1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVI Michael T. Zeller (Bar No. 196417)  michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017-2543 Telephone: (213) 443-3000 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100 Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151) charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com 50 California Street, 22nd Floor San Francisco, California 94111 Rachel Herrick Kassabian (Bar No. 1910 rachelkassabian@quinnemanuel.com 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 560 Redwood Shores, California 94065 Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.	
10	,	
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	PERFECT 10, INC., a California corporation,  Plaintiff,  vs.  GOOGLE INC., a corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,  Defendants.  AND COUNTERCLAIM  PERFECT 10, INC., a California corporation,  Plaintiff,	CASE NO. CV 04-9484 AHM (SHx) [Consolidated with Case No. CV 05-4753 AHM (SHx)]  DECLARATION OF PAUL HAAHR IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT GOOGLE'S MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT RE: GOOGLE'S ENTITLEMENT TO SAFE HARBOR UNDER 17 U.S.C. § 512  Hon. A. Howard Matz  Date: August 17, 2009 Time: 10:00 a.m. Ctrm: 14  Discovery Cut-off: None Set Pretrial Conference Date: None Set
23	vs.	Trial Date: None Set
24 25 26	AMAZON.COM, INC., a corporation; A9.COM, INC., a corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,  Defendants.	PUBLIC REDACTED
27		
28		

DECLARATION OF PAUL HAAHR IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT GOOGLE'S MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDINE NT RE: GOOGLE'S ENTITLEMENT TO SAFE HARBOR UNDER 17 U.S.C. § 512

2

11

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

23

24

25 26

## I, Paul Haahr, declare as follows:

I am an engineer at Defendant Google Inc. ("Google"). I have been employed with Google since 2002. I manage various aspects of Google's Web Search service. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein and if called and sworn as a witness, I could and would competently testify thereto.

## Google's Procedure for Processing DMCA Notices Regarding Web Search

- I handle the engineering (or "back-end") side of Google's Web Search 2. DMCA removals process. The "front-end" team is tasked with doing the initial review and processing of DMCA notices, and interfaces directly with DMCA complainants. It is my understanding that the team confirms that the necessary information has been received from the complainant (as set forth in Google's published DMCA policy), and then attempts to match the copyrighted work claimed to be infringed with the allegedly infringing material identified by the complainant.
- 3. The engineering team that handles the "back end" of the Web Search DMCA removals process I am a part of that team.
- 4. To process a removal, my team needs the complete URL at which the allegedly infringing material is located. A web page URL is a string of characters that identifies the location of that web page on the World Wide Web. It is what an Internet user sees in its browser bar. If a web page URL contains improper ellipses (that is, ellipses that replace other characters actually in the URL), unnecessary spaces, or misspellings, it cannot be used to block links to that web page from appearing in Google's search results. Stated another way, entering incomplete or incorrect URLs in the file my team uses for processing DMCA notices

will not prevent links to those web pages from being returned by Google Web Search, and can also result in engineering problems for Google's search engine. Additionally, not all web pages that are indexed by Google will 3

4

5

28

10

11

13

19

23

24

25

26

27

28

marked by the site owner with code indicating that the site should be excluded from search engine crawl. Site owners can use robot exclusion .txt files, which are instructions that tell Google's web robots not to crawl those pages or sites. Google also generally does not crawl or index websites, or those portions of websites, that are only accessible by entering a password. Nor does it crawl or index Usenet's servers. "Usenet" is a completely separate system of servers and communication protocol than the World Wide Web, which is what Google crawls and indexes for its Web and Image Search products. It is my understanding that what P10 calls "Usenet sites" in its communications refers to both Usenet groups and passwordprotected sites.

Google may crawl and index Usenet "gateway" or "mirror" web pages 15. located on standard web servers accessible to Google's web robots, but it does not crawl, index, or link to the content within Usenet groups for its Web and Image Search products. Accordingly, there are no links in Google's Web or Image Search results to allegedly infringing content in Usenet groups unless it happens to be on gateway pages of Usenet or password protected sites. To the extent web pages on these sites are crawled by Google, to remove links to those web pages from Web Search results, Google needs the complainant to provide the web page URL for the content in question, just as it does for any other web page removal. Likewise, to remove allegedly infringing images displayed on those web pages from Image Search results, Google needs the complainant to provide the image URL, just as it does for any other image removal.

## Google's Relationship With Third-Party Websites

Google does not charge websites a fee for appearing in its user-16. generated Web or Image Search results. Nor does it charge a fee for the use of Web or Image Search. Google crawls and indexes third-party websites made available on the Internet by third parties and accessible to users regardless of whether they appear in Google's Web or Image Search results, unless those sites have robot exclusion files. Google lacks the ability to remove those websites from the Internet, or to control what they choose to display.

- 17. Google's Web and Image Search services do not have account holders or subscribers. Webmasters do not "sign up" to have their web sites listed in Google's organic search results. Websites appear in search results if they are crawled by Google's web robots and are relevant to users' queries, as determined by Google's automated search algorithm.
- 18. I am not aware of Google interfering with any standard technical measures employed for the protection of copyrighted content. For example, Google does not interfere with any watermarking or digital rights management typically employed by copyright owners.
- 19. Google does not interfere with any technology used by a website to collect information directly from users visiting that website.
- 20. The cache Google makes available to users does not alter the mechanisms for access to copyrighted material established by webmasters, such as charging a payment or password protection.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of
America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed Jon 30, 2009 at
Mountain View, California.

Paul Haahr

28