

# QTCENG EXHIBIT 1024

## PART 5

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir.

2 THE COURT: That objection is overruled. You know,  
3 it's a fact that whether or not they wanted to get in the  
4 market or not or reasons for this person who is selling ends  
5 of it, how many more of these do we have?

6 MR. ALBRIGHT: That's it, your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 MR. BAHLER: Let me restate that question. This is  
9 page 21, line 15.

10 Q. "At this time, beginning of April 1996, how important was  
11 the Coronado product to Adaptec?

12 A. It was extremely important. As the technology was  
13 evolving in the industry and we looked at as an inflection  
14 point and our ability to get into the marketplace at the time  
15 that there was significant change in the marketplace."

16 Page 22, line 1.

17 Q. "Did Adaptec dedicate resources to the Coronado project  
18 from that time?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. How many resources?

21 A. Obviously, from a marketing perspective, the balance would  
22 have been engineering. There was a team of engineers working  
23 on the Fibre Channel piece out of Irvine, out of the Irvine  
24 office. That would include Mark O'Dell and his staff. There  
25 was another team out of Milpitas developing Mason Emerald.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Those are the protocol chips. And then, there was the team in  
2 Boulder that was Longmont and Boulder. We started off in  
3 Boulder working on the bridges.

4 Q. All right. From a marketing standpoint, how many  
5 individuals were involved in the Coronado product?

6 A. Marketing? Me and my boss, so two.

7 Q. Mr. Comstock?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And yourself?

10 A. Uh-huh."

11 Page 29, line 4.

12 Q. "Where was the Coronado display at Comdex '96 -- fall  
13 Comdex '96?

14 A. In the FCIA. And actually, I think it was the FCLC, Fibre  
15 Channel Loop Community which is an industry association that  
16 promotes the technologies. Had a floor space in which Fibre  
17 Channel-related companies would gather and talk about their  
18 technologies, and the product supporting those technologies.  
19 One of our potential clients customers was Unisys, and Unisys  
20 has a static display of Coronado that they showed to some of  
21 their customers.

22 Q. Was that display of Coronado in connection with Unisys in  
23 the Fibre Channel Loop Community room, was that a private room  
24 or a public room?

25 A. Public.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Any of the attendees from Comdex '96 could go there?

2 A. Yes."

3 Page 30, line 10.

4 Q. "Did you attend Comdex fall '96?

5 A. Yes."

6 Page 30, line 18.

7 Q. "Let me show you what was marked at Mr. Lavan's deposition  
8 as Lavan Deposition Exhibit No. 8. Do you know what that is?

9 A. It is marketing slides and discussing the bridge products.

10 Q. Is Coronado included in these marketing slides?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Do you know who prepared these marketing slides?

13 A. It would have been me.

14 Q. How are they used within Adaptec?

15 A. These were actually used. This is a customer  
16 presentation. So we would have started off describing the  
17 organization on the cover page and then, going into a road map  
18 on page 2, which talks about the different products and market  
19 segments on the Y axis, time on the X axis, and then, going  
20 into block diagrams for each of the proposed products.

21 Q. Specifically, turn to page 178642, and I'll get that on  
22 here. What is that a block diagram of?

23 A. It is a block diagram of Coronado.

24 Q. Did you create that block diagram?

25 A. Yes."

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Based upon what?

2 A. Based upon the engineering concepts of Coronado.

3 Q. Was this document including that figure shown to  
4 prospective Adaptec customers?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. How many?

7 A. A lot, ten to twenty."

8 Okay. Page 32, line 7.

9 Q. "At during what time? At what time?

10 A. Well, the date on this is December of '96, so in our  
11 ability, you know, before and after that time."

12 Page 33, line 3.

13 Q. "Who was involved in those customer presentations on  
14 behalf of Adaptec?

15 A. It would have been primarily me, Jim Comstock or John  
16 Hartland.

17 Q. Do you specifically recall such customer demonstrations  
18 before the end of 1996?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Using these materials?

21 A. Yes."

22 Page 33, line 22.

23 Q. "Let me show you what was marked at Mr. Kalwitz's  
24 deposition as Defendant's Exhibit 53. Do you know what that  
25 is?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. What is it?

3 A. A product brief.

4 Q. Do you know who prepared that?

5 A. I prepared it.

6 Q. Do you know the date that it was prepared?

7 A. Boy, it doesn't have a date on here, but I would say that  
8 this would be probably in October. Well, I think what I did  
9 is I had it available for Comdex, so it would be October,  
10 early November of '96."

11 Page 34, line 22.

12 Q. "Did you actually distribute this product to prospective  
13 customers at Adaptec?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Was that distribution done before the end of 1996?

16 A. Yes."

17 Page 38, line 20.

18 Q. "Defendant's Exhibit 40, do you know what that is?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. What is it?

21 A. It's a press release for announcing the Fibre-to-SCSI  
22 Channel migration.

23 Q. Who prepared this?

24 A. I would have prepared it in conjunction with Adaptec's  
25 corporate marketing organization.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. How is this document used by Adaptec?

2 A. It was used to formally announce and launch the program,  
3 make it public in the industry.

4 Q. And, specifically, what product did this deal with, this  
5 May 6, 1997 press release?

6 A. It announced the 7312A, which is the Fibre-to-SCSI one  
7 host device channel product incorporating the Emerald chip  
8 set.

9 Q. What does it have to do with Coronado?

10 A. That is Coronado."

11 Page 40, line 5.

12 Q. "Do you know when the Las Vegas show was?

13 A. Yeah, I think it was May of '97.

14 Q. Was the Coronado present at that show?

15 A. Yes."

16 Page 40, line 23.

17 Q. "Why did you take Coronado to the Net World Conference in  
18 May of 1997?

19 A. To create public awareness and to get potential  
20 customers."

21 Page 44, line 8.

22 Q. "Did you have Coronado at fall Comdex '97?

23 A. I'm sure we did.

24 Q. Why are you sure that you did?

25 A. Because that would have been a very key and strategic demo

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 for us and, again, would have been demo'd in the -- in our  
2 suite.

3 Q. Did you attend the fall Comdex '97 show?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Did you actually participate in the demonstration of  
6 Coronado for prospective customers?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. In fall Comdex '97?

9 A. Yes."

10 Page 45, line 5.

11 Q. "Was Brooklyn ultimately -- well, strike that. Was the  
12 Coronado product AKA 7312 ever released for sale to customers?

13 A. It was released. There were some people designing it, and  
14 I think when Adaptec pulled the plug, it probably was never  
15 completed.

16 Q. Was it ever offered for sale? Not actually sold, but ever  
17 offered for sale?

18 A. Yes, I'm sure we sold some.

19 Q. When was that? This is Coronado?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Do you know when that was?

22 A. It would have been Q4 of '97."

23 Page 60, line 17.

24 Q. "You mentioned Vegas interim?

25 A. Yes.



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Were you at the Vegas -- present at that booth?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Again, with respect to the Coronado here, you said you  
4 don't recall whether it was an active demo?

5 A. I'm certain it was.

6 Q. You have that actual recollection?

7 A. Yes, I do.

8 Q. Is it the same --

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. -- type of demo we talked about before?

11 A. Well, it would have been a functional demo that by this  
12 point would probably be a fairly robust demo.

13 Q. Do you know whether it was a product that could do all the  
14 things it was supposed to do?

15 A. Well, all the things it was supposed to do, the road map  
16 had numerous features that ultimately were to be added,  
17 included. I think the basic functionality, yeah, was all  
18 there. Advanced features probably would not be.

19 Q. Do you know whether it had the capability of doing reserve  
20 release at that time?

21 A. I believe so because the key attribute for that is for  
22 clustering and that was pretty -- a pretty functional, pretty  
23 basic requirement for us, and that was one that we would have  
24 been able to demonstrate, pass certifications."

25 That's the end of defendant's designations, sir.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 MR. ALBRIGHT: No cross.

2 THE COURT: You may step down.

3 MR. BAHLER: Plaintiff calls Mr. Allen Permut.

4 THE COURT: Just come forward, please.

5 (Witness was sworn.)

6 THE COURT: All right. You need to walk around this  
7 column up here and sit in the witness booth, please. If  
8 you'll tell us your full name, please, sir, and spell your  
9 last.

10 THE WITNESS: My name is Allen R. Permut. That's  
11 spelled P-E-R-M-U-T.

12 ALLEN R. PERMUT, called by the Defendant, duly sworn.

13 DIRECT EXAMINATION

14 BY MR. BAHLER:

15 Q. Morning, Mr. Permut. Who do you work for, sir?

16 A. I work for Chaparral Network Storage.

17 Q. And what's your position at Chaparral?

18 A. Manager of Software Development.

19 Q. How long have you worked there, sir?

20 A. I've worked there since January 1st of 2000, so about one  
21 years and eight months.

22 Q. Okay. And what are your responsibilities as Manager of  
23 Software Development?

24 A. I supervise a team of software engineers that develop  
25 features and functions for RAID and router controllers, and,

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 also, you know, I'm responsible for their scheduling of any  
2 development work and field -- handle any field issues relating  
3 to software in our products.

4 Q. How long have you worked in the field of computer storage?

5 A. I've worked in the field of computer storage about 11 and  
6 a half years.

7 Q. Do you have any patents issued in your name?

8 A. Yes, I do. I have five patents, all in high-tech fields.  
9 Two of them specifically in the field of computer storage and  
10 RAID controllers.

11 Q. Would you please tell the members of the jury your college  
12 education?

13 A. Yes. I have a Bachelor's Degree from the University of  
14 Colorado, Boulder, issued in 1974, and a Master's Degree in  
15 Engineering Management, which I received from University of  
16 Colorado, Boulder, also, while I was employed at Storage  
17 Technology Corporation.

18 Q. Now, what products have you worked on while at Chaparral?

19 A. I really work on all of the products at Chaparral, all of  
20 the RAID controllers, all of the storage routers,  
21 specifically, as I said before, supervising the work of the  
22 software engineers developing software for those products.

23 Q. All right, sir. Now, how many people work for you at  
24 Chaparral today?

25 A. I currently have nine people reporting to me.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Does that include Mr. Davies?

2 A. Yes, it does.

3 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with CAPI and pass-through as  
4 they're used within Chaparral?

5 A. Yes, I'm also --

6 Q. How do you have that familiarity?

7 A. Well, being responsible for the software that's embedded  
8 in our products and all of the interfaces to it, as well, I  
9 have to be very familiar with CAPI. It's a key management  
10 application and interface embedded in our products. And I've  
11 used manager products, so I need to be familiar with those and  
12 all of the functions associated therewith.

13 Q. Now, is this CAPI thing, is it actually included in  
14 Chaparral products?

15 A. Yes. CAPI is used extensively internally to our products  
16 as well as externally. The embedded firmware has CAPI  
17 functionality. It's used in the management for menu user  
18 interface, as well, and, of course, that provides all of the  
19 hooks, the interfaces, the way to interact with the  
20 controllers using the -- and the external CAPI application.

21 Q. How do customers find out about CAPI?

22 A. Well, that really starts when the sales and marketing  
23 folks talk to any prospective customers or to our customers.  
24 They make the customers and users aware of CAPI that it's a  
25 very rich set of features for configuring and managing our

1 products.

2           So, you know, they're exposed to that right from the  
3 start when they're interested in our products. Also, all of  
4 our sales literature or marketing data sheets, sales data  
5 sheets and marketing literature have CAPI described as the  
6 configuration interface to use with our products, as well, in  
7 our users guides, we have reference to the CAPI interface  
8 spec, specification, so they're aware of it in that form,  
9 also.

10 Q. All right. Let's take a look at Defendant's Exhibit 268.

11 A. I don't have my notebook up here, but I'll use the screen.

12 Q. What is Exhibit 268?

13 A. This is a typical marketing data sheet, this particular  
14 one is for the K series external RAID controllers, explicitly  
15 the K 7413 and K 5412.

16 Q. Look down here. What is that language dealing with in the  
17 low right-hand corner of that exhibit?

18 A. Yes. This is talking about the Chaparral configuration  
19 application programming interface, or CAPI for short, that is  
20 part of our product and that we provide the specification and  
21 the developers kit to facilitate users to develop applications  
22 to use CAPI.

23 Q. Okay. This is for the 7413 product?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. Is there similar language in the marketing material for

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 the other products at issue in this case?

2 A. Yes, there is.

3 Q. Okay. Take a look at Defendant's Exhibit 198. What is  
4 that?

5 A. This is the users guide for that same product, the K7413.

6 Q. Okay. Is this the only user guide that Chaparral has or  
7 there's several?

8 A. Oh, no. There's a users guide, really, for every product  
9 that we develop and sell.

10 Q. Take a look within Defendant's Exhibit 198 to page bearing  
11 bates No. 185618, which is page 1-10. What is that? That's a  
12 page within the user guide?

13 A. Yes, that's correct.

14 Q. And what is that page dealing with?

15 A. It calls out the documents that we refer our users to,  
16 other documents that are pertinent and -- okay.

17 Q. Included among the Chaparral documents is the Chaparral  
18 CAPI function specification. What's that?

19 A. That is the specification, if you will, a set of basically  
20 instructions on how to use the CAPI interface.

21 Q. Okay. Does Chaparral keep CAPI secret from its customers?

22 A. No, not at all. As I said, we talk about CAPI with our  
23 customers right from the start in meetings with customers. We  
24 -- as I say, we reference it in our sales literature, and here  
25 again, and we provide it freely without charge on our web site

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 to all of our users and customers.

2 Q. Okay. Mr. Permut, please take a look at Defendant's  
3 Exhibit 221 in your book. What is that?

4 A. This is a -- it's a little bit hard to read there on the  
5 page, but I recognize this as a CAPI functional specification.

6 Q. Okay.

7 A. On some of the other pages, they show it at the top, the  
8 actual.

9 Q. Do you know what version that is?

10 A. Yes, as you can see there, it's Version 2.8.

11 Q. Okay. Have there been any -- have there been subsequent  
12 versions of this CAPI spec?

13 A. Yes, there are. Since the 2.8 -- and they're not  
14 necessarily in chronological order due to some parallel  
15 development -- there's also CAPI Version 3.0, 3.1 and 3.2.

16 Q. Okay. Do all those versions have the CAPI add host  
17 command in them?

18 A. Yes, they do. Well, actually, not CAPI 3.0 but 3.1 and  
19 3.2 do.

20 Q. Okay. Now, why doesn't --

21 A. 2.8, as well.

22 Q. Okay. And this is an example of something that can be  
23 gotten from Chaparral's web site?

24 A. Yes, that's correct.

25 Q. Okay. And how would a customer go about getting that

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 information?

2 A. They -- very simply make a request either to their sales  
3 associate or to -- or to our tech support group, and they  
4 would set up a log-in for them on our web site and provide all  
5 the appropriate documentation for the products that they're  
6 using including this CAPI functional specification.

7 Q. Did Chaparral charge for this CAPI?

8 A. No. That's completely free, and we let customers know  
9 that right from the start.

10 Q. Now, you personally know of any Chaparral customers who  
11 have obtained a CAPI in a manner that you just described?

12 A. Yes. There's quite a number of them. Off the top of my  
13 head, I can think of in store, Ospeccs, NexSan, Terra  
14 Solutions, Urlogic, those are some of them that come to mind.

15 Q. All right, sir. Now, what is -- I'd like to move on to  
16 the issue of pass-through. What is pass-through?

17 A. Pass-through is a capability of issuing a command to our  
18 controller to directly access any of the devices that are  
19 attached behind our controller. For example, a disk device or  
20 a tape device, and allows that command to pass directly to  
21 those devices.

22 Q. Does Chaparral keep -- well, first of all, is that a  
23 capability that's in the Chaparral products?

24 A. Yes, it is. It's in our RAID products, we have the CAPI  
25 pass-through, which is actually the command that's used that's



1 called CAPI SCSI maintenance. And there's also a second type  
2 of pass-through, which, in engineering land, we call raw  
3 pass-through or direct pass-through, both of those were  
4 supported.

5 Q. Does Chaparral keep pass-through secret from its  
6 customers?

7 A. No, not at all. In this CAPI functional spec, there is a  
8 reference to the CAPI SCSI maintenance command and, you know,  
9 so customers certainly learn about that and have access to  
10 that. And we also provide a -- another document on the direct  
11 pass-through if they're interested in that.

12 Q. Okay. You just mentioned that it's mentioned in this  
13 document, this is Defendant's Exhibit 268. I've highlighted a  
14 portion of page Roman four of the table of contents.

15 A. Right.

16 Q. SCSI maintenance is mentioned there.

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. What does that have to do with pass-through?

19 A. That allows a passing through a command, a SCSI  
20 maintenance command, for example, would be something like to  
21 perform an inquiry to a device or read capacity, test unit  
22 ready, format a drive. And there's also a mechanism for doing  
23 a command that is a command contained within a command, as  
24 well, and that allows greater flexibility, still.

25 Q. Please take a look at Defendant's Exhibit 232. You

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 mentioned raw pass-through. What is Exhibit 232?

2 A. This is the first page of a document that we provide  
3 freely to customers to do raw pass-through. Did you have a  
4 specific question about that?

5 Q. Well, in that document, it talks about the command is one  
6 of -- in this section, it says any -- the array is -- or it  
7 says, commands sent to an array member, disk are permitted  
8 only if -- and it lists some. Command is one of the inquiry  
9 -- what does that section mean?

10 A. Well, it's talking about when drives are in an array,  
11 there are certain commands which would not be of any concern  
12 because you have data stored in an array, you wouldn't want to  
13 risk any of that data. And these are informational-type  
14 commands that are always allowed to go through to drives  
15 whether they're in an array or whether it's a spare drive or  
16 an unused drive, or what have you.

17 So these are examples of commands that are  
18 pass-through regardless.

19 Q. All right, sir. Now, are you familiar with the  
20 modification that was made to the Chaparral products that  
21 became effective first on August 2nd, and then, August 31st,  
22 2001?

23 A. Yes, I am.

24 Q. What were those modifications?

25 A. Modifications were made basically to ensure that the

1 device can be configured by any host, any server that's  
2 connected to our controllers, really, at any time. It always  
3 assures that capability.

4 Q. Okay. Please take a look in your book at Defendant's  
5 Exhibits 192, 193, 194, 259 and 260. Do you see those, sir?

6 A. Yes, I do.

7 Q. What are those?

8 A. These are what we call engineering change notices.  
9 They're the formal method that engineering communicates to the  
10 rest of our organization that a change has been made.

11 Q. All right. Let me put up Defendant's Exhibit 1992 and use  
12 it as an example. What specifically does this engineering  
13 change --

14 A. Up at the very top row there and the description section,  
15 it calls out a change in firmware for the A8526, which is one  
16 of our RAID controller units. So this is a software  
17 modification to that product.

18 Q. Okay. Please turn to the next page. And there's  
19 something called feature change. What is that feature change?  
20 What does that deal with?

21 A. That's talking about what I mentioned before, the ability  
22 for any host or server connected to our device to always be  
23 able to configure and manage the controller. So this is the  
24 software change to make sure that that controller LUN, which  
25 is the communication mechanism, is always available. This is

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 part of our release notes that are communicated to our  
2 customers, as well, so that they know what the change is.

3 Q. Okay. Now, as of August 2nd, what products were -- what  
4 products specifically were modified?

5 A. This one that's indicated here, the A8526, and, also, two  
6 of our router products, FS 2620 and the FS-1220.

7 Q. Okay. And is there similar language in the engineering  
8 changes for those products?

9 A. Yes, similar in the router products, there's also a change  
10 to not allow zoning of the controller LUN, as well, that's  
11 called the router one in the case of routers.

12 Q. Let's take a look at Defendant's Exhibit 193. First of  
13 all, what is this?

14 A. This is a similar engineering change notice. This one is  
15 for the product FS-1220, which is one of our router products.

16 Q. All right, sir. Next page, there's the description of the  
17 change again?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. What does that description relate to again?

20 MR. GIUST: Objection. Calls for an opinion.

21 THE COURT: It's overruled. You may answer.

22 A. That's the same change that I described before for the  
23 RAID products, the portion highlighted there. It allows the  
24 -- any workstation or server to communicate in all cases using  
25 CAPI to control or configure a controller.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. (BY MR. BAHLER) Okay. Now, who did the modifications that  
2 we just talked about?

3 A. The principal people involved in that were Mr. Ian Davies  
4 and a Mr. Monty Gilstrap.

5 Q. How much time did it take you to modify -- how much time  
6 did it take to modify each of those products?

7 A. It took approximately four person days between those two  
8 individuals to actually make the code changes and do some  
9 reasonable level of engineering tests and then, it took four  
10 to five days in our product test group for all three of those  
11 products to go through and do the testing to verify that the  
12 change was made correctly.

13 Q. Okay. Now, we talked about five products altogether,  
14 correct?

15 A. Well, I think you only asked me about -- initially anyhow  
16 about the ones changed August 2nd.

17 Q. Okay. Well, there were five -- five products have been  
18 changed altogether, right?

19 A. Yes. Two more were changed. That change was effective, I  
20 believe it was August 31st.

21 Q. All right. So you mentioned three or four days for the  
22 modification and three or four days for tests?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. That's person days?

25 A. Yes.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Okay. Is that for each product?

2 A. In that case, that was for those first three products, the  
3 8526, the FS-2620 and the FS-1220, because we had already made  
4 those changes. A lot of our code bases shared code, so making  
5 that change for the other two products, which we did effective  
6 August 31st, was a little quicker than that because we'd  
7 already had the experience of making that change and knew  
8 exactly what we had to do.

9 Q. Now, has Chaparral sold any of these modified products?

10 A. Yes, they have.

11 Q. When did Chaparral start selling these products?

12 A. I believe shortly after the August 2nd modification was  
13 made, I know of product that was shipped very shortly after.  
14 I believe it was the next week after to Overland Data.

15 Q. All right. And Chaparral received any units back from any  
16 customers because of the modification?

17 A. No, they have not.

18 Q. Has Chaparral let its customers know about the  
19 modification?

20 A. Yes. These release notes that you see still up here on  
21 the screen are communicated to our users and customers to  
22 inform them what the changes are in any software change or  
23 actually, you know, there are release notes if there were  
24 hardware changes, as well. But this particularly deals with  
25 the software change.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

- 1 Q. All right. Has Chaparral received any order of  
2 cancellation because of the modification?
- 3 A. No.
- 4 Q. To your knowledge, does Chaparral changed its prices to  
5 any of its products due to product change?
- 6 A. No.
- 7 Q. Now, you were the software development -- I'm sorry, what  
8 was your title again?
- 9 A. Manager of Software Development.
- 10 Q. If there are problems in the field with software -- first  
11 of all, is this a software change or a hardware change?
- 12 A. This is strictly a software change.
- 13 Q. And if there are problems in the field as the Manager of  
14 Software Development, would you learn about those problems?
- 15 A. Unfortunately, that's one of the characteristics of my  
16 job. If there's a problem, I usually hear about it.
- 17 Q. To your knowledge, has any Chaparral customer suffered any  
18 problems due to that modification?
- 19 A. I've heard no problems reported, no complaints about this.
- 20 Q. Now, Mr. Permut, since January 2001, has Chaparral  
21 continued to sell routers and RAID products without LUN  
22 zoning?
- 23 A. Yes, they have.
- 24 Q. Does Chaparral still sell them today?
- 25 A. Yes, they do.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Can you give us some examples of those products that don't  
2 include LUN zoning?

3 A. Our router product FS-1310 does not include LUN zoning nor  
4 do any of our SCSI-to-SCSI RAID products.

5 Q. Okay. Now, has Chaparral had any routers or RAID products  
6 sent back from customers because they do not support LUN  
7 zoning?

8 A. No, they have not.

9 Q. Pass the witness.

10 THE COURT: I'm going to let the jury have their  
11 morning break. Members of the jury, 15 minutes. Remember the  
12 instructions.

13 (Jury not present.)

14 THE COURT: All right. Fifteen minutes.

15 (Recess.)

16 THE COURT: Bring them in.

17 (Jury present.)

18 THE COURT: Mr. Permut, you understand you're still  
19 under oath, sir?

20 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

21 THE COURT: You may proceed.

22 CROSS-EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. GIUST:

24 Q. Morning, Mr. Permut.

25 A. Good morning.



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

- 1 Q. You talked about on direct some changes that were made to  
2 some Chaparral products?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Changes that were made on August 2nd of this year?
- 5 A. That's correct.
- 6 Q. That were created to the A8526, FS-2620, FS-1220 products?
- 7 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 8 Q. Changes made on August 31st, just a few weeks ago?
- 9 A. That's also correct.
- 10 Q. And what products were changed at that time?
- 11 A. The G8324 and the G7324.
- 12 Q. Okay. So there were no changes made to any of the  
13 Chaparral K Series RAID controllers?
- 14 A. That's correct.
- 15 Q. Okay. Now, you mentioned that these changes were pretty  
16 simple to do; is that right?
- 17 A. I mentioned how long it took to do them, and, yes, they  
18 weren't terribly difficult, no.
- 19 Q. Okay.
- 20 A. Straightforward.
- 21 Q. How long did it take to implement those changes?
- 22 A. It took about four days for the first group of products,  
23 those first three products to implement those changes, the  
24 actual software developer effort, and then, about four or five  
25 days in our product test lab to test, again, all three of

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 those.

2 Q. And do you know the cost per hour -- did you allocate any  
3 money to how much that would have cost?

4 A. We didn't keep specific separate budget for that, but I  
5 believe that our sort of overall averaged cost for manpower in  
6 the engineering group is about \$85 an hour burden.

7 Q. And was that eight hours a day for those four days?

8 A. Nominally.

9 Q. You mentioned on direct some testimony you gave about  
10 pass-through commands -- I'm sorry, about CAPI. Do you recall  
11 that?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And CAPI is an interface specification that Chaparral has,  
14 right?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Okay. And in order to use this CAPI, do you need to get  
17 the CAPI software development kit or the CAPI functional  
18 specification?

19 A. Yes. That certainly facilitates its use.

20 Q. And are those obtained from the Chaparral web site?

21 A. Yes, they are.

22 Q. Let me show you Exhibit 608. Is this a copy of the  
23 Chaparral web site?

24 A. Yes, or at least it sure looks like it.

25 Q. Any reason to believe this isn't the Chaparral web site?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. No.

2 Q. Does it look true and accurate?

3 A. Certainly does.

4 Q. Let me show you 609. Do you see at the top, underneath  
5 support, there's been a drop-down menu that's opened up?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Does this look like a true and accurate copy of the web  
8 site to you?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Let me show graphic 610 underneath support. You see that  
11 there's a members area that was clicked on, screen came up  
12 requiring user name password?

13 A. Yes, I see it.

14 Q. Does that look like a true and accurate copy of  
15 Chaparral's web site to you?

16 A. Yes, it does.

17 Q. Your Honor, offer Exhibits 604 -- 608, 609 and 610 into  
18 evidence.

19 MR. BAHLER: No objection, your Honor.

20 THE COURT: They're received.

21 Q. (BY MR. GIUST) To obtain the Chaparral CAPI information,  
22 one would need to go enter a user name password here in the  
23 web site; is that right?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And if one did that, would you get something looking like

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Exhibit 611 here?

2 A. Looks reasonable, yes.

3 Q. Okay. And if the password were accepted, you get what  
4 looks like 612?

5 A. I think that's probably correct.

6 Q. Okay. Offer 611 and 612.

7 MR. BAHLER: No objection.

8 Q. (BY MR. GIUST) Okay. And the CAPI information would be  
9 obtained after you get to 612 by clicking on product  
10 information as shown here on 613; is that right?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And to get the CAPI for a specific product, would you  
13 click on the product shown here on Exhibit 613?

14 A. Yes, I believe so.

15 Q. Offer 613.

16 MR. BAHLER: No objection.

17 THE COURT: 611, 12 and 13 are in.

18 Q. (BY MR. GIUST) Okay. Let's go down the page. Show you  
19 Exhibit 614. Exhibit 614 shows the information you get after  
20 clicking underneath the A8526 product on the web page; is that  
21 right?

22 A. Yes, sir.

23 Q. Offer 614.

24 MR. BAHLER: No objection.

25 THE COURT: Received.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. (BY MR. GIUST) Then, if you scroll down the page, do we  
2 get what's shown here in 615?

3 A. That looks correct.

4 Q. Offer 615.

5 MR. BAHLER: No objection.

6 Q. (BY MR. GIUST) Okay. So to download this CAPI  
7 information, you have to get all the way to 615 here, and you  
8 click on these various links that say, for example, cap  
9 2.8SDK?

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. That CAPI 2.8, would this allow the downloader to use the  
12 CAPI specification?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. And CAPI 2.8SDK, does that allow someone to download the  
15 CAPI 2.8 software development kit?

16 A. That's correct.

17 Q. And those are required to implement these CAPI  
18 applications that you discussed, correct?

19 A. Certainly facilitates it, yes.

20 Q. Okay. Now, going back to 611, while we have a password  
21 here, a user isn't supplied with a password when they purchase  
22 a Chaparral product; is that right?

23 A. To be honest, I'm not sure that that's necessarily the  
24 case. I think that that's managed by our sales accountant  
25 team. Whether they get them a password immediately when they

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 become a purchasing customer or whether they make a request, I  
2 don't have first-hand knowledge of.

3 Q. Okay. So it could be the case that they request a  
4 password after they receive the product?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. Okay. On your direct exam, you mentioned two kinds of  
7 pass-through that Chaparral uses; is that correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. One is a pass-through that's associated with this CAPI  
10 concept. Do you recall that? And in order to use that  
11 password, you'd have to get this CAPI information, first,  
12 wouldn't you?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And another kind of password you mentioned was a direct  
15 pass-through or a raw pass-through?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. That pass-through isn't mentioned in any Chaparral users  
18 guides, is it?

19 A. No, it's not.

20 Q. And that pass-through isn't mentioned on Chaparral's web  
21 site, is it?

22 A. No, it's not.

23 Q. It's not mentioned on any of Chaparral's marketing  
24 literature, is it?

25 A. No.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. No more questions, your Honor.

2 RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. BAHLER:

4 Q. Just so we're clear, Mr. Permut, how does Chaparral just  
5 get a password and user name to get into the web site?

6 A. If their account rep has not already set up, you know, as  
7 part of the business arrangement, already proactively set one  
8 up, they would simply request one and our tech support group  
9 would set them up a log-in and password and communicate that  
10 information to them.

11 Q. Why did Chaparral have a password on its web site for that  
12 area of that web site?

13 A. It facilitates being able to by knowing who has downloaded  
14 these documents, one thing it does, it facilitates being able  
15 to track who has them. So, for example, if there's an update,  
16 if we find an error in our documentation, we could have a way  
17 to know who got the older version and could correct it, that  
18 is, send them a correction or a notice that there's a newer  
19 version available or corrected version.

20 It also, you know, as I say, it allows us to keep  
21 things current rather than shipping something with a product.  
22 It allows us to provide them with the most current one. This  
23 is very common today in the computer industry to provide  
24 things electronically, lets them get it in electronic form,  
25 too, which is much easier to use typically than a bunch of

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 printed pages.

2 Q. So it's primarily for tracking purposes?

3 A. For all of those reasons, yes.

4 Q. Okay. Mr. Giust touched just on this raw pass-through.

5 To your knowledge, have any customers asked for this raw

6 pass-through?

7 A. Yes, they have.

8 Q. Do you know how many to your knowledge?

9 A. I know, for example, Terra Solutions definitely used that.

10 I believe that Adaptec has also requested information about

11 the raw pass-through.

12 Q. If it's not in Chaparral's user guides or marketing

13 materials, how do they find out about it?

14 A. Well, typically, what would happen is the -- they become

15 familiar with a pass-through concept through the CAPI

16 specification, the SCSI maintenance command, and there are

17 some limitations in that implementation, for example, the size

18 of the payload that can be passed.

19 So they might, for example, say we need to be able to

20 pass a larger payload. Can you tell us how to do that, for

21 example, in downloading firmware? And so, they would ask, we

22 say, yes, we have this other mechanism, and we provide the

23 information for them.

24 Q. Just sort of clear here, the CAPI specification that you

25 just mentioned, is that provided to customers?



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. Oh, absolutely.

2 Q. Pass the witness, your Honor.

3 MR. GIUST: No follow-up, your Honor.

4 THE COURT: You may step down. You may call your next  
5 witness.

6 MR. BAHLER: Defendant calls Barbara Bardach by  
7 deposition.

8 THE COURT: Tell us the full name of the deponent and  
9 spell the last name, please, ma'am.

10 MS. SHISHIMA: Barbara Crystal Bardach, B-A-R-D-A-C-H.

11 BY MR. BAHLER: Page 7, line 18.

12 Q. "Would you please state your name for the record, please?"

13 A. Barbara Crystal Bardach.

14 Q. And where do you live?

15 A. I live at 1607 Yacht Haven Road, Friday Harbor."

16 Page 8, line 14.

17 Q. "And at some point -- at some period of time, you were  
18 employed at Crossroads. I'd like to first go back to the time  
19 when you started at Crossroads. Was it called Infinity Comm  
20 Stor at the time?"

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. You remember when that was when you started at Infinity  
23 Comm Stor?"

24 A. Yes, it was in late August, early September, around Labor  
25 Day of '96.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. And when did you leave Crossroads?

2 A. In the summer, late summer of '98.

3 Q. At that time, you started at Infinity Comm Stor. What was  
4 your title?

5 A. Vice-president of New Business Development or Business  
6 Development.

7 Q. And did you carry that title until you left Crossroads in  
8 the summer of 1998?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Did you have any other titles during that time?

11 A. No.

12 Q. What were your responsibilities as Vice-president of New  
13 Business Development or Business Development?

14 A. To identify business opportunities, develop contacts with  
15 companies, relationships, build business relationships, win  
16 business and manage the business.

17 Q. Now when you say win business, are you talking about  
18 business for storage router products?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. Did you report to Brian Smith the entire time you were at  
21 Infinity Comm Stor and Crossroads?

22 A. No. I reported to Brian in the beginning.

23 Q. Do you recall when you reported to somebody else?

24 A. Yes. It was Bill LiVolsi sometime in early '98."

25 Turning to page 20, line 13.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Did you show Compaq any description of the Fibre Channel  
2 bridge at this September 1996 meeting?

3 A. According to this agenda, Geoff Hoese did.

4 Q. Now, I'm going back to Defendant's Exhibit 147 under the  
5 heading meeting objectives/expectations that indicates that  
6 one of Infinity Comm Stor's objectives or expectations was to,  
7 quote, confirm their desire to buy a bridge, left paren,  
8 rather than make one, close quote. Do you recall why that was  
9 one of your meeting objectives or expectations?

10 A. Yes."

11 Moving to page 23, line 1.

12 Q. "What, if anything, did Crossroads do to try and convince  
13 Compaq to buy the Fibre Channel bridge from Crossroads rather  
14 than having Compaq make it itself?

15 A. Everything possible. That was my job."

16 Page 24, line 3.

17 Q. "And did Mr. Hoese and Mr. Smith participate in the whole  
18 meeting, as well?

19 A. Yes."

20 Page 28, line 13.

21 Q. "During the September 17th, 1996 meeting, was the option  
22 or possibility of Compaq buying a Fibre Channel bridge from  
23 Crossroads discussed?

24 A. Well, that was the whole purpose of the meeting was to  
25 learn if they would have an interest in doing that, yes."

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Page 33, line 22.

2 Q. "Did you attend Comdex fall 1996?"

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And where was that?

5 A. Las Vegas."

6 Page 34, line 8.

7 Q. "And what was your responsibility with respect to Comdex?"

8 A. To introduce our company to prospective customers."

9 Page 38, line 15.

10 Q. "And at that time, had you made any arrangement with HP to  
11 incorporate HP's Mux in Crossroads' storage router line?"

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And that was going to be called the CrossPoint 4400?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. Now, at this time, in November 1996, did you have any  
16 marketing or sales collateral that discussed the 4400?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. You recall what that was?

19 A. A spec sheet."

20 Page 39, line 10. Defendant's Exhibit 153.

21 Q. "Defendant's Exhibit 153 is a spec sheet you had in  
22 November 1996 for the CrossPoint 4400?"

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. In Exhibit -- the second page of Exhibit 153, also  
25 something that you had available to prospective customers in

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 November 1996?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Do you know if one or both of these pages were provided to  
4 prospective customers at that time, in November 1996?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Yes, they were?

7 A. Yes."

8 Page 43, line 5.

9 Q. "How did you become aware that Crossroads was interested  
10 in selling storage router products to Data General?

11 A. It was one of the customers that Brian Smith had spoken to  
12 prior to my arrival at Crossroads the Infinity Comm Stor at  
13 the time."

14 Continuing line 15.

15 Q. "Did you participate in any meetings with Data General  
16 Corporation?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Were those in 1996?

19 A. Yes, some were.

20 Q. Was that your role at the meetings with Data General?

21 A. The same as always. My role was to develop the customer  
22 interest for more of the sales business relation perspective.

23 Q. Did Brian Smith have any role before you became an  
24 Infinity Comm Stor or Crossroads employee?

25 A. Yes.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Did you take a look at Exhibit -- Defendant's Exhibit 155,  
2 it appears to be a collection of documents relating to Data  
3 General. At or near the end of Exhibit 155, there appears to  
4 be a letter from Mr. Boykin to Brian Smith, dated July 12th,  
5 1996. Have you seen Defendant's Exhibit 155 all or part of it  
6 before?

7 A. Have I seen it before?

8 Q. Yes.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And did you ever talk to Mr. Boykin at Clariion or Data  
11 General?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And is it your understanding that he had responsibility  
14 for placing this order with Infinity Comm Stor?

15 A. That's my understanding.

16 Q. You know if the Fibre Channel-to-SCSI bridge referred to  
17 in Exhibit 155 was the same as the Verrazano product that you  
18 testified about earlier?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. It was the same?

21 A. To my understanding."

22 Page 50, line 2.

23 Q. "Now, do you remember any evaluation units or prototypes  
24 being sent to customers who did not return them?

25 MS. SHISHIMA: What page are we on?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 MR. BAHLER: Page 50, beginning line 2.

2 MS. SHISHIMA: Page 46.

3 MR. BAHLER: Oh, 46. Sorry. Before we do that, we'll  
4 do 46, line 1. Question:

5 Q. "Was Clariion at the Comdex show?"

6 A. The product was shown at Comdex, and I believe that they  
7 were, yes. I'm not certain."

8 Okay. Now, page 50, line 2.

9 Q. "Now, do you remember any evaluation units or prototypes  
10 being sent to customers who did not return them?"

11 A. I believe so.

12 Q. Do you remember which companies did not return them?

13 A. No.

14 Q. Did those companies end up sending the payment to  
15 Crossroads?

16 A. I would assume so, yes, if they didn't return it."

17 Okay. Line 14.

18 Q. "That if they did not return it, they would send  
19 Crossroads a payment?"

20 A. Yes, that was typical with any unit anywhere: You destroy  
21 it, you own it."

22 Line 22.

23 Q. "Going back to Comdex in the fall of 1996, do you remember  
24 that the prototype that was in the Fibre Channel association  
25 space was the Verrazano product?"

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. It would have to have been."

2 Okay. Page 52, line 22.

3 Q. "Right. Now, as a result of the Comdex 1996, did you  
4 learn of the interest that a company, quote, EMC had in  
5 Crossroads' storage router products?

6 A. As a result of the Comdex, I don't recall. If you have a  
7 document that you can show me, that might help.

8 Q. Defendant's Exhibit 158. Is it a document with bates  
9 numbers 4460, also marked Brian Smith -- also marked Brian  
10 Smith's deposition?

11 A. This is about the CrossPoint 4400.

12 Q. Right. Do you know how EMC learned of the CrossPoint  
13 4400?

14 A. I called them."

15 Page 54, line 5.

16 Q. "Do you remember why you would have told Mr. Rarich about  
17 the 4400 rather than Verrazano product? Or maybe you told him  
18 about both. I don't know.

19 A. I probably told them about both, and that was the one he  
20 was interested in.

21 Q. Did he confirm that he would be ordering an evaluation  
22 unit from you?

23 A. That's what this says, yes.

24 Q. Was that something he did in person or on the telephone,  
25 or did he send you a fax or e-mail?



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. If they were going to purchase something, they would have  
2 to send a fax PO, but it says on the memo how he should place  
3 the PO. So, therefore, my assumption is it was a verbal  
4 discussion.

5 Q. And is it your assumption, also, that he told you in  
6 person, I mean, verbally in person as opposed to telling some  
7 other Crossroads employee?

8 A. Oh, yes, definitely.

9 Q. Now, how long in advance of December 19th, 1996 did you  
10 think you contacted Mr. Rarich about the CrossPoint 4400 or  
11 Crossroads' other storage router products?

12 A. Do I think?

13 Q. Yes.

14 A. I think I would have done this prior to Comdex and,  
15 therefore, at Comdex."

16 55, line 13.

17 Q. "Now, was the CrossPoint 4400 Fibre Channel-to-SCSI router  
18 something that had been built yet?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Was that something that HP had built?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Was the CrossPoint 4400 product that HP built in existence  
23 at the time of Comdex 1996?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And did they have a unit there?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. Yes."

2 Page 56, line 6.

3 Q. "Now, how did Crossroads decide at the \$17,000 price that  
4 you referred to here in Exhibit 158?

5 A. That was a discussion between Brian Smith and myself.

6 Q. And do you remember the rationale that either you or Brian  
7 Smith had for the number \$17,000?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. What was that?

10 A. It was based on what HP was charging us.

11 Q. Do you remember what HP was charging you at the time?

12 A. No.

13 Q. Any ballpark estimate?

14 A. Slightly less than that.

15 Q. Is the HP product that was offered as the CrossPoint 4400  
16 also referred to by HP as the Mux?

17 A. Yes, the multiplexor, the Mux.

18 Q. Did Crossroads end up receiving a purchase order from EMC  
19 for the 4400?

20 A. Yes."

21 Page 69, line 1.

22 Q. "When did you start contacting customers about the 4400? "  
23 Did I miss one again?

24 MS. SHISHIMA: 69.

25 MR. BAHLER: Yes. 69, 1 through 6. Question:

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. "When did you start contacting customers about the 4400?

2 A. Well, prior to having this suite at Comdex because I  
3 organized a number of customers, large, to come visit us at  
4 the private suite to learn about the HP. So the first, it  
5 would have been at Comdex."

6 Okay. Page 72, line 1.

7 Q. "And did you have an occasion to see a prototype of the HP  
8 Mux prior to Comdex 1996?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Where was that?

11 A. In Roseville.

12 Q. Do you remember why HP showed you their Mux in Roseville?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Why was that?

15 A. Because we had an interest in working together.

16 Q. And did everybody else from Crossroads see the HP Mux in  
17 Roseville before Comdex 1996?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Who was that?

20 A. Brian Smith."

21 Page 73, line 18.

22 Q. "And when did the 4400 first enter the Crossroads business  
23 plan?

24 A. Well, the first time that it entered our plan?

25 Q. Yeah.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. I mean, obviously, we had discussions with HP prior to  
2 Comdex or we wouldn't have been sharing a suite together. So  
3 it would have had to have been prior to Comdex that we started  
4 to talk about it.

5 Q. That's helpful. I wondered if you have any idea how much  
6 in advance of Comdex?

7 A. Somewhere between when I was hired, which was the  
8 beginning of September, and Comdex was the beginning -- it was  
9 the middle of November. So in September and October, it had  
10 to have occurred.

11 Q. Did you have any discussions with HP as to what the  
12 purpose of the technology suite was?

13 A. The purpose of the technology suite?

14 Q. Right.

15 A. Yes, absolutely.

16 Q. And what was that?

17 A. We and HP were jointly showing that we had a relation --  
18 business relationship and that we would be -- that we would be  
19 reselling, we would be reselling the multiplexer on an  
20 exclusive relationship.

21 Q. And did you indicate to prospective customers that came to  
22 the technology suite that that was what you were doing?

23 A. Yes."

24 Page 82, line 18.

25 Q. And did you participate in all discussions with customers

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 or prospective customers concerning when they would receive  
2 delivery of the HP Muxes that were marked as CP 4400?

3 A. Surely I did, yes, I'd have to."

4 Page 83, line 8.

5 Q. "Do you remember the date do you remember telling  
6 prospective customers that they would be able to receive a  
7 4400 Mux or 4400 Crossroads product?

8 A. The 4400, yeah.

9 Q. As soon as Crossroads received the product from HP?

10 A. I don't know that I would put it in those words, but they  
11 certainly knew that that was the relationship."

12 Page 89, line 3.

13 Q. "I'd like to move ahead to the mid-to-late 1997 time  
14 frame, sometime in mid-to-late '97. Did you participate in  
15 discussions with Compaq Computer about their desire to have an  
16 exclusive on what was called the SCSI reserve and release  
17 commands?

18 A. Sounds familiar.

19 Q. Well, let's mark as Defendant's Exhibit 130 a draft  
20 development agreement between Compaq and Crossroads. It's got  
21 pages CRDS 42929 through 42938, the last page appears to have  
22 some notes.

23 Question: Is that your handwriting in the last page  
24 of Defendant's Exhibit 130?"

25 MS. SHISHIMA: Page 91.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 MR. BAHLER: Oh, I'm sorry. Page 92. I'm sorry, page

2 91. Let's back up just a second. 91, line 13.

3 Q. "Now, you began working on license agreement with Compaq  
4 in 1998 or development of one, excuse me, that's right?

5 A. I don't know the date.

6 Q. At some point in time?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. After October 1997?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. And you were the person responsible at Crossroads for  
11 working on that development agreement?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. Was there anybody else?

14 A. Geoff Hoese.

15 Q. Okay. Now, we'll mark as Exhibit 130 a draft development  
16 agreement between Compaq and Crossroads throughout pages 42929  
17 through 42938. The last page appears to have some notes. Is  
18 that your handwriting in the last page of Defendant's Exhibit  
19 130?

20 A. Yes, it is."

21 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, at this time, I'll offer  
22 Exhibit 130 into evidence.

23 THE COURT: Received.

24 MR. BAHLER:

25 Q. "What does the next line of your notes say?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. Underneath the slash, the -- okay.

2 Q. Yes.

3 A. Okay. It says September/October '96 is the first meeting  
4 that we had with them about the 4400.

5 Q. Okay. It says September/October 1996 is the first meeting  
6 -- I'm sorry. Question: The first meeting you had with  
7 Compaq about the 4400?

8 A. Its seems to imply that, yes. This seems to be my  
9 objectives and that's probably end quote, OBJ quote at the  
10 top, if that's what that is. That's probably what I wanted to  
11 cover with Compaq at the meeting.

12 Q. Do you think that's correct that you actually met with  
13 Compaq about the 4400 or is that about the 4100?

14 A. Well, I know we met with them about both, so I can't tell  
15 you if that's a typo on my part.

16 Q. Why did you meet with Compaq about the 4400?

17 A. Probably to try to sell it to them.

18 Q. What does the next line say?"

19 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, may I approach and show you  
20 what's going to be next in the deposition?

21 THE COURT: You may.

22 (At the Bench, on the record.)

23 MR. BAHLER: He's talking about an opinion. Which  
24 line, specifically?

25 MR. ALBRIGHT: Sorry. 98, question appears to begin

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 on line 17.

2 MR. BAHLER: Yeah.

3 THE COURT: And what is your objection?

4 MR. ALBRIGHT: It calls for an opinion from -- expert  
5 opinion from a person that's a lay witness who would not be  
6 able to provide this in testimony.

7 THE COURT: She's just indicating what people told  
8 her. I overrule the objection.

9 MR. ALBRIGHT: Thank you, sir.

10 MR. BAHLER: This is page 98, line 17.

11 Q. "What does the next line say?"

12 A. It says, reserve release which above is written as quote  
13 R/R, correlates to worldwide naming, which is our invention.

14 Q. And how did you come to the conclusion that reserve  
15 release correlates to worldwide naming?

16 A. I would have been told that by either Geoff Hoese or Brian  
17 Smith.

18 Q. What was your -- what is your understanding of worldwide  
19 naming?

20 A. Well, all devices have to have a name to be identified, so  
21 that information can be sent to them.

22 Q. And how did you come to a conclusion that reserve release  
23 correlates to worldwide naming?

24 A. Again --

25 Q. Is our invention?



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. I was told that by Brian and/or Geoff.

2 Q. They indicated that that was Crossroads' invention?

3 A. Correct."

4 MR. BAHLER: That's the end of the defendant's  
5 designations, your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Plaintiffs --

7 MR. ALBRIGHT: Nothing from Ms. Bardach.

8 THE COURT: Call your next witness.

9 MR. DELLETT: Chaparral calls David Zinger.

10 THE COURT: Come forward, please. Stand right there.  
11 This lady's going to administer an oath.

12 (Witness was sworn.)

13 THE COURT: Have a seat up here, please, sir, in the  
14 blue chair. Tell us your full name and spell your last,  
15 please.

16 THE WITNESS: David F. Zinger, Z-I-N-G-E-R.

17 DAVID F. ZINGER, called by the Defendant, duly sworn.

18 DIRECT EXAMINATION

19 BY MR. DELLETT:

20 Q. Mr. Zinger, I have a notebook here for your reference.

21 Would you please introduce yourself to the jury, please?

22 A. Hi. My name is Dave Zinger.

23 Q. What do you do for a living?

24 A. I'm a patent lawyer.

25 Q. What law firm?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. Sheridan Ross in Denver, Colorado.

2 Q. How long have you been a patent lawyer?

3 A. I've been a patent lawyer since 1978.

4 Q. What technology do you specialize in?

5 A. I primarily work in the electrical field, electrical  
6 technology.

7 Q. Any particular specialty within the electrical field?

8 A. Not really, basically a number of different inventions  
9 involving electrical controls, computer-type equipment,  
10 storage.

11 Q. Did you work as -- in electrical engineering before you  
12 went to law school?

13 A. Yes, I did.

14 Q. And where did you work?

15 A. I worked at Western Electric in New Jersey at the Bell  
16 Labs facility.

17 Q. And what did you do there?

18 A. I was involved with the anti-missile program.

19 Q. And were you working on computer hardware or software  
20 before you went to law school?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Was that for the Western Electric?

23 A. Yes, it was basically, again, involving the missile  
24 program.

25 THE COURT: Mr. Zinger, you're a little too close to

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 that microphone.

2 THE WITNESS: Sorry.

3 Q. (BY MR. DELLETT) When did you go to law school?

4 A. I went to law school in -- between 1974 and 1977.

5 Q. And when did you become registered to practice before the  
6 United States Patent and Trademark Office?

7 A. 1978.

8 Q. Approximately how many patent applications have you  
9 written on computer technology or software?

10 A. Approximately 60 to 75.

11 Q. And of those, approximately how many relate to computer  
12 storage?

13 A. Approximately 20 to 25.

14 Q. Now, what types of companies or individuals have you  
15 written patent applications for, especially in computer  
16 storage?

17 A. With respect to computer storage, some companies that I've  
18 been involved with patent applications are Fujitsu, Mag Store,  
19 Laser Magnetic Storage, and LSI logic.

20 Q. Have you in your career also written opinions for clients  
21 about whether or not somebody else's patent is valid or  
22 infringed?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And approximately how often have you done that?

25 A. Somewhere about 20 but less than 25.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. And do some of those patents deal only with the issue of  
2 whether the patent is valid or not?

3 A. Yes, some of those opinions deal on the issue of validity,  
4 yes.

5 Q. And do some of those patents deal with the issue of  
6 infringement?

7 A. Some of those opinions and analysis deal with whether or  
8 not the patent claims infringe, yes.

9 Q. And did you do any work for -- let me back up. When did  
10 you first hear of Chaparral?

11 A. Became aware of Chaparral when I visited their company  
12 late January of 2000.

13 Q. And shortly after that, did you hear from Chaparral about  
14 the 972 patent?

15 A. Yes, I did.

16 Q. And had you before that, had you written any opinions or  
17 written any patent applications for Chaparral before?

18 A. No, I had not.

19 Q. And who did you talk to about the 972 patent?

20 A. I talked to Jerry Walker at Chaparral.

21 Q. Did you read the 972 patent?

22 A. Yes, I did.

23 Q. And after you read the 972 patent, what did you do next?

24 A. Based on my initial understanding of the contents of that  
25 patent, I ordered what we call the history of that patent from

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 the records of the U.S. Patent Office.

2 Q. And did you also get the references that were mentioned on  
3 the front of the 972 patent?

4 A. Yes, there was a number of patents identified on that  
5 Crossroads patent that I obtained copies of.

6 Q. And did you meet with Mr. Walker in early 2000 to discuss  
7 that?

8 A. Yes, sometime in -- that early part of 2000, we did get  
9 together and talk about that information.

10 Q. And what did you do next after that?

11 A. After we had discussed that particular information as far  
12 as we'd gotten, one of the objectives was to learn more about  
13 that technology as well as learn more about any prior art that  
14 might be in existence.

15 Q. And while you were doing that, while you were in that  
16 process, did you learn that Crossroads had sued Chaparral?

17 A. Yes, I believe the complaint was filed in the latter part  
18 of 2000, and so, shortly thereafter, I became aware of the  
19 lawsuit.

20 Q. Did you mean to say -- what time period in 2000 did you  
21 mean to say?

22 A. Latter part of March. It would have been early part of  
23 April that I became aware of the lawsuit.

24 Q. All right. And did you actually see the complaint that  
25 Crossroads filed against Chaparral in late March 2000?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. Yes, I did.

2 Q. And did you see the time?

3 A. Would have been shortly after the filing of the lawsuit,  
4 so probably April.

5 Q. And did you read it?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And did you talk about this complaint with Mr. Walker?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And if you would turn the third page of the complaint.

10 It's on the screen here. Did you understand at that time that  
11 the complaint specified the FS-1310B, FS-1310C and FS-1310R  
12 storage routers?

13 A. Yes, it's my understanding that the complaint was claiming  
14 that Chaparral products were infringed -- that were being  
15 infringed were those identified in that particular paragraph  
16 of the complaint.

17 Q. Now, after you saw the complaint, did you continue your  
18 study of the 972 patent?

19 A. Yes, again, the early stages, I wanted to understand  
20 better what was in that patent, what the words might have  
21 meant, and certainly the issue of prior art might be  
22 available.

23 Q. And did you -- what was the status of your study of the  
24 972 patent as of the middle of April 2000?

25 A. At that point in time, I reached a conclusion based on the

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 information I had that the Crossroads patent, given the claims  
2 that were being alleged apparently infringed was invalid and  
3 not infringed.

4 Q. And what was the status of your analysis of the 972 patent  
5 as of mid-April 2000? Had you completed your study?

6 A. No. Basically, I wanted to make sure I understood the  
7 technology involved, Chaparral products involved, and  
8 certainly what prior art may be found that was relevant to  
9 those claims.

10 Q. And did you write down the results of your preliminary  
11 study in any documents in mid-April?

12 A. Yes, I did.

13 Q. And let me put up -- is, then, Exhibit D-179 something  
14 that you wrote in April -- I believe it says April 13th --

15 A. Yes, it is.

16 Q. -- 2000? And why did you address the letter to KMG?

17 A. It was addressed to that organization because it was an  
18 accounting firm that represented Chaparral, and they requested  
19 that we provide information concerning Chaparral and our  
20 representation of Chaparral.

21 Q. Now, I've highlighted a portion on the bottom of the first  
22 page. Does this paragraph that starts on the bottom of the  
23 first page -- and in a moment, we'll go to the second page.  
24 Does this accurately report the results of your preliminary  
25 studies as of April 13th, 2000?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. Yes, it does.

2 Q. And could you tell the jury what the results of your  
3 studies were as of April 13, 2000?

4 A. Basically, what it says in that letter of April 13 that  
5 based on my preliminary studies and evaluations, the  
6 conclusion was reached that Chaparral does not infringe any  
7 claims of the Crossroads patent, and that the patented claims  
8 appear to be germane are invalid based on prior art.

9 Q. And that paragraph continues on the second page of Exhibit  
10 179, and why did you indicate to KMG that you were continuing  
11 with these analyses?

12 A. Because we wanted to make sure that we had all relevant  
13 prior art, especially prior art that wasn't considered by the  
14 Patent Office when they examined the patent application.

15 Q. And was this the written opinion that you provided to Mr.  
16 Walker about the 972 patent?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And what did you do after April 13th with respect to the  
19 972 patent?

20 A. With respect to that patent, continued to -- with the  
21 analysis of the particular patent as well as consideration  
22 given to how to find perhaps more relevant or whatever prior  
23 art might exist.

24 Q. Was it unusual in your experience as a patent lawyer to  
25 take that long searching for prior art?



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. In a case like this, I don't consider it unusual. It does  
2 take considerable amount of time to identify prior art.  
3 There's a number of sources that one can look at. And  
4 especially in the context that a lawsuit was filed on this  
5 particular patent, the expectation is that it was going to  
6 take some time to make sure we had it all.

7 Q. And what did -- when did you complete a draft opinion  
8 about the 972 patent after this first letter you wrote?

9 A. A draft opinion was provided to Chaparral in June of 2000.

10 Q. Let me put up on the screen the first page of a document  
11 that is marked as D-180. Can you identify this?

12 A. Yes, I believe that first page represents the draft of the  
13 opinion that was sent to Mr. Walker at Chaparral in June of  
14 2000.

15 Q. Did you provide that draft opinion to Mr. Walker?

16 A. Yes, it was sent to him.

17 Q. And did you say anything about what Chaparral products you  
18 were considering in that opinion?

19 A. Yes, I believe in the first couple of pages, I mention  
20 that products I was considering that were apparently marketed  
21 by Chaparral.

22 Q. Let's go to the second page. The first page starts off in  
23 the bottom, the last sentence that begins on the bottom. In  
24 its complaint, Crossroads alleges that the 972 patent was  
25 infringed by the following Chaparral data routing products.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Now, how did you come to that understanding?

2 A. I came to that understanding because those were the  
3 products that were identified in the complaint that Crossroads  
4 brought against Chaparral.

5 Q. Now, what was the -- what conclusions had you reached at  
6 the time of this draft opinion with respect to the 972 patent?

7 A. As the opinion sets forth, I concluded that the Chaparral  
8 products that were alleged to be infringed were not infringed  
9 -- I'm sorry, did not infringe the Crossroads patent.

10 Q. Did you continue to study the 972 patent after this draft  
11 opinion?

12 A. I continued with the analysis in connection with that  
13 Crossroads patent including prior art and studying the  
14 information provided in the Crossroads patent, yes.

15 Q. And when did you complete your final opinion regarding the  
16 972 patent?

17 A. The opinion was completed and sent out about November 20,  
18 2000.

19 Q. Is this the first page of the opinion you wrote and sent  
20 to Mr. Walker, November 20, 2000?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And did you provide this to Mr. Walker yourself or did you  
23 mail it to him?

24 A. I mailed it to him.

25 Q. And did you discuss it with him?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. I discussed it with him insofar as what it would contain  
2 generally.

3 Q. And did you talk about specific Chaparral routers in this  
4 opinion?

5 A. Yes, it's the same Chaparral routers that were analyzed in  
6 the draft opinion.

7 Q. Why did you specify those specific Chaparral data router  
8 products, FS-1310B, FS-1310C and FS-1310R?

9 A. Those were discussed, again, because those were the  
10 Chaparral routers that Crossroads was alleging in its  
11 complaint that were being in -- that infringed the patent.

12 Q. Now, did you also conclude in your opinion definition of  
13 what you understood access controls to be at that time?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Let me refer you to page 9 of your opinion. Is this where  
16 you discuss a definition of access controls?

17 A. It is.

18 Q. And how did you get to that understanding of the  
19 definition of access controls?

20 A. Essential reliance was placed on the finding that was made  
21 in a Markman hearing as far as what those words meant.

22 Q. And did you provide in this November 20th opinion any  
23 conclusions with respect to the validity or invalidity of the  
24 972 patent?

25 A. Yes, I did.

1 Q. And is that section entitled invalidity analysis for the  
2 972 patent? What does that mean?

3 A. That refers to the determinations analysis that I made  
4 concerning whether or not the 972 patent claims were invalid,  
5 and it relates to a conclusion that was reached regarding  
6 invalidity.

7 Q. And did you make that invalidity analysis based on prior  
8 art that you found?

9 A. It was based on prior art that was made known to me  
10 through Chaparral and that prior art was the SPARC storage  
11 array information that apparently was some Micro Systems  
12 product literature.

13 Q. Could you refer to page 24 of your November 20th opinion?

14 A. Sure.

15 Q. Why did you say disclosures and prior art not considered  
16 by the U.S. Patent Examiner when the 972 patent was examined?

17 A. Because in determining whether or not patent claims might  
18 be invalid, a key piece of evidence can be whether or not the  
19 Patent Office, the patent examiner considered the prior art  
20 that is at issue that you're discussing when the patent was  
21 initially examined.

22 If it was not considered by the patent examiner, it  
23 may present a stronger case for invalidity.

24 Q. Then, why did you list the Sun SPARC storage array, which  
25 is a heading No. A, SPARC storage array? Do you have an

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 understanding, first of all? Do you have an understanding  
2 what company made what you refer to as the SPARC storage  
3 array?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. What company is that?

6 A. Sun micro systems.

7 Q. And why did you list this SPARC storage array first under  
8 your section disclosures and prior art not considered by the  
9 U.S. Patent Examiner?

10 A. Because I thought and concluded that it was relevant to  
11 the validity of the Crossroads patent claims.

12 Q. And did you reach any conclusion as to when that SPARC  
13 storage array was dated?

14 A. I concluded that it was, indeed, prior art more than one  
15 year before the filing date of the Chaparral patent.

16 Q. If you would, please, take to tab No. D-181 of your  
17 binder.

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And is that D-181 in your binder, is that a copy of your  
20 opinion?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And about two-thirds of the way through D-181, there is a  
23 paper entitled, the SPARC storage array architecture, top of  
24 the white paper.

25 A. There should be a page at the top left corner, wouldn't

1 it?

2 Q. Yeah, it says Exhibit C.

3 A. Oh, talking about an exhibit. Yes, I have it.

4 Q. And if you'd turn the second page of that, is there  
5 anything about that page that led you to conclude that this  
6 was, in fact, prior to the 972 patent?

7 A. Yes, there's a copyright notice that indicates a 1994 date  
8 of publication, which was more than one year before the filing  
9 date.

10 Q. Now, did you indicate in your report whether or not the  
11 Sun SPARC storage array included access controls? I believe if  
12 you turn to pages 23 or 24, that's where you -- excuse me.  
13 It's page, we start with a comparison with SPARC storage  
14 array. See on page 28 there? It's tab 181. Page 28, I  
15 think, is the part that I would like you to take a look at.

16 A. I'm there.

17 Q. Okay. Now, did you do a comparison between the SPARC  
18 storage array and the elements of the claims of the 972  
19 patent?

20 A. Yes, I did.

21 Q. And based on that comparison, what did you conclude?

22 A. Based on that comparison, I determined that the elements  
23 of the claim were provided in the SPARC storage array products  
24 or publications.

25 Q. And at this time, did you continue to use the definition

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 of access controls that you had obtained from the Markman  
2 hearing?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And why did you conclude that the SPARC storage array  
5 satisfied the implements access control limitation?

6 A. It was based on my opinion that if the claim were  
7 interpreted to cover reserve release, then the claim was  
8 invalid.

9 Q. And why did you think the claim could be construed to  
10 cover reserve release at that time?

11 A. Because the products that were accused of infringement  
12 included a reserve release feature. And from what I could  
13 determine, that would be the only feature that Crossroads  
14 could rely on in determining whether or not these products  
15 infringed the patent.

16 Q. And did you have an understanding at that time about any  
17 other access control feature in the products that were accused  
18 of infringement?

19 A. No.

20 Q. Now, after November 20th, 2000, did you provide any  
21 additional written opinions to Mr. Walker about the 972  
22 patent?

23 A. No.

24 Q. After November 20th, 2000, have you changed your opinion  
25 on the validity of the 972 patent?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. No.

2 Q. Now, you learned recently that Crossroads is accusing  
3 Chaparral with a product that features LUN zoning?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Have you discussed LUN zoning with Mr. Walker before you  
6 prepared your November 20th opinion?

7 A. Yes, I discussed it with him.

8 Q. And do you have any understanding as to what LUN zoning  
9 is?

10 A. Generally, yes.

11 Q. Okay. Have you prepared an opinion about whether LUN  
12 zoning infringes the 972 patent?

13 A. No.

14 Q. And do you remember that Crossroads' attorneys asked you  
15 about that in July of this year?

16 A. They took my deposition and they asked questions, I  
17 believe, related to that, yes.

18 Q. And they asked you if LUN zoning was a feature that would  
19 need to be analyzed separately? Do you remember that?

20 A. Something to that effect, yes.

21 Q. And have you analyzed LUN zoning separately?

22 A. No.

23 Q. Okay. Have you told Chaparral that it should be analyzed  
24 separately?

25 A. No.



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. And would Chaparral sales or have Chaparral sales of  
2 routers with LUN zoning required a separate opinion on  
3 validity of the 972 patent?

4 MR. ALLCOCK: Objection, your Honor. This is beyond  
5 the scope of his letter, and he's not an expert on this issue.

6 THE COURT: The question was asked by you in direct  
7 testimony of your expert. I overrule the objection. You may  
8 answer.

9 A. Could you repeat the question, please?

10 Q. (BY MR. DELLETT) Have the fact that Chaparral sold routers  
11 with LUN zoning, does that require a separate opinion on  
12 validity of the 972 patent?

13 A. No.

14 Q. Why not?

15 A. Because the invalidity opinion is based on an  
16 interpretation that is in my opinion, and as far as I know,  
17 that interpretation isn't going to change. So based on that  
18 interpretation, the claim is still invalid as set forth in my  
19 opinion.

20 Q. And that is still your opinion today?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Pass the witness.

23

24

25 CROSS-EXAMINATION

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 BY MR. ALLCOCK:

2 Q. Good morning.

3 A. Good morning.

4 Q. Mr. Zinger, we've never met. My name is John Allcock. I  
5 represent Crossroads.

6 Let me hand you a book. It has some of the same  
7 materials as in that larger book in front of you, but it might  
8 be easier if you work out of there.

9 I want to start by asking about Exhibit 27, which is  
10 your June 2000 letter. Do you see that there?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Now, this letter doesn't deal with invalidity at all; is  
13 that right?

14 A. It was a draft, and no, it does not.

15 Q. Okay. And this letter deals with the presently marketed  
16 products of Chaparral; is that right?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. So then, you wrote a final opinion in November 20 of the  
19 year 2000; is that right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And this opinion doesn't deal with a product that would  
22 have LUN zoning in it?

23 A. The opinion as far as infringement is concerned does not  
24 deal with the feature of LUN zoning.

25 Q. So you were never asked ever by Chaparral to render an

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 opinion on products that contain LUN zoning?

2 A. I was not asked to render an opinion as far as  
3 infringement is concerned.

4 Q. Okay.

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And you were never asked by Chaparral with respect to  
7 infringement to render an opinion on whether or not any of the  
8 RAID controller products infringed the 972 patent; is that  
9 right?

10 A. That's correct. The opinions as far as infringement were  
11 directed to the products identified in the Crossroads  
12 complaint.

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. So if those products are different, then the answer is no,  
15 I was not.

16 Q. Well, as of July of this year, July of 2001, you didn't  
17 even know whether or not Chaparral had any products that had  
18 the LUN zoning feature; is that right?

19 A. No, I did not know there were marketing products with LUN  
20 feature.

21 Q. So for this entire time period, no one from Chaparral ever  
22 told you that they were marketing products with the LUN zoning  
23 feature?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. That surprised you when Mr. Giust took your deposition,

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 didn't it?

2 A. That surprise is strong of a word. I mean, I didn't know  
3 it.

4 Q. Okay. Now, this says presently marketed products. Did  
5 you know that this LUN zoning feature was set to be released  
6 in a Chaparral product just a week or two before this draft  
7 letter?

8 A. No.

9 Q. No one told you that?

10 A. No.

11 Q. Did you know that Mr. Walker ordered that LUN zoning  
12 feature to be taken out of that software release because of  
13 conversations he had with you with respect to whether or not  
14 LUN zoning would infringe?

15 A. No, I didn't know.

16 Q. No one told you that?

17 A. No.

18 Q. So then, this presently marketed product language, was  
19 that language of your choosing?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And were you told that they were considering putting LUN  
22 zoning in the product thereafter?

23 A. No.

24 Q. Never?

25 A. There were discussions about LUN zoning.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. But you were never told they were considering moving it in  
2 the product?

3 A. You say considered to be put in a product. The  
4 discussions perhaps did encompass that. If you ask, did they  
5 tell you it's going into this product, the answer's no.

6 Q. Now, if you take a look at -- just one second, your Honor.  
7 I misplaced something. Yes. Exhibit 21 before you is the  
8 complaint, and I want to focus just briefly on paragraph 10  
9 that talks about the devices that are included in the suit,  
10 and it does list a number of them, specifically.

11 But when you read this, did you read the language that  
12 says such devices include but are not limited to those  
13 devices?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And did that mean to you that the devices included in this  
16 lawsuit were those specifically mentioned as well as others?

17 A. It meant to me that inquiry should be made as to possible  
18 other devices that might be relevant.

19 Q. Okay. Now, in this time period of April, May and June,  
20 there were discussions with the Chaparral engineers concerning  
21 products with access controls in them and without access  
22 controls in them; is that right?

23 A. When you say "access controls," we'd have to define it.

24 Q. Okay. There were discussions with the Chaparral engineers  
25 about having -- about analyzing a product with LUN zoning and

1 without LUN zoning. And the engineers used the term access  
2 controls when describing those two different circumstances; is  
3 that correct?

4 A. I wasn't privy to all discussions.

5 Q. I'm talking about discussions between you and them. They  
6 gave you flowcharts of the product with access controls and  
7 flowcharts of the product without access controls; is that  
8 correct?

9 A. I don't remember getting flowcharts, no.

10 Q. Could you take a look at Exhibit 39. It's already in  
11 evidence. And I'm going to show you page 408, one and two.  
12 This is Mr. Walker's notebook. And if you look at 40811,  
13 you'll see a date of 4-27-00 on it, and do you remember around  
14 this time period being given a block diagram of router  
15 products with access control features and without access  
16 control features?

17 A. I was given information, and it did include information  
18 about access controls as we're talking about here,  
19 particularly LUN zoning. Whether it was in this form of block  
20 diagram, I don't remember.

21 Q. Okay. So now, this is before your June draft opinion  
22 letter that doesn't concern products with LUN zoning. Here,  
23 Chaparral was asking you -- and I understand it would take a  
24 separate analysis, and you never did a separate analysis of  
25 LUN zoning; is that right?

1 A. Not as it implies to infringement.

2 Q. Okay. But here, you were given information about the  
3 product with access controls and without access controls, and  
4 there was, at least, some preliminary discussion; is that  
5 right?

6 A. There was some preliminary discussion, but when you're  
7 stating your question about a product, that assumes that a  
8 product was planned. So I'm not sure I understand the  
9 question.

10 Q. Right. You didn't know when you were looking that these  
11 flow diagrams that LUN zoning was slated to be included in a  
12 product in April of 2000, did you?

13 A. That's my recollection, yes.

14 Q. You didn't know that?

15 A. I didn't know that.

16 Q. Now, if you look at Exhibit 11, what is Exhibit 11?

17 MR. DELLETT: Your Honor, objection. May we approach?

18 THE COURT: You may.

19 MR. ALLCOCK: Your Honor, I'm not going to show it. I  
20 want to ask some foundation questions. We could approach now  
21 or we could approach after the foundational questions.

22 THE COURT: All right.

23 MR. DELLETT: Let's approach now.

24 THE COURT: Okay.

25 (At the Bench, on the record.)

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 MR. DELLETT: This is the time records. I don't,  
2 first of all, know the question of what these are relevant to.  
3 But even more so, I think this issue of --

4 THE COURT: I can't hear you, and I'm sure the mic  
5 can't hear you.

6 MR. DELLETT: There's a question of relevance, first  
7 of all, as to whether his time is relevant to, but there also  
8 is the question of -- brings in the Fulbright & Jaworski  
9 relationship.

10 THE COURT: Well, I don't know where we're going, but  
11 we'll just have to play it by ear. Time is relevant. Time is  
12 very relevant on this opinion.

13 MR. DELLETT: Okay.

14 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) So what I'll tell you is that Exhibit 11  
15 is the collection of billing records that we were provided  
16 from yours, and did you go through your billing records and  
17 pull out those records that related to the two opinions that  
18 you gave? Is that what you did?

19 A. I asked someone to do that.

20 Q. Okay. And so, you took out from the collection billing  
21 entries that were unrelated to the opinion work you've done  
22 for Chaparral in this regard; is that right?

23 A. That was the intent.

24 Q. Okay. And you took -- what you did was on a daily basis,  
25 when you worked on this project, you reported the amount of



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 time you spent and you also recorded with some level of detail  
2 the task that you performed in connection with working on the  
3 opinion letter; is that right?

4 A. I think that's fair, yes.

5 Q. So, for example, if you talk to someone at Chaparral, you  
6 took down frequently with some level of detail in the bill,  
7 recorded in the bill the nature and content of that  
8 conversation; is that fair to say?

9 A. Generally, yes.

10 Q. And if you looked at some prior art on any given day, you  
11 may have recorded in your time entries what you looked at and  
12 how long it took you to do that task; is that right?

13 A. That was true of prior art as well as other tasks, yes.

14 Q. Okay. So Exhibit 11, then, is a fairly detailed road map  
15 of what you did and when you did it in connection with this  
16 analysis?

17 A. It provides relevant information.

18 Q. Okay. And it was kept in the ordinary course of business?

19 A. It's something we normally do.

20 Q. And the events that were recorded in here, you recorded on  
21 pretty much a daily basis at the end of the day, you -- or I  
22 know, maybe not daily, but near the time when you did the  
23 work?

24 A. Yes, it's typically done on a weekly basis, and I take  
25 notes during the day.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Okay. And then, these were transposed from your notes?

2 A. When I say notes, it's basically an indication of what I  
3 worked on for the day because I do remember what was involved.

4 Q. Okay.

5 A. So when you say transposition, no.

6 Q. Okay. Very good. Offer Exhibit 11 in evidence, your  
7 Honor.

8 MR. DELLETT: Yes, your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Come here.

10 (At the Bench, on the record.)

11 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, we object. He's just covered  
12 this stuff that deals with his opinion, first of all. The  
13 time records are only relevant up until the date he issues his  
14 opinion, which is November 30th, or so, of 199 -- or of 2000.  
15 So anything after that is not even relevant. He hasn't issued  
16 any --

17 THE COURT: I believe your partner asked if his  
18 opinion was still the same today. Today is September the 10th  
19 of 2001. Okay. That objection he's overruled. What's your  
20 next one?

21 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, there's entries in here  
22 regarding Fulbright & Jaworski communication. We were, of  
23 course, handling factual matters conveying pleadings, that  
24 sort of stuff, with Mr. Zinger. He wrote it down. There's no  
25 -- the defendant -- the plaintiffs move to eliminate to

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 prevent any articulation of opinions based upon anything that  
2 they got from Fulbright. That was sustained. We'd like to  
3 keep any of the entries of Fulbright & Jaworski out.

4 THE COURT: I didn't really see any opinions that were  
5 there when you showed me the exhibit earlier. The reference  
6 is that he did --

7 MR. DELLETT: He talked with his lawyer.

8 MR. BAHLER: I'm concerned by implication there would  
9 be some sort of an issue.

10 THE COURT: I can't -- if I could do things about  
11 implication, I would not be a lawyer. I'd be very wealthy and  
12 I would live someplace else. The objections are overruled.  
13 11 is in.

14 By the way, while we're here, Mrs. Sims has 39 out. I  
15 have 39 in. I have it in from the beginning, but she  
16 indicates that she thought that y'all withdrew it at some  
17 point in time.

18 MR. ALLCOCK: I think it's in.

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) If you would turn to --

21 THE COURT: I think I'm going to let the -- you're  
22 going to be with the witness for a while?

23 MR. ALLCOCK: Yes.

24 THE COURT: Members of the jury, I'm going to let you  
25 go to lunch, 1:25. Please remember the instructions.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 (Jury not present.)

2 THE COURT: Mr. Zinger, just remember in Texas, any  
3 conversations you have from now on are free game. All right.  
4 1:25.

5 (Lunch recess.)

6 THE COURT: Members of the jury, during the noon hour,  
7 did anyone attempt to talk to you about this case?

8 THE JURORS: No.

9 THE COURT: Did you talk to anybody about the case?

10 THE JURORS: No.

11 THE COURT: And did you learn anything at all about  
12 the case outside the presence of each other and this  
13 courtroom?

14 THE JURORS: No.

15 THE COURT: Show negative responses to all questions  
16 by all jurors.

17 Mr. Zinger, you remain under oath, sir.

18 THE WITNESS: Yes.

19 THE COURT: You may proceed.

20 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) Mr. Zinger, I want to ask you, although  
21 you never rendered an opinion with respect to the infringement  
22 of products with LUN zoning, you did have conversations with  
23 the representatives at Chaparral from time to time on that  
24 issue, didn't you?

25 A. On the issue of LUN zoning and the product, yes.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. And if you'd turn to Exhibit 11, your August time entries,  
2 and I want to ask you, quickly, about a few of those. Here it  
3 is, August 10th of the year 2000, roughly three months before  
4 you wrote your final opinion letter, and you were talking  
5 about whether or not a locked software feature may constitute  
6 patent infringement. Do you see?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And what you were talking with Mr. Walker about here is  
9 whether or not if you put a lock and a key on the LUN zoning  
10 feature, whether or not that would avoid infringement; is that  
11 right?

12 A. We did talk about it. I believe it was in terms of LUN  
13 zoning, but I don't have any specific recollection that it was  
14 LUN zoning.

15 Q. Okay. If you look down on the same bill on the 8-14  
16 entry, do you see where it's talking about controllably unlock  
17 of the LUN zoning feature?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. So it now -- as I understand, this happened some time ago.  
20 Is it now your recollection that you were here in August,  
21 discussing the notion of if you put a lock on the LUN zoning  
22 feature, whether or not that would avoid infringement?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Now, if you look at the bottom entry, it talks about a  
25 telephone discussion with F and J. Those are the Fulbright &

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Jaworski lawyers, the ones sitting here in this courtroom?

2 It's the bottom entry, August 15th?

3 MR. BAHLER: Objection, your Honor.

4 A. I see it.

5 THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

6 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) And here, you were talking about the  
7 ability to manufacture in certain products. Those would be  
8 products that have LUN zoning in them?

9 A. To the best of my recollection, I think that's right.

10 Q. And if you look at the top of the next page, this is an  
11 actual telephone conference with Messrs. Ravine -- he's  
12 someone from Chaparral?

13 A. He was at Chaparral at that time. I don't know if he's  
14 still there.

15 Q. But Messrs. Ravine and Walker are two Chaparral folks, at  
16 least, at this time?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And, again, this use of LUN zoning and the use of a key?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. The assumption for all of these conversations is that the  
21 use of LUN zoning would be infringing; isn't it?

22 A. No. The assumption is here's a feature that appears to be  
23 relevant to the patent, and the question is, are there options  
24 that can be explored concerning that feature.

25 Q. I understand, but if at this point in time, in August,

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 people had concluded that the use of LUN zoning was not  
2 infringing, you wouldn't need to be talking about this key  
3 business, would you?

4 A. If there was an absolute slam-dunk conclusion, no, you  
5 wouldn't have to.

6 Q. Okay. Now, after you wrote your opinion in November, you  
7 continued to talk about the issues that you addressed in that  
8 opinion on occasion with the folks at Chaparral; is that  
9 right?

10 A. This is after November 2000?

11 Q. Yes.

12 A. Yes. We talked in terms of the lawsuit. The LUN zoning,  
13 in particular, I don't have any specific recollection of that,  
14 no.

15 Q. Okay. If you take a look at your April 11, 2001 bill,  
16 this references a telephone call with Mr. Barrett, but the  
17 part of the entry I want to ask you about is the bottom part  
18 where it says, and give consideration as to what, if anything,  
19 might be done further with the opinion including to prepare to  
20 discuss this with Mr. Walker. Do you see that?

21 A. I see that.

22 Q. So here we are, in April of 2001, and your opinion was  
23 given in November of the year 2000, and here, you're giving  
24 consideration to --

25 THE COURT: Counsel, what's the relevance?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1           MR. ALLCOCK: The timing of the November letter is of  
2 extreme interest. They first found out about the patent in  
3 February. They first started talking to a lawyer in November  
4 -- I mean, in April. And they didn't get the final opinion  
5 letter until November 20th.

6           And I believe that it's very relevant that as this  
7 witness just testified, the impetus for them getting that  
8 letter done was not to be timely in a reasonable fashion; it's  
9 because they knew that if they didn't get it done, it would  
10 likely be excluded from evidence in this case.

11          MR. DELLETT: The law of willful infringement, as your  
12 Honor I'm sure knows, is that the opinion is before the  
13 allegedly infringing activity. And the fact that counsel for  
14 Gray Cary requested it before Chaparral even sold devices that  
15 are alleged to infringe, I don't think there's any relevance  
16 there.

17          THE COURT: Well, there's no question that it's  
18 relevant. And there's no question that this gentleman has  
19 already provided the testimony that it triggered a necessity  
20 for his opinion. My problem on admissibility is that it has  
21 language that I do not think relevant, which is written in an  
22 advocacy way.

23          I do not have -- I will permit you to ask the witness  
24 whatever questions that you wish, but I do not intend on  
25 getting into your or Mr. Bernstein -- excuse me, Mr.



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Bernstein's idea of what the law is or what you or your client  
2 would do in the event that no opinion was forthcoming.

3 MR. ALLCOCK: Very well, your Honor.

4 THE COURT: So you'll have to choose your questions  
5 carefully, but you're entitled to, though the circumstances --

6 MR. ALLCOCK: Okay. Very well.

7 THE COURT: Ask Mr. Zinger back in, please. Mr.  
8 Zinger, at this point in time, I'm not going to admit the  
9 letter as evidence, but my ruling is that counsel has the  
10 right to ask you regarding the circumstances of the timing of  
11 the letter and your report. And I guess we'll just play it by  
12 ear. All right. Bring the jury in.

13 (Jury present.)

14 THE COURT: You may proceed.

15 MR. ALLCOCK: Thank you, your Honor.

16 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) Mr. Zinger, you had been working on this  
17 opinion issue from March of 2000. You'd written a draft in  
18 June of 2000, but as of the date of Exhibit 31, that is,  
19 November 13th of 2000, you had finalized the opinion letter;  
20 is that right?

21 A. Finalized meaning I had not signed it, correct.

22 Q. What about Exhibit 31 prompted you to finalize the letter  
23 at this time?

24 A. My understanding is that Chaparral wanted to rely on my  
25 opinion, discovery was ending, and Crossroads had the

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 opportunity to review that opinion and take discovery on it,  
2 and so, therefore, they needed time to have that done.

3 Q. Okay. Very good. Now, then you did come out with the  
4 opinion on November 20th of 2000, and as I understand it, it  
5 relies on one prior art reference and one prior art reference  
6 only, and that's this Sun SPARC workstation; is that right?

7 A. The main or the essence of the opinion is on one reference  
8 in the sense of it's one product. There's a number of  
9 publications related to that one product.

10 Q. Okay. But no other product is relied upon. It's only  
11 this Sun SPARC workstation; is that right?

12 A. With respect to all main claims.

13 Q. Okay. With respect to the invalidity of the claims, for  
14 example, that deal with access controls, the Sun workstation  
15 is the only piece of prior art that you selected to include in  
16 your letter?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And you and others had spent quite a lot of time from  
19 March, when you started on the project, through here until  
20 November, looking at various pieces of prior art, had you not?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And you had had discussions with people at Chaparral and  
23 discussions with people at Fulbright and Jaworski with respect  
24 to prior art searching that had been done; is that right?

25 A. Yes.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. If you look at Exhibit 11, and I'm just going to point to  
2 one example here on June 21 of the year 2000, you had spent  
3 five and a half hours at a meeting at the offices of  
4 Chaparral, and one of the topics discussed in that was  
5 potential prior art that would invalidate the claims of the  
6 972 patent; is that right?

7 A. Yes. And I don't remember if it was more of a general of  
8 here's where we can look for prior art as opposed to here's a  
9 piece of prior art. This may be relevant.

10 Q. Okay. But over the course of time, you actually looked at  
11 quite a number of different prior art references and in the  
12 end, selected some?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And one of the prior art references that you considered --  
15 and I'm looking at your 4-17 billing entry -- is this Adaptec  
16 technology that we've heard while -- well, you haven't heard  
17 but we've heard so much about. Is that one of the references  
18 that you considered?

19 A. Yes, whatever that paper is. I looked at it. That point  
20 in time in connection with two areas, one being understanding  
21 the technology because that was early on, and the other one  
22 was to see if there might be some relevance as it relates to  
23 the Crossroads patent.

24 Q. Very good. And that one didn't make the cut, the Sun  
25 SPARC workstation, what was better than this Adaptec prior art

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 in your opinion?

2 A. I don't think I arrived at that opinion. I didn't use it,  
3 but I don't think necessarily I would have decided one piece  
4 of prior art is -- can't be used versus another one can be.

5 Q. Okay. And then, I notice the next entry down there talks  
6 about the HP Mux. Did you see that? Do you see that?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Look at that, too.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And that didn't find its way into your opinion?

11 A. I think the same answer applies to this particular item,  
12 as well.

13 Q. Okay. Now, actually, your opinion, your final one opinion  
14 -- your final opinion actually concludes that the access  
15 controls of the 972 patent don't cover a reserve release  
16 function; is that right?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. So, at least in your judgment, the access controls that  
19 are disclosed and claimed in the 972 patent don't cover this  
20 reserve release thing; is that right?

21 A. Generally stated, that's correct.

22 Q. For example, if you looked at page 19 of your opinion, you  
23 talk about these access controls and reserve release and you  
24 come to the conclusion that providing controls to limit a  
25 computer's access doesn't encompass a reserve command. Is

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 that still your conclusion today?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And the only thing that the Sun workstation does is

4 provide these reserve commands; is that right?

5 A. I'm aware that it does do that. I'm not aware of what it

6 doesn't do or what it may also do.

7 Q. So no one's told you, for example, that the Sun

8 workstation has LUN zoning in it, for example?

9 A. No one has told me that.

10 Q. And the papers don't show that, do they?

11 A. Not that I could find.

12 Q. Now, this Sun workstation that you end up relying upon in

13 November was actually presented to you way back at the very

14 beginning, wasn't it?

15 A. Part of the publications -- I don't remember which ones --

16 were provided early on.

17 Q. Okay. Now, if you look at Exhibit 19, which is in your

18 book, it's a e-mail from Mr. Walker to a Mr. Selinger

19 referencing a conversation he had with you, and it's dated

20 March 14th of the year 2000. Do you see that e-mail? I'm

21 referring to the part in the middle that says Jerry Walker

22 wrote. Do you see that?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Now, you have the Sun workstation material in hand as of

25 this date, right?

1 A. Not all of it.

2 Q. Not all of it. But you had enough to conclude that the  
3 Sun workstation didn't have these access control features  
4 because you were asking Mr. Selinger to try to find some prior  
5 art that did.

6 A. The information that I had with respect to those Sun Micro  
7 System disclosures did not mention reserve release or anything  
8 else that I remember related to access controls.

9 Q. Okay. But as you sit here today, you're still of the  
10 opinion that even with that additional information that you  
11 got, the Sun workstation doesn't have access controls as that  
12 term is properly construed in the 972 patent; is that right?

13 A. If I understand your question, no, that's not what I was  
14 saying.

15 Q. Well, I thought we just looked at your opinion, and you  
16 said that the 972 patent requires access controls, not reserve  
17 release?

18 A. What issue are we talking about?

19 Q. We're talking right now about whether or not the reserve  
20 release that is in the Sun equals access controls according to  
21 the 972 patent. It's your conclusion that it does not?

22 A. It's my conclusion that if the patent is interpreted the  
23 way I present it in my opinion, there's no infringement based  
24 on reserve release. But if it's interpreted so it does rely  
25 on or does encompass reserve release, then it's invalid.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. I understand that. But your opinion doesn't talk at all  
2 about whether or not products with LUN zoning would infringe;  
3 is that right?

4 A. You talk about infringe to that issue, no, does not.

5 Q. Okay. So what your opinion says is if you use reserve  
6 release, it's not covered by the patent whether it's prior art  
7 or a product; is that right?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. And it's silent as to the use of LUN zoning, your opinion?

10 A. The opinion as far as infringement's concerned, yes.

11 Q. Okay. So then, did anyone ever find prior art on access  
12 controls as you define the term?

13 A. The term as defined in the opinion something to the effect  
14 of no individual controls to limit access, and based on that  
15 could be interpreted to cover reserve release, which means  
16 access controls.

17 Q. Right. But you didn't interpret it that way, did you?

18 A. In my opinion?

19 Q. Yes.

20 A. No.

21 Q. So then, no one found prior art on access controls as you  
22 interpret the term?

23 A. As that opinion states, that's correct.

24 Q. I have no further questions of the witness, your Honor.

25

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 BY MR. DELLETT:

2 Q. Mr. Zinger, Mr. Allcock asked you some questions about  
3 your time records. Can you estimate during 2000 about what  
4 fraction of your working time was spent working for Chaparral?

5 A. During the year 2000?

6 Q. Right.

7 A. I'd say it was around ten percent if I had to guess.

8 Q. And was that the only thing you were doing for Chaparral  
9 at that time?

10 A. In the year 2000, no.

11 Q. Okay. What else were you doing for Chaparral at that  
12 time?

13 A. Latter part of the year, we were working on patent  
14 applications, inventions, doing searches, writing patent  
15 applications.

16 Q. Okay. Now, during that time, did you have any access to  
17 Crossroads' confidential information?

18 A. No.

19 Q. Now, did you spend more time during 2000 talking about  
20 what Crossroads had accused of infringement or about LUN  
21 zoning?

22 A. The reliance primarily was on what was thought to be the  
23 alleged infringing products.

24 Q. And what was that?

25 A. As stated in my opinions, I believe 1310 series of



1 products.

2 Q. And why were you focussing on those products rather than  
3 the ones with LUN zoning?

4 A. They were accused as being infringed by Crossroads, and I  
5 was not aware of any other relevant products that might relate  
6 to that study.

7 Q. And did your discussions with Mr. Walker about LUN zoning  
8 in any way change your opinion about whether or not the 972  
9 patent was valid?

10 A. No.

11 Q. And do you know of any requirement that -- let me back up  
12 for a minute here.

13 Mr. Allcock asked you about the fact that you just  
14 relied on the Sun SPARC storage array. Do you remember that?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And do you know of any requirement that you have more than  
17 one piece of prior art to invalidate a patent?

18 A. There's no requirement.

19 Q. Okay. Have you written opinions before in which you just  
20 use one piece of prior art to invalidate a patent?

21 A. Certainly to invalidate it, at least a claim with a patent  
22 and I believe -- and to give an opinion that the main claim  
23 was invalid.

24 Q. So in your experience, sometimes it just takes one piece  
25 of prior art to invalidate a patent?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And I believe Mr. Allcock also asked you about an e-mail,  
3 dated March 14th, 2000. I think it's Exhibit 19.

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. As of March 14th, did you know what Crossroads was  
6 accusing infringing the 972 patent?

7 A. No. The lawsuit hadn't been filed.

8 Q. When did you first find out that Crossroads was accusing  
9 of infringing the 972 patent?

10 A. The first information was the complaint that I saw, I  
11 believe, in early April.

12 Q. And that's the one that named the 1310 routers?

13 MR. ALLCOCK: Objection. Leading and misquotes the  
14 evidence.

15 Q. (BY MR. DELLETT) Do you remember what products were  
16 specified in that complaint?

17 A. I believe, again, it was a Series 1310.

18 Q. Nothing further.

19 RE-CROSS EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. ALLCOCK:

21 Q. Other than the complaint, is the only way that you  
22 determined what products were in the lawsuit by what Chaparral  
23 or the Fulbright lawyers told you?

24 A. No. I talked to -- well, when you say Chaparral, yes. I  
25 talked to Chaparral to see what other products they might have

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 that might have relevance.

2 Q. No further questions.

3 MR. DELLETT: Nothing further.

4 THE COURT: May this witness be excused, counsel?

5 MR. ALLCOCK: Yes, your Honor.

6 MR. DELLETT: Yes.

7 THE COURT: You may be excused, sir. You may call  
8 your next witness.

9 MR. GARRETT: Your Honor, our next witness is going to  
10 be our expert, Mr. Stephens. If I could have time to set up,  
11 I think things will go smooth from the beginning.

12 THE COURT: All right. Give you five minutes.

13 (Recess.)

14 THE COURT: Bring the jury in.

15 MR. GARRETT: Chaparral calls Mr. Gary Stephens.

16 (Witness was sworn.)

17 THE COURT: Come across and sit up here on the witness  
18 box, please, sir. Tell us your full name and spell your last.

19 THE WITNESS: My name is Gary Raymond Stephens. Last  
20 name is spelled S-T-E-P-H-E-N-S.

21 GARY R. STEPHENS, called by the Defendant, duly sworn.

22 DIRECT EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. GARRETT:

24 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Stephens.

25 A. Good afternoon.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Would you introduce yourself to the jury?

2 A. Yes. My name is Gary Stephens, and I own FSI Consulting  
3 Services, Tucson, Arizona.

4 Q. What does FSI stand for, Mr. Stephens?

5 A. Fibre Channel and SCSI Interfaces.

6 Q. And this is your company?

7 A. Yes, it is.

8 Q. Could you explain what FSI does?

9 A. FSI provides consulting services to major corporations to  
10 help their senior management and architects define what their  
11 products should look like. We train their programmers and  
12 engineers on how to use Fibre Channel and SCSI and their  
13 products, and then, we provide a test system to test the  
14 product, once it's finished, to see if it meets the  
15 requirements that we set up.

16 Q. Tell the jury how long you've owned FSI.

17 A. I started FSI in late 1993.

18 Q. And what did you do before FSI?

19 A. I worked at IBM.

20 Q. When did you start there?

21 A. August 1965.

22 Q. Can you explain to the jury the type of work you did at  
23 IBM?

24 A. Yes. I was a -- in several areas when I worked in product  
25 planning, define the requirements for new products, I worked

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 in engineering, I worked in the programming segment, software  
2 engineering and helped to design, write and implement the  
3 software goes into at least one product that connected one  
4 interface to another, the second interface being the SCSI  
5 interface.

6 Q. Mr. Stephens, we've heard a lot of talk over the course of  
7 the trial about SCSI and Fibre Channel, and the standards that  
8 relate to those two things.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Do you have any experience in that area?

11 A. Yes, I do.

12 Q. Can you explain to the jury what that experience consists  
13 of?

14 A. In 1986, while I was working at IBM, I was designated the  
15 representative for IBM to both the SCSI and, later, in 1988,  
16 to Fibre Channel committees, defined the standards we've been  
17 talking about the last week.

18 Q. Now, can you explain to the jury what it means to be a  
19 designee at a Fibre Channel or a SCSI committee?

20 A. In that role, you vote for the entire corporation. You  
21 represent the entire corporation.

22 Q. Now, how many designees did IBM have for a given standards  
23 committee?

24 A. The standards committee process allows exactly, well, at  
25 least one principal person and usually one alternate who can

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 vote in the absence of the principal member.

2 Q. Out of how many employees at IBM?

3 A. At that time, there was about 300,000.

4 Q. Now, what experience do you have specifically relating to  
5 the Fibre Channel and SCSI standards?

6 A. Well, in addition to representing IBM's interest at those  
7 committee meetings, I actively participated as the editor for  
8 one of the standards called the SCSI sequential commands,  
9 which defines tape drives, tape libraries. I worked on the  
10 arbitrary loop standard, which we've heard some about in this  
11 trial.

12 And I was the first editor for that when we first  
13 started that. And I was also the only editor for another  
14 document called a technical report which used map SCSI, as  
15 we've been talking about here, instead of Fibre Channel, map  
16 it over the internet.

17 Q. Mr. Stephens, have you authored or coauthored any books  
18 that relate the technology in this case?

19 A. Yes, I have.

20 Q. And what are those?

21 A. I have two books that I coauthored with Jon Dedek, who's  
22 the President of Hancock Corporation. One's called What Is  
23 Fiber Channel, very small book, and the second one is Fibre  
24 Channel, The Basics, which went through two editions as the  
25 coauthor. And then, I took over the ownership of that book

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 and I've created what is fibre -- Fibre Channel To Basics,  
2 Third Volume, which FSI owns.

3 Q. Now, in addition to the books, do you have any teaching or  
4 training experience that relates to the technology in this  
5 case?

6 A. Yes, I do.

7 Q. Could you explain that to the jury briefly?

8 A. All through my career, I tried to teach what I knew about  
9 different things they learned at IBM, but in the case of SCSI  
10 and Fibre Channel, I made it a professional goal to teach  
11 Fibre Channel and SCSI for various corporations around the  
12 world, and I taught those to the corporations themselves or in  
13 public forums, like, a hotel conference room.

14 Q. Now, Mr. Stephens, how does all this experience relate to  
15 the technology in the 972 patent?

16 A. Well, my experience at IBM was in storage, my whole  
17 career, and the Fibre Channel and SCSI standards, obviously,  
18 are the interfaces that we've been discussing here. And my  
19 ability to teach that to other people means that I understand  
20 it.

21 Q. Your Honor, Chaparral offers Mr. Stephens as an expert in  
22 the area of storage architecture.

23 MR. ALLCOCK: No objection, your Honor.

24 THE COURT: All right. You may proceed.

25 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Mr. Stephens, what have you been asked to

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 do in connection with this case?

2 A. I have been asked to look at the validity of the 972  
3 patent itself, and to look at infringement issues relative to  
4 Chaparral.

5 Q. Now, before we get into that, about how many hours have  
6 you spent analyzing those issues?

7 A. I have spent right around 200 hours.

8 Q. Okay. Let's talk about the validity part, first. Have  
9 you come to a conclusion about the validity of the 972 patent?

10 A. It's my opinion that the 972 patent was just invalid.

11 Q. And have you prepared or assisted in the preparation of  
12 any slides that will assist the jury in understanding how you  
13 got to that conclusion?

14 A. Yes, I have.

15 Q. Okay. Mr. Stephens, if you'll look at D-509, can you tell  
16 the jury what we're seeing here?

17 A. This is the cover slide for this analysis of the prior  
18 art.

19 Q. Actually, before we jump into this, explain to the jury  
20 just generally what you did in analyzing whether the 972  
21 patent was valid or not.

22 A. I looked at lots of material, lots of deposition  
23 testimony. I heard testimony in this courtroom, looked at the  
24 standard, looked at the product manuals, looked at all of the  
25 information that we could find about these various pieces of



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 prior art to see if they, in fact, had all the claim  
2 limitations in the 972 patent.

3 Q. Okay. And I'm going to let you take a look at the things  
4 you mentioned briefly.

5 A. My goodness. I didn't know there was so much of it.

6 Q. Mr. Stephens, if you will glance over the numbers on those  
7 volumes, you will see that they cover Defendant's Exhibit 1,  
8 21 through 31, 34 through 57, 84, 87 through 102, 104, 228,  
9 249, 263 and Plaintiff's Exhibit 220. I know you've looked at  
10 these in the past. Are these materials that you reviewed in  
11 coming to the conclusions you're going to testify about today?

12 A. Could I take just a peek?

13 Q. You can, as long as it's not a long one.

14 A. Those look very familiar.

15 Q. Okay. Is that a "Yes"?

16 A. Yes, sorry.

17 Q. Your Honor, all of those Exhibits have been admitted into  
18 evidence, say, Defendant's Exhibit 87 through 92, 101 and 102,  
19 and we would offer those into evidence at this time.

20 THE COURT: 87 to 92, 100 and what?

21 MR. GARRETT: 1 and 102.

22 MR. ALLCOCK: Could I just have a moment, your Honor?

23 THE COURT: Sure.

24 MR. ALLCOCK: No objection, your Honor.

25 THE COURT: All right. I didn't catch the exhibits

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 between 104 and 249.

2 MR. GARRETT: 228 was the only one between those  
3 numbers.

4 THE COURT: So then, the Court admits or readmits, as  
5 the case may be, 1, 21 through 31, 34 through 57, 87 through  
6 102, 104, 228, 249, 263 and Plaintiff's Exhibit 220.

7 MR. GARRETT: And I believe, your Honor, Defendant's  
8 Exhibit 84, as well, if you didn't mention that. He did,  
9 okay. Sorry.

10 THE COURT: Any objection to 84?

11 MR. ALLCOCK: No, your Honor.

12 THE COURT: All right. They're admitted.

13 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) How many pieces of prior art did you  
14 analyze in this case, Mr. Stephens?

15 A. I looked at ten, maybe eleven different pieces.

16 Q. What are you going to talk about today?

17 A. We're only going to talk about three of those today.

18 Q. And what are those three?

19 A. One is the Adaptec Coronado product that we've heard some  
20 about, the topic called the SCSI LUN mapping feature, and a  
21 patent that has access authorization features.

22 Q. In your opinion, do all of these pieces of prior art have  
23 access controls?

24 A. Yes, they do.

25 THE COURT: Let me -- SCSI, LUN mapping and the third

1 one?

2 THE WITNESS: Was the patent called the 771.

3 THE COURT: All right.

4 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Is the first part of your analysis the  
5 Adaptec Coronado product?

6 A. Yes, we're going to get them in that order, Adaptec first.

7 Q. Can you explain to the jury what exactly we're going to  
8 see with respect to those slides?

9 A. We're going to look at the 972 patent and its claims,  
10 we're going to look at the material or summary of the material  
11 that I've reviewed, which is down here, part of -- and try to  
12 find out if that prior art, in fact, contained every element  
13 that's listed on those two boards that you've been looking at.

14 Q. Can you describe the setup that we're going to see the  
15 Adaptec Coronado product in these slides?

16 A. We're going to see the Adaptec Coronado with multiple  
17 hosts and multiple devices.

18 Q. Now, is it your understanding that the Adaptec Coronado  
19 product could have been operated in that fashion?

20 A. Yes, it is.

21 Q. Before I get into that, do you guys have any objections to  
22 those slides?

23 MR. ALLCOCK: I'm not sure which ones they are. You  
24 submitted those?

25 MR. GARRETT: I do.

1 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Okay. Mr. Stephens, let's look at D-510.  
2 Could you explain what we're seeing in this slide?

3 A. This is a summary of some of the material that I've looked  
4 at for this analysis. We have the 972 patent, which you've  
5 seen the boards put up of that, the text of it, patent file  
6 history, and then, there's the three pieces of material that  
7 the -- that was not cited on the patent itself, the earlier  
8 invented Adaptec product, SCSI LUN mapping feature we're going  
9 to talk about, and another patent, U.S. patent which we just  
10 fondly call 771.

11 Q. Mr. Stephens, could you step down to the screen if that's  
12 okay with the Court.

13 THE COURT: Yes, that's fine.

14 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Could you tell us what the second version  
15 of D-510 shows?

16 A. This version says that if you look at the claims of the  
17 patent itself, it's broken down into three very distinct  
18 parts, one part tells you what the storage router is and what  
19 it's supposed to do, and the second part tells you what the  
20 network in which it's supposed to be present is to look like.  
21 And the last part tells you certain steps -- patent term is  
22 methods, things it must do, processes it must perform if it's  
23 to be classified as storage router.

24 Q. Mr. Stephens, I'd like to go back, just very briefly, to  
25 what you mean by the patent file history so that we

1 understand.

2 A. Okay. Patent file history, this is the patent itself, 11  
3 or 12 pages, something like that. This is all of the  
4 administrative documents that flowed back and forth between  
5 the inventors and the lawyers, and the Patent Office over a  
6 period of a couple of three years.

7 Q. Thank you. What are we seeing in part one on D-512?

8 A. As we've discussed, we're going to talk about the Adaptec  
9 Coronado product, first.

10 Q. And what does D-513 show?

11 A. I found it useful, if I could take the claims in the  
12 patent and break them up into topics as opposed to just a  
13 string of words. And so, we're going to talk about access  
14 controls, which is the hot topic, other functions besides  
15 access controls that the router has to do, the hardware, which  
16 you've seen the little cards in different products, hardware,  
17 the actual physical device itself, and then, some other things  
18 it must operate within that environment.

19 Then, on the right-hand side, I've left four spaces  
20 blank, and it's my goal to fill in each one of these as a  
21 check mark as I try to show you how the Adaptec Coronado  
22 product, in fact, meets and has exhibited those claim elements  
23 in history.

24 Q. Mr. Stephens, did you come to a conclusion about whether  
25 you can check in those boxes?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. Yes, I did.

2 Q. What is that?

3 A. My opinion is that I'm going to be able to fill them all  
4 four in.

5 Q. Tell us what D-514 is.

6 A. In the record and testimony, the Adaptec Coronado product  
7 uses a table for something that's called reserve management.  
8 Reserve management is the process by which different devices  
9 are allocated to or reserved for using this with a particular  
10 host.

11 Q. Did you hear Mr. Bahler's opening when he referred to the  
12 reserve command?

13 A. Yes, I did.

14 Q. Is he talking about the same thing, to the best of your  
15 knowledge, that you're talking about here?

16 A. Yes, the word "reserve" in all upper cases is a very  
17 specific SCSI command.

18 Q. What about mention of reserve release? Does that have a  
19 relationship to reserve management?

20 A. Release all upper case would be the companion command to  
21 this. One sets up the reservation, and a release command  
22 would then remove that reservation after setup.

23 Q. Okay. Tell us what the next slide 515 shows.

24 A. I think we've seen this one a couple of times. There's a  
25 processor, AMD 586 processor, and this Adaptec Coronado

1 bridge, and the patent you'll see that under the term  
2 supervisor unit. And that supervisor unit and its software or  
3 firmware, however you want to call it, manages a table, and  
4 that table has the name of a workstation if it's reserved on  
5 the left and a disk drive that is holding on the right.

6 Q. What do the next group of slides show?

7 A. We're going to attempt to show you how the access  
8 control's part of this setup.

9 Q. Okay. Let's look at the next slide. Tell us what we're  
10 seeing in D-516.

11 A. We have the picture of the product in its storage network.  
12 We have three workstations over here connected by Fibre  
13 Channel. You have the Adaptec Coronado product in the middle.  
14 Then, we have the SCSI bus over here connected to the disk  
15 devices. Here's the table from the previous chart. And what  
16 we saw fly in here was that red has reserved device three.  
17 Red reserves device three for himself. Green reserves device  
18 two. So we've colored the two devices to show you which one  
19 owns it.

20 Q. What are you saying by the boxed-out portion at the top  
21 left of that slide?

22 A. Well, that the storage space on these devices belongs to  
23 red and green, respectively. No one else is allowed to alter  
24 it.

25 Q. Okay. What are we going to see in the next few slides?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. We're going to see how several commands are going to react  
2 to function in this environment.

3 Q. Tell us about 517.

4 A. First command we're going to talk about is right, the  
5 right command attempts to alter, change the storage on this  
6 device over here. I'm sorry, two. This one in green. And  
7 so, this workstation can send that command. He's not  
8 restricted from sending the command. It's the Adaptec  
9 Coronado's job to look in his table for device two and see  
10 that green owns it and deny it.

11 Q. Is that what we see in 518?

12 A. Yes. This product here, looking at this table says no.  
13 When he sends back a response which is treated as access  
14 denied.

15 Q. What are we seeing in D-519, Mr. Stephens?

16 A. Other command is a read command. The read command is like  
17 opening a file in your word processor or letter or something  
18 and you want to change. Again, it's going to device two,  
19 attempting to go to device two. It will come back to the  
20 Adaptec Coronado, again, over Fibre Channel. Same result if  
21 you look in the table, you're going to find that green owns  
22 two which then comes red, access denied.

23 Q. I think our slide show's racing ahead of us. Could you  
24 briefly explain to us what I think you identified what a read  
25 command is? What is write command?



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. A write command is saving a file after you do something in  
2 your word processor and you say save file. It's writing it to  
3 the disk so you can look at it again some other day.

4 Q. Okay. Please explain what we briefly saw in D-521.

5 A. Okay. 521 is a different kind of a command. It's called  
6 inquiry, and green, again, he's going to try anything. So  
7 he's going to try a three. Adaptec Coronado product is going  
8 to look in his table three, and he's going to see that red  
9 owns it and, in this case, this command is going to be denied,  
10 as well.

11 Q. And is that what we're seeing in 522?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. What -- can you explain to the jury what an inquiry  
14 command is?

15 A. One of the simplest ways to think about an inquiry command  
16 is a resume. It's information about a device, but it doesn't  
17 provide any information about the files that are on that  
18 device.

19 Q. Now, where in inquiry command to actually get through to  
20 No. 3 by green, would that affect the security of the user  
21 data on 3 in your opinion?

22 A. Absolutely not.

23 Q. What are we seeing in No. 523, Mr. Stephens?

24 A. There's another type of command called request sense, and  
25 blue up here is going to attempt to go to three down here.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Again, you can form the command and send it. It's Adaptec  
2 Coronado's job to look in this table for 3. He sees that red  
3 is the current owner of that storage space, and so, he's not  
4 going to let that command through either.

5 Q. And is that what we're seeing in D-524?

6 A. Response from -- back directly from the Adaptec Coronado.  
7 Notice there's been no activity on the right whatsoever, and  
8 again, it gets the access denied response.

9 Q. Okay. Explain what D-525 is, Mr. Stephens.

10 A. Well, this is kind of a small picture, but in the -- this  
11 is all the claims on the last page of the patent itself when  
12 you look at it. And these marked-in areas are all the  
13 references to access controls. It's just kind of scattered  
14 around. That's why it's kind of nice to lump it all together.

15 Q. So what's our next step?

16 A. Next step is to check off that first box.

17 Q. That's what's being shown in 526?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Now, what's the next thing you're going to see, Mr.  
20 Stephens?

21 A. The next one is some other functions beyond access  
22 controls which is isolated because it's potential. There's  
23 some other functions that the product has to do. We're going  
24 to look at those, see if they're present, also.

25 Q. What other function are you talking about?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. One is mapping which we've heard about this morning a  
2 little bit, and low-level block protocols, native low-level  
3 block protocols.

4 Q. Okay. What are we seeing in D-527?

5 A. Okay. This time, we're seeing red attempt to command to  
6 three, and because the table says red owns three, the command  
7 is going to go through there. In this case, this workstation  
8 uses a protocol called Fibre Channel protocol, FCP, Fibre  
9 Channel protocol. And in that protocol lives the SCSI  
10 command.

11 On the other side of the Adaptec Coronado product, we  
12 have a different interface, so we have this software in this  
13 Coronado product, translate it, transform or change it so it's  
14 acceptable to this, and when it does, it goes to storage  
15 device No. 3.

16 Q. Okay. What are we seeing in 528?

17 A. We're seeing now that the response goes back again on this  
18 side, it's in the SCSI interface rules, Coronado product, and  
19 translates it so that it's acceptable on the Fibre Channel  
20 side and sends it back to the workstation.

21 Q. Have you shown this, again, in the upcoming slides?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And is that true in D-529?

24 A. This time, green is trying to get to 2 and, again, Fibre  
25 Channel side with the SCSI command in it, translated and sent

1 to storage device No. 2.

2 Q. And in D-530?

3 A. The response now comes back as explained.

4 Q. Could you explain how you've illustrated mapping?

5 A. The hosts over here can only see the logical unit numbers,  
6 one, two, three. They don't actually know where these devices  
7 are on the right-hand side. So the function of the Coronado  
8 product is to in its table to say, if you ask for one, I will  
9 find it on the right-hand side of the chart. Don't worry  
10 about it. I know where it's at. That's the mapping. I hand  
11 you a coordinate and you take it there.

12 Q. Now, what about virtual local storage? What are you  
13 intending to show by including that in the heading of this  
14 slide?

15 A. It's my opinion virtual local storage is not an element of  
16 the claims of the 972 patent. But just in case the jury  
17 should decide, then we have to talk about it.

18 Q. Let me back you up a minute, Mr. Stephens. Why is it your  
19 opinion that virtual local storage is not on --

20 A. First line of the patent says something like a storage  
21 router providing, so the router is what's doing the work. The  
22 side effect is the virtual local storage itself, so there's  
23 really nothing unusual. It's just additional information.

24 If you took the entire patent and left out the phrase,  
25 you wouldn't change its meaning.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Now, you mentioned if virtual local storage is a  
2 limitation, you've mentioned it in the slide for a reason.  
3 What is that reason?

4 A. The reason is that should you decide that it is a  
5 limitation, then it's my job to show you whether it is or is  
6 not present in the Adaptec product.

7 Q. Okay. Let's move to the next slide, Mr. Stephens. What  
8 are we seeing in 531?

9 A. We have the other functions we're adding to the list. We  
10 have the access controls straight out, and we have the new  
11 list, covers all of the mapping, LUN access using native  
12 low-level block protocols and reference to virtual local  
13 storage should not be a limitation.

14 Q. What's the next step in your analysis?

15 A. Check box No. 2.

16 Q. Is that what we're seeing in 531?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Next is the router hardware?

19 A. Yes, router hardware 2.

20 Q. Could you give a brief explanation of hardware again? I  
21 think we've got it.

22 A. Well, it's the physical box. It's the little green card  
23 that's been moving around the room. It has the green card  
24 carries the chips and wires that are embedded in there, and  
25 that's hardware as opposed to the programs that people write

1 that run inside of the processor.

2 Q. Okay. What are we seeing in 533, Mr. Stephens?

3 A. Well, there are four pieces of hardware that you have to  
4 deal with in the patent. They're all four right here in the  
5 upper left-hand corner of the claims. The first one is that  
6 there's a buffer provides memory space. And on the Adaptec  
7 Coronado product, the testimony and the picture shows the word  
8 "cache," 16 megabytes and the testimony has been provided that  
9 that is the buffer for the Adaptec product.

10 Q. What is the next piece of hardware we're going to look at?

11 A. The Fibre Channel controller.

12 Q. Okay. Is that what we're seeing in 534?

13 A. Right. See it in the green color here, Emerald, the name  
14 of the chip. The companies use these code names for their  
15 chips. So Emerald was the name Adaptec assigned to that  
16 particular chip while they were developing it. And this is  
17 the Fibre Channel controller.

18 Q. What's next, Mr. Stephens?

19 A. The next is the SCSI controller.

20 Q. Okay. And is that what we're seeing in 535?

21 A. Three different places on the patent claims, you see the  
22 SCSI controller, this chip called Excalibur internally, but  
23 the AIC 7895 is its commercial name, was made by Adaptec to  
24 attach SCSI devices with their cable.

25 Q. Explain to us why on the left-hand column the bottom

1 purple square looks a little bulkier than the top square.

2 A. This one.

3 Q. Yeah. Why is that?

4 A. Well, this one says you have to have a controller, and  
5 this one tells you what has to be in the controller, the  
6 second step. So if you look at this chip, you get this claim.  
7 If you look at this one, you have to look inside of it to see  
8 what's inside of the controller itself.

9 Q. And are the inside there?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. What about the middle purple one on the right?

12 A. This one here says that something like that chip must be  
13 capable or that function must be capable of pulling data from  
14 the buffer this way, and putting it on the SCSI bus, and must  
15 be able to push data into the buffer that it receives off of.

16 Q. And is that present in the chip you've identified on the  
17 right?

18 A. Yes, it is.

19 Q. Okay. Is that same situation true for the green squares?

20 A. Yeah, we have --

21 Q. With respect to the Fibre Channel controller?

22 A. Yeah, we have the large green space for Fibre Channel  
23 here. Again, it says there must be a way to operate correctly  
24 on the Fibre Channel side of the protocol unit. There's a  
25 FIFO in here and there's a DMA engine in there, and all of

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 those are present in that Emerald chip.

2 Q. Mr. Stephens, what's the last piece of hardware we're  
3 going to look at?

4 A. The last piece is the supervisor unit.

5 Q. And is that what we're seeing in the next line, 536?

6 A. We've seen this before. Supervising unit is this AMD 586  
7 chip slide, and plus this programming runs the router itself.

8 Q. What does AMD stand for?

9 A. Advanced Micro Devices.

10 Q. Is that here in Austin?

11 A. At least part of it.

12 Q. So what's the next step, Mr. Stephens?

13 A. Well, there's only four elements here, so it's time to  
14 check off box No. 3.

15 Q. Okay. What are we seeing in 537, briefly?

16 A. Well, this just shows the four pieces altogether.

17 Q. Okay.

18 A. The buffer, the Fibre Channel controller, the SCSI  
19 controller and the supervising unit all accumulating on the  
20 chart.

21 Q. Is the box checking next?

22 A. Yes. I'm sorry, yes.

23 Q. And is that in 538?

24 A. Right. That's Claims 1 to 6 and 10.

25 Q. Okay. Now, explain to the jury what the last section in



1 your table is.

2 A. Well, these -- this part here doesn't deal with the outer  
3 itself. It deals with things that are attached to the router.  
4 And so, it covers the workstations or the computers that we've  
5 heard about, and it covers the disk drives that we've seen on  
6 the right-hand side --

7 Q. Okay.

8 A. -- of the product.

9 Q. What are we seeing in 539?

10 A. Well, this picture, we've labeled, then, as workstations,  
11 but certainly there's evidence to show that this device could  
12 work with multiple workstations. On the right-hand side, the  
13 SCSI bus cable, you have the different hard drives.

14 Q. All right. And tell the jury what we're seeing in 540.

15 A. Well, we filled in all of the references to workstations  
16 and hard disk drives and shown that if you look at all of  
17 them, these are called by the Adaptec product itself.

18 Q. Okay. What's the next step?

19 A. The last box.

20 Q. Okay. Is that what's in 541?

21 A. Yes, it is.

22 Q. Okay. Let's look at 542. Can you explain to the jury --  
23 excuse me, 544. Actually, before you explain that, Mr.  
24 Stephens, okay, what is a reset?

25 A. I'm going to go back here. On the original SCSI bus,

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 parallel bus, it's on the right-hand side of the product, it  
2 was a signal that was sent out to essentially restart the  
3 devices on that cable.

4 Q. Okay.

5 A. With Fibre Channel, the equivalent function comes along on  
6 the Fibre Channel itself and has the same effect as if you had  
7 that signal on the SCSI buses.

8 Q. What does it mean to reset the Adaptec Coronado product?

9 A. It essentially asks each device to start over as if it had  
10 just been taken out of the box, just to power up and to begin  
11 again with no history.

12 Q. Does that have any effect on the information on the table  
13 that you showed on the slides?

14 A. With the Adaptec?

15 Q. Yes.

16 A. Yes, it would.

17 Q. Okay. And what does it do?

18 A. It would clear the table.

19 Q. Okay. Now, what does a power cycle mean with respect to  
20 the Adaptec Coronado product itself?

21 A. A power cycle if the power turned on and operated, you  
22 turn it off and then, turn it back on is the power cycle.

23 Q. Would that alter the information on the table?

24 A. Yes, it would.

25 Q. And what would it do?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. It would clear the reservations we've just been talking  
2 about.

3 Q. Okay. Now, do either one of those events, a reset if --  
4 as you've described it or power cycle, clearing the tables,  
5 does that have any effect on your analysis of whether the  
6 claims are invalid in view of Adaptec?

7 A. It does not.

8 Q. Why not?

9 A. Because in the patent itself, you may or may not retain  
10 the information of cross power cycles and resets.

11 Q. Have you prepared a slide that shows that?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Is that what we're seeing in D-544?

14 A. This is a section of the patent itself. This is column 6  
15 of the patent down here in the corner is a paragraph which has  
16 been expanded here, and there's lots of things that can happen  
17 here, but one of them, the one that's important here is that  
18 this configuration information can be retained, not must be  
19 retained, and power cycle.

20 Q. What does the configuration in that sentence refer to?

21 A. That includes the mapping tables and the reservations.

22 Q. Okay. What are we seeing in your conclusion slide, D-542?

23 A. It's my opinion that with the work that I've just shown  
24 you, in summary, that the prior art Adaptec product has all  
25 the claim elements that are in that 972 patent.

1 Q. And what does that mean?

2 A. It means in this case that the Adaptec Coronado product  
3 anticipates or already has had in its fiber and being  
4 everything that was in the patent.

5 Q. I see. Okay. Now, before we move on, Mr. Stephens, let  
6 me ask you, are there any other -- you could step back up just  
7 for a second. I may wind up having you move around a little  
8 bit. Are there any other pieces of art that you considered  
9 that do access controls besides the Adaptec product?

10 A. Yes, I mentioned we do the SCSI LUN mapping feature and  
11 the access authorization feature of the 771 patent.

12 Q. Okay. Now, let's address the LUN mapping first. Have you  
13 prepared slides that will assist the jury in understanding  
14 your analysis with respect to SCSI LUN mapping?

15 A. Yes, I have.

16 Q. Okay. Step back down, if you would, please, sir. Okay.  
17 Mr. Stephens, what are we seeing in this first slide, 601?

18 A. This is the title slide for the second part, the SCSI LUN  
19 mapping feature.

20 Q. Okay. Now, what are we going to see in the SCSI LUN  
21 mapping slides? What system have you presented?

22 A. The SCSI LUN mapping is a feature of the SCSI standards,  
23 SCC standard, in particular, and this one -- we're going to  
24 show how it operates or would operate in an environment with  
25 multiple workstations again and multiple SCSI devices.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Now, are you saying that you know that this system we're  
2 about to see actually physically existed in the prior art?

3 A. No, it did not exist as a physical device that you could  
4 buy yourself. It is described in the SCSI standards as a tool  
5 that one could put in a device if you wanted to. So it's  
6 fully described.

7 Q. Okay. And so, that being the case, why are we going to  
8 see it in this next group of slides?

9 A. Well, there's some question about the reserve management  
10 that I just talked about and whether or not reserve management  
11 constitutes access controls. And should you decide that  
12 reserve management is not access controls, I want to show you  
13 another feature that was available at the time to do the same  
14 thing that does provide access controls.

15 Q. Okay. Let's see the first slide, Mr. Stephens. Explain  
16 what -- oh, no, that's right. D-602.

17 A. Right. Again, we have the very similar picture, three  
18 workstations on Fibre Channel, we have three devices, but we  
19 have four partitions, this device has been divided into two  
20 partitions or two parts. And in this particular case, we have  
21 a map just for host red or for workstation red. And that  
22 table exists this device, and unit 1 as he thinks about it is  
23 map two, disk drive one.

24 And when he talks about device 2, the mapping is going  
25 to take you to this device 3 over here. So I call it 1, you

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 call it 1, I call it 2, you call it 3. And mapping is  
2 handled, again, like I said, this mapping is maintained and  
3 remembered by the device itself.

4 Q. Okay. Mr. Stephens, if you'll give me just one second.

5 Okay. What are we going to see in the next few  
6 slides?

7 A. Well, we're going to look at a map maintained for blue and  
8 we're going to look for a map maintained for three, and we're  
9 going to look at all of them, all three together.

10 Q. Is 602 the blue map?

11 A. Yes, blue is the workstation has his own map in his device  
12 and his 1 is this device is 1. His 2 as he thinks about it is  
13 really this piece of story over here, again, the mapping,  
14 independent of whatever red had.

15 Q. All right. Mr. Stephens, tell the jury what's in 604?

16 A. Green, third one here is No. 1, his No. 1 here, but his  
17 No. 2 as he thinks about it is map 2, device 2B.

18 Q. Have you prepared slides -- a slide that pulls this all  
19 together and shows the net result?

20 A. Yes, I have.

21 Q. Is that what we see in 605?

22 A. Yes, it is. Green has access to 1 globally and 2B, blue  
23 has access to 1 and 2A. And red has access to 1 and 3.

24 Q. In this situation, Mr. Stephens, can red get access to 2A  
25 or 2B?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. No, it cannot.

2 Q. In this situation, can blue get access to 2B or 3?

3 A. No.

4 Q. What about green? Can he get access to 3 or 2A?

5 A. Cannot.

6 Q. Okay. Mr. Stephens, what did the SCSI standards teach you  
7 about how these maps can be set up?

8 A. First of all, there's a map per host, as we just saw,  
9 three pictures. Second of all, these maps can be saved in  
10 what's called nonvolatile storage. The easiest way to think  
11 of it is it can be saved in such a way that after a reset or a  
12 power cycle, the map is still available.

13 Q. And is it possible in that situation -- well, first of  
14 all, can they be set up -- can the maps be set up so that the  
15 workstations are prevented from altering them?

16 A. Yes, that, too.

17 Q. Is it possible to set the maps up so that one map is  
18 associated with a particular workstation?

19 MR. ALLCOCK: Objection, your Honor. Relevance as to  
20 what's possible.

21 MR. GARRETT: I'm presenting this to make our case  
22 about why SCSI LUN and mapping is in Mr. Stephens' opinion  
23 access control. And for the purpose of the record, the SCSI  
24 standard and Mr. Stephens' opinion do teach these permutations  
25 that I'm discussing, so this is not a hypothetical situation

1 in that sense.

2 In other words, the standard would say he could do it  
3 this way or this way.

4 THE COURT: I'll let you cross him on it. Overrule  
5 the objection. You may answer.

6 A. Please restate.

7 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) I don't remember. Does the SCSI standard  
8 teach setting up the maps up in a way that would prevent  
9 workstations -- actually, excuse me, setting the maps up in a  
10 way that would allow one map to be associated with a given  
11 workstation?

12 A. Yes, they do.

13 Q. Okay. And in the situation that we talked about just  
14 before, which is the maps are set up to be saved over power  
15 cycles?

16 A. Yes, sir.

17 Q. Let me step forward. Did the SCSI standards teach setting  
18 the map up -- maps up so that workstations cannot alter them?

19 A. Yes, it does.

20 Q. In that sense, do the SCSI standards teach setting up the  
21 maps via an administrator?

22 A. Yes, it does.

23 Q. Okay. Could you tell us what we're going to see in the  
24 next slide, Mr. Stephens, if you recall?

25 A. I do recall.



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Okay.

2 A. Now I recall.

3 Q. Okay. Tell us what we're seeing in D-607.1.

4 A. Again, we have a table here and we have six items that are  
5 part of the LUN mapping feature that you have one map per  
6 workstation, we just saw that. You have each map can be  
7 assigned to access different storage. We saw that in the  
8 demonstration. That the maps can be saved over power cycles  
9 and resets.

10 That there is denial of access to storage that's not  
11 on your map. Just can't get there from here. That the  
12 workstations cannot alter their maps. They can be set up so  
13 they can't alter the maps. And that the maps can be altered  
14 by an administrator.

15 Q. Mr. Stephens, explain the significance of pointing out  
16 these features in SCSI LUN mapping.

17 A. Well, I believe it was last week, Mr. Bianchi was a  
18 witness, and he was asked these six questions about the device  
19 mapping feature that Crossroads calls Catamaran, Catamaran  
20 device mapping feature, and he answered "Yes" to each one of  
21 these that you can have one map per workstation, that each map  
22 can assign, that each map can be saved, there is denial of  
23 access, that the workstations can alter, and that the maps can  
24 be altered by -- cannot alter -- I'm sorry, and that the maps  
25 can be done, and he says that was access controls.

1           So the Catamaran device mapping feature was claimed to  
2 be access controls. It has exactly these same six features.

3 Q. Mr. Stephens, you mentioned a moment ago that the reason  
4 we were looking at these slides had to do with a question  
5 about whether reserve management is access control?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. Do you have any opinions about whether you can combine  
8 SCSI LUN mapping with another piece of prior art?

9 A. It's my understanding that if you have one piece of prior  
10 art that has most of the claims and you have a second piece of  
11 prior art that has the rest of the claims, that you can  
12 combine the two together to cover all of the claims.

13 Q. And have you done that in your analysis?

14 A. Yes, I have.

15 Q. And what other piece of prior art is that?

16 A. We have the SCSI LUN mapping, and we go back to the  
17 Adaptec Coronado product.

18 Q. Okay. Is that what we're seeing in D-621?

19 A. Yes. It's my opinion that the Adaptec Coronado product  
20 has access controls in it already, but if you decide  
21 otherwise, then the access control feature is not here. That  
22 covers every claim in the invention. And so, if you -- that  
23 would be everything covered except that. If you add the LUN  
24 mapping feature, then you, in fact, have a complete  
25 description of exactly what's in the 972 patent.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. When you say you have an exact description of what's in  
2 the 972 patent, can you explain to the jury how that relates,  
3 if at all, to validity?

4 A. Well, each of the claims would be covered by either this  
5 or that, and so you can check off all 14 claims.

6 Q. In what flavor of validity is that, Mr. Stephens?

7 A. Before we had anticipation. In this case, it's called  
8 obviousness. It's obvious that if you put these two together,  
9 then it would meet -- the combination would provide all of the  
10 elements of the claim.

11 Q. Okay. Could you explain what you considered in arriving  
12 at that conclusion of obviousness?

13 A. There's four components, I believe, in patent law for  
14 this. One is you have to cover the scope and content of the  
15 prior art itself. You have to cover the differences between  
16 the prior art and the 972 patent in this case. You have to  
17 cover the motivation that one would have to put the two  
18 together as a combination.

19 And then, the last step is that you have to look at  
20 secondary considerations, lots of words.

21 Q. Mr. Stephens, for this combination, can you explain what  
22 the scope and content of the prior art was?

23 A. The scope and the content of the prior art were these two  
24 preexisting pieces of information, Adaptec Coronado and the  
25 SCSI LUN mapping.

1 Q. Can you explain what the differences are between the prior  
2 art and claims of the 972 patent are for this combination?

3 A. Well, as we said, my claim that this by itself is prior  
4 art and meets all the claims, but if the reserve management is  
5 not considered access controls, then this does not meet it at  
6 all. But if you add the SCSI LUN mapping feature, which is an  
7 identical function to the access controls, then the  
8 combination of each two has all of the elements.

9 Q. What was the motivation that you spoke of for this  
10 combination, Mr. Stephens?

11 A. Well, principal issue here is data security. It's the  
12 biggest item. And certainly, this provides increased level of  
13 security for the system because of the way it denied access.

14 Q. And this is what for the record?

15 A. SCSI LUN mapping feature.

16 Q. Okay.

17 A. And, in addition, the SCSI standard has a full description  
18 of this. So if you take engineers and programmers -- and we  
19 use the phrase here -- skilled in the art, okay, not just  
20 anybody, but those skilled in these particular topics that you  
21 would have reason to believe that they could understand and  
22 implement the combination of these two. And then, after you  
23 implemented it, you would have reason to believe that they  
24 would be successful with that product.

25 Q. You mentioned secondary consideration. What secondary

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 considerations were you speaking of with respect to those  
2 combinations?

3 A. Secondary considerations, the patent itself, Crossroads  
4 has not achieved commercial success with the patent itself.  
5 And second, from Mr. Russell's deposition and testimony, it's  
6 clear that this did not meet any long-felt need, the 972  
7 patent.

8 Q. Okay. Now, I believe you mentioned earlier that there was  
9 another feature in the prior art that you felt met access  
10 controls?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. What is that?

13 A. That's the -- what's called the access authorization  
14 feature of the 771 patent.

15 Q. Now, have you prepared some slides that analyze the 771  
16 patent?

17 A. Yes, I have.

18 Q. Okay. And is this the first slide?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. What are we going to see in the next group, Mr. Stephens?

21 A. We're going to look at another patent, different patent  
22 familiarly called the 771 patent that has something called an  
23 access authorization feature, and it also allows partitioning  
24 of a disk drive 2A and 2B like we had a minute ago. It allows  
25 you to partition those discs.

1 Q. Okay. Do you have an opinion about whether the 771 patent  
2 has an impact on the validity of the Crossroads patent?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And could you explain to the jury what that opinion is?

5 A. The 771 patent anticipates claims -- I believe it's 1 to 4  
6 and 7 to 14, all but two of them, all but 5 and 6 of the 972  
7 patent.

8 Q. Now, you mentioned Claims 5 and 6 are not in that group.

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. What about Claims 5 and 6? Does the 771 patent impact  
11 Claims 5 and 6?

12 A. Well, if it were to be -- if it were to totally  
13 invalidate, you'd have to have 5 and 6.

14 Q. I see. Is there anything that you consider combinable  
15 with the 771 patent to arrive at 5 and 6?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And what is that?

18 A. The Crossroads 1996 Comdex display.

19 Q. Is that part of your -- what portion of your slide sheet?

20 A. Yeah, toward the end.

21 Q. Okay. Let's look at the first slide, Mr. Stephens. What  
22 are we seeing?

23 A. This is the cover page of the 771 patent up here. Here's  
24 the title of it, data storage apparatus with improved security  
25 process and partition allocation. Sounds familiar. And here

1 we have the abstract which is this little paragraph right here  
2 which is a very nice summary of the features of this patent.

3 Q. I'd like for you to expand on that just a bit. Could you  
4 explain why you included the abstract in this slide D-613?

5 A. It's very clear in a couple of cases in the text in here  
6 exactly what they're trying to do with this improved security.

7 Q. I see. Did you point those out in the next couple of  
8 features in the slide?

9 A. Yes, I need to explain further.

10 Q. Could you explain what this first feature is?

11 A. Enables access to authorization solely to specific host  
12 devices. That's just what we've been talking about. A host  
13 can get exclusive access to one -- a piece of storage. So  
14 that's -- on the very first line, it starts talking about that  
15 particular feature of this patent.

16 Q. Okay. What are we seeing in the next section here?

17 A. Down here at the bottom, there's some other discussion,  
18 but the question is if you have access, when can a command be  
19 executed? And in this case, it says if you're not authorized,  
20 you can't get access to that piece of storage.

21 Q. And is that what's shown in the blow-up there?

22 A. Command is interpreted and executed only after access is  
23 authorized. Very clear.

24 Q. Is this what you're saying is access controls, Mr.  
25 Stephens?

1 A. This and other things, yes.

2 Q. Okay. What are we seeing in the next slide, Mr. Stephens?  
3 D-164.1?

4 A. Adaptec product we have to look at the hardware elements  
5 that are in there. We did that before. And this figure comes  
6 right out of the patent itself as the way you would implement  
7 this. And, again, we have a Fibre Channel controller and a  
8 SCSI controller, we have the buffer here, we have the CPU or  
9 the processor, supervisor unit, if you will, it's in here.

10 And then, it also is clear that you can attach  
11 workstations on the Fibre Channel side and disk to disk arrays  
12 to the SCSI controller at the bottom. These figures are  
13 amazingly similar to the Adaptec.

14 Q. What is a disc array, Mr. Stephens?

15 A. Disk array is a collection of usually two or more disks  
16 that operate as a group, and you can allocate space on them  
17 for what was needed. You can subpartition, partition the  
18 space on those disks for what you need.

19 Q. What are we seeing in the next slide?

20 A. This is out of the very first part, summary of the  
21 invention. You can -- I think it's readable. So that each  
22 host can be treated differently. That's nice. So that the  
23 example access authorization can be assigned solely to  
24 specific hosts and, furthermore, that you can actually do the  
25 access to different partitions on there.



1           This is exactly access to devices or subsets of  
2 devices as defined in the 972 patent.

3 Q. And what are we seeing in the next slide, Mr. Stephens,  
4 D-616?

5 A. We're back to this abstract again, and this is the rule  
6 that once a piece of storage is allocated that it can only be  
7 -- commands to that storage can be executed only if you're  
8 authorized. This is a total block. You either can or you  
9 cannot.

10 Q. All right. What I would like you to do next for me, Mr.  
11 Stephens, is to come around here and check off for the jury  
12 the claims that you believe are anticipated by the 771 patent.

13 A. Okay. Can I circle them? Is that all right?

14 Q. You may circle them.

15 A. No. 1, right here, No. 2, configuration, 3, Fibre Channel  
16 devices, 4, the router, 5 and 6, we've discussed, it showed it  
17 in the storage network, access controls includes allocation of  
18 subsets, we just saw that, SCSI devices or hard disks, we saw  
19 that, storage network again. 11, method, the method claims  
20 providing storage on remote devices to the host. Maintaining  
21 the configuration is in there quite clearly, Fibre Channel  
22 devices comprise workstations and hard disks.

23 Q. Could you say those numbers for the record, Mr. Stephens?

24 A. 1 through 4 inclusive and 7 through 14 inclusive.

25 Q. Okay. Now, explain which of the two -- could you check

1 off the claims that you believe are rendered obvious by the  
2 771 patent?

3 A. Well, in the combination?

4 Q. Yes, in combination.

5 A. All right. When you combine the 771 patent with  
6 Crossroads' own 1996 Comdex display, then the two that are  
7 missing, 5 and 6, the combination the Crossroads product fails  
8 in 5 and 6 because it's clear they had the Fibre Channel  
9 protocol unit in that chip, they had the FIFO in that chip,  
10 they had the DMA, and down here on the SCSI controller, they  
11 had the SCSI protocol unit, the buffer, internal buffer inside  
12 the chip itself, and another DMA unit. All those are present  
13 in the --

14 Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stephens. Do you have the slide  
15 that shows that combination that you just spoke of?

16 A. Yes, I do.

17 Q. Okay. Is this that slide?

18 A. Yes. Take the 771, which covers 1 to 4 and 7 to 14, and  
19 you add to that the Comdex chart, the Crossroads hardware from  
20 1996 which shows the protocol unit, the FIFO, the interface,  
21 protocol unit, the buffer, and the interface out of their own  
22 documentation.

23 Q. Now, Mr. Stephens, why -- excuse me. For this  
24 combination, what did you consider in arriving at your  
25 conclusion of obviousness?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. The same four factors that we talked about for the Adaptec  
2 and the SCSI LUN.

3 Q. What was the scoping content for the prior art for this  
4 combination?

5 A. For this combination, we took the 771 patent by itself  
6 plus the Crossroads hardware.

7 Q. Okay. And what were the differences between the prior art  
8 and the 972 patent claims with respect to this combination?

9 A. As we saw here, this anticipates all but two of the claims  
10 over here, and this one provides -- this one's 5 and this  
11 one's 6. So when you put the two together, you get -- you  
12 cover all the claims.

13 Q. Okay. What are the last two factors you considered?

14 A. Motivation.

15 Q. Okay.

16 A. And secondary considerations.

17 Q. Could you explain to the jury what the motivation is for  
18 this combination?

19 A. Again, motivation is that the 771 patent is missing, these  
20 two blue boxes down here, it doesn't cover them, so the  
21 motivation is to -- even though it has Fibre Channel  
22 controllers and SCSI controllers, it doesn't have the internal  
23 details of them. So the motivation is to use another piece of  
24 prior art, in this case, Crossroads demonstration, to get the  
25 other two elements, 5 and 6, two claims, I'm sorry.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Can you explain the secondary considerations that you took  
2 into account for this combination?

3 A. Well, we just covered them before, but the lack of  
4 commercial success and that it didn't -- that the patent  
5 didn't feel any long-felt need.

6 Q. Okay. Mr. Stephens, were there any other combinations  
7 that you made involving a 771 patent in your analysis?

8 A. Yes, there is.

9 Q. Can you explain what that is briefly?

10 A. We go back to the Adaptec Coronado product and the 771  
11 itself as the basis.

12 Q. And why did you consider that combination?

13 A. Well, as I said earlier, it's my opinion that this meets  
14 all of the -- and anticipates the 972 patent all by itself.

15 Q. Mr. Stephens, could you tell for the record what you're  
16 pointing to when you say "this"?

17 A. This is the Coronado hardware diagram.

18 Q. Okay. And --

19 A. So this, in my mind, represents the whole product. I  
20 point to it now, it's the whole product. So you have -- I  
21 believe that the reserve management is access controls, but if  
22 you decided it's not, then this would not work.

23 So if you add that to the access controls that's in  
24 here, this is an element -- access controls is an element of  
25 every claim in this patent in the 972 patent, then when you

1 add the access controls here, you now get the combination  
2 again that covers everything that's in here.

3 Q. And could you explain to the jury in what fashion it  
4 covers everything as you mentioned?

5 A. That the Adaptec Coronado product absent of access  
6 controls plus this, it's obvious that the combination of them  
7 meets -- has all of the elements of the 972 patent.

8 Q. And does that affect the validity of the patent claims of  
9 the 972 patent?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. In what sense?

12 A. It makes them invalid.

13 Q. What flavor of invalidity?

14 A. Obviousness in this case.

15 Q. Thank you. Now, in arriving at that conclusion of  
16 obviousness, can you explain to the jury what the factors you  
17 considered were?

18 A. Well, we have the same four factors that we have before,  
19 we spoke in content differences, motivation and secondary  
20 considerations.

21 Q. Okay. Let's just briefly walk through those. What was  
22 the scope and content for this combination?

23 A. In this case, we have the Adaptec Coronado product without  
24 reserve management being present, and the access authorization  
25 features of the 771 patent.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. And what are the differences for this combination?

2 A. Well, if you exclude reserve management here as access  
3 controls, then this would not work what you're trying to do so  
4 if you add in the access authorization features, then you have  
5 all the claims back.

6 Q. Okay. And could you explain the motivation for this  
7 combination?

8 A. Again, we have the data security issue that we're trying  
9 to deal with in here, and so certainly, we need to have  
10 improved security and this does provide that. In addition,  
11 this patent is very clear on how to perform these actions that  
12 teaches very nicely how to do this access authorization. So  
13 if you take, again, one skilled in the art and give them these  
14 two and you have every reason to believe that one could  
15 implement it and, two, that the resulting product could be  
16 successful.

17 Q. Now, Mr. Stephens, for the last point, what was the --  
18 what were the secondary considerations that you considered for  
19 this combination?

20 A. Well, we have the same ones we did the first time. That's  
21 the -- that the Crossroads patent has had no commercial  
22 success, and that the -- it didn't meet any long-felt need.

23 Q. Let's step back for a minute. Could you cut the slide  
24 show. And step back up to the stand, if you would, Mr.  
25 Stephens. Thank you.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1           When we talked about SCSI LUN mapping, what SCSI  
2 standards did you consider in arriving at your conclusions?

3   A.   SCSI LUN mapping?

4   Q.   Yes.

5   A.   Okay. The description of it initially is the SCSI three  
6 controller commands set called SCC, you'll see it in different  
7 places. That references and calls out and includes by  
8 reference the SCSI three primary commands standard, and that  
9 one includes a document called the SCSI three architecture  
10 model.

11   Q.   Okay. I'm briefly searching for those, and I'm handing  
12 you what's been marked Defendant's Exhibit 87. Is that what  
13 you referred to as the SCSI architecture model standard?

14   A.   Yes, this is the base document from which all of the SCSI  
15 three products are collected.

16   Q.   Could you read for the jury what the date on that document  
17 is?

18   A.   November 27th, 1995.

19   Q.   Okay. Thank you. Now, I believe you also mentioned the  
20 SCC standard; is that right?

21   A.   That's correct.

22   Q.   Okay. I'm handing you what's been marked as Defendant's  
23 Exhibit 88. Could you identify that for the jury?

24   A.   Yes, this is the controller commands document.

25   Q.   And what is the date on that?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. 3 September 1996.

2 Q. Okay. Thank you. Finally, I believe you mentioned PCS.

3 I'm handing you what's been marked Defendant's Exhibit 89.

4 Could you identify that for the jury, please?

5 A. Yes. This is the SCSI three primary commands standard.

6 Q. Is that what you're referring to earlier?

7 A. Yes, it is.

8 Q. What's the date on this document?

9 A. 13 November 1996.

10 Q. So that's all before December 31st, 1996?

11 A. Oh, yes.

12 Q. Okay. Mr. Stephens, could you summarize for the jury, as

13 best you can, your opinions on invalidity?

14 A. Yes. We've looked at several pieces of information today

15 that I think bear on the invalidity of the 972 patent. The

16 first is the Adaptec Coronado product itself, which I

17 described to you at first. It's my opinion it has all of the

18 elements of the 972 patent in it.

19 And, therefore, in the language that we use in this,

20 it anticipates. Everything is there and it predates. It was

21 previously invented. Second, we looked at the Adaptec

22 Coronado product with the LUN mapping feature, and the only

23 reason we looked at that is if you decide to preserve

24 management in the Adaptec Coronado product and does not access

25 controls, then we need access controls to get there.



1           And so, the Adaptec Coronado product plus the SCSI LUN  
2 mapping, it's obvious if you combine the two that you get  
3 exactly the same limitations. The third one is the 771 patent  
4 we looked at, and the 771 by itself as we show on the chart,  
5 covers Claims 1 to 4 and 7 to 14 by itself.

6 Q. Okay.

7 A. Absent 5 and 6. If you then take the combination of the  
8 771, absent five and six, and you combine it with Crossroads'  
9 own 1996 display, Comdex, then you get Claims 5 and 6. And  
10 so, the combination, 771 anticipates all twelve of them and  
11 the Crossroads product gives you 5 and 6, the combination  
12 gives you 5 and 6.

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. Let's see. Fourth one is Adaptec plus the 771. So if  
15 you, again, assume -- maybe it's the last one. If you assume  
16 that the Adaptec Coronado product with its reserve management  
17 does not access controls, then you can take the 771 instead of  
18 LUN mapping, and the combination there gets you all of the  
19 claim elements of the 972 patent.

20 Q. Thank you. Now, having that in the bulk of our -- of your  
21 presentation out of the way, did you analyze the issue of  
22 infringement?

23 A. Yes, I did.

24 Q. Okay. Did you -- what products did you consider --

25           THE COURT: I'm going to give the jury a break.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Fifteen minutes, members of the jury, 15 minutes.

2 (Jury not present.)

3 THE COURT: All right. Fifteen minutes.

4 (Recess.)

5 MR. ALLCOCK: Excuse me, your Honor. Before the jury  
6 comes back in, I think they've opened the door for me to ask  
7 this witness a question about Pathlight settlement, I mean as  
8 testified that the patent has no commercial success, and I  
9 think that's opened the door.

10 THE COURT: About as wide as it can be opened.

11 MR. ALLCOCK: That's what I thought.

12 THE COURT: Bring the jury.

13 (Jury present.)

14 THE COURT: You're still under oath, sir.

15 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

16 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Mr. Stephens, step down for a minute.

17 Come around here where the jury can see you.

18 Do you see what I'm pointing to right here?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. What are these documents right here?

21 A. In the case of -- this is the 972 patent, these are second  
22 code references cited, and these happen to be a list of U.S.  
23 patents that were considered by the Patent Office when looking  
24 at this patent.

25 Q. Is the Adaptec Coronado product up here?

1 A. No, it's not.

2 Q. This is Crossroads' 1996 Comdex display up here?

3 A. No, it's not.

4 Q. What about the 771 patent?

5 A. No, it's not.

6 Q. Thanks. You can step back up. Thank you. Mr. Stephens,

7 I'm handing you D-181. Have you ever seen that before?

8 A. I've seen parts of this, but I don't recognize the front

9 part.

10 Q. So you don't recognize what this letter is?

11 A. No.

12 Q. I've flagged a document here. Could you read that for the

13 jury?

14 A. This document says the SPARC storage array architecture

15 technical white paper.

16 Q. Could you thumb through the documents immediately behind

17 that and tell me if you see any of them?

18 A. There's some documents here, additional documents for the

19 SPARC storage array.

20 Q. Did you consider the SPARC storage array in your

21 invalidity analysis?

22 MR. ALLCOCK: Objection, your Honor. Beyond the scope

23 of his deposition.

24 MR. GARRETT: Your Honor, it's not beyond the scope of

25 anything. He included an analysis of this Sun SPARC storage

1 array in his expert report. I could show the Court, if you'd  
2 like.

3 THE COURT: All right. The objection's overruled  
4 based on the representation of counsel.

5 MR. GARRETT: Okay.

6 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Mr. Stephens, did you consider the Sun  
7 SPARC storage array in your validity analysis in this case?

8 A. Yes, that was one of the ten or 11 pieces of prior art  
9 that I did consider.

10 Q. Did you come to any conclusions about the validity of the  
11 claims in light of the Sun SPARC storage array?

12 A. The SPARC storage array could be considered prior art for  
13 the 972 patent.

14 Q. And did you go ahead and determine whether or not any of  
15 the claims were valid in view of that system?

16 A. We went through all 14 claims, looking for different  
17 documentation to support each one of those things just like we  
18 did for the Adaptec Coronado product.

19 Q. And what was your conclusion?

20 MR. ALLCOCK: Objection, your Honor. Lacks  
21 foundation.

22 MR. GARRETT: Your Honor, I think we've established  
23 that he did consider this piece of prior art in his analysis  
24 in this case, and I'm asking him what his conclusion was.

25 THE COURT: What is the lack of foundation?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 MR. ALLCOCK: He hasn't shown the basis for the  
2 arrival at his opinion. There may be some piece of paper  
3 somewhere that says something about it, but I haven't heard  
4 any testimony from this witness in this court.

5 THE COURT: I haven't either, but I assume we will.  
6 Objection overruled.

7 A. It's my opinion that the SPARC storage array anticipates  
8 the 972 patent.

9 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Okay. What documents did you consider in  
10 arriving at that conclusion?

11 A. There was some sales literature, there was a users guide,  
12 there was a -- I think we just saw it, that technical white  
13 paper that I just --

14 Q. Did some of the documents that you just saw, were they  
15 considered by you in your analysis?

16 A. Yes, they were.

17 Q. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Stephens, jumping ahead to  
18 infringement.

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. You said that you considered that issue; is that right?

21 A. Yes, I did.

22 Q. Okay. What did you -- which products did you consider  
23 that issue for?

24 A. Well, if you consider that the 8526, RAID product and the  
25 FS-2620 storage router.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Did you test those products?

2 A. Yes, I did.

3 Q. Okay. Is this the box that you tested?

4 A. That's the hardware box.

5 Q. Okay. Did you use this box for both tests?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Okay. Can you explain briefly to the jury what the test  
8 setup was?

9 A. We had two PCs running Windows MT, one of the workstations  
10 had two host adapter cards called System Right and  
11 documentation, and the other system was a T workstation with  
12 one host adapter card in it. Those three cards were attached  
13 to a Fibre Channel arbitrated with hub and the storage router  
14 was attached, also, to that hub so that there were four  
15 devices on that hub, forming a loop, and then, the router  
16 itself had one cable to a disk enclosure that had four disk  
17 drives in it.

18 Q. Now, based on your testing, did you come to any conclusion  
19 whether Chaparral's products infringed any claims of the 972  
20 patent?

21 A. That they did not infringe either literally or doctrine of  
22 equivalents.

23 Q. Okay. Have Chaparral's products, have any of them been  
24 recently modified to your knowledge?

25 A. Yes.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Could you -- what did that modification entail?

2 A. It's my understanding that the -- there was a mode of  
3 operation that allows you to turn the controller to none, and  
4 the modification was to make it so that that particular  
5 feature could no longer be activated.

6 Q. Now, could you describe for the jury how the products  
7 operated before the modification?

8 A. In case Chaparral, when they manufactured the product,  
9 they manufactured the product what I will call the default  
10 mode. And in default mode, the controller LUN was always  
11 active, and you could use it for sending the CAPI commands and  
12 pass-through commands for the RAID devices.

13 And the second mode in there allowed the controller to  
14 be turned off.

15 Q. Talk about the default mode for a minute. You mentioned  
16 the CAPI command. What could a user do using the CAPI  
17 command?

18 A. The CAPI commands allowed you, at least the ones that  
19 affected access controls would allow you to alter the  
20 permissions for who had access to which device or piece of  
21 device.

22 Q. Did you actually test the CAPI commands?

23 A. Yes, I did.

24 Q. Okay. Now, tell me about the pass-through commands you  
25 mentioned. How did they operate in the default mode that you

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 spoke of?

2 A. When the controller LUN is on and you have a RAID product  
3 at which, in any case, was the A8526, documentation says that  
4 if you form a command and send it to the controller, which is  
5 always present in that mode, then that particular command  
6 that's embedded in it, pass-through will be passed through the  
7 storage device behind the controller, which in the picture we  
8 showed up here earlier would mean that the command  
9 unconditionally, regardless of what's called the LUN zoning,  
10 would go to the back side of the device, whether it was zoned  
11 or not.

12 Q. Okay. Now, you mention there's a default mode. Is there  
13 another mode for Chaparral's products?

14 A. Yes. In the original products, you could set -- the  
15 customer, after he would receive the product, could set it to  
16 an altered mode that would, in fact, defeat that controller,  
17 turn it off so it couldn't be used.

18 Q. And does that mean that CAPI commands would go through?

19 A. No, they would not in that case.

20 Q. What about the pass-through commands that you talk about  
21 with the RAID devices? Would they go through?

22 A. No, they would not.

23 Q. Okay. Could you describe how Chaparral's products operate  
24 after the recent modification?

25 A. After the modification, since the controller LUN cannot be



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 turned off, the CAPI commands always work in the pass-through  
2 commands for the RAID products always worked.

3 Q. Okay. Now, did your analysis, does it apply to just those  
4 products?

5 A. No. It was my understanding that these -- what I was  
6 supplied with was representative of the 8526, was  
7 representative of all the RAID products, that Chaparral  
8 products and the FS-2620 was representative of all of their  
9 storage products.

10 Q. Now, do you have an opinion about whether or not  
11 Chaparral's original products infringe?

12 A. No, the original products did not infringe either  
13 literally or the doctrine of equivalents.

14 Q. What about the altered products? Do they infringe in your  
15 opinion?

16 A. No, they do not, the same reason.

17 Q. Did you prepare some slides that illustrate your analysis  
18 of that issue?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Okay. Let's look at slide D-623. If you'll step down and  
21 tell us what we're seeing in the slide, Mr. Stephens.

22 A. In the original products before the change, the mode  
23 called default mode is the mode that the product would be in  
24 when you pulled it out of the box. So in that case, the CAPI  
25 commands which are always in the router were active because

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 the controller LUN was active.

2 And so, if the host sent a CAPI command to the router  
3 itself, it could alter the access permissions and get itself  
4 access so that after the CAPI command is issued, then the host  
5 could gain access or was allowed access to the storage that he  
6 was not allowed to have access to before.

7 Q. Have you prepared a slide that relates to the modified  
8 products?

9 A. Well, before that, the reset command for SCSI has the same  
10 effect. It will alter the permission so that you could get  
11 storage you weren't able to get to before then. So the reset,  
12 reset the permission, CAPI commands can reset permissions.

13 Q. Okay. Have you prepared analysis of the modified products  
14 in slide form?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Is that what we're seeing in 624?

17 A. Right. Since there's no opportunity in the modified  
18 product to ever turn off the controller LUN, the picture is  
19 identical. The CAPI command can be used to gain access to a  
20 device, and you can follow that with as many commands as you  
21 want after you've issued the CAPI command.

22 Same thing is true with reset when you issue the reset  
23 or the reset function, then you can gain access to the SCSI  
24 device until it's reserved again, some point in time.

25 Q. You mentioned the pass-through commands a minute ago.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Have you prepared a slide that shows how the pass-through  
2 operates?

3 A. Yes, I have.

4 Q. Is that what we're seeing in D-626?

5 A. Right. This applies only to the RAID products like the  
6 AD-526, and when the controller LUN is active, then the  
7 pass-through commands through the storage controller and they  
8 go right back to the back end of the device over onto the  
9 storage devices themselves.

10 Q. Okay. What about have you prepared a slide that shows how  
11 the pass-through operates for the modified products?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Okay. Is that what we're seeing in 627?

14 A. Yes. Since you can't disable the controller LUN, the  
15 picture's exactly the same only in this mode. It's always the  
16 case that the pass-through commands will go to the storage.

17 Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stephens. You could step back up.  
18 Now, Mr. Stephens, you mentioned that the products in your  
19 opinion do not literally infringe. Can you explain why to the  
20 jury? First of all, for the original products.

21 A. If you assume that reserve management was not access  
22 controls, which we've tried to make that assumption a couple  
23 of times, if you make that assumption or if you decide that  
24 that's not access controls, then the CAPI commands, since they  
25 always get through, cannot constitute access controls

1 either --

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. -- in that case.

4 Q. Now, what about for the modified products? What is your  
5 analysis with respect to literal infringement of those  
6 products?

7 A. For the modified products since the controller LUN can  
8 never be turned off, the same is true, okay.

9 Q. Now, could you explain how you arrived at the conclusion  
10 that there's no infringement under the doctrine of  
11 equivalents?

12 A. Well, again, if the reserve management does not access  
13 controls, then the CAPI commands which operate much like the  
14 resets that I showed you are not access controls either, the  
15 device does not have access control showed; and in any way,  
16 shape or form, you can can't construe in any way, shape or  
17 form that the device has access controls in that instance.

18 Q. Okay. Mr. Stephens, have you considered the issue of  
19 whether there are any non-infringing alternatives that are  
20 available to Chaparral?

21 A. If you assume that the patent is valid, then we had to  
22 consider whether or not we would -- there would be  
23 alternatives.

24 Q. How many of those alternatives did you consider?

25 A. Total of seven.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. How many are you ready to talk about today?

2 A. Three.

3 Q. Okay. Can you tell me what these three are?

4 A. First one is to remove LUN zoning altogether from the  
5 array and RAID products -- or router products, the second one  
6 is to modify the controller LUN so they could never be  
7 disabled, which Mr. Permut has testified about, and the third  
8 one is to allow certain informational commands to be processed  
9 by the logical units, even though they're zoned.

10 Informational commands tell you about the device, but they  
11 don't alter or allow you to read or alter the files on that  
12 device.

13 Q. Now, is it your -- what is your opinion with respect to  
14 whether these three alternatives infringe?

15 A. These three cannot infringe.

16 Q. Okay. Did you prepare any slides that will assist the  
17 jury in understanding what these three alternatives are?

18 A. Yes, we do.

19 Q. Okay. Let's take a look at those. Looking at D-629, what  
20 is this slide?

21 A. This is the alternative where you would just remove the  
22 LUN zoning altogether from the product and just leave it with  
23 reserve management.

24 Q. Can you explain to the jury what it would have taken for  
25 Chaparral to achieve this alternative?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. I had a discussion with Mr. Permut who was here this  
2 morning, and he indicated that for each family, Chaparral has  
3 common code based. And so, there are families of products and  
4 so for each family of product, he said that they will take  
5 change of one line of code to remove the LUN zoning.

6 So I looked at the source code that was provided to me  
7 as part of the process. So I went and looked at the source  
8 code, and, in fact, for each of these families, if you change  
9 exactly the one line of code he indicated, LUN zoning  
10 disappears after it's compiled.

11 Q. And how long would it take for Chaparral to do this in  
12 your opinion?

13 A. Mr. Permut's estimate was that it would take one day per  
14 family, which I think there's five families, and one week per  
15 product, and there's eight products.

16 Q. Do you concur with Mr. Permut's analysis?

17 A. Yes, based on his success with the second modification.

18 Q. Okay. Let's turn to that second modification. Is that  
19 what we're seeing in D-630?

20 A. Right. This one is not allowing the controller LUN to be  
21 turned off.

22 Q. And is this the modified product that we -- that you  
23 talked about earlier today?

24 A. Yes. This is the one that Mr. Permut also testified.

25 Q. Okay. What about the third alternative? Is that what

1 we're seeing in 631?

2 A. Yes. This one says that even though a logical unit is  
3 zoned for the purposes of excessive -- having access to the  
4 storage, you can't read or write the storage itself. You can  
5 successfully with this modification send read and write -- I  
6 mean, send informational commands, four or five of them, to  
7 the logical unit and it will respond.

8 Q. What would it take to achieve this alternative for  
9 Chaparral?

10 A. Again, I talked to Mr. Permut, and he said that it would  
11 take about one week per family. There's five families. And  
12 it would take about four weeks per product. There's eight  
13 products to test those.

14 Q. And do you concur with Mr. Permut's estimates?

15 A. Yes, I looked at the source code again and the product  
16 itself, and I believe those are reasonable estimates.

17 Q. Do you have an opinion about how these three alternatives  
18 would fare in the marketplace?

19 A. Yes. If you take any one of the three and apply it to the  
20 product, it still serves its useful purposes connecting Fibre  
21 Channel hosts to the SCSI devices on the back side. Second,  
22 it does not alter the performance of the device. These  
23 particular changes don't change the speed of the box actually  
24 works. It wouldn't slow it down in any way. There's one  
25 more.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Do you have any opinion about how it would affect the  
2 manageability of the access?

3 A. The -- since the whole purpose of these different types of  
4 controls is to decide which host can control which piece of  
5 storage, if you make these modifications, you're still left  
6 with a product that can reasonably manage the storage devices.

7 Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stephens. Let's talk about the last  
8 issue here.

9 As part of your analysis in this case, did you  
10 consider or did you study anything relating to what certain  
11 Crossroads individuals knew about during the pendency of the  
12 972 patent application?

13 A. Yes, I did.

14 Q. Okay. What did this analysis entail?

15 A. Reading testimony and mostly depositions and looking at  
16 information that was available that the -- in my estimation,  
17 the Patent Office should have known about.

18 Q. Okay. What specific pieces of information are you  
19 speaking of?

20 A. There are two that we're talking about here, one is the --  
21 I mentioned it today is the Crossroads 1996 display at Comdex,  
22 and the second one, what's been referred to a couple of times,  
23 the HP Mux.

24 Q. Okay. Now, did you come to a conclusion about whether  
25 that information should have been transmitted to the Patent



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Office?

2 MR. ALLCOCK: Objection, your Honor. That's beyond  
3 the scope of this witness' expertise.

4 THE COURT: I sustain the objection.

5 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Mr. Stephens, did you come to a  
6 conclusion about whether any of this information is material  
7 as you understand it?

8 MR. ALLCOCK: Same objection, your Honor.

9 MR. GARRETT: Your Honor, may we approach?

10 THE COURT: He's already testified to that at least  
11 five times.

12 MR. GARRETT: Okay.

13 MR. GARRETT: Would the Court allow me to permit him  
14 to explain exactly why he considered it?

15 THE COURT: Well, as far as I'm concerned, you should  
16 have used your time. You could do anything you wish. It's  
17 these other folks that may or may not object.

18 MR. GARRETT: I guess we'll see what happens.

19 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Have you prepared any slides that reflect  
20 why you consider this information material?

21 A. Yes, I have.

22 Q. Okay.

23 MR. ALLCOCK: Your Honor, this area is not appropriate  
24 for this witness' expertise.

25 MR. GARRETT: Your Honor, they've been on notice of

1 this area since his rebuttal expert report. It involves an  
2 analysis of what the Patent Office looked at and what they  
3 didn't know about and how --

4 THE COURT: Well, now, you don't need to make a jury  
5 argument as to what ought to be there. Y'all come up.

6 (At the Bench, on the record.)

7 THE COURT: His rebuttal expert witness report.

8 MR. GARRETT: Oh, expert -- for the record, I'd like  
9 to be clear, it was in his initial expert report.

10 THE COURT: And his initial expert report said what?  
11 That these items should have been in there, and therefore,  
12 you're getting into inequitable arguments.

13 MR. GARRETT: No. Actually, it just said these items  
14 are material and the reasons why they're material are A and B.

15 MR. BAHLER: Second of all, he's going to talk about  
16 intent.

17 THE COURT: Of course he can't talk about that. And  
18 his specialty is that no one can patent anything. It just  
19 depends on how you phrase your questions, if there's notice  
20 that he thought that these were material, then they should  
21 have been, then there's ways to get there. And I'm not going  
22 to write out the questions for you. I'm just going to handle  
23 the objections as they come.

24 MR. GARRETT: Thank you, your Honor.

25 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Okay. Mr. Stephens, with respect to the

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Comdex '96 display by Crossroads.

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. What claims is that relevant to in the 972 patent in your  
4 opinion?

5 A. As I discussed earlier today, it's Claims 5 and 6.

6 Q. Okay. And why is it relevant to Claims 5 and 6?

7 A. Because it discloses the internal workings of or, at  
8 least, three of the pieces that are the internal workings of  
9 the Fibre Channel controller and the SCSI controller.

10 Q. Were those internal workings disclosed by any of the  
11 pieces of art that the Patent Office had seen?

12 A. They were not.

13 Q. What about the HP Mux? Why -- what claims, if any, is it  
14 relevant to?

15 A. The HP Mux is also relevant to Claims 5 and 6.

16 Q. Okay. And why?

17 A. Well, it had the commercially available HP Tachyon chip,  
18 which you've heard about, and the SCSI controller, and the  
19 information availability about that discloses those same three  
20 components for each one, protocol unit, the buffer, the FIFO  
21 and the DMA.

22 Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stephens. No further questions at  
23 this time.

24

25 CROSS-EXAMINATION

1 BY MR. ALLCOCK:  
2 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Stephens.  
3 A. Good afternoon, Mr. Allcock.  
4 Q. We've met before?  
5 A. Yes, sir.  
6 Q. Let me show you page 7-12 of Exhibit 230. This is the  
7 K3412 and K7413 Users Guide that talks about LUN mapping. Do  
8 you see that -- I mean, LUN zoning. Do you see that?  
9 A. Yes, I do.  
10 Q. Now, what this says is that one storage array can only be  
11 accessed by host 2. Another storage array can only be  
12 accessed by host 1, and then, this third storage array can be  
13 accessed by 2 and 3. Do you see that?  
14 A. Yes, in the third paragraph.  
15 Q. Now, the product does work that way, doesn't it?  
16 A. Yes, it does.  
17 Q. Okay. So all this stuff about pass-through and CAPI  
18 doesn't change the fact that the product has LUN zoning in it,  
19 and if operated according to that mode, it operates as shown  
20 in 7-12?  
21 A. To the extent you don't issue any CAPI commands to alter,  
22 yes.  
23 Q. Now, this CAPI thing, let me show you a page from Appendix  
24 A of your expert report that refers to this CAPI stuff. And  
25 the way you got that is you got a password from the Fulbright

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 law firm so that you could get in and download this CAPI  
2 software development kit; is that right?

3 A. I was not the owner of the products, but Chaparral allows  
4 any authorized owner/user to gain a log-in or password.

5 Q. Right, but you couldn't get it without the password that  
6 they gave you?

7 A. No. I'm not an owner, I didn't buy it.

8 THE COURT: We're going to get through a lot quicker,  
9 Mr. Stephens. I have a hunch you've been on the stand before.  
10 Listen to the question, just answer the question.

11 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

12 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) So that what you did is you had to get  
13 these two things, and then, you had to compile the software;  
14 is that right?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And then, you had to use that software to modify the  
17 device, the device that you were working on; is that right?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. Now, you did do some testing of this device before you  
20 made any modifications to it, and I'll show you here a test  
21 configuration that you performed that shows system right given  
22 exclusive access to array at LUN 1. Do you see that?

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. And so, what you did was you configured the system so that  
25 you had a right computer and a left computer, and here, the

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 right computer was given exclusive access to one of the  
2 arrays?

3 A. Yes, for a period of time.

4 Q. Right. And then, when you tried to access it with the  
5 left array, as opposed to the right array, you got this big  
6 error message; is that correct?

7 A. That's correct.

8 Q. So then, the product operated according to page 7-12 that  
9 we saw a few moments ago in your testing?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Now, this CAPI thing is optional; you don't need to use  
12 it?

13 A. It's shipped with the product. The customer does not have  
14 to use the application.

15 Q. Right. In fact, what you said in your deposition is you  
16 have to apply for it if you buy the product, you don't  
17 necessarily want or need that function, so it's optional.

18 Would you agree with that?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. Now, with respect to the 771 patent, that's one of the  
21 pieces of prior art you relied on?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. How many total did you rely on?

24 A. Excuse me?

25 Q. How many total of pieces of prior art did you rely on? Is

1 it like eight or nine or something?

2 A. I think I said ten or eleven different things in my expert  
3 report.

4 Q. Yeah. Now, one thing about the 771 patent, did you  
5 consider the filing date of it August 18th of 1997? Did that  
6 answer your analysis whatsoever?

7 A. No.

8 Q. So if the -- if Mr. Hoese and Mr. Russell invented their  
9 invention some three or four months before this, would that  
10 have an impact on your testimony or you just don't know?

11 A. You said if, and so, if they did, then this is still -- I  
12 was told to consider this as prior art and that would be  
13 someone else's expertise to decide whether it was or not.

14 Q. Right. But if, in fact, Mr. Hoese and Russell invented  
15 before that date this doesn't constitute prior art; is that  
16 right?

17 A. No. We don't know when this was invented either.

18 Q. Okay. You didn't look into that, though?

19 A. No, I did not.

20 Q. This is the only date you have to go by, August 18th,  
21 1997?

22 A. I was told to consider it was prior art, yeah.

23 Q. Now, you -- just one moment, your Honor. Now, you were  
24 shown on your direct examination this document. It is  
25 Plaintiff's Exhibit 32, and I think it's Defendant's Exhibit

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 161, if I'm not mistaken, and you looked at it and you said  
2 that you didn't really recognize it.

3 A. I didn't. Still don't.

4 Q. And so, this is -- you were in the courtroom when Mr.  
5 Zinger testified?

6 A. I was not.

7 Q. You were not. You've been in the courtroom most of the  
8 time, haven't you? Last week or so?

9 A. I came a little late this morning, and I was out part of  
10 this morning.

11 Q. Did somebody tell you not to stay in here during Mr.  
12 Zinger's testimony?

13 A. No, sir.

14 Q. You just didn't happen to?

15 A. That's right.

16 Q. Okay. Well, the rest of us saw the testimony in this  
17 letter that according to him, these reserve release commands  
18 that you relied upon don't constitute access controls?

19 MR. GARRETT: Objection, your Honor. I'm not sure  
20 where this is going, but Mr. Stephens' direct testimony about  
21 this exhibit related solely to the attachments that had to do  
22 with the Sun SPARC storage array. He's testified that he's  
23 never seen the letter itself. And my examination did not  
24 consist of any questions in that regards.

25 THE COURT: Well, that objection is overruled. You



1 may proceed.

2 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) Right. And so, you were never shown the  
3 Zinger letter that concludes contrary to your conclusion that  
4 reserve release is not access controls. You've never seen  
5 this before in your life?

6 A. No, I have not.

7 Q. Now, you testified, at some length, to this LUN mapping  
8 stuff, and I'm going to put up Defendant's Exhibit 602. Now,  
9 you -- 602 bears a remarkable resemblance to 602 of the  
10 patent. Is there any drawing in these LUN -- SCSI LUN  
11 standards that looks like this picture?

12 A. No, there's not. That's a description.

13 Q. So what we're looking at here is not a drawing that is  
14 actually in some piece of prior art, it's your recreation of  
15 the text of that standard; isn't that right?

16 A. I believe that's what I said earlier.

17 Q. Okay. And no device, to your knowledge, was ever built  
18 that used this SCSI LUN standard to operate according to this  
19 picture; is that right?

20 A. I know of no implementation, that's correct.

21 Q. Okay. Now, there are a couple of documents that you were  
22 shown. I think they were Defendant's 87 and 88 that are the  
23 SCSI LUN standard?

24 A. In the SCC standard.

25 Q. Yeah. The words access controls appear not once in any of

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 those documents; is that right?

2 A. The phrase itself does not, that's correct.

3 Q. Now, let me show you Exhibit 516. This is the Adaptec  
4 Coronado product. This, again, is your drawing?

5 A. Yes, yes.

6 Q. Do you have any screen shots that show your operation of  
7 this device and show the features that showed in your Power  
8 Point slide?

9 A. No. This device to my understanding is -- does not exist  
10 at this point in time.

11 Q. And it didn't exist in 1996, it was only a piece of paper  
12 then, right?

13 A. It had descriptions of documentation and was shown, I  
14 believe there was a hardware -- piece of hardware shown, at  
15 least.

16 Q. Wasn't shown in 1996, wasn't it?

17 A. I don't remember exactly when it was shown.

18 Q. Wasn't shown in 1997 either, was it?

19 A. I have no knowledge..

20 Q. And you have not actually obtained one of those. There  
21 was one sitting in the courtroom. Did you actually try to  
22 operate that device to show that it operates according to the  
23 972 patent?

24 A. No, I did not.

25 Q. And this drawing -- there's no drawing in any of the

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Adaptec documents that look like this 56C, is there?

2 A. No. This is an example of how --

3 Q. Right. If you look at D-61, what you did is you took this  
4 and recreated it so that it looked like figure 3 of the  
5 patent; is that right?

6 A. I added workstations to the FCAL side, and I added SCSI  
7 devices to the ultra SCSI side as was described in their  
8 documentation.

9 Q. Now, the words access control doesn't appear anywhere in  
10 any of these Adaptec documents; is that right?

11 A. That's again true. The phrase does not appear.

12 Q. And Adaptec uses this reserve release feature in order to  
13 do what you say is access controls; is that right?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. Now, were you shown the answers to interrogatories that  
16 Chaparral gave in this case concerning what their  
17 interpretation was, the Chaparral -- the parties'  
18 interpretation was of access -- of reserve release?

19 A. I don't remember specifically, no.

20 Q. Okay. Let me show you page 12 of Exhibit 168. Well,  
21 first, let me show the first page. And for the record, your  
22 Honor, these are the Chaparral answers to interrogatories,  
23 responses 6 through 13, and if we go to page 12, which is  
24 answer 14.

25 Have you ever seen this document?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. No, I have not.

2 Q. So the lawyers have never shown you this?

3 A. I was kept in an independent position to make a decision  
4 without all the other material.

5 Q. Now, you understand that the Adaptec Coronado product led  
6 into the Chaparral products, you understand that?

7 A. Yes, I believe it's a foundation.

8 Q. Right. And the LUN zoning wasn't even started to be  
9 worked on at Chaparral until 1999; is that right?

10 A. No, it wasn't in the -- what they acquired from Adaptec.  
11 I'm not sure.

12 Q. Right. So they had to -- they came up with something  
13 different at Chaparral?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Now, you rendered some opinions on obviousness. So  
16 looking at D-631, for this alternative, it would be one week  
17 per family for five families for design and four weeks per  
18 product for eight products for the testing?

19 A. I believe that's what I understood from Mr. Permut, yes.

20 Q. Okay. Now, you testified a lot about obviousness,  
21 combining different references. Isn't almost every invention  
22 a combination of old elements?

23 A. Not always.

24 Q. Sometimes it is?

25 A. Potentially, yes.

1 Q. Right. And here, what you were doing was combining  
2 various pieces of prior art and saying that if you kind of put  
3 them all together, it renders the patent invalid. That was  
4 the substance of your obviousness testing?

5 A. It's my understanding that the patent law allows one to do  
6 that.

7 Q. Right. And part of your opinion was that the 972 patent  
8 was not commercially successful?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. Now, you're aware that Pathlight paid \$15 million for  
11 damages and a license to that patent. You don't think that's  
12 commercially successful?

13 A. I do not.

14 Q. I have no more questions of the witness, your Honor.

15 RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. GARRETT:

17 Q. Just a couple of brief follow-up questions, your Honor.

18 Mr. Stephens, do you have to have a physical device to  
19 have a piece of prior art?

20 A. It's my understanding that if you have a complete  
21 description or in the case we discussed a combination that  
22 fully describes it, you do not have to have the physical  
23 device to make it prior art.

24 Q. Now, Mr. Allcock talked about -- see if I can pull it up  
25 on the Elmo. He asked you a question of the 7413 Users Guides

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 about how LUN zoning operates. Does it operate to deny access  
2 when it comes out of the box?

3 A. No. Out of the box, it -- all devices are accessible to  
4 all hosts.

5 Q. So is that the default mode that you talked about?

6 A. That's the default mode, yes.

7 Q. Now, he mentioned that with LUN zoning, you can have array  
8 A accessible only by host one, right?

9 A. I believe that's correct.

10 Q. Can you do that using reserve management?

11 A. Yes, you can.

12 Q. No further questions.

13 MR. ALLCOCK: I have no further questions of the  
14 witness, your Honor.

15 THE COURT: You may step down, sir.

16 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

17 THE COURT: Call your next witness.

18 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, can I have one minute to  
19 confer with counsel? I may have an objection and I may not,  
20 and I prefer to take it up in advance if I do.

21 THE COURT: You may.

22 MR. DELLETT: Chaparral calls Dr. Ken Flamm.

23 THE COURT: Be sworn, please, sir.

24 (Witness was sworn.)

25 THE COURT: Have a seat, sir.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

2 THE COURT: Tell us your full name and spell your  
3 last.

4 THE WITNESS: My name is Kenneth Samuel Flamm,  
5 F-L-A-M-M.

6 KENNETH S. FLAMM, called by the Defendant, duly sworn.

7 DIRECT EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. DELLETT:

9 Q. Would you please tell the jury what you do for a living?

10 A. I'm a professor. I teach at the University of Texas at  
11 Austin.

12 Q. What do you teach?

13 A. I teach economics. In particular, I specialize in the  
14 economics of high-tech industry, in general, in the computer  
15 communications and computer chip industries, in particular.

16 Q. Are you presently affiliated with any other academic or  
17 research institution?

18 A. I'm a Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution in  
19 Washington, D.C.

20 Q. Who else have you worked for?

21 A. I was an official in the Department of Defense from 1993  
22 to 1995. I was in charge of what is known as dual use  
23 technology policy, that is, programs that the Department of  
24 Defense has, essentially, in gest technology that has both  
25 commercial and in military applications like computer,

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 computer chip, communication systems. And I was in charge of  
2 international programs, negotiation of international  
3 technology programs by the Department of Defense.

4 Q. While you were there, did you have any involvement in  
5 patent licensing?

6 A. I supervised individuals who represented the Department of  
7 Defense in licensing negotiations involving foreign countries.

8 Q. What is your --

9 A. And foreign companies, I'm sorry.

10 Q. What is your education?

11 A. I have a Ph.D. in economics from MIT and an AB with honors  
12 in economics from Stanford University.

13 Q. Have you published anything on the economics of computer  
14 technology?

15 A. I've published five books on the subject, on computer  
16 chips communication systems and the economics of those  
17 industries, and I've published 30 plus, maybe 32 articles on  
18 the subject, as well.

19 Q. Have you also been on the boards of any publications  
20 regarding the computer industry?

21 A. I've been on the editorial board of the journal known as  
22 the Economics Innovation and New Technology. I've also served  
23 on steering committees of the National Academy of Sciences  
24 that have done reports on that subject.

25 Q. Have you consulted for computer manufacturers?



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. Yes, I've consulted for computer manufacturers including  
2 IBM, Digital Equipment, Fujitsu and AT & T.

3 Q. Have you also consulted for the Federal Government  
4 concerning computer technology?

5 A. Yes, I've served as a consultant to the U.S. Congress's  
6 Office of Technology Assessment. I've consulted, as well, for  
7 the -- I've made presentations and consulted for the U.S.  
8 Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, U.S.  
9 International Trade Commission. That's what immediately comes  
10 to mind.

11 Q. Have you testified before about computer technology?

12 A. I testified, I believe, four times before congressional  
13 committees and subcommittees on the subject.

14 Q. Have you done any economic studies recently concerning  
15 computer technology?

16 A. I'm currently working on a couple of studies at the  
17 University of Texas. One of them is we're working with the  
18 local consortium of semiconductor manufactures known as  
19 Semitech, as some of you may have heard of, and we're looking  
20 at the impact of new innovations and changes in technology on  
21 cost and manufacturing and selling computer chips.

22 I've also been working with National Academy of  
23 Sciences on a study of the impact of Semitech on -- Semitech R  
24 & D, research and development in the industry, and there's a  
25 couple of other activities, but I won't go into great details.

1 Q. Let me show you what's been marked as Defendant's Exhibit  
2 233. What is that document?

3 A. It looks like my vitae.

4 Q. What do you mean by your vitae?

5 A. My curriculum vitae, my resume. It's a list of,  
6 basically, my publications, what I've done, where I've been,  
7 what I'm working on.

8 Q. Chaparral offers Dr. Flamm as an expert in economics in  
9 computer technology.

10 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, with that restriction, he's  
11 only going to offer economic testimony, we have no objection.

12 THE COURT: Proceed.

13 Q. (BY MR. DELLETT) What have you done in this case?

14 A. I have examined and arrived at an opinion on what a  
15 reasonable royalty would be for the 972 patent.

16 Q. Does that mean that you have reached any conclusion  
17 regarding validity or infringement?

18 A. For the purposes of a reasonable royalty calculation, I'm  
19 required to assume that the patent is valid and infringed.

20 Q. Does that mean that you've reached any conclusion in that  
21 regard?

22 A. No. I mean, I have personal opinions, but that's not what  
23 I was asked to provide.

24 Q. All right. Have you analyzed reasonable royalties before  
25 in other cases?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. Yes, I have.

2 Q. Now, why did you use what's called a reasonable royalty?

3 A. Crossroads has not claimed that it has lost sales to  
4 Chaparral in this case.

5 Q. What type of information did you use in coming to your  
6 opinion?

7 A. A variety of sources of information. I looked at,  
8 literally, boxes of documents that were produced by both sides  
9 in this litigation. I've read deposition testimony from  
10 witnesses on both sides as much as we've heard read in court  
11 today. I've conducted my own independent research. I  
12 actually went out and looked at markets and products that were  
13 sold in the markets.

14 And I have relied on my experience basically studying  
15 this industry, working on it for the last 20 years.

16 Q. Did you rely on anybody that you talked to?

17 A. Yes. I also talked to individuals at Chaparral, in  
18 particular, Al Permut and Tom Lavan, I explored a number of  
19 issues with them. And I also talked to Gary Stephens, our  
20 technical expert who you just heard testify.

21 Q. And what methodology did you use in reaching your opinion  
22 as to the amount of a reasonable royalty?

23 A. I relied on what is considered a standard methodology in  
24 this area, and that is to look at what are known as the  
25 Georgia Pacific factors, the 15 Georgia Pacific factors.

1 Q. Let's take a look at that. If you would, your Honor, may  
2 Dr. Flamm step down, please?

3 THE COURT: He may.

4 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

5 Q. (BY MR. DELLETT) Now, is this list the same list of the  
6 Georgia Pacific factors that Mr. Regan testified for on behalf  
7 of -- about on behalf of Crossroads?

8 A. Well, I wasn't -- I read the Court testimony, but I wasn't  
9 in court, but I would speculate based on the logo that it most  
10 likely is.

11 Q. Did you review the testimony of Mr. Regan?

12 A. Yes, I did.

13 Q. And is it your recollection he testified about certain of  
14 those factors?

15 A. Yes. I believe he focused on -- and let me just consult  
16 my list of the Georgia Pacific factors here. I think he  
17 focused on No. 4, licensing and marketing policy, No. 5, what  
18 you call as a commercial relationship, and No. 8, the  
19 profitability of the product made number the patent. Those  
20 were the things he focused on.

21 Q. Do you agree with Mr. Regan's conclusions about those  
22 factors?

23 A. No, I don't.

24 Q. Okay. Did you come up with the same reasonable royalty  
25 that Mr. Regan came up with?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. No, I didn't.

2 Q. Why is that?

3 A. Primarily because I believe a number of other factors  
4 which he did not analyze or consider, at least in his  
5 testimony before the Court, are of some substantial importance  
6 and substantially alter his conclusions.

7 Q. And would you briefly tell the jury which of those factors  
8 are and then, we'll go into those individually, okay?

9 A. It's always the mapping between numbers and factors is  
10 always a little confusing, so I'll consult my notes if that's  
11 okay. This is my report.

12 Q. Sure.

13 A. I think No. 1 is something that is significant, No. 5 is  
14 another factor that was important, No. 8, No. 9, No. 10, No.  
15 11, 12, factor 13 and, finally, factor 15 are all of  
16 significance.

17 Q. Now, Mr. Regan testified about an agreement called the CP  
18 4200 agreement?

19 A. Yes, he did.

20 Q. And is that what you see on the screen?

21 A. I actually don't see anything on the screen. Sorry.

22 Q. Is that the first page of the HP agreement that you  
23 understand Mr. Regan testified about?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Okay. And did you look at that agreement?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. Yes, I did.

2 Q. Now, based on your review of this agreement and testimony,  
3 did Crossroads actually receive any royalties from HP for the  
4 972 patent?

5 A. No, they didn't. The 972 patent was not contained --  
6 contained in the agreement. It was not part of this  
7 agreement.

8 Q. If HP didn't get the 972 patent, what did they get?

9 A. They essentially received technology for the CP 4200, not  
10 just patent licensing rights but other technology, as well.  
11 And additional to that, it's clear to look through this that  
12 it does not specifically license the 972 patent.

13 Q. Okay. Well, let's -- is there a page in this agreement  
14 that specifies what they did get?

15 A. Yeah, somewhere. I'm hoping you can pull it up for me.

16 Q. All right. Let me see if I can get there.

17 A. Well, there's the fees they paid for what they got.

18 Q. What do these amounts listed in the CP 4200 agreement have  
19 to do with the 972 patent?

20 A. Well, actually, none of them were for the 972 patent  
21 because, as we've heard, I believe, in deposition -- both  
22 deposition testimony and testimony in this court, the CP 4200  
23 did not actually make use of the technologies in the 972  
24 patent.

25 Q. Now, in your opinion, would the hypothetical negotiation

1 for the 972 patent require Crossroads to provide source code  
2 or binary code to Chaparral?

3 A. No. The only thing -- the only part of this agreement  
4 that is really a royalty for the technologies which, as we've  
5 already remarked, do not include the 972 patent, but the  
6 royalties are specified in this part of the agreement. And  
7 this is actually payments for other stuff. Some of those  
8 payments of which were optional, as we've heard in testimony  
9 before this court.

10 Q. Okay. How does what HP got in the CP 4200 agreement  
11 compare to a hypothetical license of the 972 patent?

12 A. How does it compare?

13 Q. Yes.

14 A. Well, presumably, if they had a hypothetical license for  
15 the 972 patent, it would be a license for the bare patent, it  
16 would not be a license for all this other stuff, binary source  
17 code, assistance with hardware design. Those are transfers of  
18 concrete pieces of technology that are not what is  
19 contemplated in the Georgia Pacific factors when we talk about  
20 hypothetical negotiation.

21 It's a pure patent license, and normally a pure patent  
22 license, there's no requirement that you need to get actual  
23 transfers of technology in terms of source code or anything  
24 else.

25 Q. Okay. And is it your understanding that Mr. Regan said

1 that this agreement had a 17 percent royalty rate? Did you  
2 read his testimony?

3 A. I read his testimony.

4 Q. And do you agree with that?

5 A. No, I don't.

6 Q. Why not?

7 A. Because if you look at the royalty piece of this licensing  
8 agreement here, what was actually paid on -- for the right to  
9 use the technologies and as opposed to actual delivery of  
10 pieces of technology, like source code and binaries and  
11 hardware design information, which is not what you get  
12 normally with a bare patent license, if you just look at the  
13 royalties, you take these royalty numbers and you divide by  
14 the typical price of HP's version of this hardware, you get a  
15 number that looks more like two to four percent, not 17  
16 percent.

17 Q. Okay. And is it possible that Crossroads had source code  
18 in the CP 4200 for access controls as of the date of the  
19 hypothetical negotiation?

20 A. Again, it's my understanding that we're talking about a  
21 hypothetical negotiation that would have occurred on the eve  
22 of first infringement would have been probably in the December  
23 2000, January 2001 time frame, and at that point, it's my  
24 understanding they weren't even shipping a product which  
25 included the access controls that are now being alleged to be



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 involved in this patent.

2 Q. You're referring to Crossroads there?

3 A. Yes. Oh, I'm sorry. You asked me about Chaparral.

4 Q. I'm asking about Crossroads. Was Crossroads CP 4200

5 product source code, did that include access controls?

6 A. No, it did not.

7 Q. Okay. Now, what is the next factor that was on your list?

8 I believe you mentioned No. 5.

9 A. I'm sorry. I'll have to go back and consult my list. I

10 guess the next thing that I thought was worth the specific

11 discussion as being quite significant was No. 5.

12 Q. Okay.

13 A. The commercial relationship between the licensor and the

14 licensee.

15 Q. And what did you conclude on that factor?

16 A. Well, I conclude -- I looked carefully at the product, in

17 addition, products that were being sold by Chaparral that

18 included the feature that's alleged to infringe. And it's

19 clear, if you look at those numbers, that most of the product

20 that Chaparral sells does not compete with Crossroads in the

21 marketplace.

22 Q. And did you prepare a slide concerning your analysis of

23 that factor?

24 A. Yes, I did, which hopefully you can put up for me.

25 Nothing's happening here. Sorry.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

- 1 Q. There you go. Okay. What does that mean?
- 2 A. Crossroads doesn't sell RAID products.
- 3 Q. How did you come to that conclusion?
- 4 A. Because Crossroads doesn't sell RAID products.
- 5 Q. What did you do to verify that?
- 6 A. I went out and investigated what Crossroads sold. I
- 7 looked at their web site, their product lists, depositions of
- 8 their own information on products they sold, and it's clear
- 9 they don't sell RAID products.
- 10 Q. And what is the next point there?
- 11 A. If you look at RAID products, there are essentially 90
- 12 percent of Chaparral's products with LUN zoning. If you go
- 13 out and do the calculations on a unit basis, this calculation
- 14 actually refers to 2001 since they were alleged to start
- 15 selling infringing products. Ninety percent of what they had
- 16 been selling which contains LUN zoning is RAID products which
- 17 do not compete with Crossroads.
- 18 Q. And did you do that analysis yourself?
- 19 A. Yes, I did.
- 20 Q. Now, were Chaparral and Crossroads competitors on routers?
- 21 A. Sometimes they competed for router sales, but as you can
- 22 see, the vast majority of their sales with LUN zoning were not
- 23 routers, they were RAID products.
- 24 Q. And have you prepared any slides showing the extent to
- 25 which they competed on routers?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. Well, I have a -- I believe I have a slide. Why don't you  
2 just put the next slide up if it's there. Yes. As -- this is  
3 just another version of the same slide, and it basically shows  
4 that of the products with LUN zoning that were alleged to  
5 infringe when only ten percent of them -- 73 routers for the  
6 period for which I had data in July, only ten percent of the  
7 allegedly infringing products, these 73 routers.

8 Q. How did this conclusion impact your analysis as to a  
9 reasonable royalty?

10 A. Well, since most of Crossroads -- rather, I'm sorry, since  
11 most of Chaparral sales were a product which were not even  
12 competing with Crossroads' products, it seemed to me that that  
13 was likely to put downward pressure on my royalty rate that  
14 would be negotiated between the two in a hypothetical  
15 negotiation, most of this was going to products that did not  
16 compete directly with Crossroads.

17 Q. Now, my list indicates that the next one you've -- next  
18 Georgia Pacific factor you mentioned was No. 8.

19 A. Yes, I'm sorry. Let me follow along here. Yes, the  
20 profitability of the products being sold by in this case both  
21 -- actually, in this case, Chaparral.

22 Q. And what did you do to analyze that factor?

23 A. Well, I looked at the net profits that both of these  
24 companies were making on sales of storage router products.

25 Q. And you mentioned net profit. Why did you use net profit

1     rather than some other term?

2     A.   If you look -- because let's just be clear on the  
3     difference between gross profit and net profit.  Gross profit  
4     does not take out a number of absolutely essential types of  
5     expenses if you're selling in a high-tech industry.  In  
6     particular, any cost for research and development is not taken  
7     out of gross profit.  And to stay alive, to compete in the  
8     industry, you have to spend large sums in research and  
9     development.

10            It's simply impossible to stay in the business and not  
11     spend large sums in research and developing on continuing new  
12     products.  Secondly, sales are a significant expense.  
13     Typically, when firms do their accounting in this particular  
14     case, they don't net out sales expenses before they calculate  
15     the gross profit.

16            And finally, general sort of administrative overhead  
17     type expenses which are incurred -- increase as you expand  
18     your business, those aren't netted out as gross profit either.  
19     To actually make money and make a profit and return dollars to  
20     your shareholders, you have to take these expenses into  
21     account because they're very real parts of staying in business  
22     in this industry.

23            If you look at gross profit, it doesn't take that into  
24     account.  Net profit does.  It's what you have left over at  
25     the end of the day, after you pay all these necessary expenses

1 to continue maintaining yourself in this high technology  
2 business.

3 Q. And how should that impact your analysis impact a  
4 reasonable royalty for that factor?

5 A. The bottom line is if you're not making any money in the  
6 business, you can't afford to pay a royalty. In some sense,  
7 the amount you could possibly -- the upper bound on what you  
8 could pay on a royalty is going to be impacted by how much you  
9 have left over at the end of the day.

10 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, may we approach for a  
11 second?

12 THE COURT: You may.

13 (At the Bench, on the record.)

14 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, this witness -- under the  
15 Right Eye case and other case law, you don't have to make a  
16 profit, and that was a misstatement of the law Dr. Flamm just  
17 offered to make the statement in the manner that he did.

18 THE COURT: He's not instructing about the law. He  
19 just said if you don't make a profit, you can't afford to pay  
20 a royalty. It's factual.

21 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, that's not what the law  
22 says.

23 THE COURT: I understand that and I'll instruct them  
24 on the law if we have that. It's just his opinion to get to a  
25 net profit because if you have a loss, he's saying from a

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 factual standpoint, doesn't make any sense. I understand what  
2 the law is.

3 MR. ALBRIGHT: Okay.

4 THE COURT: The jury's going to find the facts, and  
5 that's something that they can take into consideration.

6 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir.

7 Q. (BY MR. DELLETT) Could you just very briefly summarize  
8 your conclusion on factor No. 8?

9 A. My conclusion on factor 8 is both companies are basically  
10 losing money over this period, and therefore, when you  
11 calculate the net profit and, therefore, that would tend to  
12 lower the royalty that could be paid by Chaparral.

13 Q. Okay. And what is the 9th Pacific Georgia factor that you  
14 have analyzed?

15 A. Factor 9 is the utility and advantage of patent property  
16 over old modes and devices, if any, that have been used for  
17 working out similar results. That's the full explanation.

18 Q. In analyzing this factor, did you rely on someone else?

19 A. Yes. Another way of putting this is you look at what the  
20 possible non-infringing ways of making or selling products  
21 would be and you compare what you could make in terms of  
22 profitability from using the non-infringing product with what  
23 you can make using the infringing product, and that difference  
24 should impact how much you're willing to pay to use the  
25 technology that you're alleged to infringe.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Would you tell the jury who, if anyone, you relied on in  
2 reaching your conclusions on that factor?

3 A. Yes. I primarily talked to Gary Stephens and relied on  
4 him. And if you heard briefly about I think in his testimony  
5 on a nature of alternatives that would not be infringing. I  
6 also talked to Al Permut, Tom Lavan at Chaparral and their  
7 engineering departments to get some information.

8 Q. With respect to Mr. Stephens, what are you relying on  
9 about -- the alternative that he testified about concerning  
10 modification of LUN zoning to allow control by every host?

11 A. What am I relying on?

12 Q. With respect to that particular alternative.

13 A. I'm relying on his analysis of it being noninfringing.  
14 I'm also relying on his analysis of the fact that it would be  
15 an acceptable law for acceptable performance and, therefore,  
16 be acceptable in the marketplace.

17 Q. Now, with respect to that alternative, modification of LUN  
18 zoning to allow a control by every host, what are you relying  
19 on that you heard from Mr. Permut?

20 A. I heard directly from Mr. Permut on some of -- on the  
21 types of expenses, the resources that were required to make  
22 the modifications that were described in real life, and  
23 essentially, I believe Mr. Stephens and, for that matter, Mr.  
24 Permut repeated some of that information today in their  
25 testimony in court.

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. And to what extent did you rely on Mr. Permut concerning  
2 whether that alternative has been sold?

3 A. I relied on Mr. Permut for information on -- that that  
4 alternative has been sold. Again, I do believe you heard that  
5 in court today. That was my primary source.

6 Q. If Mr. Permut and Mr. Stephens are correct about their  
7 testimony with respect to that alternative, how would that  
8 impact your opinion on amount of reasonable royalty?

9 A. You can do a calculation of the resources required to  
10 affect those modifications. In fact, I've done such a  
11 calculation. You basically take those expenses required to  
12 make the modification and then, divide it by Chaparral's  
13 annualized sales of these products, that should essentially  
14 give you what Chaparral would be willing to pay in terms of a  
15 reasonable royalty in order to avoid requirement to modify  
16 their products.

17 Q. Okay. And have you prepared a slide on that?

18 A. Yes, I have, and I'm --

19 Q. Okay. And is this a slide that you referred to?

20 A. There should be more on it.

21 Q. Okay. What does the first part of the slide indicate?

22 A. It essentially -- I essentially looked at the estimated  
23 cost of LUN zoning permitting any host to alter LUN zones.  
24 This is the first modification. This is the actual  
25 modification that was carried out at the end of July, early



1 August that you heard described in court.

2 Q. What was your conclusion?

3 A. Looking at the information I gathered, the modification  
4 cost approximately \$51,000 -- actually, it cost \$51,000, and  
5 that works out to be 1.8 percent of Chaparral's annualized  
6 2001 sales of the accused RAID and router products. So  
7 \$51,000 works out to 1.8 percent of their annualized sales of  
8 this year.

9 Q. And how would that impact the negotiation for a reasonable  
10 royalty?

11 A. Well, if you're at a hypothetical negotiation, what we  
12 have are the two parties sitting down to discuss how much they  
13 would be willing to pay in order to use the technology, and  
14 Chaparral's position would be that if it didn't license  
15 Crossroads, it could simply modify the products that were not  
16 infringing and use that modified alternative to sell in the  
17 marketplace.

18 That modified alternative would cost them \$51,000 or  
19 1.8 percent of sales, so it would not agree to a royalty of  
20 greater than 1.8 percent in that case.

21 Q. And did you also rely on Mr. Stephens regarding another  
22 alternative?

23 A. Yes, I did.

24 Q. And what is that alternative?

25 A. The other alternative was alteration of LUN zoning to

1 permit pass-through of informative SCSI commands, that is,  
2 certain of the informative SCSI commands that you've heard  
3 about -- and I know it's a lot of jargon, but basically,  
4 things like the inquiry command, let's just stick with inquiry  
5 command. There's a long list of them, but you could allow  
6 those informative SCSI commands to pass through.

7 Q. What did you rely on from Mr. Stephens?

8 A. I relied on both his opinion on the fact that it would not  
9 infringe, and I also relied on his opinion of what the cost  
10 would be to make these modifications.

11 Q. Did you rely on anything else from Mr. Stephens concerning  
12 what of that would be acceptably performing?

13 A. Yes. I also asked him, inquired as to whether this would  
14 offer acceptable performance in the workplace.

15 Q. Okay. If Mr. Stephens is correct, how would this  
16 alternative impact a reasonable royalty negotiation?

17 A. Well, this would be another potential alternative that  
18 they could bring to the negotiating table with Crossroads when  
19 our reasonable royalty was being discussed, and they could  
20 calculate the cost of this -- I'm sorry.

21 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, may we approach?

22 (At the Bench, on the record.)

23 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, I have no problem what he's  
24 testifying, the slide says \$85,000 of the cost. If we have  
25 Mr. Allcock confirm with Mr. -- that this is the amount it

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 would take -- he's relying entirely on Mr. Stephens. If you  
2 go through the amount of time Mr. Stephens testified here in  
3 trial today it would take, it's substantially more than  
4 \$85,000.

5 THE COURT: Can you show that in cross-examination?

6 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, I just don't believe it's  
7 appropriate to show the demonstrative. But if you're --

8 THE COURT: Just make your objections out there. You  
9 can make your objections about what the law would be, I'll  
10 give an instruction. Make your objection. These calculations  
11 can be out there.

12 Q. (BY MR. DELLETT) Did you perform any analysis of how this  
13 estimated cost would impact a reasonable royalty negotiation?

14 A. Yes, I did. This would be another alternative at the  
15 negotiating table.

16 Q. And is that what your conclusion --

17 A. That, in fact, was my conclusion that if instead of the  
18 first alternative they instead elected to use this  
19 noninfringing alternative, the cost to Chaparral would be  
20 \$85,000, which would work out to 2.9 percent of Chaparral's  
21 annualized 2001 sales of accused RAID and router products.

22 Q. And would that impact a hypothetical negotiation in your  
23 opinion?

24 A. Yes, it would. This is another alternative that Chaparral  
25 could bring to the bargaining table and say, look, we're not

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 going to pay more than this because this is another  
2 alternative that we could -- would like to use instead of  
3 signing a license agreement with you, and this is a  
4 non-infringing alternative.

5 Q. Now, what if Mr. Stephens and Mr. Permut are wrong about  
6 the two alternatives you just mentioned?

7 A. There is a third alternative, actually, there's more than  
8 a third alternative, but, in particular, there's a third  
9 alternative which is particularly noteworthy and which was  
10 mentioned by Mr. Stephens in his testimony, and that is simply  
11 removing LUN zoning from the products or not putting it in in  
12 the first place.

13 Q. And did you rely on Mr. Stephens and Mr. Permut for your  
14 conclusions on that?

15 A. Yes, I did.

16 Q. And did you do any independent study yourself on the  
17 viability of that alternative?

18 A. Yes, I did.

19 Q. And what did you find?

20 A. I looked at the impact of removing LUN zoning on -- you  
21 want me to describe that?

22 Q. Now, what kind of research did you do with respect to  
23 sales of products that did not have LUN zoning?

24 A. Okay. What I did, I took actual data, invoice data for  
25 Chaparral products, RAID, router products sold in 2001, and in

1 some cases, those products were sold before and after LUN  
2 zoning was added; and I performed on what's called an  
3 econometric analysis of these invoice data on sales to analyze  
4 what the impact of LUN zoning was on the price that Chaparral  
5 received for its products.

6 Q. Before we get into that, is it correct that Chaparral  
7 still sells products that do not have LUN zoning?

8 A. Yes, Chaparral sells products that -- continues to sell  
9 products that do not have LUN zoning. The FS-1310 router, for  
10 example, to this day, doesn't have LUN zoning.

11 Q. How about Crossroads? Does Crossroads have such products?

12 A. In fact, all of Crossroads' products, according to the  
13 information that's been discussed in this court, essentially  
14 until very recently, were sold without the kind of  
15 functionality that Crossroads accuses Chaparral of infringing  
16 on the 972 patent.

17 Q. Now, as far these products that would have LUN zoning  
18 removed or never have it put in in the first place, did you  
19 rely on Mr. Stephens for the cost?

20 A. Yes, I did. Mr. Stephens gave me information which  
21 indicated the cost would be less than the two alternatives  
22 I've already described. So that would lie below the two  
23 higher cost numbers I just developed for you.

24 Q. How would that information impact a hypothetical  
25 negotiation?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. Crossroads would know and Chaparral would know that they  
2 always had the option of simply removing the LUN zoning if an  
3 agreement was not reached.

4 Q. Now, do you have any understanding as to at the time of  
5 this hypothetical negotiation in December 2000 or January  
6 2001, was Crossroads still alleging that the 1310 infringed?

7 A. At the time of the hypothetical negotiation?

8 Q. Yes.

9 A. Yeah. It turns out that at the time -- as far as -- I  
10 mean, my knowledge of this, based on the materials I've read  
11 and what testimony I've heard in court, is that it wasn't  
12 really until the spring of 2001, early 2001 that Chaparral  
13 learned that Crossroads was not alleging that the reserve and  
14 release feature, which is in its products and which is also in  
15 Chaparral's non-LUN zoning products, did not infringe.

16 So they didn't learn of that, really, until early  
17 2001, but for the purposes of a hypothetical negotiation, I  
18 have to take that information, which we now know and was  
19 actually known later and project it back and assume that we  
20 knew it at the time that the hypothetical negotiation.

21 Q. Now, you talked about three alternatives. Why did you  
22 select those three from the universe of alternatives that Mr.  
23 Stephens briefly mentioned?

24 A. Because I thought those were the conservative choices.

25 Q. What do you mean by conservative?

1 A. What I mean by conservative is cautious based on things  
2 that Chaparral really did, or things that were like stuff that  
3 Chaparral really did, or in real life, similar to things that  
4 Chaparral did with its product.

5 Q. And then, your conclusion on factor 9 is what?

6 A. Factor 9, I'm sorry, I always have to -- my conclusion on  
7 factor 9 is essentially that looking at non-infringing  
8 alternatives that would have been available to Chaparral that  
9 a reasonable range would be from 1.8 to 2.9 percent. That is  
10 a cautious, conservative approach looked at what Chaparral is  
11 actually doing would conclude that Chaparral could avoid  
12 paying a license for this assumed valid technology in the 972  
13 patent and instead, spent with between 1.8 to 2.9 of its sales  
14 to modify its products so that's going to be, essentially, up  
15 or down Chaparral would be willing to pay.

16 Q. What is the next factor you listed, I believe, factor 10,  
17 what does that mean?

18 A. Yes, I always have to look. The nature of invention, the  
19 benefits to its uses to its users, I'm sorry.

20 Q. What does that factor actually say? Is that paraphrased  
21 quite accurate?

22 A. That's actually not quite right. The actual factor reads  
23 -- that's why I was kind of looking. The actual factor reads  
24 the nature of the patent invention, the character of the  
25 commercial embodiment of it as owned and introduced by the

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1     licensor and the benefits to those who have used the  
2     invention. That's the actual language in the Georgia Pacific  
3     factor.

4     Q. As of the hypothetical negotiation date, did Crossroads  
5     actually have -- patent owner actually have commercial  
6     embodiment?

7     A. No. Let's go back. Remember the hypothetical negotiation  
8     would have been December 2000, January 2001, and Crossroads  
9     had not yet shipped any commercial embodiment of these  
10    products and -- no.

11    Q. All right. Now, has Chaparral -- what fraction of  
12    Chaparral's products have used LUN zoning, approximately? I  
13    don't want a number.

14    A. You don't want a number?

15    Q. Do you have an estimate?

16    A. Actually, most of their products don't use LUN zoning.

17    Q. Okay. Now, to what extent would that factor have any  
18    impact on a reasonable royalty rate?

19    A. That would tend to lower it, as well.

20    Q. Okay. What is factor No. 11?

21    A. Factor 11, which is listed here as value of use, again,  
22    that's not exactly -- that's close, but it's not exactly what  
23    Georgia Pacific says. Georgia Pacific says the extent to  
24    which the infringer has made use of the invention and any  
25    evidence probative of the value of that use.



09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 Q. Did you do an econometric analysis to reach a conclusion  
2 on that factor?

3 A. Yes, I did, I did an econometric analysis.

4 Q. Okay. And what in -- is that a type of analysis that you  
5 have done before?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Okay. Briefly, can you tell us what the equation means  
8 there?

9 A. Okay. Well, the equation's not actually on the screen  
10 yet.

11 Q. What is this about?

12 A. Let me sort of explain what the idea is. The idea is you  
13 have a number of things going on. First of all, to begin  
14 with, I took this data. I had data on almost 500 invoices for  
15 router and RAID products sold by Chaparral in the period from  
16 January through mid-July of 2001.

17 And there are a number of things that could influence  
18 the price of these RAID and routers. There might be a general  
19 tendency for the market to go up and down for RAID and router  
20 products for prices of those products. Chaparral might have  
21 special relationships with particular customers that  
22 influenced the price paid by a particular customer vis-a-vis  
23 the price paid by another customer.

24 And there might be quantity discounts if you bought  
25 large numbers of router or RAID products. The purpose of this

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 econometric analysis is to isolate the impact of adding LUN  
2 zoning from those other potential things that affect prices in  
3 the price of RAID and router products received by Chaparral.

4 Q. Let's go down to your conclusion here.

5 A. Okay.

6 Q. All the way to the bottom of the slide. What was your  
7 conclusion of this?

8 A. The conclusion was if you look at the numbers that  
9 essentially LUN zoning had no discernible impact on the price  
10 that Chaparral actually received for the RAID and router  
11 products.

12 Q. And does this slide depict the equation that you used as  
13 well as the numerical results of your analysis?

14 A. Yes, it does. Obviously, there were more descriptive  
15 statistics associated with these numerical results, but  
16 basically, remember the factors, the things I was talking  
17 about controlling for, in addition to the thing I was  
18 isolating the impact of LUN zoning, are these other  
19 coefficients reflect the impact of those.

20 We've estimated this statistical using actual data on  
21 invoice prices, and we used what's called a weighted least  
22 square technique, which actually improves the accuracy of the  
23 result and these were the results.

24 Q. Okay. And how did this conclusion, in your opinion,  
25 affect a reasonable royalty rate?

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 A. We know that LUN zoning basically had no discernible  
2 impact, as remarked a moment ago, and that would indicate that  
3 the royalty rate would be relatively low because it has not  
4 enabled Chaparral to charge higher prices for its products.

5 Q. What is the next factor that you listed? I believe it  
6 was --

7 A. Let's see. Where did we leave off? 12, I think, is the  
8 next one.

9 Q. And what does that factor refer to?

10 A. That's the factor refers to whether or not there's any  
11 usual standard customary split of revenues or profits from the  
12 use of an invention between the inventor and the person who's  
13 licensing it.

14 Q. Have you become familiar with customer royalty rates in  
15 the computer industry?

16 A. I have read in the course of my 20 years, or whatever,  
17 I've read many, many licensing agreements. I've read  
18 hundreds, literally hundreds of licensing agreements in the  
19 computer industry, so I have a pretty good idea of the ranges  
20 for royalty rates.

21 Q. And have you also seen surveys of royalty rates in the  
22 computer industry?

23 A. Yes. There are also survey results that are published,  
24 surveys of studies of royalty rates in the computer industry.

25 Q. And based on your personal experience and your review of

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 license agreements and your surveys that you've seen, what --

2 A. Can I adjust one more thing?

3 Q. Sure.

4 A. Of course, which is I also looked at actual licensing  
5 agreements, the several that we've talked about in this  
6 particular case.

7 Q. Based on those things, what are typical royalty rates for  
8 patents relating to computer technology?

9 A. Large percentage of royalties are actually under two  
10 percent in the computer industry, and the vast majority of  
11 royalties are under five percent. It's relatively rare. It's  
12 actually quite rare to have a royalty rate that's above five  
13 percent if you look in either published tabulations in the  
14 royalty industry or if you look -- or based on my experience  
15 reading these actual licensing agreements.

16 Q. Okay. Now, let's move ahead to factor No. 15. You  
17 already mentioned factor -- on factor 13; is that right?

18 A. Yes, I think I mentioned that both Chaparral and customary  
19 -- sorry, both Chaparral and Crossroads are basically not  
20 making money.

21 Q. Okay. And did that change for Chaparral with the  
22 introduction of LUN zoning?

23 A. A good point. That situation did not change after  
24 Chaparral. They were losing money before. They're still  
25 losing money, which, of course, means that they can't afford

1 to pay a lot.

2 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, I would object, as we  
3 discussed earlier at the bench, it's inappropriate --  
4 inappropriate standard for this witness to give the jury. And  
5 I would ask the Court for an instruction with respect to the  
6 effect it profits or whether a company can make profits ought  
7 to have on the outcome.

8 THE COURT: Well, the objection is --

9 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, the objection is that Dr.  
10 Flamm is just --

11 THE COURT: The objection is granted to the degree  
12 that I'll instruct the jury that whether or not a company  
13 makes a profit does not determine whether or not that company  
14 should pay a royalty, or does pay a royalty, or is paying a  
15 royalty. And you may proceed.

16 Q. (BY MR. DELLETT) Now, finally, you mentioned briefly -- I  
17 believe you listed factor 15. Did you see any information in  
18 your analysis in this case on factor No. 15 that you  
19 considered to be significant?

20 A. Factor No. 15?

21 Q. Yes.

22 A. Okay. Yes. This is the outcome of the hypothetical  
23 negotiation. And, in particular, both sides of this  
24 negotiation would know that LUN zoning -- you've heard  
25 testimony at this trial -- actually was not considered a

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 particularly important factor in driving sales.

2 You've heard, I believe, Mr. Walker talk about that.

3 But Crossroads executives have also testified at deposition --

4 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, Chaparral has introduced no  
5 deposition testimony from anyone from Crossroads that supports  
6 the statement that Dr. Flamm just made. Had they attempted to  
7 do so, we would have objected that it was opinion testimony.

8 THE COURT: Your objection is that there's no  
9 evidence.

10 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir. No foundation.

11 THE COURT: Correct. There's no evidence in this  
12 record they testified to that statement. You may rephrase  
13 your question.

14 Q. (BY MR. DELLETT) You in your analysis relied at all on any  
15 deposition testimony that you have read concerning whether or  
16 not Crossroads believes LUN zoning is important not to put in  
17 its products?

18 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, I believe the only evidence  
19 he could consider is the evidence that the jury's heard in the  
20 courtroom with respect to testimony, and there's been none  
21 with respect to this issue.

22 THE COURT: Do you have any additional questions to  
23 ask this witness?

24 MR. DELLETT: I have one more question.

25 Q. (BY MR. DELLETT) Based on your analysis, what is your

1 opinion as to the amount of a reasonable royalty?

2 A. It would be 2.5 percent, consistent with all the factors  
3 I've discussed today.

4 Q. And is this the slide that shows your conclusion?

5 A. Yes. If you took -- take the sales of products with LUN  
6 zoning that are alleged to infringe in a period through July  
7 of this year for which they were available when I made this  
8 calculation, and you multiply it times reasonable royalty rate  
9 of 2.5 percent, you take that 1.5 million dollars, basically  
10 multiply it by 2.5 percent, and use all the significant  
11 digits, you get a figure of about \$38,474 would be the total  
12 reasonable royalty.

13 Q. No further questions. Thank you.

14 THE COURT: Members of the jury, I'm going to let you  
15 go home. If you'll be back at our regular time of 8:25.  
16 Please remember our instructions to you and be careful going  
17 home.

18 (Jury not present.)

19 THE COURT: When Dr. Flamm is through, how many more?

20 MR. BAHLER: Last witness, your Honor.

21 THE COURT: You intend to rest?

22 MR. ALLCOCK: Your Honor, we have a very short  
23 rebuttal case, maybe a half hour with Dr. Hodges and ten  
24 minutes or so with --

25 THE COURT: We're going to finish up the testimony in

09/10/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 4

1 the morning in all probability. That's what I needed to  
2 figure out.

3 Okay. Mr. Dellett, when I asked you if you had any  
4 more questions, I expected you to ask the witness if they --  
5 the witness relies on information along those lines. I didn't  
6 have enough foundation for that objection to be able to rule.

7 All right. 8:25.

8 (Proceedings adjourned.)

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



C50

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXA  
 2 WESTERN DIVISION  
 3 CROSSROADS SYSTEMS, ) Docket No. A 00-CA-217 SS (TEXAS), INC., A TE  
 4 CORPORATION )  
 5 vs. ) Austin, Texas )  
 6 CHAPARRAL NETWORK ) STORAGE, INC., A )  
 7 DELAWARE CORPORATION ) September 5, 2001  
 8 TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL ON THE MERITS  
 9 BEFORE THE HONORABLE SAM SPARKS Volume 2 of 6

11 APPEARANCES:

12 For the Plaintiff: Mr. Alan D. Albright  
 13 Mr. John Allcock  
 14 Mr. John Giust  
 15 401 B Street, Suite 1700

17 For the Defendant: Mr. David D. Bahler  
 18 Mr. Stephen D. Dellett  
 19 Fulbright & Jaworksi  
 20 Austin, Texas 78701

21 Court Reporter: Lily Iva Reznik, RPR, CRR  
 22 200 W. 8th Street  
 23 (512)916-5564

25 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by c

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

	I N D E X			
	Direct	Cross	Redirect	RecrossWitnesses:
1				
2				
3				
4	Brian R. Smith		4	15
5	Ted Neman	18	19	
6	John R. Middleton	20	30	35
7	Brian Bianchi	37	38	
8	Geoffry B. Hoese	54	77	84 96
9	Jeffry Russell	99	107	115 116
10	Keith Arroyo	118	121	
11	Robert Selinger	132		
12	Michael Gluck	144		
13	Jerry L. Walker	171	205	
14				
15				Page
16	Proceedings Adjourned			214
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

	E X H I B I T S	
	Offered	Admitted
1		
2		
3	Plaintiff's	
4	#7 Fax	68 69
5	#264 Verrazano Specification	29 30
6	#267 CP4X00 Product Specification	29 30
7	#268 Verrazano Hardware Document	29 30
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 THE COURT: Counsel, anything before we bring in the  
2 jury?

3 MR. BAHLER: Nothing from defendant.

4 MR. ALBRIGHT: No, sir.

5 THE COURT: All right. Bring them in.

6 (Jury present.)

7 THE COURT: Members of the jury, as you left last  
8 night until this morning, has anyone attempted to talk to you  
9 about this case?

10 THE JURORS: No.

11 THE COURT: Have you talked to anybody about the case?

12 THE JURORS: No.

13 THE COURT: And have you learned anything at all about  
14 the case outside the presence of each one another and this  
15 courtroom?

16 THE JURORS: No.

17 THE COURT: All right. Show negative responses to all  
18 questions by all jurors. Thank you. And I believe the  
19 witness is yours, Mr. Albright.

20 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir. Thank you, sir.

21 THE COURT: Mr. Smith, you're still under oath, sir.

22 RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. ALBRIGHT:

24 Q. Mr. Smith, during the course of Mr. Bahler's  
25 cross-examination, you saw a number of products that were

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 generally from the 1996 time period or, at least, designed for  
2 products. Do you recall him asking you questions about that?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Throughout the myriad of different companies' projected  
5 products, did anything that we saw yesterday have any software  
6 in it?

7 A. There were just hardware diagrams.

8 Q. Explain to the jury, if you would, please, sir, what you  
9 mean by the fact they were hardware diagrams as opposed to  
10 having software.

11 A. The different blocks that were shown on the diagrams  
12 represented hardware chips that were used and connected  
13 together.

14 Q. In anything that Mr. Bahler showed the jury yesterday and  
15 asked you about, would there have been anything in any of  
16 those products or conceptions of products that would have  
17 allowed access control to take place?

18 A. I don't believe so.

19 Q. And why wouldn't any of them have been able to provide for  
20 access control?

21 A. They didn't show the software would have been running.

22 Q. Okay. Not only that show software, did it even have the  
23 capability of having software?

24 A. My understanding they did not.

25 Q. Do you recall when it was that the two Jeffs, Jeff Russell

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 and Geoff Hoese, invented the concept of access controls?

2 A. As I remember, it was the spring of '97.

3 Q. If I could have Exhibit D-140, please. Mr. Smith,  
4 yesterday, Mr. Bahler showed Exhibit D-140 to the jury and  
5 asked you questions about it. These are your handwritten  
6 notes, correct, sir?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And I got the impression as I was listening to his  
9 questions that he was asking you about a product that you had  
10 actually seen at Adaptec, is that correct, was back in this  
11 time period when you were looking at stuff at Adaptec, was  
12 there actually a product there?

13 A. As I recall, I only saw presentation.

14 Q. And would you tell the jury you only saw a presentation of  
15 what was at Adaptec, what do you mean, sir?

16 A. A set of slides that we looked at yesterday to represent  
17 what they hoped to have someday.

18 Q. So there was nothing finished at Adaptec during this time  
19 period?

20 A. That's correct, as I recall.

21 Q. And there certainly wasn't anything like the jury could  
22 see there where there's actually a box or anything like that  
23 that you were able to look at?

24 A. That's how I remember, yes.

25 Q. This is a slide presentation sort of what we're looking at.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 now?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. Okay. Whatever it was that you were looking at in terms  
4 of that slide presentation, was there anything in anything  
5 that Adaptec showed you that had the kind of software in it  
6 that could provide for access controls?

7 A. I don't recall that.

8 Q. And was there any software at all in what you were looking  
9 at at Adaptec?

10 A. There were two descriptions of it, as I remember.

11 Q. Do you recall whether there was ever an actual Coronado  
12 product at Adaptec, Coronado product that got finished in '96  
13 or '97?

14 A. I don't recall that either.

15 Q. Mr. Bahler also talked to you about the Mux product. Do  
16 you recall that yesterday, multiplexer?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Was there a finished Mux product that was ready to be sold  
19 in 1996?

20 A. There was not.

21 Q. What was there in 1996 that could be called a Mux?

22 A. Prototypes and pre-betas.

23 Q. Well, I'm not certain the jury's familiar with the term  
24 pre-beta. What is a beta unit in your industry?

25 A. A device that would be able to be sold to the general

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 public. Would not have either some of the features in it or  
2 some of the certifications under the FCC Rules of Products and  
3 what their emissions can be.

4 Q. Okay. So by beta unit, you're saying something that's not  
5 for sale?

6 A. Not sellable.

7 Q. Not sellable. And when we talk about the Mux product, you  
8 describe those as a pre beta. What does that mean?

9 A. That they were devices that didn't have the latest  
10 hardware, as I remember, what would eventually be sold.

11 Q. These Mux products that you received from Hewlett Packard,  
12 can you ever pay for them?

13 A. The first 15 or so we did not.

14 Q. What did you do with those first 15?

15 A. We used them to test functionality and then, we returned  
16 them.

17 Q. So you didn't buy them and you didn't keep them?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. And just so the jury understands, when you received those  
20 first 15, was that in 1997?

21 A. I believe it was early '97.

22 Q. Okay. Let's finish up with the Mux product so the jury  
23 understands. Could any of the Mux product perform access  
24 controls?

25 A. As I understand them, no.



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. And why would they not be able to perform access controls?

2 A. I believe they were pretty much hardware from the Fibre  
3 Channel side to the SCSI side.

4 Q. The software wasn't there?

5 A. The software wasn't there to do functions like access  
6 controls, as I remember.

7 Q. Mr. Smith, I've put up on the screen for the jury D-158.

8 You were asked a question about this. Mr. Smith, we're  
9 looking at D-158, and there's a particular portion of it. If  
10 you would look at the third paragraph down, please, sir, it  
11 references a no charge PO?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Should reflect the \$17,000 price. Would you tell the jury  
14 what an evaluation PO is, please, sir?

15 A. It's a document that allows potential customers who want  
16 to evaluate or look at a product that is not sellable to be  
17 able to receive it, look at it, I believe, for 60 days and  
18 then, return it back to the original designer of the product.

19 Q. Was there anyone back in this time period that was going  
20 to pay you all \$17,000?

21 A. No. That was really a fictional price put on for standard  
22 practice in the industry.

23 Q. I just want to make sure the jury understands because  
24 you've talked a couple of times about fictional prices. Why  
25 does a company like Crossroads when they send out these type

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 of evaluation units, why you put a fictional price on it?

2 A. It's just industry standard practice in the OEM  
3 relationship where you're selling to another party at some  
4 point to put that -- to strap a price to it.

5 Q. What are you expecting to do to pay that money or send the  
6 money back?

7 A. Our expectation is we would receive all of that product  
8 back.

9 Q. And in this case, do you recall whether or not you  
10 received them back?

11 A. I don't recall whether we ever sent it to them, but as I  
12 recall, we did receive all of our betas back.

13 Q. Chaparral is in, roughly, the same business as you all,  
14 correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Router industry? Do you expect that they would have the  
17 same practice of sending out evaluation or beta units?

18 A. I would expect that.

19 Q. Same type that are not for sale, they're just evaluation  
20 units?

21 A. I would have that expectation.

22 Q. And, for example, these products, were they under an MDA  
23 when you send them out?

24 A. Very typically, yes. In fact, I don't recall any of them  
25 not being under a non-disclosure agreement.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. And what does a non-disclosure agreement provide?

2 A. It's typically an agreement between two parties possibly  
3 more where they agree not to disclose to any other party what  
4 the product is, or the intellectual property, or the concepts  
5 that are being communicated are, and just to disclose those  
6 between the two parties.

7 Q. So somebody has an MDA on it when it goes out to the  
8 persons receiving it, is that a product that's been sold to  
9 them?

10 A. Typically not. It's just under evaluation.

11 Q. I'm going to shift to -- just a quick discussion yesterday  
12 you were asked about Clariion?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Do you recall that? And Mr. Bahler asked you questions  
15 about whether or not Crossroads had made sales of products to  
16 Clariion in 1996, do you recall that, sir?

17 A. Uh-huh.

18 Q. Was there a finished product in 1996 that Crossroads could  
19 have sold to Clariion?

20 A. No.

21 Q. In 1997, did you sell a product to Clariion?

22 A. I don't recall ever selling anything to Clariion.

23 Q. Do you recall when Crossroads' first sale of a router was?

24 A. I do; it was in August of 1997 to Compaq.

25 Q. And how can you be certain that Crossroads didn't sell a

1 product until August of 1997?

2 A. The reason I remember is because it came up during our  
3 filing of registration in 1999 where we filed with the  
4 Securities and Exchange Commission to go public. We had to  
5 write and tell the public when was our first sale. We wrote  
6 August of 1997.

7 Q. And is that a pretty important document that you file with  
8 the Securities and Exchange Commission?

9 A. Very important, yes.

10 Q. Is it important to be truthful in that document?

11 A. It is, yes.

12 Q. Finally, we discussed yesterday, at some length, what was  
13 called the Verrazano project. And Mr. Bahler put up -- and  
14 I'm not going to try it again just so we can get finished here  
15 -- put up basically a diagram that had some Tachyon chip and  
16 some other parts.

17 Remember him highlighting them for the jury and  
18 pointing out what was contained in the diagram?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Again, so the jury understands, were we looking at  
21 hardware features or software features?

22 A. That was hardware block diagram.

23 Q. Was there any software anywhere in that diagram?

24 A. There was not.

25 Q. Could Mr. Bahler have highlighted anything in that diagram

1 that would have shown any software function at all?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Could he go through or could anyone go through the  
4 Verrazano documents from 1996 and find anything in them that  
5 discussed access controls?

6 A. I don't believe so.

7 Q. And could you find anything in the -- indicated the  
8 software that would provide for access controls?

9 A. I don't believe so.

10 Q. With respect to the difference between -- and I'm going to  
11 close with this -- but with respect to the difference between  
12 the hardware and software features, in your basic  
13 understanding, how does one develop as between the hardware  
14 and the software development of these type of projects or  
15 these type of routers?

16 A. We think of the hardware and software being at some levels  
17 two distinct elements that work together. In fact, we talk to  
18 our customers about how our software kind of works with our  
19 hardware. I could even draw it if it made sense to do that.

20 Q. Judge, would he be permitted to walk over to the board?

21 THE COURT: He's permitted.

22 A. So when we talk to our customers, since I have a fairly  
23 high level of understanding what we do, not too detailed, this  
24 is how I try to communicate to our customers how our hardware  
25 and our software work together. We think of it as essentially

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 kind of a pyramid where here at the low layers, we have  
2 hardware.

3 And we talked about those things yesterday being the  
4 Fibre Channel, chip, the SCSI chip, and the microprocessor.  
5 Those are things that we put together to build our products.  
6 They're the hardware elements of our product. Running on the  
7 microprocessor software that runs in the microprocessor, we  
8 have software here. That essentially configures and defines  
9 how the unit is to run.

10 And we actually have some --

11 Q. (BY MR. ALBRIGHT) I was just going to --

12 A. We actually have some patents here we have been granted in  
13 this space and some intellectual property that we have  
14 uniquely discovered. And on top of that, we have additional  
15 software that uses those services to provide even more  
16 valuable functions, and I believe in what I tell my customers  
17 is that access control and other features that we are able to  
18 lift at this layer. We also have patents at this layer.

19 Q. So when you're describing for the jury what -- what Mr.  
20 Bahler yesterday was asking you questions about what was in  
21 the Verrazano project, what was he talking about in terms of  
22 what's on that pyramid?

23 A. The block diagrams, they represent how the hardware  
24 interconnected.

25 Q. And was the software performed the access control that you

1 have at the top of the pyramid, was that even conceived in  
2 1996?

3 A. It was not and it's not contemplated in the diagram  
4 either.

5 Q. Pass the witness.

6 RE-CROSS EXAMINATION

7 BY MR. BAHLER:

8 Q. Mr. Smith, we talked yesterday about the technology  
9 demonstration at Comdex '96, right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Now, that had Fibre Channel hosts connected on the Fibre  
12 Channel side, right?

13 A. It did.

14 Q. And it had SCSI storage devices connected on the SCSI  
15 side, right?

16 A. Yes, it did.

17 Q. And there were requests for data being transferred from  
18 Fibre Channel hosts through the 4100 prototype product to the  
19 SCSI storage devices, right?

20 A. Yes, at our technology demonstration.

21 Q. And there was data in the form of images you were showing  
22 at the slide show, right?

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. Data was being transferred from the SCSI storage devices  
25 back through the 4100 prototype to the Fibre Channel host,

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 right?

2 A. Yes, correct.

3 Q. And that all required software, didn't it, sir?

4 A. Yes, it did.

5 Q. So the prototype had software, right?

6 A. It did.

7 Q. The only thing that Mr. Albright asked you that was

8 missing was access control, right?

9 A. That's what he asked, yes.

10 Q. The \$17,000 that you were offering the Hewlett Packard Mux

11 to EMC, how did you arrive at that number, sir, \$17,000?

12 A. I don't recall specifically how we got there.

13 Q. That's what you were paying Hewlett Packard for the units,

14 right?

15 A. I don't recall that.

16 Q. You mentioned that you had sold the first 4100 unit to

17 Compaq in August of '97, right?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. In fact, you'd sold a 4400 unit to Compaq in 1996, right?

20 A. I don't recall, sir, doing that.

21 Q. Let me show you what's been marked as Defendant's Exhibit

22 172, and, first of all, Mr. Smith, this is called a Crossroads

23 purchase order log, right, sir?

24 A. That's the title, yes.

25 Q. And it's dated -- it was updated July 21, 1997, right,



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 sir?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. Okay. And on that purchase order log, there's some  
4 entries for Compaq, right, just so we're clear what we're  
5 talking about. I have the banner, the column headings over on  
6 top of these Compaq entries. Now, this records a purchase  
7 order received from Compaq in December 9th, 1996, right, sir?

8 A. Appears to be, yes.

9 Q. And it was for a CP 4400, right?

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. And the price was \$17,000, right?

12 A. Yes, and to the right it says evaluation period.

13 Q. That's right. And if it met with their approval, they  
14 could keep it for \$17,000, right?

15 A. Again, industry practice to return the evaluation PO  
16 products.

17 Q. Well, the second of those wasn't ever returned, was it?

18 A. I don't know.

19 Q. Well, let's look at the whole line here. All right.

20 That's a little hard to read, I suppose. Well, let's look at  
21 the -- let's look at this part here. Let me call up this part  
22 right here in more detail. It says need to follow up in that  
23 column?

24 A. It does.

25 Q. That means as of August or July 1997, Compaq hadn't

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 returned that product, right?

2 A. I don't know.

3 Q. Pass the witness.

4 THE COURT: Any further questions?

5 MR. ALBRIGHT: No, sir.

6 THE COURT: You may step down, Mr. Smith. You may  
7 call your next witness.

8 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, we have an amazingly brief  
9 deposition transcript that --

10 THE COURT: Members of the jury, a deposition  
11 transcript is a product paper like the little book where a  
12 witness has been sworn before a Court Reporter and the lawyers  
13 have asked them questions, however, as the case may be, and  
14 then, the testimony is read into the record.

15 You will consider this testimony just like any other  
16 sworn testimony that you hear during the trial.

17 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, I only have two questions.  
18 Would you prefer I just read the question and answer?

19 THE COURT: However you wish.

20 MR. ALBRIGHT: Okay. The witness, your Honor, was the  
21 CFO of Chaparral, gentleman named Ted Neman, and the question  
22 posed was: "What is an evaluation?" His answer: "It's a  
23 unit that's sent out to a customer for the purposes of  
24 evaluation to work in a particular configuration to see if the  
25 customer would want to buy a particular product."

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1           Question: "Is that a product that Chaparral considers  
2 it has sold?" The answer was "No."

3           THE COURT: Any testimony you wish to --

4           MR. DELLETT: Next question was: "And why not?"

5           Answer: "Because sometimes those units are returned. At the  
6 time that they are sent out, we do not recognize revenue on  
7 those. A customer might possibly purchase that after an  
8 evaluation unit process, or the customer may send it back,  
9 depending on if it works for their specific needs."

10          Question: "The adjusted revenue follows the same  
11 process that you just told us about, correct?" Answer: "Not  
12 -- initially, the evaluation unit is not counted as revenue.  
13 If the customer elects to purchase it, then it -- then they  
14 are billed, and it's recognized for revenue."

15          THE COURT: Any further testimony?

16          MR. ALBRIGHT: No, sir.

17          THE COURT: All right. You may call your next  
18 witness.

19          MR. ALBRIGHT: Our next witness will be John  
20 Middleton.

21          THE COURT: Come forward, please. This is Mrs. Sims.  
22 She's going to administer an oath to you, sir.

23          (Witness was sworn.)

24          THE COURT: Walk around this column and have a seat,  
25 please. Tell us your full name and spell your last, please.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 THE WITNESS: My name is John Rob Middleton,  
2 M-I-D-D-L-E-T-O-N.

3 JOHN R. MIDDLETON, called by the Plaintiff, duly sworn.

4 DIRECT EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. ALBRIGHT:

6 Q. Mr. Middleton, would you introduce yourself to the jury,  
7 please?

8 A. Yes, my name is John Middleton.

9 Q. And tell the jury why it is that you're here. When did  
10 you go to work for Crossroads?

11 A. I was -- I went to work for Crossroads in February of  
12 1997, and was a vice-president of engineering for a good deal  
13 of that time, between February of '97 and January of 2001.

14 Q. You had the good fortune to retire in 2001?

15 A: Yes.

16 Q. Okay. When you were at Crossroads and you were working as  
17 an engineer, we've heard the discussion in this courtroom  
18 about the fact that there was hardware and that there's  
19 software. Are you a hardware guy or a software guy?

20 A. My background is a hardware engineer.

21 Q. And would you tell the jury what that means, please, sir?

22 A. Hardware engineers design the circuit boards and  
23 electronics that comprise computer products and software, on  
24 the other hand, is the code that runs on the hardware.

25 Q. And so, with respect to the issue that is primary in this

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 case with respect to the access control, is that something  
2 that as a hardware engineer, you were particularly familiar  
3 with or is that something that's more available to the  
4 software engineer?

5 A. It's more of a software feature.

6 Q. With the caveat that you are a hardware engineer, not a  
7 software engineer when you're at Crossroads and now, what was  
8 your understanding of what was meant by the term LUN  
9 management?

10 A. LUN management refers to a mechanism for allowing hosts to  
11 access devices or parts of devices, or to not access --  
12 restrict access to devices or parts of devices.

13 Q. And since I never really heard the word "host" till I  
14 started on this case, could you let the jury know in more  
15 simple terms what a host is?

16 A. Sure. It would be a computer that acts as a server that  
17 accesses the data on the storage system.

18 Q. The jury's heard that the access control feature that  
19 we've talked about or are talking about has not been in the  
20 Crossroads products. Are you familiar with a product that has  
21 recently come out from Crossroads?

22 A. I'm somewhat familiar with that product.

23 Q. Okay. And that would be the Catamaran product, right?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. To your knowledge up to January of 2001, was the process

1 at Crossroads, was the intent to put access -- the access  
2 control feature into that product?

3 A. Yes, it was.

4 MR. BAHLER: Objection. Leading.

5 THE COURT: It is leading. Don't lead.

6 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir.

7 Q. (BY MR. ALBRIGHT) Why was Crossroads developing a new  
8 product that included LUN management for access control?

9 A. In general, we were developing a new router platform for  
10 the company, and in developing, we felt access to LUN  
11 management, rather, was a valuable feature that would enhance  
12 the value of the product.

13 Q. Had any customers shown interest in having LUN management?

14 A. Yes, we had a lot of customer interest in that feature.

15 Q. Okay. Would you tell the jury, please, we've been talking  
16 about LUN management. Would you tell the jury what LUN stands  
17 for?

18 A. LUN is logical unit number.

19 Q. Okay. And that being said, would you tell the jury what a  
20 logical unit number is?

21 A. If you think of a storage device like a -- it can be  
22 divided into a number of sections, and you can assign --  
23 that's the physical device. You can divide the physical  
24 device into logical units that appear to a computer as  
25 physical units, but they're actually not at the physical

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 level. So it's a way to divide a physical device into smaller  
2 units.

3 Q. Okay. The jury heard during opening argument that  
4 Crossroads for several years has marked its products with the  
5 972 patent. Do you know why Crossroads -- let me ask you  
6 this, first.

7 What responsibility did you, John Middleton, have for  
8 putting a label on Crossroads products a year or two ago that  
9 indicated that it was protected by the 972 patent?

10 A. As the head of the engineering department, it was  
11 ultimately my decision to put that label on Crossroads'  
12 products.

13 Q. And would you explain to the jury why it is that you  
14 decided to put a label on the router product that Crossroads  
15 was selling that had the 972 patent on it?

16 A. The 972 patent was one of the first patents that  
17 Crossroads was awarded. We were proud of the patents, proud  
18 of the product and wanted to mark the products appropriately  
19 with the patent information.

20 Q. Did you personally ever do any analysis of any Crossroads  
21 router product to determine if access control actually was in  
22 the product?

23 A. Not a detailed analysis, no.

24 Q. Any kind of non-detailed analysis?

25 A. Yes, I did a general assessment.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Okay. And what kind -- when you say "general assessment,"  
2 what did you do?

3 A. I spoke with other engineers at Crossroads.

4 Q. Okay. And one of those engineers you spoke to was Geoff  
5 Hoese, who's one of the inventors, right?

6 A. Yes, I did speak to Geoff.

7 Q. And what did Mr. Hoese tell you to do with respect to  
8 putting this label on the product?

9 A. He encouraged me to have someone besides himself make that  
10 determination.

11 Q. So he gave you no advice?

12 A. Not about whether I should label the product, just about  
13 how I should proceed with determining how to label the  
14 product.

15 Q. Did you talk to anybody else?

16 A. I did speak to other people, yes.

17 Q. Anyone in particular that you remember?

18 A. I can recall Mr. Wanamaker.

19 Q. Who is Mr. Wanamaker?

20 A. He was one of the senior engineers at Crossroads.

21 Q. When you say that you spoke with Mr. Wanamaker, did you go  
22 to Mr. Wanamaker, for example, and say, I'm thinking about  
23 putting this label on the product? Is that a good idea? Is  
24 the patent in the product? Or what type of conversation was  
25 it?



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. It was just a general conversation about whether the  
2 patent was contained in the product, not about labeling,  
3 specifically.

4 Q. Did Mr. Wanamaker, as far as you know, ever perform an  
5 analysis himself of whether or not the Crossroads routers had  
6 the access control feature that's in the --

7 A. Not to my knowledge.

8 Q. And you recall, so the jury understands, did he  
9 affirmatively tell you the patent was in the products or did  
10 he not tell you it wasn't? Tell the jury what it was,  
11 basically, he told you.

12 A. Basically, he never gave me any information that made me  
13 doubt that the patent was in the product.

14 Q. Okay. Mr. Middleton, you're a hardware engineer, correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. What do you know about patent law?

17 A. Not a lot.

18 Q. Were you aware when you put this label on the product,  
19 were you aware of the consequences of what would occur if you  
20 put it on the product and the product did not have the  
21 patented feature in it?

22 A. No, I was not.

23 Q. Were you aware of what would happen if you sent out a  
24 product and it didn't have a label on it?

25 A. No.

1 Q. Why did you put a label at all on the router product?

2 A. We felt like -- my understanding was that the product  
3 contained a patent, it was proper to mark the product  
4 accordingly.

5 Q. Okay. Mr. Bahler, during opening argument, stated that  
6 because Crossroads put the label on it and because there was a  
7 feature called reserve release in the router that Crossroads  
8 was telling the world that that's what was patented.

9 Do you know at the time that you put the label on it  
10 even whether or not the Crossroads product had that feature,  
11 had the reserve release feature?

12 A. No, I don't.

13 Q. So when you decided to have the label put on it, were you  
14 making a statement to the world as to whether or not you had a  
15 belief whether this reserve release feature was what was  
16 covered by the patent?

17 A. No, I was not.

18 Q. And as we sit here today, do you have an opinion as to  
19 whether reserve release is what's covered by the patent?

20 A. Yes. I don't believe reserve release is what's covered by  
21 the patent.

22 Q. But that's something that you've come to long after the  
23 labeling issue, right?

24 A. Right.

25 Q. In other words, you just didn't consider it?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. No, I didn't.

2 Q. Your Honor, may we approach for a second?

3 THE COURT: Okay.

4 (At the Bench, on the record.)

5 MR. ALBRIGHT: The only thing I have left to do with  
6 this witness, your Honor, is I wanted to have him identify for  
7 purposes of admission some documents that Chaparral is opposed  
8 to. Basically, these documents are documents that he'll  
9 testify that he prepared.

10 Before submitting them, the relevance of them, the  
11 relevance of them is that they go to the issue of when the  
12 patent was conceived, which the defendant has put at issue  
13 here and yesterday, their argument about the conception  
14 argument, and these documents are relevant to that issue and  
15 this is the gentleman that prepared them.

16 THE COURT: Well, can you give me a hint as to the  
17 number of the document?

18 MR. BAHLER: Why don't you give me the number?

19 MR. ALBRIGHT: Sorry. 264, 267, 268.

20 MR. BAHLER: May I be heard?

21 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

22 MR. BAHLER: The relevance objection is that the  
23 conception is a very unique patent law invention. It requires  
24 not only a description of what's -- what the invention is --

25 THE COURT: Right.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 MR. BAHLER: -- but also requires the communication to  
2 another.

3 THE COURT: Right.

4 MR. BAHLER: It also has to be prepared by the  
5 inventors. I mean, conception by this gentleman is not --  
6 these documents are basically not relevant to that issue if  
7 that's what they're being offered for. They're simply not  
8 relevant to that issue.

9 THE COURT: Well, this is an alleged invention that  
10 was patented, was actually prepared by the witness, shows two  
11 gentlemen, Hoese and Russell, in their employment with the  
12 company, and I would think that any document that would tend  
13 to show from that company would be relevant. So I would have  
14 overruled the relevance objection.

15 MR. BAHLER: Thank you, your Honor.

16 MR. ALBRIGHT: Do you have any other objection?

17 MR. BAHLER: No.

18 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, I move for the admission of  
19 264, Plaintiff's 264, 267 and 268.

20 THE COURT: Well, they haven't been identified for the  
21 record.

22 MR. ALBRIGHT: May I approach, your Honor?

23 THE COURT: You don't need -- lawyers don't need my  
24 permission to move in a courtroom. Members of the jury, many  
25 judges require that. But I've got a bad back and after 30

1 years, I wanted to move around the courtroom, and I didn't  
2 like some little, old fat judge telling me I couldn't do it.  
3 But I don't have that rule.

4 All right.

5 MR. ALBRIGHT: Thank you, sir.

6 Q. (BY MR. ALBRIGHT) Mr. Middleton, if you would identify for  
7 the record what exhibit -- Plaintiff's Exhibit 264 is, please,  
8 sir.

9 A. 264 is the Verrazano enclosure specification.

10 Q. And would you identify Exhibit 267, please, sir?

11 A. 267 is a CP 4X00 product specification.

12 THE COURT: CP what?

13 THE WITNESS: CP 4X00 product specification.

14 Q. (BY MR. ALBRIGHT) Would you identify what Plaintiff's  
15 Exhibit 268 is, please, sir?

16 A. 268 is the Verrazano hardware architecture document.

17 Q. And what was your involvement with these three documents?

18 A. I wrote portions of these documents.

19 Q. Do you know if they were basically documents that were  
20 created at or about the same time back in the time period as  
21 to what they're dated?

22 A. These are in the -- '97, first half of '97.

23 Q. But they're true and correct copies of what you worked on?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. I move for their admission, your Honor.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 MR. BAHLER: No objection.

2 THE COURT: 264, 67 and 268 are admitted.

3 MR. ALBRIGHT: Judge, we pass the witness.

4 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, if I could correct, there was  
5 an objection, but you've already ruled on that.

6 THE COURT: I ruled on the relevance.

7 MR. BAHLER: For what it's worth.

8 THE COURT: So the record will speak for itself.

9 CROSS-EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. BAHLER:

11 Q. Mr. Middleton, I've handed you what's been marked into  
12 evidence as Defendant's Exhibit 123. I'll get it up on the  
13 board. First page is up on the board. That's actually a  
14 collection of exhibits, right, sir, or a collection of  
15 drawings?

16 A. Yes, sir.

17 Q. All right, sir. And those are drawings of various  
18 versions of the label that was applied to the 4100 and 4200  
19 products, right?

20 A. These are labels that were applied to different versions  
21 of the 4100 and 4200 product.

22 Q. Okay. Please turn to page 6 of that document. And this  
23 is a label for the 4100, 4200 product, right, one of the  
24 labels that were applied to those products, right?

25 A. Yes, sir.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Okay. And on that label was included the statement that  
2 product was protected by U.S. Patent Number 972, that's the  
3 patent in this case, right, sir?

4 A. Yes, it is.

5 Q. And if I understand your testimony, it was your decision  
6 to add that patent number to that patent label, right, sir?

7 A. Yes, sir, it was.

8 Q. And after that, the label was actually applied to those  
9 products, right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Now, you mentioned several people that you talked to. You  
12 talked to Mr. Hoese. He's one of the inventors before you  
13 made the decision to apply that label, correct, sir?

14 A. Could you repeat that?

15 Q. You talked to Mr. Hoese before you made the decision to  
16 apply that label, correct, sir?

17 A. Yes, I spoke to him before.

18 Q. And he didn't tell you not to put that patent number on  
19 the product, did he, sir?

20 A. No, he didn't.

21 Q. And you talked to Mr. Wanamaker you mentioned, right, sir?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Mr. Wanamaker was a very special individual within  
24 Crossroads, correct?

25 A. He was a senior engineer.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. And, in fact, he was a member and active participant in  
2 the Standard Setting Committee for the SCSI standards, right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And you knew that, right?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And that's why you went to him, right?

7 A. Yes, it was.

8 Q. And he -- and based upon the conversation you had with  
9 him, you decided and based upon the conversation you had with  
10 him and based upon the conversation you had with Mr. Hoese,  
11 you decided that the invention was in the 4100 and 4200  
12 products, right?

13 A. I would say it was not based on Mr. Hoese's -- the  
14 conversation with Mr. Hoese.

15 Q. Okay. At least it was based upon -- well, at least after  
16 the conversation with Mr. Hoese and Mr. Wanamaker, you added  
17 that patent label?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And the label was actually applied to the 4100 and 4200  
20 products, correct, sir?

21 A. Yes, patent labels were applied.

22 Q. Okay. And this was about January or so of the year 2000,  
23 right, sir?

24 A. I don't know that the -- exactly the labels were applied.

25 Q. Well, this one, in particular, is dated April 3rd, 2000,



1 right?

2 A. Yes. The reason -- yes, that's true.

3 Q. So that's a little bit later, but if you back up -- if you  
4 look in the package there, I don't have to display it, but if  
5 you look in the package there, when you look at that date  
6 which is the revision history, some go back into '99, some  
7 even go back in -- or some are 2000, right, sir?

8 A. That's true.

9 Q. All right. So that label was in April 2000, in fact,  
10 other labels with the 972 patent number were created once  
11 before that, right, sir?

12 A. Right. That's when the labels were created.

13 Q. All right. And those labels were, in fact, applied to the  
14 Crossroads products, right?

15 A. I believe they were.

16 Q. All right. Now, you left Crossroads in January 2000.  
17 Well, first of all, back when you were deciding to put the  
18 label on the product, was Crossroads thinking about suing  
19 Chaparral?

20 A. I can't answer for --

21 Q. Were you aware of any intention on behalf of Crossroads to  
22 sue Chaparral at that time?

23 A. No, I'm not.

24 Q. Now, you left Crossroads in January 2001, right, sir?

25 A. Yes.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Up until the time you left in January 2001, had anybody  
2 ever expressed to you that within Crossroads that they thought  
3 the patent number should not be applied to the Crossroads  
4 products in accordance with the labels in Exhibit 123?

5 A. No, no one had given me that.

6 Q. Just so we're clear here, you were the director of  
7 engineering, to begin with, and vice-president of engineering,  
8 those jobs started in the fall of 1998, right?

9 A. I believe so, yes.

10 Q. And as director of engineering first and as vice-president  
11 of engineering, you are in charge of all hardware and software  
12 development within Crossroads, right?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Okay. And that continued all the way until the time you  
15 left in January 2001, right, sir?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. All right, sir. During any of that -- during any of the  
18 time you were at Crossroads -- and you started there in  
19 January '97, right, sir?

20 A. That's true.

21 Q. During any of that time, did Crossroads ever have in-house  
22 a Chaparral product?

23 A. We did have a Chaparral product.

24 Q. Do you know what product that was, sir?

25 A. I don't know, though.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Was that at all unusual in this industry?

2 A. No. It's fairly typical.

3 Q. So the fact that there's nothing sinister about the fact  
4 that Crossroads had a Chaparral product in its house?

5 A. I don't believe so.

6 Q. Right? And, in fact, there would be nothing sinister, as  
7 far as you're concerned, with Chaparral having a Crossroads  
8 product in its house either, right?

9 A. No, I don't believe so.

10 Q. Pass the witness.

11 RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION

12 BY MR. ALBRIGHT:

13 Q. Mr. Middleton, how old a man are you?

14 A. Pardon me?

15 Q. What's your age?

16 A. I'm 43.

17 Q. Forty-three. As a 43-year-old man, are you familiar with  
18 the concept known as making a mistake?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. I know it takes on some high importance in a courtroom  
21 like this than there are small issues like the labeling seem  
22 like they're a major importance?

23 THE COURT: Mr. Albright, do you have any questions,  
24 sir?

25 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir. I apologize.

1 Q. (BY MR. ALBRIGHT) Describe for the jury, if you would,  
2 please, sir, what percentage of your time at Crossroads you  
3 spent worrying about what label to put on its products.

4 A. I'd say very small percentage of time.

5 Q. That's all I have, your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Any further questions of this witness?

7 MR. BAHLER: No, your Honor.

8 THE COURT: You may step down. Thank you. May this  
9 witness be excused, counsel?

10 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir.

11 THE COURT: You may be excused. You may call your  
12 next witness.

13 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, we want to call Mr. Brian  
14 Bianchi, B-I-A-N-C-H-I.

15 THE COURT: If you'd come forward, please. This is  
16 Mrs. Sims. She's going to administer an oath to you, sir.

17 (Witness was sworn.)

18 THE COURT: You need to walk around this column and  
19 have a seat up here in the blue chair. And if you would,  
20 please, sir, tell us your full name and spell your last.

21 THE WITNESS: First name is Brian. My last name is  
22 Bianchi, B-I-A-N-C-H-I.

23 BRIAN BIANCHI, called by the Plaintiff, duly sworn.

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ALBRIGHT:

Q. Mr. Bianchi, would you introduce yourself to the jury, please?

A. My name is Brian Bianchi, Director of Software at Crossroads Systems.

Q. You met Mr. Middleton, who is a hardware engineer, and you're a software engineer?

A. That is correct.

Q. From your perspective, would you tell the jury what the difference is from your role as a software engineer and that of the hardware engineers?

A. My role is to really work on the -- to manage the firmware process and the firmware that runs on the router and controls the function of the router on the software perspective.

Q. There's a new product that's been released recently by Crossroads, correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. Would you tell the jury what the name of the new product is?

A. The new product is called Catamaran. It's also known as a Crossroads 8000 router.

Q. Does the new product that was just released for sale, does the new product have the LUN management feature as it's known as access control?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Yes, it does.

2 Q. Are you generally familiar with what are known as SCSI  
3 reserve commands as well as what's known as LUN mapping?

4 A. Generally, yes.

5 Q. Could you perform the LUN management or called access  
6 control, could you perform that what is now in the Catamaran  
7 through what are known as a function called SCSI reserve  
8 release command?

9 A. No, you cannot.

10 Q. And are the SCSI reserve release commands, what has been  
11 historically in the router products at Crossroads sold?

12 A. Yes, it is.

13 Q. Could you perform LUN management, the LUN management or  
14 access control feature that's now in the Catamaran through  
15 what's known as LUN, or logical unit number, mapping as you  
16 understand?

17 A. Not as I understand it, no.

18 Q. Pass the witness, your Honor.

19 CROSS-EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. GARRETT:

21 Q. Good morning, Mr. Bianchi.

22 A. Good morning.

23 Q. My name is Mark Garrett. I represent Fulbright in this  
24 case. I believe we've met before?

25 A. Yes, we have.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. I just have a couple of questions about the Catamaran  
2 product that you mentioned and, also, the LUN mapping that you  
3 talked about. My first question is, what did you mean by LUN  
4 mapping?

5 A. What is implemented in Catamaran is the ability to  
6 restrict certain hosts from seeing the devices behind the  
7 router.

8 Q. So when you referred to LUN mapping, were you referring to  
9 what the Catamaran does or some other concept?

10 A. To what the Catamaran does.

11 Q. Okay. And so, are you saying that the Catamaran does not  
12 do access control as you understand it?

13 A. I did not say that.

14 Q. Okay. But I think you said that -- maybe I was hearing  
15 something differently, but you said LUN mapping does not do  
16 what you understand Catamaran can do, right?

17 A. The terms are -- I'm getting confused on the terms between  
18 what you asked and what Mr. Albright asked.

19 Q. Okay. Am I right or am I --

20 A. The LUN -- the SCSI LUN mapping commands that are part of  
21 the standard are implemented in Catamaran, as well. And that,  
22 I do not believe, based on my knowledge, can be -- can  
23 implement the LUN management to use that term that is  
24 implemented in Catamaran.

25 Q. So you're familiar, right now, with SCSI LUN mapping; is

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 that right?

2 A. On the surface, yes, I am.

3 Q. Okay. And you're sure it's not what Catamaran does to  
4 achieve what's called LUN management, right?

5 A. Based on my understanding in the standard, yes.

6 Q. Now, we talked a little bit -- you and I -- I took your  
7 deposition outside this courtroom sometime ago, right?

8 A. That is correct.

9 Q. And I think we talked about your understanding of SCSI LUN  
10 mapping at that time?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. Do you remember that?

13 A. Yes, I do.

14 Q. Now, at that time, it was my understanding that you didn't  
15 know whether the Catamaran product actually had SCSI LUN  
16 mapping; is that right?

17 A. I believe that is correct, yes.

18 Q. And you moreover testified, I believe, that you didn't  
19 know whether -- you didn't really understand SCSI LUN mapping.  
20 Is that fair to say?

21 A. From what I remember my answer was, I'm not an expert in  
22 that area, so I couldn't go into details that you were asking  
23 about functionality.

24 Q. Right. But I did specifically ask you whether or not SCSI  
25 LUN mapping was in Catamaran, right?



1 A. I don't remember whether you asked me that or not.

2 Q. I apologize for the pause here, Mr. Bianchi. You just  
3 kind of threw me off just a touch. Now, while I'm looking for  
4 this, I believe Mr. Middleton earlier today -- and you weren't  
5 in the courtroom, I understand that, when he testified, but he  
6 discussed the fact that the Catamaran product can actually  
7 control access between sections of devices. Is that your  
8 understanding?

9 A. The Catamaran unit can control access to SCSI disk arrays,  
10 for example, yes.

11 Q. Right. But it actually does it on a device-by-device  
12 basis, right? Disk drive-by-disk drive and not portion of the  
13 disk drive by a portion of the disk drive?

14 A. It is done at the LUN level, yes.

15 Q. Okay. We talked about LUN mapping pages, SCSI LUN mapping  
16 pages during your deposition, and I believe I asked you if the  
17 Catamaran device -- excuse me, the Catamaran device mapping  
18 that's what actually performs the LUN management; is that  
19 right?

20 A. Could you repeat the question?

21 Q. Sure. I don't mean to get you confused. The Catamaran  
22 product has a feature called Catamaran device mapping, right?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. Okay. And that's what's responsible for what's known as  
25 LUN management, right?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. Okay. Now, I asked you during the deposition if the  
3 Catamaran device mapping in any way complies with the SEC  
4 standard. And you understand that the SEC standard, all these  
5 acronyms is actually a SCSI standard, right?

6 A. That is correct.

7 Q. Like the SCSI LUN mapping that we've been discussing?

8 A. (Moving head up and down.)

9 Q. If the Catamaran device mapping complies in any way with  
10 the SEC standard suggested implementation of its LUN  
11 mapping --

12 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, I would ask he ask a full  
13 question as opposed to paraphrasing out of a deposition. I  
14 believe it's appropriate to ask a question, and if he wants to  
15 impeach him or cross him with that answer, that's fine. But  
16 he's paraphrasing the question, and I want to make certain Mr.  
17 Bianchi --

18 THE COURT: Is that an objection?

19 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir.

20 THE COURT: Restate your question.

21 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Yes, your Honor. Mr. Bianchi, does the  
22 Catamaran products device mapping feature implement the SEC  
23 standards suggested implementation of SCSI LUN mapping?

24 A. I guess I'm getting them as two separate things. There's  
25 a device mapping which is part of the router we're calling LUN

1 management. And there's a SCSI standard which is LUN mapping,  
2 which is different than the device mapping that we're  
3 referring to.

4 Q. So is the latter within a former?

5 A. My understanding is that they're independent.

6 Q. Okay. Does the Catamaran product actually have SCSI LUN  
7 mapping in it?

8 A. To the best of my knowledge, it implements that portion of  
9 the standard, yes.

10 Q. Now, let me ask you about the Catamaran device mapping.  
11 First of all, is it true that there is only one active map  
12 associated with a computer at a given time using Catamaran's  
13 device map?

14 A. A given host has one map through the device, correct.

15 Q. And each device map that can be assigned with a different  
16 host, it can assign access to different storage; is that  
17 right?

18 A. Could you repeat the question?

19 Q. Sure. As I understand it, using device mapping, you can  
20 have a computer and there can be a map within a Catamaran  
21 product that actually has a list in a sense of storage devices  
22 to which that computer gets to talk, right?

23 A. That is correct.

24 Q. And those lists, the information those maps can be set up  
25 any way that somebody wants to set them up; is that right?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Those maps are configured, yes.

2 Q. And so, the maps can have -- they could basically assign  
3 access for a given computer to any different storage  
4 combination --

5 A. That is correct.

6 Q. -- is that right? It's also my understanding that the  
7 maps can be saved across power cycles and resets; is that  
8 right?

9 A. That is correct.

10 Q. And this is the Catamaran device that we're talking about,  
11 right?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. Now, is it true that if a computer isn't mapped to a  
14 particular storage device, if that storage device is not on  
15 his map within the Catamaran device mapping, he doesn't get to  
16 talk to that storage device; is that right?

17 A. That is correct.

18 Q. So there's no command that the computer can issue that  
19 will actually get through to a storage device that's not on  
20 his map, right?

21 A. That is correct.

22 Q. Is it also true that computers, they can't change their  
23 maps in Catamaran device mapping to change who they get access  
24 to, what storage devices?

25 A. The host cannot directly change the map.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. And finally, the Catamaran device maps, they can be  
2 altered by an operator or administrator; is that right?

3 A. That is correct.

4 Q. Thank you. Pass the witness.

5 MR. ALBRIGHT: No more questions.

6 THE COURT: You may step down, sir. Call your next  
7 witness.

8 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, may we approach?

9 THE COURT: Sure.

10 (At the Bench, on the record.)

11 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, the next witness would be a  
12 gentleman named Russ Bleakley, B-L-E-A-K-L-E-Y, and he would  
13 be present by deposition, your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Okay.

15 MR. ALBRIGHT: And Mr. Bleakley is a former, first,  
16 Crossroads and then, Chaparral employee who will testify about  
17 certain issues, and defendant is going to object. I don't  
18 know really what to say. If you want to read the section Mr.  
19 Bahler's going to object to.

20 MR. BAHLER: Do you have them marked?

21 MR. ALBRIGHT: We do.

22 THE COURT: Why don't you tell me generally, then I'll  
23 read it.

24 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, this is Mr. Bleakley, first  
25 of all, is not an employee of Chaparral any longer, so he

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 wasn't a speaking agent, he wasn't speaking on our behalf. He  
2 wasn't the 36 witnesses, is not in any way a party admission,  
3 number one.

4 THE COURT: So at the time of the deposition, he  
5 wasn't either of your client?

6 MR. BAHLER: Exactly, your Honor. And, in addition,  
7 the statements that he made were -- this is just  
8 black-and-white color television business. They said what do  
9 you think about LUN zoning or LUN whatever it was. And he  
10 said, well, it's like a color TV set. If you don't have it,  
11 it's like a black-and-white TV set.

12 And, your Honor, this man is not qualified to render  
13 that opinion. In addition, that's an opinion testimony by a  
14 lay witness, and this is objectionable because it's opinion  
15 testimony. Secondly, your Honor, during --

16 THE COURT: Wait, opinion by a lay -- has he been  
17 designated as an expert witness?

18 MR. BAHLER: No, your Honor.

19 THE COURT: All right.

20 MR. BAHLER: In addition, your Honor, I don't have the  
21 transcript with me, but the portion of the transcript that we  
22 had counter-designated he admits he doesn't know anything  
23 about LUN zoning. So he admitted that he doesn't even have a  
24 basis to make that statement.

25 If you'd permit me to get the transcript from --

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 THE COURT: It's probably a good idea. Members of the  
2 jury, I'm going to give you a morning break. You'll have time  
3 to stretch, go out, see if it's raining. Don't run away. Be  
4 ready to come back.

5 (Jury not present.)

6 MR. ALBRIGHT: Mr. Bleakley had no ability to offer  
7 these opinions --

8 THE COURT: Well, if he was so able and he wanted to  
9 give an opinion, why wasn't he listed as an expert witness?

10 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, I think it's a perfectly  
11 acceptable lay opinion of a person like Mr. Bleakley.

12 THE COURT: There are no lay opinions anymore.  
13 They've changed the Rules of Evidence. You cannot give an  
14 opinion anymore. And you read the notes behind the new rules,  
15 and that was the whole point. You bring in an accountant to  
16 get the professional nuts and bolts, and then, you ask them,  
17 was this a well-managed company, you know, they used to allow  
18 them to do that.

19 But all the bright stars and their wisdom have said  
20 you're not going to do that anymore. If he's going to give an  
21 opinion, test him out through Daubert.

22 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, it's not -- Mr. Bleakley is  
23 a person who had to deal with a customer who they had promised  
24 they would sell the LUN zoning to, and he had to deal with a  
25 customer about having to take out the LUN zoning. And,

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 basically, the questions were of what was the importance from  
2 his perspective in his job of the LUN zoning.

3 THE COURT: And that's not an opinion?

4 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, it's going to be his  
5 testimony as to why customers --

6 THE COURT: I'm not saying his opinion may not be  
7 admissible, but if he's not listed as an expert and tested as  
8 an expert, he can't give an opinion anymore. Let me read this  
9 because I'm not sure I understand at all what y'all are  
10 talking about.

11 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, when you're finished reading,  
12 I found that portion of the deposition that I'd like to read  
13 to you.

14 THE COURT: All right.

15 MR. BAHLER: May I be heard, your Honor?

16 THE COURT: You may.

17 MR. BAHLER: Just so we're clear, the portion that  
18 we're objecting to is from page 47, line 15 through page 48,  
19 line 15, all right? Is that where y'all are reading?

20 THE COURT: I have been -- I don't know. Mine has  
21 11.10.

22 MR. BAHLER: The objection we have specifically is to  
23 page 47, line 15 to page --

24 THE COURT: You're looking at pages, and I'm  
25 apparently looking at minutes.



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 MR. BAHLER: Is this a video?

2 THE COURT: Okay. I've got a page. Go ahead now.

3 MR. BAHLER: Page 47, line 15 through page 48, line  
4 15. That's the objection part.

5 THE COURT: All right.

6 MR. BAHLER: All right.

7 THE COURT: Your first objection?

8 MR. BAHLER: This is opinion testimony.

9 THE COURT: Well, I understand, but, I mean, I've got  
10 some other things marked before that.

11 MR. BAHLER: This is the only objection we have to  
12 this whole deposition.

13 THE COURT: Okay. Page 47. All right.

14 MR. BAHLER: 47, line 15 to 48, line 15. And this is  
15 where he analogizes LUN zoning to this color TV,  
16 black-and-white TV business, okay? On page 53, beginning at  
17 line 9, and the following questions and answers were  
18 propounded.

19 THE COURT: Well, before you're ready to read page 53,  
20 as I understand it, you're objecting to the question. So  
21 given the direction that SAN products are -- that's S-A-N --  
22 products are headed in the LUN zoning feature as a feature  
23 that will only -- that type of feature, not LUN zoning itself  
24 necessarily, but that type of partitioning feature is  
25 something that will only increase in value.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1           And there's an objection and the answer is yes.  
2           Question, why is that? Objection. Question, for the same  
3           reasons you just talked about. Further objections. Answer,  
4           yes, as I think, yes, you need certain features as the  
5           technology evolves. If you don't have them, then you've got a  
6           black-and-white television and nobody wants it.

7           And the question, help me out there. What do you  
8           mean? I mean, you have a black-and-white TV. Does that mean  
9           other people have color TVs so no one wants a black-and-white  
10          TV? Answer, right. Stereo on their television. Question,  
11          that's the kind of feature LUN zoning is in your opinion?  
12          Answer, yes, I think it's a preferred feature in a serious  
13          storage network, yes.

14          All right. Now you can read it into the record your  
15          basis for the objection.

16          MR. BAHLER: The basis for the objection is that  
17          entire line of questioning seeks to elicit opinions. This is  
18          a lay witness, not an expert witness. He's never been  
19          designated as an expert, and he admitted so in his  
20          cross-examination the following series of questions and  
21          answers.

22          Question, are you familiar -- this is page 53  
23          beginning line 9. Question, are you familiar with the  
24          technical details of the LUN zoning feature? Answer, no. Are  
25          you familiar with any of the code associated with the LUN

1 zoning feature? Answer, no. Are you familiar with the  
2 function -- pardon? Are you familiar with the functionality  
3 features? And it says functionality feature but what was said  
4 was LUN zoning feature.

5 Question, Mr. Albright. Objection, leading. Answer,  
6 no. And, again, I have never used it in a router, and to this  
7 day at MacData, which is his present employer, I don't need to  
8 use the LUN zoning feature in any of the product that was  
9 there.

10 So this gentleman has no experience with this stuff at  
11 all. He doesn't know anything about it. He was just --

12 THE COURT: Well, he's a salesman. I've read,  
13 starting on page 4, all the way through to where you have  
14 objected, and he's full of opinions as all salesmen are, but  
15 none of them are admissible in my judgment, none, zero. I  
16 wouldn't let any of the testimony of this gentleman in, but I  
17 will sustain the objection to the opinion of black-and-white  
18 color TVs.

19 If you'll hand that back to Mr. Albright. You may  
20 make whatever record you want by bill, Mr. Albright. If  
21 you're going to have opinions given, you've got to put them  
22 down as an expert so that they can be tested. This person's  
23 testing, he couldn't even get through a filter. All right.  
24 Take five minutes.

25 (Recess.)

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 THE COURT: All right. For the state of the record, I  
2 only have one objection to the testimony and that objection is  
3 sustained. Now, are you going to read the rest of it?

4 MR. ALBRIGHT: Not at this time, your Honor. We're  
5 going to -- it causes some shifts --

6 THE COURT: That's fine. However you want to try it.  
7 But on deposition, counsel, I appreciate getting it a little  
8 in advance so that if I can read the transcript, it's helpful.  
9 But sometimes you're just going to have to go ahead and start  
10 reading the deposition and then, make your objections as we  
11 go, because there are some facts in the testimony of this  
12 gentleman Bleakley -- what an appropriate name -- from the  
13 standpoint of facts.

14 He sold, he had trouble with his customers when none  
15 was removed, but, you know, he can't testify they removed it  
16 because of the lawsuit. He can't testify to all of these  
17 opinions. But the fact of what happened, what he told the  
18 company wouldn't be admissible.

19 And I could handle that on a question-and-answer basis  
20 if -- but if you have a substantive issue, you better notify  
21 me so that I can --

22 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, would you like a copy of  
23 the deposition so you could follow along if it won't be  
24 objected?

25 THE COURT: Are you going to do another deposition

1 now?

2 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir.

3 THE COURT: No. Just give me a heads up when you are  
4 going to do that. All right. Bring the jury in.

5 (Jury present.)

6 THE COURT: Members of the jury, it occurred to me  
7 when I took the break that I probably in my general remarks to  
8 you at the beginning of the trial, I didn't talk to you about  
9 bench conferences, and I need to do that.

10 The lawyers have the right to ask to approach, warn me  
11 that there may be a train around the next turn that I need to  
12 think about, but they're required to do that under the ethics  
13 of the profession and representing their clients. And there's  
14 only two ways for me to do that: One is for me to make you go  
15 into the room and wait there and come out. Now, that may be  
16 good exercise for you, but you'd be coming back and forth.

17 So we can do it up here. The Court Reporter has a  
18 little microphone where she can hear everything and gets it on  
19 the record. If you were thinking that Lily had mental  
20 telepathy, it's not true, she's got electronics and so we can  
21 save you time. That's what we're doing, but don't think  
22 they're trying to hide anything. They're just trying to make  
23 this as easy on you as possible and that's the reason we do  
24 it. You may call your next witness.

25 MR. ALLCOCK: Thank you, your Honor. We would call to

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 the stand Geoff Hoese.

2 THE COURT: If you'll be sworn, please, sir.

3 (Witness was sworn.)

4 THE COURT: Come around this little column and have a  
5 seat, please, sir. And you need to tell us your full name and  
6 spell your last.

7 THE WITNESS: Geoffry Brian Hoese, H-O-E-S-E.

8 GEOFFRY B. HOESE, called by the Plaintiff, duly sworn.

9 DIRECT EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. ALLCOCK:

11 Q. Where do you live, Mr. Hoese?

12 A. I live in Austin.

13 Q. How long have you lived in Austin?

14 A. About 13 years.

15 Q. Have you ever worked for a company named Crossroads?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Over what time period did you work for the company named  
18 Crossroads?

19 A. From the end of May 1996 through October of 2000.

20 Q. Let me hand you a notebook that has Exhibits 1, 4, 5 and 7  
21 in it, and ask you to look at Exhibit 1. And, your Honor, I'm  
22 putting the front page of Exhibit 1 on the screen for the  
23 record.

24 THE COURT: Are these admitted already?

25 MR. ALLCOCK: Yes, all except for 7. There, I

1 believe, could be an objection to 7.

2 MR. BAHLER: There is.

3 THE COURT: All right.

4 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) What is Exhibit 1?

5 A. It's a front page of U.S. patent.

6 Q. Are you the Geoff Hoese whose name appears on that patent?

7 A. I am.

8 Q. Who else is on there?

9 A. Jeffrey Russell.

10 Q. Two of you worked together on this?

11 A. Yes, we did.

12 Q. Could you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury just

13 briefly, basically, what you did on this invention and what

14 Mr. Russell did on the invention?

15 A. Well, we collaborated quite a bit on it in large part.

16 Mr. Russell was doing a good bit of the hardware design

17 involved, and I did a lot of the software, other architectural

18 pieces. Over the large part, there was a fair amount of

19 collaboration.

20 THE COURT: Now, you have a very soft voice, and these

21 two folks over there can't any more hear you than they can

22 know that the sun is out. So speak up under the microphone.

23 THE WITNESS: I will.

24 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) Maybe you could get the mic a little

25 closer to you.

1 A. Do I need to repeat that?

2 Q. You can put that down. We'll get back to that in a  
3 minute. What did you do? What was your job when you first  
4 started at Crossroads in May of 1996?

5 A. When I first started at Crossroads, I was mainly involved  
6 in trying to find areas to do products to provide connectivity  
7 between Fibre Channel devices and storage devices.

8 Q. Did you have any experience in that kind of work before  
9 you came to Crossroads?

10 A. Well, I had a fair amount of storage experience at  
11 different companies and, also, working in networking industry  
12 and development roles of previous companies and management  
13 roles.

14 Q. Could you give the ladies and gentlemen of the jury a  
15 little bit of an idea of the kinds of companies you worked for  
16 and the kinds of things you did prior to Crossroads?

17 A. Immediately before coming to Crossroads, I managed the  
18 network device driver development group at Compaq. Had spent  
19 a couple of years there through their acquisition of Thomas  
20 Conrad Corporation, where I did the same thing, managed the  
21 development group, and was involved in development of device  
22 drivers and software runs the network, adapters.

23 Q. Let me stop you right there. A device driver, is that  
24 software?

25 A. Yes, it is.



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. And what does it do?

2 A. It interfaces the operating system to the external storage  
3 devices or network devices as the case may be.

4 Q. And you said you ran a group?

5 A. Yes, I managed the group who did the development of those  
6 device drivers.

7 Q. Okay. What did you do before that, sir?

8 A. I was with IBM in a variety of roles, mainly involved in  
9 development of storage and networking software.

10 Q. Okay. And did you work in this storage area anywhere  
11 before that?

12 A. Dell Computer Corporation prior to that, was involved in  
13 various aspects of storage RAID devices, RAID controllers,  
14 developing -- as a software developer, developing those sorts  
15 of products.

16 Q. Okay. You're going to have to keep your voice up. What  
17 is your educational background?

18 A. I was a philosophy major in school. I did not complete a  
19 degree.

20 Q. Where did you go to school?

21 A. University of Southwestern Louisiana, which is now  
22 University of Louisiana, Lafayette, and briefly at the  
23 Louisiana State University.

24 Q. You say you were a philosophy major. When did you first  
25 start writing software?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. I wrote my first software when I was in high school in the  
2 mid-to-late '70s.

3 Q. How many other patents are issued to you other than the  
4 972 patent, which is Exhibit 1?

5 A. I have five patents.

6 Q. What do you do now?

7 A. I worked in a technical advisory role as just a -- kind of  
8 a consulting arrangement with start-up here in town. I have  
9 some other involvement with other start-ups and am looking at  
10 other roles that I may do in the future.

11 Q. Why did you leave Crossroads?

12 A. I spent a number of years there, you know, four years or  
13 more working really hard, developing products, development  
14 company, had a lot of time and effort I put into it and was  
15 ready to take a break and look for something new to do.

16 Q. Okay. Can you explain your invention of the 972 patent  
17 invention in your own words, sir?

18 A. The invention provides a method for connecting computers  
19 to storage devices, providing that connectivity, the ability  
20 to map storage between different devices, providing virtual  
21 local storage and security management capabilities for those  
22 devices.

23 Q. Well, what was the state-of-the-art at the time that you  
24 came up with your invention? How were people doing that sort  
25 of thing?

1 A. Primarily through the use of network servers.

2 Q. Okay. Let me place before you Exhibit 537 and some --

3 it's a demonstrative that has not been objected to, your

4 Honor. Would this help in explaining what the

5 state-of-the-art was when you came up with your invention?

6 A. Sure. This diagram shows a network server connecting

7 multiple computers to multiple storage devices.

8 Q. Okay. I notice on the left, it's Fibre Channel. What is

9 that?

10 A. Fibre Channel is a serial transport medium, can carry

11 various protocols, storage data, network data at a high speed

12 interconnection between computers.

13 Q. And I notice it says S-C-S-I. Is that SCSI on the other

14 side?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. What is that?

17 A. SCSI is the -- a bus interconnect to connect storage

18 devices together, connecting storage devices to hosts, to

19 computers.

20 Q. And is that different than Fibre Channel?

21 A. Yes, it is.

22 Q. Now, what was the problem with the setup shown on Exhibit

23 537 as you saw it?

24 A. Well, the main problem is the network server is expensive

25 to maintain, it has various bottlenecks in transferring data

1 between these things, has to go through a lot of effort to  
2 translate the data requests, get the data from one side to the  
3 other.

4 Q. Okay. Let me show you Exhibit 567 again -- wrong one.  
5 Exhibit 567 again, unobjected to demonstrative. What is this  
6 bottleneck that you're talking about?

7 A. Well, what this shows is a network request coming from the  
8 left side, all the computers would be hooked up here, putting  
9 all these data requests into a network server. The network  
10 server has to process those from higher level network  
11 protocols to a more intrinsic method.

12 It has to translate them through a file system to  
13 represent the data on the storage medium, then it has to send  
14 those requests out after it's translated in the file system to  
15 the storage devices to get the data, bring that data back, and  
16 go through a reverse process of rebuilding those network  
17 protocols to send the data back out. So that takes a lot of  
18 time..

19 Q. So how did your invention improve on this basic situation?

20 A. Well, using the invention in this role, you basically have  
21 the computers on the one side speaking their native low-level  
22 block protocols that they communicate with to storage devices,  
23 routing those through a storage router, and connecting those  
24 devices to the actual storage without having to do the  
25 translation from the -- through the network protocols or

1 translation through the file system.

2 Q. You mentioned a storage router. What is a router?

3 A. Router is the device that interconnects multiple  
4 interfaces and sends that data according to mapping tables, to  
5 different devices.

6 Q. And how is that different than a server?

7 A. Well, a server primarily can -- provides connection point  
8 for multiple computers and represents the data locally. The  
9 device is locally rather than passing that data directly  
10 through, and so, it provides that interconnect point in such a  
11 fashion that the -- it manages all those connections.

12 It manages the data as it appears there on the  
13 computer, and it has to -- it has a file system that it has to  
14 layer above the storage devices. It has the network  
15 protocols, so it does a lot of protocol translation. So it's  
16 providing the protocol translation between the similar devices  
17 as well as the data representation through the file system  
18 that's different.

19 Q. Okay. Let me show you Exhibit 545, graphics Exhibit 545.  
20 And using that, can you explain the basic difference between a  
21 router and a server?

22 A. Well, here we have all the computers, again, on the other  
23 side connected by Fibre Channel to the router. The storage  
24 devices on the right-hand side. When these computers, want to  
25 talk to data, they're speaking -- they're seeing those devices

1 as storage devices directly.

2 They're not -- they're having to talk the same  
3 protocol, they're not having to go through a different  
4 protocol translation to talk to these devices. They're also  
5 seeing that data represented directly. They're not seeing it  
6 represented through a file system.

7 So when computer A wants to talk to device A and get  
8 that data, he is reading and writing that data directly to  
9 that device through the router, and the router handles the  
10 interconnect to that device, but it doesn't have to do any  
11 protocol translations or file system translations.

12 Q. So in the case of a router, there isn't that pileup that  
13 occurs, it just kind of passes directly through; is that  
14 right?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. Now, is this your whole invention here?

17 A. No, it is not.

18 Q. What more did you do?

19 A. Well, the invention incorporates virtual local storage and  
20 access controls that provide for the capability for the router  
21 to virtually map the different storage devices to different  
22 computing devices so that access can be controlled, visibility  
23 of devices can be controlled differently for different  
24 computers.

25 Q. What do you mean by access controls?

1 A. Access controls in this sense, really, are the ability to  
2 see a device to know whether it's there, to read, write or  
3 modify data on that device to perform manipulation on that  
4 device by a computer.

5 Q. What do you mean by virtual local storage?

6 A. Virtual local storage refers to in that the computers are  
7 connected to the storage devices, and seeing that represented  
8 in their native protocol, they see those devices. And through  
9 the mapping and access control, they can see different devices  
10 as though they are the devices that are local to the computer.

11 You have your hard drive in your computer, your  
12 computer sees it as drive C, for example, the -- you know,  
13 that your local drive, with the access controls in the router,  
14 we can map the different drives to the different computers so  
15 that they appear to be as that local storage differently to  
16 the different computers.

17 Q. So then, with your invention that computer A would look at  
18 that remote storage A and see it just as if it was in the box?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Let me show you exhibit -- graphics Exhibit 580. And  
21 perhaps you could come down and explain to the ladies and  
22 gentlemen of the jury, in more detail, this concept of access  
23 controls.

24 A. Okay. What we have here are two computers and three  
25 storage devices. These two computers are talking to the

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 router, seeing the storage through the router, this map  
2 through the router. In this case, drive A can see drives one  
3 and drive three. He can't see drive two access control and  
4 map so that this drive doesn't exist as far as A's concerned,  
5 doesn't know it's there, can't see it, can't read or write to  
6 it, doesn't know it exists.

7 Drive B, on the other hand, sees one and two, but not  
8 three. So from drive A's perspective, this might be the C  
9 drive, this might be the D drive.

10 Q. I think you said one and two. Did you mean to say one and  
11 three?

12 A. Yes, I did. I'm sorry. One and three.

13 Q. For the record.

14 A. Drive B, on the other hand, would see this as a C drive  
15 and this as the D drive. So they'd have common access to this  
16 one drive, but this computer went to see X. The data,  
17 wouldn't know the drive was there, wouldn't know the data was  
18 there whatsoever.

19 Q. Okay. Stay right there. Let me place before you Exhibit  
20 590, which is figure 3 of the patent with some color applied.  
21 Could you explain your invention with respect to Exhibit 590?

22 A. Very similar drawing in concept, a little more schematic,  
23 you know, technical drawing in that sense, but it shows  
24 multiple computers connected to multiple storage. It  
25 additionally shows that its storage device can have some



1 subsection of storage. It can also leave out. So we can have  
2 a storage device that is global to all these computers.

3 We can have restrictions such that only one or some  
4 number of computers can have access to that storage. And we  
5 can parse it out differently for different computers and  
6 within the subsections of the storage device in the computers.

7 Q. We've heard the term LUN. What is a LUN?

8 A. A LUN is a term for a logical unit, which is the smallest  
9 addressable unit in the storage device.

10 Q. Can you -- does this LUN concept have anything to do with  
11 access controls?

12 A. Well, it is the base unit of access control that can be  
13 allocated. So when a computer wants to talk to a storage  
14 device, it can talk to a disk drive or that disk drive could  
15 have multiple logical units within it, and those logical units  
16 can be addressed separately. So the access control can apply  
17 to the different logical units, or it can apply to the whole  
18 storage device itself.

19 Q. So you -- and, again, this is for the record -- you  
20 pointed to that kind of tower 62. Are there any LUNs in that  
21 tower 62?

22 A. Right. The different elements A, B, C and D, listed in  
23 62, represent the logical units in a single storage device.

24 Q. I see. And is there any other LUN shown on there?

25 A. Well, the global data represented in 60 and 64 in the

1 storage device as a whole is addressed as a logical unit.

2 It's not demonstrated here that that's broken out because of  
3 the intent of the drawing was to show that you could address  
4 it both by the logical units or by the whole thing.

5 Q. You can have a seat. So what's the basic advantage of  
6 this over what came before?

7 A. Well, primarily, it's faster. It provides the -- a  
8 similar set of capabilities that the network server will  
9 provide without a lot of the overplay. So it's easier to  
10 manage, in some respects. It's just better performance. It's  
11 faster, cheaper.

12 Q. When did you invent this?

13 A. In March of '97.

14 Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 7. What is Exhibit 7?

15 A. Exhibit 7 is a concept document that I faxed to our patent  
16 attorney at the time.

17 MR. BAHLER: Objection, your Honor. This is an  
18 exhibit that is not yet in evidence.

19 THE COURT: He's just describing it. He hadn't  
20 moved --

21 MR. BAHLER: He's getting into it a little bit more.  
22 He's talking about the contents.

23 MR. ALLCOCK: I'm just going to ask foundational  
24 questions.

25 THE COURT: All right.

1 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) So the cover is a fax page; is that  
2 right?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. And is that in your handwriting?

5 A. Yes, it is.

6 Q. And it's to who?

7 A. To Anthony Peterman, who was a patent attorney working for  
8 us at Crossroads.

9 Q. And it's from who?

10 A. From myself.

11 Q. Okay. And it's got his fax number on it?

12 A. Yes, it does.

13 Q. And it's got your phone number on it?

14 A. Yes, it does.

15 Q. And it's -- what's the date on the document?

16 A. 5-28-97.

17 Q. So did you fax this to Mr. Peterman on or about that day?

18 A. Yes, I did.

19 Q. And then, pages -- the next two pages of the document,  
20 what are those?

21 A. Those are descriptions and drawings of the invention and  
22 some of the state-of-the-art before the invention.

23 Q. And did you create those in your own hand?

24 A. Yes, I did.

25 Q. And was this done in the ordinary course of your business?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 at Crossroads?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Offer Exhibit 7 in evidence, your Honor.

4 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, may I ask one question on  
5 voir dire?

6 THE COURT: You may.

7 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. BAHLER:

9 Q. Mr. Hoese, does the fax machine at Crossroads put little  
10 date lines at the top of faxes so you can tell when they're  
11 faxed?

12 A. I believe most fax machines do that on the sent copy of  
13 the fax, you know, on the recipient side, yeah.

14 Q. All right. And this is all in your handwriting, right?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. You prepared this whole thing?

17 A. What it's typed with.

18 Q. And you prepared this whole thing?

19 A. Yes, I did.

20 Q. Did you fax it personally to Mr. Peterman?

21 A. I believe I did, yes.

22 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, we have a relevance  
23 objection. May we approach?

24 THE COURT: You may.

25 (At the Bench, on the record.)

1 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, this is the conception  
2 document. Conception requires not only that it be produced in  
3 writing, but it be communicated to somebody else, and that  
4 requires corroboration, also. Simply inventor testimony is  
5 insufficient to make this document relevant for any purpose.

6 He's testified that he personally did it. That's not  
7 good enough. That's not corroboration in accordance with the  
8 law. And this document cannot possibly stand as a conception  
9 document under any interpretation of the law, and therefore,  
10 it's irrelevant to any issue in this case.

11 THE COURT: Well, that would be absurd law if that was  
12 the law. Recipient could die, could never die. This witness'  
13 credibility is in issue, but not the admissibility. So it is  
14 admitted without -- overruled.

15 MR. BAHLER: Thank you, your Honor.

16 DIRECT EXAMINATION (Resumed)

17 BY MR. ALLCOCK:

18 Q. So referring, first, to the first page of the exhibit,  
19 that's just a fax cover sheet that shows that you faxed it to  
20 Peterman?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And he was the patent lawyer you were working with?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. Okay. Then, on the next page, what is that generally  
25 describing? I'm not going to go through it line-by-line.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 What is that generally describing?

2 A. The text basically describes state of what was available  
3 at that point in time, what the -- the context of the problem  
4 being addressed and the essentials of the concept, the  
5 invention as a concept here, describes essentially what the  
6 invention would do.

7 Q. Okay. I see down on the bottom, there's a block diagram.  
8 Is that similar to one of the graphics that we looked at  
9 earlier today?

10 A. It would be. It basically shows workstations connected  
11 through a network server to storage devices.

12 Q. Okay. So you have four workstations and three remote  
13 storage devices?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. Is that black bar going through the middle, that's a Fibre  
16 Channel?

17 A. It could be Fibre Channel, it could be an Ethernet  
18 network. It's basically some network, a local area network  
19 interconnecting the computers together.

20 Q. Okay. Now, looking at the next page, there are two  
21 pictures on the next page. What is the top picture?

22 A. The top picture shows a storage router as opposed to the  
23 network server interconnecting computers to storage devices.

24 Q. Okay. Now, does this show your invention?

25 A. No, it doesn't.

1 Q. Is this similar to a graphic that we saw earlier today?

2 A. Sure. That's -- it's similar in that -- it's dissimilar  
3 in that it shows by direction connections. It shows clients  
4 on both sides of the storage router and storage on both sides  
5 of the routers, but similar in that, it shows workstations  
6 connected through the storage router to storage devices.

7 Q. So you have workstations and a storage router but no  
8 access controls?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. Okay. Now, the -- and why did you put this figure in  
11 there? Why did you put drawing 2 in there?

12 A. It shows the state-of-the-art at the time.

13 Q. Okay. And now, finally to figure 3, which bears a  
14 remarkable resemblance to figure 3 of the patent, what is that  
15 depicting?

16 A. That depicts the invention which is the storage router  
17 interconnecting the devices and incorporating these access  
18 controls routing the virtual local storage.

19 Q. Now, I notice on the bottom, it says concept by Geoff  
20 Hoese, March 22, 1997, first draft, May 15, 1997. Do you see  
21 that?

22 A. Yes, I do.

23 Q. Did you write that?

24 A. Yes, I did.

25 Q. What does that mean?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. I had the idea, you know, the consolidated concept of  
2 integrating these access controls with a storage router to  
3 provide this type of alternative to the network server. It  
4 occurred to me, came to me on the 22nd, it was a -- I  
5 recognized it as a good enough idea that I immediately started  
6 working on putting the concept together further and expressing  
7 it --

8 Q. So it was a big moment?

9 A. Yeah.

10 Q. And so then, it took you a little while to write it up?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Okay. Could you look at Exhibits 4 and 5? What is  
13 Exhibit 4?

14 A. Exhibit 4 is a presentation, a set of slides giving an  
15 overview of Verrazano Fibre Channel-to-SCSI bridge concept.

16 Q. Who prepared these?

17 A. I believe I did for the most part.

18 Q. And approximately when were they prepared?

19 A. They're dated 6-19-96. It's probably accurate.

20 Q. Generally what do they show?

21 A. They show a Fibre Channel-to-SCSI bridge which provides  
22 the basic connectivity between storage and host computers.  
23 Doesn't necessarily provide for any kind of routing or access  
24 control.

25 Q. Okay. You hadn't come up with that idea yet?



1 A. Correct.

2 Q. And then, if you look at Exhibit 5 -- look at page 2 of  
3 Exhibit 5. What does that show?

4 A. Exhibit 5 is a document describing, again, the Verrazano  
5 bridge characteristics, the -- it's an architecture document  
6 that describes some of the characteristics we would look for  
7 in designing a bridge product of this sort.

8 Q. And so, you were working on all aspects of this router in  
9 this '96-'97 time frame; is that fair to say?

10 A. Yes, it is.

11 MR. BAHLER: Leading.

12 THE COURT: It is.

13 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) What else were you working on other than  
14 the access control feature in the '96-'97 time frame?

15 A. I was working on designing routers and bridges in detail  
16 storage routers.

17 Q. You can put that down. We're going to switch topics. Did  
18 any Crossroads product that was in place when you were at  
19 Crossroads use the 972 invention?

20 A. No, it did not.

21 MR. BAHLER: Objection. Foundation.

22 (Last question read back.)

23 THE COURT: The objection's overruled.

24 A. No, it did not.

25 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) Why not?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. We were a small, busy, growing company, trying to develop  
2 these products. This was a more advanced feature of -- that  
3 would be added into the product line, so we were getting our  
4 core set of features in place, developing, you know, the core  
5 essentials of the bridge router products, and so, we didn't  
6 have necessarily the bandwidth to go do everything that we  
7 wanted to do.

8 Q. Bandwidth means manpower?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. And was there intent to put it in the product?

11 A. I think there -- I would have liked it in the product.  
12 There was a general desire to get it there, but as far as  
13 there being a broad overall intent, I'm not sure what that  
14 really means.

15 Q. Did the Crossroads products -- how many other patents do  
16 you have?

17 A. Five.

18 Q. Now, were you aware that any Crossroads products were  
19 marked with this 972 patent number?

20 A. I became aware of that in the course of the depositions,  
21 right.

22 Q. Did you know it while you worked there?

23 A. No, I did not.

24 Q. Was that right? Did the products have your invention in  
25 it?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. No, they didn't.

2 Q. Did you have anything to do with putting that number on?

3 A. No, I didn't.

4 Q. Okay. Could you turn back to Exhibit 1 and, in  
5 particular, figure 3. I'm just going to put that in the  
6 background for a minute.

7 Did you attend Comdex in 1996 on behalf of Crossroads?

8 A. Yes, I did.

9 Q. What was shown at that -- at Comdex?

10 A. We had a technology demonstration showing connectivity  
11 between a single computer and a single storage device.

12 Q. Did that have anything to do with your invention as shown  
13 in figure 3?

14 A. No.

15 Q. Why not?

16 A. It didn't provide any routing. It was connectivity  
17 between a single computer and a single storage device. Had no  
18 routing, had no access controls, had no mapping.

19 Q. Had you even thought of access controls by the time of the  
20 Comdex?

21 A. No, not at all.

22 Q. Now, had you heard of this HP Mux prior to your coming up  
23 with your invention?

24 A. Yes, I did.

25 Q. What was your understanding of what that thing did?

1 A. Well, it was a Mux. It was a multiplexer. It provided  
2 connectivity between Fibre Channel hosts and storage devices.  
3 It did so without mapping. It did so without access controls.

4 Q. Did that have anything to do with your invention?

5 A. No, it did not.

6 Q. If you flip up to figure 2, what is figure 2?

7 A. Figure 2 shows the storage router providing connectivity  
8 between storage and computers as the previous document we  
9 looked at, previous drawing we looked at.

10 Q. Was that your best understanding of the state-of-the-art  
11 at the time?

12 A. Correct. That was the state-of-the-art prior to the  
13 invention.

14 Q. Now, was this HP Mux closer to your invention than figure  
15 2 or further away?

16 A. It was further away. It did not do what is described in  
17 this diagram. It had less functional characteristics than the  
18 diagram exhibits.

19 Q. How about the thing you showed at Comdex?

20 A. Much less.

21 Q. In your mind, Mr. Hoese, with reference to figure 3,  
22 what's the significance of your invention?

23 A. Well, it provides these capabilities of access control,  
24 virtual local storage that allows a network server essentially  
25 to be replaced with a storage router.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 MR. ALLCOCK: I have no further questions of the  
2 witness at this time, your Honor. Your Honor, for the record,  
3 Exhibit 7 was admitted?

4 THE COURT: It's in evidence.

5 CROSS-EXAMINATION

6 BY MR. BAHLER:

7 Q. Mr. Hoese, let's go back to your patent just a second.  
8 Let's take a look at -- I have up on the screen Defendant's  
9 Exhibit 1, but it's the same as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. So if  
10 you have Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 there in front of you, that  
11 will be fine for these purposes.

12 You just finished talking about figure 2, right?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. And that's not your invention, right?

15 A. No, it isn't.

16 Q. That's in your opinion the state-of-the-art, right?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. Okay. Take a look at column three in your patent. And  
19 there, beginning right about here, it starts a description of  
20 figure 2, right?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. Let me pull it out a little bit more. It says figure 2 is  
23 a block diagram of one embodiment of a storage router  
24 indicated generally and it continues, right, sir?

25 A. Correct.

1 Q. Back up just a second to the previous page. And you're  
2 talking about brief description of the drawings, right?

3 A. Okay.

4 Q. You refer to figure 1 and you refer to figure 1 is a block  
5 diagram of a conventional network that provides a storage  
6 through a network server, right? That's how you characterized  
7 figure 1, right, sir?

8 A. Uh-huh.

9 Q. And figure 2, you said figure 2 is a block diagram of one  
10 embodiment of a storage router --

11 THE COURT: You keep saying "storage router," but it  
12 says "storage network."

13 MR. BAHLER: You're right.

14 Q. (BY MR. BAHLER) Figure 2 is a block diagram of one  
15 embodiment with a storage network that provides global access  
16 and routing. That's what you told the Patent Office?

17 A. That's what it says.

18 Q. You didn't tell the Patent Office that figure 2 was  
19 state-of-the-art, did you, sir?

20 A. I think that's implicit in the descriptions.

21 Q. You didn't call it conventional like you called figure 1,  
22 did you, sir?

23 A. That's not the language that's there, no.

24 Q. They're just supposed to know that?

25 A. I think it's implicit in the text.

1 Q. Now, figure 3 is -- you describe figure 3, and that's what  
2 in your opinion shows your invention, right?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. And you described figure 3, you say figure 3 is a block  
5 diagram of one embodiment of a storage network with a storage  
6 router that provides virtual local storage, right, sir?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. You use similar language to the language you used to  
9 describe figure 2, right?

10 A. I don't think it's apparently similar language. It shows  
11 it provides additional capabilities.

12 Q. Well, the first ten words or so are exactly the same,  
13 right?

14 A. Sure, yes.

15 Q. So when you're describing your invention with respect to  
16 figure 3, you use exactly the same language to describe, at  
17 least for the first ten words or so, to describe figure 2,  
18 right?

19 A. As well as figure 1.

20 Q. And in your opinion, the Patent Office was supposed to  
21 know that figure 2 was a state-of-the-art and was not your  
22 invention, right?

23 A. Absolutely.

24 Q. Okay. Turn back to figure -- column 3, sir. And we just  
25 talked a little bit about the beginning of the description of

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 figure 2, and then, it just -- the description continues down.  
2 And in this vicinity -- and this is column 3, line about 45,  
3 starting line about 45 -- it says, in storage network 30, any  
4 workstation 36 or workstation 40 can access any storage device  
5 or storage device 38 or storage device 42 through native  
6 low-level block protocols and vice versa. That's how you  
7 described figure 2, right?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And that's not your invention, is it, sir?

10 A. No, it is not.

11 Q. Okay. And then, you continued by saying the functionality  
12 is enabled by the storage router 44 which routes requests and  
13 data as a generic transport between Fibre Channel 32 and SCSI  
14 bus 34. And it continues: Storage router 44 uses tables to  
15 map devices from one medium to the other, et cetera, see that?

16 MR. ALLCOCK: Objection, your Honor. I believe that  
17 misquotes the text. It says without any security access  
18 controls. I think counsel possibly, unintentionally, skipped  
19 over that.

20 Q. (BY MR. BAHLER) Well, Mr. Hoese, the point is, that  
21 describes something that's not your invention either, right?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. So something that routes using native low-level block  
24 protocols and it maps between Fibre Channel hosts and SCSI  
25 storage device, that's not your invention, is it, sir?



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Can you re -- can you say that again, please? I didn't  
2 quite follow you.

3 Q. Figure -- well, figure 2 is not your invention, right,  
4 sir?

5 A. Figure 2 is not my invention.

6 Q. And this description is in reference to figure 2, and this  
7 description mentions native low-level block protocols and  
8 mentions mapping, and you say figure 2 is not your invention?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. Okay. Please turn back to figures, particularly figure 5.  
11 All right. Now, you mentioned -- well, first of all, figure 5  
12 describes the router which is your invention, right?

13 A. Elements thereof.

14 Q. All right. Describes the hardware elements of your  
15 invention, right?

16 A. Some of them.

17 Q. And included in there is a Fibre Channel controller,  
18 right?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. And, also, SCSI controller, right?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. And supervisor unit which is a microprocessor, correct,  
23 sir?

24 A. It very well could be, yes.

25 Q. And a buffer which is done at the bottom, right, sir?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Now, you talked, a minute ago, with Mr. Allcock about the  
3 Comdex show in 1996, right?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And that show had a box which is a mock-up of the 4100 box  
6 sitting on a table, and it has cables coming out of that box  
7 to a PC that was under the table, right?

8 A. I would not describe that as a mock-up of the 4100  
9 product.

10 Q. But it had a box under the table and it has wires coming  
11 out of the PC that was on the floor, right?

12 A. It had a PC interconnected to another PC, as I recall,  
13 with external storage device connected to that, to the best of  
14 my recollection.

15 Q. All right. Well, the one PC was a Fibre Channel host  
16 acting as a Fibre Channel host, right?

17 A. I believe so.

18 Q. And the other PC was acting as the technology  
19 demonstration for the router product, right, sir?

20 A. Yeah, it was acting as a technology demonstration for  
21 connectivity to storage. I wouldn't say it was a router.

22 Q. Okay. All right. Well, in that technology demonstration,  
23 there was a supervisor unit?

24 A. There was a processor, yeah, I don't know if that would be  
25 characterized as a supervisor unit.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. There was a microprocessor, right?

2 A. Yes, it was a PC.

3 Q. And on this figure, the supervisor unit is a  
4 microprocessor, right?

5 A. Sure.

6 Q. And in that box, at Comdex '96 there was a Fibre Channel  
7 controller?

8 A. Yes, there was.

9 Q. In fact, it was a Fibre Channel controller that Crossroads  
10 had purchased from Hewlett Packard, right?

11 A. It was a Hewlett Packard controller. I don't know where  
12 it was purchased.

13 Q. Okay. Hewlett Packard Tachyon controller, right?

14 A. I believe so.

15 Q. And you're familiar with the inside of that controller,  
16 right?

17 A. I was at the time to some level.

18 Q. Okay. And inside that controller there was a first in,  
19 first out memory, right?

20 A. I believe so.

21 Q. Just like shown in figure 5 of your patent, right?

22 A. Yeah.

23 Q. And there was a Fibre Channel protocol unit, right?

24 A. I believe so, yes.

25 Q. And just like shown in figure 5 of your patent, right?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Sure, yes.

2 Q. And there was a DMA, which stands for direct memory access  
3 interface, in that, also, right?

4 A. I believe so.

5 Q. And that was all in the box that you had on -- at the  
6 technology demonstration at Comdex '96, right?

7 A. Those are the basic components of the Tachyon controller,  
8 yes.

9 Q. And also in that technology demonstration at Comdex '96  
10 there was a SCSI controller, right, sir?

11 A. Yes, there was.

12 Q. And in that SCSI controller, there was a SCSI controller  
13 that was purchased from Symbios Logic, right?

14 A. I believe so.

15 Q. That was the manufacturer, right?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. And inside that SCSI controller there was a buffer, right?

18 A. Yes, there was.

19 Q. And that was in the SCSI controller in the box at Comdex  
20 '96?

21 A. That is the basic component of the Symbios controller.

22 Q. And, also, there was a SCSI protocol unit, right?

23 A. Yes, there is.

24 Q. And there was a DMA interface in that chip in the box at  
25 the technology demonstration at Comdex '96, right?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And also in that box was a buffer memory, right?

3 A. Correct, there was a buffer memory.

4 Q. And that's just like shown in figure 5, right?

5 A. Yes, it is.

6 Q. And the components that were in that technology  
7 demonstration at Comdex '96 were hooked up just like you're  
8 seeing in figure 5 of your patent?

9 A. These components. I would say that's a fair description  
10 of how they were.

11 Q. All right, sir. Take a look at columns 4, 5 and 6 of your  
12 patent. What I ended up doing here is I have the bottom of  
13 column 5 and the top of column 6 --

14 MR. ALLCOCK: Your Honor, for the record, if we could  
15 just have the line numbers, it might help if anybody reads  
16 this later on.

17 MR. BAHLER: That's correct. It's column 5, line 63  
18 through column 6, about line 7 or so.

19 Q. (BY MR. BAHLER) And, first of all, for context, Mr. Hoese,  
20 in this portion of your patent, you're describing the details  
21 that are in figure 3, right?

22 A. I don't know if that's the specific reference that these  
23 are attributed to.

24 Q. Well, you're referring to -- actually, this is describing  
25 figure 5, but you're referring -- figure 5 is presented in

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 your patent at least as being part of figure 3, which is your  
2 invention, right, sir?

3 A. I believe so, yes.

4 Q. And you told the Patent Office that one implementation of  
5 that router includes the Hewlett Packard Tachyon chip, right?

6 A. Yeah.

7 Q. And that would be the Fibre Channel controller, right?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. That's the same, exact chip that was in the technology  
10 demonstration at Comdex 1996, right?

11 A. It may have been in a different step, but it was a very  
12 similar chip.

13 Q. And can you tell the Patent Office the router, according  
14 to your invention, includes the Intel i960 RP Microprocessor,  
15 right?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And that's the supervising unit that's used in your  
18 invention, at least that's what you told the Patent Office?

19 A. I think that's there.

20 Q. There was the Intel i960 processor in the technology  
21 demonstration at Comdex '96, right?

22 A. I believe there was, yes.

23 Q. You also told the Patent Office that your invention  
24 included the SCSI interface support fast 20 based on the  
25 Symbios series of SCSI controllers, right? That's what you

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 told the Patent Office was part of your router, right?  
2 A. Correct --  
3 Q. And that --  
4 A. -- as it reads, yes.  
5 Q. -- that, also, was the same chip that was in the  
6 technology demonstration at Comdex 1996, right?  
7 A. I believe so.  
8 Q. All right. And just so we're clear about this technology  
9 demonstration, Mr. Hoese, this box which connected to a Fibre  
10 Channel host, right, sir?  
11 A. It was connected to the computer with Fibre Channel --  
12 Q. Okay. There was a Fibre Channel interface going to the  
13 box, and that connected to this Fibre Channel controller in  
14 the box, right?  
15 A. Yes.  
16 Q. Okay. And then -- and then, on the other side, there was  
17 connected to the SCSI controller was a SCSI bus, right?  
18 A. Correct.  
19 Q. And connected to that SCSI bus were SCSI storage devices,  
20 right, sir?  
21 A. That's correct.  
22 Q. And the SCSI -- Fibre Channel host was requesting data  
23 from the SCSI storage devices, and those requests were passed  
24 through the router that was in the technology demonstration at  
25 Comdex '96, right?

1 A. I would say there was not a router in that demonstration.

2 Q. I understand. Let me rephrase the question, then. Passed  
3 through the technology demonstration to get to the SCSI  
4 storage device, right?

5 A. Right. The technology demonstration was the unit as  
6 described with these interfaces for a read-and-write request  
7 from that PC to -- to and from that storage device.

8 Q. Right. And the read request would say give me a picture,  
9 you were showing a slide show, right?

10 A. Yeah. I don't recall.

11 Q. Okay. Well, whenever it was. You were sending read  
12 requests, and they'd pass through your technology  
13 demonstration and go to the SCSI storage devices, right?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. And then, the SCSI storage device would read the data and  
16 send that data back through the technology demonstration to  
17 the Fibre Channel host, right?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. And that router -- I'm sorry. The technology  
20 demonstration acted to connect those two things, the Fibre  
21 Channel host and the SCSI storage device, so that they could  
22 communicate with one another, right?

23 A. I would describe that as a simple bridge, yeah. Bridge  
24 the operations between that host and that storage device.

25 Q. All right. Now, you also mentioned in your examination by



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Mr. Allcock, you mentioned the Hewlett Packard Mux, right, HP

2 Mux?

3 A. Well, he mentioned it. I didn't mention it, he did.

4 Q. Well, it was covered, right, sir?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And the Hewlett Packard Mux, that stands for multiplexor,  
7 right?

8 A. Correct.

9 Q. And it connected to multiple Fibre Channel hosts to  
10 multiple SCSI storage device, right?

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q. One on one side, one on the other, right?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Okay. And inside the Hewlett Packard Mux, there was a  
15 Hewlett Packard Tachyon Fibre Channel controller, right?

16 A. That's correct.

17 Q. And there was a microprocessor in there, too, that  
18 supervised the function of the Hewlett Packard Mux, right?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. And there was a buffer memory, correct, sir?

21 A. Yes, there was.

22 Q. And there was a SCSI controller in there, too, right?

23 A. Yes, there was.

24 Q. And that was also -- that was a Symbios controller, right?

25 A. I believe so.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. All right. And the multiple Fibre Channel hosts could  
2 read and write data to and from the SCSI storage devices  
3 through the Hewlett Packard Mux, correct?

4 A. The computers attached on the Fibre Channel side could  
5 read and write data to the storage devices on the other side,  
6 that's correct.

7 Q. All right. And that's mapping, right?

8 A. No, not necessarily.

9 Q. Let's take a look at Plaintiff's Exhibit 7, real quick.  
10 And this is this document that you contend memorializes the  
11 conception of your invention. First of all, Mr. Hoeser, this  
12 document doesn't include any sort of fax indication line at  
13 the top that it was actually faxed to anyone, does it, sir?

14 A. I think this would be the sent copy rather than the  
15 received copy.

16 Q. The received copy was received by Crossroads' patent  
17 lawyers at the time, right?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. It was a fella named Anthony Peterman, right?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. And at the time Mr. Peterman was working for a firm called  
22 Baker Botts, right?

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. And, actually, the main contact at Baker Botts was a fella  
25 named Bill Hulsey, right?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And Mr. Hulsey sent -- has since left Baker Botts and went  
3 to Gray Cary, correct --

4 A. I --

5 Q. -- after that time? After you were sending this fax, Mr.  
6 Hulsey left Baker Botts and went to Gray Cary, right?

7 A. I believe so, yes.

8 Q. And he took the file with him, there, right?

9 A. I don't have any knowledge of that.

10 Q. Okay. And although we had some pretty complete document  
11 requests, Mr. Hoese, we never got a copy of this fax that  
12 showed that it was received by anybody, correct?

13 MR. ALLCOCK: Your Honor, lacks foundation. How does  
14 this witness know?

15 THE COURT: He can so state if he doesn't know. Do  
16 you know one way or the other?

17 THE WITNESS: I have no idea.

18 Q. (BY MR. BAHLER) All right. In your experience with  
19 facsimile machines, the received copy would have this  
20 information at the top, right?

21 A. In general, I think that's correct.

22 Q. Received on such and such a date from such and such a  
23 phone number, right?

24 A. That's typical.

25 Q. Okay. Let's take a look at the last page, particularly

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 this line, consent by Geoff Hoese, March 22nd, 1997, first  
2 draft, May 15th, 1997.

3 Now, you didn't write anything down at all about your  
4 invention in this access control invention that you say you  
5 made until March 15th, 1997, right?

6 A. Until March 15th, I hadn't --

7 Q. I'm sorry, until May 15th, 1997, correct, sir?

8 A. I had likely taken some notes or drawings on my white  
9 board, that sort of thing.

10 Q. Okay. White board, you'd erase it later?

11 A. Yeah.

12 Q. Okay. And, once again, if those notes were still in  
13 existence, they would have been produced in this case?

14 A. I presume so.

15 Q. Okay. So you didn't write -- you didn't write this  
16 document -- the first draft of this document until May 15th of  
17 '97, right, sir?

18 A. Yeah, that's when I saved off a copy of it as it were in  
19 Word.

20 Q. Okay. And even assuming that it was received, it could  
21 not possibly have been received before you sent it, which is  
22 May 28th, '97, right? Even assuming it was received by  
23 someone, right?

24 A. I'm confident it was received by somebody on that day.

25 Q. Okay. And, Mr. Hoese, you mentioned this marking issue,

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 no matter how in your opinion, the 4100 product doesn't  
2 include in your invention, right?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. Now, Mr. Middleton consulted with you or talked to you  
5 before he made the decision to put the patent label on the  
6 4100 product, correct?

7 A. I don't recall any specific discussions about that.

8 Q. So if he does recall, you have no capability of saying  
9 he's wrong, right?

10 A. Again, I don't remember discussing in any specific  
11 labeling of products of patents.

12 Q. Okay.

13 A. I do remember that, you know, at some point, we had some  
14 general concept discussions, but nothing specific.

15 Q. And during the entire time you were at Crossroads until  
16 when did you say, October of 2000?

17 A. That was when I left, at the end of October 2000.

18 Q. You never expressed to anybody that you didn't think that  
19 the Crossroads products that were in production at that time  
20 should have that label on it. You didn't tell anybody that  
21 you didn't think that was correct, right?

22 MR. ALLCOCK: Lacks foundation, your Honor.

23 THE COURT: The objection is overruled. You may  
24 answer.

25 A. Again, I don't recall specifically any discussion about

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 labeling on any specific products. I don't recall that I gave  
2 that opinion or not.

3 Q. (BY MR. BAHLER) And, Mr. Hoese, you were still working at  
4 Crossroads in July of 2000, right?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. And were you aware that Chaparral, during this case, asked  
7 Crossroads to identify the products that were covered by the  
8 patent in this case? Were you aware of that that happened?

9 A. No.

10 Q. And were you aware that in response to that request,  
11 Crossroads answered, quote, Crossroads is still investigating  
12 its sales of products which incorporate the inventions of the  
13 972 patent. That was July 2000. Were you aware of that, sir?

14 A. I don't recall that, no.

15 Q. Did anybody come to you, the inventor, to see whether or  
16 not the products were covered by the patent in this case when  
17 answering this question?

18 A. It's possible. I don't specifically recall any of that,  
19 no.

20 Q. Pass the witness, your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Any further question?

22 MR. ALLCOCK: A couple, your Honor.

23 RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. ALLCOCK:

25 Q. When you left Crossroads, did you know that the product

1 was labeled?

2 A. No, I did not.

3 Q. If you could look at column 2, at lines 42 through 52, it  
4 talks about figure 2 having global access and figure 3  
5 describing a storage router. Do you see that?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Is it clear to you that figure 3 is your invention and  
8 figure 2 isn't?

9 MR. BAHLER: Objection. Relevance.

10 THE COURT: That objection is overruled.

11 A. It is very clear to me that that is a difference, yes.

12 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) Could you read to the ladies and  
13 gentlemen of the jury the title of the patent?

14 A. Storage router and method for providing virtual local  
15 storage.

16 Q. Look at figure 5, if you would. Now, you were asked some  
17 questions about hardware. Without software, what does the  
18 device shown in figure 5 do?

19 A. Nothing, absolutely nothing. It would be non-functional  
20 completely without that software.

21 Q. So in order for this to operate according to your  
22 invention, what does it need?

23 A. It needs a substantial amount of software.

24 Q. And none of that software was in existence at Comdex or  
25 with this HP Mux?

1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. No further questions, your Honor.

3 RE-CROSS EXAMINATION

4 BY MR. BAHLER:

5 Q. Mr. Hoese, you're not telling the members of this jury  
6 that the technology demonstration at Comdex '96 show had no  
7 software in it, are you?

8 A. I didn't make that statement.

9 Q. Okay. So the statement that you just said, none of this  
10 software, none of it was in the Comdex 1996 show is an  
11 exaggeration, right, sir?

12 A. I don't feel that I exaggerated, but software -- I mean,  
13 you know, some software is similar, it's possible that, you  
14 know, some elements of a driver were similar between what  
15 would be required for the invention. However, the software  
16 required for the invention absolutely was not in the Comdex  
17 technology demonstration.

18 Q. Software included in the Comdex 1996 show, at the very  
19 least, included software that permitted Fibre Channel hosts to  
20 communicate, to read and write data to SCSI storage devices,  
21 right?

22 A. That is not necessarily the software. That software does  
23 not enable the invention.

24 Q. That was in there, though, right?

25 A. Sure. There is software to do that. It was different



1 software and would be -- may be required to implement the  
2 invention. There was software that did that, though.

3 Q. So there was software in that prototype, right?

4 A. There was software in the prototype, yes.

5 Q. And, in fact, the prototype was working with native  
6 low-level block protocols, too, right?

7 A. Yes, they use SCSI which is the name of the low-level  
8 block protocol.

9 Q. Let me show you what's marked as Defendant's Exhibit 10.  
10 Now, this is a declaration that you signed and was filed in  
11 the Patent Office, right?

12 MR. ALLCOCK: Objection, your Honor. Beyond the scope  
13 of my redirect.

14 THE COURT: It is. Sustain the objection.

15 Q. (BY MR. BAHLER) All right. Pass the witness.

16 THE COURT: May this witness be excused?

17 MR. ALLCOCK: He may, your Honor, subject to recall.

18 THE COURT: It will be up to the lawyers contacting  
19 him.

20 Members of the jury, you've heard a lot of testimony.  
21 Even though I don't normally give a lot of breaks, I'm going  
22 to give you about a five-minute break, stretch, if any of you  
23 need to use the facilities, clear your mind, come back for the  
24 next witness.

25 (Jury not present.)

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 THE COURT: Take a recess. What's next?

2 MR. ALLCOCK: Mr. Russell.

3 (Recess.)

4 THE COURT: All right, gentlemen. Let's come back. I  
5 called the break for two reasons: You've got two jurors who  
6 are down and seven jurors who are obviously not understanding  
7 a word of what's going on, so I thought we'd let them get a  
8 little exercise and maybe get a little bit more oxygen in  
9 their blood, and spread the word among counsel that you don't  
10 want to lose a jury.

11 Bring them in.

12 (Jury present.)

13 THE COURT: You may call your next witness.

14 MR. GIUST: Your Honor, Crossroads calls Jeffry  
15 Russell.

16 THE COURT: If you'll come right here and be sworn,  
17 please, sir.

18 (Witness was sworn.)

19 THE COURT: If you'll walk around this column and have  
20 a seat. And if you'll tell us your full name and spell your  
21 last, please.

22 THE WITNESS: My name's Jeffry Thomas Russell. My  
23 last name's spelled R-U-S-S-E-L-L, and the first name is  
24 J-E-F-F-R-Y.

25 JEFFRY RUSSELL, called by the Plaintiff, duly sworn.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 DIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. GIUST:

3 Q. Mr. Russell, where do you live?

4 A. I live in Austin, Texas.

5 Q. How long have you lived in Austin?

6 A. I've lived here about one year.

7 Q. Where have you resided before that?

8 A. Before that, I lived down in San Antonio for about five

9 years before that.

10 Q. Could you give us a brief description of your educational

11 background?

12 A. Sure. In 1988, I graduated with a Bachelor of Science in

13 Electrical Engineering from Marquette University. In 1991, I

14 got a Masters in Electrical Engineering from Purdue

15 University.

16 Q. Could you give us a background of your work history?

17 A. Sure. After I graduated from Purdue in '91, I got

18 recruited by IBM and moved down here to Austin, Texas, and at

19 IBM, I worked on designing local area network, adapters, and

20 that work involved designing circuit boards and designing

21 circuit chips themselves.

22 Q. Okay. Did there come a time when you worked at

23 Crossroads?

24 A. Yeah, in about 1995, some of the development activity that

25 I was interested in doing at IBM was coming to an end, and

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Brian Smith contacted me and invited me to come join Infinity  
2 Comm Stor, which was the precursor to Crossroads Systems.

3 Q. What did you do when you arrived at Crossroads?

4 A. I was the first engineer so I came on board and worked on  
5 a hardware project, and after that, I started developing  
6 hardware platform for the CP 4100 Verrazano.

7 Q. And what do you do now?

8 A. My role there now is more of a architectural kind of  
9 person which is someone who looks at technologies, new things  
10 that could be wrapped into products and whatnot.

11 Q. You mentioned hardware. Could you give the jury an idea  
12 of what hardware is?

13 A. Sure. The kinds of things I was designing at that time  
14 are like what's inside of your PC. So if you've ever seen the  
15 inside, there's a green circuit board and a lot of wires and  
16 connectors and I put -- I figure out the kinds of chips to  
17 use, the kind of connectors, the kind of power supplies that  
18 have to be there, and put that all on there on the circuit  
19 board.

20 Q. Let me show you a couple of exhibits, if I may. Show you  
21 Exhibits 4 and 7. Just take a look at those. Before we talk  
22 about that, though, let me put up on the screen Exhibit 1.  
23 Have you ever seen Exhibit 1 before?

24 A. Yes, I have.

25 Q. And in what capacity?

1 A. It's the patent that Geoff Hoese and I have for the  
2 storage router for the virtual local storage.

3 Q. And you're the Jeffry Russell referred to on the front  
4 page here?

5 A. Yes, I am.

6 Q. What did you do in connection with this invention of this  
7 patent?

8 A. Well, Geoff and I collaborated on it to get the ideas  
9 going, and I really brought the hardware expertise to the  
10 whole collaboration process.

11 Q. What was the hardware that you designed to do?

12 A. The hardware does two main things: One, it provides all  
13 the physical kinds of things that would have to hook up to the  
14 outside world to specific connectors or protocols, and it also  
15 provides all of the things you need to run software and then,  
16 a lot of the higher level things that the router does is done  
17 in software.

18 Q. How did you come up with this invention in Exhibit 1?

19 A. We, at that time, we looked around and saw that the way  
20 storage is hooked up is through a network file server. And  
21 there's a lot of overhead involved in having storage  
22 implemented over a network like that, and so, we thought there  
23 would be a better way to improve its efficiency.

24 Q. Are access controls important to this invention?

25 A. Yeah, it's the central part. It's what allows the mapping

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 to occur so you can have the virtual local storage.

2 Q. Okay. When did you come up with this invention?

3 A. We started kicking around ideas in the mid-to-late 1997.

4 Q. What product were you working on at that time in  
5 mid-to-late 1997?

6 A. That time, I was working on Verrazano, which is the  
7 hardware part of the CP 4100.

8 Q. Okay. If you'd look in your folder to Exhibit 4, which is  
9 already in evidence. Do you recognize what Exhibit 4 is?

10 A. Yes, I do.

11 Q. What is it?

12 A. It's the schematic diagram for the Verrazano hardware  
13 platform, and this is what specifies how you would go put  
14 together all the chips and pieces to make the circuit board.

15 Q. Does this exhibit show the hardware elements in an early  
16 form that would be used in the 972 patent?

17 A. Yes, this is the basic hardware platform that we had in  
18 mind to support the invention.

19 Q. Okay. What's the approximate date of the document, if you  
20 could tell?

21 A. Well, from the first page, you could see that that  
22 automatic date says, I think, January 22nd, 1997, and,  
23 actually, the next page says January 31st, 1997. So, you  
24 know, late January is when we finished up the first version of  
25 this schematic when we went and tried to make a real piece of

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 hardware from this.

2 Q. Is this the final schematic for the 972 invention, or was  
3 there additional work that was done?

4 A. Oh, a lot more additional work. This was just the first  
5 try of getting it to work, and when we did make it, it didn't  
6 work. So it was refinement that had to go on.

7 Q. Okay. Did you put the 972 invention into the Crossroads  
8 CP 4100 product?

9 A. No, we didn't.

10 Q. Why not?

11 A. Well, at that point, this was the very first product of  
12 the small little company and everyone's busy running around  
13 just trying to get the basic storage router kinds of things to  
14 work, so adding that extra functionality of implementing the  
15 virtual local storage and whatnot just wasn't prioritized.

16 Q. When did you come up with the idea of virtual local  
17 storage along with Mr. Hoese?

18 A. We started that in mid-to-late 1997. I don't know the  
19 exact date, but we --

20 Q. If you take a look at Exhibit 7, that folder there. Turn  
21 to the second page entitled, network storage device with  
22 routing and security controls. This is already in evidence.  
23 Have you seen this page before?

24 A. Yes, I have.

25 Q. And flip to the next page. Can you see the next page, as

1 well?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. What do these two pages describe?

4 A. These were the first write-up of the idea for the  
5 invention, so they're kind of a high-level view of what could  
6 be happening, and the pictures kind of show how we were  
7 talking about using the device and how it would be applied.

8 Q. Did you see these two pages on or at the date reflected in  
9 the document, which is from March to May of 1997?

10 A. Yeah, it was during that time that Geoff and I first had  
11 the first talks about, hey, this should be something we should  
12 write up and try to patent. So this document was a write-up  
13 of a very early stage of that. I'm not sure if we -- this  
14 particular version was before we first talked about it or  
15 right after, but it was just as the ideas were starting to  
16 form.

17 Q. You mentioned that you work -- your work was in connection  
18 with the hardware. Did you have any -- was this document  
19 supplemental to that hardware to show other aspects of the  
20 invention?

21 A. This is more showing like how you would use the whole  
22 product when it's all put together. It's really not showing a  
23 lot of details of the different hardware pieces.

24 Q. Let me take you back to Comdex in 1996. Was there a  
25 technology demonstration at that Comdex by Crossroads?



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Yes, there was.

2 Q. Were you there?

3 A. Yes, I was there.

4 Q. Okay. What did Crossroads show in this technology  
5 demonstration?

6 A. We actually showed two things that we tried to make look  
7 as one. The first thing was the technology demonstration  
8 you're talking about, which was a PC, personal computer with  
9 some different cards plugged in so it could hook up to things  
10 like a host or a disk drive.

11 And then, we had some software running that  
12 demonstrated the technology of hooking up SCSI and Fibre  
13 Channel, the different protocols involved. And then, the  
14 other thing that we were showing which, really, we're trying  
15 to make it all look like one was a prototype of the enclosure  
16 for the CP 4100.

17 And we put the prototype enclosure on top of a table,  
18 and then, we had the cables that connected everything, sort of  
19 going on top of the table, and connect together the PC under  
20 the table.

21 Q. So was there any actual functioning circuit or anything  
22 within the enclosure?

23 A. No, there wasn't. Alls it had inside was some connectors,  
24 it had some -- a lot of epoxy and little blinking lights so  
25 from the outside, there would be lights blinking as if it was

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 doing something.

2 Q. What did the blinking lights signify, if anything?

3 A. That's just our prude engineer's way of trying to do some  
4 kind of marketing. You know, standing in front of a table at  
5 a show and lights are blinking, people usually come up and ask  
6 what's going on.

7 Q. Okay. You mentioned there's something below the table.

8 People that came up by looking at the device in the table know  
9 what was in the box below the table?

10 A. You wouldn't know what was in the box. If you looked  
11 closely at the cables and everything, you'd see that there was  
12 something under the table. And we weren't certainly trying to  
13 hide the fact that there was a PC under the table.

14 Q. Did this technology demonstration use any aspect of the  
15 972 invention?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Did the demonstration function as a bridge, at least?

18 A. I wouldn't even say it functioned as a bridge. It was  
19 just a very early demonstration of, hey, we can make these two  
20 different things talk to each other. I'd almost likened it to  
21 if you wanted a car and you tried to show it off, you wanted  
22 to sell it, and there was no engine, or something like that,  
23 you could push it down the hill and it would look like a car  
24 going down the hill, but it wouldn't look like much past that.  
25 So it was early pieces of what could be in a bridge.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. No further questions.

2 CROSS-EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. GARRETT:

4 Q. Hi, Mr. Russell. Just a follow-up on something you just  
5 talked about. You said that prototype didn't use any aspect  
6 of the invention, right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And I want to make sure that everybody understands what  
9 you're talking about. There was an empty box on the table,  
10 but actually, the guts of what was going on was under the  
11 table, right?

12 A. There was something -- yeah, the technology demonstration  
13 was under the table.

14 Q. And what was under the table certainly did use aspects of  
15 the invention, correct?

16 A. The central aspect of the invention being access control,  
17 there was nothing that would remotely look like that involved.

18 Q. You understand, though, do you not, that other aspects of  
19 the invention include hardware?

20 A. Yes, I understand that.

21 Q. And those hardware elements were present in that  
22 technology demonstration?

23 A. Yeah, there was very similar elements, especially with  
24 things that would let you connect specifically to those  
25 protocols.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

- 1 Q. Okay. Now, I want to go back to the '96-'97 time frame  
2 for a minute. When you and Mr. Hoese were coming up with your  
3 invention, did you have any communications with Mr. Smith  
4 about that process?
- 5 A. Not that I remember, no.
- 6 Q. Did he ever encourage you to protect what you considered  
7 to be your ideas or your inventions by applying for patent  
8 protection?
- 9 A. No, not specifically, you know, one-on-one.
- 10 Q. Did he ever encourage you to apply for the 972 patent?
- 11 A. Personally, no. I dealt mostly with Geoff Hoese.
- 12 Q. Did Mr. Smith ever tell you to make sure that the Patent  
13 Office learned about that technology demonstration at Comdex  
14 in 1996?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. Did he ever tell you to tell the Patent Office to make  
17 sure that they learned about the HP Mux?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Do you recognize what has been marked as Defendant's  
20 Exhibit 145? Hopefully appearing on your screen.
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Was this something that was shown at Comdex of 1996?
- 23 A. Yes, it is. It was a flyer that we had, table handout.
- 24 Q. That Crossroads passed out to people who came by?
- 25 A. Yes.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Is that right? Did Mr. Smith ever tell you to make sure  
2 that the Patent Office learned about this piece of literature?

3 A. He never specifically said that, no.

4 Q. Now, as an inventor of the 972 patent, did you understand  
5 that you had a duty of disclosure to the Patent Office?

6 A. Oh, yes.

7 Q. Okay. Did you ask your patent lawyer what that meant?

8 A. I didn't know if I asked the patent lawyer who was  
9 involved in this, but just through general knowledge and  
10 experience in the field, I was aware of that.

11 Q. Okay. Now, during the application process, did you make  
12 any attempt to find out what the Patent Office knew about the  
13 prior art to your invention?

14 A. Me personally, no.

15 Q. Did you ask your patent lawyer, or anybody else, to give  
16 you copies of the patents that the Patent Office was looking  
17 at when they were examining your application?

18 A. No, I never asked them to do that.

19 Q. Did you ever look at any of those patents?

20 A. I never saw any patents if there are any.

21 Q. So would it follow, then, that you didn't compare what was  
22 shown at Comdex to the disclosures of any of those patents?

23 A. That would be comparing apples and oranges, so no.

24 Q. Would it also follow that you didn't compare what was in  
25 this piece of literature, D-145, to the patents that the

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Patent Office had before it when it was examining your  
2 application?

3 A. Specifically off this piece of paper, no.

4 Q. Okay. Did you tell the Patent Office about the Comdex  
5 display in 1996?

6 A. Well, the Comdex display was just a technology  
7 demonstration, so no. But elements of a storage router which  
8 I think you're alluding to with this document here in front of  
9 me are included in the patent application as kind of the  
10 starting point of what a storage router is.

11 Q. Did you tell the Patent Office about Exhibit 145?

12 A. No.

13 Q. Did you tell the Patent Office about the HP Mux?

14 A. No.

15 Q. You testified earlier, when Mr. Giust was asking you some  
16 questions, that access control is pretty important to the  
17 invention, right?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Did anything that Crossroads built in 1997 have access  
20 controls in them, according to you?

21 A. Nothing that I'm aware of, no.

22 Q. And Crossroads actually shipped some stuff or shipped some  
23 products in 1997 to customers or prospective customers?

24 A. We shipped products in 1996 and '97 and ever since then,  
25 yes.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Okay. Before you shipped those products, you had to build  
2 them and make sure they worked, right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. I want to talk very briefly about the patent application  
5 drafting process. Typically what happens is the inventors  
6 work on an application, then they give it to their attorney,  
7 right?

8 A. (Moving head up and down.)

9 Q. Now, do you recall when you saw the first draft of the 972  
10 patent application?

11 A. Like I said, somewhere in the early-to-mid 1997 is my  
12 recollection of when I saw things.

13 Q. But not a specific date?

14 A. No, I don't have the specific date in mind.

15 Q. Do you recall who created the draft that you saw?

16 A. Which draft are we talking about?

17 Q. The one that you saw in early-to-mid 1997?

18 A. I created the drafts, Geoff Hoese's created drafts. I  
19 can't specifically answer that question without the draft  
20 we're talking about.

21 Q. Then, do you have a clean recollection in your mind about  
22 what it was you saw in mid-to -- early-to-mid 1997 as far as  
23 the drafts?

24 A. My recollection is we got together, we collaborated on the  
25 ideas, and we started to exchange draft documents. The

1 previous piece of paper I looked at was one of those early  
2 versions.

3 Q. Right.

4 A. And eventually, it turned into the final application we  
5 submitted.

6 Q. Do you recall how many drafts you saw of the application  
7 itself? I understand you and Mr. Giust talked about Exhibit  
8 7, which was a document that Mr. Hoese created, but I'm  
9 referring, more specifically, to an actual draft of the  
10 application.

11 A. I don't know the exact number, but I think it was less  
12 than five.

13 Q. Do you remember whether you revised the first draft that  
14 you saw of the application?

15 A. I revised the draft. I don't know if it was the exact  
16 first one I saw.

17 Q. Do you remember how long you looked at it?

18 A. I don't remember how long I looked at it. Something that  
19 size would take me several hours to read to see what's in  
20 there.

21 Q. Do you remember how quickly you looked at it once you got  
22 it?

23 A. I don't specifically remember how quickly I looked at that  
24 draft.

25 Q. But there was a gap, wasn't there, I think -- well, was



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 there a gap before -- after getting the draft and then,  
2 actually taking some action and looking over it?

3 A. So we're talking about the time delay between it came in  
4 my possession and I started looking at it?

5 Q. Yes.

6 A. I'm sure there was a delay.

7 Q. You're not sure how long that delay was, right?

8 A. No. It was a very busy time at Crossroads.

9 Q. Okay. You mentioned that there was a final draft  
10 application, right?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Okay. You don't recall revising it, do you?

13 A. I don't know.

14 Q. Last question I have, Mr. Hoese -- or, excuse me, Mr.

15 Russell. Do you think your invention solved any problems that  
16 existed in the prior art?

17 A. This is a fuzzy question because I'm not sure of the legal  
18 definition of prior art, so could you just expand that a  
19 little more?

20 Q. Well, what you and Mr. Hoese were dealing with was  
21 something that hadn't come before, as you allege. And so, the  
22 prior art is stuff that's old. Now, with that understanding,  
23 can you answer the question?

24 A. Sure. We certainly solved a problem that existed in the  
25 world. Was it something that someone had already solved

1 already, we don't think so, no. Does that answer the  
2 question?

3 Q. Well, it's not quite as clean as I'd like it. The  
4 question was pretty simple: Do you think that your invention  
5 solved any problems that existed in the prior art that was  
6 old?

7 A. Our invention solved problems that we solved in the world,  
8 yes. I'm uncomfortable with the prior art word because I  
9 don't think I understand the definition.

10 Q. Did you understand it when we -- when I asked you this  
11 question at your deposition?

12 A. I don't recall.

13 Q. Okay. See if I can refresh your memory. If you'll turn  
14 with me to page 17, line 16. And the question I asked you  
15 then was: Okay. Did your invention solve any problems that  
16 existed in the prior art? Your counsel made some objections,  
17 and I responded to his objections by saying: I'm not asking  
18 for legal conclusions or expert opinions, Mr. Russell. I'm  
19 just asking if you solved any problems that existed in the  
20 prior art.

21 And do you see what your answer is on page 18, at the  
22 top?

23 A. Yes, I see my answer.

24 Q. Could you read it, please?

25 A. Sure. It says, I don't think we solved a problem that

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 existed in the prior art.

2 Q. Thank you. Pass the witness.

3 RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION

4 BY MR. GIUST:

5 Q. Mr. Russell, you said you solved problems that existed in  
6 the world just a moment ago. Could you elaborate on that,  
7 what you meant by that?

8 A. Sure. That was the initial problem that we saw to be  
9 solved by the invention which is the way that storage was  
10 hooked up remotely. So it was done through network file  
11 servers across the network, and that's how you accessed  
12 storage.

13 Q. Mr. Garrett just read you some of your deposition.  
14 There's a lot of objections that your counsel had made about  
15 legal mumbo-jumbo. Is that why you refused when he originally  
16 asked you the question here today?

17 A. Definitely. I still think there's a legal definition  
18 behind that, and I don't know if I'm really understanding  
19 that.

20 Q. Okay. And then, Mr. Garrett asked you about drafts of the  
21 patent applications, whether there were time delays between  
22 various moments of receiving drafts. Would you be able to  
23 answer the question better had he shown you copies of drafts  
24 and relevant draft documents attached?

25 A. Oh, certainly. I personally didn't keep really good

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 records about when I got a draft, or when I updated it, or how  
2 long it's at my desk, so I really can't answer, specifically,  
3 about that kind of stuff.

4 Q. Did you attend to those drafts as fast as you could given  
5 your work load at the time?

6 A. Oh, yeah. At that point, as far as hardware design, there  
7 was four, maybe five of us involved in designing and building  
8 and getting it to work, and we were putting in, maybe, 70-hour  
9 work weeks. So I'm sure if I got a draft of the patent, it  
10 wasn't reviewed by the next morning because there was lots of  
11 other things to prioritize.

12 Q. And Mr. Garrett mentioned something about disclosing  
13 things to the Patent Office. Did you disclose all the  
14 pertinent prior art you know of to the Patent Office?

15 A. Yeah. In my mind, the starting point for the invention is  
16 a storage router, and so, the invention is built on top of  
17 that. And, you know, things like the technology demo and some  
18 of that literature, that's even more primitive than the  
19 storage router.

20 Q. No further questions.

21 MR. GARRETT: One follow-up, your Honor.

22 RE-CROSS EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. GARRETT:

24 Q. Mr. Giust asked you if you had disclosed all the pertinent  
25 prior art you know of to the Patent Office, right?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Yes, he did ask me that.

2 Q. And you disclosed that to the Patent Office?

3 A. Well, on our application, we described what a storage  
4 network is and storage router is. That's kind of the base  
5 starting point. That's not the invention. So in my mind,  
6 that covers the prior art of what a storage router is.

7 Q. So no other papers besides just your application?

8 A. I wasn't aware of any other kind of implementations of  
9 this technology at that point. This was very new stuff.

10 Q. Is that a no?

11 A. Could you repeat the question, then?

12 Q. Yeah. Did you disclose any other papers to the Patent  
13 Office besides your application?

14 A. I did not.

15 Q. Thanks.

16 MR. GIUST: No further questions.

17 THE COURT: You may step down, sir.

18 MR. GIUST: Your Honor, we reserve to right to call  
19 Mr. Russell later.

20 THE COURT: Who is your next witness?

21 MR. GIUST: Next witness is Keith Arroyo.

22 THE COURT: How long do you anticipate?

23 MR. GIUST: Less than ten minutes.

24 THE COURT: All right. Call him. If you'll come down  
25 here, please. This is Mrs. Sims. She's going to administer

1 an oath to you.

2 (Witness was sworn.)

3 THE COURT: You may come up around this column and  
4 have a seat. If you'll tell us, please, your full name and  
5 spell your last.

6 THE WITNESS: My name's Keith Arroyo, and last name is  
7 A-R-R-O-Y-O.

8 KEITH ARROYO, called by the Plaintiff, duly sworn.

9 DIRECT EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. GIUST:

11 Q. Mr. Arroyo, what kind of work do you do?

12 A. Do software development.

13 Q. What does that entail?

14 A. Basically designing, writing code and testing.

15 Q. How long have you been doing this?

16 A. I'd say for about 13 years.

17 Q. What companies have you worked for?

18 A. IBM, Thomas Conrad, Compaq and Crossroads Systems.

19 Q. What kind of work did you do at these companies?

20 A. I did software development.

21 Q. Approximately when did you start doing software  
22 development?

23 A. I believe, like, '87.

24 THE COURT: Mr. Arroyo, you may need to talk into the  
25 microphone.

1 THE WITNESS: Okay.

2 Q. (BY MR. GIUST) '87?

3 A. '87, yes.

4 Q. Have you had any other job responsibilities other than  
5 writing software?

6 A. I did software assurance, quality assurance for IBM.

7 Q. Did there come a time when you wrote software for  
8 Crossroads?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And when was that, approximately?

11 A. Sometime in '96 till I left.

12 Q. And when did you leave?

13 A. I believe it was '99, I'm not quite sure.

14 Q. Where did you go after you left Crossroads?

15 A. I went to SYSCO Systems.

16 Q. What types of work did you do at SYSCO?

17 A. Software development.

18 Q. What kind of code did you write for the Crossroads while  
19 you were at Crossroads?

20 A. I wrote the router code.

21 Q. Are you aware of a technology demonstration that  
22 Crossroads had shown at Comdex of 1996?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. What did you do in connection with that demonstration?

25 A. I was -- I wrote part of the code that was used for the

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 demonstration.

2 Q. Okay. I'm going to show you Exhibit 214. Take a look at  
3 that. It's already in evidence. Do you recognize Exhibit  
4 214?

5 A. Yes, I do.

6 Q. Actually, I'm sorry, that's Plaintiff's Exhibit -- yeah,  
7 that's Plaintiff's Exhibit 214. Now what is it? What is  
8 Exhibit 214?

9 A. It's the original file that I wrote for Crossroads.

10 Q. Was that the file that was in the Comdex technology  
11 demonstration?

12 A. It was -- this code was written for the demo -- the  
13 product demonstration, yes.

14 Q. And how would you know that?

15 A. It has routines that were called that weren't in the  
16 later-on version of this code. It also has hardware registers  
17 that were only on -- that were used in this code that were  
18 only used for the demonstration platform.

19 Q. Okay. How many Fibre Channel devices would this code  
20 function with?

21 A. One.

22 Q. How many SCSI storage devices did the code function with?

23 A. One.

24 Q. Would the technology demonstration work as attendant with  
25 more than one Fibre Channel device and more than one storage



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 device?

2 A. We wouldn't work on the SCSI side because we had  
3 hard-coded the address of the target SCSI device. And on the  
4 Fibre Channel end, we hadn't written a code, we hadn't written  
5 one Fibre Channel device on the workstation side. So does  
6 that answer your question?

7 Q. So would it work?

8 A. No.

9 Q. Okay. Did this code have any type of access controls  
10 between the one Fibre Channel device and the one SCSI device?

11 A. Access control like any kind of imitation of -- what do  
12 you mean like?

13 Q. Did it have any way to limit access to the SCSI storage  
14 device by the host?

15 A. No. I mean, if it's a well-formed command, SCSI command  
16 and you go from -- or box to the SCSI target.

17 Q. So as long as it's receiving well-formed commands --

18 A. Right.

19 Q. -- it would work? Does that mean that the command is a  
20 standard command?

21 A. Standard.

22 Q. Okay. That's all the questions, your Honor.

23 CROSS-EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. BAHLER:

25 Q. Mr. Arroyo, I'm holding in my hand Exhibit 214. This is

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 the computer program that was in the technology demonstration

2 Comdex 1996, right?

3 A. Right.

4 Q. And did you disclose this to the Patent Office at any time  
5 during the pendency of the 972 patent, sir?

6 A. I didn't disclose anything to any patent as far as this  
7 file.

8 Q. There came a time when you did work on access controls for  
9 Crossroads, right, sir?

10 A. Access controls as -- how do you define access control?

11 Q. Let's take a look at Plaintiff's Exhibit 129. I'm sorry,  
12 Defendant's Exhibit 129. I have it on the screen there for  
13 you, sir.

14 A. Uh-huh.

15 Q. Do you need a hard copy of that, too?

16 A. I don't need one yet.

17 Q. All right. This is a document that's dated October 22nd,  
18 1997, right, sir?

19 A. Uh-huh.

20 Q. And it's entitled Compaq 4100 Shiner OEM requirements,  
21 right?

22 A. Uh-huh.

23 Q. And you used those requirements -- well, at this time, you  
24 were one of the -- well, you were the principal software  
25 designer for the 4100 product, right?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. I wasn't the principal designer. I was with the group of  
2 people that --

3 Q. Well, you were one of the designers that was working on  
4 the 4100 product, right?

5 A. Yes, I was.

6 Q. And you were working on what was called the bridge code,  
7 right?

8 A. Right.

9 Q. And that's the code that actually controls the function of  
10 the router, right?

11 A. Controls some of the function of the router, yes.

12 Q. So you would have relied upon this while you were working  
13 at Crossroads. You would have relied upon this requirements  
14 document to guide your work, right?

15 A. I used -- I mean, if I remember this, I had to look -- I  
16 guess I need to look at the hard copy of it.

17 Q. All right.

18 A. I didn't use this document per se, I matched the  
19 requirements of it, but I didn't follow it. What number is  
20 it?

21 Q. 129.

22 A. What was the question?

23 Q. You used this document in designing the bridge code for  
24 the Shiner version of the 4100 product, right?

25 A. Well, I had to meet certain requirements that were -- that

1 were on certain pages.

2 Q. Okay. Please turn within that document to page 10. It's  
3 the tenth page. It doesn't have page ten on it. It's labeled  
4 page 4 -- well --

5 A. Page 4.

6 Q. -- it is page 5 of that document.

7 A. Page 5, okay.

8 Q. Yes, sir. Do you have it?

9 A. Yes, I do.

10 Q. Listed in there are implementation of the SCSI reserve and  
11 release command. That was a requirement for the Shiner 4100  
12 version of the product, right, sir?

13 A. It was a requirement for Compaq.

14 Q. All right. And one of those requirements was that a  
15 reserve command -- that's referring to a SCSI reserve command,  
16 right, sir?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. And this is a requirement for the operation of the 4100  
19 router, just so we're clear, right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. So it says, when a reserve command is received from an  
22 initiator, that means when a reserve command is received by  
23 the 4100 router from a Fibre Channel host, right?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And there is currently no reserve flag set for that LUN.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 That means the SCSI storage device, right?

2 A. Uh-huh.

3 Q. Okay. The CP 4100, 4100 router, right, will set the  
4 reserve flag for that LUN, which means the SCSI storage  
5 device, right, sir?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And store the worldwide name of the associated initiator.  
8 In other words, what would happen, what was required was that  
9 when a reserve command is received, the 4100 router would pay  
10 attention to that initiator and would reserve the SCSI storage  
11 device identified by that request to the requesting host,  
12 right?

13 A. It would send a temporary --

14 Q. Set this flag, right?

15 A. Set the temporary flag, right.

16 Q. And then, after that, it says, if any command is received  
17 which does not come from the initiator, that means the host,  
18 right --

19 A. Uh-huh.

20 Q. -- which issued the reserve command, the CP 4100 will  
21 return a reservation conflict status, right?

22 A. That's what the text says, yes.

23 Q. And that was a requirement for implementation of the SCSI  
24 reserve command, right?

25 A. Yes.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. And eventually, you did implement that function in the  
2 Crossroads 4100 router, right?

3 A. I did, but I didn't -- I couldn't guarantee that would be  
4 100 percent.

5 Q. Well, you implemented exactly what's stated in that  
6 paragraph in the 4100 router, right?

7 A. That's true, but there's circumstances that other commands  
8 can get to that target device that would be beyond my control.

9 Q. Mr. Arroyo, you implemented these functions in the 4100  
10 router, right?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And this is dated October 1997, right?

13 A. I'm not sure when I wrote the code for it. That's when  
14 the document --

15 Q. You are a programmer for 13 years, quite experienced,  
16 right, sir?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. Did you finish that by the end of '97, three months later?

19 A. I don't think it was end of '97.

20 Q. Did you finish it by the end of '98?

21 A. Sometime.

22 Q. Fifteen months later?

23 A. Sometime it was -- the reserve release command is complex  
24 in that you have to deal with a lot of events that can happen  
25 on the Fibre Channel end and, also, on the SCSI end. So it's

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 not like you can -- you know, you couldn't do it in a day.

2 You'd have to -- things would -- it's a progress of actually

3 getting a complete version of reserve release command to a

4 product, you know, product-ready state.

5 Q. Did you implement it by the end of 1998, 15 months --

6 A. I don't know if it's '98. I know it's before the end of

7 '99.

8 Q. So do you know for certain you implemented this function

9 as described here before the end of 1999 in the CP 4100

10 product, right?

11 A. I would say before '99, yes --

12 Q. And --

13 A. -- year end '99.

14 Q. The same code applies to the 4200 product, right?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Same base code.

17 A. Base code would be used.

18 Q. Same reserve support would have been in that same base

19 code by the end of 1999, right, sir?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And just to make sure we're clear here, this last sentence

22 I've highlighted said, if any command received which does not

23 come from the initiator which issued the command reserve CP

24 4100 will return a reservation conflict status. That means

25 when a command is received from a host that had not reserved

1 the reserved storage device, the CP 4100 will recognize that,  
2 right?

3 A. Yes, but, I mean, it's not complete, actually, because  
4 there's certain commands that will go through, even if the  
5 reserve is in place.

6 Q. I'm asking about if the command is received -- this says  
7 if any command is received which does not come from the  
8 initiator which issued the reserve command, the CP 4100 will  
9 return a reservation conflict. This doesn't say that there's  
10 any command, right, sir?

11 A. Well, it's not actually correct. Only certain commands  
12 are injected.

13 Q. The requirements by Compaq said any command, right?

14 A. Well, it was wrong.

15 Q. Should Compaq know what they wanted?

16 A. They should have. I mean, there's certain commands like,  
17 for instance, the inquiry command. If one initiator issues  
18 reserve, another initiator, another host computer issues an  
19 inquiry, that inquiry can go through to the target device.

20 Q. And that would have been in conflict with the specific  
21 requirements from Compaq, right?

22 A. Well, I think it was really a misunderstanding from their  
23 part when they wrote the document that certain commands  
24 actually will by the SCSI standard be allowed to go through  
25 even though reserve command is in place.



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Well, sir, let's finish this up. Just so we're clear,  
2 there's a reservation in place and, let's say, a read request  
3 comes through.

4 A. Uh-huh.

5 Q. The CP 4100?

6 A. Like what kind of read?

7 Q. Read from a piece of storage.

8 A. Like read the contents from this?

9 Q. Read this. Give me a picture, give me a document,  
10 something like that. That's sort of the request came through.

11 A. Like a data type.

12 Q. Data request, that's fine.

13 A. From a disk itself.

14 Q. Exactly. And if there was a reservation in place by a  
15 host that had not placed that -- that had not reserved that  
16 storage, then the CP 4100 would not permit that access, right?

17 A. In most cases.

18 Q. It wouldn't permit that read, would it, sir?

19 A. If the target device hadn't restarted and if our router  
20 hadn't been restarted, then that's true.

21 Q. All right. Wouldn't permit the access, right, sir?

22 A. Yes, under those conditions.

23 Q. And that's the way the SCSI reserve command acted to limit  
24 access between Fibre Channel hosts and SCSI storage devices,  
25 right?

1 A. Ask your question again.

2 Q. That's the way that the SCSI reserve command acted to  
3 limit access between Fibre Channel hosts and SCSI storage  
4 devices, right?

5 A. With those qualifications of events I couldn't control.  
6 As far as on the target side, it would prevent, you know, that  
7 one device from doing read or write command.

8 Q. So that's a yes, right?

9 A. Under those conditions, yes.

10 Q. Pass the witness.

11 MR. GIUST: No further questions, your Honor.

12 THE COURT: You may step down. Members of the jury,  
13 I'm going to let you go to lunch. Please be back at 1:25,  
14 ready to work, and remember the instructions I've given you.

15 (Jury not present.)

16 THE COURT: All right. 1:25.

17 (Lunch recess.)

18 THE COURT: All right. Counsel. Anything before we  
19 bring in the jury?

20 MR. ALBRIGHT: No, sir.

21 MR. BAHLER: No. Hang on just a second. I have an  
22 issue, in light of your Honor's admonition this morning, that  
23 we need to give you a head's up regarding the depositions. We  
24 took your Honor's comments to heart and considered some  
25 additional stuff out of Mr. Bleakley's deposition that they

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 had designated. They're not going to read it for some time,  
2 but I thought I'd give your Honor an opportunity to review --

3 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, to save you some time, we  
4 are not going to introduce the Bleakley deposition into the  
5 record.

6 MR. BAHLER: Well, okay.

7 MR. ALBRIGHT: We heard your Honor's admonitions.

8 THE COURT: Well, sometimes it pays. Bring the jury  
9 in.

10 (Jury present.)

11 THE COURT: Members of the jury, during the noon hour,  
12 did anyone attempt to talk to you about this case?

13 THE JURORS: No.

14 THE COURT: Did you talk to anybody about the case?

15 THE JURORS: No.

16 THE COURT: Did you learn anything about the case  
17 outside the presence of each other and this courtroom?

18 THE JURORS: No.

19 THE COURT: Did you get wet?

20 THE JURORS: No.

21 THE COURT: Show negative responses to all questions  
22 by all jurors. You may call your next witness.

23 MR. ALLCOCK: Your Honor, we're going to play a couple  
24 of videotapes. Mr. Bernstein's going to cue it up.

25 THE COURT: This is deposition -- videotaped

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 depositions?

2 MR. ALBRIGHT: Correct, sir.

3 THE COURT: Members of the jury, there are two ways to  
4 take a deposition. One is by a Court Reporter, and they type  
5 up the words, like you have heard it. The other is by a Court  
6 Reporter with a videotape, and that's what you're about to  
7 see. You should evaluate this testimony just as you would any  
8 other witness. You may proceed.

9 MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, we're going to show the  
10 plaintiff's designation for the deposition of Robert Selinger  
11 from July 26, 2001, and when that's completed we'll do --  
12 we'll see the defendant's designations.

13 THE COURT: All right.

14 (Videotape played.)

15 Q. "Where are you currently employed?"

16 A. Chaparral.

17 Q. And what is your current position at Chaparral?

18 A. Executive Vice-president and Chief Technical Officer.

19 Q. As the Vice-president and Chief Technical Officer of  
20 Chaparral, could you just generally describe what your  
21 responsibilities are?

22 A. My general duties are focused on strategy in terms of  
23 understanding and identifying long-term opportunities for the  
24 company and the environment, meeting with customers on a  
25 strategic basis, and then, guiding in terms of a road map our

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 engineering and marketing activities.

2 Q. Okay. When was the first time you saw the 972 patent?

3 A. In approximately February of 2000.

4 Q. And how did you come about getting a copy of the 972  
5 patent?

6 A. I don't recall if it was Jerry Walker or Dave Zinger, but  
7 it was in the context of the consulting work.

8 Q. And do you know when Chaparral first saw a copy of the 972  
9 patent?

10 A. Not by date, but it was in approximately that time frame.

11 Q. Okay. At some point in time, did Chaparral contact you  
12 about doing an investigation into the 972 patent?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And when was this?

15 A. In, again, same time frame, February 2000.

16 Q. So, at some point in time, Chaparral contacted you about  
17 doing an investigation into the 972 patent; is that correct?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. At this initial meeting with Chaparral, did you discuss  
20 LUN zoning?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. So you have no recollection as to how or why LUN zoning  
23 came up in that meeting?

24 A. Not specifically, other than, you know, the phrase appears  
25 in the context of the patent.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Can you mark -- I have marked as an exhibit -- as Exhibit  
2 305 document bearing dates No. CNS 174026 through CNS 4030,  
3 Dr. Selinger. Could you take a look at this document?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Turning to the first page, CNS 174026, it appears to be a  
6 February 29, 2000, an e-mail from you to Mike Gluck and Jerry  
7 Walker at Chaparral. Did you write such an e-mail on February  
8 29th?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And is this a true and correct copy of the e-mail and the  
11 attachment that you sent to Mr. Walker and Mr. Gluck?

12 A. I believe so.

13 Q. In the subject heading, there's reference to Overpass dot,  
14 dot, dot. Who is or what is overpass?

15 A. Overpass was a code name for Crossroads.

16 Q. Did you come up with that code name?

17 A. I believe so.

18 Q. How did you come up with -- or why did you come up with  
19 that?

20 A. I don't recall who suggested it in terms of, well, just a  
21 convenient phrase.

22 Q. Do you consider that more convenient than just using  
23 Crossroads?

24 A. I guess it was probably a combination of Crossroads and  
25 the patent. So it was a little bit more specific.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Okay. And this e-mail, is this the transmittal letter you  
2 sent with your report on the 972 patent?

3 A. It was a work-in-progress, but yeah, it was a report as of  
4 March 1st.

5 Q. For the benefit of the jury, can you please read the first  
6 paragraph of your e-mail?

7 A. Here's my Overpass report. Don't shoot the messenger.  
8 Probably the key inside is in the bottom half of page 2. And,  
9 obviously, we can discuss this all tomorrow/Tuesday.

10 Q. I want to first take a look at the middle e-mail, which  
11 appears to be an e-mail from Jerry Walker --

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. -- to you. In that e-mail, Jerry Walker is telling you to  
14 pursue documented evidence that access controls was well-known  
15 and practiced prior to December 31st, 1996; is that correct?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And did you ever pursue the documented evidence that  
18 access control was well-known and practiced in the prior art  
19 prior to December 31st, 1996?

20 A. I don't recall.

21 Q. You don't recall if you performed any additional research  
22 into access controls?

23 A. I do not -- I do not recall if I did or not.

24 Q. Do you have a definition of the term access controls?

25 A. I didn't attempt to apply one or derive one.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Okay. Well, let me -- just to clarify. When you were  
2 doing your research into the 972 patent, including your  
3 research into whether there was prior art encompassing access  
4 controls, you didn't have a definition for that term?

5 A. I didn't try and produce a limited definition or a  
6 specific one.

7 Q. Okay. Do you know a Brian Smith who works at Crossroads?

8 A. I talked to him once, yeah.

9 Q. Have you ever met him?

10 A. Not to my knowledge.

11 Q. Okay. Now, you state that you talked to him one time. Do  
12 you remember when that was?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And just for the record, you're referring to Exhibit 310?

15 A. Correct. So I believe I talked to him on February 28th.

16 Q. And you're referring to CNS 187017 in Exhibit 310?

17 A. Correct, sir.

18 Q. And are these your notes from the telephone conference you  
19 had with Mr. Smith on February 28th, 2000?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Okay. And what did -- how long was your phone  
22 conversation with Mr. Smith of Crossroads?

23 A. Don't recall exactly. I would guess it was 15 minutes or  
24 so.

25 Q. Okay. And as of this date, February 28, 2000, were you a



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 consultant for Chaparral?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. You were being paid by Chaparral?

4 A. Yes, as a consultant.

5 Q. Yes. You were being paid by Chaparral as a consultant to  
6 research and then, draft the report on Crossroads' 972 patent;  
7 is that correct?

8 A. Among other things, yes.

9 Q. Okay. At any point during your conversation with Brian  
10 Smith on February 28th, 2000 -- and I'm referring to the Brian  
11 Smith of Crossroads -- did you tell him you were a consultant  
12 to Chaparral?

13 A. No.

14 Q. At any point during your conversation with Brian Smith of  
15 Crossroads on February 28th, 2000, did you tell him you were  
16 being paid by Chaparral to research and draft a report on the  
17 972 patent?

18 A. No.

19 Q. Isn't it true that you simply told Mr. Smith that you were  
20 a consultant for a Fibre Channel company?

21 A. Approximately, yes.

22 Q. Okay. What did you and Mr. Smith discuss?

23 A. Basically, I was trying to determine initially whether or  
24 not he was a -- one of the Brian Smiths I knew at IBM. There  
25 were multiple. And I am not sure -- I think -- I'm not sure

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 we concluded that we knew each other. And then, I was trying  
2 to understand what, you know, if they were open to  
3 cross-licensing, and, you know, what they were going to do  
4 with this patent, if it was something that was filed as part  
5 of a window dressing for the IPO, or if they were serious  
6 about it.

7 Q. Okay. And at no point during the conversation did you  
8 identify yourself as a consultant for Chaparral?

9 MR. DELLETT: Objection. Asked and answered.

10 A. I agree.

11 Q. You agree with my statement?

12 A. I do not identify myself as Chaparral.

13 Q. Okay. And do you consider Pathlight and Chaparral --  
14 excuse me. Do you consider Crossroads and Chaparral to be  
15 competitors?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Okay. And just, again, I think I asked this, but I can't  
18 remember. Crossroads is a competitor of Chaparral, correct?

19 A. Yes."

20 MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, that concludes the  
21 plaintiff's designation, and now we'll proceed with  
22 defendant's designations.

23 THE COURT: All right.

24 Q. "Good morning, Dr. Selinger. Do you prefer Dr. Selinger,  
25 Mr. Selinger?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Bob is fine.

2 Q. Bob. I'll use Dr. Selinger.

3 A. Okay.

4 Q. And did they -- in the initial conversation, did they ask  
5 for a written report summarizing your findings?

6 A. Yes. Actually, I'm not sure whether they asked for it or  
7 whether it was something I prepared.

8 Q. Okay. During this conversation, did you discuss any  
9 specific prior art?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And what was the prior art discussed at this -- and we're  
12 talking about the initial meeting?

13 A. It appeared to me that the initial reading of the patent  
14 was both very obvious as well as lots of prior art. So I  
15 don't recall what the chronology of, you know, which meeting  
16 or which discussion we discussed certain prior art but --

17 Q. Okay. Do you remember any of the specific prior art  
18 discussed at that first meeting?

19 A. Not necessarily the first meeting. Like I said, I can't  
20 remember which discussion included which prior art.

21 Q. Okay. Now, a second ago, you said that you believed or  
22 you told Chaparral that the 972 patent was obvious?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And could you define for me the term obvious?

25 A. Obvious in the sense that an engineer that was familiar

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 with SCSI and Fibre Channel and RAID technology would look at  
2 this and say, there's nothing new or novel.

3 Q. What was discussed about LUN zoning?

4 A. I don't recall specifics.

5 Q. Generally, do you remember what -- why LUN zoning came up  
6 in your conversation?

7 A. Not specifically.

8 Q. When you read the 972 patent and after you had discussed  
9 LUN zoning with Chaparral, did you believe that if the patent  
10 were to be held valid that Chaparral's LUN zoning feature  
11 would infringe the 972 patent?

12 MR. DELLETT: Objection. Assumes facts not in  
13 evidence.

14 A. I wasn't familiar with the details of the Chaparral  
15 implementations.

16 Q. At the time of any of these conversations, do you know if  
17 Chaparral actually had implemented LUN zoning into its  
18 products?

19 A. I do not know for sure.

20 Q. Okay. Well, I know of at least another e-mail. And maybe  
21 that's it and maybe it's not. We'll get there in a couple of  
22 minutes?

23 Turning a page, CNS 174027 through 174030.

24 A. Uh-huh.

25 Q. And this is the actual report on the 972 patent that you

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 wrote?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. And it's dated February 29, 2000?

4 A. Right.

5 Q. How much time did you spend writing this report?

6 A. I wouldn't know exactly. My guess is probably two or  
7 three days, maybe, in terms of doing the research and writing  
8 it.

9 Q. Well, let me ask you this, then: Did you ever pursue  
10 documented evidence that access control was well-known in  
11 practice in the prior art prior to December 31st, 1997 --  
12 1996, excuse me, I apologize?

13 A. At this point, I probably would say yes, but it depends on  
14 what definition of access control is.

15 Q. Well, let's --

16 A. The whole notion -- the patent itself was somewhat  
17 ambiguous in terms of how much of the emphasis was on the  
18 virtualization or any of the access controls and, therefore,  
19 was a little bit hard to determine what prior art might apply.

20 Q. Okay. Well, let's use your unlimited, non-specific  
21 description of access controls. And could you tell for the  
22 jury what prior art you found dated prior to December 31st,  
23 1996 that covered access controls?

24 MR. DELLETT: Objection. That calls for facts not in  
25 evidence. Also, the question is vague and ambiguous because

1 the term access controls is undefined.

2 A. If I use a broad definition of access controls, then my  
3 recollection was that a large number of the RAID products  
4 already incorporated some type of access control.

5 Q. What type of access control?

6 A. Limiting host access to storage.

7 Q. And what products did that?

8 A. I think the Adaptec/Chaparral RAID products, the Sun  
9 product, many of the mainframe products.

10 Q. Let me rephrase and maybe this will make it easier. What  
11 steps has Chaparral taken to avoid infringement of the 972  
12 patent?

13 A. I believe Chaparral has done considerable amount of  
14 research into the 972 patent in the context of invalidity.  
15 And part of it has been in the context of understanding what  
16 -- you know, what possible portions might be infringing. I  
17 haven't been part of that examination, so I'm not sure what  
18 conclusions that may have reached or --

19 Q. And who did take part in those examinations?

20 A. Like I said, I think they would have been, probably, the  
21 engineering folks: Al Permut, Tom Lavan, probably others.

22 Q. Okay. And --

23 A. You know, even Ian Davies.

24 Q. Do you know at any time any of those individuals reached a  
25 conclusion that Chaparral infringed the 972 patent?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. I don't know if they did. My impression is that they  
2 concluded that they did not.

3 Q. And do you know the reason -- any of the reasons why  
4 Chaparral did not -- there was a belief that Chaparral did not  
5 infringe the 972 patent?

6 A. I think it centered on this definition of what's access  
7 control, and what is LUN zoning, and whether RAID was covered  
8 or not.

9 Q. Okay.

10 A. So I understand and believe that there were a number of  
11 ambiguities from my prior reading of it. There's a lot of  
12 prior art. And so, I don't think -- nobody certainly felt  
13 like there was a specific feature that was in violation.

14 Q. And what you believe to be the prior art, that's set forth  
15 in your report from 2-29, as well as your follow-up e-mail  
16 from March 4th, 2000?

17 A. Right. That's some of it.

18 Q. Okay.

19 A. Yeah, it's one of these where my approach was to initially  
20 read the patent. It appeared to be something that was  
21 obvious. Many of the claims appeared to have prior art. So I  
22 started to do a few days of investigation, found a number of  
23 prior art that predated either products or patents, predated  
24 many of the claims.

25 And so, you know, since I was essentially a contract

1 for hire, as I indicated, I think, in one of those e-mails,  
2 you know, do you want me to keep searching or not, there seems  
3 to be, at least, at face value a significant amount of prior  
4 art that would have invalidated that patent.

5 Q. If you could turn to CNS 187011. It should be the second  
6 page, dated 3-14-00. At the top, it states, Crossroads Claim  
7 1-method plus access controls. What do you mean by that, that  
8 phrase there?

9 A. What we were doing is basically looking at each of the  
10 Crossroads' claims in terms of which prior art invalidated  
11 those claims. So my belief was that the method invalidated  
12 Crossroads' Claim 1.

13 Q. And do you know as of March 1st, 2000 whether Chaparral  
14 had found prior art invalidating the 972, all claims of the  
15 972 patent?

16 A. At that time, I know I was probably a significant part of  
17 that investigation since the other report was dated March 1st,  
18 and I thought I had found invalidity or prior art against most  
19 of the claims, yes."

20 MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, that completes Mr.  
21 Selinger's deposition. Next, we have the deposition of  
22 Michael Gluck from November 29 of 2000, and this is from  
23 Volume 1 and this is the plaintiff's designation.

24 (Videotape played.)

25 Q. Would you tell me your name, please, sir?



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Michael J. Gluck.

2 Q. And, Mr. Gluck, where are you from? Where do you now  
3 reside? Where do you live?

4 A. In Colorado.

5 Q. Okay. And what is your position with the company  
6 Chaparral Network Storage, Inc?

7 A. President and COO.

8 Q. Mr. Gluck, how long have you been with Chaparral?

9 A. I'm one of the cofounders, since January '98.

10 Q. Does Chaparral with respect to these rack products that  
11 we're talking about that Crossroads also has a competitive  
12 device with, do you all compete in the same geographic areas  
13 with Crossroads?

14 A. Yes, we do.

15 Q. And I'm going to -- I don't mean to keep wheeling around.  
16 Let me direct you back to what we were talking about earlier,  
17 when I was talking about competitive products.

18 A. Okay.

19 Q. And you told me there were rack products that were  
20 competitive between Crossroads and Chaparral?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. Are there not also blade or board products that are  
23 competitive between Chaparral and Crossroads?

24 A. I'm not aware of any announced Crossroads blade product.

25 Q. What about any rack products?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Crossroads has rack products.

2 Q. And are any of those competitive with Chaparral products?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Okay. And with respect to those rack products, are those  
5 -- are you basically going after the same customer base?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And is that same customer base in, roughly, the same  
8 geographic areas?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Okay. Has Chaparral ever contemplated licensing that type  
11 of technology to anyone?

12 A. Not that I'm aware of.

13 Q. Okay. And if you all have not contemplated doing it, I  
14 take it is fair that you never have done it?

15 A. We have not done it.

16 Q. Okay.

17 A. But if somebody came around and gave us a big check, you  
18 know -- I'm not saying -- nothing is forever so --

19 Q. Okay. So you would consider licensing your technology if  
20 people pay you enough for it?

21 A. We would have to make a business decision.

22 Q. And what would that business decision be based on?

23 A. If it was strategic, if it was extremely profitable, et  
24 cetera.

25 Q. For example, if you thought that it gave you a strong

1 technical -- technological advantage over a competitor, would  
2 you license that to a competitor?

3 A. I'm not following you. Would we license our technology to  
4 a competitor so they could compete with us?

5 Q. Yes, sir. Would that make sense to you to do that?

6 A. It doesn't sound to me that it would make sense.

7 Q. I mean, you're obviously a bright man and the COO of a  
8 corporation. Why wouldn't it make sense to you to license  
9 that technology to a direct competitor?

10 A. Well, it depends on how much we viewed them as a direct  
11 competitor. So if --

12 Q. Let's say they are a direct competitor.

13 A. There would be potential, if we were trying to, for  
14 example, propose a new standard where we wanted this to be an  
15 industry standard in which case everybody would benefit more  
16 by having an open system.

17 So in that case, even having competitors might be an  
18 advantage would be one example I could think of where you  
19 would want to do it. If it's a proprietary thing that would  
20 allow a competitor that would only be interested in this  
21 competitor, that would then compete, unless we got much more  
22 money from the competitor for the license fee than we would  
23 get by selling the product, that would be the trade-off.

24 Q. And that would be the trade-off?

25 A. Right.

1 Q. Would it be fair to say that Crossroads is a major  
2 competitor?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And I've received a note that I think I've gotten an  
5 answer for, but just to make sure that I have. You've told us  
6 who you believe the major competitors of Chaparral are, they  
7 were Pathlight, Crossroads and ATTO, correct?

8 A. Correct, and then -- you know, there are additional --  
9 there are a lot of -- there are other competitors. You asked  
10 me who I considered the major competitors?

11 Q. Yes, sir."

12 MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, we're going to continue on  
13 with plaintiff's designations for Volume 2 of Mr. Gluck's  
14 deposition from the same date, November 29th, 2000.

15 Q. "Earlier in your testimony in the prior deposition, you  
16 said that Chaparral competed with Crossroads in some custom  
17 board opportunities.

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. Mr. Gluck I've marked as Exhibit 46 United States Patent  
20 5941972. Do you recognize that as the --

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. -- Crossroads patent?

23 A. Yes, sir, I do.

24 Q. The patent at issue in this case?

25 A. Yes, sir, I do.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. When was the first time you saw that patent?

2 A. It's -- I'm going to give you a range. It's sometime in  
3 February. I'm going to say February 9th or 10th, or the  
4 second week of February, or something like that.

5 Q. How did you come across it?

6 A. I got a call from one of our investment bankers because we  
7 were in registration, and -- who said to me that he had read a  
8 statement on the wire by Brian Smith, the CEO of Crossroads,  
9 that they were going to be very aggressive in their patent  
10 portfolio, if you will.

11 And at the same time, one of our engineers in LA saw  
12 the same wire and sent me up an e-mail, pointing me to the web  
13 site where I could pull this patent off. So I then pulled the  
14 patent off the web site and read the patent. But then,  
15 somebody else in our company grabbed the official -- Jerry  
16 Walker got the official patent. He contacted Dave Zinger --  
17 he contacted a patent attorney and got the official patent.

18 Q. Which engineer in Los Angeles notified you about the  
19 patent?

20 A. I believe George -- it was either George Kalwitz or Phil  
21 -- either George or Phil.

22 Q. Phil who?

23 A. Phil Colline.

24 Q. Okay. When you pulled the document off the web site, did  
25 you read it?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Yes, I did.

2 Q. Did you mark it up?

3 A. I highlighted it.

4 Q. Did you write anything on it?

5 A. No, I didn't write anything, just highlighted it.

6 Q. Did you read it that day, the day you were told about it?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. How much time did you spend reading it?

9 A. I read it through. I don't know, about a half hour, an  
10 hour.

11 Q. Okay. Looking at the original message from Mr. Selinger,  
12 the subject is Overpass status.

13 A. Overpass was -- well, go ahead. I'm sorry.

14 Q. What does Overpass refer to?

15 A. Overpass was the code name we gave to the patent.

16 Q. Why did you give the Crossroads patent a code name?

17 A. We just thought it would -- we needed to have these kind  
18 of issues confidential with -- client-attorney privilege  
19 confidential.

20 Q. Who gave it the name?

21 A. I don't know if it was Jerry or Gary. I don't know.

22 Q. In your response to Nigel Squibb, you also say that you  
23 and Pathlight are cooperating, and any Fibre Channel-to-SCSI  
24 device would infringe this patent, the 972 patent, if it were  
25 valid, correct?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. What you're meaning here is that if the 972 patent is  
3 valid, Chaparral storage routers along with Pathlight's --

4 A. RAID controller, right.

5 Q. Would be infringing?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. Mr. Gluck, you refer to a two-page opinion of counsel that  
8 was referenced in Chaparral's S-1 filing?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. And that opinion of counsel relating to the 972 patent was  
11 received in the April -- in the April time frame, correct?  
12 Time frame from which attorney?

13 A. From Dave Zinger.

14 Q. At which firm?

15 A. Sheridan Ross.

16 Q. Did Chaparral decide to continue making and selling its  
17 routers based on that two-page opinion of counsel?

18 A. Yes, because -- his opinion clarified my original  
19 misconception that I mentioned to you, thinking it was Fibre  
20 Channel-to-SCSI. His opinion clarified that it was really  
21 access controls and that we were not infringing. So none of  
22 the products that we were shipping were infringing.

23 So it didn't matter whether the patent was valid or  
24 not; we were not infringing. But if the patent would be so  
25 broad to cover us, then it would be invalid.

1 Q. Did -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.

2 A. As I had originally, you know, thought.

3 Q. Was there anything else that Chaparral relied on in its  
4 decision to continue making and selling its routers?

5 A. We all believed internally, after discussions with Mr.  
6 Zinger and everybody else, that now that we had understood the  
7 patent that we absolutely were not infringing any of our  
8 products. So it was opinion of counsel and our own, you know,  
9 belief, as well.

10 Q. Since that opinion of counsel in early April, did you  
11 receive any other written opinion of counsel's?

12 A. We've now had one just recently.

13 Q. The November 20 opinion?

14 A. Correct. I'm not sure of the date, but it's this month,  
15 we received a big, thick opinion from Dave Zinger.

16 Q. Okay. Just --

17 A. Which have been provided to you -- at least to you guys, I  
18 think. We waived our privilege or whatever on that.

19 Q. Right. We have that and I'll show it to you. But between  
20 the April opinion and the opinion that was provided late this  
21 month, did Chaparral receive any other written opinions of  
22 counsel?

23 A. Not that I'm aware of.

24 Q. Mr. Gluck, Exhibit 50 is a collection of fax transmittal  
25 forms --



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Uh-huh.

2 Q. -- to a variety of different people?

3 A. Uh-huh.

4 Q. If you take a look at these fax transmittal forms, I think  
5 that you'll agree with me that this is your effort to send the  
6 patent out to a variety of different people at getting their  
7 help to finding prior art, correct?

8 A. Correct.

9 Q. So it's fair to say that Chaparral launched an extensive  
10 effort to find prior art in an effort to invalidate the 972  
11 patent, correct?

12 A. I don't know, you know, what the metaphor extensive would  
13 be, but we certainly were looking for prior art to invalidate  
14 the patent.

15 Q. Sure. You were darn serious about finding prior art?

16 A. Sure.

17 Q. And you would want Mr. Walker and others who were  
18 responsible to work as hard as they possibly could to find  
19 invalidating prior art, correct?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. And to the best of your knowledge, that effort was  
22 undertaken, correct?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. It's correct, however, that the decision by Chaparral to  
25 continue making and selling routers was made back in April,

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 when the two-page opinion letter was received?

2 A. That's correct, uh-huh, that's correct.

3 Q. So when you're talking about independent suppliers,  
4 Crossroads was the only major intelligent router competition?

5 A. They were the first -- what I would call independent.

6 Q. Okay. If you look at Exhibit 63, sir, could you go a  
7 couple of pages into that and you'll see the -- right there,  
8 the business plan reference.

9 A. All right.

10 Q. Do you recognize this document, sir?

11 MR. BAHLER: Do I have that? Oh, that's what this is.

12 A. Oh, okay. This was our original business plan document  
13 when Chaparral was first trying to raise some money.

14 Q. Did you participate in the drafting of this document?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Did you write this document?

17 A. Probably the majority of it.

18 Q. Could you turn to page 14, please?

19 A. Uh-huh.

20 Q. Do you see the reference to router competition?

21 A. Uh-huh.

22 Q. Do you see the statement, the only major current  
23 intelligent router competitor is Crossroads Systems?

24 A. Again, I would qualify that as an independent. I should  
25 have said independent, but people that may cap the products

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 that are not competitors.

2 Q. Right.

3 A. So that's as we've discussed.

4 Q. That's a true statement with that qualification?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. Let me make sure that we're clear, then. You agree that

7 Crossroads did a good job at developing the router market?

8 A. The independent router market, correct.

9 Q. Okay. And you also agree that when Chaparral came on the

10 market, it took advantage of the work that Crossroads had done

11 in developing the market, correct?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. Since Chaparral came on the market, it has tracked

14 Crossroads as a competitor, correct?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. Chaparral has paid close attention to Crossroads'

17 technical progress, correct?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. You paid close attention to whatever progress Crossroads

20 is making with potential customers, correct?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. You paid close attention to Crossroads' IPO, correct?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. You paid close attention to Crossroads' pricing to the

25 extent you can learn it?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. It's fair to say that Chaparral, from the time it entered  
3 this market to and through the present time, has kept track of  
4 Crossroads' development?

5 A. Yes, sir.

6 Q. And at the time Chaparral entered this market, Crossroads  
7 was ahead of Chaparral in the market in terms of a customer  
8 base, correct?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. Crossroads was ahead of Chaparral in terms of developing  
11 the market, correct?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. Okay. At the time Chaparral was formed, Adaptec kept a  
14 percentage of the company?

15 A. 19.9 percent.

16 Q. That was negotiated percentage?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Okay."

19 MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, that concludes the  
20 plaintiff's designations for Mr. Gluck. And now we have the  
21 defendant's designations for Volume I of Mr. Gluck's  
22 deposition.

23 Q. "You may be the wrong person to ask this, but is there  
24 anything that you are aware of in Chaparral's technology that  
25 you think makes it superior to Crossroads' technology with

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 respect to the routers? For example, when you go out to sell  
2 a product, you are able to say, not only do you have to worry  
3 about price, but our products are superior?

4 A. Yes.

5 MR. BAHLER: Objection. Vague.

6 Q. Do you understand my question?

7 A. We have higher performance.

8 Q. Okay. What do you mean by higher performance?

9 A. We have higher performance in terms of the amount of data  
10 that the router can transfer in a certain amount of time. And  
11 there's two --

12 Q. Okay. Are there any other objective differences that you  
13 could cite that you believe would make Chaparral a better  
14 product?

15 A. I think it would be difficult to list all the features of  
16 a product and do a comparison, but there are many other  
17 features to a product.

18 Q. What would the most primary one be to you that we haven't  
19 talked about?

20 A. The software management capability.

21 Q. And you believe that's superior in the Chaparral product?

22 A. We have in-band and out-of-band management.

23 Q. And Crossroads doesn't?

24 A. Not to my knowledge.

25 Q. And is Chaparral paying a royalty for those licenses?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. They were royalty-free with the exception of RAID code.

2 Q. Okay. Do you know how much --

3 A. \$25 per RAID code license.

4 Q. With respect to the RAID products, what percentage of the  
5 cost of RAID product does the \$25 represent?

6 A. Again, it would depend on the -- which platform, which  
7 product. Our products range in price.

8 Q. The RAID products?

9 A. The RAID products range in price from \$1500 to as high as  
10 \$3,000.

11 Q. Well, for example, you went through a host of examples  
12 earlier why you thought Chaparral products were superior in  
13 one form or another to Crossroads' products.

14 A. Okay.

15 Q. And, for example, you talked -- I don't remember exactly  
16 the technological side of what it was, but you said there was  
17 something in the new product that would allow Chaparral to  
18 interface with -- I think it was the 168 --

19 A. 160 megabytes per second SCSI.

20 Q. Okay. That's technology that Chaparral has, correct?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And by way of example --

23 A. Okay.

24 Q. -- you'd either have to get a lot more money from the  
25 competitor or you would not want the competitor to have that

1 technology, correct?

2 A. Again, that's speculative -- I mean, it's speculation.  
3 We're not doing it today. We haven't licensed our technology  
4 today, so --

5 Q. Yes, sir.

6 A. -- we have additional competitors who could become major,  
7 such as Gadzooks, who's acquired a company called Smart SAN.  
8 There are companies that have developed their own router  
9 technology that could choose to sell it to other people. I'm  
10 thinking specifically Spectralogics has developed their own  
11 router that currently they use with their own product, but  
12 they, I believe, are now thinking or have proposed to sell  
13 that on the open market.

14 There is other companies like Spectralogics that have  
15 developed their own router products such as Sequent, which has  
16 been acquired by IBM, or Compaq that could, again, choose to  
17 sell that into the open market as a competitor. So my answer  
18 was who is today."

19 MR. BERNSTEIN: And, your Honor, we're continuing on  
20 with defendant's designations for Mr. Gluck's deposition,  
21 Volume 2.

22 Q. "What was your first impression of this patent?"

23 A. My first impression was it was -- I don't want to use the  
24 word I used before. It was a totally invalid patent because  
25 when I read it -- when I read it first, I read it as trying to

1 patent any Fibre Channel-to-SCSI device, which I said can't --  
2 you can't do this. There's all kinds of prior art out there  
3 that would totally invalidate this patent.

4 Q. Aside from thinking it was invalid, given the way you read  
5 it, you understood that if it were valid, Chaparral's router  
6 products would fall within the scope of the patent, correct?

7 A. Every product -- not only our products but every -- you  
8 know, all kinds of other companies' products would fall under  
9 the scope, correct, which is why I believe it would be -- it  
10 could not possibly be enforced.

11 Q. Okay. So you formed two first impressions: One, it was  
12 invalid?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. What was your basis for believing it was not a valid  
15 patent?

16 A. The opinion from our -- Dave Zinger came back, as well,  
17 thinking that we were not infringing.

18 Q. Do you believe that Chaparral has a duty to avoid  
19 infringing U.S. patents?

20 A. Sure.

21 Q. Did you take any steps to avoid infringing this patent?

22 A. Could you clarify that? You mean once we knew of the  
23 patent, you mean?

24 Q. Yes.

25 A. Well, we don't believe we are infringing.



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Okay. My question to you is: Has Chaparral taken any  
2 steps to avoid infringing the 972 patent?

3 MR. BAHLER: Objection. Asked and answered.

4 A. We don't believe we are infringing, so we don't need to  
5 take any steps because our products are not infringing.

6 Q. So --

7 A. So we got legal counsel that clarified that my initial  
8 interpretation wasn't the right one; that it really had to do  
9 with access controls, and we are not infringing on the patent.

10 Q. If you look at the response e-mail from Mr. Walker, it  
11 talks about Dave Zinger starting to develop -- I'm sorry, it's  
12 this paragraph.

13 A. You should pursue? No.

14 Q. Jerry Walker wrote --

15 A. He will start to develop a limited opinion letter as the  
16 why we believe the patent is invalid.

17 Q. Yeah. Let me back up a second.

18 A. Okay.

19 Q. Do you see that Mr. Walker states that, Dave Zinger may  
20 start to develop a limited opinion letter?

21 A. Right.

22 Q. Do you know if that limited opinion letter was ever  
23 written?

24 A. We did get an opinion letter that we referenced in our  
25 S-1, a two-page letter that said that he believes that we were

1 not infringing and that if the patent was to be so broad that  
2 it would be invalid.

3 Q. Did you have a conversation with Mr. Squibb prior to him  
4 sending you this e-mail?

5 A. Yes, I did.

6 Q. And what did you two discuss?

7 A. I told him that I was soliciting potential prior art  
8 because -- and I thought that they might have some, as well,  
9 that would help invalidate this claim, because from our -- if  
10 you look at my -- says, we are thinking of filing a  
11 counterclaim on the basis of a fraudulent patent. In other  
12 words, they did not disclose known prior art and, you know, in  
13 my words, duped the Patent Office.

14 This was because when our patent attorney pulled the  
15 wrapper, he learned that there was not a single interrogatory  
16 or question by the Patent Office on this patent. It went  
17 through, which I'm understanding only happens not very often.

18 Q. The patent attorney told you that?

19 A. Yes, he did. He said, maybe, I think, in his words, less  
20 than one out of 20 times, something like that.

21 Q. Okay.

22 A. And I speculated. We speculated that perhaps the reason  
23 that this happened is that Crossroads came up with new tech  
24 term knowledge, i.e., storage router, and if a patent clerk is  
25 doing a word search, you wouldn't find storage router in the

1 storage literature; you'd find bridge adapter, and so on. And  
2 so it could go through without a question.

3 And I believe my comment to Nigel was my understanding  
4 of patents was that they're supposed to reward creative  
5 invention as opposed to creative writing.

6 Q. When you had your conversation whether Mr. Rahmani, did  
7 you express that same thought?

8 A. My first conversation was with him is, A, were -- had he  
9 seen the patent. His answer, yes. B, what was their  
10 position. He said that they -- they already had prior art and  
11 had a patent consult opinion of prior art. Then, I asked him  
12 his opinion on Fibre SCSI, and he agreed with my opinion that  
13 we were to be valid, any Fibre-to-SCSI product, you know,  
14 would be infringing, and therefore, their prior art, along  
15 with other prior art, could be used to an validate the patent.

16 Q. Did Mr. Zinger advise Chaparral that his two-page opinion  
17 of counsel was sufficient to allow Chaparral to continue  
18 making and selling its routers?

19 A. I didn't talk to Mr. Zinger, but I believe so. I mean, I  
20 certainly was conveyed that from Jerry Walker and others.

21 Q. Did you read that opinion of counsel?

22 A. I read the two-page opinion of counsel, yes.

23 Q. Did Mr. Walker read it?

24 A. Yes, he did.

25 Q. And to your understanding, we don't have that opinion here.

1 with us today. To your understanding, did that opinion of  
2 counsel, provided in early April, about capture all of the  
3 bases for Chaparral's belief that it did not infringe or the  
4 patent was invalid?

5 A. I don't know what you mean, capture all the bases.

6 Q. To your mind, when you read the two-page opinion of  
7 counsel, did you think that it was complete?

8 A. Yes, and I'll paraphrase because, you know, I think it  
9 said something like, we think that the -- or the opinion of  
10 counsel, whatever, is that -- actually, I shouldn't try to --  
11 you'll get the letter, you'll see what it said. But based  
12 upon -- in my mind, it conveyed both that we were clearly not  
13 infringing, and if the patent were to be interpreted because  
14 this was prior to any Markman hearing or anything, so if the  
15 patent were to be interpreted, you know, much more broadly  
16 than we believed, then the patent would be invalid.

17 So I think it's -- the wording was something to that  
18 effect.

19 Q. So you think the two-page opinion was complete, correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And to your understanding, did Mr. Walker think the  
22 two-page opinion was complete?

23 A. Yes, correct.

24 Q. Has anybody who is now an employee of Chaparral ever told  
25 you that they were at the '96 Comdex and saw the Crossroads

1 display?

2 A. I'm not sure if the Adap -- I may have mentioned to you  
3 this product was conceived and invented by Adaptec, and so --

4 Q. Which product?

5 A. The router product. I think I mentioned that in my  
6 original briefing.

7 Q. The Chaparral router?

8 A. The Chaparral router. And so, I believed that Adaptec  
9 people had said that they had visited Crossroads, but I don't  
10 have the specific -- but you asked me if I've heard that from  
11 anybody, so my recollection would be that there were people  
12 from Adaptec that had visited the Crossroads.

13 Q. To this point, Chaparral had not heard from Crossroads  
14 that --

15 A. This was, remember, I told you about -- you asked when we  
16 first heard about the patent, I mentioned, like, February 9th  
17 or something. So all that triggered when I got the call from  
18 the investment banker and our engineer saying, here's this  
19 Crossroads patent and the notice from that Crossroads is going  
20 to be more aggressive, and that's when we immediately got  
21 Jerry to go find a patent attorney. So that's what this is --  
22 was all started out.

23 Q. Crossroads was already in the router market before  
24 Chaparral got in the market, correct?

25 A. Well, before Chaparral but Adaptec had been developing the

1 product.

2 Q. I meant '98. I'm sorry. Let me ask the question again.

3 Isn't it true that as of 1998, Crossroads was the only major  
4 intelligent router competition?

5 A. What date in '98?

6 Q. Let's just say by the end of '98.

7 A. By the end of '98, as I say, other companies had their own  
8 -- Sequent was shipping. My recollection is that Sequent was  
9 shipping its own Fibre Channel-to-SCSI. As I say, everybody  
10 called them bridge adapters, Fibre Channel-to-SCSI bridge  
11 adapters, they developed by themselves. The Unisys had an  
12 internally developed program they worked on. Spectralogics  
13 had one that they were shipping in '98, to my recollection.

14 So Crossroads as an independent supplier of routers  
15 other people, yes.

16 Q. Do you see further on down this business plan states, they  
17 first began shipping their products approximately one year  
18 ago?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. And it goes on to state, while Crossroads has done a good  
21 job educating the market and seeding the market with  
22 evaluation units, they suffered from the early Fibre Channel  
23 interoperability issues and lack of industry infrastructure?

24 A. Uh-huh.

25 Q. That statement's a true statement, right?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. That's important in your business to understand exactly  
3 what the competitors are doing?

4 A. It's very typical. We have ATTO, we have Pathlight.  
5 Everybody in our business, we have their product, we buy their  
6 product. It's very customary in the business.

7 Q. Is it at all surprising to you that a company that was in  
8 the market earlier than your company and had developed the  
9 market earlier than your company has obtained patents relating  
10 to the technology in this market?

11 A. I'm very surprised that they got that patent approved.

12 Q. That's not my question. Is it at all surprising that a  
13 company that was in the market earlier than you and developed  
14 the market earlier than you has obtained patents relating to  
15 the technology in that market?

16 A. I don't agree with the premise. Adaptec has spent \$30  
17 million on the product starting in 1996, before Crossroads was  
18 a company, had their own patents, their own technology, the  
19 400,000 gate array ASIC. So I don't agree with the premise  
20 that Crossroads was first or other companies were there with  
21 captive products. Yes, Crossroads made an independent router,  
22 but I don't agree with your premise.

23 Q. Did Adaptec make a Fibre Channel-to-SCSI router?

24 A. Bridge adapter, router it's now called, but bridge  
25 adapter.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. A Fibre Channel-to-SCSI bridge adapter?

2 A. Yes, sir. That's the part of the technology license that  
3 we -- that's how Chaparral got started out is primarily a  
4 marketing company, marketing and sales to take the Adaptec  
5 technology and focus it in on this market. And sometimes the  
6 first to the market, if you will, is the independent isn't the  
7 ultimate leader. I would offer Upancore and Brocade as  
8 examples.

9 Q. What do you mean by focus it in?

10 A. Adaptec was primarily -- felt a bigger market was the RAID  
11 market. And so, they wanted a company to focus their sales,  
12 marketing, future development efforts on their router, the  
13 Fibre Channel-to-SCSI tape bridge adapter marketplace, which  
14 we now call the router marketplace.

15 And so, they funded Chaparral in exchange for 19.9  
16 percent interest. And the three of us -- and shortly became  
17 eight of us -- started Chaparral with the exclusive license --  
18 exclusive license for the Adaptec technology that they had  
19 spent \$30 million in three years developing well before  
20 Crossroads was a company, and we were taking that product and  
21 focusing it exclusively on the Fibre Channel-SCSI bridge  
22 adapter marketplace.

23 And Adaptec was continuing to focus on the RAID  
24 marketplace. And then, six months later, Adaptec decided to  
25 get out of the Fibre Channel-to-SCSI RAID business, and we



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 spent the next three months and bought that business from  
2 Adaptec. So now we have RAID and routers.

3 And the reason that our product is so much higher  
4 performance than Crossroads' is because Adaptec spent  
5 substantially more money and a longer period of time  
6 developing the product, and we were able to leverage that  
7 platform.

8 Q. And that was part of negotiations involving a number of  
9 different issues including what Chaparral would pay Adaptec  
10 for certain licenses, correct?

11 A. No. This was -- this is different than the license  
12 agreement that I talked about, the technology transfer. The  
13 original Chaparral was formed not paying any money to Adaptec.  
14 But in exchange for giving them 19.9 percent of the company,  
15 Adaptec funded the initial \$200,000 of the company capital,  
16 give us the exclusive license to take this bridge -- Fibre  
17 Channel-SCSI bridge adapter and go market it and, effectively,  
18 transfer that technology to Chaparral in exchange for the 19.9  
19 percent.

20 Q. And the \$25 a unit --

21 A. That was a later -- so then -- I'm sorry to preempt your  
22 question.

23 Q. That's all right. That was my question. The \$25 a unit  
24 fee --

25 A. That was not involved at all. So that was -- that was

1 negotiation number one with Adaptec in January '98.  
2 Negotiation number two with Adaptec, which is a very thick,  
3 you know, technology transfer and multiple agreement, was when  
4 Adaptec decided to get out of the Fibre Channel-to-SCSI RAID  
5 business, and we decided to negotiate to take over that  
6 business.

7 So that's when we negotiated a very extensive  
8 technology transfer of all the technology, including making  
9 offers to 20 of their employees and Adaptec putting, you know,  
10 half a million in escrow to help us do that. And the \$25 RAID  
11 license code was part of that negotiation, which was started  
12 in July of '98 and concluded on November 25th of '98."

13 MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, that concludes the  
14 videotaped deposition testimony of Mr. Gluck.

15 THE COURT: All right.

16 MR. ALCOCK: Your Honor, we would call as an adverse  
17 witness Mr. Walker.

18 (Witness was sworn.)

19 THE COURT: Tell us your full name and spell your  
20 last, please.

21 THE WITNESS: My name is Jerry Lee Walker,  
22 W-A-L-K-E-R.

23 JERRY L. WALKER, called by the Plaintiff, duly sworn.  
24  
25

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ALLCOCK:

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Walker.

A. Good afternoon.

Q. What is your present job?

A. I am currently retired.

Q. And you worked for Chaparral from when to when, sir?

A. From January of 1998 until the end of July of this year.

Q. And you were the Executive Vice-president of Engineering during that entire time period?

A. Actually, my title was Executive Vice-president of Operations.

Q. Of operations. And you were responsible for all the engineers?

A. Yes, I was responsible for engineering, manufacturing, product and customer support.

Q. Okay. I'm going to hand you a book of documents that we'll use. Actually, two books. I've given them to counsel. Now, I want to direct your attention, first, to Exhibit 132, which is the first in the first book. Do you recognize Exhibit 132?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is it?

A. It is a business plan.

Q. And is it the first business plan of the company?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. I don't know if it is the first business plan of the  
2 company.

3 Q. Could you take a look at page 14 of the business plan and  
4 the portion that says "router competition." Do you see that?

5 A. Yes, sir.

6 Q. And it starts out by talking about the only major current  
7 intelligent router competitor is Crossroads Systems. Do you  
8 see that?

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. Is that -- was that an accurate statement at the time this  
11 report was made?

12 A. Mr. Gluck wrote this report most of the time, and it -- I  
13 believe my understanding at the time, that would be an  
14 accurate statement.

15 Q. Okay. And it goes on to say, Chaparral Technologies now  
16 has both the advantage of leapfrogging the market development  
17 work done by Crossroads, and the significant advantage of a  
18 cheaper, faster, better product through its strategic  
19 relationship with Adaptec.

20 Do you understand what the advantage of leapfrogging  
21 the market development means there, sir?

22 A. Well, I believe what Mr. Gluck had in mind in making that  
23 statement is Adaptec was a billion-dollar company with a lot  
24 of technology and a road map for several generations of  
25 products that they were developing that Chaparral with its

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 relationship with Adaptec would have the ability to capitalize  
2 on the technology that Adaptec was developing.

3 And because Adaptec was in the business of storage and  
4 integrated circuits for high-speed connectivity and in  
5 developing their RAID products, which by definition are  
6 high-performance products, the technology available to  
7 Chaparral would be able to use the advantages and produce, as  
8 Mr. Gluck said, a cheaper, faster, better product because of  
9 this relationship.

10 Q. And what did it mean by leapfrogging the market  
11 development work done by Crossroads? Were they the leaders in  
12 developing the storage router market at that time?

13 A. Yes, they were.

14 Q. Okay. Let me turn your attention to Exhibit 56 in the  
15 book. That's a memorandum, dated February 7, 2000, from Don  
16 Matthews to you and then, to a number of other people. Do you  
17 see that?

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 THE COURT: What is the number again, counsel?

20 MR. ALLCOCK: I'm sorry, your Honor, it's Exhibit 56.

21 THE COURT: All right.

22 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) And down in the bottom portion of the  
23 document is a discussion of LUN zoning. Do you see that?

24 A. Yes, sir.

25 Q. And it says it's scheduled for V3.1. That's a software

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 release; is that right?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. And this LUN zoning had the ability to control the access  
4 of certain hosts to certain subsets of storage devices; is  
5 that right?

6 A. That's right.

7 Q. And what this was a memo discussing, the date of this memo  
8 is February 7, 2000; is that right?

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. And so, the folks at Chaparral, the engineering folks, had  
11 been developing this LUN zoning access control capability for  
12 a little while by now?

13 A. For a little while. I believe it had actually started  
14 architecture toward the end of 1999 with the actual work  
15 beginning in the first quarter of 2000.

16 Q. Very good. And if you look at the next Exhibit, this is  
17 Exhibit 12. This is a presentation of February 18, 2000 to  
18 EMC. Do you see that?

19 A. Yes, sir.

20 Q. And EMC is a fairly large company?

21 A. Yes, they are.

22 Q. And you were presenting your company, Chaparral was  
23 presenting to EMC in an effort to get them to buy your Fibre  
24 Channel-to-SCSI routers?

25 A. This presentation I gave myself to EMC as an executive of

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 the company, giving them an overview of Chaparral and what we  
2 were doing, and familiarizing them with our efforts and trying  
3 to understand what EMC's needs might be.

4 Q. Okay. And I notice if you go into the document and there  
5 are numbers on it, CNS and then, it follows, the number I'm  
6 interested in is 033597, there's a reference there to this LUN  
7 zoning access control that we were talking about earlier. Do  
8 you see that?

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. And this is talking about this LUN zoning access control  
11 being available in 2Q 2000?

12 A. That was our planned introduction time.

13 Q. Okay. So that would have been somewhere between April and  
14 June of 2000?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. And the diagram here shows three hosts; is that right?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. And it shows a number of those SCSI storage devices there  
19 on the bottom?

20 A. Yes, sir, they are.

21 Q. And the notion of this LUN zoning is that those devices  
22 can be configured to be accessed so that one of the hosts can  
23 have access to one or more of the storage devices, and others  
24 of the hosts will be precluded from accessing one or more of  
25 the storage devices?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Yes, sir.

2 Q. Now, I notice that a couple of pages before this -- oh,  
3 I'm sorry. Before I leave that, these Chaparral Fibre  
4 Channel-to-SCSI routers, what was the router you were  
5 marketing at that time, sir? Was it is 1310?

6 A. The 1310 at that time, I believe, was the only router we  
7 had.

8 Q. Okay. Now, back a couple of pages is -- and for the  
9 record, your Honor, it's CNS 033594 -- is a different page  
10 that talks about a different function, a reserve release  
11 function. Do you see that?

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q. And that shows one SCSI device on one side of the router.  
14 Do you see that?

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. And a single host on the other side of the router?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. Now, I want to focus now on Exhibit 24 just for a moment.  
19 I think you'll find it a little further down in your book.

20 A. Yes, sir, I've got it.

21 Q. And let me call up the first page of that. Exhibit 24 is  
22 what, sir?

23 A. A presentation.

24 Q. And this is also a presentation that you made yourself?

25 A. Yes, it is.



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. And if you look, the date is April 18th of the year 2000?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. And if you'll look at page CNS 0045933, there's also that  
4 LUN zoning/masking slide that we saw earlier; is that right?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. So would it be fair to say that you were developing this  
7 LUN zoning access control feature at the end of 1999 and early  
8 2000, and you were presenting it to customers in the early  
9 part of the year 2000; is that right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Now, if you would look at Exhibit 36 -- I'm sorry, it's  
12 Exhibit 35. Could you tell us what Exhibit 35 is?

13 A. Yes, it's a Form S-1 which is a registration that's filed  
14 when a company is considering doing an initial public  
15 offering.

16 Q. And it's a pretty -- you have it in front of you there?

17 A. I do, sir.

18 Q. And you've -- I bet you, you spent a fair amount of time  
19 on this document?

20 A. Yes, sir, I have.

21 Q. You are pretty careful when you make statements to the  
22 public in these kinds of filings, aren't you?

23 A. Yes, you are.

24 Q. And if you could look at page 007564, there's a discussion  
25 at the top. I think if you look at the page before the

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 heading is embedded software, and the discussion is that, in  
2 addition, we have developed embedded software permits to our  
3 customers to prevent access to selected storage devices on a  
4 server-by-server basis. This feature provides greater data  
5 security by restricting access to shared data on the SAN only  
6 to authorized users.

7 We expect to offer this as an optional feature for our  
8 intelligent storage routers in the first half of 2000. Do you  
9 see that?

10 A. Yes, sir.

11 Q. And that's consistent with the other marketing material  
12 that we saw earlier?

13 A. Yes, it is.

14 Q. And the access control feature that is referenced here is,  
15 in fact, that LUN zoning feature we were looking at?

16 A. Yes, it is.

17 Q. Now, in the midst of this time period, this February,  
18 March, April time period, you first heard about the Crossroads  
19 972 patent; is that right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And did Mr. Gluck tell you about that?

22 A. I believe Mr. Gluck was the first to let me know about it.

23 Q. Okay. And that was in the early part of February?

24 A. I was thinking the middle part of February, but it's  
25 definitely February sometime.

1 Q. Okay. If you could take a look at Exhibit 39, can you  
2 tell us what Exhibit 39 is?  
3 A. It appears to be copies of pages from one of my notebooks.  
4 Q. Okay. And engineers kind of have a practice of keeping a  
5 notebook, don't they?  
6 A. Thirty years of doing it, yes, sir.  
7 Q. Right. So even when you get up in management, you can't  
8 lose the habit?  
9 A. That's correct.  
10 Q. And so, what this is is not every day, but very frequently  
11 in chronological order, you kept notes of various things that  
12 you did?  
13 A. That's correct.  
14 Q. Now, if you would turn, please, to Exhibit -- I mean, to  
15 page 040783 of Exhibit 39, and I want to ask you about the  
16 entries on the bottom half of that page. Do you see those?  
17 A. 040783?  
18 Q. I think that's right. Let me see if I gave you the wrong  
19 number. 040783. I apologize.  
20 A. Yes, that's what I have, yes.  
21 Q. Okay. It says 2-14-00, 2-14, 2000 on the top?  
22 A. Correct.  
23 Q. And there are a number of references on the lower portion  
24 of that page to the Crossroads patent, is that right?  
25 A. Yes.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. What are those references about?

2 A. Once we became aware of the patent -- clearly, patents are  
3 difficult to interpret, so what we did was what I think is a  
4 prudent thing to do: We sought to find people who might be  
5 able to help us understand what the patent was, whether or not  
6 there was any prior art surrounding it, or whatever. So this  
7 was -- we began the process of discovery, if you will, and  
8 learning regarding the Crossroads patent.

9 Q. Very good.

10 A. For use for people I thought who might be able to help us  
11 with that.

12 Q. And was at least one of your purposes in calling these  
13 folks trying to find prior art that may impact the validity of  
14 the Crossroads patent?

15 A. Well, certainly. Certainly is. People explore this, it  
16 would be very difficult not to be also considering whether or  
17 not there's prior art. So yes.

18 Q. Okay. And so Joel Dunning, he's at -- was he at HP at  
19 that time?

20 A. He was at that time at a company called Converge Net in  
21 California.

22 Q. Okay. And then, the next one down, it says Spectralogics.

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And the next one -- oh, then, it says Pathlight  
25 Consortium. Is that what it says?

1 A. Actually, what it says, it lists one, two, three, four  
2 companies dash Consortium.

3 Q. I see. And so, were you thinking about contacting all  
4 those four folks?

5 A. These were companies that had router products. And so,  
6 the idea there that probably should have been a question mark  
7 after consortium, basically contact these companies, are they  
8 aware of the patent, you know, would they be interested in  
9 possibly some kind of consortium.

10 Q. And you did contact Pathlight?

11 A. I did not personally. I believe Mr. Gluck did.

12 Q. Very good. And then, Bob Selinger, we'll get back to him  
13 in a minute. And then, down on the bottom, John Heartly. Who  
14 is he contacted with?

15 A. John Hartline.

16 Q. Oh, sorry.

17 A. John Hartline was an Adaptec employee who ran the  
18 Longmont-based group for Adaptec that was developing the RAID  
19 technology that Adaptec -- that Chaparral ultimately acquired  
20 from Adaptec.

21 Q. Okay.

22 A. And he also was involved with Adaptec's efforts in  
23 understanding whether or not the RAID technology could also be  
24 applied to the router technology.

25 Q. And was that the focus of your call to him in this

1 instance?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Okay. Very good. If you could turn to Exhibit 13, I said  
4 that we'd get back to Mr. Selinger. This is an agreement you  
5 had with Mr. Selinger; is that right?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. And what he was going to do was, as we've heard earlier,  
8 this overpass investigation, that was his idea to come up with  
9 that name?

10 A. It was Mr. Selinger's idea to call it Overpass. Engineers  
11 also have a tendency to want to code name everything.

12 Q. Right. And so, this was what his tasks were going to be  
13 including to contact Crossroads anonymously to understand  
14 their intentions. Now, this was before there was any  
15 litigation between Crossroads and Chaparral; is that right?

16 A. That's correct.

17 Q. Whose idea was that?

18 A. That was Mr. Selinger's idea. Mr. Selinger believed that  
19 he may have known Mr. Smith from IBM days.

20 Q. Okay.

21 A. That was his idea, not mine. As far as I'm concerned, he  
22 could have contacted Mr. Smith, representing Chaparral. I  
23 know Mr. Smith was certainly not going to tell anyone calling  
24 them out of the blue something that he didn't want to tell  
25 them.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Okay. And so, Mr. Selinger created a report; is that  
2 right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And if you'd look at Exhibit 15, that's a copy of his  
5 report to you and Mr. Gluck?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And it starts out by don't shoot the messenger. Did you  
8 get the indication that this wasn't going to be the best news  
9 you've heard when you read that?

10 A. Well, that's usually what one believes, but for the life  
11 of me, even reading it today, I'm still not certain what Mr.  
12 Selinger had in mind when he made that statement.

13 Q. Okay. Very good. And if you turn to the last -- the  
14 document is four pages, single-spaced; is that right?

15 A. Yes, it is.

16 Q. And the bottom-line recommendation is on the last page  
17 where Mr. Selinger says, figure out a way to settle. And  
18 then, his plan has three parts to it: Portfolio, Catalyst and  
19 terms. Do you see that?

20 A. I see that.

21 Q. And so, what his bottom-line recommendation to you was to  
22 attempt to take a license with Crossroads; is that right? Is  
23 that how you understood the term settle?

24 A. I think what Mr. Selinger was trying to say is if you get  
25 into some kind of patent dispute, it could be very expensive

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 and time-consuming and distracting to both companies. And I  
2 think he was trying to say the more civil way to do this is if  
3 you think you could work out some kind of arrangement with  
4 Crossroads, that's something that maybe you should consider.  
5 That's how I interpreted what he meant.

6 Q. And he thought that the first step that you needed to do  
7 was assemble a patent portfolio. Do you see that?

8 A. Yes, I do.

9 Q. And the reason that he suggested you do that first is  
10 because he thought it unlikely that Crossroads, a competitor  
11 of yours, would be willing to grant you a license; is that  
12 right?

13 A. I would think he would think that. I think most people  
14 would think that.

15 Q. So if you'd just look back and -- I don't want to spend a  
16 lot of time on this, but the first thing that the report deals  
17 with is a search for prior art. Do you see that?

18 A. Yes, I do.

19 Q. And it points out if you search the on-line patent library  
20 provided by IBM?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. That's a patent library that is searchable by computer?

23 A. Yes, it is. It's an internet-based, at least at that time  
24 -- I believe they've sold it to someone else. At that time,  
25 it was an internet-based patent search engine, if you will,



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 that allowed you to search for patents using either the patent  
2 number, or company name, or an inventor name. And that's what  
3 he used in searching for prior art.

4 Q. And then, he says he did a more general search that turned  
5 up this Unisys patent. Do you see that?

6 A. I see that.

7 Q. And then, he talks about this Sun SPARC storage prior art.  
8 Do you see that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And that's the subject of a fairly lengthy discussion  
11 later on in the memo; is that right?

12 A. Yes, correct.

13 Q. This is that Sun SPARC work station is something that you  
14 all focused on here at the beginning in February of the year  
15 2000?

16 A. I believe that the most useful thing out of our consulting  
17 arrangement with Mr. Selinger was a discovery of the Sun SPARC  
18 storage and RAID.

19 Q. Okay. Now, if you could turn back to Exhibit 39. Oh, by  
20 the way, I don't know if I have it written down. What's the  
21 date of this report, sir?

22 A. The one we've been dealing with, the 15th? My copy's a  
23 little blurred. It looks like February 29th, if I'm reading  
24 that right.

25 Q. Okay.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 THE COURT: Is this a good place to stop?

2 MR. ALLCOCK: It is.

3 THE COURT: Members of the jury, I'm going to give you  
4 your afternoon break. Stretch, use the facilities, go outside  
5 if you'd like. Take about 15 minutes. Be ready to come back  
6 in 15 minutes. Remember my instructions.

7 (Recess.)

8 THE COURT: All right. Anything before we bring in  
9 the jury? All right.

10 (Jury present.)

11 THE COURT: Mr. Walker, you're still under oath.

12 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

13 MR. ALLCOCK: Thank you, your Honor. I was just going  
14 to start orienting ourselves.

15 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) Exhibit 15, the Selinger report that we  
16 were talking about is February 29, 2000; is that right?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. And in there is the results of his prior art searching for  
19 about the last couple of weeks before that; is that right?  
20 He'd been on the job for a couple of weeks?

21 A. I don't remember exactly when we routinely -- it's here  
22 somewhere, but I wouldn't doubt that's about right.

23 Q. All right. Now, let's take a look back to Exhibit 39 and  
24 040786, and I'll put it up on the screen to save you time.

25 This is a note of 3-1, 2000. March 1st, 2000 on a

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 conversation or a meeting you had with Mr. Zinger and Mr.  
2 Selinger?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And Zinger is the patent attorney that you used in this  
5 regard?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. And what he told you, or at least what your impression  
8 was, is if you were aware of the patent and don't have an  
9 opinion but damages could be increased or, you say here,  
10 trebled; is that right?

11 A. Again, once we learned about the patent, what we were  
12 doing is trying to learn everything we could about the whole  
13 process, the patent process and what the law says, et cetera,  
14 et cetera, and we were getting advice from Mr. Zinger, and  
15 this happened to be one of the things that Mr. Zinger informed  
16 us of.

17 Q. So what you were intending to start out to do here on  
18 March 1st, if not before, to get a written opinion from Mr.  
19 Zinger that you were in this clear; is that right?

20 A. I believe what this was saying is Mr. Zinger educated us  
21 that a written opinion or an opinion is something that's very  
22 desirable and necessary regarding patents.

23 Q. Okay. So one of your goals after this date was to get a  
24 written opinion from Mr. Zinger?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And the next note says let's get prior art. Do you see  
2 that?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And it says, Dave will look at prior art. Do you see  
5 that?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Now, you had already gotten a bunch of prior art from Mr.  
8 Selinger in the -- in his initial report. You're now looking  
9 for more prior art?

10 A. Well, it's not a poignant time. We haven't stopped  
11 anything here. This is still the process of discovery and  
12 learning.

13 Q. So you hadn't satisfied yourself that the prior art you  
14 had invalidated the patent. You needed to go get more prior  
15 art?

16 A. No, we hadn't come to any conclusion regarding the prior  
17 art, yet. That's not something that we could do. That's  
18 something that we would need Mr. Zinger to do.

19 Q. Fair enough. So now, if you turn to Exhibit 19, I believe  
20 that that's an e-mail string with the first e-mail being on  
21 the bottom from, again, Mr. Selinger to you, dated March 14th  
22 of the year 2000. Do you see that?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And here, he is reporting to you on his further work on  
25 prior art that he'd undertaken after the February 28th date;

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 is that right?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And he talks about a couple of different categories of  
4 prior art, and in the first category, he notes this Methode  
5 patent. Do you see that?

6 A. Yes, I do.

7 Q. That's another piece of prior art that he had uncovered?  
8 Is that right?

9 A. If I recall correctly it was easy to uncover because it  
10 was a reference patent in the 972 patent, if I recall. I  
11 can't --

12 Q. Okay. Whatever. And then, also, on the next page, he  
13 talks about Giga Labs. Do you see that on the next page?

14 A. I'm looking.

15 Q. I'm sorry. I meant to say EMC?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And STK, what is STK?

18 A. Storage Technology Corporation is what it stands for.

19 Q. And he put those in the second category of prior art that  
20 he was looking at at that time?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. All right. Now, you had a conversation with the lawyer,  
23 Mr. Zinger, around about this time, and on that same day,  
24 March 14th, you wrote an e-mail to Bob Selinger. Do you see  
25 that? That's kind of in the middle of the string?

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. Yes, I'm trying to see what the date is of that where it  
2 says the date I wrote that.

3 Q. Well, I think if you look at the top, it's from Bob  
4 Selinger back to you that's dated March 14th. So I think all  
5 three of these e-mails occurred on one day with the first one  
6 at 12:00 in the afternoon and the last one at 6:10 p.m?

7 A. Okay.

8 Q. Is that right? Does that look right to you?

9 A. I don't know for sure.

10 Q. Well, on the top, the bottom e-mail is at 12:10. Do you  
11 see that?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And then, the top one from Selinger back to you is at  
14 6:10. Do you see that?

15 A. Right.

16 Q. And that's responding to yours?

17 A. Okay.

18 Q. And in spite of all the prior art searching you'd done to  
19 date, through March 14th of 2000, you were telling Bob  
20 Selinger that he needed to pursue documented evidence that  
21 access control, a well-known and was practiced prior to 12-31,  
22 1986 -- 1996 so that Zinger can start to develop a limited  
23 opinion letter which indicates why he believes the Overpass  
24 patent is invalid. Do you see that?

25 A. Yes.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. And this Sun product that they came up with initially, you  
2 told them don't spend any more time on that?

3 A. That was what Mr. Zinger asked me to tell Mr. Selinger to  
4 do.

5 Q. Very good. And then, Bob Selinger wrote back to you and  
6 says that he's going to put looking for prior art on access  
7 controls first thing after wrapping up this strategy review?

8 A. (Moving head up and down.)

9 Q. Is that right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. So is it fair to say that in the middle of March, you were  
12 still looking for prior art on access controls?

13 A. Yes, it is.

14 Q. Okay. Now, shortly after this, the litigation was filed,  
15 is that right, in late March?

16 A. Late March.

17 Q. Right. Then, in early April, Mr. Gluck started to try to  
18 find some prior art through his contacts; is that right?

19 A. I believe Mr. Gluck did contact several people.

20 Q. Okay. So, for example, looking at Exhibit 22, this is an  
21 e-mail to -- from Mr. Gluck to a Dave Trachy at Storage?

22 A. Dave Trachy.

23 Q. This was an effort for him to get prior art from there?

24 A. No. Mr. Trachy was an employee at Storage Technology  
25 Corporation, a company that Chaparral was attempting to do

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 business with, and Mr. Trachy was asking us about the  
2 Crossroads patent.  
3 Q. Oh, I see.  
4 A. And what our views were of that.  
5 Q. Okay. So --  
6 A. He was not seeking prior art, to my knowledge, from Mr.  
7 Trachy.  
8 Q. If you look at Exhibit 37, that's a response e-mail from a  
9 person named Nigel Squibb to Mr. Gluck and earlier in the --  
10 and lower in the e-mail string, it talks about a request to  
11 find prior art; is that right?  
12 A. Yes.  
13 Q. And who is Mr. Squibb with?  
14 A. Mr. Squibb was with a company based in England. I believe  
15 it was called Sam UK or Sam limited, something like that.  
16 Q. Okay. And if you look at the next exhibit, which is  
17 Exhibit 50, it's faxes from Mr. Gluck, mostly, and one from  
18 you to Mr. Lippitt, Mr. Stallmo, Mr. Clayton, Mr. Clark, Mr.  
19 Penn, Mr. Englebrecht, all copies of the 972 patent; is that  
20 right?  
21 A. I don't -- I haven't found Exhibit 50 yet.  
22 Q. Exhibit 38.  
23 A. Oh, 38.  
24 Q. I apologize if I said 50.  
25 A. Okay. Yes.



1 Q. And so, Mr. Gluck intensified the search for prior art  
2 here in the early part of April and in May of 2000; is that  
3 right?

4 A. That's correct. I wouldn't necessarily use the word  
5 intensify. We were still in the learning and discovery  
6 process.

7 Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Zinger was to prepare this limited opinion  
8 letter as we saw on that March 14th memo; is that right?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. Now, if you look at Exhibit 39, at page 408, one and two,  
11 this is a conversation you had with Mr. Zinger; is that right?  
12 It notes on that conversation?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And it talks about a noninfringement opinion. So this  
15 isn't about the limited opinion that the patents could be  
16 invalid; this is a noninfringement opinion and this is your  
17 products don't infringe?

18 A. That's what it appears to be, yes.

19 Q. Okay. And what you were doing is you were providing him  
20 with alternatives on this access control feature. You were  
21 giving him a flow diagram of the product with access controls  
22 and a flow diagram of the product without access controls; is  
23 that right?

24 A. That's what it says. I don't recall what those diagrams  
25 were, but that is what it says.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. And you were giving him flowcharts with mapping and  
2 address, but I think you'll agree with me, that should be  
3 access -- and mapping with no access controls. Do you see  
4 that?

5 A. I see that.

6 Q. And so, what Mr. Zinger was doing here in -- and I think  
7 if you look at the page before, it's dated April 27, 2000,  
8 page 40811.

9 A. Okay.

10 Q. So here, around about April 27 of 2000, Mr. Zinger is  
11 being put in the position to evaluate infringement of a  
12 product of yours with access controls and without access  
13 controls; is that right?

14 A. I can't remember what these diagrams were, what access  
15 control was in these particular diagrams. I don't remember  
16 what that was.

17 Q. Okay. You earlier used the term LUN zoning  
18 interchangeably with access controls. At about this time in  
19 April, you had developed the access control LUN zoning  
20 feature, but had not yet put it in the product; is that right?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. Okay. So would it be reasonable for us to assume that  
23 these flow diagrams of access controls -- are those with LUN  
24 zoning?

25 A. I don't know that for a fact. It could be.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Okay. If you used the words "access controls"  
2 interchangeably with LUN zoning then as you do today, that's  
3 what it would refer to?

4 A. Well, let me just say the words "access control" when I  
5 used them was a word of convenience. I'm not necessarily  
6 implying that the words access controls or what is stated in  
7 the patent or anything like that. I was not qualified to do  
8 that. Access control were -- was words, convenient words that  
9 we tended to all use.

10 Q. Fine. Let me ask a question this way: At this time, in  
11 April 28th of -- April 27th of 2000, the LUN zoning was an  
12 access control that you were working on at Chaparral?

13 A. LUN zoning was a feature that we were working on at  
14 Chaparral.

15 Q. That provided access controls?

16 A. Whether or not it provides access controls, I would say,  
17 is subject to interpretation.

18 Q. Fair enough. So then, the next thing that happens is if  
19 you look at Exhibit 107, I think that's in the second book.

20 A. No. It's in the first book.

21 Q. Exhibit 107 is an e-mail to a number of people from Al  
22 Permut. He worked for you, didn't he?

23 A. He worked for the vice-president of engineering that  
24 worked for me, yes.

25 Q. And this is a memo, dated May 8th of 2000, indicating that

1 you were pulling the LUN zoning out of the planned release of  
2 that software.

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. And the date of that is what?

5 A. May 8th.

6 Q. And the reason that Chaparral pulled LUN zoning from the  
7 product is because of a concern about infringement of the  
8 Crossroads 972 patent?

9 A. There were a couple of reasons that we made the decision  
10 to not introduce the feature of our product. First of all,  
11 this decision was made within a matter of just a few weeks of  
12 the lawsuit being initiated by Crossroads and Chaparral. We  
13 still did not understand all aspects of the patent and our  
14 products and what might or might not infringe, or even things  
15 that we might be considering doing with our product.

16 And so, that was a major aspect of it. The second  
17 aspect of it, also carrying an awful lot of weight in the  
18 decision, was that the feature had received very little  
19 interest from our customers. My sales force was not driving  
20 me to get this feature in our product in the presentations I  
21 had done with customers. Very lukewarm interest in this kind  
22 of feature.

23 So, here we are, a few weeks after the lawsuit is  
24 instigated and Crossroads to Chaparral, about to introduce  
25 this feature being the engineer that I am and conservative and

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 not knowing, yet, everything that I felt we needed to know, I  
2 made the decision it would be prudent to back burner this  
3 feature and not introduce it in our product at that time.

4 Q. And one of the reasons you didn't was a concern about  
5 infringing the Crossroads 972 patent?

6 A. Concern from the standpoint of we did not yet know.

7 Q. Okay. And is it just coincidence that this decision was  
8 made a few days after providing Mr. Zinger flowcharts of the  
9 product with access control or without access control, or was  
10 Mr. Zinger involved in this discussion?

11 A. We had several discussions from the time we learned of the  
12 patent all the way up to this date. It was a continuum of  
13 discussions and trying to put all this stuff together. So  
14 there were lots of things that went into us making that  
15 decision. The two main ones were the ones I just said.

16 Q. And part of your decision of pulling this feature was an  
17 actual written opinion you got from counsel; isn't that  
18 correct, sir?

19 A. We had gotten an opinion from counsel, yes.

20 Q. And that contributed to your pulling this feature, this  
21 LUN zoning feature from the product here in May of 2000?

22 A. It was one of the factors that we considered in making  
23 this decision, certainly.

24 Q. Now, if you turn to Exhibit 27, that is an opinion from  
25 Mr. Zinger, a draft opinion, dated June 14th of the year 2000;

1 is that right?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And I notice that the words say that it is the presently  
4 marketed products of Chaparral do not infringe either  
5 literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Do you see  
6 that?

7 A. Yes, I do.

8 Q. Now, at that point, on June 14th of the year 2000, the  
9 presently marketed products did not include this LUN zoning  
10 access control feature; is that right?

11 A. That's --

12 Q. Because you pulled it out a few days earlier?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. So this opinion really had nothing to do with the LUN  
15 zoning access control feature?

16 A. This opinion did not.

17 Q. Now, the LUN zoning feature as part of, I believe you said  
18 in your deposition, a standing order from you stayed out of  
19 the product through the entire year of 2000; is that right?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. So if anybody wanted to engineer one and to put this  
22 feature back in through the entire period of 2000, they would  
23 have had to go to you, and you had a standing order to keep it  
24 out?

25 A. That's correct. What I decided to do when we made the

1 decision not to introduce it in the May time frame of 2000 to  
2 back burner it and reconsider it when we were introducing a  
3 new generation of products that were under development at that  
4 time.

5 Q. Okay. Now, if you'll turn to Exhibit 32, which is in the  
6 second book, that is the final Zinger opinion, dated November  
7 20 of the year 2000; is that right?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. And as of this date, the products you were marketing did  
10 not have the LUN zoning access control feature?

11 A. That's true.

12 Q. And so, this opinion has nothing to do with products that  
13 contain that feature?

14 A. Does not.

15 Q. Now, in the first opinion, the exhibit, for the record,  
16 your Honor, 27, there is no reference to the patent being  
17 invalid; is that right? He doesn't give you an opinion on  
18 invalidity in the June 14th opinion, does he?

19 A. No, he didn't.

20 Q. So although you had been searching for prior art from  
21 early February, at least as of the middle of June, Mr. Zinger  
22 did not give you an opinion that the patent's invalid; is that  
23 right?

24 A. No, that's not correct. But if you look at the draft, the  
25 second opinion, and you look at the final opinion in November,

1 it's obvious to me that the draft was just what it said. It's  
2 a draft. It was incomplete. You can start up right from the  
3 words that end in the draft and go straight into the words on  
4 invalidity in his final opinion.

5 So it's my belief that the June 14th opinion is  
6 labeled draft. I believe it was not complete at that time  
7 would be my guess.

8 Q. Right. And it wasn't complete because there isn't a word  
9 in there anywhere about the 972 patent being invalid, not a  
10 word; is that right?

11 A. There is nothing about invalidity in the complete draft,  
12 that's true.

13 Q. Okay. And then, in this November document, there is a  
14 section on invalidity. It starts on page 23. Do you see  
15 that, the invalidity analysis?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And he, after nine months of looking for prior art and  
18 after almost eight months of Mr. Zinger analyzing this  
19 information, he relies on one reference and one reference  
20 only; is that right?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. He relies on the Sun reference; is that right?

23 A. That's right.

24 Q. Now, we've heard all about this Adaptec prior art. You  
25 worked at Adaptec?



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 A. No, I never worked from Adaptec.  
2 Q. Mr. Gluck worked at Adaptec?  
3 A. No, Mr. Gluck didn't work at Adaptec.  
4 Q. Did a number of people come over to Chaparral from  
5 Adaptec?  
6 A. Yes, there were.  
7 Q. And you were well aware what they did?  
8 A. Yes.  
9 Q. And there's not a word in that Zinger letter about Adaptec  
10 invalidating the patent?  
11 A. There is not.  
12 Q. Now, although you had -- Chaparral had taken the LUN  
13 zoning feature out of the product for the entire year of 2000,  
14 you continued to present it as a feature to customers -- I'm  
15 showing you Exhibit 104 -- didn't you?  
16 A. I'd like to, I think, correct one thing you said. We did  
17 not take it out of the product. It was never in the product.  
18 Q. Okay. You pulled it before it got in?  
19 A. We took it out of developmental software. It never was in  
20 the product, and I think that's very important.  
21 Q. Okay. But regardless of whether you took it out or you --  
22 or it never got in, you didn't take it out of the  
23 presentations that you were making to customers?  
24 A. That's correct.  
25 Q. Here's a presentation made to Dell on May 24th that looks

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 just like the earlier ones that we looked at; is that right?

2 A. That's true.

3 MR. BAHLER: Which exhibit number, counsel?

4 MR. ALLCOCK: I thought I said it earlier. It's  
5 Exhibit 104.

6 Q. (BY MR. ALLCOCK) And you were deposed on December 8th of  
7 the year 2000; is that right?

8 A. Approximately, yes.

9 Q. Right. And at that time, the engineers were still under  
10 the standing order that this wouldn't go back in the product;  
11 is that right?

12 A. Without my approval, right.

13 Q. Okay. Could you look at Exhibit 118. It's a press  
14 release, dated November 8 of the year 2000. Do you see that?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And it talks about this A8526 product?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Now, in your deposition in December, you didn't suggest to  
19 anybody that there was plans afoot for this LUN zoning to be  
20 put back in the product, did you?

21 A. I don't recall. I don't know whether I was asked that  
22 specific question.

23 Q. And you were telling the industry, or Chaparral was,  
24 without a letter from a lawyer specific to LUN zoning, that  
25 you were going to introduce these features that are highly

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 sought after in this A8526 product; is that right?

2 A. That is correct.

3 Q. Were you aware of this press release when your deposition  
4 was taken?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. You did revisit the issue of putting this LUN zoning in  
7 the product; is that right?

8 A. Right. What I said is when we chose not to introduce it  
9 and back burner it that we would reconsider it at the time  
10 this new generation of products came out, and I directed the  
11 engineering staff to make sure that the feature was able to be  
12 introduced in the new generation of products, and we made the  
13 decision to introduce it.

14 Q. Okay. If you'll look at Exhibit 30, there was some --  
15 dated October 6, 2000?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. This is a marketing requirements document?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. And this is some information from the marketing people  
20 about features that they consider important?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And a level A feature, these folks will tell you, is an  
23 essential feature; is that right?

24 A. That's how it's labeled, yes.

25 Q. And so, here in October of 1986 -- I mean, October of

1 2000, I keep saying that -- they are talking about access  
2 controls LUN zoning being a essential feature; is that right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. The Zinger final opinion was November 20?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Just a moment, your Honor. In connection with that Zinger  
7 letter, I want you to turn back to Exhibit 19, which is the  
8 e-mail --

9 A. Is that book one?

10 Q. -- that you wrote. Exhibit 19.

11 A. Okay.

12 Q. And this was after you'd already uncovered that Sun  
13 product that Mr. Zinger finally ended up relying upon some  
14 nine months later; is that right?

15 A. Right.

16 Q. And so, this pursuit of better prior art covering access  
17 controls, the best you ended up with was the Sun thing that  
18 you started with?

19 A. In terms of what Mr. Zinger cited, that's correct.

20 Q. Well, Mr. Zinger is a competent attorney, isn't he?

21 A. Yes, he is.

22 Q. And he is going to cite the best prior art that he can  
23 find?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Now, the products that now have LUN zoning, the LUN zoning

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 access control feature, were introduced in January, February  
2 and March of the year 2001?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. And you have not obtained an opinion from Mr. Zinger on  
5 whether or not those products infringe?

6 A. What the logic behind introducing the LUN zoning  
7 feature --

8 Q. Excuse me, Mr. Walker.

9 A. Yes. All right.

10 Q. If you could answer that question.

11 A. Okay. Would you ask it again, please?

12 Q. Yes. You have not obtained a written opinion from Mr.  
13 Zinger on those products that you're now introducing and  
14 selling that contain the LUN zoning access control feature?

15 A. No, we have not.

16 Q. I have no further questions at this time, your Honor.

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. BAHLER:

19 Q. Mr. Walker, in response to that last question from Mr.  
20 Allcock, you started to give an explanation and were  
21 interrupted. Let me just give the question again. You  
22 said --

23 THE COURT: Counsel, both of you -- I know the hour's  
24 late -- are going to ask questions. Mr. Allcock asked a  
25 question susceptible to a "Yes" or "No" answer, and the

1 witness started to give another answer. Now, let's don't have  
2 any sidebar remarks. If you've got a question and want to  
3 give an explanation, then ask him appropriately. You know how  
4 to ask questions.

5 MR. BAHLER: Thank you, your Honor.

6 Q. (BY MR. BAHLER) Mr. Walker, you were going to offer an  
7 explanation as to why LUN zoning was introduced in 2001. What  
8 is that explanation?

9 A. At the time we were sued by Crossroads, we had no feature  
10 called LUN zoning in our products. It's our belief that  
11 Crossroads must have investigated what our products were, and  
12 when they filed a lawsuit, they generally believed that we  
13 infringed their patent.

14 We had no such thing in our product called LUN zoning.  
15 And we got an opinion from Mr. Zinger that our products did  
16 not infringe the patent, and so, we continued to ship our  
17 product. Because we were still in the learning process, I  
18 made the decision to be conservative and not introduce the LUN  
19 zoning feature back in the May time frame, but back burner it,  
20 see where the lawsuit was, learn more about it, and reconsider  
21 it at the time the next generation of products was introduced.

22 When it came time to make the decision on the next  
23 generation of products, the lawsuit was still in effect, we  
24 had no LUN zoning in our products that whole time, and we also  
25 had, we believed, a strong case regarding invalidity of the

1 Crossroads patent. And we decided that we're already sued, we  
2 don't have the feature, we're going to add the feature. We'll  
3 still be in the same situation.

4 Crossroads sued us, we believe -- they believe we were  
5 infringing the patent. So by adding, yet, another feature to  
6 it, we didn't see that that put us in any different situation  
7 than we already were in with Crossroads.

8 Q. All right, sir. Let me put up this marketing requirements  
9 document. This is Exhibit 30 in your notebook, sir.

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And Mr. Allcock pointed you to this prioritization scheme  
12 that's over here on the left, and it says priority A and  
13 that's considered essential?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. What does essential mean within the context of this  
16 marketing requirements document, Mr. Walker?

17 A. Well, a marketing requirements document, at least at  
18 Chaparral, is something that's jointly created between the  
19 marketing department and the engineering department, and  
20 essential are the A marking is intended to say that at a  
21 particular point in time, designated by the A400, the A410,  
22 those are software releases.

23 It was the view that those features needed to be  
24 available at the time of introduction of those software  
25 levels. And the A designation that it is essential that it be

1 in there. Remember, I had directed engineering to continue  
2 the development of the LUN zoning feature so that should we  
3 decide to put it in the next generation of products, it would  
4 be engineered and ready to go.

5 So a lot of the essential that you see there is my  
6 direction to the company, as well.

7 Q. Now, does essential on that marketing requirements  
8 document imply that it was essential in order to sell a  
9 product in the marketplace?

10 A. No. We had never done a market survey or study as to the  
11 value of LUN zoning feature. If you look at the same  
12 document, there's probably a dozen other features that are  
13 scheduled to be introduced.

14 Q. Now, in fact, Mr. Walker, what was your experience with  
15 respect to the customer visits that you were making regarding  
16 LUN zoning?

17 A. My own personal experience in making customer  
18 presentations is that very lukewarm reception to it. If you  
19 remember the presentation material that was presented earlier,  
20 those tended to be 30 to 60 pages thick. It has one page that  
21 describes how LUN zoning works.

22 Typically, what would happen is I would give that part  
23 of the presentation and elicit no comments. So my own  
24 personal experience was very little interest in the feature.

25 Q. All right, sir. Let me refer you to Plaintiff's Exhibit



09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 107, which Mr. Walker -- or, I'm sorry, Mr. Allcock talked to  
2 you about.

3 And if you'd look down here, section that says, please  
4 note we will also need to pull out the more full-featured LUN  
5 zoning from the planned 4.1 -- that says release there, right,  
6 sir?

7 A. Yes, that's a release. There was not a feature in the  
8 product. He was going to pull it out of the developmental  
9 software that engineering was designing within Chaparral.

10 Q. Had LUN zoning been a feature that had been in any  
11 products at any time during the year 2000?

12 A. No --

13 Q. At Chaparral?

14 A. -- it was not.

15 Q. Let me refer you to Exhibit 12, which is this page from  
16 the presentation you were giving to EMC. First of all, this  
17 was dated -- this is Exhibit 12. This was a presentation that  
18 you made February 18th, 2000, right, sir?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. Okay. And it says, first of all, the title is not LUN  
21 zoning/access control, it's LUN masking/zoning, right?

22 A. True.

23 Q. What does that mean?

24 A. Well, LUN masking was another feature that was being  
25 developed along with LUN zoning. It operated in a slightly

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 different fashion. Our definition when we called a feature  
2 LUN masking meant that a storage device could either be seen  
3 by all the hosts on the Fibre Channel side of the router or  
4 not seen by all of the hosts. So it was an all-or-one thing.

5           You could either read and write to that device, or  
6 send commands to it. All the hosts could or none of the hosts  
7 could. It was an all-or-none thing. It was a feature  
8 different than the LUN zoning.

9 Q. Okay. Is it your understanding that Crossroads is  
10 contending that LUN masking infringes the 972 patent?

11 A. I have never heard any words to that effect, no.

12 Q. Okay. Now, on this page, there's something called --  
13 there's a reference to, says LUN masking/zoning is configured  
14 to be a CAPI using host WWNs. What is that about?

15 A. Well, WWNs stands for worldwide names. One of the, I  
16 think, valuable features of the Fibre Channel technology is it  
17 was specified such that each device in the world -- and there  
18 might be millions of them -- will be given a unique identifier  
19 that they call worldwide names so that you could always  
20 distinguish a particular device from another device.

21           What the words mean here is that the router in  
22 implementing and configuring one masking and zoning would use  
23 the worldwide names of the computers attached to the Fibre  
24 Channel side.

25 Q. Mr. Walker, what is CAPI?

1 A. CAPI stands for configuration application programming  
2 interface. But what that is is an interface, actually  
3 multiple interfaces into the Chaparral products that allow  
4 computers to be able to perform various functions including  
5 configuration in setting up a LUN masking and zoning.

6 So it's designed in our product, specified interface  
7 that we make available to our customers so that they can write  
8 applications or other software to make our product do various  
9 things.

10 Q. Mr. Walker, is CAPI a secret?

11 A. Not at all. CAPI is something that we actually greatly  
12 encourage our customers to use, and the reason we do is one of  
13 the weaknesses that Chaparral's products have always had is we  
14 have never developed the application software that can reside  
15 in a host computer and control and manage our product. Some  
16 of our competitors have done that. And so, one of our  
17 weaknesses is we haven't had the resources to develop that  
18 software to manage our product.

19 So we encourage our customers to use CAPI, which is a  
20 well-specified, defined interface, to allow them to write  
21 applications to control, configure our product and add value  
22 to the ultimate solution that they then sell to the end user.

23 Q. How do customers go about getting this CAPI?

24 A. They ask for it.

25 Q. Is that all?

1 A. Any customer, the typical way it works is any customer  
2 working with one of our salesmen or account managers,  
3 typically, they worked with us, also, and we understand what  
4 their requirements and needs are, and when we learn that they  
5 want to add this kind of value by developing this software to  
6 add value to their solutions, we freely provide them the CAPI  
7 specification and the help they need to allow them to do that.

8 Q. All right, sir. Mr. Walker, you found out about the 972  
9 patent in February of 2000, right?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. And you contacted Mr. Zinger, right?

12 A. Yes, immediately thereafter.

13 Q. Why did you pick him?

14 A. Mr. Zinger had been selected by Chaparral prior to us  
15 learning of the Crossroads patent to do what they call  
16 prosecute our own patents, which means when we have patentable  
17 ideas, Mr. Zinger would work on them and file patent  
18 applications for us.

19 So he was quite familiar with our products, had also  
20 done patent work with other data storage companies and so was  
21 very capable and competent in doing these kinds of things.

22 Q. And how long had the relationship existed with between  
23 Chaparral and Mr. Zinger before he got sued?

24 A. I don't remember the exact amount of time. It probably  
25 was six to nine months would be my guess. I'm not sure.

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 Q. Six to nine months, surely Chaparral had selected Mr.  
2 Zinger to do patent application work for it, right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Do you know how that selection was done?

5 A. I made the selection personally based on recommendations  
6 that I got from various people. I interviewed Mr. Zinger as  
7 well as other potential IP attorneys.

8 Q. All right, sir. Now, in your notebook and I'm holding in  
9 my hand are Mr. Zinger's opinions which are Defendant's  
10 Exhibit 179, 180 and 181. Are these the -- all the written  
11 opinions that you got from Mr. Zinger?

12 A. Those are the written opinions.

13 Q. Did you get any other opinions from Mr. Zinger?

14 A. We got many opinions from Mr. Zinger in terms of a  
15 dialogue and discussions we were having with him.

16 Q. All right, sir. Now, based upon the written and oral  
17 opinions that you got from Mr. Zinger, is it your belief today  
18 that Chaparral products with LUN zoning infringe the 972  
19 patent?

20 A. No.

21 Q. Is it your belief today that the 972 patent is valid?

22 A. No.

23 Q. Mr. Walker, after all you've been through in this case,  
24 and if you find out about the 972 patent today -- let's say we  
25 can erase all the way back to the beginning of February 2000,

09/05/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 2

1 you find out about that 972 patent today, would you do  
2 anything different?

3 A. No.

4 Q. Pass the witness.

5 MR. ALLCOCK: No further question.

6 THE COURT: You may step down, sir.

7 THE COURT: Members of the jury, I don't like the way  
8 the sky looks, so I'm going to let y'all slip off and beat the  
9 downtown traffic. I think the rains are supposed to calm down  
10 during the night, and I think tomorrow is supposed to be a lot  
11 better. But I do check with the weather, and I guess it's the  
12 same thing all the time.

13 We've got flash floods and warnings and all that. So  
14 be careful going home, but I'm going to recess a little early  
15 today so you could get home. But I would like to start at  
16 8:30 in the morning. Anybody have any problems with that?  
17 All right. Please remember the instructions and be careful  
18 going home.

19 (Jury not present.)

20 THE COURT: Actually, counsel, we're supposed to also  
21 receive very heavy thunderstorms, but I figured most of you  
22 can get your own way.

23 When you get cleaned up, I'd like to see counsel in  
24 chambers. Recess till 8:30.

25 (Proceedings adjourned.)

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXA  
 2 WESTERN DIVISION  
 3 CROSSROADS SYSTEMS, ) Docket No. A 00-CA-217 SS (TEXAS), INC., A TE  
 4 CORPORATION )  
 5 vs. ) Austin, Texas )  
 6 CHAPARRAL NETWORK ) STORAGE, INC., A )  
 7 DELAWARE CORPORATION ) September 4, 2001  
 8 TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL ON THE MERITS  
 9 BEFORE THE HONORABLE SAM SPARKS Volume 1 of 6

10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24

APPEARANCES:  
 For the Plaintiff: Mr. Alan D. Albright  
 Mr. John Allcock  
 Mr. John Giust  
 401 B Street, Suite 1700  
 For the Defendant: Mr. David D. Bahler  
 Mr. Stephen D. Dellett  
 Fulbright & Jaworksi  
 Austin, Texas 78701  
 Court Reporter: Lily Iva Reznik, RPR, CRR  
 200 W. 8th Street  
 (512)916-5564

25 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by c

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1	I N D E X				
2					Page
3					
4	Jury Voir Dire				11
5	Plaintiff's Opening Statements				58
6	Defendant's Opening Statements				87
7	Proceedings Adjourned				172
8					
9					
10		Direct	Cross	Redirect	RecrossWitnesses:
11					
12	Brian Smith	110	127		
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

E X H I B I T S

Offered Admitted

Plaintiff's

#1-2, 4-6, 8-9, 12-20, 22-30, 32-33,	84	85
35-40, 41-42, 44-49, 50-62, 65-68,	84	85
75-101, 104-113, 118-125, 127-137,	84	85
139-144, 182, 200-202, 214-254,	84	85
256-261, 278	84	85

Defendant's

#1-30	85	85
#31	157	157
#34-59, 62, 74, 78-79, 84, 99,	85	85
104, 107-109, 111-122, 126-129,	85	85
131, 133-168, 170-172, 174,	85	85
179-181, 188, 190-232, 238-246,	85	85
249, 253-271	85	85

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE COURT: Call 00-CA-217, Crossroads Systems, Inc.  
2 vs. Chaparral Network Storage, Inc. Anybody want to make an  
3 announcement or you just want to sit there and look kind of  
4 stupid?

5 MR. ALLCOCK: Morning, your Honor. John Allcock here  
6 again, representing Crossroads.

7 THE COURT: All right.

8 MR. BAHLER: Dave Bahler, your Honor, representing  
9 Chaparral.

10 THE COURT: All right, gentlemen. Are you ready to go  
11 to trial?

12 MR. ALLCOCK: We are, your Honor.

13 MR. BAHLER: Yes, your Honor.

14 THE COURT: All right. Have you had time to review  
15 the preliminary instructions I intend to read to the jury  
16 after the jury is selected but this morning, before I recess  
17 them, before you tear up my courtroom?

18 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, we have. I have just a few  
19 comments.

20 THE COURT: Be glad to hear them.

21 MR. BAHLER: Yes, of course. Page 2, the first full  
22 paragraph, one, two, three, four, five, the sixth line. The  
23 end of that line, it says, claimed invention that were  
24 publicly known or I would add there, that were offered for  
25 sale, comma, or publicly known or.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE COURT: That's fair. Publicly known or offered  
2 for sale or used?

3 MR. BAHLER: Or used in a publicly accessible way,  
4 yes.

5 THE COURT: All right.

6 MR. BAHLER: Second one, the next page, the third full  
7 paragraph, fourth line. We are not pursuing enablement  
8 anymore, so you can delete that they were not enabled.

9 THE COURT: Done.

10 MR. BAHLER: The line before that, it says that they  
11 were anticipated by a prior art, semicolon, that they were,  
12 quote, due to obviousness issues, should say that they were  
13 invalid due to obviousness.

14 THE COURT: Well, I've already said that once in the  
15 first part of the sentence. That's a series of things that  
16 would make it invalid. That's why they invented a semicolon.

17 MR. BAHLER: Or that they were due to obviousness.

18 All right. That sounds fine. I guess that's misread.

19 The back of the line just below that, the last part  
20 says, and they were enforceable due to inequitable conduct.  
21 That should say, and they were unenforceable due to  
22 inequitable conduct.

23 THE COURT: You're right on that one.

24 MR. BAHLER: The next, page four, the fourth line, it  
25 says, if you decide that the claims had been infringed that

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 they are not invalid and/or unenforceable, I think that should  
2 -- we should add that there. We've got a double negative,  
3 though.

4 THE COURT: That's because of the burden of proof.

5 MR. BAHLER: All right.

6 THE COURT: I don't think the jury will catch that.

7 MR. BAHLER: Yeah, I know. This is -- I'm sorry.

8 THE COURT: That's all right.

9 MR. BAHLER: I notice at the tail end of this you say,  
10 now I believe you are ready for opening statements, but then,  
11 on page 4, in the middle you say that this case will begin  
12 this afternoon at 1:30.

13 THE COURT: No. I don't want to keep y'all on edge --

14 MR. BAHLER: Oh.

15 THE COURT: -- so you don't know when your opening  
16 statements will be.

17 MR. BAHLER: I mean, 1:30 sounds doable, but it kind  
18 of depends on what happens today.

19 THE COURT: I understand. It will be doable.

20 MR. BAHLER: Okay.

21 THE COURT: All right. Plaintiff.

22 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, if I followed what Mr.  
23 Bahler was saying when he and you agreed to modify those  
24 sections, offer for sale -- the offer for sale will be more --  
25 there's a year grace period, so we offered for sale more than

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 a year prior to the filing of the patent.

2 MR. BAHLER: Fine.

3 MR. ALBRIGHT: And, your Honor, that's all the  
4 plaintiff has.

5 THE COURT: Year before the application?

6 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir, before the filing.

7 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I, frankly, don't know  
8 if this will help or not, but I have been involved out at  
9 Berkeley, only place in the world that hasn't changed since  
10 1955, '56, and the people on the panels I was speaking, they  
11 seem to know more than I did and they get these instructions,  
12 they believe it helps. So we'll give our whirl.

13 What did you decide about statements during the trial?

14 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, I considered that, and I  
15 think I'd like to save that for the next trial.

16 THE COURT: All right. We'll play it straight down  
17 the middle. All right. Anything else from the plaintiff?

18 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, one minor housekeeping  
19 matter. It's my understanding that the defendant intends to,  
20 not till this coming weekend, add some additional  
21 demonstrative exhibits that they are going to present in the  
22 case next week, and we believe that we should have those  
23 demonstrative exhibits by sometime this week so that we can  
24 adequately prepare.

25 We have provided all of our demonstrative exhibits for

1 the entire trial already as of this date.

2 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, we are striving to get all  
3 our demonstratives to them. They have an almost complete  
4 supplement. We have some supplementation. We'll get them to  
5 them by the end of this week.

6 THE COURT: See, all you had to do was ask him.

7 MR. BAHLER: We already told him.

8 THE COURT: See. That's what communication is. All  
9 right. Anything else from the plaintiff? Anything from the  
10 defendant?

11 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, I have one issue. Alan, I'm  
12 sorry. I should have brought this up. This deals with this  
13 label issue. We plan to bring that label up during opening  
14 statements. They've objected to the exhibits. This is  
15 subject to their motion in limine.

16 THE COURT: I've overruled the motion in limine.

17 MR. BAHLER: Okay.

18 THE COURT: Have y'all gotten an order? I did exactly  
19 what I told you I was going to do last week.

20 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, I don't know that we've  
21 seen an order.

22 MR. BAHLER: I don't think we've seen an order.

23 MR. ALBRIGHT: We have not seen an order.

24 MR. BAHLER: So I don't know what to say.

25 THE COURT: I entered summary judgment orders Friday.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 MR. ALBRIGHT: And we --

2 THE COURT: Margaret, I know --

3 MR. ALBRIGHT: -- we misunderstood the Court's order  
4 to be overruling our motion in limine with respect to that  
5 issue. The only issue I think the Court left open that we  
6 have not seen was with respect to the settlement from the last  
7 case.

8 THE COURT: I have sustained that motion.

9 MR. ALBRIGHT: But you sustained the motion in limine?

10 THE COURT: Yes. Before you mention anything about a  
11 settlement, you will approach the bench and tell me what and  
12 why, and then, we'll make that decision. As in all my orders  
13 on motion in limine, there is that little zinger at the bottom  
14 that says this is not an order on admissibility. So the new  
15 rules don't apply to me.

16 You have to make your objections as a real lawyer.  
17 The only possible way that that could come in is on some sort  
18 of notice theory. And I thought about that this afternoon --  
19 in the second half of the ball game, because it wasn't much of  
20 a ball game. I couldn't figure out any notice theory that I  
21 would bring up or that I would allow a settlement and come in,  
22 but my mind's open on it. You just don't mention it until you  
23 approach the bench.

24 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir. Thank you, sir.

25 MR. BAHLER: That's it.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE COURT: I'll get you an order in just a second.

2 All right. Gentlemen, I will be just introducing, I  
3 assume, Mr. Allcock and Mr. Bahler. You will introduce all  
4 the rest.

5 MR. ALLCOCK: Yes, your Honor.

6 THE COURT: All right. If you'll have your witness  
7 list available. That's the only work you'll get to do during  
8 the voir dire. Counsel, after selection of the jury, too, I'm  
9 just going to give them the converted verdict form that we  
10 used in the last trial just like I said.

11 We may -- I may change my mind and use a verdict form  
12 similar to the one requested by the plaintiff or the defendant  
13 that has all of the claims down, but that looked a little more  
14 complex. And I'm telling them that the verdict form may look  
15 like this. So anybody has any objection, I'll be glad to hear  
16 it now. I'll just show them the objections. I started to  
17 even give them the definitions, but I think we're going to  
18 give them about all they can digest right now.

19 But, anyway, the verdict form that I handed to you  
20 last week is the verdict form I intend to give a copy to each  
21 juror. Anybody have any objection?

22 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, we had discussed in chambers  
23 about modifying that verdict form to include this modified  
24 product, original modified product.

25 THE COURT: All right. And I may do that at the end.



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 MR. BAHLER: All right.

2 THE COURT: As a matter of fact, I think we'll  
3 probably have to do that at the end if the evidence comes out.

4 MR. BAHLER: Okay.

5 THE COURT: This is just to give them an idea so  
6 they'll have an idea.

7 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, do you happen to have another  
8 copy of that verdict form?

9 THE COURT: Oh, I'm sure we can get one for you. All  
10 right, counsel. Just stand at ease until we have the panel  
11 ready, I guess. Do you want to pre-admit any exhibits?

12 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, if you give us -- we'll  
13 talk about that at lunch, and I think that we'd offer  
14 pre-admitted exhibits.

15 MR. BAHLER: Not anything nobody's objected to.

16 MR. ALBRIGHT: That would be fine us with.

17 MR. BAHLER: We've cooperated with a bunch of  
18 objections. And I think everything that's not objected to, we  
19 could let in.

20 THE COURT: Get the numbers for the record, and then,  
21 we'll do that and that will save some time.

22 MR. ALBRIGHT: Great. Thank you, your Honor.

23 (Jury venire present.)

24 JURY VOIR DIRE.

25 THE COURT: Hello, members of the jury panel. You'll

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 be glad it's not raining, but they've got a 70 percent chance  
2 now. Nobody's seen any rain since Thursday, Friday, some of  
3 you last week.

4 How many of you were surprised to get our invitation?  
5 Well, the service in federal court for jury has gone pretty  
6 much along the congressional lines, so we have 16 counties in  
7 the Austin Division. Many of you from as far as Brenham and  
8 Junction in either side can be coming in.

9 It's not as bad as our Pecos Division. You can drive,  
10 actually, 240 miles one way to the courthouse and back, and  
11 because of the accommodations in Pecos and the fact that many  
12 of those folks are ranchers, they drive every day, 480 miles a  
13 day to serve the jury. So those of you who came in thought it  
14 was a long route, be glad it's not Pecos.

15 We'll use our best organization during the time that  
16 you're here to make sure that we don't waste your time. We  
17 don't want you to waste your time because you are expensive.  
18 Y'all cost the taxpayers probably \$4,500 today. So we try to  
19 keep you down if you just listen to the instructions and call  
20 on Fridays.

21 We have six federal judges here in Austin that try  
22 cases, and we will need you when we're trying cases, but we  
23 like to cut your numbers down when, all of a sudden, on  
24 Friday, lawyers settle cases or cases go away. So when you  
25 come, we can use your time efficiently.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1           How many people have never been on jury service  
2 before? Well, I'll tell you how things are going to go. In  
3 just a minute, we're going to call 15 names, they'll be  
4 selected from a computer. Show them our computer. Every one  
5 of you has a name tag in there. Those of you who win at bingo  
6 will be called first, generally.

7           But just because your name is not called, don't think  
8 that you won't get on the jury panel because from time to  
9 time, we will have to call another name. All of you have been  
10 qualified to be jurors in the United States District Court,  
11 but we have to determine whether you're qualified to be a  
12 juror on this particular case.

13           I always use the example my father was an athlete at  
14 the University of Texas. I went through school at the  
15 University on scholarship. My four sons went there. And if I  
16 were called to officiate at an A & M/Texas game, I think that  
17 I probably would be better off yelling at the referees than  
18 being one, so I would have to decline.

19           Some of you may have had life experiences that would  
20 allow you to be the best jurors in one case but not a good  
21 juror on another case. Another example that crops up  
22 frequently is in the criminal field where a lot of people  
23 think that marihuana ought to be legalized, but it is a  
24 federal, federal felony, punishable by a penitentiary  
25 sentence, to possess marihuana. And so, those folks sometimes

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 don't want to serve on the jury.

2 But we've got a civil case today. The only problem  
3 about the civil case is it's going to last two weeks. In  
4 federal court, many of the times that our cases can last  
5 months, but this is a two-week case. It's not as bad as it  
6 sounds because any jury in a two-week case, you only work  
7 Monday through Thursday so that you have one full day each  
8 week to catch up and do the things that you need to do.

9 And since Monday was a holiday, this jury will work  
10 Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday of  
11 next week. You'll be through next week. There won't be any  
12 problem about your being through next week. But it will go  
13 into next week.

14 And it's going to be an interesting case. It's a  
15 patents case. Those of you who are selected, I think, will  
16 find it very educational and enjoyable. Got good lawyers and  
17 it will be progressed as we go. In federal court, unlike the  
18 state court, the lawyers, each party has a time. Each side  
19 has ten hours to present their evidence.

20 At the end of those ten hours apiece, the evidence is  
21 over, doesn't make any difference where they are, although  
22 they'll be through. They're used to that. And so, we know  
23 exactly when the case will end and your deliberations will  
24 begin.

25 Each of you are under oath. We have the

1 questionnaires that you filled out. The lawyers have copies  
2 of it, so a lot of information they have. I'll have some  
3 questions to make sure you're qualified as a juror. If there  
4 are any questions that you want to answer only in private, you  
5 have that right. Just say, "I'd like to approach the bench."  
6 I don't know when they called this big desk the bench. I've  
7 heard a lot of stories, some of which I can't share with you.

8           But you could come up and answer the question over  
9 here. The only problem is it's not really private. You can  
10 see we're going to have twelve lawyers surrounding you, but  
11 you can come up if you need to. None of the questions will be  
12 asked in any way, shape or form to embarrass you, but simply  
13 to make sure that the lawyers have sufficient information to  
14 select from your number seven people to hear this case.

15           All right. So listen up. Now, when your name is  
16 called, Mr. Mace, the gentleman over here, who runs the  
17 courtroom, will show you where to sit. And then, if you have  
18 to respond to any questions, it would be most helpful if you  
19 would state your name each time and your number.

20           If you don't know your number, just let us know.  
21 Melissa will give it to you. And that way, the Court Reporter  
22 will identify each response that you make with your  
23 appropriate name and number. That's what the lawyers are  
24 having to use right now, forms with each of you on the number.  
25 So if you'll do that, it would be helpful.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Call the names of the panel.

2 MS. HAJDA: Juror No. 39, Carol Spreen.

3 THE COURT: There is no trophy for being first.

4 MS. HAJDA: No. 4, Joan Morgan, No. 80, Kristen  
5 Wierzowiecki, No. 55, Sheila Lankford, No. 70, Robert Hyman,  
6 No. 82, Jody Peterson, No. 74, Rob Steele, No. 26, Naomi  
7 Jenkins, No. 51, Douglas Duncan, No. 68, Mae Lebeau, No. 36,  
8 Jerome Gooch, No. 43, Laura Bost, No. 48, Karen Dillender, No.  
9 93, Dennis Case, and No. 57, Alexander Barrientes.

10 THE COURT: Now, all of those of you whose name  
11 Melissa screwed up, raise your right hand. Two. She's  
12 getting better. Over the years, she's getting better.

13 This case, as I indicated, will last today, tomorrow  
14 and Thursday and probably Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, maybe  
15 Thursday, depends on the deliberation. It will not go further  
16 than Friday of next week. Now, it may go into Friday, but I  
17 don't have a crystal -- well, I do. A fella gave me a crystal  
18 ball, and I look at it and everything's upside down. I can't  
19 ever tell anything about it one way or the other. But you'll  
20 be through in two weeks.

21 Now, is there anything, for whatever reason, valid  
22 reason, medical, somebody has a medical appointment or  
23 children, or parents, or that type of thing that you just  
24 wouldn't be able to serve those two weeks? All right. We'll  
25 start with you, ma'am. If you tell me your name.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE JUROR: Sheila Lankford. I'm Juror No. 55. I  
2 just had cancer surgery. I'm sole caretaker of my mother,  
3 who's 84, and my father --

4 THE COURT: I'm going to excuse you. All you had to  
5 do was make that telephone call that -- she's not near as mean  
6 as she looks -- and we would have been able to save you some  
7 time. So I'll excuse you and you may have a seat back over  
8 there, please, ma'am.

9 THE JUROR: Thank you. Yes, ma'am.

10 THE JUROR: I'm Kristen Wierzowiecki, No. 80, I  
11 believe. I actually start school on Monday, and I am a single  
12 mom.

13 THE COURT: Okay. What school -- do your children  
14 start school or you start school?

15 THE JUROR: No. I start school.

16 THE COURT: What school is that?

17 THE JUROR: It's in Round Rock, cosmetology school.

18 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'll excuse you.

19 THE JUROR: Okay.

20 THE COURT: I saw another hand. Yes, ma'am.

21 THE JUROR: Naomi Jenkins.

22 THE COURT: Don't think I'm easy.

23 THE JUROR: Juror No. 26. I am the care provider for  
24 my father who has a doctor's appointment on Friday. If this  
25 isn't on Friday, then that won't matter. I also have three

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 small children that I will have to put in daycare to cooperate  
2 with the jury duty. Two weeks is quite a lengthy time to --  
3 for that expense.

4 THE COURT: So you live in Round Rock?

5 THE JUROR: Yes, I do.

6 THE COURT: Child care people love to cooperate with  
7 me --

8 THE JUROR: Okay.

9 THE COURT: -- because we tell them, you know, we love  
10 to cooperate with you because you're down here serving your  
11 country --

12 THE JUROR: Okay.

13 THE COURT: -- and they don't like it, they could come  
14 down here, too. And they generally just love to cooperate.  
15 So I didn't think there's going to be a problem. Friday,  
16 you'll be able to take your dad to the doctor.

17 THE JUROR: Thank you.

18 THE COURT: All right. Yes, ma'am. Did you have your  
19 hand up?

20 THE JUROR: I'm Mae Lebeau. I'm juror No. 68. I  
21 would love to serve, but right now, I'm caretaker of my  
22 mother. My father just passed, and I'm sole provider and  
23 caretaker of my mother who's ill.

24 THE COURT: All right. I will excuse you, Ms. Lebeau.  
25 Give it a shot.



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE JUROR: I'm Carol Spreen, Juror No. 39. And I  
2 have a medical problem that sometimes I get an attack. I had  
3 a bone transplant in my neck, and I was on 500 milligrams of a  
4 pain reliever last week. I don't know.

5 THE COURT: You know, I think we'll just let you rest  
6 up a little bit, and call Melissa and when you're feeling a  
7 little bit better, we'll use you on another jury.

8 THE JUROR: I think so.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Yes, sir.

11 THE JUROR: No. 57, Alex Barrientes. I'm a teaching  
12 assistant at elementary school in the Special Ed division.  
13 It's a very one-on-one-based program.

14 THE COURT: What school?

15 THE JUROR: Anderson Mill Elementary in Round Rock  
16 District.

17 THE COURT: And on your Special Ed, have you already  
18 been assigned kids?

19 THE JUROR: Yes. School started a couple of weeks  
20 ago.

21 THE COURT: I'm not jumping on you, but this is the  
22 kind of thing. If y'all have something like this, you've got  
23 Special Ed kids that are dependent upon you or medical  
24 problem, all you have to do is -- you know, Melissa, that's  
25 all she does, just work with the jury panels. It's all she

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 does because we've got lots of juries. You're just one panel.  
2 We're dealing with two to four panels every week.

3 And so, we work as hard as we can to not inconvenience  
4 you. But we'll put you down. We'll let you be excused. You  
5 may sit and you may serve in the summer.

6 THE JUROR: Thank you.

7 THE COURT: Put him down for the summer. All right.  
8 We didn't do too hot. I want a little bit better draw.

9 MS. HAJDA: We're just going to start with seat No. 1,  
10 yes. No. 34, Carolyn Schneider, replacing No. 39, Carol  
11 Spreen.

12 THE COURT: Ms. Sneider, are you all right for these  
13 two weeks?

14 THE JUROR: Yes, sir. I promise.

15 THE COURT: All right. Ray of sunshine on a dark day.  
16 Getting darker.

17 MS. HAJDA: No. 14, Roger Chapa, replacing No. 80,  
18 Kristen Wierzowiecki.

19 THE COURT: Mr. Chapa, are you all right for those two  
20 weeks?

21 THE JUROR: Yes.

22 THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

23 MS. HAJDA: Juror No. 17, Vince Jackson, replacing No.  
24 55, Sheila Lankford.

25 THE COURT: Mr. Jackson, how about you for the next

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 two weeks?

2 THE JUROR: I've got diabetes and I've got asthma, and  
3 I have these attacks, like, if I stay too long. So I'd like  
4 to be excused, if I could.

5 THE JUROR: Are you under medication for both?

6 THE JUROR: Yes, sir.

7 THE COURT: All right. You may have a seat. Now, I  
8 know that 18 percent of you have diabetes. So I just want you  
9 to know that. All right. Call the next name.

10 MS. HAJDA: No. 78, Hayes Saxon, replacing No. 17,  
11 Vince Jackson.

12 THE COURT: Mr. Saxon, how about you, sir?

13 THE JUROR: Other than I'm a graduate of Texas A & M  
14 University, I don't --

15 THE COURT: Well, Mr. Jackson, I have two  
16 daughters-in-law that share that distinction, one son-in-law,  
17 and they sure have produced a lot of good grand-babies. So  
18 we'll let you serve. I jumped on the weatherman being wrong  
19 one day, and one of Austin's leading weatherperson's father  
20 was there, and he didn't much care for that either.

21 MS. HAJDA: Juror No. 45, Cheryl Hunter, replacing No.  
22 68, Mae Lebeau.

23 THE COURT: Ms. Hunter, are you all right for those  
24 two weeks?

25 THE JUROR: Well, I do the payroll for our company.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 If they can go without a paycheck for two weeks.

2 THE COURT: They'll just understand how important you  
3 are.

4 MS. HAJDA: No. 29, Jonathan Jones, replacing No. 57,  
5 Alexander Barrientes.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Jones, are you all right for the time?

7 THE JUROR: Yes, sir.

8 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Those of you  
9 haven't been called, stay on the edge of your seat and listen  
10 to the questions. If any of you have to be called, I will  
11 really ask you if what information you need to bring to the  
12 lawyers' attention rather than answer every single question.  
13 So listen to the questions and formulate how you would answer  
14 them.

15 Y'all are now the panelists. How quickly you become  
16 and get titles in federal court. This is a lawsuit that is a  
17 patents lawsuit, what we call an alleged patent infringement  
18 lawsuit. It's filed by Crossroads Systems, Incorporated, and  
19 it's -- one of its lawyers is Mr. John Allcock.

20 Mr. Allcock, if you will stand and introduce the folks  
21 at your table, please, sir.

22 MR. ALLCOCK: Thank you, your Honor. My name is John  
23 Allcock. I'm privileged to represent Crossroads here today.  
24 Let me introduce you, first, to the lawyer team that you'll be  
25 seeing in the course of the trial. To my left is Alan

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Albright, and that's Matt Bernstein to his left, and to my  
2 right is John Giust.

3 Now, let me introduce you to the two Crossroads  
4 representatives. First, Brian Smith is the chairman of the  
5 board and the CEO of the company. And Patty Prince is the  
6 general counsel at the company. Thank you, your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Anybody on the panel know any of the  
8 lawyers? They're associated with the law firm of Gray, Cary,  
9 Ware & Freidenrich. Anybody happen to know anybody from that  
10 law firm? Anybody have any dealings with ownership interest  
11 or business relations of any kind with Crossroads Systems,  
12 Incorporated?

13 All right. The defendant in this case is Chaparral  
14 Network Storage, Incorporated, and Mr. David Bahler is one of  
15 their lawyers and he'll introduce their team.

16 MR. BAHLER: Thank you, your Honor. My name is Dave  
17 Bahler. I'm with Fulbright & Jaworski here in Austin. To my  
18 right is Steve Dellett, also a lawyer with Fulbright. Behind  
19 me are Michael Barrett and Marc Garrett, also the lawyers with  
20 Fulbright. And my client representative is Mr. Jerry Walker,  
21 one of the founders of Chaparral Network Storage.

22 THE COURT: Anybody know anybody of these lawyers or  
23 anybody that's associated with the law firm of Fulbright &  
24 Jaworski? Anybody have any business dealings, relations with  
25 the Chaparral Network Storage, Incorporated, or any ownership

1 interest or have any business dealings at all?

2 Now, I want to tell you just a little bit about the  
3 lawsuit. There's a lot of paper involved, probably the  
4 pleadings -- I can't reach as high as the pleadings are. I  
5 just brought a portion of them in here in case I need them.  
6 So what I say is not evidence, but this is going to tell you  
7 just a little bit about what the lawsuit might be about so  
8 that it -- the questions might be more important and you might  
9 understand the questions that you're going to be asked.

10 The plaintiff, Crossroads Systems, is a developer, a  
11 manufacturer of what is known as storage router and storage  
12 solutions, and it holds the United States patent entitled  
13 storage router and method for providing virtual local storage.

14 The defendant, Chaparral Network Storage, manufactures  
15 and sells storage area network products for use in computer  
16 networks. Crossroads alleges that Chaparral's products  
17 infringe the claims of its patent and seeks compensatory  
18 damages for this alleged infringement.

19 Crossroads also alleges that the infringement was what  
20 is known in the law as a willful infringement. Chaparral  
21 denies that its products infringe the patent, but also alleges  
22 that the patent is not valid because: One, Crossroads was not  
23 the first to invent the patented router; two, that the  
24 description of the router in the patent application is  
25 unclear.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1           So the patent is what is known in the law as  
2 indefinite, and the patent is not enforceable because it's  
3 alleged that Crossroads failed to disclose material  
4 information at the Patents Office during the patent  
5 application process. And Chaparral contends that it owes no  
6 damages whatsoever.

7           So that's basically what this lawsuit is about. It's  
8 an alleged infringement as you will learn shortly, those of  
9 you selected to be a juror, that after a patent is issued,  
10 there is a presumption of validity of the patent, but a jury  
11 will determine whether the patent is valid or enforceable.

12           So now, is there anybody on the panel who knows of or  
13 ever heard of a storage router? Okay. I've got one. Name  
14 and number.

15           THE JUROR: 29, Jonathan Jones.

16           THE COURT: Okay. And do you use one?

17           THE JUROR: No.

18           THE COURT: Okay. Did you learn it in crossword  
19 puzzles or something?

20           THE JUROR: No. I work at Dell Computers.

21           THE COURT: So you know what a router is?

22           THE JUROR: Yes.

23           THE JUROR: Naomi Jenkins, Juror No. 26. I work for  
24 Advanced Micro Devices. Also, I've heard about it through  
25 professional deals.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE COURT: Do you use one?

2 THE JUROR: Personally no, but I'm sure our company  
3 uses many.

4 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

5 THE JUROR: Hayes Saxon, Juror No. 78. We do have a  
6 storage area network at our location.

7 THE COURT: All right. Do you use it yourself?

8 THE JUROR: No, I do not.

9 THE COURT: All right. And you mine as well give a  
10 plug for the employer.

11 THE JUROR: I'm sorry. Electronic Data Systems, EDS.

12 THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else know what a storage  
13 router is?

14 All right. Let's start off with some basic, just  
15 hands-up questions. How many of you use a computer in your  
16 work? Now, lawyers are slow, so keep them up for just a  
17 minute. I tell you what's better. Put your hands down. How  
18 many of you don't? Okay. Those three. How many of you have  
19 and use a computer at home? All right. How many don't? All  
20 right.

21 All right. We've already gotten at least three that  
22 work in the computer industry. Let's see how many others work  
23 in the computer industry. How many in the front row work in  
24 any way, shape or form in the computer industry all the way to  
25 selling computers at wherever they sell them?



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 All right. We've got both of you and your names. Why  
2 don't you tell us what you do. Name and number again, sir.  
3 Yes, sir. And that's a good idea. See, he's got good sight.  
4 And y'all think I can see you but you're wrong. I do my best  
5 faking. I know there are people out there because Mr. Mace is  
6 standing between you and me, but help me out.

7 THE JUROR: My name is Hayes Saxon, Juror 78. I'm an  
8 advanced system administrator with EDS. I do network  
9 engineering and, also, web design.

10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

11 THE JUROR: Naomi Jenkins, Juror No. 26. I work for a  
12 engineering group called Advanced Process Control. We work  
13 with automating the manufacturing process.

14 THE COURT: Thank you. Second row. Anybody in the  
15 engine -- in the computer industry? Yes, sir.

16 THE JUROR: Jonathan Jones, Juror 29. I work in the  
17 finance group within Dell, and I work in the planning and  
18 budgeting.

19 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anyone on the  
20 panel own a patent? Okay. You're going to get to say your  
21 name and number.

22 THE JUROR: Naomi Jenkins, No. 26. I have a patent  
23 for an analysis process for Advanced Process Control.

24 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anybody else on  
25 the panel? Anybody else applied for a patent? Well, my third

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 son writes music, and I don't know that you're ever going to  
2 hear it. I hope that you might, but he applies and gets  
3 copyrights.

4 Anybody on the panel own a copyright? Yes, sir.

5 THE JUROR: Robert Hyman, Juror No. 77, and I have  
6 music copyrights.

7 THE COURT: What do you have copyrights on?

8 THE JUROR: About 35 songs.

9 THE COURT: Songs? Good. I hope we get to hear  
10 yours. Anybody else on the copyright that you've applied for  
11 a copyright? All right. Anybody on the panel, other than  
12 this lady here, invented anything that you have utilized?

13 How many of you are familiar with the process of  
14 getting a patent? Yes, ma'am. Tell me your name and number.

15 THE JUROR: Joan Morgan, Juror No. 4. My husband  
16 invented a patent.

17 THE COURT: Okay. What did he attempt to patent?

18 THE JUROR: For a tool.

19 THE COURT: Okay. And did he get one?

20 THE JUROR: No.

21 THE COURT: Okay. But you're familiar with how he  
22 went about it?

23 THE JUROR: Yes, sir.

24 THE COURT: All right. Anybody else familiar with the  
25 process? Anybody ever heard of a company called Pathlight

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Technology? Anybody ever heard of a company called ADIC?

2 Okay. That's all right. Name and number.

3 THE JUROR: Hayes Saxon, Juror No. 78.

4 THE COURT: Okay. And what is -- have you ever had  
5 any relationship in any way with ADIC?

6 THE JUROR: Yes, sir. In a previous position, I  
7 actually purchased one of their tape stored libraries, and we  
8 currently use their products at our location here.

9 THE COURT: All right. Never worked for them?

10 THE JUROR: Never worked for them.

11 THE COURT: All right. Anybody else? All right. How  
12 many of you have any formal or practical accounting experience  
13 where you do accounting work? Yes, sir.

14 THE JUROR: Jonathan Jones, Juror 29. I work in the  
15 budgeting side of the company.

16 THE COURT: All right. You do payrolls?

17 THE JUROR: Yes, sir.

18 THE COURT: I count that as accounting sometimes when  
19 I -- back in the days when I worked.

20 THE JUROR: Only part I do are the journal entries.  
21 My name is Cheryl Hunter, Juror No. 45.

22 THE COURT: All right. Anybody? Yes, ma'am.

23 THE JUROR: Caroline Schneider, No. 34. I'm also a  
24 bookkeeper, accounting for 15 years.

25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anybody else?

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Accounting experience.

2 THE JUROR: Joan Morgan, No. 4. I did accounting --  
3 not accounting, bookkeeping in the old days.

4 THE COURT: Okay. And in the old days, who did you do  
5 it for?

6 THE JUROR: K-Mart.

7 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else? All  
8 right. How many of you have college degrees, just raise your  
9 hand and keep them up. All right. And how many of you have  
10 high school degrees? Keep them up. I believe I've covered  
11 this, but let me ask you this again. How many of you have  
12 developed or helped developed a computer program? Any kind of  
13 program?

14 All right. I know three of you are going to answer  
15 that. You've got your hands up. Anybody else? All right.  
16 How many of you believe that you're experienced and  
17 knowledgeable in computer security? Okay. Name and number  
18 again. That's all right.. You can keep your seat.

19 THE JUROR: Hayes Saxon, Juror No. 78.

20 THE COURT: I don't want to wear you out. Anybody  
21 ever been associated with a firm called Infinity Comm Stor?  
22 Anybody ever know anybody that worked for the United States  
23 Patents Office? How many of you have now or in the past  
24 operated your own business? All right. Again, we'll get  
25 names and numbers, please.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE JUROR: Carolyn Schneider, 34. I had my own  
2 jewelry business.

3 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.

4 THE JUROR: Hayes Saxon, Juror No. 78. I ran a  
5 painting business when I was in college.

6 THE COURT: Okay.

7 THE JUROR: Robert --

8 THE COURT: When you say painting business, outside  
9 painting?

10 THE JUROR: Primarily interior of apartments.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 THE JUROR: Robert Hyman, Juror 70. I had a roofing  
13 company.

14 THE COURT: All right.

15 THE JUROR: Rob Steele, 74. I own a construction  
16 company.

17 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

18 THE JUROR: Cheryl Hunter, Juror No. 45. I was in  
19 business with my husband, Hunter Gourmet Salsas.

20 THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else? Each of the parties  
21 here are corporations. A corporation is a legal entity in the  
22 law, just like a person is, just like a partnership is, just  
23 like an association is, and under the Constitution, they're  
24 entitled to equal treatment under the law. One corporation is  
25 a Texas corporation. It is a Colorado corporation.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1           Of course, corporations are owned by people, so  
2 they're really people, they're not a legal entity. Is there  
3 anybody on the panel who would not be able, for any reason, to  
4 treat either one of these corporations equally, starting out?

5           Now. Mr. Allcock, if you'd read the list of the  
6 witnesses. I've asked the lawyers to have an inclusive list  
7 of witnesses, that is, people that may be called. A lot of  
8 these people will not be called. Don't be alarmed by the  
9 length, but if you hear a name that you think you might know,  
10 if you'll raise your hand, he'll stop, and we'll ask you about  
11 them.

12           MR. ALLCOCK: Thank you, your Honor. Brian Smith,  
13 John Middleton, Brian Bianchi, Geoff Hoese, Jeff Russell,  
14 Keith Arroyo, Paul Hodges, Ken Kuffner, Paul Regan, David  
15 Zinger, Robert Selinger, Michael Gluck, Russ Bleakely. And  
16 although not called a witness that you'll hear mentioned, not  
17 infrequently, is Dale Quisenberry.

18           THE COURT: Yes, sir.

19           THE JUROR: John Middleton live in Austin?

20           MR. ALLCOCK: He does.

21           THE JUROR: I possibly know him.

22           THE COURT: Now, let's don't take -- I run this show.

23           THE JUROR: Okay. I'm sorry.

24           THE COURT: It's all right. You're doing all right.

25           But I need your name and number.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE JUROR: I'm sorry, Rob Steele, Juror No. 74.

2 THE COURT: This gentleman that you may know, is it a  
3 business relationship in any way?

4 THE JUROR: No, sir.

5 THE COURT: The fact that he may be a witness, would  
6 you be able to evaluate his testimony as you would any other  
7 that you don't know?

8 THE JUROR: Yes.

9 THE COURT: So it's not a witness like your brother  
10 come in and you wouldn't listen to him at all or something?

11 THE JUROR: No.

12 THE COURT: All right. Anybody else know any of those  
13 folks? All right. Mr. Bahler, if you'd read the list of your  
14 witnesses, please.

15 MR. BAHLER: Ian Davies, Kenneth Flamm, George  
16 Kalwitz, Stan Manzanaras, Gary Stephens, Jerry Walker, Barbara  
17 Bardach, William Hulsey, Bill Hulsey, Paul LiVolsi, Rick  
18 Luttrall, Theodore -- Ted Neman, Brad Painter, Alan Permut,  
19 Robert Sims and Neil Wanamaker.

20 THE COURT: Anybody think you may know any of those  
21 folks? How many of you know what a SCSI is?

22 THE JUROR: SCSI? SCSI cable?

23 THE COURT: S-C-S-I. Yes, you just gave it away. Two  
24 of you. Okay. Those of you in the first row, how many of you  
25 have filed a lawsuit, had a lawsuit filed against you, or your

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 company, or employer where you were involved or been a witness  
2 either in a courtroom or in what we call a deposition? How  
3 many of you had that experience, litigation experience? Okay.  
4 We'll start with you, ma'am.

5 THE JUROR: Schneider, No. 34. I work for a physician  
6 which we had a medical lawsuit against one of our physicians,  
7 and I had to participate in a deposition.

8 THE COURT: About how long ago?

9 THE JUROR: Probably ten years ago.

10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ma'am. Yes, sir.

11 THE JUROR: Robert Hyman, Juror 70. I was working for  
12 a manufacturing company and I had an injury, and it was an  
13 injury lawsuit.

14 THE COURT: And did you participate as a witness?

15 THE JUROR: Yes, I did.

16 THE COURT: About how long ago?

17 THE JUROR: Five years ago.

18 THE JUROR: Rob Steele, No. 74. I've had several  
19 safety-related lawsuits against our company. They've never  
20 gone to trial.

21 THE COURT: Have you been deposed?

22 THE JUROR: Yes.

23 THE COURT: And when is the last time?

24 THE JUROR: About three years ago.

25 THE COURT: All right.



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE JUROR: I had to give a deposition once about a  
2 criminal assault case.

3 THE COURT: Okay. About how long ago?

4 THE JUROR: Naomi Jenkins, Juror No. 26. Twelve  
5 years.

6 THE COURT: All right. Anybody in the second row have  
7 any litigation experience? Yes, ma'am.

8 THE JUROR: Karen Dillender, Juror No. 48. About 20  
9 years ago, it was a real estate. I owned some property and  
10 they were going to foreclose on it, but it was taken care of.

11 THE COURT: Did you have to be a witness anywhere?

12 THE JUROR: No. But I had to give a --

13 THE COURT: Deposition?

14 THE JUROR: Yes.

15 THE COURT: Anybody else? All right. Those of you  
16 who had that experience, was it so good or so bad that you  
17 cannot just make it go away? Don't let it influence you at  
18 all. If you can't make the pledge that it will not influence  
19 you, raise your hand.

20 How many of you have been on juries before on the  
21 front row? Yes, sir.

22 THE JUROR: Rob Steele, No. 74. I served in San  
23 Marcos several times.

24 THE COURT: Okay.

25 THE JUROR: Hays County.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE COURT: Civil or criminal or both?

2 THE JUROR: Both.

3 THE COURT: And have you reached a verdict in those  
4 cases?

5 THE JUROR: Yes, sir, we did.

6 THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else on the front row? How  
7 about the second row? Anybody, yes, ma'am.

8 THE JUROR: Cheryl Hunter, Juror No. 45. San Marcos,  
9 civil and we reached a verdict.

10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anybody else on  
11 the back row? All right. The two of you, was that experience  
12 so great or so bad that it would influence you in this case?

13 THE JUROR: No.

14 THE JUROR: I'm here.

15 THE COURT: The answer is "Yes" or "No."

16 THE JUROR: No.

17 THE JUROR: No, it would not affect me.

18 THE COURT: All right. How many of you have had that  
19 incredible experience of going to law school? How many of you  
20 have now or in the past worked for a law firm or lawyers?  
21 Anybody married to or have children who are lawyers?

22 One of the important questions that I ask in a case  
23 like this is how many of you will under your oath state that  
24 you will follow the Court's instructions at the end of the  
25 case? Now, I've never had everyone leap up and say, "I won't

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 follow them." But it's very important because you, as a  
2 juror, will be the exclusive judges of the facts; that is,  
3 you'll make the facts in this lawsuit. You'll determine from  
4 the evidence what actually happened and the factual issues.

5 But you'll be obligated to follow the instructions on  
6 the law which you'll have orally and you'll have in writing  
7 when you make your determination to the facts. And you're not  
8 at liberty to think, well, the law ought to be something else.  
9 You'll be under an obligation to follow the legal instructions  
10 where you think they're right, wrong or indifferent.

11 Now, is there anybody who can't make that commitment  
12 and that is to follow the legal instructions? Because we all  
13 will rely on the fact that the jury will.

14 How many of you, if any, knew anybody else on the  
15 panel before you came here today? Anybody know any of the  
16 federal court staff that works here or at the Thornberry  
17 Center? All right. I'll have the lawyers up here, please.

18 (At the Bench, on the record.)

19 THE COURT: Do you have any additional questions?

20 MR. ALBRIGHT: We do, your Honor. One juror, No. 82,  
21 Jody Peterson.

22 THE COURT: You have to speak a little louder.

23 MR. ALBRIGHT: Juror No. 82, Jody Peterson.

24 THE COURT: Okay.

25 MR. ALBRIGHT: I guess in the form under employment

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 and as prior employment in a -- if he could just give us a  
2 hint.

3 THE COURT: Who is it?

4 MR. ALBRIGHT: No. 82. I believe that's 82, Peterson.

5 MR. ALLCOCK: See No. 6, your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Is it a man?

7 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yeah.

8 THE COURT: It's a man. Okay.

9 MR. ALBRIGHT: He hasn't answered anything to  
10 anything. The other is Mr. 74, Rob Steele. He said he knew  
11 Mr. Middleton, and I think we need to know how he knows John  
12 Middleton.

13 MR. BAHLER: That applies to my question.

14 THE COURT: Y'all just stay right here. Mr. Peterson.

15 THE JUROR: Yes.

16 THE COURT: What type of work do you do, sir?

17 THE JUROR: I'm a stay-at-home dad.

18 THE COURT: I have a son that does that..

19 THE JUROR: Yeah.

20 THE COURT: And those kids are some of the best  
21 grandkids. What is the last work you did?

22 THE JUROR: Maintenance engineering.

23 THE COURT: All right.

24 THE JUROR: Commercial.

25 THE COURT: Are you married?

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE JUROR: Widowed.

2 THE COURT: And where do you live?

3 THE JUROR: Near Lexington.

4 THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Steel, I need to know how  
5 you know Mr. Middleton.

6 THE JUROR: If it's the same person.

7 THE COURT: If it is. I don't know if it is.

8 THE JUROR: He is a cousin.

9 THE COURT: A what?

10 THE JUROR: He's related to me. He would be a cousin  
11 -- second cousin.

12 THE COURT: Now, there are cousins and cousins. Let  
13 me ask you this and see if I can get out of this hole. Tell  
14 me the frequency that you might run into him.

15 THE JUROR: I see him once every ten years.

16 THE COURT: Okay. Well, you got me out of the hole.  
17 Any other questions?

18 MR. ALLCOCK: No.

19 THE COURT: All right. Members of the jury, for those  
20 of you out there, as well as here, that have that terrible  
21 habit of smoking, just like junior high school, you go out the  
22 front door. Don't let the -- Mr. Mace doesn't smoke, but the  
23 Security Officers will race you to the door.

24 Those of you in the box, talk about everything you  
25 want except this case. Don't talk about this case. Those of

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 you out here, it's America; you can talk about anything as  
2 long as you don't let these folks hear you. So talk about  
3 anything but the case.

4 And y'all be back and sit anywhere you want, but I  
5 want you to be back and be in the same seat that you are now.  
6 And I'm going to give a 20-minute recess. Twenty minutes.

7 (Jury not present.)

8 THE COURT: If the plaintiff will state your  
9 peremptories in the record, please.

10 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir. Mr. Hayes Saxon, No. 78.

11 THE COURT: Poor guy got doubled, probably.

12 MR. ALBRIGHT: Ms. Naomi Jenkins, No. 26. Mr.  
13 Jonathan Jones, No. 29.

14 THE COURT: Just don't want anybody that understands  
15 this case. Go ahead.

16 MR. ALBRIGHT: And Mr. Rob Steele, No. 79, I believe.

17 THE COURT: Any objection, exceptions, or Batson  
18 challenges to any of the peremptories of the plaintiff?

19 MR. BAHLER: No, your Honor.

20 THE COURT: I'll have the defendant read their  
21 challenges in the record.

22 MR. BAHLER: No. 26, Jenkins, No. 48, Dillender, No.  
23 -- I'm sorry, No. 43, Bost, and No. 14, Chapa.

24 THE COURT: Any exceptions, objections, or Batson  
25 challenges on any of the defendant's peremptories?

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 MR. ALBRIGHT: No, your Honor.

2 THE COURT: The Court finds no basis for a Batson  
3 challenge. The Clerk will read the jury selected.

4 THE CLERK: Juror No. 34, Carolyn Schneider, Juror No.  
5 4, Joan Morgan, Juror No. 70, Robert Hyman, Juror No. 82, Jody  
6 Peterson, Juror No. 51, Douglas Duncan, Juror No. 45, Cheryl  
7 Hunter and Juror No. 36, Jereme Gooch.

8 THE COURT: The jury acceptable to the plaintiff?

9 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir.

10 THE COURT: Acceptable to the defense?

11 MR. BAHLER: Yes, your Honor.

12 THE COURT: All right. Let's go select them.

13 (Jury present.)

14 THE COURT: Members of the jury panel, the Clerk is  
15 going to read the names of those persons who have been  
16 selected. If your name is read, if you'll simply stand at  
17 your chair, please.

18 THE CLERK: Juror No. 34, Carolyn Schneider, Juror No.  
19 4, Joan Morgan, Juror No. 70, Robert Hyman, Juror No. 82, Jody  
20 Peterson, Juror No. 51, Douglas Duncan, Juror No. 45, Cheryl  
21 Hunter, and Juror No. 36, Jereme Gooch.

22 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm  
23 going to put you in the custody of Mr. Mace, who's going to  
24 show you where the jury room is. And then, everybody else  
25 that desires to is going to be able to be released. And then,

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 we'll bring you back in and we'll start the hearing. So those  
2 of you selected, please go with Mr. Mace, he'll show you the  
3 jury room and the way to come in and out of that jury room.

4 (Jury exited.)

5 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury panel,  
6 that's the only case I have because I'm trying it for two  
7 weeks, so I can't give you another opportunity today, but I  
8 will give you another opportunity, I hope, to serve as a jury.

9 It is, of course, to me the most important  
10 responsibility that each of you have because since 1963, I've  
11 been trying cases, and I've been fortunate to go throughout  
12 the world. And we have the best system of justice because  
13 people are the ones who run our system.

14 When I came here in 1991, I got half this docket, 960  
15 plus cases, civil and three and a half years of behind  
16 criminal. Judge Nowlin took the other half. He had had the  
17 entire docket until then. And through jury panel after jury  
18 panel after jury panel, we are now trying cases ten months,  
19 eleven months after the lawsuit has been filed, and we're  
20 current on our criminal docket. And the reason only that we  
21 can do that is you folks come in for jury service.

22 So we appreciate it and which -- there's not anything  
23 wrong than having a trial hanging over your head whether you  
24 -- no matter what side you're on, and so when you come in, I  
25 appreciate it. The jury service used to be six months in



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 federal court. When you were tied up, you were tied up for  
2 six months.

3 And every first Monday of every month, you would come  
4 in, and we'd select juries for that month. We cut it back to  
5 two months. So I don't know if you'll be back or not, because  
6 we have a lot of numbers, probably you will be back. Remember  
7 that it's not that much out of your life to fulfill that  
8 responsibility.

9 Those of you who have been on juries know how  
10 difficult it is at the end of the evidence to make those  
11 decisions that affect people's lives. It's so much better for  
12 each of you who have your everyday walk of life to come in and  
13 make those decisions than it is for judges to do it. We see  
14 the same thing time and time and time again.

15 So I'm going to release you today. Be careful going  
16 back to your homes. I appreciate your coming in. And when  
17 you get that call and come in, if you have a problem, call  
18 Melissa. Now, if it's just trying to get out of jury verdict,  
19 I can -- I mean jury duty, I can smell that a mile away, and  
20 I'll tell her no, you tell them to come in. But if you've got  
21 some problem, she'll work it out with you where we want you at  
22 your most convenient spot because it's a lot cheaper for the  
23 taxpayer to do it.

24 Y'all may be excused with the thanks of the Court.  
25 (Jury venire exited.)

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE COURT: Counsel, in addition to the preliminary  
2 instructions I intend to give the jury, I am also going to  
3 allow them to take notes during this trial. Any objections  
4 I'll hear them now.

5 MR. ALBRIGHT: Not from us, your Honor.

6 MR. BAHLER: No objection, your Honor.

7 THE COURT: All right. Counsel, does either side or  
8 both wish to invoke the Rule?

9 MR. ALBRIGHT: We do, your Honor.

10 MR. BAHLER: Yes, your Honor

11 (Jury present.)

12 THE COURT: Members of the jury, I open court every  
13 day and every day after the noon hour with three questions.  
14 Those questions are very important and I -- it requires an  
15 oral answer to each of you from each of you, and, of course,  
16 you remain under oath.

17 But the questions are: Has anybody attempted to talk  
18 to you about this case? Have you talked to anybody about the  
19 case? Have you learned anything at all about the case outside  
20 the presence of one another and this courtroom?

21 The reason these questions are very important is that  
22 the seven of you are to hear the evidence at the same time and  
23 only the evidence that you hear together. And you'll have all  
24 of the exhibits with you when I ask you the questions to  
25 resolve at the end of the presentation of the evidence.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1           But when you go home, your family members or your  
2 friends are going to ask, you know, what kind of case is it,  
3 what did they do, that type of thing, and if you talk to them  
4 about that, they may say something that might influence you  
5 but the other six did not hear, and that's the reason we ask  
6 you not to talk about the case to anybody.

7           That includes yourselves. The law does not want the  
8 jurors to talk during the trial about themselves, about the  
9 case until they've heard all of the evidence, and at that  
10 time, then only when all seven of you are within hearing  
11 distance are you to discuss the case because the whole theory  
12 of our jurisprudence is that the jurors hear the case at the  
13 same time and decide the case at the same time so that there  
14 are no individual influences that are involved.

15           So let's practice. Has anybody attempted to talk to  
16 you about this case? Now, a shake of the head won't do it.  
17 She cannot get a shake in that machine. Now, she tried but  
18 she can't. Yes or no?

19           THE JURORS: No.

20           THE COURT: Have you talked to anybody about this  
21 case?

22           THE JURORS: No.

23           THE COURT: And have you learned anything at all about  
24 the case outside the presence of each other and this court  
25 room?

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE JURORS: No?

2 THE COURT: All right. If you'll stand, please, and  
3 be sworn as the jury.

4 THE CLERK: Each of you raise your right hand, please.  
5 Do you and each of you solemnly swear or affirm that in the  
6 case of Crossroads Systems, Inc. vs. Chaparral Network  
7 Storage, Inc. that you will a true verdict render according to  
8 the law as it may be given to you in charge by the Court and  
9 to the evidence as submitted to you under the rulings of the  
10 Court, so help you God?

11 (Affirmative responses given.)

12 THE COURT: Let the record reflect that each juror had  
13 a negative answer to the first three questions and affirmative  
14 answer to the oath.

15 Now, members of the jury, this case is a dispute  
16 relating to a United States patent. Patents are issued by the  
17 United States Patent and Trademark Office, which will be  
18 referred to as the PTO, for the protection of an invention.

19 The purpose of a patent is to promote the progress of  
20 science and technology. A valid United States patent gives  
21 the inventor or the patent holder the right for a period of  
22 time to keep others from making, using, offering to sell, or  
23 selling the patented invention within the United States or for  
24 importing it into the United States without the patent  
25 holder's permission.

1           A violation of the patent holder's rights is called an  
2 infringement. A patent also gives the patent holder the right  
3 to keep others from contributing to an infringement by someone  
4 else and from actively inducing others to infringement.

5           The patent holder may seek to enforce a patent against  
6 persons believing to be infringers by filing a lawsuit in  
7 federal court. To obtain a patent, a person must file an  
8 application with the PTO. The PTO is an agency of the federal  
9 government and has technically educated examiners who review  
10 the applications for patents.

11           The application includes what is called a  
12 specification which must contain a written description of the  
13 claimed invention, telling what the invention is, how it  
14 works, how to make it and how to use it so others skilled in  
15 the field will know how to make or use it.

16           The specification must also contain a description of  
17 what the inventor believed at the time of the filing to be the  
18 best way of making or using the invention. The specification  
19 concludes with one or more numbered sentences, and these are  
20 what are called patent claims. The purpose of the claims is to  
21 specify what the applicant considers the invention so it could  
22 be understood by anyone in the ordinary skill in the field.

23           When the patent is eventually issued by the PTO, the  
24 claims define the boundaries of the claimed invention and give  
25 notice to the public of those boundaries. After the applicant

1 files the application, the PTO patent examiner will review the  
2 patent application to determine whether the claims are  
3 patentable and whether the specification adequately describes  
4 the invention claimed.

5 In examining a patent application, the patent examiner  
6 makes a search of the PTO records for what is referred to as  
7 prior art. Prior art is defined by law. And I will give you,  
8 at a later time, specific instructions as to what constitutes  
9 prior art.

10 However, in general, prior art includes things which  
11 existed before the claimed invention that were publicly known  
12 or offered for sale for more than a year before the  
13 application, or used in a publicly accessible way in this  
14 country, or that were patented or described in a publication  
15 in any country.

16 The examiner considers, among other things, whether  
17 each claim defines an invention that is new, useful and not  
18 obvious in view of the prior art. Prior art considered by the  
19 examiner is listed on the patent and is often referred to as  
20 cited references. After the prior art search and examination  
21 of the application, the patent examiner then advises the  
22 applicant in writing what the examiner has found and whether  
23 any claim is being allowed.

24 This writing for the patent examiner is called an  
25 office action. And often, the first office action by the

1 examiner rejects the claims. The applicant then responds to  
2 this and sometimes changes the claims or submits new claims.  
3 The process may go back and forth between the patent examiner  
4 and the applicant for some time until the examiner is  
5 satisfied that the application and claims meet the  
6 requirements for patentability.

7 The papers generated during this time of communicating  
8 back and forth between the patent examiner and the applicant  
9 is what is called a prosecution history. And all of this  
10 material is kept secret by the -- between the applicant and  
11 the PTO until the patent is issued. At the time of issuance,  
12 the patent becomes available to the public.

13 The fact that the PTO issues a patent, however, does  
14 not necessarily mean that any invention claimed in the patent  
15 is, in fact, deserving of patent protection. A person accused  
16 of infringement has the right to argue in federal court that a  
17 claimed invention in a patent application does not meet the  
18 requirements for patentability, and therefore, the issued  
19 patent claim is invalid.

20 In this case, the plaintiff, Crossroads Systems.  
21 Incorporated, has been issued and is the holder of a United  
22 States patent 5941972. It will be referred to as the 972  
23 patent. This patent relates to what is entitled storage  
24 router and method for providing virtual local storage.

25 The plaintiff, Crossroads Systems, alleges that

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Chaparral Network Storage has infringed this patent through  
2 what is known as literal infringement as well as infringement  
3 under the doctrine of equivalents. The plaintiff, Crossroads  
4 Systems, additionally alleges that the defendant, Chaparral  
5 Network Storage, induced others by -- regarding claims under  
6 this patent and that it -- excuse me, induced infringement by  
7 others regarding the claims under the patent and that it  
8 contributorily infringed claims under the patent.

9 The plaintiff, Crossroads Storage, also alleges that  
10 the infringement was willful and entitles it to compensatory  
11 damages for these infringements. The defendant, Chaparral  
12 Network Storage, denies that its products infringe the patent  
13 in any way.

14 The defendant, Chaparral Network Storage, further  
15 contends that the claims of the 972 patent are not valid as  
16 they were anticipated by prior art, that they were due to  
17 obviousness, that they were indefinite, and that they're  
18 unenforceable due to inequitable conduct during the  
19 application of the patent.

20 I will, of course, give you further instructions when  
21 I have heard the evidence and will give you specific  
22 definitions and descriptions of these terms. I'm giving you a  
23 copy of what is referred to as a verdict form, which is a list  
24 of questions that may be submitted to you for determination at  
25 the end of the evidence.



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1           There may be modifications on these questions, but  
2 basically, these are the questions that you may be asked, and  
3 I'm giving a copy to each of you so that you can think about  
4 these questions as you hear the evidence and listen to the  
5 lawyers proceed in the trial.

6           Basically, your job will be to decide whether certain  
7 claims of the 972 patent had been infringed and whether those  
8 claims are valid. If you decide that the claims have been  
9 infringed and that they are not invalid or unenforceable, the  
10 plaintiff is entitled to compensatory damages established by  
11 the evidence.

12           Now, the lawyers will be more specific in detail in  
13 their opening statements, and I believe you will find this  
14 case to be interesting and will fully understand the issues to  
15 be determined by you at the end of the presentation of the  
16 evidence in this case.

17           Don't feel lost as you proceed along. Wait and keep  
18 an open mind. Don't make any decisions before you've heard  
19 all of the evidence and have had the opportunity to discuss  
20 that evidence with your fellow jurors.

21           Now, the case will begin at 1:30 this afternoon with  
22 each side making an opening statement. The opening statement  
23 is not evidence, but it should give you an outline to help you  
24 understand what the evidence will be presented and the reasons  
25 for that presentation.

1           The plaintiff, who has the burden of proving  
2 infringement and damages, will be allowed to call its  
3 witnesses first. The plaintiff's counsel will then ask the  
4 witnesses that they call their questions, then the defendant's  
5 counsel has the right to ask questions. And then, the  
6 plaintiff's counsel has the right to finish up with the  
7 witness and ask questions.

8           And we'll proceed all the way through all of the  
9 witnesses that the plaintiff will call, and then, the process  
10 turns around. The defendant will call the witnesses that the  
11 defendant wants, and the defendant's lawyer will answer -- ask  
12 the questions first and last.

13           When all of the evidence has been presented, it is my  
14 responsibility to prepare the legal instructions for you. I  
15 will then give a copy to the lawyers. I will read them to  
16 you, as I'm required to do, but I also give them to you in  
17 writing, and you'll have that in the deliberation room when it  
18 is time to deliberate.

19           You will also have your total recall of the evidence.  
20 We've known since the 1950s that a jury of five or more people  
21 in a trial that lasts no more than two weeks retains 90  
22 percent of everything that goes on in the courtroom, not just  
23 the evidence but everything else that goes in.

24           So listen to the evidence. All of the exhibits, that  
25 is, the documents admitted into evidence, you will have when

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 you deliberate, and the lawyers will tell you at the end of  
2 the case which ones they think are the most important that you  
3 should review, if any, and you will make your determination  
4 from the evidence.

5 Now, the evidence is going to come in three forms.  
6 The evidence is going to come in the answers under oath by the  
7 witnesses, not the questions, not what the lawyers say, but  
8 the answers and the documents I admit into evidence. And  
9 sometimes there's stipulations.

10 For example, the lawyers could stipulate today was  
11 Tuesday and didn't have to bring anybody with a calendar. Or  
12 they could stipulate that it rained a minute ago, and you  
13 won't have to look out the window and see that it rained. It  
14 would be a fact that's not in dispute, and they're going to  
15 try to save you time by saying you can rely upon this fact  
16 because we agree upon it.

17 Now, I'm going to allow you in this case, because of  
18 the nature of the case, to take notes. So when you come back  
19 at 1:30, Mr. Mace will give each one of you a notebook and you  
20 take notes, but the notes are just for you. Take whatever  
21 notes that you think are important, but remember, just like  
22 when you're back in school, when you're writing something out,  
23 you're forgetting to listen. So just take things that are  
24 important.

25 And when you get back there to deliberate, remember

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 that the notes are just for you to remind you of certain  
2 things. You're not to share your notes with anybody. You're  
3 not to become a witness by saying this is what my notes say.  
4 It's just a personal reminder to you so that you can discuss  
5 with your other jurors what your view of the evidence is.

6 Also remember that at the end of the case, Mr. Mace  
7 takes the notebooks back. So don't write the Judge is fat or  
8 something like that on them because we have to look at them  
9 afterwards. Little pictures are fine, but as long as we don't  
10 understand them, but remember that they become part of the  
11 record.

12 Your job in this case will be to find the facts.  
13 You'll see from the verdict form basically the type of  
14 questions that are going to be asked. And in our system of  
15 justice, the jury finds -- you have exclusive authority to  
16 find the facts, whatever you find in the facts will stand up.

17 My job is to determine what evidence that you should  
18 base it on. I may sustain an objection to evidence. The  
19 lawyers are obligated to bring my attention by objection to  
20 evidence that they think that you may not should see legally  
21 or should rely on. If I sustain the objection, that means  
22 that you probably won't hear the evidence. But don't try to  
23 guess at what it was or think it's important.

24 If I overrule the objection, that means that you'll  
25 hear the evidence, but, again, don't think it's more important

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 than anything else because we've gone to school for three long  
2 years and we've gotten lots of scar tissue in courtrooms  
3 learning what the Rules of Evidence are.

4 Sometimes you'll hear evidence and I may turn to you  
5 and I'll say, members of the jury, I'm going to instruct you,  
6 you cannot rely upon that evidence in any way, shape or form.  
7 I'm not telling you to forget it because I can't tell you to  
8 erase what you've heard, but I'm telling you don't rely on  
9 this evidence for any purpose when you're determining the  
10 answers to the questions.

11 So, basically, that's how the case will go. Now, the  
12 lawyers, before they make their opening statements, want to  
13 set up the courtroom so that we can have some presentation  
14 that will assist you in getting you in the case and get you to  
15 understand the mechanism of this invention.

16 You're very fortunate because the lawyers are good.  
17 And don't feel lost, you'll catch up pretty quickly, and  
18 you'll find out what this case is about. I think you'll find  
19 it very interesting.

20 Remember the instructions now. I'm going to release  
21 you until 1:25. For those of you who are not familiar with  
22 downtown, there's some restaurants right down the street here.  
23 For those of you who, like myself, don't need lunch or don't  
24 want lunch, just walk in right over here, even though it looks  
25 like it has stopped raining.

1           Those of you who have not seen the Capitol that has  
2       been redone, it is fantastic. I recommend that you do that.  
3       Be but be back at 1:25. Mr. Mace will show you where to be  
4       here. And we'll try to start promptly at 1:30.

5           (Jury not present.)

6           THE COURT: You've got two hours.

7           MR. ALBRIGHT: Sir, may I raise one issue for  
8       housekeeping purposes?

9           THE COURT: Sure.

10          MR. ALBRIGHT: What we are planning to do -- and we've  
11       given notice to Fulbright about -- is after opening arguments,  
12       which would just ballparking take about an hour and a half  
13       total, we've got three witnesses lined up to go, which we  
14       think will take the remainder of the afternoon.

15          Ballparking, we'll go through about 4:30. Is that  
16       sufficient for you because we are going to start with more  
17       technical witnesses in the morning, and we believe it won't  
18       have an impact on when the plaintiff's case is going to get  
19       over with, anyway.

20          But I just wanted to make sure after three witnesses,  
21       you didn't want -- you weren't going to look up and say, "I'd  
22       like another one." But that's what we are planning on doing  
23       today, if that's all right with you.

24          THE COURT: Well, you know, I've been at this job  
25       almost ten years. I've never said I want another one, I'd

1 like another one. But the answer in this meek little  
2 argument, we will go a full day today. But we'll see. I  
3 don't want to give them too much, but on the other hand, this  
4 is Tuesday and we'll just see how. I don't anticipate  
5 quitting at 4:30.

6 MR. ALBRIGHT: Thank you, your Honor.

7 (Lunch recess.)

8 THE COURT: All right, counsel. Ready for the jury?

9 MR. ALLCOCK: We are, your Honor.

10 MR. BAHLER: Yes, your Honor.

11 THE COURT: As I indicated to you earlier, the Rule  
12 has been invoked, so it will be up to counsel to identify the  
13 witnesses and make sure the witnesses do not violate the rules  
14 subject to disqualification of their testimony. Bring the  
15 jury in.

16 (Jury present.)

17 THE COURT: Members of the jury, during the lunch  
18 break, did anyone attempt to talk to you about this case?

19 THE JURORS: No, sir.

20 THE COURT: Did you talk to anybody about the case?

21 THE JURORS: No.

22 THE COURT: And did you learn anything at all about  
23 the case outside the presence of each other and this  
24 courtroom?

25 THE JURORS: No, sir.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE COURT: All right. Show negative responses to all  
2 questions by all jurors. Mr. Allcock, you have the lectern.

3 MR. ALCOCK: Thank you, your Honor.

4 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, may I move around to see  
5 better?

6 THE COURT: You may anywhere that you desire.

7 MR. BAHLER: Thank you, your Honor.

8 MR. ALCOCK: May it please the Court, counsel.

9 PLAINTIFF'S OPENING STATEMENT

10 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, as I said, I'm  
11 privileged to represent Crossroads in this case. I'd like to  
12 say that every case can be summarized in just a few words, and  
13 this case is no different. This is a case about invention and  
14 infringement, about inventors and infringers.

15 I represent Crossroads. They are the inventors in  
16 this case. The defendant, Chaparral, are the infringers.  
17 Crossroads got a patent from the United States Patent and  
18 Trademark Office in August of 1999. The defendants,  
19 upper-level management, found out about that patent just a few  
20 months later, in February of the year 2000.

21 And they were immediately very concerned about their  
22 patent, about that patent. They knew immediately that all  
23 their products were at great risk of infringing that patent,  
24 so they hired an expert, a technical consultant, very capable  
25 gentleman, who's now their chief technical officer, and he



1 wrote a report.

2           And that report about the Crossroads patent told them  
3 one thing and one thing only, figure out a way to sell, and  
4 that was before there was even litigation. So they did some  
5 further investigation, they hired a patent lawyer, and they  
6 tried hard to find a way around the Crossroads patent and they  
7 couldn't.

8           So in May of the year 2000, they pulled from the  
9 product the patented feature. They took it out so as to  
10 attempt to avoid infringement. There were two problems. For  
11 the rest of the year 2000, although they had the feature eye  
12 of the product, they didn't tell anyone, not their customers,  
13 not anyone, that they had pulled this feature because of a  
14 potential infringement problem.

15           In fact, they did the opposite. And, second of all,  
16 as the year wore on, they realized that this patented feature  
17 was essential, in their own words, that trying to sell their  
18 product without it was like trying to sell a black and white  
19 TV set. So at the beginning part of the year 2001, without  
20 going back to their patent lawyer, without going back to their  
21 expert, they introduced the infringing feature back into the  
22 product.

23           So there aren't very many sales of the products.  
24 They've only been selling them for a few months. And so, this  
25 case isn't primarily about damages, although we will ask for

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 reasonable compensation. This case is primarily about a  
2 determination that the product that they're selling infringes  
3 and a determination that the conduct of which I've just  
4 summarized is not acceptable conduct here in Austin.

5           So that's a brief summary of the case. I am now going  
6 to spend, actually, a fair amount of time going over generally  
7 what you're going to see in the case. I do that because I  
8 think it's helpful for the jury to have an overview of the  
9 case as the evidence comes in. And so, while it might take a  
10 little bit of time to go through this, I think in the long  
11 run, it will save time because as the witnesses' testimony  
12 comes in, you'll have a proper context for that testimony.

13           So I'm going to talk about four topics here today,  
14 first, just a little bit about the parties, second, about  
15 Crossroads and Crossroads' patented invention, and I'm going  
16 to spend a little bit of time on that subject. I'm going to  
17 show you some graphics, and I think you'll understand the  
18 invention after I show you those.

19           Then, Chaparral's use, the defendant's use of the  
20 patented invention and the story that I just told, how they  
21 took it out and then, put it back in. And then, very briefly,  
22 I'm going to talk about damages, reasonable compensation. So  
23 those are the topics.

24           Let me start out with Crossroads. Crossroads is an  
25 amazing company. In 1994, two gentlemen, Brian Smith, who

1 you'll hear from, and Dale Quisenberry, who you'll hear about,  
2 just the two of them, started a little company. It was a  
3 consulting company to begin with. And then, they realized  
4 that they could build a product and sell a product, a product  
5 that really wasn't fully commercialized before.

6 And that's what they did. They came up with a product  
7 called a storage router, and they, ladies and gentlemen, made  
8 the market. There wasn't really a market for these products  
9 back then. They also hired two brilliant engineers that  
10 you'll hear from tomorrow, Geoff Hoese and Jeff Russell.  
11 They're the inventors of the patent at issue.

12 Now, I will describe the invention here to you in some  
13 detail, in a few moments, but right now, I want to bring you  
14 forward. And these four words, if five years from now, ten  
15 years from now, anyone asks you about what your jury service  
16 was about here in this Austin federal court, you'll be able to  
17 answer them with just these four words.

18 Access controls, that's easy to understand in broader  
19 term. LUN zoning, that's the more technical term and perhaps  
20 a more limited term. Those features are a key part of what  
21 Geoff Hoese and Jeff Russell's invention is all about, and  
22 those features are the ones that Chaparral has used in their  
23 product and infringed.

24 So I'm going to explain to you, in some detail, about  
25 what those features are and how they work in these router

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 products that we're talking about, but let me give you some  
2 background, first. For some people, problems are bad things;  
3 for other people, problems are opportunities.

4           And for Crossroads and Geoff Hoese and Jeff Russell,  
5 problems were opportunities. This was the state of the  
6 computer networking world when Crossroads came up with its  
7 invention. It's a picture that you're all very familiar with.  
8 You have computers that are connected to each other, and one  
9 of these fancy things is called a network so that they can  
10 communicate with each other.

11           But increasingly in the modern world, you need more  
12 memory than those computers have in their own systems, and you  
13 want to store that memory some distance away from the main  
14 building, for example, and so you can have remote storage.  
15 That's just memory that the computers use to find files, like,  
16 for example, it could be the personnel department's records or  
17 the tax department's records, but they -- sometimes it's  
18 convenient and more frequently than ever, it's convenient, for  
19 those things to be some distance away.

20           And the problem becomes that you need to find a way  
21 for the computers to communicate with these remote storage  
22 devices. Now, before the Crossroads invention, this picture  
23 that I've showed you is the common picture, it's the common  
24 way things were done. And when Brian Smith and Dale  
25 Quisenberry started the company, this stuff called Fibre

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Channel was just starting to become a big deal. It's a real  
2 big deal now.

3 But it was just starting to become in common use in  
4 1994, and it was so because information can move really fast  
5 on this Fibre Channel. On the other side of the picture,  
6 there's something called SCSI. The Court mentioned it earlier  
7 using the more common term for it, SCSI. And that's a very  
8 old way for devices to communicate with each other.

9 And you'll be explained in more detail as the trial  
10 goes on, but for now, all you need to understand is this Fibre  
11 Channel speaks one language; let's call it English. This SCSI  
12 speaks a different language; let's call it Greek. And so, the  
13 English computers cannot communicate with the Greek storage  
14 devices without a translator.

15 And so, before Crossroads came up with its router  
16 products, the common way of communicating was something called  
17 a network server. You've heard about those, and anyone that  
18 has used computers has communicated through those. And when  
19 you have an occasional -- you run into this maddening problem,  
20 the server slows things down.

21 The one thing we know about the modern computing era  
22 is there is a need, a need for speed, and increasingly, we are  
23 unhappy when the computers don't work as fast as we want them  
24 to work. And these network servers before the Crossroads  
25 routers became part of the landscape had this problem.

1           So Crossroads came up with an alternative, something  
2           called a storage router. It solved this speed problem. It  
3           allowed the computers that spoke this language to communicate  
4           with the remote devices that spoke the other language. Now,  
5           routers were not completely new. They had been in existence  
6           before.

7           But Crossroads was the first company to really put  
8           these things on the landscape. And, as I said earlier, they  
9           kind of made a market. And they were able to do this and, in  
10          fact, introduced a product in 1997, but it was a fairly  
11          bare-bone product. It was kind of like a Chevrolet, not a  
12          luxury sedan.

13          It didn't have all the features that it could have  
14          had. After all, it was kind of starting the market, and so,  
15          it did not use this access control LUN zoning invention of the  
16          patent. Crossroads did fairly well selling products without  
17          the inventive feature for a number of years, and in fact, it  
18          just introduced recently products using the patented feature.

19          So the product that Crossroads initially introduced  
20          what was not the invention but Hoese and Russell, way back in  
21          1997, they came up with something that was far ahead of their  
22          time and that's the invention. So the early Crossroads  
23          products didn't succeed because they were fancy; they  
24          succeeded because they were first.

25          So now, let me tell you what the invention is.

1 Security is important in the modern world. So you've got a  
2 couple of computers on this side of the router, and on the  
3 other side of the router, you've got the personnel  
4 department's information. That's in remote storage A. In  
5 remote storage B, you've got the tax department's information.  
6 And in storage C, you've got the company web site.

7 You would like it to be that computer A, which is in  
8 the personnel department, can only get to the personnel  
9 records. They can't get to the tax records, but they can also  
10 get to the company web site.

11 So, in other words, their access to the remote storage  
12 is restricted to only the information that they have a right  
13 to see. And computer B is the tax department's records. They  
14 similarly can't get into your personnel file. They can get  
15 into the company's tax records. And because the company web  
16 site is a general interest to everybody, they can get into  
17 there.

18 So A is limited to A's storage location. B is limited  
19 to B's storage location. And there's a storage location that  
20 either of them can access freely. No one, no one before Geoff  
21 Hoese and Jeff Russell had thought of a storage router with  
22 access controls. The defendants will try to prove that  
23 someone else came up with this concept first.

24 You'll look at that evidence and you'll conclude that  
25 Geoff Hoese and Jeff Russell were the first people to think of

1 the idea of combining a storage router with access controls.  
2 The Patent Office thought so. On December 31, 1997,  
3 Crossroads filed for a patent on this invention. It was  
4 granted August 24th of 1999.

5 And the Court has said a few words to you about  
6 patents, but let me amplify on what you've been told. If you  
7 look over the last decade, you'll see a lot of inventions, and  
8 I think most of us would think the world is better for them,  
9 at least the federal government thought so or our founding  
10 fathers did.

11 The right to grant patents is found in the United  
12 States Constitution. And the way it works is if you think  
13 you've invented something new, you can prepare a patent  
14 application and send it to the Patent and Trademark Office;  
15 it's in Washington, D.C. There, they have technically trained  
16 examiners, people who will examine the patent and look to see  
17 if anyone had done it before.

18 And if they conclude that no one had done what you  
19 claim to have invented before, they will grant you a patent,  
20 and the patent is sort of like a deed on your property, except  
21 for it's a form of intellectual property. It gives you a  
22 right to own that property and gives you the right to keep  
23 other people from using that property.

24 So if they fall within the scope of the patent, then  
25 they're trespassing on your property, and you have the right



1 to stop them from doing so, and you have the right to be paid  
2 reasonable compensation for their trespass.

3 But the Patent Office doesn't have the patent police.  
4 No one enforces patents for patent owners. They have to do it  
5 themselves, and the way that we do it in this country is what  
6 we're doing here: We come into court in front of a jury, like  
7 yourself, and present our case to enforce our patent rights,  
8 and that's why we're here.

9 One more thing about patents. You're going to hear a  
10 lot about claims, and some of the discussion I'm going to get  
11 to in a minute involves that. Here's a fancy invention, a  
12 screwdriver, and remember I told you a patent is -- at the end  
13 has claims. There are a list of elements that define what you  
14 own, like a deed.

15 So here's a claim covering this invention, a tool  
16 comprising a handle, a shaft and a tip for engaging a threaded  
17 fastener. So if somebody thought of a screwdriver first,  
18 applied to the Patent Office, no one had done it before, this  
19 would be the kind of a claim that the Patent Office might  
20 allow.

21 And so, if someone uses a tool that has a handle, a  
22 shaft and a tip for engaging a threaded fastener -- patent  
23 lawyers never talk in complete English, they need to use some  
24 funny words sometimes -- then you would infringe that patent.  
25 And if you took one of the elements off, you wouldn't.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1           So in other words, if I took the handle off and just  
2 had a bare steel shaft with no handle, that wouldn't infringe  
3 this patent claim. May not be very useful, but it wouldn't  
4 infringe. Now, the reason I mention that to you is because in  
5 a few minutes, we're going to see how Chaparral took the  
6 handle off to try to avoid the patent, and then, put the  
7 handle back on.

8           This will be my final point for those of you that are  
9 keeping track of where we are in the presentation. I've  
10 already told you most of what I've got to tell you about the  
11 parties. I'm going to have a little more to say about that  
12 with respect to Chaparral here in a moment.

13           And I have now told you most of what I'm going to tell  
14 you about the patented invention. This is the last slide that  
15 I wanted to go over with you. This is figure 3 of the patent.  
16 It's the figure that you see on the cover of the patent. If  
17 you pick the patent up and you looked at the front page, this  
18 is what you'd see.

19           And with the exception of we've added some color and  
20 added, you know, some computer monitors and other things to  
21 make it look a little bit more realistic. But it's a lot like  
22 the picture that you saw a few moments ago, and what this  
23 shows you is a storage router with access controls.

24           On your left-hand side of the picture, you've got five  
25 different work stations or computers. In the middle, you've

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 got the storage router. This channel is a Fibre Channel  
2 connecting all the computers so the information can go really  
3 quickly. On the other side, we've got three storage devices,  
4 two kind of little ones, and one really big one, and that --  
5 they're all connected by a SCSI bus. Bus is just a fancy word  
6 for wire.

7 And so you can see work station A is limited to this  
8 part of the storage device. Work station B is limited to that  
9 part of the storage device, and so on for C and D. E is  
10 lucky, it has its own little storage device all to itself.  
11 And up at the top, you've got a global data that every work  
12 station or computer can access.

13 So it's a little more detailed than the drawing that I  
14 showed you earlier, but it basically describes what the  
15 invention is. Now, I mentioned to you earlier, Crossroads  
16 didn't include this in their earlier products, and it only  
17 came in in the later products, and the reason that's so is  
18 because they were first to market. They were kind of building  
19 the market. They could sell products that didn't have  
20 necessarily the latest advanced features and still do pretty  
21 well.

22 Not so with Chaparral. Chaparral is a Colorado  
23 company. Unlike Crossroads, they were late to the market.  
24 They started in 1998 and they first started products in 1999.  
25 Starting in late 1999 and early 2000, they talked about

1 internally putting access controls into their product. They  
2 had two kinds of products that are kind of related to each  
3 other: One's a storage router, and another thing is something  
4 called a RAID controller.

5 The difference between them isn't really important for  
6 this case, but you'll be explained what the differences are  
7 when technical testimony comes in. But they had some of these  
8 products and they were internally looking at adding access  
9 controls -- or their technical internal term for it was LUN  
10 zoning -- to their products.

11 And they were doing this because they saw the need for  
12 this advanced feature in order to sell their products, and so,  
13 they pitched LUN zoning to all the big companies. They went  
14 to EMC. And this slide is actually a slide from a  
15 presentation to EMC. That's their slide. And they went to  
16 Dell and IBM. The Dell and IBM slides are almost identical to  
17 this.

18 And you can see, you have host one, host two, host  
19 three. Those are the computers. You have remote storage down  
20 here. That's comparable to the little storage devices I  
21 showed you a few moments ago. And here it says SCSI, S-C-S-I  
22 devices can be configured to be accessed or masked from  
23 multiple hosts. That is, you can have access controls from  
24 multiple hosts as I showed you on figure 3 of the patent just  
25 a few moments ago.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1           And they are calling it LUN masking and zoning and  
2 they are telling people, and they said this in a statement  
3 they filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission in the  
4 beginning part of the year 2000 that this feature was going to  
5 be available in the second quarter, that is, April, May, June  
6 of the year 2000.

7           They ran into a stumbling block. In February of 2000,  
8 the then president of the defendant, Chaparral, came across  
9 the Crossroads patent. One of the investment bankers for the  
10 company gave it to him. It prompted a flurry of activity. He  
11 immediately sent it around to all of the upper-level  
12 management at the company. He immediately recognized that  
13 their products were at risk, at serious risk for infringing  
14 the Crossroads patent.

15           So the first thing he did -- or one of the first  
16 things after they had this internal discussion is they sent  
17 the patent on to an expert in the industry, a guy named  
18 Selinger. He's now the chief technical officer of Chaparral  
19 although back then, he was a consultant. Maybe you'll hear  
20 from him in this case. You certainly will by deposition.  
21 We're going to read his deposition to you. Maybe they'll  
22 bring him live, I don't know.

23           And they wanted this Selinger to do a investigation  
24 and analysis of this Crossroads patent. And they gave it a  
25 code name because they knew that later on, people would look

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 at what was written down. They called it overpass. Another  
2 reason is they wanted the consultant to call Brian Smith and  
3 talk to him, but they didn't want him to tell him who he was  
4 working for when he made that call and that's what happened.

5 And after a couple of weeks, this expert consultant  
6 came back with his report on the 972 patent. It's about a  
7 three- or four-page, single-spaced document. You'll see it,  
8 it will be in evidence. And it was written to the company  
9 president and the executive vice-president of engineering, Mr.  
10 Walker.

11 Here's my overpass report. Don't shoot the messenger.  
12 So from the cover of it, you know that this was not good news  
13 for Chaparral. After it goes on for a number of pages, he  
14 comes up with a final recommendation, figure out a way to  
15 settle. Now what's remarkable is there was no lawsuit when  
16 this was written.

17 This was an analysis done by Chaparral before this  
18 lawsuit was filed, so the investigation went further. They  
19 went and hired a patent lawyer, and what I'm showing you is a  
20 March 1 notebook entry of Mr. Walker's concerning a meeting  
21 between Dave Zinger, he's the patent lawyer that they went to  
22 see, Bob Selinger, that's the expert that wrote the "figure  
23 out a way to settle" memo that I showed you a moment ago.

24 And there are a few interesting, indeed, remarkable  
25 things about this. The first is they realized that they

1 desperately need a letter, opinion from this patent lawyer.  
2 It says here, we are aware of patent, we don't have an  
3 opinion, damages are trebled.

4           Now, I'm not sure that's quite right, but clearly,  
5 they were very concerned and very interested in getting a  
6 letter from this patent lawyer, giving them a clearance to  
7 sell at least some of their products. Then, it goes on:  
8 Don't want to back burner the patent. Let's get prior art.  
9 Dave will look at prior art. And then, it lists a number of  
10 types of prior art.

11           So what's that all about? Well, as the Court told you  
12 earlier, one of the ways that you can invalidate a patent is  
13 trying to find prior art, trying to find publications or  
14 patents or products that show that somebody else did what you  
15 invented first. And then, that can invalidate the patent.

16           So they wanted to see if they could find prior art to  
17 invalidate the Crossroads patent so they could go on and sell  
18 their products with the access control LUN zoning feature. So  
19 they went at it with a vengeance. Here's a March 14th memo.  
20 Bob, I spoke with Dave Zinger. Bob is Bob Selinger and this  
21 is a memo from Mr. Walker -- without having him see your  
22 e-mail, Dave indicates that we should do two things.

23           You should pursue documented evidence that access  
24 control, in quotes, it means the same thing as LUN zoning --  
25 is well-known and was practiced prior to 12-31-96. And he

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 will start to develop a, quote, limited opinion letter, which  
2 indicates why we believe the overpass patent is invalid. He  
3 needs to access control info as part of it.

4 No one had done a router with access controls before.  
5 So even though they had been searching for a month and a half  
6 by now, they hadn't found anything, and they needed to find  
7 something in order to get this letter that they needed to sell  
8 their products.

9 The search intensified in April of 2000 because this  
10 lawsuit was filed at the end of March 2000. So the search  
11 intensified and went on through April of 2000. And you will  
12 see in evidence notes from Mr. Walker calling all kinds of  
13 companies, trying to find prior art to invalidate this patent.

14 You'll see faxes from the company president, Mr.  
15 Gluck, to all kinds of people, sending him the patent, trying  
16 to find prior art to invalidate it. You'll see e-mails from  
17 the president of the company to a number of people, trying to  
18 find prior art to invalidate the patent.

19 What happened? In early May, they pulled LUN zoning  
20 out of their product. Please note the memo of May 8th, 2000  
21 to quite a number of people in the company, copied to quite a  
22 number of people. And there were other documents that are  
23 like this that say hold the LUN zoning feature.

24 Please note, we will also need to pull out the more  
25 full-featured LUN zoning from the planned 4.1 release. So



1 they were telling their customers in February and March and  
2 they were telling the SEC C in March that they were going to  
3 have LUN zoning in their products.

4 They found out about the patent, they did analysis  
5 including hiring a patent lawyer, and they had to pull it out.  
6 Now, when Mr. Walker was asked questions in his deposition  
7 about why it was taken out, do you know why it was decided to  
8 pull the feature? That's the LUN zoning feature -- out of  
9 that firmware? It was decided based on interpretation of  
10 Crossroads' patent and opinion of our legal counsel. You say  
11 opinion of legal counsel. Are you referring to an opinion  
12 that's been reduced to writing? Yes.

13 So they got their written opinion that they wanted,  
14 but in order to get it, they had to pull LUN zoning out of  
15 their product. They pulled it out of their products in May,  
16 middle of May. They got a draft of the opinion just a couple  
17 of weeks later. Here's the letter, June 14th.

18 Based on this, it is our judgment that the presently  
19 marketed products -- very carefully worded letter, presently  
20 marketed products. They pulled the LUN zoning feature out  
21 just a couple of weeks before this letter was written -- of  
22 Chaparral including its data routers do not infringe the  
23 claims of the 972 patent.

24 Let's see why they don't infringe. Here's page 28 of  
25 this draft letter and comparing the claim language with the

1 Chaparral router, it is determined that the Chaparral router  
2 does not include this feature. Let's see what feature they're  
3 talking about.

4 Specifically, the Chaparral router does not, according  
5 to the interpretation of this claim language, provide any  
6 restriction regarding which SCSI storage devices can be  
7 accessed by particular FC -- that's Fibre Channel devices. No  
8 such control or feature is maintained in the Chaparral router.

9 So they didn't have an access control feature in the  
10 presently marketed devices. They pulled it a couple of weeks  
11 earlier because of a concern about the patent. And within a  
12 couple of weeks after pulling that feature, they get the  
13 letter that they need that justifies their continuing to sell  
14 the product, and they continued to sell the product throughout  
15 the year 2000.

16 And this draft letter of June 2000 turned into a final  
17 letter in November of 2000. And you'll hear testimony that  
18 throughout that entire time period, they did not include LUN  
19 zoning or access controls of any type in their products. So  
20 you may be wondering why are we here if they looked at the  
21 patent, realized that they had a problem, and took the feature  
22 out. Why are we troubling you with this case?

23 Two reasons. First, they never told anybody that they  
24 pulled it out. They never told anybody that the feature  
25 wasn't going to be available because of this problem with the

1 Crossroads patent. And secondly, in the course of that year,  
2 they figured something out. In the words of one of their own  
3 internal marketing documents that you'll see in a minute, it  
4 was essential to selling the product. In the words of one of  
5 their former engineers who we deposed, selling the product  
6 without access controls was like selling a black and white  
7 television.

8           And so, it was a commercial necessity for them to put  
9 it back in. Here's a presentation made to Dell Computer on  
10 May 24th of 2000. Remember, they pulled the access controls  
11 in early May of 2000 and that draft letter was in early June  
12 of 2000.

13           What were they telling Dell Computer? Nothing  
14 different. They're talking about LUN masking and zoning.  
15 They're talking about the devices can be configured to be  
16 accessed or masked from multiple hosts. And this all is  
17 talking about Chaparral, Fibre Channel-to-SCSI routers.

18           Here's a press release, November 8 of 2000. This is  
19 talking about one of their RAID controllers. The A8526 has  
20 the features that are highly sought after in SAN environments.  
21 SAN environments are the storage area network. It involves  
22 the computers and the remote storage.

23           LUN zoning and array partitioning provide a cost  
24 effective solution for sharing disk arrays. This is November  
25 8th of 2000. They throughout the year 2000, even though they

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 pulled it and it isn't in their product, are still trying to  
2 appear to the outside world like it's still in there.

3 And as I told you, they realized in the course of that  
4 time it needed to be. Here's a former Chaparral engineer.  
5 You'll hear his deposition read to you. He's not available to  
6 be here live. Yes, as I think, yes, you need certain features  
7 as the technology evolves. If you don't have them, then  
8 you've got a black and white television and nobody wants it.

9 So the routers, without the access control LUN zoning  
10 feature, Chaparral found out were like trying to sell a black  
11 and white television. You don't have to believe me. You can  
12 see what the documents written at the time show. Here's a  
13 marketing document. Internal Chaparral marketing document.  
14 It was written in the fall of the year 2000.

15 Talks about LUN zoning. And if you have any question  
16 about LUN zoning is and whether or not it is the same as  
17 access control, the controller will maintain a list of host  
18 systems -- that's computers, work stations -- that are either  
19 allowed to access or prevented from accessing each partition.

20 So that's on one page of the document. Now, if you go  
21 to the back, you see what the release priorities are. And  
22 there's a number of categories. I think it's A through E, if  
23 memory serves. And category A is essential and in case you  
24 don't know what the essential means, the category is defined  
25 as requirements that must be included in the product.

1           And if you look at the priority level as to the  
2 products shown on this page and there are products on other  
3 pages that you can see when you actually see the document,  
4 they are category A products. They are products for which LUN  
5 zoning or access controls is essential.

6           And they were. Here are the sales that are after  
7 January of 2001, when they put the LUN zoning back in. You  
8 can see the total shipments, you can see the date of the  
9 document, you can see the total revenue, \$1,667,830 of revenue  
10 after they put the LUN zoning access controls back in.

11           So let's recap and then, I'll move on to the last  
12 topic. They discover the patent in February of 2000. They  
13 hire an expert and a lawyer to analyze the patent and try to  
14 find prior art. In May of 2000, they pulled LUN zoning out of  
15 the product because of a concern with the patent.

16           They tell the public nothing throughout the year about  
17 their pulling LUN zoning. They get two letters from a patent  
18 lawyer, one in June, one in November, that don't address a  
19 product with LUN zoning and say it's okay to sell a product  
20 that doesn't have access controls.

21           And then, they put it back in in January of 2001.  
22 Now, you've got to say what did they tell their lawyer, who  
23 wrote these letters about this? Exhibit 136 is the November  
24 opinion letter from Mr. Zinger. Mr. Zinger is the lawyer. So  
25 the question here is: Does this November letter mention LUN

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 zoning anywhere in it? That's the letter that says it's okay  
2 to sell products that don't have access controls.

3 And the lawyer says no, my letter doesn't mention LUN  
4 zoning anywhere. When, of course, why would it? They pulled  
5 it out of their products in May and didn't put it in until  
6 after he wrote this November letter. But it gets more  
7 interesting. In fact, you said you didn't know of any  
8 Chaparral products that use LUN zoning; is that right? That's  
9 correct.

10 Now, the interesting thing about that answer is this  
11 deposition was taken in July of 2001, after Chaparral had been  
12 selling products with LUN zoning for the better part of seven  
13 months. They apparently didn't tell their lawyer. Subsequent  
14 to the time you prepared this opinion, have you become aware  
15 of any Chaparral products that use LUN zoning? Answer, no.

16 Did you perform any analysis of LUN zoning to  
17 determine whether that feature if incorporated into a  
18 Chaparral product would be infringing? Answer, no. Now, I  
19 don't think that's quite right. I think what we're going to  
20 find out, if Mr. Zinger comes here to testify, is that before  
21 he wrote that letter in June, he talked with the people at  
22 Chaparral about access controls.

23 And he took a look. There's nothing written down or  
24 very little written down. But he took a look at the product  
25 with access controls and without access controls. And I'll

1 leave it for you to conclude as to whether or not he thought  
2 that it was okay for them to use access controls when it's  
3 nowhere mentioned in his opinion letter.

4 They took the handle off for a while, realized they  
5 couldn't sell it without a handle and then, put it back on.  
6 We will prove to you that the product that they sell have all  
7 the elements of the claims of the 972 patent. Now, the claims  
8 of the 972 patent are a little more complicated than a  
9 screwdriver.

10 But we will through technical testimony and some  
11 graphics that we've prepared and some animations that we've  
12 prepared, we'll explain to you the background that you need to  
13 know to understand this slightly more complicated claim. And  
14 we will present to you one of the best experts you could find  
15 anywhere on this topic. He's a Ph.D. from Stanford.

16 He spent almost 30 years at IBM working in the very  
17 area that this patent involves, storage area networks. He has  
18 analyzed multiple pages of documents that describe the  
19 defendant's product. He has tested. He set up a test setup  
20 and he has tested the defendant's product, and he will explain  
21 to you how it is that they have every element of these claims  
22 including the element that requires implement access controls.

23 You may hear some testimony that there have been some  
24 very recent, like, within the last week, changes to these  
25 Chaparral products. I'm not so sure you'll hear the

1 testimony, but it's possible that you'll hear that, and you'll  
2 just have to make your judgment about why that activity is  
3 occurring a week before opening statement in this case.

4           You also may hear that the LUN zoning that Chaparral  
5 has isn't really access controls because it's like Swiss  
6 cheese; you can find your way through it quite easily. That  
7 isn't what they're telling their customers about their LUN  
8 zoning and access controls.

9           So I've now completed three of four topics that I was  
10 going to talk with you about. And the fourth one, as I  
11 promised you, is going to be very short. And the reason it's  
12 very short is because the time period that they've sold as  
13 opposed to marketed products that are infringing is very  
14 short.

15           Here's a summary of the sales of products, what we  
16 believe is a reasonable royalty rate on those products, and  
17 the total damages shown there is \$275,000. Crossroads is  
18 entitled to reasonable compensation. As I said at the  
19 beginning, that's not the primary purpose that we're here.

20           The primary purpose that we're here is to have a  
21 determination that the products that the defendant is selling  
22 infringe our patent and a determination that the patent is  
23 valid and a determination that the conduct that the defendant  
24 has engaged in should not be tolerated, that the conduct  
25 evidences willful infringement of a patent.



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1           And it is conduct that they should be dissuaded from  
2 engaging in and others should be dissuaded from engaging in so  
3 that the patent won't be infringed after today. I thank you  
4 very much for your attention, and I look forward to putting  
5 this case on before you.

6           THE COURT: Members of the jury, I'm going to give you  
7 ten minutes to stretch, use the facilities, and we will  
8 continue.

9           (Jury not present.)

10          MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, we have done what we said  
11 earlier we're going to do with exhibits. If you want to take  
12 two minutes now, we could take care of that, or I'll do it  
13 whenever you care to.

14          THE COURT: Well, that's fine.

15          MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, I would offer a list of  
16 Plaintiff'S Third Amended Trial Exhibit List which has no  
17 objections by the defendant.

18          THE COURT: Counsel, let's remember that this is a  
19 courtroom and I'm presiding over.

20          MR. BAHLER: Thank you, your Honor.

21          THE COURT: All fights are scheduled for Friday. All  
22 right. What exhibits?

23          MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, we have actually printed  
24 out -- I can submit or I can read them, whichever you --

25          THE COURT: Let's read the numbers and put them in the

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 record, and then, you could submit however you want.

2 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir. Without objection,  
3 Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13 through 20, 22  
4 through 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35 through 40.

5 THE COURT: 38, 32 --

6 MR. ALBRIGHT: I'm sorry, 32, 33, your Honor, 35  
7 through 40, 41 and 42, 44 through 49, 50 through 56, 57  
8 through 62, 65, 66 through 68, 71 through 74, 75 through 83,  
9 84 through 94, 95 through 101, 104 through 113, 118 through  
10 125, 127, 128 through 134, 135 through 137, 139 through 144,  
11 Plaintiff's Exhibit 182, Plaintiff's Exhibit 200 through 202,  
12 Plaintiff's Exhibit 214 through 221, Plaintiff's Exhibit 222  
13 through 228, Plaintiff's Exhibit 229 through 236, Plaintiff's  
14 Exhibit 237 through 244, Plaintiff's Exhibit 245 through 251,  
15 Plaintiff's Exhibit 252 through 254, Plaintiff's 256 through  
16 261, Plaintiff's Exhibit 278. And a formal list of that is  
17 here, your Honor.

18 Defendant's Exhibits we have no objections by  
19 plaintiff are Defendant's Exhibit --

20 MR. BAHLER: Mr. Albright, why don't you let me read  
21 them. Might speed things up.

22 MR. ALBRIGHT: Be delighted.

23 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, Defendant's Exhibits that  
24 have been admitted without objection are Defendant's Exhibit 1  
25 through 30, 34 through 59, 62, 74, 78, 79, 84, 99, 104, 107

1 through 109, 111 --

2 THE COURT: Wait, 107 through what?

3 MR. BAHLER: 109. 111 through 122, 126 through 129,  
4 131, 133 through 168, 170 through 172, 174, 179 through 181,  
5 188, 190 through 232, 238 through 246, 249 --

6 THE COURT: 238.

7 MR. BAHLER: Through 246.

8 THE COURT: All right.

9 MR. BAHLER: 249 and 253 through 271.

10 THE COURT: Okay, counsel. Are you sure you have  
11 enough exhibits?

12 MR. BAHLER: I think so, your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Those exhibits are admitted for the record  
14 without objection.

15 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor, I have a point. The reason  
16 Mr. Allcock and I were having a heated discussion was that we  
17 never did see many of these slides before today, and I'm so  
18 hesitant to hop up in front of the jury to just put Christmas  
19 lights around it. But there was stuff in here, for example,  
20 Zinger's testimony.

21 Mr. Zinger is going to be here on the stand. That  
22 stuff is all hearsay. If we'd have been given an opportunity  
23 to review those slides beforehand and object to them, we could  
24 have done that. We weren't going -- we were not given that  
25 opportunity.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 MR. ALLCOCK: Your Honor, everything I showed was  
2 either a demonstrative exhibit that they've already had, or a  
3 portion of an exhibit that was on the list that just was read  
4 as being admitted exhibits.

5 MR. BAHLER: Your Honor --

6 THE COURT: But deposition testimony, it's fair game.  
7 I usually relax the admissibility on opening statements with  
8 regard to deposition testimony that counsel's aware of, but  
9 they're entitled to know it's coming so that they can object  
10 to it just as if the witness was in the chair.

11 And I'm not so sure of the hearsay -- usually is --  
12 but sworn testimony can be admissible and it's discretionary.  
13 But you're entitled to know about it beforehand. So if  
14 there's any other susses, not SCSIs but susses, I don't want  
15 anybody complaining about it.

16 MR. ALLCOCK: Very well, your Honor.

17 MR. BAHLER: Thank you, your Honor.

18 THE CLERK: When he was giving these names, you left  
19 these numbers -- he included 39, but 39 is not listed on the  
20 Plaintiff's Exhibits. It needs to be clear on the record.

21 THE COURT: He's got 35 and 40.

22 THE CLERK: Right. And 39 is supposed to be included,  
23 apparently.

24 THE COURT: Okay. Did you try to slip 39 in there?

25 MR. ALBRIGHT: Don't --

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 THE COURT: Is 39 objected to?

2 MR. BAHLER: No.

3 MR. DELLETT: It isn't.

4 THE COURT: It's two-to-one.

5 MR. BAHLER: It's withdrawn.

6 MR. ALBRIGHT: Was just pressing it.

7 THE COURT: All right. Ten minutes.

8 (Recess.)

9 THE COURT: Bring them in.

10 (Jury present.)

11 THE COURT: Mr. Bahler, you have the lectern, sir.

12 DEFENDANT'S OPENING STATEMENTS

13 MR. BAHLER: Thank you, your Honor. May it please the  
14 Court, counsel.

15 Members of the jury, my name is Dave Bahler. As I  
16 said, I work for Fulbright & Jaworski here in Austin, Texas,  
17 and I'm proud to represent Chaparral in this case. This case  
18 was filed in the end of March last year, March 2000. Judge  
19 Sparks mentioned that his docket runs in ten months. Well,  
20 this is a complicated case, and patent cases are a little bit  
21 slower.

22 This one has come to trial not soon enough for  
23 Chaparral. Chaparral has looked so forward to this day. When  
24 this case was filed, it was a horrible disruption to their  
25 business. They've lost sales, they've lost investments,

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 they've lost their good name in the marketplace. And finally,  
2 it can come to an end.

3 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, Crossroads filed  
4 this case simply because they can't compete in the  
5 marketplace. They can't compete. They've lost money every  
6 single quarter that they've been in business, and they are  
7 running to the courthouse and trying to accomplish in the  
8 courthouse what they fail to accomplish in the marketplace.

9 Now, Judge Sparks mentioned to you the order of  
10 evidence. I'd just like to remind you again, if I may. The  
11 way the rules are set up to apply to courts or trials like  
12 this, the plaintiff always gets to go first. Crossroads gets  
13 to go first. You just heard Mr. Allcock's opening statement.  
14 I get to go second, which is what I'm doing now.

15 Then, when I sit down, they will present their  
16 evidence first. So you will hear all of it. And the way the  
17 Court has set up the schedule, it's likely that you won't hear  
18 Chaparral's side of this case until sometime next week.  
19 That's a big gap. We're going to get a three-day weekend  
20 here, and that's a big gap between their side of the case and  
21 Chaparral's side of the case.

22 And what I ask you to do, ladies and gentlemen, is to  
23 wait to hear the entire story because I do assure you that  
24 there are two sides to this story. At the end of this  
25 evidence, three things will become clear. First, this patent

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 never should have issued. This patent is old. This patent  
2 has been tried in things that have come before and never  
3 should have issued that patent, and I'll get into that in much  
4 more detail in just a little bit.

5           Second, the patent is unenforceable which means it  
6 cannot be enforced against anyone, against you, against me,  
7 and, quite significant, it can't be enforced against  
8 Chaparral. Why? Because Crossroads was less than honest when  
9 they were dealing with the Patent Office when they were  
10 getting this patent. That is -- and the consequences of that  
11 act mean that the patent is unenforceable.

12           And lastly, the patent is does not infringe. Now, if  
13 any one of these three things is proven to your satisfaction,  
14 any one, Crossroads -- I'm sorry, Chaparral pays Crossroads  
15 nothing, zero. Only one of those things needs to be necessary  
16 for you to conclude that Chaparral owes Crossroads nothing.

17           But at the end of the day, the end of the evidence,  
18 sometime next week, probably Tuesday with any luck, all three  
19 will be shown to your satisfaction. Now, I don't want you to  
20 think for a moment that since Chaparral is here in this  
21 courthouse, that they have done anything wrong. This is  
22 America, ladies and gentlemen, and anybody can file a lawsuit.  
23 Anybody with a word processor and/or a typewriter and \$140  
24 could walk into the Clerk's Office, which is right across the  
25 court lobby here, and file a complaint.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1           That's what Crossroads did here in this case. That's  
2 all they have done. That's why Chaparral is here. Chaparral  
3 did that, as I mentioned, because they've been losing money  
4 hand over fist, and the only way they think they could make  
5 money is from you, ladies and gentlemen. They want you to  
6 give them money from Chaparral in this case.

7           None of us should be here. This is a day after Labor  
8 Day. This thing really messed up my weekend, I'll really tell  
9 you that. I know you have better things to do. I know  
10 Chaparral has better things to do. I enjoy this stuff. I  
11 would not rather be anywhere else in the world, frankly,  
12 however, we shouldn't be here. Why? Because this case is  
13 completely baseless.

14           This case should be fought in the marketplace, not in  
15 this courthouse. Put these parties right back where they  
16 belong, in the marketplace where they can fight fair and  
17 square. Before I get started in a little bit more detail  
18 about those three topics, I'd like to tell you a little bit  
19 about Chaparral.

20           Chaparral is a company that's located in Boulder,  
21 Colorado, and was started by three friends, one of whom is  
22 Jerry Walker. I introduced you to Mr. Walker. He'll be  
23 sitting with me at counsel table, and you'll be hearing from  
24 him in this case. He was one of those founders.

25           The other two are a fella named Gary Allison, fella



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 named Michael Gluck. Those three guys got together and formed  
2 Chaparral. Turned out that Mr. Allison had a contact at a  
3 company called Adaptec. And Adaptec is a very big company,  
4 much bigger than Crossroads, much bigger than Chaparral.  
5 Chaparral's only 70 employees. And they, Adaptec, had been in  
6 this area for quite some time, but they hadn't really been  
7 making products that did this routing stuff.

8           What they had been making is chips that go into  
9 computers that handle Fibre Channel, on the one hand, they  
10 handle SCSI on the other hand. They were very good at doing  
11 that. And Adaptec got the idea and this was 1996 when they  
12 got this idea, 1996, that's a very important date.

13           This is long before Crossroads had thought of  
14 anything. Adaptec thought of the idea of making a Fibre  
15 Channel-to-SCSI router device and they built it. And they  
16 started selling it, but then, they decided they didn't have  
17 the expertise to really sell it right and what did they do?  
18 Well, Mr. Allison got with his friend, the chairman and CEO of  
19 Adaptec, and decided that these three guys, Mr. Gluck, Mr.  
20 Allison and Mr. Walker, were to combine their almost 70 years  
21 of experience in the storage industry and take this product  
22 that Adaptec had developed but didn't quite know how to market  
23 and Chaparral would take that over.

24           And they would market it and that's what happened.  
25 Chaparral's product started with Adaptec. They didn't get one

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 thing from Crossroads, not one, not one thing. This is a  
2 patent case. I'd like to tell you just a little bit about the  
3 patent process. The Judge gave you a little bit of a  
4 background, but there's a few things that you really need to  
5 know in order to appreciate this.

6 I know that one of y'all had a husband that applied  
7 for a patent, so you might be more familiar than the others,  
8 but nonetheless, patent application process is confidential.  
9 When Crossroads filed their patent on December 31st, 1997,  
10 December 31st, 1997, there were only -- from that point until  
11 the patent issued in August 1999, there were only two people  
12 in the world that knew about the existence of that thing.

13 Crossroads, actually, the company, bunch of people  
14 within Crossroads knew about it and the patent examiner. The  
15 rest of us, Chaparral included, didn't know. They had no  
16 right to participate in that proceeding. They couldn't tell  
17 the Patent Office what the Patent Office needed to know. What  
18 they couldn't tell the Patent Office that what Crossroads was  
19 trying to do had, in fact, been done before, for example, at  
20 Adaptec, and we'll hear evidence of that.

21 Because it's confidential, because the relationship  
22 between the patent -- the person applying for the patent and  
23 the Patent Office is confidential, the law places a very heavy  
24 burden on people applying for a patent. Why? Well, the  
25 confidence is one, but just them and the Patent Office.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 That's it.

2           Number two, the Patent Office has a lot of work to do.  
3 There are over 100,000 patents filed in the United States  
4 every year, and there is a brace of examiners that kind of  
5 varies between 2,200 and 2,500 depending on the time, and  
6 those examiners are charged with examining patent applications  
7 on behalf of these people who file inventions.

8           Now, the Patent Office, contrary to some beliefs, is  
9 not a marble pillar building, sitting on a hill in oak trees  
10 shade in Washington, D.C., no way. The Patent Office, in  
11 fact, is in rented space. It's not even a government-owned  
12 building, it's not even in Washington, it's in Virginia. It's  
13 right next to Washington Reagan Airport.

14           The Patent Office is not filled with scientists in  
15 white jackets running around with beakers and microscopes and  
16 meters, measuring people's inventions. No. The Patent Office  
17 is filled with offices. That's what it is. It's an office  
18 building, very large office building, and in those offices are  
19 these patent examiners.

20           And what the patent examiners have to look at is not  
21 beakers, or test tubes, or microscopes, or meters. It's  
22 paper, lots and lots of paper. That's how examiners look at  
23 things to determine whether or not something's patentable.

24           Do they look at products that are sold by people? No,  
25 they don't look at that. They can't unless the patent

1 applicant tells them about it. And this, the evidence will  
2 show, Crossroads did not do. Crossroads had very valuable  
3 information that they withheld from the Patent Office they  
4 didn't tell the Patent Office about.

5 And if they had, the evidence will show that this  
6 patent never should have issued. It is, in fact, invalid.  
7 Now, the law recognizes that the Patent Office is not perfect,  
8 that it has a lot of work to do that it has to rely upon  
9 people applying for patents to be completely honest with them.

10 And that's not a perfect system. It couldn't hardly  
11 be. There's almost six million patents that have issued since  
12 the beginning of time. But the law provides a safety net.  
13 There are, in fact, two Patent Offices. There's one in  
14 Washington, D.C., and there's one sitting right in front of  
15 you, you, the members of this jury.

16 You have the right, in fact, a duty and the power to  
17 look at these facts all by yourself, brand-new, and determine  
18 whether or not this patent should have issued, whether or not  
19 Crossroads committed inequitable conduct in front of the  
20 Patent Office, whether this patent is a valid patent or not.  
21 That's your right. That's your duty.

22 Now, I'd like to go into a little bit more detail on  
23 those three topics starting with the invalidity. And that all  
24 starts with a sticker that Crossroads put on their products.  
25 It's a sticker that had the patent number, the patent number

1 from the patent in this case.

2 And many of you have seen patent numbers applied to  
3 products. Sometimes you see them on cartons. Sometimes  
4 they're molded into the metal of parts. I collect old  
5 railroad lanterns, and that's one of the ways you can tell how  
6 old they are is you look at the patent numbers. They're  
7 stamped right into the metal, all of these old things, some  
8 date back to the 1800s.

9 But the law doesn't permit -- well, the law permits  
10 people to put patent numbers on products. It's kind of like  
11 advertising. But they can't just do it because they want to  
12 because the law prohibits falsely marking products with patent  
13 numbers. Prohibits that. As a result, companies do  
14 investigations before they put the patent numbers on their  
15 products.

16 That's exactly what Crossroads did in this case.  
17 Upper management of Crossroads conducted an investigation.  
18 When was that done? That was done in late 1999. This was  
19 before they sued Chaparral, before they were motivated by  
20 litigation.

21 That after this patent issued, their first patent that  
22 ever issued to that company, after it issued they did an  
23 analysis, upper management did an analysis and determined that  
24 the product that they were selling at the time, the 4100  
25 product, included the invention of the 972 patent. Here's

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 that patent label right here. May I have the first slide,  
2 please.

3 This is actually a drawing of the label. The label is  
4 this part right here. And this is an engineering drawing.  
5 And may I have the next slide, please. It applies to the  
6 Crossroads 4100 and 4200 products. Those are storage routers.  
7 May I have the next slide, please? And the label up in that  
8 area included the word protected by U.S. Patent Number  
9 5941972. This was applied to their products in January 2000.

10 They told the world that their product, the 972  
11 patent, was embodied or included in both their 4100 and 4200  
12 products. That's what they told the world. That's what they  
13 told Chaparral, also. May I have the next slide, please.

14 So what we have here is we have Crossroads patent  
15 issuing -- they filed their patent on December 31st, 1997.  
16 Next slide, please. And after it issued, right about here in  
17 August of 1999, beginning at about January 2000, Crossroads  
18 labeled its product. Now, I've included this line here that  
19 shows old. That's one year before the filing date of that  
20 patent, and I'll explain that in just a little bit.

21 So this is what Crossroads told the world when they  
22 put that patent number on their product. They told the world  
23 that the 972 patent was included in their own 4100 -- the 4100  
24 product, the product that they were selling at that time.

25 And then, what did they do next? Well, they took this

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 patent, first patent that had ever issued to that company, and  
2 they filed their first lawsuit and they filed it against  
3 Chaparral. May I have the next slide, please. They filed  
4 this lawsuit against Chaparral on March 31st, 2000. Now, this  
5 is interesting.

6 I don't have the benefit of the slides that Mr.  
7 Allcock used during his opening statement, but if you take a  
8 look at those, first of all, the one he showed you showing  
9 announcement of LUN zoning in the second quarter of 2000.  
10 That shows infringement in his mind. That's what he wanted  
11 you to believe. You know what? It's not infringement.

12 You're just telling people what you're planning to do  
13 is not infringement. And by the way, also, what is the second  
14 quarter of 2000? It starts April 1st, 2000 and ends when?  
15 The end of June. When did they sue them? They sued them at  
16 the end of March. LUN zoning was not in this product.

17 And filing a lawsuit is very, very serious. Companies  
18 do not take this lightly. They have to do an investigation  
19 before they do this because filing baseless lawsuits is like  
20 putting a patent label on your product that's wrong. It's  
21 against the law. There's serious sanction for that, and I  
22 have no doubt that a careful company like Crossroads did that  
23 investigation.

24 They investigated it and they concluded that the  
25 Crossroads patent -- Crossroads -- that the Chaparral 1310

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 product without LUN zoning infringed. That's important.  
2 That's the second thing they told the public. They filed the  
3 lawsuit. And the only way they could have done that is to  
4 have concluded, had to have investigated and had to conclude  
5 that the 1310 product infringed. They had to have done that.  
6 That's required.

7 It's not their story today. You heard all this talk  
8 about LUN zoning. They've changed their story. They're not  
9 shooting at that 1310 anymore. And the evidence will show  
10 that this patent label, they'll say that's a mistake. That's  
11 what they're going to tell you, whoops, we made a mistake, we  
12 accidentally marked our product with that patent number. We  
13 made a mistake. It was no mistake.

14 Why did they change their story? Here's why. May I  
15 have the next slide, please. It turns out that the access  
16 control in the 4100 product and in the Chaparral 1310 product  
17 in both of these products was something called the SCSI  
18 reserve command. The SCSI reserve command. You'll hear a lot  
19 of evidence about that.

20 SCSI is a language. It's not only a bus or a bunch of  
21 wires that are included in the computer, dedicated primarily  
22 to storage, it's kind of an industry standard. And in those  
23 industry standards, there are specifications that tell you how  
24 to communicate on that bus. One of these things is a command  
25 called the SCSI reserve command.



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1           You'll hear a lot of evidence about that. The only --  
2 the evidence will show that the only access control in the  
3 4100 in the spring of 2000, actually, the only access control  
4 that's ever existed in the 4100 is the SCSI reserve command.  
5 The evidence would show that the access control that existed  
6 in the 1310 was also the SCSI reserve command.

7           Now, about the fall of last year, as this case was  
8 developing, the parties go through what's called discovery.  
9 You have to tell each other what's going on. That's part of  
10 the rules. Kind of unusual in the United States, but it's the  
11 rules that we play with a lot in the United States in courts.

12           The parties have to tell the other side what's going  
13 on. Well, about the fall of last year, Crossroads figured out  
14 that Chaparral knew that the SCSI reserve command was old, and  
15 that was what was being used in the 4100 and the 1310  
16 products. So before they changed this story, they found this  
17 out.

18           They found out that both the 4100 product, the product  
19 that they had put their label on and the 1310 product, the  
20 product that they had sued Chaparral on, that product was old.  
21 And you know what? If the 972 patent is in the Crossroads  
22 4100 which they told people that they labeled, if the 972  
23 patent is in the 1310, SCSI reserve command and both of those  
24 things are old, guess what, that means the 972 patent itself  
25 is old. And if it's old, what? It's invalid. So they had to

1 change their story.

2           If they hadn't changed their story right out of their  
3 own acts, they would have invalidated their own patent. So  
4 now they say LUN zoning. That's what it is. That's what it  
5 has been all along of the LUN zoning. Oh, the SCSI reserve  
6 command, that never was access control. Dr. Hodges, their  
7 Ph.D., is going to stand up here and tell you that to your  
8 face. Don't believe it for a minute.

9           They were right when they put that patent label on  
10 that product. That product was -- they had a right when they  
11 concluded that the SCSI reserve command was their invention  
12 and that's old and their patent is invalid. For your  
13 information, the jury forms that you have, this deals with  
14 Questions 7 and 8. The answer to those questions, ladies and  
15 gentlemen, is a definite yes, patents in these claims are  
16 invalid.

17           The second aspect that I would like to talk to you  
18 about is unenforceability. And that, as I mentioned earlier,  
19 is if Crossroads or if a patent applicant, in this case,  
20 Crossroads, is not completely honest with the Patent Office  
21 when dealing with the Patent Office and they don't tell the  
22 Patent Office everything that they should tell them, then they  
23 can't enforce the patent later.

24           That's the law. Why is that? Well, the secrecy is  
25 one thing. Also, the patent is a very powerful and precious

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 right. An issued U.S. patent permits a company like  
2 Crossroads to drag anybody they want into federal court,  
3 anybody. It's very, very powerful.

4 These cases are not cheap, ladies and gentlemen. This  
5 case has been going on since March 31st, and there's been a  
6 lot of money spent in defending Chaparral -- Chaparral  
7 defending itself against these baseless charges. Very, very  
8 powerful right.

9 So if you're not completely honest with the Patent  
10 Office when you deal with the Patent Office while your patent  
11 application is pending, the consequences are very severe,  
12 justifiably so, and the consequences are unenforceability.  
13 That means that Crossroads cannot enforce their patent against  
14 Chaparral. They can't enforce it against you or me or  
15 anybody. Simply unenforceable.

16 And that, once again, starts with the patent label.  
17 May I have the next slide, please. Here's the patent label.  
18 This is the label they apply to their 4100 product, all right?  
19 And they told the public that it was covered by the 972  
20 patent, patent in this case.

21 The 972 patent included the 4100 product or vice  
22 versa, actually, is more accurate. The 4100 product included  
23 the invention or was using the invention, the 972 patent. And  
24 when they filed the application with the Patent Office in  
25 December 31st, 1997, they were required to tell the Patent

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Office about things that they, themselves, had done more than  
2 one year before.

3 Things like public uses of the invention, things like  
4 offering the invention for sale. Did they do that? Did they  
5 do those acts? Did they have activity before the end of 1996?  
6 You bet. May I have the next slide, please.

7 Turns out that in November 1996, now, this is a month  
8 before the so-called critical date, that December 31st, 1996,  
9 more than one year before the filing date -- Crossroads took  
10 the 4100 product, prototype of the 4100 product and took it to  
11 a show in Las Vegas called Comdex, huge show, hundreds of  
12 thousands of people go to this show.

13 And they had a technology demonstration, as I  
14 mentioned, and they handed out this brochure right here saying  
15 that CrossPoint 4100 Fibre Channel-to-SCSI router, and they  
16 had there the same booth, the machine operating. That's a  
17 public use, ladies and gentlemen, and it's something the  
18 Patent Office should have known about.

19 Public use of their own invention. A public use of  
20 their invention that they told after the patent issued, they  
21 said it was included in the patent. They said that the  
22 product included the invention in the patent, and yet, they'd  
23 shown that product more than a year before they filed. Don't  
24 you think that was important for the Patent Office to know?

25 I certainly do. And yet, not one word. Not one word

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 did they tell the Patent Office. They took a gamble. They  
2 took a gamble when they filed their patent that the Patent  
3 Office wouldn't find out about their own activity more than  
4 one year before the filing date. They won. The Patent Office  
5 didn't find out.

6           You know what? This stuff is nothing that the Patent  
7 Office could have found. This is exactly the stuff that this  
8 rule that I'm talking about applies to, exactly. Patent  
9 Office looks at these papers, mounds of papers, Crossroads'  
10 own product wouldn't have been in that stuff. That's  
11 something that Crossroads knew about. That was unique  
12 knowledge between the Crossroads and the Patent Office between  
13 this unique relationship of trust and honesty.

14           Who knew that? Crossroads did. They didn't tell the  
15 Patent Office examiner. They won that gamble. They got their  
16 patent. They also took a gamble that they could hide it from  
17 Chaparral and lost that gamble. And they also took a gamble  
18 they could hide it from you, and they're going to lose that  
19 one because you're going to find out about this.

20           They didn't tell the Patent Office critical  
21 information, information that would have invalidated their  
22 patent, clearly, and that means their patent is unenforceable.  
23 We shouldn't be here and they know it. Jury questionnaire,  
24 that's Question 11 for those of you keeping track. The  
25 question should be answered a resounding yes.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1           So we have the first two things. First, the patent is  
2           invalid. Second, the patent is unenforceable. I'm about to  
3           go to the noninfringement issue. Either one of those first  
4           two, if proven to your satisfaction, ladies and gentlemen,  
5           means that Chaparral owes Crossroads nothing. Even if it's  
6           invalid, if you conclude that, or unenforceable, indeed, the  
7           evidence will show both of those, but only one is necessary.

8           Moving on to the third one which is infringement. As  
9           I mentioned, ladies and gentlemen, Chaparral got started using  
10          technology from Adaptec. May I have the next slide, please.  
11          Here's a drawing of what -- of what they got from Adaptec.  
12          This is dated December 1996.

13          And Adaptec invented a Fibre Channel-to-SCSI, what  
14          they call a bridge at that time. This is Fibre Channel  
15          arbitrated loop over here, this is SCSI over here, and this is  
16          a box, this is a storage router. And that's what -- that's  
17          where Chaparral got it started, and they're still using  
18          Adaptec today.

19          Chaparral took that technology from Adaptec and took  
20          it further forward. You'll hear Mr. Walker talk about how  
21          that technology was adapted and still exists today in  
22          Chaparral's products, still exists today, still used today.  
23          Technology that they got from Adaptec is still being used  
24          today.

25          You'll hear from a fella named Ian Davies, software

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 developer. Ian Davies is an interesting individual because he  
2 got started at Adaptec. He worked on that Adaptec product  
3 that I just had up there. He worked on it while at Adaptec  
4 and when that product was transferred from Adaptec to  
5 Chaparral, he continued working on it.

6 You'll hear from him. You'll hear from him how they  
7 didn't use one screw, one bolt, one resistor, capacitor,  
8 anything from Crossroads, not one thing. They got the stuff  
9 that they are using from Adaptec. They got it from the  
10 beginning and are using it today.

11 Now, Mr. Allcock mentioned that Chaparral found out  
12 about this 972 patent in February of 2000. That's absolutely  
13 true. They found out about it and what did they do? They did  
14 exactly the right thing. They contacted their patent lawyer  
15 almost immediately. That's exactly what the law requires you  
16 to do. That's what they expect.

17 If you see a patent, you don't know what it means.  
18 These guys are not lawyers, so they contact an expert. They  
19 contacted Mr. Zinger, patent law expert. Mr. Zinger had been  
20 working with them. His name's Dave Zinger. Been working with  
21 him for many months as -- actually, it may be a year -- on  
22 patenting Chaparral's own products.

23 He knew Chaparral's own products very well, so he  
24 didn't have to get up to speed. It's a very logical choice.  
25 Mr. Zinger not only had a law degree and knew patent law very

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 well but, also, he was an engineer. He has a technical  
2 degree. He knew computers very well.

3 Mr. Zinger was a fine choice. And Mr. Zinger looked  
4 at this 972 patent and concluded that it was invalid, never  
5 should have issued, or, in the alternative, he concluded that  
6 it was not infringed by the Chaparral products. And so,  
7 ladies and gentlemen, if you find that, you won't be first.  
8 Mr. Zinger had done that months before.

9 Now, as Mr. Allcock noted, Chaparral found out about  
10 this patent without any word from Crossroads, not one word,  
11 not a letter, not a phone call, not a, hey, why don't you look  
12 at this patent, nothing. No personal conversation, nothing.  
13 What did Crossroads do? First thing they did was to file  
14 suit.

15 That's the first thing they did, shoot first and ask  
16 questions later. That's Crossroads' attitude in this case.  
17 Now, Mr. Allcock wrote some four words for you to remember,  
18 ten years from now, access controls and LUN zoning. That's  
19 the essence of the invention.

20 Patent says access controls, no doubt about that.  
21 You're not going to hear one witness from this stand, and that  
22 patent document does not include any mention of LUN zoning,  
23 not one. The patent isn't about LUN zoning, it's about access  
24 controls. In fact, you won't even hear mention of the word  
25 zoning in that patent. It's just not there.



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1           And, in fact, the LUN zoning that occurred -- this  
2 appears in Chaparral's most recent products -- is much more  
3 like the SCSI reserve command, using the SCSI reserve  
4 commands. Technology that they had, although relating all the  
5 way back to the Adaptec day, much more like that than it is  
6 the access controls that are contemplated by the 972 patent.

7           Much more like that. And this, ladies and gentlemen,  
8 deals with Questions 1 through 4 and 6 on your form, those are  
9 the infringement questions. Each of those questions should be  
10 answered a resounding no. Chaparral doesn't infringe, they  
11 never have and never will.

12           So we've got these three reasons. First, Chaparral  
13 owes Crossroads nothing because the Crossroads patent never  
14 should have issued. It's invalid. Second, Crossroads' patent  
15 was not enforceable because Crossroads was less than honest  
16 when dealing with Patent Office. And third, there is no  
17 infringement of the Chaparral products, the 1310, before, now  
18 or ever. There's no infringement.

19           Mr. Allcock says this case is not about money. Now,  
20 whenever I hear that, this case is not about money, it's not  
21 about money, it's always about money, every single time and  
22 that's what this case is about. They want to convince you to  
23 get Chaparral to pay them money. It's exactly what this case  
24 is about.

25           They say it's all about access control. Well, in

1 fact, access control is a very small part of their invention.  
2 Mr. Allcock made reference to the claims that are at the end  
3 of the patent. He's right. They're like a deed to land.  
4 They kind of describe, it's kind of archaic patent law  
5 language exactly what's being claimed.

6 And let me have the next slide, please. Now, what  
7 I've done here, I don't expect you to read this. What I've  
8 done here is reproduce the last page of this patent. We're  
9 going to go into much more detail on this. But what I've done  
10 is I've gone into the claim. This includes all the claims, 1  
11 through 14.

12 You can kind of make that out. I've gone through all  
13 those claims, and I've highlighted the word access control.  
14 That's how much it occurs. And yet, they're going to get a  
15 witness on this stand who is supposed to be an expert in  
16 economics that's going to ask you to pay them either 25  
17 percent or 17 percent of the gross selling price of the  
18 Chaparral product when this is how much of their invention is  
19 really access control.

20 Looked at another way, the accused Chaparral products  
21 have about 500,000 lines of code. That's the way programmers  
22 like to measure things, the lines of code. They printed out  
23 on a sheet of paper -- actually, they probably do it on the  
24 screens, and they count the lines of code.

25 The product -- the accused products include about

1 500,000 lines of code. How much of that code is dedicated to  
2 LUN zoning? This feature that they're shooting at that they  
3 say is so incredibly valuable? Well, it turns out that it's  
4 less than 5,000 lines. That's one percent. One percent of  
5 our product.

6 This much of their invention, one percent of our  
7 product includes the thing that they're shooting at. Yet,  
8 they want -- they're going to try to convince you to pay them  
9 either 25 percent or 17 percent of the gross selling price.  
10 This outrage never stops.

11 So, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we have these  
12 three things. First, the patent is not valid, never should  
13 have issued by the Patent Office. It's old. Crossroads is  
14 trying to patent something that's old, and you're the first to  
15 hear about it because the Patent Office didn't see it.

16 Second of all, the Patent Office didn't see it because  
17 Crossroads didn't tell them about it, and that means the  
18 patent is unenforceable. This patent never should have  
19 issued, ever. And third, the patent doesn't infringe. If any  
20 one of those -- at the end of the day, once again, this  
21 evidence is not going to be completely in this case until  
22 Tuesday next week, and if at that time you find any one of  
23 those things true, then Chaparral pays Crossroads absolutely  
24 nothing.

25 But, indeed, ladies and gentlemen, I feel confident

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 that you will find each one of those true, all three of them.  
2 I'd like to thank you in advance for your attention to this  
3 case on behalf of Chaparral. I know Tuesday after Labor Day  
4 is not the favorite thing to come to the courthouse sitting on  
5 a jury.

6 And on behalf of Chaparral, I'd like to thank you for  
7 coming here today, and what I ask is that you listen to all  
8 the evidence and when all the evidence is in, you make a fair  
9 judgment. That's all we can ask. Thank you.

10 THE COURT: You may call your first witness.

11 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, we're going to move the  
12 screen.

13 THE COURT: If you're going to move the screen, I  
14 suggest you move it.

15 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, we would call Brian Smith  
16 to the stand, please, sir.

17 THE COURT: Come forward, be sworn, please.

18 (Witness was sworn.)

19 THE COURT: Take your seat, please. If you'll tell us  
20 your full name, please, sir, and spell your last.

21 THE WITNESS: Brian Rutledge Smith, S-M-I-T-H.

22 BRIAN R. SMITH, called by the Plaintiff, duly sworn.

23 DIRECT EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. ALBRIGHT:

25 Q. Mr. Smith, would you introduce yourself to the ladies and

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 gentlemen of the jury, please, sir?

2 A. Good afternoon. My name is Brian Smith. I am the  
3 Chairman and CEO of Crossroads Systems.

4 Q. And would you briefly tell the jury what your educational  
5 background is, starting with college?

6 A. Yes. I have an undergraduate degree in electrical  
7 engineering from the University of Cincinnati, and I have a  
8 graduate degree in electrical engineering from Purdue  
9 University.

10 Q. When you graduated from Purdue, what did you do  
11 professionally, sir?

12 A. I went to work for IBM.

13 Q. What time period would that be?

14 A. That was 1990.

15 Q. Okay. Moving ahead to 1992, 1993 time period, tell the  
16 jury, if you would, please, sir, how it is that what is now  
17 Crossroads began?

18 A. When I moved from New York to Austin to work for IBM and  
19 after a while, we met a gentleman named Dale Quisenberry, who  
20 we started to talk about -- I started to talk with about a  
21 business opportunity, and we founded Crossroads together,  
22 precursor to that in 1994.

23 Q. And what was the name of the precursor that you and Mr.  
24 Quisenberry formed?

25 A. We called it Infinity Comm Stor.

1 Q. And just very briefly, tell the jury what it is that you  
2 all did in that time period.

3 A. We did consulting work. We used our expertise to provide  
4 potential customers with answers to questions they may have or  
5 develop different things for them, marketing, engineer  
6 products, that kind of thing.

7 Q. Tell the jury, if you would, fast-forwarding to 1996 what  
8 it was that made you decide to launch out and begin Crossroads  
9 with Mr. Quisenberry?

10 A. Consulting was a very good business but it didn't scale  
11 very well, so we looked to get back to our original roots  
12 which was in delivering products. And so, we looked for a  
13 product to develop.

14 Q. And what product was that?

15 A. We decided to invent the new world, new space called the  
16 storage router world.

17 Q. And would you give the jury an idea during the '96-'97  
18 time period what Brian Smith's role was with respect to  
19 selling Fibre Channel and SCSI -- Fibre Channel routers to --

20 A. I spent a lot of time doing a number of things. First was  
21 evangelizing, because Fibre Channel was a new standard, and  
22 educating potential customers, as well as our partners, on the  
23 merits of Fibre Channel. I also spent a great deal of time  
24 with customers, looking for opportunities to potentially sell  
25 products that we would eventually develop to them over time.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. And would you give the jury in the 1996-1997 time period  
2 what kind of commitment in terms of hours in your personal  
3 life, professional life you invested in Crossroads?

4 A. That was certainly an extraordinary amount, 80 plus hours  
5 each week in flying around, meeting with investors, meeting  
6 with potential customers and talking to partners.

7 Q. Your Honor, may I move to the table for just a second,  
8 your Honor?

9 THE COURT: Pardon?

10 MR. ALBRIGHT: May I move to the table? We have a  
11 couple of demonstratives I'd like to show Mr. Smith.

12 THE COURT: You don't need my permission to move  
13 around in the courtroom.

14 Q. (BY MR. ALBRIGHT) Mr. Smith, just quickly, since these are  
15 physical items we're going to be discussing, I just wanted to  
16 give the jury an idea of what it is that we're talking about  
17 when we're talking about it. Would you tell the jury what  
18 this is I'm holding in my hands?

19 A. It's a SCSI cable.

20 Q. And that SCSI would be the S-C-S-I that we've seen and  
21 heard so much about?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. Comparing this to this, tell the jury what this long  
24 orange cord is.

25 A. That's a fiber-optic cable that can be used to connect

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Fibre Channel devices together.

2 Q. Okay. And in terms of length comparing the Fibre Channel  
3 to the SCSI spec, what happens with respect to the distance  
4 that information can carry?

5 A. The SCSI spec allows us to go up to 25 meters but  
6 typically only six meters in enterprise whereas Fibre Channel  
7 allows us to extend up to ten kilometers.

8 Q. Okay. In terms of speed, is there any difference?

9 A. There are differences: The SCSI has a different set of  
10 data rates, 20 megabytes a second, 40 megabytes a second, 80  
11 megabytes a second. Fibre Channel started off at slower rates  
12 than the 100 megabytes a second that currently use that and  
13 has moved to 200 megabytes. And there's contemplation even  
14 beyond that today, so it's even a lot faster.

15 Q. What would this be?

16 A. That is a disk drive, looks like a SCSI disk drive.

17 Q. Where does this go?

18 A. Typically in either a computer server or in an external  
19 storage device.

20 Q. And this is what?

21 A. That is -- if you'll show me the back. That is a 4100.

22 Q. Okay. Who makes this?

23 A. Crossroads does.

24 Q. So this is the Crossroads 4100 router?

25 A. It is.



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. Okay. Mr. Allcock discussed a little bit about the  
2 technology describing what it did. He described it as  
3 basically translating Greek to English. Do you remember that  
4 portion of the argument?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Would you give the jury just a brief understanding of what  
7 Mr. Allcock was telling them?

8 A. Fibre Channel and SCSI speak different languages. One's a  
9 networking language, the other one is a bus or point-to-point  
10 language, and there needs to be a conversion between the two  
11 so that devices on either end to speak to each one another.

12 Q. Thinking back to 1996, about how many folks were at  
13 Crossroads during time period?

14 A. In the middle of '96, six or seven. About the end of the  
15 year, about twelve.

16 Q. And was Brian Smith's role during that period of time to  
17 be design products?

18 A. No.

19 Q. Or inventing stuff?

20 A. No.

21 Q. Getting patents?

22 A. No.

23 Q. Who did you rely on at Crossroads to perform that task?

24 A. My engineering team, the couple of gentlemen we had hired,  
25 including Mr. Hoese and Mr. Russell.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. Okay. And the jury's going to meet Mr. Hoese and they're  
2 going to meet Mr. Russell. And would you tell the jury who  
3 they are with respect to the 972 patent?

4 A. They are the inventors of the 972 patent.

5 Q. Okay. What was Brian Smith's direct involvement with the  
6 972 patent?

7 A. None in terms of invention, just simply encouraging our  
8 engineering team to patent things that they thought were  
9 patentable.

10 Q. Did you have an involvement on the micro level of this  
11 patent?

12 A. I did not.

13 Q. And fast-forwarding just for a second, is this the only  
14 patent that Crossroads has obtained?

15 A. It is not.

16 Q. How many off the top of your head?

17 A. I believe currently we hold seven patents issued.

18 Q. And do you have any idea how many patents Crossroads has  
19 applied for?

20 A. More than 30 additionally from that.

21 Q. So it would be fair to say intellectual property is pretty  
22 important?

23 A. It's a key part of our company, yes.

24 Q. I want to also go back to Crossroads' investment in the  
25 Crossroads industry. Could you give the jury an idea because

1 we heard during the defense opening argument about, you know,  
2 why you were bringing the lawsuit in terms of wanting damages  
3 and your financial condition. Would you give the jury an idea  
4 of how much money investors put in Crossroads?

5 A. To date, we have raised over \$100 million to fund and  
6 develop the company and this product line as well as the  
7 marketplace.

8 Q. Could you give the jury an idea of how much you've made in  
9 revenues?

10 A. Somewhere in excess of \$75 million.

11 Q. And what has Crossroads done with that revenue of \$75  
12 million?

13 A. We've taken the profits and redeployed them into the  
14 company to continue to develop new products that we continue  
15 to work on.

16 Q. There's going to be evidence in this case that will come  
17 in the future that the reason that folks at Chaparral  
18 discovered the 972 patent was indirectly the fact that you had  
19 made certain statements in public about protecting your  
20 intellectual property and this was back in early 2000.

21 A. Uh-huh.

22 Q. Would you tell the jury why you made those statements in  
23 early 2000 about Crossroads' intention of protecting its  
24 intellectual property?

25 A. Crossroads has always had the intent of protecting its

1 intellectual property, even from days much earlier than 2000,  
2 and we had made that a part of our public communication to  
3 investors at different venues.

4 Q. Could you give the jury how much Crossroads invests in  
5 terms of each patent disclosure?

6 A. Patent disclosure costs us around \$15,000 each today, but  
7 we invest dramatically more than that in engineering time to  
8 write it down and search for the implementation of it.

9 Q. So it's early 2000. You've made the statements that  
10 you're going to protect Crossroads' intellectual property.  
11 What did you do, as the CEO and Chairman of Crossroads, to put  
12 that in effect?

13 A. All along, ask the engineering team to patent things that  
14 were patentable, file for patent protection, and then, to work  
15 through the process with the Patent and Trademark Office to  
16 get them issued.

17 Q. Okay. And with respect to protecting, specifically, the  
18 972 patent, what did you do?

19 A. Asked our then advising counsel to look into the patent  
20 and see if there were infringers.

21 Q. Okay. And what was the result of that investigation to  
22 the best of your knowledge?

23 A. We were told that there were infringement by Chaparral and  
24 others.

25 Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Bahler spent a fair amount of time talking

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 about the fact that Crossroads has marked some of its product  
2 or all of its products since a certain date with a label that  
3 has the 972 patent on it. You're aware that that's been done,  
4 correct?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Did you have any responsibility as the CEO and Chairman of  
7 Crossroads in terms of putting labels on the products?

8 A. I did not.

9 Q. Who would you have delegated the responsibility for making  
10 the decision to apply a label to the routers to?

11 A. Be part of the process with our engineering team and  
12 marketing team.

13 Q. Okay. Specifically in this case, do you know if it was  
14 Mr. John Middleton who got the task of deciding whether or not  
15 to put this label on the products?

16 A. I'm sure he would have been part of the process, yes.

17 Q. Okay. At the time Crossroads put this label on the  
18 product, were you, Brian Smith, as the CEO and Chairman of  
19 Crossroads Technology, telling the world that it believed that  
20 SCSI reserve or some form of software was in the product  
21 actually performed what is covered by the 972 patent?

22 A. I'm sorry, beginning of the question again.

23 Q. Did you make the decision that that was what was in it by  
24 the decision --

25 A. It was not my decision.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. Okay. Would you -- and we're about to meet Mr. Middleton.

2 A. Uh-huh.

3 Q. Would you defer to Mr. Middleton in terms of explaining to  
4 the jury under oath why it is that Crossroads did put the  
5 label on the product?

6 A. Yes, I would.

7 Q. Okay. I want to go back to the '97 time period when the  
8 972 patent was being invented. Are you with me during that  
9 time period?

10 A. Uh-huh.

11 Q. Would you tell the jury who it was at Crossroads who was  
12 working on that patent?

13 A. The patent would have been worked on by Geoff Hoese and  
14 Jeff Russell.

15 Q. Okay. And, as I understand it, Mr. Hoese is a person  
16 who's on the software side?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. And Mr. Russell is a person who is on the hardware side?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. In terms of what those words mean, if we look at the  
21 router I showed you earlier, the box, for example, would be  
22 the hardware, correct?

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. So it's Mr. Hoese who's going to be best able to explain  
25 what the access control feature is in the 972 patent?

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 A. I believe so.

2 Q. With respect specifically to the 972 patent, who did you,  
3 as the CEO and Chairman of Crossroads, rely on to get this  
4 patent process completed?

5 A. Originally would have been with Geoff Hoese and he was  
6 hired to be our director of software, and then, over time, he  
7 and John Middleton together had that responsibility.

8 Q. And who would you have relied on to make certain that the  
9 Patent Office got every bit of information that they needed to  
10 make the right decision?

11 A. Would have been Geoff and Jeff.

12 Q. Okay. Geoff Hoese and Jeff Russell?

13 A. Yes, that would be.

14 Q. Okay. I want to go quickly -- actually, I think I'm going  
15 to skip that.

16 Let's talk about the 4100. And Mr. Bahler showed the  
17 jury a picture of -- I think it's the CrossPoint 4100 that was  
18 from the 1996 Comdex. Do you remember that portion of the  
19 argument?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Tell the jury what Comdex is.

22 A. Comdex is an annual trade show held in November in Las  
23 Vegas where computer dealers and customers can come together  
24 to learn about new products.

25 Q. Okay. And did Crossroads, in fact, show something that

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 was called the CrossPoint 4100 at Comdex?

2 A. We did not.

3 Q. Did you show something at the Comdex in 1996?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And what was it that you actually showed in 1996?

6 A. We showed the technology demonstration connecting one  
7 server to one storage device through a hard-wired prototype.

8 Q. And just so I make sure I understand, would you tell the  
9 jury what you mean through a hardware prototype?

10 A. Hard-wired.

11 Q. Hard-wired.

12 A. It is one way to connect from one server to one of the  
13 storage device. Everything was prefixed before getting to the  
14 show.

15 Q. So going back to our Greek and English example of this  
16 translation, what would that thing in '96 have been able to  
17 do?

18 A. Simply ask or convert how do I go to the rest room or  
19 where is the rest room kind of analogy.

20 Q. Jury's heard a lot about access controls. Would this  
21 thing that was shown in 1996 at Comdex, would it have enabled  
22 to perform anything in the possible universe of words would  
23 have been able to accomplish what is access control?

24 A. No, I don't believe so.

25 Q. I want to turn your attention, if you would, please, sir,



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 to a company that's actually in the news today, Hewlett  
2 Packard.

3 A. Uh-huh.

4 Q. Would you tell the jury what part Hewlett Packard played  
5 in Crossroads' history?

6 A. Hewlett Packard was viewed and still is viewed as a  
7 significant strategic customer and partner. They own a big  
8 part of the marketplace that we sell to today from a  
9 connectivity viewpoint, so we wanted them as a partner and a  
10 customer so we began to discuss with them in the early time  
11 frame how we could either work together or how they could buy  
12 our products.

13 Q. I want to take you back to that time period again, and  
14 there was a product that is known as a Mux.

15 A. Uh-huh.

16 Q. Are you familiar with that term?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. In case the jury isn't, could you tell them what Mux  
19 stands for?

20 A. Mux stands for multiplexer.

21 Q. Okay. In what role did the Mux play in the relationship  
22 between Hewlett Packard and Crossroads in 1996?

23 A. HP had developed a project called multiplexer that they  
24 had no additional resources to continue to develop and were  
25 looking for a partner to take over that development.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. Okay. Now, down the road in this trial, I believe there's  
2 a probability that the jury is going to be told that Hewlett  
3 Packard can be considered to be competitive with Crossroads.  
4 Would you give the jury an idea of what their position is  
5 currently with respect to Crossroads in terms of being an  
6 investor?

7 A. They're certainly an investor. They purchased \$3 million  
8 worth of our securities in 1998. So they have been a great  
9 partner even since before then, but from a financial point of  
10 view, they invest in the company and they still hold that  
11 position today.

12 Q. Where would Hewlett Packard rank in terms of first,  
13 second, third, or whatever, as a customer of Crossroads?

14 A. Today, in our last reported public quarter, they were over  
15 a ten percent customer, which is a significant part of our  
16 business. In fact, substantially higher than ten percent.

17 Q. Could be closer to 20, maybe?

18 A. I think even above that.

19 Q. Okay. Would it be fair to say they're one of the top one  
20 or two customers of Crossroads products?

21 A. They are today, yes.

22 Q. And products of y'all's, Hewlett Packard and Crossroads,  
23 that are competitive with each other?

24 A. They're not.

25 Q. Can you imagine any scenario in which someone fairly

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 looking at your relationship with Hewlett Packard could  
2 describe you all as being competitive, given their  
3 relationship with you as an investor and a customer?

4 A. I cannot.

5 Q. Would it be fair to say, at some point, you picked Hewlett  
6 Packard or they picked you perhaps as a strategic partner?

7 A. Absolutely, it would be fair to say they picked us because  
8 of the abilities we had in the company, and they believed what  
9 we were about.

10 Q. Compare and contrast, we just talked about Hewlett Packard  
11 in relationship -- Chaparral's the defendant in this case.  
12 Would it be fair to say that Crossroads and Chaparral are  
13 competitors?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And why would you describe your products, the router  
16 product that the jury can see right in front of them, as being  
17 competitive with Chaparral products?

18 A. We compete in the market for the same set of customers.

19 Q. Okay. They also sell what's known as a RAID product,  
20 correct?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And would you tell the jury what R-A-I-D, RAID stands for?

23 A. RAID stands for redundant array of inexpensive discs.

24 Q. Okay. If you were to have to enter negotiations with  
25 Chaparral to license some of your intellectual property

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 portfolio, would you consider them to be a competitor?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Mr. Smith, did you authorize this suit to obtain damages?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Okay. Did you do it to protect Crossroads' intellectual  
6 property?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. I'm going to finish up, Mr. Smith, with one quick area.  
9 We heard that you've never made a profit, that dire economic  
10 times abound, and that's the reason these seven people are  
11 having to sit in this trial. Would you tell the jury what  
12 Crossroads' current financial health is?

13 A. Sure. We're a very healthy company. We are no doubt. We  
14 have over \$60 million in cash, and we have very good other  
15 financial metrics that indicate we are a healthy company.

16 Q. For some time and let me ask it this way: In, say, 1988  
17 and 1999, what was Crossroads' position in terms of share of  
18 the market in the router industry?

19 A. We had significant part of that kind of growing market at  
20 the time. Probably 80 plus percent.

21 Q. Is Crossroads still greater than 50 percent in the router  
22 market?

23 A. We are today, yes.

24 Q. As part of that result of being the first to market?

25 A. Yes, definitely.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. I pass the witness.

2 CROSS-EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. BAHLER:

4 Q. Mr. Smith, you brought up Comdex 1996, and I'd like to  
5 cover that in little bit more detail. That show in 1996 was  
6 November 1996, correct, sir?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. That was in Las Vegas?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And there were -- I've heard reports that there were  
11 200,000 people there. Does that sound aligned to you?

12 A. That sounds about right.

13 Q. And you mentioned this technology demonstration, right?

14 A. Uh-huh.

15 Q. And just so we're clear about this, what you had on the  
16 table was kind of a mock-up of what you have here on the  
17 table, the 4100, and you had wires coming out of it down to a  
18 PC that was under the table, right?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. And in the PC, that's where all the translations from  
21 Greek to English were going on, right?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And that's where all the Fibre Channel stuff is coming in,  
24 right?

25 A. Yes.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. That's where all the SCSI stuff was coming out the other  
2 side, right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. It was all done in the PC, but there was hardware down  
5 there, correct?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. And it was working?

8 A. It was.

9 Q. Okay. Now you mentioned the middle of 1996, there were  
10 six or seven people working for Crossroads. The project which  
11 ultimately became the Crossroads 4100 product was called the  
12 Verrazano product inside, right?

13 A. Actually, Verrazano was an architectural description.

14 Q. Okay. Would you please take a look at what I have up on  
15 the screen as Defendant's Exhibit 150. This is a presentation  
16 that you prepared, right, sir?

17 A. I don't remember if I prepared it or not. It has my name  
18 on it.

19 Q. At least your name's on it, right?

20 A. Uh-huh.

21 Q. Okay. And you prepared this in June 1996, right?

22 A. That's the date, yes.

23 Q. All right. And just so we're clear about this, this is  
24 called -- this presentation is called Verrazano Fibre  
25 Channel-to-SCSI bridge product overview, right?

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 A. It is.

2 Q. So Verrazano was a product, right?

3 A. As I remember, Verrazano was a description of an

4 architecture that we used internally.

5 Q. Well, this doesn't say architectural overview, does it,

6 sir?

7 A. It does not.

8 Q. Okay. Please take a look at within that document, this is

9 page 12 of that document. And here is a presentation of the

10 Verrazano architecture, right, sir?

11 A. I believe so, yes.

12 Q. All right. And this was June 1996, right?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And, in fact, what was in the computer underneath the

15 table at Comdex 1996 looked just like this, right, sir?

16 A. I don't know that.

17 Q. Okay. Well, let me ask you this: The technology

18 demonstration at Comdex 1996 included a Tachyon Fibre Channel

19 controller, right, sir?

20 A. It did.

21 Q. And the technology demonstration at Comdex 1996 included a

22 SCSI controller, right, sir?

23 A. It did.

24 Q. Just like shown in the picture, right?

25 A. Uh-huh.

1 Q. And the Tachyon Fibre Channel controller was connected to  
2 a Fibre Channel at Comdex 1996, right, sir?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And the SCSI controller was connected to a SCSI bus in  
5 1996, right, sir?

6 A. It was.

7 Q. All right. And just so we're clear here, Tachyon,  
8 T-A-C-H-Y-O-N, that's a chip made by Hewlett Packard, right?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. And that has certain things inside of it that permit  
11 computers such as -- well, that permit computers to  
12 communicate with Fibre Channel, right?

13 A. It permits devices behind it to communicate. I don't know  
14 what they are specifically.

15 Q. Okay. And it has certain elements, right, the Tachyon,  
16 right --

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. -- that are permitted to do that. One of the things is a  
19 buffer memory inside there?

20 A. I believe so.

21 Q. And that's a first in, first out or so-called FIFO memory,  
22 right?

23 A. I don't know that.

24 Q. Okay. And there is a DMA, or direct memory access engine,  
25 in there, too, right?



1 A. I believe there is.

2 Q. Okay. And that transfers information from the FIFO memory  
3 to the system memory, right? That's how it works?

4 A. I believe that's how it works.

5 Q. And also in there is a Fibre Channel protocol unit, right?

6 A. I don't recall what else is in there.

7 Q. Maybe Mr. Hoese can help us more on this, but the very  
8 least, the technology demonstration at Comdex 1996 included a  
9 Fibre Channel controller and it was, indeed, a Hewlett Packard  
10 Tachyon Fibre Channel?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And it was working, right?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Now, the SCSI controller that was included in the  
15 technology demonstration at Comdex 1996 was made by a company  
16 called Symbios Logic, right, sir?

17 A. I believe so, yes.

18 Q. And they made chips that connected to Fibre Channel -- I'm  
19 sorry, SCSI buses to computer buses, right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And that's how -- that's what a SCSI controller basically  
22 does, right?

23 A. I believe so.

24 Q. And inside this Symbios Logic SCSI controller chip, there  
25 were things that permitted it to do its function, also, right,

1 sir?

2 A. Indeed.

3 Q. And had an internal buffer memory, right?

4 A. I believe so.

5 Q. Okay. And it also had one of these direct memory access  
6 or DMA engines that transferred data from the internal -- from  
7 the buffer inside of a SCSI controller into the computer  
8 memory, right?

9 A. I believe so.

10 Q. Okay. And it also had a SCSI protocol unit, right?

11 A. That I'm not sure of.

12 Q. Okay. Mr. Hoese may be able to help us on that, right?

13 A. Uh-huh, yes.

14 Q. In any event, the Symbios Logic SCSI controller was  
15 included in the technology demonstration at Comdex 1996,  
16 right?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Okay. Now, the technology demonstration also included a  
19 microprocessor, right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And, in fact, included an Intel i960 microprocessor?

22 A. I believe so.

23 Q. Just like shown on this drawing from Exhibit 150, right?

24 A. I believe so.

25 Q. Okay. And the microprocessor that was in the technology

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 demonstration at Comdex 1996, that kind of supervised the  
2 operation of the entire router, correct?

3 A. Of the technology prototype, yes.

4 Q. By the way, sir, have you ever called that technology  
5 prototype a prototype of the 4100?

6 A. I don't recall that.

7 Q. You don't recall that? All right, sir. Have you ever  
8 told anybody that the technology demonstration at Comdex 1996  
9 was a prototype of the 4100?

10 A. Again, I don't recall that.

11 Q. Okay. And, also, included in Comdex 1996 technology  
12 demonstration was a system memory, right?

13 A. I believe so, but I'm not clear on that.

14 Q. Okay. And that technology demonstration operated to take  
15 information from the Fibre Channel through the Tachyon Fibre  
16 Channel stored in memory?

17 A. I don't know how the data flow actually worked.

18 Q. That was under control by the -- well, however it did it,  
19 that was under control by the microprocessor, right?

20 A. Yes, I believe so.

21 Q. The technology demonstration had a system memory, didn't  
22 it, sir?

23 A. Again, I don't know the --

24 Q. Mr. Hoese would know that?

25 A. Mr. Hoese would certainly know that.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. Okay. And then, well, if you don't know, you don't know.

2 And at that technology -- and this was -- technology  
3 demonstration was in a room that was sponsored by the Fibre  
4 Channel arbitrated -- Fibre Channel loop community, right?

5 A. I believe so.

6 Q. FCLC, right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. There was a big room, right?

9 A. Big, couple of thousand square feet, I think.

10 Q. Right. And it was open to the public?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Right? And Crossroads was there and had a booth there,  
13 right?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And in that booth was this technology demonstration  
16 working away, correct?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. And also in that booth, you had handouts, right?

19 A. I believe we did, yes.

20 Q. Take a look at Defendant's 166. This is an example of a  
21 handout that you had at Comdex 1996, correct, sir?

22 A. Yes, I believe so.

23 Q. All right. And this deals with the CrossPoint 4100  
24 product, right?

25 A. Preliminary technical data, yes.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. You had a technology demonstration running at Comdex 1996,

2 right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. As we discovered intensely?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And you were handing out this CrossPoint 4100 product

7 literature, right?

8 A. Correct.

9 Q. That technology demonstration was a prototype of the 4100

10 product, right, sir?

11 A. I don't believe so.

12 Q. Now, why were you at Comdex '96?

13 A. We were there to meet potential customers.

14 Q. Customers, right?

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. You were interested in selling this thing, right?

17 A. We were interested in getting their feedback on what

18 products they would like to have.

19 Q. Okay. In fact, as a result of the Comdex 1996 show, you

20 actually sold some 4100 products, right?

21 A. What do you mean by as a result?

22 Q. Well, after the Comdex 1996 show, you actually sold 4100

23 products, right?

24 A. Certainly historically, yes.

25 Q. And you sold some of those before the end of 1996,

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 correct?

2 A. No, that's not true.

3 Q. All right. Please take a look at Defendant's Exhibit 156.

4 Got that in front of the screen there. Can you read that,

5 sir?

6 A. Barely.

7 Q. Mr. Smith, I have a notebook to refer to what we're  
8 talking about. I think a better copy of 156 is in there. Can

9 you see it? Is that a good copy, sir?

10 A. It's about the same quality.

11 Q. Okay. Let's take a look at the third page, okay? Now,  
12 first of all -- I'm sorry, back up to the first page. This is

13 an e-mail that you wrote to a fella named Joe Boykin, right,

14 sir?

15 A. That's what it says, yes.

16 Q. And Joe Boykin was at Clariion, right?

17 A. That's what it says.

18 Q. Clariion was part of the visual equipment at the time?

19 A. No, I don't believe so.

20 Q. This relationship came later perhaps?

21 A. I don't know that Clariion and Digital were ever related.

22 Q. Okay. In any event, it was Clariion, right?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And you wrote this e-mail December 20th, 1996, right?

25 A. That's what it says, yes.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

- 1 Q. Before the end of '96, right, sir?
- 2 A. That's correct.
- 3 Q. Okay. Now, this is actually an e-mail which shows -- it  
4 shows -- actually, there's several e-mails stacked up here,  
5 right, sir?
- 6 A. That's what it looks like, yes.
- 7 Q. And some of the e-mails, it's kind of interlinked between  
8 e-mails he wrote to you and e-mails you wrote to him, right?
- 9 A. I believe so.
- 10 Q. And this part right here is something that was written by  
11 Mr. Boykin, right where he says, first, we have already  
12 provided you with a PO for four no-cost evaluation units to be  
13 delivered in mid-December. That's what he told you, right?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And Crossroads had received the purchase order for these  
16 evaluation units before this time, correct?
- 17 A. I believe so.
- 18 Q. All right. And then, but he doesn't want those anymore,  
19 right, he wants the real thing, right?
- 20 A. He says here he wants the evaluation units.
- 21 Q. At the bottom of that page, he says on completion of a  
22 successful evaluation, they intend to purchase 50 devices at a  
23 price of \$1995, right?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. They wanted to buy them from you, right?

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 A. That was his intent.

2 Q. Okay. And he had delivery time. He wants ten in  
3 February, another 15 in March or February, 15 in March and  
4 then, another 15 -- another ten at the end of March, right?

5 A. Yes, that's what he says.

6 Q. That's a definite price for the product, right?

7 A. He certainly mentions that, yes.

8 Q. And definite delivery schedule for the product, right,  
9 sir?

10 A. That's what he was requesting.

11 Q. Okay. Take a look at the last page of that exhibit. This  
12 is kind of on the e-mail trail again. This is where he said,  
13 this is -- kind of repeats that other e-mail: It is still my  
14 intention to purchase units on completion of the evaluation.  
15 And he talks about a PO for \$100,000, which is \$1995 for 50  
16 units, right?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And that's the 50 units he was talking about earlier,  
19 right?

20 A. I believe so.

21 Q. And those were for the 4100 product, right, sir?

22 A. I'm not sure of that. He's asking for betas of the 4100.

23 Q. Right. 4100 product, right, sir?

24 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, Mr. Bahler can you tell us  
25 which exhibit number he's showing?



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 MR. BAHLER: This is 156. Sorry. I thought I said  
2 that.

3 A. The document says betas.

4 Q. (BY MR. BAHLER) Right. It shows the 4100 product, right?

5 A. That's what it says.

6 Q. And you say in the next paragraph that you would prefer  
7 that they did their evaluation on beta units, right?

8 A. Where are you?

9 Q. The next paragraph. This is -- it's on the screen there,  
10 sir. Here, I'll highlight it. We would prefer that you did  
11 your evaluation with our beta units, right?

12 A. That's what it says, yes.

13 Q. And you said the prototype units, now, that's something  
14 different from beta units, right?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. But they still were -- they're 4100 prototype units,  
17 right, sir?

18 A. I don't know that.

19 Q. They could be sent in January. That's what you told them,  
20 right?

21 A. It's what it says, yes.

22 Q. And then, you said -- you told them that beta would be  
23 better units than prototype units, right?

24 A. It says that we would prefer that they did their  
25 evaluation with our beta units.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. Okay. And then, at the last part of that paragraph, you  
2 say -- you defer to the prototypes that you're going to be  
3 offering to them. The prototypes have a slightly more  
4 difficult method of field upgrade but nothing too painful.  
5 These are the units that you saw at Comdex. That's what you  
6 told Mr. Boykin, right?

7 A. That's what it says.

8 Q. And you're referring to the technology demonstration at  
9 Comdex 1996, right there, right, sir?

10 A. I don't know that.

11 Q. Did you have any other prototype units at Comdex 1996?

12 A. I don't know what else we had there.

13 Q. So the only one that you can remember is the technology  
14 demonstration that we just talked about, right, sir?

15 A. That was the technology prototype.

16 Q. And right here, you refer to the prototype at Comdex 1996  
17 as being the prototype of the 4100 product, right, sir?

18 A. I don't know if they're the same. I can't tell that.

19 Q. Once again, you don't recall any other prototypes at 1996,  
20 do you?

21 A. I don't.

22 Q. And lastly, you conclude in that paragraph -- and this is  
23 you. You say, betas can be returned for the real thing so we  
24 are allowing customers to evaluate betas for 60 days  
25 evaluation PO, 60 days evaluation beta for class price of

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 \$3300. You wanted him to pay you \$3300 for each of those beta  
2 units, right, sir?

3 A. I don't believe so. I'm sure this was under an evaluation  
4 for this order which we would have expected them back.

5 Q. They were evaluating them, though, weren't they? They  
6 were expected to evaluate them, right?

7 A. We were certainly going to evaluate our product, yes.

8 Q. And if it was acceptable to them, they just keep them,  
9 right?

10 A. We -- when we do evaluation purchase orders, we expect to  
11 receive the units back because we cannot sell them.

12 Q. Doesn't say anywhere in this e-mail that you wanted them  
13 back, does it?

14 A. No. It's customary knowledge in the industry that  
15 evaluation purchase orders are to be evaluated and then  
16 returned. In fact, the FCC won't even let us sell them  
17 because they weren't -- they didn't have the clearance of the  
18 FCC by then.

19 Q. Is the FCC approval required to sell evaluation units?

20 A. That was my understanding.

21 Q. You're still asking for \$3300 there, weren't you, sir?

22 A. Like I said, it's customary to put a price on evaluation  
23 PO.

24 Q. Why didn't you just give it to them and say give it back?

25 A. We were just following industry standard practice.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. And industry standard practice is to put a price and a  
2 delivery time on evaluation units, right?

3 A. That's what we were doing, yes.

4 Q. And evaluation that's being done is by the customer, not  
5 by Crossroads here, right?

6 A. That's right.

7 Q. And if it was acceptable to the customer, they could keep  
8 it, right?

9 A. That's not what the arrangement was.

10 Q. Is there anywhere -- can you find anywhere on this e-mail  
11 that says you've got to give it back regardless?

12 A. I'd have to go read it all.

13 Q. Well, I think I'll let your counsel bring that to your  
14 attention.

15 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, I would ask for the sidebar  
16 comments --

17 MR. BAHLER: I'll hold it down, your Honor, I'm sorry.

18 THE COURT: Not only hold it down, but stop it.

19 Q. (BY MR. BAHLER) Now, Mr. Smith, you talked about the  
20 Hewlett Packard Mux, right, sir?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. It's a -- that's short for multiplexor, right?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And that was you mentioned your relationship with Hewlett  
25 Packard, right?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. You not only were in the Fibre Channel loop community,  
3 which is a prototype of the 4100, but you were also in the  
4 technology suite with Hewlett Packard at Comdex 1996?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And that was for the purpose of promoting the Hewlett  
7 Packard Mux, HP Mux, right, sir?

8 A. I don't remember the exact purpose.

9 Q. Okay. Well, that's what the first technology transfer  
10 between Crossroads and Hewlett Packard was this Hewlett  
11 Packard Mux, right, sir?

12 A. We were certainly talking about owning that product, yes.

13 Q. And that ultimately became known as the Crossroads  
14 CrossPoint 4400 product, right, sir?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. Now, the Hewlett Packard Mux was connectable to multiple  
17 Fibre Channel hosts, right?

18 A. As I understand it, at least two.

19 Q. Okay. And it had a Fibre Channel controller inside of it,  
20 right?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And since it was a Hewlett Packard product, that was  
23 Hewlett Packard Tachyon Fibre Channel, wasn't it, sir?

24 A. I know it was a HP Tachyon. I don't know if there was a  
25 causal relationship.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. All right. Fair enough. And inside the HP Mux was a  
2 supervisor unit or a microprocessor, right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And it was also an internal memory inside of that?

5 A. It was.

6 Q. System memory, and there was also a SCSI controller,  
7 right?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And the Hewlett Packard Mux was a box that included all  
10 that stuff that connected Fibre Channel hosts to SCSI storage  
11 devices, right, sir?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And you established a -- well, let's see. Take a look at  
14 Defendant's Exhibit 152. That's a letter from Ms. Barbara  
15 Bardach, right?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And at the time, she was vice-president of business  
18 development for Crossroads, right, sir?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And let's see here. You got a copy of that letter, right,  
21 sir?

22 A. That's what it says.

23 Q. All right. The first sentence there, it says, on behalf  
24 of Crossroads, I'd like to -- Brian and I -- that's you,  
25 right?

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 A. I believe so.

2 Q. Want to thank you and Joel -- that's Mr. Joel Dunning,  
3 right?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. For inviting us to represent Crossroads in your technology  
6 suite at the Mirage Hotel during Comdex.

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Right? So Crossroads was with Hewlett Packard in the  
9 technology suite at the Comdex, right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And, once again, that occurred beginning of November '96,  
12 right?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Dated the end of November 1996, right?

15 A. It is.

16 Q. All right. Later on, you tell him or Ms. Bardach tells  
17 him, as you know, we enjoyed an extremely successful week.  
18 Our prospective customer -- there were prospective customers  
19 in the technology suite, right, Mr. Smith?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Who visited us at Comdex are quite enthusiastic about the  
22 Fibre Channel SCSI Mux Joel's group designed. That's the  
23 Hewlett Packard Mux, right?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. That's what ultimately became known as the Crossroads 4400

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 product, right, sir?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Now, eventually, Crossroads entered into what is known as  
4 a reseller agreement with Hewlett Packard, right, sir?

5 A. I believe so.

6 Q. And reseller agreement means you would buy product from  
7 Hewlett Packard and you agreed to sell it, right?

8 A. That was the intent.

9 Q. All right. Okay. And that's contrasted with OEM, which  
10 means you change it a little bit. Reseller means you're going  
11 to buy it and resell it with your label on it, right, sir?

12 A. I believe we originally contemplated the reseller  
13 agreement to keep things moving.

14 Q. And so that the units that were going to be transferred  
15 from Hewlett Packard to Crossroads, Crossroads was going to  
16 pay for, right?

17 A. I don't recall the actual terms.

18 Q. Well, it didn't -- wasn't called a seller agreement, it  
19 was called a reseller agreement, right?

20 A. That was the name, yes.

21 Q. And reseller means there's got to be a sale to began with,  
22 right?

23 A. I assume so.

24 Q. That means that units that were coming from Hewlett  
25 Packard to Crossroads were being sold to Crossroads so that



1 they could resell them to other people, right?

2 A. Again, I don't recall when we actually would have done  
3 that, if we ever did.

4 Q. But it was called a reseller agreement, right?

5 A. Yes, absolutely.

6 Q. Please take a look at Defendant's Exhibit 153. Now, this  
7 is a flyer that you had at that technology suite in Comdex  
8 1996 with Hewlett Packard, right, sir?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. You handed this out to prospective customers, right?

11 A. I believe so.

12 Q. And this dealt with the CrossPoint 4400. Now, that was  
13 the Crossroads version of the 4400 Hewlett Packard Mux, right,  
14 or it was rather -- strike that. It was Crossroads' label  
15 that they applied and called the Hewlett Packard Mux, right?

16 A. I don't know that HP applied that. I'm confused with the  
17 question.

18 Q. Crossroads did.

19 A. Again, I don't recall what the marketing strategy was.

20 Q. But nonetheless, CrossPoint 4400 was Crossroads' version  
21 of the HP Mux, right, sir?

22 A. Yes, that's what it says.

23 Q. And these were being handed out in November 1996 to  
24 potential customers, right, these flyers, Exhibit 153, right?

25 A. Yes, again, I don't recall where but yes.

1 Q. Okay. Please take a look at Defendant's Exhibit 163.  
2 Now, this is an e-mail from you, right?  
3 A. Yes.  
4 Q. And it's to Ms. Bardach, right?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. And it talks about, also, Mr. Hoese's involved in this,  
7 too, right?  
8 A. Yes, that's his name.  
9 Q. Okay. And the subject -- actually e-mailed. These are  
10 cc's actually e-mailed to Joel, this is Joel Dunning, right?  
11 A. It says to Barbara.  
12 Q. Okay. Why is Joel's name on here?  
13 A. I don't know that.  
14 Q. Okay. All right. And in here, this is before -- in here  
15 you say delivery of the first five Muxes shipped from HP due  
16 to arrive 1-3-97, right, or earlier, right?  
17 A. Yes, but this e-mail's only to Crossroads people.  
18 Q. All right. Exactly. And you're telling them that the  
19 delivery of the first five Muxes will be shipped from Hewlett  
20 Packard today and they will arrive on January 3rd, '97, right?  
21 A. That's what it says.  
22 Q. All right. And today meant December 30th, '96, right?  
23 A. Yeah, that's the e-mail.  
24 Q. So Crossroads bought those HP Muxes from Hewlett Packard,  
25 right?

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 A. I don't know that we ever bought them.

2 Q. Okay. Well, once again, Crossroads was a reseller of  
3 Hewlett Packard products, right?

4 A. But we would have had the same evaluation relationship  
5 when we would have looked at the product first, so they never  
6 bought these.

7 Q. In fact, Crossroads needed those five units because it had  
8 already resold some to some people, right?

9 A. I don't know that.

10 Q. Take a look at Exhibit 158. Now, this is a letter to a  
11 fella at EMC, right?

12 A. Yes, I believe so.

13 Q. Fella named Bob Rarich?

14 A. It's Tom, yes.

15 Q. Tom Rarich. And you were carbon-copied on the letter,  
16 right, sir?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Okay. And you say -- this is from Barbara Bardach, again,  
19 right, sir?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Happy holidays, Barbara Bardach, right, sir?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Okay. Ms. Bardach says to Tom, thanks for confirming  
24 today that you will be ordering an evaluation unit for the  
25 CrossPoint 4400 Fibre Channel-to-SCSI router, right?

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Now, this is December 19th, 1996, right, sir?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And so, you needed some products from Hewlett Packard to  
5 sell this guy, right?

6 A. Again, it says in a 60-day evaluation for evaluation, so I  
7 don't know that we needed to buy any.

8 Q. All right. Letter continues by saying, your no charge PO  
9 should reflect the \$17,000 price. That's for the evaluation  
10 unit, right, sir?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And should the evaluation not be returned to Crossroads,  
13 right?

14 A. Those are the words, yes.

15 Q. So here's an offer of an evaluation unit that does not  
16 require any returning of anything to Crossroads, right, sir?

17 A. I can't confirm that.

18 Q. Well, doesn't this say that if this evaluation unit met  
19 with EMC's approval that they would pay you \$17,000, no  
20 questions asked, right?

21 A. I don't read that here.

22 Q. All right. There's nothing there that requires them to  
23 return anything, is there, sir?

24 A. Certainly those words are not here.

25 Q. The fact that details of the offer, sir, are the 4400,

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 right? That's the subject, right?

2 A. That's the product ordered, yes.

3 Q. And evaluation is 60 days at no charge, right?

4 A. Yes, that's correct.

5 Q. And if the evaluation unit meets with their approval, they  
6 pay you \$17,000, right?

7 A. Again, that's not the industry practice or practice we  
8 employed which is to have them returned.

9 Q. But regardless of what the industry standard is, that's  
10 what this letter says, right, sir?

11 A. It has an evaluation unit price on it.

12 Q. Now, Mr. Smith, there came a time when you visited a  
13 company called Adaptec, right?

14 A. I believe so.

15 Q. And, in fact, you visited Adaptec in the spring of 1997,  
16 just a little bit after all these discussions we've been  
17 having?

18 A. I believe that's correct.

19 Q. Please take a look at Defendant's Exhibit 140. It's a  
20 two-page document, and this is in your handwriting, right,  
21 sir?

22 A. Yes, it is.

23 Q. And these are notes that you took regarding your visit to  
24 Adaptec, right?

25 A. They appear to be.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. And you looked at something called an Adaptec bridge,  
2 right?

3 A. I believe so.

4 Q. All right. Something called an Adaptec bridge, right?  
5 And you called it a 4200 look-alike, right?

6 A. Yes, that's the words -- those are the words.

7 Q. And the 4200 product is one of Crossroads' own products,  
8 right?

9 A. It is.

10 Q. And it has -- 4200 product has a single Fibre Channel wire  
11 connection and two SCSI connections --

12 A. It does.

13 Q. -- right? And that's contrasted with the 4100 which has  
14 one of each, right?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. So you characterized this Adaptec bridge as the 4200  
17 look-alike, yes?

18 A. Those are the words, yes.

19 Q. And you took a close look at it and you included all this  
20 stuff, right?

21 A. I don't recall taking a close look at it physically,  
22 but --

23 Q. Well, you concluded that it had an Emerald on the Fibre  
24 Channel side?

25 A. Uh-huh.

1 Q. Actually, that's a SCSI controller?  
2 A. I believe that's a Fibre Channel controller.  
3 Q. You're absolutely right. That's a Fibre Channel  
4 controller?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. And it had an 895 dual channel controller that's a SCSI  
7 channel?  
8 A. That's correct.  
9 Q. Microprocessor?  
10 A. That's what it says.  
11 Q. And it had a PCI bridge?  
12 A. That's what it says, yes.  
13 Q. It has two PCI buses?  
14 A. That's what it says.  
15 Q. And you looked at it close enough to realize it has all  
16 that stuff including all the other elements, a RAID box, XOR  
17 assist engine, right?  
18 A. This may have been what they presented. I don't know.  
19 Q. And then, they said they told you they had a  
20 three-and-a-half-inch form factor sandwich design with a  
21 baseboard that would have included a 586 plus memory and  
22 plug-in interface card, right?  
23 A. That's what's written, yes.  
24 Q. Please take a look at Defendant's Exhibit 28. Actually,  
25 the fourth page of Defendant's 28.

1 A. I don't have that --  
2 Q. It's a block diagram.  
3 A. I actually don't have that document.  
4 Q. Do you have the Exhibit 61, sir?  
5 A. I don't.  
6 Q. Well, I'll get you a hard copy if you need it, but why  
7 don't we just try to work from the screen, if we can, all  
8 right?  
9 A. Okay.  
10 Q. Now, this block diagram on the right is called a Coronado  
11 Lite Fibre Channel-to-SCSI bridge, right, sir?  
12 A. Yes, that's the title.  
13 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, I think Mr. Bahler ought to  
14 move for admission of the exhibit.  
15 MR. BAHLER: This is 28.  
16 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I thought you said 61.  
17 MR. BAHLER: No. 28's in, which is the same as 61.  
18 61's not in. 28, page 4 is.  
19 Q. (BY MR. BAHLER) And it's called a Coronado Lite Fibre  
20 Channel, the SCSI bridge, and a nomenclature AEC 7312, right?  
21 A. Yes.  
22 Q. And this is actually dated December 6th, 1996, right, sir?  
23 A. Yes.  
24 Q. And that was before you visited Adaptec in February of  
25 1997, right?



1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And the thing you looked at was -- well, first of all,  
3 were you looking at the AEC 7312 when you went to Adaptec?

4 A. I don't recall.

5 Q. Okay. Well, the -- well, whatever you looked at at  
6 Adaptec had an Emerald on the Fibre Channel side?

7 A. That's what it says, yes.

8 Q. And Emerald on the Fibre Channel side, right?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And that's what this block diagram shows, right?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And it had an 895 dual channel SCSI on the SCSI side,  
13 right?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Okay. That's what this had. That's what the block  
16 diagram on Exhibit 28 has, right?

17 A. Those are the same numbers, yes. I'm not familiar with  
18 what Excalibur is.

19 Q. Okay. And it had what the thing you looked at at Adaptec  
20 had an AMD 586 processor, right?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And that's the same as in Exhibit 28, page 4, right?

23 A. It appears to be.

24 Q. Okay. And the thing you looked at at Adaptec was PCI  
25 bridge chip, right?

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And that also appears in the block diagram of Exhibit 28,  
3 page 4, right?

4 A. Appears to be, yes.

5 Q. And then, you had PCI buses, right?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. The thing you saw at Adaptec in February '97, right?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And the block diagram on the right has PCI bus, right,  
10 sir?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And the thing you saw at Adaptec in February of '97 had a  
13 RAID XOR, assist engine, right?

14 A. The presentation has it, yes.

15 Q. And the block diagram has a RAID X or engine, right?

16 A. Appears to be, yes.

17 Q. And then, you mentioned that it had a  
18 three-and-a-half-inch form factor. And although this says  
19 three-and-a-quarter-inch form factor, did you actually measure  
20 the thing you saw at Adaptec?

21 A. I don't recall that I saw anything physically other than  
22 this presentation.

23 Q. Now, the block diagram on the right is a block diagram of  
24 whatever you saw at Adaptec in February of 1997, right, sir?

25 A. Appears to be.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. Did you ever see a product?

2 A. I don't believe I ever did.

3 Q. Well, let me see if I can jog your memory. I'll hand you  
4 what's been marked as Defendant's Exhibit 31. Before I do  
5 this, your Honor, I offer 31 into evidence.

6 MR. ALBRIGHT: No objection, your Honor.

7 THE COURT: All right. 31's admitted.

8 Q. (BY MR. BAHLER) Please take a look at Defendant's Exhibit  
9 31, Mr. Smith. Now, that is a -- let's see here. That is a  
10 three-and-a-half-inch form factor product, right, sir?

11 A. I would assume so without measuring it, yes.

12 Q. And it's a sandwich design, right?

13 A. Appears to be, yes.

14 Q. And the baseboard in the 586 and memory are on one of  
15 those boards, right?

16 A. They appear to be.

17 Q. Okay. And the plug-in interface card with custom  
18 connector, that's on one of the ends of those boards, right?

19 A. I would assume so.

20 Q. That's what you wrote down on your notes when you went to  
21 Adaptec in February '97?

22 A. That's what I wrote down.

23 Q. Did you see that board when you went to Adaptec in  
24 February 1997?

25 A. I don't recall ever seeing a board like this.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. Possible, though, right?

2 A. I would guess so.

3 Q. Did you see any board?

4 A. I really don't recall that.

5 Q. All right. Now, Mr. Smith, you're no longer employed by

6 Crossroads today?

7 A. That's not true.

8 Q. Okay. Well, you're no longer the president, right?

9 A. I haven't been president for a long time.

10 Q. Okay. But there was a time when you were both President

11 and CEO and Chairman of the Board of Crossroads, right?

12 A. That's true.

13 Q. And when you had that position, you signed documents on

14 behalf of Crossroads all the time, right, sir?

15 A. That's true.

16 Q. Okay. And when you signed those documents, you made sure

17 that they were correct, right?

18 A. Certainly wanted them to be, yes.

19 Q. And if you didn't understand them, you had somebody

20 explain them to you, right?

21 A. Certainly.

22 Q. You never signed anything that you didn't completely

23 understand when you were signing on behalf of your company;

24 right?

25 A. I signed things that -- many things that required --

1 Q. The question was, you never signed anything that you  
2 didn't completely understand, did you, sir?

3 A. I'm not sure I completely understood everything, but  
4 certainly had people who are -- that I trusted to work for me  
5 to help me whether it was a document to sign or not.

6 Q. Please take a look at Defendant's Exhibit 9. There we go.  
7 Okay. Now, that's Defendant's Exhibit 9, first of all, Mr.  
8 Smith, turn to the second page.

9 A. I don't actually have 9.

10 Q. You don't have 9?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Well --

13 A. I'm sorry. I do.

14 Q. It's kind of in numerical order.

15 A. Actually, they aren't. That's okay. Go ahead.

16 Q. That's a paper you signed. Take a look at the second  
17 page. I have it up on the screen here.

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. That's your signature, right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. You signed it in April 1998, right, sir?

22 A. Yes, that's the date.

23 Q. And that's a paper that was filed with the Patent Office,  
24 right?

25 A. That appears to be.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. And it was filed in the Patent Office in connection with  
2 the 972 patent that's the patent at issue in this case, right,  
3 sir?

4 A. It appears to be, yes.

5 Q. All right. Now, just above your signature, you made the  
6 following declaration to the Patent Office: We acknowledge  
7 the duty to disclose information which is material to the  
8 examination of this application in accordance with Title 27,  
9 Code of Federal Regulations, Section 156A, right?

10 A. That's what it says.

11 Q. And you understood that to be the -- you acknowledged that  
12 you were going to comply with what's known as the duty of  
13 disclosure, right, sir?

14 A. That's what it says here.

15 Q. All right. And you personally acknowledged that duty,  
16 right, sir?

17 A. As it related to me, yes.

18 Q. Okay. And it was explained to you that you need to tell  
19 the Patent Office everything that you know about when applying  
20 for a patent, right?

21 A. I don't recall that.

22 Q. Okay. And was it explained to you that you need to  
23 disclose things that aren't simply exactly like the invention  
24 but things that are close? Was that explained to you, sir?

25 A. I don't recall that.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. Okay. Well, Mr. Smith, even though you signed this paper,  
2 personally acknowledging duty to disclose information to the  
3 Patent Office, you never told the Patent Office about the  
4 technology demonstration at Comdex in 1996, did you, sir?

5 A. I don't recall doing that.

6 Q. And you never told the Patent Office about the 4100  
7 evaluation offers before the end of '96, did you, sir?

8 A. I don't recall that.

9 Q. And you never told anybody about the -- you never told the  
10 Patent Office about the 4400 evaluation unit that you were  
11 offering to EMC, did you?

12 A. I don't recall that either.

13 Q. And you didn't tell the Patent Office about the Adaptec  
14 product that you saw in February '97 either, did you?

15 A. I don't recall that either.

16 Q. Mr. Smith, who made the decision within Crossroads to file  
17 the lawsuit against Chaparral?

18 A. Would have been our senior executive team.

19 Q. Okay. That included yourself?

20 A. It would.

21 Q. And you concurred with that?

22 A. I did.

23 Q. And before you did that, you had an investigation done,  
24 right?

25 A. We did.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Q. And you concluded to your satisfaction that the Crossroads  
2 1310 product infringed the 972 patent, right?

3 A. Which product was that?

4 Q. I'm sorry. The Chaparral 1310 product, you would -- this  
5 team, including yourself, concluded that the Chaparral 1310  
6 product infringed your patent, right?

7 A. That was, as I recall, the advice given us in the -- from  
8 our counsel.

9 Q. Okay. Had you bought a 1310 product before that?

10 A. I don't recall.

11 Q. Had you tested one?

12 A. Again, I don't recall.

13 Q. Okay. Did the 1310 have access controls at that time?

14 A. I don't know.

15 Q. You don't know, and yet, you filed suit against Chaparral,  
16 not even knowing if the 1310 had access control; is that what  
17 you're telling us?

18 A. That's something I would rely on someone else to tell me.

19 Q. Okay. You didn't know personally?

20 A. I certainly couldn't make that evaluation. That's why I  
21 hired others to help me.

22 Q. And you have no doubt that that evaluation was correct,  
23 right?

24 A. I don't.

25 Q. And that somebody concluded that the 1310 had access



09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 controls, right?

2 A. Again, I would rely on the counsel that we hired to help  
3 us.

4 Q. And this was a -- before you filed this lawsuit in March  
5 of 2000, right?

6 A. I believe so.

7 Q. Pass the witness.

8 THE COURT: Mr. Albright.

9 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, we have a matter to take up  
10 outside of the jury.

11 THE COURT: Members of the jury, I'll let you slip in  
12 to use the facilities. Mr. Mace will tell you when it's  
13 needed to come back.

14 (Jury not present.)

15 THE COURT: You need the witness up here?

16 MR. ALBRIGHT: No, sir.

17 THE COURT: You may step down.

18 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, may I approach and hand you  
19 this exhibit?

20 THE COURT: You may.

21 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor --

22 THE COURT: Defendant's 242.

23 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir. It was admitted. It's  
24 obviously the defendant's exhibit. It was admitted without  
25 objection by us today. If the Court would turn -- actually,

1 Mr. Bahler in his questions just brought into account an issue  
2 that is part of page 1 of this, which is indirectly Crossroads  
3 Systems names Sanders Chief Executive Officer by his questions  
4 relating to what Mr. Smith's position was.

5 If you would turn to page 2 of this exhibit, which is  
6 in evidence, if you would look at the first topic, Pathlight  
7 Technology admits infringement and settles lawsuit with  
8 Crossroads Systems. Your Honor, we would argue that the issue  
9 of the Pathlight settlement has now been brought in by the  
10 questions that Mr. Bahler asked as well as an exhibit that the  
11 defendants offered and the Court admitted.

12 And, therefore, pursuant to your earlier order that we  
13 approach the bench, I wanted to approach the bench and raise  
14 this issue with the Court. We believe that the document is  
15 relevant, also, based on the fact that Mr. Bahler made -- I  
16 think, at least, twice arguments in his opening statement that  
17 the lawsuit against Chaparral was frivolous, and I think it  
18 would go to rebut that.

19 In addition, an argument that I would make with  
20 respect just generally to the admissibility of the license  
21 with respect to rebut their counterclaim of obviousness in one  
22 of three that would be a secondary consideration, I wanted to  
23 get basically all the arguments out up front.

24 Your Honor, this is now in evidence. It's something  
25 that the jury has. And we believe we ought to be able to

1 discuss both the Pathlight Technology admission of  
2 infringement as well as if you look down on -- under April  
3 24th, 2001, there's an entry that says Chaparral Network  
4 Storage drops lawsuit against Crossroads Systems.

5 We believe that that issue is now open for examination  
6 of witnesses, as well, given that this is an exhibit that's in  
7 evidence.

8 THE COURT: All right. Two grounds, one is the  
9 exhibit. What questions or statements did you believe Mr.  
10 Bahler has stated in the record before the jury would allow  
11 the settlement in?

12 MR. ALBRIGHT: First, your Honor, that he discussed --  
13 he argued during opening argument that this lawsuit was  
14 frivolous.

15 THE COURT: Well, this lawsuit could be frivolous. I  
16 don't see all the smoke Mr. Bahler has put in on all of this  
17 stuff which is just smoke. It's not even good smoke, but I've  
18 heard the evidence twice, so I know. I don't know what the  
19 jury's smelling, but this lawsuit could be frivolous or the  
20 other one may not have. You're talking about a different  
21 product. That's not going get you on the horse. What's next?

22 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, it would be that Mr. Bahler  
23 has raised the issue of Mr. Smith's position at Crossroads and  
24 there --

25 THE COURT: So what? What is the problem? He's no

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 longer chief. You put him in as president and chief executive  
2 officer. He was entitled to ask if he still is.

3 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, he is the chief executive  
4 officer and chairman.

5 THE COURT: Okay. But he's not the president. I  
6 don't know --

7 MR. ALBRIGHT: He never asked if he was president,  
8 right.

9 THE COURT: I'm missing something. What is the  
10 significance of this?

11 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor, I just believe that since  
12 there is information in evidence now that someone else is  
13 going to become the CEO that we're -- we should be allowed to  
14 put in evidence of with respect to anything that's in the  
15 exhibits, been admitted into evidence.

16 THE COURT: Okay. So we're getting down. Any other  
17 statements or questions by Mr. Bahler that would allow the  
18 Pathlight lawsuit to come in?

19 MR. ALBRIGHT: No, sir.

20 THE COURT: All right. The Court finds no basis  
21 whatsoever for any of the statements nor any of the questions  
22 to let the settlement in. However, I'm going to hear Mr.  
23 Bahler's argument on 242. It is in evidence.

24 MR. BAHLER: It is in evidence, your Honor. This is  
25 three pages from Crossroads' web site which obviously was

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 overlooked, and this line item that's on the third page.

2 THE COURT: It's on the second page.

3 MR. BAHLER: Second page was inadvertently included in  
4 this exhibit. It was a mistake, your Honor, plain and simple,  
5 and I would move the Court to withdraw this exhibit at this  
6 time. I know they have been unopposed, but I make one  
7 observation. I cut them a break when it came to opening  
8 statements. Those slides came in without me looking at them.

9 They don't permit me to withdraw this exhibit, then I  
10 think they're being very unreasonable.

11 MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, may I say one thing? This  
12 exhibit may have been admitted, but that was just an  
13 inadvertent mistake. We made very clear to opposing counsel  
14 that we didn't want any mention of the settlement in any web  
15 pages, and we have objected to all the other web pages, and  
16 this one was just a simple mistake.

17 By admitting this, we're not saying the settlement is  
18 now in play. That was never the intention. That was simply a  
19 mistake to put that on the agreed-to list. We made very clear  
20 we didn't want any settlement on the web page which is that  
21 stack of papers in there. And this somehow slipped in as a  
22 mistake, and we didn't want to admit this.

23 THE COURT: Well, counsel, y'all have tried very hard  
24 to pre-admit hundreds of exhibits. I can see where a exhibit  
25 -- I'm going to allow 242 to be withdrawn. I would not have

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 allowed, for the record, any questions to go into the exhibit  
2 because of its admission in the event that I did not allow 242  
3 to be withdrawn.

4 But it was there and would be in evidence, and the  
5 lawyers would be free to at least read it to the jury. They  
6 would not be able to enlarge upon it. That's for the record.  
7 But I believe because we had pre-admitted hundreds of exhibits  
8 in a short period of time that it would be most inequitable to  
9 allow that exhibit to be in, and they are withdrawn with the  
10 objection of plaintiff.

11 MR. ALBRIGHT: Your Honor. Would the ruling be the  
12 same with respect to the issue of the withdrawal of the  
13 lawsuit that Chaparral -- the information -- I understand the  
14 Court's going to withdraw exhibit --

15 THE COURT: Is this the counterclaim that was filed in  
16 this lawsuit?

17 MR. ALBRIGHT: Well, your Honor, it wasn't. Frankly,  
18 it was not a counterclaim. Chaparral filed a state court  
19 lawsuit against Crossroads in Colorado. The case was removed  
20 in Colorado and motions for transfer were filed, and it was  
21 filed -- it was brought to this court, although I don't  
22 believe that it was ever consolidated in this court. It was  
23 transferred to this court.

24 THE COURT: We're talking about the same one here.

25 MR. ALBRIGHT: Yes, sir. Chaparral dismissed that

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 case with prejudice. Again, they have opened the door to the  
2 admissibility of that issue by arguing our claim against them  
3 is frivolous. I think it's fair for the jury to hear that  
4 Chaparral filed the lawsuit against us, and not only did they  
5 file the lawsuit against us that they dismissed it with  
6 prejudice. Voluntarily dismissed it with prejudice.

7 THE COURT: And that lawsuit was one for --

8 MR. ALBRIGHT: I believe, at a minimum, it was for  
9 defamation. Actually, I apologize, your Honor. Actually, it  
10 was the thrust of the lawsuit was -- that the Chaparral  
11 lawsuit against us was that this case was -- our case against  
12 them was frivolous and had been done in order to injure  
13 Chaparral and defame Chaparral.

14 And when push came to shove in terms of us requesting  
15 depositions and discovery for Chaparral folks to learn about  
16 the basis of that claim, Chaparral decided to file a motion to  
17 dismiss with prejudice. And I believe that the plaintiff --  
18 I'm sorry, Chaparral's opened the door with respect to that  
19 issue by continuing to maintain to this jury that Crossroads'  
20 claims are frivolous. It would go directly to that issue,  
21 your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Well, certainly argumentative and subject  
23 to objection as an opening statement, but none was made. So  
24 we're here waiting for somebody to stand up. Nobody stood up.  
25 At this point in time, I'm not going to permit it. It's not

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 to say that I may not if it gets any worse, I'll have to  
2 review those pleadings myself to see what the circumstances  
3 are. And I will do that before the meet of the morning.

4 MR. ALBRIGHT: And, finally, your Honor, just for  
5 purposes of the record, if the Court would give a ruling with  
6 respect to Crossroads' argument that going back to the  
7 admissibility of the settlement which included a license,  
8 Crossroads would argue that the license would be evidence to  
9 rebut -- as a consideration to rebut Chaparral's argument of  
10 obviousness.

11 And we believe there are a million cases on --

12 THE COURT: As far as the jury will know, Pathlight  
13 may have had bad lawyers. I mean, there's just no relevance  
14 of it as to what one party might do and those lawyers. I  
15 don't mean that to be critical. I mean, it's just nothing  
16 that is relevant that the jury can draw from.

17 I wondered about the admissibility on that, that my  
18 ruling would still be before you get into that, you need to  
19 advise counsel and myself of that. I didn't know if you were  
20 going to use it in your damage presentation or not.

21 MR. ALBRIGHT: I believe that's where we would use it,  
22 your Honor.

23 THE COURT: We'll cross that bridge when we have to.  
24 No pun intended. All right. Bring the jury in. I'm going to  
25 recess the jury and let them go home.



1 (Jury present.)

2 THE COURT: Members of the jury, it's come to my  
3 attention that we've got at least two of you that have a lot  
4 of miles to go. You're not used to driving to Austin and back  
5 and forth, so I'm going to go ahead and recess early today so  
6 that you can get home and try to make your plans.

7 I generally run the courtroom to 6:00, and the reason  
8 for that is, as you will learn, even though I'm letting you  
9 out at ten to 5:00, it's not a real nice thing to do because  
10 you're not going to get home much earlier getting out at 5:00  
11 than you would at 6:00.

12 I have one letter for one of you with regard to the  
13 keeping the children, which I'm going to sign and give to  
14 them. They always say, you know, no matter what, we're going  
15 to do this. And I don't ever want to be involved between  
16 parents and the people keeping their children, but I do get  
17 involved in it occasionally, just to explain the necessity for  
18 it.

19 So this letter will go to -- and if there's any  
20 problem, I understand the husband picked up -- the father did  
21 the things today. If there's any problem, let me know, and I  
22 can be, believe it or not, diplomatic, as well as  
23 non-diplomatic.

24 Now, all of you are going to go home this evening and  
25 then, drive back tomorrow. Is 8:30 too early or -- tell me.

09/04/2001 Chaparral Trial - Day 1

1 Is 8:30 too early for anybody?

2 THE JUROR: 8:30 is better.

3 THE COURT: We'll try to start promptly at 8:30.

4 Please remember my instructions: Please don't talk to anybody  
5 including your family. You can tell them that it's a patent  
6 case and you caught the crazy judge who you don't know and  
7 you've heard a lot of crazy things about him, and he told you  
8 not to talk to anybody, so you better not talk to anybody.  
9 And we'll see you in the morning at 8:30. And I've got this  
10 letter, they're making a copy for the file, and we'll deliver  
11 it.

12 Okay. Any questions from the jury? All right. All  
13 stand as the jury recesses.

14 (Jury not present.)

15 THE COURT: Mr. Albright, here, I'm going to give you  
16 this fine notebook that I -- just come on up here. Anything  
17 further of the plaintiff?

18 MR. ALCOCK: Nothing further, your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Anything from the defendant this evening?

20 MR. BAHLER: No, your Honor.

21 THE COURT: All right. 8:30 in the morning, counsel.

22 (Proceedings adjourned.)  
23  
24  
25

**CROSSROADS VS. PATHLIGHT  
PLAINTIFF'S REVISED TRIAL EXHIBIT LIST**

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-1	N/A for certified; uncert. Is Exh. 2. To Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/24/99	U. S. Patent No. 5,941,972 to Hoese (certified copy)			Admitted 6/6/01
P-2	N/A	N/A	Pre-8/24/99	File Wrapper for U. S. Patent No. 5,941,972 (certified copy)			
P-3	N/A	N/A	4/27/01	Declaration of Geoff Hoese in Support of Crossroads' Opposition to Pathlight's Motion for Summary Judgment	Hearsay; relevance		
P-4	Hoese Exhibit 2	CRDS 40807 - CRDS 40823	6/19/96	PowerPoint Presentation: Verrazano FC-SCSI Bridge Product Overview			
P-5	Hoese Exhibit 3	CRDS 40925 - CRDS 40958 (mixed pages)	9/10/96	Confidential Document: Verrazano Software Development			

449

Gray Cary\SD\1447270.1  
103671-160174

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-6	Hoese Exh. 4	CRDS 39727 - CRDS 39758	1/22/97	Verrazano System Structure			
P-7	Hodges Exh. 5	CRDS 40510 - CRDS 40512	5/28/97	Fax from Geoff Hoese to Anthony Peterman enclosing Conception of Invention	Hearsay; relevance		Admitted 6/6/01
P-8	Rahmani Exh. 37	PTI 007775 - PTI 007780	3/30/99	ITL Access Control Design Specification			
P-9	Rahmani Exh. 38	PTI 008287 - PTI 008291	4/19/99	ITL Access Control - Requirement Specification Version 1.03			
P-10	Rahmani Exh. 39	PTI 007771 - PTI 007774	9/7/99	ITL Access Control (IAC) Requirement Specification			
P-11	Rahmani Exhibit 43	PTI 064685 - PTI 064689	9/7/99	Email from Said Rahmani to Peter Passeretti dated 9/7/99 with attachments			
P-12	Rahmani Exhibit 50	PTI 064243 - PTI 064288	3/21/99	Powerpoint Presentation: SAN Solutions: Overall Comparison of Three SAN Solutions			
P-13	Rahmani Exhibit 54	PTI 126760 - PTI 126773	2/28/00	Powerpoint Presentation: Pathlight Enterprise SAN Demonstration			
P-14	Rahmani Exh. 55	PTI 007854 - PTI 007899	1998	SAN Gateway Remote Management and Configuration Guide Version 1.11			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-15	Rahmani Exh. 62	PTI 065368 - PTI 065479	1999	IBM Publication: Installation and User's Guide 2108 Model G07			
P-16	Rahmani Exhibit 64	PTI 064329 - PTI 064330	3/6/99	Powerpoint Presentation: Storage Area Networking IP Protection			
P-17	Rahmani Exh. 76	N/A	1999	Pathlight SAN Gateway Service Guide Version 2.02			
P-18	Rahmani Exh. 78	N/A	1999	Pathlight SAN Router Installation and User's Guide Version 2.00			
P-19	Rahmani Exh. 79	PTI 165062 - PTI 165243	2000	Pathlight SAN Router Installation & User's Guide			
P-20	Rahmani Exh. 80	PTI 164348 - PTI 164531	1999	Pathlight SAN Gateway Installation and User's Guide Version 2.02			
P-21	Rahmani/Ke lleher Exh. 85	PTI 165032 - PTI 165243	2000	Pathlight SAN Router Installation and User's Guide Version 2.04			
P-22	Rahmani Exh. 88	PTI 167074 - PTI 167293	8/00	SAN Gateway Installation and User's Guide Version 2.04, August 2000		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-23	Rahmani Exh. 89	PTI 165032 - PTI 165243	8/00	SAN Router Installation and User's Guide Version 2.04, September 2000		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-24	Fiamm Exh. 6 (partial)	N/A	Printed 2/2/01	CD ROM of the Pathlight Web Site	Hearsay, relevance/403	6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-25	Regan Exh. 2	CRDS 63593 - CRDS 63594	Undated	Product Gross Margin chart			
P-26	Regan Exh. 3	CRDS 63595 - CRDS 63597	Undated	Product ASP chart			
P-27	Regan Exh. 4	CRDS 63598 - CRDS 63600	Undated	Product Cost chart			
P-28	Regan Exh. 5	N/A	Undated	Crossroads Systems vs. Pathlight Technology Sales Information from 11/1/99 through 1/31/01			
P-29	Regan Exh. 6	CRDS 51873 - CRDS 51977	7/00	Crossroads Systems, Inc. Financial Reporting Package, July 2000 (Fiscal Q3, '00)			
P-30	Regan Exh. 7	PTI 048416	8/99	OEM Price List (August 1999)			
P-31	Regan Exh. 8	CRDS 63590 - CRDS 63592	3/30/01	Crossroads Systems, Inc. Hewlett-Packard - Total Historical Revenue & Units			
P-32	Hood Exh. 109	PTI 169581 - PTI 169646	1/01	Amendment and Plan of Merger among ADIC, Ptech Acquisition, Inc. and Pathlight	Hearsay; relevance/403		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-33	Hood Exh. 110	PTI 170791 - PTI 170970	2/14/01	Securities and Exchange Commission Form S-4 filed by Advanced Digital Information Corporation	Relevance/403		
P-34	Hood Exh. 111	PTI 170971 - PTI 171039	1/30/01	Securities and Exchange Commission For 8-K pertaining to ADIC	Relevance/403		
P-35	Hood Exh. 114	PTI 169664 - PTI 169748	Undated	Database of VPS License Key Activation for IBM SAN Gateway's manufacturing			
P-36	Hood Exh. 115	PTI 169647 - PTI 169655	2/15/01	New database listing of customers and software features activated by license key			
P-37	Hood Exh. 116	PTI 169656 - PTI 169663	12/8/99 - 12/13/00	Database used to track issuing of license keys for software options for customers			
P-38	Hood Exh. 119	PTI 169749 - PTI 169883	2/5/01	Pathlight Sales, Order and Backlog Reports			
P-39	Smith Exh. 4	CRDS 52581 - CRDS 52641	4/26/97	OEM License and Purchase Agreement Between Crossroads and Hewlett-Packard		06/06/01	Admitted 06/06/01
P-40	Smith Exh. 6	CRDS 02273 - CRDS 02290	4/15/98	Hewlett-Packard SSD and Crossroads CP4200 License Agreement		06/06/01	Admitted 06/06/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-41	Smith Exh. 7	CRDS 29603 - CRDS 29646	9/22/98	Purchase and License Agreement Between Hewlett-Packard and Crossroads		06/06/01	Admitted 06/06/01
P-42	Flamm Exh. 5 (Livolsi Exh. 16)	CRDS 39764 - CRDS 39788	2/7/00	SWOT Analysis	Hearsay		
P-43	Flamm Exh. 7	N/A	4/20/00	Memo from Randy Hood to Jan White re VPS client software license			
P-44	Flamm Exh. 8	N/A	Undated	Handwritten calculation			
P-45	N/A	PTI 82750 - PTI 82871	4/21/98	IBM's Request for Proposal to Pathlight			
P-46	N/A	PTI 173350 - PTI 173369	3/12/01	Summary - Sales, Orders and Backlog Report			
P-47	N/A	PTI 047912 - PTI 047913	9/29/99	Email from James Watson to IBM			
P-48	N/A	PTI 047939 - PTI 047950	9/29/99	Fax from James Watson to Randy Hood enclosing documents pertaining to IBM and VPS			
P-49	N/A	PTI 047865 - PTI 047867	11/24/99	Fax from Randy Hood to Hank Watson enclosing VPS quotation to IBM		6/6/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-50	N/A	PTI 048566 - PTI 048569	Undated	Vicom White Paper: Comparing Crossroads, Pathlight, and SLIC	Hearsay		



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-51	N/A	PTI 048393 - PTI 048398	Undated	Pathlight Marketing Document (discusses VPS)			
P-52	N/A	CRDS 22345 - CRDS 22346	2000	Charts pertaining to Competition	Hearsay		
P-53	N/A	CRDS 39765 - CRDS 39773	2/7/00	Competitive Snapshots	Hearsay		
P-54	N/A	CRDS 63620 - CRDS 63623	6/23/00	Amendment to Licensing Agreement By and Between Hewlett-Packard and Crossroads Systems, Inc.		06/06/01	Admitted 06/06/01
P-55	N/A	PTI 183455 - PTI 183558		Documents produced by Pathlight on 5/15/01			
P-56	Rahmani Exh. 65	PTI 165498 - PTI 165425	10/23/00	Billing statement from Salzman & Levy			
P-57	Rahmani Exh. 66	PTI 165706	12/23/99	12/23/99 Handwritten notes			
P-58	Rahmani Exhibit 67	PTI 165428 - PTI 165429	Undated	Document entitled "Response to Crossroads '972 Patent"			
P-59	Rahmani Exh. 68	PTI 165658 - PTI 165659	2/25/00	2/25/00 Email from Rahmani to Mark DeWilde re Crossroads Opinion Documentation			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-60	Rahmani Exh. 69	PTI 165663 - PTI 165665	2/24/00	Document entitled "Crossroads Patent Opinion Documentation, Thursday, February 24, 2000", with handwritten notes			
P-61	Rahmani Exh. 70	PTI 165660 - PTI 165662	2/26/00	Document entitled "Crossroads Patent Opinion Documentation, Thursday, February 24, 2000"			
P-62	Rahmani Exh. 71	PTI 165684	3/31/00	2/26/00 Email from Rahmani to Mark DeWilde and Salzman & Levy re patent issues			
P-63	Rahmani Exh. 74	PTI 165685	4/6/00	Email from Greg Prestas to Mark DeWilde and Salzman & Levy re Storage Router definition			
P-64	Rahmani Exh. 95	PTI 167772 - PTI 167774	2/24/00	Crossroads Patent Opinion Documentation dated 2/24/00			
P-65	Rahmani Exh. 100	PTI 167669	2/28/00	2/28/00 Email from Mark DeWilde to Frank Hopkins			
P-66	Rahmani Exh. 101	PTI 167770	2/25/00	2/25/00 Email from Said Rahmani to Mark DeWilde			
P-67	Rahmani Exh. 102	PTI 167776	4/4/00	4/4/00 Email from Said Rahmani to Mark DeWilde and Greg Prestas			
P-68	Rahmani Exhibit 104	PTI 167809	11/15/99	Email from Mark DeWilde to Patents		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-69	Rahmani Exhibit 105	PTI 167810	11/18/99	Email from Said Rahmani to Patents		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-70	Levy/ Rahmani Exhibit 81	PTI 165433 - PTI 165614	4/10/00	Opinion letter of Mark Levy, Esq.		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-71	N/A	PTI 167665 - PTI 167666	2/25/00	Email from Mark DeWilde to Said Rahmani re Crossroads Opinion Documentation			
P-72	N/A	PTI 167811	11/19/99	Email from Mark DeWilde to Patents			
P-73	N/A	PTI 167812	11/19/99	Email from Mark DeWilde to Patents			
P-74	N/A	PTI 167813 - PTI 167858	2/24/00	Email from Mark DeWilde to Mark Levy with attachments			
P-75	N/A	PTI 167667 - PTI 167668	2/25/00	Email from Said Rahmani to Mark DeWilde		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-76	N/A	PTI 167775	4/6/00	Email from Prestas to Patents			
P-77	N/A	N/A	7/26/00	Pathlight's Original Answers to Crossroads' First Set of Interrogatories (1 - 5)			
P-78	N/A	N/A	1/4/01	Pathlight's Original Answers to Crossroads' Second Set of Interrogatories (6)			
P-79	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Pathlight's Original Answers to Crossroads' Third Set of Interrogatories (7 - 13)			
P-80	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Pathlight's Answers to Crossroads' Request for Admissions (1 - 20)			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-81	N/A	N/A	5/8/01	Pathlight's Supplemental Answers to Crossroads' Interrogatory Nos. 1 - 7 and 9			
P-82	N/A	N/A	5/8/01	Crossroads' Supplemental Answers to Pathlight's Interrogatory Nos. 2 - 10			
P-83	N/A	N/A	4/6/01	Pathlight Technology, Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity and Brief in Support Thereof, with attached exhibits	Hearsay; relevance		
P-84	N/A	N/A	4/27/01	Crossroads' Opposition to Pathlight's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity and Brief in Support Thereof, with exhibits	Hearsay; relevance		
P-85	N/A	N/A	5/8/01	Defendant Pathlight Technology Inc.'s Reply to Crossroads' Opposition to Pathlight's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity	Hearsay; relevance		
P-86	N/A	N/A	5/14/01	Order Denying Pathlight's Motion for Summary Judgment	Hearsay; relevance		
P-87	N/A	N/A	6/19/00	Crossroads' Preliminary Statement	Hearsay; relevance		
P-88	N/A	N/A	6/19/00	Pathlight's Preliminary Statement	Hearsay; relevance		
P-89	N/A	N/A	7/11/00	Crossroads' Markman Brief	Hearsay; relevance		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-90	N/A	N/A	7/11/00	Pathlight's Markman Brief	Hearsay, relevance		
P-91	Hodges Exh. 3; also Exh. 4 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	7/27/00	Markman Order	Hearsay, relevance (Agree to introduction of actual claim construction)		
P-92	Hodges Exh. 1	N/A	3/12/01	Expert Report of Paul Hodges, Ph.D., with attached exhibits 1 - 20 (includes screenshots) (exhibits are listed separately)	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-93	Hodges Exh. 4	N/A	3/26/01	Rebuttal Report of Paul Hodges, Ph.D.	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-94	Regan Exh. 1	N/A	3/13/01	Expert Report of D. Paul Regan, CPA, CFE, including all exhibits thereto and documents cited therein	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-95	Kuffner Exh. 1	N/A	3/12/01	Expert Report of Kenneth E. Kuffner, including all exhibits attached thereto and documents cited therein	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-96	Kuffner Exh. 2	N/A	3/26/01	Supplemental Report of Kenneth E. Kuffner	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-97	Stephens Exh. 1	N/A	3/13/01	Expert Report of Gary R. Stephens, including all documents cited therein	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-98	Stephens Exh. 2	N/A	3/26/01	Rebuttal Report of Gary R. Stephens, including all documents cited therein	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-99	Berg Exh. 3	N/A	3/13/01	Expert Report of Brian Berg, with exhibits 1 - 7 and including all documents therein	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-100	Flamm Exh. 1	N/A	3/26/01	Expert Report of Kenneth Flamm, including all documents cited therein and with exhibits 1 - 9	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-101	N/A	N/A	4/9/01	Pathlight's 35 U.S.C. § 282 Notice	Relevance		
P-102	N/A	N/A	5/14/01	Pathlight's Supplemental 35 U.S.C. § 282 Notice	Relevance		
P-103	Hodges Exh. 6	N/A	6/16/98	U. S. Patent No. 5,768,623 to Judd			
P-104	Smith Exh. 24	CRDS 08556 - CRDS 08557	7/12/96	Letter from Clarion to Brian Smith			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-105	Smith Exh. 25	CRDS 08558 - CRDS 08555	7/22/96	Fax enclosing Data General/Clarion Purchase Order			
P-106	N/A	CRDS 13635 - CRDS 13653	1996 - 1997	Group of Clarion Emails			
P-107	Exh. 1 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	Undated	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Hodges	Agreement that will only object if not allowed to jointly introduce CV for Stephens; hearsay		
P-108	Exh. 5 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Photographs of Pathlight SAN Router			
P-109	Exh. 6 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Photographs of SAN Gateway (IBM Version)			
P-110	Exh. 7 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen Shots from Left Gateway (Test 1, SAN Gateway, IBM version) LeftG01 through LeftG41	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-111	Exh. 8 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen shots from Right computer (Test 1, SAN Gateway, IBM version) RightG01 through RightG21	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-112	Exh. 9 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen Shots from Left computer (Test 2, SAN Gateway, IBM version) LeftG42 through LeftG53	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-113	Exh. 10 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen shots from Right computer (Test 2, SAN Gateway, IBM version) RightG22 through RightG33	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-114	Exh. 11 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen Shots from Left computer (Test 3, SAN Gateway, IBM version) LeftG54 through LeftG60	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-115	Exh. 12 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen shots from Right computer (Test 3, SAN Gateway, IBM version) RightG34 through RightG40	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-116	Exh. 13 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen Shots from Left computer (Test 4, SAN Router) SANLeft01 through SANLeft30	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-117	Exh. 14 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen shots from Right computer (Test 4, SAN Router) SANRight01 through SANRight15	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-118	Exh. 15 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Hyperterminal screen shots relating to a reboot of SAN Gateway (IBM Version)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-119	Exh. 16 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Hyperterminal screen shots relating to VPS of SAN Gateway (IBM Version)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-120	Exh. 17 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Hyperterminal screen shots relating to rescanning the SCSI bus of SAN Gateway (IBM Version)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-121	Exh. 18 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Performance Tests/ Data of SAN Gateway (IBM version)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-122	Exh. 19 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		SYM53C876/876E Data Pages			
P-123	Exh. 20 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		ISP2100, 2200 Data Pages			
P-124	N/A	N/A		Pathlight's SAN Gateway, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-125	N/A	N/A		Pathlight's SAN Router, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional			
P-126	N/A	N/A		IBM's Storage Area Network Data Gateway, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional			
P-127	N/A	N/A		Crossroads CP 4100 Product, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional			
P-128	N/A	N/A		Crossroads CP 4400 Product, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional			
P-129	Rahmani Exh. 42	PTI 039169 - PTI 039176	Undated	Document Entitled "Introduction"			
P-130	Hood Exh. 30	PTI 048906 - PTI 048921	5/12/00	Manufacturing Services Agreement between Pathlight and XeTel			
P-131	Rahmani Exh. 40	PTI 154501 - PTI 154516	1998	SAN Gateway Firmware Overview, Major Components	Hearsay		
P-132	Rahmani Exh. 47	PTI 155471 - PTI 155546	5/31/00	IBM SAN Gateway Installation Cookbook (5/31/00 Draft Document)			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-133	Rahmani Exh. 48	PTI 149751 - PTI 149833	1999	IBM Publication: IBM 2108 Model G07 San Data Gateway			
P-134	Rahmani Exh. 75	N/A	1999	Pathlight SAN Gateway Service Guide Version 2.01			
P-135	Walker Exh. 136	CNS 173589 - CNS 173621	11/20/00	Opinion Letter of David Zinger, Esq.	Hearsay; relevance		
P-136	N/A	CRDS 64417 - CRDS 64430	5/18/01	Pages Printed from ADIC Web Site	Hearsay; relevance/403	6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-137	Rahmani Exh. 72	PTI 165641 - PTI 165657	3/31/00	3/31/00 Letter from Alan Albright to Gary Allison enclosing Crossroads complaint against Chaparral			
P-138	N/A	CRDS 64431	5/21/01	ADIC Press Release	Hearsay; relevance/403		
P-139	Arroyo Exh. 3	N/A	Undated	Printout of Arroyo's floppy drive disc drive directory			
P-140	Arroyo Exh. 4	CRDS 63362 - CRDS 63363	Undated	Notes written by witness into computer file			
P-141	Arroyo Exh. 5	CRDS 63301 - CRDS 63331	1996	Bridge.c code, copyright 1995, revised 1996			Admitted 6/6/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-142	Arroyo Exh. 6	CRDS 63334 - CRDS 63440	1996	Bridge.c code, copyright 1995, revised 1996			
P-143	Arroyo Exh. 7	CRDS 63498 - CRDS 63574	1996	Bridge.c code, copyright 1995, revised 1996			
P-144	Arroyo Exh. 8	CRDS 63441 - CRDS 63497	3/19/97	Bridge.c code, further revised, 3/19/97			
P-145	Arroyo Exh. 9	CRDS 63127.9729 G.1 - CRDS 63127.9729 G.107	9/18/97	Bridge.c code, further revised, 9/18/97			Admitted 6/6/01
P-146	N/A	PTI 49674 - PTI 49675	Undated	PowerPoint Presentation entitled "Competition"			
P-147	N/A	PTI 57537 - PTI 57599	5/12/00	Competitive Analysis PowerPoint Presentation			
P-148	Dunning Exh. 13	HP 335 - HP 486	1997	Hewlett-Packard Service and User Manual for Fibre Channel SCSI Multiplexer			
P-149	Hood (2/22/01) Exh. 120	PTI 169884 - PTI 170012	2000	Pathlight Invoices (to customers purchasing Pathlight products)			
P-150	Hood (9/7/00) Exh. 5	PTI 056770 - PTI 056771	5/00	Pathlight's OEM Price List (May 2000)			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-151	Hood (12/12/00) Exh. 8	PTI 049712 - PTI 049733	4/18/00	4/25/00 Email from James Watson to Terry Kelleher and Hank Watson re Quote for IBM on LYD		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-152	Hood (2/22/01) Exh. 113	N/A	Undated	Untitled list of shareholders	Relevance	6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-153	N/A	N/A	2/2/01	Color Printout of CD ROM of the Pathlight Website	Relevance & Prej for ADIC. references		
P-154	N/A	PTI 165524 - PTI 165544	4/10/00	Opinion Letter from Mark Levy, Esq. To Pathlight (clean copy)			
P-155	N/A	PTI 124129	9/9/99	Email from Said Rahmani to "Coreteam"			
P-156	N/A	PTI 124120	9/2/99	Email from Jeffrey Goldner to Said Rahmani re "Problems That Must Be Fixed or Verified"			
P-157	N/A	PTI 093551	10/5/99	Letter from Randy Hood to Richard Lamperd re Existing SAN Gateway upgrade quotation			
P-158	N/A	PTI 165618 - PTI 165619	4/6/00	Letter from Mark DeWilde to Mark and David re Crossroads' claims			
P-159	Engelbrecht Exh. 2	LSI 01421 - LSI 1658	1997	Symbios Logic Software Interface Specification Series 3 SCSI RAID Controller Software Release 02.xx			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-160	Engelbrecht Exh. 9	LSI 01853 – LSI 02040	9/96	RAID Manager 5 With RDAC 5 For UNIX V.4 User's Guide			
P-161	Exh. 3 to Hodges' Expert Report	N/A	N/A	Data CD Containing Snapshot of Pathlight Website	Relevance & Prej for ADIC references		
P-162	Sims Exh. 4	CRDS 28244 – CRDS 28400	7/14/99	PowerPoint Presentation: Organizational Meeting			
P-163	LiVolsi Exh. 9	CRDS 42968 – CRDS 43033	11/3/98	Crossroads Presentation to Dell Computer			
P-164	N/A	N/A	4/14/00	Plaintiff Crossroad Systems, (Texas), Inc.'s Original Complaint	Relevance; hearsay		
P-165	N/A	N/A	9/15/00	Plaintiff Crossroad Systems, (Texas), Inc.'s First Amended Complaint	Relevance; hearsay		
P-166	N/A	PTI 048829	5/4/00	Letter from Randy Hood to Jan white re VPS client software license			
P-167	N/A	PTI 049813 – PTI 049828	4/14/00	Pathlight Statement Package, March 2000, Fiscal Year 2000			
P-168	N/A	PTI 049798 – PTI 049812	5/16/00	Pathlight Statement Package, April 2000, Fiscal Year 2000			
P-169	N/A	N/A	5/25/01	CD ROM of the Crossroads Web Site	Hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-170	N/A	N/A	5/25/01	Supplemental Expert Report of D. Paul Regan, CPA, CFE, including revised Exhibit C	Not entered per agreement b/w parties; hearsay		
P-171	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 2: Pathlight Product Configuration(s)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-172	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 3: Equipment Used For Testing Pathlight Products	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-173	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 4: Drive Identities	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-174	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 5A: Test 1	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-175	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 5B: Test 1 (continued)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-176	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 6: Information and Menus Available/Test Setup	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-177	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 7: Channel Zoning Drive Identities	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-178	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 8: Channel Zoning	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-179	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 9: Local/Global Storage	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-180	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 10A: SAN Router Drive Identities	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-181	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 10B: Screen Shots From SAN Router	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-182	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Screen Shot 1: Host Viewing SCSI Storage Devices ("LeftG12")	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-183	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Graphs 1 - 4	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-184	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Figure 1: Block Diagram of SAN Gateway	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-185	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Screen Shot 2: Maintaining The Configuration of the Map (LeftG36)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-186	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Figure 3: Pathlight Web Site Excerpt Regarding Access Controls	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-187	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Figure 4: VPS Access Controls (Annotated)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-188	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Computer code commands chart	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-189	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 11: Claim Chart for Claims 2 - 14	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-190	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Figure 5: Channel Zoning	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-191	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Screen Shot 3: Access Controls Via Channel Zoning (LeftG45)	Hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-192	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 12: Conception Chart			
P-193	N/A	N/A	N/A	SCSI Cable			
P-194	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fibre Channel Cable			
P-195	N/A	N/A	N/A	SCSI Disk Drives			
P-196	N/A	N/A	6/30/00	Crossroads' First Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-197	N/A	N/A	7/13/00	Crossroads' Second Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-198	N/A	N/A	10/26/00	Crossroads' Third Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-199	N/A	N/A	11/22/00	Crossroads' Fourth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-200	N/A	N/A		Crossroads' Fifth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-201	N/A	N/A	2/9/01	Crossroads' Sixth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-202	N/A	N/A	11/24/00	Pathlight's First Request for Admissions (Nos. 1-19)	Relevance		
P-203	N/A	N/A	1/5/01	Crossroads' Responses to Pathlight's First Request for Admissions (Nos. 1-19)			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-204	N/A	N/A	2/2/01	Pathlight's Second Request for Admissions (Nos. 20-30)	Relevance		
P-205	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Crossroads' Responses to Pathlight's Second Request for Admissions (Nos. 20-30)			
P-206	N/A	N/A	2/2/01	Crossroads' Requests for Admissions to Pathlight (Set One)	Relevance		
P-207	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Pathlight's Answers to Crossroads' Request for Admissions (Set One)			
P-208	N/A	N/A	4/17/00	Crossroads' First Request for Production of Documents to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-209	N/A	N/A	6/16/00	Pathlight's Answers to Crossroads' First Request for Production of Documents			
P-210	N/A	N/A	9/18/00	Crossroads' Second Request for Production of Documents to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-211	N/A	N/A	10/26/00	Pathlight's Answers to Crossroads' Second Request for Production of Documents			
P-212	N/A	N/A	2/2/01	Crossroads' Third Request for Production of Documents to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-213	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Pathlight's Answers to Crossroads' Third Request for Production of Documents			
P-214	N/A	N/A	6/26/00	Crossroads' First Set of Interrogatories to Pathlight	Relevance		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-215	N/A	N/A	7/26/00	Pathlight's Original Answers to Crossroads' First Set of Interrogatories			
P-216	N/A	N/A	11/22/00	Crossroads' Second Set of Interrogatories to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-217	N/A	N/A	1/4/01	Pathlight's Original Answers to Crossroads' Second Set of Interrogatories	Relevance		
P-218	N/A	N/A	2/2/01	Crossroads' Third Set of Interrogatories to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-219	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Pathlight's Original Answers to Crossroads' Third Set of Interrogatories	Relevance		
P-220	N/A	N/A	6/20/00	Pathlight's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-6) to Crossroads	Relevance		
P-221	N/A	N/A	6/26/00	Crossroads' Responses to Pathlight's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-6)			
P-222	N/A	N/A	11/24/00	Pathlight's Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 7) to Crossroads	Relevance		
P-223	N/A	N/A	1/5/01	Crossroads' Responses to Pathlight's Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 7)			
P-224	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Crossroads' Supplemental Responses to Pathlight's Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 7)			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-225	N/A	N/A	2/2/01	Pathlight's Third Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 8-16) to Crossroads	Relevance		
P-226	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Crossroads' Responses to Pathlight's Third Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 8-16)			
P-227	Hood Exh. 4	PTI 054705 - PTI 055418	2000	Pathlight's Financial Statement Package for Fiscal Year 2000		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-228	N/A	N/A	5/9/01	Crossroads' Supplemental Responses to Chaparral's First Set of Interrogatories (Interrogatory No. 3)			
P-229	Lavan Exh. 24 (Pltf. Exh. 214)	CNS 0045256		5/16/00 Memo to Michael Gluck, et al., from Morris (Pltf. Exh. 214)	Relevance; prejudice		
P-230	Lavan Exh. 26 (Pltf. Exh. 216)	N/A		User's Guide, G6322/G7324 (Pltf. Exh. 216)	Relevance; prejudice		
P-231	Levy Exh. 122 (portion of Court Exh. C)	PTI 173554	2/8/01	Letter from Mark Levy to Mark DeWilde		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-232	Levy Exh. 123 (Court Exh. B)	PTI 171664 - PTI 171714	10/4/00	Letter from Mark Levy to Mark DeWilde enclosing patent application documents		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-233	Levy Exh. 124 (portion of Court Exh. C)	PTI 173555 - PTI 173605	10/4/00	Letter from Mark Levy to Mark DeWilde enclosing patent application documents			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-234	Levy Exh. 125 (portion of Court Exh. C)	PTI 173606	8/22/00	Letter from David Banner to Mark DeWilde			
P-235	N/A	PTI 183704 - PTI 183742	4/7/00 - 10/4/00	Patent documents produced by Pathlight on 6/7/01			
P-236	N/A	N/A		Chaparral's Original Responses to Crossroads' Second Set of Interrogatories (6/14)			

**CROSSROADS VS. CHAPARRAL  
CIVIL ACTION NO. A-00CA-217SS  
PLAINTIFF'S FOURTH AMENDED TRIAL EXHIBIT LIST  
(updated 9/11/01)**

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-1		N/A	8/24/99	U. S. Patent No. 5,941,972 to Hoese (certified copy)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-2	N/A	N/A	Pre-8/24/99	File Wrapper for U. S. Patent No. 5,941,972 (certified copy)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-3	N/A	N/A	4/27/01	Declaration of Geoff Hoese in Support of Crossroads' Opposition to Pathlight's Motion for Summary Judgment	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-4	Hoese Exhibit 2	CRDS 40807 - CRDS 40823	6/19/96	PowerPoint Presentation: Verrazano FC-SCSI Bridge Product Overview		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-5	Hoese Exhibit 3	CRDS 40925 - CRDS 40958 (mixed pages)	9/10/96	Confidential Document: Verrazano Software Development		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-6	Hoese Exh. 4	CRDS 39727 - CRDS 39758	1/22/97	Verrazano System Structure		9/4/01	9/4/01

248

1

Gray Cary\AU\4067283.1  
103671-160175

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-7	Hodges Exh. 5/ Hoese Exh. 24	CRDS 40510 - CRDS 40512	5/28/97	Fax from Geoff Hoese to Anthony Peterman enclosing Conception of Invention	Hearsay; Relevance	9/5/01	9/5/01
P-8	Sims Exh. 4	CRDS 28244 - CRDS 28400	7/14/99	PowerPoint Presentation: Organizational Meeting		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-9	LiVolsi Exh. 9	CRDS 42968 - CRDS 43033	11/3/98	Crossroads Presentation to Dell Computer		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-10		N/A	8/17/01	Expert Report of Kenneth E. Kuffner, including all exhibits attached thereto and documents cited therein	Hearsay		
P-11	Zinger Exh. 320	N/A		Billing Records produced by David Zinger, Esq.	Relevance; Attorney-Client Privilege (for portions)	9/10/01	9/10/01
P-12	Walker Exh. 112	CNS 033582 - CNS 033609	2/18/00	Presentation by Chaparral Network Storage to EMC2, Chaparral Fibre Channel-to-SCSI Routers		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-13	Selinger Exh. 317	N/A	2/22/00	Chaparral Independent Contractor/Consultant Agreement between Chaparral and Selinger		9/4/01	9/4/01



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-14	Selinger Exh. 310	CNS 187010 - CNS 187023	2/22/00 - 3/14/00	2/22/00 - 3/14/00 Selinger notes		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-15	Walker Exh. 132	CNS 174026 - CNS 174030	2/29/00	Email to Mike Gluck and Jerry Walker from Bob Selinger		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-16	Zinger Exh. 322	N/A	3/1/00	3/1/00 Letter from C. Jennison to Zinger pertaining to '972 patent		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-17	Selinger Exh. 304	CNS 012945 - CNS 012949		Invoices and expense reports from Selinger to Chaparral		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-18	Zinger Exh. 321	N/A	3/8/00	Letter from Zinger to Walker enclosing various patents		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-19	Selinger Exh. 308	CNS 039583 - CNS 039584	3/14/00	Email from Selinger to Walker regarding Overpass status		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-20		CNS 172469	7/27/98	7/27/98 Lab notes (Walker)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-21	Rahmani Exh. 98	PTI 165641 - PTI 165657		Letter from Alan Albright to Chaparral enclosing Complaint (faxed on this date to/from Pathlight to Chaparral)	Hearsay; Relevance	9/10/01	Excluded
P-22	Gluck Exh. 48	CNS 041062	4/10/00	Memo to Dave Trachy from Michael Gluck		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-23	Walker Exh. 131	CNS 174031 – CNS 174032	4/13/00	Letter to KPMG, LLP from David F. Zinger		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-24	Walker Exh. 111	CNS 0045915 – CNS 0045945	4/18/00	PowerPoint Presentation: 4/18/00 IBM Tucson, Chaparral Network Storage Fibre Channel/SCSI Routers		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-25		CNS 001207 – CNS 001209	12/2/99	Memorandum from Mike Gluck to File re Conversation with Terry Roelands & Peter Campagna		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-26	Bleakley Exh. 341	CNS 043352 – CNS 043411		Bleakley Lab Notebook		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-27	Gluck Exh. 52	CNS 173894 – CNS 173923	6/14/00	6/14/00 Letter to Jerry Walker from David Zinger marked "Draft"		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-28	Zinger Exh. 324	N/A	6/8/00	Letter from Zinger to Walker enclosing draft opinion		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-29	Zinger Exh. 325	N/A		Series of Emails attaching the Markman Order		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-30	Walker Exh. 337	N/A	10/6/00	A8526 RAID Controller Marketing Requirements Documents, by Durk Watts		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-31	Zinger Exh. 330	N/A	11/13/00	Letter to Michael Barrett, Esq. from Gray Cary	Relevance; Prejudicial	9/10/01	

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-32	Walker Exh. 136	CNS 173589 – CNS 173893	11/20/00	Opinion Letter from David Zinger to Jerry Walker		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-33	Niemann Exh. 277	CNS 186217	7/17/01	CNSi FC-SCSI Product Shipments with LUN Zoning		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-34	Selinger Exh. 314	CRDS 64447- CRDS 64451	6/13/01	Consent Judgment from the Pathlight matter	Hearsay; Relevance; Prejudicial; Fed. R. Evid. 408	9/6/01	9/6/01 (redacted version)
P-35	N/A	CNS 007524 – CNS 007589	March 2000	Securities and Exchange Commission Form S-1 filed by Chaparral		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-36	Gluck Exh. 47	CNS 039583 – CNS 039584	3/14/00	3/14/00 Memo to Jerry Walker from Bob Selinger		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-37	Gluck Exh. 49	CNS 000305 – CNS 000306	4/19/00	4/19/00 Memo from Nigel Squibb to Michael Gluck with attachments		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-38	Gluck Exh. 50	CNS 000297 – CNS 000302		Copies of Fax Transmittal cover sheets		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-39	Gluck Exh. 53	CNS 040708 – CNS 040824		Handwritten notes of Jerry Walker	Attorney-Client Privilege (for portions)	9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-40	Walker Exh. 130	CNS 039583 – CNS 039584	3/14/00	3/14/00 Email to Jerry Walker from Bob Selinger		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-41	Walker Exh. 132	CNS 174026 – CNS 174030	2/29/00	2/29/00 Email to Mike Gluck and Jerry Walker from Bob Selinger		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-42	Walker Exh. 133	CNS 174036	11/27/00	11/27/00 Letter to Whom It May Concern from Eugene C. Nagle at Quantum		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-43	Walker Exh. 134	CNS 172387 – CNS 172546		Jerry Walker lab notebook	Attorney-Client Privilege (for portions)		
P-44	Walker Exh. 141	CNS 173524		Email from David Trachy (Storage Tek) to Michael Alam re patent issues (Redacted)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-45	Walker Exh. 142	CNS 173528 – CNS 173530		Interoffice Memorandum from The Chairman to All Employees re “Making Good Things Happen”		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-46	Walker Exh. 143	CNS 161863 – CNS 161878	4/12/00	Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors April 12, 2000		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-47	Walker Exh. 144	CNS 0048544 – CNS 0048576		File entitled “Crossroads Patent” and containing International Patent publication No. WO 99/34297		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-48	Zinger Exh. 318	N/A	10/6/00	10/6/00 Fax from Walker to Zinger attaching information on reserve/release command		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-49	Zinger Exh. 319	N/A	4/24/00	4/24/00 email between Zinger, Walker and others discussing Crossroads patent		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-50	Zinger Exh. 322	N/A	3/1/00	3/1/00 Letter from C. Jennison to Zinger pertaining to '972 patent		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-51	Zinger Exh. 323	N/A	3/9/00	3/9/00 Letter from Zinger to Walker discussing Crossroads patent applications		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-52	Lavan Exh. 25 (Pltf. Exh. 215)	CNS 0045238	3/6/00	3/6/00 Memo to Lavan from Matthews		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-53	Lavan Exh. 26 (Pltf. Exh. 216)	N/A		User's Guide, G6322/G7324 (Pltf. Exh. 216)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-54	N/A	CNS 023824	5/24/00	Email from Pat Foose to Harris Ravine re LUN Masking, with handwritten notes		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-55	N/A	CNS 188463 - CNS 188469	7/31/01	Engineering Change Notice re A8526 code upgrade		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-56	Walker Exh. 78	CNS 0048165 - CNS 0048167	2/7/00	Memorandum to Jerry Walker from Don Matthews re FS1310 Features		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-57	Walker Exh. 85	CNS 042932 - CNS 042945	1/10/00	CAP1 Functional Specification - Version 3.0 (Router Errata), Configuration Application Programming Interface for Chaparral External RAID Controllers and Routers, Document Revision :1, Preliminary		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-58	Walker Exh. 114	CNS 0051329 - CNS 0051331	6/30/99	Document entitled C:\Windows\Temp\FS1310 Perf comparison.doc 6/30/99		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-59	Walker Exh. 123	CNS 032396 - CNS 032398	3/27/00	Memorandum to Jerry Walker from Tom Lavan		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-60	Walker Exh. 124	CNS 032406 - CNS 032410	5/1/00	Memorandum to Jerry Walker from Tom Lavan re Weekly Status		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-61	Selinger Exh. 305	CNS 174026 - CNS 174030	2/29/00	Email from Selinger to Gluck attaching Overpass Report		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-62	Engelbrecht Exh. 9	LSI 01853 - LSI 02040	9/96	RAID Manager 5 With RDAC 5 For UNIX V.4 User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-63		N/A	8/10/01	Expert Report of D. Paul Regan, CPA, CFE, including all exhibits thereto and documents cited therein	Hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-64		N/A	8/17/01	Expert Report of Kenneth Flamm	Hearsay		
P-65	Smith Exh. 4	CRDS 52581 - CRDS 52641	4/26/97	OEM License and Purchase Agreement Between Crossroads and Hewlett-Packard		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-66	Smith Exh. 6	CRDS 02273 - CRDS 02290	4/15/98	Hewlett-Packard SSD and Crossroads CP4200 License Agreement		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-67	Smith Exh. 7	CRDS 29603 - CRDS 29646	9/22/98	Purchase and License Agreement Between Hewlett-Packard and Crossroads		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-68	Flamm Exh. 5 (Livolsi Exh. 16)	CRDS 39764 - CRDS 39788	2/7/00	SWOT Analysis		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-69	N/A	CRDS 22345 - CRDS 22346	2000	Charts pertaining to Competition	Hearsay		
P-70	N/A	CRDS 39765 - CRDS 39773	2/7/00	Competitive Snapshots	Hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-71	N/A	CRDS 64618 - CRDS 64619; CRDS 63622- CRDS 63623	6/23/00	Amendment to Licensing Agreement By and Between Hewlett-Packard and Crossroads Systems, Inc. (signed version)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-72	Walker Exh. 118	CNS 037349 - CNS 037358		PowerPoint Presentation: Competitive Landscape (Routers)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-73	Niemann Exh. 279	CNS 186219	6/30/01	Statement of Cash Flows, 6/30/01		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-74	Niemann Exh. 280	CNS 186220	6/30/01	Financial Statement, 6/30/01		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-75	Niemann Exh. 281	CNS 186221 - CNS 186229		Q1 FY -02 Gross Router Revenue		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-76	Niemann Exh. 282	CNS 186230	3/31/01	Income Statement Year Ended 3/31/01		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-77	Niemann Exh. 283	CNS 186231 - CNS 186233	2000	Revenues Q2 '00		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-78	Niemann Exh. 284	CNS 186234 - CNS 186240	2001	Q4 FY '01 Gross Router Revenue		9/4/01	9/4/01



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-79	Niemann Exh. 285	CNS 186245 - CNS 186249		LUN Zoning Shipments to Date		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-80	Niemann Exh. 286	CNS 186250 - CNS 186257		Product/Cost/Unit Chart		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-81	Niemann Exh. 287	CNS 186170		CNSi FC-SCSI Product Shipments with LUN Zoning Inventory Plan		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-82	Niemann Exh. 288	CNS 186171 - CNS 186184				9/4/01	9/4/01
P-83	Niemann Exh. 289	CNS 186185		Product Cost (Fully Loaded Cost)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-84	Niemann Exh. 290	CNS 186186		Product Cost		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-85	Niemann Exh. 291	CNS 186187 - CNS 186195		Product Masterschedule		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-86	Niemann Exh. 292	CNS 186196 - CNS 186204		Product Masterschedule		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-87	Niemann Exh. 293	CNS 186205 - CNS 186211		Product Masterschedule		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-88	Niemann Exh. 294	CNS 186212 - CNS 186216		Product Masterschedule		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-89	Niemann Exh. 295	N/A	3/1/01	Invoice to Adaptec, 3/1/01		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-90	Niemann Exh. 296	N/A	6/1/01	Invoice to Arrow, 6/1/01		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-91	Niemann Exh. 297	N/A		Detail Account Transactions		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-92	Niemann Exh. 298	N/A	11/25/98	Technology Cross-License Agreement with Adaptec		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-93	Niemann Exh. 299	N/A	6/25/01	OEM Purchase and License Agreement		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-94	Niemann Exh. 300	N/A	2000	Income Statement FY '00		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-95	Niemann Exh. 301	N/A	2001	Income Statement FY '01		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-96	Niemann Exh. 302	N/A	2001	Income Statement FY '02		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-97	Walker Exh. 334	N/A		Log-in Page from Chaparral Website		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-98	Walker Exh. 335	CNS 185379 - CNS 185394		Chaparral "Quick Start Guide"		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-99	Walker Exh. 336	N/A		Page from Chaparral Website pertaining to RAID controllers		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-100	Walker Exh. 337	CNS 186686- CNS 186702	10/6/00	A8526 RAID Controller Marketing Requirements Documents, by Durk Watts		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-101	Walker Exh. 88	CNS 0046546 - CNS 0046548	5/22/00	5/22/00 Memorandum to Jerry Walker from Tom Lavan		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-102	Walker Exh. 94	CNS 024788	11/10/99	11/10/99 Email to various people at Chaparral from Lambertus	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-103	Walker Exh. 95	CNS 025879	2/2/00	2/2/00 Email to Jerry Walker, Bob Morris, Tom Lavan from Bruce Lambertus	Hearsay		
P-104	Walker Exh. 103	CNS 000550 - CNS 000617	5/24/00	5/24/00 PowerPoint Presentation: Dell Computer, Chaparral Network Storage Fibre Channel/SCSI Routers		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-105	Walker Exh. 133	CNS 174036	11/27/00	11/27/00 Letter to Whom It May Concern from Eugene C. Nagle at Quantum		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-106	Permut Exh. 176	CNS 175975 - CNS 175976	5/1/00	5/1/00 Memorandum re FS1310 Router Version 4.0		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-107	Permut Exh. 177	CNS 175979	5/8/00	5/8/00 Email from Al Permut re changes to Router Code 4.0		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-108	Permut Exh. 178	CNS 175982 - CNS 175983	5/16/00	5/16/00 Memorandum re FS1310 Router Version 4.0		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-109	Permut Exh. 179	CNS 175980 – CNS 175981	5/19/00	Engineering Change Notice, 5/19/00 Router Code Version 4.0		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-110	Permut Exh. 180	CNS 175986 – CNS 175987	6/7/00	6/7/00 Memorandum re FS1310 Router Version 4.1		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-111	Permut Exh. 181	CNS 175988	6/7/00	6/7/00 Email from Jim Jones re Router Code Version 4.1		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-112	Permut Exh. 182	CNS 175984 – CNS 175985		Engineering Change Notice Router Code Version 4.1.0		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-113	Lavan Exh. 24 (Pltf. Exh. 214)	CNS 0045256	5/16/00	Memo to Michael Gluck, et al., from Morris		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-114	Regan Exh. 1 (from Pathlight case)	N/A	3/13/01	Expert Report of D. Paul Regan, CPA, CFE, including all exhibits thereto and documents cited therein (prepared in Pathlight case)	Hearsay		
P-115		CRDS 64613 – CRDS 64617		Revised HP 4200 Royalty Revenue Schedule and Schedule of Income from HP (prepared by Paul Regan)	Hearsay		
P-116		CRDS 64609 – CRDS 64612		Revised Crossroads Financial Information (prepared by Paul Regan)	Hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-117		CRDS 64600 - CRDS 64608	6/12/01	Pathlight/Crossroads Settlement and License Agreement	Hearsay; Relevance; Prejudicial; Red. R. Evid. 408	9/6/01	No; objection sustained
P-118		CRDS 64621 - CRDS 64622	11/8/00	Chaparral Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-119		CRDS 64623 - CRDS 64624	2/12/01	Chaparral Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-120		CRDS 64625 - CRDS 64626	2/26/01	Chaparral Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-121		CRDS 64627 - CRDS 64628	3/5/01	Chaparral Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-122		CRDS 64629 - CRDS 64630	3/22/01	Chaparral Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-123		CRDS 64631 - CRDS 64632	5/8/01	Chaparral Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-124		CRDS 64633 - CRDS 64634	6/11/01	Chaparal Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-125				Crossroads' Annual Report for 2000		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-126	N/A	CNS 000209	1/25/00	Email from Russ Bleakley to Michael Gluck re Crossroads	Relevance, Prejudicial		
P-127	N/A	CNS 024753 - CNS 024754	11/10/99	Memo from Bruce Lambertus to R. Speyer and G. Nagle re FS1310 Feature Enhancement Proposal		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-128	N/A	CNS 023820 - CNS 023824	10/29/99	Memo from Bruce Lambertus to S. Walsh and G. Nagle re FS1310 Feature Enhancement Proposal		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-129	N/A	CNS 187407 - CNS 187427	4/11/01	Purchase and License Agreement between Chaparral and Overland Data, Inc.		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-130	N/A	CRDS 02057 - CRDS 02117	5/12/97	Letter from Alan Leal to Barbara Bardach enclosing OEM License and Purchase Agreement between Hewlett-Packard and Crossroads		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-131	N/A	CRDS 19929 - CRDS 19952	9/18/98	Crossroads Series C Convertible Preferred Stock Purchase Agreement, with Purchasers attached as Schedule A		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-132	Gluck Exh. 63	CNS 029850 - CNS 029871		Chaparral Technologies, Inc., Business Plan Copy #50		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-133	Bianchi Exh. 2	CRDS 64469- CRDS 64470		LUN Management Map Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-134	Bianchi Exh. 3	CRDS 64452- CRDS 64454	1999	Catamaran Device Mapping		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-135	Bianchi Exh. 4	CRDS 64471- CRDS 64474	2000	Common Definition for Global Configuration Data Structures		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-136	Bianchi Exh. 5	CRDS 64493- CRDS 64495	2000	Common Source Code for VPD/Device Mapping and Configuration		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-137	Bianchi Exh. 6		1999	Catamaran Device Mapping		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-138	N/A	CRDS 64620		Catamaran Block Diagram	Hearsay		
P-139	Sims Exh. 12	N/A		Chart showing planned dates for changes in product labelling		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-140	Sims Exh. 13	CRDS 64589		Crossroads Product Label		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-141	Gluck Exh. 55	N/A	3/31/00	Plaintiff Crossroad Systems, (Texas), Inc.'s Original Complaint		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-142	N/A	N/A	9/15/00	Plaintiff Crossroad Systems, (Texas), Inc.'s First Amended Complaint		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-143	N/A	N/A	6/19/00	Crossroads' Preliminary Statement		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-144	N/A	N/A	6/19/00	Chaparral's Preliminary Statement		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-145	N/A	N/A	7/7/00	Declaration of Paul Hodges, Ph.D.	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-146	Zinger Exh. 326	N/A	7/11/00	Crossroads' <i>Markman</i> Brief	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-147	Zinger Exh. 327	N/A	7/11/00	Chaparral's <i>Markman</i> Brief			
P-148	Selinger Exh. 307/ Stephens Exh. 342	N/A	7/27/00	<i>Markman</i> Order	Hearsay; Relevance (except with respect to definitions contained in Order)		
P-149	Gluck Exh. 56	N/A	5/19/00	Chaparral's Complaint Against Crossroads (filed in Colorado and later consolidated with Texas case)	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-150	N/A	N/A	4/17/01	Chaparral's Unopposed Motion for Dismissal (of the Colorado Complaint)	Hearsay; Relevance; Prejudicial		



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-151	N/A	N/A	4/20/01	Order Dismissing with Prejudice (3 Claims for Relief brought by Chaparral)	Hearsay; Relevance; Prejudicial		
P-152	N/A	N/A	7/27/01	Chaparral's Motion for Summary Judgment of No Infringement and Brief in Support Thereof, with attached exhibits and declarations	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-153	N/A	N/A	8/10/01	Crossroads' Opposition to Chaparral's Motion for Summary Judgment of No Infringement and Brief in Support Thereof, including all attached exhibits and declarations	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-154	N/A	N/A	8/14/01	Chaparral's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity and Brief in Support Thereof, with attached exhibits and declarations	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-155	N/A	N/A	PENDING	Crossroads' Opposition to Chaparral's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity and Brief in Support Thereof, including all attached exhibits and declarations	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-156	N/A	N/A	8/1/01	Chaparral's 282 Notice	Relevance		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-157	Walker Exh. 69	N/A	6/30/00	Crossroads' First Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-158	Walker Exh. 70	N/A	7/13/00	Crossroads' Second Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-159	Walker Exh. 71	N/A	10/26/00	Crossroads' Third Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-160	Walker Exh. 72	N/A	11/10/00	Crossroads' Fourth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-161	Walker Exh. 73	N/A	11/22/00	Crossroads' Fifth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-162		N/A	12/13/00	Crossroads' Sixth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-163	Permut Exh. 266	N/A	2/14/01	Crossroads' Seventh Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-164	Permut Exh. 267	N/A	6/28/01	Crossroads' Eighth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-165	Walker Exh. 338	N/A	7/23/01	Crossroads' Ninth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-166	Walker Exh. 74	N/A	10/17/00	Crossroads' First Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral (in the Colorado Case)	Relevance		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-167	N/A	N/A	7/26/00	Chaparral's Original Responses to Crossroads' First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1 - 5)	Relevance		
P-168	N/A	N/A	1/5/01	Chaparral's Original Responses to Crossroads' Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 6 - 14)	Relevance		Excluded
P-169	N/A	N/A	7/18/01	Chaparral's Original Responses to Crossroads' Fourth Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 15 - 21)	Relevance		
P-170	N/A	N/A	Pending	Chaparral's Original Responses to Crossroads' Fifth Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 21 - 25)	Relevance		
P-171	N/A	N/A	7/17/01	Chaparral's Supplemental Answers to Crossroads' Interrogatory Nos. 1 - 5 and 14	Relevance		
P-172	N/A	N/A	7/26/01	Chaparral's Supplemental Answers to Crossroads' Interrogatory Nos. 2 and 3	Relevance		
P-173	N/A	N/A	8/2/01	Chaparral's Responses to Crossroads' First Set of Requests for Admission (Nos. 1 - 25)	Relevance		
P-174	N/A	N/A	7/26/00	Crossroads' Responses to Chaparral's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1 - 6)	Relevance		Excluded

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-175	N/A	N/A	1/5/01	Crossroads' Responses to Chaparral's Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 7)	Relevance		
P-176	N/A	N/A	1/5/01	Crossroads' Responses to Chaparral's First Set of Requests for Admission (Nos. 1 - 19)	Relevance		
P-177	N/A	N/A	5/9/01	Crossroads' Supplemental Response to Chaparral's First Set of Interrogatories (No. 3 only)	Relevance		Excluded
P-178	N/A	N/A	7/6/01	Crossroads' Second Supplemental Response to Chaparral's First Set of Interrogatories (No. 3 only)	Relevance		
P-179	N/A	N/A	7/31/01	Crossroads' Responses to Chaparral's Second Set of Requests for Admissions (Nos. 20 - 23)	Relevance		
P-180		N/A	8/17/01	Expert Report of Paul Hodges, Ph.D.	Hearsay		
P-181	Attachment 1 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Paul Hodges' Biography	Hearsay		
P-182	Attachment 2 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	U. S. Patent No. 5,941,972		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-183	Attachment 3A to Hodges Expert Report	CRDS 64444	2/13/01	Data CD containing snapshot of Chaparral Web Site	Relevance; Prejudicial; Rule 408 (any mention of settlement)		
P-184	Attachment 3B to Hodges Expert Report	CRDS 64445	5/22/01	Data CD containing snapshot of Chaparral Web Site	Relevance; Prejudicial; Rule 408 (any mention of settlement)		
P-185	Attachment 3C to Hodges Expert Report	CRDS 64446	6/14/01	Data CD containing snapshot of Chaparral Web Site	Relevance; Prejudicial; Rule 408 (any mention of settlement)		
P-186	Attachment 4 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	7/27/00	Markman Order	Hearsay; Relevance (except with respect to definitions contained in Order)		
P-187	Attachment 5 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Photographs of RAID Controller (K7413)	Hearsay	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-188	Attachment 6 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Screen Shots From RAID Controller Admin (Menu Tree)/Test 1	Hearsay	9/6/01	9/6/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-189	Attachment 7 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Screen Shots From RAID Controller Admin and Host Computers/Test 2	Hearsay	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-190	Attachment 8 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Screen Shots From RAID Controller Admin and Host Computers/Test 3	Hearsay	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-191	Attachment 9 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Data From RAID Controller Reboot	Hearsay	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-192	Attachment 10 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Data from "scu.exe"	Hearsay	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-193	Attachment 11 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Performance Tests	Hearsay		
P-194			8/24/01	Rebuttal Report of Paul Hodges, Ph.D., with attachments	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-195			8/10/01	Declaration of Paul Hodges, Ph.D. in support of Crossroads' Opposition to Defendant Chaparral's Motion for Summary Judgment of No Infringement	Hearsay; Relevance		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-196		N/A	8/17/01	Expert Report of Gary R. Stephens, including all documents cited therein			
P-197		N/A	8/24/01	Rebuttal Report of Gary R. Stephens, including all documents cited therein			
P-198	Davies Exh. 331	N/A	7/27/01	Declaration of Ian Robert Davies in Support of Chaparral's Motion for No Infringement			
P-199	Davies Exh. 332	N/A	7/27/01	Declaration of Ian Robert Davies in Support of Chaparral's Motion for No Infringement, with attached Exhibits A - F			
P-200	Davies Exh. 333	CRDS 64432 - CRDS 64441		LUN Zoning for the FS2620 Router User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-201	Walker Exh. 339	CNS 185195 - CNS 185208		A8526 External Rack RAID Controller User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-202	Stephens Exh. 335	CNS 187024		Photocopy of a CD ROM cover: DATA CD R For Computer Writers		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-203	Stephens Exh. 336	CNS 187025		Screen shot	Hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-204	Stephens Exh. 337	CNS 187026 – CNS 187122		Chaparral A8526 Testing Performed by FSI Consulting Services, 7/10/01 – 7/21/01	Hearsay		
P-205	Stephens Exh. 338	CNS 187123 – CNS 187219		Chaparral A8526 Testing Performed by FSI Consulting Services, 7/10/01 – 7/21/01	Hearsay		
P-206	Stephens Exh. 339	CNS 187220 – CNS 187298		Chaparral A8526 Testing Performed by FSI Consulting Services, 7/10/01 – 7/??/01	Hearsay		
P-207	Stephens Exh. 340	CNS 187299 – CNS 187388		Chaparral A8526 Testing Performed by FSI Consulting Services, 7/10/01 – 7/??/01	Hearsay		
P-208	Stephens Exh. 341	CNS 187389 – CNS 187406		Chaparral A8526 Testing Performed by FSI Consulting Services, 7/10/01 – 7/21/01	Hearsay		
P-209	N/A	N/A	5/25/01	CD ROM of the Crossroads Web Site	Relevance; Prejudicial; Rule 408 (any mention of settlement)		
P-210	N/A	N/A		Crossroads CP 4100 Product, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional	Relevance; Prejudicial		



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-211	N/A	N/A		Crossroads CP 4400 Product, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional	Relevance; Prejudicial		
P-212	Arroyo Exh. 3	N/A	Undated	Printout of Arroyo's floppy drive disc directory	Hearsay		
P-213	Arroyo Exh. 4	CRDS 63362 - CRDS 63363	Undated	Notes written by witness into computer file	Hearsay		
P-214	Arroyo Exh. 5	CRDS 63301 - CRDS 63331	1996	Bridge.c code, copyright 1995, revised 1996		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-215	Arroyo Exh. 6	CRDS 63364 - CRDS 63440	1996	Bridge.c code, copyright 1995, revised 1996		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-216	Arroyo Exh. 7	CRDS 63498 - CRDS 63574	1996	Bridge.c code, copyright 1995, revised 1996		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-217	Arroyo Exh. 8	CRDS 63441 - CRDS 63497	3/19/97	Bridge.c code, further revised, 3/19/97		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-218	Arroyo Exh. 9	CRDS 63127.9729 G.1 - CRDS 63127.9729 G.107	9/18/97	Bridge.c code, further revised, 9/18/97		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-219	Permut Exh. 233	CNS 184737 – CNS 184948	Jan. 2001	CAPI Functional Specification Version 3.1, January 2001		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-220	Permut Exh. 234	CNS 184949 – CNS 185046		Chaparral FS2620R User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-221	Permut Exh. 235	CNS 185047 – CNS 185048		Chaparral FS2620 marketing matrix		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-222	Permut Exh. 236	CNS 185049 – CNS 185064		Quick Start Guide for rack mount products		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-223	Permut Exh. 237	CNS 185065 – CNS 185073		Chaparral SNMP MIB Capabilities		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-224	Permut Exh. 238	CNS 185074 – CNS 185167		Chaparral FS1310 User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-225	Permut Exh. 239	CNS 185195 – CNS 185376		A8526 User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-226	Permut Exh. 240	CNS 185377 - CNS 185378		A-Series External RAID Controller marketing matrix		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-227	Permut Exh. 241	CNS 185404 - CNS 185593		G6322/G7324/G8324 User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-228	Permut Exh. 242	CNS 185594 - CNS 185595		G8324 External RAID Controller marketing matrix		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-229	Permut Exh. 243	CNS 185598 - CNS 185599		G-Series External RAID Controllers marketing matrix		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-230	Permut Exh. 244	CNS 185600 - CNS 185767		K5412/K7413 User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-231	Permut Exh. 245	CNS 185768 - CNS 185769		K-Series External RAID Controllers marketing matrix		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-232	Permut Exh. 246	CNS 185770 - CNS 185927		G- and K-Series User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-233	Permut Exh. 247	CNS 185928 – CNS 185929		G-Series External RAID Controllers marketing matrix		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-234	Permut Exh. 248	CNS 184733 – CNS 184734		RAID and Router Product Overviews		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-235	Permut Exh. 249	N/A		Chart of RAID and router products		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-236	Permut Exh. 250	CNS 186488 – CNS 186514		Rainrock Hardware Platform K5412, K7413, FS1310 Engineering Requirements Document		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-237	Permut Exh. 251	CNS 186429 – CNS 186455		K5312/K7313 Board-Only Design In Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-238	Permut Exh. 252	CNS 186314 – CNS 186338		Skyway II/Goldengate II Hardware Design Specification		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-239	Permut Exh. 253	CNS 186578 – CNS 186587		Dual Loop Fibre Channel Daughterboards Hardware Design Specification		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-240	Permut Exh. 254	CNS 186726 – CNS 186728		Memorandum to Pat Foose from Victor Pecone		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-241	Permut Exh. 255	CNS 186943 – CNS 186950		Rack Mount RAID Product Review		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-242	Permut Exh. 256	CNS 186984 – CNS 187002	1/21/00	G6322G7324 Product Presentation		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-243	Permut Exh. 257	CNS 172224.1	3/23/00	Mainboard Block Diagram, FS2620R		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-244	Permut Exh. 258	CNS 162205.192		FS2424/FS2430 Block Diagram		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-245	Permut Exh. 259	CNS 185939 – CNS 185943	2/09/01	Engineering Change Notice A400 SW on A8526		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-246	Permut Exh. 260	CNS 185948 – CNS 185961		Engineering Change Notice G-Series Maintenance Upgrade vG400		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-247	Permut Exh. 261	CNS 185980 – CNS 186000	11/29/00	Engineering Change Notice G2-Series Maintenance Upgrade vL400		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-248	Permut Exh. 262	CNS 185962 – CNS 185978		Engineering Change Notice K-Series vK410		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-249	Permut Exh. 263	CNS 186544 – CNS 186551	6/04/01	Skyway II RAID Software Release 4.0 Incremental Engineering Requirements		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-250	Permut Exh. 264	CNS 186686 – CNS 186702	10/06/00	A8526 RAID Controller Marketing Requirements Document		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-251	Permut Exh. 265	CNS 186951 – CNS 186967	8/23/01	G8526 V1.0 Functional Specification		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-252	Permut Exh. 268	CNS 186001 – CNS 186005		Engineering Change Notice, Forward Router Code vR430		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-253	Permut Exh. 269	CNS 186537 – CNS 186543		G/K RAID Software, Software Release 4.0 Incremental Engineering Software		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-254	Permut Exh. 270	CNS 186295 – CNS 186313		Skyway II RAID Software, Software Release 4.0, Engineering Requirements		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-255	Permut Exh. 271	N/A		Chaparral Screen Shots	Hearsay		
P-256	Permut Exh. 272	CNS 186145 – CNS 186161		Skyway Software Design, Revision 0.2		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-257	Permut Exh. 273	CNS 186162 - CNS 186169		Code descriptions		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-258	Permut Exh. 274	CNS 184735- CNS 184736		1.1 Pass Through Commands		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-259	Permut Exh. 151	CNS 0162205.47 6 - CNS 0162205.62 6		CAPI Functional Specification v2.8		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-260	Permut Exh. 154	CNS 0165205.78 2 - CNS 0165205.96 4	3/21/00	CAPI Functional Specification v3.0 dated 3/21/00		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-261		CRDS 64635		CAPI Functional Specification v3.2		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-262	N/A	CRDS 50579	9/3/97	Drawing of the Verrazano placement Bare Board and Bare Board	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-263	Hoese Exh. 12	CRDS 41182- CRDS 41260		Hoese notebook.	Relevance; incomplete	9/11/01	9/11/01
P-264	N/A	CRDS 14926 - CRDS 14935	6/5/97	Verrazano Enclosure Specification, Revision 2.1	Relevance; incomplete	9/5/01	9/5/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-265	N/A	CRDS 16189	7/7/97	Email from Geoffrey B. Hoese to Crossroads regarding Verrazano Release 1	Relevance; Hearsay		
P-266	N/A	CRDS 41920- CRDS 41952	7/11/97	Letter from Anthony Peterman to Geoff Hoese regarding US Patent entitled Storage Router and Method for Providing Virtual Local Storage; patent application	Relevance; authentication	9/11/01	9/11/01
P-267	Russell Exh. 10	CRDS 43928 - CRDS 43982	9/5/97	CP4x00 Product Specification	Relevance; incomplete	9/5/01	9/5/01
P-268	Russell Exh. 2	CRDS 16392 - CRDS 16423	8/25/97	Verrazano Hardware Architecture, Revision 1.0	Relevance; incomplete	9/5/01	9/5/01
P-269	N/A	CRDS 16425 - CRDS 16444	8/27/97	Verrazano Software Architecture, Revision 1.1	Relevance; incomplete		
P-270	N/A	CRDS 50585; CRDS 50616	9/3/97	Excerpts from the Verrazano System Structure	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-271	N/A	CRDS 50452 - CRDS 50459	9/5/97	Verrazano Programmable Device Instructions, Version 1.1	Hearsay; Relevance		



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-272	N/A	CRDS 43605- CRDS 43694 (mixed pages)	9/29/97	Component and Insertion Lists for Verrazano	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-273	Russell Exh. 9	CRDS 40258 - CRDS 40288	10/13/97	CP4100 Power Point Slides	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-274	Hoese Exh. 14	CRDS 41321 - CRDS 41426		Geoff Hoese Laboratory Notebook	Relevance; incomplete	9/11/01	9/11/01
P-275	N/A	CRDS 41887- CRDS 41919	12/31/97	Letter to Dale Quisenberry from William N. Hulsey III regarding Patent Application entitled "Storage Router and Method for Providing Virtual Local Storage"; draft application	Relevance; authentication	9/11/01	9/11/01
P-276	N/A	CRDS 41830 -- CRDS 41859		Patent application for a Storage Router and Method for Providing Virtual Local Storage	Relevance; authentication	9/11/01	9/11/01
P-277	Walker Exh. 140		4/19/00	4/19/00 Memo from Nigel Squibb to Michael Gluck with attachments	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-278		CRDS 64635		CAPi 3.2 Software Development Kit		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-279	Russell Exh. 5	CRDS 39575 - CRDS 39698	12/95 - 11/99	Jeff Russell Lab Notebook			
P-532				Demonstrative	Objection Overruled	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-508				Demonstrative	Objection Overruled	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-509				Demonstrative	Objection Overruled	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-530				Demonstrative	Objection Overruled	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-608				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-609				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-610				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-611				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-612				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-613				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-614				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-615				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served via pdf on this \_\_\_ day of September, 2001.

**CROSSROADS VS. PATHLIGHT  
PLAINTIFF'S REVISED TRIAL EXHIBIT LIST**

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-1	N/A for certified; uncert. Is Exh. 2. To Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/24/99	U. S. Patent No. 5,941,972 to Hoese (certified copy)			Admitted 6/6/01
P-2	N/A	N/A	Pre-8/24/99	File Wrapper for U. S. Patent No. 5,941,972 (certified copy)			
P-3	N/A	N/A	4/27/01	Declaration of Geoff Hoese in Support of Crossroads' Opposition to Pathlight's Motion for Summary Judgment	Hearsay; relevance		
P-4	Hoese Exhibit 2	CRDS 40807 - CRDS 40823	6/19/96	PowerPoint Presentation: Verrazano FC-SCSI Bridge Product Overview			
P-5	Hoese Exhibit 3	CRDS 40925 - CRDS 40958 (mixed pages)	9/10/96	Confidential Document: Verrazano Software Development			

Gray Cary\SD\1447270.1  
103671-160174

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-6	Hoes Exh. 4	CRDS 39727 - CRDS 39758	1/22/97	Verrazano System Structure			
P-7	Hodges Exh. 5	CRDS 40510 - CRDS 40512	5/28/97	Fax from Geoff Hoes to Anthony Peterman enclosing Conception of Invention	Hearsay, relevance		Admitted 6/6/01
P-8	Rahmani Exh. 37	PTI 007775 - PTI 007780	3/30/99	ITL Access Control Design Specification			
P-9	Rahmani Exh. 38	PTI 008287 - PTI 008291	4/19/99	ITL Access Control - Requirement Specification Version 1.03			
P-10	Rahmani Exh. 39	PTI 007771 - PTI 007774	9/7/99	ITL Access Control (IAC) Requirement Specification			
P-11	Rahmani Exhibit 43	PTI 064685 - PTI 064689	9/7/99	Email from Said Rahmani to Peter Passeretti dated 9/7/99 with attachments			
P-12	Rahmani Exhibit 50	PTI 064243 - PTI 064288	3/21/99	Powerpoint Presentation: SAN Solutions: Overall Comparison of Three SAN Solutions			
P-13	Rahmani Exhibit 54	PTI 126760 - PTI 126773	2/28/00	Powerpoint Presentation: Pathlight Enterprise SAN Demonstration			
P-14	Rahmani Exh. 55	PTI 007854 - PTI 007899	1998	SAN Gateway Remote Management and Configuration Guide Version 1.11			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-15	Rahmani Exh. 62	PTI 065368 - PTI 065479	1999	IBM Publication: Installation and User's Guide 2108 Model G07			
P-16	Rahmani Exhibit 64	PTI 064329 - PTI 064330	3/6/99	Powerpoint Presentation: Storage Area Networking IP Protection			
P-17	Rahmani Exh. 76	N/A	1999	Pathlight SAN Gateway Service Guide Version 2.02			
P-18	Rahmani Exh. 78	N/A	1999	Pathlight SAN Router Installation and User's Guide Version 2.00			
P-19	Rahmani Exh. 79	PTI 165062 - PTI 165243	2000	Pathlight SAN Router Installation & User's Guide			
P-20	Rahmani Exh. 80	PTI 164348 - PTI 164531	1999	Pathlight SAN Gateway Installation and User's Guide Version 2.02			
P-21	Rahmani/Ke Ileher Exh. 85	PTI 165032 - PTI 165243	2000	Pathlight SAN Router Installation and User's Guide Version 2.04			
P-22	Rahmani Exh. 88	PTI 167074 - PTI 167293	8/00	SAN Gateway Installation and User's Guide Version 2.04, August 2000		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-23	Rahmani Exh. 89	PTI 165032 - PTI 165243	8/00	SAN Router Installation and User's Guide Version 2.04, September 2000		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-24	Flamm Exh. 6 (partial)	N/A	Printed 2/2/01	CD ROM of the Pathlight Web Site	Hearsay, relevance/403	6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01

Gray Cary\SD\1447270.1  
103671-160174

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-25	Regan Exh. 2	CRDS 63593 - CRDS 63594	Undated	Product Gross Margin chart			
P-26	Regan Exh. 3	CRDS 63595 - CRDS 63597	Undated	Product ASP chart			
P-27	Regan Exh. 4	CRDS 63598 - CRDS 63600	Undated	Product Cost chart			
P-28	Regan Exh. 5	N/A	Undated	Crossroads Systems vs. Pathlight Technology Sales Information from 11/1/99 through 1/31/01			
P-29	Regan Exh. 6	CRDS 51873 - CRDS 51977	7/00	Crossroads Systems, Inc. Financial Reporting Package, July 2000 (Fiscal Q3, '00)			
P-30	Regan Exh. 7	PTI 048416	8/99	OEM Price List (August 1999)			
P-31	Regan Exh. 8	CRDS 63590 - CRDS 63592	3/30/01	Crossroads Systems, Inc. Hewlett-Packard - Total Historical Revenue & Units			
P-32	Hood Exh. 109	PTI 169581 - PTI 169646	1/01	Amendment and Plan of Merger among ADIC, Ptech Acquisition, Inc. and Pathlight	Hearsay, relevance/403		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-33	Hood Exh. 110	PTI 170791 - PTI 170970	2/14/01	Securities and Exchange Commission Form S-4 filed by Advanced Digital Information Corporation	Relevance/403		
P-34	Hood Exh. 111	PTI 170971 - PTI 171039	1/30/01	Securities and Exchange Commission For 8-K pertaining to ADIC	Relevance/403		
P-35	Hood Exh. 114	PTI 169664 - PTI 169748	Undated	Database of VPS License Key Activation for IBM SAN Gateway's manufacturing			
P-36	Hood Exh. 115	PTI 169647 - PTI 169655	2/15/01	New database listing of customers and software features activated by license key			
P-37	Hood Exh. 116	PTI 169656 - PTI 169663	12/8/99 - 12/13/00	Database used to track issuing of license keys for software options for customers			
P-38	Hood Exh. 119	PTI 169749 - PTI 169883	2/5/01	Pathlight Sales, Order and Backlog Reports			
P-39	Smith Exh. 4	CRDS 52581 - CRDS 52641	4/26/97	OEM License and Purchase Agreement Between Crossroads and Hewlett-Packard		06/06/01	Admitted 06/06/01
P-40	Smith Exh. 6	CRDS 02273 - CRDS 02290	4/15/98	Hewlett-Packard SSD and Crossroads CP4200 License Agreement		06/06/01	Admitted 06/06/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-41	Smith Exh. 7	CRDS 29603 - CRDS 29646	9/22/98	Purchase and License Agreement Between Hewlett-Packard and Crossroads		06/06/01	Admitted 06/06/01
P-42	Flamm Exh. 5 (Livolsi Exh. 16)	CRDS 39764 - CRDS 39788	2/7/00	SWOT Analysis	Hearsay		
P-43	Flamm Exh. 7	N/A	4/20/00	Memo from Randy Hood to Jan White re VPS client software license			
P-44	Flamm Exh. 8	N/A	Undated	Handwritten calculation			
P-45	N/A	PTI 82750 - PTI 82871	4/21/98	IBM's Request for Proposal to Pathlight			
P-46	N/A	PTI 173350 - PTI 173369	3/12/01	Summary - Sales, Orders and Backlog Report			
P-47	N/A	PTI 047912 - PTI 047913	9/29/99	Email from James Watson to IBM			
P-48	N/A	PTI 047939 - PTI 047950	9/29/99	Fax from James Watson to Randy Hood enclosing documents pertaining to IBM and VPS			
P-49	N/A	PTI 047865 - PTI 047867	11/24/99	Fax from Randy Hood to Hank Watson enclosing VPS quotation to IBM		6/6/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-50	N/A	PTI 048566 - PTI 048569	Undated	Vicom White Paper: Comparing Crossroads, Pathlight, and SLIC	Hearsay		



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-51	N/A	PTI 048393 - PTI 048398	Undated	Pathlight Marketing Document (discusses VPS)			
P-52	N/A	CRDS 22345 - CRDS 22346	2000	Charts pertaining to Competition	Hearsay		
P-53	N/A	CRDS 39765 - CRDS 39773	2/7/00	Competitive Snapshots	Hearsay		
P-54	N/A	CRDS 63620 - CRDS 63623	6/23/00	Amendment to Licensing Agreement By and Between Hewlett-Packard and Crossroads Systems, Inc.		06/06/01	Admitted 06/06/01
P-55	N/A	PTI 183455 - PTI 183558		Documents produced by Pathlight on 5/15/01			
P-56	Rahmani Exh. 65	PTI 165498 - PTI 165425	10/23/00	Billing statement from Salzman & Levy			
P-57	Rahmani Exh. 66	PTI 165706	12/23/99	12/23/99 Handwritten notes			
P-58	Rahmani Exhibit 67	PTI 165428 - PTI 165429	Undated	Document entitled "Response to Crossroads '972 Patent"			
P-59	Rahmani Exh. 68	PTI 165658 - PTI 165659	2/25/00	2/25/00 Email from Rahmani to Mark DeWilde re Crossroads Opinion Documentation			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-60	Rahmani Exh. 69	PTI 165663 - PTI 165665	2/24/00	Document entitled "Crossroads Patent Opinion Documentation, Thursday, February 24, 2000", with handwritten notes			
P-61	Rahmani Exh. 70	PTI 165660 - PTI 165662	2/26/00	Document entitled "Crossroads Patent Opinion Documentation, Thursday, February 24, 2000"			
P-62	Rahmani Exh. 71	PTI 165684	3/31/00	2/26/00 Email from Rahmani to Mark DeWilde and Salzman & Levy re patent issues			
P-63	Rahmani Exh. 74	PTI 165685	4/6/00	Email from Greg Prestas to Mark DeWilde and Salzman & Levy re Storage Router definition			
P-64	Rahmani Exh. 95	PTI 167772 - PTI 167774	2/24/00	Crossroads Patent Opinion Documentation dated 2/24/00			
P-65	Rahmani Exh. 100	PTI 167669	2/28/00	2/28/00 Email from Mark DeWilde to Frank Hopkins			
P-66	Rahmani Exh. 101	PTI 167770	2/25/00	2/25/00 Email from Said Rahmani to Mark DeWilde			
P-67	Rahmani Exh. 102	PTI 167776	4/4/00	4/4/00 Email from Said Rahmani to Mark DeWilde and Greg Prestas			
P-68	Rahmani Exhibit 104	PTI 167809	11/15/99	Email from Mark DeWilde to Patents		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-69	Rahmani Exhibit 105	PTI 167810	11/18/99	Email from Said Rahmani to Patents		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-70	Levy/ Rahmani Exhibit 81	PTI 165433 -PTI 165614	4/10/00	Opinion letter of Mark Levy, Esq.		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-71	N/A	PTI 167665 -PTI 167666	2/25/00	Email from Mark DeWilde to Said Rahmani re Crossroads Opinion Documentation			
P-72	N/A	PTI 167811	11/19/99	Email from Mark DeWilde to Patents			
P-73	N/A	PTI 167812	11/19/99	Email from Mark DeWilde to Patents			
P-74	N/A	PTI 167813 -PTI 167858	2/24/00	Email from Mark DeWilde to Mark Levy with attachments			
P-75	N/A	PTI 167667 -PTI 167668	2/25/00	Email from Said Rahmani to Mark DeWilde		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-76	N/A	PTI 167775	4/6/00	Email from Prestas to Patents			
P-77	N/A	N/A	7/26/00	Pathlight's Original Answers to Crossroads' First Set of Interrogatories (1 - 5)			
P-78	N/A	N/A	1/4/01	Pathlight's Original Answers to Crossroads' Second Set of Interrogatories (6)			
P-79	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Pathlight's Original Answers to Crossroads' Third Set of Interrogatories (7 - 13)			
P-80	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Pathlight's Answers to Crossroads' Request for Admissions (1 - 20)			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-81	N/A	N/A	5/8/01	Pathlight's Supplemental Answers to Crossroads' Interrogatory Nos. 1 - 7 and 9			
P-82	N/A	N/A	5/8/01	Crossroads' Supplemental Answers to Pathlight's Interrogatory Nos. 2 - 10			
P-83	N/A	N/A	4/6/01	Pathlight Technology, Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity and Brief in Support Thereof, with attached exhibits	Hearsay; relevance		
P-84	N/A	N/A	4/27/01	Crossroads' Opposition to Pathlight's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity and Brief in Support Thereof, with exhibits	Hearsay; relevance		
P-85	N/A	N/A	5/8/01	Defendant Pathlight Technology Inc.'s Reply to Crossroads' Opposition to Pathlight's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity	Hearsay; relevance		
P-86	N/A	N/A	5/14/01	Order Denying Pathlight's Motion for Summary Judgment	Hearsay; relevance		
P-87	N/A	N/A	6/19/00	Crossroads' Preliminary Statement	Hearsay; relevance		
P-88	N/A	N/A	6/19/00	Pathlight's Preliminary Statement	Hearsay; relevance		
P-89	N/A	N/A	7/11/00	Crossroads' Markman Brief	Hearsay; relevance		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-90	N/A	N/A	7/11/00	Pathlight's Markman Brief	Hearsay, relevance		
P-91	Hodges Exh. 3; also Exh. 4 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	7/27/00	Markman Order	Hearsay, relevance (Agree to introduction of actual claim construction)		
P-92	Hodges Exh. 1	N/A	3/12/01	Expert Report of Paul Hodges, Ph.D., with attached exhibits 1 - 20 (includes screenshots) (exhibits are listed separately)	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-93	Hodges Exh. 4	N/A	3/26/01	Rebuttal Report of Paul Hodges, Ph.D.	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-94	Regan Exh. 1	N/A	3/13/01	Expert Report of D. Paul Regan, CPA, CFE, including all exhibits thereto and documents cited therein	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-95	Kuffner Exh. 1	N/A	3/12/01	Expert Report of Kenneth E. Kuffner, including all exhibits attached thereto and documents cited therein	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-96	Kuffner Exh. 2	N/A	3/26/01	Supplemental Report of Kenneth E. Kuffner	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-97	Stephens Exh. 1	N/A	3/13/01	Expert Report of Gary R. Stephens, including all documents cited therein	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-98	Stephens Exh. 2	N/A	3/26/01	Rebuttal Report of Gary R. Stephens, including all documents cited therein	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-99	Berg Exh. 3	N/A	3/13/01	Expert Report of Brian Berg, with exhibits 1 - 7 and including all documents therein	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-100	Flamm Exh. 1	N/A	3/26/01	Expert Report of Kenneth Flamm, including all documents cited therein and with exhibits 1 - 9	Agreement b/w parties to not introduce; hearsay		
P-101	N/A	N/A	4/9/01	Pathlight's 35 U.S.C. § 282 Notice	Relevance		
P-102	N/A	N/A	5/14/01	Pathlight's Supplemental 35 U.S.C. § 282 Notice	Relevance		
P-103	Hodges Exh. 6	N/A	6/16/98	U. S. Patent No. 5,768,623 to Judd			
P-104	Smith Exh. 24	CRDS 08556 - CRDS 08557	7/12/96	Letter from Clarion to Brian Smith			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-105	Smith Exh. 25	CRDS 08558 - CRDS 08555	7/22/96	Fax enclosing Data General/Clarion Purchase Order			
P-106	N/A	CRDS 13635 - CRDS 13653	1996 - 1997	Group of Clarion Emails			
P-107	Exh. 1 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	Undated	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Hodges	Agreement that will only object if not allowed to jointly introduce CV for Stephens; hearsay		
P-108	Exh. 5 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Photographs of Pathlight SAN Router			
P-109	Exh. 6 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Photographs of SAN Gateway (IBM Version)			
P-110	Exh. 7 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen Shots from Left Gateway (Test 1, SAN Gateway, IBM version) LeftG01 through LeftG41	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-111	Exh. 8 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen shots from Right computer (Test 1, SAN Gateway, IBM version) RightG01 through RightG21	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-112	Exh. 9 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen Shots from Left computer (Test 2, SAN Gateway, IBM version) LeftG42 through LeftG53	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-113	Exh. 10 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen shots from Right computer (Test 2, SAN Gateway, IBM version) RightG22 through RightG33	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-114	Exh. 11 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen Shots from Left computer (Test 3, SAN Gateway, IBM version) LeftG54 through LeftG60	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-115	Exh. 12 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen shots from Right computer (Test 3, SAN Gateway, IBM version) RightG34 through RightG40	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-116	Exh. 13 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen Shots from Left computer (Test 4, SAN Router) SANLeft01 through SANLeft30	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-117	Exh. 14 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Screen shots from Right computer (Test 4, SAN Router) SANRight01 through SANRight15	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-118	Exh. 15 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Hyperterminal screen shots relating to a reboot of SAN Gateway (IBM Version)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-119	Exh. 16 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Hyperterminal screen shots relating to VPS of SAN Gateway (IBM Version)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-120	Exh. 17 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Hyperterminal screen shots relating to rescanning the SCSI bus of SAN Gateway (IBM Version)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-121	Exh. 18 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		Performance Tests/ Data of SAN Gateway (IBM version)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if introduced		
P-122	Exh. 19 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		SYM53C876/876E Data Pages			
P-123	Exh. 20 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A		ISP2100, 2200 Data Pages			
P-124	N/A	N/A		Pathlight's SAN Gateway, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-125	N/A	N/A		Pathlight's SAN Router, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional			
P-126	N/A	N/A		IBM's Storage Area Network Data Gateway, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional			
P-127	N/A	N/A		Crossroads CP 4100 Product, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional			
P-128	N/A	N/A		Crossroads CP 4400 Product, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional			
P-129	Rahmani Exh. 42	PTI 039169 - PTI 039176	Undated	Document Entitled "Introduction"			
P-130	Hood Exh. 30	PTI 048906 - PTI 048921	5/12/00	Manufacturing Services Agreement between Pathlight and XeTel			
P-131	Rahmani Exh. 40	PTI 154501 - PTI 154516	1998	SAN Gateway Firmware Overview, Major Components	Hearsay		
P-132	Rahmani Exh. 47	PTI 155471 - PTI 155546	5/31/00	IBM SAN Gateway Installation Cookbook (5/31/00 Draft Document)			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-133	Rahmani Exh. 48	PTI 149751 - PTI 149833	1999	IBM Publication: IBM 2108 Model G07 San Data Gateway			
P-134	Rahmani Exh. 75	N/A	1999	Pathlight SAN Gateway Service Guide Version 2.01			
P-135	Walker Exh. 136	CNS 173589 - CNS 173621	11/20/00	Opinion Letter of David Zinger, Esq.	Hearsay; relevance		
P-136	N/A	CRDS 64417 - CRDS 64430	5/18/01	Pages Printed from ADIC Web Site	Hearsay; relevance/403	6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-137	Rahmani Exh. 72	PTI 165641 - PTI 165657	3/31/00	3/31/00 Letter from Alan Albright to Gary Allison enclosing Crossroads complaint against Chaparral			
P-138	N/A	CRDS 64431	5/21/01	ADIC Press Release	Hearsay; relevance/403		
P-139	Arroyo Exh. 3	N/A	Undated	Printout of Arroyo's floppy drive disc drive directory			
P-140	Arroyo Exh. 4	CRDS 63362 - CRDS 63363	Undated	Notes written by witness into computer file			
P-141	Arroyo Exh. 5	CRDS 63301 - CRDS 63331	1996	Bridge.c code, copyright 1995, revised 1996			Admitted 6/6/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-142	Arroyo Exh. 6	CRDS 63334 - CRDS 63440	1996	Bridge.c code, copyright 1995, revised 1996			
P-143	Arroyo Exh. 7	CRDS 63498 - CRDS 63574	1996	Bridge.c code, copyright 1995, revised 1996			
P-144	Arroyo Exh. 8	CRDS 63441 - CRDS 63497	3/19/97	Bridge.c code, further revised, 3/19/97			
P-145	Arroyo Exh. 9	CRDS 63127.9729 G.1 - CRDS 63127.9729 G.107	9/18/97	Bridge.c code, further revised, 9/18/97			Admitted 6/6/01
P-146	N/A	PTI 49674 - PTI 49675	Undated	PowerPoint Presentation entitled "Competition"			
P-147	N/A	PTI 57537 - PTI 57599	5/12/00	Competitive Analysis PowerPoint Presentation			
P-148	Dunning Exh. 13	HP 335 - HP 486	1997	Hewlett-Packard Service and User Manual for Fibre Channel SCSI Multiplexer			
P-149	Hood (2/22/01) Exh. 120	PTI 169884 - PTI 170012	2000	Pathlight Invoices (to customers purchasing Pathlight products)			
P-150	Hood (9/7/00) Exh. 5	PTI 056770 - PTI 056771	5/00	Pathlight's OEM Price List (May 2000)			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-151	Hood (12/12/00) Exh. 8	PTI 049712 - PTI 049733	4/18/00	4/25/00 Email from James Watson to Terry Kelleher and Hank Watson re Quote for IBM on LVD		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-152	Hood (2/22/01) Exh. 113	N/A	Undated	Untitled list of shareholders	Relevance	6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-153	N/A	N/A	2/2/01	Color Printout of CD ROM of the Pathlight Website	Relevance & Prej for ADIC references		
P-154	N/A	PTI 165524 - PTI 165544	4/10/00	Opinion Letter from Mark Levy, Esq. To Pathlight (clean copy)			
P-155	N/A	PTI 124129	9/9/99	Email from Said Rahmani to "Coreteam"			
P-156	N/A	PTI 124120	9/2/99	Email from Jeffrey Goldner to Said Rahmani re "Problems That Must Be Fixed or Verified"			
P-157	N/A	PTI 093551	10/5/99	Letter from Randy Hood to Richard Lamperd re Existing SAN Gateway upgrade quotation			
P-158	N/A	PTI 165618 - PTI 165619	4/6/00	Letter from Mark DeWilde to Mark and David re Crossroads' claims			
P-159	Engelbrecht Exh. 2	LSI 01421 - LSI 1658	1997	Symbios Logic Software Interface Specification Series 3 SCSI RAID Controller Software Release 02.xx			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-160	Engelbrecht Exh. 9	LSI 01853 – LSI 02040	9/96	RAID Manager 5 With RDAC 5 For UNIX V.4 User's Guide			
P-161	Exh. 3 to Hodges' Expert Report	N/A	N/A	Data CD Containing Snapshot of Pathlight Website	Relevance & Prej for ADIC references		
P-162	Sims Exh. 4	CRDS 28244 – CRDS 28400	7/14/99	PowerPoint Presentation: Organizational Meeting			
P-163	LiVolsi Exh. 9	CRDS 42968 – CRDS 43033	11/3/98	Crossroads Presentation to Dell Computer			
P-164	N/A	N/A	4/14/00	Plaintiff Crossroad Systems, (Texas), Inc.'s Original Complaint	Relevance; hearsay		
P-165	N/A	N/A	9/15/00	Plaintiff Crossroad Systems, (Texas), Inc.'s First Amended Complaint	Relevance; hearsay		
P-166	N/A	PTI 048829	5/4/00	Letter from Randy Hood to Jan white re VPS client software license			
P-167	N/A	PTI 049813 – PTI 049828	4/14/00	Pathlight Statement Package, March 2000, Fiscal Year 2000			
P-168	N/A	PTI 049798 – PTI 049812	5/16/00	Pathlight Statement Package, April 2000, Fiscal Year 2000			
P-169	N/A	N/A	5/25/01	CD ROM of the Crossroads Web Site	Hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-170	N/A	N/A	5/25/01	Supplemental Expert Report of D. Paul Regan, CPA, CFE, including revised Exhibit C	Not entered per agreement b/w parties; hearsay		
P-171	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 2: Pathlight Product Configuration(s)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-172	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 3: Equipment Used For Testing Pathlight Products	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-173	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 4: Drive Identities	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-174	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 5A: Test 1	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-175	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 5B: Test 1 (continued)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-176	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 6: Information and Menus Available/Test Setup	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-177	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 7: Channel Zoning Drive Identities	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-178	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 8: Channel Zoning	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-179	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 9: Local/Global Storage	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-180	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 10A: SAN Router Drive Identities	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-181	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 10B: Screen Shots From SAN Router	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-182	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Screen Shot 1: Host Viewing SCSI Storage Devices ("LeftG12")	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-183	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Graphs 1 - 4	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-184	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Figure 1: Block Diagram of SAN Gateway	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-185	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Screen Shot 2: Maintaining The Configuration of the Map (LeftG36)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-186	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Figure 3: Pathlight Web Site Excerpt Regarding Access Controls	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-187	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Figure 4: VPS Access Controls (Annotated)	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-188	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Computer code commands chart	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-189	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 11: Claim Chart for Claims 2 – 14	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-190	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Figure 5: Channel Zoning	Demonstrative o.k.; hearsay if evidence		
P-191	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Screen Shot 3: Access Controls Via Channel Zoning (LeftG45)	Hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-192	Graphic from Expert Report of Paul Hodges	N/A	3/13/01	Table 12: Conception Chart			
P-193	N/A	N/A	N/A	SCSI Cable			
P-194	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fibre Channel Cable			
P-195	N/A	N/A	N/A	SCSI Disk Drives			
P-196	N/A	N/A	6/30/00	Crossroads' First Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-197	N/A	N/A	7/13/00	Crossroads' Second Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-198	N/A	N/A	10/26/00	Crossroads' Third Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-199	N/A	N/A	11/22/00	Crossroads' Fourth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-200	N/A	N/A		Crossroads' Fifth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-201	N/A	N/A	2/9/01	Crossroads' Sixth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-202	N/A	N/A	11/24/00	Pathlight's First Request for Admissions (Nos. 1-19)	Relevance		
P-203	N/A	N/A	1/5/01	Crossroads' Responses to Pathlight's First Request for Admissions (Nos. 1-19)			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-204	N/A	N/A	2/2/01	Pathlight's Second Request for Admissions (Nos. 20-30)	Relevance		
P-205	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Crossroads' Responses to Pathlight's Second Request for Admissions (Nos. 20-30)			
P-206	N/A	N/A	2/2/01	Crossroads' Requests for Admissions to Pathlight (Set One)	Relevance		
P-207	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Pathlight's Answers to Crossroads' Request for Admissions (Set One)			
P-208	N/A	N/A	4/17/00	Crossroads' First Request for Production of Documents to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-209	N/A	N/A	6/16/00	Pathlight's Answers to Crossroads' First Request for Production of Documents			
P-210	N/A	N/A	9/18/00	Crossroads' Second Request for Production of Documents to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-211	N/A	N/A	10/26/00	Pathlight's Answers to Crossroads' Second Request for Production of Documents			
P-212	N/A	N/A	2/2/01	Crossroads' Third Request for Production of Documents to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-213	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Pathlight's Answers to Crossroads' Third Request for Production of Documents			
P-214	N/A	N/A	6/26/00	Crossroads' First Set of Interrogatories to Pathlight	Relevance		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-215	N/A	N/A	7/26/00	Pathlight's Original Answers to Crossroads' First Set of Interrogatories			
P-216	N/A	N/A	11/22/00	Crossroads' Second Set of Interrogatories to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-217	N/A	N/A	1/4/01	Pathlight's Original Answers to Crossroads' Second Set of Interrogatories	Relevance		
P-218	N/A	N/A	2/2/01	Crossroads' Third Set of Interrogatories to Pathlight	Relevance		
P-219	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Pathlight's Original Answers to Crossroads' Third Set of Interrogatories	Relevance		
P-220	N/A	N/A	6/20/00	Pathlight's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-6) to Crossroads	Relevance		
P-221	N/A	N/A	6/26/00	Crossroads' Responses to Pathlight's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-6)			
P-222	N/A	N/A	11/24/00	Pathlight's Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 7) to Crossroads	Relevance		
P-223	N/A	N/A	1/5/01	Crossroads' Responses to Pathlight's Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 7)			
P-224	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Crossroads' Supplemental Responses to Pathlight's Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 7)			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-225	N/A	N/A	2/2/01	Pathlight's Third Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 8-16) to Crossroads	Relevance		
P-226	N/A	N/A	3/9/01	Crossroads' Responses to Pathlight's Third Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 8-16)			
P-227	Hood Exh. 4	PTI 054705 - PTI 055418	2000	Pathlight's Financial Statement Package for Fiscal Year 2000		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-228	N/A	N/A	5/9/01	Crossroads' Supplemental Responses to Chaparral's First Set of Interrogatories (Interrogatory No. 3)			
P-229	Lavan Exh. 24 (Pltf. Exh. 214)	CNS 0045256		5/16/00 Memo to Michael Gluck, et al., from Morris (Pltf. Exh. 214)	Relevance; prejudice		
P-230	Lavan Exh. 26 (Pltf. Exh. 216)	N/A		User's Guide, G6322/G7324 (Pltf. Exh. 216)	Relevance; prejudice		
P-231	Levy Exh. 122 (portion of Court Exh. C)	PTI 173554	2/8/01	Letter from Mark Levy to Mark DeWilde		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-232	Levy Exh. 123 (Court Exh. B)	PTI 171664 - PTI 171714	10/4/00	Letter from Mark Levy to Mark DeWilde enclosing patent application documents		6/7/01	Admitted 6/7/01
P-233	Levy Exh. 124 (portion of Court Exh. C)	PTI 173555 - PTI 173605	10/4/00	Letter from Mark Levy to Mark DeWilde enclosing patent application documents			

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-234	Levy Exh. 125 (portion of Court Exh. C)	PTI 173606	8/22/00	Letter from David Banner to Mark DeWilde			
P-235	N/A	PTI 183704 - PTI 183742	4/7/00 - 10/4/00	Patent documents produced by Pathlight on 6/7/01			
P-236	N/A	N/A		Chaparral's Original Responses to Crossroads' Second Set of Interrogatories (6/14)			

**CROSSROADS VS. CHAPARRAL  
CIVIL ACTION NO. A-00CA-217SS  
PLAINTIFF'S FOURTH AMENDED TRIAL EXHIBIT LIST  
(updated 9/11/01)**

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-1		N/A	8/24/99	U. S. Patent No. 5,941,972 to Hoese (certified copy)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-2	N/A	N/A	Pre-8/24/99	File Wrapper for U. S. Patent No. 5,941,972 (certified copy)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-3	N/A	N/A	4/27/01	Declaration of Geoff Hoese in Support of Crossroads' Opposition to Pathlight's Motion for Summary Judgment	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-4	Hoese Exhibit 2	CRDS 40807 - CRDS 40823	6/19/96	PowerPoint Presentation: Verrazano FC-SCSI Bridge Product Overview		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-5	Hoese Exhibit 3	CRDS 40925 - CRDS 40958 (mixed pages)	9/10/96	Confidential Document: Verrazano Software Development		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-6	Hoese Exh. 4	CRDS 39727 - CRDS 39758	1/22/97	Verrazano System Structure		9/4/01	9/4/01

Gray Cary/AU\4067283.1  
103671-160175

1

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-7	Hodges Exh. 5/ Hoese Exh. 24	CRDS 40510 - CRDS 40512	5/28/97	Fax from Geoff Hoese to Anthony Peterman enclosing Conception of Invention	Hearsay; Relevance	9/5/01	9/5/01
P-8	Sims Exh. 4	CRDS 28244 - CRDS 28400	7/14/99	PowerPoint Presentation: Organizational Meeting		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-9	LiVolsi Exh. 9	CRDS 42968 - CRDS 43033	11/3/98	Crossroads Presentation to Dell Computer		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-10		N/A	8/17/01	Expert Report of Kenneth E. Kuffner, including all exhibits attached thereto and documents cited therein	Hearsay		
P-11	Zinger Exh. 320	N/A		Billing Records produced by David Zinger, Esq.	Relevance; Attorney-Client Privilege (for portions)	9/10/01	9/10/01
P-12	Walker Exh. 112	CNS 033582 -- CNS 033609	2/18/00	Presentation by Chaparral Network Storage to EMC2, Chaparral Fibre Channel-to-SCSI Routers		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-13	Selinger Exh. 317	N/A	2/22/00	Chaparral Independent Contractor/Consultant Agreement between Chaparral and Selinger		9/4/01	9/4/01



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-14	Selinger Exh. 310	CNS 187010 – CNS 187023	2/22/00 – 3/14/00	2/22/00 - 3/14/00 Selinger notes		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-15	Walker Exh. 132	CNS 174026 – CNS 174030	2/29/00	Email to Mike Gluck and Jerry Walker from Bob Selinger		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-16	Zinger Exh. 322	N/A	3/1/00	3/1/00 Letter from C. Jennison to Zinger pertaining to '972 patent		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-17	Selinger Exh. 304	CNS 012945 – CNS 012949		Invoices and expense reports from Selinger to Chaparral		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-18	Zinger Exh. 321	N/A	3/8/00	Letter from Zinger to Walker enclosing various patents		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-19	Selinger Exh. 308	CNS 039583 – CNS 039584	3/14/00	Email from Selinger to Walker regarding Overpass status		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-20		CNS 172469	7/27/98	7/27/98 Lab notes (Walker)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-21	Rahmani Exh. 98	PTI 165641 – PTI 165657		Letter from Alan Albright to Chaparral enclosing Complaint (faxed on this date to/from Pathlight to Chaparral	Hearsay; Relevance	9/10/01	Excluded
P-22	Gluck Exh. 48	CNS 041062	4/10/00	Memo to Dave Trachy from Michael Gluck		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-23	Walker Exh. 131	CNS 174031 – CNS 174032	4/13/00	Letter to KPMG, LLP from David F. Zinger		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-24	Walker Exh. 111	CNS 0045915 – CNS 0045945	4/18/00	PowerPoint Presentation: 4/18/00 IBM Tucson, Chaparral Network Storage Fibre Channel/SCSI Routers		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-25		CNS 001207 – CNS 001209	12/2/99	Memorandum from Mike Gluck to File re Conversation with Terry Roelands & Peter Campagna		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-26	Bleakley Exh. 341	CNS 043352 – CNS 043411		Bleakley Lab Notebook		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-27	Gluck Exh. 52	CNS 173894 – CNS 173923	6/14/00	6/14/00 Letter to Jerry Walker from David Zinger marked "Draft"		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-28	Zinger Exh. 324	N/A	6/8/00	Letter from Zinger to Walker enclosing draft opinion		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-29	Zinger Exh. 325	N/A		Series of Emails attaching the Markman Order		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-30	Walker Exh. 337	N/A	10/6/00	A8526 RAID Controller Marketing Requirements Documents, by Durk Warts		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-31	Zinger Exh. 330	N/A	11/13/00	Letter to Michael Barrett, Esq. from Gray Cary	Relevance; Prejudicial	9/10/01	

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-32	Walker Exh. 136	CNS 173589 – CNS 173893	11/20/00	Opinion Letter from David Zinger to Jerry Walker		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-33	Niemann Exh. 277	CNS 186217	7/17/01	CNS IFC-SCSI Product Shipments with LUN Zoning		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-34	Selinger Exh. 314	CRDS 64447- CRDS 64451	6/13/01	Consent Judgment from the Pathlight matter	Hearsay; Relevance; Prejudicial; Fed. R. Evid. 408	9/6/01	9/6/01 (redacted version)
P-35	N/A	CNS 007524 – CNS 007589	March 2000	Securities and Exchange Commission Form S-1 filed by Chaparral		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-36	Gluck Exh. 47	CNS 039583 – CNS 039584	3/14/00	3/14/00 Memo to Jerry Walker from Bob Selinger		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-37	Gluck Exh. 49	CNS 000305 – CNS 000306	4/19/00	4/19/00 Memo from Nigel Squibb to Michael Gluck with attachments		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-38	Gluck Exh. 50	CNS 000297 – CNS 000302		Copies of Fax Transmittal cover sheets		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-39	Gluck Exh. 53	CNS 040708 – CNS 040824		Handwritten notes of Jerry Walker	Attorney-Client Privilege (for portions)	9/4/01	9/4/01

Gray Cary/AU4067283.1  
103671-160175

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-40	Walker Exh. 130	CNS 039583 – CNS 039584	3/14/00	3/14/00 Email to Jerry Walker from Bob Selinger		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-41	Walker Exh. 132	CNS 174026 – CNS 174030	2/29/00	2/29/00 Email to Mike Gluck and Jerry Walker from Bob Selinger		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-42	Walker Exh. 133	CNS 174036	11/27/00	11/27/00 Letter to Whom It May Concern from Eugene C. Nagle at Quantum		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-43	Walker Exh. 134	CNS 172387 – CNS 172546		Jerry Walker lab notebook	Attorney-Client Privilege (for portions)		
P-44	Walker Exh. 141	CNS 173524		Email from David Trachy (Storage Tek) to Michael Alam re patent issues. (Redacted)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-45	Walker Exh. 142	CNS 173528 – CNS 173530		Interoffice Memorandum from The Chairman to All Employees re “Making Good Things Happen”		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-46	Walker Exh. 143	CNS 161863 – CNS 161878	4/12/00	Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors April 12, 2000		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-47	Walker Exh. 144	CNS 0048544 – CNS 0048576		File entitled “Crossroads Patent” and containing International Patent publication No. WO 99/34297		9/4/01	9/4/01

Gray CaryAU4067283.1  
103671-160175

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-48	Zinger Exh. 318	N/A	10/6/00	10/6/00 Fax from Walker to Zinger attaching information on reserve/release command		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-49	Zinger Exh. 319	N/A	4/24/00	4/24/00 email between Zinger, Walker and others discussing Crossroads patent		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-50	Zinger Exh. 322	N/A	3/1/00	3/1/00 Letter from C. Jennison to Zinger pertaining to '972 patent		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-51	Zinger Exh. 323	N/A	3/9/00	3/9/00 Letter from Zinger to Walker discussing Crossroads patent applications		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-52	Lavan Exh. 25 (Pltf. Exh. 215)	CNS 0045238	3/6/00	3/6/00 Memo to Lavan from Matthews		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-53	Lavan Exh. 26 (Pltf. Exh. 216)	N/A		User's Guide, G6322/G7324 (Pltf. Exh. 216)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-54	N/A	CNS 023824	5/24/00	Email from Pat Foose to Harris Ravine re LUN Masking, with handwritten notes		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-55	N/A	CNS 188463 - CNS 188469	7/31/01	Engineering Change Notice re A8526 code upgrade		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-56	Walker Exh. 78	CNS 0048165 - CNS 0048167	2/7/00	Memorandum to Jerry Walker from Don Matthews re FS1310 Features		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-57	Walker Exh. 85	CNS 042932 – CNS 042945	1/10/00	CAP Functional Specification – Version 3.0 (Router Errata), Configuration Application Programming Interface for Chaparral External RAID Controllers and Routers, Document Revision : 1, Preliminary		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-58	Walker Exh. 114	CNS 0051329 – CNS 0051331	6/30/99	Document entitled C:\Windows\Temp\FS1310 Perf comparison.doc 6/30/99		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-59	Walker Exh. 123	CNS 032396 – CNS 032398	3/27/00	Memorandum to Jerry Walker from Tom Lavan		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-60	Walker Exh. 124	CNS 032406 – CNS 032410	5/1/00	Memorandum to Jerry Walker from Tom Lavan re Weekly Status		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-61	Selinger Exh. 305	CNS 174026 – CNS 174030	2/29/00	Email from Selinger to Gluck attaching Overpass Report		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-62	Engelbrecht Exh. 9	LSI 01853 – LSI 02040	9/96	RAID Manager 5 With RDAC 5 For UNIX V.4 User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-63		N/A	8/10/01	Expert Report of D. Paul Regan, CPA, CFE, including all exhibits thereto and documents cited therein	Hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-64		N/A	8/17/01	Expert Report of Kenneth Flamm	Hearsay		
P-65	Smith Exh. 4	CRDS 52581 - CRDS 52641	4/26/97	OEM License and Purchase Agreement Between Crossroads and Hewlett-Packard		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-66	Smith Exh. 6	CRDS 02273 - CRDS 02290	4/15/98	Hewlett-Packard SSD and Crossroads CP4200 License Agreement		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-67	Smith Exh. 7	CRDS 29603 - CRDS 29646	9/22/98	Purchase and License Agreement Between Hewlett-Packard and Crossroads		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-68	Flamm Exh. 5 (Livolsi Exh. 16)	CRDS 39764 - CRDS 39788	2/7/00	SWOT Analysis		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-69	N/A	CRDS 22345 - CRDS 22346	2000	Charts pertaining to Competition	Hearsay		
P-70	N/A	CRDS 39765 - CRDS 39773	2/7/00	Competitive Snapshots	Hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-71	N/A	CRDS 64618 - CRDS 64619; CRDS 63622- CRDS 63623	6/23/00	Amendment to Licensing Agreement By and Between Hewlett-Packard and Crossroads Systems, Inc. (signed version)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-72	Walker Exh. 118	CNS 037349 - CNS 037358		PowerPoint Presentation: Competitive Landscape (Routers)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-73	Niemann Exh. 279	CNS 186219	6/30/01	Statement of Cash Flows, 6/30/01		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-74	Niemann Exh. 280	CNS 186220	6/30/01	Financial Statement, 6/30/01		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-75	Niemann Exh. 281	CNS 186221 - CNS 186229		Q1 FY -02 Gross Router Revenue		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-76	Niemann Exh. 282	CNS 186230	3/31/01	Income Statement Year Ended 3/31/01		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-77	Niemann Exh. 283	CNS 186231 - CNS 186233	2000	Revenues Q2 '00		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-78	Niemann Exh. 284	CNS 186234 - CNS 186240	2001	Q4 FY '01 Gross Router Revenue		9/4/01	9/4/01



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-79	Niemann Exh. 285	CNS 186245 – CNS 186249		LUN Zoning Shipments to Date		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-80	Niemann Exh. 286	CNS 186250 – CNS 186257		Product/Cost/Unit Chart		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-81	Niemann Exh. 287	CNS 186170		CNS; FC-SCSI Product Shipments with LUN Zoning Inventory Plan		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-82	Niemann Exh. 288	CNS 186171 – CNS 186184				9/4/01	9/4/01
P-83	Niemann Exh. 289	CNS 186185		Product Cost (Fully Loaded Cost)		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-84	Niemann Exh. 290	CNS 186186		Product Cost		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-85	Niemann Exh. 291	CNS 186187 – CNS 186195		Product Masterschedule		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-86	Niemann Exh. 292	CNS 186196 – CNS 186204		Product Masterschedule		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-87	Niemann Exh. 293	CNS 186205 – CNS 186211		Product Masterschedule		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-88	Niemann Exh. 294	CNS 186212 – CNS 186216		Product Masterschedule		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-89	Niemann Exh. 295	N/A	3/1/01	Invoice to Adaptec, 3/1/01		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-90	Niemann Exh. 296	N/A	6/1/01	Invoice to Arrow, 6/1/01		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-91	Niemann Exh. 297	N/A		Detail Account Transactions		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-92	Niemann Exh. 298	N/A	11/25/98	Technology Cross-License Agreement with Adaptec		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-93	Niemann Exh. 299	N/A	6/25/01	OEM Purchase and License Agreement		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-94	Niemann Exh. 300	N/A	2000	Income Statement FY '00		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-95	Niemann Exh. 301	N/A	2001	Income Statement FY '01		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-96	Niemann Exh. 302	N/A	2001	Income Statement FY '02		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-97	Walker Exh. 334	N/A		Log-in Page from Chaparral Website		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-98	Walker Exh. 335	CNS 185379 – CNS 185394		Chaparral "Quick Start Guide"		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-99	Walker Exh. 336	N/A		Page from Chaparral Website pertaining to RAID controllers		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-100	Walker Exh. 337	CNS 186686-186702	10/6/00	A8526 RAID Controller Marketing Requirements Documents, by Durk Watts		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-101	Walker Exh. 88	CNS 0046546 -- CNS 0046548	5/22/00	5/22/00 Memorandum to Jerry Walker from Tom Lavan		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-102	Walker Exh. 94	CNS 024788	11/10/99	11/10/99 Email to various people at Chaparral from Lambertus	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-103	Walker Exh. 95	CNS 025879	2/2/00	2/2/00 Email to Jerry Walker, Bob Morris, Tom Lavan from Bruce Lambertus	Hearsay		
P-104	Walker Exh. 103	CNS 000550 -- CNS 000617	5/24/00	5/24/00 PowerPoint Presentation: Dell Computer, Chaparral Network Storage Fibre Channel/SCSI Routers		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-105	Walker Exh. 133	CNS 174036	11/27/00	11/27/00 Letter to Whom It May Concern from Eugene C. Nagle at Quantum		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-106	Permut Exh. 176	CNS 175975 -- CNS 175976	5/1/00	5/1/00 Memorandum re FS1310 Router Version 4.0		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-107	Permut Exh. 177	CNS 175979	5/8/00	5/8/00 Email from Al Permut re changes to Router Code 4.0		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-108	Permut Exh. 178	CNS 175982 -- CNS 175983	5/16/00	5/16/00 Memorandum re FS1310 Router Version 4.0		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-109	Permut Exh. 179	CNS 175980 - CNS 175981	5/19/00	Engineering Change Notice, 5/19/00 Router Code Version 4.0		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-110	Permut Exh. 180	CNS 175986 - CNS 175987	6/7/00	6/7/00 Memorandum re FS1310 Router Version 4.1		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-111	Permut Exh. 181	CNS 175988	6/7/00	6/7/00 Email from Jim Jones re Router Code Version 4.1		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-112	Permut Exh. 182	CNS 175984 - CNS 175985		Engineering Change Notice Router Code Version 4.10		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-113	Lavan Exh. 24 (Pltrf. Exh. 214)	CNS 0045256	5/16/00	Memo to Michael Gluck, et al., from Morris		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-114	Regan Exh. 1 (from Pathlight case)	N/A	3/13/01	Expert Report of D. Paul Regan, CPA, CFE, including all exhibits thereto and documents cited therein (prepared in Pathlight case)	Hearsay		
P-115		CRDS 64613 - CRDS 64617		Revised HP 4200 Royalty Revenue Schedule and Schedule of Income from HP (prepared by Paul Regan)	Hearsay		
P-116		CRDS 64609 - CRDS 64612		Revised Crossroads Financial Information (prepared by Paul Regan)	Hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-117		CRDS 64600 - CRDS 64608	6/12/01	Pathlight/Crossroads Settlement and License Agreement	Hearsay; Relevance; Prejudicial; Red. R. Evid. 408	9/6/01	No; objection sustained
P-118		CRDS 64621 - CRDS 64622	11/8/00	Chaparral Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-119		CRDS 64623 - CRDS 64624	2/12/01	Chaparral Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-120		CRDS 64625 - CRDS 64626	2/26/01	Chaparral Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-121		CRDS 64627 - CRDS 64628	3/5/01	Chaparral Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-122		CRDS 64629 - CRDS 64630	3/22/01	Chaparral Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-123		CRDS 64631 - CRDS 64632	5/8/01	Chaparral Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-124		CRDS 64633 - CRDS 64634	6/11/01	Chaparral Press Release printed from Chaparral Web Site		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-125				Crossroads' Annual Report for 2000		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-126	N/A	CNS 000209	1/25/00	Email from Russ Bleakley to Michael Gluck re Crossroads	Relevance; Prejudicial		
P-127	N/A	CNS 024753 - CNS 024754	11/10/99	Memo from Bruce Lambertus to R. Speyer and G. Nagle re FS1310 Feature Enhancement Proposal		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-128	N/A	CNS 023820 - CNS 023824	10/29/99	Memo from Bruce Lambertus to S. Walsh and G. Nagle re FS1310 Feature Enhancement Proposal		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-129	N/A	CNS 187407 - CNS 187427	4/11/01	Purchase and License Agreement between Chaparral and Overland Data, Inc.		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-130	N/A	CRDS 02057 - CRDS 02117	5/12/97	Letter from Alan Leal to Barbara Bardach enclosing OEM License and Purchase Agreement between Hewlett-Packard and Crossroads		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-131	N/A	CRDS 19929 - CRDS 19952	9/18/98	Crossroads Series C Convertible Preferred Stock Purchase Agreement, with Purchasers attached as Schedule A		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-132	Gluck Exh. 63	CNS 029850 - CNS 029871		Chaparral Technologies, Inc., Business Plan Copy #50		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-133	Bianchi Exh. 2	CRDS 64469- CRDS 64470		LUN Management Map Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-134	Bianchi Exh. 3	CRDS 64452- CRDS 64454	1999	Catamaran Device Mapping		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-135	Bianchi Exh. 4	CRDS 64471- CRDS 64474	2000	Common Definition for Global Configuration Data Structures		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-136	Bianchi Exh. 5	CRDS 64493- CRDS 64495	2000	Common Source Code for VPD/Device Mapping and Configuration		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-137	Bianchi Exh. 6		1999	Catamaran Device Mapping		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-138	N/A	CRDS 64620		Catamaran Block Diagram	Hearsay		
P-139	Sims Exh. 12	N/A		Chart showing planned dates for changes in product labelling		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-140	Sims Exh. 13	CRDS 64589		Crossroads Product Label		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-141	Gluck Exh. 55	N/A	3/31/00	Plaintiff Crossroad Systems, (Texas), Inc.'s Original Complaint		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-142	N/A	N/A	9/15/00	Plaintiff Crossroad Systems, (Texas), Inc.'s First Amended Complaint		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-143	N/A	N/A	6/19/00	Crossroads' Preliminary Statement		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-144	N/A	N/A	6/19/00	Chaparral's Preliminary Statement		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-145	N/A	N/A	7/7/00	Declaration of Paul Hodges, Ph.D.	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-146	Zinger Exh. 326	N/A	7/11/00	Crossroads' <i>Markman</i> Brief	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-147	Zinger Exh. 327	N/A	7/11/00	Chaparral's <i>Markman</i> Brief			
P-148	Selinger Exh. 307/ Stephens Exh. 342	N/A	7/27/00	<i>Markman</i> Order	Hearsay; Relevance (except with respect to definitions contained in Order)		
P-149	Gluck Exh. 56	N/A	5/19/00	Chaparral's Complaint Against Crossroads (filed in Colorado and later consolidated with Texas case)	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-150	N/A	N/A	4/17/01	Chaparral's Unopposed Motion for Dismissal (of the Colorado Complaint)	Hearsay; Relevance; Prejudicial		



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-151	N/A	N/A	4/20/01	Order Dismissing with Prejudice (3 Claims for Relief brought by Chaparral)	Hearsay; Relevance; Prejudicial		
P-152	N/A	N/A	7/27/01	Chaparral's Motion for Summary Judgment of No Infringement and Brief in Support Thereof, with attached exhibits and declarations	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-153	N/A	N/A	8/10/01	Crossroads' Opposition to Chaparral's Motion for Summary Judgment of No Infringement and Brief in Support Thereof, including all attached exhibits and declarations	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-154	N/A	N/A	8/14/01	Chaparral's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity and Brief in Support Thereof, with attached exhibits and declarations	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-155	N/A	N/A	PENDING	Crossroads' Opposition to Chaparral's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity and Brief in Support Thereof, including all attached exhibits and declarations	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-156	N/A	N/A	8/1/01	Chaparral's 282 Notice	Relevance		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-157	Walker Exh. 69	N/A	6/30/00	Crossroads' First Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-158	Walker Exh. 70	N/A	7/13/00	Crossroads' Second Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-159	Walker Exh. 71	N/A	10/26/00	Crossroads' Third Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-160	Walker Exh. 72	N/A	11/10/00	Crossroads' Fourth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-161	Walker Exh. 73	N/A	11/22/00	Crossroads' Fifth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-162		N/A	12/13/00	Crossroads' Sixth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-163	Permut Exh. 266	N/A	2/14/01	Crossroads' Seventh Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-164	Permut Exh. 267	N/A	6/28/01	Crossroads' Eighth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-165	Walker Exh. 338	N/A	7/23/01	Crossroads' Ninth Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral	Relevance		
P-166	Walker Exh. 74	N/A	10/17/00	Crossroads' First Notice of 30(b)(6) Deposition to Chaparral (in the Colorado Case)	Relevance		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-167	N/A	N/A	7/26/00	Chaparral's Original Responses to Crossroads' First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1 - 5)	Relevance		
P-168	N/A	N/A	1/5/01	Chaparral's Original Responses to Crossroads' Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 6 - 14)	Relevance		Excluded
P-169	N/A	N/A	7/18/01	Chaparral's Original Responses to Crossroads' Fourth Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 15 - 21)	Relevance		
P-170	N/A	N/A	Pending	Chaparral's Original Responses to Crossroads' Fifth Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 21 - 25)	Relevance		
P-171	N/A	N/A	7/17/01	Chaparral's Supplemental Answers to Crossroads' Interrogatory Nos. 1 - 5 and 14	Relevance		
P-172	N/A	N/A	7/26/01	Chaparral's Supplemental Answers to Crossroads' Interrogatory Nos. 2 and 3	Relevance		
P-173	N/A	N/A	8/2/01	Chaparral's Responses to Crossroads' First Set of Requests for Admission (Nos. 1 - 25)	Relevance		
P-174	N/A	N/A	7/26/00	Crossroads' Responses to Chaparral's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1 - 6)	Relevance		Excluded

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-175	N/A	N/A	1/5/01	Crossroads' Responses to Chaparral's Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 7)	Relevance		
P-176	N/A	N/A	1/5/01	Crossroads' Responses to Chaparral's First Set of Requests for Admission (Nos. 1 - 19)	Relevance		
P-177	N/A	N/A	5/9/01	Crossroads' Supplemental Response to Chaparral's First Set of Interrogatories (No. 3 only)	Relevance		Excluded
P-178	N/A	N/A	7/6/01	Crossroads' Second Supplemental Response to Chaparral's First Set of Interrogatories (No. 3 only)	Relevance		
P-179	N/A	N/A	7/31/01	Crossroads' Responses to Chaparral's Second Set of Requests for Admissions (Nos. 20 - 23)	Relevance		
P-180		N/A	8/17/01	Expert Report of Paul Hodges, Ph.D.	Hearsay		
P-181	Attachment 1 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Paul Hodges' Biography	Hearsay		
P-182	Attachment 2 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	U. S. Patent No. 5,941,972		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-183	Attachment 3A to Hodges Expert Report	CRDS 64444	2/13/01	Data CD containing snapshot of Chaparral Web Site	Relevance; Prejudicial; Rule 408 (any mention of settlement)		
P-184	Attachment 3B to Hodges Expert Report	CRDS 64445	5/22/01	Data CD containing snapshot of Chaparral Web Site	Relevance; Prejudicial; Rule 408 (any mention of settlement)		
P-185	Attachment 3C to Hodges Expert Report	CRDS 64446	6/14/01	Data CD containing snapshot of Chaparral Web Site	Relevance; Prejudicial; Rule 408 (any mention of settlement)		
P-186	Attachment 4 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	7/27/00	Markman Order	Hearsay; Relevance (except with respect to definitions contained in Order)	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-187	Attachment 5 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Photographs of RAID Controller (K7413)	Hearsay	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-188	Attachment 6 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Screen Shots From RAID Controller Admin (Menu Tree)/Test 1	Hearsay	9/6/01	9/6/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-189	Attachment 7 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Screen Shots From RAID Controller Admin and Host Computers/Test 2	Hearsay	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-190	Attachment 8 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Screen Shots From RAID Controller Admin and Host Computers/Test 3	Hearsay	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-191	Attachment 9 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Data From RAID Controller Reboot	Hearsay	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-192	Attachment 10 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Data from "scu.exe"	Hearsay	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-193	Attachment 11 to Hodges Expert Report	N/A	8/17/01	Performance Tests	Hearsay		
P-194			8/24/01	Rebuttal Report of Paul Hodges, Ph.D., with attachments	Hearsay, Relevance		
P-195			8/10/01	Declaration of Paul Hodges, Ph.D. in support of Crossroads' Opposition to Defendant Chaparral's Motion for Summary Judgment of No Infringement	Hearsay, Relevance		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-196		N/A	8/17/01	Expert Report of Gary R. Stephens, including all documents cited therein			
P-197		N/A	8/24/01	Rebuttal Report of Gary R. Stephens, including all documents cited therein			
P-198	Davies Exh. 331	N/A	7/27/01	Declaration of Ian Robert Davies in Support of Chaparral's Motion for No Infringement			
P-199	Davies Exh. 332	N/A	7/27/01	Declaration of Ian Robert Davies in Support of Chaparral's Motion for No Infringement, with attached Exhibits A - F			
P-200	Davies Exh. 333	CRDS 64432 - CRDS 64441		LUN Zoning for the FS2620 Router User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-201	Walker Exh. 339	CNS 185195 - CNS 185208		A8526 External Rack RAID Controller User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-202	Stephens Exh. 335	CNS 187024		Photocopy of a CD ROM cover: DATA CD R For Computer Writers		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-203	Stephens Exh. 336	CNS 187025		Screen shot	Hearsay		

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-204	Stephens Exh. 337	CNS 187026 – CNS 187122		Chaparral A8526 Testing Performed by FSI Consulting Services, 7/10/01 – 7/21/01	Hearsay		
P-205	Stephens Exh. 338	CNS 187123 – CNS 187219		Chaparral A8526 Testing Performed by FSI Consulting Services, 7/10/01 – 7/21/01	Hearsay		
P-206	Stephens Exh. 339	CNS 187220 – CNS 187298		Chaparral A8526 Testing Performed by FSI Consulting Services, 7/10/01 – 7/??/01	Hearsay		
P-207	Stephens Exh. 340	CNS 187299 – CNS 187388		Chaparral A8526 Testing Performed by FSI Consulting Services, 7/10/01 – 7/??/01	Hearsay		
P-208	Stephens Exh. 341	CNS 187389 – CNS 187406		Chaparral A8526 Testing Performed by FSI Consulting Services, 7/10/01 – 7/21/01	Hearsay		
P-209	N/A	N/A	5/25/01	CD ROM of the Crossroads Web Site	Relevance; Prejudicial; Rule 408 (any mention of settlement)		
P-210	N/A	N/A		Crossroads CP 4100 Product, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional	Relevance; Prejudicial		



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-211	N/A	N/A		Crossroads CP 4400 Product, including all hardware and software necessary to make it functional	Relevance; Prejudicial		
P-212	Arroyo Exh. 3	N/A	Undated	Printout of Arroyo's floppy drive disc drive directory	Hearsay		
P-213	Arroyo Exh. 4	CRDS 63362 - CRDS 63363	Undated	Notes written by witness into computer file	Hearsay		
P-214	Arroyo Exh. 5	CRDS 63301 - CRDS 63331	1996	Bridge.c code, copyright 1995, revised 1996		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-215	Arroyo Exh. 6	CRDS 63364 - CRDS 63440	1996	Bridge.c code, copyright 1995, revised 1996		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-216	Arroyo Exh. 7	CRDS 63498 - CRDS 63574	1996	Bridge.c code, copyright 1995, revised 1996		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-217	Arroyo Exh. 8	CRDS 63441 - CRDS 63497	3/19/97	Bridge.c code, further revised, 3/19/97		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-218	Arroyo Exh. 9	CRDS 63127.9729 G.1 - CRDS 63127.9729 G.107	9/18/97	Bridge.c code, further revised, 9/18/97		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-219	Permut Exh. 233	CNS 184737 – CNS 184948	Jan. 2001	CAPI Functional Specification Version 3.1, January 2001		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-220	Permut Exh. 234	CNS 184949 – CNS 185046		Chaparral FS2620R User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-221	Permut Exh. 235	CNS 185047 – CNS 185048		Chaparral FS2620 marketing matrix		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-222	Permut Exh. 236	CNS 185049 – CNS 185064		Quick Start Guide for rack mount products		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-223	Permut Exh. 237	CNS 185065 – CNS 185073		Chaparral SNMP MIB Capabilities		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-224	Permut Exh. 238	CNS 185074 – CNS 185167		Chaparral FS1310 User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-225	Permut Exh. 239	CNS 185195 – CNS 185376		A8526 User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-226	Permut Exh. 240	CNS 185377 – CNS 185378		A-Series External RAID Controller marketing matrix		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-227	Permut Exh. 241	CNS 185404 – CNS 185593		G6322/G7324/G8324 User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-228	Permut Exh. 242	CNS 185594 – CNS 185595		G8324 External RAID Controller marketing matrix		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-229	Permut Exh. 243	CNS 185598 – CNS 185599		G-Series External RAID Controllers marketing matrix		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-230	Permut Exh. 244	CNS 185600 – CNS 185767		K5412/K7413 User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-231	Permut Exh. 245	CNS 185768 – CNS 185769		K-Series External RAID Controllers marketing matrix		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-232	Permut Exh. 246	CNS 185770 – CNS 185927		G- and K-Series User's Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-233	Permut Exh. 247	CNS 185928 – CNS 185929		G-Series External RAID Controllers marketing matrix		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-234	Permut Exh. 248	CNS 184733 – CNS 184734		RAID and Router Product Overviews		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-235	Permut Exh. 249	N/A		Chart of RAID and router products		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-236	Permut Exh. 250	CNS 186488 – CNS 186514		Rainrock Hardware Platform K5412, K7413, FS1310 Engineering Requirements Document		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-237	Permut Exh. 251	CNS 186429 – CNS 186455		K5312/K7313 Board-Only Design In Guide		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-238	Permut Exh. 252	CNS 186314 – CNS 186338		Skyway II/Goldengate II Hardware Design Specification		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-239	Permut Exh. 253	CNS 186578 – CNS 186587		Dual Loop Fibre Channel Daughterboards Hardware Design Specification		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-240	Permut Exh. 254	CNS 186726 – CNS 186728		Memorandum to Pat Foose from Victor Pecone		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-241	Permut Exh. 255	CNS 186943 – CNS 186950		Rack Mount RAID Product Review		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-242	Permut Exh. 256	CNS 186984 – CNS 187002	1/21/00	G6322G7324 Product Presentation		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-243	Permut Exh. 257	CNS 172224.1	3/23/00	Mainboard Block Diagram, FS2620R		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-244	Permut Exh. 258	CNS 162205.192		FS2424/FS2430 Block Diagram		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-245	Permut Exh. 259	CNS 185939 – CNS 185943	2/09/01	Engineering Change Notice A400 SW on A8526		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-246	Permut Exh. 260	CNS 185948 – CNS 185961		Engineering Change Notice G-Series Maintenance Upgrade vG400		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-247	Permut Exh. 261	CNS 185980 – CNS 186000	11/29/00	Engineering Change Notice G2-Series Maintenance Upgrade vL400		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-248	Permut Exh. 262	CNS 185962 – CNS 185978		Engineering Change Notice K-Series vK410		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-249	Permut Exh. 263	CNS 186544 – CNS 186551	6/04/01	Skyway II RAID Software Release 4.0 Incremental Engineering Requirements		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-250	Permut Exh. 264	CNS 186686 – CNS 186702	10/06/00	A8526 RAID Controller Marketing Requirements Document		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-251	Permut Exh. 265	CNS 186951 – CNS 186967	8/23/01	G8526 V1.0 Functional Specification		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-252	Permut Exh. 268	CNS 186001 – CNS 186005		Engineering Change Notice, Forward Router Code vR430		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-253	Permut Exh. 269	CNS 186537 – CNS 186543		G/K RAID Software, Software Release 4.0 Incremental Engineering Software		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-254	Permut Exh. 270	CNS 186295 – CNS 186313		Skyway II RAID Software, Software Release 4.0, Engineering Requirements		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-255	Permut Exh. 271	N/A		Chaparral Screen Shots	Hearsay		
P-256	Permut Exh. 272	CNS 186145 – CNS 186161		Skyway Software Design, Revision 0.2		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-257	Permut Exh. 273	CNS 186162 - CNS 186169		Code descriptions		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-258	Permut Exh. 274	CNS 184735- CNS 184736		1.1 Pass Through Commands		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-259	Permut Exh. 151	CNS 0162205.47 6 - CNS 0162205.62 6		CAPI Functional Specification v2.8		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-260	Permut Exh. 154	CNS 0165205.78 2 - CNS 0165205.96 4	3/21/00	CAPI Functional Specification v3.0 dated 3/21/00		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-261		CRDS 64635		CAPI Functional Specification v3.2		9/4/01	9/4/01
P-262	N/A	CRDS 50579	9/3/97	Drawing of the Verrazano placement Bare Board and Bare Board	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-263	Hoese Exh. 12	CRDS 41182- CRDS 41260		Hoese notebook.	Relevance; incomplete	9/11/01	9/11/01
P-264	N/A	CRDS 14926 - CRDS 14935	6/5/97	Verrazano Enclosure Specification, Revision 2.1	Relevance; incomplete	9/5/01	9/5/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-265	N/A	CRDS 16189	7/7/97	Email from Geoffrey B. Hoese to Crossroads regarding Verrazano Release 1	Relevance; Hearsay		
P-266	N/A	CRDS 41920- CRDS 41952	7/11/97	Letter from Anthony Peterman to Geoff Hoese regarding US Patent entitled Storage Router and Method for Providing Virtual Local Storage; patent application	Relevance; authentication	9/11/01	9/11/01
P-267	Russell Exh. 10	CRDS 43928 - CRDS 43982	9/5/97	CP4x00 Product Specification	Relevance; incomplete	9/5/01	9/5/01
P-268	Russell Exh. 2	CRDS 16392 - CRDS 16423	8/25/97	Verrazano Hardware Architecture, Revision 1.0	Relevance; incomplete	9/5/01	9/5/01
P-269	N/A	CRDS 16425 - CRDS 16444	8/27/97	Verrazano Software Architecture, Revision 1.1	Relevance; incomplete		
P-270	N/A	CRDS 50585; CRDS 50616	9/3/97	Excerpts from the Verrazano System Structure	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-271	N/A	CRDS 50452 - CRDS 50459	9/5/97	Verrazano Programmable Device Instructions, Version 1.1	Hearsay; Relevance		



TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-272	N/A	CRDS 43605- CRDS 43694 (mixed pages)	9/29/97	Component and Insertion Lists for Verrazano	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-273	Russell Exh. 9	CRDS 40258 - CRDS 40288	10/13/97	CP4100 Power Point Slides	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-274	Hoesse Exh. 14	CRDS 41321 - CRDS 41426		Geoff Hoesse Laboratory Notebook	Relevance; incomplete	9/11/01	9/11/01
P-275	N/A	CRDS 41887- CRDS 41919	12/31/97	Letter to Dale Quisenberry from William N. Hulsey III regarding Patent Application entitled "Storage Router and Method for Providing Virtual Local Storage"; draft application	Relevance; authentication	9/11/01	9/11/01
P-276	N/A	CRDS 41830 -- CRDS 41859		Patent application for a Storage Router and Method for Providing Virtual Local Storage	Relevance; authentication	9/11/01	9/11/01
P-277	Walker Exh. 140		4/19/00	4/19/00 Memo from Nigel Squibb to Michael Gluck with attachments	Hearsay; Relevance		
P-278		CRDS 64635		CAP1 3.2 Software Development Kit		9/4/01	9/4/01

TRIAL EX. NO.	DEPO EX. NO.	BATES RANGE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OBJECTIONS	OFFERED	ADMITTED
P-279	Russell Exh. 5	CRDS 39575 - CRDS 39698	12/95 - 11/99	Jeff Russell Lab Notebook			
P-532				Demonstrative	Objection Overruled	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-508				Demonstrative	Objection Overruled	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-509				Demonstrative	Objection Overruled	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-530				Demonstrative	Objection Overruled	9/6/01	9/6/01
P-608				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-609				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-610				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-611				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-612				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-613				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-614				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01
P-615				Demonstrative		9/10/01	9/10/01

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served via pdf on this \_\_\_ day of September, 2001.

244

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN DIVISION

CROSSROADS SYSTEMS, (TEXAS),  
INC., a Texas Corporation,  
  
Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant,  
  
v.  
  
PATHLIGHT TECHNOLOGY, INC.  
a Delaware corporation,  
  
Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff.

CIVIL ACTION NO. A-00CA-248-SS  
  
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

DEFENDANT PATHLIGHT TECHNOLOGY INC.'S  
THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL TRIAL EXHIBIT LIST

One or more of the exhibits listed below may be used for cross-examination purposes only. Pathlight reserves the right to supplement its trial exhibit list as necessary. Pathlight hereby supplements its trial exhibit list with exhibits D-350 – D-355.

Exhibit No.	Description	Offered	Objected	Admitted
D-1	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 5,941,972; entitled, "Storage Router and Method for Providing Virtual Local Storage" (Hoese et al)			
D-2	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 5,941,972; entitled, "Storage Router and Method for Providing Virtual Local Storage" (Hoese et al)			
D-3	U.S. Patent 5,748,924, entitled, "Method and Apparatus for Transferring Data from SCSI Bus to Serial Device and From Serial Device to SCSI Bus" (Liorens et al)			
D-4	U.S. Patent 5,768,623, entitled, "System and Method for Sharing Multiple Storage Arrays by Dedicating Adapters as Primary Controller and Secondary Controller for Arrays Reside in Different Host Computers" (Judd et al) (Hodges Ex 6)			

Exhibit No.	Description	Offered	Objected	Admitted
D-5	U.S. Patent 5,809,328, entitled, "Apparatus for Fibre Channel Transmission having Interface Logic, Buffer Memory, Multiplexor/Control Device, Fibre Channel Controller, Gigabit Link Module, Microprocessor and Bus Control Device" (Nogales et al)			
D-6	U.S. Patent 5,812,754, entitled, "Raid System with Fibre Channel Arbitrated Loop" (Lui et al)			
D-7	U.S. Patent 5,835,496, entitled, "Method and Apparatus for Data Alignment" (Yeung et al)			
D-8	U.S. Patent 5,848,251, entitled, "Secondary Channel for Command Information for Fibre Channel System Interface Bus" (Lomelino et al)			
D-9	Hewlett-Packard SSD and Crossroads CP4200 License Agreement (Alvarez Ex 4 (CRDS 2273-90))			
D-10	Hewlett-Packard Royalty Revenue Report (Alvarez Ex 6)			
D-11	Crossroads Regulatory Label (Sims.Ex 9 (CRDS 51996-201; 52036-037))			
D-12	Press Release, "Crossroads Announces Expectations for Fiscal Third Quarter" (Root Ex 1)			
D-13	U.S. Patent No. 5,941,972; entitled, "Storage Router and Method for Providing Virtual Local Storage" (Hoese et al (Hulsey 1))			
D-14	Compaq and Crossroads FC to SCSI Bridge Discussion (Hulsey Ex 4; Bardach Ex 3; Hoese Ex 11 (CRDS 42459-475))			
D-15	Emulex Fibre Channel Information Series Volume 1 (Hulsey Ex 5 (CRDS 23784-791))			
D-16	Ancot Corporation Fibre Channel to SCSI Bridge Preliminary Datasheet (Hulsey Ex 6 (CRDS 23859-860))			
D-17	Ancot Corporation Fibre Channel to SCSI Bridge Preliminary Datasheet w/Attachments (Hulsey Ex 7 (CRDS 22759-767))			

25038740.1