Exhibit 6

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

_____
)
NETWORK-1 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,   )
)
              Plaintiff,   )
)
vs.   ) No. 14 Civ. 2396
)   14 Civ. 9558
)   (PGG)
GOOGLE LLC and YOUTUBE, LLC,   )
)
              Defendants.   )
_____)

CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF AUDIBLE MAGIC 30(b)(6)

ERLING WOLD

September 4, 2019 at 10:01 a.m.

Three Embarcadero Center, 26th Floor

San Francisco, California

REPORTED BY: LANA L. LOPER,

          RMR, CRR, CCP, CME, CLR, CSR No. 9667

_____

DIGITAL EVIDENCE GROUP

1730 M Street, NW, Suite 812

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 232-0646

Page 14

1   C-l-a-n-g-o?

2   A   Yes.

3   Q   And in general terms, what was Clango?

4   A   Clango was intended for people to be listening

5   to, say, an Internet radio station. And when they were

6   listening to an Internet radio station, they can run

7   this other operation called Clango on their desktop.

8   And if they heard a tune that they liked, they

9   could press a button, I think, and they would identify

10   that tune that was playing and then allow you to, you

11   know, purchase it, for example, if you were interested.

12   It showed you the metadata, and then it gave

13   you a URL to an e-commerce site.

14   Q   Is it fair to say that Clango identified songs

15   by their content?

16   A   Yes.

17   Q   Why try to identify songs by -- by their

18   content?

19   A   Well, at the time there wasn't -- there wasn't

20   always metadata. So if -- if someone was just listening

21   to a radio station on the Internet, it might just be a

22   stream from a terrestrial radio station, and so it

Page 29

1   simple idea.

2   It's basically, at the time we were using

3   10 MFCCs per segment of sound. And a segment of sound,

4   you know, could be 25 milliseconds, or it could be a

5   second, for example, something in that -- but it's

6   something short, in that range.

7   And the -- the way those -- so they're just

8   floating by numbers.

9   Let me think.

10   The way that they are computed is, you do some

11   kind of spectral analysis of the sound. So that's,

12   like, what the ear does. You look for low frequencies,

13   high frequencies, so on. And then you rectify that.

14   And then you take another spectral analysis of that.

15   And -- and what you end up with is a set of

16   features that really describes the spectral shape of the

17   sound. The lower-order features are kind of the gross

18   shape of the spectrum, and the higher-order features are

19   more the detail, the -- yeah, the higher features on the

20   spectrum, and over time.

21   Q   And once the Clango application had extracted

22   those features, what would it do next in the process of

Page 30

1   identifying a song?

2   MR. LEDAHL: Lacks foundation.

3   THE WITNESS: So in the actual application, as

4   it was released in mid-2000, there would be the Clango

5   application, itself, would just extract the features.

6   And so it would -- when the person pressed the button,

7   there would be, say, a circular buffer of the last -- or

8   not necessarily a circular buffer. There would be a

9   buffer containing the last so many seconds of the sound

10   of what they had been listening to.

11   That would all be fingerprinted at the Clango

12   application. So this set of MFCCs would be extracted.

13   Then that would -- that package would be sent

14   over the network to a server at -- under Audible Magic's

15   control. I think they actually had it in a third-party

16   site at the time. I'm not sure.

17   And at that -- and on -- on that end, there

18   would be a reference database of fingerprints. And then

19   some kind of lookup algorithm would be done to compare

20   the fingerprint coming in with that set of references

21   and -- to see if any of them were close enough that we

22   would report a match.

DOCKET ALARM

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts

Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research

With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips

Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS
Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS
Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.