint jury instructions.

THE COURT: What's the case? Can you just put it on the record.

MR. ARD: Sorry. Need my glasses.
the court: Yeah.
MR. ARD: Weiner v. Anesthesia Associates, it's
203 A.D.2d 455, New York.
THE COURT: All right. Thanks very much.
MR. ARD: That's the Samsung license.
Also, on estoppel, we think the only evidence
that they presented -- that they purport to have presented that it allegedly was not in the publications was a uncorroborated oral statement. So we think that they should be estopped from raising CyberDesk. And for the rest of them, we don't think there is anything they put in the record that was noncumulative to the publications that was germane to their invalidity theories. So we would move on estoppel as well, for obviousness and
to talk to me about the point about apparently under New York law, they have a case that says that if you don't -if the Court ultimately rules that the contract is ambiguous and you don't present any extrinsic evidence that you should grant judgment for the other side?

MR. UNIKEL: Your Honor, there's ample case law cited in our various submissions on this that the best evidence of the intent of the parties is the contract agreements itself, and that actually is the most accurate, most complete, and most on-point indication of what the parties intended.

In addition, Mr. Hedloy, in cross-examination, when taken through the terms did acknowledge that he agreed to those terms voluntarily. When I asked him whether or not he agreed to these on behalf of Arendi, he acknowledged that he did. This is, in fact, evidence of his intent and of what it was that he was agreeing to.

In addition, we pointed out to the court the integration clause of the contract itself, which actually directs anybody to the terms of the contract as the indication of the parties' agreement, as opposed to any oral statements or anything extrinsic to the agreement. So Mr. Hedloy's testimony itself is extrinsic testimony that supports the intent and shows what the actual positions of the parties were when they agreed to
1

THE COURT: Okay. Your position is noted. I'm going to reserve judgment on the license issue.

Counsel?
MR. ARD: May I respond very briefly?
THE COURT: Very briefly.
MR. ARD: Yes, Your Honor. First of all, the
cases they cited are not about ambiguous contracts. They are all about the plain meaning of the contract.

Two, they have the burden of proof here. And under the Wiseman case, it says explicitly if they don't present any extrinsic evidence, they lose as ambiguous.

And three, on the parol evidence rule, under $\wedge^{\wedge}$ FCHR1 one of the cases they cite, it says explicitly that parol evidence rule, parol evidence is admissible if a Court finds ambiguity in the contract.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Your position is noted for the record. I'm going to reserve judgment on this no-license issue. I do want to talk about this again in the context of the jury instructions, but we will get to that in a minute.

Any motions to make for the record?
MR. UNIKEL: Yes, Your Honor. I assume that I'm doing a quick recitation now and then we're submitting the papers; is that correct?
the court: In post-trial briefing, correct.
MR. UNIKEL: Correct.
So, first, Your Honor, we will be filing a
motion for 102 (a) and (b), anticipation of the asserted claims in view of CyberDesk, both on the base of public knowledge and in public use before the $102(\mathrm{~b})$ critical date and certainly before the application filing date of November 10, 1998 or September 3, 1998. We believe there's clear and convincing evidence that CyberDesk system discloses all the asserted elements.

We'll also be making a motion on 103, obviousness of the asserted claims, in view of the combinations of CyberDesk system plus ADD, CyberDesk system plus Word '97 and ADD system plus Word '97. We believe there's been clear and convincing evidence that has been unrebutted that each of these combinations discloses all of the elements.

We also will be renewing, because it is a affirmative defense, the patent exhaustion and implied license defense based on the Samsung license agreement, which the parties both seem to agree is unambiguous.

In addition, Your Honor, I won't go through them all unless you want me to, but we will be renewing our previous 50A motions which were submitted at the close of plaintiff's evidence.

Mr. Toki, Mr. Choc, as well as both sides' infringement and noninfringement experts, Dr. Smedley and Dr. Rinard, and the damages experts, Mr. Weinstein, Mr. Kidder. This was a dispute that we believe the jury needs to decide.

THE COURT: How is it going to help us if we have an answer to that? Because we've still got a dispute about the one guy that downloaded it at midnight when it came out versus when everybody else downloaded it.

MR. LING: Well, we believe the record is clear and the evidence is clear that there was no possible infringement earlier than December 5th, 2017. As to how further allocate that, I think that is a separate issue. But at least the period between August 21, 2017, which is Arendi's asserted earliest possible date and Google's asserted first possible date, there is a several-month gap that was either in or out and without this question in the verdit form, we believe it would not be possible to unwind the damages verdict to the extent that issue is resolved in Google's favor on appeal or either way, really.

THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from the other side on this.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, it's a disputed fact issue. We offered a representative product stipulation that Google offered as to when the accused applications -- the devices that should be used that for
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all other applications and products to be representative. The jury received an instruction on that, and they heard testimony about it. So it is not an issue they should be asked to determine on the verdict form. They've heard extensive testimony from Mr. Kidder that he started on a different date because he viewed that as the appropriate date. And they heard other testimony from Mr. Weinstein based on his reliance on Dr. Smedley.

So it is not -- you know, it's not an issue of law that should be presented to the jury. It is a disputed fact issue that's obviously relevant for how they calculated different damages. But the jury heard evidence as to why it would be appropriate to select August 2017.

THE COURT: Right. But the jury also heard evidence that a later date would be appropriate as well.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Correct. And that's part of their apportionment for damages they offered today a methodology if -- as one of many different for reducing damages on that basis. But I don't think that there's -there's sort of a fact finding on that particular question that's needed because Google has explained to the jury, if they believe Mr. Kidder and the evidence that he relied on, then they can make an allocation of how to reduce and offset damages.

But it is a disputed fact issue, and to force

1439
devices or not.
If we knew that answer, if they answered "yes" to that question, then we could, if it turns out to be the case that those apps were covered, then we could just -then we know they did include them. If the jury answered "no" and it turns out later that those devices were -those apps were covered, then we could do a pro rata, theoretically, as one way to fix the jury verdict. So it's one way --

THE COURT: I understand your position. I'm not going to say this is my view, but one reasonable observer watching this trial might say there's a lot we're not going to know if the jury comes back in between your number and their number.

Would you disagree with that?
MR. LING: Understood, Your Honor. I take your point. It's just one way we think that we could avoid error and try to streamline things on appeal. I just wanted to preserve the objection.

THE COURT: I appreciate it. Thanks.
Let's hear Arendi's position on that.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Well, first. I think the inclusion of that in the verdict form is asking the jury to decide what they've characterized as a legal issue, question of law. That's been Google's position. So I
the jury to make a fact finding on that date, we don't think is necessary for the verdict form.

THE COURT: All right. So I've let everybody put their positions on the record. So we're going to go with what the Court had proposed not include that question.

Did you have another one you wanted to put Google's position on the record about?

MR. LING: Yes, Your Honor. On the proposed question about whether the damages include Google apps installed on Samsung devices, similarly, that's clearly been a dispute in this trial based on the record. And again, any damages number that's presented as a lump sum would be impossible to unwind or to fix depending on how that question is answered if we don't know what the jury was accounting for in their verdict.

THE COURT: Well, your expert opined about a lump sum that would be appropriate if Samsung devices were included and if they weren't included, right?

MR. LING: That's correct, Your Honor. But the jury could come back with conceivably a number in between, for example, the damages experts' numbers. If we don't know which party's theories they went with, it would not be possible to tell whether or not they thought the
damages included the Google apps installed on Samsung
don't think they should be advocating for the jury to do that in the first instance. And I concur with the court. We went through damages, direct testimony by Google in which there are probably 20 different options of potential numbers that the jury could consider as offsets to a damages calculation, whether it be with respect to the Samsung license or taking off a certain time frame. And the number that they come up with is going to reflect how they weighed the evidence.

But in this case in particular, given what Google has said repeatedly with respect to its Samsung license defense, it would not be proper to ask for $a$ verdict question on that given that they've maintained this question is wrong.

THE COURT: All right. In this issue, I also agree with Arendi, and we are going to not have that question on the verdict form. So, so far, we're sticking with what the Court filed earlier today.

Anybody else have anything else they want to say about this form of verdict?

MR. LING: Not from Google.
MS. SRINIVASAN: Not from Arendi, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay, great. Let's turn to the jury instructions.
Okay. Some of these, I don't need to hear
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argument on. We'll try to make it through this really quick. So the first dispute I see in what was filed this morning...

MR. LING: Your Honor, before we do them in order, I was wondering if I could address a question you raised earlier about the prior art section?

THE COURT: Let's go in order, because otherwise, it's late in the day. We're all going to get off track. Here we go.

So let's, when we get to one, we'll get to that one.

So I'm looking now at document 511 filed
5/1/23. Does somebody want to remind me what the first dispute is here?

MR. DIEHL: Page 19, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Page 19. I'm just going to tell you what's going to happen here, which is this. After it says, "I will now instruct you as to the rules you must follow when deciding whether plaintiff Arendi has proven that Google infringed the ' 843 patent," I'm going to say, "a claim covers a product for each of the claim elements or limitations as present in that product."

Does anybody have a dispute that that's an accurate summary of the all elements rule?

MR. UNIKEL: Your Honor, forgive me. In this

Okay. So Google's got a proposal in there. That's not going to be inserted there, but I'll tell you where it will be inserted. We're coming up on that. I don't think it's appropriate right there. Actually, we inserted it to the previous instruction. So do you dispute that that's good enough?

MR. LING: That's okay, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right, fine. So 3.4, that's
not going to be inserted.
Turning to 3.5. Okay. Here's what it's going to say in the second paragraph: "To show that infringement was willful, Arendi must establish that it is more likely than not that Google knew of the ' 843 patent at the time of the alleged infringement, and also, that Google engaged in deliberate or intentional infringement." And then none of the rest of the parties proposed language is going to be inserted. And then the next line will start with "To decide whether Google acted willfully."

MR. DIEHL: Your Honor, may I place an objection on the record for that one?

THE COURT: You may.
MR. DIEHL: Yes. I just want to say that Arendi believes that, in light of the Ironburg case that came down from the Federal Circuit -- Ironburg Inventions at 64 F.4th 1274.
particular case, we're dealing with a computer readable medium, not a pure product. The concern with the product -- I know computer readable medium makes it very difficult to assess and instruct on, which is why the just going on the element-by-element basis language seemed to make more sense.

THE COURT: I guess I would tend to agree with that, except we used "product" all over the rest of jury instructions. So given it's late in the day on that.

MR. LAHAD: Also, there is support in Federal Circuit law that CRM claims are treated as apparatus claims. There is supporting evidence.

THE COURT: You know, if we want to start
relooking at that, we're going to have to go and search and find product. I know we used it other places, so I was just trying to be consistent with what we've done other places in the jury instructions.

Any other dispute as to adding that sentence there?

MS. SRINIVASAN: Not for Arendi.
THE COURT: All right. I'm hearing none, so
that's going to get accepted.
All right. Let's turn to 3.5.
MR. LING: There's an issue on 3.4.
THE COURT: Okay. Let's see. 3.4.

We think it's important to clarify for the jury that deliberate or intentional includes reckless disregard for a patent owner's rights.

THE COURT: Okay. That objection is noted for the record. It's overruled. I read the Ironburg case. I think Judge Stark was pretty clear there that he was dealing with a situation where the parties had agreed on that instruction. I read a lot of his opinions, and that seemed to me to be exactly what was going on.

And so I'm not going to let the jury find willful infringement based upon a finding of recklessness.

MR. LING: Can I also make an objection for the record. There's a sentence that Google proposed that said that, "Mere knowledge of the patent at the time is not sufficient," and I understand that's not going to be in the jury instruction per the Court's ruling, and if so, I wanted to lodge just the objection and state for the record that that's a particularly important sentence instruction in this case where there's little more than knowledge being alleged for willfulness. This is -- this sentence is found in the FCBA Model Patent Jury Instruction 3.10, as well as the AIPLA model patent jury instruction.

THE COURT: All right. That's fine. I think your objection is covered by the Court's ruling that I'm
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going to instruct the jury that Arendi must establish both that it's more likely than not that Google knew of the patent, and also that Google engaged in deliberate or intentional infringement. I think that's covered, and I don't think that what the Court's going to instruct the jury is error. It doesn't leave the jury open to find willful infringement based on mere knowledge.

All right. Prior art?
MR. LING: Your Honor, the parties reached
agreement on this we're happy to report. Per your
suggestion, we do believe FCBA Model Patent Jury
Instruction 4.3a-1, prior art is not in dispute, would be appropriate because I understand there's no dispute over the 1998 priority date. And so we think that instruction would simplify things.

THE COURT: Okay, great. Stand by while I pull it up.

Okay. So we're going to say, "In order for someone to be entitled to a patent, the invention must actually be new and not obvious over what came before, which is referred to as the prior art. Prior art is considered in determining whether Claims 23 and 30 of the ' 843 patent are anticipated or obvious. Prior art may include items that were publicly known or that have been used." Do we need to say "or offered for sale"? I didn't
system.
THE COURT: Counsel?
MR. DIEHL: Your Honor, that's fine. If I may respond briefly to something Google's counsel said prior about no dispute about the priority date, I just want to make clear that Arendi does not dispute the date for 102 (b) purposes as November 10, 2017, and that the US filing date for the $\quad 843$ patent application was November 10, 1998. So I just want to make clear that that's what we're not disputing.

THE COURT: Does it matter for these pieces of prior art?

MR. DIEHL: No, I'm just responding to their assertion.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. DIEHL: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. And then that would be the end of 4.3.

MR. DIEHL: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. LING: Yes, Your Honor.
the court: Great.
Then we had a typo fixed on Page 34, 5.3?
MR. LING: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. DIEHL: Yes, Your Honor. That's not a

MR. UNIKEL: Yeah, I think, Your Honor, there was an Apple Data Detectors product that was monetized.

THE COURT: Okay. "So known or have been used or offered for sale."

Any objection on Arendi's side to saying, "or offered for sale"?

MR. DIEHL: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And then I'd be inclined to
cross out "or references such as publications or patents," so it would just say, "Prior art may include items publicly that were known or have been used or offered for sale that disclose the claimed invention or elements of the claimed invention."

MR. LING: That's okay, Your Honor.
MR. DIEHL: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Then it would say, "Arendi
contends the following is prior art to the ' 843 patent."
MR. LAHAD: I think it's going Google contends.
THE COURT: I'm sorry. I only do that like
half the time. Let's see here. "Google contends that the following is prior art to the 843 patent," and then we have --

MR. LING: CyberDesk system, Apple Data
Detectors system, and Word 97 system -- Microsoft Word 97
typo. The alleged word is not in the Federal Circuit Bar Association --

THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. We're talking about a different section here. I'm talking about 5.3 where we changed "each defendant" to "Google."

MR. DIEHL: Oh, we have no objection.
THE COURT: Okay. And then we turn to the next page with the "alleged," that's not going to come in. I agree with you.

MR. DIEHL: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. 5.5. Is that the next one?

MR. DIEHL: Yes, that's next, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. And the last I heard, Arendi was reviewing Google's proposals.

MR. DIEHL: Yes, we did, Your Honor. We noted case that law that Google cites is from the 1800 s here. If you look at Footnote 13, they cite case law from 1915, 1884. We don't think this statement is accurate, and federal Circuit has, you know, wasn't even in existence at the time. So we think, we would say that Google's proposed addition there should be stricken.

THE COURT: Well, I know you're not saying that the Federal Circuit doesn't have to follow the Supreme Court cases from the 1800 s and early 1900s.
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just been a lot of intervening law, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from Google.

MR. LING: All right. We also cite the Lucent case from 2009. I don't think this is a controversial point that the plaintiff has the burden to show apportionment. It's also, if Your Honor wants a more recent case cite, there's Finjan v. Blue Coat from 2018, and that's 879 F.3d 1299. That's clearly discussing the burden in the context of apportionment.

THE COURT: All right. We'll take a look at that.

MR. DIEHL: Your Honor, if I may respond briefly.

THE COURT: You may.
MR. DIEHL: We do cover that same point in the Arendi's proposal at the top of the instruction. So right there it says, "Damages must be based on the value attributable at the time to technology as distinct from other unpatented features of the accused product." And we are working from the Federal Bar Association's model.

THE COURT: All right. I'll take a look at that. With respect to the debate at the top, we'll go with Google's proposal that it say, "other market
factors," and then we'll look at the dispute at the bottom and get you an answer on that.

MR. LAHAD: Your Honor, it seems like the
dispute at the bottom -- Google's proposed addition at the bottom seems redundant in light of --
the court: Yeah. We'll take a look at it.
MR. LING: Just to clarify, Your Honor, I think
the proposal on the bottom, the distinction is "the burden."

THE COURT: I understand.
MR. LING: Thank you.
THE COURT: Okay. I don't need to hear
argument on 5.6. We're not going to include that instruction.

MR. LING: Google preserves just its --
THE COURT: Yeah. You've made the proposal.
Your objection is preserved.
MR. LING: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Let's just skip 5.7 for
a second. Were there any other issues besides 5.7
remaining?
MR. DIEHL: No, Your Honor.
MR. LING: I don't believe so, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let me pull up
my notes.
other, but I don't have proposed instructions on this issue.

And so what I was hoping to get from the parties was, to the extent this agreement needed interpretation, sort of like a claim of a patent sometimes needs construction, that you would say which part needed interpretation and then you would say what you thought it meant.

And what I still have from the parties is, "I win," "No, I win." And so I'm in a little bit of a conundrum here, and so I'm -- let's just walk through this license, and you can tell me what you think it means.

MR. ARD: Well, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's hear from defendant first.
MR. UNIKEL: Your Honor, I just have to find a
copy of the agreement.
Thank you, Your Honor. And is there a
particular question that you --
THE COURT: Absolutely. So let's talk about
this.
MR. UNIKEL: Okay.
THE COURT: Let's talk about licensed products. So it says, "Means that a past, present, or future product that is made, used, or sold, or offered for sale by licensee and its affiliates."

So what is the product that you are saying is a licensed product?

MR. UNIKEL: The devices themselves, Your Honor. And there was a clause there that the court did not get, which is "including hardware and software and any service relating thereto."

THE COURT: Okay. So when Samsung sells the product, it has on it what?

MR. UNIKEL: The Android operating system, which includes Smart Text Selection feature. We all know that it's part of the operating system. When Samsung sells a device, it includes Android operating system. And it also includes the Smart Text Selection functionality that is the service related thereto. So it has both software and the service related thereto.

In addition, Your Honor, the apps, to the extent they're preloaded onto a Samsung are also contained on the device. They're software. So when Samsung sells a device which is includes the Android operating system and includes downloaded preinstalled Android apps, those are all licensed. That's just under this paragraph, and there are other paragraphs.

THE COURT: Okay. So let's just talk about that for a second. And so are the numbers that were put up on the screen with respect to devices or downloads,
operating system is, because --
THE COURT: They didn't show me numbers for the Android operating system.

MR. UNIKEL: But remember that the download numbers mean nothing unless they combine up with the right operating system.

THE COURT: I understand that, but you have to have both, right?

MR. UNIKEL: Correct. And the Android part is on the device, and it's licensed under the -- under 1.6. The apps by themselves are for non -- we believe from what they've told us, they believe that those are non-preloaded. So post-installed by users.

So they still, though, have to go to a device that has the operating system; and, therefore, the device with the operating system is licensed.

THE COURT: Okay. So your view is -- okay. So let's -- before we get to your final view.

So your view is the licensed product include the Android device -- or sorry -- the Samsung phones that include the Android operating system on them.

MR. UNIKEL: Correct.
THE COURT: And some of them also have
preloaded apps?
MR. UNIKEL: Correct.
including samsung phones or downloads post-sale onto Samsung phones?

MR. UNIKEL: The downloads, we know from the testimony, that you must have the right Android operating system and you must have the app; otherwise, there cannot be infringement. The Samsung devices come with the Android operating system or they're pushed to the Android operating system.

So even if a user -- the install numbers are just for the app. But the Android part of the infringement is part of the device. So in order for anybody to infringe, they would not just have to download an app. If you downloaded an app to the wrong Android operating system, as we know, there couldn't be any infringement. The Android operating system is part of the device that comes through Samsung, and that is what makes, purely based on the license product definition, there's no possible infringement on a licensed samsung device.

THE COURT: So let me just understand. So I buy a Samsung phone, and it has on it the Android operating system, and it has preloaded Chrome and Gmail.

Are the Chrome and Gmail included in the
numbers that were presented for downloads?
MR. UNIKEL: No. I don't think the Chrome and Gmail are, but the app is -- I'm sorry -- the Android 1456

THE COURT: And then to the extent that apps are loaded onto the device by the user after they get the device, those would be licensed because they use the Android 8 operating system?

MR. UNIKEL: Yes, because the device and the operating system is already licensed under 1.6 .

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. UNIKEL: So the Smart Text Selection
functionality that is part of the operating system is part of what's covered by the license under this paragraph.

THE COURT: Okay. And any other paragraphs you want to point the Court to?

MR. UNIKEL: Yes, Your Honor. In addition, 2.1 defines the license rights. In the second sentence, it says, "Licensor, on behalf of itself and its affiliates, agrees that the license granted to the license and its affiliates under this section permits licensee and its affiliates, and their distributors, wholesalers, resellers, retailers, and customers" -- and this is the important part -- "and customers to sell or use any licensed product anywhere in the world under the licensed patents, regardless of the country in which the first sale took place."

For anything that is a post-sale download,
that's in the hand of a consumer. The customer is the one
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## who is using the device and makes the decision to download

 an app. That customer use is expressly licensed by 2.1 of the agreement. You cannot have a post-installation download unless the user decides that they're going to make a download and actually use their device in that way.THE COURT: Let me just ask you, that argument made a little more sense when there was an indirect infringement claim. Now Arendi is only alleging that Google infringed. You're not saying that Google is a customer.

MR. UNIKEL: No. But first of all, that app never makes it onto a device for a post-sale installation unless the customer makes the decision to download it. The customer use is licensed. They can use their phone for whatever they want under the patents, and that includes to make a download.

So given the license rights extends to the customers' use, there's no way that that can actually become infringing because it's the customer use that would ultimately be the source of the download.

There's one more provision as well, Your Honor, when you are done.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's hear the next one.
MR. UNIKEL: The next is 3.1 , which indicates:
"That in consideration of the license and settlement fee,

MR. UNIKEL: They are supplying -- they are supplying the apps to Samsung devices. And customers themselves are also insulated from any allegation under the patent.

So whether you look at Google as the supplier or as the customer, essentially, as the supplier because they're downloading it -- or sorry, just because the customer is downloading it to their device by choice, either way, both of those parties who are at all possibly related to the downloading of apps post sale are released from any possible claim under the licensed patents under this agreement.

And, obviously, Samsung received a full
license, paid a full license fee for all of this protection to assure that their customers could not potentially be on the hook or their suppliers could not potentially be on the hook for post-sale use of the devices in this way. That's why all of these together are essentially in the Venn diagram of protection, all dealing with the extension of the license and the release to cover everything that is part of the phone and everything that a customer might do with the phone, including downloading apps.

THE COURT: All right. I understand your position.
licensor, on behalf of itself and its affiliates, hereby irrevocably releases and forever discharges licensees and -- licensee and its affiliates, including their officers, directors, attorneys, employees, and together with their suppliers" -- and the "suppliers" is
important -- "distributors, wholesalers, resellers, retailers, and customers" -- also customers -- "from any or all claims in connection with any licensed patent that have been or could have been brought against any of the aforementioned on or prior to the effective date."

First, the effective date of this agreement is after the expiration of the patent. So any release would cover anything under the patent.

Second, it is acknowledged, including by
Mr. Hedloy, that Google is the supplier to Samsung of the Android operating system, and Google is the supplier of the apps that are ultimately downloaded to the Samsung devices, whether those are -- sorry.

THE COURT: Let me just ask you that question. So whether there was -- I know exactly what you're going to say, whether those are preloaded or loaded apps?

MR. UNIKEL: Correct.
THE COURT: All right. So for the ones that are loaded after the sale, they are not Samsung suppliers Google is not Samsung's supplier.

Let's here from Arendi.
MR. LAHAD: Just as a threshold point, Your
Honor, we dispute that this infringement in this context -- CRM infringes server. There's no active downloading that requires infringement.

The way the CRM claim is written, since they're on the server, so there's this notion that, well, we've got to look at the downloads, and it's on the operating system. That's a false premise factually.

Dr. Smedley testified that infringement occurs both ways, the CRM claim on the server. That infringes -that meets the claim elements of Claim 23. It's not a method claim, as you know. So that threshold issue, factually, is just incorrect.

MR. ARD: And then, Your Honor, I can address the rest of the contract. The key term here -- I actually have some slides on this that we prepared months ago that will probably be easier for me to point to.

So go to the next one, please. Next one. Next one. No. Sorry. Back one.

The key term of the contract is the one that defines what the license -- sorry.

Can you go to the next one. I'm sorry. One more. This one. Thank you.

So "licensed product" is the key term of this
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## agreement. And I think I heard Google's counsel just

 concede that the only thing that they can even plausibly argue is made, used, sold, offered for sale, for -- by or for the licensee and its affiliates on the preinstalled apps. The post-installed apps are not made for -- the ones that are downloaded by consumer.THE COURT: Well, you didn't have the -MR. ARD: So the --

THE COURT: You didn't have the preinstalled apps on your damages calculation. Right?

MR. ARD: Exactly. And that's the only thing that's being licensed here. The only thing that's being licensed here, as the only thing that's a licensed product here are the preinstalled apps. And I think counsel just conceded that, that this does not cover a post-installed -- an app that a user downloads is not -that's just something that Google's making available in the Play Store. They are not making that for Samsung. That's not something that they're selling for Samsung. That's something, if anything, made for a user.

And that basic -- that's the basic idea of this
license, is that it's only licensing the licensed
products, which are the preinstalled downloads. And again, I think counsel conceded that at the very beginning.
supplier to Samsung for a user download app. That's just something that's made available in the App Store for anybody. It's not for Samsung. It's for consumers. That's the whole idea of this license.

And if I can just step back a second, Your Honor, it is important to talk about specific language, but I think it's also important to talk about New York law.

If you go back to the first slide -- yeah. Right there.

So under New York law -- let me step back -one more.

Google is arguing that a settlement agreement between two third parties, which did not involve or mention Google, and where Google paid zero role in negotiations, Google paid no money, intended to secretly and silently release almost half the claims that Arendi's asserting in a different lawsuit, and Google is not saying it had any role in this, that it paid any money to Samsung for Samsung -- Samsung would have to pay money to us for us to release claims that we're asserting in a different lawsuit against Google. Google is not saying it did that. Google is not saying it had any role in negotiation. It never even raised this issue until, like, three years later.

And if that -- if we go from there to the next one, the next slide, every single license in here, release in here, is all tied to licensed products. So it's all only being tied to the preinstalled apps, not apps that a user downloads onto a phone. That's a separate issue.

If you go to the next one as to license, the same think with the release. The release is only being given with respect to licensed product, the preinstalled apps.

So Google tries to talk about other provisions, agreement, and thinks it supports it, but all of them are tied back to the idea of a licensed product. And even here, the release, it released their suppliers. The release is for their suppliers. "Their" is Samsung, their affiliates. So for --

THE COURT: Just to make sure I understand.
MR. ARD: Yes.
THE COURT: You agree that Google is a supplier of the preinstalled apps that are --

MR. ARD: Yeah. I mean, we don't have a view on that. That's not what this case is about, but yes. That's fine. I mean, they haven't put any supply agreement in this case. I mean, we don't dispute that. That's not the issue. The issue is whether, you know, they're not a
1

Under New York law, it's a little bit unique in that, yes, you consider -- when you're determining the unambiguous meaning of a contract, you consider the words of the contract, but you're also supposed to consider the relationship of the parties and the circumstances under which it's executed, the overall intention of the parties.

Go to the next slide.
Well, so this just explains that, you know, at the time this agreement was made --
the court: Yeah. I get all of this.
MR. ARD: Go to the next slide. Next slide.
So if you look at the "whereas" clauses, the intent, the overall intent of the parties is very clear. They are trying to resolve their disputes, the disputes between Arendi and Samsung.

They then mention the following disputes that have been filed in court. And there's a long list in the agreement of different lawsuits that were filed between Samsung and Arendi. That's what they are saying they are trying to resolve. It does not list the Google case. They are trying to resolve the Samsung case.

And, you know, it says, "Whereas, licensee
desires a license to grant to licensee and its affiliates certain rights on a license patents," it's -- the grant is to the licensee and its affiliates. That's the overall
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## intention of the parties

Under New York law, that has to be considered when you are evaluating the plain language of the contract.

There's also -- in our jury instructions, we cite a couple cases that sort of have two threshold principles that are at play here. One is that release language is strictly construed. You are not supposed to extend a release beyond the explicit words in the agreement. And the case that we cite in our instructions -- Bugel V. Wps, which is 19 AD3d 1081, says: "It is unreasonable to conclude that the parties as a condition of the release intended that plaintiff release all his existing unrelated claims against conceivably hundreds of named and unnamed corporations, employees, et cetera."

It also says in the New York Pattern Jury Instructions that we cite that: "If, from recitals therein, it appears that the release is to be limited to only particular claims, demands, or obligations, then the release will be operative as to those matters only."

So that's Principle Number 1, is that, under New York law, when you have a release, that's strictly construed and you're supposed to look at the recitals to figure out what the parties were intending to do.

MR. UNIKEL: Can I make a 30 -second point?
THE COURT: 30 seconds.
MR. UNIKEL: Your Honor, the one thing that was
ignored in that presentation is the Android operating system. Google supplies the Android operating system for a device upon its sale, and that contains the Smart Text Selection functionality that is the source of the accusation here. 1.6 completely -- specifically says that the license includes the hardware, the software, and any service related thereto. And Google is clearly the supplier of Android. Regardless of what you think about the apps, without Android, there is no infringing functionality. And we are clearly the supplier, and that is clearly licensed because it is sold with the device. The device does not work without the operating system.

THE COURT: All right. I understand everybody's point, so I think there's at least one ambiguity that can go to the jury on this.

With respect to 3.1, I think it's ambiguous as to whether the contract releases Google as a supplier from claims in connection with downloads of apps after sale onto Samsung phones.

With respect to --
MR. ARD: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Please have a seat.

And if you go back a slide. Another slide.

It also says you're not supposed to look -- you
shouldn't look -- you shouldn't look at particular words -- should be considered not in isolation, and form should not prevail over substance and a sensible meaning of the words should be sought in light of the overall intention of the parties. So that's one limiting principle.

A second limiting principle, independent limiting principle in New York law, is the idea of a third-party beneficiary. A third-party beneficiary is what Google is saying they are here. They're saying a third-party beneficiary to this contract, without a contract. We cite a case -- or, sorry. Again, in the New York Pattern Jury Instructions, "Courts are generally reluctant to construe an intent to benefit a third party in the absence of clear contractual language evincing such an intent."

So you have two limiting principles. You have principle of release and you have the principle of $a$ third-party beneficiary that both require that their agreement be strictly construed. And what you're trying to do as an overall thing here is try to find out what the intention of parties was.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

With respect to 1.6 , I think it's ambiguous as to whether licensed products includes Samsung phones containing the Android operating system onto which apps from Google are later downloaded.

So we are going to go to the jury on this. I don't know what to make of this proposed jury instruction because we have a lot of proposals that are statements of the law that are really directed to the court about the agreement being unambiguous.

MR. ARD: Your Honor, that's Google's proposal. Our proposal didn't do that. Our proposal, if you look at Arendi's alternative proposal, we tried to do exactly what the Court asked.

THE COURT: Okay. So why don't you meet and confer with the other side. It's 7:00 right now. And get me competing proposals by 9:00, to the extent you can, and I will look at those before bed. And I will get up again at 4:00 a.m. tomorrow and get the rest of it done.

Yes, Counsel.
MR. ARD: I thought that the instructions said as a supplier, and it should be an alleged supplier. That's disputed. That's part of what is being disputed.

THE COURT: Okay. So you're saying there's an ambiguity as to "supplier" now?

MR. ARD: Well, so -- they're not a supplier to

Samsung of user-installed apps.
the court: Okay. So that's another -- that's another ambiguity. Right. So that's another question.

MR. ARD: Yeah, throughout, yeah.
THE COURT: Right. So why don't you have competing proposals in light of the Court's ruling that there are ambiguities in the contract that the jury can decide. And then I'll take what you get. And we'll get you something by tomorrow morning.

What we might do is put up a proposed version tonight that has a placeholder for this particular part, because I think we've ruled on the rest and we have a working document.

So we'll go work on that now while you all discuss the license.

We're almost finished, folks.
We will be in recess.
(The proceedings concluded at 6:56 p.m.)
$\qquad$ proceeding.
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THE COURT: [361] THE WITNESS: [16] 1145/18 1164/25 1204/21 1204/25 1205/8 1287/20 1318/18 1321/1 1341/9 1355/7 1378/20 1381/9 1383/9 1386/20 1407/14 1427/1

## \$

|  | \|'22 [2] 1143/16 1249/' |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | '80s [2] 1173/22 1174/6 |
|  | '843 [67] 1149/21 1150/2 |
|  | 1150/11 1151/3 1152/7 |
|  | 1152/25 1153/6 1153/13 |
|  | 1154/11 1155/12 1160/21 |
|  | 1164/13 1167/9 1169/8 |
|  | 1171/7 1172/10 1174/20 |
|  | 1180/22 1190/8 1190/24 |
|  | 1192/6 1195/7 1199/25 |
|  | 1209/21 1209/23 1209/24 |
|  | 1214/6 1216/7 1216/13 |


| Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH | $103[14143 / 111605-3$ Fil | d $99408 / 309 / 28$ age 890 | 1443 agel $\mathrm{H}_{1} 62414$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| '843... [38] 1216/21 1218/11 | 105 minon 4] 130918 1319/16 1319/25 1320/17 | 1963[1] 1385/2 |  |
| 1219/15 1264/17 1264/23 | 105,609 [1] 1309/15 | 1965 [2] 11 |  |
| 1265/15 1266/6 1266/22 | 1081 [1] 1465/11 | 1967 [2] 1146/20 1149/5 | 1247/4 1248/6 1248/15 |
| 1267/15 1269/8 1290/5 | 1081 [1] 1465/11 | 1967 [2] 1146/20 1149/5 | 1247/4 1248/6 1248/15 |
| 1290/10 1292/5 1296/22 | 10:00 [1] 1380/20 | 1972 [1] 1147/12 | 48/22 1249/12 1249/18 |
| 1297/4 1301/18 1301/22 | 10:41 [1] 1286/9 | 1978 [1] 1147/24 | 1249/20 1293/2 1293/ |
| 1305/4 1384/1 1384/11 | 10:45 [1] 1224/23 | 1980s [1] 1173/20 | 1306/22 1313/9 1313/19 |
| 1391/4 1391/18 1391/19 | 11 [11] 1251/9 1251/16 | 1981 [1] 1147/25 | 1316/24 1318/11 1320/11 |
| 1393/3 1394/15 1394/17 | 1320/11 1320/16 1337/2 | 1983 [1] 1147/25 | 1320/15 1320/25 1321/7 |
| 1399/9 1401/11 1409/2 | 1337/9 1337/22 1338/15 | 1996 [2] 1154/7 1188/5 | 1329/20 1342/2 1344/14 |
| 1409/5 1409/19 1419/3 | 339/2 1406/10 1407/11 | 1997 [7] 1150/14 1151/11 | 1344/16 1345/13 1346/24 |
| 1441/20 1443/13 1445/23 | 11 months [2] 1338/14 1340 | 1156/8 1176/23 1188/6 | 1347/3 1348/2 1348/6 |
| 1446/18 1446/22 1447/8 | 11-month [3] 1251/25 | 1188/6 1421/1 | 1349/15 1349/18 1349/20 |
| '90s [5] 1174/6 1278/2 1278/4 | 1303/13 1321/9 | 1998 [5] 1412/6 1434/8 | 1350/17 135 |
| 1278/5 1385/21 | 1100 [1] 1148/25 | 1434/8 1445/14 1447/9 | 1351/13 1353/16 1353/22 |
| '97 [16] 1158/22 1183/12 | 111 [2] 1170/2 1170/3 | 1999 [1] 1156/4 | 1354/8 1354/13 1358/24 |
| 1188/3 1188/8 1188/10 | 114 [2] 1165/14 1165/15 | 1:04 [1] 1283/18 | 1359/9 1359/22 1364/5 |
| 1188/25 1189/8 1190/14 | 1148 [9] 1236/1 1236/16 | 1st [2] 1343/15 1348/ | 13 |
| 1284/6 1284/9 1284/18 | 1307/16 1307/20 1308/25 | 2 | 2018.com.Android [1] |
| 1408/19 1409/3 1429/8 | 1317/15 | 2.1 [2] 1456/13 1457/2 | 2019 [5] 1150/1 1277/20 |
| 1434/14 1434/14 |  | 20 [7] 1136/20 1203/7 | 1314/7 1317/18 1317/19 |
| '97's [1] 1408/22 '98 [2] 1284/6 1284/18 |  | 1230/24 1355/22 1392/11 | 2020 [19] 1136/20 1143/21 |
| '98 [2] 1284/6 1284/18 | 12[18] 1143/12 1247/8 | 1417/14 1440/4 | 1247/8 1247/15 1248/3 |
| - | 1247/14 1247/18 1249/11 | 2009 [1] 1449/6 | 1248/13 1327/13 1353/11 |
| -and [3] 1129/25 1130/10 | 1249/19 1285/21 1292/24 | 2010 [1] 1164/9 | 1353/14 1355/22 1355/25 |
| 1130/15 | 1328/4 1328/5 1328/12 | 2012 [8] 1235/19 1247/7 | 1359/7 1359/10 1359/13 |
|  | 1329/8 1330/13 1330/14 | 1247/10 1247/25 1252/10 | 1359/18 1359/21 1410/17 |
|  | 1359/18 1359/23 1371/14 | 1306/22 1359/19 1359/24 | 1410/25 1411/4 |
|  | 1376/14 | 2013 [2] 1277/15 1278/2 | 2022 [22] 1136/21 1136/25 |
|  | 12.4 [1] 1303/12 | 2014 [4] 1277/15 1277/21 | 1140/20 1141/3 1142/6 |
|  | 1274 [1] 1443/25 | 1277/24 1278/3 | 1143/22 1236/21 1237/4 |
|  |  | 2015 [3] 1244/14 1245/24 | 1247/2 1247/3 1248/16 |
|  | 1299 [1] 1449/10 | 1246/24 | 1249/19 1249/22 1250/16 |
|  | 12:22[1] 1253/20 | 2016 [5] 1244/25 1245/5 | 1251/17 1314/7 1335/8 |
|  | 12:26 [2] 1286/8 1286/9 | 1246/17 1246/25 1309/13 | 1343/18 1344/5 1344/6 |
|  | 13 [6] 1143/13 1249/11 | 2017 [94] 1138/8 1138/18 | 1358/22 1379/21 |
|  | 1249/19 1260/19 1328/6 | 1138/23 1140/5 1140/7 | 2023 [1] 1129/11 |
|  | 1448/18 | 1141/13 1142/24 1143/10 | 203 [1] 1430/14 |
|  | 13-919-JLH [1] 1129/6 | 1143/20 1144/7 1232/19 | 21 [10] 1235/25 1236/4 |
|  |  | 1234/11 1235/12 1235/17 | 1237/18 1237/23 1240/12 |
|  | 14 [4] 1155/24 1274/2 1274/5 | 1237/8 1237/8 1242/1 | 1245/20 1310/19 1320/3 |
| $.9 \text { million [1] }$ | 1293/23 | 1244/20 1244/25 1245/5 | 1320/13 1436/13 |
| .but [1] 1345/10 |  | 1245/6 1246/11 1246/15 | 21st [2] 1139/14 1251/22 |
|  | 149 million [1] 1310/23 | 1246/17 1246/20 1246/20 | 22 [1] 1164/9 |
| / |  | 1246/25 1247/4 1248/5 | 22.65 [1] 1326/5 |
| /s [1] 1470/7 |  | 1248/15 1248/22 1249/11 | 22.65 million [1] 1326/4 |
|  | 15 percent [6] 1330/24 | 1249/12 1249/15 1249/17 | 220 [1] 1430/2 |
| 0 | 1330/25 1331/1 1331/6 | 1249/20 1251/12 1251/23 | 23 [12] 1153/13 1170/24 |
| 0-MR1 [1] 1311/25 | 1331/9 1331/12 | 1252/9 1292/21 1293/1 | 1177/7 1180/23 1181/25 |
| $0581 \text { [1] 1318/10 }$ | 15-minute [1] 1224/19 | 1293/10 1308/18 1309/14 | 1190/20 1394/4 1394/5 |
| 1 | 6/25 | 1309/16 | 1394/9 1441/13 1445/22 |
|  | 156349 [1] 1238/18 | 1311/24 1312/5 1312/10 | 1460 |
| 1-inch [1] 1410/6 |  | 1312/18 1312/19 1313/9 |  |
| 1.5 million [1] 1329/1 | 15th [1] 1293/25 | 1316/24 1318/11 1319/11 |  |
| 1.6 [4] 1455/10 1456/6 1467/8 | 15th factor [1] 1293/24 | 1319/14 1319/15 1319/22 | 25[3] 1137/13 1288/18 |
| 1468/1 | 16 [2] 1379/14 1412/11 | 1320/1 1320/3 1320/6 1320/8 | 1354/13 |
| 10 [10] 1293/2 1342/2 | 16 years [1] 1380/2 | 1320/25 1321/6 1329/20 | 26 [4] 1136/21 1231/19 |
| 1342/13 1360/5 1402/12 | 160 [1] 1136/25 | 1337/5 1339/16 1342/2 | 1344/6 1354/13 |
| 1402/16 1420/15 1434/8 | 175 [5] 1140/6 1141/9 | 1342/5 1343/15 1349/15 | 27 million [1] 1321/8 |
| 1447/7 1447/9 | 1142/14 1142/20 1142/21 | 1349/18 1349/19 1350/17 | 28 [1] 1376/8 |
| 10-K [1] 1375/14 | 18 [1] 1285/21 | 1351/2 1351/11 1351/25 | 29 million [2] 1321/5 1321/5 |
| 10-second [1] 1285/13 | 18 seconds [1] 1199/20 | 1353/16 1353/22 1354/16 | 2:20 [1] 1287/8 |
| 10.018 [1] 1134/12 | 1800s [2] 1448/17 1448/25 | 1355/14 1358/24 1359/9 | 3 |
| 10.026 [1] 1137/7 | 1884 [1] 1448/19 19 [3] 1441/15 1441/16 | 1359/11 1359/13 1359/22 |  |
| 10.032 [1] 1138/4 | 19 [3] 1441/15 1441/16 | 1436/11 1436/13 1437/13 $1447 / 7$ | 3.1 [2] 1457/24 1467/19 3.10 [1] 1444/22 |
| 10.10 [1] 1342/24 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 1465 / 11 \\ \text { 1900s [1] } 1448 / 25 \end{array}$ | $2017 \text { LLC [1] 1203/21 }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.10[1] \quad 1444 / 22 \\ & 3.4[3] \quad 1442 / 241442 / 25 \end{aligned}$ |



Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH actually... [14] $1381 / 19140$
$1411 / 21$ 1414/16 1422/11 1422/19 1423/17 1432/9 1432/19 1443/4 1445/20 1457/5 1457/18 1460/16
AD3d [1] 1465/11
ADA [1] 1404/25
add [69] 1140/25 1148/24 1170/8 1170/10 1171/18 1172/18 1172/21 1172/23 1172/25 1173/2 1174/2
1175/13 1181/19 1183/15 1183/16 1183/22 1183/22 1184/1 1184/10 1184/16 1184/25 1185/1 1185/3 1185/7 1185/22 1186/17 1189/23 1190/6 1190/15 1275/7 1275/17 1275/24 1278/9 1278/24 1280/4 1280/4 1280/9 1280/20 1280/24 1281/1 1281/6 1281/10 1282/2 1394/23 1394/25 1395/1 1395/10 1395/11 1395/12 1395/23 1395/24 1396/3 1396/3 1396/6 1398/19 1399/12 1399/16 1399/23 1401/9 1401/9 1407/4 1407/5 1408/19 1408/20 1409/3 1429/6 1429/7 1434/13 1434/14
added [7] 1138/21 1149/5 1154/8 1184/16 1187/7 1396/5 1400/6
adding [1] 1442/18 addition [12] 1148/12 1182/9 1191/7 1284/13 1293/23 1432/12 1432/18 1434/22 1448/22 1450/4 1453/16 1456/13
additional [25] 1139/13
1163/18 1169/4 1169/13
1174/3 1179/18 1180/13 1181/10 1184/1 1185/17 1216/17 1225/12 1225/17 1226/15 1227/2 1271/24 1281/15 1286/4 1302/15 1302/16 1302/19 1312/2 1332/5 1357/19 1382/12 address [27] 1158/9 1161/23 1162/5 1162/13 1168/9 1168/13 1168/17 1169/1 1169/2 1169/5 1169/14 1169/23 1170/12 1170/12 1180/11 1186/18 1186/18 1186/24 1186/25 1187/4 1187/5 1187/6 1187/8 1274/13 1435/12 1441/5 1460/15
addressed [3] 1168/24 1226/18 1365/7
addresses [2] 1167/24 1179/25
adjective [1] 1415/2 adjudged [4] 1334/20 1335/10 1335/11 1335/19 Adjunct [1] 1289/11 adjust [2] 1294/14 1304/8 adjustment [5] 1143/2 1297/8

1297/91302/6 1322/73
admissible [1] 1433/15 admission [2] 1307/2 1366/3 admit [5] 1240/22 1306/23
1307/16 1361/11 1362/10 admits [1] 1151/15 admitted [21] 1142/4 1153/10 1163/22 1236/16 1238/6 1242/15 1244/9 1296/4 1296/5 1307/9 1307/19 1307/20 1362/15 1362/16 1366/7 1366/8 1372/19 1375/25 1376/1 1406/6 1406/8
adopt [1] 1215/10 adopted [1] 1322/11 advantage [4] 1401/4 1402/25 1403/2 1421/13
advertising [26] 1363/18 1367/13 1367/17 1367/21
1367/22 1369/7 1369/11
1369/19 1370/1 1370/5 1370/9 1371/2 1371/4 1373/25 1374/2 1374/6 1374/6 1376/5 1376/17 1377/25 1378/1 1378/5 1378/9 1378/15 1379/1 1386/7
advisement [1] 1368/5 advisor [1] 1147/4 advocating [1] 1440/1 AESD [13] 1164/8 1165/9 1165/10 1165/12 1169/25 1170/7 1171/16 1172/15 1174/19 1174/24 1175/20 1214/1 1216/3
affect [2] 1304/2 1317/24 affects [1] 1317/25 affiliates [10] 1452/25
1456/15 1456/17 1456/18
1458/1 1458/3 1461/4
1462/15 1464/23 1464/25 affiliations [1] 1289/10 affirmative [5] 1229/12 1317/24 1337/24 1341/19 1434/19
affirmed [3] 1145/21 1287/23 1383/14
aforementioned [1] 1458/10 after [34] 1131/25 1157/18 1197/25 1204/9 1217/15 1225/21 1226/22 1228/17 1229/9 1230/17 1248/13 1248/13 1249/10 1253/1 1260/17 1286/1 1292/20 1320/1 1320/2 1324/6 1327/8 1342/5 1360/25 1380/22 1385/18 1388/3 1392/14 1427/17 1427/21 1441/17 1456/2 1458/12 1458/24 1467/21
afternoon [12] 1225/23
1287/13 1288/5 1288/6
1341/12 1368/4 1368/16
1383/21 1383/23 1393/8 1410/4 1410/5
again [76] 1159/17 1160/25 1161/8 1163/9 1163/12 1165/25 1166/4 1169/20

1208/24 1215/16 1215/24 1217/1 1219/14 1228/23 1229/3 1232/13 1233/1 1236/20 1236/22 1237/3 1240/1 1244/16 1246/19 1249/11 1249/19 1251/12 1268/5 1271/14 1273/1 1273/19 1279/4 1281/20 1281/21 1292/24 1293/10 1295/7 1297/21 1299/15 1303/21 1304/15 1309/2 1309/15 1312/5 1316/8 1318/23 1321/3 1321/9 1326/6 1326/17 1330/2 1330/7 1340/23 1350/19 1355/11 1355/21 1366/11 1388/5 1405/7 1405/16 1408/3 1408/20 1415/6 1417/9 1423/1 1433/19 1438/13 1451/16 1461/24 1466/14 1468/17
against [6] 1208/11 1296/12 1385/13 1458/9 1463/22 1465/14
aggregating [1] 1319/9 ago [8] 1150/15 1257/19 1257/20 1276/18 1277/19 1416/11 1417/14 1460/17 agree [37] 1229/19 1242/23 1245/13 1260/25 1264/15 1264/17 1272/25 1321/24 1327/17 1327/18 1336/4 1345/25 1348/21 1351/17 1354/20 1357/7 1359/12 1360/2 1387/11 1387/14 1387/16 1389/8 1389/9 1389/10 1389/11 1389/12 1392/2 1397/14 1402/4 1402/8 1413/22 1419/15 1434/21 1440/16 1442/7 1448/9 1462/18
agreed [16] 1213/17 1239/11 1241/23 1250/4 1250/5 1250/8 1273/19 1284/2 1311/13 1327/25 1369/24 1417/20 1432/14 1432/15 1432/25 1444/7
agreed-upon [1] 1369/24 agreeing [2] 1327/17 1432/17 agreement [39] 1135/14 1294/20 1294/21 1294/21 1294/22 1295/20 1295/23 1325/10 1326/25 1327/3 1327/8 1327/23 1328/15 1328/25 1329/10 1329/14 1332/18 1332/20 1333/25 1397/17 1432/21 1432/22 1434/20 1445/10 1451/25 1452/4 1452/16 1457/3 1458/11 1459/12 1461/1 1462/11 1462/23 1463/13 1464/9 1464/18 1465/10 1466/22 1468/9
agreements [4] 1286/22 1295/6 1303/16 1432/9 agrees [4] 1239/21 1311/16 1382/19 1456/16
ahead [7] 1143/13 1177/8
aid [1] 1344/19 aiming [1] 1405/16 AIPLA [1] 1444/22 air [2] 1257/8 1260/23 alarm [1] 1372/8 alert [1] 1368/6 all [320] 1131/10 1132/2 1132/11 1132/20 1133/9 1133/20 1133/24 1134/12 1137/8 1137/19 1137/20 1137/22 1137/25 1139/6 1140/9 1143/9 1143/10 1143/21 1144/25 1145/1 1147/18 1148/5 1148/22 1148/23 1148/24 1149/16 1150/5 1151/11 1152/3 1152/8 1152/13 1153/23 1153/24 1154/10 1154/18 1154/22 1155/8 1155/16 1155/17 1157/9 1158/10 1158/14 1159/9 1159/10 1163/18 1164/14 1164/19 1165/3 1167/7 1169/14 1169/16 1174/8 1176/12 1177/6 1177/8 1177/10 1177/19 1177/22 1178/2 1178/3 1178/22 1179/10 1180/3 1180/4 1180/20 1180/21 1180/23 1185/8 1185/13 1188/4 1188/11 1190/1 1190/17 1190/18 1191/16 1192/6 1195/2 1195/5 1197/19 1199/5 1199/7 1199/13 1200/4 1200/6 1200/19 1202/1 1202/4 1203/5 1203/15 1205/14 1206/13 1209/13 1209/23 1210/22 1210/24 1211/24 1212/12 1215/15 1215/21 1217/1 1219/17 1220/6 1220/18 1220/20 1221/8 1221/13 1221/17 1222/5 1222/9 1222/10 1222/19 1222/23 1230/19 1231/14 1231/16 1232/14 1233/1 1233/17 1233/25 1234/2 1235/3 1237/15 1239/4 1240/20 1240/25 1241/10 1243/13 1244/5 1246/14 1248/1 1248/23 1249/11 1249/25 1250/2 1250/24 1251/14 1251/18 1252/7 1254/24 1255/16 1260/7 1262/11 1268/25 1269/17 1269/23 1275/12 1276/16 1277/23 1280/19 1282/5 1283/4 1283/19 1284/19 1285/2 1285/5 1285/12 1286/13 1287/6 1290/1 1290/18 1292/13 1293/3 1293/17 1297/3 1299/4 1301/12 1301/17 1301/22 1301/23 1303/8 1303/10 1304/22 1305/1 1305/7 1307/3 1308/20 1309/11 1309/12 1311/18 1313/20 1313/22 1314/19 1315/15 1316/3 1318/11

Case 1:13-cv-00919-JL1 all... [135] 1318/20 1319/3 1319/4 1319/24 1320/21 1321/10 1322/7 1322/12 1323/12 1324/1 1326/13 1326/18 1328/20 1331/1 1332/11 1335/5 1335/22 1335/24 1338/1 1338/10 1338/15 1339/5 1341/12 1342/7 1342/13 1342/24 1343/6 1343/16 1344/13 1345/3 1345/13 1345/20 1345/20 1346/24 1347/6 1348/21 1349/17 1350/21 1351/4 1351/25 1352/4 1354/4 1355/5 1356/21 1359/6 1360/5 1360/11 1360/15 1362/24 1364/16 1366/11 1366/21 1368/3 1368/21 1369/1 1371/6 1371/18 1372/12 1373/10 1376/20 1381/9 1381/10 1386/24 1386/25 1387/2 1387/22 1388/2 1388/8 1388/13 1390/18 1392/7 1393/13 1394/12 1395/17 1405/20 1410/10 1422/6 1423/25 1424/16 1426/20 1427/9 1428/6 1429/14 1429/20 1430/15 1431/2 1431/19 1431/23 1433/7 1433/9 1433/17 1434/10 1434/17 1434/23 1435/1 1435/20 1436/20 1437/1 1438/3 1440/15 1441/8 1441/24 1442/8 1442/21 1442/23 1443/8 1444/24 1445/8 1447/17 1448/11 1448/14 1449/3 1449/5 1449/12 1449/23 1450/19 1450/24 1453/10 1453/21 1457/11 1458/8 1458/23 1459/9 1459/14 1459/18 1459/19 1459/24 1462/3 1462/3 1462/11 1464/10 1465/14 1466/25 1467/16 1469/14
allegation [2] 1396/18 1459/3 allege [1] 1280/16 alleged [6] 1142/23 1443/14 1444/20 1448/1 1448/8 1468/21
allegedly [1] 1430/19 alleging [2] 1380/19 1457/8 allocate [1] 1436/12 allocated [1] 1346/6 allocation [2] 1324/11 1437/23
allow [6] 1161/24 1236/15 1315/16 1405/20 1416/10 1416/19
allowed [9] 1144/20 1152/16 1161/2 1193/17 1316/12 1372/24 1414/17 1416/15 1418/25
almost [6] 1230/5 1286/16 1380/4 1427/5 1463/17 1469/16
alone [3] 1267/10 1268/1 1268/2
 already [18] 1143/18 1198/14 1222/8 1231/19 1250/7 1250/20 1262/24 1267/21 1273/15 1284/2 1325/23 1327/7 1327/20 1332/6 1360/9 1410/20 1431/4 1456/6
also [101] 1133/14 1141/9 1144/17 1147/7 1148/21 1149/5 1150/15 1150/24 1151/6 1154/23 1156/9 1158/1 1158/22 1160/23 1161/10 1162/3 1162/18 1163/25 1164/6 1172/16 1172/20 1173/5 1173/9 1176/6 1179/6 1180/25 1181/20 1182/1 1182/23 1183/8 1184/10 1184/15 1184/17 1185/9 1187/5 1188/12 1191/2 1196/3 1207/1 1235/11 1237/15 1239/22 1244/22 1254/19 1257/14 1263/24 1266/18 1267/9 1268/23 1285/6 1289/14 1290/6 1292/10 1293/21 1293/24 1296/20 1298/22 1301/23 1302/4 1303/25 1305/4 1308/19 1312/3 1312/8 1313/4 1316/15 1319/19 1321/14 1324/4 1334/11 1349/16 1354/4 1354/15 1359/23 1386/11 1387/3 1393/17 1394/3 1399/18 1423/13 1430/17 1434/11 1434/18 1437/14 1440/15 1442/10 1443/14 1444/12 1445/3 1449/5 1449/8 1453/13 1453/17 1455/23 1458/7 1459/3 1463/7 1464/4 1465/5 1465/17 1466/2 alternative [7] 1141/10 1144/8 1334/3 1334/23 1337/25 1338/8 1468/12 alternatives [11] 1333/17 1334/10 1334/21 1335/1 1335/3 1335/12 1336/1 1336/9 1336/22 1340/12 1408/10
altogether [1] 1401/6 always [10] 1138/23 1142/11 1142/15 1142/19 1142/20 1207/11 1208/9 1209/1 1334/25 1412/22
am [12] 1131/10 1133/3 1210/19 1317/17 1319/23 1375/6 1395/22 1400/19 1412/15 1415/17 1423/12 1425/18
ambiguities [1] 1469/7 ambiguity [4] 1433/16 1467/18 1468/24 1469/3 ambiguous [7] 1270/24 1430/3 1432/4 1433/8 1433/12 1467/19 1468/1 amend [1] 1237/24
Amherst [1] 1289/8
among [5] 1161/24 1171/22

1285/23 1291/10 1294/7 1299/11 1299/20 1302/7 1303/9 1303/24 1304/25 1305/2 1316/11 1316/13 1344/14 1435/17 amounts [1] 1297/16 ample [1] 1432/6 analogy [3] 1282/5 1300/1 1301/25
analyses [1] 1359/25 analysis [54] 1138/24 1143/17 1168/3 1168/9 1170/20 1170/22 1175/6 1177/9 1178/16 1178/21 1181/3 1193/18 1215/17 1268/18 1268/20 1294/3 1294/10 1299/9 1300/7 1302/17 1309/20 1310/10 1310/13 1311/1 1311/3 1312/24 1313/5 1316/4 1318/3 1321/13 1325/17 1327/4 1327/5 1327/24 1329/24 1330/8 1341/18 1350/14 1353/11 1355/11 1356/15 1359/4 1360/16 1366/1 1378/23 1387/14 1387/16 1387/19 1388/18 1393/2 1412/3 1412/16 1412/17 1413/20
analyze [2] 1140/18 1141/15 analyzed [5] 1141/4 1164/7 1167/22 1178/19 1378/7 analyzes [4] 1170/10 1172/2 1172/24 1401/21
analyzing [5] 1151/20 1171/25 1172/19 1388/24 1413/21 ANDERSON [1] 1130/9 ANDREA [1] 1130/13 Android [100] 1140/9 1142/24 1173/8 1232/1 1232/16 1232/23 1245/1 1245/5 1246/12 1246/14 1246/15 1246/15 1292/18 1292/20 1293/2 1310/20 1310/21 1311/25 1312/6 1312/9 1312/21 1312/21 1313/11 1313/20 1313/21 1313/22 1315/13 1316/3 1318/2 1318/11 1318/12 1318/12 1319/4 1319/5 1319/17 1319/19 1319/21 1320/10 1320/22 1321/10 1321/11 1321/18 1322/4 1322/9 1322/13 1323/7 1323/10 1326/15 1329/18 1329/18 1329/21 1332/12 1332/12 1333/9 1342/1 1344/17 1345/10 1345/14 1345/17 1345/24 1346/2 1346/4 1346/6 1346/21 1346/22 1346/25 1347/3 1347/8 1348/11 1356/22 1357/20 1359/6 1371/14 1381/6 1381/6 1381/13 1381/14 1453/9 1453/12 1453/19 1453/20 1454/4 1454/7 1454/7 1454/10 1454/13 1454/15 1454/20 1454/25

1467/4 1467/5 1467/11 1467/12 1468/3
Android 8 [32] 1140/9 1232/16 1232/23 1245/1 1245/5 1246/12 1246/15 1246/15 1292/18 1293/2 1310/20 1310/21 1311/25 1312/6 1312/9 1312/21 1312/21 1313/11 1313/20 1318/2 1318/12 1319/5 1320/10 1321/11 1321/18 1322/4 1322/13 1326/15 1329/18 1342/1 1381/6 1456/4
Android 9 [3] 1318/12 1329/18 1381/6
Andy [1] 1181/9
Anesthesia [1] 1430/13 angles [1] 1261/10 Anind [18] 1150/18 1150/25 1151/6 1154/6 1154/17 1154/20 1156/8 1158/1 1160/7 1161/15 1178/12 1181/17 1185/21 1191/1 1263/2 1266/24 1267/23 1416/23
annual [1] 1345/20 another [37] 1158/2 1158/6 1158/24 1162/5 1163/10 1165/11 1165/11 1165/20 1166/6 1178/6 1181/5 1186/21 1187/8 1187/15 1187/17 1187/20 1206/17 1229/14 1272/14 1273/17 1274/13 1296/17 1319/20 1324/8 1385/12 1398/10 1398/13 1398/14 1408/22 1429/18 1429/20 1438/7 1451/10 1466/1 1469/2 1469/3 1469/3 answer [39] 1141/20 1142/8 1160/12 1160/25 1161/5 1165/2 1165/3 1196/1 1200/1 1208/19 1212/21 1219/21 1232/2 1264/11 1266/21 1268/4 1268/10 1281/2 1301/4 1335/15 1336/18 1339/24 1340/4 1340/8 1346/19 1364/3 1369/5 1372/21 1373/8 1373/17 1411/9 1411/13 1414/1 1419/4 1419/12 1425/5 1436/6 1439/2 1450/2 answered [7] 1267/21 1323/6 1413/15 1438/15 1439/2 1439/5 1451/11 answers [1] 1412/25 anticipate [18] 1225/20 1225/25 1264/18 1264/23 1265/1 1265/3 1265/15 1266/6 1266/21 1268/2 1391/19 1393/3 1393/18 1393/21 1394/4 1394/5 1394/16 1424/18 anticipated [11] 1151/5 1176/4 1180/22 1182/1 1190/25 1203/11 1255/21 1265/9 1265/10 1269/8

| Ca <br> anticipated... [1] 1445/23 anticipates [9] 1176/6 <br> 1176/14 1177/6 1181/22 1181/24 1391/4 1394/14 1394/20 1416/9 <br> anticipating [1] 1264/19 anticipation [33] 1176/9 1176/11 1177/3 1177/9 1181/2 1257/8 1257/10 1266/1 1267/4 1267/6 1267/20 1267/25 1268/8 1268/13 1268/19 1268/25 1282/9 1282/11 1389/7 1389/15 1389/20 1389/22 1391/3 1393/16 1399/11 1424/11 1425/13 1428/22 1428/24 1429/1 1429/12 1431/1 1434/4 <br> any [115] 1138/20 1140/1 1140/14 1159/25 1160/19 1161/3 1161/13 1161/13 1161/17 1163/15 1172/3 1172/14 1172/25 1180/16 1183/24 1184/3 1184/23 1187/22 1195/13 1195/15 1197/5 1201/17 1201/20 1215/16 1220/23 1222/12 1222/15 1225/12 1231/6 1232/10 1234/8 1241/3 1241/12 1249/13 1278/12 1278/15 1278/17 1279/9 1279/13 1280/8 1289/19 1292/25 1300/23 1304/10 1314/21 1315/23 1316/10 1318/10 1324/9 1327/19 1330/12 1336/3 1336/3 1336/10 1336/20 1344/23 1353/16 1356/19 1357/14 1363/7 1363/12 1366/16 1369/16 1370/1 1371/8 1373/3 1377/16 1377/17 1379/1 1382/12 1389/8 1389/9 1389/12 1398/2 1408/16 1411/16 1415/8 1417/18 1422/7 1424/5 1424/11 1426/13 1426/21 1427/19 1427/20 1428/21 1429/6 1429/9 1430/4 1432/4 1432/21 1433/12 1433/22 1438/13 1442/18 1446/1 1446/6 1447/24 1450/20 1451/20 1453/5 1454/14 1456/11 1456/20 1458/7 1458/8 1458/9 1458/12 1459/3 1459/11 1462/22 1463/19 1463/19 1463/23 1467/9 <br> anybody [16] 1198/9 1356/14 1356/18 1356/23 1357/18 1357/25 1364/21 1378/14 1378/24 1426/10 1432/20 1435/5 1440/19 1441/23 1454/12 1463/3 anymore [2] 1262/17 1413/20 anyone [1] 1230/2 anything [33] 1132/16 1191/24 1197/6 1197/24 1197/24 1202/3 1223/9 1226/12 1227/18 1234/10 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| being... [50] 1193/16 1195/7 <br> 1195/13 1195/16 1204/8 1208/13 1212/22 1213/23 1214/22 1216/22 1219/20 1229/10 1229/17 1234/14 1236/23 1238/2 1243/3 1251/16 1265/17 1265/18 1273/4 1280/11 1287/23 1289/16 1297/11 1298/6 1307/22 1308/24 1314/14 1332/25 1333/1 1335/10 1337/1 1352/18 1375/10 1383/14 1393/13 1396/14 1403/15 1410/10 1410/13 1423/10 1423/22 1444/20 1461/12 1461/12 1462/4 1462/7 1468/9 1468/22 belabor [2] 1304/16 1430/2 BELGAM [1] 1129/24 belief [1] 1423/5 believe [66] 1232/1 1236/8 1238/23 1238/24 1239/9 1243/17 1249/3 1250/1 1255/23 1256/6 1267/8 1267/19 1272/17 1286/11 1302/19 1305/23 1314/16 1320/25 1325/6 1326/8 1326/10 1328/18 1351/3 1361/9 1369/20 1373/7 1373/12 1376/16 1376/18 1384/2 1385/21 1399/24 1403/24 1409/16 1410/25 1411/10 1411/13 1411/16 1411/18 1413/10 1414/2 1414/25 1415/17 1416/12 1416/15 1417/4 1417/5 1418/22 1420/4 1421/8 1421/10 1422/6 1422/11 1422/23 1423/2 1425/15 1434/8 1434/15 1436/4 1436/9 1436/17 1437/22 1445/11 1450/23 1455/11 1455/12 <br> believes [3] 1245/1 1392/6 1443/23 <br> bench [3] 1286/2 1286/5 1368/22 <br> beneficiary [4] 1466/11 1466/11 1466/13 1466/21 benefit [6] 1149/22 1196/3 1217/13 1217/19 1378/25 1466/16 <br> benefits [2] 1230/2 1378/15 Berkeley [1] 1289/8 besides [4] 1163/11 1176/24 1318/9 1450/20 best [6] 1228/19 1240/25 1298/23 1300/1 1392/10 1432/7 <br> better [11] 1225/14 1258/5 1265/12 1269/10 1285/5 1356/24 1357/4 1357/8 1357/9 1357/14 1410/6 between [34] 1134/18 1212/23 1213/5 1223/1 1229/3 1241/22 1244/25 1293/1 1293/10 1294/15 1295/18 1303/5 1303/23 1304/17 1306/22 1310/22 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



|  | 14889bm46t1405-3 |  | 923047 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chrome [51] 1138/24 1232/19 | claiming [2] 1175/24 117 | closely [2] 1231/16 1233/2 | 1231/16 1231/20 1248/19 |
| 1233/2 1234/24 1237/7 <br> 1237/21 1241/24 1241/25 | claims [59] 1149/21 1150/3 | closest [1] 1375/2 | 1275/14 1276/4 1300/1 |
| 1242/10 1244/12 1247/5 | 1151/3 1151/16 1152/25 | closing [5] 1230/1 1427/5 | 1305/16 1308/1 1310/5 |
| 1247/6 1 | 1153/6 1154/11 1172/ | 1427/12 1427/17 1427/2 | 1315/19 1322/12 1346/5 |
| 1309/13 1309/15 1319/12 | 1172/20 1172/22 1 | closings [5] 1230/3 | 1350/12 1352/24 1363/18 |
| 1319/16 1320/8 1332/15 | 1176/4 1180/22 1183/14 | 1230/13 1285/17 1286/14 | 363/24 1366/12 1369/7 |
| 1333/15 1350/10 1350/12 | 118 |  | 1373/8 1379/20 1381/21 |
| 1350/13 1352/23 1353/12 | 1190/24 1196/4 1196/12 | clunky [1] 1406/24 | 1385/23 1395/8 1428/13 |
| 1353/15 1353/15 1353/22 | 121 |  | 1438/21 1440/8 1448/8 |
| 1354/1 1354/5 1354/25 | 1216/7 1216/13 1216/15 | code [14] 1138/10 1138/20 | 454/6 |
| 1355/13 1358/24 1359/8 |  |  | es [12] 1161/6 118 |
| 1359/11 1359/13 1359/19 | 330/18 1390/22 | 74/12 | /7 1194/15 1244/9 |
| 1360/2 1360/17 1362/25 | 1390/23 1394/15 1394/16 | 1396/5 1398/14 1405/9 | 4 |
| 1363/10 1363/14 1364/1 | 9/9 1399/18 | 1407/21 1422/19 1423/20 | 338/1 1413/22 1439/ |
| 1365/6 1370/4 1423/9 |  | cc |  |
| 1423/13 1454/21 1454/22 | 1401/17 1404/21 1404/23 |  | comfortable [1] 1238 |
| 1454/24 |  | collaboration [1] 1395/5 |  |
| chunk [2] 1253/15 1309/18 | 1442/11 1442/12 1445/ | 1211/20 1386/6 | 1391/11 144 |
| chunks [1] 1422/19 | 1458/8 1463/17 1463/21 | collection [5] 1262 | comma [2] 1268/12 12 |
| Circuit [6] 1285/7 1442/11 | 1465/14 1465/20 1467/2 | 1262/13 1275/6 1422 | command [5] 1151/22 |
| 1443/24 1448/1 1448/20 1448/24 | Claims 23 [1] 1445/22 | college [4] 1147/15 1163/3 | 1151/23 1175/10 1181/ |
| circumstan | clarification [1] | 1289/8 1289/12 | 1418/12 |
| circumstances [2] 1328/21 | clarifed [2] 127013 135612 | color [1] 1157 | mands |
| 1464/5 | clarify [3] 1425/17 1444/1 | Columbia [1] 11 | commenced [1] 1131/4 |
| citation [1] |  | column [4] 1272/12 131 |  |
| cite [9] 1430/7 1433/ | ris [2] 1187/4 1187/5 | 9/13 132 | comments [1] 122 |
| 1448/18 1449/5 1449/9 | class [3] 1148/3 1155 | columns [2] 1301 | mercial [8] |
| /6 1465/10 1465/18 |  | com.Android.Chrome | 1195/23 1195/25 1400/6 |
| 1466/14 | classes [1] 1146/16 | 1319/11 | 401/2 1403/9 1403/12 |
| cited [12] 1 | clause [2] 1432/19 | com.google.Android.Cale | 1421/14 |
| 1220/16 1220/19 1221/3 |  |  | rciali |
| 1221/13 1221/24 1314/24 | cleaned [1] | combination [3 | commercialize [1] 1385/1 |
| 1317/14 1430/7 1432/7 | clear [54] 1152/10 1154/ | 1183/4 1183/13 1184/ | mmon [2] 1151/10 1332/1 |
| 1433/8 | 1158/14 1160/2 1161/1 | 184/12 1185/6 | mmonly [1] 1231/25 |
|  | 1161/8 1169/11 1175/2 | 1188/8 1188/9 1188/20 | communicating [1] 1212/2 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { cites [3] 1 } \\ 1448 / 17 \end{gathered}$ | 1181/21 1185/7 1186/7 | 1190/1 1190/7 1190/17 | communication [1] 1398/8 |
|  | 1187/10 1192/2 1200/14 | 1212/9 1269/17 1269/23 | community [2] 1148/11 |
| 58] | 1213/11 1216/14 1238/12 | 1281/10 1298/21 1399/12 | 400/8 |
|  | 1248/12 1255/13 1255/15 | 1399/16 1399/18 1399/20 | companies [1] 1385/9 |
| 1181/23 1181/24 1181/25 | 1255/19 1266/24 1267/1 | 1401/10 1401/12 1401/14 | company [9] 1169/13 1296/1 |
|  | 1267/23 1267/24 1268/1 | 1401/16 1401/18 1404/7 | 1332/19 1332/19 1371/4 |
|  | 1268/2 1269/6 1269 | 1405/1 1409/3 | 1385/1 1385 |
|  | 1270/22 1271/5 1272/6 | combinations | 1385/15 |
|  | 1275/1 1275/2 1279/16 | 1183/18 1184/23 1187/ | company's [1] 1298/1 |
| 1210/3 1210/6 1321/23 | 1301/13 1308/21 1315/4 | 1189/16 1190/10 1191/3 | mpany-wide [1] 13 |
|  | 1326/8 1339/9 1359/5 | 13 | mpara |
| 1388/4 1388/14 1390/1 | 1393/3 1429/2 1434/9 | 1278/11 1279/6 1394/1 | comparable [12] 1294/12 |
| 1390/2 1390/3 1393/21 | 1434/15 1435/23 1436/9 | 42 | 1294/18 1294/19 12 |
| 1393/22 1394/1 1394/1 | 1436/10 1444/6 1447/6 | 1434/13 1434 | 296/9 1296/18 1296/20 |
| 1394/2 1394/2 1394/4 1394/4 | 1447/9 1464/13 1466/17 |  | 1296/23 1297/1 1297/3 |
| 1394/5 1394/9 1394/9 | cleared [1] 1 | 1183/22 1212/3 1279/ | 1301/21 1305/22 |
| 1399/17 1412/21 1413/3 |  |  |  |
| 1413/4 1413/12 1429/4 |  |  |  |
| 1441/21 1441/21 1452/5 | clearest [1] 1305/23 |  | comparative [1] 1239/3 |
| 1457/8 1459/11 1460/6 | clearly [17] 1135/12 1153/18 | 1281/12 1281/15 1281/18 | [4] 1300/9 1301/2 |
| 1460/11 1460/12 1460/12 |  |  |  |
| 1460/13 | $11184 / 22$ 1190/ | 1282/10 1282/14 1282/17 | pared [2] |
| Claim 23 [10] 1153 | 9/6 1337/16 1374/23 | 99/2 | mpares [1] 1351/5 |
| 1170/24 1177/7 1180/23 | 1438/11 1449/10 | 01/7 1402 | comparing [1] 1134/17 |
| 1181/25 1190/20 1394/4 | 767/10 1467/13 1467/1 | 1403/21 1404/14 1404/17 | comparison [3] 1137/2 |
| 1394/5 1394/9 1460/12 | click [2] 1185/24 1186/21 | 407/18 1429/ | 54/12 |
| Claim 30 [14] 1181/2 1181/20 | clicked [1] 1414/10 | 1455/5 [3] 1280/16 | ompensated [3] 1149/8 |
| 1181/23 1181/24 1185/16 | clicking [1] 1180/7 | 329/8 |  |
| 185/17 1186/7 1187/9 | clicks [1] 1 | 429/8 | [3] 1284 |
| 1187/11 1187/21 1393/2 | client [1] | combining [12] 1185/12 | ting [3] 1284/1 1468/16 |
| 1393/22 1394/4 1394/9 | close [6] 1227/24 1229/16 |  |  |
| Claim 33 [1] 1181/13 claimed [7] 1174/23 1181/1 | 1286/20 1369/18 1413/21 | 1213/2 1213/14 1272/1 | completely [4] 1242/19 1291/2 |


|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| completely... [2] 1323/16 |  | 1220/22 1221/18 1223/3 |  |
| 1467/8 | confer [7] 1133/4 1134/6 | 1254/25 1265/10 1314/23 | adicting [1] 121 |
| complex [2] 1358/18 1360/4 | 1284/8 1284/19 1362/4 | 1315/6 1371/9 1375/14 | contradictory [1] 1217/7 |
| compliance [1] 1369/8 | 1370/20 1468/15 | 1377/24 1445/22 1465/2 | contradicts [1] 1325/19 |
| complicated [3] 1261/12 1267/5 1358/19 | conference [10] 1156/2 | 1466/4 | contrast [2] 1400/12 1408/22 |
| component [1] 1333/1 | 1156/3 1156/4 1 | considering [3] 1150/12 | 1 |
| components [2] 1159/8 | 176/23 123 | 1223/10 1305/1 | dral |
| components [2] 1159/0 | 1258/1 1387/2 1451/15 | consisted [1] 1431/7 | conundrum [1] 1452/11 |
| computer [55] 1146/22 | conferences [4] 1148/14 | consistent [1] 1442/16 | convenient [1] 1189/7 |
| 1146/24 1147/8 | 1257/24 1258/1 1258/4 | consistently [1] 1388/12 | conversation [1] 1316/23 |
| 1148/7 1148/11 1149/4 | conferred [1] 1134/20 | Consortium [1] 1206/23 | conversations [1] 1324/23 |
| 1152/21 1156/4 1160/6 | confetti [1] 1388/3 | constituted [1] 1223/2 | convert [1] 1159/4 |
| 1160/13 1160/14 1167/4 | confident [2] 1319/23 1348/7 | construction [14] 1160/5 | converting [1] 1157/11 |
| $67 / 2$ | Confidential [1] 1203/7 | 1160/15 1178/2 1209/18 | convincing [9] 1255/13 |
|  | configured [3] 1172/21 | 1210/9 1210/10 1210/12 | 1255/15 1255/19 1268/3 |
|  | 1179/10 1179/11 | 1210/20 1217/14 1217/1 | 69/6 1272/7 1429/2 1434 |
| 1180/9 1211/7 1212/7 1258/2 | configures [1] 1172/25 | 1217/19 1388/25 1391/1 | 15 |
| 1259/15 1270/15 1272/19 | confirm [6] 1171/4 1240/13 | 1452/6 | cool [2] 1259/1 1408 |
| 1272/21 1274/22 1384/19 | 1244/23 | constructions | nate [ |
| 1385/1 1385/4 1386/16 | 62/8 | construe [1] 1466 | copies [3] 1132/16 1221 |
| 1388/6 1388/8 1388/23 | confirmation [2] | construed [6] 1401/24 |  |
| 1395/2 1395/11 1395/25 | 1259/4 | 1412/21 1429/3 1465/8 | copy [24] |
| 1399/7 1400/2 1400/22 | confirmed [4] 1166/5 | 1465/24 1466/22 | 1136/14 1136/16 113 |
| 1410/7 1420/11 1422/2 | 1274/21 1318/1 | construing [1] 1451/23 | 1193/20 1204/18 1205 |
| 1422/7 1423/5 1424/11 | confirms [2] 1184/9 1318/10 | consulting [2] 1203/6 13 | 1206/19 1242/12 |
| 1424/19 1424/22 1425/8 | confuse [1] 1135/18 | consumer [3] 1386/7 1456/25 | 1258/4 1258/19 1258 |
| 1442/1 1442/3 | confusing [2] 1212/19 | 1461/6 | 258/21 1258/23 |
| computers [9] 1146/22 | 1213 | consumer-selected [1] 1386/7 | 259/1 1259/4 1259/7 |
| 1173/14 1174/7 1189/4 | connected [3] 136 | consumers [1] 1463/3 | 260/10 1371/17 1390/1 |
| 1189/5 1384/24 1384/24 | 88 | contact [17] 1141/5 1157/23 | 1452/16 |
| 1385/4 1400/9 | connecting [3] 1153/23 | 1157/24 1163/11 1165/23 | copyright [2] 1188/6 127 |
| Computing [3] 1148/10 | 212/2 | 1168/18 1168/18 1169/ | ornell [2] 1147/22 1147/2 |
| 1149/2 1414/5 | connection [16] 1185/14 | 1171/23 1181/13 1181/1 | Corp [1] 1206/20 |
| concede [1] 1461/2 | 1240/20 1309/9 | 1185/22 1185/25 1187/ | rporate [2] 1371/4 137 |
| conceded [2] 1461/15 | 1315/13 1350/6 1374/1 | 1187/17 1195/25 1401/2 | corporations [1] 1465/15 |
| 1461/24 | 1377/25 1378/16 1379/ | contained [6] 1178/3 1233/1 | rrect [248] 1131/10 113 |
| nceivably | 1411/11 1411/21 1412/3 | 1262/16 1263/24 1431/20 | 1140/18 1181/20 1185/22 |
| $1465 / 14$ | 1414/3 1458/8 1467/21 | 1453/17 | 1196/4 1196/5 1199/1 |
|  | connections [2] 1262/7 | containing [2] 1263/21 1468/3 | 201/12 1201/13 1201/15 |
|  | 1262/13 | contains [2] 1233/12 1467/6 | 1201/16 1201/18 1201/19 |
|  | conscious [1] 1338/9 | contemporaneous [4] 1392/8 | 201/21 1201/22 1201/25 |
|  | consequently [1] 1391/17 | 1392/19 1415/11 1416/21 | 1202/5 1202/9 1202/14 |
| ize [1] | conservative [2] 1305/13 | contends [3] 1446/18 1446/19 | 1202/23 1204/2 1207/2 |
| $1250 / 231442 / 2$ | 1305/24 | 1446/21 | 1207/6 1207/13 1207/16 |
|  | conservatively [2] 1325/4 | content [3] 1143/23 1181/8 | 1207/23 1208/8 1208/11 |
|  | 1325/5 | 1220/21 | 1208/12 1208/14 1209/5 |
| 1241/11 1245/22 1265/6 | consider [33] 1140/7 1141/10 | contents [4] 1165/13 1170/ | 09/16 1209 |
| 1270/4 1278/7 1408/1 | 1142/15 1142/22 1154/12 | 1306/19 1421/3 | 1210/9 1210/14 1212/4 |
| concerning [4] 1149/20 | 1166/17 1181/2 1185/15 | context [19] 1210/20 1210/22 | 213/22 1215/10 1216/7 |
| 1414/12 1415/20 1415/24 | 1191/8 1191/25 1192/25 | 1225/14 1230/22 1282/10 | 1216/13 1216/21 1217/14 |
| concerns [2] 1236/18 1241 | 1193/4 1194/22 1195/24 | 1327/16 1331/7 1331/8 | 1218/19 1220/19 1227/7 |
| conclude [1] 1465/12 | 1196/3 1197/23 1199/4 | 1333/19 1333/20 1333/21 | 1241/18 1244/1 1244/8 |
|  | 1224/2 1264/25 1265/2 | 1338/1 1338/24 1377/19 | 246/15 1254/10 1254/20 |
| 1469/18 [2] 1416/18 | 1268/6 1312/8 1334/7 1334/8 | 1400/23 1425/11 1433/20 | 255/3 1255/13 1255/2 |
|  | 1338/1 1340/1 1340/11 | 1449/11 1460/4 | 256/6 1257/3 1257/4 1257/5 |
|  | 1370/11 1373/9 1440/5 | contextual [2] 1168/10 | 257/6 1257/9 1257/13 |
|  | 1464/2 1464/3 1464/4 | 1170/13 | 257/18 1259/11 1259/16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | consideration [9] 1194/17 | contingency [1] 1253/1 | 261/8 1262/3 1263/25 |
| 1368/13 1371/20 1372/9 | 1194/20 1194/23 1195/4 | continue [5] 1138/3 1145/10 | 1264/18 1264/23 1265/15 |
| 1376/22 1383/5 1397/22 | 1260/11 1304/13 1371/19 | 1317/8 1377/8 1397/21 | 1266/7 1268/3 1268/19 |
| 1425/24 | 1372/21 1457/25 | CONTINUED [1] 1130/1 | 1269/3 1271/12 1273/14 |
|  | considerations [13] 1191/6 | continues [1] 1172/17 | 1274/6 1274/15 1275/8 |
| $\text { 4/11 1217/9 } 124$ | 1191/9 1191/14 1191/19 | contract [17] 1429/25 1432/3 | 1278/3 1279/7 1279/15 |
| 5/4 1268/7 1268/13 | 1192/2 1192/8 1193/1 | 1432/8 1432/19 1432/20 | 1280/10 1280/13 1280/17 |
| 1245/4 1268/7/18 1268/13 | 1193/15 1195/3 1304/10 | 1433/9 1433/16 1451/18 | 280/24 1281/7 1281/13 |
| 1268/18 1268/21 1268/24 | 1409/6 1409/10 1409/11 | 1460/16 1460/21 1464/3 | 1281/18 1282/2 1289/17 |
| 1305/5 1310/5 1319/3 1329/5 1387/11 1417/2 1419/16 | considered [23] 1140/20 | 1464/4 1465/4 1466/13 | 1308/10 1310/7 1311/8 |
| conclusions [4] 1191/15 | 1151/9 1167/8 1191/17 | 1466/14 1467/20 1469/7 | 1311/13 1313/13 1322/4 |



Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH CyberDesk... [146] 1178/20 1179/11 1180/22 1181/5 1181/22 1182/15 1182/17 1182/25 1183/2 1183/15 1183/16 1183/21 1183/23 1184/3 1184/12 1184/25 1185/1 1185/8 1185/15 1188/1 1188/8 1188/12 1189/11 1189/21 1190/13 1190/15 1191/1 1197/21 1199/4 1199/24 1255/25 1256/1 1256/10 1256/11 1256/17 1256/18 1257/3 1257/8 1257/12 1257/15 1257/17 1259/12 1260/23 1261/8 1261/12 1261/21 1263/14 1263/17 1264/16 1265/14 1266/1 1266/6 1266/21 1267/10 1269/1 1269/25 1270/11 1273/1 1273/9 1274/5 1274/8 1274/11 1274/19 1275/10 1278/9 1279/6 1279/10 1279/15 1279/23 1280/1 1280/20 1280/24 1281/1 1281/6 1281/11 1281/18 1391/3 1391/4 1391/7 1391/11 1391/18 1391/24 1392/12 1393/1 1393/3 1393/16 1393/18 1393/21 1394/14 1394/16 1394/19 1394/24 1399/12 1399/16 1399/23 1400/12 1400/17 1401/8 1401/9 1401/12 1401/18 1402/2 1402/5 1402/8 1403/3 1403/8 1403/16 1404/8 1404/14 1404/19 1413/22 1413/23 1413/25 1414/3 1414/6 1414/12 1414/16 1415/14 1415/21 1416/9 1416/20 1421/23 1422/1 1422/4 1422/6 1422/11 1422/13 1422/16 1422/17 1423/6 1423/17 1423/19 1423/24 1423/25 1424/12 1429/1 1429/2 1429/6 1429/7 1430/21 1431/6 1434/5 1434/9 1434/13 1434/13 1446/24
CyberDesk's [1] 1393/10

## D

Daily [1] 1319/13
damage [5] 1232/3 1232/8 1245/17 1291/12 1380/19 damages [56] 1132/23 1135/24 1140/21 1140/22 1143/4 1143/4 1230/22 1288/10 1288/10 1288/18 1289/13 1289/24 1290/4 1290/6 1290/12 1290/25 1293/14 1293/18 1305/11 1310/6 1323/19 1324/3 1324/4 1326/1 1328/13 1328/14 1329/11 1332/8 1333/19 1333/21 1334/25 1335/25 1338/11 1339/16 1339/22 1340/24 1379/25


1436/18 1437/12 1437/17 1437/19 1437/24 1438/10 1438/13 1438/22 1438/25 1440/3 1440/6 1449/19 1461/10
dance [1] 1395/7
data [106] 1142/23 1143/23
1150/24 1151/8 1151/10 1153/7 1166/7 1166/7 1166/12 1166/16 1166/18 1167/3 1167/8 1167/13 1169/23 1170/5 1170/7 1170/14 1172/15 1172/18 1175/3 1183/1 1183/2 1183/6 1183/10 1184/6 1184/12 1185/16 1187/12 1187/16 1187/21 1188/2 1188/9 1188/12 1189/11 1190/4 1190/13 1190/13 1197/22 1199/5 1245/1 1245/3 1246/13 1246/22 1247/24 1248/8 1248/17 1312/23 1313/6 1313/9 1316/2 1318/10 1318/24 1319/2 1320/18 1320/19 1320/21 1324/10 1352/14 1352/15 1352/17 1355/13 1355/23 1356/18 1356/24 1357/1 1357/4 1357/8 1357/10 1357/12 1357/14 1357/19 1358/2 1358/2 1358/8 1358/9 1358/24 1359/3 1359/5 1359/6 1359/13 1361/7 1361/17 1362/6 1362/9 1366/11 1366/17 1366/23 1377/13 1386/4 1397/9 1398/7 1398/11 1398/12 1399/9 1399/11 1405/4 1405/19 1406/21 1406/23 1408/14 1408/15 1420/5 1420/7 1446/3 1446/24 database [1] 1385/14 date [71] 1138/9 1138/12 1138/15 1138/18 1138/23 1139/1 1140/5 1140/7 1140/8 1140/12 1140/15 1140/17 1140/23 1141/1 1143/20 1144/8 1144/11 1154/3 1154/7 1154/10 1154/16 1163/4 1163/4 1166/10 1167/1 1249/15 1251/12 1269/8 1278/20 1284/4 1284/6 1284/7 1284/9 1284/10 1284/13 1284/18 1284/18 1284/24 1304/17 1311/13 1311/14 1311/20 1311/21 1337/23 1342/2 1343/14 1351/11 1354/17 1354/18 1380/14 1380/18 1410/18 1410/20 1412/5 1421/6 1434/7 1434/7 1435/16 1435/24 1436/14 1436/15 1437/6 1437/7 1437/15 1438/1 1445/14 1447/5 1447/6 1447/8 1458/10 1458/11
dated [1] 1344/5
dates [4] 1284/15 1285/8

DAVID [1] 1130/9 day [22] 1131/8 1166/1 1167/2 1170/18 1172/11 1173/10 1188/24 1189/24 1226/10 1230/18 1272/24 1298/17 1325/8 1356/3 1380/22 1382/18 1388/2 1410/9 1424/16 1441/8 1442/9 1451/16 days [8] 1154/25 1319/9 1320/2 1346/13 1352/18 1354/3 1355/1 1363/17 DDX [4] 1134/12 1230/24 1341/23 1342/24
DDX-10.018 [1] 1134/12 DDX-10.10 [1] 1342/24 deal [8] 1137/21 1157/7 1200/16 1225/2 1225/10 1271/2 1299/24 1317/5 dealing [4] 1305/18 1442/1 1444/7 1459/19
dealt [1] 1225/2
dean [2] 1272/18 1272/19 debate [2] 1332/2 1449/24 debating [1] 1357/23 decades [3] 1257/19 1257/20 1258/8
decay [2] 1259/18 1260/12 decays [1] 1259/22
December [46] 1138/8 1138/18 1138/23 1140/5 1140/7 1141/13 1142/24 1143/20 1144/7 1144/14 1232/5 1249/11 1249/15 1251/12 1251/23 1251/23 1252/9 1292/21 1293/1 1293/10 1309/16 1309/17 1310/22 1311/5 1311/12 1311/15 1311/17 1311/20 1311/24 1312/5 1312/7 1312/10 1312/17 1312/18 1312/19 1317/18 1317/19 1325/25 1337/6 1342/2 1342/5 1343/15 1352/2 1354/18 1355/14 1436/11 December 15 [1] 1312/18 December 1st [1] 1343/15 December 2017 [15] 1138/8 1138/18 1140/7 1143/20 1144/7 1249/11 1249/15 1251/12 1251/23 1252/9 1311/5 1311/24 1312/5 1312/10 1355/14
December 2019 [1] 1317/18
December 5 [7] 1141/13 1142/24 1292/21 1293/1 1293/10 1311/12 1342/5 December 5th [1] 1436/11 December of [1] 1312/19 decide [6] 1268/22 1281/16 1436/4 1439/24 1443/18 1469/8
decided [4] 1146/24 1147/18 1153/15 1337/4
decides [4] 1158/1 1158/2 1281/19 1457/4
deciding [2] 1429/16 1441/19 decision [14] 1191/20

1338/9 1338/12 1338/14 1373/5 1429/15 1457/1 1457/13
decisions [1] 1282/3
deck [3] 1201/10 1310/1 1324/20
dedicated [1] 1346/21
defendant [10] 1129/8
1130/18 1131/23 1206/7 1207/5 1207/8 1428/15 1428/20 1448/5 1452/14 defendant's [2] 1256/15 1431/6
defendants [2] 1202/25 1206/5
defense [5] 1420/17 1434/19 1434/20 1440/12 1451/18 deficient [1] 1429/3 defined [1] 1219/17 defines [2] 1456/14 1460/22 definitely [1] 1171/4 definition [2] 1218/5 1454/17 definitive [1] 1313/16 degree [1] 1147/11
DELAWARE [2] 1129/3 1129/17
delay [4] 1337/2 1337/8 1338/21 1339/10
delayed [6] 1251/9 1251/11 1251/15 1251/15 1337/6 1339/1
deliberate [4] 1427/17 1443/15 1444/2 1445/3 deliberations [1] 1427/13 delve [1] 1153/9
demand [1] 1291/13
demands [1] 1465/20 demo [3] 1154/24 1274/8 1351/4
demonstrate [2] 1261/17 1316/25
demonstrated [1] 1393/17 demonstrating [2] 1166/24 1393/2
demonstration [5] 1168/1
1179/2 1180/1 1261/4 1264/11
demonstration's [1] 1264/2 demonstrations [9] 1155/1 1166/11 1261/14 1261/16 1261/19 1261/22 1261/25 1263/25 1264/2
demonstrative [23] 1236/17 1238/8 1238/15 1238/22 1238/24 1238/25 1239/14 1239/18 1240/22 1242/3 1242/6 1242/16 1244/13 1256/3 1307/1 1307/11 1316/24 1344/20 1344/22 1345/5 1350/3 1351/5 1379/18
demonstratives [7] 1132/3 1132/5 1132/10 1132/20 1146/13 1225/11 1360/6 denied [1] 1451/6 department [3] 1146/24 1147/10 1272/21
depend [1] 1179/24

Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH dependent [3] 1141/24 1179/22 1393/25 depending [3] 1175/19 1259/16 1438/14
depends [10] 1142/3 1207/10 1208/20 1212/10 1262/5
1394/1 1394/3 1394/4 1422/4 1422/4
deposed [2] 1278/24 1314/6 deposition [38] 1150/17 1166/20 1166/21 1195/21 1203/16 1270/6 1276/16 1276/18 1276/23 1277/5 1277/7 1277/12 1277/18 1279/4 1279/25 1280/8 1308/2 1308/6 1313/17 1314/23 1315/5 1315/7 1315/13 1317/13 1317/14 1317/18 1317/20 1318/9 1356/20 1358/7 1364/8 1364/25 1365/8 1373/4 1387/5 1392/16 1410/7 1411/5
depositions [3] 1280/12 1314/22 1387/1
describe [7] 1146/17 1148/1 1182/24 1214/22 1261/8 1291/7 1370/5
described [10] 1161/16 1174/15 1176/24 1248/19 1270/18 1270/21 1272/9
1304/15 1422/21 1423/21 describes [3] 1154/22 1165/18 1269/16 describing [4] 1150/16 1201/20 1209/20 1260/22 description [4] 1171/19 1182/14 1271/5 1412/18 descriptions [1] 1171/2 design [2] 1152/9 1209/15 designated [1] 1149/3 designed [2] 1400/5 1418/16 desires [1] 1464/23 desk [1] 1275/18 desktop [9] 1182/16 1272/15 1414/16 1414/21 1415/4 1415/14 1422/22 1422/24 1422/25
despite [1] 1271/16 detail [7] 1140/25 1161/17 1166/20 1177/3 1177/10 1181/25 1389/5 detailed [1] 1322/21 details [4] 1192/3 1258/7 1277/4 1277/5
detectors [53] 1141/5 1143/23 1150/24 1151/9 1151/10 1153/7 1166/7 1166/8 1166/12 1166/16 1166/18 1167/3 1167/8 1167/13 1169/23 1170/5 1170/7 1172/15 1172/18 1175/3 1183/1 1183/2 1183/6 1183/10 1184/6 1184/13 1185/16 1187/12 1187/16 1187/21 1188/2 1188/9 1188/12 1189/12 1190/4 1190/13 1190/14 1197/22 1199/5 1397/9 1398/7 1399/9
 1408/15 1420/5 1420/7 1446/3 1446/25
determination [1] 1356/4 determine [8] 1170/10 1294/17 1298/19 1377/20 1399/8 1400/23 1401/22 1437/4
determined [2] 1335/2 1435/18
determining [4] 1202/4 1223/8 1445/22 1464/2
develop [1] 1140/17
developed [5] 1154/5 1154/8 1395/2 1418/20 1418/22 developer [2] 1400/8 1418/11 developers [7] 1395/17
1400/10 1405/8 1408/2 1408/4 1408/7 1423/4 developing [1] 1147/17 device [55] 1151/21 1151/23 1152/18 1156/25 1172/21 1172/25 1175/9 1179/7 1179/8 1179/10 1312/19 1312/20 1318/8 1319/13 1319/17 1323/10 1328/3 1328/6 1328/7 1328/8 1330/9 1332/16 1347/17 1348/14 1348/16 1355/22 1359/24 1395/12 1395/24 1396/1 1396/3 1396/4 1399/7 1420/8 1420/12 1453/12 1453/18 1453/19 1454/11 1454/16 1454/18 1455/10 1455/14 1455/15 1455/20 1456/2 1456/3 1456/5 1457/1 1457/5 1457/12 1459/8 1467/6 1467/14 1467/15 devices [50] 1143/1 1167/2 1232/1 1232/15 1232/22 1234/24 1239/23 1241/8 1250/14 1278/1 1292/15 1292/17 1292/18 1292/19 1293/7 1297/25 1307/24 1310/24 1311/16 1315/1 1315/11 1319/21 1321/16 1321/18 1325/24 1326/14 1329/15 1329/17 1330/1 1342/1 1343/1 1346/22 1346/25 1346/25 1376/15 1381/21 1387/4 1435/19 1436/25 1438/11 1438/18 1439/1 1439/6 1451/6 1453/3 1453/25 1454/6 1458/18 1459/2 1459/18
Dey [35] 1150/18 1150/25 1151/6 1154/6 1154/17 1154/20 1156/8 1160/7 1161/15 1165/18 1171/22 1171/24 1178/12 1181/18 1185/21 1191/1 1199/11 1257/21 1262/22 1269/3 1271/18 1272/6 1278/25 1279/4 1279/9 1279/25 1391/21 1392/11 1392/20 1413/23 1414/2 1414/24 1416/23 1417/16 1417/21 Dey's [18] 1256/6 1263/2 1266/24 1267/23 1269/24

1392/4 1415/9 1415/19 1415/23 1416/5 1417/1 1417/7
diagram [2] 1391/10 1459/19 dictionaries [1] 1162/24 did [212] 1134/16 1135/6 1140/6 1141/15 1141/15 1141/22 1141/24 1146/13 1146/15 1147/11 1149/24 1150/1 1151/2 1151/6 1154/12 1155/10 1155/19 1155/21 1161/1 1163/21 1165/8 1166/17 1167/7 1167/13 1169/16 1169/23 1170/6 1170/20 1172/14 1174/10 1175/21 1176/13 1181/2 1185/15 1188/4 1189/7 1191/1 1191/25 1194/22 1196/6 1199/3 1199/22 1199/23 1201/17 1203/11 1208/2 1217/13 1222/5 1222/17 1222/19 1223/11 1224/8 1228/1 1230/4 1231/9 1231/13 1232/23 1233/25 1235/8 1238/5 1238/15 1238/17 1242/3 1243/21 1258/5 1258/5 1258/17 1258/19 1258/21 1258/23 1259/2 1262/18 1262/25 1263/1 1265/7 1268/10 1269/6 1269/7 1269/24 1274/18 1275/7 1275/7 1276/14 1277/10 1277/18 1278/12 1278/15 1278/17 1278/23 1279/10 1280/8 1283/25 1288/12 1288/14 1291/13 1291/17 1293/20 1293/22 1294/2 1294/8 1294/13 1294/17 1295/23 1298/2 1298/19 1299/13 1300/23 1301/4 1301/19 1302/16 1302/18 1305/7 1305/9 1306/16 1306/18 1308/6 1308/7 1309/6 1309/7 1309/8 1309/20 1310/6 1311/10 1311/11 1312/8 1312/16 1312/23 1313/4 1313/8 1314/17 1317/19 1317/21 1323/21 1324/12 1324/17 1325/17 1327/4 1327/11 1327/19 1327/22 1329/7 1329/10 1334/7 1336/5 1336/20 1336/24 1339/9 1339/15 1339/25 1340/11 1340/13 1341/18 1342/4 1343/21 1343/23 1346/13 1346/14 1351/5 1356/18 1356/19 1357/14 1358/5 1359/2 1360/3 1361/17 1364/14 1366/17 1366/19 1373/11 1374/17 1377/16 1377/20 1378/1 1378/8 1380/14 1380/18 1384/17 1384/18 1385/17 1386/4 1386/22 1387/10 1390/15 1411/4 1412/18 1414/3 1414/15 1414/18 1414/19

1425/16 1426/14 1428/23 1429/1 1429/5 1429/18 1431/3 1431/3 1432/13 1432/16 1435/11 1438/7 1439/5 1448/16 1453/4 1463/14 1463/22
didn't [131] 1134/23 1134/25 1138/16 1139/1 1140/17 1140/17 1140/18 1140/24 1143/19 1146/22 1155/16 1156/5 1164/22 1175/25 1188/25 1191/24 1197/24 1197/24 1198/4 1200/4 1202/1 1202/21 1208/19 1212/13 1216/10 1217/19 1219/1 1219/5 1221/1 1222/9 1222/10 1222/21 1223/6 1223/9 1224/1 1224/2 1224/14 1224/15 1237/3 1237/3 1237/19 1242/5 1248/17 1253/7 1254/15 1254/17 1254/19 1254/24 1255/1 1258/4 1258/19 1258/20 1258/21 1258/25 1259/3 1259/4 1259/6 1259/7 1262/20 1262/21 1262/23 1263/6 1264/25 1265/2 1265/4 1266/8 1267/5 1268/11 1268/15 1268/17 1268/20 1271/23 1275/14 1276/3 1276/13 1277/9 1277/12 1279/9 1279/11 1279/13 1282/9 1284/16 1286/3 1291/15 1292/19 1314/10 1324/10 1327/5 1339/19 1342/6 1346/11 1353/15 1356/2 1356/23 1357/13 1357/17 1357/25 1358/3 1358/6 1358/7 1358/10 1358/11 1358/12 1358/15 1359/12 1363/7 1363/20 1364/21 1366/16 1370/11 1373/8 1374/5 1378/10 1378/12 1378/14 1378/24 1379/4 1388/9 1388/10 1392/15 1392/16 1394/4 1416/12 1418/3 1418/3 1418/5 1445/25 1455/2 1461/7 1461/9 1468/11
DIEHL [1] 1130/4
difference [8] 1241/22 1244/25 1299/6 1346/17 1355/3 1355/16 1381/19 1381/24
differences [1] 1294/15 different [119] 1134/16 1134/18 1135/7 1135/21 1139/10 1139/12 1142/16 1148/9 1148/18 1148/22 1148/25 1153/14 1155/6 1157/8 1157/13 1159/20 1159/21 1174/9 1175/18 1178/23 1179/3 1179/9 1180/7 1180/7 1181/6 1182/15 1183/4 1186/8 1189/10 1193/25 1202/25 1203/9 1211/17 1212/16

Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH
different... [85] 1212/18 1213/3 1213/6 1213/14 1213/14 1216/15 1216/16 1219/21 1223/4 1231/4 1231/4 1231/13 1237/21 1237/22 1238/20 1244/7 1252/23 1258/11 1259/17 1261/10 1261/10 1262/4 1262/7 1262/10 1264/3 1264/4 1264/6 1264/12 1264/13 1269/16 1269/17 1272/1 1272/3 1272/9 1272/13 1272/21 1272/23 1273/16 1275/10 1278/11 1280/18 1282/19 1289/1 1294/23 1296/17 1298/5 1302/10 1305/1 1305/20 1310/5 1314/25 1325/12 1328/16 1331/14 1332/19 1335/1 1335/16 1346/18 1352/1 1352/18 1352/20 1352/20 1355/1 1356/6 1357/19 1358/2 1365/22 1377/20 1388/13 1395/6 1398/2 1398/13 1400/3 1401/5 1401/5 1421/23 1423/3 1437/6 1437/12 1437/18 1440/4 1448/4 1463/18 1463/21 1464/18 differentiating [2] 1212/23 1213/5
difficult [1] 1442/4
dig [2] 1363/20 1364/14 digital [4] 1259/10 1259/10
1259/12 1260/5
direct [24] 1146/1 1201/9 1229/16 1240/18 1275/16 1280/25 1286/20 1287/3 1288/3 1331/16 1349/7 1357/3 1357/11 1364/10 1366/21 1383/17 1395/18 1402/19 1405/22 1406/10 1408/22 1419/19 1425/7 1440/3
directed [1] 1468/8 direction [2] 1281/12 1404/10 directions [3] 1400/5 1401/5 1405/17
directly [7] 1198/1 1203/25 1244/9 1315/8 1408/23 1408/24 1408/24 directors [1] 1458/4 directs [1] 1432/20 disagree [7] 1135/11 1337/18 1359/15 1374/25 1391/4 1402/6 1439/15
disagreeing [1] 1392/4 disagreement [1] 1327/14 disagrees [2] 1137/11 1137/15
disc [1] 1259/15 discharges [1] 1458/2 disclose [10] 1138/8 1138/16 1155/19 1167/13 1171/23 1171/25 1172/19 1172/21 1314/17 1446/13 disclosed [17] 1134/22 1136/23 1143/18 1159/25 1160/19 1161/14 1198/18

 1314/7 1314/11 1316/11 distinctions [1] 1420/5 distinguish [1] 1172/9 1429/2
discloses [2] 1434/10 1434/17 distinguished [3] 1174/24 disclosing [2] 1142/13 1221/5 disclosure [4] 1166/14 1261/18 1262/1 1370/23 discovers [1] 1158/1 discovery [1] 1373/3 discuss [4] 1252/13 1395/4 1396/14 1469/15 discussed [5] 1198/14 1217/22 1337/20 1387/4 1430/1
discusses [1] 1264/1
discussing [3] 1188/16
1266/17 1449/10
discussion [50] 1153/15 1163/24 1166/15 1170/4 1171/6 1171/17 1191/12 1192/17 1194/10 1196/21 1200/20 1211/5 1211/19 1216/24 1218/23 1219/10 1223/1 1223/20 1234/5 1264/24 1290/21 1306/7 1307/6 1307/14 1314/2 1317/9 1326/21 1331/19 1334/15 1336/15 1337/14 1340/5 1342/21 1361/20 1362/12 1367/5 1368/13 1371/20 1372/1 1372/9 1372/14 1372/25 1373/1 1376/22 1383/5 1397/1 1397/22 1398/5 1425/1 1425/23
discussions [1] 1170/21 display [5] 1159/4 1178/10 1178/11 1181/16 1186/21 displayed [3] 1156/25 1178/15 1388/23
displaying [2] 1178/9 1180/21 displays [1] 1158/11
dispute [34] 1135/2 1135/3
1197/22 1231/6 1231/6
1231/24 1232/2 1284/17 1284/19 1284/25 1285/8 1327/7 1350/9 1351/10 1415/19 1415/23 1416/5 1435/23 1436/4 1436/6 1438/12 1441/2 1441/14 1441/23 1442/18 1443/6 1445/12 1445/13 1447/5 1447/6 1450/1 1450/4 1460/3 1462/23
disputed [6] 1227/14 1436/22 1437/11 1437/25 1468/22 1468/22
disputes [3] 1464/14 1464/14 1464/16
disputing [5] 1215/6 1231/8 1283/23 1284/4 1447/10 disregard [13] 1165/2 1165/3 1165/3 1194/3 1194/14
1194/17 1255/9 1280/25 1335/14 1335/15 1336/18 1340/8 1444/2
distance [1] 1168/6
distinct [2] 1431/14 1449/20
distinction [8] 1142/2 1172/8

1175/21 1272/17
distinguishing [1] 1214/17
distributed [1] 1173/21
distribution [1] 1370/25
distributors [2] 1456/18
1458/6
DISTRICT [3] 1129/2 1129/3 1470/9
divide [3] 1299/14 1302/12 1330/14
divided [2] 1320/3 1347/8 divides [1] 1330/10 dividing [1] 1330/12 do [277] 1131/15 1132/12 1133/4 1135/2 1135/3 1136/7 1137/16 1144/24 1147/19 1149/10 1149/19 1150/13 1153/10 1156/22 1157/4 1157/16 1159/15 1159/18 1159/21 1159/23 1162/19 1162/23 1168/5 1168/12 1169/17 1171/15 1175/19 1175/25 1176/16 1178/4 1178/22 1179/14 1180/3 1182/13 1186/16 1188/18 1188/18 1189/5 1190/9 1193/18 1195/24 1196/1 1199/18 1201/10 1201/24 1202/6 1202/7 1202/10 1203/17 1203/18 1203/22 1206/11 1206/12 1206/15 1206/16 1206/24 1208/21 1209/10 1210/11 1210/19 1211/8 1211/9 1211/18 1211/24 1213/11 1217/25 1221/5 1222/13 1222/14 1223/15 1223/17 1224/15 1225/11 1225/16 1227/9 1228/1 1228/3 1228/14 1228/17 1229/19 1230/12 1231/5 1233/23 1234/7 1234/22 1234/23 1235/1 1235/9 1235/12 1238/3 1239/15 1240/19 1240/25 1242/11 1242/17 1245/7 1248/21 1249/21 1250/22 1252/2 1254/7 1254/8 1254/14 1254/15 1254/17 1256/15 1256/24 1258/6 1258/14 1258/17 1263/11 1263/12 1263/13 1264/22 1266/6 1266/15 1266/20 1267/14 1267/18 1268/17 1268/20 1270/16 1270/20 1273/7 1273/19 1276/19 1276/24 1277/1 1278/6 1278/14 1282/20 1283/16 1283/25 1285/4 1285/5 1286/25 1287/4 1288/18 1288/23 1290/3 1290/17 1294/12 1295/14 1295/15 1296/23 1298/22 1300/23 1301/1 1302/7 1302/19 1302/21 1303/5 1305/12 1306/11 1308/13 1313/15
$134522131731312 / 258$
1322/23 1323/1 1323/22 1324/7 1324/11 1325/6 1325/6 1326/10 1326/17 1328/18 1330/6 1333/3 1333/10 1334/1 1334/5 1335/17 1337/18 1337/19 1338/13 1343/6 1344/3 1344/4 1347/5 1347/22 1348/25 1349/11 1357/4 1357/22 1358/3 1358/10 1358/12 1360/17 1360/17 1361/16 1361/22 1363/8 1363/13 1364/9 1369/16 1374/25 1375/11 1375/21 1379/22 1379/23 1382/18 1384/4 1385/17 1387/11 1387/14 1387/20 1388/9 1388/21 1389/12 1390/9 1391/24 1391/25 1393/11 1393/12 1393/15 1396/16 1396/20 1396/21 1397/12 1400/15 1402/2 1402/4 1402/9 1402/10 1404/5 1405/12 1405/24 1405/25 1406/17 1407/7 1409/13 1410/22 1410/25 1411/5 1411/7 1411/10 1411/14 1411/16 1411/20 1412/19 1412/19 1413/2 1413/20 1413/24 1414/2 1414/3 1417/6 1417/14 1417/17 1422/6 1425/20 1426/6 1427/19 1427/19 1428/11 1428/11 1433/19 1439/7 1440/1 1441/4 1443/5 1445/11 1445/25 1446/20 1449/17 1459/22 1465/25 1466/23 1468/11 1468/12 1469/10
Doc [1] 1407/3
docket [2] 1136/11 1430/2 Doctor [6] 1225/4 1253/24 1384/7 1395/18 1404/20 1424/9
document [77] 1152/19 1153/3 1157/5 1160/6 1161/7 1164/8 1164/12 1165/12 1169/10 1169/10 1169/25 1170/10 1171/16 1171/24 1172/1 1172/3 1172/16 1172/20 1172/22 1173/1 1178/9 1178/13 1178/15 1178/16 1182/19 1183/8 1184/20 1186/9 1186/11 1186/12 1213/23 1214/9 1214/12 1214/19 1215/1 1218/1 1218/6 1218/9 1221/16 1223/20 1241/24 1270/14 1270/25 1271/6 1271/19 1274/7 1295/16 1295/17 1295/18 1306/12 1306/16 1313/19 1321/14 1349/12 1358/8 1373/22 1388/22 1389/24 1391/14 1391/15 1391/16 1392/15 1393/5 1393/6 1401/22 1402/19 1404/7 1406/15 1415/6 1415/9 1415/11

Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH document... [6] 1416/19 1425/6 1425/7 1429/3 1441/12 1469/13 document's [1] 1248/25 documentation [11] 1150/6 1182/12 1223/19 1273/17 1282/25 1283/1 1299/3 1398/7 1401/20 1422/16 1422/21
documented [5] 1269/4 1269/5 1269/10 1273/2 1273/10
documenting [1] 1258/18 documents [45] 1182/20 1184/22 1220/23 1222/5 1222/9 1222/10 1222/19 1222/23 1254/20 1255/1 1255/17 1261/14 1261/16 1262/3 1262/5 1262/8 1262/12 1263/16 1263/21 1266/13 1268/1 1268/2 1269/12 1269/13 1269/14 1269/25 1270/12 1273/3 1274/15 1274/19 1274/20 1274/24 1292/13 1308/1 1308/5 1309/4 1309/6 1349/3 1374/7 1391/24 1392/19 1406/1 1416/10 1416/16 1422/13
does [97] 1131/22 1138/7 1142/17 1144/13 1159/6 1168/25 1171/22 1171/24 1172/18 1172/21 1173/2 1178/20 1179/13 1180/5 1197/23 1221/13 1225/7 1225/21 1242/18 1243/7 1244/6 1245/3 1252/8 1265/5 1271/16 1284/5 1286/10 1291/20 1301/25 1303/17 1304/5 1311/1 1314/20 1314/22 1317/22 1317/22 1318/3 1323/12 1325/16 1327/18 1329/16 1329/23 1330/17 1331/25 1332/7 1337/3 1357/10 1365/6 1373/18 1379/24 1382/12 1388/23 1389/25 1390/1 1393/21 1393/23 1394/6 1394/8 1394/16 1397/7 1397/8 1397/12 1399/9 1399/18 1400/21 1401/16 1402/7 1403/20 1404/6 1404/7 1404/9 1404/18 1404/21 1404/22 1404/22 1405/1 1405/2 1407/4 1407/5 1407/17 1408/18 1408/18 1409/5 1416/10 1422/13 1424/11 1425/5 1426/21 1435/5 1435/9 1441/13 1441/23 1447/6 1447/11 1461/15 1464/20 1467/15 doesn't [36] 1137/11 1137/15 1140/13 1144/19 1158/1 1160/15 1189/17 1192/8 1192/9 1194/16 1239/23 1260/8 1262/17 1271/13 1271/15 1303/22 1317/24 1322/12 1335/22 1370/11 1374/8 1374/17 1381/12


1409/12 1412/19 1413/19 1417/12 1427/6 1445/6 1448/24
doing [28] 1134/18 1134/21 1134/24 1147/21 1155/5 1157/8 1162/5 1178/16 1178/21 1219/6 1255/6 1255/12 1255/18 1260/16 1276/15 1293/17 1316/21 1331/12 1378/23 1395/6 1395/14 1398/16 1400/3 1405/10 1407/22 1412/20 1412/22 1433/24 dollar [1] 1291/12 dollars [4] 1300/3 1300/5 1331/11 1331/13 don't [193] 1132/16 1133/20 1134/8 1134/24 1138/22 1144/22 1155/14 1155/23 1156/6 1156/14 1167/11 1191/19 1193/2 1193/25 1194/5 1194/25 1200/2 1200/15 1202/24 1204/21 1207/9 1210/15 1211/20 1211/25 1212/1 1214/16 1218/15 1219/7 1219/21 1222/11 1222/11 1222/13 1222/15 1222/23 1223/22 1224/3 1225/22 1225/22 1225/23 1226/1 1226/11 1226/25 1228/2 1228/21 1228/23 1228/25 1229/9 1230/2 1230/7 1230/9 1231/1 1231/17 1231/21 1233/10 1234/3 1235/1 1235/15 1235/16 1235/20 1236/19 1236/24 1237/5 1238/10 1238/23 1244/18 1245/25 1246/6 1247/18 1247/19 1250/17 1250/18 1253/12 1254/15 1258/7 1258/8 1262/19 1263/8 1263/15 1264/17 1265/17 1265/18 1265/19 1265/23 1265/25 1266/1 1266/4 1266/17 1268/5 1273/5 1276/24 1277/1 1277/3 1277/11 1278/6 1280/11 1280/14 1282/12 1282/16 1284/14 1284/24 1285/2 1285/5 1299/24 1302/9 1315/23 1318/13 1319/20 1322/18 1329/4 1333/4 1335/11 1336/2 1348/24 1356/13 1356/16 1358/14 1359/10 1360/3 1362/3 1362/6 1363/12 1364/8 1367/25 1368/9 1368/11 1369/14 1369/17 1370/16 1370/21 1371/17 1371/18 1373/7 1374/15 1374/19 1387/13 1387/16 1389/10 1389/14 1398/21 1399/24 1403/24 1408/4 1409/13 1410/18 1410/23 1411/3 1411/23 1413/20 1415/7 1415/7 1415/13 1415/17 1416/1 1416/9 1416/15 1417/4

1426/16 1427/20 1428/12 1428/13 1430/2 1430/3 1430/22 1432/2 1432/4 1433/11 1435/20 1437/19 1438/1 1438/15 1438/22 1440/1 1440/25 1443/4 1445/5 1448/19 1449/6 1450/12 1450/23 1451/22 1452/1 1454/24 1462/20 1462/23 1468/6 1468/14 1469/5
done [41] 1133/25 1134/16 1147/18 1148/22 1163/12 1190/8 1220/5 1222/12 1222/16 1228/21 1229/6 1230/17 1251/19 1256/19 1256/20 1257/19 1257/20 1260/15 1269/19 1277/17 1283/24 1300/15 1301/6 1332/22 1338/25 1339/7 1339/19 1339/20 1379/11 1385/6 1386/3 1388/15 1390/12 1392/13 1392/14 1398/8 1406/20 1426/9 1442/16 1457/22 1468/18 door [7] 1197/9 1197/12 1197/25 1198/8 1198/11 1200/15 1335/24
double [3] 1283/15 1331/23 1332/1
doubt [2] 1184/3 1320/21
Doug [1] 1288/8
Douglas [4] 1136/20 1287/14 1287/20 1287/22
down [34] 1134/7 1134/10 1176/12 1176/17 1204/13 1225/4 1250/14 1251/5 1254/13 1275/4 1283/11 1294/4 1294/15 1306/1 1308/1 1309/3 1319/18 1320/13 1321/7 1323/10 1326/8 1329/14 1341/22 1343/10 1343/13 1345/15 1358/20 1360/7 1371/18 1382/8 1395/8 1402/21 1426/25 1443/24
download [24] 1142/20 1177/17 1248/8 1313/18 1319/12 1329/19 1332/15 1350/14 1350/17 1351/1 1355/13 1356/18 1357/12 1358/2 1454/12 1455/4 1456/24 1457/1 1457/4 1457/5 1457/13 1457/16 1457/20 1463/1
download-based [1] 1142/20 downloaded [23] 1244/13 1293/1 1293/4 1293/10 1310/24 1312/17 1312/18 1312/19 1314/9 1326/14 1329/17 1329/21 1346/12 1381/13 1381/14 1436/7 1436/8 1451/6 1453/20 1454/13 1458/17 1461/6 1468/4
downloading [6] 1358/2 1459/7 1459/8 1459/10 1459/22 1460/5

种隺 15
1241/25 1244/10 1244/11 1244/19 1246/11 1246/13 1246/18 1246/20 1309/2 1310/23 1313/18 1315/14 1318/1 1318/5 1318/6 1318/7 1319/1 1319/3 1319/16 1319/21 1320/1 1320/15 1321/6 1321/25 1332/11 1345/16 1345/17 1345/23 1346/2 1346/4 1346/10 1346/15 1346/21 1346/22 1346/24 1347/3 1347/9 1348/2 1348/9 1348/16 1349/15 1349/16 1349/17 1350/5 1352/19 1354/5 1354/24 1359/13 1359/19 1381/6 1381/10 1453/25 1454/1 1454/3 1454/23 1460/8 1461/16 1461/23 1462/5 1467/21
downward [7] 1143/2 1302/6 1302/7 1303/20 1304/2 1304/8 1304/25
Dr [9] 1149/14 1149/16 1191/23 1199/11 1211/3 1260/19 1386/15 1415/23 1460/10
Dr. [96] 1131/11 1131/12 1131/13 1131/16 1132/4 1145/14 1149/19 1162/12 1163/9 1176/1 1177/11 1180/25 1181/4 1185/10 1193/13 1194/20 1196/2 1199/11 1201/5 1209/8 1211/7 1211/16 1216/2 1219/14 1220/4 1225/18 1225/25 1229/11 1229/16 1252/22 1254/5 1256/6 1257/21 1262/22 1269/3 1269/24 1270/2 1270/5 1270/11 1271/18 1272/6 1273/3 1273/12 1274/18 1278/25 1279/4 1279/9 1279/25 1281/2 1283/12 1296/24 1316/17 1336/8 1336/25 1382/23 1384/25 1387/4 1387/6 1387/11 1387/14 1388/8 1389/6 1389/8 1389/13 1391/1 1391/21 1392/4 1392/11 1392/20 1393/9 1394/20 1396/9 1397/10 1398/15 1399/10 1402/1 1413/23 1414/2 1414/19 1414/24 1415/7 1415/9 1415/19 1416/5 1417/1 1417/7 1417/16 1417/21 1426/14 1428/23 1429/5 1429/9 1436/2 1436/2 1437/8 1451/5 Dr. Dey [18] 1199/11 1257/21 1262/22 1269/3 1271/18 1272/6 1278/25 1279/4 1279/9 1279/25 1391/21 1392/11 1392/20 1413/23 1414/2 1414/24 1417/16 1417/21
Dr. Dey's [14] 1256/6 1269/24 1270/2 1270/5 1270/11

Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH Dr. Dey's... [9] 1273/3 1273/12 1274/18 1392/4 1415/9 1415/19 1416/5 1417/1 1417/7 Dr. Earl [2] 1225/25 1382/23 Dr. Edward Fox [1] 1145/14 Dr. Fox [30] 1131/11 1131/13 1131/16 1132/4 1149/19 1193/13 1194/20 1196/2 1201/5 1209/8 1219/14 1220/4 1225/18 1229/11 1254/5 1281/2 1283/12 1384/25 1388/8 1389/6 1393/9 1394/20 1399/10 1402/1 1414/19 1415/7 1426/14 1428/23 1429/5 1429/9
Dr. Fox's [7] 1387/6 1387/11 1387/14 1389/8 1389/13 1391/1 1397/10
Dr. Kidder [1] 1131/12
Dr. Martin [1] 1296/24
Dr. Miller [1] 1387/4
Dr. Rinard [5] 1211/7 1211/16 1336/8 1336/25 1436/2
Dr. Sacerdoti's [1] 1229/16
Dr. Smedley [9] 1162/12
1176/1 1177/11 1180/25 1216/2 1396/9 1398/15 1436/2 1437/8
Dr. Smedley's [4] 1163/9 1181/4 1185/10 1316/17 Dr. Weinstein's [2] 1252/22 1451/5
dramatic [1] 1304/3 dramatically [1] 1291/23 draw [1] 1321/13 drawn [1] 1173/5
drill [1] 1341/22
drive [1] 1259/23
dropped [1] 1253/15
DTX [33] 1164/18 1236/1
1236/16 1238/18 1244/10
1256/5 1256/14 1274/2
1274/5 1295/13 1296/1
1296/5 1306/10 1306/24
1307/16 1307/20 1308/25
1312/25 1313/4 1313/9
1317/15 1318/10 1318/22
1318/24 1349/5 1395/20
1402/12 1402/16 1405/23
1405/24 1406/4 1406/8
1420/15
DTX-0581 [1] 1318/10
DTX-10 [3] 1402/12 1402/16 1420/15
DTX-1148 [8] 1236/1 1236/16 1306/10 1306/24 1307/16
1307/20 1308/25 1317/15
DTX-14 [2] 1274/2 1274/5
DTX-192 [1] 1395/20
DTX-2 [1] 1164/18
DTX-499 [3] 1295/13 1296/1 1296/5
DTX-581 [8] 1238/18 1244/10
1312/25 1313/4 1313/9
1318/22 1318/24 1349/5
DTX-8 [1] 1256/5
DTX-9-54 [1] 1405/23

due [2] 1305/15 1329/13 duly [3] 1145/21 1287/23 1383/14
duration [1] 1303/17
during [17] 1150/10 1211/19 1225/16 1253/1 1257/1 1277/5 1279/25 1280/7 1339/14 1349/6 1358/24 1364/10 1373/2 1373/3 1373/4 1398/14 1426/14 dynamically [4] 1395/1 1400/2 1405/7 1405/21

## E

E-A-R-L [1] 1383/9
E-D-W-A-R-D [1] 1145/18
e-mail [19] 1160/9 1160/9
1160/10 1162/5 1165/21
1168/8 1169/1 1169/5
1170/12 1186/17 1186/18
1186/24 1186/25 1187/4
1187/6 1270/18 1271/2
1271/3 1416/19
e-mailer [1] 1187/5
e-mailers [1] 1187/4
e-mails [1] 1292/12
e.g [1] 1165/23
each [30] 1134/19 1153/19
1174/7 1177/11 1207/4
1207/12 1207/15 1208/7
1216/3 1226/10 1254/19
1254/25 1295/5 1297/12
1301/8 1330/20 1346/7
1349/15 1350/6 1351/21
1352/19 1379/17 1380/7
1405/18 1405/19 1427/18
1429/10 1434/16 1441/21 1448/5
Earl [5] 1225/25 1382/23
1383/9 1383/13 1383/23
earlier [29] 1142/23 1163/14
1166/7 1173/22 1184/9
1185/21 1189/4 1196/2
1213/17 1249/7 1250/3
1273/19 1274/14 1284/24
1305/5 1329/18 1331/7
1331/10 1346/10 1377/24
1379/5 1412/5 1414/19
1424/21 1425/4 1435/5
1436/11 1440/18 1441/6
earliest [3] 1435/15 1435/24
1436/14
early [4] 1137/23 1174/6 1188/5 1448/25
earns [2] 1377/18 1377/21
ease [2] 1212/2 1408/11
easier [2] 1406/25 1460/18
easy [6] 1153/17 1189/23
1277/20 1356/16 1379/5
1419/18
echoing [1] 1215/13
economic [2] 1296/10
1296/18
Edge [1] 1156/18
edit [2] 1271/9 1274/22
editable [12] 1184/22 1270/24
1270/25 1271/2 1273/4
1273/11 1388/22 1391/14
edited [2] 1270/21 1271/21 editing [24] 1152/19 1153/3 1157/5 1159/15 1160/16 1171/24 1172/1 1172/3 1172/20 1172/22 1173/2 1186/11 1186/11 1213/24 1214/9 1214/12 1214/20 1215/2 1270/14 1270/16 1270/20 1271/19 1416/10 1416/19
editor [5] 1161/6 1398/19 1417/7 1417/10 1417/12 editorial [1] 1148/9 edits [3] 1178/11 1271/4 1435/4
educational [2] 1146/17 1289/4
Edward [5] 1145/14 1145/18 1145/18 1145/20 1146/9 effect [4] 1301/25 1303/17 1303/20 1304/3
effective [3] 1372/7 1458/10 1458/11
effectively [2] 1300/4 1354/23
efficiently [1] 1169/17
effort [4] 1278/15 1377/16
1377/20 1401/2
efforts [1] 1385/20
eight [10] 1137/7 1153/16
1153/21 1158/18 1185/8
1220/15 1220/16 1221/2
1255/4 1320/19
either [14] 1175/19 1200/15
1207/18 1234/9 1280/12
1280/14 1285/22 1394/5
1399/20 1402/3 1436/16
1436/19 1451/23 1459/9
Elbouchikhi [6] 1311/23
1311/23 1322/8 1398/24
1423/20 1435/25
elected [1] 1148/10
elective [1] 1146/25
electro [3] 1146/24 1146/25 1147/10
electro-engineering [3] 1146/24 1146/25 1147/10 electronically [1] 1178/9 element [15] 1178/14 1179/4 1179/6 1180/15 1180/16 1183/24 1183/25 1184/4 1184/10 1196/8 1390/1 1425/6 1425/8 1442/5 1442/5 elements [52] 1151/16 1153/11 1153/12 1153/22 1155/20 1158/14 1158/18 1160/1 1160/20 1161/11 1161/14 1163/22 1163/25
1166/4 1167/14 1169/20
1170/16 1170/20 1170/24 1170/25 1171/5 1171/11 1177/7 1177/12 1178/15 1180/24 1185/3 1188/14 1188/17 1188/17 1190/1 1190/16 1190/18 1190/19 1190/20 1195/7 1210/7 1387/22 1387/23 1388/4 1388/7 1388/12 1388/13 1413/11 1424/17 1425/13

ELLIS [1] 1130/9
ELS [1] 1206/1
else [11] 1180/10 1189/20 1198/9 1252/18 1328/23 1334/1 1335/17 1345/24 1436/8 1440/19 1440/19 elsewhere [1] 1158/6 email [1] 1168/20 emphasized [1] 1196/8 emphasizing [1] 1341/15 employed [1] 1232/9 employee [2] 1308/4 1385/19 employees [2] 1458/4 1465/15
empowered [1] 1282/3 enabled [8] 1138/19 1140/8 1142/24 1249/14 1293/2 1310/21 1310/25 1312/6 encourage [1] 1162/25 end [11] 1226/9 1298/17 1316/5 1355/14 1356/3 1382/18 1389/2 1390/18 1401/4 1419/10 1447/18 ending [1] 1238/18 engaged [2] 1443/15 1445/3 engagements [1] 1379/18 engine [5] 1203/16 1205/19 1205/23 1205/24 1206/17 engineer [2] 1261/4 1312/3 engineering [3] 1146/24 1146/25 1147/10 engineers [1] 1201/17 engines [1] 1147/20
enormously [1] 1260/13 enough [3] 1157/11 1285/17 1443/6
enters [4] 1145/5 1253/20 1287/8 1377/5
entire [10] 1167/22 1211/19 1219/1 1219/5 1222/25 1304/2 1308/12 1311/3 1311/3 1340/17 entirely [2] 1248/18 1340/22 entirety [5] 1218/3 1349/19 1381/23 1412/17 1417/18 entities [2] 1134/18 1167/24 entitled [2] 1193/6 1445/19 entity [1] 1264/13
entrepreneurial [1] 1385/9
entries [1] 1309/8
entry [4] 1169/2 1170/1 1183/1 1206/17
envelope [1] 1168/24
environment [1] 1424/1
Environment's [1] 1414/6
Eolas [1] 1205/20
equals [2] 1135/16 1135/20 equate [1] 1298/8 equivalent [1] 1305/22 erase [1] 1308/19 error [10] 1302/20 1323/9 1324/19 1326/24 1330/5 1331/23 1333/16 1355/19 1439/18 1445/6 errors [10] 1310/9 1310/13 1312/11 1312/13 1324/9 1324/13 1326/8 1340/14 1340/18 1340/21


Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH extended [2] 1134/17 1291/7 extends [1] 1457/17 extension [1] 1459/20 extensive [3] 1143/3 1355/25 1437/5
extensively [2] 1259/9 1260/5 extent [15] 1198/13 1202/18 1241/12 1291/9 1298/23 1300/16 1307/9 1372/24 1431/5 1436/18 1451/5 1452/4 1453/17 1456/1 1468/16
extra [3] 1158/10 1174/21 1180/20
extrinsic [5] 1430/4 1432/4 1432/22 1432/23 1433/12 eyes [1] 1132/25

## F

F-O-X [1] 1145/19
F.3d [1] 1449/10
F.4th [1] 1443/25
F.4th 1274 [1] 1443/25 face [11] 1221/3 1221/14 1254/20 1255/24 1256/23 1264/16 1264/16 1317/15 1374/23 1379/3 1400/21 faced [1] 1337/7 facility [2] 1419/7 1419/18 fact [31] 1139/3 1244/23 1245/3 1248/11 1257/17 1261/24 1271/16 1273/24 1279/17 1279/19 1315/24 1318/1 1327/20 1335/9 1338/6 1358/6 1364/5 1379/9 1409/18 1414/9 1417/2 1418/5 1419/17 1420/1
1420/11 1432/16 1436/23
1437/11 1437/20 1437/25 1438/1
factor [5] 1174/11 1174/14 1194/21 1293/24 1293/25 factoring [1] 1189/12 factors [6] 1293/20 1293/23 1294/9 1297/6 1305/2 1450/1 facts [1] 1339/8 factual [2] 1233/18 1339/5 factually [2] 1460/9 1460/14 faculty [1] 1148/4 fail [2] 1334/7 1340/11 failed [4] 1334/8 1334/11 1337/25 1429/9 fails [1] 1399/7 failure [1] 1302/19 fair [26] 1246/6 1249/25 1261/5 1286/3 1310/8 1316/13 1316/15 1336/14 1343/9 1350/11 1351/15 1352/11 1353/16 1356/11 1356/13 1356/15 1356/16 1358/16 1363/21 1370/13 1373/12 1374/10 1378/12 1379/12 1392/18 1426/12 fairly [1] 1203/10 fairness [1] 1357/25 fall [2] 1154/7 1324/10 false [2] 1372/8 1460/9 familiar [6] 1151/11 1220/3 1262/11 1295/8 1319/18
 family [1] 1292/17 far [14] 1148/20 1219/23 1258/22 1265/5 1278/7
1279/19 1280/3 1291/8 1291/8 1311/10 1322/24 1343/25 1421/6 1440/17 fashion [1] 1422/17
faster [1] 1406/25
father [1] 1147/22
favor [3] 1430/1 1436/19 1451/13
favored [1] 1451/25
FCBA [2] 1444/21 1445/11
FCE [3] 1198/5 1262/2
1272/11
FCHR1 [1] 1433/14
feature [8] 1311/25 1348/15 1371/3 1408/5 1408/9 1418/10 1420/1 1453/10 features [6] 1154/8 1154/10 1174/3 1395/7 1419/1 1449/21
federal [8] 1285/7 1376/25
1442/10 1443/24 1448/1
1448/20 1448/24 1449/22
fee [2] 1457/25 1459/14
feel [6] 1268/17 1301/19
1348/7 1368/22 1420/10 1423/23
feels [1] 1139/17
fellow [1] 1149/4
felt [1] 1195/14
few [20] 1134/15 1152/9
1162/21 1167/15 1176/16
1191/25 1206/3 1209/14
1220/25 1227/6 1247/3
1363/16 1380/1 1380/13
1386/1 1394/22 1412/4
1416/11 1418/2 1420/22
fewer [1] 1302/5
field [9] 1147/8 1147/19 1149/6 1156/7 1187/19
1222/7 1232/19 1258/2 1260/2
fifth [3] 1131/8 1152/1 1292/8 figure [17] 1157/11 1158/24 1158/24 1221/21 1244/17 1270/18 1271/23 1277/17
1288/25 1346/9 1346/20
1358/11 1364/14 1370/9
1371/5 1400/24 1465/25
Figure 3 [2] 1158/24 1270/18 figured [1] 1169/14
figures [9] 1156/12 1291/22 1309/14 1311/18 1331/5 1349/14 1350/14 1350/17 1370/3
figuring [2] 1211/8 1241/1 file [31] 1150/3 1164/2 1164/14 1164/15 1187/17 1217/24 1218/2 1218/4 1218/5 1218/6 1218/7 1218/10 1218/18 1219/1 1219/5 1219/6 1219/15 1219/18 1219/19 1220/20 1220/22 1221/5 1221/7 1221/13 1221/15 1221/18 1222/24 1224/9 1254/6

1164/1 1218/7 1226/22
1435/4 1440/18 1441/2
1441/12 1451/4 1464/17 1464/18
filing [5] 1148/18 1412/5 1434/3 1434/7 1447/8 filings [3] 1367/17 1374/11 1377/17
fill [1] 1187/19
filled [2] 1185/11 1270/3 final [2] 1340/23 1455/18
financial [4] 1149/10 1292/10
1362/18 1374/18
financials [1] 1292/11
financing [1] 1260/15
find [28] 1151/20 1151/25
1179/17 1179/18 1179/19
1179/24 1180/13 1181/9 1204/11 1247/18 1249/13 1251/16 1258/23 1258/25 1259/7 1273/5 1281/14 1324/12 1357/18 1375/11 1403/15 1403/16 1428/21 1442/15 1444/10 1445/6 1452/15 1466/23 finding [11] 1147/20 1162/13 1163/4 1178/16 1252/22 1395/21 1400/23 1406/22 1437/20 1438/1 1444/11 finds [11] 1169/3 1180/16 1216/5 1216/11 1280/15 1280/23 1281/5 1281/11 1281/17 1282/1 1433/16 fine [14] 1144/9 1162/4 1181/8 1221/19 1243/13 1243/15 1316/19 1318/14 1362/22 1382/20 1443/8 1444/24 1447/3 1462/22 finish [5] 1148/3 1225/18 1229/10 1253/17 1275/21
finished [4] 1131/23 1147/12 1147/25 1469/16
finishing [1] 1227/22
Finjan [1] 1449/9
firm [2] 1288/17 1289/16
firms [4] 1203/23 1204/6
1204/6 1409/18
first [141] 1134/12 1135/14
1137/6 1139/16 1139/19 1140/8 1142/23 1145/21 1147/7 1151/5 1151/6 1151/15 1151/20 1152/21 1153/25 1155/25 1157/4 1157/13 1158/8 1159/4 1160/6 1160/13 1160/14 1162/3 1162/22 1166/1 1167/16 1169/14 1170/18 1173/10 1177/13 1178/8 1178/8 1178/10 1178/17 1178/18 1178/19 1179/12 1179/15 1179/17 1179/19 1179/23 1181/15 1183/13 1185/19 1186/13 1186/19 1187/25 1189/4 1191/1 1191/21 1195/12 1196/10 1197/19 1202/12 1203/13 1204/12 1204/17 1205/1 1205/8 1205/9 1205/19
$1245 / 7321217212452$
1270/15 1271/21 1272/2 1272/3 1272/9 1274/22 1287/23 1292/1 1292/16 1294/12 1295/17 1297/8 1297/9 1304/18 1307/22 1309/13 1310/14 1310/18 1311/24 1314/15 1318/20 1319/6 1319/13 1319/24 1325/8 1328/20 1330/11 1330/25 1339/5 1347/20 1351/11 1354/17 1354/18 1364/16 1371/6 1380/14 1380/18 1383/14 1384/6 1385/1 1385/15 1386/3 1388/6 1388/7 1388/22 1388/23 1393/6 1394/23 1395/11 1395/25 1399/7 1402/23 1420/11 1421/8 1423/5 1424/10 1424/19 1433/7 1434/3 1435/16 1435/24 1436/15 1439/22 1440/2 1441/2 1441/13 1451/3 1451/16 1452/14 1456/22 1457/11 1458/11 1463/9
fit [2] 1173/24 1212/22 five [11] 1132/17 1133/25 1154/15 1168/11 1206/13 1276/18 1277/21 1330/10 1330/12 1330/14 1428/4 five minutes [2] 1132/17 1133/25
five-minute [1] 1428/4 fix [2] 1438/14 1439/8 fixed [1] 1447/22 flagged [2] 1228/9 1365/4 flash [2] 1167/20 1168/3 flatten [1] 1262/8 flavor [2] 1385/3 1386/2 flight [1] 1163/10
floor [1] 1388/3
floppy [1] 1259/16
focus [7] 1139/10 1139/12 1206/7 1344/13 1345/6 1347/6 1409/7
focused [8] 1284/14 1284/22
1298/18 1356/6 1358/22
1359/8 1359/25 1411/24
focusing [3] 1199/20 1341/16 1353/11
folks [5] 1336/6 1403/8 1408/20 1428/1 1469/16 follow [11] 1158/2 1194/6 1200/13 1210/10 1216/10 1354/21 1369/7 1380/13 1425/16 1441/19 1448/24 follow-up [5] 1194/6 1200/13 1369/7 1380/13 1425/16 followed [2] 1210/12 1305/9 following [27] 1183/3 1189/12 1192/17 1196/21 1218/23 1290/21 1307/6 1314/2 1326/21 1334/15 1337/14 1342/21 1348/17 1348/19 1361/20 1367/5 1369/3 1372/1 1372/14 1397/1 1400/3 1411/8 1411/9 1425/1 1446/18 1446/22 1464/16


Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH go... [43] 1357/17 1357/25 1358/6 1358/7 1359/17 1359/18 1360/5 1369/1 1377/16 1379/17 1384/17 1386/13 1388/10 1389/2 1389/4 1395/15 1402/12 1402/21 1402/22 1404/25 1405/8 1406/15 1427/3 1427/10 1429/18 1434/22 1438/4 1441/7 1441/9 1442/14 1449/24 1455/14 1460/19 1460/23 1462/1 1462/6 1463/9 1464/7 1464/11 1466/1 1467/18 1468/5 1469/14 GODFREY [1] 1130/3 goes [13] 1137/1 1158/5 1168/25 1171/19 1176/24 1188/12 1202/18 1208/16 1220/14 1234/20 1326/2 1359/24 1371/15
going [158] 1131/16 1132/25 1133/25 1134/8 1140/4 1140/10 1143/6 1144/2 1144/16 1144/16 1144/17 1144/18 1144/23 1145/10 1147/13 1154/3 1159/2 1159/7 1159/11 1162/13 1174/11 1179/24 1180/8 1183/23 1193/20 1194/2 1194/2 1194/14 1200/10 1218/25 1219/4 1223/21 1224/17 1225/16 1225/23 1227/9 1227/18 1228/14 1228/20 1229/1 1229/6 1230/6 1230/11 1230/14 1230/23 1231/15 1233/4 1233/13 1233/22 1234/5 1234/8 1235/6 1235/7 1237/5 1237/6 1238/4 1240/14 1240/21 1240/22 1241/1 1242/11 1242/13 1242/23 1242/24 1243/11 1245/11 1246/9 1246/10 1247/2 1247/5 1247/9 1247/10 1247/24 1248/25 1249/20 1251/16 1252/12 1255/16 1257/24 1265/21 1277/20 1278/13 1283/20 1291/24 1301/25 1307/1 1315/16 1316/10 1316/21 1316/23 1316/25 1325/15 1329/9 1335/15 1339/6 1339/24 1350/2 1350/12 1352/10 1352/24 1354/14 1354/16 1364/13 1364/15 1366/15 1368/12 1368/16 1368/23 1373/8 1375/15 1379/17 1384/7 1384/8 1384/10 1385/23 1385/24 1394/7 1397/14 1400/4 1400/6 1403/6 1404/11 1412/24 1427/8 1427/9 1431/10 1433/3 1433/18 1435/7 1436/5 1438/4 1439/11 1439/13 1440/8 1440/16 1441/8 1441/16 1441/17 1441/20 1442/5 1442/14 1442/22 1443/2 1443/9
 1445/5 1445/18 1446/19 1448/8 1450/13 1457/4 1458/20 1468/5 Golden [1] 1289/11 gone [9] 1158/23 1159/3 1167/4 1171/1 1184/18 1255/21 1323/10 1340/14 1374/10
good [38] 1131/7 1132/4 1145/7 1146/6 1146/7 1146/9 1147/2 1162/25 1163/2 1176/9 1176/22 1189/1 1201/5 1201/6 1202/7 1230/8 1260/15 1287/2 1287/13 1288/5 1288/6 1291/22 1294/2 1309/18 1313/3 1341/12 1347/23 1350/12 1353/13 1383/21 1383/23 1390/10 1392/21 1393/18 1402/6 1410/4 1410/5 1443/6 GOOG [1] 1309/3
GOOG-something [1] 1309/3 google [233] 1129/7 1134/21 1138/24 1139/7 1145/12 1145/13 1162/2 1196/11 1197/10 1198/9 1200/13 1201/17 1202/13 1202/17 1202/18 1202/22 1203/16 1203/19 1203/21 1203/24 1203/25 1204/2 1204/4 1204/5 1204/6 1204/7 1204/8 1204/10 1204/13 1206/4 1206/7 1206/21 1206/24 1207/2 1207/5 1207/8 1207/10 1207/12 1207/15 1208/7 1208/11 1208/14 1208/24 1213/18 1214/25 1222/21 1227/18 1228/9 1230/23 1238/2 1243/21 1250/21 1253/3 1253/12 1279/12 1284/2 1285/21 1286/8 1286/9 1287/12 1287/14 1290/12 1291/8 1291/12 1292/11 1293/1 1295/1 1295/2 1295/4 1295/11 1295/19 1296/12 1299/4 1299/5 1299/5 1300/24 1300/24 1301/15 1302/4 1303/6 1303/11 1303/13 1303/14 1303/18 1304/17 1304/18 1305/3 1305/19 1305/22 1308/1 1308/4 1309/4 1311/13 1311/17 1312/3 1313/6 1315/22 1318/25 1322/2 1322/20 1330/21 1330/23 1332/4 1333/6 1333/8 1333/10 1333/13 1333/14 1333/23 1337/7 1338/8 1338/21 1338/24 1339/1 1340/1 1342/25 1349/3 1352/15 1356/4 1356/8 1356/11 1356/23 1357/7 1357/8 1357/9 1357/14 1357/18 1357/20 1358/1 1360/13 1362/5 1363/3 1363/12 1363/20 1363/24 1366/12 1366/17 1366/24

1369/12 1369/24 1370/3 1370/3 1370/4 1370/4 1370/6 1370/24 1371/1 1371/2 1371/3 1371/10 1371/13 1374/9 1375/1 1376/4 1376/5 1376/6 1376/6 1376/7 1376/14 1377/14 1377/18 1377/21 1378/2 1378/14 1378/16 1378/24 1378/25 1379/6 1379/9 1379/11 1379/13 1379/25 1380/5 1380/6 1382/12 1382/14 1398/16 1423/9 1423/13 1431/25 1435/19 1436/24 1437/21 1438/10 1438/25 1440/3 1440/11 1440/21 1441/20 1443/13 1443/15 1443/18 1444/13 1445/2 1445/3 1446/19 1446/21 1448/5 1448/17 1449/4 1450/15 1451/3 1451/10 1451/17 1451/19 1457/9 1457/9 1458/15 1458/16 1458/25 1459/5 1462/10 1462/18 1463/13 1463/15 1463/15 1463/16 1463/18 1463/22 1463/22 1463/23 1464/20 1466/12 1467/5 1467/10 1467/20 1468/4 google's [53] 1152/24 1153/2 1175/8 1201/21 1202/13 1213/22 1214/5 1214/8 1214/11 1214/13 1214/18 1214/22 1215/6 1215/10 1215/24 1216/6 1216/11 1216/12 1216/19 1224/12 1230/24 1231/10 1231/12 1254/10 1276/12 1286/16 1293/5 1300/9 1300/10 1300/18 1300/20 1300/22 1355/23 1356/9 1362/18 1369/11 1369/15 1369/18 1377/16 1435/16 1436/14 1436/19 1438/8 1439/25 1443/1 1447/4 1448/15 1448/21 1449/25 1450/4 1461/1 1461/17 1468/10 got [61] 1132/2 1132/14 1132/15 1132/17 1138/4 1144/2 1144/15 1201/8 1204/9 1222/22 1226/14 1228/16 1230/5 1240/24 1245/22 1248/1 1254/9 1256/21 1268/1 1284/12 1286/14 1286/16 1301/10 1301/11 1301/13 1301/15 1302/11 1303/1 1303/8 1303/11 1312/21 1321/9 1322/13 1332/14 1341/23 1343/4 1347/1 1354/21 1355/12 1359/19 1360/13 1361/4 1363/3 1363/8 1363/23 1364/21 1365/24 1366/11 1377/14 1378/23 1385/8 1386/1 1394/22 1409/15 1419/10 1424/16 1429/20 1436/6 1443/1 1451/2 1460/8
srab [1] 1193320 62434 grading [2] 1148/5 1155/3 graduate [4] 1258/5 1258/9 1258/10 1384/18 graduated [1] 1289/6 grandchildren [1] 1146/12 grandfather [1] 1147/6 grant [4] 1198/11 1432/5 1464/23 1464/24 granted [1] 1456/16 graphic [1] 1291/4 graphically [1] 1308/13 graphing [1] 1248/2 great [11] 1136/18 1136/18 1200/19 1244/4 1308/15 1318/18 1397/16 1397/17 1440/23 1445/16 1447/21 greater [1] 1143/2 green [7] 1153/21 1157/17 1157/17 1157/22 1171/11 1188/15 1300/14
Gregory [6] 1157/10 1157/12 1158/8 1178/17 1179/20 1180/12
Gregory's [1] 1158/2
ground [1] 1394/19
grounds [2] 1391/2 1431/19
group [3] 1385/19 1395/3 1395/5
guess [14] 1207/21 1221/10 1224/3 1228/18 1229/6 1239/24 1244/16 1254/21 1263/23 1313/3 1345/19 1348/6 1367/8 1442/7 guide [1] 1182/13 gutter [2] 1282/6 1282/14 guy [1] 1436/7
guys [2] 1402/8 1403/16
H
had [116] 1134/22 1138/13 1140/23 1142/15 1142/19 1142/20 1145/9 1147/4 1147/9 1147/14 1147/18 1154/10 1155/4 1155/5 1155/16 1160/17 1167/4 1184/14 1185/3 1195/12 1200/4 1205/19 1207/8 1223/20 1223/24 1226/13 1232/13 1232/20 1233/15 1236/1 1237/22 1238/7 1238/17 1238/25 1239/2 1239/4 1239/4 1239/9 1239/10 1242/9 1242/12 1242/21 1242/24 1245/18 1248/20 1249/21 1253/5 1255/21 1255/22 1257/1 1259/3 1268/20 1268/24 1269/6 1269/10 1270/2 1275/9 1275/16 1276/15 1276/21 1278/11 1283/25 1284/2 1284/6 1284/10 1285/1 1295/2 1302/24 1303/10 1311/25 1312/20 1314/8 1315/19 1316/16 1319/19 1319/25 1320/12 1320/17 1324/6 1324/11 1324/19 1324/23 1327/9 1334/9 1337/7 1339/16
case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH had... [30] 1347/24 1355/13 1356/20 1357/1 1358/1 1364/8 1365/1 1367/7 1369/6 1372/25 1374/21 1375/20 1377/11 1377/24 1385/22 1386/8 1390/9 1402/1 1410/20 1410/20 1428/15 1435/10 1435/10 1438/5 1444/7 1447/22 1451/9 1451/24 1463/19 1463/23 hadn't [1] 1358/21 half [12] 1218/14 1229/14 1291/11 1300/4 1300/5 1328/13 1328/14 1329/12 1329/13 1331/11 1446/21 1463/17
halfway [1] 1204/12
HALL [1] 1129/19 hand [26] 1133/21 1153/18 1156/2 1156/12 1156/17 1158/23 1158/25 1159/11 1159/16 1160/3 1166/3 1168/7 1169/11 1170/17 1175/1 1182/14 1231/25 1269/9 1269/11 1269/15 1273/1 1273/8 1273/9 1319/7 1341/7 1456/25
handed [3] 1133/5 1136/19 1374/9
handling [2] 1171/23 1272/9 hang [5] 1343/25 1344/7 1344/16 1353/8 1365/16 hanging [1] 1201/7 happen [2] 1242/5 1441/17 happened [5] 1150/15 1197/25 1248/4 1249/18 1329/19
happening [2] 1322/16 1423/23
happens [4] 1150/11 1156/16 1174/4 1282/23
happy [5] 1213/1 1400/10 1413/2 1425/18 1445/10 hard [12] 1163/17 1173/18 1259/15 1259/23 1262/7 1262/9 1273/7 1299/25 1303/21 1321/4 1401/6 1423/4
harder [1] 1168/22 hardware [5] 1278/16 1385/24 1400/11 1453/5 1467/9 harm [1] 1337/10 harmful [1] 1373/6 Harvard [1] 1147/14 has [96] 1136/9 1136/22 1138/17 1138/23 1140/4 1142/11 1142/16 1143/9 1149/3 1149/4 1149/5 1168/16 1171/10 1175/2 1177/22 1181/8 1185/7 1185/8 1186/9 1187/4 1197/5 1202/22 1205/1 1210/8 1222/12 1231/11 1231/17 1233/5 1234/22 1234/23 1236/4 1236/18 1237/11 1237/17 1239/19 1242/16 1245/22 1247/4 1247/9 1247/24 1248/12 1248/18 1252/2 1253/4 1256/4
 1277/3 1290/22 1301/24 1303/1 1304/2 1314/15 1315/20 1318/8 1321/16 1322/12 1325/22 1330/12 1330/15 1332/13 1333/14 1334/20 1335/2 1339/10 1342/14 1342/22 1344/24 1352/10 1357/8 1357/9 1367/11 1367/15 1375/25 1388/14 1390/11 1401/23 1415/1 1434/16 1437/21 1440/11 1441/19 1448/20 1449/7 1451/20 1453/8 1453/14 1454/20 1454/21 1455/15 1465/2 1469/11 hasn't [3] 1387/18 1390/23 1390/23
HASTINGS [1] 1130/11 have [370]
haven't [4] 1277/17 1401/20 1424/18 1462/22
having [18] 1134/11 1145/20 1163/1 1173/14 1176/18 1187/18 1211/8 1212/1 1241/13 1285/1 1287/22 1334/2 1338/4 1338/5 1383/13 1395/15 1395/21 1451/6
he [350]
he's [50] 1139/19 1140/5 1140/10 1140/22 1142/15 1142/15 1142/19 1143/6 1143/16 1143/24 1144/16 1144/16 1144/17 1193/3 1197/3 1197/4 1197/8 1197/9 1232/25 1233/13 1240/15 1245/11 1249/20 1258/13 1258/14 1272/8 1272/17 1272/17 1272/22 1308/4 1316/9 1316/14 1316/24 1320/4 1321/17 1323/3 1323/4 1330/21 1330/23 1330/24 1369/14 1369/17 1370/8 1373/8 1374/7 1386/18 1387/16 1394/22 1397/5 1397/6
headed [1] 1401/6
health [1] 1208/20
hear [37] 1131/16 1139/7 1160/17 1185/20 1191/22 1213/1 1225/12 1226/10 1227/17 1228/19 1234/12 1235/5 1265/13 1265/21 1268/15 1276/13 1277/9 1277/12 1279/9 1279/13 1280/8 1287/3 1315/23 1357/15 1426/14 1427/4 1427/11 1428/15 1435/9 1436/20 1439/21 1440/25 1446/1 1449/3 1450/12 1452/14 1457/23
heard [82] 1140/1 1150/17 1150/21 1153/1 1154/6 1154/16 1154/20 1154/23 1155/17 1155/25 1158/13 1160/7 1160/25 1162/12 1163/24 1166/19 1172/11 1174/19 1175/10 1175/20

1195/7 1195/11 1195/22 1200/6 1214/7 1214/10 1214/15 1214/24 1215/4 1215/11 1215/13 1215/15 1215/15 1215/21 1215/22 1227/5 1228/5 1228/20 1235/7 1243/25 1246/1 1246/2 1257/21 1270/6 1276/16 1277/7 1279/4 1280/7 1283/4 1284/6 1292/9 1294/24 1310/21 1315/20 1322/2 1327/2 1333/20 1349/9 1357/11 1385/16 1387/3 1389/23 1391/9 1391/20 1393/25 1398/3 1407/9 1423/12 1427/21 1437/2 1437/4 1437/7 1437/12 1437/14 1448/14 1461/1
hearing [5] 1188/23 1213/7
1227/17 1269/13 1442/21 Hedloy [19] 1150/18 1164/1 1164/5 1165/25 1170/19 1172/12 1173/9 1195/21 1324/24 1324/24 1325/9 1325/9 1325/14 1325/16 1417/25 1418/6 1418/25 1432/12 1458/15
Hedloy's [1] 1432/23
held [19] 1192/17 1196/21
1198/2 1217/24 1218/17 1218/23 1290/21 1307/6 1314/2 1326/21 1334/15 1337/14 1342/21 1361/20 1367/5 1372/1 1372/14 1397/1 1425/1
help [6] 1169/17 1208/23 1285/10 1360/21 1412/25 1436/5
helped [1] 1148/13
helpful [3] 1199/18 1204/14 1284/20
helps [3] 1176/25 1244/22 1399/8
hemorrhage [1] 1147/8 her [1] 1147/15
here [192] 1134/15 1137/23 1138/1 1138/21 1141/21 1142/2 1144/3 1144/16 1144/25 1150/17 1151/19 1155/8 1155/17 1156/15 1156/20 1157/1 1158/25 1159/11 1160/24 1161/19 1161/21 1161/24 1162/4 1162/17 1162/20 1162/22 1163/9 1164/4 1164/16 1164/17 1164/23 1165/25 1169/2 1170/8 1171/11 1171/19 1172/6 1172/7 1175/11 1176/24 1179/14 1184/2 1185/6 1185/20 1185/23 1186/4 1187/3 1187/14 1187/25 1189/15 1191/10 1192/1 1192/10 1195/6 1195/18 1196/7 1199/16 1201/11 1201/14 1202/9 1202/10 1211/4 1211/5 1211/19 1212/11

1217/6 1218/1 1220/8 1220/10 1220/13 1222/17 1222/22 1230/11 1230/23 1235/9 1236/5 1237/25 1240/13 1240/25 1241/20 1245/22 1248/2 1250/12 1250/12 1251/24 1261/3 1269/14 1283/16 1289/6 1291/4 1292/3 1292/15 1292/17 1292/24 1293/3 1293/7 1293/13 1293/17 1293/24 1294/9 1296/19 1297/8 1298/20 1300/2 1300/3 1301/4 1301/5 1301/6 1304/4 1305/10 1305/12 1305/18 1307/22 1308/9 1308/24 1311/3 1315/2 1316/7 1317/23 1318/21 1319/7 1319/18 1320/4 1321/8 1321/23 1323/14
1324/1 1327/1 1327/15 1328/1 1330/6 1332/1 1335/9 1337/1 1348/12 1348/14 1348/25 1349/14 1354/25 1355/10 1357/13 1358/23 1359/9 1364/2 1367/25 1371/7 1372/4 1381/5 1383/24 1383/25 1388/10 1388/16 1390/12 1390/15 1391/8 1392/25 1396/11 1396/11 1396/13 1398/8 1399/5 1399/6 1403/19 1415/13 1417/9 1433/10 1441/9 1441/14 1441/17 1446/21 1448/4 1448/17 1451/2 1452/11 1460/1 1460/16 1461/12 1461/13 1461/14 1462/2 1462/3 1462/13 1465/7 1466/12 1466/23 1467/8
Here's [6] 1200/10 1237/9 1242/11 1324/2 1360/16 1443/10
hereby [2] 1458/1 1470/4 hey [5] 1208/2 1222/21
1258/25 1273/24 1280/1 high [6] 1151/12 1289/7 1290/25 1322/1 1331/2 1332/14
higher [1] 1328/10 highlight [8] 1162/20 1172/7 1178/18 1242/16 1243/5 1307/10 1308/14 1407/13 highlighted [20] 1157/16 1157/18 1161/22 1162/21 1165/17 1167/19 1168/21 1170/8 1172/2 1179/5 1182/17 1186/13 1186/14 1186/17 1186/19 1237/1 1237/2 1241/21 1420/22 1421/8
highlighting [10] 1157/10 1204/24 1236/21 1237/1 1237/19 1240/24 1242/17 1242/25 1243/3 1243/12 highlights [2] 1165/21 1170/9 highly [1] 1272/17
him [36] 1138/22 1138/25

Catse 1:13-cv-00919-JLH him... [34] 1140/24 1147/24 1154/24 1160/18 1200/18 1229/2 1248/19 1252/13 1255/7 1279/12 1280/11 1314/12 1315/16 1315/24 1335/3 1336/3 1339/1 1339/13 1358/8 1362/1 1362/8 1367/14 1369/10 1370/13 1370/22 1371/18 1372/5 1372/20 1373/14 1373/17 1375/13 1393/19 1410/24 1432/14
himself [2] 1232/23 1314/10 hindsight [2] 1390/12 1390/22 hired [4] 1208/24 1279/16 1279/17 1385/18 his [195] 1132/5 1134/16 1134/22 1135/1 1135/6 1135/16 1136/2 1136/3 1136/8 1136/17 1138/9 1138/16 1138/17 1138/23 1139/17 1139/18 1140/6 1140/6 1140/19 1142/6 1142/14 1143/15 1143/18 1144/12 1144/17 1144/18 1144/19 1144/21 1147/6 1156/13 1157/24 1158/9 1158/9 1158/9 1161/8 1164/1 1166/19 1166/20 1166/21 1168/8 1168/9 1168/17 1169/13 1169/13 1169/14 1193/13 1193/15 1193/20 1193/21 1225/19 1226/2 1231/13 1232/16 1232/19 1233/3 1233/15 1234/18 1236/8 1236/21 1238/9 1238/9 1238/22 1238/23 1242/6 1244/25 1246/25 1247/1 1247/8 1247/15 1248/12 1248/21 1249/12 1249/18 1249/22 1250/16 1250/19 1251/10 1251/12 1251/17 1252/23 1253/5 1253/7 1253/14 1256/6 1257/23 1258/9 1258/10 1258/10 1258/11 1258/14 1258/16 1262/1 1267/1 1270/20 1271/24 1276/15 1276/16 1276/22 1277/5 1277/7 1277/11 1278/7 1279/25 1286/20 1291/14 1291/22 1302/17 1302/23 1302/25 1309/9 1310/10 1310/13 1310/19 1311/1 1311/3 1311/8 1311/12 1311/18 1312/23 1313/11 1314/5 1314/11 1314/13 1314/18 1314/20 1314/25 1315/4 1315/6 1315/6 1316/8 1316/14 1317/1 1318/5 1319/25 1320/6 1321/25 1323/18 1323/19 1323/20 1324/6 1324/14 1324/16 1324/17 1326/1 1327/23 1328/6 1328/10 1328/12 1328/12 1328/14 1330/8 1334/19 1335/6 1338/3 1338/11 1339/14 1339/16 1339/23 1348/18 1348/19
 1354/18 1357/11 1358/7 1361/16 1362/2 1364/7 1370/10 1373/14 1381/4 1382/2 1387/5 1387/14 1387/15 1389/6 1389/10 1392/10 1410/24 1414/24 1415/25 1417/18 1417/25 1418/2 1425/3 1426/14 1428/25 1432/17 1437/8 1444/8 1465/14
history [34] 1150/3 1150/4 1163/2 1163/3 1163/4 1164/2 1164/14 1164/15 1198/3 1217/24 1218/2 1218/4 1218/5 1218/8 1218/10 1218/18 1219/2 1219/5 1219/7 1219/15 1219/18 1219/18 1220/20 1220/23 1221/8 1221/13 1221/15 1221/19 1222/24 1224/9 1254/6 1254/9 1285/1 1386/25
hit [2] 1187/2 1323/10 hmm [1] 1353/23 hold [3] 1165/5 1259/21 1267/9
home [3] 1183/1 1230/17 1413/1
homes [1] 1386/12 honest [2] 1207/11 1209/1 honestly [2] 1359/10 1360/3 Honor [214] 1131/14 1131/17 1132/1 1132/7 1132/13 1132/19 1133/14 1134/1 1134/14 1135/11 1136/7 1136/13 1136/15 1136/16 1136/24 1137/10 1137/24 1138/5 1139/9 1139/21 1142/10 1144/1 1144/5 1145/4 1145/13 1146/2 1149/13 1149/15 1164/24 1192/13 1192/24 1194/9 1196/17 1196/23 1198/8 1199/9 1199/15 1199/18 1200/8 1200/18 1200/23 1201/1 1204/24 1205/5 1205/12 1208/16 1225/8 1226/11 1228/5 1231/3 1231/23 1233/25 1234/15 1235/24 1236/15 1238/1 1238/23 1239/18 1240/7 1241/4 1241/5 1241/18 1243/14 1243/15 1243/19 1244/8 1245/15 1246/8 1247/3 1247/7 1247/16 1247/19 1249/2 1249/8 1250/1 1250/10 1251/2 1251/6 1251/22 1252/6 1252/15 1253/21 1254/3 1283/5 1283/9 1284/22 1285/13 1286/11 1286/12 1286/18 1287/1 1287/5 1287/9 1287/13 1289/22 1290/16 1290/23 1296/1 1306/2 1306/23 1307/13 1313/23 1314/4 1316/1 1317/6 1317/7 1326/16 1331/15 1334/12 1335/7

1344/19 1361/11 1361/24 1362/17 1366/5 1366/25 1367/7 1367/19 1370/15 1372/3 1372/23 1373/21 1375/2 1375/4 1375/18 1377/4 1377/6 1378/18 1382/10 1382/14 1382/16 1382/22 1383/18 1386/15 1386/17 1386/19 1386/20 1396/23 1397/4 1397/24 1399/1 1406/4 1406/5 1406/7 1409/23 1410/1 1425/21 1425/22 1426/18 1426/23 1427/1 1428/7 1428/18 1429/13 1429/19 1429/24 1432/6 1433/7 1433/23 1434/3 1434/22 1435/2 1435/9 1435/11 1436/22 1438/9 1438/20 1439/16 1440/22 1441/4 1441/15 1441/25 1443/7 1443/19 1445/9 1446/2 1446/8 1446/15 1446/16 1447/3 1447/19 1447/20 1447/23 1447/25 1448/10 1448/13 1448/16 1449/2 1449/8 1449/14 1450/3 1450/7 1450/18 1450/22 1450/23 1452/13 1452/15 1452/17 1453/4 1453/16 1456/13 1457/21 1460/3 1460/15 1463/6 1467/3 1467/24 1468/10
Honor's [4] 1204/15 1232/2 1242/20 1373/5
HONORABLE [1] 1129/19 hood [1] 1159/2
hook [2] 1459/16 1459/17 hope [3] 1145/9 1277/20 1426/6
hoped [1] 1408/10
hoping [3] 1308/13 1426/8 1452/3
hour [12] 1131/17 1146/15 1154/17 1209/5 1229/14 1229/17 1279/13 1285/21 1285/21 1286/14 1286/15 1410/13
hour-long [1] 1146/15 hourly [5] 1149/9 1207/13 1207/16 1209/2 1410/11 hours [4] 1229/15 1229/17 1286/16 1427/8
house [2] 1260/7 1301/25 how [115] 1131/16 1137/5 1154/12 1155/7 1166/17 1167/6 1170/20 1171/12 1175/5 1177/6 1181/25 1186/6 1186/8 1188/18 1188/18 1188/18 1191/14 1201/5 1201/6 1201/14 1211/8 1218/11 1219/21 1225/23 1226/2 1226/9 1227/9 1227/10 1228/23 1228/25 1229/21 1231/5 1232/15 1234/5 1235/12 1235/15 1238/5 1240/24 1244/13 1246/5 1261/15

1285/2 1286/23 1294/8 1295/5 1296/23 1297/1 1297/10 1298/9 1298/19 1298/24 1299/11 1299/22 1301/1 1303/5 1303/20 1305/7 1313/15 1317/22 1322/24 1323/22 1323/24 1325/16 1329/17 1330/8 1332/18 1332/22 1341/22 1343/4 1346/2 1346/9 1346/12 1347/5 1348/7 1354/4 1360/6 1363/12 1363/15 1363/20 1368/9 1374/8 1374/17 1377/18 1378/1 1384/23 1387/16 1388/4 1388/14 1391/10 1397/7 1397/9 1397/12 1398/2 1409/8 1411/20 1412/19 1413/7 1413/23 1417/24 1418/3 1422/4 1428/10 1436/5 1436/11 1437/11 1437/23 1438/14 1440/8 1451/2
How's [1] 1242/8
HTML [1] 1177/19
huge [1] 1330/16
huh [1] 1313/3
human [2] 1156/3 1258/2
humans [1] 1299/24
hundreds [4] 1148/14 1329/2 1332/17 1465/15 hunted [1] 1136/10 hyperlinks [1] 1414/11 hypertext [2] 1222/2 1262/11 hypothetical [15] 1141/12 1144/7 1251/13 1252/9 1294/1 1294/3 1304/16 1305/15 1333/22 1333/22 1334/3 1337/23 1338/24 1339/2 1339/7

I'd [18] 1149/13 1193/7 1213/1 1225/11 1228/24 1229/25 1235/24 1266/10 1343/4 1344/21 1351/4 1352/25 1365/14 1386/15 1393/19 1403/24 1446/9 1451/24
I'll [15] 1161/1 1164/4 1165/17 1167/15 1248/25 1291/6 1310/12 1335/14 1353/9 1389/4 1410/18 1410/24 1443/2 1449/23 1469/8
I'm [168] 1141/17 1141/19 1148/6 1149/9 1154/3 1155/3 1174/16 1176/9 1176/16 1176/21 1193/19 1194/1 1194/2 1194/14 1200/10 1201/7 1202/8 1204/11 1204/12 1204/17 1204/23 1205/22 1207/14 1208/4 1208/9 1208/19 1208/20 1208/25 1210/15 1212/5 1213/7 1213/25 1214/2 1215/11 1215/21 1219/6

Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH I'm... [132] 1219/20 1220/20 1221/5 1221/15 1225/15 1229/6 1229/23 1230/14 1239/24 1239/25 1240/21 1240/22 1242/19 1243/22 1245/21 1247/2 1247/17 1247/18 1252/24 1256/9 1259/19 1260/4 1261/23 1261/24 1264/8 1264/19 1265/17 1268/4 1268/10 1271/14 1279/2 1279/5 1281/2 1282/21 1283/15 1283/19 1285/19 1285/20 1288/10 1288/17 1289/14 1298/17 1304/23 1304/23 1305/11 1305/12 1305/13 1305/14 1308/13 1312/25 1318/15 1322/16 1322/18 1324/7 1331/12 1333/12 1335/15 1342/16 1343/20 1343/21 1343/25 1344/7 1344/8 1345/25 1345/25 1346/8 1346/23 1347/23 1348/23 1349/22 1349/25 1350/2 1353/11 1354/21 1355/7 1357/23 1359/17 1364/12 1365/21 1368/23 1371/23 1372/12 1374/22 1378/20 1379/17 1381/20 1383/25 1384/15 1387/15 1389/10 1389/21 1392/6 1395/21 1399/6 1400/20 1400/20 1400/21 1404/20 1407/15 1412/22 1412/22 1412/23 1413/2 1413/2 1414/23 1415/7 1417/9 1417/11 1421/11 1426/8 1426/8 1426/9 1427/9 1433/2 1433/18 1433/24 1439/10 1441/12 1441/16 1441/20 1442/21 1444/10 1444/25 1446/20 1447/13 1448/3 1448/4 1449/1 1452/10 1452/11 1454/25 1460/23 I've [68] 1148/8 1148/12 1148/21 1148/22 1148/25 1153/15 1153/16 1153/19 1155/4 1155/4 1155/5 1155/7 1162/21 1166/4 1170/16 1176/5 1186/12 1186/19 1187/7 1191/18 1195/11 1201/8 1202/15 1202/15 1202/24 1206/6 1206/19 1212/8 1217/7 1220/5 1220/23 1220/24 1221/7 1222/22 1246/2 1249/6 1256/19 1256/21 1260/9 1262/24 1267/21 1267/21 1269/19 1269/19 1269/19 1273/5 1273/15 1288/20 1288/20 1288/25 1300/15 1300/15 1300/16 1300/19 1301/6 1301/6 1305/24 1326/7 1331/1 1331/10 1361/4 1365/24 1385/6 1386/3 1392/16 1402/11 1423/12 1438/3
IAD [2] 1275/23 1276/1 idea [18] 1202/6 1208/25
 1294/2 1294/4 1299/19 1345/21 1390/10 1390/16 1461/21 1462/12 1463/4 1466/10
ideas [2] 1189/19 1238/20 identical [4] 1351/21 1354/9 1354/14 1354/16
identified [18] 1151/22 1151/24 1151/25 1153/19 1162/17 1191/18 1196/7 1256/23 1310/9 1311/4 1315/20 1324/19 1333/16 1334/22 1336/7 1336/8 1340/15 1414/24 identify [2] 1335/1 1388/24 identifying [1] 1401/25
IEEE [1] 1149/2
ignored [2] 1210/13 1467/4 ignoring [2] 1374/18 1392/4 illustrate [1] 1155/22
image [3] 1173/13 1174/18 1175/16
imagine [3] 1228/1 1228/2 1390/22
impact [18] 1170/21 1191/19
1203/16 1205/19 1205/23
1205/24 1206/17 1289/19
1311/11 1317/23 1325/21
1327/22 1329/10 1329/23
1330/16 1332/7 1381/17 1381/25
impacted [2] 1191/15 1378/2 impaneled [1] 1380/22
implement [3] 1159/8 1408/9 1419/19
implemented [5] 1171/23
1337/6 1419/6 1419/14 1422/17
implication [2] 1338/12 1339/9 implied [1] 1434/19
important [19] 1139/18 1152/5 1152/13 1152/22 1184/18
1184/21 1192/3 1192/11 1237/14 1259/24 1301/19 1327/15 1409/12 1444/1 1444/18 1456/20 1458/6 1463/6 1463/7 importantly [1] 1390/12 impose [1] 1412/10 impossible [2] 1257/17 1438/14
improperly [1] 1451/7 improved [1] 1154/8 inability [1] 1198/18 inappropriate [2] 1328/18 1367/20
inch [1] 1410/6
inches [1] 1218/14
inclined [1] 1446/9
include [21] 1181/15 1185/19 1219/7 1221/13 1262/6 1311/16 1327/4 1327/5
1328/19 1342/6 1407/4
1408/13 1435/11 1438/5
1438/10 1439/5 1445/24
1446/11 1450/13 1455/19 1455/21
included [23] 1161/20

1245/1 1246/11 1253/9 1301/23 1316/3 1350/14 1350/17 1371/11 1373/25 1378/5 1414/20 1415/14 1438/19 1438/19 1438/25 1454/22
includes [20] 1161/5 1164/20
1164/21 1236/2 1246/13
1265/11 1319/3 1321/24
1326/12 1375/1 1435/18
1444/2 1453/10 1453/12
1453/13 1453/19 1453/20
1457/16 1467/9 1468/2
including [11] 1148/19 1191/3 1242/10 1273/16 1275/11 1376/5 1453/5 1454/1 1458/3 1458/14 1459/22
inclusion [3] 1327/22 1329/10
inconsistent [6] 1286/6 1392/1
1417/2 1417/8 1417/16
1417/20
incorporate [1] 1412/20
incorporating [1] 1195/18
incorrect [7] 1197/24 1198/7
1198/22 1244/23 1323/17 1324/15 1460/14
increase [1] 1304/10
increment [1] 1401/4
incumbent [1] 1451/19
indeed [3] 1172/4 1192/1
1270/21
independent [5] 1394/1
1394/2 1394/13 1423/1 1466/9
independently [1] 1278/18
indeterminate [1] 1298/14
indicate [3] 1271/15 1271/17 1388/4
indicated [1] 1357/13
indicates [3] 1398/8 1422/16 1457/24
indication [2] 1432/10 1432/21
indirect [1] 1457/7
individual [6] 1308/4 1405/8
1415/20 1415/24 1416/2 1423/1
infer [4] 1245/12 1246/5
1248/8 1248/16
inference [1] 1245/24
inflated [2] 1248/9 1291/23
inflates [1] 1302/23
information [99] 1147/19
1147/23 1149/6 1149/7 1151/21 1151/22 1151/24 1151/25 1152/1 1152/3 1155/16 1157/4 1157/25 1158/7 1158/8 1158/10 1160/23 1162/13 1163/10 1163/11 1163/11 1163/15 1163/19 1167/12 1168/7 1168/19 1169/3 1169/4 1169/4 1169/6 1169/13 1171/23 1171/25 1172/19 1172/24 1178/16 1178/17 1178/18 1178/19 1178/24 1178/25 1179/16 1179/17

1180/13 1180/14 1180/17 1180/18 1180/20 1180/21 1181/10 1181/10 1181/14 1181/15 1185/18 1185/19 1186/14 1186/19 1187/18 1187/20 1199/6 1200/4 1235/3 1244/18 1259/10 1259/13 1261/7 1261/11 1261/14 1262/9 1263/3 1263/22 1269/17 1271/24 1272/22 1277/3 1305/8 1322/21 1323/12 1360/13 1362/19 1362/25 1363/3 1365/25 1374/19 1377/12 1377/17 1379/6 1388/24 1401/22 1401/23 1401/25 1401/25 1424/22
infringe [3] 1201/25 1305/4 1454/12
infringed [11] 1208/11 1208/22 1208/23 1290/5 1290/11 1304/14 1304/19 1304/24 1340/25 1441/20 1457/9
infringement [47] 1140/8 1141/11 1142/23 1201/12 1201/15 1202/1 1202/4 1202/4 1202/16 1207/18 1208/6 1208/8 1208/12 1214/14 1294/5 1305/13 1309/15 1332/25 1336/5 1351/12 1354/18 1354/19 1380/15 1396/10 1397/6 1397/7 1397/8 1398/5 1423/10 1435/16 1435/25 1436/1 1436/11 1443/12 1443/14 1443/15 1444/11 1445/4 1445/7 1454/6 1454/11 1454/15 1454/18 1457/8 1460/3 1460/5 1460/10
infringer [1] 1293/19 infringes [3] 1213/18 1460/4 1460/11
infringing [28] 1214/25 1295/1 1297/11 1300/6 1311/16 1316/8 1318/6 1321/17 1321/17 1333/17 1334/2 1334/10 1334/21 1334/22 1335/1 1335/3 1335/11 1335/12 1335/20 1336/1 1336/9 1336/22 1337/25 1338/8 1340/12 1360/1 1457/19 1467/12 initial [1] 1385/12 initially [2] 1135/16 1374/21 initiate [1] 1170/13 initiates [1] 1158/3 inNova [20] 1137/14 1292/9 1294/22 1294/23 1294/25 1294/25 1295/2 1295/2 1295/10 1295/18 1295/20 1295/23 1296/2 1296/8 1296/12 1299/1 1300/23 1301/14 1303/10 1408/16 innovation [1] 1148/16 innovative [1] 1409/20 input [19] 1151/21 1151/23

Clase 1:13-cv-00919-JLH input... [17] 1152/17 1156/25 1172/21 1172/25 1175/9 1179/7 1179/8 1179/10 1391/11 1395/12 1395/24 1396/1 1396/3 1396/4 1399/6 1420/8 1420/12 insert [2] 1161/3 1161/7 inserted [7] 1187/7 1241/17 1443/2 1443/3 1443/5 1443/9 1443/17
insertions [1] 1184/8 inside [9] 1152/21 1159/8 1177/23 1196/9 1418/12 1418/13 1418/15 1421/20 1422/2
insist [1] 1412/20
insisting [1] 1134/24 insofar [2] 1208/23 1228/10 inspected [2] 1150/20 1387/4 install [1] 1454/9
installation [4] 1351/19 1352/9 1457/3 1457/12 installations [10] 1232/24 1242/10 1252/25 1347/18 1350/18 1351/1 1353/15 1353/25 1354/24 1357/21 installed [15] 1142/17 1187/4 1232/1 1232/15 1232/22 1276/22 1314/9 1342/1 1435/19 1438/11 1438/25 1455/13 1461/5 1461/16 1469/1
installs [4] 1319/13 1348/14 1355/22 1359/24
instance [1] 1440/2
instances [3] 1199/20 1379/24 1418/2
instantiation [2] 1154/9 1269/7
instead [7] 1172/23 1175/23 1311/17 1325/4 1330/14 1338/13 1349/2
institute [3] 1146/20 1385/7 1385/8
institution [1] 1260/17 instruct [5] 1389/18 1441/18 1442/4 1445/1 1445/5 instructed [10] 1138/8 1138/11 1138/18 1140/14 1144/7 1144/9 1227/9 1227/10 1249/14 1451/17 instruction [20] 1193/8 1193/8 1197/15 1198/16 1226/16 1227/15 1437/2 1443/5 1444/8 1444/16 1444/19 1444/22 1444/23 1445/12 1445/14 1449/18 1450/14 1451/19 1451/23 1468/6 instructions [61] 1152/8 1152/17 1152/20 1153/2 1175/9 1178/3 1182/12 1196/12 1209/13 1209/23 1210/24 1212/12 1212/17 1212/23 1213/4 1213/5 1213/10 1213/10 1213/23 1214/8 1214/11 1214/19 1215/1 1226/14 1227/4 1227/8 1227/21 1228/8 1228/22 1229/22 1229/25
 1285/7 1418/11 1422/2 1422/7 1422/12 1423/17 1427/4 1427/11 1427/21 1428/3 1430/8 1433/20 1435/8 1435/13 1440/24 1442/9 1442/17 1451/20 1452/1 1465/5 1465/11
1465/18 1466/15 1468/20 insufficient [2] 1428/21 1429/11
insulated [1] 1459/3
integrate [1] 1405/6
integrated [8] 1402/24 1403/2
1403/5 1403/17 1404/10
1414/22 1421/13 1423/17
integrates [1] 1172/5
integrating [2] 1395/2 1400/2
integration [10] 1165/20
1395/15 1402/24 1403/1
1405/9 1405/21 1421/12
1421/20 1422/24 1432/19 intellectual [2] 1288/19 1289/23
Intellibutton [1] 1159/9
Intelligence [2] 1385/10 1385/16
intend [3] 1131/23 1235/15
1371/18
intended [6] 1258/16 1388/3
1407/23 1432/11 1463/16 1465/13
intending [4] 1232/25 1240/19 1371/7 1465/25
intent [7] 1432/8 1432/17
1432/24 1464/13 1464/13
1466/16 1466/18
intention [4] 1464/6 1465/1
1466/7 1466/24
intentional [3] 1443/15 1444/2 1445/4
interacted [1] 1386/10 interaction [1] 1156/4 interactions [1] 1258/2 interactive [1] 1386/5 interest [3] 1149/10 1164/9 1379/17
interested [2] 1239/12 1407/15
interesting [4] 1163/5 1164/21 1164/22 1226/9
interface [1] 1407/2
internal [2] 1299/5 1362/5
Internet [3] 1147/6 1147/7
1174/8
interpret [2] 1158/13 1388/14 interpretation [6] 1279/20
1422/8 1422/10 1424/19 1452/5 1452/7
interpreted [1] 1451/13 interrogatory [3] 1315/3
1315/19 1315/20
intertwined [1] 1358/18
intervening [1] 1449/2
interviewed [2] 1150/24 1155/5
interviews [1] 1269/19
intricate [1] 1387/21
introduce [5] 1133/15 1133/18
introducing [1] 1335/4 introduction [1] 1402/22 invalid [12] 1151/4 1152/11 1153/8 1190/25 1207/23 1216/7 1216/13 1216/15 1216/15 1216/21 1216/23 1223/8
invalidate [1] 1391/18 invalidity [18] 1190/23 1207/19 1207/22 1217/6 1255/12 1255/19 1255/20 1255/23 1272/6 1278/2 1391/2 1394/20 1397/11 1428/19 1428/22 1430/24 1431/18 1431/20 invented [1] 1386/2 invention [29] 1152/19 1166/14 1192/5 1192/11 1192/12 1194/22 1195/6 1195/6 1195/10 1195/12 1195/14 1195/16 1195/19 1195/20 1284/24 1293/19 1388/21 1390/8 1390/17 1390/19 1390/19 1390/21 1390/24 1419/6 1419/13 1419/19 1445/19 1446/13 1446/14
inventions [2] 1149/22 1443/24
inventor [1] 1154/17
inventors [1] 1147/3 investigate [5] 1259/3 1262/24 1266/11 1266/13 1427/19
involve [1] 1463/14 involved [2] 1149/1 1288/21 involves [1] 1339/7 involving [1] 1385/4 iOS [5] 1319/20 1345/13 1345/18 1346/25 1347/9 IPR [8] 1197/9 1197/12 1197/13 1197/25 1198/14 1200/16 1219/8 1431/4 Ironburg [3] 1443/23 1443/24 1444/5
irrevocably [1] 1458/2
is [1037]
iSchool [1] 1272/22 isn't [11] 1134/25 1210/5 1222/23 1224/5 1225/15 1321/10 1323/9 1381/11 1390/13 1394/2 1405/14 isolate [1] 1348/8
isolated [1] 1353/22
isolation [1] 1466/4
issue [59] 1133/15 1136/4
1137/8 1139/11 1139/13
1144/6 1153/19 1196/6 1200/13 1219/19 1229/21 1234/2 1235/14 1235/17 1236/24 1237/6 1248/21 1249/12 1250/3 1250/22 1251/23 1301/1 1301/3 1339/21 1343/2 1343/7 1347/7 1351/15 1352/1 1352/17 1355/1 1367/16 1370/6 1370/16 1371/14 1373/7 1373/22 1428/20
$1431 / 4.1433 / 31433 / 1938$
1437/3 1437/9 1437/11 1437/25 1439/24 1440/15 1442/24 1451/2 1451/21 1452/2 1460/13 1462/5 1462/24 1462/25 1463/24 issued [16] 1139/5 1148/19 1150/7 1155/12 1167/9 1197/21 1199/25 1217/16 1218/7 1238/12 1248/14 1257/5 1324/2 1358/22 1367/15 1387/9 issues [19] 1139/15 1139/16 1141/21 1198/14 1202/1 1212/18 1213/15 1226/17 1226/20 1226/21 1227/2 1227/8 1228/8 1235/13 1252/22 1358/20 1411/24 1435/7 1450/20 it [645] it's [278] 1135/7 1135/12 1135/20 1135/20 1135/25 1137/17 1137/20 1140/18 1143/16 1143/17 1143/18 1148/25 1155/13 1156/5 1156/6 1157/1 1157/11 1162/21 1163/17 1167/10 1169/9 1169/10 1172/6 1172/8 1173/6 1173/6 1173/18 1175/23 1175/24 1175/24 1175/25 1176/10 1176/22 1178/7 1178/19 1178/21 1179/9 1179/10 1179/16 1179/18 1179/21 1180/10 1180/12 1184/20 1186/7 1187/6 1188/19 1189/23 1190/17 1192/3 1192/5 1192/11 1193/22 1199/18 1200/1 1201/9 1203/6 1205/9 1206/14 1206/25 1212/13 1212/14 1214/25 1218/5 1218/7 1218/13 1218/14 1218/15 1220/8 1220/19 1222/4 1222/22 1224/2 1227/22 1229/8 1231/3 1231/4 1231/6 1232/7 1234/19 1234/21 1234/22 1236/20 1236/21 1237/5 1237/14 1237/24 1239/13 1240/23 1242/25 1245/25 1246/4 1246/5 1248/10 1250/16 1251/11 1255/12 1256/6 1256/14 1256/15 1258/14 1260/13 1260/18 1260/24 1261/20 1261/21 1262/4 1262/7 1262/9 1262/12 1262/14 1263/24 1264/12 1264/19 1265/11 1265/19 1266/16 1270/5 1270/24 1272/23 1273/7 1273/8 1283/1 1289/1 1289/6 1290/13 1291/2 1292/20 1292/25 1293/3 1293/11 1294/11 1295/2 1295/3 1296/4 1296/9
1296/13 1296/20 1297/14
1297/19 1299/16 1299/25 1301/21 1301/21 1303/21 1304/3 1305/4

|  | Jocument 605-3 Filed <br> J.C.R [1] 1147/5 <br> James [4] 1150/18 1150/21 1407/6 1407/9 January [2] 1348/5 1351/13 January 1st [1] 1348/5 jargon [1] 1295/3 jargoning [1] 1297/9 Java [4] 1396/15 1396/18 1398/6 1422/18 JENKINS [1] 1129/23 JENNIFER [1] 1129/19 $\operatorname{Jim}[7]$ 1166/19 1168/7 1168/8 1168/17 1191/3 1279/1 1407/10 <br> Jim Manzi [2] 1168/8 1168/17 Jim Manzi's [1] 1168/7 JLH [1] 1129/6 JMOL [1] 1431/11 job [8] 1147/14 1202/7 1258/6 1260/15 1279/17 1279/18 1294/2 1385/25 <br> JOHN [2] 1130/3 1201/7 join [3] 1147/14 1289/15 1407/11 <br> joined [3] 1149/5 1398/23 1423/21 <br> joint [2] 1226/16 1430/8 joist [1] 1147/16 Journal [3] 1167/18 1167/23 1168/13 <br> Judge [3] 1129/19 1431/21 1444/6 <br> judged [1] 1334/9 <br> judgment [12] 1234/21 <br> 1234/22 1235/14 1248/4 <br> 1248/13 1428/19 1430/5 <br> 1431/22 1432/5 1433/3 <br> 1433/18 1451/8 <br> July [1] 1164/9 <br> July 22 [1] 1164/9 <br> junk [1] 1260/8 <br> juror [1] 1138/2 <br> jurors [1] 1144/25 <br> jury [191] 1129/12 1135/4 <br> 1135/18 1135/19 1137/21 <br> 1145/3 1145/5 1145/7 1146/8 <br> 1146/18 1148/2 1149/24 <br> 1151/12 1158/21 1162/10 <br> 1162/17 1164/15 1165/5 <br> 1169/19 1173/13 1174/18 <br> 1175/16 1176/20 1177/8 <br> 1183/20 1187/14 1189/15 <br> 1190/3 1190/22 1193/3 <br> 1193/8 1194/2 1194/3 <br> 1194/13 1195/4 1201/23 <br> 1202/3 1202/6 1216/5 <br> 1216/11 1216/18 1216/19 <br> 1217/2 1224/18 1224/21 <br> 1224/23 1226/13 1227/4 <br> 1227/8 1227/9 1227/10 <br> 1228/8 1228/22 1229/22 <br> 1229/25 1230/1 1230/8 <br> 1230/12 1230/16 1230/17 <br> 1233/19 1234/3 1234/11 <br> 1234/13 1235/2 1235/18 <br> 1236/14 1237/12 1237/15 <br> 1240/5 1244/18 1245/23 <br> 1246/5 1252/19 1253/1 <br> 1253/19 1253/20 1253/21 | $1255(2230 / 4128 / 23$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH
Kidder... [99] 1131/13 1131/19 1131/20 1131/25 1132/3 1132/11 1133/2 1134/16 1134/22 1135/16 1135/25 1136/20 1136/21 1137/1 1137/12 1138/16 1139/9 1139/12 1139/15 1140/4 1141/22 1142/6 1144/1 1225/6 1228/25 1232/8 1232/13 1239/3 1239/10 1239/11 1239/20 1239/21 1244/11 1245/2 1246/23 1247/2 1247/8 1248/5 1249/4 1250/15 1251/24 1253/5 1287/14 1287/20 1287/22 1288/5 1288/8 1289/16 1289/22 1290/3 1290/10 1290/25 1291/24 1292/14 1293/5 1296/7 1299/8 1300/8 1301/1 1301/19 1305/1 1306/10 1307/22 1314/5 1314/15 1314/20 1314/22 1316/6 1317/13 1322/2 1323/12 1326/24 1331/23 1333/16 1336/20 1337/24 1341/12 1343/2 1343/19 1345/5 1345/9 1348/20 1350/12 1353/17 1354/20 1356/8 1358/16 1362/24 1365/19 1372/3 1373/3 1376/3 1377/11 1380/13 1382/5 1382/9 1436/3 1437/5 1437/22
Kidder 2022 [1] 1247/2 Kidder's [13] 1138/7 1141/23 1141/23 1142/12 1225/20 1229/12 1229/14 1247/14 1250/13 1253/13 1286/19 1316/22 1331/16 kind [54] 1144/3 1158/12 1159/3 1159/14 1160/22 1167/12 1167/16 1168/6 1174/8 1175/18 1176/15 1180/1 1190/4 1193/4 1197/14 1198/11 1211/21 1213/13 1215/13 1215/16 1226/13 1258/15 1260/15 1260/16 1261/2 1262/10 1283/4 1289/1 1292/13 1298/13 1319/17 1386/5 1386/24 1388/17 1388/18 1388/21 1391/16 1393/19 1395/4 1395/14 1400/4 1400/17 1401/24 1404/4 1405/4 1405/10 1406/21 1406/23 1406/25 1412/18 1418/22 1422/23 1424/11 1429/9
kinds [11] 1154/18 1162/6 1178/22 1178/23 1260/8 1264/12 1278/22 1335/24 1400/14 1400/18 1401/1 King [1] 1129/17 knew [5] 1142/12 1222/7 1439/2 1443/13 1445/2 knock [2] 1176/11 1176/17 know [129] 1134/24 1140/16 1141/17 1150/14 1185/8
 1223/17 1223/22 1223/23 1224/3 1225/22 1225/22 1226/2 1226/15 1228/23 1228/25 1231/6 1231/21 1232/6 1232/8 1234/3 1235/15 1236/6 1236/15 1237/16 1244/9 1244/12 1244/18 1246/6 1246/13 1247/19 1254/15 1258/22 1259/21 1262/19 1266/19 1271/3 1275/20 1276/24 1277/1 1278/6 1280/3 1285/2 1285/5 1285/16 1290/13 1291/5 1296/23 1298/5 1298/22 1298/24 1299/11 1301/21 1301/22 1302/12 1310/12 1313/15 1316/25 1318/13 1319/6 1322/9 1322/11 1325/23 1328/24 1329/3 1332/23 1333/4 1337/4 1346/12 1346/24 1349/16 1349/24 1351/10 1354/2 1357/13 1358/7 1358/14 1362/6 1364/10 1364/12 1364/13 1364/23 1368/9 1369/14 1370/7 1370/11 1370/16 1374/8 1374/17 1378/10 1379/16 1381/22 1388/21 1389/3 1390/9 1408/7 1410/8 1411/20 1415/10 1418/13 1418/14 1431/4 1437/9 1438/15 1438/23 1439/5 1439/13 1442/3 1442/13 1442/15 1448/20 1448/23 1453/10 1454/3 1454/14 1458/20 1460/13 1462/25 1464/8 1464/22 1468/6 knowledge [4] 1434/6 1444/14 1444/20 1445/7 known [13] 1151/17 1153/11 1160/17 1173/22 1304/14 1402/25 1403/3 1419/7 1420/1 1421/13 1445/24 1446/4 1446/12 knows [4] 1157/12 1371/11 1413/23 1414/2

## L

lab [1] 1260/7
labeled [4] 1153/16 1344/2 1359/23 1360/21 labels [1] 1238/18 lack [5] 1232/15 1232/21 1233/14 1407/18 1425/8 ladies [10] 1145/7 1194/13 1224/18 1224/24 1283/14 1287/10 1336/17 1340/7 1368/15 1427/2
LAHAD [4] 1130/3 1201/7 1322/23 1323/3 laid [1] 1342/11 language [16] 1285/9 1333/2 1385/13 1412/21 1413/3 1413/4 1413/12 1418/19 1418/23 1421/17 1442/5 1443/16 1463/6 1465/3

1275/18 1276/13 1277/15 1277/16 1277/23 1278/13 1278/17
large [4] 1154/25 1166/12 1255/4 1261/25
larger [4] 1355/18 1367/20 1367/22 1376/17 last [70] 1134/2 1134/20 1148/3 1153/1 1154/6 1157/13 1160/7 1160/25 1165/2 1166/13 1166/19 1173/7 1176/1 1180/2 1186/4 1195/18 1206/23 1206/25 1211/2 1214/7 1214/10 1214/15 1214/24 1215/4 1215/11 1215/13 1215/15 1215/15 1216/24 1226/14 1226/16 1227/6 1233/9 1240/10 1240/11 1251/5 1268/15 1270/7 1275/12 1276/16 1277/13 1284/12 1311/8 1311/19 1316/17 1318/4 1330/7 1333/16 1335/15 1336/18 1337/1 1337/22 1339/24 1340/8 1352/23 1357/12 1363/16 1375/8 1387/2 1391/10 1391/20 1396/9 1398/3 1404/25 1405/23 1407/9 1423/21 1424/9 1426/8 1448/14
lasted [1] 1303/11 late [6] 1226/16 1278/2 1380/16 1410/9 1441/8 1442/9
later [17] 1145/2 1159/13 1176/6 1191/23 1206/14 1249/18 1276/10 1291/7 1311/14 1337/6 1392/11 1411/20 1429/16 1437/15 1439/6 1463/25 1468/4 latest [1] 1322/18 latter [1] 1431/12 launch [2] 1311/7 1311/11 law [25] 1193/3 1193/18 1198/22 1203/23 1204/5 1204/6 1227/14 1228/11 1389/19 1428/19 1432/2 1432/6 1437/10 1439/25 1442/11 1448/17 1448/18 1449/2 1463/8 1463/11 1464/1 1465/2 1465/23 1466/10 1468/8 lawsuit [2] 1463/18 1463/22 lawsuits [1] 1464/18 lawyer [3] 1193/2 1209/9 1389/21
lawyerly [1] 1404/4
lawyers [7] 1207/12 1207/15 1208/14 1222/21 1224/12 1254/10 1276/12
lay [1] 1132/25
layout [1] 1220/3
lead [2] 1183/11 1245/3
leader [1] 1147/22
leaders [1] 1149/6
leading [4] 1147/6 1381/7
lean [1] 1241/19
learn [6] 1159/13 1163/5 1173/19 1188/18 1269/24 1380/18
learned [6] 1155/7 1169/4 1188/13 1270/4 1270/11 1270/13
learning [1] 1386/12
least [17] 1132/4 1152/2 1152/2 1179/15 1179/15 1179/22 1180/18 1193/8 1197/14 1227/25 1235/4 1257/2 1359/25 1370/7 1392/10 1436/13 1467/17 leave [5] 1219/4 1253/16 1300/24 1372/5 1445/6 leaving [1] 1293/11 led [3] 1309/23 1313/7 1327/7 left [21] 1156/11 1156/22 1157/24 1158/23 1159/11 1160/3 1178/13 1182/14 1182/23 1186/9 1231/25 1232/4 1236/11 1256/5 1256/9 1256/22 1260/17 1286/15 1319/7 1326/5 1329/13
left-hand [6] 1158/23 1159/11 1160/3 1182/14 1231/25 1319/7
legal [4] 1193/4 1250/21 1429/16 1439/24
legally [3] 1428/21 1428/23 1429/11
length [4] 1303/5 1303/23 1322/3 1322/6
less [4] 1193/6 1202/23
1269/5 1321/9
let [58] 1133/3 1139/6 1139/24 1141/2 1144/24 1193/10 1199/7 1199/13 1199/22 1200/12 1203/3 1207/21 1211/1 1213/16 1218/21 1219/14 1226/10 1227/17 1228/19 1239/7 1240/2 1240/2 1252/17 1265/23 1272/25 1274/17 1275/15 1278/12 1279/3 1279/5 1307/3 1314/19 1338/10 1338/16 1339/13 1349/24 1361/18 1368/3 1384/9 1389/12 1390/13 1396/7 1402/23 1405/22 1406/13 1417/23 1420/14 1422/14 1431/25 1436/20 1438/3 1444/10 1449/3 1450/24 1454/19 1457/6 1458/19 1463/11
let's [92] 1134/7 1134/10 1138/2 1144/23 1145/1 1145/12 1153/9 1153/25 1166/6 1176/2 1176/8 1182/2 1186/25 1190/21 1203/1 1213/16 1218/17 1229/12 1249/1 1253/17 1253/19 1253/25 1256/3 1261/13 1273/25 1287/6 1291/25 1306/4 1308/23 1312/17

Clase 1:13-cv-00919-JLH let's... [62] 1317/8 1320/23 1326/18 1331/17 1333/19 1335/5 1341/23 1342/13 1342/18 1345/1 1345/10 1347/10 1352/5 1354/11 1355/6 1360/15 1362/22 1365/14 1368/3 1369/1 1375/17 1376/20 1377/2 1377/3 1377/8 1384/23 1391/1 1391/2 1393/21 1394/13 1394/18 1394/22 1394/23 1395/22 1396/7 1397/21 1401/12 1402/12 1404/13 1404/25 1409/1 1409/6 1425/20 1428/2 1428/3 1428/15 1439/21 1440/23 1441/7 1441/10 1442/23 1442/25 1446/21 1450/19 1452/11 1452/14 1452/19 1452/22 1453/23 1455/18 1457/23 1460/1 lets [4] 1156/22 1159/2 1287/12 1418/11 letter [12] 1132/14 1132/15 1160/22 1160/24 1168/22 1168/23 1169/7 1169/15 1184/6 1451/10 1451/10 1451/11
letters [2] 1169/18 1451/12 level [3] 1151/12 1232/18 1290/25
leverage [1] 1304/24 libraries [2] 1259/10 1260/5 license [89] 1134/19 1192/7 1192/24 1192/25 1193/5 1194/15 1227/10 1291/7 1292/9 1294/6 1294/7 1294/25 1295/4 1295/6 1295/18 1296/2 1296/8 1296/11 1296/13 1296/16 1297/19 1297/22 1299/11 1299/13 1299/20 1300/22 1301/8 1301/11 1301/13 1301/15 1302/5 1303/3 1303/4 1303/5 1303/6 1303/11 1303/11 1303/14 1303/15 1303/18 1303/24 1304/21 1327/9 1327/11 1327/12 1327/19 1327/21 1328/15 1328/17 1331/4 1332/2 1332/18 1333/3 1333/25 1334/2 1338/13 1409/15 1429/24 1430/16 1433/3 1433/19 1434/20 1434/20 1440/7 1440/12 1451/3 1451/12 1451/23 1452/12 1454/17 1456/10 1456/14 1456/16 1456/16 1457/17 1457/25 1459/14 1459/14 1459/20 1460/22 1461/22 1462/2 1462/6 1463/4 1464/23 1464/24 1467/9 1469/15 licensed [31] 1296/21 1297/4 1304/9 1327/21 1328/25 1332/7 1452/22 1453/2 1453/21 1454/18 1455/10 1455/16 1455/19 1456/3 1456/6 1456/21 1456/21
 1461/13 1461/13 1461/22 1462/3 1462/8 1462/12 1467/14 1468/2
licensee [9] 1304/22 1332/23 1452/25 1456/17 1458/3 1461/4 1464/22 1464/23 1464/25
licensees [2] 1297/12 1458/2 licenses [26] 1192/4 1192/5 1193/24 1194/4 1194/21 1194/22 1289/1 1292/6 1294/18 1294/19 1296/15 1296/16 1297/1 $1297 / 7$ 1300/16 1301/10 1301/22 1301/23 1303/6 1303/8 1305/18 1305/19 1331/1 1332/17 1333/2 1409/18 licensing [9] 1288/23 1289/24 1295/3 1295/3 1305/21 1409/7 1409/8 1409/8 1461/22
licensor [2] 1456/15 1458/1 Licklider [1] 1147/5 lies [1] 1389/22 life [2] 1273/6 1351/14 light [8] 1151/7 1171/6 1230/14 1409/3 1443/23 1450/5 1466/6 1469/6 like [97] 1133/15 1133/22 1138/2 1149/13 1150/14 1155/3 1156/6 1156/6 1163/1 1164/21 1174/4 1174/10 1176/11 1176/18 1178/22 1183/12 1187/18 1190/8 1197/6 1197/17 1199/15 1199/21 1203/10 1203/13 1210/3 1225/11 1227/5 1228/9 1228/11 1228/17 1229/25 1231/24 1235/2 1235/7 1235/13 1235/24 1250/24 1256/12 1258/25 1259/1 1260/4 1261/2 1261/21 1262/14 1269/18 1273/23 1276/14 1286/8 1289/15 1294/11 1297/19 1314/11 1316/18 1320/13 1321/4 1323/9 1329/3 1334/4 1343/4 1344/21 1346/14 1351/4 1352/25 1358/12 1358/14 1364/13 1364/17 1364/18 1365/14 1366/2 1367/13 1367/16 1370/3 1370/6 1371/2 1375/14 1380/20 1380/21 1382/21 1390/17 1392/8 1396/1 1398/22 1398/23 1400/19 1400/21 1403/17 1410/10 1415/2 1415/9 1418/25 1424/21 1428/11 1446/20 1450/3 1452/5 1463/24 likely [5] 1176/15 1327/17 1386/13 1443/13 1445/2 likewise [4] 1208/6 1357/17 1401/16 1429/5
limine [6] 1367/8 1367/15 1368/12 1369/9 1373/12 1377/1
limitation [1] 1210/4
limited [8] 1234/1 1281/2 1292/11 1369/7 1373/22 1374/13 1375/10 1465/19 limiting [4] 1466/7 1466/9 1466/10 1466/19 line [12] 1138/17 1226/14 1237/21 1238/1 1241/21 1247/24 1345/10 1350/10 1388/10 1388/11 1389/10 1443/17
linear [1] 1303/23
lined [1] 1237/17
LING [1] 1130/16
link [4] 1403/6 1408/21 1408/23 1408/24
linked [3] 1262/9 1398/21 1423/20
Linkify [15] 1334/8 1334/9 1335/10 1335/10 1335/20 1335/20 1336/6 1336/6 1336/7 1336/8 1336/8 1336/21 1336/21 1340/11 1340/12
linking [3] 1398/13 1398/16 1408/25
links [2] 1262/4 1262/6 list [29] 1161/20 1162/18 1162/20 1163/13 1182/16 1186/16 1191/10 1192/1 1203/7 1203/9 1203/12 1222/1 1222/4 1222/4 1222/6 1254/21 1254/25 1256/10 1256/17 1256/18 1292/25 1314/22 1333/4 1340/17 1348/12 1391/16 1414/15 1464/17 1464/20
listed [11] 1143/9 1148/24 1151/19 1154/22 1165/24 1192/10 1195/3 1202/10 1269/14 1293/23 1347/2 Literally [1] 1205/17 litigation [11] 1150/12 1155/18 1172/11 1200/7 1210/23 1291/13 1291/14 1301/2 1325/11 1325/15 1379/20
litigations [2] 1301/3 1301/6 little [31] 1131/17 1146/15 1168/21 1181/12 1224/19 1260/16 1261/3 1261/3 1261/4 1265/22 1286/15 1289/3 1292/9 1294/23 1304/15 1308/17 1323/24 1341/22 1343/21 1346/18 1351/25 1352/22 1360/6 1396/8 1406/24 1422/19 1428/2 1444/19 1452/10 1457/7 1464/1
live [4] 1146/9 1407/13 1407/19 1407/24 LiveDoc [5] 1406/16 1406/19 1406/20 1407/1 1407/4 LiveDoc's [1] 1408/3
LLC [2] 1129/7 1203/21 LLP [2] 1129/23 1130/3 load [1] 1177/18
loaded [5] 1178/5 1422/20 1456/2 1458/21 1458/24
lodge [1] 1444/17
logic [1] 1217/6
long [25] 1131/16 1146/15 1155/1 1162/18 1186/16 1195/14 1197/25 1222/4 1222/4 1226/2 1228/21 1228/23 1229/1 1229/21 1234/25 1235/2 1270/5 1270/5 1277/7 1322/15 1336/12 1369/8 1372/25 1384/23 1464/17 long-felt [1] 1195/14 longer [12] 1219/7 1224/20 1237/6 1257/18 1263/1 1269/1 1308/9 1309/12 1352/10 1364/18 1364/19 1384/25
look [112] 1132/18 1133/10 1136/5 1136/22 1137/3 1137/13 1137/20 1144/7 1153/20 1154/21 1155/14 1155/15 1157/22 1157/25 1159/2 1161/18 1163/17 1164/12 1164/18 1164/22 1165/13 1165/23 1166/2 1167/11 1180/24 1181/8 1182/14 1183/2 1183/6 1184/2 1185/1 1198/4 1198/5 1199/7 1199/13 1200/2 1200/3 1203/1 1230/21 1231/24 1240/14 1244/24 1247/2 1247/3 1247/8 1247/23 1260/7 1264/3 1265/4 1265/6 1265/8 1265/12 1265/12 1268/22 1270/23 1272/11 1273/23 1277/2 1285/6 1285/6 1294/12 1298/14 1308/14 1320/24 1330/25 1335/5 1342/13 1343/16 1347/10 1347/24 1349/21 1350/1 1352/25 1354/11 1355/8 1358/12 1358/14 1359/9 1359/17 1360/15 1360/18 1360/23 1362/2 1365/14 1365/19 1368/23 1370/21 1377/16 1378/1 1389/4 1390/13 1400/21 1407/1 1410/6 1414/23 1415/6 1415/9 1418/3 1448/18 1449/12 1449/23 1450/1 1450/6 1459/5 1460/8 1464/12 1465/24 1466/2 1466/3 1466/3 1468/11 1468/17
looked [59] 1139/15 1153/13 1160/17 1160/21 1163/13 1164/3 1165/12 1167/18 1184/25 1222/3 1222/3 1222/6 1223/19 1223/22 1223/24 1248/5 1249/6 1254/25 1266/12 1269/19 1269/20 1270/17 1275/1 1278/20 1278/21 1278/21 1292/5 1292/6 1297/24 1304/1 1305/17 1341/15 1345/16 1346/21 1347/1 1349/6 1349/10 1349/16

| Clase 1:13-cv-00919-JLH <br> looked... [21] 1349/19 <br> 1352/23 1354/4 1355/11 <br> 1358/23 1359/21 1362/25 <br> 1364/17 1365/5 1369/4 <br> 1370/7 1370/8 1370/12 <br> 1370/14 1374/10 1386/24 <br> 1389/11 1412/2 1417/24 <br> 1418/2 1418/4 <br> looking [64] 1160/2 1161/9 <br> 1162/12 1162/23 1163/10 <br> 1181/6 1199/19 1204/21 <br> 1221/24 1223/6 1235/12 <br> 1247/20 1247/21 1251/24 <br> 1252/24 1261/20 1263/20 <br> 1265/25 1268/21 1296/18 <br> 1298/2 1318/21 1324/7 <br> 1332/15 1337/22 1339/8 <br> 1341/25 1343/6 1347/25 <br> 1348/8 1348/9 1348/23 <br> 1355/10 1355/21 1356/3 <br> 1357/19 1357/20 1358/9 <br> 1358/23 1359/9 1359/11 <br> 1359/20 1361/2 1365/1 <br> 1365/21 1367/17 1374/22 <br> 1381/20 1392/7 1400/13 <br> 1400/17 1400/18 1400/19 <br> 1400/23 1400/25 1401/3 <br> 1401/24 1405/5 1406/24 <br> 1408/20 1413/21 1420/19 <br> 1422/14 1441/12 <br> looks [14] 1155/13 1165/10 <br> 1167/11 1169/1 1200/2 <br> 1203/10 1203/13 1223/17 <br> 1250/6 1256/12 1286/8 <br> 1320/13 1321/4 1366/2 <br> lose [1] 1433/12 <br> losing [3] 1324/25 1324/25 1325/1 <br> loss [1] 1417/9 <br> lost [2] 1212/5 1419/9 <br> lot [37] 1148/18 1148/22 <br> 1150/1 1155/9 1156/14 <br> 1159/21 1161/17 1162/24 <br> 1163/1 1166/13 1173/24 <br> 1174/12 1178/23 1184/17 <br> 1220/19 1228/2 1236/18 <br> 1246/17 1256/8 1258/7 <br> 1272/16 1282/23 1296/15 <br> 1302/13 1304/4 1306/22 <br> 1331/1 1332/10 1391/9 <br> 1392/13 1400/8 1416/1 <br> 1427/6 1439/12 1444/8 <br> 1449/2 1468/7 <br> lots [13] 1155/21 1159/19 <br> 1162/6 1164/22 1171/4 <br> 1173/15 1173/16 1179/2 <br> 1220/5 1261/11 1270/7 <br> 1272/9 1272/13 <br> lotus.com [4] 1168/20 <br> 1168/22 1168/24 1169/12 <br> low [1] 1196/12 <br> lower [3] 1245/5 1246/17 1246/21 <br> Lucent [1] 1449/5 <br> lucky [1] 1176/16 <br> lump [4] 1143/4 1253/5 <br> 1438/13 1438/18 <br> lunch [9] 1225/6 1225/21 <br> 1228/18 1283/15 1283/20 |  <br> lunches [1] 1283/16 <br> M <br> MAC [2] 1276/18 1387/4 machine [7] 1277/2 1372/4 1372/6 1385/10 1385/11 1385/15 1386/11 machines [2] 1278/4 1278/20 macro [5] 1418/10 1418/16 1418/23 1419/7 1419/18 macros [5] 1418/7 1419/14 1426/13 1426/15 1426/17 Macworld [2] 1166/22 1166/23 made [41] 1135/24 1150/20 1174/25 1175/2 1190/19 1191/21 1211/21 1213/8 1217/12 1223/3 1240/9 1255/21 1266/9 1266/23 1267/14 1268/11 1275/2 1279/16 1293/19 1297/8 1297/9 1298/16 1298/24 1309/21 1324/13 1330/12 1331/4 1338/8 1341/14 1347/8 1367/21 1374/21 1410/21 1450/16 1452/24 1457/7 1461/3 1461/5 1461/20 1463/2 1464/9 Magistrate [1] 1129/19 mail [35] 1159/13 1160/3 1160/9 1160/9 1160/10 1160/15 1162/5 1165/21 1168/8 1168/20 1169/1 1169/5 1170/12 1186/17 1186/18 1186/24 1186/25 1187/4 1187/6 1270/18 1270/18 1271/2 1271/3 1391/12 1391/12 1391/12 1391/13 1416/10 1416/15 1416/18 1416/19 1417/2 1417/8 1417/10 1417/12 mailer [1] 1187/5 mailers [1] 1187/4 mails [1] 1292/12 main [4] 1156/21 1159/7 1172/8 1227/8 maintained [2] 1440/13 1451/11 maintenance [7] 1138/10 1138/19 1139/18 1140/12 1144/12 1312/1 1312/22 major [5] 1146/21 1163/3 1310/9 1310/13 1333/16 $\begin{array}{lll}\text { majority [2] } & 1323 / 111323 / 18 \\ \text { make [103] } & 1137 / 22 & 1139 / 19\end{array}$ make [103] 1137/22 1139/19 $1151 / 14$ 1153/7 1153/14 1153/17 1157/3 1158/14 1161/1 1169/11 1172/14 1173/23 1174/13 1178/11 1182/8 1182/10 1183/3 1185/5 1185/6 1187/23 1188/25 1190/10 1190/10 1199/19 1219/9 1225/2 1228/9 1233/4 1233/16 1235/7 1237/3 1239/20 1240/2 1240/19 1241/20 1242/16 1242/18 1243/7 1245/24 1246/23 1251/17 |  <br> 1271/4 1278/12 1278/15 1278/17 1279/18 1281/19 1281/21 1281/25 1282/3 1283/16 1291/13 1297/7 1307/10 1314/19 1328/21 1332/24 1353/13 1356/4 1361/14 1361/25 1362/17 1364/14 1367/14 1375/5 1375/19 1377/16 1377/20 1381/19 1381/24 1387/18 1390/17 1390/20 1401/4 1406/25 1407/21 1408/4 1408/21 1408/21 1412/23 1413/6 1427/6 1428/12 1433/22 1437/23 1438/1 1441/1 1442/6 1444/12 1447/6 1447/9 1451/24 1457/5 1457/16 1462/16 1467/1 1468/6 <br> makes [14] 1151/8 1152/10 1152/11 1159/4 1183/14 1281/21 1320/18 1363/13 1408/6 1442/3 1454/16 1457/1 1457/12 1457/13 making [16] 1157/3 1184/8 1209/12 1212/8 1240/14 1262/7 1267/3 1291/11 1347/8 1400/25 1405/8 1422/23 1423/2 1434/11 1461/17 1461/18 man's [1] 1255/7 manager [4] 1157/23 1157/24 1165/23 1195/25 managing [1] 1288/17 manner [3] 1134/21 1231/11 1291/25 <br> manufactured [2] 1276/5 1276/8 manufacturing [1] 1147/16 many [32] 1137/5 1148/25 1173/20 1174/6 1179/3 1182/9 1202/24 1216/15 1216/15 1216/16 1216/22 1217/5 1218/2 1218/11 1222/6 1222/7 1233/5 1244/13 1255/24 1261/9 1272/3 1277/18 1302/11 1304/22 1318/5 1329/17 1346/12 1376/13 1387/23 1403/9 1421/14 1437/18 manzi [6] 1168/8 1168/17 1168/20 1168/22 1168/24 1169/12 <br> Manzi's [1] 1168/7 $\operatorname{map}[5] 1161 / 241161 / 25$ 1162/2 1162/2 1162/13 MapQuest [1] 1162/1 Maps [3] 1370/4 1371/2 1376/6 <br> March [2] 1327/13 1421/1 mark [5] 1184/3 1184/14 1184/15 1188/17 1268/14 marked [3] 1236/1 1295/13 1360/23 market [3] 1332/13 1386/13 1449/25 <br> Marri [19] 1308/2 1308/3 $1308 / 6$ 1313/17 1313/17 1308/6 1313/17 1313/17 | 113842 <br> 1317/13 1317/22 1318/1 1319/15 1358/6 1364/7 1364/20 1364/25 Marri's [6] 1314/6 1315/7 1317/19 1318/9 1356/20 1365/8 Martin [1] 1296/24 master's [3] 1147/25 1258/13 1289/9 match [5] 1157/9 1231/1 1256/19 1256/20 1351/23 matched [1] 1381/4 material [3] 1132/17 1227/6 1356/2 materials [12] 1154/12 1155/10 1166/17 1167/7 1198/10 1199/24 1201/20 1275/7 1314/23 1315/6 1386/22 1414/11 math [15] 1146/21 1324/8 1324/9 1324/13 1324/17 1327/25 1328/6 1328/10 1329/1 1329/3 1348/18 1348/19 1349/11 1354/22 1364/11 mathematical [1] 1231/7 mathematically [1] 1346/15 mathematics [1] 1174/10 matter [9] 1137/16 1149/11 1213/14 1284/5 1292/11 1303/6 1329/7 1428/19 1447/11 <br> matters [3] 1224/20 1288/19 1465/21 <br> MATTHIAS [1] 1130/13 MAX [1] 1130/4 maximum [1] 1229/3 may [50] 1129/11 1133/8 1134/1 1139/21 1146/2 1194/6 1200/23 1201/1 1205/5 1218/20 1224/19 1225/4 1225/16 1228/5 1254/1 1283/11 1283/12 1285/13 1287/16 1296/16 1317/3 1335/19 1339/25 1341/6 1360/21 1366/25 1370/9 1375/19 1382/8 1382/9 1382/11 1383/18 1385/16 1411/3 1411/4 1412/9 1412/10 1412/12 1426/24 1426/25 1427/23 1428/7 1433/5 1443/19 1443/21 1445/23 1446/11 1447/3 1449/14 1449/16 maybe [9] 1144/19 1218/16 1284/9 1285/9 1306/14 1320/13 1346/7 1346/16 1417/4 me [128] 1133/3 1133/10 1136/12 1139/6 1139/22 1139/24 1141/2 1141/14 1141/19 1141/20 1144/24 1149/3 1149/5 1150/5 1154/14 1164/25 1176/15 1193/10 1199/7 1199/13 1199/22 1203/3 1204/25 1205/4 1207/21 1211/1 1212/16 1213/16 1218/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| Case $\qquad$ <br> Ms.... [4] 1253/19 1290/18 1368/19 1377/3 <br> Ms. Garfinkel [6] 1137/25 1144/24 1253/19 1290/18 1368/19 1377/3 much [39] 1189/4 1189/5 1189/5 1189/7 1190/7 1208/21 1245/5 1246/5 1246/21 1262/12 1265/11 1267/5 1279/3 1283/7 1295/5 1297/11 1298/24 1300/11 1302/14 1303/20 1305/9 1305/14 1323/4 1323/4 1328/10 1334/4 1355/25 1358/17 1358/19 1368/9 1381/19 1382/7 1382/15 1400/15 1410/6 1411/20 1412/13 1426/20 1430/15 muddling [1] 1134/9 multi [2] 1297/21 1395/3 multi-year [2] 1297/21 1395/3 multiple [7] 1144/2 1155/4 1169/21 1174/7 1301/5 1388/24 1390/5 1328/4 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  |  | 1157/15 1158/2 1158/10 <br> 1159/18 1161/22 1162/19 <br> 1164/6 1166/25 1168/4 <br> 1168/9 1168/15 1168/15 <br> 1174/15 1174/16 1174/20 <br> 1175/1 1175/4 1175/17 <br> 1175/18 1175/22 1179/4 <br> 1180/12 1183/25 1188/22 <br> 1192/4 1193/2 1198/6 1206/2 <br> 1231/21 1233/11 1235/6 <br> 1239/7 1240/15 1240/16 <br> 1241/24 1244/10 1244/11 <br> 1245/19 1246/16 1246/17 <br> 1246/20 1246/21 1252/25 <br> 1255/5 1256/1 1264/1 1270/2 <br> 1273/16 1297/25 1297/25 <br> 1298/14 1301/1 1301/2 <br> 1301/9 1302/1 1303/21 <br> 1304/8 1306/21 1307/24 <br> 1308/18 1310/11 1310/14 <br> 1310/16 1310/19 1313/12 <br> 1319/1 1320/1 1320/2 1320/4 <br> 1320/9 1320/11 1320/15 <br> 1321/16 1322/2 1323/17 <br> 1323/19 1325/14 1326/11 <br> 1328/13 1328/24 1330/15 <br> 1340/19 1341/24 1342/13 <br> 1343/5 1343/10 1345/6 <br> 1345/11 1345/15 1345/16 <br> 1345/17 1346/10 1346/14 <br> 1347/2 1347/4 1347/10 <br> 1352/18 1353/24 1354/3 <br> 1354/5 1354/8 1354/14 <br> 1354/24 1355/1 1355/12 <br> 1355/20 1361/25 1364/2 <br> 1364/5 1366/20 1370/1 <br> 1371/8 1372/24 1374/3 <br> 1374/16 1378/8 1380/19 <br> 1385/9 1418/24 1438/13 <br> 1438/21 1439/14 1439/14 <br> 1440/8 1465/22 <br> Number 1 [7] 1174/20 <br> 1175/17 1175/22 1188/22 <br> 1193/2 1198/6 1465/22 <br> Number 10 [1] 1342/13 <br> Number 12/841302 [1] 1164/6 <br> Number 2 [5] 1174/15 <br> 1174/16 1175/1 1175/4 <br> 1175/18 <br> Number 4 [1] 1206/2 <br> Number 7 [1] 1192/4 <br> Number 9 [1] 1341/24 <br> Number C [1] 1179/4 <br> numbered [1] 1191/11 <br> numbers [103] 1137/16 <br> 1137/17 1142/5 1148/24 <br> 1161/19 1179/25 1230/24 <br> 1231/1 1233/19 1234/3 <br> 1235/17 1236/2 1236/12 <br> 1238/7 1238/13 1238/25 <br> 1240/4 1240/5 1240/20 <br> 1242/4 1242/24 1245/22 <br> 1245/23 1246/5 1246/24 <br> 1247/4 1247/9 1248/2 1248/2 <br> 1248/8 1256/19 1256/21 <br> 1261/25 1295/7 1298/19 <br> 1299/24 1300/14 1302/3 <br> 1304/7 1304/8 1304/11 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

CQse 1:13-cv-00919-JLH obvious... [46] 1152/9 1152/10 1175/19 1182/7 1183/14 1184/24 1185/13 1185/16 1187/23 1188/10 1188/19 1190/9 1190/11 1190/19 1191/2 1209/14 1210/1 1210/25 1212/4 1212/6 1212/9 1212/10 1212/13 1212/13 1212/14 1255/21 1267/7 1267/15 1280/17 1394/9 1394/10 1399/17 1399/19 1401/9 1401/11 1401/15 1401/17 1404/21 1404/23 1405/1 1409/2 1409/5 1409/16 1409/17 1445/20 1445/23 obviously [8] 1138/22 1235/20 1250/21 1300/19 1362/1 1428/11 1437/11 1459/13 obviousness [42] 1176/7 1176/18 1182/3 1189/16 1191/7 1191/8 1191/15 1191/18 1213/8 1257/13 1267/7 1267/10 1278/10 1279/6 1279/18 1279/24 1280/5 1280/6 1280/18 1280/24 1281/6 1281/12 1281/18 1281/24 1282/2 1282/8 1282/13 1282/15 1389/7 1389/16 1389/20 1390/4 1390/5 1394/6 1399/12 1409/9 1428/22 1428/24 1429/5 1429/12 1430/25 1434/12
occasionally [1] 1146/11 occurred [3] 1309/17 1339/16 1369/3
occurs [1] 1460/10
October [6] 1136/20 1308/18 1355/22 1355/24 1410/17 1410/25
October 20 [2] 1136/20 1355/22
October 2017 [1] 1308/18 October 2020 [1] 1410/25 off [46] 1134/8 1135/12 1153/21 1158/5 1158/17 1161/10 1166/4 1169/12 1169/21 1170/17 1170/25 1174/12 1179/18 1180/23 1181/7 1183/21 1183/24 1184/16 1185/4 1188/15 1190/19 1192/19 1192/21 1224/14 1232/7 1232/8 1236/25 1257/25 1268/4 1298/16 1309/21 1322/24 1323/4 1324/16 1324/17 1324/18 1329/23 1343/25 1363/13 1363/14 1388/1 1388/10 1388/11 1394/12 1440/7 1441/9
offer [13] 1146/24 1233/1 1233/6 1248/15 1249/20 1316/10 1316/12 1324/3 1386/15 1397/11 1400/24 1406/4 1425/15 offered [15] 1248/7 1251/10 1354/15 1375/20 1380/7 1418/20 1436/23 1436/24
 1461/3
offering [1] 1337/24 offers [2] 1143/4 1165/22 office [53] 1152/16 1153/5 1155/13 1164/2 1164/11 1164/22 1165/16 1166/2 1167/10 1168/23 1169/24 1170/4 1170/6 1170/19 1171/17 1171/20 1172/13 1172/15 1175/5 1197/2 1197/3 1197/4 1197/11 1197/23 1198/4 1198/6 1198/10 1198/19 1199/6 1199/12 1200/2 1214/3
1216/21 1217/13 1217/23 1221/1 1221/6 1221/21 1221/22 1223/1 1223/1 1223/7 1254/13 1255/17 1263/17 1297/20 1298/9 1298/24 1305/21 1328/7 1403/5 1405/18 1418/24 officers [1] 1458/4
Official [1] 1470/8
offset [1] 1437/24
offsets [1] 1440/5
often [2] 1147/5 1202/20 oh [12] 1219/23 1247/1 1271/18 1279/2 1308/14 1344/6 1390/10 1390/13 1398/4 1402/25 1448/3 1448/6
okay [163] 1131/15 1131/18 1131/22 1132/2 1132/8 1132/11 1132/14 1133/20 1133/24 1134/7 1135/2 1135/9 1136/3 1136/12 1136/18 1137/3 1137/9 1137/19 1138/4 1142/7 1164/19 1187/2 1192/22 1193/19 1193/23 1204/9 1205/19 1206/8 1206/17 1207/4 1207/21 1212/1 1213/5 1214/25 1215/9 1215/20 1217/10 1219/4 1219/9 1221/12 1225/10 1226/7 1227/7 1227/16 1228/4 1228/12 1228/16 1230/19 1230/21 1231/5 1231/14 1232/10 1233/8 1240/21 1242/8 1243/2 1243/5 1243/6 1243/13 1249/9 1250/18 1252/11 1252/17 1253/17 1257/1 1259/1 1263/20 1265/8 1267/17 1267/20 1270/10 1270/13 1271/16 1274/14 1274/17 1279/9 1283/10 1283/14 1285/10 1286/17 1286/23 1287/2 1308/15 1318/13 1318/18 1319/7 1320/7 1341/22 1344/1 1344/8 1344/10 1345/1 1345/9 1349/2 1349/14 1350/1 1350/11 1351/18 1352/13 1352/22 1353/22 1354/11 1360/23 1360/25 1361/4 1362/11 1362/24 1363/19 1364/21 1365/14

1375/22 1376/9 1387/24 1387/24 1388/10 1394/22 1396/7 1396/22 1397/3 1399/15 1407/19 1413/19 1413/20 1427/22 1428/1 1429/23 1433/2 1433/17 1435/3 1440/23 1440/25 1442/25 1443/1 1443/7 1443/10 1444/4 1445/16 1445/18 1446/4 1446/9 1446/15 1446/17 1447/15 1448/7 1450/12 1450/24 1452/21 1453/7 1453/23 1455/17 1455/17 1456/7 1456/11 1457/23 1468/14 1468/23 1469/2
old [3] 1224/5 1260/8 1276/21 older [4] 1208/20 1273/6 1308/10 1415/7
OLSON [1] 1130/16 once [3] 1208/9 1232/4 1259/3
one [228] 1136/9 1136/16 1138/2 1138/17 1147/3 1147/7 1148/9 1148/15 1148/16 1148/17 1148/19 1149/3 1152/8 1152/9 1153/19 1155/25 1155/25 1156/12 1156/21 1157/22 1159/20 1160/4 1160/22 1161/25 1162/5 1163/3 1164/4 1164/16 1164/17 1165/10 1165/11 1166/22 1166/23 1171/9 1172/11 1174/12 1174/14 1175/19 1176/11 1177/13 1178/1 1180/8 1182/18 1182/20 1182/20 1183/18 1184/14 1184/21 1185/9 1185/9 1186/17 1187/1 1187/25 1188/1 1188/11 1188/23 1192/8 1192/19 1193/10 1195/24 1196/7 1199/9 1200/16 1205/11 1205/21 1206/18 1208/2 1208/10 1209/14 1209/14 1209/24 1210/24 1211/17 1211/22 1212/7 1212/12 1212/17 1212/21 1216/8 1216/16 1216/17 1216/22 1217/5 1220/13 1221/24 1226/22 1233/6 1239/2 1239/3 1239/9 1241/10 1243/17 1246/16 1248/23 1249/1 1249/2 1250/24 1251/5 1252/12 1255/20 1256/5 1256/18 1256/20 1258/25 1261/7 1265/5 1269/9 1270/13 1272/2 1272/15 1272/23 1273/1 1273/8 1273/9 1274/22 1275/9 1279/6 1279/18 1279/21 1280/6 1282/9 1282/18 1291/9 1294/23 1294/25 1296/12 1296/16 1297/4 1298/8 1298/10 1301/5 1302/12 1310/14 1316/9 1320/14 1320/23 1322/17 1324/7

1348/25 1349/4 1356/7 1359/25 1360/16 1360/21 1362/1 1365/14 1365/22 1366/5 1367/16 1368/4 1370/8 1372/8 1379/12 1379/14 1384/6 1385/10 1388/6 1391/8 1394/12 1395/6 1398/4 1398/10 1398/11 1398/14 1398/22 1399/20 1400/25 1401/23 1402/14 1403/1 1403/4 1403/23 1404/25 1406/1 1406/22 1407/6 1408/22 1409/7 1412/11 1419/3 1419/11 1420/4 1421/12 1421/19 1422/13 1424/17 1424/19 1427/3 1429/18 1429/20 1431/15 1433/14 1436/7 1437/18 1438/7 1439/8 1439/9 1439/11 1439/17 1441/10 1441/11 1443/20 1448/12 1451/25 1456/25 1457/21 1457/23 1460/19 1460/19 1460/20 1460/20 1460/21 1460/23 1460/23 1460/24 1462/2 1462/6 1463/12 1465/7 1466/7 1467/3 1467/17 ones [12] 1133/11 1133/13 1153/22 1155/15 1200/3 1237/19 1293/4 1323/9 1326/14 1409/10 1458/23 1461/6
ongoing [1] 1229/11 only [66] 1139/15 1139/16 1139/18 1139/20 1140/19 1140/21 1141/10 1143/12 1143/14 1143/22 1143/25 1144/8 1159/14 1197/20 1197/21 1231/23 1232/2 1233/3 1236/7 1237/8 1238/25 1240/15 1245/1 1245/1 1245/5 1245/18 1246/11 1246/15 1246/18 1246/19 1250/3 1253/6 1253/9 1266/1 1271/9 1277/7 1292/20 1301/5 1302/14 1312/21 1316/24 1320/7 1333/3 1337/20 1337/21 1358/20 1359/8 1359/21 1380/15 1394/19 1395/25 1425/5 1425/6 1430/17 1431/6 1446/20 1457/8 1461/2 1461/11 1461/12 1461/13 1461/22 1462/4 1462/7 1465/20 1465/21 onwards [2] 1246/18 1246/20 open [6] 1197/12 1197/25 1226/17 1306/2 1335/24 1445/6
opened [2] 1197/8 1198/12 opening [6] 1285/4 1352/25 1353/2 1353/3 1353/7 1353/21
opens [2] 1198/8 1200/15 operated [2] 1154/13 1166/18 operating [40] 1172/23 1173/1 1173/6 1173/8 1314/17

CQse 1:13-cv-00919-JLH operating... [35] 1333/7 1395/13 1396/2 1396/4 1396/5 1396/19 1400/7 1401/3 1420/7 1424/1 1453/9 1453/11 1453/12 1453/19 1454/4 1454/7 1454/8 1454/14 1454/15 1454/21 1455/1 1455/3 1455/6 1455/15 1455/16 1455/21 1456/4 1456/6 1456/9 1458/16 1460/8 1467/4 1467/5 1467/15 1468/3 operative [2] 1284/10 1465/21 opine [3] 1139/1 1213/18 1233/13
opined [4] 1140/21 1143/21
1416/8 1438/17
opines [1] 1136/4
opinion [121] 1139/2 1139/18
1139/20 1140/6 1143/24
1144/17 1144/19 1144/20
1144/21 1149/20 1151/3
1151/13 1152/6 1152/23 1176/3 1182/6 1183/13 1184/24 1187/23 1188/7 1190/12 1190/24 1191/20 1193/4 1196/6 1201/12 1204/3 1207/22 1208/22 1209/1 1209/19 1210/15 1210/17 1232/25 1233/6 1245/11 1245/16 1248/7 1248/15 1248/19 1249/21 1250/22 1251/10 1251/11 1251/18 1251/25 1252/22 1252/23 1253/4 1253/5 1253/7 1253/11 1253/14 1253/14 1269/1 1290/11 1291/14 1291/21 1294/6 1296/7 1296/24 1302/23 1304/5 1305/2 1305/24 1309/10 1314/5 1314/7 1314/8 1314/11 1314/18 1315/4 1316/7 1316/10 1316/12 1316/17 1317/24 1317/25 1323/11 1323/15 1324/4 1335/4 1335/22 1335/25 1336/2 1336/3 1337/17 1337/21 1337/24 1339/6 1340/15 1340/23 1341/19 1381/5 1381/24 1382/3 1384/10 1384/11 1389/8 1389/13 1392/2 1393/15 1394/14 1397/7 1397/8 1397/10 1399/15 1401/8 1401/10 1401/14 1401/16 1404/13 1404/16 1406/2 1409/4 1417/15 1417/20 1420/4 1425/4 1425/16 1427/20 opinions [37] 1138/7 1149/25 1151/2 1154/1 1176/2 1182/2 1190/21 1190/23 1201/18 1207/9 1207/9 1215/12 1278/8 1279/21 1290/7 1291/24 1292/3 1295/24 1303/18 1306/17 1309/9 1309/19 1311/12 1315/23 1316/14 1317/20 1317/23 1323/14 1325/22 1336/13
 1444/8
opportunity [12] 1138/14 1140/23 1141/25 1200/9 1227/5 1228/9 1232/13 1232/20 1233/15 1248/20 1249/21 1253/8
opposed [10] 1252/10
1297/25 1298/3 1311/20
1319/4 1346/25 1398/16
1400/13 1432/21 1435/7
opposing [1] 1204/23
opposite [3] 1245/4 1400/4 1405/16
option [4] 1158/4 1177/15 1337/8 1338/21
options [10] 1157/21 1161/24 1165/22 1179/9 1179/18 1339/18 1400/14 1400/18 1400/24 1440/4
oral [2] 1430/20 1432/22 order [18] 1135/18 1157/14 1171/9 1205/1 1205/4 1205/10 1205/12 1215/9 1238/2 1292/3 1335/4 1385/24 1405/9 1431/22
1441/5 1441/7 1445/18 1454/11
orders [2] 1235/20 1336/13 ordinary [11] 1182/4 1271/7 1273/22 1279/22 1335/25 1374/8 1374/16 1390/8 1399/22 1419/5 1419/16 organized [1] 1153/14 original [4] 1164/20 1198/25 1234/18 1327/21
originally [2] 1238/12 1277/12 other [146] 1133/4 1138/24 1149/4 1151/6 1155/16 1156/19 1159/25 1160/19 1161/13 1167/12 1171/22 1172/18 1174/7 1174/12 1174/24 1175/24 1176/15 1179/19 1179/25 1182/9 1183/5 1184/23 1187/22 1187/24 1188/16 1189/22 1190/18 1191/1 1191/8 1192/10 1195/2 1195/2 1195/12 1195/12 1195/15 1195/17 1200/4 1200/17 1202/20 1206/5 1206/14 1211/23 1212/21 1216/3 1220/8 1222/13 1222/15 1222/24 1223/6 1223/10 1226/12 1228/7 1228/20 1229/4 1229/21 1232/6 1233/2 1233/5 1235/3 1236/12 1240/20 1241/3 1252/5 1259/25 1269/11 1272/24 1273/3 1275/1 1277/11 1278/22 1284/13 1286/21 1289/4 1291/3 1292/12 1296/13 1297/10 1297/12 1301/3 1301/6 1301/23 1302/13 1303/1 1303/7 1303/15 1303/16 1312/11 1316/14 1318/10 1321/25 1322/10 1323/10 1327/11 1334/6 1346/7

1363/15 1365/1 1370/12 1370/14 1371/1 1373/4 1374/18 1375/14 1379/11 1386/9 1387/25 1388/12 1388/12 1400/23 1401/2 1403/24 1405/19 1405/19 1407/1 1407/2 1408/23 1409/11 1409/18 1416/2 1416/21 1426/21 1426/22 1427/19 1429/3 1429/10 1432/5 1436/21 1437/1 1437/7 1442/15 1442/17 1442/18 1449/21 1449/25 1450/20 1452/1 1453/22 1456/11 1462/10 1468/15 others [8] 1162/21 1192/4 1194/21 1206/3 1206/4 1269/10 1387/25 1388/8 otherwise [2] 1441/8 1454/5 ought [2] 1250/25 1315/22 our [39] 1131/8 1134/5 1140/10 1146/11 1153/15 1159/12 1166/9 1166/15 1176/25 1177/1 1177/6 1178/5 1184/22 1199/20 1224/17 1226/2 1228/10 1235/16 1260/14 1283/15 1284/21 1284/23 1316/1 1316/22 1340/18 1350/11 1376/12 1397/7 1397/12 1402/23 1408/4 1429/25 1430/8 1432/7 1434/24 1465/5 1465/10 1468/11 1468/11
out [115] 1137/21 1150/20 1157/11 1158/15 1158/18 1165/25 1167/23 1168/17 1169/14 1174/11 1174/14 1181/25 1184/21 1189/13 1200/16 1202/15 1205/1 1205/10 1205/12 1211/8 1217/7 1221/21 1224/21 1229/4 1230/16 1234/10 1237/17 1237/18 1238/2 1241/1 1241/20 1241/21 1244/2 1244/17 1245/14 1245/25 1246/22 1248/2 1248/25 1249/11 1249/19 1253/4 1253/19 1272/14 1272/15 1274/18 1275/10 1277/17 1283/17 1284/7 1285/22 1286/1 1286/2 1286/6 1286/17 1287/7 1291/2 1295/3 1296/11 1301/20 1305/16 1308/12 1311/4 1311/5 1322/4 1322/12 1325/23 1326/1 1326/1 1326/5 1326/7 1328/11 1328/11 1329/13 1332/10 1333/4 1337/5 1338/4 1338/21 1339/2 1339/18 1340/2 1342/11 1346/9 1346/20 1357/18 1358/11 1358/21 1364/14 1368/8 1369/13 1376/19 1381/22 1384/15 1385/12 1385/15 1385/23 1389/24 1395/6 1395/7 1395/8
$1490 / 14140824.146223$
1436/8 1436/16 1439/3 1439/6 1446/10 1451/15 1465/25 1466/23
out-licensing [1] 1295/3 outcome [2] 1149/10 1289/19 outlier [3] 1328/11 1328/21 1329/6
outliers [1] 1329/4
Outlook [1] 1298/11
outside [4] 1132/22 1178/6 1382/17 1397/5
over [38] 1131/17 1148/12 1148/25 1149/22 1155/1 1196/4 1218/19 1227/19 1233/21 1259/18 1272/12 1275/18 1279/13 1284/9 1286/15 1288/21 1288/21 1289/1 1297/14 1297/19 1297/21 1298/7 1298/24 1304/2 1315/17 1320/16 1321/9 1379/14 1379/25 1380/2 1388/5 1388/5 1391/10 1400/18 1442/8 1445/13 1445/20 1466/5 overall [9] 1170/22 1369/19 1369/25 1373/25 1464/6 1464/13 1464/25 1466/6 1466/23
overinflated [3] 1246/3 1246/4 1246/6
overinflation [1] 1246/9
overlapping [1] 1358/18
overnight [1] 1226/20 overreaching [1] 1175/24 overruled [12] 1198/16 1208/17 1219/12 1231/15 1233/22 1249/24 1252/12 1378/19 1381/8 1392/23 1399/3 1444/5
overstate [1] 1381/5 overstated [7] 1311/2 1311/18 1314/9 1314/16 1316/10 1316/13 1317/2 overstatement [2] 1381/17 1381/25
overview [2] 1151/12 1406/16 owe [1] 1290/12 own [21] 1141/23 1141/23 1144/17 1144/19 1171/3 1210/13 1214/2 1216/6 1224/14 1253/5 1282/12 1288/20 1339/16 1341/18 1349/11 1357/8 1357/9 1362/7 1369/11 1390/25 1427/20
owner's [1] 1444/3
p.m [7] 1253/20 1283/18 1287/8 1368/20 1377/5 1427/25 1469/18 Pacific [5] 1293/20 1294/3 1294/8 1294/10 1297/6 pack [1] 1262/10 package [1] 1319/11 packages [1] 1189/23 page [50] 1133/3 1134/12 1136/5 1162/8 1165/14

Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH page... [45] 1165/15 1165/17 1170/2 1170/2 1170/3 1177/19 1181/8 1183/1 1204/12 1204/16 1204/17 1205/1 1205/8 1205/9 1205/14 1205/23 1206/1 1206/9 1206/10 1206/20 1206/22 1206/23 1206/25 1207/1 1215/5 1217/2 1219/23 1220/14 1237/11 1238/21 1254/21 1262/4 1307/23 1308/23 1308/24 1314/20 1373/16 1376/8 1395/19 1406/10 1407/11 1441/15 1441/16 1447/22 1448/8
Page 111 [2] 1170/2 1170/3 Page 114 [2] 1165/14 1165/15
Page 19 [2] 1441/15 1441/16 Page 28 [1] 1376/8
Page 34 [1] 1447/22
Page 8 [1] 1406/10 pages [22] 1136/22 1164/4 1164/21 1205/9 1206/14 1218/11 1218/15 1218/17 1218/18 1218/19 1219/7 1219/16 1220/15 1220/16 1220/18 1220/19 1221/3 1222/22 1241/23 1255/4 1255/5 1415/1 paid [23] 1207/12 1207/15 1295/2 1295/5 1295/8 1295/10 1299/12 1299/20 1300/4 1303/24 1327/16 1328/6 1328/7 1328/8 1386/9 1409/18 1410/11 1410/13 1459/14 1463/15 1463/16 1463/19
paper [17] 1156/2 1156/10 1156/10 1156/11 1156/13 1158/22 1158/24 1158/24 1223/23 1223/25 1270/16 1274/11 1391/9 1392/9 1392/13 1392/14 1407/6 papers [11] 1256/11 1256/17 1256/18 1256/23 1258/1 1258/3 1395/4 1402/11 1416/3 1416/7 1433/25 paragraph [17] 1140/6 1141/8 1141/9 1142/14 1142/20 1142/21 1193/22 1250/16 1274/2 1335/7 1402/21 1406/12 1407/15 1420/23 1443/11 1453/21 1456/10
Paragraph 147 [1] 1335/7 Paragraph 154 [1] 1250/16 Paragraph 175 [3] 1142/14 1142/20 1142/21
Paragraph 30 [2] 1141/8 1141/9
Paragraph 514 [1] 1193/22 paragraphs [3] 1136/25 1453/22 1456/11
paraphrase [1] 1240/3 pardon [1] 1132/8 parentheses [1] 1183/8 parol [3] 1433/13 1433/15 1433/15

Pr 1166/15 1166/21 1166/21 1172/17 1172/23 1172/25 1173/6 1177/24 1178/8 1178/9 1178/20 1179/7 1179/15 1179/16 1179/22 1180/18 1183/5 1193/24 1198/10 1198/25 1203/13 1213/19 1217/2 1220/22 1221/20 1234/25 1242/22 1257/12 1257/21 1258/10 1258/11 1262/1 1265/16 1266/2 1266/5 1268/15 1272/23 1278/8 1279/24 1295/23 1302/25 1308/18 1309/14 1313/4 1314/23 1314/24 1315/6 1317/20 1323/20 1350/19 1355/18 1376/15 1396/19 1403/5 1414/9 1417/24 1437/16 1451/18 1452/6 1453/11 1454/10 1454/11 1454/15 1455/9 1456/9 1456/9 1456/20 1459/21 1468/22 1469/11
Part B [1] 1178/9 participate [1] 1405/20 participated [1] 1148/13 particular [36] 1140/1 1156/24 1158/5 1159/12 1159/16 1159/17 1160/3 1161/23 1162/8 1164/9 1170/24 1174/23 1176/22 1195/16 1215/14 1216/23 1217/8 1269/5 1269/15 1271/5 1271/6 1284/17 1326/13 1353/18 1375/9 1413/3 1418/19 1421/21 1429/9 1437/20 1440/10 1442/1 1452/18 1465/20 1466/3 1469/11
particularly [5] 1196/1 1244/24 1312/14 1373/7 1444/18
parties [25] 1204/7 1228/8
1285/16 1294/4 1327/16
1432/8 1432/11 1432/25
1434/21 1443/16 1444/7
1445/9 1451/11 1452/4
1452/9 1459/9 1463/14
1464/5 1464/6 1464/13 1465/1 1465/12 1465/25 1466/7 1466/24
parties' [2] 1432/21 1435/5 partly [1] 1303/25 partner [1] 1288/17 partners [1] 1370/25 parts [10] 1153/16 1156/20 1159/7 1159/10 1177/22 1261/10 1266/23 1310/17 1389/11 1396/12 party [7] 1388/18 1424/16 1466/11 1466/11 1466/13 1466/16 1466/21 party's [1] 1438/23 pass [4] 1196/13 1341/3 1380/10 1409/23 passage [1] 1150/8 past [7] 1225/21 1230/8
paste [1] 1388/1 patent [191] 1148/19 1149/21 1150/2 1150/6 1150/10 1150/11 1151/4 1152/11 1152/16 1152/16 1153/5 1153/6 1153/7 1154/11 1155/12 1155/13 1160/21 1164/2 1164/11 1164/13 1164/21 1165/16 1166/2 1167/9 1167/10 1169/9 1169/24 1170/4 1170/6 1170/19 1171/8 1171/9 1171/13 1171/17 1171/20 1172/12 1172/15 1174/21 1175/5 1175/13 1175/14 1184/18 1190/8 1190/25 1192/6 1197/2 1197/3 1197/4 1197/4 1197/11 1197/16 1197/16 1197/21 1197/23 1198/4 1198/6 1198/10 1198/19 1198/25 1199/6 1199/12 1199/25 1200/1 1203/6 1208/3 1208/10 1208/12 1208/22 1209/21 1209/24 1210/4 1214/3 1214/6 1216/7 1216/13 1216/14 1216/20 1216/21 1217/13 1217/15 1217/23 1218/6 1218/11 1219/15 1219/19 1219/20 1219/25 1220/4 1220/7 1221/1 1221/3 1221/6 1221/14 1221/21 1221/22 1222/25 1223/1 1223/7 1223/9 1223/11 1223/13 1223/18 1254/13 1254/20 1255/17 1255/25 1256/24 1257/1 1257/5 1263/16 1264/17 1264/18 1264/23 1265/15 1266/6 1266/14 1266/22 1267/15 1273/23 1289/24 1290/5 1290/10 1292/5 1293/3 1293/15 1295/1 1296/21 1296/21 1296/22 1297/4 1301/5 1301/15 1301/18 1301/23 1302/12 1304/19 1304/19 1305/4 1332/25 1337/9 1338/22 1339/10 1340/24 1351/14 1384/1 1386/11 1386/25 1388/21 1389/4 1389/13 1390/13 1390/15 1391/4 1391/18 1391/19 1393/4 1394/15 1394/17 1399/9 1401/11 1404/6 1409/2 1409/5 1409/19 1409/21 1412/2 1413/5 1419/3 1419/5 1419/11 1419/13 1431/7 1434/19 1441/20 1443/13 1444/3 1444/14 1444/21 1444/22 1445/3 1445/11 1445/19 1445/23 1446/18 1446/22 1447/8 1452/5 1458/8 1458/12 1458/13 1459/4
patent's [5] 1152/7 1152/25 1209/23 1210/6 1223/8 patented [1] 1420/6


1200/2 1207/23 1216/22 1219/17 1220/5 1221/5 1223/15 1288/22 1296/11 1296/13 1296/17 1301/1 1301/3 1301/5 1301/9 1301/11 1301/11 1301/12 1301/13 1301/14 1301/15 1302/1 1302/9 1302/13 1302/15 1302/16 1302/20 1303/2 1303/10 1303/11 1303/13 1303/16 1304/9 1304/23 1386/1 1386/4 1386/7 1387/12 1412/6 1446/10 1456/22 1457/15 1459/11 1464/24 path [1] 1335/23 patience [1] 1253/23 pattern [3] 1387/21 1465/17 1466/15
PAUL [1] 1130/11 pay [7] 1294/13 1304/25 1334/4 1338/5 1338/13 1409/17 1463/20
paying [3] 1332/4 1409/14 1409/15
payment [2] 1143/4 1253/6
payments [2] 1291/10 1331/3
PCs [1] 1297/14
PDX [9] 1239/13 1242/7 1242/9 1354/13 1355/6 1355/10 1380/25 1381/3 1412/11
PDX-4 [1] 1242/7
PDX-4-3-31 [1] 1242/9
PDX-4-37 [1] 1239/13
PDX-5-16 [1] 1412/11
PDX-7-25 [1] 1354/13
PDX-7-3 [2] 1380/25 1381/3 PDX-7-8 [2] 1355/6 1355/10 pending [2] 1368/24 1397/19 people [16] 1156/22 1157/2 1163/2 1166/13 1195/12 1195/13 1258/8 1258/17 1260/1 1289/15 1294/13 1365/1 1386/9 1418/20 1418/25 1419/22
people's [3] 1195/15 1195/17 1264/11
per [14] 1316/22 1328/3 1328/6 1330/4 1330/8 1330/9 1330/10 1330/17 1330/22 1331/11 1331/13 1409/14 1444/16 1445/10
percent [22] 1250/15 1250/19 1299/16 1300/13 1323/8 1329/23 1329/25 1330/24 1330/25 1331/1 1331/5 1331/6 1331/7 1331/9 1331/10 1331/12 1332/9 1332/13 1346/20 1346/24
percentage [9] 1230/25 1231/12 1299/15 1299/19 1300/19 1330/19 1331/2 1346/5 1346/13
percentages [2] 1299/21 1299/23
perform [1] 1412/16

| $1215 / 16$ <br> performing [3] 1152/1 <br> 1180/17 1412/17 <br> perhaps [1] 1239/19 <br> period [18] 1150/14 1154/13 <br> 1155/1 1166/18 1198/1 <br> 1259/19 1291/8 1293/4 <br> 1297/14 1297/19 1309/25 <br> 1311/15 1313/19 1321/10 <br> 1351/14 1352/11 1358/24 <br> 1436/13 <br> periods [2] 1234/2 1310/22 <br> permission [1] 1204/15 <br> permits [1] 1456/17 <br> permitted [1] 1375/21 <br> person [19] 1147/5 1167/25 <br> 1182/4 1264/3 1271/3 1271/7 <br> 1272/17 1273/22 1273/23 <br> 1279/1 1279/22 1375/6 <br> 1390/7 1399/21 1403/22 <br> 1410/5 1419/4 1419/12 <br> 1419/16 <br> personal [3] 1403/9 1403/12 <br> 1421/15 <br> personally [3] 1195/24 1413/7 1414/10 <br> perspective [6] 1163/5 <br> 1194/25 1251/25 1296/20 <br> 1387/18 1408/3 <br> persuasive [1] 1375/11 <br> pertains [1] 1333/6 <br> PETERMAN [1] 1130/12 <br> Petition [1] 1150/9 <br> Ph.D [1] 1258/14 <br> phantom [2] 1269/1 1315/3 <br> phase [2] 1427/3 1427/4 <br> PhD [2] 1147/25 1384/20 <br> phone [17] 1158/2 1158/9 <br> 1168/9 1168/14 1168/15 <br> 1179/25 1180/12 1322/13 <br> 1322/16 1328/8 1328/9 <br> 1333/14 1454/20 1457/14 <br> 1459/21 1459/22 1462/5 <br> phones [19] 1297/14 <br> 1298/6 1327/10 1327/12 <br> 1327/20 1327/20 1332/4 <br> 1332/6 1332/10 1332/13 <br> 1332/14 1333/11 1333/13 <br> 1454/1 1454/2 1455/20 <br> 1467/22 1468/2 <br> photograph [2] 1186/22 1187/15 <br> phrase [1] 1346/9 <br> pick [1] 1162/25 <br> picked [6] 1147/21 1158/10 <br> 1167/23 1168/3 1168/13 <br> 1168/15 <br> picking [2] 1208/4 1208/9 <br> picks [4] 1158/4 1169/3 <br> 1180/11 1180/11 <br> picture [11] 1156/1 1176/25 <br> 1178/13 1181/7 1183/7 <br> 1186/9 1188/22 1261/9 <br> 1266/12 1282/23 1392/8 <br> pictures [6] 1186/5 1186/8 <br> 1282/19 1282/24 1282/25 <br> 1283/1 <br> pie [6] 1232/3 1232/7 1233/12 |  | $13996\}$ <br> 1434/14 1434/14 <br> point [66] 1131/22 1147/18 <br> 1152/5 1152/7 1152/14 <br> 1152/15 1152/22 1156/18 <br> 1165/25 1184/21 1195/18 <br> 1196/10 1196/11 1214/18 <br> 1216/1 1216/24 1224/16 <br> 1230/10 1237/17 1239/21 <br> 1242/1 1246/7 1246/9 <br> 1246/10 1246/22 1250/12 <br> 1256/7 1279/25 1280/7 <br> 1284/2 1301/20 1302/2 <br> 1304/16 1315/2 1316/1 <br> 1316/20 1337/1 1339/22 <br> 1340/20 1341/14 1346/23 <br> 1353/13 1356/5 1361/14 <br> 1375/9 1375/11 1392/9 <br> 1392/12 1392/14 1403/23 <br> 1405/6 1410/21 1413/6 <br> 1414/25 1426/13 1430/2 <br> 1432/1 1432/10 1439/17 <br> 1449/7 1449/17 1456/12 <br> 1460/2 1460/18 1467/1 <br> 1467/17 <br> pointed [12] 1158/15 1181/25 <br> 1182/21 1217/7 1221/17 <br> 1253/4 1255/1 1272/14 <br> 1272/14 1274/20 1420/14 <br> 1432/18 <br> pointer [2] 1262/16 1280/25 <br> pointing [3] 1164/11 1183/2 <br> 1275/10 <br> points [9] 1150/8 1151/14 <br> 1152/12 1153/9 1175/7 <br> 1183/16 1209/11 1262/6 <br> 1373/10 <br> pool [1] 1360/12 <br> pop [3] 1157/20 1168/10 <br> 1186/15 <br> pop-up [2] 1168/10 1186/15 <br> popped [3] 1169/9 1180/19 1358/21 <br> populated [1] 1169/10 <br> portfolio [2] 1296/16 1386/6 <br> portion [15] 1165/2 1170/11 <br> 1194/3 1194/14 1194/17 <br> 1198/2 1275/16 1277/8 <br> 1318/7 1344/17 1346/3 <br> 1348/11 1389/8 1389/9 <br> 1402/19 <br> portions [2] 1396/13 1451/4 <br> position [23] 1213/21 1214/21 <br> 1214/22 1225/14 1226/9 <br> 1226/10 1226/24 1237/25 <br> 1273/14 1315/8 1317/1 <br> 1397/10 1430/5 1431/23 <br> 1433/2 1433/17 1435/21 <br> 1438/8 1439/10 1439/21 <br> 1439/25 1451/24 1459/25 <br> positions [2] 1432/25 1438/4 <br> possibilities [1] 1200/11 <br> possible [15] 1149/22 <br> 1160/10 1263/23 1263/24 <br> 1268/5 1305/14 1435/16 <br> 1435/24 1436/10 1436/14 <br> 1436/15 1436/17 1438/24 <br> 1454/18 1459/11 <br> possibly [4] 1210/11 1250/12 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH presented... [19] 1136/9 1242/2 1242/6 1258/1 1258/3 1280/18 1280/20 1305/8 1318/4 1344/24 1350/6 1387/17 1430/18 1430/18 1431/17 1431/21 1437/10 1438/13 1454/23 presenting [2] 1140/22 1143/16
presently [1] 1362/20
preserve [2] 1227/25 1439/19 preserved [1] 1450/17
preserves [1] 1450/15
preserving [2] 1431/10
1431/13
pressure [1] 1334/3
presumes [1] 1271/10 pretty [13] 1226/24 1302/10
1317/17 1323/3 1323/4
1332/14 1332/21 1337/16
1359/17 1384/8 1393/3
1402/6 1444/6
prevail [1] 1466/5
prevent [3] 1133/1 1367/8 1367/8
previous [3] 1217/10 1434/24 1443/5
previously [4] 1136/23
1292/25 1358/21 1430/1
principal [2] 1152/15 1227/21
principle [6] 1465/22 1466/8
1466/9 1466/10 1466/20 1466/20
principles [2] 1465/7 1466/19 print [3] 1162/4 1162/22 1181/9
prior [68] 1149/23 1150/13
1150/16 1150/16 1151/7
1151/17 1152/17 1153/6
1153/11 1153/25 1154/4
1163/14 1163/23 1163/24
1164/7 1165/8 1170/21
1171/2 1171/7 1182/5 1196/4
1198/3 1198/18 1202/18
1223/3 1223/18 1227/10
1234/3 1234/20 1235/20
1237/8 1240/8 1248/8
1248/17 1249/21 1251/22
1251/23 1269/4 1284/1
1284/5 1284/15 1292/19
1314/11 1335/24 1338/18
1359/13 1377/1 1381/14
1387/1 1387/25 1388/1
1389/23 1389/24 1399/19
1404/5 1431/7 1441/6 1445/8
1445/12 1445/21 1445/21
1445/23 1446/11 1446/18
1446/22 1447/4 1447/12
1458/10
priority [2] 1445/14 1447/5 pro [1] 1439/7
probability [1] 1332/14
probable [1] 1225/7
probably [14] 1224/1 1227/4
1229/9 1229/15 1229/16
1229/17 1260/8 1284/11
1292/7 1323/8 1360/19
1422/13 1440/4 1460/18
problem [3] 1144/22 1298/4

1374/12
procits $2 n+305-31406 / 2$ procedure [2] 1197/4 1197/16 proceed [6] 1148/5 1201/2 1230/14 1253/25 1345/1 1362/22
proceeding [2] 1140/25 1470/6
proceedings [5] 1131/4
1156/10 1197/12 1197/13
1469/18
process [5] 1178/20 1323/7 1323/24 1405/21 1427/7
processing [9] 1169/9 1170/9
1182/19 1182/20 1183/8
1183/9 1184/7 1186/9 1196/9
processor [1] 1189/8
processors [1] 1183/11
produce [4] 1237/3 1237/20 1268/23 1357/2
produced [15] 1235/25 1236/4 1236/6 1236/11 1236/12 1236/20 1237/18 1237/22 1240/11 1292/11 1308/5 1309/4 1352/15 1366/24 1373/2
product [34] 1297/21 1299/14 1305/22 1364/18 1385/12 1385/14 1385/15 1385/22 1395/5 1398/19 1403/13 1405/9 1407/3 1418/3
1436/23 1441/21 1441/22
1442/2 1442/3 1442/8
1442/15 1446/3 1449/21
1452/23 1453/1 1453/2
1453/8 1454/17 1455/19
1456/21 1460/25 1461/13
1462/8 1462/12
production [1] 1278/21
productivity [3] 1403/9 1403/13 1421/15
productized [1] 1275/25 products [37] 1139/11 1139/13 1152/25 1153/2 1195/18 1201/14 1201/21 1201/24 1214/6 1214/8 1214/11 1214/19 1215/1 1253/15 1291/10 1292/15 1297/13 1298/16 1299/5 1299/6 1306/22 1332/24 1342/14 1342/25 1356/1 1385/23 1403/10 1405/18 1409/22 1417/25 1418/24 1421/15 1437/1 1452/22 1461/23 1462/3 1468/2 professional [5] 1148/1 1149/3 1288/9 1288/15 1289/10
professor [2] 1189/1 1289/11 proffer [1] 1375/19
profits [1] 1298/16
program [84] 1146/23 1152/8 1152/19 1152/21 1153/3 1157/5 1158/6 1160/6 1160/13 1160/14 1171/24 1172/1 1172/20 1172/22 1173/2 1174/23 1177/23 1178/8 1178/10 1179/8 1179/12 1180/9 1180/10 1186/10 1186/11 1186/11

1211/22 1211/23 1212/7 1212/12 1212/18 1213/4 1213/6 1213/10 1213/11 1213/12 1213/24 1214/9 1214/12 1214/20 1215/2 1270/14 1270/15 1271/21 1272/2 1274/22 1275/23 1385/1 1388/6 1388/8 1388/23 1395/11 1395/25 1398/12 1398/13 1398/22 1399/7 1400/21 1403/7 1407/20 1415/3 1418/17 1418/20 1418/25 1420/11 1421/21 1422/3 1422/7 1422/12 1423/5 1423/6 1423/21 1423/24 1424/2 1424/11 1424/20 1424/22 1425/9
programmed [1] 1189/22
programming [2] 1189/22
1386/16
programs [21] 1172/4
1178/11 1211/7 1211/17
1212/3 1212/7 1213/3 1213/6 1213/11 1272/3 1272/10 1272/13 1278/16 1395/2 1398/20 1400/2 1405/6 1405/20 1408/21 1408/24 1422/20
project [6] 1392/12 1395/3
1400/12 1400/22 1400/25
1406/20
projects [1] 1148/6
prompt [5] 1181/14 1181/16
1185/18 1187/19 1359/2
prompts [1] 1187/19
proof [2] 1273/2 1433/10
proper [1] 1440/12
properly [1] 1141/11
properties [11] 1294/14
1367/18 1369/12 1370/3
1370/6 1370/24 1371/1
1371/3 1375/1 1376/5 1376/13
property [8] 1255/7 1288/19
1289/23 1294/14 1294/16 1370/24 1371/10 1371/13 proposal [10] 1435/17 1443/1 1449/18 1449/25 1450/8 1450/16 1468/10 1468/11 1468/11 1468/12
proposals [7] 1283/23 1284/1
1284/2 1448/15 1468/7
1468/16 1469/6
propose [3] 1234/1 1235/24 1451/19
proposed [14] 1283/21 1435/4
1435/11 1438/5 1438/9
1443/16 1444/13 1448/22
1450/4 1451/20 1451/22
1452/1 1468/6 1469/10
proposes [1] 1370/21
propounded [1] 1245/6
prorate [1] 1320/17
prorated [3] 1320/5 1348/22
1349/20
prorating [3] 1351/16 1351/18
1354/2
prosecution [7] 1150/4 1150/10 1197/16 1198/3 1198/25 1219/18 1257/2 protected [1] 1396/12 protection [2] 1459/15 1459/19
prototype [4] 1407/23 1407/25 1417/25 1422/17
prototypes [3] 1418/2 1418/7 1423/3
prove [5] 1255/18 1257/8 1272/6 1389/24 1429/1 proven [2] 1390/3 1441/19 provide [7] 1149/20 1169/16 1201/12 1332/22 1333/1 1359/12 1395/14
provided [18] 1201/20 1207/4 1233/9 1238/12 1255/15 1298/21 1313/6 1318/25 1321/23 1323/18 1341/18 1346/11 1356/4 1367/25 1389/6 1396/15 1408/9 1416/14
provides [2] 1179/7 1333/8 providing [8] 1143/24 1151/21 1172/21 1179/9 1181/14 1185/18 1407/2 1427/14 provision [1] 1457/21 provisions [2] 1227/14 1462/10
proxy [1] 1291/22
PTO [8] 1155/10 1155/11 1167/7 1167/9 1199/22 1199/23 1199/25 1254/13 public [12] 1166/12 1166/14 1261/17 1261/17 1261/24 1261/25 1262/1 1298/22 1367/17 1377/16 1434/5 1434/6
publication [12] 1160/17 1161/9 1167/22 1182/24 1259/25 1265/4 1265/4 1270/22 1273/19 1416/4 1421/4 1431/7
publications [42] 1148/22 1154/16 1154/19 1155/14 1161/18 1161/18 1163/15 1163/17 1166/25 1167/11 1182/24 1198/7 1200/2 1220/9 1261/5 1264/16 1264/17 1264/21 1264/22 1264/25 1265/2 1265/9 1265/11 1265/14 1266/1 1266/6 1266/21 1266/25 1267/2 1267/8 1267/10 1267/13 1267/13 1267/22 1269/14 1273/10 1273/18 1273/24 1430/19 1430/23 1431/20 1446/10 publicly [5] 1188/3 1299/3 1377/17 1445/24 1446/12 publish [1] 1344/22
published [3] 1138/10 1140/13 1312/4 pull [7] 1160/9 1273/25 1274/1 1318/16 1341/23 1445/16 1450/24
pulled [1] 1254/12

|  | quanifinelit beitit File <br> 1137/18 1160/8 1160/25 <br> 1183/25 1184/2 1184/14 <br> 1185/21 1188/16 1188/17 <br> 1194/7 1195/24 1198/1 <br> 1199/23 1200/13 1203/11 <br> 1217/11 1219/22 1232/2 <br> 1232/14 1233/18 1235/18 <br> 1237/7 1255/10 1265/13 <br> 1268/5 1268/11 1268/12 <br> 1268/14 1268/16 1274/18 <br> 1274/24 1281/3 1282/22 <br> 1283/25 1285/14 1294/6 <br> 1295/17 1312/15 1312/15 <br> 1319/23 1322/24 1335/16 <br> 1339/25 1340/3 1340/9 <br> 1346/18 1357/5 1358/12 <br> 1358/14 1378/21 1388/22 <br> 1390/7 1392/7 1397/19 <br> 1398/2 1398/4 1399/8 <br> 1400/20 1411/8 1411/10 <br> 1413/16 1419/9 1425/5 <br> 1425/16 1425/19 1428/8 <br> 1435/10 1435/10 1435/15 <br> 1435/17 1435/18 1436/16 <br> 1437/20 1438/6 1438/10 <br> 1438/15 1439/3 1439/25 <br> 1440/13 1440/14 1440/17 <br> 1441/5 1452/18 1458/19 <br> 1469/3 <br> Question 4 [2] 1435/10 1435/15 <br> Question 5 [1] 1435/18 <br> Question 6 [2] 1435/10 1435/17 <br> questioned [1] 1376/3 questioning [4] 1276/12 1280/8 1369/8 1369/22 questions [35] 1197/20 1201/8 1211/16 1232/8 1241/3 1264/12 1277/11 1279/12 1279/13 1282/18 1283/6 1356/19 1359/2 1365/8 1365/10 1365/12 1366/17 1372/17 1380/13 1382/6 1385/13 1388/19 1389/1 1391/16 1412/16 1412/24 1413/10 1413/15 1419/4 1419/11 1424/4 1426/2 1426/18 1429/16 1431/15 <br> quick [7] 1141/5 1291/4 1400/16 1428/7 1429/22 1433/24 1441/2 <br> quickly [4] 1151/18 1167/21 1226/24 1384/8 <br> quite [9] 1214/16 1216/10 1277/7 1322/15 1345/25 1350/8 1356/16 1379/9 1398/13 <br> $\begin{aligned} & \text { quote [3] } \\ & \text { 1262/15 }\end{aligned} 1168 / 17$ 1260/25 <br> quote-unquote [2] 1260/25 1262/15 <br> quoted [3] 1248/12 1421/12 1421/17 <br> quotes [2] 1257/8 1260/23 | Po9/08/23 Page 127 of R. [1] 1407/6 <br> R. Miller [1] 1407/6 raise [5] 1232/14 1232/21 1356/19 1382/17 1431/11 raised [14] 1146/11 1193/16 1232/16 1236/18 1250/15 1250/23 1314/14 1372/25 1373/2 1374/13 1429/6 1429/17 1441/6 1463/24 raising [1] 1430/21 ramp [1] 1323/7 ramp-up [1] 1323/7 ran [2] 1154/24 1174/7 range [2] 1385/6 1386/3 rare [1] 1176/10 rata [1] 1439/7 rate [6] 1207/13 1207/16 1209/2 1209/4 1328/3 1410/13 rather [9] 1234/2 1265/23 1307/1 1341/15 1392/19 1393/9 1415/11 1422/14 1451/7 <br> ratio [1] reach [4] 1149/25 1151/2 <br> 1196/6 $1217 / 8$ <br> reached [2] 1226/13 1445/9 reaction [2] 1144/18 1144/21 read [34] 1139/7 1157/9 1161/1 1162/4 1164/4 1164/19 1165/17 1168/6 1168/22 1170/8 1171/18 1172/17 1222/25 1225/13 1229/22 1229/25 1230/1 1231/16 1263/2 1271/9 1271/9 1271/10 12747 1288/25 1331/1 1357/16 1358/7 1387/9 1392/16 1402/11 1402/23 1403/23 1444/5 1444/8 <br> readable [3] 1177/14 1442/1 1442/3 <br> reader [20] 1159/13 1160/4 1160/15 1270/18 1270/23 1271/1 1271/7 1271/8 1271/10 1271/16 1271/18 1391/12 1391/12 1416/10 1416/15 1416/18 1417/3 1417/8 1417/10 1417/13 readers [1] 1270/19 readily [2] 1419/6 1419/14 reading [9] 1186/23 1263/11 1310/12 1390/22 1391/13 1391/14 1419/5 1419/13 1421/11 <br> reads [1] 1222/2 <br> ready [7] 1132/6 1132/9 1286/17 1337/5 1371/23 1372/12 1427/10 reaffirmed [1] 1191/17 real [2] 1294/11 1401/4 realize [2] 1375/7 1419/17 really [27] 1137/18 1141/24 1142/1 1147/2 1173/18 1176/9 1181/8 1202/8 1227/20 1249/18 1256/14 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1284/25 1293/25 1357/17 | recollection [9] 1195/10 <br> 1238/5 1263/9 1284/17 |



Câse 1:13-cv-00919-JLH represented [2] 1278/19 1348/5
represents [4] 1148/11 1158/25 1232/3 1300/3 request [3] 1198/15 1291/1 1337/7
requested [1] 1366/24 require [3] 1312/20 1405/7 1466/21
required [6] 1152/20 1172/1
1172/20 1172/22 1253/12 1401/2
requirement [7] 1152/8 1185/17 1209/21 1209/23 1210/2 1210/3 1212/12 requires [2] 1210/4 1460/5 rereviewed [1] 1339/13 research [10] 1148/10 1148/11 1258/12 1385/7 1385/7 1400/12 1400/22 1400/25 1406/20 1427/19 resellers [2] 1456/19 1458/6 reserve [5] 1285/17 1286/14 1429/15 1433/3 1433/18 resolve [8] 1226/24 1227/16 1243/22 1244/6 1250/25 1464/14 1464/20 1464/21 resolved [2] 1243/20 1436/18 respect [43] 1135/24 1144/4 1144/6 1181/22 1184/11 1190/12 1226/21 1227/8 1227/12 1234/24 1238/21 1243/20 1249/8 1251/18 1292/22 1306/17 1310/6 1313/8 1314/25 1340/23 1367/20 1367/24 1370/15 1373/5 1389/6 1389/15 1390/5 1392/25 1393/15 1399/15 1407/17 1408/15 1408/19 1429/1 1440/6 1440/11 1449/24 1451/2 1453/25 1462/8 1467/19 1467/23 1468/1 respond [7] 1141/16 1245/18 1253/8 1323/22 1433/5 1447/4 1449/14 responding [6] 1133/2 1143/11 1143/24 1226/19 1226/19 1447/13 response [12] 1185/21
1191/22 1191/23 1206/9
1245/16 1268/9 1282/18 1315/19 1315/20 1338/16 1338/18 1435/18 responsive [1] 1142/12 rest [14] 1216/24 1217/4
1225/23 1297/1 1378/8
1378/11 1396/9 1428/15
1430/22 1442/8 1443/16
1460/16 1468/18 1469/12 restful [1] 1145/9 restriction [1] 1408/11 restroom [1] 1368/17 rests [1] 1382/14 result [11] 1135/20 1135/22 1135/23 1143/2 1186/15 1192/6 1192/7 1193/5 1194/4 1194/16 1209/3
results [2] 1180/8 1387/17
 retained [15] 1202/13 1202/20 reviewed [12] 1155/11 1202/22 1203/19 1203/23 1163/16 1199/24 1233/20 1203/24 1204/1 1206/21 1208/13 1324/3 1356/9 1380/6 1426/3 1426/6 1426/10
retake [1] 1225/18
retaking [1] 1226/4
retention [1] 1202/18
retire [1] 1427/16
retrieval [4] 1147/20 1147/23 1149/6 1149/7
retrieve [2] 1161/24 1414/11 retrieved [1] 1179/6 retrieving [1] 1161/25 returns [1] 1158/7
reveal [1] 1375/16
revenue [100] 1137/1 1137/12 1137/14 1142/16 1231/4 1231/10 1231/11 1293/12 1297/11 1297/16 1297/22 1298/1 1298/2 1298/19 1299/1 1299/6 1300/5 1300/9 1300/10 1300/11 1300/22 1302/3 1304/1 1304/7 1330/21 1330/22 1341/15 1341/25 1342/5 1342/6 1342/7 1342/8 1342/14 1342/25 1343/7 1343/11 1344/14 1345/16 1346/5 1346/20 1346/21 1347/6 1347/11 1348/3 1348/8 1348/20 1349/12 1358/10 1360/7 1360/12 1360/13 1360/15 1361/7 1361/17 1361/25 1362/6 1362/7 1362/25 1363/1 1363/3 1363/17 1363/21 1364/1 1365/6 1365/25 1366/13 1366/15 1366/22 1367/10 1367/12 1367/18 1367/24 1368/1 1369/6 1369/19 1370/2 1370/5 1370/9 1370/12 1370/24 1371/3 1371/4 1371/10 1371/11 1373/15 1374/8 1375/15 1375/15 1376/5 1376/7 1377/12 1377/18 1377/21 1378/1 1378/2 1378/7 1378/16 1378/24 1379/1 1381/23
revenue-based [2] 1137/1 1142/16
revenues [24] 1134/17 1135/12 1135/13 1135/15 1235/4 1293/5 1293/7 1298/14 1298/15 1298/18 1299/4 1299/20 1300/21 1304/1 1309/24 1345/13 1369/25 1373/14 1373/15 1374/17 1378/4 1378/5 1381/20 1381/21 reverse [1] 1184/25 review [18] 1155/10 1193/10 1198/11 1199/23 1219/1 1219/5 1222/5 1222/9 1222/10 1222/19 1254/19 1254/24 1308/6 1309/6

1249/25 1292/2 1292/10 1313/17 1315/17 1369/6 1369/14 1369/17 reviewing [10] 1223/17 1285/23 1286/5 1292/5 1332/17 1363/16 1363/17 1419/3 1419/11 1448/15 revise [1] 1251/2 right [329] 1131/10 1132/2 1132/11 1133/9 1133/20 1133/24 1134/12 1135/8 1136/5 1137/19 1137/20 1137/25 1138/5 1139/6 1144/15 1145/1 1149/16 1152/13 1153/18 1156/2 1156/12 1156/17 1156/25 1157/15 1158/16 1158/25 1159/16 1161/11 1161/25 1164/14 1166/3 1168/7 1169/11 1170/17 1173/11 1174/16 1175/1 1175/12 1177/8 1182/23 1183/5 1185/23 1186/12 1187/3 1195/2 1199/7 1199/13 1200/14 1200/19 1202/19 1203/5 1203/15 1203/19 1204/5 1204/7 1204/10 1205/14 1205/20 1205/24 1206/1 1206/2 1206/4 1206/5 1206/13 1206/18 1206/20 1206/21 1206/24 1207/19 1208/3 1209/2 1209/13 1210/3 1210/18 1210/21 1213/6 1213/18 1213/21 1214/6 1214/9 1214/14 1214/18 1214/21 1214/23 1215/2 1215/5 1215/7 1215/12 1215/13 1215/18 1215/25 1216/5 1216/11 1217/1 1217/11 1217/17 1217/20 1218/4 1220/4 1220/5 1220/6 1220/7 1220/10 1220/12 1220/15 1220/16 1220/17 1221/4 1221/5 1221/22 1221/25 1222/14 1222/17 1222/19 1222/20 1222/22 1223/23 1223/25 1228/14 1229/20 1229/23 1230/11 1230/15 1230/19 1231/14 1233/17 1233/25 1235/22 1239/24 1241/10 1242/14 1242/25 1243/13 1244/5 1247/6 1248/1 1248/23 1250/24 1252/3 1252/5 1252/7 1252/11 1255/16 1256/4 1256/10 1256/17 1257/19 1257/22 1257/24 1258/9 1258/14 1258/16 1259/10 1259/13 1259/24 1260/6 1260/12 1260/23 1261/15 1261/22 1263/18 1263/22 1264/10 1264/20 1265/16 1265/20 1266/14 1267/11 1268/8 1268/12 1268/13 1268/25 1269/15 1271/9

1241/81272/20.1233/204

1276/11 1276/13 1277/15 1277/16 1277/22 1277/23 1277/24 1278/9 1278/25
1278/25 1279/23 1280/5 1280/20 1281/11 1281/24 1282/5 1282/7 1282/11 1282/15 1283/2 1283/17 1283/19 1285/12 1285/19 1286/10 1286/12 1286/13 1287/6 1290/1 1290/18 1298/5 1305/19 1307/3 1311/17 1315/15 1316/16 1321/5 1321/8 1322/18 1326/18 1329/2 1329/5 1330/14 1331/13 1332/3 1335/5 1338/10 1341/12 1341/16 1342/13 1342/24 1343/2 1343/2 1343/8 1343/16 1344/13 1345/3 1349/19 1350/21 1351/4 1351/25 1352/4 1352/22 1353/2 1354/4 1354/9 1355/4 1355/5 1356/5 1356/8 1356/25 1360/4 1360/5 1360/11 1360/15 1362/24 1363/7 1365/2 1366/11 1366/13 1368/3 1368/21 1369/1 1372/12 1376/20 1391/17 1394/12 1397/10 1399/10 1399/13 1406/12 1409/17 1409/21 1410/14 1412/7 1412/8 1413/12 1413/17 1413/18 1414/13 1417/3 1419/8 1421/9 1421/24 1423/7 1423/14 1426/20 1428/6 1429/14 1429/20 1430/15 1431/2 1431/23 1433/17 1435/20 1436/20 1437/14 1438/3
1438/19 1440/15 1442/21 1442/23 1443/4 1443/8 1444/24 1445/8 1447/17 1448/11 1448/14 1449/3 1449/5 1449/12 1449/18 1449/23 1450/19 1450/24 1451/9 1454/4 1455/5 1455/8 1458/23 1459/24 1461/10 1463/10 1466/25 1467/16 1468/15 1469/3 1469/5 right-hand [11] 1153/18 1156/2 1156/12 1156/17 1158/25 1159/16 1166/3 1168/7 1169/11 1170/17 1269/15
rights [5] 1207/2 1444/3
1456/14 1457/17 1464/24
Rinard [7] 1211/3 1211/7
1211/16 1296/24 1336/8 1336/25 1436/2
roadmap [1] 1385/23
ROBERT [1] 1130/12 ROBERTS [1] 1130/13 robotics [1] 1385/11
Rockstar [1] 1206/23 role [3] 1463/15 1463/19 1463/23
roles [1] 1207/20 roll [4] 1322/3 1337/5 1339/18

Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH
roll... [1] 1340/2 rolling [3] 1338/4 1338/21 1339/2 rollout [7] 1249/10 1249/13 1249/17 1252/1 1322/10 1338/19 1339/10 room [2] 1382/24 1427/17 rough [1] 1286/7
roughly [1] 1319/16 rounded [1] 1300/19 rounding [1] 1323/9 row [9] 1308/12 1309/10 1309/13 1319/10 1320/13 1320/25 1321/1 1321/7 1350/19
Row 6 [2] 1309/10 1350/19 royalties [2] 1250/14 1250/20 royalty [21] 1141/16 1230/25 1231/12 1253/9 1293/18 1300/18 1305/3 1326/12 1328/3 1329/14 1330/4 1330/8 1330/9 1330/10 1330/17 1330/19 1330/22 1330/24 1331/3 1332/5 1341/20
rule [10] 1227/25 1240/21 1285/24 1370/19 1376/25 1428/18 1431/4 1433/13 1433/15 1441/24
Rule 50A [2] 1227/25 1428/18 ruled [7] 1231/20 1249/7 1250/7 1373/24 1376/17 1451/16 1469/12
rules [3] 1283/23 1432/3 1441/18
ruling [21] 1234/22 1235/14 1241/1 1241/3 1241/5 1243/9 1250/3 1336/14 1338/17 1339/12 1367/14 1369/9 1372/16 1374/21 1375/16 1376/24 1377/1 1444/16 1444/25 1451/24 1469/6 rulings [3] 1235/21 1252/21 1335/24
run [4] 1277/2 1332/4 1400/9 1405/21
runnable [2] 1422/20 1423/2
running [23] 1147/17 1177/23
1177/24 1178/3 1178/7
1179/11 1180/9 1187/5
1187/16 1278/21 1283/3
1312/20 1312/21 1321/18
1322/13 1322/18 1326/14
1329/18 1332/16 1368/8 1423/19 1423/25 1425/12 runtime [1] 1423/19

## S

S-A-C-E-R-D-O-T-I [1] 1383/10
S.A.R.L [1] 1129/4 Sacerdoti [8] 1191/23 1226/1 1229/1 1382/23 1383/9 1383/13 1383/23 1386/15 Sacerdoti's [1] 1229/16 Safari [1] 1156/18 Sai [4] 1308/2 1308/3 1313/17 1314/24 said [97] 1134/23 1138/11

140/7114/31142/22 1163/21 1174/25 1175/21 1180/23 1181/1 1181/24 1192/24 1193/15 1198/3 1198/3 1198/5 1202/3 1208/10 1212/11 1212/11 1212/25 1213/8 1214/24 1221/18 1222/15 1224/6 1240/4 1245/8 1246/11 1248/11 1249/13 1251/12 1255/2 1260/5 1262/24 1263/5 1263/5 1263/9 1263/11 1267/22 1271/18 1271/20 1271/22 1272/15 1272/16 1273/15 1276/8 1276/17 1276/20 1276/22 1279/13 1282/18 1299/21 1307/9 1312/3 1313/21 1323/3 1324/2 1324/24 1325/2 1331/1 1331/10 1337/25 1339/20 1345/9 1353/2 1360/19 1361/2 1361/17 1361/24 1365/7 1367/11 1368/11 1379/3 1388/9 1390/10 1392/6 1396/1 1398/24 1405/16 1407/24 1408/6 1414/25 1416/12 1417/4 1421/11 1426/16 1429/21 1431/4 1440/11 1444/13 1447/4 1451/22 1468/20
sake [1] 1191/11
sale [15] 1445/25 1446/5 1446/7 1446/13 1452/24 1454/1 1456/22 1456/24 1457/12 1458/24 1459/10 1459/17 1461/3 1467/6 1467/21
same [62] 1133/3 1133/15 1135/20 1137/4 1137/8 1137/17 1143/17 1150/11 1150/25 1162/20 1169/25 1177/10 1188/4 1190/4 1198/9 1199/19 1204/22 1205/14 1206/18 1213/25 1215/5 1217/1 1219/23 1230/1 1231/7 1235/9 1237/7 1238/13 1250/2 1264/10 1267/20 1280/4 1281/10 1293/17 1298/7 1301/14 1314/20 1316/25 1317/14 1323/21 1328/22 1345/21 1346/15 1349/12 1351/14 1351/16 1351/18 1352/10 1352/13 1354/2 1354/17 1354/23 1362/9 1380/20 1381/3 1387/23 1388/7 1388/12 1405/4 1407/9 1449/17 1462/7 sample [1] 1274/12 samples [1] 1274/12 Samsung [80] 1137/14 1143/3 1250/14 1250/20 1292/7 1294/21 1294/24

d 1 1332/13 1332/16 1333/6 1333/9 1333/10 1333/11 1333/13 1333/13 1333/14 1429/24 1430/16 1434/20 1435/19 1438/11 1438/18 1438/25 1440/7 1440/11 1451/3 1451/6 1451/12 1453/7 1453/11 1453/17 1453/18 1454/1 1454/2 1454/6 1454/16 1454/18 1454/20 1455/20 1458/15 1458/17 1458/24 1459/2 1459/13 1461/18 1461/19 1462/14 1463/1 1463/3 1463/19 1463/20 1463/20 1464/15 1464/19 1464/21 1467/22 1468/2 1469/1 Samsung's [1] 1458/25 San [2] 1166/23 1289/12 San Francisco [1] 1166/23 sat [1] 1305/10 satisfied [1] 1195/14 satisfy [1] 1190/18 save [1] 1188/11 saves [1] 1259/19 saw [40] 1156/1 1158/22 1159/19 1159/22 1162/14 1162/20 1164/3 1166/13 1166/22 1166/24 1173/5 1177/21 1178/17 1179/1 1179/7 1180/1 1180/6 1180/19 1184/9 1190/15 1221/1 1222/1 $1232 / 6$ 1237/10 1238/6 1239/22 1257/20 1270/17 1275/12 1278/20 1300/10 1310/13 1331/5 1332/11 1346/10 1381/14 1386/10 1387/2 1387/3 1392/19 say [91] 1140/4 1140/11 1144/10 1144/14 1165/8 1168/2 1170/6 1171/9 1171/14 1180/25 1186/25 1191/24 1197/24 1197/24 1200/10 1208/2 1209/13 1212/13 1214/5 1214/8 1215/23 1216/8 1220/21 1223/9 1228/25 1229/12 1231/17 1231/25 1240/18 1243/21 1245/12 1246/2 1246/4 1248/20 1260/22 1263/6 1265/4 1267/14 1271/13 1271/14 1271/18 1271/23 1277/19 1281/20 1302/11 1311/10 1324/15 1335/22 1339/17 1343/4 1346/12 1349/9 1356/11 1356/13 1358/8 1358/16 1379/12 1387/24 1388/20 1392/18 1402/10 1402/11 1403/3 1403/8 1407/17 1408/18 1408/18 1412/19 1413/8 1415/7 1416/12 1417/12 1423/18 1426/14 1428/14 1435/6 1439/11 1439/12 1440/20 1441/20 1443/11 1443/22 1445/18 1445/25 1446/11 1446/17
saying [39] 1132/15 1141/3 1194/1 1197/9 1212/5 1213/4 1213/25 1214/25 1221/15 1234/12 1235/6 1239/10 1240/3 1240/24 1241/16 1264/8 1269/11 1273/1 1323/5 1325/14 1333/3 1335/2 1337/8 1403/19 1404/4 1404/9 1415/17 1446/6 1448/23 1449/1 1453/1 1457/9 1463/18 1463/22 1463/23 1464/19 1466/12 1466/12 1468/23 says [54] 1138/17 1140/9 1141/9 1142/15 1142/25 1157/22 1164/4 1181/13 1181/14 1181/20 1182/18 1183/1 1183/9 1185/22 1185/24 1186/17 1186/18 1186/23 1187/3 1192/4 1204/13 1205/2 1209/22 1209/24 1213/3 1217/6 1230/24 1256/10 1266/3 1274/8 1304/22 1308/12 1309/11 1315/21 1319/7 1319/10 1325/18 1330/9 1335/6 1335/25 1392/9 1406/15 1432/2 1433/11 1433/14 1441/18 1449/19 1452/23 1456/15 1464/22 1465/11 1465/17 1466/2 1467/8
scale [9] 1137/12 1137/13 1291/2 1291/10 1299/11 1300/20 1300/22 1302/3 1331/14
scaled [2] 1300/16 1304/7 scaling [2] 1300/23 1304/1 scared [1] 1322/17 scenario [9] 1140/20 1141/4 1141/10 1142/22 1142/25 1143/25 1144/8 1360/1 1424/9
scenarios [2] 1264/1 1274/12 scenes [1] 1178/21 scheduled [1] 1224/19 school [5] 1272/20 1272/22 1289/7 1289/13 1384/17 science [11] 1146/23 1146/25 1147/12 1148/4 1148/7 1272/19 1272/22 1289/9 1384/19 1385/4 1386/16 scope [5] 1132/22 1155/10 1199/23 1316/14 1397/5 screen [23] 1140/2 1158/16 1168/11 1183/5 1183/6 1186/12 1187/3 1204/14 1256/8 1256/9 1256/15 1256/16 1264/9 1269/15 1270/17 1270/17 1271/6 1305/10 1324/14 1402/17 1410/7 1422/24 1453/25 screens [3] 1157/7 1264/4 1278/22
screenshots [1] 1416/20 Scripting [1] 1418/6 scroll [1] 1320/13
se [1] 1409/14

Case 1:13-cV-00919-JLH seal [13] 1290/17 1290/18 1290/21 1326/17 1326/18 1326/21 1342/17 1342/18 1342/19 1342/21 1362/18 1362/20 1362/21
sealed [6] 1129/15 1290/22
1306/7 1331/19 1342/22 1383/5
search [14] 1147/20 1151/25
1158/3 1162/5 1162/6
1168/25 1179/14 1180/14 1180/17 1208/25 1370/4 1370/24 1370/25 1442/14 searched [3] 1178/25 1179/2 1179/3
searches [2] 1292/13 1298/23 searching [3] 1157/8 1180/16 1259/5
seat [10] 1134/11 1145/6
1224/24 1229/24 1283/10 1287/11 1377/7 1428/1 1435/3 1467/25
seated [10] 1131/6 1132/15
1145/8 1145/24 1253/22
1283/19 1285/12 1288/1
1383/11 1428/6
SEC [2] 1374/11 1376/4 second [60] 1136/17 1136/25 1139/22 1151/21 1152/3 1152/5 1152/7 1154/9 1158/7 1168/16 1169/3 1179/17 1179/21 1180/8 1180/13 1180/16 1180/18 1188/1 1192/20 1193/19 1196/11 1205/3 1205/20 1205/21 1206/25 1209/11 1228/15 1238/20 1239/15 1247/17 1269/7 1272/2 1272/12 1282/16 1285/13 1295/16 1308/24 1343/25 1344/7 1344/17 1353/8 1360/25 1366/5 1394/7 1402/21 1407/14 1407/19 1418/23 1424/22 1424/22 1425/8 1431/16 1443/11 1450/20 1453/24 1456/14 1458/14 1463/5 1466/9 1467/1 second-generation [1] 1418/23
secondarily [1] 1303/25 secondary [14] 1191/6 1191/9 1191/14 1191/19 1192/2 1192/8 1193/1 1193/14 1194/16 1194/23 1195/2 1409/6 1409/10 1409/13 secondly [1] 1328/24 seconds [3] 1199/20 1362/10 1467/2
secretly [1] 1463/16 section [14] 1161/22 1166/11 1170/8 1172/7 1172/17 1203/15 1205/2 1220/6 1270/7 1306/3 1326/17 1441/6 1448/4 1456/17
Section A [1] 1203/15
Section E [1] 1205/2
sections [2] 1165/17 1171/18 securities [1] 1377/17 see [184] 1132/24 1133/4
 1153/20 1154/22 1156/10 1156/12 1156/20 1156/24 1156/25 1157/2 1157/6 1157/15 1157/17 1157/23 1158/8 1158/9 1158/9 1158/16 1159/2 1159/11 1159/16 1160/6 1160/21 1160/24 1161/7 1161/10 1161/11 1161/20 1161/22 1161/24 1162/22 1163/9 1165/6 1165/14 1165/15 1166/3 1166/9 1166/10 1167/6 1167/19 1168/2 1168/8 1168/9 1168/14 1168/16 1169/2 1169/7 1169/8 1169/18 1169/20 1170/1 1170/3 1170/16 1170/24 1171/17 1173/4 1175/1 1178/12 1181/4 1181/6 1181/9 1181/12 1182/9 1182/15 1182/16 1182/23 1182/25 1183/6 1183/7 1185/2 1185/5 1185/23 1186/3 1186/11 1186/16 1187/25 1188/1 1188/18 1192/1 1195/22 1202/10 1203/4 1203/8 1203/17 1203/22 1205/8 1206/11 1206/15 1206/24 1218/21 1221/1 1221/2 1223/19 1224/15 1229/9 1229/17 1234/14 1239/16 1241/16 1247/4 1247/9 1247/18 1247/24 1252/17 1254/17 1256/14 1256/15 1256/16 1256/24 1256/25 1260/7 1265/9 1266/17 1272/12 1272/12 1273/24 1286/5 1291/3 1295/14 1296/15 1299/6 1300/10 1301/7 1301/10 1304/4 1304/20 1307/3 1307/25 1309/2 1309/10 1319/10 1319/17 1320/10 1320/12 1320/13 1320/15 1321/3 1322/17 1324/8 1335/6 1336/2 1339/19 1347/22 1348/12 1348/13 1348/24 1348/25 1360/21 1360/22 1360/24 1360/25 1361/1 1361/18 1365/5 1369/2 1371/23 1379/19 1379/22 1387/24 1388/11 1390/13 1390/14 1390/16 1390/19 1391/8 1406/17 1407/7 1410/5 1414/15 1414/19 1415/10 1415/10 1418/3 1424/16 1427/24 1441/2 1442/25 1446/21
seeing [5] 1184/22 1235/19 1247/18 1305/10 1364/2 seem [2] 1256/25 1434/21 seemed [2] 1442/5 1444/9 seems [6] 1225/5 1250/24 1312/5 1337/16 1450/3 1450/5
seen [15] 1153/14 1166/21 1169/21 1183/16 1188/22

1390/23 1390/23 1401/20 1424/18
segments [1] 1286/19
select [1] 1437/13
selected [7] 1138/25 1160/11 1171/25 1172/19 1172/24 1253/1 1386/7
selection [5] 1210/8 1453/10
1453/13 1456/8 1467/7
self [2] 1178/3 1262/16
self-contained [2] 1178/3 1262/16
sell [2] 1386/13 1456/20
sellers [1] 1297/13
selling [6] 1298/15 1298/24
1308/16 1308/17 1400/11
1461/19
sells [3] 1453/7 1453/12 1453/18
semester [1] 1148/7
send [4] 1168/20 1221/6
1230/17 1405/19
sending [1] 1398/16
sense [16] 1131/15 1242/18
1243/7 1259/5 1296/9
1296/18 1297/3 1301/21
1304/21 1320/18 1330/13
1398/20 1408/6 1427/7
1442/6 1457/7
senses [1] 1296/10
sensible [1] 1466/5
sensibly [1] 1212/22
sent [2] 1134/21 1398/9
sentence [6] 1402/23 1442/18
1444/13 1444/18 1444/21
1456/14
sentences [2] 1420/23 1421/9 separate [23] 1152/18 1153/2 1172/3 1172/8 1173/1 1173/4
1174/25 1175/3 1175/10 1180/10 1189/6 1196/11 1213/23 1214/2 1214/9
1214/12 1214/19 1215/1 1306/14 1327/12 1332/19 1436/12 1462/5
separated [1] 1422/1
separately [1] 1422/19
separation [1] 1189/12
September [2] 1143/16 1434/8
September 3 [1] 1434/8
sequence [3] 1388/19 1389/1 1412/15
Serial [1] 1164/6
served [6] 1148/8 1233/3
1353/19 1379/13 1380/4 1422/22
server [3] 1460/4 1460/7 1460/11
service [12] 1148/16 1156/22 1158/4 1158/7 1159/12 1159/14 1163/1 1410/11 1453/6 1453/14 1453/15 1467/10
serviced [1] 1396/14 services [22] 1159/10 1159/15 1159/20 1161/19 1161/20 1162/17 1162/18

1403/5 1414/16 1414/16 1414/22 1415/4 1415/14 1421/14 1421/20 1421/20 set [20] 1152/17 1154/20 1159/10 1161/16 1175/9 1178/3 1232/18 1240/11 1276/17 1276/21 1282/23 1355/25 1356/6 1358/18 1389/1 1395/25 1396/1 1396/4 1399/7 1420/7 SETH [1] 1130/5 sets [2] 1395/12 1396/3 setting [4] 1180/2 1180/3 1201/11 1420/11
settled [3] 1291/3 1291/5 1327/13
settlement [18] 1135/14
1192/7 1192/25 1193/25 1194/4 1194/16 1286/21 1291/17 1294/20 1294/20 1294/21 1294/22 1295/5 1327/16 1328/15 1333/25 1457/25 1463/13
settlements [2] 1192/6 1193/5
seven [8] 1256/23 1257/2
1301/11 1301/11 1301/14 1301/15 1302/11 1302/12 seventh [1] 1194/21
seventh factor [1] 1194/21 several [5] 1164/20 1186/5 1389/23 1393/25 1436/15 several-month [1] 1436/15 share [1] 1150/11
she [6] 1370/13 1370/21
1372/24 1373/14 1373/16 1373/18
she's [1] 1252/3
sheet [4] 1205/3 1205/11 1361/1 1381/15
Sheets [3] 1244/12 1248/6 1248/15
short [3] 1156/16 1271/6 1301/4
shortcomings [1] 1428/25
shortcut [30] 1151/16 1152/4
1153/10 1153/12 1153/22 1153/23 1155/19 1158/14 1158/18 1160/1 1160/20 1161/14 1163/22 1163/25 1166/4 1167/13 1169/16 1169/20 1170/16 1170/20 1170/25 1171/5 1174/22 1185/3 1188/14 1189/21 1189/24 1190/5 1190/16 1196/8
shorter [6] 1146/15 1291/8 1291/9 1303/15 1303/17 1304/9
shortly [1] 1228/17
should [48] 1133/5 1136/22 1144/20 1164/12 1165/25 1186/24 1194/17 1201/23 1202/3 1202/6 1220/22 1221/18 1227/10 1227/15 1231/19 1234/10 1235/4 1284/12 1284/25 1292/7 1293/16 1326/3 1327/25 1336/18 1340/8 1353/1

Câse 1:13-cv-00919-JLH should... [22] 1357/19 1357/20 1358/9 1362/10 1373/8 1378/14 1382/25 1404/11 1427/10 1427/12 1430/21 1432/5 1436/25 1437/3 1437/10 1440/1 1448/22 1451/13 1466/4 1466/5 1466/6 1468/21 shoulders [1] 1406/22 shouldn't [6] 1249/17 1328/22 1335/21 1404/5 1466/3 1466/3
show [36] 1167/15 1173/10 1173/13 1183/25 1184/15 1185/9 1186/22 1188/18 1237/6 1237/12 1237/14 1237/16 1240/5 1244/19 1245/24 1255/12 1255/20 1255/20 1256/3 1257/13 1267/10 1275/7 1278/1 1280/5 1316/24 1326/3 1367/17 1371/17 1372/18 1410/24 1424/11 1429/5 1429/9 1443/11 1449/7 1455/2
showed [9] 1174/13 1178/13 1180/20 1185/20 1275/9 1324/13 1366/21 1392/8 1393/17
showing [13] 1186/2 1189/15 1235/2 1235/16 1244/18 1257/25 1261/15 1291/4 1388/16 1392/25 1399/5 1399/6 1424/15
shown [15] 1155/23 1157/20 1158/25 1168/10 1171/11 1181/7 1187/3 1187/14 1191/10 1220/8 1264/5 1264/7 1329/16 1373/3 1416/20
shows [13] 1158/21 1166/13 1167/17 1179/8 1187/17 1234/15 1274/12 1347/17 1391/10 1391/11 1415/11 1421/4 1432/24
side [38] 1133/5 1153/18 1156/2 1156/12 1156/17 1157/6 1158/23 1158/25 1159/11 1159/16 1160/3 1166/3 1168/7 1169/11 1170/17 1173/11 1174/12 1182/15 1226/12 1228/20 1231/25 1234/9 1256/9 1256/22 1256/22 1258/15 1269/15 1285/23 1290/9 1344/2 1344/4 1432/5 1436/21 1446/6 1451/13 1451/23 1451/25 1468/15 side's [1] 1226/10 sidebar [44] 1192/14 1192/18 1194/10 1196/18 1196/22 1200/20 1218/20 1218/21 1218/24 1219/10 1307/4 1307/7 1307/14 1313/24 1314/3 1317/9 1334/12 1334/16 1336/15 1337/12 1337/15 1340/5 1361/18 1361/21 1362/12 1367/3 1367/6 1368/7 1368/13


1372/15 1376/22 1376/25 1396/23 1397/2 1397/22 1424/24 1425/2 1425/23 sides [1] 1286/3 sides' [1] 1436/1
sign [1] 1324/17 signed [3] 1324/16 1324/17 1332/2
significant [3] 1285/23 1382/2 1428/25
silently [1] 1463/17 similar [13] 1155/8 1163/12 1169/8 1172/14 1249/7 1250/6 1275/9 1292/4 1294/14 1296/21 1296/21 1305/18 1334/10 similarly [7] 1275/3 1275/6 1297/18 1322/15 1324/3 1438/11 simple [14] 1153/15 1182/18 1182/18 1265/13 1296/14 1329/7 1407/13 1407/19 1407/21 1407/24 1415/2 1415/5 1415/15 1415/18 simplify [1] 1445/15 simply [2] 1244/11 1427/18 since [6] 1167/4 1173/20 1234/25 1345/19 1385/4 1460/6
single [7] 1177/15 1233/12 1389/23 1422/2 1422/7 1422/12 1462/2 sir [35] 1204/14 1205/22 1206/24 1208/19 1209/10 1235/7 1254/23 1268/10 1287/15 1382/8 1383/21 1383/24 1386/22 1393/1 1410/4 1410/10 1410/25 1411/5 1411/8 1412/9 1412/15 1412/23 1413/3 1413/22 1414/5 1415/13 1415/19 1416/8 1417/11 1417/14 1417/23 1419/3 1420/4 1420/14 1424/3 sit [3] 1134/10 1294/4 1371/18
site [2] 1161/16 1262/6 sitting [6] 1150/5 1218/1 1230/11 1275/18 1325/8 1415/13
situation [13] 1177/25 1207/10 1208/5 1212/10 1216/23 1252/13 1267/25 1281/9 1282/8 1304/20 1316/16 1375/7 1444/7 six [17] 1147/13 1147/16 1153/21 1158/17 1166/4 1169/20 1170/25 1171/1 1185/4 1185/7 1188/14 1190/16 1310/13 1322/10 1328/12 1329/8 1340/18 size [2] 1259/16 1369/24 skill [12] 1182/4 1271/3 1271/8 1273/22 1279/22 1390/8 1399/22 1403/22 1419/5 1419/12 1419/17 1419/22
skip [1] 1450/19
slice [1] 1329/12 slide [98] 1137/7 1137/13 1139/25 1155/24 1158/20 1162/9 1162/10 1162/16 1163/7 1163/8 1163/14 1163/14 1165/15 1168/2 1169/1 1169/7 1169/18 1170/3 1170/23 1173/12 1174/15 1174/17 1175/15 1176/8 1176/19 1176/20 1176/21 1177/3 1177/5 1181/7 1182/9 1183/19 1183/20 1184/5 1185/2 1185/5 1186/1 1186/1 1187/13 1188/2 1188/11 1188/21 1189/14 1190/2 1190/22 1191/13 1195/3 1195/22 1201/10 1201/10 1209/7 1209/8 1209/21 1210/14 1213/16 1213/20 1214/4 1215/9 1217/10 1217/11 1230/24 1233/12 1233/21 1235/1 1260/19 1260/22 1272/14 1275/9 1293/16 1310/12 1321/20 1324/20 1326/3 1328/1 1334/6 1337/1 1337/19 1342/13 1342/24 1351/8 1352/6 1353/5 1360/5 1388/3 1388/16 1388/19 1413/8 1414/23 1424/15 1424/16 1425/14 1462/2 1463/9 1464/7 1464/11 1464/11 1466/1 1466/1
Slide 25 [1] 1137/13 Slide 32 [1] 1139/25 Slide 4 [2] 1201/10 1352/6 Slide 8 [1] 1209/7 slides [32] 1133/4 1133/5 1133/22 1134/15 1134/21 1136/1 1136/10 1137/5 1137/7 1138/6 1139/7 1143/5 1144/4 1144/6 1144/22 1167/15 1167/17 1231/16 1231/24 1232/6 1233/10 1249/16 1249/24 1264/4 1264/6 1264/14 1270/2 1288/12 1341/23 1384/2 1412/11 1460/17
slightly [2] 1135/21 1321/9 slip [1] 1361/1
slow [5] 1134/7 1249/10 1249/13 1249/17 1323/7 small [9] 1162/22 1173/17 1240/15 1277/7 1288/17 1299/15 1299/21 1299/22 1299/25
smaller [3] 1143/1 1189/5 1300/11
smallest [1] 1401/3 smart [14] 1157/11 1178/21 1206/20 1334/8 1335/10 1335/20 1336/6 1336/8 1336/21 1340/11 1453/10 1453/13 1456/8 1467/6 Smedley [10] 1162/12 1176/1 1177/11 1180/25 1216/2 1396/9 1398/15 1436/2
$143781460 / 10$ \#. 624.57
smediey $1185 / 10$ 1316/17 SMITH [1] 1129/23 so [763] so-called [2] 1151/16 1152/4 societies [2] 1149/3 1289/15 society [2] 1149/4 1260/14 software [23] 1147/17 1150/22 1165/20 1167/5 1173/23 1189/17 1189/18 1207/1 1215/3 1275/25 1276/21 1276/24 1277/1 1277/9 1278/4 1278/15 1283/3 1385/24 1400/9 1453/5 1453/15 1453/18 1467/9
sold [9] 1288/20 1292/18 1292/19 1292/20 1310/24 1310/24 1452/24 1461/3 1467/14
sole [2] 1226/3 1268/25 solely [2] 1246/10 1251/18 solution [3] 1235/25 1242/20 1242/21
some [115] 1134/2 1146/13 1146/16 1156/11 1157/19 1159/6 1161/10 1170/11 1173/17 1177/1 1182/24 1192/3 1193/4 1195/2 1197/14 1198/11 1201/8 1201/11 1206/14 1211/21 1222/2 1222/3 1224/20 1225/16 1225/17 1226/18 1226/20 1227/1 1228/7 1228/16 1228/17 1230/16 1230/22 1232/14 1236/11 1237/12 1238/20 1240/14 1240/15 1241/23 1249/17 1257/24 1258/15 1261/2 1261/4 1261/5 1263/24 1264/4 1266/3 1266/24 1269/2 1269/3 1270/15 1273/5 1278/23 1284/4 1285/9 1285/18 1288/12 1291/25 1292/11 1292/19 1297/13 1301/14 1301/24 1302/25 1302/25 1304/2 1304/24 1308/8 1309/2 1316/13 1319/17 1323/10 1324/11 1327/2 1332/12 1344/21 1358/20 1360/15 1360/21 1366/15 1367/12 1382/17 1384/2 1385/3 1386/6 1387/24 1387/25 1387/25 1387/25 1390/11 1391/1 1391/2 1391/23 1392/12 1392/13 1392/14 1394/18 1396/11 1407/1 1408/10 1412/24 1412/25 1414/10 1414/11 1414/20 1414/25 1415/2 1416/3 1426/2 1426/13 1440/25 1455/23 1460/17
somebody [3] 1390/23
1431/25 1441/13 somehow [2] 1201/23 1314/8 someone [3] 1279/21 1409/14 1445/19
something [87] 1143/18

|  |  | stightag <br> 1374/20 <br> standing [1] 1406/21 <br> stands [1] 1282/12 <br> Stanford [4] 1384/19 1384/20 1385/7 1385/8 <br> Stark [1] 1444/6 <br> Stark's [1] 1431/22 <br> start [21] 1132/18 1134/9 <br> 1147/24 1159/14 1159/15 <br> 1183/21 1235/19 1292/15 <br> 1294/11 1298/8 1304/6 <br> 1310/18 1341/14 1342/2 <br> 1343/14 1351/13 1391/1 <br> 1391/3 1427/7 1442/13 <br> 1443/18 <br> started [26] 1132/4 1137/22 <br> 1146/19 1146/21 1147/21 <br> 1150/20 1169/12 1173/14 <br> 1189/4 1292/5 1308/16 <br> 1308/17 1310/19 1343/6 <br> 1345/11 1345/12 1345/12 <br> 1354/17 1354/18 1355/17 <br> 1360/12 1360/12 1380/17 <br> 1380/21 1395/3 1437/5 <br> starting [5] 1150/1 1154/6 <br> 1230/4 1302/2 1340/19 <br> starts [6] 1170/9 1205/3 <br> 1220/10 1304/18 1309/16 <br> 1406/13 <br> state [6] 1137/10 1145/16 <br> 1287/18 1383/7 1418/5 <br> 1444/17 <br> stated [1] 1305/5 <br> statement [19] 1166/5 <br> 1191/21 1198/22 1212/15 <br> 1212/17 1213/12 1214/2 <br> 1214/15 1240/8 1266/3 <br> 1268/11 1280/3 1310/8 <br> 1325/12 1325/16 1338/7 <br> 1417/18 1430/20 1448/19 <br> statements [11] 1153/4 <br> 1171/3 1172/14 1197/12 <br> 1216/2 1216/2 1216/3 <br> 1217/12 1376/4 1432/22 <br> 1468/7 <br> states [3] 1129/2 1129/19 <br> 1194/15 <br> stay [1] 1199/16 <br> staying [2] 1175/23 1328/5 <br> steel [1] 1147/16 <br> stems [1] 1187/25 <br> stenographic [1] 1470/5 <br> step [22] 1180/5 1199/22 <br> 1211/1 1213/17 1221/24 <br> 1225/4 1275/15 1278/12 <br> 1279/3 1279/5 1280/22 <br> 1283/11 1291/25 1291/25 <br> 1299/8 1300/7 1305/14 <br> 1382/8 1406/13 1426/25 <br> 1463/5 1463/11 <br> stepped [1] 1340/18 <br> steps [2] 1159/3 1399/20 <br> Stevens [1] 1146/20 <br> stick [3] 1174/3 1370/19 <br> 1372/21 <br> sticking [1] 1440/17 <br> sticky [1] 1343/21 <br> still [14] 1154/21 1226/17 |  <br> 1339/23 1372/3 1408/1 1436/6 1452/9 1455/14 stipulation [1] 1436/24 stood [1] 1150/23 storage [1] 1260/6 store [5] 1168/19 1259/15 1357/18 1461/18 1463/2 storing [1] 1259/10 story [2] 1159/12 1159/17 straight [2] 1272/25 1274/2 straightened [1] 1230/16 strange [1] 1273/5 STRAUS [1] 1130/4 streamline [2] 1284/20 1439/18 <br> streams [1] 1377/21 <br> street [6] 1129/17 1167/17 1167/22 1168/13 1179/25 1180/11 stretch [1] 1368/17 stricken [3] 1338/18 1339/24 1448/22 <br> strict [1] 1267/3 <br> strictly [3] 1465/8 1465/23 1466/22 <br> strike [10] 1176/10 1193/9 1194/2 1194/2 1216/18 1265/24 1273/8 1280/22 1451/4 1451/7 <br> strong [1] 1403/24 <br> strongly [1] 1402/6 <br> structure [3] 1159/1 1398/11 1398/12 <br> STS [59] 1138/18 1139/15 1139/16 1139/18 1139/20 1140/5 1140/8 1140/19 1140/21 1141/4 1141/10 1141/22 1141/25 1142/24 1143/12 1143/14 1143/22 1143/25 1144/8 1232/1 1232/16 1233/2 1249/20 1251/9 1251/13 1251/19 1253/6 1253/10 1292/18 1292/20 1293/2 1310/21 1310/25 1311/8 1311/11 1312/6 1312/20 1318/8 1322/4 1326/15 1337/2 1337/4 1338/4 1338/21 1339/2 1340/2 1342/1 1342/10 1348/15 1354/1 1356/7 1358/20 1358/23 1358/25 1359/8 1360/1 1360/9 1380/15 1381/6 STS-only [6] 1139/16 1139/18 1139/20 1140/19 1143/25 1144/8 <br> student [5] 1147/10 1148/5 1150/25 1258/5 1258/9 students [7] 1148/18 1148/21 1150/13 1162/24 1173/16 1258/6 1269/18 studied [10] 1150/2 1150/3 1150/13 1150/15 1150/16 1151/1 1166/20 1166/25 1195/21 1218/2 <br> studying [2] 1207/7 1216/4 stuff [18] 1169/15 1169/16 1174/9 1179/11 1179/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Cåse 1:13-cv-00919-JLH stuff... [13] 1180/4 1188/4 1189/23 1219/8 1222/24 1256/8 1258/15 1301/23 1327/6 1385/25 1386/24 1400/3 1409/14
sub [1] 1156/20 sub-windows [1] 1156/20 subject [8] 1140/19 1235/16 1241/14 1368/2 1369/23 1373/24 1376/16 1429/16 submission [2] 1164/20 1198/10 submissions [2] 1148/13 1432/7
submit [3] 1198/6 1198/24 1429/15
submitted [9] 1197/7 1197/8 1198/9 1217/22 1217/23 1226/16 1263/16 1430/4 1434/24
submitting [1] 1433/24 subsequently [1] 1328/4 subset [2] 1268/22 1268/23 substance [1] 1466/5 substantive [2] 1381/24 1435/7
success [3] 1195/19 1195/23 1195/25
such [9] 1141/11 1221/16 1263/15 1288/11 1328/20 1365/4 1402/7 1446/10 1466/17
sudden [1] 1322/12 sufficient [6] 1260/1 1263/3 1266/18 1428/23 1428/24 1444/15
suggest [3] 1157/19 1393/20 1401/21
suggested [2] 1388/18 1402/1
suggestion [5] 1157/22
1158/3 1159/5 1234/1
1445/11
suggestions [1] 1157/3 suggests [5] 1235/3 1302/5 1404/5 1409/19 1415/3 suite [7] 1402/24 1403/2 1403/5 1403/17 1405/18 1418/24 1421/13
sum [5] 1143/4 1253/5 1340/15 1438/13 1438/18 summaries [1] 1363/23 summarize [1] 1151/18 summarizes [1] 1274/11 summarizing [1] 1242/4 summary [18] 1154/1 1170/3 1170/15 1176/2 1182/2 1190/21 1203/6 1234/20 1234/22 1235/13 1248/4 1248/13 1260/24 1412/18 1430/5 1431/22 1441/24 1451/8
supplement [2] 1344/10 1345/5
supplemental [20] 1136/20 1140/19 1142/14 1143/8 1232/20 1233/3 1234/19 1248/5 1248/21 1252/24 1317/15 1339/14 1343/16 1343/20 1344/2 1344/4
 supplier [16] 1333/1 1333/6 1458/15 1458/16 1458/25 1459/5 1459/6 1462/18 1463/1 1467/11 1467/13 1467/20 1468/21 1468/21 1468/24 1468/25 suppliers [8] 1333/3 1333/5 1458/5 1458/5 1458/24 1459/16 1462/13 1462/14 supplies [1] 1467/5 supply [1] 1462/22 supplying [2] 1459/1 1459/2 support [12] 1150/9 1164/8 1207/10 1248/19 1260/16 1315/4 1338/7 1339/5 1395/9 1396/6 1430/4 1442/10 supported [3] 1182/17 1184/1 1248/11
supporting [4] 1152/5 1152/22 1154/15 1442/12
supports [6] 1165/19 1214/15 1272/16 1311/20 1432/24 1462/11
suppose [2] 1229/20 1431/13 supposed [7] 1173/13 12027 1210/19 1464/4 1465/8 1465/24 1466/2
Supreme [1] 1448/24 sure [63] 1137/22 1139/23 1158/22 1171/4 1188/25 1199/19 1212/5 1216/9 1217/21 1219/9 1225/2 1240/2 1242/19 1251/2 1259/19 1265/18 1267/3 1267/18 1268/17 1270/19 1271/1 1281/5 1282/21 1283/16 1288/8 1289/6 1292/4 1302/14 1304/23 1304/23 1310/17 1314/19 1317/17 1318/13 1318/22 1324/22 1325/23 1331/10 1331/12 1332/24 1340/17 1347/9 1348/1 1353/11 1355/10 1359/17 1361/14 1361/25 1361/25 1362/17 1365/21 1367/14 1375/5 1378/23 1383/2 1387/15 1389/10 1392/6 1412/23 1414/23 1428/12 1435/12 1462/16
surprise [1] 1193/17
surprised [1] 1323/23 surprisingly [1] 1352/8 surrounding [1] 1328/21 SUSMAN [1] 1130/3 suspect [1] 1287/4 sustain [1] 1248/25 sustained [3] 1165/1 1211/12 1255/9
Swish [1] 1386/8
switch [2] 1157/12 1267/7 switchboard [4] 1158/3 1158/6 1180/9 1180/19 switched [1] 1146/25 sworn [3] 1145/21 1287/23 1383/14
Symantec [1] 1385/16 symmetrical [1] 1185/1

1154/2 1154/5 1154/5 1154/13 1154/15 1154/23 1155/2 1155/11 1155/19 1156/1 1156/21 1157/3 1157/10 1157/18 1158/5 1159/1 1159/4 1159/5 1159/8 1161/17 1162/7 1162/15 1162/19 1163/12 1166/6 1167/19 1168/2 1168/25 1170/5 1170/7 1172/9 1172/23 1173/1 1173/6 1173/8 1176/4 1176/6 1177/6 1177/16 1178/5 1178/21 1181/5 1181/22 1183/23 1184/12 1184/13 1185/15 1185/16 1186/6 1186/15 1187/11 1188/8 1190/1 1190/13 1190/14 1191/1 1197/21 1197/22 1199/4 1199/5 1199/24 1257/8 1257/12 1257/15 1257/18 1257/23 1258/18 1259/12 1260/23 1260/25 1261/1 1261/8 1262/1 1262/15 1262/23 1262/25 1264/19 1264/24 1265/6 1265/10 1265/11 1265/19 1265/21 1267/11 1268/21 1268/24 1269/1 1269/5 1269/6 1269/10 1269/21 1270/9 1271/25 1272/1 1272/8 1272/8 1275/25 1276/2 1278/21 1282/24 1283/2 1283/3 1314/17 1386/5 1389/24 1389/25 1394/19 1395/1 1395/8 1395/13 1396/2 1396/4 1396/5 1396/19 1397/7 1397/12 1398/10 1400/5 1400/7 1401/3 1402/1 1405/18 1407/1 1407/22 1408/16 1413/23 1413/25 1420/7 1422/17 1423/4 1423/20 1424/17 1431/6 1431/16 1431/17 1434/10 1434/13 1434/14 1434/14 1446/24 1446/25 1446/25 1447/1 1453/9 1453/11 1453/12 1453/19 1454/5 1454/7 1454/8 1454/14 1454/15 1454/21 1455/1 1455/3 1455/6 1455/15 1455/16 1455/21 1456/4 1456/6 1456/9 1458/16 1460/9 1467/5 1467/5 1467/15 1468/3
systems [37] 1147/17 1150/16 1150/21 1150/23 1151/7 1151/9 1153/1 1153/7 1155/7 1155/14 1155/15 1173/15 1173/16 1173/18 1173/21 1174/3 1182/5 1183/15 1187/17 1195/13 1197/23 1198/18 1198/24 1200/3 1200/3 1209/1 1215/4 1269/4 1271/2 1273/6 1278/11 1280/16 1333/7 1399/19 1400/1 1401/11
$1^{14} 49{ }^{29}$ agelD $\#: 62459$ T
tab [8] 1295/12 1319/19 1319/20 1352/23 1360/23 1381/14 1395/19 1405/23 table [3] 1165/13 1170/1 1201/11
tabled [1] 1451/14
tables [1] 1142/21
tablet [2] 1328/8 1328/9 tablets [3] 1297/14 1298/6
tabs [1] 1360/18
take [91] 1133/10 1136/5 1137/19 1145/1 1145/2 1156/14 1160/23 1180/2 1189/17 1189/19 1189/21 1189/24 1190/5 1199/7 1199/13 1213/9 1220/18 1224/17 1224/21 1225/16 1228/2 1229/21 1231/19 1232/7 1236/25 1239/15 1241/20 1241/21 1244/2 1247/3 1255/2 1255/5 1255/7 1260/11 1275/4 1283/15 1283/17 1283/20 1284/3 1285/6 1285/6 1290/5
1295/16 1296/16 1299/14 1300/12 1300/20 1306/1 1308/12 1310/12 1311/4 1311/5 1326/1 1326/5 1328/11 1328/11 1329/13 1329/22 1334/2 1335/5 1340/4 1346/20 1347/6 1351/7 1361/22 1362/3 1362/10 1368/3 1368/4 1368/16 1368/18 1368/23 1370/21 1371/19 1373/17 1378/9 1388/17 1390/14 1401/4 1402/25 1403/2 1410/18 1421/13 1427/8 1428/3 1439/16 1449/12 1449/23 1450/6 1469/8 taken [20] 1141/12 1156/2 1156/10 1186/5 1187/6 1187/15 1222/11 1230/20 1238/2 1277/12 1285/11 1300/15 1325/23 1326/7 1368/25 1371/22 1372/11 1373/11 1428/5 1432/13 takes [7] 1159/5 1229/15 1236/17 1252/9 1322/10 1322/11 1322/15
taking [12] 1132/18 1146/19 1225/6 $1232 / 7$ 1244/11 1295/4 1330/23 1330/24 1339/21 1355/13 1404/9 1440/7
talk [49] 1134/10 1151/17 1153/25 1176/6 1176/8 1192/10 1210/24 1213/20 1222/17 1223/11 1224/1 1224/20 1231/20 1252/18 1261/13 1265/21 1275/13 1284/12 1339/15 1343/4 1356/15 1357/17 1357/25 1358/6 1360/11 1367/18 1369/24 1376/4 1388/6 1393/21 1394/7 1394/22


Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH that's... [214] 1257/6 1257/10 1257/14 1257/17 1259/1 1259/8 1259/11 1259/14 1263/23 1264/24 1266/10 1267/15 1267/19 1269/20 1270/21 1271/10 1271/20 1273/14 1273/17 1273/21 1274/19 1276/1 1276/22 1277/15 1277/25 1278/7 1279/18 1279/19 1279/24 1280/3 1280/6 1281/15 1282/6 1282/8 1282/24 1284/11 1285/19 1286/3 1286/6 1295/13 1296/17 1298/16 1300/24 1304/14 1308/10 1309/11 1309/13 1310/8 1313/11 1316/5 1316/9 1316/11 1316/19 1318/14 1319/12 1320/11 1320/16 1321/2 1321/5 1324/13 1329/13 1329/13 1330/15 1330/23 1331/2 1332/9 1334/2 1336/2 1336/14 1336/14 1338/1 1339/19 1339/22 1343/2 1343/3 1343/9 1343/15 1343/17 1343/23 1344/12 1345/12 1346/15 1347/4 1347/5 1348/2 1348/4 1348/7 1349/4 1349/6 1349/8 1349/13 1350/11 1350/21 1351/3 1352/20 1353/13 1353/18 1353/19 1353/19 1354/7 1355/3 1355/4 1355/15 1355/19 1356/5 1356/13 1356/16 1357/1 1358/8 1359/1 1360/14 1360/21 1362/22 1363/22 1364/19 1364/23 1365/3 1365/13 1366/14 1366/23 1367/19 1367/21 1370/25 1375/16 1380/2 1382/20 1384/22 1388/18 1389/21 1390/22 1392/21 1393/6 1394/21 1395/24 1398/25 1403/19 1407/8 1407/10 1408/6 1410/12 1412/1 1412/8 1413/13 1413/18 1414/14 1416/20 1418/14 1419/2 1421/3 1421/3 1421/4 1423/23 1424/21 1426/12 1427/3 1430/16 1431/7 1431/21 1431/21 1437/11 1437/16 1437/21 1438/11 1438/13 1438/20 1439/25 1441/23 1442/22 1443/2 1443/6 1443/7 1443/8 1444/15 1444/18 1444/24 1445/4 1446/15 1447/3 1447/10 1447/25 1448/8 1448/13 1449/10 1449/10 1453/21 1456/25 1459/18 1460/9 1461/11 1461/12 1461/12 1461/13 1461/17 1461/19 1461/20 1461/21 1462/5 1462/21 1462/22 1462/24 1463/1 1463/2 1463/4 1464/19 1464/25 1465/22 1465/23 1466/7

their [62] 1131/23 1139/3 1148/5 1155/6 1159/5 1166/14 1171/2 1193/18 1194/1 1220/21 1237/24 1248/11 1281/23 1289/13 1297/13 1298/16 1322/13 1332/24 1338/4 1339/22 1362/6 1362/7 1367/16 1368/4 1385/20 1390/24 1395/3 1400/7 1400/10 1401/4 1402/11 1405/9 1408/2 1408/8 1409/21 1418/21 1418/24 1427/12 1430/4 1430/24 1431/19 1437/17 1438/4 1438/16 1439/14 1447/13 1451/12 1451/13 1456/18 1457/5 1457/14 1458/3 1458/5 1459/8 1459/15 1459/16 1462/13 1462/14 1462/14 1462/14 1464/14 1466/21 them [78] 1132/25 1135/19 1136/9 1136/10 1137/22 1139/4 1150/14 1153/16 1155/4 1155/6 1162/25 1173/19 1173/19 1173/24 1175/19 1184/8 1185/9 1188/11 1188/13 1189/6 1189/18 1191/11 1191/11 1191/17 1212/21 1213/12 1222/7 1222/8 1223/10 1225/12 1233/6 1233/11 1243/23 1254/25 1260/14 1269/19 1269/21 1273/6 1273/6 1276/7 1276/10 1276/21 1276/21 1277/18 1292/18 1300/16 1304/8 1304/24 1310/11 1313/10 1323/11 1325/24 1332/9 1333/2 1333/4 1334/1 1340/16 1344/2 1358/1 1365/4 1374/9 1379/3 1388/1 1390/6 1395/7 1395/8 1400/9 1401/7 1409/21 1422/2 1428/12 1430/22 1434/23 1439/5 1441/4 1455/21 1455/23 1462/11 them 1 [1] 1191/11 themselves [8] 1264/22 1373/6 1373/19 1373/23 1423/2 1453/3 1455/11 1459/3
then [132] 1131/11 1131/18 1131/19 1133/14 1137/3 1137/4 1137/21 1138/4 1138/24 1141/19 1143/7 1146/23 1147/13 1147/16 1147/20 1148/5 1153/5 1159/4 1159/4 1159/5 1168/1 1168/16 1168/21 1170/10 1173/24 1175/12 1177/2 1177/18 1179/7 1180/2 1183/25 1184/11 1186/18 1187/2 1187/5 1205/20 1205/24 1205/24 1206/13 1210/13 1214/8 1215/23 1216/7 1216/12 1216/23 1217/4 1217/8 1221/19
$2323.122_{2}$ 1228/17 1229/15 1230/5 1230/12 1232/6 1232/7 1239/10 1243/8 1243/8 1247/5 1250/6 1251/4 1267/4 1274/9 1280/16 1281/15 1281/21 1281/24 1289/8 1291/22 1292/8 1294/14 1296/10 1298/17 1300/1 1305/10 1309/12 1309/14 1311/15 1320/10 1321/25 1322/12 1326/1 1330/9 1337/9 1343/10 1358/20 1360/4 1360/25 1371/1 1385/5 1386/11 1389/2 1390/3 1390/19 1391/16 1394/2 1394/9 1396/3 1398/12 1399/20 1403/10 1413/15 1427/11 1433/24 1437/23 1439/3 1439/4 1439/5 1439/7 1443/16 1443/17 1446/9 1446/17 1446/22 1447/17 1447/22 1448/7 1450/1 1451/9 1451/15 1451/22 1452/7 1456/1 1460/15 1464/16 1465/20 1469/8
theoretically [1] 1439/8 theories [2] 1430/24 1438/23 theory [5] 1133/2 1135/24 1139/14 1343/14 1431/18 there [289] 1132/15 1136/8 1139/10 1139/13 1140/1 1140/11 1143/22 1144/11 1144/12 1144/13 1147/14 1147/23 1148/24 1151/14 1154/14 1154/15 1154/22 1156/5 1156/9 1156/19 1159/8 1159/25 1160/19 1161/11 1161/13 1162/19 1166/10 1166/11 1166/11 1166/14 1166/25 1167/20 1168/21 1175/7 1176/23 1177/17 1178/18 1181/16 1183/7 1183/24 1184/23 1185/7 1185/8 1186/4 1186/12 1186/16 1186/23 1187/22 1188/18 1191/7 1192/5 1194/6 1195/2 1195/23 1198/15 1198/17 1199/19 1200/8 1200/10 1201/7 1203/1 1203/3 1203/21 1205/11 1206/2 1206/17 1208/7 1214/1 1220/15 1221/2 1222/1 1224/20 1226/15 1226/17 1226/17 1226/20 1226/21 1227/1 1227/5 1227/13 1227/13 1227/13 1227/24 1227/24 1228/7 1232/21 1233/14 1233/24 1234/4 1235/3 1236/22 1237/7 1237/11 1237/12 1238/16 1241/12 1245/11 1249/10 1249/17 1250/11 1251/8 1251/14 1251/20 1255/24 1258/24 1259/4 1259/17 1260/3 1261/3 1262/15 1263/5 1263/9 1266/3

1272/2 1272/12 1272/13 1272/14 1273/11 1275/19 1277/11 1280/15 1281/5 1281/6 1281/14 1281/17 1281/23 1282/2 1282/6 1284/19 1284/23 1284/25 1285/8 1286/19 1289/14 1292/6 1292/7 1292/19 1292/24 1293/24 1293/25 1294/19 1294/20 1295/12 1296/11 1296/15 1298/10 1299/3 1299/7 1299/22 1300/14 1301/5 1302/24 1303/22 1304/7 1304/10 1308/14 1309/10 1310/11 1310/17 1311/19 1312/2 1312/11 1313/3 1317/4 1318/6 1318/9 1319/2 1319/13 1319/15 1321/1 1321/3 1323/2 1324/9 1324/18 1324/24 1325/1 1325/3 1328/20 1330/11 1330/13 1332/10 1332/11 1335/3 1336/10 1338/6 1338/12 1338/20 1339/5 1341/23 1344/15 1347/1 1347/2 1347/9 1347/20 1348/18 1349/4 1349/11 1349/24 1349/25 1350/3 1350/9 1350/9 1350/19 1353/9 1354/12 1355/7 1356/24 1357/14 1357/18 1358/9 1360/25 1361/5 1361/13 1364/15 1365/20 1367/14 1367/20 1367/21 1369/5 1369/7 1370/23 1384/15 1385/12 1385/25 1387/22 1389/7 1389/9 1389/11 1390/15 1396/1 1397/19 1398/18 1399/6 1402/22 1402/23 1403/20 1404/14 1404/16 1405/14 1406/12 1407/15 1409/19 1409/20 1409/20 1414/25 1415/4 1415/17 1421/19 1425/8 1425/13 1426/2 1426/13 1428/20 1428/24 1430/22 1431/14 1435/25 1436/10 1436/15 1440/4 1442/10 1442/12 1442/19 1443/1 1443/2 1443/4 1444/6 1446/2 1448/22 1449/19 1450/20 1452/17 1453/4 1453/4 1453/21 1454/5 1454/14 1457/7 1458/20 1462/1 1463/10 1467/12 1469/7
there's [121] 1133/14 1137/13 1138/9 1138/19 1141/4 1141/21 1144/13 1148/6 1150/8 1152/11 1152/11 1154/14 1161/25 1162/4 1165/14 1177/15 1179/14 1181/10 1181/12 1182/25 1184/3 1184/17 1191/10 1195/9 1197/5 1197/22 1203/16 1205/14 1206/1 1206/9 1206/17 1206/20


Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH think... [93] 1315/22 1316/15 1317/17 1321/5 1324/3 1328/22 1333/20 1333/21 1334/6 1334/17 1335/11 1341/19 1347/19 1349/9 1356/13 1356/16 1357/3 1357/9 1357/16 1358/15 1364/7 1364/19 1364/23 1364/24 1365/7 1367/19 1367/25 1369/17 1369/18 1369/23 1371/6 1371/15 1379/14 1380/2 1380/2 1382/18 1393/15 1400/15 1402/8 1405/12 1405/23 1409/17 1410/16 1412/12 1413/7 1413/14 1414/23 1416/8 1416/9 1417/1 1423/16 1425/11 1429/11 1429/25 1430/1 1430/3 1430/5 1430/17 1430/20 1430/22 1431/14 1431/21 1436/12 1437/19 1438/2 1439/17 1439/22 1440/1 1443/4 1444/1 1444/6 1444/24 1445/4 1445/5 1445/14 1446/2 1446/19 1448/19 1448/21 1449/6 1450/7 1452/12 1454/24 1461/1 1461/14 1461/24 1462/7 1463/7 1467/11 1467/17 1467/19 1468/1 1469/12
thinking [9] 1135/15 1191/7 1229/24 1237/10 1242/12 1244/21 1267/12 1267/18 1305/12
thinks [4] 1182/20 1370/9 1451/17 1462/11
third [16] 1151/23 1152/13 1152/15 1162/23 1206/25 1217/2 1311/5 1320/7 1325/24 1325/25 1463/14 1466/11 1466/11 1466/13 1466/16 1466/21
third-party [4] 1466/11 1466/11 1466/13 1466/21 this [747]
thorough [1] 1387/18 thoroughly [2] 1210/11 1210/12
those [143] 1133/13 1134/23 1137/15 1137/17 1138/6 1144/6 1151/18 1152/20 1153/9 1153/17 1153/21 1154/19 1157/7 1157/21 1158/15 1166/3 1166/24 1168/3 1170/17 1180/8 1183/4 1183/17 1185/4 1185/10 1191/25 1195/4 1197/11 1198/9 1200/17 1202/10 1202/19 1206/4 1207/4 1207/12 1207/15 1207/19 1207/20 1209/16 1212/18 1214/21 1216/4 1220/18 1221/6 1221/8 1222/10 1226/24 1227/16 1227/20 1230/25 1232/24 1236/22 1240/5 1242/4 1242/9 1249/11 1249/16
 1261/10 1261/14 1263/20 1264/17 1266/16 1267/24 1269/17 1270/4 1275/13 1275/14 1275/14 1276/3 1278/11 1280/12 1280/19 1292/20 1293/21 1298/25 1299/20 1299/22 1301/8 1303/5 1303/7 1309/4 1309/6 1310/22 1312/13 1314/10 1314/16 1315/24 1317/5 1318/1 1318/6 1318/7 1322/17 1324/10 1332/12 1334/20 1349/3 1350/13 1351/21 1353/24 1353/24 1360/15 1365/8 1369/18 1371/3 1378/8 1378/11 1378/16 1378/25 1379/18 1379/19 1379/19 1380/8 1390/16 1390/23 1401/10 1416/7 1416/7 1421/20 1422/18 1428/11 1429/7 1429/10 1432/14 1435/1 1435/6 1435/12 1435/21 1439/4 1439/6 1439/7 1453/20 1455/12 1456/3 1458/18 1458/21 1459/9 1465/21 1468/17 though [11] 1144/13 1175/8 1228/15 1232/13 1234/16 1236/3 1251/17 1260/9 1264/10 1390/6 1455/14 thought [15] 1223/4 1226/13 1230/8 1259/24 1263/3 1294/1 1299/25 1305/11 1325/11 1325/15 1328/22 1339/17 1438/24 1452/7 1468/20
thousand [5] 1289/1 1300/3 1300/5 1331/11 1331/13 thousands [1] 1364/17 threat [1] 1338/5 three [27] 1138/6 1144/4 1144/6 1144/22 1151/7 1151/9 1162/22 1182/15 1186/8 1192/10 1227/21 1249/16 1278/11 1296/11 1297/1 1300/4 1300/4 1301/15 1322/10 1328/8 1331/11 1365/1 1411/20 1427/8 1429/22 1433/13 1463/24
threshold [4] 1229/18 1460/2 1460/13 1465/6
through [77] 1137/1 1137/6 1137/7 1151/8 1153/16 1153/18 1155/21 1155/23 1156/13 1157/9 1158/15 1158/23 1159/3 1162/8 1164/1 1164/3 1164/19 1166/20 1167/21 1168/25 1171/1 1175/20 1177/6 1177/9 1177/10 1177/11 1181/25 1183/23 1184/18 1185/9 1186/5 1191/2 1191/11 1193/14 1209/8 1222/1 1222/3 1222/4 1222/6 1231/19 1242/15 1243/4 1254/24 1255/16 1255/22

1310/13 1320/20 1324/9 1325/11 1340/14 1340/17 1340/18 1348/5 1351/13 1355/14 1367/13 1379/17 1384/8 1389/2 1398/8 1413/4 1413/14 1413/14 1422/14 1428/22 1432/13 1434/22 1440/3 1441/1 1452/11 1454/16
throughout [2] 1388/13 1469/4
thrust [1] 1405/10
ticked [4] 1158/17 1169/21 1170/16 1170/25
tie [2] 1175/7 1367/21
tied [7] 1369/19 1370/3
1371/3 1375/13 1462/3
1462/4 1462/12
tight [2] 1365/17 1395/8 tightly [6] 1402/24 1403/2 1403/5 1403/16 1404/10 1421/12
time [95] 1137/22 1138/11
1139/4 1139/16 1139/19
1143/11 1150/6 1150/20
1150/25 1154/9 1154/13
1155/1 1156/14 1156/18 1166/18 1183/12 1188/11 1198/1 1200/11 1202/12 1207/25 1208/2 1208/10 1211/4 1216/8 1217/12 1218/6 1224/17 1225/3 1225/17 1228/2 1228/21 1230/1 1230/10 1233/3 1234/1 1245/20 1253/11 1258/17 1259/18 1266/4 1271/8 1281/2 1285/17 1285/21 1285/22 1285/23 1285/25 1286/1 1286/4 1289/17 1290/16 1291/8 1293/8 1294/5 1303/9 1309/25 1311/24 1313/19 1314/15 1317/5 1321/10 1322/3 1322/6 1322/16 1339/22 1346/1 1346/16 1348/21 1351/14 1352/10 1355/3 1358/17 1358/23 1368/8 1379/17 1380/20 1385/19 1390/8 1390/14 1392/9 1400/18 1405/21 1410/22 1419/10 1426/8 1428/2 1440/7 1443/14 1444/14 1446/21 1448/21 1449/20 1451/14 1464/9 timeline [1] 1166/9 times [12] 1164/20 1169/22 1198/14 1218/2 1220/25 1302/11 1340/19 1368/7 1380/4 1389/23 1393/25 1412/4
Tiny [1] 1424/6 title [6] 1250/11 1251/1 1251/3 1274/7 1413/8 1416/18
titled [1] 1203/6
today [34] 1131/11 1137/23 1140/22 1143/6 1143/16 1145/10 1146/14 1191/23
$1249 / 4120961226 / 2463$ 1230/3 1230/11 1233/1 1233/7 1240/13 1269/13 1285/20 1288/13 1383/24 1384/2 1384/7 1384/10 1387/6 1411/22 1414/19 1415/13 1428/11 1435/5 1437/17 1440/18 together [16] 1173/24 1176/17 1185/12 1189/18 1212/22 1277/14 1277/16 1277/24 1291/4 1388/1 1390/11 1390/18 1398/21 1398/23 1458/4 1459/18 Toki [2] 1312/3 1436/1 told [14] 1137/22 1165/16 1171/20 1180/25 1212/16 1234/7 1258/24 1262/23 1310/18 1410/20 1413/16 1417/1 1423/16 1455/12 TOLLES [1] 1130/16 tomorrow [8] 1148/3 1230/3 1230/7 1427/10 1427/14 1427/24 1468/18 1469/9 tongue [1] 1364/11 tonight [2] 1427/7 1469/11 too [3] 1262/2 1322/1 1381/19 took [27] 1174/21 1175/3 1230/21 1261/9 1282/19 1285/23 1286/2 1299/8 1315/8 1320/2 1320/7 1322/3 1322/7 1325/25 1343/10 1343/13 1357/1 1370/10 1372/20 1381/23 1385/25 1388/17 1392/12 1413/3 1413/14 1421/23 1456/23 tool [2] 1165/18 1174/13 toolbox [1] 1408/9 tools [6] 1160/16 1196/8 1402/25 1403/2 1403/17 1421/13
top [19] 1137/13 1156/20 1156/25 1157/15 1162/3 1178/12 1182/16 1182/23 1183/8 1186/9 1186/12 1187/3 1302/4 1319/10 1348/13 1391/17 1407/5 1449/18 1449/24
topic [1] 1258/11
total [12] 1293/7 1293/12
1306/21 1307/24 1320/15 1328/24 1330/25 1344/14 1346/5 1346/20 1353/24 1353/24
totally [3] 1142/3 1248/10 1338/5
touch [1] 1409/6
track [1] 1441/9
tracking [1] 1364/18
tracks [1] 1147/8
Traditionally [1] 1238/10 traffic [3] 1370/25 1376/7 1376/7
transactions [1] 1294/13 transcript [8] 1199/8 1199/14 1199/21 1263/10 1263/11 1263/14 1373/11 1470/5 transcripts [3] 1150/17 1387/1 1392/16

| Case 1:13-cv-00919-JLH <br> transitory [2] 1177/13 1178/6 transmitted [1] 1398/12 travel [1] 1148/23 traveled [1] 1150/19 treated [1] 1442/11 trends [1] 1245/24 triaging [1] 1225/1 trial [24] 1129/12 1140/1 1166/1 1170/18 1173/10 1201/18 1203/15 1204/7 1204/7 1253/1 1289/19 1291/15 1324/25 1325/1 1374/1 1380/16 1380/21 1427/3 1434/1 1435/24 1438/12 1439/12 1451/9 1451/16 | 11574116614 <br> 1183/15 1185/10 1185/12 1185/20 1187/24 1188/17 1190/9 1196/7 1200/17 1202/11 1202/15 1207/20 1212/3 1212/18 1212/19 1213/3 1213/6 1213/14 1213/15 1216/1 1218/14 1229/15 1229/16 1239/18 1241/22 1257/19 1257/20 1272/1 1286/19 1296/9 1296/13 1305/22 1306/14 1310/22 1328/9 1328/20 1330/11 1344/4 1349/2 1373/21 1379/12 1379/15 1400/1 1401/10 1403/10 1403/21 1405/12 1421/8 1421/15 1427/8 1428/17 1429/7 1429/22 1431/14 1433/10 1463/14 1465/6 1466/19 <br> two-year [1] 1147/15 <br> type [4] 1163/11 1179/21 1179/22 1375/6 <br> types [8] 1148/22 1151/20 1178/24 1179/21 1179/23 1388/24 1401/23 1401/24 typical [3] 1322/9 1328/17 1332/21 <br> typically [2] 1270/19 1332/23 typo [2] 1447/22 1448/1 <br> U <br> U.S [7] 1148/12 1347/17 1348/13 1355/22 1359/24 1412/5 1470/9 UC [1] 1289/8 ultimate [2] 1323/13 1327/23 ultimately [4] 1291/17 1432/3 1457/20 1458/17 Um [1] 1353/23 Um-hmm [1] 1353/23 unambiguous [5] 1434/21 1451/12 1451/25 1464/3 1468/9 <br> unambiguously [1] 1429/25 uncorroborated [4] 1272/5 1273/12 1392/20 1430/20 under [57] 1141/22 1141/25 1142/25 1145/21 1159/2 1203/15 1232/4 1253/24 1276/25 1287/23 1290/21 1297/6 1301/8 1301/8 1326/21 1327/10 1327/21 1328/5 1328/10 1328/25 1342/21 1343/14 1362/18 1362/20 1362/21 1368/4 1371/15 1371/19 1372/20 1383/14 1391/14 1393/2 1411/6 1422/7 1424/18 1428/18 1431/21 1432/1 1433/11 1433/13 1453/21 1455/10 1455/10 1456/6 1456/10 1456/17 1456/21 1457/15 1458/13 1459/3 1459/11 1459/11 1463/11 1464/1 1464/5 1465/2 1465/22 <br> undergraduate [3] 1147/4 | dity <br> 1324/18 1327/7 1352/13 understand [74] 1140/11 1140/15 1143/5 1150/23 1154/12 1160/18 1163/18 1164/12 1166/17 1167/3 1171/21 1186/6 1188/19 1192/3 1192/11 1208/4 1210/15 1212/3 1214/16 1214/21 1215/6 1218/3 1218/10 1218/18 1220/18 1221/2 1221/12 1222/24 1228/12 1231/14 1233/20 1239/25 1242/20 1249/23 1250/17 1257/7 1259/22 1260/23 1261/12 1269/20 1275/14 1276/3 1277/14 1277/16 1279/19 1284/16 1297/24 1298/23 1299/10 1309/23 1313/8 1317/3 1323/24 1334/17 1339/21 1346/23 1379/4 1380/14 1387/15 1389/21 1394/19 1401/6 1419/6 1419/13 1427/14 1439/10 1444/15 1445/13 1450/10 1454/19 1455/7 1459/24 1462/16 1467/16 <br> understanding [37] 1140/4 1155/13 1167/10 1193/14 1193/17 1195/5 1195/23 1200/1 1210/6 1210/8 1212/25 1213/2 1216/4 1234/6 1236/3 1236/10 1237/10 1250/11 1284/1 1284/21 1285/3 1289/4 1292/14 1292/23 1306/25 1308/8 1322/6 1322/8 1323/6 1333/8 1345/25 1363/12 1378/4 1378/8 1385/13 1388/14 1398/15 understands [3] 1321/24 1375/6 1418/10 understood [16] 1134/2 1235/5 1235/22 1241/14 1243/21 1267/2 1271/7 1276/10 1287/6 1313/10 1315/18 1374/22 1417/17 1419/22 1423/18 1439/16 undisclosed [6] 1138/7 1139/2 1245/10 1314/5 1337/17 1338/6 undisputably [1] 1245/20 Unfortunately [2] 1259/18 1260/14 <br> unhighlighted [1] 1244/3 UNIKEL [1] 1130/12 Uniloc [4] 1203/21 1204/9 1205/21 1205/24 unique [1] 1464/1 unit [9] 1241/13 1298/8 1298/10 1298/13 1312/11 1313/7 1319/8 1328/7 1330/22 <br> UNITED [2] 1129/2 1129/19 units [30] 1141/24 1142/4 1142/4 1142/11 1142/17 1236/7 1244/24 1253/9 1297/25 1298/3 1298/4 |  <br> 1310/15 1310/16 1310/19 1311/4 1314/8 1316/8 1316/25 1320/8 1320/9 1328/25 1340/19 1341/16 1355/20 <br> universe [4] 1227/1 1234/11 1244/17 1248/14 university [5] 1146/20 1147/22 1147/24 1272/19 1289/11 unless [4] 1434/23 1455/5 1457/4 1457/13 unlimited [1] 1356/11 unnamed [1] 1465/15 unpatented [1] 1449/21 unpleasant [1] 1395/16 unquote [3] 1260/25 1262/15 1411/13 unreasonable [1] 1465/12 unreasonably [1] 1331/2 unrebutted [1] 1434/16 unrelated [1] 1465/14 unreliable [3] 1316/4 1323/16 1340/22 <br> unsatisfactory [4] 1403/10 1403/18 1403/23 1421/15 unseal [3] 1306/4 1331/15 1331/17 <br> unsealed [2] 1382/24 1382/25 until [13] 1150/1 1150/2 1150/6 1218/7 1284/11 1284/22 1310/21 1312/7 1337/9 1338/21 1427/16 1427/20 1463/24 unwind [2] 1436/17 1438/14 up [126] 1133/5 1133/21 1134/9 1136/19 1137/12 1137/17 1140/2 1140/11 1143/15 1145/2 1150/1 1150/2 1150/13 1152/17 1153/15 1154/20 1157/20 1157/22 1157/25 1158/10 1161/2 1161/16 1162/12 1162/23 1165/5 1165/23 1168/3 1168/10 1168/13 1168/15 1169/1 1169/3 1169/9 1173/19 1174/9 1175/9 1180/2 1180/3 1180/11 1180/11 1180/19 1186/15 1186/15 1194/6 1198/2 1200/13 1200/14 1206/19 1217/24 1218/17 1219/25 1227/2 1237/24 1239/19 1243/2 1245/11 1253/17 1256/19 1256/20 1258/6 1273/25 1274/1 1276/17 1276/21 1279/2 1283/22 1285/3 1285/3 1285/4 1292/6 1294/14 1300/2 1300/14 1304/7 1309/13 1318/16 1320/4 1323/7 1329/5 1340/16 1341/23 1345/4 1345/7 1346/5 1347/20 1350/2 1353/5 1354/21 1355/10 1363/1 1363/24 1364/2 1364/25 1366/10 1366/12 1366/20 1369/7 1375/10 1375/12 1380/13 1380/24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Cdse 1:13-cv-00919-JLH up... [25] 1390/18 1395/12 1395/25 1396/1 1396/3 1396/4 1398/11 1399/7 1404/13 1409/1 1412/11 1420/7 1420/12 1420/16 1425/16 1428/14 1440/8 1443/3 1445/17 1450/24 1451/2 1453/25 1455/5 1468/17 1469/10 update [1] 1322/17 updated [1] 1309/21 updating [3] 1181/14 1185/18 1187/20
upon [16] 1236/8 1295/23 1297/2 1306/16 1312/23 1313/7 1315/4 1316/2 1321/14 1336/20 1336/24 1361/15 1369/24 1444/11 1451/19 1467/6
upwards [2] 1219/15 1304/11 us [98] 1136/10 1146/12
1152/13 1154/18 1155/23 1156/15 1158/11 1158/15 1159/2 1159/3 1160/13 1161/24 1162/14 1167/16 1167/17 1169/17 1172/6 1173/7 1174/6 1176/22 1176/25 1177/4 1178/14 1179/4 1179/8 1180/15 1180/20 1180/21 1180/25 1181/20 1182/13 1183/2 1183/10 1183/11 1183/17 1184/9 1184/17 1185/2 1185/17 1187/18 1187/21 1188/11 1190/1 1190/8 1190/16 1191/14 1199/15 1201/11 1201/14 1210/7 1226/8 1229/9 1229/15 1229/17 1230/6 1230/22 1231/19 1233/9 1236/1 1236/4 1236/11 1237/18 1237/23 1237/24 1240/11 1249/3 1256/4 1258/20 1271/24 1277/25 1285/10 1351/8 1355/3 1356/21 1361/14 1364/6 1366/21 1372/8 1384/2 1386/1 1388/16 1389/19 1392/25 1393/17 1395/23 1399/5 1399/6 1402/19 1412/25 1413/14 1415/11 1427/7 1428/11 1436/5 1447/7 1455/12 1463/20 1463/21 use [64] 1138/9 1138/11 1138/18 1140/14 1140/16 1144/9 1153/2 1162/1 1170/13 1174/12 1174/13 1189/2 1192/4 1194/21 1214/8 1214/19 1215/1 1216/17 1235/15 1236/17 1237/11 1238/22 1240/22 1243/22 1249/14 1266/23 1275/17 1291/9 1293/19 1293/21 1297/10 1300/17 1305/21 1307/1 1309/20 1316/21 1316/23 1329/4 1329/6 1332/24 1333/10 1333/13 1333/24 1344/22 1344/22 1351/18 1351/19
 1419/23 1434/6 1456/3 1456/20 1457/2 1457/5 1457/14 1457/14 1457/18 1457/19 1459/17 used [61] 1132/3 1143/3 1152/17 1173/25 1188/24 1189/6 1195/13 1210/13 1214/22 1219/20 1234/17 1236/16 1237/16 1237/24 1238/8 1238/15 1239/14 1239/20 1240/12 1244/24 1246/9 1246/10 1251/12 1257/15 1264/2 1267/1 1272/3 1275/11 1275/21 1284/10 1284/18 1309/24 1311/15 1318/25 1323/20 1323/21 1333/14 1346/13 1347/11 1348/3 1351/16 1352/19 1362/6 1366/12 1366/20 1388/5 1412/16 1414/17 1418/6 1418/7 1418/16 1418/23 1420/7 1436/25 1442/8 1442/15 1445/25 1446/4 1446/12 1452/24 1461/3 useful [2] 1163/1 1267/23 user [32] 1151/22 1152/18 1159/5 1160/10 1161/2 1165/21 1168/4 1168/11 1168/11 1170/9 1170/12 1172/2 1175/10 1180/6 1180/7 1181/19 1185/22 1186/23 1395/8 1400/2 1400/14 1400/24 1406/25 1407/2 1454/9 1456/2 1457/4 1461/16 1461/20 1462/5 1463/1 1469/1
user's [2] 1395/9 1405/6 user-installed [1] 1469/1 users [5] 1311/25 1322/17 1400/14 1401/5 1455/13 users' [1] 1322/16 uses [2] 1314/10 1351/20 using [50] 1138/13 1138/14 1138/15 1140/5 1140/24 1152/2 1158/3 1169/5 1176/21 1178/10 1179/15 1179/16 1180/18 1181/4 1210/2 1214/11 1234/8 1234/20 1235/1 1236/5 1236/20 1237/5 1238/13 1239/12 1249/3 1256/21 1257/12 1261/7 1261/19 1267/3 1276/2 1282/5 1303/13 1304/18 1316/25 1329/9 1330/2 1342/10 1348/15 1348/19 1354/1 1354/2 1360/8 1388/12 1400/20 1400/21 1406/20 1419/7 1419/17 1457/1 usually [1] 1375/5 utility [3] 1194/1 1194/23 1195/1
utilized [2] 1174/8 1232/24 utilizing [1] 1138/25
V

1304/23 1305/4 1340/25 1384/12
validated [1] 1384/11 validity [12] 1149/21 1202/9 1226/1 1305/12 1368/8 1383/25 1387/12 1389/13 1397/5 1406/2 1411/24 1412/3
valuable [1] 1409/16 valuation [1] 1289/23 value [9] 1196/12 1241/13 1301/24 1302/24 1302/25 1379/3 1400/8 1401/4 1449/19
values [1] 1302/10 valuing [2] 1294/11 1294/11 various [17] 1165/20 1165/22 1172/5 1191/2 1247/10 1294/15 1319/4 1340/14 1343/7 1387/2 1387/22 1388/4 1411/2 1411/12 1418/21 1422/25 1432/7 vast [2] 1323/11 1323/18 vastly [1] 1303/15
Venn [1] 1459/19 verdict [16] 1226/18 1226/22 1226/25 1227/21 1283/22 1435/5 1435/11 1436/18 1437/4 1438/2 1438/16 1439/8 1439/23 1440/13 1440/17 1440/20
verdit [1] 1436/17
verified [1] 1312/9
verify [3] 1278/12 1278/15 1278/18
version [27] 1161/2 1177/16 1177/16 1188/4 1203/10 1204/25 1236/13 1237/17 1237/20 1237/22 1241/20 1262/14 1262/16 1274/8 1276/1 1283/22 1285/6 1308/10 1318/13 1322/19 1329/21 1353/18 1353/19 1353/20 1381/13 1407/19 1469/10
versions [18] 1155/6 1156/1 1246/14 1313/21 1313/22 1316/3 1318/11 1319/4 1319/24 1320/21 1321/10 1321/25 1329/18 1332/11 1332/12 1356/21 1359/6 1414/11
versus [19] 1135/13 1135/14 1136/1 1203/16 1203/21 1204/9 1204/13 1206/21 1206/23 1207/2 1284/6 1295/3 1303/6 1320/25 1329/18 1345/17 1345/24 1346/22 1436/8
very [66] 1151/10 1152/9 1152/9 1155/8 1162/3 1162/21 1162/24 1163/1 1163/2 1166/12 1167/21 1169/8 1176/9 1176/10 1178/21 1184/21 1186/7 1189/1 1190/7 1197/14 1209/14 1222/4 1224/2 1233/20 1248/12 1260/15
 2509 1292/4 1297/3 1299/15 1299/21 1300/11 1305/9 1305/24 1310/5 1315/4 1325/12 1327/17 1328/16 1333/2 1372/7 1372/25 1373/6 1373/6 1374/23 1382/7 1382/15 1387/21 1391/17 1394/24 1400/3 1405/5 1412/13 1426/20 1430/15 1433/5 1433/6 1442/3 1461/24 1464/13 VI [1] 1129/13
video [3] 1167/17 1167/20 1274/11
videos [7] 1166/13 1166/22 1167/16 1261/21 1275/11 1275/13 1387/2
view [33] 1171/21 1198/21 1212/4 1213/22 1214/13 1214/20 1215/10 1221/12 1233/17 1253/3 1253/4 1255/16 1264/22 1317/25 1376/10 1376/12 1405/1 1405/6 1409/1 1417/8 1420/1 1421/23 1422/1 1422/4 1423/16 1431/3 1434/5 1434/12 1439/11 1455/17 1455/18 1455/19 1462/20 viewed [2] 1294/19 1437/6 views [3] 1134/17 1175/2 1369/16
VINCENT [1] 1130/16
vintage [2] 1278/13 1278/14 violate [1] 1368/12
Virginia [3] 1146/10 1148/4 1148/15
virtual [1] 1386/7
virtually [1] 1232/14
vision [1] 1385/11
visit [1] 1146/12
Visual [3] 1418/6 1418/19 1419/23
visualization [1] 1386/4 visualizations [1] 1386/6 Volume [1] 1129/13 voluntarily [1] 1432/14 volunteer [1] 1148/8

## W

wait [6] 1141/2 1247/17 1338/13 1338/15 1339/18 1353/9
waited [1] 1340/1
waive [1] 1428/12
walk [5] 1155/23 1177/5 1177/8 1243/4 1452/11 Wall [3] 1167/17 1167/22 1168/13
want [74] 1133/4 1133/17 1134/8 1135/19 1137/21 1156/5 1156/14 1156/15 1157/4 1180/24 1183/17 1183/21 1199/19 1201/10 1206/7 1212/15 1213/1 1217/10 1225/23 1231/20 1235/20 1236/25 1237/1 1239/15 1240/5 1241/17 1242/15 1243/4 1244/19


| cas <br> ase $1: 13-\mathrm{CV}-00919-\mathrm{JLH}$ <br> well... [4] 1460/7 1461/7 <br> 1464/8 1468/25 <br> well-documented [1] 1269/10 well-known [1] 1420/1 <br> went [30] 1132/22 1143/13 <br> 1147/14 1156/4 1166/20 <br> 1167/1 1167/21 1168/1 <br> 1181/25 1185/8 1193/14 <br> 1209/8 1222/1 1254/24 <br> 1263/4 1263/5 1263/14 <br> 1270/6 1270/8 1289/7 1289/8 <br> 1324/9 1325/11 1365/4 <br> 1369/4 1407/21 1413/14 <br> 1414/10 1438/23 1440/3 <br> were [209] 1132/15 1139/13 <br> 1142/4 1142/5 1144/3 <br> 1149/19 1151/5 1151/7 <br> 1151/14 1151/16 1152/18 <br> 1153/11 1154/8 1154/18 <br> 1154/24 1160/8 1161/19 <br> 1161/20 1161/23 1162/7 <br> 1162/19 1163/22 1166/10 <br> 1166/11 1166/25 1169/9 <br> 1171/12 1173/25 1182/11 <br> 1182/12 1182/17 1186/4 <br> 1189/5 1190/25 1191/2 <br> 1195/13 1196/3 1196/12 <br> 1201/20 1203/19 1203/23 <br> 1204/1 1206/5 1206/21 <br> 1207/18 1207/22 1208/1 <br> 1208/6 1210/17 1210/25 <br> 1211/2 1211/6 1211/15 <br> 1212/1 1212/5 1212/6 1212/9 <br> 1213/2 1222/1 1224/12 <br> 1226/20 1226/21 1227/1 <br> 1227/6 1232/16 1232/22 <br> 1233/2 1234/7 1236/13 <br> 1236/23 1244/13 1244/17 <br> 1244/18 1246/17 1246/19 <br> 1248/9 1249/12 1251/23 <br> 1253/2 1253/6 1254/5 1255/1 <br> 1259/17 1263/16 1264/2 <br> 1265/14 1265/15 1266/23 <br> 1266/25 1267/13 1267/22 <br> 1267/22 1270/1 1270/9 <br> 1272/24 1275/11 1276/5 <br> 1276/8 1277/11 1278/10 <br> 1280/25 1284/23 1286/5 <br> 1290/3 1290/7 1292/10 <br> 1292/18 1292/19 1292/20 <br> 1293/5 1293/9 1294/17 <br> 1294/19 1297/13 1299/4 <br> 1299/20 1299/21 1300/6 <br> 1304/1 1305/18 1306/15 <br> 1306/25 1309/4 1310/3 <br> 1310/9 1310/24 1313/19 <br> 1313/20 1314/9 1318/1 <br> 1319/8 1319/16 1321/17 <br> 1321/18 1321/22 1322/25 <br> 1325/15 1327/10 1327/20 <br> 1329/9 1329/17 1329/21 <br> 1335/12 1336/22 1341/25 <br> 1342/11 1345/16 1345/17 <br> 1345/23 1346/10 1346/12 <br> 1346/24 1347/5 1348/7 <br> 1348/16 1352/22 1356/2 <br> 1356/3 1357/13 1359/7 <br> 1359/11 1364/18 1364/24 <br> 1374/9 1374/22 1381/13 |  |  | $1415 / 13$ $141 / / 6,143 / 1 / 4$ <br> $1 / 4 t 9 / 4$  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |





[^0]:    2

[^1]:    So one was a research project looking at making

[^2]:    

