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PROCEEDNGS
BJORN MARKUS JAKOBSSON, Ph.D.,
the witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION
BY MR. SELWYN:
Q Good morning, sir.
A Good morning.
Q Could you please state your full name.
A Bjorn Markus Jakobsson.
Q Dr. Jakobsson, do you understand that you have
taken an oath to tell the truth?

A Yes.
Q Is there any that reason you cannot give your
best and most complete testimony here today?
A Not that $I$ know of.
Q By whom have you been retained in these
matters?
A USR retained me.
Q USR is the patent owner?
A Yes.
Q When were you retained?
A I don't remember exactly.
Q Was it in 2018?
A No. It was before that.
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Q Was it in 2017?
A I think it was.
Q Was it in the second half of 2017?
A I remember it being April or May when I was retained, or $I$ remember being retained in April or May.

Q Of 2017?
A I don't remember that.
Q Was it after litigation commenced between USR and Apple that you were retained?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I actually don't know.
Q What's your best estimate of the year that you were retained?

A I think it was two years ago. In the spring.
Q So the spring of 2017?
A That's what I think, but I'd have to go back and check my record.

Q How did you come to be retained?
A I had worked with Quinn Emanuel in the past, and they called me up and asked whether I had any conflicts, and I didn't.

Q What did you do to prepare for today's deposition?

MR. MACK: I'll just caution the witness, don't reveal the substance of any attorney/client
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privileged communications.

But you can answer.
A So, among other things, I met with Brian yesterday in these offices and spoke on the phone with some other counsel of Quinn Emanuel and reviewed my declarations.

Q Did you speak with anyone other than counsel to prepare for today's deposition?

A No.

Q Did you review any documents other than your declarations to prepare for today's deposition?

A Yes.
Q What documents did you review?
A I reviewed the patents related to today's declarations. And I reviewed -- I'm sorry. So the patents-in-suit and some of the prior art patents and associated file histories.

Q Anything else?
A Not that $I$ can think of right now.
Thank you. Is there two documents?
Q Yeah. I have just handed you copies of Patent Owner's Exhibit 2108 in case number IPR 2018-812 and Patent Owner's Exhibit 2017 in same IPR, 2018-812.

Do you recognize those as declarations that you submitted in connection with the '539 IPR?
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A Yes, I do.
Q I've now handed you four additional
declarations, Patent Owner's Exhibit 2011 in
CBM 2018-34, Patent Owner's Exhibit 2101 in CBM 2018-24,
Patent Owner's Exhibit 2013 in CBM 2018-25, and Patent
Owner's Exhibit 2012 in CBM 2018-25.
Do you have those before you?
A Yes, I do.
Q Are those the four declarations that you submitted in connection with the two CBMs associated with the '813 patent?

A Yes, they are.
Q Did you review all six declarations that I've put before you in preparation for your deposition today?

A Yes, I did.
Q Are your declarations complete and accurate in all respects?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I remember that one of the motions to amend had a typo. And if $I$ find it, I will point it out to you. It related to the -- to the citation.

Q Other than that, are your declarations complete and accurate in all respects?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A As far as I'm aware of.
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Q Do your declarations contain all your support for your opinions?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So I'll -- the current support. I might be asked to opine about related things onwards, in which case, I will amend them.

Q Do your declarations contain all the support you currently have for your opinions?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A To the best of my knowledge, yes.
Q Who wrote your declarations?
A This was collaborative, where I wrote some parts and dictated other parts. The motions to amend, I reviewed the suggested claims, but I did not write them.

Q When you say it was collaborative, who did you collaborate with?

A Counsel for Quinn Emanuel.
Q Are there any portions of your six declarations before you that you did not author?

A So I did not author the proposed claims and the conditions -- the conditional motions to amend. Those were given to me.

Q Anything else?
A I did not author the legal standards portions. Nothing else comes to mind.
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Q Okay. Let me hand you a copy of U.S. patent number 8,856,539.

Do you recognize that?
A $\quad$ I do.
Q And will you understand me today if I refer that as the '539 patent?

A Yes, I will.
Q Now let me hand you a copy of U.S. patent number 8,577,813.

Do you recognize that?
A Yes, I do.
Q And will you understand me today if I refer to that as the ' 813 patent?

A Yes, I will.
Q Were you aware of the '539 patent before you were retained by counsel for USR?

A I was not.
Q Were you aware of the ' 813 patent before you were retained by counsel for USR?

A No, I was not.
Q What was the first time that you read the '539
and ' 813 patents?
A Actually, can I modify my answer to the previous questions?

I was aware of them when $I$ started discussing
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with counsel to be retained, but prior to being retained.

Q Prior to being contacted by counsel for USR, you were not aware of either the '539 or ' 813 patents, correct?

A That is correct.
Q What was the first time that you read the '539 and '813 patents?

A In connection with being contacted by counsel and them asking whether $I$ would have a conflict and whether I would feel comfortable with the material in these patents.

Q You didn't know about either the '539 or '813 patents before being contacted by USR's counsel?

A In the context of this case, correct.
Q You have never cited the '539 or ' 813 patents in any of your own papers or patents, correct?

A Would you break that down, please?
Q Sure.
You have never cited the ' 539 patent in any of your own patents or papers, correct?

A Would you ask it not broken down -- will you ask -- break it down into two questions, please?

Q Sure. Let's try it this way.
Prior to the time that you were retained for
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this matter, you had never cited the '539 or '813 patents in any of your own papers or publications, correct?

A Can you break it down by papers and publications, please?

Q Sure. Before you were retained -- strike that.

You have never cited the 539 patent in any of your own patents, correct?

A I don't know.
Q You have never cited the 813 patent in any of your own patents, correct?

A I don't know.
Q You have never cited the '539 patent in any of your own publications, correct?

A By "publication," do you mean peer-reviewed publications?

Q I'm not limiting it to that.
A Do you include patent publications?
Q Yes.
A I don't know.
Q You have never cited the 813 patent in any of your own papers or publications, correct?

A I don't know. The reason I do not know is that sometimes things get cited in context of the
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application, but it was not maybe used -- you didn't set out to cite it. So I don't know.

Q You're not aware of ever having cited the '539 or ' 813 patents in any of your own publications or work, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A By "work," what do you mean?
Q Any of the professional work that you've done outside of this matter.

A Okay. I'm not aware of having done that.
Q The '539 and '813 patents have never been discussed at any academic or industry conferences, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I would not know that.
Q You're not aware of the '539 or ' 813 patents ever having been discussed at any academic or industry conferences, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I wasn't asked to review that, and $I$ have not.
Q And therefore you're not aware of those patents ever having been discussed at any academic or industry conferences, correct? MR. MACK: Objection; form.

A Since $I$ wasn't asked to do that, I didn't
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review that.
Q The '539 and '813 patents have never, to your knowledge, been the subject of any academic, industry, or other praise or acclaim, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I wasn't asked to review either of that.
Q You are not aware of the '539 or ' 813 patents ever having been the subject of any academic, industry, or other praise or acclaim, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Again, I was not asked to review that. I do not know.

Q The '539 and '813 patents have never received any awards, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I was not asked to do that, and I am not aware of any as a result.

Q Mr. Ken Weiss did not receive any praise or awards in connection with the '539 or ' 813 patents, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Counsel has not informed me of that, and they've not asked me to review whether it would be so.

Q You're not aware of Mr. Weiss ever having received any praise or awards in connection with the
'539 or '813 patents, correct?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I was not informed one way or the other by counsel, and I wasn't asked to find out.

Q And you're not aware, correct?
A As a result, just -- I wasn't informed or asked to find out. I didn't try to establish that.

Q And therefore, to be clear, you are not aware of Ken Weiss ever having received any praise or awards in connection with the ' 539 or ' 813 patents, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I wasn't informed about it, and I wasn't asked to find out. So, as a result, I didn't attempt to find out.

Q And therefore you have no such awareness, correct?

A As a result of not being told and not being asked to find out, I am not aware of it one way or the other.

Q You're not aware of the '539 or ' 813 patents ever having been licensed, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I was not informed about that, and I wasn't asked to find out. As a result, I do not know one way or the other.
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Q You're not aware of anyone ever offering to purchase the '539 or '813 patents, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection to form.
A I was not informed about that by counsel, and I wasn't asked to find out either, so I don't know one way or the other.

Q You're not aware of any awards given for the '539 or '813 patents, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Would you please read that question back?
Q I can do it again.
A Okay.
Q You're not aware of any awards having been given for the '539 or ' 813 patents, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A What do you mean by "award"?
Q The broadest sense of the word.
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Well, USR were awarded patents for these applications.

Q Anything other than that?
A I wasn't told about any other, and I wasn't asked to find out. So, as a result, I do not know one way or the other.

Q All right. Could you put in front of you
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Exhibit 2107 from IPR 2018-812, which is your declaration.

A Did you say 2107?
Q 2107 in IPR 2018-812.
A Yes, I have that in front of me.
Q This is your declaration in support of the conditional motion to amend the '539 patent, correct?

A Yes, it is.
Q Could you please turn to paragraphs 31 and 32.
A Give me a moment, please, to review them.
Yes, I have reviewed that.
Q In paragraphs 31 and 32 of your declaration, Exhibit 2107, you testified that you had reviewed the priority applications for the '539 patent, correct?

A That is correct.
Q Did you read the priority applications in their entireties?

A Do you include the file histories when you say that?

Q No, just the priority application, which you're referring to in paragraph 31.

A I either read or skimmed them in their entirety.

Q There are two applications to which the '539 patent claims priority, correct?
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A I'm aware of at least two.
Q Are there more than two?
A Not that $I$ know of.
Q You testified in paragraph 31 of your declaration that, quote, It is my opinion that each limitation of the proposed substitute claims 39 through 47 is disclosed in and fully supported by the '729 application to which the '539 patent claims priority, correct?

A Yes, that's what it says.
Q And you gave the same testimony about the ' 703 application in paragraph 32 , correct?

A Would you read that question to me please?
Q Sure. You gave the same testimony about the ' 703 application in paragraph 32, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Yes.
Q Are there limitations in proposed substitute claims 39 through 47 that are only supported by one priority application but not the other?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I would have to review them and think about that. I don't recall one way or the other. But reading these two paragraphs, it's my understanding that they're fully supported. If you want to, we could go through
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them, though, and I could verify.
Q Did you consider, before today, whether there are any limitations in proposed substitute claims 39 through 47 that are only supported by one priority application but not the other?

A I don't --
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I don't recall one way or the other. I recall reviewing them, but I don't recall whether I was posed with that particular question. If I were, then I would have.

Q Could you now put before you Exhibit 2010 from CBM 2018-00024.

A Yes, I have them.
Q This is your declaration in support of the conditional motion to amend the '813 patent, correct?

A Yes, it is.
Q Could you turn please to paragraphs 30 through 32.

A Did you say 30 to 32?
Q 31 and 32.
A Okay. Give me a moment, please.
Yes, I've reviewed those two.
Q You've reviewed paragraphs 30 through 32?
A I reviewed portions of paragraph 30 for
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context, and I reviewed paragraph 31 and 32.
Q Have you read the '586 and '14 [sic]
applications that are referenced in paragraphs 30 through 32?

A With this, do you include the file histories?
Q I include the applications that you have -that you're referring to in those paragraphs.

A Yes, I've either read or skimmed them in their entirety.

Q Focusing on paragraph 31 of your declaration, you testified there that, quote, It is my opinion that each limitation of the proposed substitute claims 27 through 48 is disclosed in and fully supported by the '184 application, which is the originally filed specification of the '813 patent, correct?

A That's what it says, yes.
Q And you gave the same testimony about the '184 application in your declaration in support of the conditional to amend the ' 813 patent in CBM 2018-25, correct?

A Would you please read that question back?
Q You gave the same testimony about the '184 application in your declaration in support of the conditional motion to amend the '813 patent in CBM 2018-25, correct?

Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D., Volume 2
Conducted on April 24, 2019

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A You're going too fast for me. I need to
review. What is the other one?
Q CBM -- your declaration, CBM 2018-25.
A $\quad 2018$.
Q Exhibit 2012 .
A Exhibit 2012. Now, I'm ready to hear your question. I'm sorry.

Q Okay. You gave the same testimony about the '184 application in your declaration in support of the conditional motion to amend the $\quad 813$ patent in CBM 2015-00025 [sic], correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I'm struggling with the number there. What's the number that -- CBM?
(The requested portion of the record was read back by the reporter.)

A Yes, I did.
Q Now, could you put back in front of you your declaration in CBM 2018-24? It's Exhibit 2010.

A Yes, I have got that.
Q And directing you to paragraph 32. In paragraph 32 of that declaration, you testified that it is your opinion that each limitation of proposed substitute claims 27 through 48 is disclosed in and
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fully supported by the '586 application to which the '813 patent claims priority, correct?

A That is correct.
Q And you gave the same testimony about the '586 application in your declaration in support of the conditional motion to amend the '813 patent, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A What exhibit are you asking about now?
Q I'm asking about Exhibit 2012 in CBM 2018-25.
A And would you read the question back to me please?

Q Sure. You gave the same testimony about the '586 application in your declaration in support of the conditional motion to amend the '813 patent, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A In the exhibit that you just referred to.
Q Exhibit 2012, correct.
A In Exhibit 2012, I -- paragraph 32 in that one matches paragraph 32 in Exhibit 2010 with regards to the question you asked me.

Q Are there limitations in proposed substitute claims 39 through 47 that are only supported by the '184 application but not the '586 application?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Would you read that question back to me?
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Q Are there limitations in proposed substitute claims 39 through 47 that are only supported by the '184 application but not the '586 application?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A I don't think $I$ understand your question.
Q Let me ask a new one.
Are there limitations in proposed substitute
claims 39 through 47 that are only supported by one priority application but not the other?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A I don't know if $I$ can answer that. I don't understand your question.

Q What don't you understand?
A Would you ask it again?
Q Sure.
Are there limitations in proposed substitute claims 39 through 47 that are only supported by one priority application but not the other?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A You are asking only about 39 to 47?
Q Correct.
A So we're not talking about the paragraphs that you asked me to review here?

Q I'm asking you about proposed substitute claims 39 to 47. Do you have those in mind?
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A I need to look at those. 39 to 47. So that's a subset of the claims, in the substitute claims, described in paragraph 32 , correct?

Q Let me re-ask the question.
A Yes.
Q Are there limitations in proposed substitute claims 27 through 48 that are only supported by one priority application but not the other?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I believe they're both fully supported. Oh, yes -- wait. Do I understand you to ask this in context of one of these CBMs or both of them at the same time?

Q Both of them.
A Would you please break it down?
Q Sure.
Let's focus first on CBM 2018-0024. Do you have that in mind?

A Yes.
Q And you have given an opinion with respect to proposed substitute claims 27 through 48, correct?

A That's correct.
Q Are there limitations in proposed substitute claims 27 through 48 that are only supported by one priority application but not the other?

A They're fully supported by both.
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Q And is your opinion the same with respect to CBM 2018-00025?

A That is correct.
Q Let me ask you to put in front of you Exhibit 2010 from CBM 2018-24, your declaration.

A Yes, I got it.
Q And can you turn, please, to paragraph 30?
A Paragraph? I'm sorry.
Q 30.

A 30. Yes. I'm at paragraph 30. Let me review this for a moment.

Yes, I reviewed that.
Q Do you see in the second sentence of paragraph 30, you testified that, quote, The '813 patent also claims priority through a series of continuing and provisional application dating back to February 21st, 2006?

A That's what it says.
Q Did you read any of these continuing and provisional applications?

A I read or skimmed them.
Q You have not offered an opinion in any declaration regarding whether any of the continuing and provisional applications referenced in paragraph 30 support the proposed substitute claims, correct?
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MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A You'd have to refer me to a particular portion of one of my declarations and ask in that context. It's hard for me to answer general question about six declarations at the same time.

Q Well, I'm asking with respect to any declaration for the '813 patent. You haven't offered an opinion regarding whether any of the continuing and provisional applications referenced in paragraph 30 of Exhibit 210 support the proposed substituted claims, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Do you mean one by one?
Q I'm referring to all of them, yes.
A So let me -- to understand your question, let me just review the material here.

Q Sure.
A I can actually not recall one way or the other, sitting here. But if there's an expression of it in my declarations, I'd be -- my recollection would be refreshed. So if you have something in mind, we can turn to that portion.

Q Well, let me ask you about the declaration you have in front of you, Exhibit 210.

You haven't offered an opinion in that

Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D., Volume 2
Conducted on April 24, 2019
declaration regarding whether any of the continuing and provisional applications to which the ' 813 patent claims priority support the proposed substitute claims, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I'd have to refresh my recollection by reviewing the declaration. I don't recall, sitting here today.

Q In your declaration in support of the conditional motion to amend the ' 813 patent in CBM 2018-25, which is Exhibit 2012, you do not offer any opinion regarding whether any of the continuing and provisional applications to which the $\quad 813$ patent claims priority support the proposed substitute claims, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Do you have a particular paragraph in mind for me to review?

Q I'm referring to the entirety of the declaration.

A I'd have to review it again, then. I mean, I -- I -- with six declarations, I can't remember them verbatim, and I don't recall, but -- so if you have a particular paragraph that you would ask about, I'd be very happy to help.
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Q Do you recall in that declaration, Exhibit 220 -- Exhibit 2012, offering any opinion regarding whether any of the continuing and provisional applications to which the '813 patent claims priority support the proposed substitute claims?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I don't recall one way or the other, but that doesn't mean that it's not in here. It's just a statement about the extent to which $I$ recall the details of these -- the declaration.

Q Could you put back in front of you your declaration Exhibit 2012 from CBM 2018-25?

A Yes, I got it.
Q And please turn to paragraph 32.
A Yes.
Q In paragraph 32 of your declaration in support of the conditional motion to amend the ' 813 patent, you say, quote, It is my further opinion that because all the limitations recited in substitute claims 27 through 48 have sufficient written support in the '586 application, as set forth below, the substitute claims have an effective priority date at least as early as February 26, 2009.

Did I read that correctly?
A Yes, you did.
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Q Your opinion is that the earliest priority for the substitute claims of the ' 813 patent is February 26, 2009, correct?

A That's not what it says.
Q Well, is that your opinion?
A I haven't been asked to render an opinion about that.

Q The substitute claims for the ' 813 patent are not entitled to a priority date before February 26, 2009, correct?

A I haven't been asked to review that. I don't know.

Q You have not offered any opinion suggesting that the substitute claims for the $\quad 813$ patent are entitled to a priority date before February 26, 2009, correct?

A I don't recall, sitting here.
But if there's a particular paragraph that you want to refer me to, I'd be very happy to review it.

Q Okay. Let me ask you some questions, if I might, about the '813 patent.

You have studied the '813 patent, correct?
A Yes, I have.
Q And you've read it many times, correct?
A At least in part, yes.
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Q The ' 813 patent claims generally relate to verifying an account holder's identity, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection to form.
A There's much more to it than that, of course, but that's one aspect of it.

Q The verification described in the '813 patent is used to enable a transaction with a point-of-sale terminal, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A That's one aspect of it, but there are others as well.

Q The '813 patent describes verifying an account holder's identity based on codes, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I need to look at the phrasing of this. Is there a particular paragraph that you have in mind here?

Q No. I'm not limiting it to a particular paragraph. Can you tell me whether the ' 813 patent describes verifying an account holder's identity based on codes?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A I wouldn't characterize it as such. The reason I'm having a hard time with the questions is that I believe those -- some of those words are used in the claim -- in the claims, and $I$ want to make sure that $I$
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answer it correctly.
So can -- with that in mind, can I ask you to rephrase the question, please?

Q Let me re-ask it and see if you can answer it as phrased.

The '813 patent describes verifying an account holder's identity based on codes, correct?

A Let me review this with -- in mind that $I$ want to make sure that $I$ don't be careless with respect to the use of the terminology you are using.

I disagree with your characterization. I would say that one aspect of the ' 813 patent is for a user to convey its identity to a token -- to a device -sorry -- and for that device to authenticate to USR. And one aspect of that is to use encrypted identity information.

Q Would you agree with me that one aspect of the '813 patent is to verify an account holder's identity based on codes?

A That's not the characterization I would use. As I mentioned, what is done is that the device is verifying the identity of a user and then the device is interacting with the USR conveying an encrypted authenticate -- identity -- encrypted authentication information -- I'm sorry -- encrypted authentication
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information.
Q In the '813 patent, are codes used to verify an account holder's identity?

A So that's not how I characterize it. Instead, the user would be locally authenticated at the device, and the device would interact via proxies with the USR and transmitting encrypted authentication information, and that is used to determine whether to perform the transaction associated with this or not.

Q So you would disagree with the suggestion that in the ' 813 patent codes are used to verify an account holder's identity, correct?

A I haven't considered that exact formulation before. As I mentioned, I believe that the identity is verified locally by a device.

Q So I'm asking you to consider that characterization now. Can you tell me whether in the '813 patent codes are used to verify an account holder's identity?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I would have to think about that.
Q Okay. Can you tell me whether in the '813 patent an account holder's identity is verified based on codes?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.

A So as I mentioned, I believe that an -there's an authentication of a user local to a device where the device makes an assessment about the identity of the user and then the device communicates via proxies with the USR, with the Universal Secure Registry -- I'm sorry. No, I'm misusing this term. It's communicating with a secure registry. USR is, of course, the name of the company. I apologize for that. So the device communicates with the secure registry.

Q In the '813 patent --
A But wait. To convey encrypted authentication information that relates to the interaction between the user and the device. And that encrypted authentication information, among other things, is used to determine an action by the secure registry.

Q Would you agree with me that in the '813 patent the codes used to verify an account holder's identity typically incorporate information related to the account holder?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I disagree with that characterization.
Q Would you agree with me that the ' 813 patent is generally directed to the idea of verifying an account holder's identity to enable a transaction based on codes or information related to an account holder?

Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D., Volume 2
Conducted on April 24, 2019

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Would you please read that to me again?
Q Sure. Would you agree that the $\quad 813$ patent is directed to the idea of verifying an account holder's identity to enable a transaction based on codes or based on information related to an account holder?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A So let me break it down what I believe is happening in -- among other things, in the '813 patent.

Q Do you agree or disagree with what I said?
A I want to make sure that I answer correctly.
Q Well, are you able to answer it whether you agree or disagree?

A I -- please, for the context and for the record, I'd like to reformulate it and explain my understanding.

Q I'll just move on if you can't agree or disagree with my question.

A I just need to formulate it using my words.
Q I'm just asking you, sir, do you agree that the ' 813 patent is generally directed to the idea of verifying an account holder's identity to enable a transaction based on codes or based on information related to an account holder?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
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A So, as I mentioned, that is not how I'd characterize it. And if you want to, I could explain why.

Q Let me move to the '539 patent.
A Okay.
Q The '539 patent claims generally relate to verifying an account holder's identity, correct?

A Just a moment, please.
Q Sure.
A May I ask you to please read back the question?

Q Sure. The '539 patent claims generally relate to verifying an account holder's identity, correct?

A So the '539 patent, among other things, describes using validation information, which is information about the user of the database to whom the data pertains and is to be used by the USR software 18 to validate that the person attempting to access the information is the person to whom the data pertains or is otherwise authorized to receive it.

I think that might answer your question.
Q It doesn't. I'm not asking you to read from your declaration, sir. I'm asking you this question.

The '539 patent generally relates to verifying an account holder's identity, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A
So I don't quite agree with that
characterization. What I believe, among other things, that the '539 patent does is it allows a determination that user initiates a purchase, and then, for example, the user can enter a secret code, such as using SecurID, and that code is transmitted to the USR, among other things. And the USR determines whether the code is valid, among other things that it determines, and then accessing user's credit card information, which then conditionally is transmitted to the credit card company.

Q So I want to make sure we're clear. You disagree with the suggestion that the '539 patent generally relates to verifying an account holder's identity, correct?

A So this is not about identity authentication as such, but it's a much bigger concept. Identity and authentication play roles here, but it's not a correct characterization as you do. It's a little bit narrow. That is not the goal of the patent as such, but, instead, it's using authentication of a user to determine whether a transaction is performed -- to be performed, among other things, where this transaction may involve, for example, a credit card company.

Q Does the '539 patent describe verification?
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A So, for example, if you look at figure 6 of the '539 patent, in portion 604, it's determined whether the requester has right -- have rights to access the type of requested data. That's a form of verification.

Q So you agree that the $' 539$ patent describes verification, correct?

A I'm not sure whether the -- whether it uses the word "verification" but, for example, it determines whether a requester has rights to access a particular type of requested data.

Q Would you agree that the '539 patent describes verification used to conduct different kinds of transactions?

A So, among other things, as I mentioned in figure 6, element 604 is to determine whether a requester have rights to access some type of requested data. Now, there are many kinds of data in the context of '539 that are considered. That is a form of verification that is performed there.

Q Okay. My question is a little bit different.
A Okay.
Q The verification that's described in the '539 patent is used to conduct different kinds of transactions, correct?

A When you are saying "different kind of
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transactions," what do you mean?
Q Do you not understand that?
A I just want to understand what you mean by it.
Q I'm not giving it any kind of special meaning.
A Okay.
Q More than one kind of transaction.
A So, for example, the '539 patent describes that the USR system or database may be used to identify the user in many situations and thus might take the place of multiple conventional forms of identification. It does speak a little bit further down about enabling anonymous identification, which facilitates multiple new forms of transactions.

Q Okay. So let me re-ask my question. The verification described in the $' 539$ patent is used to conduct different kinds of transaction, correct?

A The reason I'm hesitating to answer is I don't understand whether you mean that there's an implication here between the verification and the different kinds of transactions.

Would you re-ask your questions in a way that avoids that risk of confusion, please?

Q Well, I am asking you whether there's a relationship between the verification and the different kinds of transactions.
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A What -- would you rephrase your question so that I don't have to feel hesitant about what you mean.

Q Okay. The '539 patent describes verification, correct?

A So I gave an example before of where a requester, it's determined whether the requester has -have the rights to access the type of requested data.

Q Are you able to answer my question yes or no?
A I didn't -- I was not aware of the question yet.

Q The '539 patent describes verification, correct?

A So I'm giving an example here that $I$ believe is verification, which is, does the requester have rights to access type of requested data?

Q So is the answer to my question "correct"?
A So I'm giving you an example that I believe would answer your -- your question.

Q I'm not asking you to give me an example. I'm asking whether the '539 patent describes verification.

Is that correct or incorrect?
A So the USR system in the $\quad 539$ patent may be used to identify the person in many situations. So identifying a person could be seen as verifying the person. And then it enables anonymous identification,

Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D., Volume 2
Conducted on April 24, 2019
which in turn facilitates multiple new forms of transactions.

Q I'll try it one more time, and then I'll move on.

Do you agree or disagree that the '539 patent describes verification?

A So the '539 patent, among other things, speaks about enabling anonymous identification, which facilitates multiple new forms of transactions. It gives a description -- various descriptions of this.

One that is -- one that might be helpful here is figure 8, element 806, which is that USR determines if the code is valid.

So in the context of your question, that determination is made, and in 812 -- no. I'm sorry -'814, the USR notifies merchant of the result of the transaction. That can be many forms of transaction.

MR. SELWYN: I move to strike as not responsive.

Q Can you put in front of you the $\quad 813$ patent?
A And after this line of questioning, I'd like to take a short break.

Q Yes. Do you want to take it now or?
A If you don't mind.
Q That's fine.
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A Okay. Thank you.
(A recess ensued from 10:03 a.m. to
10:10 a.m.)
BY MR. SELWYN:
Q All right, Dr. Jakobsson, can you put the '813 patent in front of you?

A Yes.
Q And would you turn to column 4, lines 12
through 14.
A Columns 4?
Q Column 4, lines 12 through 14.
A Just a moment. Yes.
Q Do you see the sentence that reads, quote, The system or database of the invention may be used to identify the person in many situations and thus may take the place of multiple conventional forms of identification?

A Yes, I do.
Q Would you agree with me that one problem that the ' 813 patent claims to address is verifying a user's identity?

A That's only a small part of what it's doing.
Q Would you agree with me that that is one problem the ' 813 patent claims to address?

A Well, it's part of a bigger picture. The
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reason I'm -- I'm clarifying this is that it is not used, for example, as password replacement.

Q Does the ' 813 patent address the problem of verifying a user's identity, yes or no?

A It's in the context of a transaction that one needs to verify an identity, but it's -- the patent itself is not relating to, for example, verification of an identity such as a password replacement method would do.

Q Can you answer my question yes or no? Does the '813 patent claim to address the problem of verifying a user's identity?

A So I don't want this to be misunderstood out of context, so I'm going to explain that that's one part of it only. And, you know, it's in order to perform a transaction, such as a credit card transaction, where there are multiple parties interacting.

And one part of this is for the system or component of the system to verify that a user is who he or she claims to be. So one example would be using biometrics.

Q The '813 patent doesn't claim a technique to verify the identity of an electronic device, correct?

A Would you say that again, please?
Q The ' 813 patent does not claim a technique to
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verify the identity of an electronic device, correct? MR. MACK: Objection; form.

A So it relates to identifying multiple things.
One is for a device to identify the identity of a user. And another one is for the device to convey information to the USR. And that information, it's useful for the USR to identify the identity of the device.

Q You're not answering my question, sir.
Does the '813 patent claim -- claim a
technique to verify the identity of an electronic device?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A When you say "claim," do you mean is it in the claim language?

Q Yes.
A So I have to look at the claim language. Is there a particular claim you have in mind.

Q Well, you've studied the patent, sir, right?
A Yes, I have.
Q You've read it many times, correct?
A Yes, I have.
Q You've offered multiple declarations on this patent, correct?

A Yes.
Q Can you tell me whether the $\quad 813$ patent claims
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a technique to verify the identity of an electronic device?

A Do you mean that is the full claim, and that's it?

Q Does --
A Do you mean is it a limitation of a claim, or is it the claim that you're reading now?

Q Let's start with the claim.
A So I have to look at whether there is a claim.
I gather you mean that this would be an independent claim that I'm looking for.

Is that so?
Q Let me ask you this.
In the ' 813 patent, the user device is what is performing the authentication, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Using the identification?
Would you read the question?
Q In the '813 patent, the user device is performing the authentication, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A The -- there are many types of authentication performed. When you say "the authentication," what do you mean?

Q The user device is authenticating the identity
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of the user of the device in the '813 patent, correct?
A So one part of how the ' 813 patent works or the technology in the ' 813 patent works is that a device is verifying the user, for example, using biometrics, but it could be a PIN. But that should not be seen out of context. It does that, and then conveys encrypted authentication information to the USR. And, again, the USR performs verifications and computations on this involving other parties. And then either it approves or disapproves an associated transaction.

I think that's the question you're asking me about.

Q It wasn't.
In the ' 813 patent, authentication of the user of the user device can take place using biometric information, correct?

A Would you please read that back to me?
Q In the '813 patent, authentication of the user of the user device can take place using biometric information, correct?

A When you say "of the user of the user device," do you also mean by the user device? Or is the question -- would you clarify it?

Q You understand what a user of a user device is, correct?
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A A user of the user device is the user associated with the user device.

Q Okay. With that in mind, in the '813 patent, authentication of the user of the user device can take place using biometric information, correct?

A So the device here could verify the user based on biometric information.

Q And that biometric is specific to the particular user, correct?

A That's not what I said. There are various forms of biometric information, and some might not be specific. So one form of biometric information is one's fingerprint. One's fingerprint is unique or close to unique to the person associated with it whereas there are other biometric information that isn't unique. For example, information about a biometrics might be that, for example, a fingerprint sensor was used. That is biometric information in some contexts.

You have to ask the question in context of a particular situation, and I would be able to answer.

Q Let me try it again.
In the '813 patent, authentication of the user of the user device can be done using biometric information, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
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A So the user device can use biometric methods to authenticate the user in order to determine what to do and what to transmit to the USR.

Q And when that is done in the ' 813 patent, the biometric is specific to a particular user, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I would have to review the context to see if I could answer that question.

Q In the invention claimed in the '813 patent, biometric information is not used to identify a specific device, correct?

A I'm sorry. I did not understand that question.

Q Let me try it again.
In the claimed invention of the ' 813 patent, biometric information is not used to identify a specific device, correct?

A That's not the question $I$ considered before.
Q In the '813 patent, biometric information would include comparing an image of a person's face to a stored image, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A There are many ways of performing verification. I would have to review the ways described in the $' 813$ patent in order to give you a good answer to
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that question.
Q Well, can you tell me, as you sit here today, based upon all of the work that you've done in this case, whether in the ' 813 patent biometric identification would encompass comparing an image of a person's face to a stored image?

A So first of all, that is not normally how it's done. One using -- one uses templates. Now, based on how you define "stored information," that might be a template.

With that in mind, would you please re-ask the question?

Q In the '813 patent, biometric identification would encompass comparing an image of a person's face to a stored image, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I need to look at my declaration to answer that question.

You know, $I$ don't think $I$ opined on that. Please correct me if $I$ think -- if you think I'm mistaken. So I don't see anything in my declaration that addresses that question.

Q So you don't have an opinion whether in the '813 patent biometric identification would encompass comparing an image of a person's face to a stored image,
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correct?
A Sitting here right now, I would have to review '813 in order to answer your question. I can't recall one way or the other.

Q Would you agree with me that one way that people recognize others is by comparing how they look to a mental stored image?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Do you mean what people do as opposed to what machines do?

Q What human beings do.
A What human beings do. I'm not a specialist in how human cognition works.

Q So you don't know.
A I don't feel comfortable rendering an opinion about how that works.

Q Would you agree with me that one problem that the '539 and ' 813 patents claim to address is interception of data by unintended third parties?

A Did you say --
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A --'813 and '539?
Q Yes.
A Would you break it down, please?
Q Sure. One problem that the '539 patent claims
to address is interception of data by unintended third parties, correct?

A So it's a bit narrow to say that that's the goal of the patent. Of course, it's an important aspect to address the problem of potential interception in any system that involves communication over networks. So '539 has components in it that address the problem of potential interception, but it also has components to perform other tasks. This is just a puny portion of the technical goals associated with '539.

Q Okay. But you agree that the '539 patent addresses, among other things, the problem of interception of data by unintended third parties, correct?

A So in a situation where you have a multiparty computation of any form and communication over a network, it's important if they are not dedicated networks to address the problems of potential interception. There are ways that the '539 patent uses that would address the problem of potential interception. But $I$ don't know if those methods are used for the pure purpose of addressing interception.

So with that in mind, would you please re-ask your question?

Q Let me ask a new question.
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The '813 patent addresses, among other problems, the interception of data by unintended third parties, correct?

A So there are components in the $\quad 813$ patent that, by using them, you reduce the risk of exposure of data to third parties that might interpret messages being communicated between the parties described in
'813. Now, that is, of course, not the entirety of the technical goals set out to be addressed in the ' 813 patent.

Q Okay.
A And $I$ don't know one way or the other if the pure goal of using the techniques that do address the potential interception of information was to address that or whether there are other goals as well for those particular components.

Q I'm not asking you about the entirety of the goals of the patents. My question is more simple that that.

Would you agree that one problem that the '539 and '813 patents claim to address is interception of data by unintended parties?

A Would you please break that down by the patent, please?

Q Do you think the answer may be different
depending on the patent?
A I want to answer it in a good way. And in order to answer it correctly for the record, I want to be able to refer to the individual patent. And since these are two different patents, I'd like to ask you to break down the question.

Q One problem that the $' 539$ patent claims to address is interception of data by unintended parties, correct?

A I think I answered this question before, didn't I?

Q I don't think you did.
A Okay. So let me try again. So --
Q Can you answer my question, correct or incorrect?

A Can I answer it correctly or incorrectly?
Q No. Can you answer my question in terms of the way it has been framed? Let me ask it again.

Would you agree with me, yes or no, that one problem that the ' 539 patent claims to address is interception of data by an unintended party?

A When you say "claim," do you mean that it's in the claim language?

Q No. Anywhere in the patent.
A I would have to review the entirety of the
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patent again to answer that question.
Q One patent -- strike that.
Would you agree with me that one problem that the ' 813 patent says it addresses is interception of data by unintended parties?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Do you mean verbatim like you said it, that it addresses it, or that $I$ would understand it or that a person of skill in the art would?

Q A person of skill in the art.
A I haven't considered that question. I can review it whether that would be the understanding of a person of skill in the art.

Q So you have not considered whether one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the '539 and '813 patents to address the problem of interception of data by unintended parties, correct?

A Would you please break that down by the patent?

Q You have not considered whether one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the '539 patent to address the problem of unintend -- of interception of data by unintended third parties, correct?

A I don't recall, but we can refer to my
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declaration to see if it's in there.
Q You have not considered whether one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the '813 patent to address the problem of interception of data by unintended parties, correct?

A I would have to refer to my declaration to recall whether I have opined or not.

Q Would you agree with me that interception of sensitive information by unintended parties is not a problem limited to the context of electronic transactions?

MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.
A I don't understand your question. Would you give me an example, please?

Q Sure.
Interception of data can occur if someone steals a letter containing credit card information from the U.S. Postal Service mailbox on the street corner, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A One would not quite call it interception of data, I think. Is that what you call interception of data?

Q Yeah.
A I would characterize it as theft of mail.
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Q Okay. If theft of mail occurs where a letter contains credit card information, that would be an example of interception of sensitive data by an unintended party, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A So, generally speaking, beyond the technical scope of the patents, interception, I think, to a person on the street, would have a meaning in the context of sports, not necessarily in the context of mail theft.

I'm not sure $I$ could answer that question
without you reformulating it not using the word
"interception."
Q How about this?
Theft of sensitive information by unintended parties is not a problem limited to the context of electronic transactions, correct?

A Would you clarify what an unintended party is?
Q A party that's not supposed to have the information.

A What information? The stolen information?
Q Yes.
A Would you please re-ask your question.
Q I'll try it one more time.
Theft of sensitive information by an
unintended party is not a problem limited to the context
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of electronic transactions, correct?
MR. MACK: Objection; form and the scope.
A When you're asking -- you're not asking about the patents now or the declarations, right?

Q I'm asking you as somebody who says in your declarations is an expert in cryptography, correct?

A Right.
Q And an expert in secure transactions, correct?
A But not mail theft.
Q Okay. Let me try it one more time and see if you can answer this question because I want it to be clear when the Board sees the transcript whether you've answered the question or not. Okay?

A That sounds good.
Q Theft of sensitive information by an unintended party is not a problem limited to the context of electronic transactions, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.
A When you're saying "electronic transactions," I understand that. When you say "beyond electronic transactions," what kind of transactions did you have in mind?

Q I didn't say "beyond."
A No. I'm sorry. Then I misunderstood.
Would you please reread your question? Would
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you -- it would be helpful for me if you rephrased it, actually, because there's some vague aspects of it that makes me have a hard time to understand what you actually are asking.

Q I'll ask it one more time. If there's something vague in it, you tell me words that are vague. Okay?

A I'll do my best.
Q Because I want the Board to understand what you think is vague.

Theft of sensitive information by an unintended party is not a problem limited to electronic transactions, correct?

A So let's start with theft of the information. What do you mean by theft of information?

Q What else do you think is vague in that question?

A I have to understand theft of information first, and then $I$ can parse it beyond that.

Q Okay. So the words "theft of sensitive information," that's vague to you?

A So it could be used in the context of communications, for example, whether digital or not. But it could also be used in the context of data at rest, which, in the physical case, might be somebody
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entering my home and stealing something.
What -- what did you have in mind?
Q I'll move on if you don't understand the question.

A It's not so much that $I$ don't understand the question as I don't understand what you understand the question to mean. So if you rephrase it, it would be helpful me.

Q You understand a deposition is an opportunity for me to ask you questions, right?

A Yes, sir.
Q And what's important is whether you understand the questions, right?

A But the question, I'm saying, is vague. Okay? You need to clarify in order for me to answer it in a way that is going to be helpful.

Q And if your testimony is that, in my question, theft of sensitive information is vague to you, I will move on.

A Okay.
Q Would you agree with me that the ' 813 patent generally relates to the fields of security and cryptography?

A Along with other things, yes.
Q Would you agree with me that the ' 813 patent
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generally relates to the field of payment systems?
A That's another thing, yes.
Q Would you agree with me that the application of security and cryptography to the field of payment systems was known before the '813 patent?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Would you please say that again?
Q The application of security and cryptography to the field of payment systems was known before the ' 813 patent, correct?

A There were aspects that were known. They were not the same aspects that are disclosed in the '813 patent.

Q The '813 patent doesn't disclose any new form of biometric sensor, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A No, it doesn't.
Q The '539 patent doesn't disclose any new form of biometric sensor, correct?

A That is correct.
Q The '539 patent doesn't disclose any new form of user interface, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Did you say '539?
Q Yes.
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A Sometimes people, when they say "user interface," also include user experience. When you ask the question, do you include user experience?

Q No.
A So by "user interface," what do you mean?
Q What the user sees on a device.
A So what he sees or the manner in which it's presented?

Q Both.
A So what he sees would, of course, be contextually dependent on the patent because the patent causes things to be shown that in another entirely different context would not have been shown.

Q Let me ask it this way.
A Okay.
Q Does the '539 patent claim to have invented a new form of user interface?

A Not that I'm aware of.
Q Does the ' 813 patent claim to have invented a new form of user interface?

A I'm not aware of that.
Q Does the '539 patent claim to have invented a new form of fingerprint sensor?

A Not that I'm aware of.
Q Does the ' 813 patent claim to have invented a

# Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D., Volume 2 

Conducted on April 24, 2019
new form of fingerprint sensors?
A Not that I'm aware of.
Q Does the '539 patent claim to have invented a new form of processor?

A Processor?
Q Yes. Computer processor.
A So you're speaking of the hardware?
Q Yes.
A So you don't mean it in the terms of how it's used, but rather the raw processor?

Q That's my question now, and I'll ask it again.
A Okay.
Q Does the '539 patent claim to have invented a new form of processor?

A Not that I'm aware of.
Q Does the ' 813 patent claim to have invented a new form of processor?

A Not that I'm aware of.
Q Does the ' 539 patent claim to have invented a improved way to operate a processor?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Now, that question is interesting because the manner in which one operates a processor, of course, relates to the software that is being executed on it.

With that in mind, would you paraphrase the
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question, please?
Q Sure. The '539 patent doesn't improve the way processors operate, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Do you mean, for example, in terms of their speed?

Q That would be one example, but I'm not limiting to that.

A So they do improve on what the processors perform in -- for example, the patent describes technology that is run on a processor. And -- in order to achieve goals that are specific to the patent. And, therefore, it improves the use of the processor by including this new functionality in this context.

MR. SELWYN: I move to strike as nonresponsive.

Q Does the '539 patent disclose an improved processor?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A By "improved," what do you mean?
Q Better.
A So "better" in that it can perform tasks that processors did not perform before?

Q No.
Does the '539 disclose improved hardware for a
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processor?
A Not that I'm aware of.
Q Does the '813 patent disclose improved
hardware for a processor?
A Not that I'm aware.
Q Does the '539 patent disclose any new form of communication interface?

A It describes communication interfaces between the entities described in the patent. And when you saying -- describing the new form of user interface, you just mean the raw interface --

Q Yes.
A -- or do you mean what it's doing too?
Q The interface.
A Just by itself.
Q Yes.
A So would you please re-ask the question with that in mind.

Q Does the '539 patent disclose any new form of communication interface?

A May I ask you to clarify in the -- in the question what you mean by the "new form"? Do you mean only the raw form of communication -- of interface?

Q Let me ask it this way. Does the ' 539 patent claim to have invented a new form of communication
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interface?
A No, not to my knowledge.
Q Does the ' 813 patent claim to have invented a new form of communication interface?

A Not to my knowledge.
Q Does the '539 patent claim to have invented a new way of operating a database?

A So that depends on what you mean, because, of course, the database would be used in the context of the patent.

Would you please paraphrase the question with that in mind.

Q Does the '539 patent claim to have invented a new form of database?

A So a new form of database, does that include its functionality and its use?

Q Can the invention claimed in the $' 539$ patent be used with any form of database?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A That's my understanding, yes.
Q Can the invention claimed in the ' 813 patent be used with any form of database?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A I haven't considered it in detail, but I believe it to be true.
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Q Can the invention claimed in the '539 database -- strike that.

Can the invention claimed in the $' 539$ patent be used with prior art databases?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I haven't reviewed all prior art databases, so I can't tell for sure. There might be some that are not suitable.

Q Do you know of any reason the invention claimed in the '813 patent couldn't be used with a prior art database?

A I haven't considered that question.
Q Do you know of any reason the invention claimed in the '539 patent couldn't be used with a prior art database?

A I also have not considered that question.
Q The '539 patent doesn't claim to have invented a new form of encryption, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A It does not.
Q The '813 patent doesn't claim to have invented a new form of encryption, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A When you say "claimed," do you mean in the claim language?
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Q I mean, anywhere in the patent.
A I'm not aware of it, but $I$ also wasn't asked to look for that.

Q The '539 patent doesn't disclose any new form of encryption algorithm, correct?

MR. MACK: Object to form.
A Not that I'm aware of.
Q And the '813 patent doesn't disclose any new form of encryption algorithm, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Not that I'm aware of.
Q The '539 patent doesn't disclose any new form of computer memory, correct?

A I don't think so.
Q The '813 patent doesn't disclose any new form of computer memory, correct?

A I also don't think so.
Q Would you agree that disabling an electronic device in response to failed authentication attempts was known before the ' 539 patent?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A When you say "disable," what do you mean by it?

Q Just the ordinary English meaning of "disable."
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A So such as nonoperable.
Q That would be one example.
A So I'm aware of -- would you please ask
your -- the question again?
Q Disabling an electronic device in response to failed authentication attempts was known prior to the '539 patent, correct?

A I would say a temporary disablement of devices was known prior to the '539 patent.

Q Disabling an electronic device in response to failed authentication attempts was known before the '813 patent, correct?

A So I think temporary disabling was understood prior to the patent, prior to that.

Q Before the '539 and '831 -- strike that.
Before the '539 patent was filed, downloading software to electronic devices was known, correct?

A Yes, it was.
Q Before the '813 patent was filed, downloading software to electronic devices was known, correct?

A Yes, it was.
Q Conducting a transaction anonymously was something people could do prior to the filing of the '539 patent, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
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A What kind of transaction do you have in mind?
Q Any kind of financial transaction.
A So financial transactions.
Would you please re-ask the question with that in mind?

Q Conducting a financial transaction anonymously is prior art to the '539 patent, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A There were ways proposed wherein people could transact anonymously prior to the $' 539$ patent.

Q Conducting a financial transaction anonymously is prior art to the ' 813 patent, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A There were proposals of how to transact anonymously prior to the priority date of the '813 patent.

Q Before the -- strike that.
Before the priority date of the ' 813 patent,
there were methods and systems that existed to conduct a financial transaction anonymously, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Would you read that back to me slowly?
Q Before the priority date of the $\quad 813$ patent, there were methods and systems in existence to conduct a financial transaction anonymously, correct?
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MR. MACK: Same objection.
A I actually have not considered that question.
Q Before the priority date for the '539 and '813 patents, downloading apps over a wireless network was known, correct?

A That is not something I have opined on, and I would have to review that in order to tell.

Q Before the priority date of the '539 and '813 patents, downloading apps that conducted financial transactions was known, correct?

A Would you rephrase this question without using the word "app," please?

Q Sure. Before the '539 -- strike that.
Before the priority date of the '539 and
'813 patents, downloading software that conducted financial transactions was known, correct?

A Would you please break it down by the patent.
Q Before the priority date of the '539 patent, downloading software that conducted financial transactions was known, correct?

A Would you give me some more context here, who's downloading and where to?

Q No. You can't answer that question that I asked?

A It's a little bit vague.
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Q What is vague in my question?
A For example, it could be a consumer that downloads something, or it could be a bank that downloads something.

And also I'd like to ask you to clarify what you mean by "downloading."

Q You don't understand the word "downloading"?
A I understand downloading, how it's used currently, but not how you used it in the context of the patents.

Q I'm not using it in the context of the patents.

A Okay.
Q I'm using the ordinary English meaning of the word.

A Okay. Now, how about the context of what kind of entity is downloading?

Q No. I'm not limiting it, sir. Listen to my question. Okay?

Before the priority date of the ' 539 patent, downloading software that conducted financial transactions was known, correct?

A It's not something I've considered.
Q Before the priority date of the ' 813 patent, downloading software that conducted financial
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transactions was known, correct?
A It's not something I've considered.
Q And you don't know, therefore?
A So if you help me by specifying where to software is downloaded, that might help me answer the question.

Q Before the priority date of the '539 patent, point-of-sale terminals were known, correct?

A Yes, they were.
Q Before the priority date of the '813 patent, point-of-sale terminals were known, correct?

A Yes, they were.
Q The '539 patent doesn't disclose any new form of point-of-sale device, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Did you say '539?
Q I did.
A So it does disclose point-of-sales devices that are compatible with the technology described, for example, in figure 8. And I haven't considered whether existing prior to the priority date point-of-sale devices would have been compatible with that.

With that in mind, may $I$ ask you to please rephrase your question again?

Q You're -- respectfully, you're answering a
question $I$ didn't ask. Let me try it again.
The '539 patent doesn't claim to have invented
any new form of point-of-sale device, correct?
A That's correct.
Q The '813 patent doesn't claim to have invented any new form of point-of-sale device, correct?

A Not that I'm aware.
Q The '539 patent does not claim to have invented multifactor authentication, correct?

A In general or in the context of the patent?
Q You know what multifactor authentication is, correct?

A Yes, I do.
Q What is multifactor authentication?
A So when you -- for example, that you have to use two things to prove your identity.

Q The '539 patent doesn't claim to have invented multifactor authentication, correct?

A That is correct.
Q The '813 patent doesn't claim to have invented multifactor authentication, correct?

A You mean in the context of the claim language?
Q In the context of anything the patent says.
A I haven't actually looked for that. I'm not aware of it. I -- you know, whether they claim it or
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not.
Q You would agree that multifactor
authentication is prior art to the '539 and '813 patents, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Would you please break it down by the patent?
Q Multifactor authentication has existed since at least the 1990s, correct?

A I actually don't -- haven't prepared to answer
this question. I don't know when multifactor
authentication was introduced, just sitting here today.
Q You work for RSA, correct?
A Correct.
Q Did any part of RSA's business involve multifactor authentication?

A Yes.
Q What was that part of the business?
A Well, for example, the security token.
Q When was that introduced?
A I don't remember.
Q It was at least by the 1990s, correct?
A Yes.
Q Before 2006, it was known that one authentication factor in multifactor authentication could include information that a user knows, correct?
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A So many multifactor authentication methods prior to 2006 involve, for example, a PIN that the user would have to enter in addition to another factor that would have to be measured or inputted.

Q Before the priority date of the '539 and '813 patents, it was known that one authentication factor in multifactor authentication could include biometric information, correct?

A Would you please break it down by the patent?
Q Before the year 2000, it was known that one authentication factor in multifactor authentication could include biometric information, correct?

A Yes.
Q Before the year 2000, it was known that one authentication factor in multifactor authentication could include a non-predictable value, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So I need to ask you to clarify that because the context, as I see it, is you're asking me about methods of determining the user's identity by device, for example.

With that in mind, would you please rephrase your question.

Q Well, I'm not sure what context you're -- have in mind. Just focus on my question. Okay?
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Before the year 2000, it was known that one authentication factor in multifactor authentication could include a non-predictable value, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So a non-predictable value produced by tokens, such as a SecurID, in combination with, for example, a PIN that was entered by user could be used to determine the likely identity of a user. And that was well understood prior to 2000.

Is that the question you're asking me about?
Q I believe so. Let me try it again.
A Sure.
Q Before the year 2000, it was known that one authentication factor in multifactor authentication could include a non-predictable value?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So prior to 2000, one way of authenticating user in a multifactor context would be to ask the user to use a token that produced a value that varied with time. And sometimes, in addition, would enter -- the user would enter a PIN. And based on those two elements, the user would be authenticated.

Q Before the year 2000, it was known that one authentication factor in multifactor authentication could include a SecurID code, correct?
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A So the SecurID code could be one of the elements that a back end would verify in order to determine the likely identity of a user.

Q Before the year 2000, it was known that one authentication factor in multifactor authentication could include a user's account number, correct?

A I don't understand when you say "include" here. Would you please explain what you have in mind?

Q What's confusing to you about the word "include"?

A Well, "include" could mean either be part of something else or that, for example, if you include something in something else, then it's inserted, for example.

Q Multifactor authentication has more than one factors, correct?

A Yes.

Q So my question to you is whether one of those factors includes a user's account number.

Do you have that in mind?
A That is not how one authenticates a user in a multifactor authentication. The account number is -whether it is public or not, it is believed to be known or understood to be known and not used in order to authenticate the user.
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Q Let me ask it again.
Before the year 2000, it was known that one authentication factor in multifactor authentication could include a user's account number, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So a user's account number, I'm not aware of instances where that was used to authenticate users. I think you're asking me that question, and I -- unless you can paraphrase it to make me understand that it's a different question, $I$ do not think that account numbers would be useful for purposes of establishing identity.

Q Before the year 2000, it was known that one authentication factor in multifactor authentication could include a digital signature, correct?

A Please read that back to me.
Q Before 2000, it was known that one authentication factor in multifactor authentication could include a digital signature, correct?

A Digital signatures were used for authentication. Whether they were included in multifactor authentication or not, I -- I'd have to review my declaration if $I$ opined on that or look at any evidence that, for example, whether the patents that we are discussing spoke of that exact thing.

Q Okay. Let me hand you a copy of the '586
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application, which has been previously -- been marked as USR Exhibit 2011.

Have you seen that before?
A Yes, I have.
Q You've reviewed that?
A Yes, I have.
Q Could you please turn to page 68.
A Yes. I'm there.
Q And let me ask you to read to yourself from
line 24 on page 68 to line 2 on page 69.
A Just a moment.
Yes. I've read that.
Q That passage explains that after certain
events, there may be a lockout period during which the user device is rendered unusable, correct?

A It speaks of a lockout period.
Q And it says that after certain events, that lockout period renders the user device unusable, correct?

A Yes.
Q This passage doesn't specify what functions of the device would be rendered unusable during the lockout period, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A It speaks of the device being rendered

Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D., Volume 2
Conducted on April 24, 2019
unusable. I understand that you cannot use the device.
Q The passage doesn't specify the particular functions of the device that would be rendered unusable during the lockout period, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A I'm sorry. Would you please say it again?
Q Sure. The passage doesn't specify particular functions of the device that would be rendered unusable during a lockout period, correct?

A No. Let me go back and correct my previous questions -- answer. It's unclear to me from this context alone what you -- what the answer to your question is. So it speaks of the device being rendered unusable. I'd have to review other paragraphs to see whether that -- to "render unusable" has been described previously. Sitting here today, I don't know if it has been discussed elsewhere in the application.

Q I'm just asking you to focus on this particular passage. Okay?

This passage doesn't specify which functions of the device would be rendered unusable during a lockout period, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A To understand the description here, person of skill in the art may have to read the context of the
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application with that in mind. Now, I haven't read the application with that question in mind.

I don't understand your question, maybe. And if you could help me clarify it, it might be helpful. But as I under -- believe I understand it, I would have to review if there are descriptions elsewhere that clarifies what it means to have rendered unusable.

Q Okay. This passage doesn't explain how a device would implement a lockout period, correct?

A That is correct.
Q A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the '586 application would have understood what a lockout period is as referenced in this paragraph, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A A person of skill in the art would have read the remaining specification to make sure that he or she understood what was meant by the lockout period in order to make sure that he or she does not make a mistake.

Q A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the '586 application would have understood what a lockout period is, correct?

A Are you asking in the context of this paragraph or in general?

Q In general.
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A In general, the term "lockout period" would have been understood by a person of skill in the art.

Q The '586 application didn't coin the term
"lockout period," correct?
A I do not believe it did.
Q The concept of a lockout period after failed authentication attempts was known before the
'586 application, correct?
A I believe it was, yes.
Q And the concept of a lockout period after failed authentication attempts was known before the priority date of the '539 patent, correct?

A I believe it was.
Q The concept of a lockout period after failed authentication attempts was known before the priority date of the ' 813 patent, correct?

A Are you asking about lockout periods alone? Would you please restate the question.

Q The concept of a lockout period after failed authentication attempts was known before the priority date of the ' 813 patent, correct?

A So it's not a question that I have considered before, but $I$ believe so.

Q A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the '586 application would have understood how

Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D., Volume 2
Conducted on April 24, 2019
to implement a lockout period in software, correct?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Is this the '586 application?
Q Exhibit 2011.
A Yes.
So they would know how to implement some
lockout periods. I don't know in general whether they would be able to know how to implement all kinds of lockout periods.

Q The idea of disabling a device for a period of time after failed authentication attempts was known before the priority date of the ' 813 patent, correct?

A So the notion of limiting the functionality of a user device based on failed authentication was known prior to the priority date of the ' 813 patent.

Q And the notion of limiting the functionality of a user device based on failed authentication attempts was known prior to the priority date of the '539 patent, correct?

A Yes.
Q And the idea of limiting the functionality of a user device based on failed authentication attempts was known before the '586 application, correct?

A This is the '586, Exhibit 2011?
Q Yes.
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A I'm sorry. The reason I'm asking is that it doesn't say '586, and $I$ want to make sure that $I$ don't misunderstand you.

So the 5 -- assuming this is $\mathbf{~ ' 5 8 6 , ~ t h i s ~ i s ~ o n e ~}$ of the provisionals for which the -- from which the '539 patent issued. So the same answer would apply as to the '539 patent.

MR. MACK: We've been going about an hour, if
now is a good time for a --
MR. SELWYN: Would you like a break?
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
MR. SELWYN: Okay.
(A recess ensued from 11:09 a.m. to
11:16 a.m.)
BY MR. SELWYN:
Q Dr. Jakobsson, could you put back in front of you the '539 patent? I want to ask you some questions about it.

A Yes.
Q The '539 patent describes embodiments that transmit an entity's personal information to a provider, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I know that it -- it describes embodiment where the personal information is not transmitted. If
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you draw my attention to some paragraph that does the opposite, I'd be very happy to review it.

Q Do you recall, based upon your study of the '539 patent, whether it describes embodiments that transmit an entity's personal information to a provider?

A I don't recall one way or the other.
Q Let's look at column 3, lines 24 through 27.
A So it says "Additionally, USR system may enable the user's identity to be confirmed or verified without providing any identifying information about the person to the identity requiring identification."

Q So would you agree with me that the '539 patent doesn't prohibit transmitting a user's personal information to a provider?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I'm sorry. That's not what this says. This says something else.

Q Okay. I'm asking a new question, then.
A Okay.
Q The invention claimed in the '539 patent doesn't prohibit transmitting a user's personal information to a provider, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I'd have to review it with that question in mind. If you have a particular paragraph, I would be
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happy to review it.
Q So, based upon your study of the '539 patent, you can't answer the question whether the claimed invention prohibits or does not prohibit transmitting a user's personal information to a provider?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I understand the claimed invention, but you're asking me about various embodiments, and I haven't considered that question. I don't know.

Q Does anything in the $' 539$ patent prohibit transmission of a user's personal information to a provider?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Would you please rephrase the question? First of all, I'd like to know whether you're asking about the claims or the specification if you may -- if you don't mind.

Q I'm asking anything in the patent.
Is there anything in the 539 patent that prohibits transmissions of a user's personal information to a provider?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A I haven't considered that question.
Q Well, let's look at column 12, line 55.
Do you see that paragraph describes figure 9?
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A Yes. Let me take a quick look at figure 9 in this paragraph to refresh my recollection.

Yes, I have read the paragraph.
Q Okay. And have you looked at figure 9?
A Briefly, yes.
Q Now that you've read that paragraph and figure 9, can you tell me whether the '539 patent prohibits transmitting a user's personal information to a provider?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So this -- this paragraph speaks of transmitting -- well, $I$ don't know if we should call it transmitting but of a user providing a check to a merchant. I understand that the check might, for example, have a username and an address, which would be personal information. So this is not an embodiment that corresponds to the claim language that I have reviewed carefully.

With that in mind, please -- do -- do I make sense, or would you like to rephrase the question?

Q I think I understand what you're saying. Let me try to piece it apart.

A check typically includes a user's or an account holder's name and address, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
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A So, actually, let -- let me go back.
I think that the personal information has not been construed yet. So under some construction, under some proposed constructions, the username and the address may be personal information. And I'm not saying one way or another in this context. We can go to that later, that question of the construction of that information.

Q I'm not sure what question you're answering.
A Okay.
Q My question to you is a check typically includes an account holder's name and address, correct?

A That is common, yes.
Q And an account holder's name and address are personal information of the account holder, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A That depends on the construction. If the -so let me review here.

Are you saying personal information?
Q Yeah. You would consider an account holder's name and address to be personal information of the account holder, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So I want to make sure that I answer your question given the terminology that we are using in the
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context of this analysis.
My apologies for the delay. I just need to
brush up on claim language.
Q Okay. Let me re-ask my question.
An account holder's name and address are personal information of the account holder, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I haven't considered that question in the context of the claim language and the specifications here.

Are you asking me in general?
Q I'm asking you in general.
A In general, I would say a person of skill in the art would say that. But in the context of the patent, I haven't considered that question.

Q Okay. But you'd agree with me that a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand an account holder's name and address to be personal information of the account holder, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Beyond the scope of patents, a person of skill in the art would likely consider the name and the address to be personal information.

Q Okay. Let's look at column 12, lines 59 through 62.
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A Of the '539.
Q Of the '539.
A I heard you say column 12. But then I missed what you --

Q I want you to look at '539 patent, column 12, beginning at line 59.

A 59.
Q Do you see where it says "The check may be a conventional check containing identifying information or may be a check bearing a unique serial number and no identifying information to enable the check to be used anonymously"?

A Yes, I see that.
Q That passage makes clear that the claimed invention doesn't require the check to be used anonymously, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A When you say "claim," I'm not sure what you mean.

Q The invention claimed in the ' 539 patent.
A So you mean according to the claim language.
Q Yes.
A I don't see -- this is not the claim language we're reading here. So if we want to, we can go to the claim language. This is a specification, and this is
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not the embodiment $I$ understand to be part of the claims that I have reviewed.

Q Well, let's just speak about figure 9, then.
This passage from column 12, lines 59
through 62 make clear that in the context of figure 59, the check need not be used anonymously, correct?

A I'm sorry.
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Just a moment.
MR. MACK: I think you said figure 59.
A Yes.
Q I'm sorry. Okay. Let me try it again.
The passage at column 12, lines 59 through 62 makes clear that figure 9 doesn't require the check to be used anonymously, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So this is a different embodiment than I have studied in detail before. I haven't considered this paragraph very carefully before. I have to read it a bit and think about it. This is a different embodiment, clearly, than the other ones I have considered.

Q Okay. Well, I'm asking you to consider
figure 9 now.
A Yes.
Q My question to you is figure 9 doesn't require
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the check to be used anonymously, correct?
A It says it might be a conventional check. It doesn't use the word "personal" -- "personal information" that you did before, and I don't understand personal information to be the same as identifying information, necessarily.

So in this context of a check, I don't know what identifying information would mean. And identifying information, I believe, is something that we haven't yet construed. There have been constructions proposed but no decisions made.

So would you please ask your question with that in mind?

Q Well, I'll just re-ask the question.
Would you agree that figure 9 doesn't require the check to be used anonymously?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Figure 9 on its own speaks not of whether it's anonymous or not. It says that the user initiates a purchase and writes a check to the merchant, in step 900. So figure 9 by itself doesn't seem to have the answer to your question.

Q Well, let's look at lines 59 through 62 on column 12.

A Yes.
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Q That passage contemplates sending a check that contains personal information about a user on it, correct?

A That's not what it says. It doesn't use those words.

Q Well, one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret that passage to mean that a check can contain personal information about a user, correct?

A This passage by itself, I don't think, says anything about that. It doesn't describe even personal information. It does speak about identifying information, which I don't necessarily understand to be the same as personal information.

Q Well, that sentence says the check may contain identifying information but need not contain identifying information, correct?

A The paragraph says "The check may be a conventional check containing identifying identification or may be a check bearing a unique serial number and no identifying information to enable the check to be used anonymously."

Q So a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the reference to a check "may be a conventional check containing identifying information," to be disclosing a conventional check that contains an
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account holder's personal information, correct?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I haven't considered that.
Q Well, a conventional check containing identifying information would include an account holder's name and address, correct?

A I don't know one way or the other. I -- the only thing $I$ could say is that it says that the check may be a conventional check containing identifying information or may be a check bearing a unique serial number and no identifying information to enable the check to be used anonymously.

Q Would you agree that a check containing identifying information is not a check that can be used anonymously?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I haven't considered that in the context of the claim language. And, as you know, we haven't had the terms construed. Identifying information hasn't yet been construed. I don't know how to answer that question, given that.

Q An account holder's name and address would be an example of identifying information, correct?

A I don't know one way or the other. That depends on the construction.
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Q You would agree that the claims of the '539 patent are not limited to anonymous systems, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Would you please read me your question?
Q Yes. The claims of the $\quad 539$ patent are not limited to anonymous systems, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A So if you mean that there's no limitation describing anonymous systems, I cannot find such a limitation.

Is that the answer you're looking for?
Q That's part of the answer.
Would you agree that a person of ordinary skill in the art reading the claims of the $' 539$ patent would understand that they're not limited to anonymous systems?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Could I ask you to please point me to the part of the declaration where I opine about that? I can't remember doing that.

Q I'm just asking you, sir, to look at the claims.

And my question again is would you agree that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the
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'539 patent claims are not limited to anonymous systems? MR. MACK: Same objection.

A That's a different question than I've been -different from questions that I've been asked to opine on. Sitting here right now, I could tell you that that would take me more time than you would be willing to spend on this to determine the answer.

Q So you do not have an opinion one way or the other whether the '539 patent claims are or are not limited to anonymous systems, correct?

A So as I said, this is not something I believe that I have opined on. If you think I'm mistaken and it is in my declaration, I'd ask you to please refer me to that section.

That said, I cannot recall one way or the other. And in order to answer your question, I would have to look at that in more detail.

Q In your opinion, could a system that transmits name or address information to a merchant meet the claims of the '539 patent?

MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.
A First of all, that depends on the claim constructions that are selected, that are decided on. I think this cannot be answered without knowing how the claims would be construed.
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Q What claims or terms would you need construed to answer my question?

A So, at the very least, identifying information.

Q Anything else?
A I would have to think about that.
Q How do you understand the term "identifying information" in the '539 patent?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Can I use this as a placeholder?
So in the context of the 539 patent, the
petitioner has identified account-identifying
information as personal information about an entity, such as name, address, or account number.

Now, I understand that the patent owner
contends that construction of this and other terms is not necessary to resolve the matters raised in here. So the term "account" -- "account-identifying information" hasn't been construed yet. I am aware of the petitioner's view of how it would -- should be construed. But for the patent owner's view, it should be described -- it should be used in a way that doesn't require construction.

Q Okay. That was not my question.
My question to you, sir, is how do you
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understand the term "identifying information" as used in the '539 patent?

A So you're not asking about account-identifying information but identifying information?

Q Yes.
A I don't remember opining on that.
Q Okay. Do you have an opinion as to what the term "identifying information" means as used in the '539 patent?

A I would have to read the whole specification carefully in order to answer that. I know you don't want me to do that, right? It's -- I'm sorry. This is not something that I have opined on, I believe.

Q Do you have an opinion as to what the term "account identifying" means -- strike that.

Do you have an opinion as to what the term "account-identifying information" means as used in the '539 patent?

A I don't think this is one of the terms that $I$ was asked to opine on. I don't think that I have expressed an opinion in either one of the declarations that we are discussing.

Q And you don't have an opinion, as you sit here today, as to what the term "account-identifying information" means, correct?

A I would need to consider that before I answer.
Q It's not something you've considered before, correct?

A I wasn't asked to consider that.
Q And therefore you haven't, correct?
A I only do what I'm asked to do.
Q Okay. And you have not previously considered the meaning of "account-identifying information," correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I don't remember having opined on that. Now, I don't -- there -- of course, there was much work going into these declarations, and I'm happy when they're detailed because they jog my memory as to what I've done. But I don't remember it being expressed in these two declarations related to the '539 and opinion related to this, and I don't remember either having been asked to express such an opinion.

Q Do you remember being -- strike that.
Do you remember considering, in the context of any of the work that you've done in connection with the IPRs and the CBMs on the USR patents, the meaning of "account-identifying information" or "identifying information"?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.

A You know, just today, there are six declarations, and we were here some weeks ago discussing another six declarations. It's just impossible for me to remember all the details about this. I apologize that $I$-- my memory is flawed, like you might expect in this case and I don't remember all the opinions I have rendered before. I would have to go back and look at those declarations to see whether I rendered an opinion there.

Q But we can agree, as you sit here today, you have no opinion or view as to the meaning of "account-identifying information" or "identifying information," correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.

A That's not what I said.
Q Well, I'm asking you that question.
A I haven't -- I don't remember having rendered an opinion. Now, in the context of -- I'm not going to include declarations that are not in front of me today because $I$ cannot remember those. And $I$ don't find it in the declarations we are discussing now. I can't recall one way or the other.

Q Let's look at the '539 patent, column 3, lines 22 through 27. Do you see the passage that reads, quote, This USR system or database may be used to
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identify the person in many situations and thus may take the place of multiple conventional forms of identification. Additionally, the USR system may enable the user's identity to be confirmed or verified without providing any identifying information about the person to the entity requiring identification.

Did I read that correctly?
A Yes.
Q That passage makes clear that the USR system may work in a mode that provides personal information to authenticate a user or in a mode that authenticates a user without providing personal information, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A That's not what it says.
Q This passage makes clear that the USR system may provide personal information to authenticate a user, correct?

A I'm sorry. I think it says "without providing any identifying information." So did you -- did I mishear you?

Q No. Let me try it again.
Do you see the reference where it says
"Additionally, the USR system may enable the user's identity to be confirmed or verified" and the sentence continues?
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A Yes.
Q Would you agree that this passage makes clear that the USR system either may provide personal information to authenticate a user or may not provide personal information to authenticate a user?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A That's not how I understand the sentence. The sentence says "Additionally, the USR system may enable the user's identity to be confirmed or verified without providing any identifying information about the person to the entity requiring identification."

I think that's clear what it means, but that's different from what you're asking me.

Q Does the '539 patent disclose an embodiment where the USR system authenticates a user without providing personal information?

A I'm sorry. Did you say "personal
information"?
Q Yes.
A I haven't considered that question because I haven't considered the term "personal information."

Q Does the USR -- strike that.
Does the '539 patent disclose an embodiment where the USR system authenticates a user in a mode that provides personal information?
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MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Is there a particular paragraph you'd want me to review?

Q No.
A It's a big question and rather open-ended. I need to -- I could read all of it, of course, but I know you wouldn't want me to.

Q Let me ask a new question.
Does the '539 patent disclose any embodiments where the USR system operates by providing personal information to authenticate a user?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A This is not a question I've considered, and I wasn't asked to consider that. So I don't believe I've rendered any opinions on that.

Q Does the '539 patent disclose any embodiments where the USR system operates by authenticating a user without providing personal information?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So I haven't considered personal information, and, therefore, it's hard for me to answer questions related to personal information. I don't know how the '539 patent -- what it means by personal information.

Q Dr. Jakobsson, in your view, account-identifying information can include a credit
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card number, correct?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Please refer me to the -- the appropriate declaration. I don't remember one way or the other.

Q Well, I'm just asking you what your opinion is here, sir.

A But I know I'm here to describe and explain my rendered opinion. I don't believe this is a rendered opinion.

Q Does account-identifying information, in your view, include a bank account number?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A I haven't been asked, as far as I can recall, to render an opinion about what account-identifying information should be construed as. But if you think I'm mistaken and there is something in one of my declarations that does it, I apologize for my weak memory. And I would be happy to discuss it in that context.

Q Is it your understanding that Apple has offered a construction of account-identifying information?

A What patent are you speaking in context of?
Q The '539 patent.
A I understand that the petitioner proposed the
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construction for account-identifying information as personal information about an entity, such as name, address, or account number.

Q And you have not offered any opinion in any declaration whether the petitioner's proposed construction of account-identifying information is right or wrong, correct?

A So I could tell you about what the patent owner has said. The patent owner contends construction of this term along with the other terms identified in the context of the '539 patent is not necessary to resolve the matters raised in this context.

I don't recall being asked to render an opinion about what it would mean. And, in light of this, I suspect that I was not.

Q You have not offered any opinion in your declaration whether the petitioner's proposed construction of account-identifying information is right or wrong, correct?

A I recall rendering an opinion related to account-identifying information in the context of the '539 related to Reber and Franklin and, in particular, in the context of the petitioner's description of these two prior references.

Beyond that, I'm not currently aware of other
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opinions that $I$ rendered, but I'd be happy to look through it carefully, if you want me to.

Q Is "name" account-identifying information as that term is used in the $' 539$ patent?

A I'm so sorry. Would you --
Q Is a name an example of account-identifying information as that term is used in the '539 patent?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A You know, I don't remember the text here by heart. It's hard for me to answer that question. But if you have a particular paragraph you would like me to analyze I, would be very happy to do so.

Q I don't. I'm just asking you your best opinion, as you sit here today.

Is "name" an example of account-identifying
information as that term is used in the '539 patent?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I'd have to review it carefully and consider.
Q Is an address an example of account-identifying information as that term is used in the ' 539 patent?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A I haven't been asked to opine on that, and I would have to review it carefully and think about it.

Q Have you been asked to opine on whether "name"
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is an example of account-identifying information as that term in used in the ' 539 patent?

A I cannot recall, but $I$ don't see it described in my -- in one of my declarations. Now, I don't recall whether I was asked, but nothing was used. It would surprise me.

Q Is it your opinion that "name" is not an example of account-identifying information?

A I haven't established any opinions about this.
Q Is it your opinion that "address" is not an example of account-identifying information?

A Since I haven't been asked to opine about this, I have no opinions. This is not straightforward. I would have to review this carefully in order to establish this.

Q Can you give us any examples of account-identifying information as that term is used in the patent, as you sit here today?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A This is not what I've been asked to do, and I would need to analyze it carefully. These are important terms to construe.

Q Before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could include authentication information from a transmitting device, correct?
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MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Are you using these terms as they are used in the claim language?

Q What term are you talking about?
A Well, in general, your question.
Would you please rephrase the question in a way that doesn't use the same words?

Q Well, I'm going to ask the same question. See if you understand.

Before 2006, it was known that encrypted
messages could include authentication information from a transmitting device, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Now, to save us some time, is there a particular reference this is relevant to? I can look through all of this, but $I$ just want to help you save time. I know these are terms that are of relevance, and I don't want to answer in a way that can be misunderstood. So I need to review the declaration to make sure that my answer is representative of my opinions.

Q PIN-based authentication was known before 2006, correct?

A Yes.
Q Biometric authentication was known before
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2006, correct?
A Yes.
Q It was known before 2006 that PINs and biometric information could be combined to authenticate a user, correct?

A What does it mean to be combined?
Q You don't understand that?
A I don't understand your question.
Q Okay. Before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could be used by the receiving device to authenticate the transmitting device, correct?

A I need a little bit more context, since you're saying "the transmitting device."

Is there a particular transmitting device you have in mind?

Q Any transmitting device.
A Say that again, please.
Q Before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could be used by a receiving device to authenticate a transmitting device, correct?

A The way $I$ understand your question is that somehow the encryption of the messages would be useful for the authentication.

No, I don't understand that to be correct.
Q Okay. Let me ask it one more time to make
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sure the record's clear.
Before 2006, it was known that encrypted
messages could be used by the receiving device to authenticate the transmitting device, correct?

A I would need a little bit more context what you mean here.

So what would the messages contain in particular?

Q Local authentication was known before 2006, correct?

A Yes.
Q Before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could include information from the transmitting device that could be used to verify the identity of an individual, correct?

A Would you explain what you mean by "include," and then reread the question after that?

Q Include, I mean be part of.
A Be part of what? The encrypted -- the input to encryption function?

Q Yes.
A Would you please repeat the question.
Q Before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could include information from the transmitting device that could be used to verify the identity of an
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individual, correct?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I'm sorry. You're reading it so fast. I have a hard time making sure that $I$ understand the question. Say that again, but slower.

Q Before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could include information from the transmitting device that could be used to verify the identity of an individual, correct?

A So you're saying -- the transmitting device here, you mean any kind of transmitting device?

Q Yes.
A So it was known that one could encrypt messages, and it was also known that one could authenticate a user on a device, for example, using a PIN.

Is that the answer to your question?
Q You remember being deposed by me about a month or two ago?

A Yes.
Q Do you stand by all the testimony you gave in that deposition?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A You know, there is nothing I recall being
incorrect. I answered to the best of my knowledge then.
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If I misspoke, I apologize.
So unless there are particular questions you have, it's hard for me to answer this.

Q Do you have any reason to believe that you would answer the same questions that I asked you previously different if I were to ask them today?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Not unless I misunderstood the question either then or now.

The contexts are different too, of course. So I am considering the context right now of the '539 -sorry -- the '539 patent most recently. And in the previous deposition, we did not discuss the '539.

So to the extent that the questions depend on the context of the patent, the answers might, of course, be different.

Q Can you put in front of you your declaration Exhibit 2108 from IPR 2018-812?

A Just a moment.
Yes, I have that.
Q Okay. Could you turn to paragraph 51, please?
A So, by the way, I want to ask you if this is a long series of questions because this might be a good time for us to take a lunch break?

Q This will be relatively short, a few minutes,

I would guess.
A That sounds good.
Q Okay.
A Let me review paragraph 51.
Yes, I've reviewed it.
Q In paragraph 51, you state that "Access
restrictions indicate what requested data may or may not be accessed," right?

A Yeah. What I'm saying is that the language of the '539 patent confirms to one skilled in the art that the access restrictions indicate what data may or may not be accessed.

Q Access restrictions are used to determine whether a party is authorized to access specific data, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Are you asking in the context of the

Q Is it different outside the context of the

```
'539 patent?
```

A I would have to consider that.
Q Okay. Well, let's talk about in the context of paragraph 51 of your declaration. Okay?

A Okay.
Q Access restrictions are used to determine
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whether a party is authorized to access specific data, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So it says that the provider requesting the transaction, it's verified that that party complies with the access restrictions before the secure data is accessed or released.

Q So is it correct, then, to say that access restrictions are used to determine whether a party is authorized to access specific data?

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A So it doesn't use the terms you're using.
I -- I'm not sure what your question really means. But I could say that access restrictions in this context are used to verify that a provider requesting a transaction complies with these restrictions before secure data is released or accessed.

Q So if a merchant is permitted to complete a transaction with the user, the requesting merchant has complied with any access restrictions, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So that's not what this says. The determination might, of course, be wrong. So the system has a belief about the access restrictions having been complied with. Whether that is -- could be wrong at
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some time.
Q Well, would you agree that if a merchant is allowed to complete a transaction with the user, the requesting merchant has complied with any access restrictions?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A That's not what this says. You're asking me a very different question.

Q Okay. Can you answer my question?
A I would have to consider it. Would you say it again?

Q If a merchant is allowed to complete a transaction with the user, the requesting merchant has complied with any access restriction, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I don't think I've rendered an opinion on that. That's a different question than is addressed in here.

Q Have you offered any opinion that merchant validation is different from determining compliance with access restrictions?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I don't remember, but $I$ understand them to be different.

Q What is the difference between compliance with
an access restriction and merchant validation? MR. MACK: Objection; form.

A Let me give you an example to clarify it.
Q Well, I'm not asking for an example. I'm asking you to tell me what the difference is between compliance with an access restriction on the one hand and merchant validation on the other.

A Let me give you an example to clarify it. I think that might be easiest. So say that you go and fill up your car, assuming that it's a gassed car, and you put, say, $\$ 100$ of gas in your car at your neighborhood gas station. Now, your neighborhood gas station, we assume, is a valid merchant. Now, say that you drop your card as you leave and there's somebody there who picks it up and they start gassing up other cars. So as many cars as they can. Now, it's -- the merchant here, the gas station, is still a valid merchant, but the access restrictions will indicate at some point -- and I don't know what point that is -that this is not okay. So for -- this is a fraud prevention measure in particular. So in this example, maybe after $\$ 500$ worth of gas, an entity tasked with evaluating the access restrictions would determine that this is not permissible and, therefore, would not give access. And that's a way of protecting you in case you
drop your credit card.
And it's not a statement about the merchant.
The merchant hasn't become a nonvalid merchant. I could come right after this and fill up my car and my transaction, independently of what transpires with your credit card, would either go through or not go through based on my credit card. So the merchant, still, would be valid in this example, but the access restrictions, which are different from the validity consideration and which applies to your credit card and the merchant in that context, would not apply to my credit card and the merchant because it's a different context.

Q Do you have an opinion as to the meaning of the term "access restrictions" as it's used in the patent?

A Are we speaking about the '539?
Q Yes.
A So I see under the claim construction title on page 19 of the declaration, Exhibit 2108, that the patent owner consents that construction of these terms, the six terms construed by the petitioner, that the patent owner contends that this is not necessary to resolve the matters. So I have not provided an opinion about a construction provided by the patent owner.

Q What do you understand the meaning of the term
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"access restrictions" to be as it's used in the '539 patent?

A So in -- a little bit more context, access restriction for the provider and then whether that is to secure data or to at least one portion of secure data. So that term, the patent owner contends, should be construed to mean two or more restrictions specific to the provider that indicate what secure data may or may not be accessed.

That's a slightly different question from what you're asking, though.

Q So my question to you, sir, is what do you understand the meaning of the term "access restrictions" to be as used in the ' 539 patent?

A Sorry. Read it in the context of the phrase, for example, access restriction for the provider.

Q I'm just asking you about the two words, "access restrictions." What's your understanding of the meaning of those words?

A It's restrictions for access.
Q Can you give me some examples of what would be an access restriction as that term is used in the '539 patent?

MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.
A So I gave you an example with the gas station
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before to clarify the difference between access restrictions and merchant validity. Would you like me to think of another example like that?

Q Yes.

A So here's one where $I$ can explain how this is not the same as validity, and the access restrictions are used to determine whether the merchant gets access or not.

So imagine that you use your credit card to initiate a payment to an offshore gambling site. Now, the entity tasked with evaluating access restrictions in this example may determine, based on context, that it is not okay to transfer money to offshore gambling corporations even though this is a valid merchant.

In your context or in the context considered in this example, the access restriction here would prevent transfer of funds because, even though the offshore gambling company is a valid credit card merchant, they do not comply with the access restrictions.

Now, this is, of course, a little bit hypothetical because these are not examples that I've been asked to opine on, and you're asking me about my understanding sitting here today. I might be able to come up with further clarifications, but I want to check

## Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D., Volume 2

Conducted on April 24, 2019
first if this is helpful to you.
Q Is merchant validation a prerequisite for determining compliance with an access restriction?

MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.
A I haven't considered that question.
MR. SELWYN: Why don't we take our lunch
break.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
(A recess ensued from 12:22 p.m. to
12:56 p.m.)
BY MR. SELWYN:
Q Dr. Jakobsson, can you put back in front of you your declaration that's been marked as Patent Owner's Exhibit 2108?

A Yes. Got it.
Q And please turn to paragraph 51 again.
A Let me refresh my recollection about this. Yes. I reviewed it again.

Q In paragraph 51 of your declaration, you've offered the opinion that the access restrictions for the provider should refer to, quote, two or more restrictions specific to the provider, correct?

A That is correct.
Q And the basis that you give for that in your declaration is that the limitation reads access
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restrictions in the plural, correct?
A That's at least one of the reasons.
Q The only reason that you have given in your declaration for the "two or more" portion of the construction is that the limitation received -- reads access restrictions in the plural, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I'd have to verify, but I remember the access restrictions were plural, meaning -- making it obvious that there are at least two.

Q The only basis you've given in paragraph 51 of your declaration for the "two or more" portion of that construction is that the limitation reads access restrictions in the plural, correct?

A In paragraph 51, yes.
Q And there's no place else in your declaration where you offer an opinion that two or more -- I'm sorry. There's no -- strike that.

There's no place other than paragraph 51 in your declaration where you offer the opinion that access restrictions for the provider should refer to two or more restrictions specific to the provider, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I would have to review the declaration with that in mind.
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Would you like me to?
Q Not as we sit here.
A Okay.
Q You don't recall, as you sit here, providing any basis in your declaration for the "two or more" portion of that construction, other than that the limitation reads access restrictions in the plural, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I recall that there is analysis related to the access restrictions in the context of the Reber and Franklin references. I could review that to see if I make additional analysis in there.

Q Do you recall without re-reviewing?
A I know that the access restrictions was relevant to the analysis of the Reber and Franklin component, but I do not recall the answer of the question you're asking because I'm more focused on what I do say rather than locations that I say it.

Q Okay. The '539 patent never describes any systems where there are two or more access restrictions for a single provider, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So it mentions several places. One is in 18, 45 to 50. Another one is in 20, 16 to 20. And a third
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one, I believe, is 22, 1 through 4. Let me check that. Well, the last one is not so clear on it, but the other two make it clear that there are access restrictions.

Q Does the specification of the '539 patent ever describe any systems where there are two or more access restrictions for a single provider?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I don't recall that. But it's clear from the language of these two claims, number 1 and 22 , that it's a plural form. This is clearly not a typo. They are access restrictions, and they're all for the provider. So it specifies that there's one provider and multiple access restrictions.

Q I'm not asking you about the claims. I'm asking you to focus on the specification.

Does the specification of the ' 539 patent ever describe any systems where there are two or more access restrictions for a single provider?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
Q You've been looking at the spec for several minutes. Can you answer my question?

A I've only gotten to the sixth column. I need to review it in detail to tell.

Q Do you recall, sir, anyplace in the
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specification of the '539 patent where it describes systems where there are two or more access restrictions for a single provider?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So even though the '539 patent is relatively short, there's 22 columns. It's hard to memorize all of it.

Q I'm not asking you, sir, to memorize it. I'm asking you what your recollection is. Okay?

Do you recall anyplace in the specification of
the '539 patent where it describes systems where there are two or more access restrictions for a single provider?

A I would have to refresh my recollection by looking at something I have written. Do you see that -would you like me to look at the declaration?

Q No, we don't have time for you to reread the entire specification.

A No, I didn't say specification. I'm sorry. Declaration.

Q No, we don't have time for you to reread your entire declaration.

A Okay. It's hard for me to answer without that context.

Q Well, you knew I would be asking you about the
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patent today, didn't you?

A Yes.
Q You knew I'd be asking you about the declaration, correct?

A Yes.
Q There's nothing in your declaration where you identify anyplace in the specification of the
'539 patent where it describes systems where there are
two or more access restrictions for a single provider, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection to form.
A Is that a question or a statement?
Q That is a question.
A I would have to review it.
Q Look at the ' 813 patent. Can you turn to claim 1.

A Just a moment. Let me review it again.
Yes, I've reviewed claim 1 now.
Q Claim 1 doesn't require the electronic ID
device to include computer memory, correct?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A What unit would you -- did you say?
Q Claim 1 does not require the electronic ID device to include computer memory, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
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A Why do you say that? I think it has -- the processor of the electronic ID device has been programmed to perform some actions, and, typically, those instructions are stored in memory.

Q What specific language do you see in claim 1 that leads you to believe the electronic ID device must include computer memory?

A It says the processor also being programmed such as once -- let me -- just a moment, please.

Yeah. This processor is associated with electronic ID device. I know that because it says "It's coupled to the biometric sensor to receive information among other things."

And it also states that "The processor is being programmed such that once the electronic ID device is activated, the processor is configured to generate a non-predictable value," among other things. So that tells me reading it as a person of skill in the art that there would be instructions stored and those instructions that are stored there would be stored in the memory.

Q Okay. Does claim 1 require that the electronic ID device store in memory any information concerning user accounts?

A Are you asking about my legal understanding?
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Q I'm asking you as a person of ordinary skill in the art.

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So I could speak about processors executing instructions, needing to store the instructions. Now, of course, a claim does not need to specify all the components and all the steps in order to perform a process in order to be found inventive. It's sufficient, is my understanding, that the examiner determines that it distinguishes over prior art.

Q That's not my question.
Claim 1 does not require that the electronic
ID device store in memory any information concerning user accounts, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I was ask -- I thought you asked about whether it has memory? Did I misunderstand your question?

Q You did. Let me re-ask it.
Claim 1 does not require that the electronic
ID device store in memory any information concerning user accounts, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A Would the code be concerning user accounts because it processes it, the instructions related to the functionality of the processor?
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Q Can you answer my question, please?
A First, I need to understand whether you include the instructions in this description because they concern -- they are applied to matters related to the input.

Q Is there any language in claim 1 that you believe requires the electronic ID device to store in memory information concerning user accounts?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I haven't rendered an opinion about this in my declarations, I believe. I need to consider that.

Q Are you able to answer my question now?
A Give me a moment, and I'll consider it.
I need to ask you about the second part of your question just to make sure that $I$ recall it correctly.

Would you please reread your question to me.
Q Claim 1 does not require that the electronic ID device store in memory information concerning user accounts, correct?

A So what I need to ask you about in order to understand the scope of your question is the latter part, the "information concerning."

Would you include data or instructions or both
in that?
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Q Either or both.
A Can we take them one by one?
Q Go ahead.
A So which one do you want me to start with?
Q Any one you want to.
A So you're asking -- let me consider, then, the question whether the electronic ID device stores instructions.

Q That wasn't my question.
A Okay.
Q Don't change my question. Okay?
A No --
Q Stick with the question I'm asking, sir.
A That's why I need for you to state the question.

Q Okay. Let me break it down. In your declaration, you have not offered any opinion that claim 1 requires that the electronic ID device store in memory information concerning user accounts, correct?

A That is a question not a statement, right?
Q Right. I ended it with "correct."
A Okay. So I do not recall. I would have to review my declaration. Now, since we're speaking about --

Q And as --
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A I'm sorry.
Q Let me ask my new question.
A But you're cutting me off.
Q I think you answered my question.
A Okay. That's good.
Q As you sit here today, you don't have an opinion as to whether claim 1 does or does not require that the electronic ID device store in memory information concerning user accounts, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Then you understand my answer, if that is what you concluded. So I -- we -- I thought we talked about whether my declaration opines about it.

Q You answered that question.
A So this is a separate question, then, isn't it?

Q Yes, it is.
A May I ask you to please read back the question for me?
(The requested portion of the record was read back by the reporter.)

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Information about user accounts.
So do you mean information unique to user
accounts?
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Q I mean information about user accounts.
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I haven't considered this question, I think. If you think I have and want a clarification, let's talk about my declaration.

Q Do you -- you remember your declarations, correct?

A Not by heart, but I understand approximately what statements I've made.

Q Are you familiar with the '585 reference?
A '585. Is that the one we normally call the Jakobsson reference?

Q We called it the '585 reference in the last deposition.

A I don't remember the number so well.
Would you please refresh my recollection?
Q Let me hand you --
A Thank you.
Yes. This is the Jakobsson reference. So, yes, I'm familiar with this.

Q You are one of the named inventors on this reference?

A Yes, I am.
Q And the last three digits of this reference are '585?
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A Yes.
Q And you'll understand me if $I$ refer to this as the '585 reference?

A Yes.
Q Would you agree with me that the '585
reference discloses a communication terminal 140?
A Yes. I see that on page -- I'm not sure. The first figure. So the first out of eight papers.

Q One example that the '585 reference gives of a communication terminal 140 is a card reader, correct?

A Just to make sure $I$ don't mangle the terminology here, do you have a particular paragraph you'd like me to refer to?

Q What terminology are worried about mangling?
A Card reader.
Q Do you know what a card reader is?
A I do know what a card reader is, but I need to make sure that I understand in the context of this specification here.

Q What is a card reader?
A Well, for example, it's a device which can -you could swipe a mag stripe of a credit card and which then reads signals based on the magnetic information, encoded information.

Q Okay.
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A Another card reader device would be the version in which a chip card is being read by -- mostly, most of the time, powering the chip card, but not necessarily, and sending a signal to and receiving a response from.

Q Can you turn, please, to paragraph 44 of the '585 reference?

A Let me review this for a moment, please.
Yes. I reviewed that.
Q One example that paragraph 44 of the '585
reference gives of a communication terminal 140 is a card reader, correct?

A Yes. It says a card reader, a device receptacle, cradle, or holder for personal computer, telephone, personal digital assistant, a network interface card, a wireless receiver, and so on.

Q What is a card reader as that term is used in paragraph 44?

A A device that reads cards.
By cards, I understand it to mean chip cards, for example, or mag stripe cards.

Q A credit card would be an example?
A Not in the context of the 585 reference. It doesn't read credit cards.

Q In the '585 reference, the communication
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terminal 140 can communicate directly with the user device 120, correct?

A So let me review that.
It says that the user, optionally and
depending on implementation, has one or both of direct access to the communications terminal and indirect access to communication terminal 140 via the user authentication device.

Q I'm not sure what the answer is to my question.

A So would you please reread your question to make sure that I --

Q In the '585 reference, the communication terminal 140 can communicate directly with the user device 120 , correct?

A It doesn't say so.
Q Are you positive?
A Well, this sentence doesn't -- doesn't say so. If there are other places, I could review those.

Q Look at paragraph 44. Do you see it says in paragraph 44 "The communication terminal 140 can receive direct input from the user 110 , the user authentication device 120, or both"?

A I'm -- I'm sorry. Where -- where are you
looking?
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Q Paragraph 44.
A It's just kind of a long paragraph. What page are you on?

Q Yeah. It's -- it's the fourth line on page 16.

A Fourth line, page 16. Let me review that.
So it says "Likewise, the communication
terminal 140 can receive direct input from the user 110, the user authentication device 120, or both."

Q And my question to you is in the
'585 reference, the communication terminal 140 can communicate directly with the user device 120, correct?

A That's not exactly what it says here. It says "The communication terminals can receive direct input from the user 110, the user authentication device 120, or both."

Q And --
A That's very different from what you're saying.
Q So your opinion is that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not interpret the sentence that begins "Likewise, the communication terminal" to mean that the communication terminal 140 can communicate directly with the user device 120?

A Communicate normally would mean two-way, and this sentence does not speak about two-way
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communication. So I don't think the sentence speaks of that. This says that "The communications terminal can receive direct input from the user 110, the user authentication device 120, or both." But it doesn't speak of authentication device 120 receiving a signal from the communications terminal 140.

Q Let me make sure I understand.
A Yes.
Q You say that the word "communicate" requires two-way communication?

A Well, I want to understand how you think about it.

Q No, no, no. I'm not being deposed, sir.
The -- in your opinion, the word "communicate" requires two-way communication?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So maybe I should not jump to conclusions, and I apologize for that.

Would you please restate your question clarifying what you mean so that $I$ can answer the question correctly.

Q I don't know what you need clarification.
A So if the question is whether they send information back and forth, this sentence doesn't say so. If it's -- if the question is whether the
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communication terminal receives direct input from the user 110, the authentication device 120, or both, then the answer is yes. That's what it says.

Q So let me try it again.
In the '585 reference, the communication
terminal 140 can communicate directly with the user device 120, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So this sentence doesn't speak about two-way communication. So your question is broader than what this speaks about. This speaks about communication from the user or from the authentication device 120 to the terminal 140, but it doesn't speak about communication in the other direction.

Q My question didn't refer to two-way

```
communication --
```

A Okay.
Q -- anyplace.
A So --
Q Listen to my question, sir.
A Yes.
Q In the '585 reference, the communication terminal 140 can communicate directly with user device 120, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.

A So for the record, I need to just make clear that communication could mean two-way, and this does not disclose two-way communication. We can look at other paragraphs to see if they do. This paragraph discloses one-way communication. So to the extent that that is your question, yes, they do. The communications terminal 140 can receive direct input from the user 110, the user authentication device 120, or both. It's silent on other direction of communication.

Q Okay. In the '585 reference, the communication terminal can communicate directly from the user device 120, correct?

A What does it mean to "communicate directly from"? I can restate what I believe is happening here, but I don't understand your question. You normally communicate to.

Q In the '585 reference, the communication terminal 140 can communicate directly to the user device 120, correct?

A Not if you consider bi-directional communication or communication in which the communications terminal 140 transmits a message to the device 120 in the context of this sentence.

Q I'm not limiting it to this sentence.
A Then I need to review the other sentences too.
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Q Device 120 in the '585 reference can be a credit card, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A '585 does not deal with credit cards. It speaks of credit card form factor. But in this context that we're reviewing now and the -- the card reader you're speaking about, that is not a credit card.

Q Can you answer my question?
Would device 120 in the '585 reference be a credit card? Yes or no?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So the '585 reference deals with a password replacement system. A credit card has no role in a password replacement system. It doesn't speak about credit cards being read, and there would be no meaning. A person of skill in the art would not see any relevance of credit cards being read by this reader.

Q So your opinion is that the '585 reference -strike that.

Your opinion is that device 120 in the
'585 reference cannot be a credit card, correct?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Did you say the device -- the user authentication device 120?

Q Yes.

A A credit card is used to store on a mag stripe or on a chip financial information.

Now, the '585 reference do not -- does not
deal with reading financial information. It has no relevance here. To the extent that credit card form factors are described, it's to describe what the device might look like.

MR. SELWYN: I move to strike.
Q Can you answer my question yes or no?
Can device 120 be a credit card in the
'585 reference?
A Is the question whether I could answer your question?

Q Yes.
A I cannot answer your question unless you clarify.

Q Let's look at paragraph 41.
A Just a moment, please.
Q I'm not asking you to look at the declaration. I'm asking you to look at paragraph 41.

A I understand, yes.
Q So you're -- I'm asking you to look at paragraph 41, not your declaration.

A Yes, I understand. I'm looking at the paragraph you're asking me to.
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Q Okay. Do you see the sentence on page 14 beginning around line 9 that says, quote, In still other embodiments, a credit-card-sized device 120 is a card, such as a credit card, including a magnetic strip or other data store on one of its sides.

Do you see that sentence?
A Yes, I do.
Q Now, when it says "still other embodiments," do you see that phrase?

A Yes, I do.
Q That's referring to still other embodiments of the invention claimed in the '585 reference, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A That's my understanding.
Q And one of the embodiments disclosed in the '585 reference is "a credit-card-sized device 120 where the card is a credit card, including a magnetic strip or other data store on one of its sides," correct?

A I'm sorry. Where did you read that?
Q The same sentence I read to you.
A So what this refers to -- there's actually a really good picture on -- if you're looking at --

Q Can you answer my question?
A Yes, I'm trying to give you context. If you look at Exhibit 2013 on page 34, there are three images
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of -- representing the security product line. Two of these would fit in the wallet in the same space as a credit card would. So these are the credit-card-sized or might even say credit-card-shaped devices that is being referred to in this paragraph, paragraph 41.

MR. SELWYN: I move to strike as
nonresponsive.
Q Communication terminal 140 can be a card reader in the '585 reference, correct?

A Would you say that again slowly, please?
Q Communication terminal 140 can be a card reader, correct?

A That is correct.
Q And page 14, lines 9 and 10 say that user device 120 can be a credit card, correct?

A No. Then you misunderstand. I'm sorry.
It speaks about the form factor. This paragraph is about the form factor of the user device.

Q Okay. So your opinion is that the '585 reference does not disclose an embodiment that uses a credit card and card reader?

A So let's leave it to one by one. Do you want to discuss the card reader or the credit card in one?

Q Can you answer my question?
A So I can tell you that the '585 reference has
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nothing to do with reading credit cards. This is not about performing financial transactions, such as credit card transactions.

Q You changed my question, sir. That's not what I asked you.

A No. I'm trying to explain you with context -to you with context.

So the '585 reference is a password
replacement scheme with special features, but those special features are not the payment of credit cards.

MR. SELWYN: Okay. I move to strike as
nonresponsive.
Q Would you agree -- have you ever heard of something called a block cipher?

A Yes.
Q Block ciphers are prior art to the
'539 patent, correct?
A Yes.
Q And a block cipher is one type of encryption function, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Yes.
Q Can you turn to paragraph 73 of the '585 reference.

Paragraph 73 --
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A Just a moment. I need to take a look at it.
Yes. I have read the paragraph now.
Q Paragraph 73 indicates that authentication code 291 is one of the inputs to create authentication code 292, correct?

A So I think you're referring to the paragraph -- the sentence saying the combination function 230 then combines the generated authentication
code 291 with a PIN (P) to generate an authentication
code 292 that is a function of (K, T, E, P).
Is that the one you have in mind?
Q I'm asking you about paragraph 73.
Can you answer my question?
A What is the question again, please?
Q Paragraph 73 indicates to one of ordinary skill in the art that authentication code 291 is one of the inputs to create authentication code 292 , correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So, yes, it does.
Q A block cipher can be applied to authentication code 291 to create authentication code 292, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A That is one way of doing it.
Q Paragraph 73 of the '585 reference is an
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example of an encryption process that takes an authentication code as an input, correct?

A That's not what it says. This reference can use encryption functions, but that doesn't mean that it encrypts. And there's a subtle distinction here.

Encryption functions are one-way functions, and this reference, the Jakobsson reference, relies on having access to a one-way function.

Q Paragraph 73 is not limited to one-way functions, correct?

A It -- you could apply other functions too.

Now, let me explain why you need a one-way function.

Q No. Your counsel can ask you a redirect question. I haven't asked you a question.

Authentication code 292 is the output of a block cipher, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So the block cipher can be used as a one-way function, taking as input the generated authentication code 291 and a PIN (P). But when you use an authentic -- when you use a block cipher for encryption purposes, you need a key.

Now, this does not describe using a key. In
fact, in other places, it describes how to use the input
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in the key field, but it isn't a key. It's using it as a one-way function.

Q Paragraph 73 discloses how the PIN (P) can be combined with A, correct?

A So I think you should -- A is a function. So I -- I think, for correctness, you should say that combined with A (K, T, E).

Is that what you mean?
Q It is. Fair enough.
Paragraph 73 discloses that the PIN (P) can be combined with the function A, parentheses, $\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{T}, \mathrm{E}$, correct?

A Yes.
Q And paragraph 73 discloses that those can be combined using any algorithm, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A It doesn't say any algorithm. It gives examples here. For example, arithmetically adding, that's one example using a block cipher, which as I explained, is not used to encrypt, but it's used for purposes of applying a one-way function or an -- or other one-way function or other algorithm.

Q Now, when it says "or other algorithm," that's not limited to any particular algorithm, correct?

A It doesn't specify.
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Q Authentication code 292 is an encrypted authentication code, correct?

A No, it isn't. That's what I tried to explain. Thank you.

MR. MACK: Thanks.
THE WITNESS: Before you start, how about a quick break?

MR. SELWYN: Sure.
(A recess ensued from 1:41 p.m. to 1:47 p.m.)
BY MR. SELWYN:
Q All right. Dr. Jakobsson, can you put in front of you the Maritzen reference?

A Yes.
Q In Maritzen, the personal transaction device, or PTD, is the user's device, correct?

A It's referred to as a personal transaction device. I'm not sure what you mean by "user's device."

Q The PTD is the device that the user has, correct?

A It's associated with a vehicle. I'm not so sure it's associated with a user.

Q Well, who uses the PTD?
A I would assume the driver of the vehicle.
Q So the driver is the user?
A Yeah. But the driver might change over time.
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Q The PTD is intended to be used by a person, correct?

A Yes. Well, in the sense that -- you mean as a person, as opposed to a dog?

Q That would be one example.
A So it has a biometric sensor that I presume is taking an input from a person.

Q We can agree the PTD is used by a user who is a person, correct?

A When you say "user," what do you mean?
Q The person who uses the PTD.
A So that might change over time. So there might be different users for one PTD over time. So it's used by one or more people.

Q The PTD is used by a user who is a person, correct?

A I would characterize it slightly different.
The PTD is used by one or more users, whom
I -- each one, I believe, is a person.
Q Maritzen uses something called a "transaction key" to conduct transactions, correct?

A Let me look at the terminology.
So they refer to as the VAPGT transaction key. That's the vehicle-accessed, payment-gateway terminal transaction key.
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Q So you agree, don't you, that Maritzen uses something called a "transaction key" to conduct transactions?

A So the way they describe it is it's a VAPGT transaction key. The place I'm looking -- is there another place where they refer to it only as a transaction key?

Q The VAPGT120 is a transaction key, correct?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A The VAPGT is not a transaction key.
Q I'm sorry. Let's back up.
Maritzen uses something called a "transaction
key," correct?
A Let me review.
Yes, transaction key 340.
Q And the transaction key is used to conduct transactions in Maritzen, correct?

A So it's used in the context of transmitting to the server. No, I'm so sorry. I'm looking at the wrong place.

So in general, Maritzen is -- is describing how to perform toll payments. The VAPGT is a vehicle-accessed, payment-gateway terminal, and the transaction key 340 is used by the VAPGT to carry out the payment of the toll.
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Q In Maritzen, the PTD 100 generates the transaction key, correct?

A I need to refresh my recollection on how it's generated. Is there a particular paragraph you would like me to look at?

Q Look at paragraph 45.
A Here, it states that the PTD 100 creates a transaction key.

Q And Maritzen also describes that before a transaction, the user can select which transaction key to use, correct?

A I don't recall that being said. Would you draw my attention to a paragraph that describes that, please?

Q Paragraph 48.
A I don't see it say what you asked about. It does speak about the transaction key, but I think it says something else.

Q Paragraph 48 discloses that a user can select which transaction key to use, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I'm so sorry. I don't see this described.
Does it say it in an alternative way?
Q I'll move on if you don't see it.
A Would you read the sentence to me where you
think it says it?
Q No, sir. You have read this reference before, haven't you?

A I have, but I don't recall the characterization you gave.

Q Okay. In Maritzen, the selection of the transaction key can occur at the PTD 100, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So you referred me before to paragraph 45 where it says that "the PTD creates a transaction key." Now, you're asking a slightly different question, the selection of it.

Did I get that right?
Q Let me re-ask the question again.
In Maritzen, the selection of the transaction key can occur at the PTD 100, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A This is a very particular question. I need for you either to refer to my -- one of my declarations or to the sentence in Maritzen that says it because I can't recall one way or the other.

Q Well, I'm asking you as a person of ordinary skill in the art having read Maritzen, can you tell us whether the selection of a transaction key can occur at the PTD 100?

A So I know that the PTD generates the key, but I don't recall whether it selects it. That's a very different thing, of course.

Q Maritzen discloses one type of user input device, correct?

A I'd have to refresh my recollection on that.
Q Do you recall any user input device disclosed in Maritzen other than PTD 100?

A So it says here in paragraph 76 that "Figure 6A and 6B are example of personal transaction devices." So these are two examples. Now, they're very hard to see, at least in my copy here. It's not a very clear copy. So I can't say what they mean at all, but Maritzen says that there are two different. I understand it to be examples of a PTD.

Q Okay. My question to you is does Maritzen disclose any user input device other than PTD 100?

A So here it refers to personal transaction device 610 and 640.

Q Where are you reading from?
A So this is paragraph 76. I'm trying to understand the context of your question. So here there are -- the personal transaction device, that's the PTD, and there are two examples here, 610 and 640, as I understand this. So there are two -- at least two PTDs
disclosed, 610 and 640.
Q Okay. Does Maritzen disclose any user input device other than the PTD?

A I have to scan this quickly to say.
I know you don't want me to read all of this. I don't recall offhand. This is not something I think I've opined on. I'm happy to review in more detail. I've reviewed portions of page 4 so far. I want to, of course, answer your question accurately, and so far I don't know one way or the other.

Q Do you recall, as you sit here, Maritzen disclosing any user input device other than the PTD?

A Well, in paragraph 57 it says "Alternatively, user may pay the transaction amount by any other appropriate means, such as, for example, cash, credit card, or the like." That might not disclose another user interface. I'm not so sure. I would have to consider this more to give an accurate answer.

Q My question is do you recall, as you sit here, Maritzen disclosing any user input device other than the PTD?

A I think I understand your question. This is not something I think I opined on; so I -- I haven't really reviewed those portions of Maritzen in preparation for this deposition. And I would be happy

Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D., Volume 2
Conducted on April 24, 2019
to review this in order to give you a good answer. But just sitting here today, I can't tell one way or the other.

Q Maritzen discloses a PTD that is capable of receiving user input, correct?

A Now, I'd like to ask you to refer me to the paragraph where it says that, and I would be happy to verify the language.

Q Can you answer my question based upon your memory of having reviewed Maritzen?

A So I know that the -- the PTD receives a biometric input, but I'm looking for the context of that now. I think it speaks about that in paragraph 67, "The biometric control manager 330 includes computer-readable instructions used by CPU 210 to receive biometric information from privacy card 110, verify the biometric information, and unlock the PTD 100."

So I know, based on this, that the PTD can receive information from the privacy card 110. It appears from this that the privacy card 110 is the entity that collects the biometric information in the first place. It doesn't say that the PTD does.

Q Listen to my question, sir, please. Maritzen discloses that the PTD is capable of receiving user input, correct?
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A So what do you mean by "user input" in this context?

Q Are you familiar with -- strike that.
You don't understand the term "user input"?
A In general, I do. But in Maritzen, I know that since this is in the context of a person driving a vehicle, it's not desirable to provide, for example, key-based input. And Maritzen, I believe, addresses the problem of a user interface that should be operable while driving.

Q Can you just tell us whether or not the PTD in Maritzen can receive user input?

A You know, this is not one of those things that I believe that I opined on. I'd be very happy to consider the question in the context of, for example, the paragraph you asked me to read.

Q Have you considered before today whether the PTD disclosed in Maritzen is capable of receiving user input?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So, as we discussed before, I've been working on the case for roughly two years, if not more. I actually don't recall everything that I considered along the way. In the context of these declarations that we're reviewing today, I cannot recall having considered
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it.
Q In Maritzen, each transaction key can be associated with a particular user account, correct?

A Would you please say that again?
Q Maritzen discloses that each transaction key can be associated with a particular user account, correct?

A I know you don't want me to speculate. I don't recall opining about that, but -- and I didn't prepare for this question, as a result, for today's deposition. But I understand Maritzen well enough that I don't think $I$ would have to read all through this to understand it. But it's enough that you point me to a couple of places where it discusses it, and I would probably be able to understand and explain the answer to your question.

Q Sir, do you know whether Maritzen discloses that each transaction key can be associated with a particular user account?

A This is not something I opined on, I believe.
If you think I'm wrong, I'd love to ask you to point me to the portion in my declaration where I talk about it.

Q Okay.
A I -- I don't recall one way or the other,
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since $I$ haven't committed Maritzen to my memory.
Q Would you agree that Maritzen discloses that the user can select a transaction key associated with an account?

A I -- again, I'd have to look at the formulation to understand the context of the question.

Q Would you agree that Maritzen discloses that after the transaction key is generated by the PTD, it is sent to the VAPGT 120?

A No. It would be really helpful if you refer me to the paragraph where this is discussed, to make sure that $I$ speak accurately for the record.

Q How much time have you spent reviewing Maritzen?

A I've spent a lot of time with Maritzen, but not in the days leading up to this deposition. And I haven't committed to my memory, but I'm pretty sure that you have something in mind.

So if you want to ask me about a particular paragraph, I'd be really happy to answer that.

Q Let's go back to my question.
How much time have you spent reviewing
Maritzen?
A Are you asking altogether?
Q Yes.

A I don't know.
Q What's your best estimate?
A I'd be guessing. I have spent time enough to be able to opine on the matters involving Maritzen that are included in these declarations.

Q Have you considered -- have you spent more than 10 hours reviewing Maritzen?

A I -- you know, that's not how I do the bookkeeping, by the -- by the reference. And I wouldn't be able to answer that off the bat here. I could review my invoices and -- to see whether they described whether it was Maritzen I reviewed or other prior art, but I cannot think of the answer and answer correctly sitting here today.

Q Can you turn to paragraph 45 of Maritzen. Let me know when you finish reading that.

A Sure.
Yes. I think I have -- have finished that
now.
Q In Maritzen, after the transaction key is generated by the PTD, it is sent to the VAPGT 120, correct?

A So just to make sure that I don't misunderstand, would you please read it to me again, the question?
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Q Maritzen discloses that after the transaction key is generated by the PTD, it is sent to the VAPGT 120, correct?

A Yeah. It doesn't use exactly the same terminology, but that's how I understand it.

Q The VAPGT 120 forwards the transaction key on to the clearinghouse 130 as part of the transaction request, correct?

A No. The paragraph you spoke about doesn't describe that, and I need to review whether it forwards or it processes and forwards before I can --

Q Can you look at paragraph 46?
A Yes.
Yes. Thank you for drawing my attention to that.

Q Would you agree with me that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand paragraph 46 to mean that the VAPGT 120 forwards the transaction key on to clearinghouse 130 as part of a transaction request?

A So it says that the transaction request is transmitted via the communication link 160 to clearinghouse 130.

Let me review the -- is there a figure that goes with this? It doesn't speak to whether it's sending it directly or there are proxies.
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Is that your question about?
Q No.
A Would you rephrase your question? I just need to make sure that $I$ don't misunderstand.

Q Would you agree that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand paragraph 46 of Maritzen to mean that the VAPGT 120 forwards the transaction key on to clearinghouse 130 as part of a transaction request?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A When you're saying "as part of a transaction request," a transaction request is actually a data item.

It says that in one embodiment, the
transaction request includes the transaction key. And, also, it speaks of other things, like a transaction amount, a transaction type, and a terminal identifier.

Later on, it speaks about an alternate -alternate embodiment. So this is not the same embodiment. It says in alternate embodiments, the transaction request may include other information. The transaction request is transmitted.

So I don't know that this speaks about the same embodiment that the paragraph begins with.

Q Wait a second. You're saying that paragraph 46 discloses multiple embodiments that are unrelated?
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A It -- I'm not saying one way or the other. It say that -- it says "in alternate embodiments," so, obviously, there are two embodiments being described in this paragraph.

Q The alternate embodiment is describing something that can be included in the prior embodiment described in the same paragraph, correct?

A So, I -- you know, the only thing I can say with certainty is that in the -- in the context of the alternate embodiment, the transaction request is transmitted via communication link 160 to the clearinghouse 130.

Given this information alone in this paragraph, I can't say with certainty whether that applies to the previous embodiment as well, but maybe there are other paragraphs that clarifies that.

Q Maritzen discloses pre-funded accounts, correct?

A Yes.
Q And Maritzen's pre-funded accounts are loaded onto the PTD?

A Let me verify the location.
So paragraph 49 speaks of clearinghouse 130 selecting a preexisting account. It doesn't speak of the PTD having access to this.
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Q Okay. I'm not limiting my question to paragraph 49.

Does Maritzen disclose pre-funded accounts
loaded onto the PTD?
A I'd have to -- I don't remember opining about that.

Q Did you study Maritzen to see whether it discloses pre-funded accounts loaded onto the PTD?

A I don't recall.
Q Can you look at paragraph 8 of Maritzen?
A Yes. That says that in an alternate embodiment, a preregistered key-enabled personal transaction device, PTD, is loaded with a pre-funded cash account.

Q So would you agree with me that Maritzen discloses pre-funded accounts loaded onto the PTD?

A In at least this alternate embodiment, yes.
Q Maritzen's pre-funded accounts contain the user's funds, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A What do you mean when you say "contains the user's fund"?

Q What is -- funds are loaded onto the PTD, correct?

A So a representation of funds are loaded onto
the PTD.
Q And those funds are the user's funds, correct? MR. MACK: Objection; form.

A So it doesn't actually say so. For example, we've spoken about it -- it is possible that a PTD is associated with multiple users; for example, by means of an organization. When we were here last time, we spoke of an example of a bus, which, of course, is a vehicle. Which, if you think about the bus having to pay tolls, there might be several bus drivers. These are not the users in this context.

Q Would one of ordinary skill in the art understand Maritzen to disclose that the pre-funded accounts can include the user's funds?

MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.
A Would you please rephrase the question without saying "user"?

Q No. My question is about a user.
A So I don't -- I'd have to study Maritzen in the context of the word "user" to answer that question. Maritzen is not very clear on what the user's role is here. And in this particular paragraph, he doesn't speak of user.

Q Does Maritzen disclose that a pre-funded account can be a standard bank checking account?
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A If you want to, I could review that. But, just to understand the context, that, of course, could belong to an organization.

Q Can you answer my question?
A I -- I'd have to look at the context, please.
Q The use of a pre-funded account is one embodiment in Maritzen, correct?

A Yes, the one that is described in paragraph 8.
Q Have you read paragraph 7 of Maritzen before?
A Yes, I have. Let me refresh my recollection by reading it again.

Yes. So that must be the -- the other embodiment, so to speak.

Q In paragraph 7, Maritzen discloses an embodiment that involves a transaction request that is transmitted to a server, correct?

A Yes, it does.
Q And in the embodiment described in paragraph 47, if the transaction is approved, the server subsequently sends a transaction authorization message, correct?

A It doesn't say so. It says "Further, a transaction authorization message is received from the server to complete the transaction."

Q And one of ordinary skill in the art would
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understand that to mean that upon approval of the transaction, the server sends a transaction authorization message, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So I think it's plain what it says. It -- a transaction authorization message is received from the server to complete the transaction.

Do I fail to understand your question?

Q I think you do.
One of ordinary skill in the art would understand the embodiment described in paragraph 7 to mean that upon approval of the transaction, the server sends a transaction authorization message, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A You know, it doesn't speak of approval. It says "The transaction authorization message is received from the server to complete the transaction."

Q You understand the transaction authorization message is what authorizes the transaction, correct?

A A transaction authorization message sounds like a message that authorizes the transaction message unless defined otherwise. I'd have to review Maritzen to see if there's anyplace where they describe it as having another meaning.

Q The embodiment described in paragraph 7 does
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not involve pre-funded accounts, correct?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A It doesn't say one way or the other.
Q Nothing in paragraph 7 discloses pre-funded accounts, correct?

A It does not.
Thank you.
Q I've handed you U.S. patent number 5,930,767
to Reber. Do you recognize that?
A Yes, I do.
Q And you'll understand me if $I$ refer to this as the Reber patent?

A I will.
Q Reber discloses that interception of sensitive personal or financial information is undesirable, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A It speaks about -- it says "Additionally, the interception of the end user's personal identification number can result in transactions by unauthorized parties."

There might be other paragraphs it speaks of interception to. Would you like me to look for those?

Q No. Can you tell us based upon your -- strike that.
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Did you review Reber?
A Yes.
Q How much time have you spent reviewing Reber?
A I don't recall.
Q More than an hour?
A Yes.
Q More than ten hours?
A I don't recall.
Q Based upon your review of Reber, can you tell us whether the reference discloses the interception of sensitive personal or financial information is undesirable?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So it says here that "Interception of the end user's personal identification number can result in transactions by authorized parties."

I understand the personal identification number to be what often is referred to as the PIN. So there might be other places where Reber speaks of interception of data, but I'd have to look for those.

Q Reber discloses the use of a time-varying code to prevent interception of personal data, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A It says in one -- an exemplary embodiment "The personal identification code is time varying and
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non-predictable by authorized parties." That is column 4, 18 to 20.

Q Can you answer my question, please?
A Would you please restate your question?
Q Reber discloses the use of a time-varying code to prevent interception of personal data, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I would have to look for that. In this particular sentence, it doesn't make an implication of why, and it doesn't speak of personal data as such. But it says "Personal identification code is time-varying." It doesn't speak about the reasons, and it doesn't generalize, but there might be other sentences. This is not something I've looked for. If you'd like me to, I could look for other places.

Q So in reaching your opinion in this case, you did not examine Reber to see whether it disclosed the use of time-varying codes to prevent interception of personal data, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A That's not what I'm saying.
Q Well, did you?
A So we haven't used the terminology "personal data," so it's hard for me to answer without knowing what you mean by "personal data."
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Q Data of a person?
A Data of a person?
Q A person's data.
A A person's data. That is different from how I understand personal data. But maybe I should go with your definition of it.

Q Is a personal identification code personal data?

MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.
A So I think that depends on how you define it. For example, my PIN number, if used by my wife too, does not belong to me alone, and so I couldn't lay claims to saying that it's personal. I don't think I understand how you mean by personal well enough to answer your question.

Q Okay. Let's look at column 2, lines 29 through 32.

A Did you say 29 to 32?
Q I did.
A Okay. "To reduce the likelihood of unauthorized interception of a personal identification code, a time-varying bar code is used to authenticate the end user."

Q So can we agree that Reber discloses the use of a time-varying code to prevent interception of a
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personal identification code?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A That's not quite what it says. First of all, it speaks about time-varying bar codes, and it speaks about them -- using them to authenticate the user, and it doesn't eliminate the risk of interception. But this speaks of reducing the likelihood of unauthorized interception of this personal identification code.

Q So your opinion is that column 2, lines 29
through 32 do not disclose the use of a time-varying
code to prevent interception of a personal
identification code, correct?
A So it says that "to reduce the likelihood of an unauthorized interception of a personal identification code, a time-varying bar code is used to authenticate the end user." I take that at face value.

Q I don't know what you mean by that, sir.
One of ordinary skill in the art reading this passage would understand Reber to disclose the use of a time-varying code, correct?

A It uses a time-varying bar code.
Q And a time-varying bar code is an example of a time-varying code, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection.
A So time-varying bar code is different, I
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think, than a time-varying code as I understand it in the context of these patents, and I haven't considered whether one is a subset of the other.

Q So I want to be perfectly clear for the Board who is going to be reading this.

Do you believe that a time-varying bar code is not an example of a time-varying code, correct?

A That's not what $I$ said.
Q Okay. Let's be clear, then. Is a time-varying bar code an example of a time-varying code?

MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.

A I haven't considered that question.
Q I'm asking you to consider it this moment.
Okay?

Is a time-varying bar code an example of a time-varying code? Yes or no.

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A I would have to review Reber to understand the context in which the time-varying bar code is used.

Q So you are not and have not offered any opinion that a time-varying bar code is or is not a time-varying code, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A I do not recall that. But if there is a particular portion of my -- of one of my declarations
you would like to review in this context, that would refresh my memory on this matter.

Q Would you agree that a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Reber patent would understand that having your data misappropriated is undesirable, whether it's misappropriated by a merchant or by a third party?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A By "misappropriated," you mean stolen, in general?

Q That would be an example.
A That would not be desirable.
Q And a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the use of a time-varying code helps protect against misappropriation, whether that misappropriation is done by a merchant or by a third party, correct?

MR. MACK: Object --
A Are you speaking in the context of Reber?
Q I'm talking about what one of ordinary skill in the art would understand at the time of the Reber patent.

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So you're not speaking in context of the Reber patent, then, but just in general?
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Q I am, in general. We'll get to the Reber patent.

A Okay. Would you please re-ask the question?
Q One of ordinary skill in the art in the 1990s and in the 2000 s would understand that the use of a time-varying code helps protect against misappropriation, whether that misappropriation is done by a merchant or by a third party, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.
A I wouldn't say that it stops the misappropriation of it, but it might -- it might limit the effects of the misappropriation.

Q Did I use the word "stop" in my question?
A I'm sorry. Would you please rephrase your question?

Q One of ordinary skill in the art in the 1990 s or in the 2000 s would understand that use of a time-varying code helps protect against misappropriation, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A When you say "misappropriation," you mean theft of something?

Q That would be an example.
A So, in some contexts, time-varying codes were used. So, for example, the Security Dynamics SecurID
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technology, which I showed, I think, a few images of before. Exhibit 2013, page 34, there's one image with three of them. That was used as a password replacement. And the reason for that was that people were concerned that if they transmitted their password over a network, somebody may, for example, shoulder-surf. And as they're entering their password, it would become known to somebody whom they didn't want it to be known to, which would be a form of misappropriation, as I understand your question.

Q One of ordinary skill in the art in the 1990s would understand that a time-varying code could be used to help protect against misappropriation by a merchant or misappropriation by a third party, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A I don't understand when you're saying "by a merchant." Do you mean by the merchant's shoulder surfing?

Q That would be an example.
A So if we limit this to the example where you're saying the merchant is shoulder-surfing and -and looking at some information that is being entered, such as a password, then the merchant would know the password, and that would be undesirable.

Q In the 1990s, the use of a time-varying code
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was a way to help protect against misappropriation, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A So the example I gave you was one of where you don't want your password to be misappropriated. That is the example that comes to mind in the context of time-varying code in the 1990s. I'm sure there are other examples, but let me explain this one.

So, here, a person who sees the person entering this code, this time-varying code, would not have much use of that because they can't, for example, go home and use it instead of your password, had -- as they would have been able to if they had been able to see your password being entered. So that helped against misappropriation for a shoulder surfer.

Now, in the context of a merchant, it may be different, unless you'd consider a merchant who's shoulder surfing. And so I need a particular example that you have mind for me to answer your question accurately.

Q Okay. Let's turn to column 4, lines 14 to 20.
A Did you say 14 to 20?
Q Yes.
A Just a moment, please.
Yes. I have read that now.
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Q This passage of Reber discusses the second data element, correct?

A Yes, it does.
Q And this passage of Reber states that the second data element can include a personal identification code, correct?

A Yes, it does.
Q And this passage states that in an exemplary embodiment, the personal identification code is time varying, correct?

A Well, for more -- that's part of it, yes.
Q A person of ordinary skill in the art would have understand -- stood this passage of Reber to mean that the personal identification code could vary based on the time it is generated, correct?

A Would you say that again?
Q A person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the passage in Reber from column 4, lines 14 through 20 to mean that the personal identification code could vary based on the time it is generated, correct?

A So it describes that the personal identification code is time varying and non-predictable by unauthorized parties.

I don't think I understand your question.
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If -- if you're asking about something else, would you please clarify?

Q I don't know what you find confusing in my question. Let me re-ask it.

A Mm.
Q A person of ordinary skill would have understood the passage in Reber in column 4, lines 14 through 20 to mean that the personal identification code could vary based on the time it's generated, correct?

A See, I have a hard time understanding "could vary based on the time it was generated." That doesn't make much sense to me. That's why I'm trying to rephrase it and use "time varying" instead, instead of using varying based on the time it was generated.

Would you say it in another way?
Q No. Let -- let me re-ask my question. A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand this passage of Reber to mean that a personal identification code would vary based on the time it is generated, correct?

A Would vary based on the time it was generated. I don't understand what you say.

Q Okay. Do you understand what Reber means by time varying?

A We spoke before about time-varying bar codes.
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This may be the same, or it may be different. I would have to review it because this is not something that I opined on, I believe.

Q Okay. Could -- do you know how one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the term "time varying" as it's used in Reber in column 4, lines 14 through 20?

A So I haven't considered what a person of skill in the art would have considered time varying as described in Reber in the -- this paragraph, from 4, 14 to 20, but I would be happy to do so. Now, that would require for me to understand the context of this.

Q Do you understand how one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the term "time varying" as it's used anywhere in the Reber disclosure?

A They would say that in the context of bar codes, the time-varying bar code is something that is used to authenticate an end user, for example. The portion we spoke about was about the benefits, I think.

Q How would one of ordinary skill in the art define time varying as that term is used in the Reber patent?

A Claim construction is difficult and takes time. I would have to consider that question. I haven't considered it so far.
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Q You have not considered how Reber uses the
term "time varying," correct?
A That's not what I'm saying.
Q I'm asking you.
A I have considered Reber in the context of the request $I$ was being made to analyze Reber. I have read Reber in general, but $I$ haven't focused on all the aspects of Reber. If they didn't seem relevant to the question $I$ was being asked, I would skim through and would not necessarily form an opinion about what it meant.

Q I'll ask you again.
Have you considered how Reber uses the term
"time varying"?
A I would have refer to my declaration to refresh my memory.

Q Can you tell us how Reber uses the term "time varying"?

A So I gave you a few contexts where Reber does use "time varying."

Q How does Reber -- strike that.
How would one of ordinary skill in the art understand how Reber uses the term "time varying"?

A I think you're asking me for a claim construction.
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Q Would one of ordinary skill in the art understand Reber's reference to time varying to mean that the code varies based on the time it is generated? MR. MACK: Objection; form.

A I have a hard time understanding what you mean when you say varying based on the time it was generated. So, if you please, reformulate that.

Q Have you ever heard a time-varying code defined as a code that varies based on the time it is generated?

A I can't recall the exact definitions that I've seen. I understand in general what time-varying codes means, but the formulation you have strikes me as a little bit odd, and I'm not so sure that I've heard that exact formulation.

Q Okay. Let's look at the next paragraph of Reber beginning at 4 -- column 4, line 21.

A Yes, I've reviewed that.
Q The paragraph that begins at column 4, line 21 of Reber discusses an alternate embodiment where the second data element is generated by a code generator at the network access apparatus 32 , correct?

A It describes two things. It can be generated -- I'm sorry. It can be "prestored in the network access apparatus 32 , or it could be generated by
a code generator associated with the network access apparatus $32 . "$

Q And the passage from lines 25 through 27 of column 4 of Reber discloses that the second data element could be time varying, correct?

A So it describes that the previously described, the second example that we gave in the previous sentence, preferably in that case, the code generator generates the second data element, which is time varying and non-predictable by unauthorized persons -- parties. I'm sorry.

Q Do you know what Reber means by "time varying" as it's used in the sentence in column 4, lines 25 through 27?

A So this refers to the second data element, and it says "this should be time varying." Now, it's -- we know from before that the second data element includes personal identification code, such as a personal identification number to identify the end user, an organization, or an account. So Reber says that -- that refers probably to the embodiment where the second data element can be prestored in the network access apparatus because I don't see data of that format being generated by a code generator.

Q I'm asking you about the words "time varying"
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that appear on those lines. Do you know what Reber means by "time varying" as it's used in the sentence in column 4, lines 25 through 27?

A So the second data element should be time varying. Now, it does not make sense for me, for example, to be an organization being time varying. So I'm going to exclude that embodiment and instead speak about where it's generated by the code generator. So the code generator would produce something that is time varying and non-predictable by unauthorized parties.

I don't know from reading Reber exactly how Reber anticipates that would be done, given this context alone. I would have to look at other portions of Reber to understand that.

Q Okay. And I'm asking you to focus on the words "time varying." Do you know what Reber means by "time varying" as it's used in column 4, lines 24 to 27?

A I suspect that I do, but I would have to verify to make sure that $I$ don't make a mistake here. I haven't opined on exactly what Reber means in this context in terms of time varying.

Q A person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that one possible input to the code generator referenced in column 4, lines 25 through 27 could be the current time, correct?
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MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.
A So in Reber, I don't know one way or the other how this is going to be done. There are many ways of generating time-varying codes.

Q Okay. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that one possible input to the code generator disclosed in column 4, lines 25 through 27, could be the current time, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A So I haven't considered this question in the context of Reber. I could speak about time-varying values in general.

Q Okay. Would you agree with me that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that one possible input to a code that generates -- strike that.

Would you agree that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that one possible input to a generator that generates a time-varying code would be the current time?

A In the context of Reber or in general?
Q No, in general.
A So, for example, in the context of the SecurID tokens, which I can speak about with confidence, I know that there is a representation of time. Now, it might
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not be accurate. In fact, it's suspected often that it isn't accurate, and there are methods to deal with that, but it is a representation of time since some beginning time kept in the card here and which provides an input to the algorithm that produces the output here. This is known as a time-varying code.

Q Can you look again -- strike that.
Can you look at column 6 beginning at line 25 of Reber?

A It says "Optionally, the computer 64 directs that an account for the first party be credited by the transaction amount and an account for the second party be debited by the transaction amount."

Q Yes.
A Let me read the context for this.
Yes, I've reviewed the context.
Q Reber discloses in that sentence that the computer 64 could direct a third party to credit and/or debit an account, correct?

A So it says "The computer 64 directs that an account for the first party be credited by the transaction amount, and an account for the second party be debited by the transaction amount," but it doesn't speak about what entity would perform it.

Whether this is a third party or not, I can't
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tell from this context. Now, third party, of course, is something that may need construction. So if you could ask the question without using "third party," that would be helpful.

Q Well, let me ask the questions the way I think they should be asked.

In that sentence, the computer 64 is directing something, correct?

A You know, it's a little bit unclear from the context here what it means.

Q Well, what do you interpret the word "directs" to mean in that sentence?

A So it could be at least two things. One could be that it sends a signal to another party to cause that second party to perform this action. It's also possible that it directs it by executing instructions. I need to look at the context here to understand what is being said, and there might be other interpretations as well. It's a little bit vague with just directs.

Q Well, we know -- strike that.
One of ordinary skill in the art would interpret that sentence in column 6, lines 25 through 28 to mean that the computer 64 is telling someone or some entity or something to take an action, correct?

A We know that it directs that the -- the
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crediting and the debiting be taking place, but we don't know whether this is another party. We just know that it's being directed.

Q Well, it's not directing itself to do something, correct?

A So I don't know how Reber describes this. Let me look at the figure for this. Some of these patents use a little bit goofy terminology, so I want to make sure that $I$ interpret it correctly.

So I know from reviewing my declaration -- and I'm speaking now of Exhibit 2108, page 46, paragraph 87 -- that computer 64 is tasked with allowing or disallowing the transaction by authenticating the transaction data's second data element. So it refers to, for example, at Reber at 617 to 18, the computer 64, which is the one you referred to, "authenticates the second data element to allow or disallow the transaction."

So I think that's the answer to the question you had.

Q What question are you answering?
A So you were asking about the directing. And -- performed. Now, I apologize. I lost my marker of where in Reber we described this.

Would you remind me of the paragraph?
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Q Let me ask a new question.
Directing your attention to column 6, lines 25 through 29 of Reber.

A Just a moment, please.
That's the same paragraph then, right?
Q Yes.
A Yes.
Q Would you agree that a person of ordinary skill in the art could fairly interpret that sentence as directing a third party or someone else to do something?

A Now, this must be read in context, of course, and it's vague. But in Reber 617 to 18, it's very clear. It says "The computer 64 authenticates the second data element to allow or disallow the transaction," so that clarifies what happens. The direction is not to a third party. The direction must be the computer performing the task or directing a portion of the computer.

Q So your opinion is that column 6, lines 26 through 29 should be interpreted to mean that the computer 64 is directing the computer 64 to take an action; is that right?

A Sir, that's not what I'm saying. I'm saying this sentence in the paragraph you pointed to is a little bit vague about what is happening. And so in
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order to answer it correctly, I would have to read the context of it and related statements. So one place that it's very clear is Reber at 617 to 18 , and that clarifies things in my mind. It says "The computer 64 authenticates a second data element to allow or disallow the transaction."

Q What do you interpret the word "optionally" to mean in column 6 beginning at line 26?

A So "optionally" means it's not necessary.
Q Okay. And the rest of the sentence says "The computer 64 directs that an account for the first party be credited by the transaction amount, and an account for the second account be debited by the transaction amount."

Did I read that correctly?
A Yes, I think so.
Q So can we agree that the computer 64 in that optional mode is directing something to happen or some entity to take an action?

A So it initiates an action. And that action is for the crediting and the debiting, but it doesn't say who performs the action.

Q But it's directing somebody to perform that action, correct?

A Well, it doesn't say directing somebody.
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It's -- it's kind of vague, what it says.
And, as I mentioned before, several of these patents, you have to read them over and over to understand what they really mean and look at the context. And Reber is one of those. It just -- it's hard to understand one sentence without the context.

MR. SELWYN: I move to strike as nonresponsive.

Q Let me ask the question one more time because I want this to be very clear for the Board when they review the transcript.

Is it your opinion that the phrase "the computer 64 directs" should be interpreted to mean the computer 64 directs computer 64 to take some action?

A That is not what I'm saying. I'm saying this is vague as to the meaning, so I have to look at the context.

And there's some very helpful context at Reber 6:17 to 18, which is that the computer 64 authenticates the second data element to allow or disallow the transaction.

Since one is unclear and one is clear, if you're asking me what is happening, I have to go with the one that is perfectly clear.

MR. SELWYN: I move to strike everything after
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"That's not what I'm saying."
THE WITNESS: What do you think about a short
break?
MR. SELWYN: If you need one.
THE WITNESS: Just to stretch my legs once every hour is nice.

MR. SELWYN: Okay.
(A recess ensued from 3:01 p.m. to 3:10 p.m.)
BY MR. SELWYN:
Q Dr. Jakobsson, I'm handing you a European patent application with the named defenser -- inventor Dan Schutzer.

Do you recognize that?
A Yes, I do. It's a while since I reviewed it, though.

Q Will you understand if I refer to this today as the Schutzer reference?

A Yes, I do.
Q Schutzer discloses a system for conducting bank card transactions, correct?

A You know, it says "method and system for performing bank card transaction." That's how it starts, so I believe that is a very appropriate description.

Q And you'd agree that a bank card transaction
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```
is a financial transaction?
```

A Let me see what -- what Schutzer says here. What was the exact term you asked me about? I'm sorry.

Q A bank card transaction is a financial transaction, correct?

A That's how I understand it, yes.
Q To perform bank card transactions, Schutzer discloses what it calls an alternate card number, correct?

A Yes.
Q And in Schutzer, the alternate card number is used in a transaction as a proxy for a user's actual credit card number, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I've read a portion of it now. I'm not sure what you're going to ask, of course. You did ask something.

Q I did.
A I'm sorry. It took -- took me a while to review the first and second page.

Q Would you agree with me that in Schutzer, the alternate card number is used in a transaction as a proxy for the user's actual credit card?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
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A So the -- Schutzer describes that the person would use -- let me see here.

So it describes -- this is paragraph 19 of Schutzer. In an embodiment of the present invention, the anonymous or alternate card number is used in a transaction by the transaction card user in place of the transaction card user's transaction card number.

So the way I understand that is if I would have in one context input my credit card number into -onto a web page, for example, instead, now I would input the transaction -- I'm sorry -- the transaction card number. So I would use one in the way that I would otherwise have used the other one.

Q When you said "transaction card number," you mean alternate card number?

A Yes. I'm sorry.
So what I meant to say was that if, in a normal standard credit card transaction -- say online -instead of entering my credit card in a website, instead I would enter my alternate card number. And the merchant would process it without essential deviation from how the credit cards would have been processed.

There are some differences, of course. Instead of sending the credit card to an issuer, we know that the transaction card number sends the anonymous
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card number to the merchant, which in turn sends it to the merchant's bank with a request for authorization.

Then the merchant bank sends the anonymous card number over the card associate network to the transaction card issuer. That's the entity that would be able to process this.

Q So the alternate card number disclosed in Schutzer is not an actual account number, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A What do you mean by "an actual account number"?

Q Let me ask it this way. The alternate account -- strike that.

The alternate card number disclosed in Schutzer is not an account number, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.
A I don't know one way or the other. I don't know how Schutzer describes it, but it has the format of a credit card number.

Q The alternate card number is used in place of the account number, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A So that's not quite what it says.
It's used in place of the transaction card user's transaction card number. This doesn't speak of
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an account.
Q The alternate card number is not a transaction card number, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A The -- say that again, please.
Q The alternate card number is not a transaction card number.

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A I wouldn't know. It just says that it's used in place of it.

Q The alternate card number disclosed in Schutzer is linked to an actual credit card number, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A When you say "linked," what do you mean?
Q Connected to.
A Let me review further to see what the association is.

So paragraph 25 clarifies a little bit. It says, Upon receipt of the anonymous card number for authorization, the anonymous card number can be associated by the issuing bank 8 with a proper cardholder 2. And the cardholder's account then can be authorized.

Q Doesn't paragraph 19 tell us that the
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alternate card number is linked to an actual card number?

MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.
A What do you have in mind there? I don't see that.

Q Do you see the sentence in paragraph 19 that says "The transaction card issuer's authorization processor receives the anonymous card number linked with the transaction card number," and it continues?

A Yes, I see that.
Q So is it fair to say that the alternate card number is linked to an actual card number?

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A When you say "linked" with, it could either be an action, or it could be a relationship. What -- which one do you have in mind here?

Q I'm just using the words of Schutzer.
A So I don't know reading this alone which one Schutzer means. I'd have to read other paragraphs to understand if it's an action or a relationship.

Q But you would agree that Schutzer indicates that the alternate card number is linked with an actual card number.

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A But it doesn't specify whether that is an
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action or a relationship, and $I$ think that is relevant in the context of your question.

Q Does paragraph 19 say that the alternate card number is linked with an actual card number or not?

A So it says, among other things, "The transaction card issuer's authorization processor receives the anonymous card number linked with a transaction card number and sends an authorization back to the merchant via the card association network and the merchant's bank."

Now, to understand your question, in the context of Schutzer, so that it wouldn't be misunderstand out of context, I would have to consider whether you mean a relationship or an action, and this sentence doesn't clarify it.

MR. SELWYN: I move to strike as nonresponsive.

Q Schutzer discloses an embodiment where users must authenticate themselves to their electronic device before they can access their alternate card number, correct?

A Let me review that part.
So in paragraph 14, it speaks of an alternative embodiment. "In an alternate aspect for an embodiment of the presentation invention, the
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transaction card user authenticates himself or herself with a transaction card user information at a local computing device, such as a personal computer, personal digital assistant, or a smart card of the transaction card user."

MR. SELWYN: Move to strike as nonresponsive.

Q Schutzer discloses an embodiment where users must authenticate themselves to their electronic device before they can access their alternate card number, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.
A I'm not sure that $I$ understand to their
device? What did you say there?
Q Schutzer discloses an embodiment where users must authenticate themselves to their electronic device before they can have access to their alternate card number, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objections.
A So the recipient of that authentication you refer to as to their electronic device? Is that so?

Q Have you considered paragraph 35 of Schutzer?
A In the context of your question, not yet, but I will take a look at it.

MR. MACK: And I know, Mark, that Schutzer is in your opposition for motions to amend. Can $I$ just
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have a standing objection that this is beyond the scope of his declarations? Are you guys taking another deposition after his declaration and our surreply or our reply? I don't think Schutzer is actually at issue in any of his declarations that we're here today for, the six declarations. I think Schutzer was cited in your opposition to the motions to amend. So he's going to be maybe submitting a reply declaration with notice.

MR. SELWYN: But we're submitting an
opposition to the condition of motion to --
MR. MACK: Right.
MR. SELWYN: Okay.
MR. MACK: But I'm just -- I'll just have a standing objection this is beyond the scope of the six declarations that he's submitted so far.

MR. SELWYN: Okay. Our view is that because the conditional motions to amend were filed, prior art like Schutzer is relevant as part of those oppositions.

MR. MACK: Our position would be that he submits a declaration and reply, then you would depose him at that time, and that would be the time to ask about Schutzer. But we'll just have a standing objection that it's beyond the scope to this deposition.

MR. SELWYN: That's -- you can have your standing objection. We would be entitled to depose him
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after he submits a declaration of that kind. But because of the conditional motions to amend, it's relevant today.

MR. MACK: Okay.
A So I need to apologize. I wasn't quite able to absorb the material while you were having that discussion, so I'm going to continue reading it now.

Q And I'm just asking about paragraph 35.
A Yes, I understand. I'm also going to look at figure 5, though, because paragraph 35 refers to figure 5.

Q Fine.
A So this speaks of a input device 34. Now, I don't see that actually being part of -- of figure 5. Would you happen to know where that is described?

Q User 2 in figure 5.
A Oh. I see. Yes.
Okay. I have reviewed that paragraph now.
Q Paragraph 35 and figure 5 of Schutzer shows an embodiment where users authenticate themselves to their electronic device before they can gain access to their alternate card number, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So it speaks of the input device 34 , but it doesn't speak of ownership of this here. Based on the
context, $I$ don't think $I$ could tell what the answer is to your question.

Q Why are you referring to ownership?
A I'm sorry. What was your question?
Q Do you see that paragraph 35 refers to the user 2 entering a password onto the input device 34?

A Yes.
Q And do you see that later in the same paragraph, it indicates that upon entering the correct password or biometric onto that input device 34, the anonymous card number is displayed?

A Yes.
Q Would you agree with me that the paragraph discloses an embodiment wherein users authenticate to themselves to their electronic device before they gain access to the alternate card number?

A So this doesn't speak of their electronic device. So that's why I spoke of ownership. When you say "their electronic device," that suggests an ownership of a electronic device.

Q Okay. Let me eliminate the word "their" if that's your problem.

Schutzer discloses an embodiment where users must authenticate themselves to a electronic device before they can gain access to an alternate card number,
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correct?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A This does not speak of gaining access to. It describes, for example, "upon entering the correct password or biometric onto the input device 34, the anonymous card number is displayed on the LCD 36."

Is that what you mean?
Q Schutzer discloses an embodiment where users must authenticate themselves to an a electronic device before they receive an alternate card number, correct?

A This speaks of an anonymous card number. And it displayed on the LCD 36 as the card number, which I'm not sure what it means here. I haven't prepared to be deposed on Schutzer, so I need a little bit more time on this. I recall reviewing Schutzer a long time ago, but I know I haven't been opining on it in the declarations.

Q You do know --
A In front of us.
Q You do --
A And I was given the impression, maybe incorrectly, so -- and please correct me so that the deposition cover the material and the declarations.

Q Schutzer requires biometric authentication at a user device to conduct a financial transaction, correct?
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MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So I need to look at it carefully before I answer your questions. As you know, many of the terms you use are claim terms, and I need to understand how to relate to those in the context of Schutzer.

Q Which term did I just use that's a claim term?
A Would you say your question again?
Q Schutzer requires biometric authentication at a user device to conduct a financial transaction, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I'm sorry to keep you waiting here. As I explained, $I$ haven't really prepared to be testifying on Schutzer. So I'm very happy to do so, but I need to look at the claim language of the patents that were considered in my declarations in order to make sure that I understand the subtleties of Schutzer in the context of the question you're asking, and this may take some time.

Q I'm not asking you about the claim language.
A But some of the words you're using, I think, are related to the claim language, and I want to make sure that I don't use the wrong terminology or misunderstand your questions.

Q Do you have an understanding of Schutzer?
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A Yes, but I haven't reviewed Schutzer ahead of the -- the declaration -- the deposition today. So my recollection is a bit hazy, and that means that $I$ would have to revisit many aspects before I could answer pretty much any question you may have regarding Schutzer to make sure that $I$ don't answer out of context.

Q Okay. Let me ask a new question.
Digital signatures have existed since at least the 1990s, correct?

A Yes.
Q X. 509 digital certificates have existed since at least the 1990s, correct?

A I don't remember when they were introduced.
Q Certainly before 2000 .
A Yes.
Q You wrote about digital signatures in your own articles before 2006, correct?

A Yes, I did.
Q You wrote about digital signatures in your own patents before 2006, correct?

A I don't recall what patents I'm listed on as an inventor prior to 2006 and whether they relate to digital signatures.

Is there a particular one you have in mind?
Q No, there's not.
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A So I -- I mean, I'm -- I'm listed as an inventor for a large number of patents. And after they're filed, I pretty much forget about them, sadly. So I don't know really know how to attribute a year or topic.

Q Okay. Let me ask you a little bit more about digital signatures.

A person of ordinary skill in the art before 2006 would have known that digital signatures could be use to authenticate the generator of the digital signature, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form, beyond the scope.
A So normally the way people think about it is they that don't authenticate a generator, but they authenticate the fact that the generator has access to some information, whoever that might be.

A good way of thinking about that is, for example, if I were to be able to access your private key used by you normally -- or your device, I should say -to generate digital signatures, I can typically produce -- on my device, of course -- generate a digital signature that would be indistinguishable from one that you generate. So it's the possession rather than the originator that is being authenticated.

Q Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the
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art would have understood that one purpose of generating a digital signature is to verify the device that generated it, correct?

A So that is not entirely accurate. What I wanted to clarify before -- but let me try in another way -- is that it isn't the device per se that is being authenticated, but it's the access to a secret piece of information, which is referred to often as the private key. So any device that has access to the private key is able to generate the digital signature you're asking about. And for the typical digital signature context, there would be no way for a verifier to determine what device that was.

Q Can you put in front of you Patent Owner's Exhibit 2108, your declaration in support of the patent owner's response for the '539 patent?

A Yes. I have it here.
Q You did not offer any opinion in that declaration, Exhibit 2108, regarding secondary considerations of nonobviousness, correct?

A So could you break the question down into the secondary considerations and the nonobviousness, please?

Q No. Why -- why would you need that?
A So that I could answer each question separately.

Q Do you know what secondary considerations of nonobviousness are?

A Did you say "of nonobvious"?
Q Secondary considerations of nonobviousness.
A I'm sorry. I misheard you.
So in this declaration, I do not offer any opinions of that because $I$ wasn't asked to.

Q Okay. Now, can you put in front of you Patent Owner's Exhibit 2013, your declaration in support of the patent owner's response in CBM 2018-25. And at the same time, I'd ask you to put in front of you Exhibit 2011, your declaration in support of the patent owner's response in CBM 2018-00024.

A I've got 2011.
Q You have both of those in front of you?
A Yes, I do.
Q And in both of those declarations, you offer an opinion regarding commercial success, correct?

A So in the Exhibit 2011, I offer an opinion about commercial success in paragraphs 126 and 127 whereas in Exhibit 2013, I offer opinions about commercial success in paragraphs 124 and 125.

Q And the opinions that you give in each of those declarations on commercial success are identical, correct?
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A Just a moment.
Yes, I find them identical to the extent that they may not be -- not counting the paragraph numbers. That would probably be a typo.

Q Okay. I want to ask you some questions, then, about the opinions that you've offered in both of those declarations on commercial success. Okay?

A Okay.
Q Your declarations do not cite any technical documents that show how Apple Pay works, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Are you speaking about these two declarations?
Q I am.
A No, they do not.
Q Your declarations don't explain how Apple Pay works, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A They do not.
Q Your declarations do not cite any evidence that Apple Pay infringes the claims of the ' 813 patent, correct?

A So in the context of these declarations, which are both part of patent owner's response, I wasn't asked to do that.

Q Okay. Can we agree your declaration does not
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cite any evidence that Apple Pay infringes the claims of the '813 patent?

A I was not asked to opine on that, and, accordingly, $I$ did not opine on it.

Q Your declarations do not compare any claims of the ' 813 patent to any Apple product or service, correct?

A So just to make sure that I understand the question, you're still speaking in the context of these two declarations, right? You're not speaking about my declarations in general. You're speaking about declaration Exhibit 2013 and declaration 2011.

Q I am.
You have Exhibit 2013 and Exhibit 2011 in front of you?

A Yes.
Q And both of those have sections that address commercial success, correct?

A Right.
Q Those declarations do not compare any claims of the ' 813 patent to any Apple product or service, correct?

A That is correct.
Q Your declarations, Exhibit 8 -- 211 and Exhibit 213, do not compare any claims of the '813
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patent to any Visa product or service, correct?
A That is also correct.
Q Your declarations do not cite any documents or
other evidence that show how Visa Checkout works, correct?

A I was not asked to do that.
Q And therefore the answer is correct?
A As a result of not being asked to do that, I didn't do it.

Q Your declarations do not identify any USR products or service that practice the '813 patents, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Are you still speaking in the context of the commercial success?

Q I am.
A So it does not describe the -- the products of USR.

Q You are not aware of any products of USR, correct?

A I am aware that USR has products, but I can't recite what they're doing.

Q You -- strike that.
Your declaration identifies no evidence that USR has practiced the ' 813 patent in any USR product or
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service, correct?
A I wasn't asked to do that, and, accordingly, I didn't do that.

Q Your declarations, Exhibit 211 and Exhibit 2013, do not identify any USR products or services, correct?

A I wasn't asked to identify any products or services of USR, and, as a result, I did not do that.

Q Your declarations do not identify any evidence that USR has ever made any money or enjoyed any commercial success from the '813 patent, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A I wasn't asked to opine about that, and I haven't been given information about it. I haven't, for no particular reason, looked that up and tried to determine it. And so I have no way of knowing and therefore could not put it in my declarations.

Q Your declarations do not identify any evidence that USR has ever licensed the ' 813 patent, correct?

A I haven't asked about nor been informed about licensing history. And I wasn't asked to determine it, so I do not know what the licensing history is and therefore could not opine about it in these declarations.

Q Did you ever request, in the context of
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researching your opinion on commercial success, to speak with anybody employed by USR?

A I neither have spoken with anybody at USR, to my knowledge, nor requested to do so.

Q In the context of researching your opinion on commercial success, did you ever ask anyone at USR for any information?

A I have not asked anybody at USR for any information, whatsoever. I have not spoken with anybody at USR.

Q In the context of researching your opinion on secondary considerations of nonobviousness, did you investigate whether the ' 813 patent had ever received any praise, acclaim, or recognition?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Did I ever research it, you said?
Q Yes. In the context of preparing your opinion on secondary considerations.

A I was not asked to review that, and, as a result, I didn't review it. These opinions here describe -- these paragraphs here describe my opinions related to the secondary considerations of nonobviousness.

Q You also gave an opinion in your declarations, Exhibit 211 and 213, on long-felt need.
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A Yes. Let me review that paragraph -- those paragraphs in order to respond to your question.

Yes.
Q In connection with preparing your opinion on long-felt need, did you ever discuss with Ken Weiss what need he thought he was addressing by the invention claimed in the ' 813 patent?

A I reviewed the patents. And having done substantial research in the context of electronic transactions starting as early as 1991, I had an understanding of what would constitute the long-felt need.

And there are two citations here, one in paragraph 121 of Exhibit 213 and one in 122 of 213, that I think address the sentiment at the time.

For example --
Q I don't mean to interrupt, but my question wasn't what you wrote here.

My question was: Did you speak with Mr. Weiss in connection with writing this?

A As I mentioned before, I've never, to my knowledge, spoken with Mr. Weiss.

Q Would you agree that remote authentication was known before 2006?

A So the question may not be whether the
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individual limitations were known but whether their composition were known.

Would you like me to address that?
Q No. Just please answer my question.
A Would you say it again, please?
Q Remote authentication was a known concept before 2006, correct?

A And you don't mean it in the context of the claims or the specification, but just freestanding remote authentication?

Q One of ordinary skill in the art before 2006 would have known about remote authentication, correct?

A By "remote authentication," I gather that you mean a server not co-located with a device can verify some aspect associated with the device or its identity --

Q Yes.
A -- is that correct?
That was known prior to 2006 .
Q Prior to 2006, combining local and remote authentication was known, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So I would have to consider the context of this. When you say "combining," what do you mean? Using them both in the same product?
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Q That would be one example.
A So that would have been known.
Q How many patents have you reviewed in the course of your professional life?

A That's a hard question to answer.
When you say "reviewed," what's the context?
Do you mean in the context of expert work?
Q No. I'm talking about your entire professional career.

How many patents have you reviewed?
A I would not be able to answer that question.
Q Would it be more than a thousand?
A I couldn't quite tell. I'd have to sit down and think carefully.

Q Fair to say hundreds?
A What do you mean by "review"? Just read some part of it?

Q Read enough that you feel comfortable to say that you reviewed them.

A That's a little bit circular. I don't know how to answer that question.

Q Have you read the ' 539 patent?
A The '539 patent?
Q Yes.
A Yes.
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Q Is that Mr. Weiss?
A Yes.
Q With that understanding of "read," was it fair to say that you have read hundreds of patents relating to cryptography in the course of your career?

A So that is not a reasonable comparison because I've spent a very big amount of time reading these particular patents that we've spoken about today.

Whether -- whereas there are many patents that I may only have reviewed to a much lesser extent, and I wouldn't know where you want to set that threshold of effort.

Would you help me understand what you had in mind, please?

Q If you're not able to tell me approximately how many patents you've reviewed in the course of your career, I'll move on.

A It's a difficult question. I apologize for not having prepared for that.

Q Okay. Let me hand you what has been previously been marked -- I may have given you my copy.

A Sorry.
Thank you.
Q Would have been previously been marked as Apple 1007, which is U.S. patent number 6,000,832. Do
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you recognize that?
A Yes, I do. It is the one that we have referred to as Franklin at times.

Q You'll understand me this afternoon if I refer to you as patent number $6,000,832$ as the Franklin patent?

A Yes, I would.
Q Have you read the Franklin patent?
A Yes, I have.
Q How much time have you spent reading it?
A I would not be able to tell you that without reviewing my spreadsheets related to invoicing.

Q Fair to say you've spent hours reviewing the Franklin patent?

A Do you mean as in at least two hours?
Q Sure.
A Yes, I have.
Q Would you please turn to column 1 beginning at

```
line 48 of Franklin?
```

A Yes.
Q That sentence beginning at column 1, line 48 is within the background of the invention, correct?

A Yes, it is.
Q And do you see it says "Another concern is that dishonest merchants may reuse or redistribute an
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individual's credit card information"?
A Yes, it says so.
Q Do you understand what that means?
A So to reuse a credit card information might mean to perform two transactions instead of one where the owner of the credit card is only aware of one. To redistribute an individual credit card information, I take to mean give it to somebody who is not authorized to receive it, and this redistribution is not what the user of the credit card intended.

Q In this passage, Franklin discloses that providing account-identifying information to merchants can sometimes lead to unauthorized use, correct?

A It doesn't say so.
Q One of ordinary skill in the art would understand this passage in Franklin to mean that providing account-identifying information to merchants can sometimes lead to unauthorized use, correct?

A We haven't yet determined in claim construction what account-identifying information means, so that would be hard for me to opine on.

Q In this passage, Franklin discloses that providing a individual's credit card information to merchants can sometimes lead to unauthorized use, correct?
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A It says that "concern is that dishonest merchant may reuse or redistribute an individual's credit card information."

Q One of ordinary skill in the art would understand those words in Franklin to mean that providing an individual's credit card information to merchants can sometimes lead to unauthorized use, correct?

A That's not what it says. There might be other paragraphs that describe this, but this only speaks of the "concern that dishonest merchant may reuse or redistribute an individual's credit card information."

Q And such reuse or redistribution would be unauthorized, correct?

A It doesn't particularly call it out.
Q Well, what do you interpret "dishonest merchants" to mean?

A So somebody who is not honest and is a merchant.

Q And an example of a merchant being dishonest would be a merchant who used an individual's credit card information in a way that was not authorized, correct?

A There are many ways of being dishonest. I would have to review the context here to see exactly what they had in mind.
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Q Well, you can -- you would agree with me, wouldn't you, that one example of a merchant being dishonest would be a merchant who uses a individual's credit card information in a way that that individual didn't authorize.

A So it doesn't speak --
Q Correct?
A -- of authorization here. What it says is that the concern that a dishonest merchant may reuse or redistribute a individual's credit card information. You know, we could speculate about the authorization, but it doesn't speak about it. So I'd rather focus on what it does say if you want me to opine on that.

Q Would you agree, sir, than an example of a dishonest merchant would be a merchant who uses an individual's credit card information without authorization?

A That would be dishonest, yeah.
Q And Franklin discloses that providing sensitive information to a dishonest merchant could result in fraud, correct?

A Would you please reread the question?
Q Franklin discloses to one of ordinary skill in the art that providing sensitive information to a dishonest merchant can result in fraud.
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MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A When you say "sensitive information," what do you refer to?

Q Credit card information would be an example.
A So I think Franklin does not speak of
sensitive information. Please correct me if I'm wrong. Would you like me to answer about credit card information?

Q Let me rephrase the question in terms of credit card -- well, let me ask you this first.

Credit card information is a form of sensitive information, correct?

A That might be in the eyes of the beholder. So since we've talked about things that are sensitive before, I want to make sure for the record what we agree on, and this does not speak about sensitive information.

Q Do you regard your own credit card information as sensitive information?

A I willingly give it to strangers, and that might be foolish but, you know, if $I$ truly consider it to be sensitive, I would never hand my credit card to somebody I don't inherently trust.

Q When you give your credit card information to strangers, is it your expectation that they will be using that credit card information in a way that you
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have authorized?
A It's always my hope that they would.
Q Does Reber propose a solution to the problem of dishonest merchants reusing credit card information?

MR. MACK: Did you mean Franklin or Reber?
Q I meant Franklin. I'm sorry. Let me rephrase it.

Does Franklin propose a solution to the problem of dishonest merchants reusing credit card information?

A So you would have to direct me to particular paragraphs that describe this connection between things. I know the technology -- at least, I think I do -- that is being proposed in Franklin.

Now, in terms of the motivation that it's done, which I think you're asking about, in order not to see it reused, I haven't considered that particular question. And I'd like to ask you to refer me to a particular paragraph for me to review the context.

Q So you don't recall whether Franklin proposes a solution to the problem of dishonest merchants reusing credit card information, correct?

A That's not what $I$ was saying. So it speaks of a concern, which is a dishonest merchant "may reuse or redistribute an individual's credit card information."
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Q Does it propose a solution to that problem?
A So I know it proposes technology. Now, I haven't considered whether it's particularly to address that problem. Now, the problem is stated in the background, which is an indication that it might be so. But I haven't asked myself that question before, so I need to review Franklin in the context of your question to see whether they make that connection when they describe the technology.

Q Does Franklin disclose the use of one-time codes?

A I have to apologize. You have to excuse me for looking. It's getting late in the day, and I want to make sure $I$ don't mix them up in the blur.

Did you ask whether they disclose time-varying codes?

Q Nope.
A What did you ask?
Q Franklin discloses the use of a one-time code, correct?

A One-time code. Let me see. I don't recall offhand if they do.

You know, I haven't committed Franklin to memory, and I don't know whether they use the term "one-time code," but if you have a particular paragraph
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in mind that would highlight this, $I$ would be able to answer your question.

While you're looking, I'm going to get some
water. I hope that's okay.
Q Can you turn, please, to column 5 of Franklin beginning at line 36.

A Let me read the context of this in the paragraph.

Yes, I've reviewed that portion.
Q Do you see the reference to a temporary transaction number that is specific to a single transaction?

A Where does it say that?
Q Line 38, column 5.
A Yes, I see that part.
Q One of ordinary skill in the art would understand a temporary transaction number that is specific to a single transaction to be an example of a one-time code, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So I know that the customer computer embeds the code number in the reserved digits of the customer account number.

Now, the context of Franklin is a transaction system where the merchant does not need to make any
changes. So the reserved digits, I understand to refer to those of a typical credit card number or that format. So this is a small number of digits that are reserved digits.

And so I understand that there will be collisions. It's not a unique number. And when they refer to a temporary transaction number that is specific to a single transaction, it doesn't refer to a unique number.

Now, I don't know what you have in mind when you say a "one-time code." Can you ask the question without using that term, please?

MR. SELWYN: Move to strike the answer as nonresponsive.

Q Have you ever heard of a one-time code?
A I understand one-time codes in, for example, the context of security tokens.

Q Okay. What do you understand a one-time code to be in the context of security tokens?

A So security tokens are used for password replacement. So security tokens and their output are used to authenticating a user and his or her device -rather, the possessor of this device -- to a server, in general.

Now, you're asking in the context of Franklin,
right?
Q No, sir.
A No.
Q I asked you the question, what do you understand a one-time code to be in the context of security tokens?

Have you answered that question?
A So I gave you an example in the context of
SecurID. That would not necessarily match my understanding of Franklin. I don't know whether Franklin refers to one-time codes.

Q Okay. Let's go to the $' 539$ patent.
Does the '539 patent refer to one-time codes?
A Let me take a look.
Q You don't remember?
A No. It's getting late in the day. And a particular word, whether they used them or not, I don't remember.

Q You have -- let's be clear.
You have no memory of whether the ' 539 patent refers to one-time codes?

A I know what the ' 539 patent is about, but whether they use a particular phrase or not, that's hard to say without referring to it.

Q Okay. Do you know whether the '539 patent
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describes providing a one-time code to a merchant?
A So I see one place that says a multi-character public code may be provided, which the system can map to provide permits, delivery of items, complete telephone calls, and perform other functions for entities.

I will look for one-time code to see if it does mention that.

So '539 does refer to codes. Now, I need to look at the particular context here, but in figure 8, item 806, it refers to code in context of USR determines if code is valid.

Now, I could look at that to see if that brings to light to whether they use the term "one-time code."

Q Does the invention claimed in the '539 patent have anything to do with one-time codes?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A It does refer to a secret user code and/or time-varying value.

Now, I'm looking for a particular -- it says here a one-time non-predictable code. Now, that is not the same, of course, as a one-time code.

Q A --
A It is a particular form of one-time code which is non-predictable.

Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D., Volume 2
Conducted on April 24, 2019

Q Wait a second. Your testimony is that a one-time non-predictable code is not a type of one-time code?

A No, that's not what I said.
I said a one predict -- one-time
non-predictable code is a type -- is a type of a one-time code that is non-predictable.

Q Okay. So tell us, if you would, what is a one-time non-predictable code that's referred to in the '539 patent?

A So that is what is used to determine if the user is authorized access to the USR database.

Q What is it?
A What is the nature of it?
Q Yeah. What is a one-time non-predictable code as used in the ' 539 patent?

A It's a bit string that is used for the purposes of determining if the user gets authorized access.

Q What --
A Now, that is, of course, an abbreviated explanation, and I'm reading this from one portion. There are many other aspects, and I could look at other aspects of this to give a more seasoned answer.

Q What are the characteristics of the one-time
non-predictable code as disclosed in the '539 patent? MR. MACK: Objection; form.

A I need to review the $' 539$ patent with that in -- question in mind. That is not one of the questions that I have opined on, I believe.

Q Okay. What are the characteristics of the temporary transaction number that is specific to a single transaction that's disclosed in the Franklin reference?

A Now, you spoke very fast, and I wasn't quite able to capture what you said.

Would you please reread it very slowly?
Q What are the characteristics of the temporary transaction number that is specific to a single transaction that Franklin discloses?

A So it's getting really late in the day, and I haven't committed Franklin to memory. I need to ask you to either refer me to my declaration, which I would prefer, or to a particular portion of Franklin for me to answer it.

Q Does your declaration say anything about the characteristics of the temporary transaction number that is specific to a single transaction that's disclosed in Franklin?

A It's getting really late in the day, and $I$
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cannot remember whether I do or not. I would have to look at my declaration --

Q Go ahead.
A -- for that.
Q Go ahead. We've got all day.
A Just to make sure I'm looking for the right -I look for the right thing, would you say again what you're looking for?

Q Does your declaration say anything about the characteristics of the temporary transaction number that is specific to a single transaction that is disclosed in the Franklin reference?

A That's quite a mouthful. Let me review this, but I may have to ask you to state it again in a moment after I have done -- made some progress on this.
(An off-the-record discussion ensued.)
A So in Exhibit 2107, page 19, I say "For example, Reber, alone or in combination with Franklin, fails to disclose, among other things, received from the provider a transaction request including, at least, a time-varying multi-character code for the entity on whose behalf the transaction is to be performed and an indication of the provider requesting the transaction."

So that is one of the things.
MR. SELWYN: I move to strike as
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nonresponsive.
THE WITNESS: Since you said that, let me ask
you. What was your question again?
Q Does your declaration say anything about the characteristics of the temporary transaction number that is specific to a single transaction that is disclosed in the Franklin reference? Yes or no.

A I do refer to Franklin, for example, in the context of the -- of USR Exhibit 2107, page 19, and it continues on page 20.

Would you like to discuss that, or would you like me to go to the other declarations and review material there?

Q I -- I just need an answer to my question.
A I -- I need to look at the others in order to understand if there is an exact match to what you're asking or if you're asking me to generalize.

Can I limit it to '539 declarations?
Q Yes.
A Thank you.
Q How much more time do you need?
A I -- there's only a few pages left. I'm looking for discussion of Franklin.

Did I understand correctly that that's what you want me to do?
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Q I want you to tell me whether your declaration says anything about the characteristics of the temporary transaction number that Franklin discloses.

A Then I have to look at the portions of my declaration that describes Franklin.

Q How much more time do you need to do that?
A My guess is three or four minutes, but I don't know. It depends on --

Q We can do that on the next break, then.
A Okay.
Q Okay. Turn to Franklin, column 4.
A Franklin at 4, did I hear?
Q Column 4 of Franklin.
A Column 4.
Q Do you see in lines 3 through 9, it says "Although labeled as a bank, the issuing bank 26 may represent other types of card-issuing institutions, such as credit card companies, card-sponsoring companies, or third-party issuers under contract with financial institutions. It is further noted that other participants may be involved in some phases of the transaction, such as an intermediary settlement institution, but these participants are not shown."

Did I read that right?
A Yes, you did.
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Q Franklin discloses in this passage that, quote, other participants may be involved in some phases of the transaction, correct?

A It does not describe what those do or what they are. It's unclear what they're -- what Franklin refers to in this paragraph alone.

Q Sir, does Franklin disclose in this passage that, quote, other participants may be involved in some phases of the transaction?

A Such as an intermediary settlement institution, but these participants are not shown.

This refers to figure 1. So it says that they're not shown in figure 1. I don't know whether they're shown elsewhere. I don't understand what they are without seeing what they refer to.

Q My question, sir, is just: Does this passage disclose, quote, other participants may be involved in some phases of the transaction?

A It gives no details of what they are. A person of ordinary skill in the art would not know what this refers to.

Q Do the words that $I$ just said appear in that sentence?

A The sentence says "It's further noted that other participants may be involved in some phases of the
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transaction."
Q You see the words "the transaction" there?
A Wait. You -- you cut me off.
So it says "It's further noted that other participant may be involved in some phases of the transactions, such as an intermediary settlement institution, but these participants are not shown."

This relates to -- you -- you asked me to look at a portion that describes the --

Q No, I didn't.
Are you just trying to run the clock, sir?
A No. I want to make sure --
Q Listen to my question.
A Yes.
Q Okay?
Do the words "other participants may be involved in some phases of the transaction" appear in that sentence?

A It says "It is further noted that other participants may be involved in some phases of the transactions, such as an intermediary settlement institution, but these participants are not shown."

So are you asking me about that sentence?
Q Yes.
A So I think it says what it says. It's very
clear.
Q Okay. What does "the transaction" refer to?
A I would not know without reading the context.
Q What are the phases of the transaction that are referred to?

A I -- again, I'd have to look at the context to know that.

Q Did you consider, in reaching your opinions in this case, what the words "the transaction" refer to in that sentence?

A So I don't remember in this sentence particularly what I considered. I reviewed Franklin. I don't have a recollection of particular sentences.

Q Are you able to tell us any examples of other participants in some phases of the transaction as referred to by Franklin?

A Are you asking on top of my head, potentially speculating, or with knowledge of what Franklin says?

Q Obviously, with knowledge of what Franklin says based upon all the work you've done in this case.

A I'd have to review it again. This is not a question $I$ remember particularly being asked to review.

Q Okay. In the passage in column 4, lines 3 through 9, Franklin discloses that the function of the issuing institution can be spread among multiple
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parties, correct?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A It doesn't say what you are saying. It says something else. Maybe I misunderstand your question.

Q One of ordinary skill in the art reading this passage would understand Franklin to disclose that the function of the issuing institution can be spread among multiple parties, correct?

MR. MACK: Same objection.
A You know, out of context, it's hard to judge. I'd have to look at other portions of Franklin to understand the context of this sentence.

Q And you haven't done that, correct?
A I have looked at other portion, but not in the context of this particular question.

Q Franklin states in this passage that participants in some phases of the transaction might not be shown in the figure, such as figure 1, correct?

A That's not what it said. It said that "other participants may be involved in some phases of the transaction, such as an intermediary settlement institution, but these participants are not shown. It sounds to me like you're asking me something else.

Q This passage says participants in some phases of the transaction might not be shown in the figures,
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correct?
A That's not how $I$ read it.
Q Okay. Franklin doesn't restrict which phases these other parties can participate in, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Are you asking about Franklin in general or in this particular sentence?

Q Either.
A So can we start with one of those?
Q How about in this sentence?
A Would you read the question to me again, please?

Q Let's try it this way.
Franklin states that an intermediary settlement institution is one example of a participant in the transaction that is not shown, correct?

A It says that it's "further noted other participants may be involved in some phases of the transaction, such as an intermediary settlement institution, but these participants are not shown."

Q So is the answer to my question correct?
A So you're answering -- asking a question about a portion of this. I want to make sure that I understand your question and answer in the context of this paragraph.
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Q I'll try it one more time, and I want your best answer, please.

Franklin states that an intermediary settlement institution is one example of a participant in the transaction that is not shown, correct?

A I don't know whether the transaction is shown or not. I don't understand your question. You're asking me about whether the transaction is shown?

Q No.
A No.
Q The sentence indicates that an intermediary settlement institution is not shown, correct?

A You know, I don't want this to be misunderstood, and I haven't considered the other sentences in this context. So my best bet to avoid confusion here and misstatement is that -- to clarify, that it's "further noted that other participants may be involved at some phases of the transaction, such as an intermediary settlement institution, but these participants are not shown."

If you look at other sentences, I might be able to give you a better answer.

Q You just need to answer my question, sir.
Is an intermediary settlement institution one of the participants in the transaction?
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A It doesn't say that it is.
Q That's your best understanding of that
sentence?
A It says, it's "further noted other participants may be involved" -- doesn't say that they are involved -- "in some phases of the transaction, such as an intermediary settlement institution, but these participants are not shown."

I don't know one way or the other, but there might be other parts of Franklin that clarifies this.

Q Okay. Let's turn to lines 16 through 21 of column 4. Have you read that?

A I need to read the context here. If you don't mind, I'm going to read the entire paragraph.

MR. SELWYN: Okay. Let's take a break, and you can read as much of it as you want.
(A recess ensued from 4:38 p.m. to 4:46 p.m.) BY MR. SELWYN:

Q Dr. Jakobsson, have you now had a chance to read column 4, lines 16 through 21 and any associated context that you want?

A I have not done that. I needed the break.
Q Okay. Could you read, please, to yourself column 4, line 16 through 21.

A Only those lines?

Q Yes.
A Did you say 16 through 21, right?
Q Okay. I'll read it to you.
A Okay.
Q Do you see it says "The bank 26 has a
computing center 32 shown as a mainframe computer.
However, the bank computing center 32 may be implemented in other forms, such as a minicomputer, a PC server, a
networked set of computers, and the like."
Did I read that correctly?
A Yes, you did.
Q In Franklin, the computing center 32 is part of the bank 26, correct?

A Let me refer to the figure for that.
Q Sir, the sentence I just disclosed -- I just read to you discloses that the computing center 32 is part of the bank 26 , correct?

A Yes. "The bank 26 has a computing center 32 shown as the mainframe computer."

Q The functions of Franklin's bank 26 can be distributed among multiple parties, correct?

A Would you please read that back to me?
Q The functions of bank 26 in Franklin can be distributed among multiple parties, correct?

A I need to refer to my declaration for that. I
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don't remember one way or the other.
Q Column 4, lines 3 through 9 of Franklin tells one of ordinary skill in the art the functions of Franklin's bank 26 can be distributed among multiple parties, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A This is the sentence we spoke of before, I think. It's a little bit unclear what it discloses. It says. "Although labeled as a 'bank,'" I presume that's the sentence you mean?

Q Yes.
A "The issuing bank 26 may represent other types of card-issuing institutions, such as credit card companies card sponsoring companies, or third-party issuers under contract with financial institutions."

Q And that tells us that the functions in bank 26 can be distributed among more than one party, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A That's not how I read it. You're speaking of a distributional functionality. I understand that to mean that there are many parties that perform the function.

Is that what you're asking about?
Q Well, let's look again at the sentences I read
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to you in column 4, line 16 through 21.
Do you have those in mind?
A 16 to 21. It says "The bank 26 has a
computing center 32 shown as a mainframe computer.
However, bank computing center 32 may be implemented in
other forms, such as a minicomputer, a PC server, a networked set of computers, and the like."

I think this addresses something else than what you're asking about.

Q Sir, in that passage that you just read, Franklin discloses that the functions of the bank computing center 32 can be distributed among multiple networked computers, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So it says that it might be implemented as a networked set of computers among other things, but I don't understand that to be a distribution of functionality.

Q A networked set of computers is multiple computers, correct?

A Connected to a network, yes.
Q Franklin also discloses that the functions of the bank computing center 32 can be distributed among multiple parties which are not shown, correct?

A It doesn't use the word "distribution." Let
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me explain why --
Q We don't have time --
A Please --
Q -- for you to answer questions I haven't asked.

A No, but -- can you re-ask the questions without using the word "distribution"?

Q Mr. Mack can ask you questions if he wants, but you have to answer my questions, not something that I didn't ask. Okay?

A But you used the "distribute" --
"distributed," right?
Q So you can answer my answer "incorrect" if you disagree with me.

A No. But the word "distribution" has meaning in the context of security. I need to understand what you're asking.

Could you please ask the questions without saying "distributed."

Q No. I am going to ask the questions I want the way I want to frame the question.

A Sure.
Q Okay? Here's the question. See if you can answer it.

Franklin discloses that the functions of the
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bank computing center 32 can be shared or distributed among multiple parties, some of which are not shown, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A So both the words "shared" and "distributed"
has very specific meanings in the context of
cryptography, and I do not see Franklin making
statements in these paragraphs about sharing or distributing.

Q Okay.
A It's very difficult for me to answer your question when $I$ don't know when you mean by the terms.

Q Now, did you look at the '539 and ' 813 patents for the words "distributed" or "sharing"?

A Do you mean ever or at some particular time?
Q Ever.
A I -- was I asked to look for those words, or did I see those words?

Q Focus on my question. Did you consider -strike that.

Did you look at the ' 539 and ' 813 patents for the words "distribute" or "share" or any cognates?

A Sitting here right now, I cannot recall, but I could look at my declarations to determine whether I did opine about it, and that would tell me for sure if $I$ did
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opine and, of course, $I$ did review it.
Q Do you think that -- strike that.
Did you consider a patent to someone named
Maes?
A Yes, I did.
Q How much time did you spend reviewing Maes?
A Do you mean at any time during my involvement or in preparation for this deposition?

Q No, any time in connection with your
engagement by USR?
A I do not recall.
Q What's your best estimate?
A I haven't prepared to make estimates like that. I reviewed it to the extent that I needed in order to make the determinations I was asked to make.

Q Do you feel you're qualified today to testify about Maes?

A Certainly.
Q Do you feel you're qualified today to testify about Franklin?

A Certainly.
Q Have you given your best testimony today about Franklin?

A I've done my best.
Q Have you given your best testimony today about
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Reber?
A Certainly.
Q And have you given your best testimony today about the '539 and '813 patents?

A I've done the best I could to answer your questions. Some of your questions are difficult to answer, such as the last one.

MR. MACK: Thanks.
Q I've handed you U.S. patent number 6,016,476. That's the Maes patent?

A Yes.
Q And Maes discloses to one of ordinary skill in the art that the object of his invention is compatibility with current infrastructure or existing infrastructure, correct?

A Yes.
Q Infrastructure in Maes refers to systems that use magnetic cards or smart cards, correct?

A Among other things, yes.
Q And existing infrastructure could cover an ATM system, correct?

A I have not considered that question. It says "The PDA includes a modem, serial port, and/or a parallel port as to provide direct communication capability with peripheral devices, such as a
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point-of-sale, POS, and ATM terminals and is capable of transmitting or receiving information through wireless communications, such as radio frequency, $R F$, and infrared communication."

Am -- am I understanding your question?
Q Wasn't existing infrastructure as of 1998 -strike that.

Wouldn't existing infrastructure as of 1998
include an ATM system?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A Are you asking in general or in the context of Maes?

Q In the context of Maes.
A So it's an object of the invention to provide a PDA device with digital certificate security -- and now I'm skipping a couple of things -- for performing ATM transactions.

So ATM transactions would be part of what is considered in the context of Maes.

Q An ATM system was part of what Maes was referring to by existing infrastructure, correct?

A So Maes spends a lot of time speaking of consumer transactions in the context of pre-enrolled credit cards. That would not involve an ATM.

It does say the present invention may
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immediately be employed without the need for changes in the infrastructure since the $P D A$ and universal card may utilized with any system which utilizes magnetic cards or smart cards for electronic data transfer, such as point-of-sale, POS, terminals or automated teller machines, ATM, which provide direct debit capability.

So I read this to understand that ATMs could be used in the context of Maes.

Q Existing infrastructure, as referred to in Maes, could cover a credit or debit card payment system, correct?

A I know from the paragraph I read before that it could involve a credit card transaction. Let me verify whether debit cards are also used or described. If you know the place, I'd be very happy for a pointer. Otherwise, I just have to skim through it to look for the debit card.

Q Look, for example, at column 4, lines 12 through 18. Or column 11, lines 51 through 57.

A So it describes that the invention is compatible with all credit card and/or smart card electronic funds transfer system; that is, systems that process ATM cards, debit cards, credit cards, access control cards, calling cards and/or service cards.

So do I understand your question to be about
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debit cards alone?

Q My question is when Maes refers to existing infrastructure, that would include a credit or debit card payment system, correct?

A It doesn't say that it's a payment system. It says that it's an electronic fund transfer system.

So, for example, if $I$ withdraw money in an ATM, I am transferring funds from my account to, you know, the bills that come out, but I'm not paying, per se.

With that in mind, may $I$ ask you to please reformulate your question?

Q Maes refers to something called the existing infrastructure, correct?

A So this particular sentence speaks of the current infrastructure, which I take to be the same.

Q Okay. Part of the current or existing infrastructure in 1998 was credit or debit card payment systems, correct?

A In general, there were, of course, credit crd and debit card transactions and systems to process them. This sentence speaks about electronic fund transfer systems. It doesn't specify that it's for payment.

If -- if you want to, we could speak about another sentence, if there is one context in which
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payments are -- are used. This speaks about electronic funds transfer system, which is related to, but it isn't a payment.

Q My -- my question didn't refer to any particular sentence.

A Okay. So you -- I appreciate you drawing my attention to this sentence. I saved myself a lot of search.

This does not speak about payment systems. It speaks about electronic fund transfer systems.

Q Did the existing infrastructure in 1998 include the use of magnetic swipe cards?

A Do you mean in general or in the context of Maes?

Q In general.
A In general, there was an existing infrastructure that involved magnetic swipe cards.

Q Did the existing infrastructure as of 1998 include credit or debit card payment systems?

A So can I again assume that you mean in the context not in Maes, but in general?

Q Not necessarily in Maes.
A So we're not considering Maes, but we are considering the general infrastructure, not as recited by Maes.
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Q It could include what's recited in Maes, but I'm not limiting myself.

A Okay. So I need to be careful with what Maes defines existing infrastructure to be because I don't recall that by heart. I understand the term in general, but I don't recall whether Maes made any particular callouts as to what he meant by "the existing infrastructure."

Q As of 1998, did the existing infrastructure use digital certificates to validate users?

A I know that in the context of SSL, for example, which, of course, is not a payment system but a method to secure a link, I -- or I should say secure a communications link, that certificate -- digital certificates were used. For example, there were authorities, such as certification authorities, that certified public keys of parties who wished to be -- the address bar to indicate that they were SSL connected. I'm not saying that very well. So that the user would know that there's an SSL connection.

Q When was SSL introduced?
A I don't remember the exact dates, but it was prior to the year 2000 .

Q In 1998, the existing infrastructure included use of infrared to transmit information to an ATM or a
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point-of-sale device, correct?
MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A May I please ask you to rephrase that question? I'm just maybe a little bit confused by it because it's late in the day.

Q Are you familiar with the use of infrared -infrared to transmit information?

A Yes.
Q In the 1998, the existing infrastructure included use of infrared to transmit information to a ATM or to a point-of-sale device, correct?

MR. MACK: Objection; form.
A This is not something I've opined upon, and I'm not sure one way or the other.

I presume, by "existing infrastructure," you mean actually deployed system as opposed to publications; am I right?

Q Let's talk about deployed systems as of 1998.
A So with that in mind, can I ask you to please restate the question?

Q In 1998, the existing infrastructure included use of infrared to transmit information either to an ATM or to a point-of-sale device, correct?

A So before I give the answer, I want to comment that this is in the context of deployed systems.
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I'm not so sure. This is not something I have been asked to opine on. Nothing comes to mind here. If there's something that you're aware of and you would like me to look at, I'd be delighted to.

Q Did the existing infrastructure in 1998 include encryption and decryption?

A When you say "existing infrastructure," do you mean in the context of, for example, the World Wide Web or Maes?

Q Could be in the context of the World Wide Web. Whatever existed in 1998.

A So there was encryption and decryption used, for example, in the context of SSL, which existed prior to 1998.

Q Do you understand "existing infrastructure," as that term is used in Maes, to refer to systems that were in use as of 1998?

A That's how I understand it.
Q So existing infrastructure, as that term is used in Maes, would include financial transaction systems that were in use as of 1998, correct?

A It would include systems considered by Maes. So I need to refresh my recollection on what exactly Maes is speaking about because Maes obviously was not interested in any kinds of existing infrastructure, but
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only existing infrastructure relevant to the patent itself.

Q You are not an expert in back-end credit card systems that were in existence in 1998, correct?

A So I understand the structure of credit card systems. I haven't prepared for your question. And depending on the nature of the question, this might fall into my expertise, but it might not. It depends on what you're going to ask about.

For example, I am not an expert when it comes to, say, regulation or legal aspects related to credit cards at that time. I do understand encryption technology used at that time, but I haven't been asked to consider the question you're asking. So I don't have a ready-made answer for you.

Q You're not an expert in ATM kiosks that were in existence in 1998, correct?

A So I am at least a person of skill in the art as it relates to ATM kiosks. So I could evaluate statements in the context of ATM kiosks. Whether you're asking about whether -- if you're asking whether I was an expert in this, it depends on what aspect you're asking.

So, as I mentioned before, I'm not an expert in terms of regulation related to these things or the
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legal aspects in general. But $I$ do understand encryption, for example, and $I$ was an expert in 1998 in the context of encryption.

Q Can you turn, please, to column 2, lines 23 through 30, of Maes.

A I heard the column, but I missed the line.
Q 23 through 30.
Do you see it reads "It is therefore an object of the present invention to provide a portable information and transaction-processing device, parenthesis, personal digital assistant or PDA, closed parenthesis, in which a user can store his or her credit card, ATM card, and/or debit card, parentheses, i.e., financial, closed parentheses, information"?

A Yes. And continues "as well as personal information, and then access and write selected information to a smart card," which they refer to as the universal card, "which is then used to initiate the POS, ATM, or consumer transaction."

Q Would you agree that a credit card account is an example of a financial account?

A The reason I'm looking at my declaration is because some of these terms are -- their meaning is contested. And it's late in the day, and I'm getting a little bit blurred. I need to make sure that I answer
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your question correctly. I'm just looking for these terms.

Now, you said one was financial accounts. I think the other you asked about was credit card.

Q I'm just asking you, sir, whether a credit card account is an example of a financial account.

A Do you mean in the context of these specifications that we're considering now?

Q Would one of ordinary skill in the art reviewing Maes understand a credit card account to be an example of a financial account?

A You know, I forgot where we were before, and I think that has information of relevance here.

What was the paragraph we've reviewed before?
Q Of Maes?
A Yes.
Q I was initially referring you to column 2, lines 22 through 30.

MR. MACK: I think, Mark, we've hit the seven-hour limit. If there's -- maybe we can wrap up.

MR. SELWYN: Well, I'm -- I'm not done with the deposition. I don't believe that the witness has been responsive in a consistent way to my questions. So I believe I am entitled to finish the questions that I came prepared to ask.
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THE WITNESS: We could finish this question, but I'm really getting exhausted. You took a long time asking about Schutzer. And it might seem really trivial to you, and you know that I've reviewed Schutzer, but I haven't prepared my -- I haven't prepared for my deposition to review Schutzer. And it really made me really tired to focus my attention on the questions of Schutzer that I haven't considered in this context. I really need for us to stick to the time.

That said, I'll try to answer the question you're asking now, but $I$ would like us to stick to the rules here.

MR. MACK: Yeah. And I think we're taking the position that we're limited to seven hours. If you'd like to ask the Board for more time, we can do that. We can bring him back for a few hours if the Board authorizes it, but we're taking the position that your time is up.

But if you'd like to ask one or two more questions to finish this line, we'll give you that courtesy. But, yeah, I'm not --

MR. SELWYN: Okay. Well, why don't we have Dr. Jakobsson answer, if he could, the question that was pending.

We do reserve the right to ask the Board for

# Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D., Volume 2 

Conducted on April 24, 2019
more time --
MR. MACK: Understood.
MR. SELWYN: -- with Dr. Jakobsson. But I
think as a matter of good housekeeping, why don't we have him answer the question that has been posed.

A Would you please read it back to me.
Q I will do my best.
Would one of ordinary skill in the art
reviewing Maes understand a credit card account to be an example of a financial account?

A So let me review the section that we spoke about before in order to understand how to best answer that question.

No. I remember that this -- the section I'm -- the portion I'm looking for refers to financial. I even believe that it was financial in parenthesis, but I can't remember where I saw that.

Do you remember that?
Q Do I remember where you saw something? No.
A Well, you drew my attention to it. I think you read it to me.

Q Column 2, lines 22 through 30?
A No, I don't think that's the one. Do you remember you read out when I started to get really tired, you did me the favor of reading out one paragraph
to me until $I$ found it, and $I$ read the very end of it. I think one of the things you read was in parenthesis, financial, but $I$ might be just blurred about that. Now I -- you have access to the screen that clarifies the record. So if you look back on that, if you may -- if I may ask you, would you please tell me where that it was to save me the time to search for this.

Q I referred you at various times to different parts of Maes, so I'm not sure what you have in mind. Among other things, I referred you to column 4, lines 12 through 18 and column 11, lines 51 through 57. But there may have been other portions.

A You said column 11. What -- what lines, please?

Q 51 through 57. I'm not intending to limit you to that.

A No, of course, not.
THE WITNESS: Let me please ask the court reporter, do you have on the record when counsel read to me a statement that was an excerpt from the '832 patent. It was in the last, I'd say 15 minutes.

Could I ask you to please look that up?
Q The '832 patent? I'm not even asking you to --

A I'm sorry. Am I looking at the wrong thing?
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You were asking in the context of Franklin?
Q I'm asking you about Maes.
A Maes. I'm so sorry. It's getting really late. So I was actually looking at the wrong patent before when I was searching. There's no wonder that I couldn't find it. Then let me just take a look here.

Now, Maes refers to collectively ATM cards and direct debit cards as financial cards and credit cards as well. So it -- in paragraph -- in line 1 -- 50 through 54, it says "Accordingly, there's a strong trend today moving towards a 'cashless society,' which has caused a substantial increase in the use of credit cards, ATM cards, and direct debits cards (collectively
'financial cards,') for performing consumer
transactions." I'm hoping I'm answering your question.
Q I'm not sure that you are, but...
A I'm sorry. I'm really running out of steam.
Q Okay.
MR. SELWYN: Why don't we call it a day subject to my previous statements regarding our reservation to ask the Board for additional time.

THE WITNESS: Of course. Thank you.
MR. MACK: Nothing from us, but we'll reserve the right for the witness to review and sign his deposition transcript. Thanks.
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```
    (The deposition concluded at 5:19 p.m.)
```
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 353:18, $360: 21$, | 502:8 | contemplates | correctly |
| 362:10, 375:11, | Consistent | 340:1 | 276:24, 279:1, |
| 375:13, 376:6, | 502:23 | contends | 282:11, 300:3, |
| 385:20, 400:18, | constitute | 344:16, 352:9, | 300:16, 348:7, |
| 402:15, 418:13, |  | $364: 22,365: 6$ | 375:16, 383:21, |
| 422:17, 425:24, | construction | contested | 405:13, 433:9, |
| 443:13, 460:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 335: 3, \quad 335: 7, \\ & 335: 17, \quad 341: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 501:24 | 435:1, 435:15, |
| 467:20, 481:8, |  | contexts | 477:24, 486:10, |
| 490:19, 491:3, | 344:16, 344:23, <br> $351: 21,352: 1$ | 294:18, 359:10, | 502:1 |
| 500:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 351: 21, \quad 352: 1, \\ & 352: 6, \quad 352: 9, \end{aligned}$ | 420:24, 426:19 | correctness |
| consideration | 352:6, 352:9, <br> $352 \cdot 18$ 364:18 | contextually | 393:6 |
| 364:9 | $\text { 352:18, } 364: 18 \text {, }$ $364: 20, \quad 364: 24$ | 308:11 | corresponds |
| considerations | 364:20, 364:24, | continue | 334:17 |
| 452:20, 452:22, |  | 446:7 |  |
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| 316:18, 316:23, | 268:18, 268:23, | 274:5, 274:20, | delivery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $317: 3,317: 8$, | 269:4, 269:10, | 275:22, 291:22, | 473:4 |
| 317:14, 317:18, | 269:20, 269:23, | 304:4, 304:6, | depend |
| 318:20, 318:24, | 270:5, 270:13, | 345:21, 346:13, | 359:14 |
| 319:7, 319:10, | 273:5, 273:23, | 346:16, 347:2, | dependent |
| 319:21, 322:5, | 274:7, 274:23, | 347:3, 347:8, | 308:11 |
| 329:12, 329:16, | 275:1, 275:7, | 347:19, 347:21, | depending |
| 329:21, 330:12, | 275:9, 275:20, | 351:17, 354:4, | 300:1, 381:5, |
| 330:15, 330:18 | 276:1, 276:10, | 375:11, 378:6, | 500:7 |
| dates | 276:12, 276:16, | 398:19, 402:24, | depends |
| 497:22 | 283:23, 296:17, | 405:5, 418:25, | 312:8, 335:17, |
| dating | 296:21, 302:1, | 445:2, 445:5, | 341:25, 343:22, |
| 273:16 | 302:6, 325:22, | 445:6, 445:15, | 416:10, 478:8, |
| day | 342:20, 343:13, | 448:16, 448:22, | 500:8, 500:22 |
| 469:13, 472:16, | 351:4, 352:5, | 449:16, 453:17, | deployed |
| 475:16, 475:25, | 352:17, 355:19, | 453:24, 454:7, | $498: 16,498: 18,$ |
| 476:5, 498:5, | 359:17, 360:23, | 454:9, 454:12, | $498: 25$ |
| 501:24, 506:19 | 364:19, 367:13, | 454:15, 454:19, | depose |
| days | 367:19, 367:25, | 454:22, 455:5, | $445: 20,445: 25$ |
| 404:16 | 368:4, 368:12, | $455: 10, \quad 455: 11$ | deposed |
| deal | $\begin{array}{ll} 368: 16, & 368: 20, \\ 368: 24 & 369: 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 455: 20, \quad 455: 24, \\ & 456: 3 . \end{aligned}$ | $358: 18,383: 13,$ |
| 386:4, 387:4, | $\begin{array}{ll} 368: 24, & 369: 5, \\ 371: 16, & 371: 20, \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 456: 3, & 456: 10, \\ 457: 4, & 457: 9, \end{array}$ | $448: 14$ |
| $431: 2$ | $371: 22,372: 4,$ | $457: 17,457: 18$ | deposition |
| 386:12 | $372: 6,376: 17$, | 457:24, 458:24, | $\begin{array}{ll} 249: 13, & 250: 1, \\ 254: 23, & 255: 8 \end{array}$ |
| debit | $376: 23,377: 13,$ $378 \cdot 5 \cdot 387 \cdot 19$ | $477: 12,477: 18$ | $255: 11,256: 14,$ |
| 431:19, 494:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 378: 5, \quad 387: 19, \\ & 387: 23, \quad 403: 22, \end{aligned}$ | 490:24 <br> decryption | 306:9, 358:22, |
| 494:10, 494:14, | $426: 15,433: 10 \text {, }$ | decryption 49 | 359:13, 378:14, |
| 494:17, 494:23, | $445: 3,445: 8,$ | dedicated | 400:25, 403:11, |
| $495: 18,495: 21,$ | 445:20, 446:1, | 298:17 | $\begin{array}{ll} 404: 16, & 445: 3, \\ 445: 23, & 448: 22 \end{array}$ |
| 496:19, 501:13, | 450:2, 452:15, | defenser | 450:2, 491:8, |
| 506:8 | 452:19, 453:6, | $437: 11$ | 502:22, 503:6, |
| debited | 453:9, 453:12, | define | 506:25, 507:1, |
| 431:13, 431:23, | $\begin{array}{ll} 454: 25, & 455: 12, \\ 456: 24, & 475: 18, \end{array}$ | 296:9, 416:10, | 508:5, 508:7, |
| 435:13 debiting | $\begin{aligned} & 456: 24, ~ 475: 18, \\ & 475: 21,476: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 425:21 } \\ & \text { defined } \end{aligned}$ | $508: 12,508: 13$ |
| debiting | $476: 9,477: 4$ | $412: 22,427: 9$ | derek |
| $\begin{aligned} & 433: 1, \quad 435: 21 \\ & \text { debits } \end{aligned}$ | $478: 1,478: 5$ | defines | $\begin{aligned} & 251: 4 \\ & \text { describe } \end{aligned}$ |
| $506: 13$ | 486:25, 501:22 declarations | $497: 4$ | 284:25, 340:10, |
| decided | $255: 6, \quad 255: 11,$ | definition | $351: 7,370: 6$ |
| 343:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 255: 6, \quad 255: 11, \\ & 255: 15, \quad 255: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $416: 6$ | 370:18, 387:6, |
| decisions | $256: 3, \quad 256: 9$ | definitions | 392:24, 396:4, |
| 339:11 | $256: 13,256: 16,$ | 427:11 | 406:10, 412:23, |
| declaration | $256: 22,257: 1$ | delay | 456:17, 458:21, |
| 265:2, 265:6, | 257:7, 257:11, | 336:2 | 465:10, 468:12, |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 265: 12, & 266: 5 \\ 267: 15, & 268: 10 \end{array}$ | 257:19, 274:3, | delighted $499: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 469: 9, \quad 479: 4 \\ & \text { described } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | 272:3, 278:6, |
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| 285:22, 286:15, | details | 273:19, 276:24, | 457:3, 458:20, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 295:24, 299:7, | 276:9, 347:4, | 276:25, 295:12, | 466:5, 480:10, |
| 311:9, 319:19, | 479:19 | 297:20, 300:12, | 489:10, 496:4 |
| 327:15, 344:22, | determination | 304:21, 306:2, | difference |
| 354:3, 387:6, | 284:4, 288:15, | 307:24, 310:23, | 362:25, 363:5, |
| 397:22, 405:11, | 361:23 | 319:16, 319:17, | 366:1 |
| 408:3, 408:7, | determinations | 321:14, 329:5, | differences |
| 411:8, 411:18, | 491:15 | 339:4, 348:7, | 439:23 |
| 412:11, 412:25, | determine | 348:19, 349:17, | different |
| 425:10, 428:6, | 280:8, 281:14, | 359:13, 372:22, | 285:12, 285:20, |
| 433:24, 446:15, | 284:22, 285:15, | 374:17, 374:18, | 285:23, 285:25, |
| 494:14 | 295:2, 323:7, | 386:23, 388:19, | 286:16, 286:19, |
| describes | 324:3, 343:7, | 398:13, 409:7, | 286:24, 299:25, |
| 278:12, 278:19, | 360:13, 360:25, | 414:1, 415:17, | 300:5, 308:13, |
| 279:6, 283:15, | 361:9, 363:23, | 415:22, 416:18, | 325:10, 338:17, |
| 285:5, 285:11, | 366:7, 366:12, | 416:19, 420:13, | 338:20, 343:3, |
| 286:7, 287:3, | 452:12, 457:16, | 422:22, 435:15, | 343:4, 349:13, |
| 287:11, 287:20, | 457:21, 474:11, | 438:17, 438:19, | 359:6, 359:10, |
| 288:6, 310:10, | 490:24 | 444:13, 449:6, | 359:16, 360:19, |
| 311:8, 331:20, | determined | 450:18, 452:18, | 362:8, 362:17, |
| 331:24, 332:4, | 285:2, 287:6, | 453:3, 455:4, | 362:20, 362:24, |
| 333:25, 369:20, | 464:19 | 457:8, 457:25, | 364:9, 364:12, |
| 371:1, 371:11, | determines | 458:6, 458:12, | 365:10, 382:18, |
| 372:8, 392:25, | 284:8, 284:9, | 458:16, 459:5, | 395:13, 395:17, |
| 397:9, 397:13, | 285:8, 288:12, | 459:19, 468:5, | $398: 11, \quad 399: 3,$ |
| 423:22, 427:23, | $374: 10,473: 10$ | $469: 15,469: 18,$ | $399: 14,416: 4,$ |
| 428:6, 433:6, | determining | $477: 24,478: 12,$ | $417: 25,422: 17$ |
| $439: 1,439: 3$ | 322:20, 362:20, | $478: 24,478: 25$ | $425: 1, \quad 505: 8$ |
| $440: 18,448: 4$ | $367: 3,474: 18$ | $481: 8,486: 2$ | difficult |
| $473: 1,478: 5$ | deviation | 486:10, 486:11, | 425:23, 462:18, |
| 480:9, 494:20 | 439:21 | $\begin{array}{ll} 490: 13, & 490: 18, \\ 490 \cdot 19 & 490 \cdot 21 \end{array}$ | 490:11, 492:6 |
| describing | devices | 490:19, 490:21, | digital |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 311: 10, & 342: 10, \\ 396: 21, & 408: 5 \end{array}$ | 315:8, 315:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 490: 24, \quad 490: 25, \\ & 491: 1, \quad 491: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 305:23, 325:14, |
| $396: 21,408: 5$ | 315:20, 319:18, | $\begin{array}{ll} 491: 1, & 491: 3, \\ 491: 5, & 491: 6, \end{array}$ | 325:18, 325:19, |
| description | 319:22, 389:4, | 491:5, 491:6, | 380:15, 444:4, |
| 252:8, 288:10, $327: 24,352.23$, | 399:11, 492:25 | $497: 9,499: 5$ | 450:8, 450:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 327: 24, \quad 352: 23, \\ & 375: 3,437: 24 \end{aligned}$ | dictated | $\begin{aligned} & 497: 9, \quad 499: 5, \\ & 504: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 450: 16, & 450: 19, \\ 450: 23 . & 451: 7 \end{array}$ |
| descriptions | $\begin{aligned} & 257: 13 \\ & \text { did } \end{aligned}$ | didn't | $451: 9,451: 10,$ |
| $288: 10, \quad 328: 6$ | 254:18, 254:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 254: 21, \quad 259: 13, \\ & 261: 1.261: 25 . \end{aligned}$ | 451:20, 451:21, |
| desirable | $255: 7,255: 10,$ | $261: 1,261: 25,$ | $452: 2,452: 10,$ |
| 402:7, 419:12 | 255:13, 256:13, | $\begin{array}{ll} 263: 7, & 263: 13, \\ 287: 9, & 300: 11 \end{array}$ | $452: 11,493: 15,$ |
| detail | 256:15, 257:14, | 287:9, $300: 11$, $304: 23, ~ 320: 1$, | 497:10, 497:14, |
| 312:24, 338:18, | 257:15, 257:19, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 304: 23, \quad 320: 1, \\ & 329: 3, \quad 371: 19, \end{aligned}\right.$ | $501: 11$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 343: 17,370: 24 \\ & 400: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 257:20, 257:24, | $372: 1, \quad 384: 15,$ | digits $378: 24,470: 22$ |
| detailed | $\begin{array}{ll} 262: 18, & 265: 3, \\ 265: 16, & 267: 2, \end{array}$ | 403:9, 421:8, | $471: 1,471: 3,$ |
| 346:14 | 267:20, 269:18, | 426:8, 456:9, | 471: 4 |
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| direct | 435:5, 436:21 | 431:17, 437:19, | distinguishes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 381:5, 381:22, | disallowing | 438:9, 443:18, | 374:10 |
| 382:8, 382:14, | 433:13 | 444:7, 444:14, | distribute |
| $383: 3,384: 1$, | disapproves | 447:14, 447:23, | 489:11, 490:22 |
| 385:7, 431:18, | 293:10 | 448:8, 464:11, | distributed |
| 468:11, 492:24, | disclose | 464:22, 466:19, | 486:21, 486:24, |
| 494:6, 506:8, | 307:14, 307:18, | 466:23, 469:19, | 487:4, 487:17, |
| 506:13 | 307:21, 310:17, | 475:15, 478:3, | 488:12, 488:23, |
| directed | 310:25, 311:3, | 479:1, 481:24, | 489:12, 489:19, |
| 281:23, 282:4, | 311:6, 311:19, | 486:16, 487:8, | 490:1, 490:5, |
| 282:21, 433:3 | $314: 4,314: 8$, | 488:11, 488:22, | 490:14 |
| directing | 314:12, 314:15, | 489:25, 492:12 | distributing |
| 269:22, 432:7, | 319:13, 319:18, | disclosing | 490:9 |
| 433:4, 433:22, | 349:14, 349:23, | 340:25, 400:12, | distribution |
| 434:2, 434:10, | 350:9, 350:16, | 400:20 | 488:17, 488:25, |
| 434:17, 434:21, | 385:3, 389:20, | disclosure | 489:7, 489:15 |
| 435:18, 435:23, | 399:17, 400:2, | 425:15 | distributional |
| 435:25 | 400:16, 409:3, | discuss | 487:21 |
| direction | 410:13, 410:24, | 351:18, 359:13, | documents |
| 384:14, 385:9, | 417:10, 417:19, | 389:23, 459:5, | 255:10, 255:13, |
| 434:16 | 469:10, 469:15, | 477:11 | 255:20, 454:10, |
| directly | 476:19, 479:7, | discussed | 456:3 |
| 381:1, 381:14, | 479:17, 482:6 | 261:12, 261:17, | doesn't |
| 382:12, 382:23, | disclosed | 261:22, 327:17, | 276:8, 283:22, |
| 384:6, 384:23, | 266:7, 268:13, | 402:21, 404:11 | 290:22, 307:14, |
| 385:11, 385:13, | 269:25, 307:12, | discusses | 307:17, 307:18, |
| 385:18, 406:25 | 388:15, 399:7, | 403:14, 423:1, | 307:21, 310:2, |
| directs | 400:1, 402:18, | 427:20 | 313:17, 313:21, |
| 431:10, 431:20, | 415:17, 430:7, | discussing | $314: 4,314: 8$, |
| 432:11, 432:16, | 440:7, 440:14, | 258:25, 325:24, | 314:12, 314:15, |
| 432:19, 432:25, | 441:11, 475:1, | 345:22, 347:2, | 319:13, 320:2, |
| 435:11, 436:13, | 475:8, 475:23, | 347:21 | 320:5, 320:17, |
| 436:14 | 476:11, 477:6, | discussion | 320:20, 326:21, |
| disable | 486:15 | 446:7, 476:16, | 327:2, 327:7, |
| 314:22, 314:25 | discloses | 477:23 | 327:20, 328:8, |
| disablement | 379:6, 385:4, | dishonest | $331: 2,332: 13$, |
| 315:8 | 393:3, 393:10, | 463:25, 465:1, | $332: 21,337: 15$, |
| disabling | 393:14, 397:19, | 465:11, 465:16, | 338:14, 338:25, |
| 314:18, 315:5, | 399:4, 401:4, | 465:20, 465:23, | 339:3, 339:15, |
| 315:10, 315:13, | 401:24, 403:5, | 466:3, 466:9, | 339:21, 340:4, |
| 330:10 | 403:17, 404:2, | 466:15, 466:18, | $340: 10,344: 22$, |
| disagree | 404:7, 406:1, | 466:20, 466:25, | 355:7, 361:12, |
| 279:11, 280:10, | 407:24, 408:17, | 468:4, 468:9, | 372:19, 380:24, |
| 281:21, 282:10, | 409:8, 409:16, | 468:21, 468:24 | 381:16, 381:18, |
| 282:13, 282:18, | 411:14, 413:4, | displayed | 383:4, 383:24, |
| 284:13, 288:5, | 413:14, 414:10, | 447:11, 448:6, | 384:9, 384:13, |
| 489:14 | 414:21, 415:5, | 448:12 | 386:14, 392:4, |
| disallow | 416:24, 428:4, | distinction | 393:17, 393:25, |
| 433:17, 434:14, |  | 392:5 |  |
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|  | 376:16, 452:21, 461:13 <br> downloaded $319: 5$ <br> downloading $315: 16,315: 19,$ $317: 4,317: 9$ $317: 15, \quad 317: 19,$ $317: 22,318: 6$ $318: 7,318: 8,$ $318: 17,318: 21,$ $318: 25$ <br> downloads <br> 318:3, 318:4 dr 253:11, 289:5, $331: 16, \quad 350: 24$ $367: 12, \quad 394: 11,$ $437: 10, \quad 485: 19,$ $503: 23,504: 3$ <br> draw $332: 1,397: 13$ <br> drawing $406: 14,496: 6$ <br> drew $504: 20$ <br> drive $250: 3,508: 16$ <br> driver $394: 23, \quad 394: 24$ $394: 25$ <br> drivers $410: 10$ <br> driving $402: 6,402: 10$ <br> drop <br> 363:14, 364:1 duly $253: 3,508: 6$ <br> during $\begin{aligned} & 326: 14, \quad 326: 22, \\ & 327: 4, \quad 327: 9, \\ & 327: 21, \quad 491: 7 \\ & \text { dynamics } \\ & 420: 25 \end{aligned}$ <br> E <br> e <br> 393:7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```409:12, 409:17, 411:7, 411:13, 411:15, 411:18, 412:11, 412:25, 414:24, 423:9, 427:20, 428:21, 429:7, 439:4, 443:18, 443:24, 443:25, 444:7, 444:14, 446:20, 447:14, 447:23, 448:8 embodiments 331:20, 332:4, 333:8, 350:9, 350:16, 388:3, 388:8, 388:11, 388:15, 407:18, 407:24, 408:2, 408:3 employed 458:2, 494:1, 508:21 enable 278:7, 281:24, 282:5, 282:22, 332:9, 337:11, 340:20, 341:11, 348:3, 348:23, 349:8 enables 287:25 enabling 286:11, 288:8 encoded 379:24 encompass 296:5, 296:14, 296:24 encrypt 358:13, 393:20 encrypted 279:15, 279:23, 279:24, 279:25, 280:7, 281:11, 281:13, 293:6, 354:23, 355:10, 356:10, 356:18,``` | ```357:2, 357:12, 357:19, 357:23, 358:6, 394:1 encryption 313:18, 313:22, 314:5, 314:9, 356:22, 357:20, 390:19, 392:1, 392:4, 392:6, 392:22, 499:6, 499:12, 500:12, 501:2, 501:3 encrypts 392:5 end 324:2, 413:19, 414:14, 416:23, 417:16, 425:18, 428:19, 505:1 ended 376:21 engagement 491:10 english 314:24, 318:14 enjoyed 457:10 enough 393:9, 403:11, 403:13, 405:3, 416:14, 461:18 ensued 289:2, 331:13, 367:9, 394:9, 437:8, 476:16, 485:17 enter 284:6, 322:3, 323:20, 323:21, 439:20 entered 323:7, 421:22, 422:14 entering 306:1, 421:7, 422:10, 439:19, 447:6, 447:9, 448:4``` | entire $371: 18, \quad 371: 22$, $461: 8, \quad 485: 14$ entirely $308: 12, \quad 452: 4$ entireties $265: 17$ entirety $265: 23, \quad 268: 9$, $275: 19, \quad 299: 8$, $299: 17, \quad 300: 25$ entities $311: 9, \quad 473: 5$ entitled $277: 9, \quad 277: 15$, $445: 25, \quad 502: 24$ entity $318: 17, \quad 344: 13$, $348: 6, \quad 349: 11$, $352: 2, \quad 363: 22$, $366: 11, \quad 401: 21$, $431: 24, \quad 432: 24$, $435: 19, \quad 440: 5$, $476: 21$ entity's $331: 21, \quad 332: 5$ esquire $251: 3, \quad 251: 4$, $251: 12$ essential $439: 21$ establish $263: 7, \quad 354: 15$ established $354: 9$ establishing $325: 11$ estimate $254: 12, \quad 405: 2$, $491: 12$ estimates $491: 13$ european $437: 10$ evaluate $500: 19$ evaluating $363: 23, \quad 366: 11$ | even <br> 340:10, 366:14, <br> 366:17, 371:5, <br> 389:4, 504:16, <br> 505:23 <br> events <br> 326:14, 326:17 <br> ever <br> 261:3, 261:17, <br> 261:22, 262:8, <br> 262:24, 263:9, <br> 263:21, 264:1, <br> 370:5, $370: 17$, <br> 390:13, 427:8, <br> 457:10, 457:19, <br> 457:25, 458:6, <br> 458:13, 458:16, <br> 459:5, 471:15, <br> 490:15, 490:16 <br> every <br> 437: 6 <br> everything <br> 402:23, 436:25 <br> evidence <br> 325:23, 454:19, <br> 455:1, 456:4, <br> 456:24, 457:9, <br> 457:18 <br> exact $\begin{aligned} & 280: 13, \quad 325: 24, \\ & 427: 11, \quad 427: 15, \\ & 438: 3,477: 16, \\ & 497: 22 \\ & \text { exactly } \\ & 253: 23, \quad 382: 13, \\ & 406: 4,429: 11, \\ & 429: 20,465: 24, \\ & 499: 23 \end{aligned}$ <br> examination <br> 252:4, 253:5 <br> examine <br> 415:17 <br> examined <br> 253:4 <br> examiner <br> 374:9 <br> examples <br> 354:16, 365:21, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 366:22, 393:18, | 450:8, 450:11, | exposure | fails |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 399:11, 399:15, | 499:11, 499:13 | 299:5 | 476:19 |
| 399:24, 422:8, | existence | express | fair |
| 481:14 | 316:24, 500:4, | 346:18 | 393:9, 442:11, |
| excerpt | 500:17 | expressed | 461:15, 462:3, |
| 505:20 | existing | 345:21, 346:15 | 463:13 |
| exclude | 319:21, 492:14, | expression | fairly |
| 429:7 | 492:20, 493:6, | 274:19 | 434:9 |
| excuse | 493:8, 493:21, | extent | fall |
| 469:12 | 494:9, 495:2, | 276:9, 359:14, | 500:7 |
| executed | 495:13, 495:17, | 385:5, 387:5, | familiar |
| 309:24 | 496:11, 496:16, | 454:2, 462:10, | 378:10, 378:20, |
| executing | 496:18, 497:4, | 491:14 | 402:3, 498:6 |
| 374:4, 432:16 | 497:7, 497:9, | eyes | far |
| exemplary | 497:24, 498:9, | 467:13 | 256:25, 351:13, |
| $414: 24,423: 8$ | $498: 15,498: 21,$ $499: 5.499: 7$ | F | 400:8, 400:9, |
| exhausted | $\begin{aligned} & 499: 5, \quad 499: 7, \\ & 499: 15, \quad 499: 19, \end{aligned}$ | face | $425: 25,445: 15$ |
| 503:2 | $499: 25, \quad 500: 1$ | 295:20, 296:6, | fast |
| exhibit | expect | 296:14, 296:25, | $269: 2,358: 3,$ |
| 255:22, 255:23, | $347.5$ | 417:16 | 475:10 |
| 256:3, 256:4, |  | facilitates | favor |
| 256:5, 256:6, | expectation 467:24 | 286:12, 288:1, | 504:25 |
| 265:1, 265:13, | 467:24 | 288:9 | features |
| 267:12, 269:6, | experience | fact | 390:9, 390:10 |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 269: 7, & 269: 20, \\ 270: 8 . & 270: 9 . \end{array}\right.$ | $308: 2,308: 3$ <br> expert | 392:25, 431:1, | february |
| $270: 16, \quad 270: 17,$ | $304: 6, \quad 304: 8,$ | 451:15 | 273:16, 276:23, |
| $270: 18, \quad 270: 19,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 304: 0, & 504: 8, \\ 461: 7, \end{array}$ | factor | 277:2, 277:9, |
| 273:5, 274:10, | 500:10, 500:16, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 321: 24, ~ 322: 3, \\ & 322: 6,322: 11, \end{aligned}\right.$ | feel |
| 274:24, 275:11, | 500:22, 500:24, | $322: 15,323: 2,$ | 259:11, 287:2, |
| $\begin{array}{ll}276: 2, & 276: 12, \\ 326: 2, & 330: 4,\end{array}$ | 501:2 | $323: 14,323: 24,$ | 297:15, 461:18, |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 326: 2, & 330: 4, \\ 330 \cdot 24 & 359 \cdot 18 \end{array}$ | expertise $500: 8$ | 324:5, 325:3, | $491: 16,491: 19$ |
| $330: 24, ~ 359: 18$, $364: 19, ~ 367: 14$, | explain | 325:13, 325:17, | few |
| $364: 19, ~ 367: 14$, $388: 25, ~ 421: 2$, | explain $282: 15,283: 2$, | 386:5, 389:17, | 359:25, 421:1, |
| $388: 25, ~ 421: 2$, $433: 11, ~ 452: 15$, | 282:15, 283:2, 290:14, 324.8 | 389:18 | 426:19, 477:22, |
| 433:11, 452:15, 452:19, 453:9, | $290: 14,324: 8$, $328: 8,351: 7$, | factors | 503:16 |
| $452: 19, ~ 453: 9$, $453: 11, ~ 453: 19$, | $328: 8,351: 7$, $357: 16,366: 5$, | 324:16, 324:19, | field |
| 453:11, 453:19, $453: 21, ~ 455: 12$, | $357: 16,366: 5$, $390: 6,392: 12$, | 387:6 | 307:1, 307:4, |
| $453: 21, ~ 455: 12$, $455: 14, ~ 455: 24$, | 390:6, 392:12, | fail | 307:9, 393:1 |
| $455: 14,455: 24$, $455: 25,457: 4$, | 394:3, 403:15, | 412:8 | fields |
| $455: 25,457: 4$, $457: 5,458: 25$, | 422:8, 454:15, | failed | 306:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 457: 5,458: 25, \\ & 459: 14, \quad 476: 17, \end{aligned}$ | 489:1 explained | 314:19, 315:6, | figure |
| $477: 9$ | 393:20, 449:13 | 315:11, 329:6, | 285:1, 285:15, |
| exhibits | explains | $\begin{array}{ll} 329: 11, & 329: 14, \\ 329: 19, & 330: 11 \end{array}$ | 333:25, 334:1, |
| 252:8 | 326:13 | $\begin{array}{ll} 329: 19, & 330: 11, \\ 330: 14, & 330: 17 \end{array}$ | $334: 4, \quad 334: 7,$ |
| existed | explanation | $330: 22$ | $338: 3,338: 5,$ |
| 316:19, 321:7, | 474:22 |  | $338: 10,338: 14$, |
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| 338:23, 338:25, | 342:10, 347:20, | 471:2 | 475:15, 475:17, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 339:15, 339:18, | 424:3, 454:2, | forms | 475:19, 475:24, |
| 339:21, 379:8, | 506:6 | 286:10, 286:13, | 476:12, 476:18, |
| 399:10, 406:23, | fine | 288:1, 288:9, | 477:7, 477:8, |
| 433:7, 446:10, | 288:25, 446:12 | 288:17, 289:16, | 477:23, 478:3, |
| 446:11, 446:14, | fingerprint | 294:11, 348:2, | 478:5, 478:11, |
| 446:16, 446:19, | 294:13, 294:17, | 486:8, 488:6 | 478:12, 478:13, |
| 473:9, 479:12, | 308:23, 309:1 | formulate | 479:1, 479:5, |
| 479:13, 482:18, | finish | 282:19 | 479:7, 481:12, |
| 486:14 | 405:16, 502:24, | formulation | 481:16, 481:18, |
| figures | 503:1, 503:20 | 280:13, 404:6, | 481:19, 481:24, |
| 482:25 | finished | 427:13, 427:15 | 482:6, 482:11, |
| file | 405:18 | forth | 482:16, 483:3, |
| 255:17, 265:18, | first | 276:21, 383:24, | 483:6, 483:14, |
| 268:5 | 253:3, 258:21, | 508:5 | 484:3, 485:10, |
| filed | 259:7, 272:16, | forwards | 486:12, 486:23, |
| 268:14, 315:16, | 296:7, 305:19, | 406:6, 406:10, | 487:2, 488:11, |
| 315:19, 445:17, | 333:14, 343:22, | 406:11, 406:18, | 488:22, 489:25, |
| 451:3 | 367:1, 375:2, | 407:7 | 490:7, 491:20, |
| filing | 379:8, 401:22, | found | 491:23, 506:1 |
| 315:23 | 417:3, 431:11, | 374:8, 505:1 | franklin's |
| fill | 431:21, 435:11, | four | 486:20, 487:4 |
| 363:10, 364:4 | 438:21, 467:10 | 256:2, 256:9, | fraud |
| financial | fit | 478:7 | 363:20, 466:21, |
| 316:2, 316:3, | 389:2 | fourth | 466:25 |
| 316:6, 316:11, | flawed | 382:4, 382:6 | freestanding |
| 316:20, 316:25, | 347:5 | frame | 460:9 |
| 317:9, 317:16, | floor | 489:21 | frequency |
| 317:19, 318:21, | 250:3, 251:14, | framed | 493:3 |
| 318:25, 387:2, | 508:16 | 300:18 | from |
| 387:4, 390:2, | focus | francisco | 265:1, 267:12, |
| 413:15, 414:11, | 272:16, 322:25, | $251: 15$ | 273:5, 276:12, |
| 438:1, 438:5, | 327:18, 370:16, | franklin | 283:22, 289:2, |
| 448:24, 449:9, | 429:15, 466:12, | 352:22, 369:12, | $302: 17, \quad 326: 9$ |
| 478:19, 487:15, | 490:19, 503:7 | 369:16, 463:3, | 327:11, 331:5, |
| 499:20, 501:14, | focused | 463:5, 463:8, | 331:13, 338:4, |
| 501:21, 502:3, | 369:18, 426:7 | 463:14, 463:19, | 343:4, 349:13, |
| 502:6, 502:11, | focusing | 464:11, 464:16, | 354:24, 355:11, |
| 504:10, 504:15, | 268:10 | 464:22, 465:5, | 357:13, 357:24, |
| 504:16, 505:3, | follows | 466:19, 466:23, | 358:7, 359:18, |
| 506:8, 506:14 | 253:4 | 467:5, 468:5, | 362:20, 364:9, |
| financially | foolish | 468:6, 468:8, | 365:10, 367:9, |
| 508:23 | 467:20 | 468:14, 468:20, | 370:9, 380:5, |
| find | forget | $469: 7,469: 10,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 381: 22, & 382: 8, \\ 382: 15, & 382: 18, \end{array}$ |
| $256: 20,263: 4$ | $451: 3$ | $469: 19,469: 23,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 382: 15,382: 18, \\ & 383: 3.383: 6 . \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{rr} 263: 7, & 263: 13, \\ 263.18 & 263.24 \end{array}$ | forgot | $470: 5,470: 24,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 383: 3, & 383: 6, \\ 384: 1, & 384: 11, \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 263: 18, \quad 263: 24, \\ & 264: 5, \quad 264: 23, \end{aligned}$ | 502:12 <br> format | $\begin{array}{ll} 471: 25, & 472: 10, \\ 472: 11, & 475: 8, \end{array}$ | $384: 12,385: 7,$ |
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| 380:11, 393:17, | 276:13, 367:15, | 404:20, 425:11, | 320:24, 321:9, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 479:19 | 453:14, 476:5 | 449:14, 494:15 | 328:1, 333:8, |
| giving | gotten | hard | 333:23, 336:8, |
| 286:4, 287:13, | 370:23 | 274:4, 278:23, | 336:15, 338:18, |
| 287:17 | guess | 305:3, 350:21, | 339:10, 341:3, |
| go | 360:1, 478:7 | 353:10, 358:4, | 341:17, 341:18, |
| 254:16, 266:25, | guessing | 359:3, 371:6, | 346:5, 347:17, |
| 327:10, 335:1, | 405:3 | 371:23, 399:12, | 349:20, 349:21, |
| 335:6, 337:24, | guys | 415:24, 424:10, | 350:20, 351:13, |
| 347:7, 363:9, | 445:2 | 427:5, 436:6, | 353:23, 354:9, |
| 364:6, 376:3, | H | 461:5, 464:21, | 354:12, 367:5, |
| $404: 21, ~ 416: 5, ~$ $422: 12, ~ 436: 23$, | had | 472:23, 482:10 | $\begin{array}{ll} 375: 10, & 378: 3, \\ 397: 15 . & 398: 3 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 422: 12, ~ 436: 23, \\ & 472: 12, ~ 476: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 254:19, 254:20, | hardware $309: 7, \quad 310: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 392: 15, ~ 398: 3, \\ & 400: 23, ~ 404: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| $476: 5, \quad 477: 12$ | 256:20, 260:1, | $\text { \| } 311: 4$ | $404: 17,415: 23$ |
| goal | 265:13, 341:18, | has | 418:2, 418:12, |
| 284:20, 298:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 422: 12, \\ & 422: 13, \\ & 433: 20, \end{aligned} 58: 13,$ | 262:22, 285:3, | 425:8, 425:25, |
| 299:13 | $459: 10,462: 13,$ | 285:9, 287:6, | 426:7, 429:20, |
| goals | $465: 25, \quad 485: 19$ | 298:7, 298:8, | 430:10, 448:13, |
| 298:10, 299:9, | hale | 300:18, 321:7, | 448:16, 449:13, |
| 299:15, 299:18, | 251:5 | 324:15, 326:1, | 450:1, 457:14, |
| 310:12 | half | $327: 15, \quad 327: 16$ | 457:20, 464:19, |
| goes | 254:3 | 335:2, 344:12, | 468:17, 469:3, |
| $406: 24$ qoing | hand | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 351: 20, & 352: 9, \\ 361: 19, & 361: 24 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 469: 6, \quad 469: 23, \\ & 475: 17, \quad 482: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
| 269:2, 290:14, | 258:1, 258:8, | $362: 4, \quad 362: 13,$ | 484:14, 489:4, |
| 306:16, 331:8, | $\begin{array}{ll}325: 25, & 363: 6, \\ 378: 17, & 462: 20,\end{array}$ | 373:1, 373:2, | 491:13, 500:6, |
| 346:12, 347:18, | $378: 17, ~ 462: 20, ~$ $467: 21,509: 3$ | 374:17, 381:5, | 500:13, 503:5, |
| 355:8, 418:5, | 467:21, 509:3 | 386:13, 387:4, | 503:8 |
| 429:7, 430:3, | handed | 389:25, 394:18, | having |
| 438:17, 445:7, | $413: 8, \quad 492: 9$ | 395:6, 440:18, | 253:3, 261:3, |
| 446:7, 446:9, | handing | 451:15, 452:9, | 261:10, 261:17, |
| 470:3, 485:14, | handing | 456:21, 456:25, | 261:22, 262:8, |
| 489:20, 500:9 | 437:10 | 457:10, 457:19, | 262:24, 263:9, |
| good | happen | 462:20, 486:5, | 263:21, 264:13, |
| 253:7, 253:8, | 435:18, 446:15 | 486:18, 488:3, | 278:23, 346:11, |
| 295:25, 300:2, | happening | 489:15, 490:6, | 346:17, 347:17, |
| 304:14, 331:9, | $\begin{array}{ll} 282: 9, & 385: 14, \\ 434: 25, & 436: 23 \end{array}$ | 502:13, 502:22, | $361: 24,392: 8$, |
| 359:23, 360:2, | 434:25, 436:23 | 504:5, 506:11 | 398:23, 401:10, |
| 377:5, 388:22, | happens | hasn't | 402:25, 408:25, |
| 401:1, 451:17, | 434:15 | 341:19, 344:19, | 410:9, 412:24, |
| 504:4 | happy | 364:3 | 419:5, 446:6, |
| goofy | 275:25, 277:19, | haven't | 459:8, 462:19 |
| 433:8 | 332:2, 333:1, | 274:7, 274:25, | hazy |
| gosma | 346:13, 351:18, | 277:6, 277:11, | 450:3 |
| $251: 4$ | 353:1, 353:12, | 280:13, 301:11, | he's |
| got | $\begin{array}{ll} 400: 7, & 400: 25, \\ 401: 7, & 402: 14, \end{array}$ | $312: 24,313: 6,$ $313: 12,319: 20$ | $445: 7,445: 15$ |
| 269:21, 273:6, | 401:7, 402:14, | 313:12, 319:20, | head $481: 17$ |
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| 497:1, 499:6, | 465:2, 465:6, | 384:1, 385:7, | intending |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 499:20, 499:22 | 465:12, 465:21, | 392:2, 392:20, | 505:15 |
| included | 466:3, 466:10, | 392:25, 395:7, | interact |
| 325:20, 405:5, | 466:16, 468:25 | 399:4, 399:7, | 280:6 |
| 408:6, 497:24, | industry | 399:17, 400:2, | interacting |
| 498:10, 498:21 | 261:12, 261:17, | 400:12, 400:20, | 279:23, 290:17 |
| includes | 261:23, 262:3, | 401:5, 401:12, | interaction |
| 324:19, 334:23, | 262:8 | 401:25, 402:1, | 281:12 |
| 335:12, 401:14, | informed | 402:4, 402:8, | interception |
| 407:13, 428:17, | 262:22, 263:3, | 402:12, 402:19, | 297:19, 298:1, |
| 492:23 | 263:6, 263:12, | 429:23, 430:6, | 298:5, 298:8, |
| including | 263:23, 264:4, | 430:15, 430:19, | 298:13, 298:19, |
| 310:14, 388:4, | 457:20 | 431:4, 439:9, | 298:21, 298:22, |
| 388:17, 476:20 | infrared | 439:10, 446:13, | 299:2, 299:14, |
| incorporate | 493:4, 497:25, | 446:24, 447:6, | 299:21, 300:8, |
| 281:18 | 498:6, 498:7, | 447:10, 448:5 | 300:21, 301:4, |
| incorrect | 498:10, 498:22 | inputs | 301:16, 301:23, |
| 287:21, 300:15, | infrastructure | 391:4, 391:17 | $302: 4, \quad 302: 8,$ |
| $358: 25, \quad 489: 13$ | 492:14, 492:15, | inputted | $302: 16, \quad 302: 21,$ |
| incorrectly | 492:17, 492:20, | 322:4 | 302:22, 303:3, |
| 300:16, 448:21 | 493:6, 493:8, | inserted | 303:7, 303:12, |
| increase | 493:21, 494:2, | 324:13 | 413:14, 413:19, |
| 506:12 | 494:9, 495:3, | instances | 413:23, 414:10, |
| independent | 495:14, 495:16, | 325:7 | 414:14, 414:20, |
| 292:10 | 495:18, 496:11, | instead | 414:22, 415:6, |
| independently | 496:17, 496:18, | 280:4, 284:21, | 415:18, 416:21, |
| 364:5 | 496:24, 497:4, | 422:12, 424:13, | 416:25, 417:6, |
| indicate | 497:8, 497:9, | 429:7, 439:10, | 417:8, 417:11, |
| 360:7, 360:11, | $497: 24$, $498: 975$, $498: 21$, | $439: 19,439: 24$ | $417: 14$ |
| 363:18, 365:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 498: 15, \quad 498: 21, \\ & 499: 5, \quad 499: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $464: 5$ <br> institution | interested $499: 25.508: 23$ |
| 497:18 indicates | $499: 15,499: 19,$ | institution 478:23, 479:11, | interesting |
| 391:3, 391:15, | 499:25, 500:1 | 480:7, 480:22, | $309: 22$ |
| 442:21, 447:9, | infringes $454: 20, \quad 455: 1$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 481: 25, & 482: 7, \\ 482: 22, & 483: 15 \end{array}$ | interface |
| 484:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 454: 20,455: 1 \\ & \text { inherently } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 482: 22, ~ 483: 15, \\ & 483: 20, \end{aligned} 484: 4,$ | $307: 22,308: 2, ~$ $308: 5,308 \cdot 17$ |
| indication | inherently <br> 467:22 | 483:20, 484:4, | 308:5, 308:17, |
| 469:5, 476:23 | $467: 22$ <br> initially | $\begin{aligned} & 484: 12, ~ 484: 19, \\ & 484: 24, ~ 485: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 308: 20, & 311: 7, \\ 311: 10, & 311: 11 \end{array}\right.$ |
| indirect | $\begin{aligned} & \text { initially } \\ & 502: 17 \end{aligned}$ | institutions | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 311: 10, & 311: 11, \\ 311: 14, & 311: 20, \end{array}\right.$ |
| indistinguishable | initiate | 478:17, 478:20, | $311: 23,312: 1,$ |
| 451:22 | 366:10, 501:18 | 487:13, 487:15 | 312:4, 380:16, |
| individual | initiates | instructions | 400:17, 402:9 |
| 300:4, 357:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 284: 5, \quad 339: 19, \\ & 435: 00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lr} 373: 4, & 373: 19, \\ 372 \cdot 20 & 374 \cdot 5 \end{array}$ | interfaces |
| 358:1, 358:9, | $435: 20$ <br> input | $\begin{aligned} & 373: 20, ~ 374: 5, \\ & 374: 24, ~ 375: 3, \end{aligned}$ | ```311:8}\mathrm{ intermediary``` |
| $\begin{aligned} & 460: 1, \quad 464: 7 \\ & 466: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $357: 19,375: 5,$ | $375: 24, \quad 376: 8,$ | $478: 22,479: 10,$ |
| individual's | $381: 22,382: 8,$ | $401: 15,432: 16$ | $480: 6,480: 21,$ |
| 464:1, 464:23, | 382:14, 383:3, | intended $395: 1,464: 10$ | 482:21, 483:14, |
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| 468:6, 469:21, | 488:7, 491:13, | 463:19, 463:21, | 432:19, 433:8, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 470:7, 472:14, | 499:4, 503:11, | 470:6, 470:14, | 434:25, 441:19, |
| 476:13, 477:2, | 503:15, 503:19 | 485:24, 488:1, | 448:14, 451:6, |
| 486:14, 488:25, | likelihood | 501:6, 503:20, | 461:20, 487:8, |
| 494:13, 504:11, | 416:20, 417:7, | 506:9 | 498:4, 501:25 |
| 505:18, 506:6 | 417:13 | lines | llc |
| let's | likely | 289:8, 289:11, | 249:8, 251:11, |
| 259:24, 272:16, | 323:8, 324:3, | 332:7, 336:24, | 508:11 |
| 292:8, 305:14, | 336:22 | 338:4, 338:13, | 11p |
| 332:7, 333:24, | likewise | 339:23, 347:24, | 250:3, 251:5, |
| 336:24, 338:3, | 382:7, 382:21 | 389:14, 416:16, | 251:13, 508:15 |
| 339:23, 347:23, | limit | 417:9, 422:21, | loaded |
| 360:22, 378:4, | 420:11, 421:20, | 423:19, 424:7, | 408:20, 409:4, |
| 387:17, 389:22, | 477:18, 502:20, | 425:7, 428:3, | 409:8, 409:13, |
| 396:11, 404:21, | 505:15 | 428:13, 429:1, | 409:16, 409:23, |
| 416:16, 418:9, | limitation | 429:3, 429:17, | 409:25 |
| 422:21, 427:16, | 266:6, 268:12, | 429:24, 430:7, | local |
| 472:12, 472:19, | 269:24, 292:6, | 432:22, 434:2, | 281:2, 357:9, |
| 483:13, 485:11, | 342:9, 342:11, | 434:19, 478:15, | 444:2, 460:20 |
| 485:15, 487:25, | 367:25, 368:5, | 481:23, 485:11, | locally |
| 498:18 | 368:13, 369:7 | 485:20, 485:25, | 280:5, 280:15 |
| letter | limitations | 487:2, 494:18, | location |
| 302:17, 303:1 | 266:18, 267:3, | 494:19, 501:4, | 408:22 |
| licensed | 270:21, 271:1, | 502:18, 504:22, | locations |
| 263:21, 457:19 | 271:7, 271:16, | 505:10, 505:11, | 369:19 |
| licensing | 272:6, 272:22, | 505:13 | lockout |
| 457:21, 457:22 | 276:19, 460:1 | link | $326: 14, \quad 326: 16,$ |
| life | limited | 406:21, 408:11, | $326: 18,326: 22,$ |
| 461:4 | 302:10, 303:15, | 497:13, 497:14 | 327:4, 327:9, |
| light | 303:25, 304:16, | linked | 327:22, 328:9, |
| 352:14, 473:13 | 305:12, 342:2, | 441:12, 441:15, | 328:13, 328:18, |
| like | 342:7, 342:16, | 442:1, 442:8, | 328:22, 329:1, |
| 282:15, 288:21, | 343:1, 343:10, | 442:12, 442:14, | 329:4, 329:6, |
| 300:5, 301:7, | 392:9, 393:24, | 442:22, 443:4, | 329:10, 329:14, |
| 318:5, 331:10, | 503:14 | 443:7 | 329:17, 329:19, |
| 333:15, 334:20, | limiting | listed | 330:1, 330:7, |
| 347:5, 353:11, | 260:18, 278:17, | 450:21, 451:1 | 330:9 |
| 366:2, 366:3, | 310:8, 318:18, | listen | long |
| 369:1, 371:16, | 330:13, 330:16, | 318:18, 384:20, | 359:23, 382:2, |
| 379:13, 387:7, | 330:21, 385:24, | 401:23, 480:13 | 448:15, 503:2 |
| 397:5, 400:16, | 409:1, 497:2 | litigation | long-felt |
| 401:6, 407:14, | line | 254:8 | 458:25, 459:5, |
| 412:21, 413:23, | 288:21, 326:10, | little | 459:11 |
| 415:14, 419:1, | 333:24, 337:6, | 284:19, 285:20, | look |
| 445:18, 460:3, | 382:4, 382:6, | 286:11, 317:25, | 272:1, 278:15, |
| 467:7, 468:18, | 388:2, 389:1, | 356:12, 357:5, | 285:1, 291:16, |
| 477:11, 477:12, | 427:17, 427:19, | 365:3, 366:21, | 292:9, 296:17, |
| 482:23, 486:9, | 431:8, 435:8, | 427:14, 432:9, | 297:6, 314:3, |
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|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

PLANET DEPOS
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| 409:12, 413:15, | phrased | 368:9, 368:14, | 503:17 |
| 413:19, 414:11, | 279:5 | 369:7, 370:11 | positive |
| 414:15, 414:17, | phrasing \|278:15 | point $256: 20,342: 19$ | 381:17 <br> possession |
| $\begin{aligned} & 414: 22, \quad 414: 25, \\ & 415: 6,415: 10, \end{aligned}$ | physical | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 256: 20, & 322: 19, \\ 363: 19, & 403: 13, \end{array}\right.$ | $451: 23$ |
| 415:6, 415:10, | 305:25 | 403:22 | possessor |
|  |  |  | 471:23 |
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| possible | 491:13, 500:6, | 322:2, 323:9, | 301:16, 301:22, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 410:5, 429:23, | 502:25, 503:5 | 323:17, 330:15, | 302:4, 302:10, |
| 430:6, 430:15, | preparing | 330:18, 352:24, | 303:15, 303:25, |
| 430:18, 432:15 | 458:17, 459:4 | 374:10, 390:16, | 304:16, 305:12, |
| postal | preregistered | 405:12, 408:6, | 402:9, 447:22, |
| 302:18 | 409:12 | 445:17, 450:22, | 468:3, 468:9, |
| potential | prerequisite | 460:19, 460:20, | 468:21, 469:1, |
| 298:5, 298:8, | 367:2 | 497:23, 499:13 | 469:4 |
| 298:18, 298:20, | present | priority | problems |
| 299:14 | 439:4, 493:25, | 265:14, 265:16, | 298:18, 299:2 |
| potentially | 501:9 | 265:20, 265:25, | process |
| 481:17 | presentation | 266:9, 266:20, | 374:8, 392:1, |
| powering | 443:25 | 267:4, 270:2, | 439:21, 440:6, |
| 380:3 | presented | 271:9, 271:18, | 494:23, 495:21 |
| practice | 308:8 | 272:8, 272:24, | processed |
| 456:11 | prestored | 273:15, 275:3, | 439:22 |
| practiced | 427:24, 428:22 | 275:14, 276:4, | processes |
| 456:25 | presume | 276:22, 277:1, | 374:24, 406:11 |
| praise | 395:6, 487:9, | 277:9, 277:15, | processor |
| 262:4, 262:9, | 498:15 | 316:15, 316:18, | 309:4, 309:5, |
| 262:18, 262:25, | pretty | 316:23, 317:3, | 309:6, 309:10, |
| 263:9, 458:14 | 404:17, 450:5, | 317:8, 317:14, | 309:14, 309:17, |
| pre-enrolled | 451:3 | 317:18, 318:20, | 309:20, 309:23, |
| 493:23 | prevent | 318:24, 319:7, | $310: 11,310: 13$, |
| pre-funded | 366:17, 414:22, | 319:10, 319:21, | 310:18, 311:1, |
| 408:17, 408:20, | 415:6, 415:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 322: 5, \quad 329: 12, \\ & 329: 15, \quad 329: 20, \end{aligned}$ | 311:4, 373:2, |
| 409:3, 409:8, | 416:25, 417:11 | $330: 12, \quad 330: 15,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 373: 8, \quad 373: 10, \\ & 373: 14, \quad 373: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| 409:13, 409:16, | prevention | $\begin{aligned} & 330: 12, \quad 330: 15, \\ & 330: 18 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 409:18, 410:13, | $363: 21$ | privacy | $\begin{aligned} & 374: 25,442: 8, \\ & 443: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 410:24, 411:6, | previous | $401: 16,401: 19,$ | 443:6 <br> processors |
| 413:1, 413:4 | $258: 24,327: 10,$ | 401:16, 401:19, $401: 20$ | processors $310: 3, \quad 310: 9,$ |
| predict $474: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 359: 13, \quad 408: 15, \\ & 428: 7, \quad 506: 20 \end{aligned}$ | private | $\begin{array}{ll} 310: 3, & 310: 9, \\ 310: 23, & 374: 4 \end{array}$ |
| preexisting | previously | 451:18, 452:8, | produce |
| $408: 24$ <br> prefer | $\begin{array}{ll} 326: 1, & 327: 16, \\ 346: 7, & 359: 6, \end{array}$ | 452:9 privileged | $\begin{aligned} & 429: 9, \quad 451: 21 \\ & \text { produced } \end{aligned}$ |
| 475:19 | $428: 6, \quad 462: 21$ | 255:1 | 323:5, 323:19 |
| preferably | 462:24 | probably | produces |
| 428:8 | prior | 403:15, 428:21, | 431:5 |
| preparation | 255:16, 259:1, | 454:4 | product |
| 256:14, 400:25, | 259:3, 259:25, | problem 289:19, 289:24, | $389: 1, \quad 455: 6,$ |
| $491: 8$ | 313:4, 313:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 289:19, 289:24, } \\ & \text { 290:3, 290:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 455: 21, & 456: 1 \\ 456: 25, & 460: 25 \end{array}$ |
| prepare | 313:10, 313:14, | 297:17, 297:25, | 456:25, 460:25 products |
| $\begin{array}{lll}254: 22, & 255: 8, \\ 255: 11, & 403: 10\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 315: 6, \quad 315: 9, \\ & 315: 14, \quad 315: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $298: 5,298: 7,$ | products $456: 11,456: 17,$ |
| 255:11, 403:10 prepared | $\begin{aligned} & 315: 14, ~ 315: 23, \\ & 316: 7,316: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $298: 12,298: 20,$ | $456: 19,456: 21$ |
| $\begin{array}{lr} 321: 9, & 448: 13, \\ 449: 13 . & 462: 19 . \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 316: 12, & 316: 15, \\ 319: 21, & 321: 3, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 299: 20, \quad 300: 7, \\ & 300: 20, \quad 301: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 457: 5, \quad 457: 7 \\ & \text { professional } \end{aligned}$ |
| 449:13, 462:19, | 319.21, 321.3, |  | 261:8, 461:4, |
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| $\begin{aligned} & 479: 2, \quad 479: 8, \\ & 479: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 365: 15, & 377: 18, \\ 377: 20, & 380: 2, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 474: 22, \quad 481: 3, \\ & 482: 5,504: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 424: 18, \quad 424: 23, \\ & 425: 6,425: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R | 380:24, 386:15, | reads | 425:15, 425:21, |
| radio | 386:17, 388:19, | 289:13, 347:24, | 426:1, 426:5, |
| 493:3 | 388:20, 391:2, | 367:25, 368:5, | 426:6, 426:7, |
| raised | 397:25, 398:2, | 368:13, 369:7, | 426:8, 426:13, |
| 344:17, 352:12 | 398:23, 400:5, | 379:23, 380:19, | 426:17, 426:19, |
| rather | 402:16, 403:12, | 501:8 | 426:21, 426:23, |
| 309:10, 350:5, | 405:24, 411:9, | ready | 427:17, 427:20, |
| 369:19, 451:23, | 422:25, 426:6, | 269:7 | 428:4, 428:12, |
| 466:12, 471:23 | 431:15, 434:11, | ready-made | 428:20, 429:1, |
| raw | 435:1, 435:15, | 500:15 | 429:11, 429:12, |
| 309:10, 311:11, | 436:3, 438:16, | really | 429:13, 429:16, |
| 311:23 | 442:19, 461:16, | 361:13, 388:22, | 429:20, 430:2, |
| re-ask | 461:18, 461:22, | 400:24, 404:10, | 430:11, 430:21, |
| 272:4, 279:4, | 462:3, 462:4, | 404:20, 436:4, | 431:9, 431:17, |
| $286: 14,286: 21,$ | 463:8, 470:7, | 449:13, 451:4, | 433:6, 433:15, |
| 296:11, 298:23, | 478:24, 483:2, | 475:16, 475:25, | 433:24, 434:3, |
| 303:22, 311:17, | 483:11, 485:12, | 503:2, 503:3, | 434:12, 435:3, |
| 316:4, 336:4, | 485:13, 485:14, | 503:6, 503:7, | 436:5, 436:19, |
| $339: 14,374: 18$, | 485:16, 485:20, | 503:9, 504:24, | 468:3, 468:5, |
| 398:14, 420:3, | 485:23, 486:3, | 506:3, 506:17 | 476:18, 492:1 |
| 424:4, 424:16, | 486:10, 486:16, | reason | reber's |
| $489: 6$ | 486:22, 487:20, | 253:14, 260:24, | 427:2 |
| re-reviewing | 487:25, 488:10, | 278:23, 286:17, | recall |
| 369:14 | 494:7, 494:12, | 290:1, 313:9, | 266:23, 267:8, |
| reaching | 504:6, 504:21, | 313:13, 331:1, | 267:9, 274:18, |
| 415:16, 481:8 | 504:24, 505:1, | 359:4, 368:3, | 275:7, 275:23, |
| read | 505:2, 505:19 | 421:4, 457:15, | 276:1, 276:7, |
| 258:21, 259:7, | ad | 501:22 | 276:9, 277:17, |
| 264:10, 265:16, | $379: 16, \quad 379: 17,$ | reasonable | 297:3, 301:25, |
| 265:22, 266:13, | $379: 20, \quad 380: 1,$ | $462: 6$ reasons | $\begin{array}{ll} 302: 7, & 332: 3, \\ 332: 6, & 343: 15, \end{array}$ |
| 268:2, 268:8, | 380:12, 380:13, | reasons $368: 2, ~ 415: 12$ | $347: 21,351: 13$, |
| 268:21, 269:16, | 380:17, 386:6, | reber | 352:13, 352:20, |
| 270:10, 270:25, | 386:17, 389:9, | 352:22, 369: | 354:3, 354:4, |
| 273:19, $273: 21$, $276: 24, ~ 277: 24$, | 389:12, 389:21, | $369: 16,413: 9,$ | 358:24, 369:4, |
| $276: 24, ~ 277: 24$, 282:2, 283:10, | 389:23 | $413: 12,413: 14$ | 369:10, 369:14, |
| $282: 2, ~ 283: 10$, $283: 22, ~ 291: 20, ~$ | reading | $414: 1,414:$ | 369:17, 370:9, |
| $283: 22, ~ 291: 20, ~$ $292: 18, ~ 293: 17$, | 266:23, 292:7, | $414: 9, \quad 414: 19$ | 370:25, 371:10, |
| $292: 18, ~ 293: 17$, $316: 22, ~ 325: 15$, | 337:24, 342:15, | $414: 21,415: 5$ | 375:15, 376:22, |
| $316: 22,325: 15$, $326: 9,326: 12$, | 358:3, 373:18, | $415: 17,416: 24$ | 397:12, 398:4, |
| $326: 9,326: 12$, $327: 25,328: 1$, | 387:4, 390:1, | 417:19, 418:18, | 398:21, 399:2, |
| $327: 25,328: 1$, $328: 16, ~ 334: 3$, | 399:20, 405:16, | $419: 4, \quad 419: 1$ | 399:7, 400:6, |
| $328: 16,334: 3$, $334: 6,338: 19$, | 411:11, 417:18, | $419: 21,419:$ | 400:11, 400:19, |
| $334: 6, ~ 338: 19$, $342: 5,345: 10$, | 418:5, 429:11, | $420: 1,423$ | 402:23, 402:25, |
| $342: 5,345: 10$, $348: 7,350: 6$, | 442:18, 446:7, | $\begin{array}{ll} 423: 4, & 423: 13 \\ 423 \end{array}$ | 403:9, 403:25, |
| 348:7, 350:6, | 462:7, 463:10, | 423:18, 424:7, | 409:9, 414:4, |
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|  | ```recognition 458:14 recognize 255:24, 258:3, 258:10, 297:6, 413:9, 437:13, 463:1 recollection 274:20, 275:6, 334:2, 367:17, 371:9, 371:14, 378:16, 397:3, 399:6, 411:10, 450:3, 481:13, 499:23 record 254:17, 269:16, 282:15, 300:3, 377:20, 385:1, 404:12, 467:15, 505:5, 505:19, 508:8 record's 357:1 redirect 392:14 redistribute 463:25, 464:7, 465:2, 465:12, 466:10, 468:25 redistribution 464:9, 465:13 reduce 299:5, 416:20, 417:13 reducing 417:7 redwood 249:15, 250:4, 508:16 refer 258:5, 258:12, 274:2, 277:19, 300:4, 301:25, 302:6, 343:13, 351:3, 367:21, 368:21, 379:2, 379:13, 384:15,``` |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| run <br> 310:11, 480:11 <br> running $506: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 441: 8, \quad 441: 14, \\ & 442: 13, \quad 442: 24, \\ & 444: 18, \quad 447: 8, \\ & 453: 10, \quad 460: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 446: 19, \quad 447: 23, \\ & 448: 8, \quad 448: 14, \\ & 448: 15,448: 23, \\ & 449: 5,449: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 458: 12,458: 18, \\ & 458: 22 \\ & \text { secret } \\ & 284: 6,452: 7, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | 473:22, 482:9, | 449:14, 449:17, | 473:18 |
| sadly | 495:16 san | $449: 25, ~ 450: 1$, $450: 5,503: 3$, | section $343: 14,504$ |
| 451:3 said | 251:15 | 503:4, 503:6, | 504:14 |
| 282:10, 294:10, | save | 503:8 | sections |
| 301:7, 338:10, | 355:14, 355:16, | scope | 455:17 |
| $343: 11,343: 15$, | 505:7 | 302:12, 303:7, | secure |
| 347:15, 352:9, | saved | 304:2, 304:18, | 249:8, 251:10, |
| 397:12, 418:8, | 496:7 | 336:21, 343:21, | 281:5, 281:7, |
| 432:18, 439:14, | saw | 365:24, 367:4, | 281:9, 281:15, |
| 458:16, 474:4, | 504:17, 504:19 | 375:22, 410:15, | 304:8, 361:6, |
| 474:5, 475:11, | saying | 416:9, 418:11, | $361: 16,365: 5$, |
| 477:2, 479:22, | 285:25, 304:19, | 420:9, 430:1, | 365:8, 497:13, |
| 482:19, 502:3, | 306:14, 311:10, | 440:16, 442:3, | 508:11 |
| 503:10, 505:13 | 334:21, 335:5, | 444:11, 445:1, | securid |
| same | 335:19, 356:13, | 445:14, 445:23, | 284:6, 323:6, |
| 255:23, 256:24, | 358:10, 360:9, | 451:12 | 323:25, 324:1, |
| 264:15, 266:11, | 382:18, 391:7, | screen | 420:25, 430:23, |
| 266:14, 268:17, | 407:10, 407:23, | 505:4 | 472:9 |
| 268:22, 269:9, | 408:1, 410:17, | se | security |
| 270:4, 270:12, | 415:21, 416:13, | 452:6, 495:10 | 306:22, 307:4, |
| 271:4, 271:10, | 421:16, 421:21, | search | 307:8, 321:18, |
| 271:19, 272:12, | 426:3, 434:23, | 496:8, 505:7 | 389:1, 420:25, |
| 273:1, 274:5, | 436:15, 437:1, | searching | 471:17, 471:19, |
| 278:21, 282:7, | 468:23, 482:3, | 506:5 | 471:20, 471:21, |
| 302:20, 303:5, | 489:19, 497:19 | seasoned | 472:6, 489:16, |
| 307:12, 312:23, | scan | 474:24 | 493:15 |
| 317:1, 327:5, | 400:4 | second | see |
| 331:6, 333:22, | scheme | 254:3, 273:13, | 273:13, 279:4, |
| 339:5, 340:13, | 390:9 | 375:14, 407:23, | 289:13, 295:7, |
| 342:8, 343:2, | schutzer | 423:1, 423:5, | 296:21, 302:1, |
| 351:12, 353:22, | 437:12, 437:17, | 427:21, 428:4, | 304:10, 322:19, |
| 355:7, 355:8, | 437:19, 438:2, | 428:7, 428:9, | 327:14, 333:25, |
| 359:5, 361:11, | 438:8, 438:12, | 428:15, 428:17, | 337:8, 337:13, |
| 366:6, 374:22, | 438:22, 439:1, | 428:21, 429:4, | 337:23, 347:8, |
| 388:20, 389:2, | 439:4, 440:8, | 431:12, 431:22, | 347:24, 348:22, |
| 406:4, 407:17, | 440:15, 440:18, | 432:15, 433:14, | 354:3, 355:8, |
| 407:22, 408:7, | 441:12, 442:17, | 433:17, 434:14, | 364:18, 369:12, |
| 418:17, 418:23, | 442:19, 442:21, | 435:5, 435:13, | 371:15, 373:5, |
| 420:20, 421:15, | 443:12, 443:18, | 436:20, 438:21, | 379:7, 381:20, |
| 422:3, 425:1, | 444:7, 444:14, | 474:1 | 385:4, 386:16, |
| 430:9, 434:5, | 444:21, 444:24, | secondary | 388:1, 388:6, |
| 440:22, 441:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 445: 4, \quad 445: 6, \\ & 445: 18, \quad 445: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 452: 19, \quad 452: 22, \\ & 453: 1, \quad 453: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 388: 9, \quad 397: 16, \\ & 397: 22, \quad 397: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
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|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```365:6, 367:21, 368:21, 383:17, 393:5, 393:6, 402:9, 416:5, 428:16, 429:4, 432:6, 434:20, 436:13, 451:19, 497:13 shoulder 421:17, 422:15, 422:18 shoulder-surf 421: 6 shoulder-surfing 421:21 show 454:10, 456:4 showed 421:1 shown 308:12, 308:13, 478:23, 479:11, 479:13, 479:14, 480:7, 480:22, 482:18, 482:22, 482:25, 483:16, 483:20, 484:5, 484:6, 484:8, 484:12, 484:20, 485:8, 486:6, 486:19, 488:4, 488:24, 490:2 shows 446:19 sic 268:2, 269:12 sides 388:5, 388:18 sign 506:24 signal 380:4, 383:5, 432:14 signals 379:23 signature 325:14, 325:18, 451:11, 451:22,``` |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| some | 339:9, 343:11, | sounds | 495:15, 495:22, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 255:5, 255:16, | 345:13, 346:2, | 304:14, 360:2, | 496:1, 496:10 |
| 257:12, 277:20, | 351:16, 371:15, | 412:20, 482:23 | spec |
| 278:24, 285:16, | 390:14, 395:20, | space | 370:21 |
| 294:11, 294:18, | 396:2, 396:12, | 389:2 | special |
| $305: 2,313: 7$, | 397:18, 400:6, | speak | 286:4, 390:9, |
| 317:21, 330:6, | 400:23, 403:20, | 255:7, 286:11, | 390:10 |
| 331:17, 332:1, | 404:18, 408:6, | 338:3, 340:11, | specialist |
| $335: 3,335: 4$, | 415:14, 420:22, | 374:4, 382:25, | 297:12 |
| 347:2, 355:14, | 424:1, 425:2, | 383:5, 384:9, | specific |
| 362:1, 363:19, | 425:17, 429:9, | 384:13, 386:14, | 294:8, 294:12, |
| 365:21, 373:3, | 432:2, 432:8, | 397:17, 404:12, | 295:5, 295:10, |
| 420:24, 421:22, | 432:24, 433:5, | 406:24, 408:24, | 295:16, 310:12, |
| 431:3, 432:23, | 434:10, 435:18, | 410:23, 411:13, | 360:14, 361:1, |
| 433:7, 435:18, | 438:18, 482:4, | 412:15, 415:10, | 361:10, 365:7, |
| 436:14, 436:18, | 482:23, 488:8, | 415:12, 429:7, | 367:22, 368:22, |
| 439:23, 449:18, | 489:9, 495:13, | 430:11, 430:24, | 373:5, 470:11, |
| 449:21, 451:16, | 498:13, 499:1, | 431:24, 440:25, | 470:18, 471:7, |
| 454:5, 460:15, | 499:3, 504:19 | 446:25, 447:17, | 475:7, 475:14, |
| 461:16, 470:3, | sometimes | 448:3, 458:1, | 475:23, 476:11, |
| 476:15, 478:21, | 260:25, 308:1, | 459:19, 466:6, | 477:6, 490:6 |
| 479:2, 479:8, | 323:20, 464:13, | 466:12, 467:5, | specification |
| 479:18, 479:25, | 464:18, 464:24, | 467:16, 495:24, | 268:15, 328:17, |
| 480:5, 480:17, | 465:7 | 496:9 | 333:16, 337:25, |
| 480:20, 481:15, | sorry | speaking | 345:10, 370:5, |
| 482:17, 482:20, | 255:15, 269:8, | 303:6, 309:7, | 370:16, 370:17, |
| 482:24, 483:18, | 273:8, 279:14, | 351:23, 364:16, | 371:1, 371:10, |
| 484:18, 485:6, | 279:25, 281:6, | 376:23, 386:7, | 371:18, 371:19, |
| 490:2, 490:15, | 288:15, 295:12, | 419:19, 419:24, | 372:7, 379:19, |
| 492:6, 501:23 | 304:24, 327:6, | 433:11, 454:12, | 460:9 |
| somebody | $331: 1,332: 16$, | 455:9, 455:10, | specifications |
| 304:5, 305:25, | 338:7, 338:12, | 455:11, 456:14, | 336:9, 502:8 |
| 363:14, 421:6, | 345:12, 348:18, | 487:20, 493:22, | specifies |
| 421:8, 435:23, | 349:17, 353:5, | 499:24 | 370:13 |
| 435:25, 464:8, | 358:3, 359:12, | speaks | specify |
| 465:18, 467:22 | 365:15, 368:18, | 288:7, 326:16, | $326: 21, \quad 327: 2$ |
| somehow | 371:19, 377:1, | 326:25, 327:13, | $327: 7,327: 20$ |
| 356:22 | 381:24, 388:19, | 334:11, 339:18, | $374: 6, \quad 393: 25,$ |
| someone | 389:16, 396:11, | 383:1, 384:11, | $442: 25,495: 23$ |
| 302:16, 432:23, | 396:19, 397:22, | 386:5, 389:17, | specifying |
| 434:10, 491:3 | 420:14, 427:24, | 401:13, 407:14, | $319: 4$ |
| something | 428:11, 438:4, | 407:16, 407:21, | speculate |
| 274:21, 305:6, | $438: 20,439: 11,$ | 408:23, 413:18, | 403:8, 466:11 |
| 306:1, 315:23, | 439:16, 447:4, | $413: 22,414: 19$ | speculating |
| 317:6, 318:3, | $\begin{array}{ll} 449: 12, & 453: 5, \\ 462: 22, & 468: 6 \end{array}$ | $417: 4,417: 7,$ | $481: 18$ |
| $318: 4, ~ 318: 23$, $319: 2,324: 12$, | $\begin{array}{ll} 462: 22, & 468: 6, \\ 505: 25, & 506: 3, \end{array}$ | $443: 23,446: 13,$ | speed |
| 319:2, 324:12, | $505: 25,506: 3,$ | 446:24, 448:11, | $310: 6$ |
| 324:13, 332:17, | 506:17 | 465:10, 468:23, | spend |
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| spends | starting | stop | string |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 493:22 | 459:10 | 420:13 | 474:17 |
| spent | starts | stops | strip |
| 404:13, 404:15, | 437:23 | 420:10 | 388:4, 388:17 |
| 404:22, 405:3, | state | store | stripe |
| 405:6, 414:3, | 250:8, 253:9, | 373:23, 374:5, | 379:22, 380:21, |
| 462:7, 463:10, | 360:6, 376:14, | 374:13, 374:20, | 387:1 |
| 463:13 | 476:14, 508:3 | 375:7, 375:19, | strong |
| spoke | stated | 376:18, 377:8, | 506:10 |
| 255:4, 325:24, | 469:4 | 387:1, 388:5, | structure |
| 406:9, 410:7, | statement | 388:18, 501:12 | 500:5 |
| 424:25, 425:19, | 276:9, 364:2, | stored | struggling |
| 447:18, 475:10, | 372:12, 376:20, | 295:21, 296:6, | 269:14 |
| 487:7, 504:11 | 505:20 | 296:9, 296:15, | studied |
| spoken | statements | 296:25, 297:7, | 277:22, 291:18, |
| 410:5, 458:3, | 378:9, 435:2, | 373:4, 373:19, | 338:18 |
| 458:9, 459:22, | 490:8, 500:20, | 373:20 | study |
| $462: 8$ | 506:20 | stores | 332:3, 333:2, |
| sponsoring | states | 376:7 | 409:7, 410:19 |
| $487: 14$ | 249:1, 373:14, | straightforward | subject |
| sports | 397:7, 423:4, | 354:13 | 262:3, 262:8, |
| 303:9 | 423:8, 482:16, | strangers | 506:20 |
| spread | 483:14, 484:3 | 467:19, 467:24 | submits |
| 481:25, 482:7 | station | street | $445: 20,446: 1$ |
| spreadsheets | 363:12, 363:13, | 251:14, 302:18, | submitted |
| 463:12 | 363:17, 365:25 | 303:8 | 255:25, 256:10, |
| spring | stealing | stretch | 445:15 |
| 254:14, 254:15 | 306:1 | 437:5 | submitting |
| ssl | steals | strike | 445:8, 445:9 |
| 497:11, 497:18, | 302:17 | 260:6, 288:18, | subsequently |
| 497:20, 497:21, | steam | 301:2, 310:15, | 411:20 |
| 499:13 | 506:17 | 313:2, 315:15, | subset |
| st | step | 316:17, 317:13, | 272:2, 418:3 |
| 273:16 | 339:21 | 345:15, 346:19, | substance |
| stand | steps | 349:22, 368:18, | $254: 25$ |
| 358:21 | 374:7 | 386:19, 387:8, | substantial |
| standard | stick | $\begin{array}{ll} 389: 6, & 390: 11, \\ 402: 3, & 413: 24 \end{array}$ | $459: 9, \quad 506: 12$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 410: 25, \quad 439: 18 \\ & \text { standards } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 376: 13, \quad 503: 9 \\ & 503: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 402: 3, \quad 413: 24, \\ & 426: 21, \quad 430: 15, \end{aligned}$ | substitute 266:6, 266:18, |
| 257:24 | still | 431:7, 432:20, | $\begin{array}{ll} 267: 3, & 268: 12, \end{array}$ |
| standing | 363:17, 364:7, | 436:7, 436:25, | 269:25, 270:21, |
| 445:1, 445:14, | 388:2, 388:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 440: 13, \quad 443: 16, \\ & 444 \cdot 6,456 \cdot 23 \end{aligned}$ | $271: 1,271: 7,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 445: 22,445: 25 \\ & \text { start } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 388: 11, \quad 455: 9, \\ & 456: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 444: 6, \quad 456: 23, \\ & 471: 13, \quad 476: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 271: 16, \quad 271: 24, \\ & 272: 2,272: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| 292:8, 305:14, | stolen | $490: 20,491: 2$ | $272: 20,272: 22,$ |
| $363: 15,376: 4$ | $303: 20,419: 9$ | $493: 7$ | $273: 25,275: 3$ |
| $394: 6, \quad 483: 9$ | stood | strikes $427: 13$ | $275: 14,276: 5$ |
| started | 423:13 | 427:13 | $276: 19,276: 21,$ |
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|  | $\begin{aligned} & 501: 23 \\ & \text { them } \\ & 257: 6, \quad 257: 14, \\ & 258: 25, \quad 259: 10, \\ & 265: 10, \quad 265: 22, \\ & 266: 22, \quad 267: 1, \\ & 267: 9, \quad 267: 14, \\ & 268: 8, \quad 272: 12, \\ & 272: 13, \quad 273: 21, \\ & 274: 14, \quad 275: 22, \\ & 299: 5, \quad 359: 6, \\ & 362: 23, \quad 376: 2, \\ & 417: 5, \quad 421: 3, \\ & 436: 3, \quad 451: 3, \\ & 454: 2, \quad 460: 25, \\ & 461: 19, \quad 469: 14, \\ & 472: 17, \quad 495: 21 \\ & \text { themselves } \\ & 443: 19, \quad 444: 8, \\ & 444: 15, \quad 446: 20, \\ & 447: 15, \quad 447: 24, \\ & 448: 9 \\ & \text { then } \\ & 267: 10, \quad 275: 21, \\ & 279: 22, \quad 281: 4, \\ & 284: 5, \quad 284: 9, \\ & 284: 10, \quad 287: 25, \\ & 288: 3, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| typically | unintended | urquhart | 333:20, 334:8, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 281:18, 334:23, | 297:19, 298:1, | 250:2, 251:13, | 334:23, 348:4, |
| 335:11, 373:3, | 298:13, 299:2, | 508:15 | 348:23, 349:9, |
| 451:20 | 299:22, 300:8, | use | 394:15, 394:17, |
| typo | 300:21, 301:5, | 279:10, 279:15, | 409:19, 409:22, |
| 256:20, 370:11, | 301:17, 301:23, | 279:20, 295:1, | 410:2, 410:14, |
| 454:4 | 302:5, 302:9, | 310:13, 312:16, | 410:21, 413:19, |
| U | 303:4, 303:14, | 320:16, 323:19, | 414:15, 438:13, |
| unauthorized | 303:17, 303:25, | 327:1, 339:3, | 438:24, 439:7, |
| 413:20, 416:21, | 304:16, 305:12 | 340:4, 344:10, | 440:25 |
| $417: 7, \quad 417: 14,$ | unique | 355:7, 361:12, | username |
| $423: 24,428: 10$ | 294:13, 294:14, | 366:9, 392:4, | 334:15, 335:4 |
| 429:10, 464:13, | 294:15, 337:10, | 392:21, 392:22, | users |
| 464:18, 464:24, | 340:19, 341:10, | 392:25, 397:11, | 325:7, 395:13, |
| 465:7, 465:14 | 377:24, 471:6, | 397:20, 406:4, | 395:18, 410:6, |
| unclear | 471:8 | 411:6, 414:21, | 410:11, 443:18, |
| $327: 11,4$ | unit | 415:5, 415:18, | 444:7, 444:14, |
| 436:22, 479:5, | 372:22 | 416:24, 417:10, | 446:20, 447:14, |
| 487:8 | united | 417:19, 419:14, | 447:23, 448:8, |
| under | 249:1 | 420:5, 420:13, | 497:10 |
| 328:5, 335:3, | universal | 420:17, 421:25, | uses |
| 364:18, 478:19, | 249:8, 251:10, | 422:11, 422:12, | 285:7, 296:8, |
| $487: 15$ | 281:5, 494:2, | 424:13, 426:20, | 298:19, 389:20, |
| understanding | 501:18, 508:11 | 433:8, 439:2, | 394:22, 395:11, |
| 266:24, 282:16, | unless | 439:12, 449:4, | 395:20, 396:1, |
| 301:12, 312:20, | 325:8, 359:2, | 449:6, 449:23, | 396:12, 417:21, |
| $351: 20,365: 18$, | 359:8, 387:15, | $\begin{array}{ll} 451: 10, & 464: 13, \\ 464: 18, & 464: 24 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 426: 1, \quad 426: 13, \\ & 426: 17, \quad 426: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 366:24, 373:25, | unlock | $465: 7,469: 10$ | $466: 3,466: 15$ |
| $374: 9,388: 14,$ $424: 10,427: 5,$ | 401:17 | 469:19, 469:24, | using |
| $449: 25,459: 11$ | unrelated | 472:23, 473:13, | 279:10, 282:19, |
| $462: 3,472: 10$ | 407:25 | 488:25, 492:18, | 283:15, 284:6, |
| $485: 2, \quad 493: 5$ | until | 496:12, 497:10, | 284:21, 290:20, |
| understood | 505:1 | 497:25, 498:6, | 292:17, 293:4, |
| 315:13, 323:9, | unusable | 498:10, 498:22, | 293:15, 293:19, |
| $324: 24,328: 12$, | 326:15, 326:18, | 499:17, 499:21, | 294:5, 294:23, |
| 328:18, 328:21, | 326:22, 327:1, | 506:12 | 296:8, 299:5, |
| 329:2, 329:25, | 327:3, 327:8, | useful 291:6, $325: 11$ | 299:13, 303:11, |
| 423:18, 424:7, | 327:14, 327:15, | $356: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 317: 11,318: 11, \\ & 318: 14,335: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll}429: 23, & 430: 6, \\ 430: 14, & 430: 18,\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 327: 21,328: 7 \\ & \text { upon } \end{aligned}$ | user's | $\begin{aligned} & 318: 14,335: 25, \\ & 355: 2,358: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 430: 14, \quad 430: 18, \\ & 452: 1, \quad 504: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $296: 3,332: 3,$ | 284:10, 289:20, | $361: 12,392: 24$, |
| undesirable | $333: 2,401: 9,$ | 290:4, 290:12, | 393:1, 393:15, |
| 413:15, 414:12, | 412:1, 412:12, | 322:20, 324:6, | 393:19, 417:5, |
| 419:6, 421:24 | 413:24, 414:9, | 324:19, 325:4, | 424:14, 432:3, |
| unintend | 441:20, 447:9, | 325:6, 332:9, | 442:17, 449:21, |
| 301:22 | $448: 4,481: 20,$ | $332: 13,332: 21,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 460: 25, & 467: 25, \\ 471: 12, & 489: 7 \end{array}$ |
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|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 496: 23, \\ & 503: 13, \\ & 503: 8, \\ & 503: 17 \\ & \text { we've } \\ & 331: 8, \\ & 462: 8, \\ & 467: 14, \\ & 476: 5, \\ & 502: 19 \\ & \text { weak } \\ & 351: 17 \\ & \text { web } \\ & 439: 10, \\ & 499: 10 \\ & \text { website } \\ & 439: 19 \\ & \text { wednesday } \\ & 249: 16, \\ & \text { weeks } \end{aligned},$ | $\begin{aligned} & 432: 5, \quad 432: 11, \\ & 432: 18, \quad 432: 20, \\ & 433: 4, \quad 435: 25, \\ & 465: 16, \quad 466: 1, \\ & 467: 10, \quad 487: 25, \\ & 497: 19, \quad 501: 15, \\ & 502: 21, \quad 503: 22, \\ & 504: 20, \quad 506: 9 \end{aligned}$ <br> were $\begin{aligned} & 253: 22, \quad 254: 9, \\ & 254: 13, \\ & 258: 15, \\ & 258: 258: 16, \\ & 259: 4, \quad 258: 19, \\ & 260: 6, \quad 264: 19, \\ & 267: 10, \quad 307: 11, \end{aligned}$ $316: 9,316: 14$ $316: 19,316: 24$ $319: 8,319: 9,$ $319: 11,319: 12,$ $325: 19,325: 20,$ $347: 2,359: 6,$ $368: 9,410: 7,$ $420: 24,421: 4,$ $433: 22,445: 17$ $446: 6,449: 15$ $450: 13,451: 18$ $460: 1,460: 2$ $495: 20,497: 15$ 497:18, 499:17, $499: 21, \quad 500: 4$ $500: 16, \quad 502: 12,$ $506: 1$ <br> what's <br> 254:12, 269:14, <br> 306:12, 324:9, <br> 365:18, 405:2, <br> 461:6, 491:12, <br> 497:1 <br> whatever <br> 499:11 <br> whatsoever <br> 458:9 <br> when <br> $\begin{array}{ll}253: 22, & 254: 4, \\ 257: 15, & 258: 25, \\ 265: 18, & 285: 25, \\ 291: 13, & 292: 23,\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| word $\begin{aligned} & 264: 17, \quad 285: 8, \\ & 303: 11, \quad 317: 12, \\ & 318: 7, \quad 318: 15, \\ & 324: 9, \quad 339: 3, \\ & 383: 9, \quad 383: 14, \\ & 410: 20, \quad 420: 13, \\ & 432: 11,435: 7, \\ & 447: 21,472: 17, \\ & 488: 25,489: 7, \\ & 489: 15 \end{aligned}$ <br> words $278: 24,282: 19$ $305: 6,305: 20$ $340: 5,355: 7$ $365: 17,365: 19$ $428: 25, \quad 429: 16$ $442: 17,449: 21$ $465: 5,479: 22$ $480: 2,480: 16$ $481: 9,490: 5$ $490: 14, \quad 490: 17$ $490: 18, \quad 490: 22$ <br> work <br> 261:4, 261:7, <br> 261:8, 296:3, <br> 321:12, 346:12, <br> 346:21, 348:10, <br> 461:7, 481:20 <br> worked <br> 254:19 <br> working <br> 402:21 <br> works <br> 293:2, 293:3, <br> 297:13, 297:16, <br> 454:10, 454:16, <br> 456:4 <br> world <br> 499:8, 499:10 worried <br> 379:14 <br> worth <br> 363:22 <br> wouldn't <br> 278:22, 350:7, <br> 405:9, 420:10, <br> 441:9, 443:12, | ```462:11, 466:2, 493:8 wrap 502:20 write 257:14, 501:16 writes 339:20 writing 459:20 written 276:20, 371:15 wrong 352:7, 352:19, 361:23, 361:25, 396:19, 403:21, 449:23, 467:6, 505:25, 506:4 wrote 257:11, 257:12, 450:16, 450:19, 459:18``` Y <br> yeah <br> year $\begin{aligned} & 254: 12, \\ & 322: 14, \\ & 3223: 10, \\ & 323: 13, \\ & 324: 1, \\ & 325: 23, \\ & 425: 12, \\ & 497: 23 \\ & \text { years } \\ & 254: 4, \\ & \text { yesterday } \\ & 255: 4 \\ & \text { yet } \\ & 287: 10, \\ & 339: 10, \\ & 345: 31, \\ & 344: 19, \\ & 464: 19 \end{aligned} \quad 44: 22, \quad,$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 10 | 122 | 415:2, 433:15, | 497:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 289:2, 289:3, | 459:14 | 434:12, 435:3, | 2006 |
| 389:14, 405:7, | 124 | 436:19, 494:19, | 273:17, 321:23, |
| 437:8 | 453:22 | 505:11 | 322:2, 354:23, |
| 100 | 125 | 184 | 355:10, 355:23, |
| 397:1, 397:7, | 453:22 | 268:14, 268:18, | 356:1, 356:3, |
| 398:7, 398:16, | 126 | 268:23, 269:10, | 356:9, 356:18, |
| 398:25, 399:8, | 453:20 | 270:23, 271:3 | 357:2, 357:9, |
| 399:17, 401:17 | 127 | 19 | 357:12, 357:23, |
| 1007 | 453:20 | 364:19, 439:3, | 358:6, 450:17, |
| 462:25 | 130 | 441:25, 442:6, | 450:20, 450:22, |
| 11 | 406:7, 406:19, | 443:3, 476:17, | 451:9, 451:25, |
| 331:13, 331:14, | 406:22, 407:8, | 477:9, 507:1, | 459:24, 460:7, |
| 494:19, 505:11, | 408:12, 408:23 | 508:18 | 460:11, 460:19, |
| 505:13 | 14 | 1990 | 460:20 |
| 110 | 268:2, 289:9, | 321:8, 321:21, | 2009 |
| 381:22, 382:8, | 289:11, 388:1, | 420:4, 420:16, | 276:23, 277:3, |
| 382:15, 383:3, | 389:14, 422:21, | 421:11, 421:25, | 277:10, 277:15 |
| 384:2, 385:7, | 422:22, 423:19, | 422:7, 450:9, | 2010 |
| 401:16, 401:19, | 424:7, 425:7, | 450:12 | 267:12, 269:20, |
| 401:20 | 425:10, 443:23 | 1991 | 270:19, 273:5 |
| 12 | 140 | 459:10 | 2011 |
| 289:8, 289:11, | 379:6, 379:10, | 1998 | 256:3, 326:2, |
| 333:24, 336:24, | 380:11, 381:1, | 493:6, 493:8, | 330:4, 330:24, |
| 337:3, 337:5, | 381:7, 381:14, | 495:18, 496:11, | 453:11, 453:14, |
| 338:4, 338:13, | 381:21, 382:8, | 496:18, 497:9, | 453:19, 455:12, |
| 339:24, 367:9, | 382:11, 382:22, | 497:24, 498:9, | 455:14 |
| 367:10, 494:18, | 383:6, 384:6, | 498:18, 498:21, | 2012 |
| 505:10 | 384:13, 384:23, | 499:5, 499:11, | 256:6, 269:6, |
| 120 | 385:7, 385:18, | 499:14, 499:17, | 269:7, 270:9, |
| 381:2, 381:15, | 385:22, 389:8, | 499:21, 500:4, | 270:17, 270:18, |
| 381:23, 382:9, | 389:11 | 500:17, 501:2 | 275:11, 276:2, |
| 382:12, 382:15, | 14224 | 2 | 276:12 |
| 382:23, 383:4, | 249:25, 509:7 | 20 | 2013 |
| 383:5, 384:2, | 15 | 369:25, 415:2, | 256:5, 388:25, |
| 384:7, 384:12, | 505:21 | 422:21, 422:22, | 421:2, 453:9, |
| 384:24, 385:8, | 16 | 423:19, 424:8, | 453:21, 455:12, |
| 385:12, 385:19, | 331:14, 369:25, | 425:7, 425:11, | 455:14, 457:5 |
| 385:23, 386:1, | 382:5, 382:6, | 477:10 | 2015 |
| 386:9, 386:20, | 485:11, 485:20, | 2000 | 269:12 |
| 386:24, 387:10, | $485: 24,486: 2,$ | $322: 10,322: 14,$ | 2017 , |
| 388:3, 388:16, | $488: 1,488: 3$ | $323: 1,323: 9,$ | 254:1, 254:3, |
| 389:15, 396:8, |  | $323: 13,323: 17,$ | $254: 6, \quad 254: 15$ |
| 404:9, 405:21, | $406: 21, \quad 408: 11$ | $323: 23,324: 4$ | $255: 23$ |
| $406: 3,406: 6,$ | $17$ | $325: 2, \quad 325: 12,$ | $2018$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 406: 18, \quad 407: 7 \\ & 121 \end{aligned}$ | 436:19 | $325: 16, \quad 420: 5$ | 249:11, 253:24, |
| 459:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & 283: 17, \quad 369: 24, \end{aligned}$ | 420:17, 450:14, | $256: 4,256: 5$ |
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| 256:6, 265:1, | 24 | 392:21 | 340 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 265:4, 267:13, | 249:16, 256:4, | 292 | 396:15, 396:24 |
| 268:19, 268:25, | 269:20, 273:5, | 391:5, 391:10, | 35 |
| 269:4, 269:5, | 326:10, 332:7, | 391:17, 391:22, | 444:21, 446:8, |
| 269:20, 270:9, | 429:17, 508:17 | 392:16, 394:1 | 446:10, 446:19, |
| 272:16, 273:2, | 240969 | 3 | 447:5 |
| 273:5, 275:11, | 249:23 | 3 | 36 |
| 276:12, 359:18, | 249 | 437: 8 | 448:6, 448:12, |
| 453:10, 453:13 | 249:24 | 30 | 470:6 |
| 2019 | 25 | 267:18, 267:20, | 38 |
| 249:16, 508:17, | $256: 5, \quad 256: 6,$ | $267: 24,267: 25$ | $470: 14, \quad 485: 17$ |
| $509: 3$ | $268: 19,268: 25$ | $268: 3,273: 7$ | $39$ |
| 21 | $269: 4, \quad 270: 9,$ | 273:9, 273:10, | $266: 6,266: 19,$ |
| 273:16, 427:17, | 275:11, 276:12, | 273:14, 273:24, | 267:3, 270:22, |
| 427:19, 485:11, | 428:3, 428:13, | 274:9, 501:5, | 271:2, 271:8, |
| 485:20, 485:24, | 429:3, 429:24, | 501:7, 502:18, | 271:17, 271:20, |
| 486:2, 488:1, | 430:7, 431:8, | 504:22 | 271:25, 272:1 |
| 488:3 | 432:22, 434:2, | 31 | 4 |
| 210 274.10, 274.24 | 441:19, 453:10 | 265:9, 265:12, | 4 |
| 274:10, 274:24, | $253$ | 265:21, 266:4, | 485:17 |
| $401: 15$ | $\text { 252: } 4$ | 267:21, 268:1, | 41 |
| $2101$ | $26$ | 268:10 | 387:17, 387:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 256: 4 \\ & 2107 \end{aligned}$ | $276: 23,277: 2,$ | 32 | 387:23, 389:5, |
| $2107$ | $277: 9,277: 15,$ | 265:9, 265:12, | 394:9 |
| $265: 1, \quad 265: 3,$ | $434: 19, \quad 435: 8$ | 266:12, 266:15, | 415 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 265: 4, \quad 265: 13, \\ & 476: 17, \quad 477: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 478: 16, & 486: 5, \\ 486: 13, & 486: 17 \end{array}$ | 267:19, 267:20, | 251:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 476: 17,477: 9 \\ & 2108 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 486: 13, ~ \end{aligned} 4_{66: 17,} 486: 18,486: 20, ~ l$ | 267:21, 267:24, | 44 |
| 255:22, 359:18, | 486:23, 487:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 268: 1, \quad 268: 4, \\ & 269: 22, \quad 269: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{rr} 380: 6, & 380: 10, \\ 380 \cdot 18 & 381 \cdot 20 \end{array}$ |
| 364:19, 367:14, | 487:12, 487:17, | 270:18, 270:19, | 381:21, 382:1 |
| 433:11, 452:15, | 488:3 | 272:3, 276:14, | 45 |
| 452:19 | 27 $268 \cdot 12 \quad 269.25$ | $276: 16,416: 17$ | 369:25, 397:6, |
| 211 | 268:12, 269:25, | $416: 18,417: 10$ | 398:9, 405:15 |
| $455: 24,457: 4$, $458: 25$ | $272: 7,272: 20$, $272: 23, ~ 276: 19$, | $427: 22,427: 25$ | 46 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 458: 25 \\ & 213 \end{aligned}$ | 272:23, 276:19, $332: 7,347: 24$, | 428:2, 486:6, | 406:12, 406:17, |
| 455:25, 458:25, | 428:3, 428:14, | $486: 16,486: 18$, | 407:6, $407: 24$, |
| 459:14 | 429:3, 429:17, | 488:4, 488:5, |  |
| 22 | 429:24, 430:8 | 488:12, 488:23, | $266: 7,266: 19,$ |
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