11/19/2008 Beckwith, Marta Confidential - Subject To The Protective Order

Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

TYLER DIVISION

ERIC M. ALBRITTON,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

CASE NO. 6:08-CV-00089

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., RICHARD FRENKEL, MALLUN YEN and JOHN NOH,

Defendants.

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

DEPOSITION OF MARTA BECKWITH

Wednesday, November 19, 2008

SHEILA CHASE & ASSOCIATES Reporting For WEST COURT REPORTING SERVICES 221 Main Street, Suite 1250 San Francisco, California 94105 Phone: (415) 321-2300

Fax: (415) 618-0743

Reported by SHEILA CHASE, CSR, RPR License No. 4934

West Court Reporting Services 800.548.3668 Ext. 1

Page 14 1 MR. McWILLIAMS: Objection. Form. MR. PATTON: Q. Do you think he was? MS. PARKER: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: I think he was a person responsible for talking to the media. MR. PATTON: Q. Okay. What do they call those in Washington, D.C., these days? I don't know. Q. How about "spin doctor"? 10 MS. PARKER: Objection. Form. 11 MR. McWILLIAMS: Same objection. 12 MR. PATTON: Q. Did you suggest to 13 Mr. Frenkel that he inform Mr. Noh that he was the Troll Tracker? 15 Α. I don't believe so. 16 When the controversy about the filing arose, 17 Ms. Beckwith, were you involved at all? 18 MS. PARKER: Objection. Form. 19 MR. McWILLIAMS: Same objection. 20 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what you mean about 21 controversy. 22 MR. PATTON: O. Let me describe this. 23 think you're probably aware of it. There's a 24 controversy about whether the ESN complaint was actually 25 filed on the 15th of October or the 16th. You're aware

- of that, are you not?
- A. Iam.
- Q. That is the controversy I'll be talking about.
- A. Okay.
- ⁵ Q. Okay. Were you aware of that controversy?
- A. I was aware that the complaint appeared to
- 7 have been filed on the 15th. We have a --
- ⁸ Q. The case what?
- ⁹ A. That the case appeared to be filed on the
- 15th, according to what we received. And then later it
- was claimed that it was actually filed on the 16th.
- Q. Okay. Were you involved in the effort to
- determine what happened?
- 14 A. I was aware in the effort to determine what to
- do about what had happened.
- Q. Okay. Were you -- are you aware that Baker
- Botts was contacted regarding that?
- ¹⁸ A. Yes.
- Q. And what was the purpose of contacting Baker
- Botts in the Dallas office?
- MS. PARKER: I'm going to instruct you not to
- answer anything that has to do with litigation strategy.
- MR. PATTON: What litigation are we talking
- about?
- MR. McWILLIAMS: Well, you're just asking

- about the ESN litigation and the controversy, and now
- you are going into communications with counsel.
- MR. PATTON: No, I'm not. I'm asking if they
- 4 contacted Baker Botts about this issue.
- MS. PARKER: You asked her what the purpose of
- 6 the call was.
- MR. PATTON: Q. You did contact Baker Botts?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Did they undertake some work for you?
- 10 A. Yes.
- Q. What was the work that they did?
- MS. PARKER: I'm going to instruct her not to
- answer.
- MR. PATTON: There are e-mails here that say
- they contacted the clerk.
- MS. PARKER: She is testifying they contacted
- the clerk. You haven't asked her whether she --
- MR. PATTON: O. Did Baker Botts contact the
- 19 clerk's office?
- A. I believe they did.
- Q. Okay. You received an e-mail that basically
- informed you that they did, did you not?
- ²³ A. Yes.
- Q. And the e-mail told you -- there are a number
- of e-mails, but they basically told you what they

- thought had occurred?
- MR. McWILLIAMS: Objection. Form.
- MS. PARKER: Objection. Form.
- THE WITNESS: What they had heard had
- ⁵ occurred.
- MR. McWILLIAMS: There wasn't a question on
- 7 the table, and you answered one that wasn't there.
- MR. PATTON: Q. Whatever the question would
- have been, you just answered it. Okay.
- Did you ask Baker Botts to determine what
- happened -- you or someone on your team ask the Baker
- Botts lawyer to determine what had happened about the
- 13 ESN filing?
- A. We were trying to determine what to do with
- what had happened.
- Q. Was Baker Botts to assist in giving you the
- information so that you could determine what to do?
- ¹⁸ A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Why did you call Baker Botts?
- A. They had been working on the prelitigation
- issues with ESN.
- Q. Were they one of the firms that was under
- consideration to represent Cisco in that litigation?
- A. I don't remember if they were under
- consideration. But they did not end up representing us

- 1 with respect to the later portions of the case.
- Q. Well, I must not have understood what you
- ³ first told me. Why did you call Baker Botts?
- A. We did not have and had not yet decided on
- basis. They had
- 6 been helping us with respect to the prelitigation
- matters. So when we needed immediate help, they were
- 8 available and knowledgeable.
- 9 Q. Did you know that Baker Botts practices in the
- 10 Eastern District of Texas?
- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. And that they regularly do so?
- 13 A. Yes.
- Q. And am I correct in assuming that you wanted
- someone who was familiar with the Eastern District of
- Texas practice to help you out with this matter?
- MR. McWILLIAMS: Objection. Form.
- MS. PARKER: Objection. Form.
- MR. McWILLIAMS: Ms. Beckwith, we will
- instruct you not to answer about the litigation strategy
- within Cisco.
- MR. PATTON: Q. But, whatever the reason,
- Baker Botts did assist with this?
- MR. McWILLIAMS: Objection. Form
- MR. PATTON: You object to what?

```
Page 19
 1
               MR. McWILLIAMS: I objected to the form.
     Whatever reason.
               MS. PARKER: Same objection.
               THE WITNESS: Baker Botts helped us.
               MR. McWILLIAMS: Whoa, Ms. Beckwith.
               THE WITNESS: Sorry.
               MR. PATTON: Are you telling her not to answer
     the question?
               MR. McWILLIAMS: Well, I'm telling her not to
10
     the answer a question that's not asked.
11
               MR. PATTON: There is a question, is there
12
     not?
13
                          (Record read as follows:
14
                         Q. But, whatever the reason, Baker
15
                         Botts did assist with this?)
16
               THE WITNESS: That's not a question.
17
               MR. McWILLIAMS: Did you put a question mark
18
     at the end of that?
19
               MR. PATTON: O. Did Baker Botts assist --
20
               Baker Botts assisted when the ESN case was
          Α.
21
     filed.
22
               Is that privileged, you think, that they
2.3
     assisted you?
24
               MR. McWILLIAMS: Objection. Form. And I
25
     instruct her not to answer that.
```

- MR. PATTON: Q. Right.
- A. I'm not sure, to this day, that I actually
- 3 know what occurred.
- Q. Okay. Well, do you think that the serious
- words in that blog, like "conspiracy" and the others
- that I have mentioned to you -- don't you think you need
- to have determined what really happened before you blog
- 8 about it?
- MS. PARKER: Objection. Form.
- MR. McWILLIAMS: Same objection.
- THE WITNESS: I believe that the blog reflects
- what occurred.
- MR. PATTON: Q. All right.
- A. We received a file-stamped copy of the
- 15 complaint dated the 15th. Magically, the file stamp was
- changed to reflect the 16th.
- Q. You say "magically" why?
- A. Because a motion should -- if your client and
- 19 ESN believed that something had happened and that the
- date on that complaint was not the actual date of
- filing, a motion should have been brought, so that we
- could have all found out what had occurred.
- Q. Well, why didn't you guys file one?
- MS. PARKER: Objection. Form.
- MR. McWILLIAMS: Same objection.

- THE WITNESS: We ended up taking a different
- ² tact.
- MR. PATTON: Q. I see. I want you to tell me
- all of the things that you are aware of that was done to
- 5 investigate this incident with the filing, everything
- ⁶ you can remember about the investigation.
- A. Baker Botts talked with the clerk. We
- 8 discussed the issue with other attorneys who had been in
- similar circumstances. And eventually we decided to
- 10 take a different tact with ESN --
- MR. McWILLIAMS: Ms. Beckwith --
- THE WITNESS: Sorry. You are right.
- MS. PARKER: I'm going to instruct you not to
- answer anything that has to do with your litigation
- strategy in the ESN case.
- MR. PATTON: Q. What else? What else did you
- do in the investigation?
- 18 A. Those are the --
- 19 Q. You talked to the clerk, or Baker Botts talked
- to the clerk. What else?
- A. As I said, we discussed it with other
- 22 attorneys who had been in similar circumstances.
- O. And that would be who?
- A. I spoke with Tony Downs, at Goodwin Procter.
- Q. Okay. What else?