VOLUME 7

PAGES 1363
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ALSUP

BERNARD PAUL PARRISH, HERBERT)
ANTHONY ADDERLEY, WALTER ROBERTS)
III,)

PLAINTIFFS,)

VS.) NO. C 07-0943 WHA
NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE PLAYERS)
ASSOCIATION AND NATIONAL FOOTBALL)
LEAGUE PLAYERS INCORPORATED D/B/A

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

PLAYERS INC,

FOR PLAINTIFFS: MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS

DEFENDANTS.

1001 PAGE MILL ROAD, BUILDING 2

THURSDAY

) SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

OCTOBER 30, 2008

PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94304

BY: RONALD S. KATZ, ESQ.

RYAN S. HILBERT, ESQ.

MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS

7 TIMES SQUARE

NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK 10036

BY: L. PETER PARCHER, ESQ.

MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS
11355 WEST OLYMPIC BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90064

BY: CHAD HUMMEL, ESQ.

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

ALSO FOR PLAINTIFFS: MCKOOL SMITH

300 CRESCENT COURT

SUITE 1500

DALLAS, TEXAS 75201

BY: LEWIS T. LECLAIR, ESQ.

JILL ADLER NAYLOR, ESQ.

ANTHONY GARZA, ESQ. BRETT CHARHON, ESQ.

FOR DEFENDANTS: DEWEY & LEBOEUF

1301 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS

NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK 10019-6092

BY: JEFFREY L. KESSLER, ESQ.

DAVID GREENSPAN, ESQ. DAVID G. FEHER, ESQ.

ROY TAUB, ESQ.

MOLLY DONOVAN, ESQ. JASON CLARK, ESQ.

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

767 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10153-0119

BY: BRUCE S. MEYER, ESQ.

REPORTED BY: KATHERINE POWELL SULLIVAN, CSR #5812 OFFICIAL REPORTER - U.S. DISTRICT COURT

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 OCTOBER 30, 2008 7:30 A.M. 3 THE COURT: GOOD MORNING. ALL RIGHT. 4 LET'S GO TO WORK. HAVE A SEAT. 5 HERE ARE THE DESIGNATIONS BACK ON THE WITNESS NAMED 6 ZUCKER, SO I DON'T HAVE TO COME AROUND HERE. 7 MR. KESSLER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: NEXT, I WANT TO GET TO THIS MOTION THAT 8 WAS MADE ON HALL OF FAME, UNLESS THERE'S SOMETHING ELSE THAT'S URGENT THAT YOU NEED TO TAKE UP. 10 11 OKAY. MR. LECLAIR, GO AHEAD. MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR, WE BELIEVE THAT WE'RE NOW 12 13 ENTITLED TO GET THE HALL OF FAME E-MAILS IN THE CASE. AND THE REASON IS THE DEFENDANTS ARE TRYING THIS CASE BY SAYING "NO 14 15 GOOD DEED GOES UNPUNISHED." AND THEY HAVE INJECTED INTO THE CASE THE MONEY FROM AD HOC LICENSE AGREEMENTS OVER OUR 16 17 OBJECTION. THEY HAVE SAID TO THE JURY: 18 19 "OKAY, WE DIDN'T CREATE AN ESCROW ACCOUNT. THERE WASN'T ANY GROUP LICENSING MONEY. BUT DON'T WORRY ABOUT THAT 2.0 BECAUSE WE DID THE GOOD DEED FOR THE RETIRED PLAYERS BY GETTING 21 THEM 7 MILLION FOR THE CLASS AND 30 MILLION FOR RETIRED 22 23 PLAYERS, AND THAT'S ALL FROM AD HOC LICENSE AGREEMENTS." 24 THE COURT: I THOUGHT IT WAS 7 MILLION. MR. LECLAIR: 7 MILLION FOR THE CLASS. 30 MILLION

```
THEY ELICITED FROM DOUG ALLEN FOR RETIRED PLAYERS.
 2
             AND THAT WAS ALL OVER OUR OBJECTION. WE ARE ENTITLED
 3
   TO REBUT THAT EVIDENCE. AND WHAT WE ARE SHOWING IS THROUGH
 4
   THIS EVIDENCE THAT THEY SAY THEY HAVE NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST:
 5
                   "WE USED BEST EFFORTS FOR RETIRED PLAYERS."
 6
             AND WE'RE ENTITLED TO SHOW THAT THEY DO HAVE A
 7
   CONFLICT OF INTEREST. THIS IS EVIDENCE OF THEIR CONFLICT OF
   INTEREST. IT'S EVIDENCE THAT THEY DIDN'T ALWAYS ACT IN THE
 8
   BEST INTEREST OF RETIRED PLAYERS.
             SO FOR THAT REASON, IT IS RELEVANT TO THE ISSUE THEY
10
   HAVE INJECTED IN THE CASE, WHICH IS THEY SAY:
11
12
                  "WE GOT THEM A WHOLE BUNCH OF MONEY. WE'RE GOOD
1.3
   GUYS."
             WE WANTED TO TRY THIS CASE ON THE GROUP MONEY. THERE
14
15
   WASN'T ANY.
16
             THEY ARE INJECTING INTO THE CASE --
17
             THE COURT: I'M SORRY, WHAT? YOU WANTED TO TRY WHAT?
             MR. LECLAIR: THE CASE ON THE GROUP MONEY.
18
19
             THEY HAD INJECTED INTO THE CASE THE MONEY FROM THE
2.0
   INDIVIDUAL AGREEMENTS.
             THE COURT: PLEASE DON'T TRY TO FOOL ME ON THAT,
21
22
   MR. LECLAIR. IN THE OPENING STATEMENT, ALL I HEARD ABOUT WAS
23
   THE CONSTITUTION AND THE MAGNA CARTA, AND THAT CAME FROM YOUR
   SIDE.
24
25
             SO IF ANYBODY INJECTED BROADER ISSUES INTO THE CASE,
```

```
IT WAS YOUR SIDE, THE MAGNA CARTA -- I'M SORRY, THE --
 2
             MR. KESSLER: CONSTITUTION.
 3
              THE COURT: -- CONSTITUTION.
 4
              SO YOU MAY HAVE -- YOU KNOW, THIS IS A PROBLEM.
 5
   SOMETIMES YOU HAVE SOME GOOD POINTS, BUT YOU SURROUND THEM WITH
 6
   A BUNCH OF BAD POINTS THAT YOU THINK I'M GOING TO FALL FOR.
 7
             I WANT YOU TO -- HERE, LET ME JUST ASK YOU SOME
   QUESTIONS. I'M NOT SAYING -- YOU'VE GOT SOME POINTS HERE THAT
 8
   DESERVE ATTENTION, BUT TO BLAME THEM FOR BRINGING UP BROADER
   ISSUES IN THE CASE AFTER YOUR OPENING STATEMENT IS JUST NOT
10
11
   FAIR.
12
             MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR, I'M NOT BLAMING THEM. I
1.3
   APOLOGIZE, YOUR HONOR, IF I'M NOT BEING CLEAR.
14
             I'M NOT BLAMING THEM FOR BRINGING UP BROADER ISSUES.
15
   I AM SAYING ON THIS SPECIFIC ISSUE THEY HAVE INJECTED IT INTO
   THE CASE, AND WE'RE ENTITLED TO REBUT IT.
16
17
             THE COURT: THEY NEVER MENTIONED THE HALL OF FAME.
18
             MR. LECLAIR: WHAT?
              THE COURT: THEY NEVER MENTIONED THE HALL OF FAME.
19
             MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR, THEY CANNOT SAY:
2.0
                   "WE DID GOOD BY RETIRED PLAYERS BY GETTING THEM
21
    7 MILLION AND $30 MILLION OF AD HOC MONEY," AND JUST LEAVE OUT
22
23
   ONE DEAL AND SAY WE CAN'T TALK ABOUT THE DEAL WHERE WE HAVE
24
   EVIDENCE THAT THEY DIDN'T DO GOOD FOR RETIRED PLAYERS.
25
             THAT'S WHY IT'S RELEVANT.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: WELL, EXPLAIN -- FIRST OF ALL, EXPLAIN --
 2
   THESE E-MAILS ON THEIR FACE ARE WAY OUT OF -- WITHOUT CONTEXT.
 3
   I'M NOT THE SAYING OUT OF CONTEXT.
 4
             YOU'RE TRYING TO TAKE A LINE OR TWO OUT OF SOMEBODY'S
 5
   E-MAIL, AND IT IS NOT CLEAR FROM THIS OFFER OF PROOF -- IN FACT
 6
   VERY UNCLEAR.
 7
              SO TELL ME YOUR OFFER OF PROOF OF WHO THE WITNESSES
   WOULD BE AND WHAT THEY WOULD ACTUALLY SAY WAS THE HALL OF FAME
 8
   DEAL, AND THEN BEFORE YOU EVEN GET INTO THESE, EXPLAIN THAT
   PART TO ME.
10
11
             MR. LECLAIR: ALL RIGHT, YOUR HONOR.
             THE COURT: TELL ME THE WITNESS FIRST THAT I'M
12
13
   LISTENING TO ON THE STAND, HYPOTHETICALLY.
14
             MR. LECLAIR: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS, YOUR HONOR,
15
   WOULD BE JOE NAHRA.
16
             THE COURT: WHO?
17
             MR. LECLAIR: JOE NAHRA.
18
             THE COURT: WHO IS HE?
19
             MR. LECLAIR: HE WAS COPIED ON THE E-MAILS. HE WAS
2.0
   THE DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE
   PLAYERS ASSOCIATION.
21
22
             THE COURT: IS HE HERE NOW?
23
             MR. LECLAIR: HE'S SITTING RIGHT THERE (INDICATING).
24
             THE COURT: IS HE A DESIGNATED -- SO HE'S ON THE
25
    STAND.
```

```
1
             MR. LECLAIR: HE'S ON THE STAND. HE RECEIVED EVERY
   SINGLE ONE OF THESE E-MAILS. HE WAS THE PERSON WHO WAS SAID TO
 2
 3
   HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN FORGING AND NEGOTIATING THIS DEAL ON
 4
   BEHALF OF --
 5
              THE COURT: PLEASE, SIT DOWN.
 6
             MR. LECLAIR: AND IT IS -- THE HALL OF FAME DEAL WAS
 7
   AN AD HOC DEAL DONE, AND OUR EVIDENCE WILL SHOW IT WAS DONE
   BECAUSE THEY -- TAKE 2 WAS OUT SIGNING UP RETIRED PLAYERS. AND
 8
   EA AND THE DEFENDANTS DECIDED TO TRY TO KEEP TAKE 2 OUT OF THE
   MARKET, THEY WOULD GO FORGE THIS DEAL WITH THE HALL OF FAME,
10
   WHICH INCLUDES MR. ADDERLEY, WHO IS A MEMBER OF THE CLASS.
11
             AND THE POINT IS IN THE AD HOC DEAL THE ONLY DEALS
12
13
   THEY DID WERE AD HOC DEALS. THEY NEVER DID, THEY ADMIT, A
   GROUP DEAL.
14
             AND IN THIS DEAL THEY DID IT BELOW MARKET. AND THEY
15
   DIDN'T CARE -- IT'S OBVIOUS THEY FAVORED THE INTEREST OF EA
16
17
   OVER THE RETIRED PLAYERS.
             THAT'S WHY IT'S ALSO RELEVANT TO THE CREDIBILITY OF
18
19
   MR. LINZNER WHEN HE TESTIFIES ON THE STAND. AND HE SAYS ALL
2.0
   THE THINGS --
             THE COURT: YOU RELEASED MR. LINZNER. HE'S IN
21
   SINGAPORE AS FAR AS WE KNOW BY NOW.
22
             MR. LECLAIR: THAT'S FINE, YOUR HONOR.
23
24
             THE COURT: IS IT FAIR TO IMPEACH HIM AFTER THE FACT?
25
             MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR, WE WANTED TO DO IT --
```

```
1
             THE COURT: WHY DIDN'T YOU BRING IT UP SOONER, THEN?
 2
             MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR --
 3
             THE COURT: WHY DIDN'T YOU AT LEAST SAY: "NO, WE
 4
   CAN'T RELEASE HIM, BECAUSE WE MAY NEED TO RECALL HIM TO LET
 5
   HIM, IN FAIRNESS, BE ABLE TO ADDRESS THIS"?
 6
             MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR, THEY CAN CALL HIM BACK.
 7
   YOUR HONOR, THIS IS A GUY WHO'S -- THE WHOLE POINT OF THIS
   EVIDENCE IS THESE TWO ARE LINKED TOGETHER. THEY ARE WORKING
 8
   FOR EACH OTHER. THEY ARE NOT WORKING FOR THE RETIRED PLAYERS.
             THAT'S THE POINT. THAT'S WHY THE EVIDENCE IS
10
   RELEVANT. IF THEY WANTED TO KEEP MR. LINZNER HERE -- WE HAD
11
   FILED THE MOTION -- THEY COULD HAVE SAID: "WE NEED
12
13
   MR. LINZNER."
             THE COURT: IS IT TRUE THAT -- I'M QUOTING NOW FROM
14
   THE OPPOSING BRIEF HERE. IT SAYS:
15
                   "PLAINTIFFS HAVE STIPULATED THAT" -- I'M
16
   QUOTING. THIS IS A QUOTE WITHIN A QUOTE: "THEY DO NOT SEEK TO
17
   RECOVER IN THIS CASE ANY MONIES PAID TO SOME GLA CLASS MEMBERS
18
19
   UNDER SEPARATE SO-CALLED AD HOC LICENSE AGREEMENTS."
             SO YOU'RE NOT TRYING TO RECOVER -- YOU'RE NOT TRYING
20
   TO SAY, AS I READ THAT -- AND MAYBE I'M WRONG -- THAT -- YOU'RE
21
22
   NOT TRYING TO RECOVER IN THIS CASE ANY MONIES THAT WERE PAID
23
   UNDER THE HALL OF FAME AGREEMENT TO PLAYERS.
24
             MR. LECLAIR: WE'RE NOT TRYING TO RECOVER THE MONEY
   BACK FROM THE PLAYERS, YOUR HONOR. WE'RE TRYING TO RECOVER THE
25
```

```
GROUP MONEY.
 1
 2
              BUT THE POINT IS TO REBUT THEIR CONTENTION THAT THEY
 3
   ACTED IN THE BEST INTEREST OF RETIRED PLAYERS. EVEN YOUR HONOR
 4
   SAID WHEN WE ARGUED THIS MOTION IN LIMINE:
 5
                   "I WANT TO MAKE IT VERY CLEAR THAT I THINK THERE
 6
   IS A 50/50 LIKELIHOOD, MR. KESSLER, THAT YOU ARE GOING TO OPEN
 7
   THE DOOR TO THIS BY MAKING A LINE OF ARGUMENTS THAT THE
   DEFENDANTS HAVE THE BEST INTEREST OF RETIRED PLAYERS AT HEART,
 8
   OR SOMETHING CLOSE TO THAT."
              I MEAN, THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT THEY'VE DONE, YOUR HONOR.
10
11
   THEY HAVE SAID THAT. AND THEY'VE SAID: "WE DID GOOD."
12
              IT'S NOT FAIR TO TIE OUR HANDS. THEY INJECT ALL
13
   THESE AD HOC AGREEMENTS, AND SAY:
14
                  "WE GOT ALL THIS MONEY FOR RETIRED PLAYERS.
15
   DON'T WORRY THAT WE DIDN'T DO ANY GROUP MONEY. WE GOT THEM ALL
   THIS INDIVIDUAL MONEY."
16
17
             AND THEN, THEY WANT TO KEEP US FROM SHOWING:
                  "WELL, YOU WEREN'T ACTING IN THE BEST INTEREST OF
18
19
   RETIRED PLAYERS. YOU, IN FACT, HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST.
   YOU DENIED IT, BUT YOU DID. YOU FAVORED EA OVER THE RETIRED
2.0
21
   PLAYERS."
              THAT'S WHY THE EVIDENCE IS --
22
23
              THE COURT: HOW MUCH MONEY WAS INVOLVED IN THIS HALL
2.4
   OF FAME AGREEMENT?
             MR. LECLAIR: $400,000.
25
```

```
1
              THE COURT: AND WHO GOT THAT MONEY?
             MR. LECLAIR: THE VARIOUS HALL OF FAME PLAYERS GOT IT
 2
 3
   THROUGH PLAYERS INC.
 4
             MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR -- SORRY.
 5
             THE COURT: AND 17 OF THOSE WERE CLASS MEMBERS?
 6
             MR. LECLAIR: THAT'S CORRECT, YOUR HONOR.
 7
              THE COURT: SO -- AND WERE THERE CLASS MEMBER
   COMPLAINTS ABOUT THAT DEAL?
 8
 9
             MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR, NOBODY KNEW THIS. NOBODY
   HAD ANY IDEA UNTIL --
10
              THE COURT: WHEN I EXCLUDED COMPLAINTS -- IT SAYS:
11
                   "PLAINTIFFS MAY NOT INTRODUCE EVIDENCE RELATED
12
1.3
   TO PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINTS."
             WHAT COMPLAINTS WERE -- DID LETTERS OR E-MAILS COME
14
   IN ABOUT THIS? NOT COME INTO THE EVIDENCE, BUT COME IN TO
15
   PLAYERS INC OR SOMEBODY AT THE UNION ABOUT THIS DEAL WHEN IT --
16
17
             MR. LECLAIR: NO, YOUR HONOR. LET ME EXPLAIN. WE
   SAID FROM THE BEGINNING -- OUR APPROACH TO TRIAL WAS WE ARE NOT
18
19
   COMPLAINING ABOUT THE AD HOC MONEY, BECAUSE WE DIDN'T WANT IT
   INJECTED IN THE CASE. WE THOUGHT IT WAS GOING TO CONFUSE THE
2.0
   JURY TO HAVE THEM HEAR ABOUT ALL THESE INDIVIDUAL DEALS WHEN WE
21
   THINK THE CASE IS ABOUT GROUP MONEY.
22
23
             BUT THEY, INSTEAD, THROUGH OPENING STATEMENT AND
24
   THROUGH MR. ALLEN, HAVE INJECTED IT ALL INTO THE CASE OVER OUR
25
   OBJECTION AND HAVE SAID:
```

```
1
                   "WE WANT TO TELL THE JURY WE GOT $30 MILLION FOR
 2
  RETIRED PLAYERS, AND WE GOT $7 MILLION FOR THE CLASS."
 3
             AND WHEN THEY SAY THAT TO THE JURY, TO TIE OUR HANDS
 4
  AND NOT LET US SAY:
 5
                  "WAIT A MINUTE, ALL THESE INDIVIDUAL DEALS,
 6
   HERE'S ONE WHERE YOU WEREN'T ACTING IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF
 7
   RETIRED PLAYERS."
             THE COURT: OKAY. LET'S FOCUS ON THAT POINT FOR A
 8
9
   SECOND.
             TELL ME THE POINT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST THAT YOU
10
   THINK THE E-MAILS SHOW.
11
12
             MR. LECLAIR: ALL RIGHT, YOUR HONOR. IT SAYS:
13
                   "WE GOT YOU" -- THIS IS THE STATEMENT OF PLAYERS
   INC TO EA. IT SAYS:
14
15
                   "WE GOT YOU THESE PLAYERS FOR SUBSTANTIALLY
  UNDER MARKET VALUE."
16
17
             AND ANOTHER E-MAIL SAYS:
                  "MILLIONS LESS." OR -- OR "WOULD HAVE COST YOU
18
   A MILLION. INSTEAD, YOU GOT IT FOR CHEAP."
19
             THE COURT: WAIT. THESE ARE STATEMENTS BY PLAYERS
2.0
   INC, OR THIS IS SOME -- SOMETHING FROM SOMEBODY ELSE?
21
22
             MR. LECLAIR: NO, THEY ARE TWO DIFFERENT SETS OF
23
   STATEMENTS. SOME OF THEM ARE DIRECTLY BY CLAY WALKER, WHO WAS
24
   THE BUSINESS EXECUTIVE WHO DID THIS DEAL AT PI.
25
             AND THEN, THERE'S STATEMENTS BY CLAY WALKER A YEAR
```

```
LATER THAT CONFIRM WHAT HE DID AFTER HE LEFT PLAYERS INC. AND
 2
   THERE'S A CONFIRMING E-MAIL FROM ANDY FEFFER -- FEFFER, WHO
 3
   REPLACED MR. WALKER WHO CONFIRMS AND ADOPTS MR. WALKER --
 4
             THE COURT: ALL THESE PEOPLE WORK FOR THE DEFENDANTS?
 5
             MR. LECLAIR: ALL WORK FOR THE DEFENDANTS.
 6
   MR. WALKER'S ONE E-MAIL WAS AFTER HE LEFT, BUT THAT E-MAIL WAS
 7
   THEN ADOPTED BY THE EMPLOYEES OF PLAYERS INC. SO THEY ARE --
   THIS CLEARLY IS AN ADMISSION, YOUR HONOR.
 8
 9
             I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANY ISSUE UNDER HEARSAY.
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO LET'S ASSUME FOR THE SAKE
10
11
   OF ARGUMENT THAT THIS GETS INTO EVIDENCE. HOW DOES THAT
   RELATE, THEN, TO YOUR FIDUCIARY -- IN OTHER WORDS, THEY WERE
12
13
   NOT PURPORTING TO ACT UNDER THE GLA IN THAT DEAL. SO HOW DOES
   THAT RELATE TO A FIDUCIARY DUTY THAT PERTAINS TO THE GLA?
14
15
             MR. LECLAIR: BECAUSE OUR THEORY IS, YOUR HONOR, THAT
   INSTEAD OF DOING WHAT THEY DID, THEY SHOULD HAVE LICENSED OUR
16
17
   GLA PEOPLE TO EA.
18
             THE COURT: THERE'S ONLY 17 OF THEM.
19
             MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR, NO. OUR THEORY IS THEY
   SHOULD HAVE GIVEN THEM THE GROUP. WHAT WAS HAPPENING WAS --
2.0
             THE COURT: GIVE THEM WHAT?
21
22
             MR. LECLAIR: THAT THEY SHOULD HAVE LICENSED TO EA
23
   THE GROUP, THE GROUP THAT THEY REPRESENTED.
24
             THE COURT: BUT THERE WAS ONLY 17.
25
             MR. LECLAIR: NO, YOUR HONOR. THEY REPRESENTED 2,000
```

GLA SIGNERS. 2 THE COURT: THEY ONLY WANTED THE HALL OF FAMERS. 3 MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR, THEY COULD HAVE LICENSED 4 ANYBODY THEY WANTED TO. THAT'S OUR THEORY OF THE CASE. 5 COULD HAVE LICENSED THEM EVERYBODY. THEY NEVER TRIED TO DO 6 THAT. THEY DIDN'T TRY TO LICENSE THE GLA MEMBERS. 7 AND WHAT THEY SHOULD HAVE DONE WAS THAT. AND THAT'S NOT WHAT THEY DID. SO OUR THEORY IS THEY BREACHED THEIR 8 9 FIDUCIARY DUTY. WHAT THEY REALLY DID, YOUR HONOR, WAS THEY 10 CHERRY-PICKED THE BEST PLAYERS, THE MOST VALUABLE PLAYERS TO 11 TRY TO KEEP A COMPETITOR OUT OF THE MARKET. 12 13 THE COURT: BUT THE THING THAT WAS ON THE TABLE IN THAT INSTANCE WAS THE HALL OF FAME, RIGHT? WASN'T IT -- WHAT 14 15 WAS IT CALLED, DOUBLE DECK OR --MR. LECLAIR: TAKE 2. 16 THE COURT: TAKE 2. TAKE 2 WAS OUT THERE TRYING TO 17 SIGN UP THE HALL OF FAME PLAYERS. 18 MR. LECLAIR: NO, YOUR HONOR. THAT'S NOT CORRECT. 19 2.0 THEY WERE SIGNING UP RETIRED PLAYERS, GENERALLY. AND WHAT THESE DEFENDANTS DID IS THEY SAID: 21 22 "OH, WE'VE GOT AN EXCLUSIVE." 23 AND INSTEAD OF LICENSING THEIR GLA GROUP, THEY GO OUT 2.4 AND FORM A DEAL TO PICK OFF THE MOST VALUABLE PLAYERS UNDER 25 MARKET AND SAY:

```
1
                  "WE'RE GOING TO LICENSE THEM, AND THEN THAT WILL
  KEEP TAKE 2 OUT OF THE MARKET OF SIGNING UP RETIRED PLAYERS."
 2
 3
   THAT'S WHY IT'S A BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY AND WHY IT'S A
 4
   CONFLICT OF INTEREST.
 5
             THEY'RE WORKING FOR THEIR INTERESTS AND EA'S
 6
   INTERESTS AND AGAINST THE INTERESTS OF THE RETIRED PLAYERS.
 7
   THEY ARE NOT DOING WHAT'S IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE GLA
   GROUP. IT'S CREDIBILITY, YOUR HONOR, FOR DOUG ALLEN, WHO SAID
 8
   HE HAD NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST, FOR JOEL LINZNER, WHO SAID HE
   HAD NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST.
10
             I'M SORRY. JOEL LINZNER, WHO SAID EVERYTHING THEY
11
  WANTED HIM TO SAY ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED WITH EA.
12
13
             THE JURY IS ENTITLED TO KNOW WHAT REALLY HAPPENED
14
   HERE.
15
             THE COURT: THAT LAST KIND OF ARGUMENT IS WHAT GETS
  ME GOING. YOU COULD MAKE THAT ARGUMENT TO JUSTIFY ANYTHING:
16
17
                   "THE JURY'S ENTITLED TO KNOW WHAT REALLY
18
   HAPPENED HERE."
19
             WE HAVE TO KEEP THE CASE IN SOME KIND OF REASONABLE
2.0
   BOUNDS. I'M TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW THIS SCREWS IN WITH THE
   GLA. SO --
21
22
             MR. LECLAIR: ALL RIGHT. I UNDERSTAND, YOUR HONOR.
             THE COURT: -- YOU GOT ME SO OFF TRACK WHEN YOU MADE
23
2.4
   THAT CRAZY REMARK. I WANT TO GIVE YOU ANOTHER CHANCE.
25
             SAY IT AGAIN WITH LASER-LIKE PRECISION, IF THAT IS
```

1	POSSIBLE.
2	LASER-LIKE PRECISION TELL ME HOW THE HALL OF FAME
3	E-MAILS RELATE TO THE GLA FIDUCIARY CLAIM.
4	MR. LECLAIR: ALL RIGHT, YOUR HONOR.
5	THEY SIGNED UP 2,000 RETIRED PLAYERS WITH THE GLA.
6	THEY BECOME THEIR REPRESENTATIVE. WHAT HAPPENS IS THEY DO AN
7	EXCLUSIVE DEAL AND CLAIM IT DOESN'T INCLUDE RETIRED PLAYERS,
8	DOESN'T INCLUDE OUR GLA CLASS.
9	THEY AND EA REALIZE THAT ALL OF A SUDDEN SOMEBODY
10	ELSE IS SIGNING UP RETIRED PLAYERS FOR A COMPETING GAME. THEY
11	DON'T WANT THAT BECAUSE IT IS COMPETITION THAT MAY HURT THEIR
12	REVENUES.
13	THE COURT: "THEIR" BEING?
14	MR. LECLAIR: THEIR BEING PI'S REVENUES AND EA'S
15	REVENUES. THEY'RE SAYING:
16	"THIS IS NOT GOOD FOR US."
17	BUT INSTEAD OF SAYING:
18	"WHY DON'T YOU TAKE ALL OF OUR GLA SIGNED UP
19	THAT WE ALREADY HAVE, AND PUT THEM IN THE GROUP?"
20	INSTEAD, WHAT THEY DO IS THEY SAY:
21	"LET'S GO OUT AND FORGE A DEAL UNDER MARKET FOR
22	A FEW OF THE MOST MARKETABLE PLAYERS, AND THE EFFECT WILL BE
23	WE'LL GET TAKE 2 TO BACK OFF SIGNING UP RETIRED PLAYERS."
24	THAT'S WHY IT'S A BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY. THAT'S
25	WHY IT SHOWS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST. THEY WERE FAVORING

THEMSELVES AND EA OVER THE RETIRED PLAYERS. AND IT DOES RELATE 2 TO THE GLA, BECAUSE THE CHOICE THEY HAD WAS: 3 "DO WE GIVE EA OUR GLA GROUP? OR DO WE INSTEAD 4 GO OFF AND PICK OFF THE MOST VALUABLE RETIRED PLAYERS?" 5 OUR THEORY OF THE CASE IS THEY SHOULD HAVE LICENSED 6 OUR GROUP. AND THEY DIDN'T DO IT, AND THAT'S WHY WE THINK IT'S 7 A BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. 8 9 LET'S HEAR FROM MR. KESSLER. MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS SO FAR AFIELD FROM 10 ANYTHING HAVING TO DO WITH THE GLA. 11 THE COURT: NO, WAIT A MINUTE. BUT YOU YOURSELF -- I 12 HEARD YOU ASK ALL THESE QUESTIONS OF MR. ALLEN. YOU HAVE LEFT 13 THE IMPRESSION WITH THE JURY THAT YOUR DEFENDANTS ARE OUT THERE 14 LOOKING OUT FOR THE INTERESTS OF THE RETIRED PLAYERS, AND 15 7 MILLION, 30 MILLION, ALL THESE AD HOC DEALS. 16 17 AND HERE'S ONE INSTANCE WHERE IT CAN BE ARGUED, CAN BE ARGUED, THAT YOU DID NOT HAVE THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE 18 19 RETIRED PLAYERS, YOU SOLD THEM OUT CHEAP IN ORDER TO KEEP SOMEBODY OUT OF THE MARKET. 2.0 21 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, LET ME EXPLAIN TO YOU THE ACTUAL EVIDENCE AND FACTS ABOUT THE HALL OF FAME DEAL, BECAUSE 22 23 YOU DIDN'T GET AN ACCURATE PICTURE, I'M AFRAID. 24 THE HALL OF FAME LICENSE WAS BETWEEN THE HALL OF FAME

ITSELF, AN INSTITUTION, AND EA. IT WAS NOT A PLAYERS INC-EA

LICENSE AT ALL TO BEGIN WITH. THEREFORE --2 THE COURT: WHERE DOES ALL THOSE E-MAILS COME FROM 3 THAT SAY 400 --4 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, IF YOU LET ME EXPLAIN ALL 5 THE FACTS --6 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 7 MR. KESSLER: -- I WILL. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GO AHEAD. I WILL BE QUIET 8 9 AND LISTEN. MR. KESSLER: OKAY. OKAY. SO IT WAS -- WHAT 10 HAPPENED IS, THE HALL OF FAME WANTED TO LICENSE ONLY HALL OF 11 FAME PLAYERS. SO AS YOUR HONOR CORRECTLY SAID, IT COULDN'T 12 INVOLVE THE WHOLE GROUP OF RETIRED PLAYERS UNDER THE GLA. 13 COULD HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH THAT, BECAUSE IT WAS ONLY MEMBERS 14 15 OF THE HALL OF FAME, A VERY SELECT GROUP. 16 THE COURT: SO THE HALL OF FAME WAS GOING TO PUT OUT 17 A VIDEO GAME. MR. KESSLER: NO, THEY WERE TO LICENSE EA TO PUT OUT 18 19 A VIDEO GAME. SO HALL OF FAME HAS RIGHTS, AND THEY GIVE RIGHTS TO EA, OKAY? 2.0 21 EA MAKES THE VIDEO GAME. 22 NOW, WHAT HAPPENED IS SOME OF THE PLAYERS, 17 OF 23 THEM, OKAY, WERE GLA MEMBERS, JUST HAPPENED TO BE. BUT THIS 2.4 HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THE GLA.

WHAT HAPPENS IS PLAYERS INC WAS IN THE MIDDLE, IN

```
EFFECT, SAYING:
 2
                   "WELL, THE HALL OF FAME CAN GIVE THE RIGHTS TO
 3
   ITS NAME, ITS LOGO, 'HALL OF FAME,'" WHICH IT DID.
 4
             AND, BY THE WAY, SOME OF THAT $400,000 WAS FOR THE
 5
   LOGO. IT WASN'T EVEN FOR THE PLAYER RIGHTS.
 6
             AND HALL OF FAME HAD THE RIGHTS ITSELF TO SOME OF THE
 7
   HALL OF FAME PLAYERS SIGNED UP, BUT THEY DIDN'T HAVE ALL.
             SO PLAYERS INC HELPED THE HALL OF FAME AND EA GET
 8
9
   SOME OF THE PLAYERS --
10
             THE COURT: HOW MANY?
             MR. KESSLER: -- SIGNED UP. I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY.
11
   THERE'S NO EVIDENCE AS TO HOW MANY THEY HELPED GET. BUT SOME
12
13
   NUMBER THEY HELPED FACILITATE GETTING.
             HALL OF FAME HAD SOME. THEY HAD SOME. AND IT WAS
14
15
   ALL DONE THROUGH AD HOCS, OKAY?
             AND THEN, THOSE PLAYERS SIGNED THOSE AD HOCS AND GAVE
16
   THE MONEY -- THEY GOT THE MONEY. THE MONEY WAS PAID TO HALL OF
17
   FAME, OKAY? AND THEN, ULTIMATELY TO THE PLAYER, FOR THE
18
   PLAYER'S SHARE, SO THE PLAYERS GOT THE MONEY.
19
             NONE OF THIS HAD ANYTHING TO DO WITH THE GROUP
2.0
   LICENSING AUTHORIZATION.
21
22
             THE COURT: HERE'S THE PART I DON'T UNDERSTAND, 17
   WAS MORE THAN SIX. SO WHY DIDN'T YOUR CLIENT SAY:
23
24
                  "WELL, WE'VE ALREADY GOT 17 OF THESE PEOPLE
25
   SIGNED UP. WE'LL JUST RELY ON THE GLA"?
```

1 MR. KESSLER: WELL, YOUR HONOR, AGAIN, THIS IS THE CLAIM THAT'S NOT IN THE CASE. AND THIS IS VERY, VERY 2 3 IMPORTANT. 4 THERE IS NO CLAIM IN THIS CASE, AS HAS BEEN SAID 5 REPEATEDLY -- AND AS YOUR HONOR RULED, BECAUSE OTHERWISE WE'D 6 HAVE TO DECERTIFY THE CLASS -- THERE'S NO CLAIM IN THIS CASE 7 THAT BECAUSE IT WAS 17, WHICH WOULD BE A GROUP, IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN PURSUANT TO THE GLA AND GONE INTO AN ESCROW ACCOUNT 8 INSTEAD OF JUST DOING AD HOC DEALS. IF THAT WAS A CLAIM IN THIS CASE, THERE COULD BE NO 10 CLASS. AND YOUR HONOR HAS CHASTISED ME FOR SUGGESTING THERE 11 COULD BE THAT CLAIM IN THIS CASE. 12 13 SO WE CAN'T CONFUSE THAT. THERE COULD BE NO CLAIM IN THIS CASE THAT THERE WAS SOMETHING WRONG IN USING AD HOCS FOR 14 THOSE 17S INSTEAD OF PUTTING THAT MONEY INTO THE ESCROW ACCOUNT 15 AND SAYING IT'S A GROUP LICENSE DEAL. 16 THAT'S JUST NOT A CLAIM HERE. 17 18 THE COURT: WELL, IT LOOKS LIKE THEY STIPULATED TO 19 SOMETHING SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT. 20 MR. KESSLER: YES. THE COURT: THEY DON'T SEEK TO RECOVER MONEY PAID 21 22 UNDER THOSE AGREEMENTS, BUT THEY'RE NOT SAYING THAT THEY --23 YOU'RE SAYING THAT'S DIFFERENT FROM SAYING THERE'S NOTHING 24 WRONG WITH IT.

MR. KESSLER: NO, YOUR HONOR SAID THERE WAS NOTHING

WRONG WITH IT. 2 YOUR HONOR SAID IN --3 THE COURT: I DON'T REMEMBER SAYING THAT. 4 MR. KESSLER: OKAY. WELL, CAN WE GET THE COURT'S 5 RULING ON REJECTING THE DECERTIFICATION? 6 IN THE DECERTIFICATION WE ARGUED THAT WE THOUGHT YOUR 7 HONOR WAS SUGGESTING IN THE SUMMARY JUDGMENT OPINION, AS YOUR HONOR FRANKLY SUGGESTED YESTERDAY, THAT THERE COULD BE SOME 8 CLAIM BASED ON IF THERE'S A GROUP OF PLAYERS, 17 PLAYERS, THAT THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN, INSTEAD OF PAYING THOSE PLAYERS A 10 11 HUNDRED PERCENT OF THE MONEY, THAT THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN PUT INTO AN ESCROW ACCOUNT. 12 13 AND WE POINTED OUT THAT CLAIM WOULD CREATE A CONFLICT BETWEEN THE CLASS, BECAUSE THAT WOULD MEAN ALL THE PARTIES TO 14 15 THE AGREEMENT, MR. ADDERLEY, FOR EXAMPLE WITH US, WE BREACHED THE AGREEMENT BY GIVING HIM ALL OF HIS MONEY; THAT MONEY SHOULD 16 17 HAVE GONE INTO AN ESCROW ACCOUNT. AND BECAUSE OF THAT, THEY'VE REPEATEDLY DENIED THAT 18 CLAIM, NOT JUST IN THE STIPULATION, BUT THEY'VE REPEATEDLY 19 DENIED IT IN THEIR OWN -- WE HAVE INTERROGATORY ANSWERS, 2.0 REQUESTS TO ADMIT. AND WHAT YOUR HONOR -- THIS IS THE 21 INTERROGATORY I ASKED. WE ASKED: 22 23 "DO PLAINTIFFS CONTEND THAT THE MONEY RECEIVED

24 BY ADDERLEY FROM DEFENDANTS FOR LICENSING HIS IMAGE SHOULD HAVE
25 BEEN PROVIDED TO PROVIDE A SHARE OF THAT MONEY TO OTHER RETIRED

NFL PLAYERS WHO HAD SIGNED GLAS?" 2 AND THEIR ANSWER IS: 3 "TO THE EXTENT THAT DEFENDANTS ARE REFERRING TO 4 THE MONEY -- THE AMOUNTS OF MONEY PAID TO ADDERLEY PURSUANT TO 5 AD HOC AGREEMENTS, PLAINTIFFS DO NOT CONTEND, DO NOT CONTEND 6 THAT SUCH AMOUNTS SHOULD HAVE BEEN DIVIDED. THE ACTIONS OF THE 7 DEFENDANTS MAKE CLEAR THAT SUCH AMOUNTS, THE AD HOC AMOUNTS, ARE IN ADDITION TO AMOUNTS PAID FOR THE GRANTING OF RIGHTS 8 PURSUANT TO THE GLA AND REFLECT THE ADDITIONAL EFFORTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL INVOLVED." 10 SO THEY MADE IT A HUNDRED PERCENT CLEAR -- AND 11 THEY'VE DONE THIS REPEATEDLY -- THEY'RE NOT ADVANCING ANY CLAIM 12 13 THAT THE AMOUNTS, FOR EXAMPLE, THOSE 17, SHOULD HAVE BEEN DIVIDED INTO AN ESCROW ACCOUNT. 14 15 THAT'S PRECISELY THE PROBLEM. AND THAT'S WHY YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE, GRANTED THE IN LIMINE. 16 17 WHAT THE JURY IS GOING TO THINK, EVEN AS YOUR HONOR MIGHT THINK, MAYBE THERE'S A CLAIM ABOUT THAT. BUT THEY WON'T 18 19 MAKE THAT CLAIM, AND IT'S NOBODY'S FAULT. THEY HAVE JUST CHOSEN NOT TO AS CLASS COUNSEL TO MAKE THAT CLAIM. 2.0 AND I BELIEVE IF THEY MADE IT THAT IT WOULD CREATE A 21 CONFLICT WITHIN THE CLASS, SO THEY COULDN'T DO THAT. 22 23 THEY MAYBE SHOULD HAVE ASKED FOR DIFFERENT CLASSES, 2.4 OR WHATEVER. BUT THE POINT IS YOU CAN'T HAVE THAT CLAIM IN 25 THIS CASE.

```
1
             AND THE JURY IS GOING TO THINK THAT'S A CLAIM. AND
   SO WE BELIEVE, YOUR HONOR --
 2
 3
             THE COURT: THAT PART WE COULD SOLVE WITH A
 4
   CAUTIONARY INSTRUCTION.
 5
             MR. KESSLER: OKAY. BUT, YOUR HONOR, THEN WE GO:
 6
   WHAT'S THE RELEVANCE OF THIS? SINCE THIS HALL OF FAME --
 7
             THE COURT: WELL, HERE'S THE RELEVANCE. THE
   RELEVANCE MAY BE -- AT LEAST IT'S TENDERED TO ME AS THE
 8
   ARGUMENT -- THAT THIS SHOWS THAT YOUR CLIENTS WERE WILLING TO
   SELL OUT THE RETIRED PLAYERS IN ORDER TO KEEP SOMEBODY OUT OF
10
   THE MARKET AND DO A FAVOR TO EA AND DID NOT REALLY HAVE THE
11
   BEST INTERESTS OF RETIRED PEOPLE AT HEART, AND THAT THEY SHOULD
12
13
   HAVE OFFERED THE ENTIRE GROUP OF GLA'S.
             NOW, YOU KNOW, IT'S A STRETCH TO SAY --
14
15
             MR. KESSLER: OKAY.
             THE COURT: -- THAT'S THEIR ARGUMENT. IT'S A STRETCH
16
17
   TO SAY --
             MR. KESSLER: BUT, YOUR HONOR, LET'S GO INTO WHAT
18
19
   THEY DID. THE E-MAILS COME FROM MR. CLAY WALKER. THEY CHOSE
2.0
   TO NEVER DEPOSE MR. CLAY WALKER.
             THE COURT: THEY GOT SOMEBODY HERE --
21
             MR. KESSLER: NO. NO, THEY DON'T. I WANTED TO GET
22
23
   TO THAT. MR. NAHRA WAS NOT INVOLVED IN ANY OF THE DISCUSSIONS
24
   ABOUT THE NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE MONEY. SO ALL THEY COULD DO FOR
   HIM -- THIS IS VERY IMPORTANT, YOUR HONOR -- IS, YES, HE WAS
25
```

THE LAWYER WHO WAS NEGOTIATING THE LANGUAGE OF THE EA 2 AGREEMENT. 3 HE HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THE ISSUE OF HOW MUCH MONEY 4 WAS PAID OR ANYTHING. SO HE'S A CC ON AN E-MAIL, BUT HE COULD 5 OFFER NOTHING SUBSTANTIVELY ABOUT THOSE NEGOTIATIONS WITH EA OR 6 THE HALL OF FAME. 7 SO WHAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE IS JUST LAWYERS' ARGUMENT ABOUT A STATEMENT FROM A WITNESS WHO'S NOT HERE, WHERE THEY'RE 8 9 GOING TO ARGUE: 10 "OH, YES. THIS IS WHAT'S GOING TO MEAN." THEY HAVE NO WITNESS. AND MR. FEFFER, THEY SAY, 11 ADOPTED THIS. THEY DIDN'T CHOOSE TO DEPOSE MR. FEFFER. SO 12 13 THEY DIDN'T RAISE THIS ISSUE BEFORE TO ASK ANYONE FROM EA ABOUT 14 THIS. 15 SO WHAT WE'RE GOING TO GET TO THE JURY IS THESE THREE E-MAIL SNIPPETS, NO CONTEXT, NO ARGUMENT, RELATING TO THE HALL 16 17 OF FAME WHO CANNOT USE ALL THE GLA MEMBERS, ONLY HALL OF FAME MEMBERS WHO ALREADY HAD SOME HALL OF FAME MEMBERS SIGNED UP, SO 18 19 THE LEAST CONTEXT. AND THEN, THE REALITY IS, YOUR HONOR -- LET'S GO TO 20 WHAT THE FACTS WOULD BE. 21 THE FACTS ARE THIS CAME UP BECAUSE EA PAID 400,000 TO 22 23 THE HALL OF FAME, AND WAS COMPLAINING, NOT THAT THEY PAID TOO

"WE PAID TOO MUCH," OKAY?

2.4

25

LITTLE, WAS COMPLAINING:

1	AND WAS ASKING THE PLAYERS INC:
2	"WE THOUGHT YOU WERE GOING TO GIVE US SOME OF
3	THIS MONEY TO SUPPORT US IN DOING THIS, BECAUSE YOU WANTED US
4	TO HELP OUT THE HALL OF FAME."
5	AND PLAYERS INC SAYS:
6	"NO, THAT WASN'T THE DEAL."
7	THIS HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THE BELOW-MARKET DEAL,
8	BUT THERE'S NO EVIDENCE OF THESE FACTS. THERE'S NO WITNESSES
9	ABOUT THIS. IT SHOULDN'T BE IN THE CASE. IT'S THE CLASSIC 403
10	DIVERSIONARY SIDESHOW.
11	AND NO MATTER WHAT INSTRUCTIONS YOUR HONOR GIVES, THE
12	JURY IS STILL GOING TO BE CONFUSED.
13	THE COURT: YOU BROUGHT UP ALL THESE AD HOCS.
14	MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, FIRST OF ALL, WE NEVER
15	MENTIONED THE HALL OF FAMERS, YOUR HONOR.
16	THE COURT: YOU DID NOT, BUT YOU LEFT THE IMPRESSION
17	THAT YOU'RE OUT THERE LOOKING OUT FOR THE BEST INTEREST OF
18	RETIRED PEOPLE THROUGH AD HOCS.
19	MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, IF YOU LOOK AT WHAT
20	HAPPENED IN OPENING STATEMENT, IN OPENING STATEMENT THEY RAISED
21	THE AD HOCS FIRST.
22	THE COURT: THAT'S BECAUSE THEY KNEW YOU WERE GOING
23	TO RAISE IT.
24	MR. KESSLER: THAT'S BECAUSE YOUR HONOR SAID AND
25	YOUR HONOR PROPERLY NOTED BEFORE AD HOCS CAN'T BE IGNORED

```
HERE BECAUSE AD HOCS WERE -- IN FACT, WHAT HAPPENED IS, AS YOU
   HEARD THE TESTIMONY, PLAYERS INC WOULD SAY:
 2
 3
                  "WE TRIED TO SELL RETIRED PLAYERS, AND THE ONLY
 4
   THING LICENSEES WANTED WAS SMALL GROUPS OF PLAYERS, MANY OF
 5
   WHOM DIDN'T SIGN GLA'S, SO THEY HAD TO DO AD HOCS."
 6
             THEY HAVE TO EXPLAIN THAT PROCESS, THAT PROCESS, TO
 7
   SHOW, YES, THEY WEREN'T IN BAD FAITH. BECAUSE WHAT YOU HEARD
   MR. PARCHER SAY IN OPENING:
 8
 9
                 "THEY NEVER DID ANYTHING. THEY NEVER SPOKE TO
   ANYONE. THEY NEVER DID ANYTHING FOR RETIRED PLAYERS."
10
             AND BROUGHT IN THE BROTHERHOOD, AND EVERYTHING ELSE.
11
   SO WE HAD NO CHOICE, YOUR HONOR, BUT TO SAY:
12
                   "YES, WE TRIED TO DO RETIRED PLAYER MARKETING.
13
   AND THE ONLY DEALS PEOPLE ARE INTERESTED IN ARE AD HOCS."
14
15
             AND THAT WAS -- WE AGREE THAT IS EVIDENCE TO NEGATE
   HIS CHARGE THAT WE TRIED TO DO NOTHING. BUT IT SHOULDN'T, YOUR
16
   HONOR, GO TO THEM PUTTING IN THIS SIDESHOW ABOUT THIS AGREEMENT
17
   THAT'S A HALL OF FAME LICENSE.
18
19
             THEY MIGHT HAVE HAD SOME SLENDER ARGUMENT IF IT WAS A
   PLAYERS INC LICENSE. BUT IT'S NOT EVEN A PLAYERS INC LICENSE.
2.0
21
   IT'S A HALL OF FAME LICENSE, AND IT COULD NEVER INVOLVE THE
   GROUP BECAUSE IT ONLY COULD BE HALL OF FAME PLAYERS.
22
23
              THE COURT: BUT YOU SAID THAT YOUR PEOPLE WENT OUT
24
   AND FACILITATED GETTING THE HALL OF FAME PLAYERS TO SIGN UP.
```

MR. KESSLER: ALL WE DID IS WE HELPED THE HALL OF

FAME AND EA CONTACT SOME OF THE PLAYERS AND DO THIS. 2 WE WEREN'T PARTIES EVEN. WE -- THIS WAS NOT ONE LIKE 3 THE OTHER AD HOCS. 4 THE OTHER THING -- THIS IS IMPORTANT, YOUR HONOR. 5 THE COURT: IF YOU DID SO LITTLE, HOW COME EA OWED 6 YOU A FAVOR? 7 MR. KESSLER: THEY DIDN'T OWE US A FAVOR. THE COURT: THAT'S WHAT THE E-MAIL SAYS. THEY OWED 8 9 YOU A FAVOR. MR. KESSLER: I GUESS BECAUSE WE WEREN'T A PARTY TO 10 THE AGREEMENT, WE HELPED THEM GET PLAYERS, OKAY. 11 12 THIS WAS, BY THE WAY, A STATEMENT OF A FORMER 1.3 EMPLOYEE WHO SAID THAT. 14 MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR --15 THE COURT: MR. LECLAIR, PLEASE SIT DOWN NOW. MR. KESSLER: IT WAS A STATEMENT OF A FORMER EMPLOYEE 16 17 WHO'S TRYING TO SAY: "WELL, WHY DON'T YOU SAY THIS TO EA AS TO WHY WE 18 19 DON'T OWE THEM MONEY?" 20 BECAUSE THEY WERE ASKING US FOR MORE MONEY IN THIS CONTEXT. THEY WERE SAYING: 21 "COULD YOU GIVE US BACK SOME MONEY? WE THOUGHT 22 23 WHEN WE DID THE HALL OF FAME DEAL YOU HAD INDICATED YOU HELPED 24 SUPPORT US WITHOUT MONEY." 25 WE'RE SAYING:

1 "NO, WE DIDN'T AGREE TO GIVE YOU MONEY." 2 BUT, YOUR HONOR, HERE'S THE REAL POINT. WHEN WE TALK 3 ABOUT THE AD HOCS, WE HAVE NEVER ARGUED TO THE JURY, WE'VE NEVER PRESENTED ANY EVIDENCE SAYING THE AMOUNT OF THE AD HOCS 5 IS FAIR OR THE AMOUNT OF THE AD HOCS IS MARKET PRICE. 6 IN OTHER WORDS, WE DIDN'T COME IN AND SAY: 7 "IS THE AD HOC MONEY EVIDENCE THAT IT IS A FAIR AMOUNT OF MONEY?" 8 9 THAT'S WHAT THEY'RE CHALLENGING. THEY'RE SAYING IN THIS PARTICULAR AD HOC THE AMOUNT OF MONEY SHOULD HAVE BEEN 10 HIGHER WHEN THEY HAD NO DAMAGE CLAIM FOR IT, WHEN IT'S A HALL 11 OF FAME DEAL, WHEN THE CONTRACT IS -- THE 400,000 -- AND THIS 12 13 IS CRITICAL, MAYBE THE MOST CRITICAL, MOST CRITICAL. THE COURT: YOU SAID THAT SEVERAL TIMES. 14 MR. KESSLER: I THINK AS I'M GOING. THE 400,000 AND 15 THE OTHER AMOUNT IS AGREED TO BETWEEN THE HALL OF FAME AND EA. 16 IN OTHER WORDS, THAT'S WHERE THE 400,000 GOES THROUGH. 17 18 SO, YES, WE WERE INVOLVED IN FACILITATING THE TRANSACTION. BUT TO PUT US IN AND TO SAY THAT WE ARE 19 RESPONSIBLE FOR THAT NEGOTIATION BETWEEN THE -- HALL OF FAME IS 2.0 A SEPARATE COMPANY. THEY ARE NOT IN THIS CASE. 21 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. LET ME -- MR. LECLAIR, I'LL 22 23 GIVE YOU ONE MINUTE. 24 MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T SAY THIS LIGHTLY, BUT HE IS MISREPRESENTING SOMETHING TO THE COURT, AND I DON'T

```
LIKE IT. HE SAID THEY WERE NOT A PARTY TO THE AGREEMENT.
 2
             THAT'S WHAT MR. KESSLER JUST SAID. THAT IS
 3
   ABSOLUTELY FALSE. HE KNOWS IT'S FALSE. THEY ARE A PARTY. HE
 4
   IS LOOKING AT IT RIGHT NOW. THEY ARE A PARTY TO THIS
 5
   AGREEMENT.
 6
             AND WHY ARE THEY INVOLVED, YOUR HONOR? THIS IS
 7
   WHAT'S SO AMAZING TO ME. THEY ARE INVOLVED BECAUSE THEY PUT A
   PROVISION IN THEIR LICENSE AGREEMENT THAT SAYS THAT EA CANNOT
 8
   APPROACH ANY PLAYER WHO WAS EVER IN THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL
   LEAGUE. THEY HAVE TO GO THROUGH PLAYERS INC.
10
             THEY ARE THE ONLY PERSON --
11
             THE COURT: WHICH AGREEMENT?
12
13
             MR. LECLAIR: IN THE EA LICENSE AGREEMENT, AND EVERY
   LICENSE AGREEMENT THEY INSERT A PROVISION THAT SAYS THAT THE
14
15
   LICENSEE CANNOT TALK TO OR APPROACH ANY PLAYER WHO EVER PLAYED
   IN THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE. THAT'S WHY --
16
17
             THE COURT: THE $25 MILLION DEAL HAS THAT?
             MR. LECLAIR: YES, IT DOES.
18
             THE COURT: YOU NEVER BROUGHT THAT TO ANYONE'S
19
2.0
   ATTENTION.
             MR. LECLAIR: WELL, THEN WE SHOULD AND WE WILL.
21
             MR. KATZ: IT'S COMING.
22
             MR. LECLAIR: IT'S COMING, YOUR HONOR.
23
24
             OKAY. AND, NOW, THE SECOND THING THEY MISREPRESENTED
   IS HE SAID THIS LAWYER, MR. NAHRA, DIDN'T HAVE ANYTHING TO DO
```

```
WITH THE NEGOTIATION.
 2
             I WANT TO READ THE E-MAIL FROM ANDY FEFFER, WHO IS
 3
   THEIR CLIENT, THEIR WITNESS, EXHIBIT 522.
 4
             HE SAYS, QUOTE:
                  "I CAN TELL YOU THAT CLAY AND JOE'S" -- JOE IS
 5
 6
   MR. NAHRA -- "CLAY AND JOE'S NEGOTIATION OF THESE DISCOUNTED
 7
   TERMS WAS A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO EA, AS YOU MORE THAN
   LIKELY WOULD HAVE PAID IN EXCESS OF $1 MILLION FOR THESE RIGHTS
 8
   WITHOUT THEIR INVOLVEMENT AND ASSISTANCE."
10
             I'M SORRY, YOUR HONOR, I GET WORKED UP. I APOLOGIZE.
11
              (LAUGHTER)
             MR. KATZ: IT'S HIS MOST CRITICAL POINT.
12
13
             (LAUGHTER)
             MR. LECLAIR: BUT MR. NAHRA IS IN THE BIG FAT MIDDLE
14
15
   OF THIS. FOR THEM TO SAY HE HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THIS IS AN
   OUTRAGE, YOUR HONOR.
16
17
             IT'S AN OUTRAGE, REALLY. SO IT IS HIGHLY RELEVANT.
             WE DID NOT CLAIM THAT MR. ADDERLEY HAS TO GIVE BACK
18
19
   HIS MONEY. THAT'S WHAT WE'VE SAID CONSISTENTLY.
             WHAT WE SAY IS: THEY SHOULD HAVE GIVEN US THE GROUP
20
   MONEY. THAT'S OUR CLAIM.
21
             THE COURT: THERE WASN'T ANY GROUP MONEY HERE.
22
23
             MR. LECLAIR: THERE WAS GROUP MONEY, YOUR HONOR.
   THIS IS WHERE MAYBE WE HAVEN'T COMMUNICATED WELL WITH YOUR
2.4
25
   HONOR.
```

```
1
             THERE WAS A TON OF GROUP MONEY. THEY JUST DIDN'T
   SHARE IT WITH US. THEY CALL IT "ACTIVE PLAYER MONEY." BUT WE
 2
 3
   SAY IT'S GROUP MONEY, AND IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN SHARED WITH OUR
 4
   CLIENTS. THAT'S OUR THEORY OF THE CASE.
 5
             THE COURT: WELL, THAT ASSUMES THE JURY IS GOING TO
 6
   GO WITH YOU ON THE MEANING OF THIS CONTRACT.
 7
             MR. LECLAIR: ACTUALLY, YOUR HONOR --
             THE COURT: THAT'S THE CONTRACT THEORY. I THOUGHT
 8
   YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT THE BREACH OF FIDUCIARY THEORY.
             MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR, OUR THEORY -- WE HAVE
10
   DIFFERENT THEORIES OF CONTRACT, AND MAYBE THIS IS NOT THE BEST
11
   TIME TO GO INTO ALL OF THAT. BUT WE DON'T HAVE TO -- WE SAY:
12
                   "SIX OR MORE MEANS SIX OR MORE, PRESENT OR
13
14
   FORMER."
             AND IF THEY DO A GROUP LICENSE, SIX OR MORE, PRESENT
15
   OR FORMER, WE'RE ENTITLED TO SHARE IN THE MONEY. THAT'S WHAT
16
   HAPPENED. THAT'S WHAT ALL THESE LICENSES ARE.
17
18
             AND WE SHOULD HAVE SHARED IN THE GROUP MONEY.
19
             THE COURT: EVEN IF IT'S ALL ACTIVE.
20
             MR. LECLAIR: EVEN IF IT'S ALL ACTIVE.
21
             WE ALSO SAY THAT IF THERE'S SIX OR MORE RETIRED
22
   PLAYERS IN THE -- IN THE GROUP OF PEOPLE THEY USE IN THE
23
   PRODUCT, WE'RE ENTITLED TO SHARE IN THE GROUP MONEY BECAUSE,
24
   THAT'S WHAT THE RETIRED PLAYER GLA SAYS.
25
             SO WE -- WE'RE ENTITLED TO SHARE IN THE MONEY
```

```
UNDER -- THE THEORY THAT WE'RE IN THE LICENSE IS ONE THEORY.
 2
   BUT IT'S NOT OUR ONLY THEORY, YOUR HONOR. WE'RE ENTITLED TO
 3
   SHARE IN THE GROUP MONEY BECAUSE THEY WROTE THIS CONTRACT AND
 4
   SAID "SIX OR MORE, PRESENT OR FORMER."
 5
             THAT'S OUR THEORY OF THE CASE.
 6
             THE COURT: LET'S GO THROUGH THESE E-MAILS ONE AT A
 7
   TIME, AND I WANT TO UNDERSTAND HOW YOU WOULD EVEN GET THEM INTO
   EVIDENCE.
 8
 9
             MR. LECLAIR: ALL RIGHT. I'M HAPPY TO DO SO.
             THE COURT: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT 5 --
10
             MR. LECLAIR: 521?
11
             THE COURT: 521. THIS IS AN E-MAIL -- I CAN'T TELL
12
13
   WHO IT'S FROM. JOE NAHRA. ALL RIGHT. HE'S HERE IN THE
   COURTROOM.
14
15
             MR. KESSLER: WHICH ONE, YOUR HONOR? BECAUSE THERE'S
16
   THREE.
17
             MR. LECLAIR: THE TOP E-MAIL IS FROM JOE NAHRA.
             THE COURT: WHO IS PAUL CAIRNS?
18
             MR. LECLAIR: PAUL CAIRNS IS WITH EA. I CAN TAKE IT
19
   E-MAIL BY E-MAIL IF YOU'D LIKE, YOUR HONOR.
2.0
             THE COURT: JUST A SECOND. I'M LOOKING AT 521 NOW.
21
             IS IT YOUR VIEW THAT JOE NAHRA RECEIVED ALL OF THESE?
22
23
             MR. LECLAIR: ABSOLUTELY, YOUR HONOR.
24
             THE COURT: WHO IS CLAY WALKER? WHO DID HE WORK FOR?
25
             MR. LECLAIR: CLAY WALKER WAS THE KEY BUSINESS
```

```
EXECUTIVE, A SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT OF MARKETING FOR PLAYERS
 2
   INC.
 3
             THE ONE E-MAIL IN HERE THAT HE WROTE AFTER THE TIME
 4
   WAS THIS E-MAIL IN 521. BUT, YOUR HONOR, IT IS ADMISSIBLE
 5
   UNDER 801(D)(2)(B) AND (C.)
 6
             THE COURT: 801 WHAT?
 7
             MR. LECLAIR: (D).
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. (2).
 8
 9
             MR. LECLAIR: (2)(B) AND (C).
             THE COURT: (B) IS ADOPTION AND (C) IS --
10
11
             MR. LECLAIR: IS AUTHORIZATION.
             THE COURT: "AUTHORIZED BY THE PARTY TO MAKE A
12
13
   STATEMENT CONCERNING THE SUBJECT."
14
             MR. LECLAIR: OKAY.
15
             THE COURT: LET'S -- WHAT IS THE SEQUENCE OF THIS
  || E-MAIL CHAIN? WHICH ONE CAME FIRST?
16
17
             MR. LECLAIR: ALL RIGHT. THE BOTTOM E-MAIL ON THIS
   ONE, YOUR HONOR, IF YOU LOOK AT THE VERY BOTTOM, IT'S AN E-MAIL
18
19
   FROM JOE NAHRA TO CLAY WALKER.
2.0
             IT SAYS:
                   "CAN YOU PLEASE PUT YOUR PI HAT BACK ON, AND
21
   PROVIDE SOME INSIGHT HERE?"
22
             THAT IS AN AUTHORIZATION BY JOE NAHRA AT PI TO
23
2.4
  MR. WALKER TO COMMUNICATE ON THIS SUBJECT, WHICH HE THEN DOES.
25
             MR. KESSLER: MR. WALKER WAS NOT AN EMPLOYEE AT THAT
```

```
TIME.
 2
             MR. LECLAIR: I UNDERSTAND, YOUR HONOR. THAT'S WHY
 3
   IF HE WAS AN EMPLOYEE THERE WOULDN'T BE ANY QUESTION.
 4
             THE COURT: BUT MR. NAHRA DOES SAY:
                   "PUT HIS PI HAT BACK ON."
 5
 6
             MR. LECLAIR: RIGHT. THAT'S WHY IT FITS UNDER
 7
   801(D)(2)(B) --
 8
             MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR --
 9
             (COUNSEL SPEAKING SIMULTANEOUSLY, WHICH WAS NOT
   REPORTABLE.)
10
11
             MR. LECLAIR: (C).
             MR. KESSLER: WE WOULD DISAGREE. WHAT HE WAS SIMPLY
12
1.3
   SAYING WAS A COLLOQUIAL PHRASE: I DON'T KNOW ANY FACTS ABOUT
   THIS, CLAY. WOULD YOU THINK BACK TO WHEN YOU USED TO WORK AT
14
15
   PI AND GIVE ME SOME FACTS?
16
             BUT IT'S STILL HEARSAY FROM SOMEONE ELSE.
17
             THE COURT: YOU'RE INTERRUPTING MR. LECLAIR.
             GO AHEAD, MR. LECLAIR.
18
19
             MR. LECLAIR: THE SECOND REASON THIS E-MAIL IS
   ADMISSIBLE, YOUR HONOR, IS BECAUSE IT WAS ADOPTED. AND THAT IS
2.0
   IN EXHIBIT 522.
21
             IF YOU LOOK AT EXHIBIT 522, THE TOP E-MAIL -- I'M
22
23
   SORRY. LET ME MAKE SURE.
24
             YES. THE TOP E-MAIL ON EXHIBIT 522 IS FROM ANDY
   FEFFER TO PAUL CAIRNS AT EA.
25
```

```
1
             ANDY FEFFER WAS MR. WALKER'S REPLACEMENT AT PLAYERS
   INC. MR. FEFFER, IN HIS E-MAIL, AT ABOUT THE MIDDLE OF
 2
 3
   THE E-MAIL -- ALL RIGHT. I'M SORRY -- AT THE START OF THE
 4
  ||E-MAIL SAYS:
 5
                    "UNFORTUNATELY, I'M NOT IN A POSITION WHERE I
 6
   CAN ASSIST YOU WITH THIS. I HAVE EXHAUSTIVELY REVIEWED THE
 7
   ISSUES WITH CLAY, JOE, OUR COUNSEL AND SEVERAL OTHERS."
             AND THEN, HE GOES ON TO PARROT WHAT MR. CLAY WALKER
 8
   HAS SAID. SO HE IS ADOPTING WALKER'S EXPLANATION. THEY ARE
   NOT DISAVOWING IT. THEY'RE ADOPTING IT. THAT'S WHY IT'S
10
   ADOPTED AND AUTHORIZED, YOUR HONOR.
11
             MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS NOT AN ADOPTION OF
12
   THE PRIOR E-MAIL. I AGREE THAT MR. -- THERE'S AN -- IN OTHER
13
   WORDS, MR. FEFFER MADE A STATEMENT HERE. BUT THAT'S NOT AN
14
   ADOPTION OF THE -- THERE IS NO REFERENCE TO THE PRIOR E-MAIL.
15
   IT JUST SAYS, "I'VE SPOKEN..." THIS IS DIFFERENT WORDS AND
16
   DIFFERENT LANGUAGE AND DIFFERENT INFORMATION.
17
             SO I DON'T THINK 522 HELPS 521.
18
19
             MR. LECLAIR: MR. NAHRA WILL TESTIFY THAT MR. FEFFER
   GOT HIS FACTS FROM CLAY WALKER. THAT'S WHAT HE TESTIFIED.
2.0
21
             THE COURT: 521, THE DATE OF THAT IS NOVEMBER 1 AT
   THE TOP. AND THE 522 IS ALSO NOVEMBER 1. AND IT'S A COUPLE OF
22
23
   HOURS LATER.
24
             MR. LECLAIR: IN OTHER WORDS, YOUR HONOR --
```

THE COURT: WAIT. DOES HE ATTACH THE E-MAIL FROM --

```
1
             MR. LECLAIR: HERE'S THE SEQUENCE, YOUR HONOR.
   MR. WALKER WRITES HIS E-MAIL -- IN 521, MR. WALKER WRITES HIS
 2
 3
   E-MAIL ON FEBRUARY 20TH, 2007.
              ON NOVEMBER 1ST, 2007, MR. NAHRA FORWARDS IT TO ANDY
 4
 5
   FEFFER, FORWARDS THE VERY E-MAIL IN QUESTION TO ANDY FEFFER.
 6
   OKAY?
 7
              THEN, ON THE SAME DAY, ABOUT AN HOUR LATER,
   MR. FEFFER WRITES HIS E-MAIL AND SAYS:
 8
 9
                   "I'VE REVIEWED THE ISSUES WITH CLAY AND JOE,"
   AND MR. NAHRA WILL TESTIFY HE THINKS THAT HE GOT IT, THIS
10
11
    INFORMATION, FROM THE E-MAIL.
12
              SO THEY HAVE ADOPTED IT, YOUR HONOR. THAT'S THE
1.3
   SEQUENCE OF EVENTS.
14
             MR. FEFFER IS ADOPTING THE E-MAIL OF MR. WALKER.
15
             MR. KESSLER: AND, YOUR HONOR, JUST TO RESPOND TO
   THAT, FOR EXAMPLE, THERE'S NO REFERENCE IN THE E-MAIL OF
16
17
   MR. FEFFER THAT "I'M LOOKING TO TAKE 2."
              THERE IS NO REFERENCE IN THIS E-MAIL TO A LOT OF THE
18
19
   THINGS IN THAT PREVIOUS E-MAIL.
              THE MERE FACT THAT HE SENT AN E-MAIL BASED ON
20
   INFORMATION FROM SOMEONE ELSE IS NOT AN ADOPTION UNDER THE
21
22
   RULE.
              AN ADOPTION UNDER THE RULE IS YOU LITERALLY TAKE THAT
23
2.4
   AND ADOPT IT. THERE'S NO ADOPTION HERE.
25
             MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR, I'VE GOT SOME CASES ON
```

```
THIS, IF YOUR HONOR IS INCLINED TO LOOK FURTHER INTO THIS.
 2
             MR. KESSLER: MR. CLAY'S E-MAIL WAS NEVER FORWARDED
 3
   OUTSIDE THE COMPANY, THIS PARTICULAR ONE. THAT'S THE KEY.
 4
             IF THEY FORWARDED MR. -- IF THEY FORWARDED
 5
   MR. WALKER -- MR. WALKER. IF THEY FORWARDED CLAY WALKER'S
 6
   E-MAIL OUTSIDE THE COMPANY THEY WOULD HAVE AN ADOPTION
 7
   ARGUMENT. THAT WAS NOT DONE FOR THIS PARTICULAR E-MAIL FOR
   521.
 8
 9
             THE COURT: BUT WHEN MR. JOE NAHRA SENT IT TO
   MR. FEFFER.
10
11
             MR. KESSLER: WHO IS INTERNAL.
             THE COURT: YES, BUT WHY DOES THAT MATTER? HE'S
12
13
   SENDING IT ON TO FEFFER FOR HIS INFORMATION. WHY WOULD HE BE
   SENDING BOGUS INFORMATION TO MR. FEFFER?
14
15
             MR. KESSLER: MR. FEFFER WAS MR. NAHRA'S CLIENT
   INSIDE THE COMPANY. MR. NAHRA'S THE COUNSEL. HE SENT HIM THIS
16
17
   INFORMATION. NONE OF THAT, OF COURSE, MAKES IT DISCOVERABLE.
18
             WHAT THEY'RE ARGUING IS WHEN MR. FEFFER -- I BELIEVE
19
   IS HOW HE PRONOUNCES HIS NAME -- WHEN MR. FEFFER THEN SENT A
   DIFFERENT E-MAIL TO EA, THAT SOMEHOW THAT ADOPTS THIS PRIOR
2.0
21
   E-MAIL, WHICH WAS NEVER SHOWN TO EA WHICH IS NOT --
             THE COURT: SO YOU'RE SAYING FEFFER IS AT EA?
22
23
             MR. LECLAIR: NO.
24
             MR. KESSLER: NO. FEFFER IS INTERNALLY AT PI.
25
             THE FIRST -- 521 IS A SERIES OF INTERNAL CORE
```

```
E-MAILS --
 2
             THE COURT: THAT DOESN'T MEAN IT'S NOT ADMISSIBLE.
 3
   WHY DOES THAT MATTER?
 4
             MR. KESSLER: NO. IT'S NOT ADMISSIBLE BECAUSE
 5
   MR. WALKER'S STATEMENT WAS A FORMER EMPLOYEE. SO IT'S NOT A
 6
   STATEMENT OF A PARTY.
 7
             MR. WALKER DID NOT WORK AT PI AT THIS TIME. HE WAS
   ALREADY IN HIS OWN BUSINESS --
 8
 9
             THE COURT: YES, BUT THEY'RE ASKING HIM TO PUT HIS
   HAT BACK ON AS A PI EMPLOYEE.
10
11
             MR. KESSLER: BUT I DO NOT BELIEVE ASKING SOMEONE TO
  PUT HIS HAT BACK ON, WHICH MEANT -- DIDN'T MEAN "YOU ARE NOW
12
1.3
   WORKING FOR US."
14
             THEY DIDN'T REHIRE HIM. WHAT THEY WERE SAYING IS --
15
             THE COURT: HAVE YOU EVER BROUGHT AN OUTSIDE PERSON
16 | AS A 30(B)(6) WITNESS?
17
             MR. KESSLER: IF WE DESIGNATED HIM FOR THAT, FOR
   30(B)(6) YOU COULD DO THAT, OF COURSE, YOUR HONOR.
18
19
             THE COURT: WELL, THEY ARE ASKING HIM TO PUT --
   THEY'RE DESIGNATING HIM AS A PI HAT WEARER.
2.0
             MR. KESSLER: NO, YOUR HONOR THEY'RE NOT. THEY
21
22
   DIDN'T SAY:
23
                  "WE DESIGNATE YOU TO GO TALK TO EA ON OUR
24 | BEHALF."
```

THIS WAS SIMPLY -- AND MR. NAHRA WILL TESTIFY TO

```
THIS -- WAS A COLLOQUIAL PHRASE:
 2
                  "THINK BACK TO WHEN YOU USED TO BE AT PI, AND
 3
   GIVE ME SOME FACTS."
 4
              THAT'S WHAT HE WAS ASKING WHEN HE SAID:
 5
                   "PUT YOUR PI HAT BACK ON."
 6
              IT'S LIKE IF I HAD A FORMER ASSOCIATE, AND I NEEDED
 7
   TO REMEMBER SOMETHING, I'D SAY:
                   "PUT YOUR DEWEY HAT BACK ON. DO YOU REMEMBER
 8
9
   THIS?"
10
              THAT'S WHAT THIS IS. THAT WOULDN'T MAKE ME
11
   DESIGNATING HIM A NEW EMPLOYEE OF DEWEY FOR PURPOSES OF
12
   ADMISSIONS. THERE'S NO WAY HE BECOMES AN EMPLOYEE FOR
13
   ADMISSIONS UNDER THIS.
              SO THEY NEED AN ADOPTION. AND TO GET AN ADOPTION
14
15
   THEY WOULD HAVE HAD TO HAVE RESENT THE E-MAIL TO SOMEBODY.
  THEY DIDN'T DO THAT.
16
17
              YOU KNOW, MR. FEFFER SAID SOMETHING DIFFERENT TO EA.
   HE DIDN'T REPEAT WORD FOR WORD WHAT MR. WALKER TOLD HIM, WHICH
18
19
   IS HEARSAY.
2.0
             MR. LECLAIR: CAN I QUOTE A CASE, YOUR HONOR?
              THE COURT: GO AHEAD.
21
22
             MR. LECLAIR: IN A D.C. CIRCUIT CASE, MAY 23, 2006,
23
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA VERSUS SAFAVIAN, S-A-F-A-V-I-A-N, THE
2.4
   COURT STATED AS FOLLOWS:
25
                    "THE STATEMENTS ATTRIBUTED DIRECTLY TO
```

```
MR. SAFAVIAN COME IN AS ADMISSIONS BY A PARTY OPPONENT UNDER
   RULE 801(D)(2)(A). THE CONTEXT AND CONTENT OF CERTAIN E-MAILS
 2
 3
   DEMONSTRATE CLEARLY THAT MR. SAFAVIAN MANIFESTED AN ADOPTION OR
 4
   BELIEF IN THE TRUTH OF THE STATEMENTS OF OTHER PEOPLE AS HE
 5
   FORWARDED THEIR E-MAILS. THEY, THEREFORE, ARE ADMISSIBLE AS
 6
   ADOPTED ADMISSIONS."
 7
             BECAUSE MR. -- MR. FEFFER'S E-MAIL DEMONSTRATES AN
   ADOPTION OF WHAT MR. WALKER HAS SAID.
 8
 9
             THE COURT: EXPLAIN TO ME HOW THAT -- AGAIN, YOUR
   ARGUMENT ON THAT. YOU SAID IT, BUT I DON'T SEE A REFERENCE TO
10
11
   THE E-MAIL IN MR. FEFFER'S E-MAIL.
12
             MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR, WHEN HE SAYS:
13
                   "I HAVE EXHAUSTIVELY REVIEWED THE ISSUES WITH
   CLAY, JOE AND SEVERAL OTHERS, THEN HE SAYS:
14
15
                   "I CAN TELL YOU THAT CLAY AND JOE'S NEGOTIATION
   OF THESE DISCOUNTED TERMS WAS A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO EA
16
   AS YOU MORE THAN LIKELY WOULD HAVE PAID IN EXCESS OF 1 MILLION
17
   FOR THESE RIGHTS WITHOUT THEIR INVOLVEMENT AND ASSISTANCE."
18
             THAT IS AN ADOPTION OF MR. WALKER'S STATEMENT:
19
                  "I WAS ABLE" -- THIS IS IN 521 -- "I WAS ABLE
20
   TO" --
21
22
             THE COURT: WAIT. LET ME FIND THAT. WHERE IS THAT?
23
   "I WAS ABLE" WHERE?
24
             MR. LECLAIR: "I WAS ABLE" IS IN THE MIDDLE OF 521.
25
                   "I WAS ABLE TO FORGE THIS DEAL WITH THE HOF THAT
```

- 1 PROVIDES THEM WITH 400K PER YEAR, WHICH IS SIGNIFICANTLY BELOW
 2 MARKET RIGHT IN EXCHANGE FOR THE HOF PLAYER RIGHTS."
- 3 MR. FEFFER HAS ADOPTED THAT VERY STATEMENT IN HIS 4 E-MAIL. THIS IS THE SOURCE.
- IT IS NOT A COINCIDENCE, YOUR HONOR, THAT HE RECEIVED

 THIS E-MAIL, AND ONE HOUR LATER WROTE HIS E-MAIL TO EA. THAT

 IS A CLEAR INFERENCE AS TO WHAT IS GOING ON.
- 8 MR. -- MR. KESSLER CAN ARGUE TO THE JURY WHATEVER HE
 9 WANTS TO. BUT THERE IS A CLEAR INFERENCE HERE THAT THIS WAS
 10 ADOPTED AND, THEREFORE, ADMISSIBLE.
 - MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, THE JURY DOESN'T GET TO DECIDE ADOPTION. THE COURT DOES.

11

12

16

17

18

22

23

- THE CASE MR. LECLAIR READ -- AND HE QUOTED IT, SO I

 THANK HIM FOR QUOTING IT ACCURATELY -- SAID THE E-MAIL THERE

 WAS FORWARDED.
 - MR. WALKER'S E-MAIL WAS NOT FORWARDED TO EA OUTSIDE
 THE COMPANY. THAT IS A CRITICAL DISTINCTION ON IT NOT BEING
 ADOPTED, BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT MANIFESTED THE ADOPTION.
- SO, FOR EXAMPLE, THE WORDS "BELOW MARKET" APPEAR

 NOWHERE IN MR. FEFFER'S E-MAIL. THE REFERENCE TO TAKE 2 DOES

 NOT APPEAR IN MR. FEFFER'S E-MAIL.
 - THEY WANT TO GET IN OUT-OF-COURT STATEMENTS OF A WITNESS, CLAY WALKER, WHO WAS NOT AN EMPLOYEE OF THE COMPANY, WHO THEY CHOSE NOT TO DEPOSE, SO HE'S NOT HERE TO EXPLAIN
- 25 || CONTEXT, AND ATTRIBUTE THEM AS AN ADOPTION BY MR. FEFFER WHEN

HE DOESN'T REPEAT THAT.

5

6

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- 2 IF YOUR HONOR ALLOWS THIS IN AT ALL, WHICH WE
 3 CERTAINLY HOPE YOU WON'T, THE SECOND E-MAIL WAS OBVIOUSLY A
 4 STATEMENT OF THE COMPANY, WHAT MR. FEFFER SAID.
 - BUT THAT DOESN'T MAKE 521 ADMISSIBLE. IT ONLY MAKES
 522 ADMISSIBLE, IF YOUR HONOR WERE TO ALLOW THIS LINE AT ALL.
- 7 MR. LECLAIR: YOUR HONOR, IT'S BOTH ADOPTED AND 8 AUTHORIZED.
- 9 MR. NAHRA ASKED FOR THIS INFORMATION, AND THEN THEY
 10 USED IT. AND IT IS BOTH AN ADOPTION AND AN AUTHORIZATION.
- 11 MR. KESSLER: AN AUTHORIZATION HE HAS TO AUTHORIZE
 12 HIM TO SPEAK OUTSIDE THE COMPANY, WHICH THEY DID NOT DO.
- THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I'M GOING TO MAKE A RULING

 NOW. EVERYBODY HAVE A SEAT SO YOU WON'T BE TEMPTED TO LEAP UP

 AND ARGUE WITH ME.
 - THE SUBJECT OF THE AD HOCS HAS BEEN BROUGHT UP MAINLY
 BY THE DEFENSE. IT'S BEEN BROUGHT UP IN ORDER TO SHOW THAT
 WHILE ALMOST NOTHING, OR PROBABLY ZERO, WAS EVER PAID UNDER THE
 GLA, RETIRED MEMBERS -- SOME RETIRED PLAYERS GOT SOME MONEY
 UNDER THE AD HOC AGREEMENTS AND CLASS MEMBERS GOT \$7 MILLION
 UNDER AD HOC AGREEMENTS.
 - SO THIS IS BEING USED TO SHOW -- TO MEET THE ISSUE OF FIDUCIARY DUTY, MAYBE EVEN HAS SOME RELEVANCE TO THE CONTRACT CLAIM. AND THE JURY HAS HEARD A LOT ABOUT THE AD HOC AGREEMENTS.

```
1
             NOW, THE IMPRESSION HAS BEEN LEFT WITH THE JURY THAT
   THE DEFENDANTS -- IN FACT, THE IMPRESSION HAS BEEN LEFT BY THE
 2
 3
   DEFENDANTS, THAT THE DEFENDANTS HAVE HONORED WHATEVER
 4
   OBLIGATIONS THEY HAVE TO BE FAIR TO THE RETIRED PLAYERS.
 5
             AND NOW THE ISSUE IS WHETHER OR NOT THE -- A SPECIFIC
 6
   AD HOC AGREEMENT CAN BE GONE INTO, IS SOMEWHAT DIFFERENT AD HOC
 7
   AGREEMENT, BUT THE HALL OF FAME ONE, TO SHOW THAT -- SHOW THAT
   THE -- THE DEFENDANTS HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO ARGUE FOR A GROUP
 8
   LICENSE ON BEHALF OF THE RETIRED PLAYERS, AND THAT INSTEAD OF
   DOING THAT, THE DEFENDANTS FACILITATED A SWEETHEART DEAL WITH
10
   EA SO AS TO CUT THE COMPETITOR OUT OF THE MARKET, AND THAT THAT
11
   WAS WORTH A MILLION DOLLARS, AND THEY GOT IT FOR 400,000,
12
13
   MEANING EA GOT A MILLION DOLLAR BENEFIT FOR ONLY 400,000, AND
   THAT EA OWES ONE BACK TO THE DEFENDANTS.
14
15
             NOW, IT -- THIS IS COMPLICATED BY THE FACT THAT
   BECAUSE IT'S A CLASS ACTION, THE PLAINTIFFS, IN LIGHT OF THE
16
   POSSIBLE CONFLICT OF INTEREST THEY WOULD HAVE, ARE NOT TRYING
17
   TO RECOVER MONEY UNDER THE AD HOC AGREEMENTS TO REDISTRIBUTE
18
19
   THAT AMONG CLASS MEMBERS.
20
             I SAY THIS BECAUSE THE NINTH CIRCUIT LOOKING AT THIS
21
   LATER MIGHT SAY:
22
                 "WELL, LOOK. THE AD HOC AGREEMENTS WERE SIX OR
23
   MORE. WHY WASN'T THAT COVERED BY THE GLA? WHY DIDN'T THEY
2.4
   REALLOCATE THAT?"
```

AND THE ANSWER TO THAT IS: THE PLAINTIFFS HAVE

- 1 | FORSAKEN THAT ARGUMENT LIKELY BECAUSE OF THE -- THE POTENTIAL 2 | CONFLICTS WITHIN THE CLASS.
- 3 SO, INSTEAD, THE PLAINTIFFS ARGUE THIS ENTIRE GROUP 4 THING.
- NOW, IT MAY BE A STRETCH, AND IT MAY STRAIN THE

 CREDULITY OF COUNSEL AND THE JURY TO ARGUE THAT -- WHAT

 MR. LECLAIR SAID, THAT THE DEFENDANTS SHOULD HAVE GONE TO EA

 AND SAID:
- 9 "HERE, TAKE THIS ENTIRE GROUP OF RETIRED

 10 PLAYERS, ALL 2,000. FORGET ABOUT THE HALL OF FAME. JUST TAKE

 11 THESE RETIRED PLAYERS AS A GROUP."

- BUT THAT IS THE ARGUMENT THAT MR. LECLAIR AND HIS
 TEAM IS MAKING. AND THE IMPRESSION HAVING BEEN LEFT BY THE
 DEFENSE THAT THE -- MR. ALLEN AND HIS TEAM WERE ALWAYS LOOKING
 OUT FOR THE BEST INTERESTS OF RETIRED MEMBERS. THE SEQUENCE OF
 E-MAILS DOES HAVE SOME PROBATIVE VALUE TO THE CONTRARY AND CAN
 BE READ TO MEAN THAT THE CLASS WAS SOLD OUT IN ORDER TO MAKE EA
 HAPPY, AND THAT EA OWES A DEAL BACK TO -- OWES ONE BACK TO THE
 DEFENDANTS.
- THAT'S ONE INTERPRETATION. MAYBE THERE IS AN INNOCENT INTERPRETATION.
- NOW, AT THE OUTSET I TRIED TO KEEP ALL OF THIS OUT OF EVIDENCE BECAUSE I THOUGHT THE MAIN ISSUES OUGHT TO BE THE GLA.

 AND I WARNED MR. KESSLER THAT THERE WAS A 50/50 CHANCE THAT HE WAS GOING TO INJECT THIS BACK INTO THE CASE, AND IN MY JUDGMENT

- L HE HAS DONE SO.
- 2 SO I'M GOING TO ALLOW THIS LINE OF QUESTIONS, THIS
- 3 | LINE OF E-MAILS.
- 4 | I WANT TO TURN NOW TO THE ISSUE OF THE EVIDENTIARY
- 5 BASIS. IT'S TRUE THAT MR. CLAY WALKER IN 521 WAS NO LONGER
- 6 WITH THE DEFENDANTS WHEN HE WROTE THIS CRITICAL E-MAIL. BUT
- 7 | HERE'S THE INTERESTING THING: MR. JOE NAHRA, WHO IS THE
- 8 | CORPORATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE DEFENDANT HERE, FEBRUARY 22,
- 9 2007, SENT AN E-MAIL TO HIM AND SAID, QUOTE:
- 10 | "CAN YOU PLEASE PUT YOUR PI HAT BACK ON AND
- 11 PROVIDE SOME INSIGHT HERE?" CLOSED QUOTE.
- 12 AND THEN, IN DIRECT RESPONSE TO THAT, THE CRITICAL
- 13 | E-MAIL WAS WRITTEN FROM MR. CLAY WALKER, WEARING HIS HAT AGAIN
- 14 AS THE PI PERSON.
- 15 NOW, FROM ANY PRACTICAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE RULES OF
- 16 EVIDENCE THIS WAS AN INVITED STATEMENT. IT WAS ONE THAT WAS
- 17 | INTENDED TO BE RELIED UPON BY MR. NAHRA. HE WOULDN'T HAVE --
- 18 AT LEAST SOMEBODY COULD CONCLUDE REASONABLY, THAT MR. NAHRA
- 19 WOULD NOT HAVE ASKED MR. CLAY WALKER TO GIVE THIS SUMMARY OF
- 20 WHAT HAD HAPPENED UNLESS HE WAS INTENDING TO RELY UPON IT.
- 21 | SO RIGHT OFF THE BAT THERE IS DEFINITE INDICIA OF
- 22 | RELIABILITY TO THIS E-MAIL.
- 23 AND THEN, IN FURTHER RELIANCE ON IT MR. JOE NAHRA
- 24 | SENDS IT TO MR. ANDY FEFFER. IN FACT, YOU CAN TELL FROM THE
- 25 | SEQUENCE HERE HE SENDS IT SEVERAL MONTHS LATER, INDICATING THAT

HE TOOK THE TROUBLE AND TIME TO GO BACK AFTER THE FACT, SIX

MONTHS LATER, AND SEND IT TO SOMEBODY ELSE IN THE COMPANY,

WHICH WOULD BE A FURTHER INDICATION THAT IT WAS WORTHY OF

2.0

RELIANCE.

THEN, YOU COME TO THE RECIPIENT, MR. FEFFER, IN EXHIBIT 522. WHILE HE DOESN'T REFER TO THAT E-MAIL, A FEW HOURS LATER, AFTER HE SAYS THAT HE HAS TALKED WITH CLAY AND HE'S ALSO TALKED TO -- HE COMES VERY CLOSE TO PARROTING THE WORDS OF THE E-MAIL TO INDICATE THAT IT HAS BEEN ADOPTED, AND IT HAS BEEN RELIED UPON, SO THAT THE COURT IS GOING TO FIND THAT UNDER THREE RULES OF EVIDENCE THIS IS ADMISSIBLE: THE TWO THAT WERE CITED BY MR. LECLAIR, AND, FINALLY, UNDER RULE 807, THE RESIDUAL EXCEPTION.

EVEN IF THIS IS NOT OTHERWISE ADMISSIBLE, WHICH I

THINK IT IS ADMISSIBLE, THE STATEMENT IS OFFERED ON A MATERIAL

FACT. THE COURT FINDS FURTHER IT IS MORE PROBATIVE ON THE

POINT FOR WHICH IT IS OFFERED THAN ANY OTHER EVIDENCE WHICH THE

PROPONENT CAN PROCURE THE REASONABLE EFFORTS AND THE GENERAL

PURPOSES OF THESE RULES AND THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE WILL BE

SERVED BY THE ADMISSION OF THE STATEMENT IN EVIDENCE.

FURTHER, I WANT TO SAY THIS WAS MARKED AS AN EXHIBIT
BEFORE THE TRIAL, AND THE DEFENSE HAS HAD A FAIR OPPORTUNITY TO
MEET THE PARTICULARS OF IT, INCLUDING WHO THEIR DECLARANT IS.

SO THE COURT IS GOING TO ALLOW THE LINE OF QUESTIONS AND ALLOW THE PLAINTIFFS TO CALL MR. NAHRA TO GO THROUGH THESE

```
E-MAILS. AND THE OBJECTIONS THERETO ARE OVERRULED, ASSUMING --
 2
   THIS IS WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO FOUNDATIONAL -- YOU'RE GOING TO
 3
   HAVE TO LAY THE FOUNDATION, BUT I'M FAIRLY CONFIDENT MR. NAHRA
 4
   WILL ADMIT HE RECEIVED AND SENT THE E-MAILS IN QUESTION. BUT
 5
   LET'S SEE WHAT HE SAYS WHENEVER HE IS CALLED AS A WITNESS.
 6
             SO THAT'S THE RULING. ALL RIGHT.
 7
             ARE WE READY TO CALL IN OUR JURY NOW?
             MR. HUMMEL: YES, YOUR HONOR.
 8
 9
             MR. PARCHER: YES, YOUR HONOR.
             MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR.
10
             THE COURT: YES.
11
             MR. KESSLER: COULD I JUST ASK, THEN, COULD WE HAVE
12
   AN INSTRUCTION AT THE TIME THIS IS COVERED THAT THERE IS NO
13
   CLAIM FOR ANY DAMAGES TO THE CLASS FROM THIS HALL OF FAME
14
15
   AGREEMENT?
             THE COURT: I THINK THAT'S FAIR. I THINK I SHOULD
16
17
   SAY THAT.
18
             MR. KESSLER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
             THE COURT: FROM THE -- NO, THAT'S NOT QUITE. THERE
19
   IS NO CLAIM TO REDISTRIBUTE THE AD HOC -- THE MONEY PAID UNDER
2.0
   THAT AGREEMENT.
21
22
             MR. KESSLER: ALL RIGHT.
23
             THE COURT: REMIND ME I AGREE THAT OUGHT TO BE GIVEN.
24
             MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, I THINK THERE ALSO HAS TO
25
   BE, IF I MAY, THAT THERE WAS NO CLAIM THAT IT WAS WRONG TO USE
```

- AD HOC INSTEAD OF DOING THIS UNDER THE GROUP LICENSE. 2 THE COURT: I'M NOT SURE THAT'S BEEN AGREED TO. HAS 3 THAT BEEN AGREED TO? 4 MR. LECLAIR: NO, YOUR HONOR. 5 THE COURT: WELL, I'M NOT GOING TO GO THAT FAR. I'M 6 GOING TO READ WHAT THE -- I'M GOING TO READ THE STIPULATION 7 THAT YOU -- THAT YOU QUOTED IN YOUR LETTER. MR. KESSLER: THANK YOU. THAT'S FINE, YOUR HONOR. 8 9 I WOULD NOTE, JUST FOR THE RECORD, IF PLAINTIFF IS MAINTAINING A CLAIM THAT IT WAS WRONG TO USE THE AD HOCS 10 INSTEAD OF THE GLA FOR THOSE DEALS, WE BELIEVE THAT THE CLASS 11 WAS IMPROPERLY CERTIFIED, AND WE'RE GOING TO RENEW THAT MOTION 12 13 IF THEY PROCEED WITH THAT IN THIS CASE. I'M JUST PUTTING PLAINTIFFS ON NOTICE. 14 15 BECAUSE WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE SEEKING THE MONEY
 - BECAUSE WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE SEEKING THE MONEY
 FROM MR. ADDERLEY OR NOT, IF THEY'RE CLAIMING IT WAS WRONGFUL
 FOR MR. ADDERLEY TO HAVE ENTERED INTO THAT AGREEMENT AS AN AD
 HOC, INSTEAD OF UNDER THE GLA, THAT RERAISES THE CLASS
 CERTIFICATION ISSUE.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: FINE. EVERYONE IS ON NOTICE.

I FULLY EXPECT YOU WHENEVER MR. ADDERLEY TESTIFIES TO BRING OUT THE FACT THAT HE GOT MONEY UNDER THE HALL OF FAME AGREEMENT, AND SAY:

"MR. ADDERLEY, ARE YOU TRYING TO SAY THAT YOU WANT TO GIVE THAT MONEY UP AND HAVE IT REDISTRIBUTED TO THE

```
PEOPLE WHO WERE SITTING ON THE BENCH AND NEVER PLAYED IN ANY
 2
   GAME?"
 3
             ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN HAVE PERFECT LATITUDE TO ASK
 4
   THOSE QUESTIONS.
 5
             MR. KESSLER: IN LIGHT OF YOUR HONOR'S RULING, I
 6
   WOULD LIKELY COVER THAT SUBJECT.
 7
              THE COURT: VERY WELL. NOW, LET'S BRING IN OUR JURY.
              (RECESS TAKEN FROM 8:30 TO 8:38 A.M.)
 8
 9
              (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT,
             IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)
10
              THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. EVERYBODY WELCOME BACK. I
11
   APOLOGIZE FOR VIOLATING MY PROMISE TO YOU THAT WE WOULD ALWAYS
12
13
   START BY 8 O'CLOCK.
             SOMETIMES THE LAWYERS BRING UP A POINT OF -- HERE,
14
15
   HAVE A SEAT -- THAT MAKES IT NECESSARY FOR ME TO REGULATE WHAT
   COMES INTO EVIDENCE AND SO FORTH. SO THAT'S WHY WE WERE
16
17
   WORKING IN HERE.
             ALL RIGHT. NOW, YOU WILL REMEMBER THAT WE WERE
18
   READING IN THE DEPOSITION OF SOMEONE NAMED EYRICH, E-Y-R-I-C-H.
19
             NOW, I BET SOME OF YOU HAVE PROBABLY FORGOTTEN WHO HE
2.0
   IS AND WHAT HIS CONNECTION IS TO THE CASE. SO BEFORE WE GET
21
   STARTED WITH THE READING, EXPLAIN -- WHAT'S YOUR NAME AGAIN?
22
23
             MR. CHARHON: CHARHON.
24
             THE COURT: CHARHON?
```

MR. CHARHON: YES.

```
1
              THE COURT: EXPLAIN TO THE JURY, IN 30 SECONDS OR
   LESS, WITHOUT ARGUMENT, WHAT IS THIS GUYS'S CONNECTION TO THE
 2
 3
   CASE AND WHY ARE WE HEARING THIS?
 4
             MR. CHARHON: OKAY. GLENN EYRICH IS AN OUTSIDE
 5
   AUDITOR FOR THE DEFENDANTS, THAT THEY DESIGNATED AS THE PERSON
 6
   MOST KNOWLEDGABLE ABOUT THE FLOW OF LICENSING REVENUES
 7
   GENERATED UNDER THEIR THIRD-PARTY LICENSING AGREEMENTS.
             HE'S TESTIFIED ABOUT THE ALLOCATION OF THE GLR POOL,
 8
   AND HE'S GOING TO TESTIFY HOW THOSE REVENUES ARE DISTRIBUTED TO
   ACTIVE PLAYERS EQUALLY.
10
11
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THAT'S GOOD.
             ANYTHING THE OTHER SIDE WANTS TO SAY, ADD OR SUBTRACT
12
1.3
   FROM THAT?
             MR. KESSLER: YES. MR. EYRICH WILL TESTIFY THAT ALL
14
15
   OF THE MONEY IN THE GLR POOL WAS GENERATED 100 PERCENT FROM
   ACTIVE PLAYER LICENSING AND NOT ONE PENNY CAME FROM RETIRED
16
17
   PLAYER LICENSING.
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, IF YOU WANT TO ADD 15
18
   SECONDS OF ARGUMENT OF A EQUIVALENT CHARACTER YOU CAN RESPOND,
19
   BECAUSE MR. KESSLER WAS A BIT ARGUMENTATIVE THERE.
2.0
21
             MR. CHARHON: THE ONLY OTHER THING I'LL ADD IS THAT
   I'M NOT SURE THAT MR. EYRICH CHARACTERIZES ONE WAY OR ANOTHER
22
23
   WHAT'S IN THE GLR POOL. HE ALSO TESTIFIES ABOUT THE $8 MILLION
24
   REALLOCATION THAT CAME DIRECTLY OUT OF THE GLR POOL.
```

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, WHAT THE LAWYERS SAY IS

NOT EVIDENCE. I'VE JUST ASKED THEM TO DO THIS TO GET YOU IN 2 THE RIGHT FRAME OF MIND SO THAT YOU WILL BE ABLE TO PICK 3 SOMETHING OF VALUE OUT OF THIS DEPOSITION. 4 ALL RIGHT. YOU'VE GOT ABOUT 30 MORE MINUTES TO GO? 5 MR. CHARHON: HOPEFULLY LESS. 6 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GO RIGHT AHEAD. 7 GLENN EYRICH, CALLED AS A WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS HEREIN, TESTIFIED VIA 8 DEPOSITION READ IN OPEN COURT IN THE PRESENCE AND HEARING OF 10 THE JURY AS-FOLLOWS: 11 (TRANSCRIPT OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY READ BY MR. 12 CHARHON AND MR. GARZA AS FOLLOWS:) 13 EXAMINATION AND DOES THIS INCLUDE ROYALTIES THAT WERE PAID TO OR 14 0. 15 PAYMENTS THAT WERE MADE TO RETIRED PLAYERS? IT INCLUDES BOTH ACTIVE AND RETIRED. 16 17 Q. DOES IT INCLUDE PAYMENTS THAT WERE MADE PURSUANT TO GROUP LICENSING AUTHORIZATIONS, SUCH AS EXHIBIT 19, THE ONE THAT 18 19 MR. ADDERLEY SIGNED? I DON'T KNOW SPECIFICALLY IF THAT WAS INCLUDED IN THIS 2.0 ACCOUNT, BUT THAT IS THE ACCOUNT THAT HAS ALL OF THE ROYALTIES 21 EARNED BY BOTH ACTIVE AND RETIRED PLAYERS. 22 23 Q. SO WITH RESPECT TO ACTIVE PLAYERS, LET'S JUST FOCUS ON 24 THEM FIRST. THEY GOT AN EQUAL SHARE; IS THAT CORRECT?

25

Α.

CORRECT.

- 1 Q. NOW, FOCUSING ON RETIRED PLAYERS, DO RETIRED PLAYERS GET
- 2 AN EQUAL SHARE ROYALTY?
- 3 | A. RETIRED PLAYERS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE EQUAL SHARE
- 4 ROYALTY POOL.
- 5 Q. THERE IS AN ACTIVE PLAYER EQUAL SHARE ROYALTY POOL.
- 6 YOU'VE TESTIFIED TO THAT.
- 7 A. CORRECT.
- 8 Q. AND WITH RESPECT TO RETIRED PLAYERS EQUAL SHARE POOL, YOU
- 9 DON'T KNOW?
- 10 A. CORRECT.
- 11 Q. WELL, YOU KNOW THAT THEY GET PAYMENTS. YOU KNOW THE
- 12 RETIRED PLAYERS GET PAYMENTS, RIGHT?
- 13 A. CORRECT.
- 14 Q. AND YOU KNOW THAT THEY DON'T GET IT FROM THE EQUAL SHARE
- 15 | POOL, RIGHT?
- 16 A. CORRECT.
- 17 Q. NOW, IN THE PLAYER AND ROYALTY APPEARANCES OF \$54 MILLION
- 18 ON THE SAME PAGE, 6033, HOW DID YOU AUDIT TEST THE
- 19 | APPROPRIATENESS OF THAT AMOUNT, IF IT DID?
- 20 | A. WE REVIEW THE CALCULATION OF THE EQUAL SHARE POOL, WHICH
- 21 IS A LARGE COMPONENT OF THAT.
- 22 Q. AND DO YOU COMPARE IT TO THE REVENUE THAT CAME IN, THE
- 23 | 54 -- EXCUSE ME, THE 67, APPROXIMATELY, AND THE 29 MILLION FROM
- 24 | LICENSING AND PREMIUM PLAYER APPEARANCES, DO YOU COMPARE THOSE
- 25 EXPENSES TO THE REVENUE THAT CAME IN FOR APPROPRIATENESS?

- $1 | \mathbf{A}. \quad \text{YES}.$
- 2 Q. AND HOW DO YOU DO THAT?
- 3 | A. THERE'S A RECONCILIATION OF THE PREMIUM AND PLAYER
- 4 | APPEARANCES FLOWING INTO THE PLAYER APPEARANCES AND PLAYER
- 5 | EXPENSE, AS YOU SEE THERE. AND THERE'S AN ALLOCATION OF THE
- 6 ACTIVE PLAYER EQUAL SHARE POOL THAT WE REVIEW.
- 7 Q. ARE NFLPA AND PI RELATED PARTIES?
- 8 | **A.** YES.
- 9 Q. AND WHY ARE RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS THE SUBJECT OF THE
- 10 | FOOTNOTE? WHY DID YOU SEE FIT TO MAKE IT THE SUBJECT OF A
- 11 | FOOTNOTE?
- 12 A. IT'S A TECHNICAL ACCOUNTING REQUIREMENT TO DISCLOSE
- 13 | SIGNIFICANT RELATED-PARTY TRANSACTIONS.
- 14 Q. AND WITH RESPECT TO, FOR EXAMPLE, PLAYERS' DUES, ACTIVE
- 15 | PLAYERS' DUES, ARE THOSE USED TO FINANCE ANY PARTICULAR THING,
- 16 OR DO THEY ALSO JUST GO INTO THE GENERAL POOL?
- 17 | A. THEY JUST GO INTO THE GENERAL POOL.
- 18 Q. WITH RESPECT TO RETIRED PLAYERS' DUES, DO THEY FINANCE ANY
- 19 | PARTICULAR THING, OR DO THEY JUST GO INTO THE GENERAL POOL OF
- 20 || REVENUES?
- 21 A. THEY ALSO GO INTO THE GENERAL POOL OF REVENUES.
- 22 | Q. WELL, THE REVENUES COME FROM THE GENERAL POOL, RIGHT?
- 23 | A. THE REVENUES COME FROM THE GENERAL POOL, THE NET ASSETS OF
- 24 | THE COMPANY ARE FROM THE GENERAL POOL THAT IS GENERATED. BUT
- 25 | SPECIFICALLY EXPENSES RELATING TO ANY ONE INDIVIDUAL REVENUE

- $1 \parallel$ ITEM, THERE IS NO TIE.
- 2 Q. BUT THAT GENERAL POOL ALSO INCLUDES THE LICENSING
- 3 | REVENUES, DOESN'T IT, SIR?
- 4 A. CORRECT.
- 5 Q. DIRECTING YOUR ATTENTION TO NOTE 11, REFERS TO AN
- 6 | \$8 MILLION REALLOCATION FROM PLAYERS INC TO THE NFLPA. DO YOU
- 7 | SEE THAT?
- 8 **A.** YES.
- 9 Q. AND CAN YOU JUST DESCRIBE TO US, AS BEST YOU CAN, WHAT
- 10 | THAT IS, WHAT THAT WAS?
- 11 | A. THE \$8 MILLION WAS A REALLOCATION BASED ON CHANGING MARKET
- 12 CONDITIONS IN THE OVERALL LICENSING OPERATION FOR PLAYERS INC.
- 13 AND THE NFLPA.
- 14 Q. AND WAS THAT REFLECTED IN AN AGREEMENT?
- 15 | A. YES.
- 16 Q. AND HAVE YOU SEEN THE AGREEMENT?
- 17 **A.** YES.
- 18 Q. WHEN IT SAYS TO REFLECT CHANGED MARKET CONDITIONS, WHAT
- 19 WERE THOSE CHANGED MARKET CONDITIONS, SIR?
- 20 A. THE BASIS FOR THE \$8 MILLION WAS INCREASE OVER TIME IN THE
- 21 LOGO VALUE OF THE NFLPA AND PLAYERS INC.
- 22 | Q. SO IF I'M GETTING THIS CORRECTLY, THE INCREASE IN THE --
- 23 | THE CHANGE IN MARKET CONDITIONS WAS AN INCREASE IN THE LOGO
- 24 | VALUE OF THE LOGO OF BOTH PLAYERS INC AND THE NFLPA?
- 25 A. CORRECT.

- 1 Q. HOW DID THE REALLOCATION WORK?
- 2 A. THE REALLOCATION WAS AN AMOUNT THAT WAS DEDUCTED FROM THE
- 3 | EQUAL SHARE POOL, ALLOCATED TO THE NFLPA AND PLAYERS INC.
- 4 | Q. DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT THE EFFECT OF EXHIBIT 91 IS?
- $5 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. YES.
- 6 Q. PLEASE TELL ME.
- 7 | A. THE CHANGE IN MARKET CONDITIONS WAS DESIGNATED THAT THE
- 8 LOGO VALUE OF THE NFLPA AND PLAYERS INC WAS \$8 MILLION. THAT
- 9 WAS DETERMINED TO BE REALLOCATED FROM THE EQUAL SHARE POOL TO
- 10 BOTH NFLPA AND PLAYERS INC.
- 11 Q. SO THE NFLPA -- OF THE \$8 MILLION, HOW MUCH OF IT WENT TO
- 12 | THE NFLPA?
- 13 **A.** 60 PERCENT.
- 14 Q. AND HOW MUCH OF IT WENT TO PI?
- 15 **A.** 40 PERCENT.
- 16 Q. AND 100 PERCENT OF IT WAS TAKEN FROM THE EQUAL SHARE POOL
- 17 WHICH WENT TO ACTIVE PLAYERS; IS THAT CORRECT?
- 18 A. CORRECT.
- 19 O. I UNDERSTAND THAT. BUT DID YOU DO ANYTHING AS A RESULT OF
- 20 THE FACT THAT BOTH OF THE SIGNATORIES OF THIS AGREEMENT ARE
- 21 HIGH OFFICERS OF BOTH ORGANIZATIONS THAT BENEFIT FROM THIS
- 22 | AGREEMENT?
- 23 | A. PLAYERS INC MANAGEMENT, ALONG WITH LEGAL COUNSEL,
- 24 | SUPPORTED -- WE REQUESTED SUPPORT FOR AN UNDERSTANDING OF THIS
- 25 | REALLOCATION OF \$8 MILLION.

- 1 Q. AND WHAT SUPPORT DID YOU RECEIVE, IF ANY?
- 2 A. THE PRIMARY SUPPORT FOR THAT \$8 MILLION WAS A PEER REVIEW
- 3 | OF ANOTHER SPORTS ORGANIZATION'S LOGO USE REVENUE.
- 4 | Q. AND WHO CONDUCTED THAT PEER REVIEW?
- 5 A. LEGAL COUNSEL.
- 6 Q. WAS THIS EVALUATION -- WHAT WAS THE OTHER SPORTS
- 7 | ORGANIZATION?
- 8 A. THE NBA PLAYERS ASSOCIATION.
- 9 | Q. WHAT I'M GETTING AT, I'M NOT ASKING YOU ABOUT ANY LEGAL
- 10 | EVALUATION THAT WAS DONE. THIS WAS A BUSINESS EVALUATION. IT
- 11 WAS ABOUT THE VALUE OF A LOGO; IS THAT CORRECT?
- 12 A. CORRECT.
- 13 | Q. WHO MADE THE EVALUATION; WHO MADE THE EVALUATION THAT THE
- 14 LOGO, THE VALUE OF THE LOGO WENT UP \$8 MILLION?
- 15 | A. THERE WAS NO FORMAL EVALUATION PERFORMED.
- 16 Q. AND NOW, I JUST HAVE TO UNDERSTAND, WAS THERE ANY INFORMAL
- 17 | EVALUATION PERFORMED?
- 18 | A. THERE WAS AN EVALUATION PERFORMED AS FAR AS A REVIEW OF
- 19 | PEER LOGO VALUE.
- 20 Q. WHO MADE THAT REVIEW?
- 21 A. PLAYERS INC MANAGEMENT IN CONSULTATION WITH LEGAL COUNSEL.
- 22 | Q. AND YOU WERE THE OUTSIDE CONSULTANT AT THE TIME?
- 23 A. CORRECT.
- 24 $\| \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet} \|$ AND IS IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT YOU BASED YOUR AUDIT OF THIS
- 25 PARTICULAR TRANSACTION ON WHAT YOU WERE TOLD BY MANAGEMENT OF

- 1 | THE NFLPA?
- 2 A. WE ALSO WERE AWARE OF WHAT THE NBA PLAYERS ASSOCIATION WAS
- 3 | RECEIVING AS PART OF THEIR LOGO VALUE.
- 4 Q. HOW DID YOU BECOME AWARE OF THAT?
- 5 | A. THAT INFORMATION WAS DISCLOSED IN THEIR LM-2, AND ALSO IN
- 6 THEIR FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.
- 7 | Q. MY QUESTION IS: DID YOU RELY IN ANY WAY ON WHAT
- 8 | MANAGEMENT IN THE NFLPA TOLD YOU IN COMING TO THE ASSESSMENT
- 9 | THAT THIS WAS AN APPROPRIATE TRANSACTION?
- 10 | A. WE WOULD TAKE THE ADVICE OR UNDERSTANDING OF OUR CLIENTS
- 11 | IN EVALUATING THE PROPRIETY OF IT, OF THE EVALUATION OF THE
- 12 | \$8 MILLION.
- 13 Q. SO IT DID PLAY A ROLE?
- 14 | A. YES.
- 15 | O. BUT YOU CAN'T RECALL WHAT THAT ROLE IS RIGHT NOW?
- 16 **A.** NOT EXACTLY, NO.
- 17 Q. ISN'T IT A FACT THAT YOU BASED YOUR ASSESSMENT OF THE
- 18 | PROPRIETARY OF THIS TRANSACTION IN PART ON WHAT MANAGEMENT TOLD
- 19 | YOU?
- 20 | A. YES.
- 21 Q. WAS THERE ANYONE ELSE AT MANAGEMENT BESIDES MR. ALLEN AND
- 22 MS. DOUGLAS ON WHOM YOU SPOKE ON THE SUBJECT?
- 23 **A.** NOT THAT I RECALL.
- 24 Q. AND IT'S CORRECT TO SAY THERE WAS NO INDEPENDENT APPRAISAL
- 25 | FIRM THAT WAS RETAINED TO DETERMINE THE ARM'S LENGTH VALUE OF

- 1 | THIS TRANSACTION?
- 2 A. THAT'S CORRECT.
- 3 | Q. HAVE YOU EVER SEEN THIS AGREEMENT, SIR?
- 4 | A. YES.
- 5 Q. AND TELL US WHAT IT IS, PLEASE.
- 6 A. IT'S THE ORIGINAL LICENSE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE NFLPA AND
- 7 | PLAYERS INC.
- 8 | Q. AND IN WHAT CONTEXT DID YOU -- HAVE YOU SEEN THIS?
- 9 | A. THIS HAS BEEN PART OF OUR AUDIT PERMANENT FILE IN
- 10 | PERFORMING OUR AUDIT.
- 11 Q. AND WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE, IF ANY, OF THE DOCUMENT
- 12 | BEING IN THAT FILE?
- 13 A. THIS SUPPORTS THE LICENSE AMOUNT PAID TO NFLPA, RECEIVED
- 14 BY NFLPA. AND THE AMOUNT OF ROYALTIES PAID TO THE PLAYERS.
- 15 | Q. IN THE AGREEMENT WE SAW EARLIER, THE \$8 MILLION
- 16 REALLOCATION, THERE WAS NO INDEPENDENT THIRD-PARTY APPRAISAL
- 17 | FIRM, WAS THERE?
- 18 **A.** NO.
- 19 | O. AND DO YOU BELIEVE THAT -- I THINK YOU'VE TESTIFIED THAT
- 20 | SUCH AN INDEPENDENT APPRAISAL MAKES THE RESULT MORE RELIABLE,
- 21 DOES IT NOT?
- 22 A. CORRECT.
- 23 Q. HAVE YOU EVER SEEN THIS DOCUMENT, SIR?
- 24 | A. YES.
- 25 Q. CAN YOU TELL US WHAT IT IS, PLEASE?

- 1 A. IT'S THE INITIAL DUFF & PHELPS VALUATION OF THE LICENSING
- 2 | OPERATIONS.
- 3 | Q. AND DID YOU SEE IT ON OR AROUND THE TIME OF ITS DATE,
- 4 | JANUARY 1995?
- $5 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. YES.
- $6 \parallel \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}$ AND NOTHING LIKE THIS WAS DONE FOR THE \$8 MILLION
- 7 || REALLOCATION THAT WE'VE SEEN -- THAT WE TALKED ABOUT EARLIER;
- 8 | ISN'T THAT RIGHT, SIR?
- 9 | A. CORRECT.
- 10 | Q. DO YOU KNOW HOW \$8 MILLION WAS ARRIVED AT AS OPPOSED TO
- 11 | 5 MILLION, 25 MILLION, OR ANOTHER NUMBER?
- 12 **A.** NO, I DON'T.
- 13 | Q. AND IS IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT YOU AGREED WITH THE
- 14 ASSESSMENT THAT THE VALUE OF THE ASSET WENT UP BY \$8 MILLION?
- 15 | A. IN EVALUATING THE \$8 MILLION TRANSACTION, WE DETERMINED
- 16 THAT IT WAS REASONABLE TO ASSESS THAT THE LOGO VALUE WAS
- 17 | \$8 MILLION.
- 18 Q. ASIDE FROM THAT, THAT INCREASED VALUE OF \$8 MILLION
- 19 DOESN'T APPEAR ANYWHERE?
- 20 A. RIGHT. IT'S INCLUDED IN THE LICENSING REVENUE NUMBERS,
- 21 UNDER THE SPECIFIC ALLOCATION TO THE ENTITIES.
- 22 | Q. SO THERE WAS A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF LICENSING REVENUE, WHAT
- 23 | DID WE SAY, \$67 MILLION. THE LICENSING REVENUE WAS
- 24 | APPROXIMATELY \$67 MILLION; IS THAT CORRECT, LOOKING AT 6033
- 25 | AGAIN?

- 1 A. CORRECT.
- 2 $||\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}||$ SO WHAT THIS DEAL DID WAS SAY FROM THAT \$67 MILLION WE'RE
- 3 GOING TO TAKE \$8 MILLION THAT WE DIDN'T TAKE BEFORE FROM THE
- 4 | EQUAL SHARE ROYALTY POOL AND WE'RE GOING TO PUT THAT
- 5 | \$8 MILLION, WE'RE GOING TO ALLOCATE THAT TO THE NFLPA AND PI?
- 6 **A.** CORRECT.
- 7 Q. THAT'S WHAT HAPPENED?
- 8 A. CORRECT.
- 9 | Q. BUT THERE IS NOWHERE -- THERE IS NO ADDITIONAL \$8 MILLION.
- 10 | THE 67 MILLION, IF IT WOULD HAVE BEEN THE SAME THE YEAR BEFORE,
- 11 | IT WOULD JUST HAVE BEEN ALLOCATED AND THAT \$8 MILLION WOULD
- 12 HAVE STAYED IN THERE?
- 13 A. CORRECT.
- 14 Q. AND THIS YEAR THE \$8 MILLION WAS TAKEN OUT?
- 15 A. CORRECT.
- 16 Q. DO YOU RECOGNIZE THIS DOCUMENT?
- 17 **A.** YES.
- 18 Q. CAN YOU TELL US WHAT IT IS?
- 19 | A. IT'S THE LICENSE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE NFLPA AND PLAYERS
- 20 | INC.
- 21 Q. DATED MARCH 1ST, 2000?
- 22 A. CORRECT.
- 23 | Q. HOW DID YOU MAKE A DETERMINATION, AS THE AUDITOR, OF THE
- 24 | PROPRIETY OF THE TERMS OF EXHIBIT 95 WITHOUT AN INDEPENDENT
- 25 EVALUATION SUCH AS EXHIBIT 93?

- 1 A. MY VIEW, THE AGREEMENT THAT YOU SEE HERE, DATED MARCH 1ST,
- 2 2000, WAS AN AGREEMENT THAT, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DUFF &
- 3 | PHELPS VALUATION, CONTINUES THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS OF THE
- 4 | EQUAL SHARE POOL SPECIFICALLY AS IT HAS BEEN SINCE 1994,
- 5 GENERALLY.
- 6 Q. SO IS WHAT YOU'RE SAYING THAT YOU BELIEVE THAT THE WORK OF
- 7 | DUFF & PHELPS -- THE WORK THAT DUFF & PHELPS DID IN JANUARY OF
- 8 | 1995 COVERS THIS DOCUMENT DATED A LITTLE OVER FIVE YEARS LATER?
- 9 | A. CORRECT.
- 10 | Q. SO YOU SAID TO MY OUESTION A COUPLE OF OUESTIONS AGO THAT
- 11 YOU THOUGHT THAT -- THAT YOU THOUGHT THAT YOU COULD MAKE A
- 12 DETERMINATION ON THE PROPRIETY OF THE EXHIBIT 95, MARCH 2000
- 13 AGREEMENT, BASED ON WHAT DUFF & PHELPS HAD DONE IN 1995. WAS
- 14 THERE ANY OTHER REASON THAT YOU THOUGHT THAT YOU COULD MAKE AN
- 15 ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPRIETY OF EXHIBIT 95?
- 16 A. THE DUFF & PHELPS VALUATION WAS STILL THE BASIS FOR THE
- 17 | ALLOCATION OF FUNDS AND THE REASONABLENESS OF IT THAT WE RELIED
- 18 ON INTO THIS AGREEMENT.
- 19 O. CAN YOU IDENTIFY FOR US 1307 THROUGH WHATEVER?
- 20 A. THE TITLE REFERS TO THE ROYALTY ELIGIBILITY FOR 2002,
- 21 2003, 2004, 2005 AND 2006 SEASON.
- 22 Q. UNDER 1310, IT'S CORRECT TO SAY THAT THE RETIRED PLAYERS
- 23 DO NOT MEET THE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT?
- 24 A. THAT IS CORRECT.
- 25 Q. NOW, DIRECTING YOUR ATTENTION BACK TO EXHIBIT 95,

- 1 | PARAGRAPH 4(B). YOU'VE TESTIFIED ALREADY THAT THE DUFF &
- 2 PHELPS REPORT, EXHIBIT 93, DID NOT MAKE ANY REFERENCE TO
- 3 | RETIRED PLAYERS?
- 4 A. CORRECT.
- 5 | Q. SO NOW MY QUESTION IS HOW, IF AT ALL, DID YOU ASSESS THE
- 6 | PROPRIETY OF THIS, THE EXCLUSION OF RETIRED PLAYERS FROM THE
- 7 | ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS IN PARAGRAPH 4(B) OF EXHIBIT 95?
- 8 | A. I DON'T RECALL ASSESSING THE IMPACT ON EXCLUDING THE
- 9 RETIRED PLAYERS FROM THE PROGRAM.
- 10 Q. AND DO YOU KNOW WHETHER ANYONE FROM THE RETIRED PLAYERS,
- 11 WHETHER THERE WAS ANY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE RETIRED PLAYERS
- 12 THAT HAD A SAY IN THIS AGREEMENT?
- 13 | A. I HAVE NO KNOWLEDGE OF THAT.
- 14 | O. LET'S MOVE BACK TO THE 2006 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS WHICH ARE
- 15 EXHIBIT 85. FOOTNOTE 11. BEFORE MOVING TO THE SPECIFICS OF
- 16 NOTE 11, LET ME ASK YOU WHETHER THIS \$8 MILLION REALLOCATION --
- 17 | IF I ASKED YOU THIS BEFORE, I APOLOGIZE. WHETHER THIS
- 18 | \$8 MILLION REALLOCATION WAS A ONE-TIME ONLY, OR DID IT HAPPEN
- 19 | EVERY YEAR?
- 20 A. THE \$8 MILLION REALLOCATION OCCURRED THE YEAR ENDED
- 21 | FEBRUARY 28, 2006, AND ALSO FEBRUARY 28TH, 2007.
- 22 | Q. AND IS IT YOUR UNDERSTANDING IT'S GOING TO OCCUR IN 2008?
- 23 | A. I DON'T KNOW THAT RIGHT NOW.
- 24 || Q. NOW, WHEN IT OCCURRED IN 2007, WAS IT JUST \$8 MILLION OFF
- 25 | THE TOP, OR ARE WE TALKING NOW ABOUT 16 MILLION? 8 MILLION FOR

- 1 | 2006 PLUS 8 MILLION FOR 2007?
- 2 A. IT WAS 8 MILLION INDIVIDUALLY.
- 3 $\|\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}\|$ SO FOR 2006, 8 MILLION CAME OUT OF THE GROSS LICENSING
- 4 | REVENUES AND WAS REALLOCATED TO NFLPA 60 PERCENT AND PI
- 5 | 40 PERCENT?
- 6 A. CORRECT.
- 7 Q. AND IN 2007 THE SAME THING HAPPENED?
- 8 A. CORRECT.
- 9 Q. TAKING A LOOK AGAIN AT EXHIBIT 95, WHICH IS THE MARCH 2000
- 10 AGREEMENT. AND ON PAGE 135 WE HAVE THE DEFINITION OF GROSS
- 11 | LICENSING REVENUES. IS THAT THE DEFINITION THAT YOU USED FOR
- 12 GROSS LICENSING REVENUES IN YOUR WORK, IN YOUR WORK FOR THE
- 13 | NFLPA?
- 14 **A.** YES.
- 15 | O. YOU'VE REVIEWED NOW THE DEFINITION OF GROSS LICENSING
- 16 REVENUES, EXHIBITS 92 AND 95; IS THAT CORRECT? 95 IS THE 2000
- 17 | AGREEMENT.
- 18 **A.** YES.
- 19 Q. AND YOU'VE RESPONDED THAT THEY ARE DIFFERENT?
- 20 A. CORRECT.
- 21 Q. SO THE NFLPA IS SUPPOSED TO GET 40 PERCENT OF THE GROSS
- 22 | LICENSING REVENUES; IS THAT CORRECT?
- 23 | A. APPROXIMATELY 40 PERCENT OF GROSS LICENSING REVENUE.
- 24 | Q. WHERE IS THE 60 PERCENT? WHERE'S THE 40 PERCENT CUT SET
- 25 | OUT?

- 1 A. THE 40 PERCENT NFLPA LICENSE AMOUNT IS SET OUT IN THE
- 2 | ORIGINAL DUFF & PHELPS VALUATION OF THE BREAKDOWN OF THE GROSS
- 3 | LICENSING REVENUE.
- 4 Q. SO IT'S SET OUT IN THE 1994 AGREEMENT?
- 5 A. CORRECT.
- 6 | Q. AND THAT DIDN'T CHANGE IN EXHIBIT 95, IN THE 2000
- 7 | AGREEMENT?
- 8 | A. FUNCTIONALLY, THE BREAKDOWN DIDN'T CHANGE ON THE
- 9 | ALLOCATION BETWEEN THE NFLPA, PLAYERS INC. AND THE PLAYERS.
- 10 | Q. IN FACT, IT JUST CARRIED FORWARD BECAUSE IT WASN'T EVEN
- 11 | MENTIONED SPECIFICALLY IN THE 2000 AGREEMENT?
- 12 A. CORRECT.
- 13 | Q. WHY DON'T YOU TELL US WHAT THIS DOCUMENT IS.
- 14 A. THIS IS THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT PACKET, INCLUDING THE
- 15 | AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, DESCRIPTIVE CHARTS AND GRAPHS AND
- 16 THE NFLPA AND PLAYERS INC BUDGET AND ANALYSIS FOR THE YEAR
- 17 | ENDING 2/28/07.
- 18 Q. DO YOU RECOGNIZE EXHIBIT 99?
- 19 **A.** YES.
- 20 Q. TELL US WHAT IT IS, PLEASE.
- 21 | A. THIS IS THE SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENT BETWEEN NFL PROPERTIES
- 22 AND PLAYERS INC.
- 23 Q. AND I THINK YOU TESTIFIED A MOMENT AGO THAT THE MECHANICS
- 24 OF THIS AGREEMENT OR THE 25 PERCENT OF THE MONIES PAID BY THE
- 25 | NFL TO NFLPA GO INTO SOME SORT OF PLAYER PROGRAMS AND

- 1 | 75 PERCENT GOES INTO THE ACTIVE PLAYER EQUAL SHARE POOL?
- 2 A. I'M SORRY. CAN YOU REPEAT THAT FOR ME?
- 3 | O. OR CAN YOU JUST GIVE IT TO ME IN YOUR OWN WORDS?
- 4 | A. 25 TO 28 PERCENT OF THE SPONSORSHIP REVENUE GOES INTO
- 5 | PAYMENTS TO PLAYERS. THE REMAINING AMOUNT GOES INTO THE ACTIVE
- 6 | PLAYER EQUAL SHARE POOL.
- 7 Q. CAN YOU TELL US WHAT THAT IS, SIR?
- 8 A. LABOR ORGANIZATION ANNUAL REPORT LM-2, THE YEAR ENDED
- 9 | FEBRUARY 28TH, 2005.
- 10 | Q. AND I THINK YOU TESTIFIED BEFORE THAT YOU REVIEW THESE
- 11 | BEFORE THEY'RE FILED; IS THAT CORRECT?
- 12 A. CORRECT.
- 13 Q. CAN YOU TELL US WHAT EXHIBIT 101 IS?
- 14 | A. LABOR ORGANIZATION ANNUAL REPORT FORM LM-2 FOR THE YEAR
- 15 ENDED FEBRUARY 28TH, 2006.
- 16 Q. WELL, WHY DON'T YOU TELL ME WHAT YOUR PROCEDURES WERE IN
- 17 GENERAL IN TRACKING THE FLOW OF LICENSING REVENUES FROM THE
- 18 | LICENSEE TO PI AND THE NFLPA AND TO THE PLAYER, TO THE ACTIVE
- 19 | PLAYER FIRST, AND THEN I'LL ASK THE SAME QUESTION FOR THE
- 20 | RETIRED PLAYER.
- 21 | A. THERE ARE NUMEROUS PROCEDURES THAT WE PERFORM IN EACH
- 22 | CYCLE OF EXPENSE AND DISBURSEMENT AND RECEIPT. FOR THE
- 23 | LICENSING MONEY THAT'S COMING IN THERE'S A SAMPLE OF LICENSEES'
- 24 | LICENSING AGREEMENTS THAT WE WILL REVIEW TO ENSURE WHAT WAS TO
- 25 | BE PAID, WHAT WAS PAID. AND WITH THAT WE ALSO PERFORM CERTAIN

- 1 | LICENSING AUDITS ON A ROTATING BASIS FOR THE REVENUES THAT ARE
- 2 COMING INTO PLAYERS INC AND THE NFLPA.
- 3 | Q. BUT ONCE IT GETS TO -- I THINK YOU JUST SAY BEFORE THEY
- 4 | COME SIMULTANEOUSLY FROM THE LICENSEE TO BOTH NFLPA AND PI?
- 5 A. CORRECT.
- 6 | Q. AND THEN FROM THERE TO THE PLAYER. DID YOU AUDIT THAT?
- 7 | A. WE LOOK AT THE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS AND DO A SAMPLING
- 8 | OF INDIVIDUAL PLAYERS TO THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT WAS RECEIVED.
- 9 Q. NOW, I THINK YOU TESTIFIED THAT UNDER THE ELIGIBILITY
- 10 | REQUIREMENTS, YOUR UNDERSTANDING WAS RETIRED PLAYERS WEREN'T
- 11 || ELIGIBLE?
- 12 A. CORRECT.
- 13 Q. SO WITH RESPECT TO RETIRED PLAYERS, YOU DIDN'T DO ANYTHING
- 14 | FURTHER TO CHECK THAT THEY WERE RECEIVING THE AMOUNTS OF MONEY
- 15 | DUE THEM, BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T THINK THERE WERE ANY AMOUNTS OF
- 16 MONEY DUE THEM?
- 17 A. ON THE EQUAL SHARE ROYALTY POOL, THAT IS CORRECT.
- 18 Q. DO YOU RECOGNIZE THIS DOCUMENT?
- 19 | **A.** YES.
- 20 Q. CAN YOU TELL US WHAT IT IS, PLEASE.
- 21 A. IT'S THE CALCULATION.
- 22 Q. EXCUSE ME. THE QUESTION IS, SIR, WHAT IS THIS?
- 23 | A. THIS IS A CALCULATION PERFORMED BY THE PLAYERS INC FINANCE
- 24 | DEPARTMENT ON THE ALLOCATION OF THE EQUAL SHARE ROYALTY POOL.
- 25 Q. AND HAVE YOU REVIEWED IT, ALSO?

```
1
        YES.
 2
              (READING STOPPED.)
 3
              MR. CHARHON: PLAINTIFFS OFFER EXHIBIT 102 INTO
 4
   EVIDENCE.
 5
             MR. KESSLER: COULD I SEE?
 6
              YOUR HONOR, IF I JUST CAN SEE WHAT IT IS.
 7
              THE COURT: ANY OBJECTION?
             MR. KESSLER: NO OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: RECEIVED.
              (TRIAL EXHIBIT 102 RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)
10
              (READING RESUMED.)
11
        CAN YOU TAKE US THROUGH IT, PLEASE? THIS IS FOR 2003?
12
13
        RIGHT. FISCAL YEAR ENDED 2/28/03.
        IF YOU COULD TAKE US THROUGH THE FIRST PAGE OF THIS
14
15
   DOCUMENT, SIR?
        UNDER THE GROSS LICENSING REVENUES YOU SEE THAT THERE'S
16
   LICENSING ROYALTIES, NFLPA, WHICH REPRESENTS THE CALCULATED
17
   40 PERCENT SHARE OF GROSS LICENSING REVENUE EQUAL SHARE POOL,
18
   COMING TO $14,074,000. LICENSING ROYALTIES, PLAYERS INC
19
   REPRESENTS THE PLAYERS INC PORTION OF THE EQUAL SHARE POOL.
2.0
   COMING TO TOTAL AMOUNT RECEIVED, TOTAL LICENSING ROYALTIES OF
21
   $27.2 MILLION FOR THE YEAR ENDED 2/28/03. IN ADDITION TO THE
22
23
   TOTAL LICENSING ROYALTIES FOR THAT YEAR, THE NFL SPONSORSHIP
2.4
   AND INTERNET AMOUNTS ARE ADDED THERE AT THAT $10 MILLION.
   THERE'S A DEDUCTION FOR THE 25 PERCENT NFL FUND RELATING TO THE
25
```

- 1 | SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENT OF \$2.1 MILLION.
- 2 COMING DOWN TO THE NET GROSS LICENSING REVENUE OR
- 3 | EQUAL SHARE POOL OF \$35.1 MILLION.
- 4 | GOING TO THE BOTTOM, GROSS LICENSING REVENUE, COMING
- 5 | STRAIGHT DOWN FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE PAGE, \$35.1 MILLION LESS
- 6 THE NFL PORTION, \$14 MILLION, COMES TO \$21,111,198, WHICH FROM
- 7 | THERE 60 PERCENT OF THAT WOULD GO TO ACTIVE PLAYERS IN THE
- 8 | PLAYER POOL, COMING TO \$12,666,718.
- 9 Q. AND THEN MOVING TO THE SECOND PAGE.
- 10 A. STARTING AT THE TOP, NFLPA, WHAT IT CURRENTLY HAS
- 11 | RECEIVED, \$10.9 MILLION. THE ACCRUALS AT THE END OF THE YEAR,
- 12 2/28/03, \$2.8 MILLION. PLAYERS INC CURRENTLY RECEIVED
- 13 | 12.2 MILLION.
- 14 THE ACCRUALS RELATED TO PLAYERS INC IS \$1.\$ MILLION.
- 15 THERE YOU SEE THE \$10 MILLION FROM THE SPONSORSHIP AND THE
- 16 INTERNET AGREEMENT LESS THE 25 PERCENT SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENT,
- 17 | DEDUCTION OF \$2.1 MILLION, TO COME TO THE NET GROSS LICENSING
- 18 | REVENUE OF \$35.1 MILLION.
- 19 YOU CAN SEE THE NFLPA PORTION, WHICH IS 40 PERCENT OF
- 20 | THAT \$35.1 MILLION, IS 14,074,131.
- 21 || Q. THERE ARE TWO MORE NUMBERS THERE.
- 22 | A. I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY WHAT THE LESS WHAT PA WILL GET WITH
- 23 ACCRUALS MEANS.
- 24 | THE NEXT LINE DUE TO NFLPA TO MEET PORTION OF GROSS
- 25 | LICENSING REVENUE IS THE AMOUNT DUE TO NFLPA TO GET THEM TO

- 1 THEIR 40 PERCENT LICENSING AMOUNT.
- 2 LOOKING AT THE BOTTOM, GOING TO THE \$21.1 MILLION,
- 3 | THE 60 PERCENT THAT'S GOING TO THE PLAYERS CALCULATED ON THE
- 4 | PREVIOUS PAGE IS DEDUCTED FROM THAT \$21.1 MILLION, COMING TO
- 5 | THE AMOUNT RETAINED BY PLAYERS INC, THE \$8.4 MILLION FOR THE
- 6 YEAR.
- 7 | Q. THEN MOVING TO THE NEXT PAGE. ACTUALLY, THE NEXT PAGE ARE
- 8 | ALL THE SAME FORMAT.
- 9 | A. THE NEXT PAGES ARE ALL ROLLING UP INTO THE SECOND PAGE
- 10 HERE UNDER GROSS LICENSING REVENUE.
- 11 | Q. SO THE -- AFTER PAGE 2 OF EXHIBIT 102, AFTER THE SECOND
- 12 PAGE OF EXHIBIT 102, THE REMAINDER IS THE BACKUP FOR PAGE 2; IS
- 13 | THAT FAIR TO SAY?
- 14 A. CORRECT.
- 15 | O. NOW LET'S DO THE SAME THING FOR 2004. WHAT IS EXHIBIT
- 16 | 103, SIR?
- 17 | A. EXHIBIT 103 IS THE CALCULATION OF THE ACTIVE PLAYER EQUAL
- 18 SHARE POOL FOR 2004, THE YEAR ENDED FEBRUARY 28TH, 2004.
- 19 (READING STOPPED.)
- 20 | MR. CHARHON: PLAINTIFFS MOVE EXHIBIT 103 INTO
- 21 | EVIDENCE.
- 22 MR. KESSLER: NO OBJECTION.
- 23 THE COURT: RECEIVED.
- 24 | (TRIAL EXHIBIT 103 RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)
- 25 (READING RESUMED.)

- 1 Q. IN THE HOPE OF MOVING THIS ALONG AND GETTING MR. FEHER ON
- 2 | HIS TRAIN, COULD YOU COMPARE AND CONTRAST EXHIBIT 103 AND 102?
- 3 | IF IT'S THE SAME FORMAT, THE SAME WAY OF CALCULATION, TELL US
- 4 | THAT; IF IT'S DIFFERENT, TELL US THAT.
- 5 | A. THE ONLY THING DIFFERENT THAT I CAN SEE ON THE FIRST PAGE
- 6 | RELATES TO THE 528,000 REFERRING TO LICENSING ROYALTIES NOT
- 7 | SUBJECT TO THE POOL, 5 AND 10 PERCENT PORTIONS.
- 8 Q. I'M SORRY. OH, YES, I SEE THAT.
- 9 A. THE THIRD LINE.
- 10 0. HOW IS THAT DIFFERENT?
- 11 | A. THE NFLPA -- WELL, THE TOTAL GROSS LICENSING REVENUES WAS
- 12 OVER \$40 MILLION FOR THE FIRST TIME. AND IN MAKING A
- 13 CALCULATION RELATING TO PLAYERS INC, NFLPA, AND WHAT THE
- 14 | PLAYERS GET IN THAT ALLOCATION, THERE IS A DIFFERENCE OF
- 15 | 528,000 BETWEEN THE NFLPA GETTING 40 PERCENT AND EFFECTIVELY A
- 16 REDUCED AMOUNT BECAUSE IT WENT OVER \$40 MILLION.
- 17 | Q. I SEE. EXHIBIT 103 DOES NOT SHOW ANY FLOWS OF MONEY TO
- 18 | RETIRED PLAYERS, RIGHT?
- 19 | A. BASED ON THE FORM OR LOOKING AT IT, IT'S NOT CLEAR,
- 20 WITHOUT HAVING DETAIL OF WHAT THE 25 PERCENT NFL FUND WHO THAT
- 21 WAS DISTRIBUTED TO.
- 22 Q. ASIDE FROM THAT, IT DOES NOT TRACK A RETIRED PLAYERS --
- 23 **A.** NO.
- 24 | Q. LET'S ASK THE REPORTER TO MAKE THIS THE NEXT EXHIBIT, 104.
- 25 CAN YOU TELL US WHAT EXHIBIT 104 IS?

```
CALCULATION EQUAL SHARE ROYALTY POOL FOR THE YEAR ENDED
 2
   FEBRUARY 28, 2005.
 3
              (READING STOPPED.)
 4
             MR. CHARHON: PLAINTIFFS OFFER EXHIBIT 104 INTO
 5
   EVIDENCE, YOUR HONOR.
 6
             MR. KESSLER: NO OBJECTION.
 7
             THE COURT: RECEIVED.
              (TRIAL EXHIBIT 104 RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)
 8
 9
              (READING RESUMED.)
        FOR ACTIVE PLAYERS, RIGHT?
10
   Q.
11
       EQUAL SHARE ROYALTY POOL IS FOR ACTIVE PLAYERS ONLY.
12
        AND CAN YOU COMPARE AND CONTRAST EXHIBIT 104 WITH EXHIBIT
   103 AND 102, JUST TELLING US IF IT'S THE SAME FORMAT OR
14
  DIFFERENT?
15
        THE ONLY DIFFERENCE I CAN SEE ON THE FIRST PAGE IS THERE'S
   MORE DETAIL IN THE INITIAL CATEGORIES OF GROSS LICENSING
16
17
   REVENUES AS OPPOSED TO HAVING ONE ROLLED-UP LINE WITH NFLPA AND
   PLAYERS INC.
18
19
        AND THE DETAIL ROLLS INTO WHICH LINE?
       WELL, THE DETAIL -- IT'S ALL ROLLING UP IN THE TOP FOUR
2.0
21
   LINES THERE.
       ARE THERE ANY OTHER DIFFERENCES?
22
23
   A. NOT THAT I SEE HERE.
       LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT 2006.
24
25
             (READING STOPPED.)
```

```
MR. CHARHON: PLAINTIFFS OFFER 106 INTO EVIDENCE,
 1
 2
   YOUR HONOR.
 3
             THE COURT: THERE IS NO 106 ON THE LIST. ARE YOU
 4
  SURE OF THE NUMBER? IT SKIPS FROM 105 TO 107.
             MR. CHARHON: 105. EXCUSE ME.
 5
             THE COURT: 105 IS RECEIVED.
 6
 7
              (TRIAL EXHIBIT 105 RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)
             MR. KESSLER: NO OBJECTION TO 105.
 8
 9
             (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
             (READING RESUMED.)
10
11
        CAN YOU COMPARE AND CONTRAST EXHIBIT 106 WITH 105, 104 AND
   Q.
12
   103?
13
        THE ONLY DIFFERENCE THAT I NOTE BETWEEN THE THREE IS THE
   CHANGE IN MARKET CONDITION ADJUSTMENT OF $8 MILLION.
14
15
   O. WHERE DOES THAT APPEAR?
   A. THAT APPEARS ON THE SIXTH LINE, UNDER ACTUAL FISCAL YEAR
16
17
   2006 REVENUE.
   Q. OKAY. AND THEN FOOTNOTE ONE APPEARS TO READ SPONSOR,
18
   DOLLAR SIGN, DOLLAR SIGN OF 20,453,778, LESS 500K. INTERNET
19
   DOLLAR SIGN OF 3 MILLION. 3 PERCENT FUND USED OF 169,500.
2.0
             CAN YOU EXPLAIN THAT FOOTNOTE?
21
        THAT'S REFERRING TO THE NFL PROPERTIES SPONSORSHIP
22
   AGREEMENT. TOTAL REVENUE FROM THAT, $13,252,000 LESS 500,000,
23
   AS DESCRIBED IN THE PLAYERS INC NFLPA AGREEMENT. ADDING THE
24
   INTERNET AMOUNT RECEIVED FOR THE YEAR OF 3 MILLION AND ALSO
25
```

- 1 | ADDING CERTAIN AUDIT FINDINGS RELATED TO THESE AGREEMENTS OF
- 2 | 362,000, TOTALING THE AMOUNT THAT'S FLOWING INTO THAT FIRST
- 3 | LINE. ONE NOTE.
- 4 | Q. HAS THE EQUIVALENT DOCUMENT THAT WE'VE BEEN LOOKING AT FOR
- 5 | 2007 BEEN DONE?
- $6 \, || \mathbf{A}. \quad \text{YES}.$
- 7 | Q. DO YOU KNOW AN INDIVIDUAL NAMED PAMELA ADOLPH?
- 8 **A.** YES.
- 9 Q. HAVE YOU EVER SEEN THIS PARTICULAR E-MAIL BEFORE, EXHIBIT
- 10 | 52?
- 11 **A.** NO.
- 12 | Q. IT'S CORRECT THAT PAMELA ADOLPH IN DECEMBER 2003 WAS
- 13 ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT OF PLAYERS INC AS FAR AS YOU KNOW?
- 14 A. AS FAR AS I KNOW? YES.
- 15 | O. SHE REFERS TO SOMETHING CALLED THE INC CUT OF THE
- 16 ROYALTIES. INC IS IN ALL CAPS. DOES THAT MEAN ANYTHING TO
- 17 YOU?
- 18 | A. I BELIEVE SHE'S REFERRING TO PLAYERS INC.
- 19 $\|\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}\|$ DO YOU KNOW HOW THE ROYALTIES FLOW WITH RESPECT TO RETIRED
- 20 | PLAYER APPAREL?
- 21 **A.** NO, I DON'T.
- 22 Q. THE LICENSING REVENUES COME INTO A GENERAL POOL OF MONIES
- 23 | FOR BOTH PI AND NFLPA; IS THAT CORRECT?
- 24 | A. IT GOES INTO THEIR RESPECTIVE BANK ACCOUNTS, CORRECT.
- 25 Q. AND THAT'S JUST A GENERAL POOL OF MONEY?

1	A. OPERATING ACCOUNT, YES.
2	(READING STOPPED.)
3	MR. CHARHON: YOUR HONOR, AT THIS TIME WE HAVE A
4	NUMBER OF OTHER EXHIBITS THAT WE'D LIKE TO OFFER INTO EVIDENCE.
5	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GO AHEAD.
6	MR. CHARHON: 19.
7	MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE TO SEE THEM ALL.
8	I'M SORRY. IF YOU COULD GIVE ME THE LIST, AND WE WILL GET THEM
9	OUT.
10	IF YOU GIVE US THE LIST, WE'LL PULL THEM ALL.
11	MR. CHARHON: I'VE GOT IT RIGHT HERE.
12	THE COURT: IS THIS SOMETHING THAT WE CAN DO DO WE
13	NEED TO TAKE UP JURY TIME ON THIS?
14	MR. CHARHON: LIKELY NOT. WE CAN DO IT ON A BREAK.
15	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THEN ARE WE DONE WITH THE
16	READING?
17	MR. CHARHON: WE ARE, YOUR HONOR.
18	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO WE WILL
19	MR. KESSLER: THERE'S NO OBJECTION TO 19, YOUR HONOR.
20	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 19 IS RECEIVED.
21	(TRIAL EXHIBIT 19 RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)
22	MR. CHARHON: AND WE'LL TAKE THE REST UP ON A BREAK.
23	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE BURDEN IS ON YOU, THE
24	PROPONENT, TO BRING IT BACK TO MY ATTENTION.
25	ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN STEP DOWN, SIR.

1 NEXT WITNESS, PLEASE. 2 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, I'M SORRY, 19 CONTAINS 3 MR. ADDERLEY'S SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER. I THINK THEY WANT TO DO 4 A REDACTED VERSION. 5 THE COURT: PLEASE DO A REDACTED VERSION OF THAT. 6 ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. 7 NEXT WITNESS. MR. KATZ: I BELIEVE WE'RE CALLING MR. BYRD OUT OF 8 9 ORDER; IS THAT CORRECT? MR. KESSLER: YES, YOUR HONOR. 10 MR. CLARK: THAT'S CORRECT. THE DEFENSE IS GOING TO 11 12 CALL STEVEN BYRD NOW. 13 THE COURT: OKAY. LET ME EXPLAIN WHAT'S GOING TO | HAPPEN HERE. 14 15 OCCASIONALLY A WITNESS HAS TRAVELING PROBLEMS. IN THIS CASE, THE DEFENSE HAS A WITNESS THAT THEY WANT TO CALL, 16 BUT IT'S NOT THE DEFENSE CASE YET. WE'RE STILL ON THE 17 18 PLAINTIFFS' CASE. BUT THE PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL HAVE BEEN 19 COURTEOUS ENOUGH TO AGREE THAT THE WITNESS CAN BE CALLED OUT OF 2.0 TURN. SO WE'RE GOING TO LEAP FORWARD INTO THE DEFENSE CASE, 21 22 HEAR ONE WITNESS WHO HAS TO TRAVEL SOMEPLACE, AND THEN WE WILL 23 LEAP BACKWARDS INTO THE PLAINTIFFS' CASE AFTER THAT WITNESS HAS 24 COME AND GONE. 25 SO LET'S HEAR FROM MR. BYRD.

```
1
             MR. KESSLER: I'M SORRY, YOUR HONOR. WE HAVE TO CALL
 2
  HIM FROM OUTSIDE. HE WAS WAITING, SEQUESTERED.
 3
             THE COURT: YOU MIGHT WONDER WHY IT IS THAT THE
 4
   WITNESSES ARE OUTSIDE. IT'S SO THEY CAN'T HEAR EACH OTHER
 5
   TESTIFY.
             IT'S A STANDARD RULE. THE EXCEPTIONS TO THAT ARE
 6
 7
   WITNESSES WHO ARE THE PARTIES IN THE CASE. THOSE CAN ALWAYS
   STAY IN THE COURTROOM BECAUSE THEY HAVE AN INTEREST IN THE
 8
 9
   CASE.
10
             YES, SIR, ARE YOU MR. BYRD?
             THE WITNESS: YES.
11
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. PLEASE RAISE YOUR RIGHT HAND.
12
1.3
   WE'LL SWEAR YOU IN.
14
             (THEREUPON, THE WITNESS WAS SWORN.)
15
             THE WITNESS: YES, I DO.
             THE CLERK: OKAY. THANK YOU. PLEASE BE SEATED.
16
17
             THE COURT: MR. BYRD, HAVE A SEAT. CAN WE TAKE YOUR
   PICTURE SO IT CAN BE DISPLAYED TO THE CLOSING -- IN THE CLOSING
18
19
   ARGUMENTS?
2.0
             THE WITNESS: SURE.
             THE COURT: SO WE CAN REMIND THE JURY WHO'S WHO.
21
22
             THE CLERK: OKAY. THANKS.
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SCOOT FORWARD ENOUGH AND
23
   ADJUST THE MIC SO IT CATCHES YOUR VOICE.
24
25
             THE WITNESS: OKAY.
```

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GO RIGHT AHEAD, STATE YOUR 1 2 FULL NAME. 3 THE WITNESS: STEVEN CHARLES BYRD. 4 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WELCOME. 5 GO AHEAD, COUNSEL. REMIND THE JURY OF YOUR NAME. 6 MR. CLARK: YES, YOUR HONOR. 7 LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, MY NAME IS JASON CLARK. I'M AN ATTORNEY FOR THE DEFENDANTS. 8 9 THE COURT: GO AHEAD, MR. CLARK. MR. CLARK: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 10 11 STEVEN BYRD, CALLED AS A WITNESS FOR THE DEFENDANTS HEREIN, HAVING BEEN 12 13 FIRST DULY SWORN, WAS EXAMINED AND TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS: 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION 15 BY MR. CLARK: 16 Q. GOOD MORNING, MR. BYRD. 17 A. GOOD MORNING. 18 Q. ARE YOU CURRENTLY EMPLOYED? 19 A. YES. **Q.** WHO IS YOUR EMPLOYER? 20 21 A. STATS LLC. 22 AND WHAT DOES STATS DO? Q. 23 **A.** IT'S A SPORTS INFORMATION CONTENT AND FANTASY GAME 24 COMPANY.

Q. IS STATS AFFILIATED WITH OR RELATED TO ANY OTHER

COMPANIES?

- 2 A. YES. STATS IS A JOINT VENTURE. IT IS OWNED 50 PERCENT BY
- 3 | NEWS CORPORATION AND 50 PERCENT BY THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, THE
- 4 | AP.
- 5 Q. AND HOW LONG HAVE YOU WORKED FOR STATS?
- 6 **A.** 11 YEARS.
- 7 Q. SO SINCE 1997?
- 8 **A.** YES.
- 9 | Q. AND WHAT POSITIONS HAVE YOU HELD AT STATS?
- 10 | A. INITIALLY, I WAS VICE PRESIDENT OF MARKETING, AND THEN I
- 11 WAS VICE PRESIDENT OF THE FANTASY SPORTS BUSINESS UNIT. AND MY
- 12 CURRENT TITLE IS EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OVERSEEING SALES,
- 13 MARKETING AND THE FANTASY SPORTS BUSINESS UNIT.
- 14 | O. AND WHAT TYPES OF DUTIES DO YOU DO AS THE EXECUTIVE VICE
- 15 | PRESIDENT OVERSEEING ALL THOSE THINGS?
- 16 A. I MANAGE STAFF. I DEAL WITH CLIENTS. I WORK WITH LEAGUES
- 17 AND PLAYER ASSOCIATIONS WITH THE RELATIONSHIPS STATS HAS WITH
- 18 | THEM.
- 19 O. WHEN YOU WERE PREVIOUSLY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE FANTASY
- 20 | SPORTS BUSINESS UNIT, WHAT TYPES OF RESPONSIBILITIES DID YOU
- 21 | HAVE THEN?
- 22 | A. MORE DIRECTLY OVERSEEING THE DEVELOPMENT OF FANTASY SPORTS
- 23 GAMES AND THE MARKETING OF THOSE PRODUCTS.
- 24 | Q. WERE YOU INVOLVED IN LICENSING, AS WELL, IN THAT POSITION?
- 25 | A. YES.

- 1 | Q. AND TO WHOM DO YOU REPORT CURRENTLY AT STATS?
- 2 A. THE CEO, GARY WALRATH.
- 3 $\|\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}\|$ MR. BYRD, SINCE YOU STARTED AT STATS IN 1997, HAS STATS
- 4 | ENTERED INTO ANY LICENSE AGREEMENTS WITH PLAYERS INC?
- $5 | \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{YES}$
- 6 Q. AND WHAT ROLE DID YOU PLAY IN NEGOTIATING ANY OF THESE
- 7 | LICENSE AGREEMENTS?
- 8 | A. I WAS THE LEAD BUSINESS PERSON INVOLVED IN THOSE
- 9 DISCUSSIONS AND NEGOTIATIONS.
- 10 | MR. CLARK: MAY I APPROACH THE WITNESS, YOUR HONOR?
- 11 THE COURT: GO AHEAD.
- 12 MR. CLARK: I'D LIKE TO SHOW THE WITNESS TRIAL
- 13 EXHIBIT 1109, WHICH IS ALREADY IN EVIDENCE.
- 14 | (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
- 15 BY MR. CLARK:
- 16 Q. MR. BYRD, ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THIS DOCUMENT?
- 17 **A.** YES.
- 18 | Q. WHAT IS IT?
- 19 A. IT IS THE LICENSE AGREEMENT THAT STATS HAD WITH PLAYERS
- 20 INC FOR THE 2006 NFL SEASON, TO OPERATE FANTASY GAMES UNDER A
- 21 | LICENSE.
- 22 | Q. AND WERE YOU INVOLVED IN NEGOTIATING THIS AGREEMENT?
- 23 **A.** YES.
- 24 | Q. AND IF YOU'LL LOOK AT THE -- IF WE COULD LOOK AT THE LAST
- 25 PAGE, PAGE 12 -- SORRY, I GUESS IT'S NOT THE VERY LAST PAGE.

- 1 THE LAST PAGE OF THE AGREEMENT.
- 2 A. RIGHT. OKAY.
- 3 | Q. THERE WE GO. DO YOU RECOGNIZE THE SIGNATURE THAT'S
- 4 UNDERNEATH WHERE IT SAYS "STATS LLC"?
- $5 \parallel \mathbf{A}_{\bullet} \quad \text{YES}$.
- 6 Q. WHOSE SIGNATURE IS THAT?
- 7 A. THAT IS GARY WALRATH, OUR CEO.
- 8 Q. AND DID YOU REPORT TO MR. WALRATH AT THE TIME YOU WERE
- 9 | NEGOTIATING THIS AGREEMENT?
- 10 **A.** YES.
- 11 MR. CLARK: AND COULD WE GO BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE,
- 12 | PLEASE, LAUREN?
- 13 (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
- 14 BY MR. CLARK:
- 15 Q. COULD I DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO PARAGRAPH 2A, THE GRANT
- 16 OF LICENSE, TOWARDS THE BOTTOM OF THE PAGE.
- 17 MR. CLARK: IF WE COULD BLOW THAT UP.
- 18 THANK YOU.
- 19 BY MR. CLARK:
- 20 Q. WHAT TYPE OF PRODUCT WAS STATS LICENSING IN THIS
- 21 | AGREEMENT?
- 22 A. FANTASY FOOTBALL GAMES.
- 23 | Q. AND SO THAT'S A FANTASY FOOTBALL GAME DISTRIBUTED OVER THE
- 24 | INTERNET, IT SAYS, CORRECT?
- 25 **A.** CORRECT, YES.

- 1 Q. SINCE YOU JOINED STATS IN 1997, HAS STATS EVER NEGOTIATED
- 2 A LICENSE AGREEMENT WITH PLAYERS INC FOR ANY PRODUCT BESIDES
- 3 | FANTASY FOOTBALL?
- $4 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. NO.
- 5 | O. AND FROM YOUR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AND YOUR PERSONAL
- 6 EXPERIENCE ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH HOW FANTASY FOOTBALL GAMES ARE
- 7 | PLAYED?
- 8 | **A.** YES.
- 9 | O. COULD YOU BRIEFLY EXPLAIN TO THE JURY THE TYPE OF FANTASY
- 10 GAME STATS PROVIDED WITH THIS LICENSE AGREEMENT?
- 11 | A. SURE. THERE ARE A COUPLE OF DIFFERENT STYLES OF FANTASY
- 12 | FOOTBALL, BUT THE CORE ESSENCE OF THEM IS THE SAME, WHERE
- 13 YOU -- YOU PICK NFL -- CURRENT NFL PLAYERS TO BE ON YOUR TEAM,
- 14 AND THEY CAN BE FROM ACROSS ANY OF THE TEAMS IN THE LEAGUE.
- 15 | AND THEN, YOU GET POINTS BASED ON THE STATISTICS THAT
- 16 THEY ACCUMULATE IN THAT WEEKEND'S GAMES. AND THEN, YOU HAVE
- 17 DIFFERENT WAYS OF SCORING THE GAME, BUT ULTIMATELY YOU TRY TO
- 18 GET MORE POINTS THAN THE PEOPLE YOU ARE PLAYING AGAINST, AND
- 19 | THEN YOU WIN.
- 20 Q. AND DID STATS PROVIDE THIS SERVICE DIRECTLY TO CONSUMERS
- 21 OR DID IT PROVIDE IT TO OTHERS? WHAT DID STATS PROVIDE?
- 22 A. BOTH. AT THAT TIME STATS DID RUN A GAME CALLED "STATS
- 23 | FANTASY FOOTBALL." IT WAS ON OUR WEB SITE THAT CONSUMERS COULD
- 24 | PLAY DIRECTLY WITH US. AND THEN, STATS ALSO PROVIDES A WHITE
- 25 | LABEL SERVICE, PRIVATE LABEL, WHERE WE ARE THE OPERATING ENTITY

- oxdot FOR OTHER COMPANIES' FANTASY FOOTBALL GAMES UNDER THEIR BRAND.
- 2 Q. AND JUST TO GIVE THE JURY A LITTLE BIT MORE INFORMATION
- 3 | ABOUT FANTASY FOOTBALL, AFTER PARTICIPANTS DRAFT THEIR TEAMS
- 4 | THEY'RE GOING TO USE, WHAT DO THEY DO THE REST OF THE SEASON
- 5 WITH THESE TEAMS?
- 6 A. SO YOU INITIALLY CHOOSE THE ROSTER FOR YOUR TEAM. A
- 7 | COUPLE OF DIFFERENT WAYS THAT YOU CAN DO THAT. AND THEN,
- 8 | AGAIN, THERE'S A FEW DIFFERENT STYLES OF PLAY, BUT BASICALLY
- 9 | EACH WEEK FROM THE PLAYERS THAT YOU HAVE AVAILABLE ON YOUR TEAM
- 10 YOU PICK WHICH ONES WILL BE ACTIVE THAT WEEK. SO YOU DON'T
- 11 | PLAY EVERYONE.
- 12 YOU HAVE TO DECIDE WHO'S GOING TO START AND WHO'S
- 13 GOING TO BE ON YOUR BENCH. AND YOU'RE HOPEFUL TO GET THE ONES
- 14 WHO ARE GOING TO DO THE BEST THAT WEEK, OBVIOUSLY.
- 15 | AND IF SOMEONE'S INJURED, YOU OBVIOUSLY WOULDN'T
- 16 START THEM. YOU WOULD BENCH THEM.
- 17 AND THEN, THROUGHOUT THE SEASON, THERE MAY BE NEW
- 18 PLAYERS COME ALONG THAT ARE ROOKIES THAT NO ONE KNEW ABOUT,
- 19 || THAT SUDDENLY ARE DOING WELL. SO YOU WANT TO TRY AND ADD THEM.
- 20 AND THE LEAGUES HAVE WAYS TO PICK UP FREE AGENTS.
- 21 | IT'S CALLED TO PICK UP NEW PLAYERS WITH YOUR TEAM. OR YOU CAN
- 22 | TRADE WITH SOMEONE ELSE IN YOUR LEAGUE. MAYBE THEY HAVE A
- 23 COUPLE OF QUARTERBACKS, AND YOUR QUARTERBACKS AREN'T ANY GOOD
- 24 OR THEY ARE HURT, SO YOU MIGHT TRADE YOUR DEFENSIVE TEAM FOR
- 25 | THEIR QUARTERBACK KIND OF THING, BACK AND FORTH.

- SO IT'S JUST KIND OF MANAGING EACH WEEK TO TRY TO GET THE MOST POINTS.
- 3 Q. AND YOU SAY YOU HOPEFULLY PICK THE ONES THAT ARE GOING TO
- 4 | DO WELL THAT WEEK. CAN YOU GIVE A FEW EXAMPLES OF HOW YOU
- 5 | SCORE POINTS IN FANTASY FOOTBALL?
- 6 A. SURE. AGAIN, LEAGUES CAN SET DIFFERENT RULES. BUT YOU
- 7 WOULD GET POINTS. WHEN A PLAYER ON YOUR TEAM SCORES A
- 8 | TOUCHDOWN, YOU MIGHT GET SIX POINTS, JUST LIKE THE SIX POINTS
- 9 THAT ARE SCORED IN THE REAL NFL GAME.
- 10 | IF IT'S A PASS PLAY, BOTH THE OUARTERBACK AND THE
- 11 RECEIVER WOULD GET POINTS ON THEIR FANTASY TEAM. IF IT'S A
- 12 RUSHING PLAY, THE PERSON WHO SCORED THE TOUCHDOWN WOULD GET THE
- 13 POINTS. YOU CAN GET POINTS FOR THE NUMBER OF YARDS
- 14 ACCUMULATED, RUSHING YARDS, RECEIVING YARDS, ET CETERA.
- 15 YOU CAN GET POINTS FOR DEFENSIVE PLAYERS, FOR
- 16 INTERCEPTIONS AND FUMBLE RECOVERIES. AND A DEFENSIVE TEAM CAN
- 17 GET POINTS FOR A SHUTOUT OF THE OTHER TEAM, ET CETERA.
- 18 || **Q.** THANK YOU.
- 19 AT THE TIME YOU WERE NEGOTIATING THE TRIAL EXHIBIT
- 20 | 1109, THE 2006 AGREEMENT, WHAT WAS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE
- 21 TYPE OF PLAYER RIGHTS THAT STATS WAS ACQUIRING?
- 22 | A. THE -- IT WAS THE RIGHT TO USE THE CURRENT NFL PLAYERS
- 23 | THAT WERE ACTIVE, THAT WE WERE ALLOWED TO THEN PUT THEM INTO
- 24 | THE FANTASY FOOTBALL GAMES THAT WE WERE OPERATING AND HAVE
- 25 | THEIR NAMES AND INFORMATION IN THOSE GAMES.

- AND COULD I DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO PARAGRAPH 2A UNDER 2 THE GRANT OF LICENSE, AGAIN? 3 MR. CLARK: PUT THAT BACK UP, LAUREN. SORRY. WE'RE 4 STAYING WITH THAT PARAGRAPH STILL. 5 (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.) 6 BY MR. CLARK: 7 O. AND I WANT TO DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION SORT OF TOWARDS THE END OF THE FIRST LINE WHERE IT SAYS: 8 9 "PLAYERS INC HEREBY GRANTS TO LICENSEE THE NAMES, LIKENESSES" -- SORRY. THEN IT PICKS UP IN THE MIDDLE. I 10 SKIPPED A FEW WORDS, BUT: 11 "THE NAMES, LIKENESSES, PICTURES, PHOTOGRAPHS, 12 VOICES, FACSIMILE SIGNATURES, AND/OR BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION 13 OF THE NFL PLAYERS REFERENCED IN PARAGRAPH 1(A) ABOVE." 14 15 AT THE TIME YOU WERE NEGOTIATING THIS AGREEMENT, WHAT PLAYERS DID YOU UNDERSTAND THAT YOU WERE LICENSING UNDER THIS 16 17 PROVISION? 18 A. CURRENT NFL PLAYERS THAT WERE PLAYING IN THE LEAGUE THAT 19 YEAR. Q. NOW, I'D LIKE TO DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION UP TO PARAGRAPH 2.0 1(A) UNDER THE "REPRESENTATIONS." 21 AND, IN PARTICULAR, TO THE LAST SENTENCE THERE, WHICH 22 23 SAYS:
- "LICENSEE ACKNOWLEDGES THAT PLAYERS INC ALSO, ON OCCASION, SECURES AUTHORIZATION FOR INCLUSION IN PLAYERS INC

```
LICENSING PROGRAMS FROM PLAYERS, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO,
 2
  RETIRED PLAYERS."
 3
             AND IT CONTINUES ON FROM THERE.
 4
             WHAT WAS YOUR UNDERSTANDING AT THE TIME -- I'M SORRY.
 5
   WITHDRAWN. LET ME START OVER.
 6
             YOU SEE THAT, RIGHT?
 7
   Α.
       YES, SIR.
       DID YOU UNDERSTAND YOU WERE LICENSING ANY RETIRED PLAYER
 8
   Q.
   RIGHTS AT THE TIME YOU WERE NEGOTIATING THIS AGREEMENT?
10
             MR. KATZ: OBJECT, LEADING.
             THE COURT: WHAT?
11
12
             MR. KATZ: OBJECT, LEADING.
13
             THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
             PLEASE ASK IT IN A NONLEADING WAY.
14
15
  BY MR. CLARK:
       DID YOU UNDERSTAND THAT YOU WERE LICENSING ANY OTHER TYPES
16
   OF PLAYER RIGHTS BESIDES WHAT YOU HAVE ALREADY TESTIFIED ABOUT
17
   UNDER THIS PROVISION OF THE AGREEMENT?
18
19
             MR. KATZ: OBJECTION, LEADING.
             THE COURT: JUST SAY:
20
                   "WHAT WAS THE SIGNIFICANCE, IF ANY, OF THAT
21
   SENTENCE" AND HIS UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONTRACT.
22
23
             MR. KATZ: NO OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR.
24
             (LAUGHTER)
25
```

BY MR. CLARK:

- 2 Q. AT THE TIME WERE YOU NEGOTIATING THIS AGREEMENT, MR. BYRD,
- 3 | WHAT WAS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THIS PROVISION OF THE AGREEMENT,
- 4 | IF ANY?
- 5 | A. THE -- THAT SOMETIMES PLAYERS INC MAY DO THINGS WITH THE
- 6 | RETIRED PLAYERS. THAT'S WHAT IT SAYS. IT HAD NOTHING TO DO
- 7 | WITH OUR LICENSE FOR FANTASY FOOTBALL, BECAUSE WE DIDN'T NEED
- 8 ANY RETIRED PLAYERS TO PLAY FANTASY FOOTBALL.
- 9 Q. AS A NEGOTIATOR FOR STATS IN 2006, MR. BYRD, WOULD STATS
- 10 HAVE HAD ANY INTEREST IN LICENSING RETIRED PLAYER RIGHTS FOR
- 11 ANY OF ITS PRODUCTS?
- 12 MR. KATZ: OBJECT, LEADING.
- 13 THE COURT: IT IS LEADING. IT'S AN IMPORTANT ENOUGH
- 14 QUESTION, I THINK YOU SHOULD BACK UP AND ASK IT IN LIKE:
- 15 | "WHAT, IF ANY, INTEREST WOULD STATS HAVE HAD IN
- 16 | LICENSING RETIRED PLAYERS?"
- 17 | THAT'S NONLEADING AND GETS AT THE SAME POINT.
- 18 MR. CLARK: YES, YOUR HONOR.
- 19 BY MR. CLARK:
- 20 Q. MR. BYRD, IN 2006, WHEN YOU WERE NEGOTIATING THESE
- 21 AGREEMENTS, WHAT INTEREST, IF ANY, WOULD STATS HAVE HAD IN
- 22 | LICENSING RETIRED PLAYERS?
- 23 **A.** NONE.
- 24 | Q. SINCE YOU'VE WORKED AT STATS IN 1997, HAS STATS EVER USED
- 25 | RETIRED PLAYER LICENSING RIGHTS IN ANY OF ITS PRODUCTS?

1 MR. KATZ: OBJECT, LEADING. 2 THE COURT: SUSTAINED. 3 BY MR. CLARK: Q. WHAT PLAYER RIGHTS HAS STATS USED IN ITS PRODUCTS SINCE 5 1997? 6 A. WE HAVE HAD FANTASY LICENSES FOR ACTIVE PLAYERS FOR 7 FANTASY GAMES. Q. AND HAS STATS EVER HAD A LICENSE FROM PLAYERS INC FOR ANY 8 OTHER PRODUCTS -- HAS -- SORRY. LET ME START OVER. WITHDRAWN. HAS STATS EVER HAD A LICENSE FROM PLAYERS INC FOR 10 PLAYER RIGHTS FOR ANY PRODUCT OTHER THAN FANTASY FOOTBALL? 11 MR. KATZ: OBJECT, LEADING. 12 THE COURT: WELL, IT IS LEADING, BUT GO AHEAD AND 13 14 | ANSWER IT. 15 THE WITNESS: NO. THE COURT: LET ME ASK YOU THIS: TO WHAT EXTENT, IF 16 AT ALL, HAS STATS EVER LICENSED OR USED A RETIRED PLAYER IN 17 18 ANYTHING? THE WITNESS: FOR FOOTBALL? NOTHING EVER. 19 20 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GO AHEAD. MR. CLARK: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THAT'S ALL MY 21 22 QUESTIONS. 23 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. CROSS EXAMINATION. 24 MR. KATZ: GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY. MY NAME IS RON KATZ. I'M NOT FROM BROOKLYN. I'M NOT 25

1 | FROM TEXAS. I'M ACTUALLY FROM OUR BEAUTIFUL BAY AREA.

CROSS EXAMINATION

- 3 BY MR. KATZ:
- 4 Q. GOOD MORNING, SIR.
- 5 A. GOOD MORNING.
- 6 | Q. I REPRESENT THE PLAINTIFFS IN THIS MATTER. DO YOU KNOW
- 7 | THAT?

- 8 NOW, SIR, WHY ON EARTH WOULD YOU SIGN AN AGREEMENT
- 9 | THAT MENTIONS RETIRED PLAYERS PROMINENTLY IF YOU DON'T THINK
- 10 YOU LICENSE RETIRED PLAYERS?
- 11 | A. I DON'T THINK IT MENTIONS IT PROMINENTLY. AND IT SAYS
- 12 THEY MAY INCLUDE RETIRED PLAYERS AT SOME POINT. BUT THERE'S A
- 13 | SPECIFIC LIST OF PLAYERS THAT WE HAVE THAT WE ACCESS IN ORDER
- 14 TO KNOW WHO IS AVAILABLE FOR THE FANTASY GAMES.
- 15 | Q. WELL, LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT THE DOCUMENT YOU WERE TALKING
- 16 ABOUT, WHICH IS 1109.
- 17 MR. KATZ: CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE.
- 18 | (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
- 19 | **BY MR. KATZ:**
- 20 Q. AND YOU HAVE THAT IN FRONT OF YOU, DON'T YOU, SIR?
- 21 | A. YES.
- 22 | Q. SO THAT MENTIONS RETIRED PLAYERS AND WHAT YOU WERE ASKED
- 23 | ABOUT IN 1(A), RIGHT?
- 24 | A. IT SAYS THAT ON OCCASION THEY MAY, YES.
- 25 Q. WHY WOULD YOU EVEN CARE?

- 1 $\|$ **A.** WE DON'T.
- 2 Q. SO WHY -- WHY MENTION THEM?
- 3 | A. IT'S NOT OUR LANGUAGE. WE DIDN'T WRITE THAT IN, SO IT --
- 4 | Q. WHY DIDN'T YOU JUST TELL WHOEVER -- WHO DID YOU NEGOTIATE
- 5 | WITH, MR. ALLEN?
- 6 A. NO, NOT DIRECTLY.
- 7 Q. WHO WERE YOU NEGOTIATING WITH?
- 8 A. PROBABLY CLAY WALKER AT THE TIME.
- 9 Q. WHY DIDN'T YOU JUST SAY:
- 10 | "MR. WALKER, WE DON'T NEED THIS STUFF IN HERE
- 11 ABOUT RETIRED PLAYERS. WE DON'T CARE ABOUT RETIRED PLAYERS"?
- 12 DID YOU TELL HIM THAT?
- 13 A. THERE WAS NO NEED TO.
- 14 O. YOU JUST SIGNED AN AGREEMENT -- THIS AGREEMENT GENERATED
- 15 | MILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR YOUR COMPANY, DIDN'T IT, SIR?
- 16 A. NO, NOT EVEN CLOSE.
- 17 Q. HOW MUCH DID IT GENERATE FOR YOUR COMPANY?
- 18 A. I DON'T KNOW. NOT EVEN CLOSE.
- 19 Q. HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS?
- 20 **A.** NO.
- 21 Q. YOU DON'T KNOW? YOU CAN'T TELL?
- 22 **A.** NO. I SAID "NO".
- 23 | Q. HOW MUCH DID IT GENERATE FOR YOUR COMPANY, SIR?
- 24 | A. PROBABLY LESS THAN A HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS.
- 25 Q. AND DO YOU THINK A HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS IS AN

- 1 | INSIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF MONEY?
- 2 A. I NEVER SAID THAT.
- 3 Q. DO YOU THINK THAT? YES OR NO.
- $4 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. NO.
- 5 | O. SO WHY WOULD YOU SIGN AN AGREEMENT FOR A HUNDRED THOUSAND
- 6 | DOLLARS THAT MENTIONS SOMETHING THAT YOU DON'T CARE ABOUT?
- 7 A. THE AGREEMENT WAS NOT FOR A HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS.
- 8 | Q. WELL, IT'S GENERATED A HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS. WHY
- 9 WOULD YOU HAVE SOMETHING IN THERE THAT YOU DIDN'T CARE ABOUT,
- 10 | SIR?
- 11 | A. BECAUSE THERE'S -- THERE'S NO -- IT HAD NO MEANING. IT
- 12 HAD NO BEARING ON IT.
- 13 Q. THAT'S MY POINT.
- 14 | A. THERE WAS NO NEGATIVE TO IT TO HAVE IT IN THERE.
- 15 | O. WHY WOULD YOU PUT SOMETHING IN THERE THAT HAD NO MEANING?
- 16 A. WE DIDN'T.
- 17 MR. CLARK: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR, ARGUMENTATIVE.
- 18 BY MR. KATZ:
- 19 Q. YOU SIGNED IT, DIDN'T YOU, SIR?
- 20 **A.** NO, I DIDN'T.
- 21 MR. CLARK: SAME OBJECTION.
- 22 THE COURT: OKAY. WAIT. WAIT.
- 23 | BY MR. KATZ::
- 24 Q. YOU DIDN'T SIGN THIS AGREEMENT?
- 25 | THE COURT: YOU ARE BEING ARGUMENTATIVE WITH HIM.

- 1 MR. KATZ: ALL RIGHT, SIR. 2 THE COURT: I THINK YOU SHOULD MOVE TO NEW POINT. 3 BY MR. KATZ: 4 AND IT'S ALSO REFERENCED IN 2A. RETIRED PLAYERS ARE ALSO 5 REFERENCED IN 2A BECAUSE PARAGRAPH 2A REFERENCES 1A, DOESN'T 6 IT? 7 MR. CLARK: OBJECTION. THE COURT: SORRY. I DON'T SEE THE WORD "RETIRED" IN 8 9 2A. 10 MR. KATZ: IT REFERS TO THE NFL PLAYERS REFERENCED IN 1A AND RETIRED PLAYERS ARE REFERENCED IN 1A. 11 12 THE COURT: THAT'S A BIT MISLEADING. I THINK YOU 13 SHOULD BE MORE CLEAR. 14 MR. KATZ: OKAY. 15 THE COURT: WHY DON'T YOU HIGHLIGHT FOR THE JURY --16 MR. KATZ: SURE. 17 THE COURT: -- THE EXACT PHRASE YOU HAVE IN MIND. 18 MR. KATZ: RIGHT. THE COURT: AND ASK THE WITNESS IF HE AGREES WITH 19 20 YOUR INTERPRETATION. MR. KATZ: IF WE LOOK AT THE FIFTH LINE FROM THE 21 22 BOTTOM, IT SAYS "THE NFL PLAYERS REFERENCED IN 1A, PARAGRAPH 1A 23 ABOVE. HIGHLIGHT THAT.
- 24 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 25 | Q. AND IN 1A, RETIRED PLAYERS ARE REFERENCED, RIGHT?

- L A. IN 1A RETIRED PLAYERS ARE REFERENCED.
- 2 Q. SO THAT'S YET ANOTHER REFERENCE TO "RETIRED PLAYERS,"
- 3 RIGHT?
- $4 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. NO.
- 5 MR. CLARK: OBJECTION. ARGUMENTATIVE.
- 6 THE COURT: IT'S ARGUMENTATIVE, BUT THE WHOLE POINT
- 7 | HERE IS TO FIND OUT WHAT THE UNDERSTANDING -- WELL, AS PHRASED,
- 8 AS PHRASED, I'M GOING TO LET YOU ASK THAT QUESTION. BUT YOU'RE
- 9 | NOT -- YOU OUGHT TO BE FOCUSING ON THE INTENTION AND
- 10 UNDERSTANDING AT THE TIME, AND NOT TRYING TO DISSECT THE
- 11 | LANGUAGE IN PRESENT-DAY OPINIONS.
- 12 BUT IF THIS IS PRELIMINARY TO HIS UNDERSTANDING AT
- 13 THE TIME, THEN YOU CAN GO AHEAD.
- 14 YOUR QUESTION IS WHAT, MR. KATZ?
- 15 MR. KATZ: I JUST ASKED HIM WHETHER THAT REFERENCES
- 16 | 1A AND 1A MENTIONS "RETIRED PLAYERS."
- 17 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 18 Q. ISN'T THAT RIGHT, SIR?
- 19 | THE COURT: YOU CAN ASK AT THE TIME HE SIGNED THE
- 20 | AGREEMENT DID HE UNDERSTAND NFL PLAYERS REFERENCED IN PARAGRAPH
- 21 | 1A TO BE A LICENSE OF RETIRED PLAYERS? THAT WOULD BE A FAIR
- 22 QUESTION.
- 23 MR. KATZ: NO, I THINK THE LANGUAGE ITSELF, YOUR
- 24 | HONOR, REFERENCES IT TODAY, YESTERDAY, AT THE TIME HE SIGNED
- 25 | IT, A HUNDRED YEARS FROM NOW --

- THE COURT: MR. KATZ, WE'VE GONE AROUND AND AROUND ON
- 2 BOTH SIDES ON THIS VERY ISSUE. AND IF SUBJECTIVE INTENTIONS
- 3 | THAT WERE NOT DISCLOSED TO THE OTHER SIDE MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE
- 4 | AT ALL, IT'S ONLY AT THE TIME THEY -- SO I HAVE INSISTED THAT
- 5 | BOTH SIDES STICK TO WHAT THEIR UNDERSTANDINGS WERE AT THE TIME.
- 6 MR. KATZ: OKAY.
- 7 BY MR. KATZ:
- 8 Q. AT THE TIME THAT YOU SIGNED THIS CONTRACT, ISN'T IT A FACT
- 9 | THAT THAT LANGUAGE, "NFL PLAYERS REFERENCED IN 1A ABOVE,"
- 10 | REFERENCED RETIRED PLAYERS THAT WERE REFERENCED IN 1A ABOVE;
- 11 | ISN'T THAT CORRECT, SIR?
- 12 MR. CLARK: OBJECTION. AGAIN, ARGUMENTATIVE.
- 13 | THE COURT: NO. OVERRULED.
- 14 PLEASE ANSWER.
- 15 | THE WITNESS: I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE POINT OF THE
- 16 QUESTION. I'M SORRY.
- 17 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 18 Q. ALL RIGHT.
- 19 | A. IT'S GOING AROUND SO MANY TIMES. WHAT -- WHAT -- ARE YOU
- 20 ASKING SPECIFICALLY: DOES IT SAY RETIRED PLAYERS THERE? I
- 21 THINK WE'VE ESTABLISHED THAT.
- 22 Q. YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION?
- 23 A. THERE IS AN OPTION --
- 24 Q. IF YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND IT, THERE'S NOTHING I CAN DO ABOUT
- 25 | IT.

- 1 LET'S MOVE TO PARAGRAPH 12, WHICH IS ON PAGE --
- 2 MR. KESSLER: OBJECTION.
- 3 | BY MR. KATZ::
- 4 | Q. -- PAGE 6.
- 5 MR. KESSLER: WHAT WAS THE OBJECTION? I NEED TO
- 6 | STRIKE THAT COMMENT FROM COUNSEL. HE JUST MISCHARACTERIZED
- 7 WHAT THE WITNESS SAID.
- 8 | THE COURT: THE JURY WILL DISREGARD ALL OF THE SIDE
- 9 | COMMENTS MADE BY COUNSEL ON BOTH SIDES. THEY DO IT ALL THE
- 10 | TIME. IT'S JUST RUNNING COMMENTARY LIKE CNN, AND IT'S NOT
- 11 EVIDENCE AT ALL, AND DISREGARD IT ON BOTH SIDES.
- 12 GO AHEAD, MR. KATZ.
- 13 **BY MR. KATZ:**
- 14 Q. DOES THIS LICENSE INCLUDE SIX OR MORE PRESENT OR FORMER
- 15 | NFL PLAYERS?
- 16 A. PRESENT PLAYERS, YES.
- 17 Q. OKAY. SIX OR MORE?
- 18 **A.** YES.
- 19 Q. OKAY. AND IF WE LOOK AT PARAGRAPH 12 ON PAGE 6 -- IS THIS
- 20 2000? ON PAGE 7, EXCUSE ME.
- 21 MR. KATZ: AND IF YOU CAN HIGHLIGHT 12A. 12A.
- 22 | (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
- 23 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 24 Q. LET ME READ IT TO YOU, SIR. APPARENTLY, IT'S NOT IN OUR
- 25 | SYSTEM.

- 1 YOU HAVE IT IN FRONT OF YOU?
- $2 \| \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{YES} \|$
- 3 | Q. "THE LIST OF PLAYERS FOR WHOM PLAYERS INC HAS GROUP
- 4 | LICENSING AUTHORIZATION, THE PLAYER AGREEMENT REPORT IS
- 5 AVAILABLE TO LICENSEE VIA THE INTERNET AT
- 6 WWW.NFLPLAYERS.COM/LICENSEE, WITH LICENSEE'S USER NAME AND
- 7 | PASSWORD. IN ADDITION, PLAYERS INC MAY SECURE AUTHORIZATION
- 8 FROM PLAYERS NOT LISTED ON THE PLAYER AGREEMENT REPORT,
- 9 INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED, TO RETIRED PLAYERS."
- 10 DO YOU SEE THAT, SIR?
- 11 **A.** YES.
- 12 Q. WAS THAT ANOTHER PART OF THE AGREEMENT YOU DIDN'T CARE
- 13 | ABOUT?
- 14 | I'M SORRY. DID YOU ANSWER?
- 15 | A. WHAT DO YOU MEAN DID I CARE ABOUT?
- 16 Q. YOU DIDN'T CARE ABOUT THE RETIRED PLAYERS PART, RIGHT?
- 17 A. WE ABSOLUTELY DID NOT CARE ABOUT RETIRED PLAYERS FOR A
- 18 FANTASY FOOTBALL LICENSE, BECAUSE IF YOU LISTEN TO THE
- 19 | DESCRIPTION OF FANTASY FOOTBALL, THEY ARE IRRELEVANT. YOU
- 20 | DON'T USE THEM IN FANTASY FOOTBALL.
- 21 Q. SIR, YOU CAME HERE TODAY VOLUNTARILY; IS THAT CORRECT?
- 22 **A.** YES.
- 23 $\| \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet} \|$ AND IS IT BECAUSE -- DID YOU COME HERE VOLUNTARILY BECAUSE
- 24 | THE LICENSE AGREEMENT REQUIRES YOU TO COOPERATE WITH DEFENDANTS
- 25 TO ASSIST PLAYERS INC TO THE EXTENT NECESSARY TO PROTECT ANY OF

- 1 | THE RIGHTS CONVEYED UNDER THE LICENSE? IS THAT ONE OF THE
- 2 | REASONS YOU CAME HERE?
- 3 | A. UHM, NO, NOT -- NOT PARTICULARLY, NO.
- 4 | Q. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT YOU HAVE THAT LEGAL OBLIGATION
- 5 UNDER THE LICENSE?
- 6 MR. CLARK: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR A LEGAL CONCLUSION.
- 7 || THE COURT: WELL, YOU CAN ASK HIM IF HE IS AWARE OF
- 8 | THE PROVISION. YOU CAN ASK HIM IF HE WAS AWARE OF THAT
- 9 | PROVISION AT THE TIME HE DECIDED TO COME HERE.
- 10 MR. KATZ: ALL RIGHT.
- 11 | THE COURT: I'M NOT SURE THAT THE LEGAL IMPORT OF
- 12 | THAT PARAGRAPH IS ENFORCEABLE AND SO FORTH, SO LET'S NOT GET
- 13 | INTO THE LEGALITIES OF IT.
- 14 BY MR. KATZ:
- 15 | Q. ARE YOU AWARE OF THAT LEGAL PROVISION IN THE CONTRACT,
- 16 | SIR?
- 17 A. NOT SPECIFICALLY, NO.
- 18 Q. LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT PARAGRAPH 10.
- 19 | THE COURT: WELL, IF HE WASN'T AWARE OF IT, WHY IS IT
- 20 || RELEVANT TO GET INTO THAT?
- 21 MR. KATZ: BIAS.
- 22 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. PARAGRAPH 10, IS THAT THE ONE
- 23 ON THE SCREEN NOW?
- 24 MR. KATZ: 10. AND THE LANGUAGE IS IN 10B. EXCUSE
- 25 ME, 10A. EXCUSE ME. IT'S 10B.

- 1 | "LICENSEE FURTHER AGREES TO ASSIST PLAYERS INC
- 2 TO THE EXTENT NECESSARY IN THE PROCUREMENT OF ANY PROTECTION TO
- 3 | PROTECT ANY OF THE RIGHTS CONVEYED HEREUNDER, AND PLAYERS INC,
- 4 | IF IT SO DESIRES, MAY COMMENCE OR PROSECUTE AT ITS OWN EXPENSE
- 5 ANY CLAIMS OR SUITS IN ITS OWN NAME, IN THE NAME OF LICENSEE OR
- 6 JOIN LICENSEE AS A PARTY HERETO."

7 | BY MR. KATZ:

- 8 Q. ARE YOU AWARE OF THAT OBLIGATION THAT YOU HAD, SIR?
- $9 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. YES.
- 10 Q. IS THAT ONE OF THE REASONS YOU'RE HERE?
- 11 | A. NO, BECAUSE THAT'S NOT WHAT'S GOING ON HERE.
- 12 Q. ARE YOU HERE BECAUSE YOU'RE FRIENDS WITH MR. NAHRA?
- 13 **A.** NO.
- 14 Q. YOU WORK WITH MR. NAHRA ON THE FANTASY SPORTS ASSOCIATION,
- 15 DON'T YOU?
- 16 A. WE ARE BOTH ON THE BOARD OF THAT ORGANIZATION.
- 17 Q. ARE YOU FRIENDS WITH HIM?
- 18 **A.** NO.
- 19 Q. OKAY. AND ARE YOU HERE BECAUSE YOU'RE FRIENDS WITH
- 20 MR. CLAY WALKER, WHO STARTED THE FANTASY SPORTS ASSOCIATION?
- 21 | A. NO, SIR.
- 22 | Q. ARE YOU HERE BECAUSE YOU'RE FRIENDS WITH MR. RICKY MEDINA
- 23 OF PLAYERS INC, WHO ALSO WORKS WITH YOU ON THE FANTASY SPORTS
- 24 | ASSOCIATION?
- 25 **A.** NO, SIR.

- 1 Q. NOW, SIR, YOU CLAIM THAT YOU LICENSED ALL ACTIVE PLAYERS;
- 2 I IS THAT CORRECT?
- 3 | A. THE PLAYERS THAT WERE ON THE LIST FOR THAT YEAR.
- 4 | SOMETIMES PLAYERS OPT OUT OF THE GROUP LICENSING. I DON'T KNOW
- 5 THAT THERE WERE ANY THAT YEAR.
- 6 Q. AND YOU HAD TO PAY THEM WHETHER YOU USED THEM OR NOT,
- 7 | RIGHT? YOU HAD TO PAY -- YOU HAD TO MAKE YOUR \$25,000 PAYMENT,
- 8 OR WHATEVER IT WAS, WHETHER YOU USED THOSE PLAYERS OR NOT;
- 9 I ISN'T THAT RIGHT?
- 10 | A. UHM, WE DID USE ALL OF THEM. BUT --
- 11 Q. YOU DIDN'T USE ALL THE PLAYERS IN THE NATIONAL -- YOU
- 12 | DIDN'T USE ALL THE ACTIVE PLAYERS IN THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL
- 13 | LEAGUE, SIR, DID YOU, FOR YOUR FANTASY GAME?
- 14 A. SURE. THEY'RE ALL AVAILABLE.
- 15 | Q. WELL, YOU DON'T EVEN USE OFFENSIVE LINEMEN, DO YOU?
- 16 A. THERE CAN BE OFFENSIVE TEAM POINTS AS AN OPTION IN SOME OF
- 17 | THE COMMISSIONER-STYLE GAMES, WHERE YOU -- BECAUSE THE
- 18 CONSUMERS CAN PICK THEIR OWN RULES. SO, I MEAN, WE BUILD THE
- 19 | ENGINE SO CONSUMERS CAN CHOOSE.
- 20 | SO THERE CAN BE ANY NUMBER OF COMBINATIONS OF PLAYERS
- 21 AND SCORING.
- 22 Q. DO YOU HAVE EXHIBIT 2000 UP THERE, SIR?
- 23 A. I DON'T BELIEVE SO.
- 24 MR. KATZ: MAY I APPROACH, YOUR HONOR?
- 25 THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

BY MR. KATZ:

- 2 Q. CAN YOU TELL US WHAT 2000 IS, SIR?
- 3 | A. IT IS THE SAME AS THE OTHER DOCUMENT WE WERE JUST LOOKING
- $4 \parallel \text{AT}$, EXCEPT IT WAS FOR THE 2007 SEASON.
- 5 | O. SO IT'S A LICENSE BETWEEN --
- 6 **A.** 2006.
- 7 | Q. LICENSE BETWEEN STATS AND PLAYERS INC?
- 8 A. CORRECT.
- 9 | Q. OKAY. AND THAT'S SIGNED BY WHOM?
- 10 A. BY STATS' CEO, GARY WALRATH.
- 11 MR. KATZ: I OFFER 2000, YOUR HONOR.
- 12 MR. CLARK: WE OBJECT, YOUR HONOR, BECAUSE IT'S
- 13 | EFFECTIVE MARCH 1ST, 2007. IT'S NOT RELEVANT.
- 14 THE COURT: I'M SORRY. YOUR OBJECTION IS WHAT?
- 15 MR. CLARK: THAT IT'S EFFECTIVE MARCH 1ST, 2007, AND,
- 16 THEREFORE, NOT RELEVANT TO THIS CASE.
- 17 | THE COURT: WHAT'S THE RELEVANCE OF IT?
- 18 MR. KATZ: WELL, IT'S RELEVANT FOR A COUPLE OF
- 19 | REASONS, YOUR HONOR. FIRST OF ALL, I THINK THAT IS -- JUST
- 20 BECAUSE IT'S AFTER THE STATUTORY PERIOD DOES NOT MEAN THAT IT
- 21 CANNOT REFLECT THINGS ABOUT THE NATURE OF FANTASY GAMES DURING
- 22 THE PERIOD. AND THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO SHOW.
- 23 THE COURT: THIS IS 2007.
- 24 | MR. KATZ: RIGHT. IF YOU LOOK AT ATTACHMENT C, IN
- 25 | PARTICULAR, YOUR HONOR, IT TALKS ABOUT WHO IS ON THE ROSTER OF

```
THESE GAMES.
 2
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 2007 IS RECEIVED.
 3
             MR. KATZ: IT'S NOT 2007. IT'S 2000.
 4
             THE COURT: I THOUGHT YOU SAID "2007."
 5
             MR. KATZ: IT'S EXHIBIT 2000, YOUR HONOR.
 6
             THE COURT: 2000 IS RECEIVED.
 7
             MR. KATZ: THANK YOU.
             (TRIAL EXHIBIT 2000 RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)
 8
   BY MR. KATZ:
10
   Q. LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT ATTACHMENT C, YOUR HONOR -- SIR.
             MR. KATZ: CAN WE GET THAT? IT'S PAGE 14.
11
12
             (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
13
             AND IT SAYS "ROSTER." IF YOU CAN ENLARGE THAT.
14 BY MR. KATZ:
15
   Q. NOW, THIS IS DESCRIBING THE RULES OF YOUR GAME, RIGHT,
16
   SIR?
17
   A. NO, IT IS DESCRIBING THE RULES OF THE PARTICULAR GAME THAT
   WE RAN FOR PLAYERS INC ON THEIR WEB SITE. AS I MENTIONED
18
   EARLIER, WE RUN GAMES FOR OTHER COMPANIES. THIS IS THE
19
   SPECIFIC SET OF RULES FOR THAT GAME THAT THEY RAN ON THEIR
2.0
21
   WEB SITE, WHICH IS A SPECIFIC STYLE OF GAME.
22
       AND IN THAT PARTICULAR GAME, RUN BY PLAYERS INC, THEY
23
   DON'T USE OFFENSIVE LINEMEN, DO THEY, SIR?
24
       IN -- IN THAT PARTICULAR GAME AN OFFENSIVE LINEMAN WOULD
```

ONLY SHOW UP IF HE WAS ALSO ON SPECIAL TEAMS, WHICH IS

- 1 | CERTAINLY POSSIBLE.
- 2 Q. RIGHT. BUT THEY DO NOT USE -- IS IT SAFE TO SAY THAT THEY
- 3 | DO NOT USE ALL OFFENSIVE LINEMEN? YOU LICENSED ALL THE
- 4 | OFFENSIVE LINEMEN IN THE NFL, DIDN'T YOU, SIR?
- $5 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. YES.
- 6 | Q. AND IS IT SAFE TO SAY THEY DIDN'T USE IN THE GAME ALL THE
- 7 | OFFENSIVE LINEMEN IN THE NFL?
- 8 A. IT'S POSSIBLE, SIR.
- 9 O. AND YOU WOULDN'T CARE IF THOSE OFFENSIVE LINEMEN HAD AN
- 10 AGREEMENT WITH PLAYERS INC THAT THEY SOMEHOW GOT PAID FROM YOUR
- 11 | LICENSE, YOU WOULDN'T CARE ABOUT THAT. IF PI PAID THEM, YOU
- 12 | WOULDN'T CARE, WOULD YOU, SIR?
- 13 **A.** NO.
- 14 O. AND YOU WOULDN'T CARE IF RETIRED PLAYERS GOT PAID AS A
- 15 | RESULT OF YOUR AGREEMENT, IF PI PAID THEM, WOULD YOU, SIR?
- 16 A. IF IT WOULDN'T CHANGE THE TERMS OF THE LICENSE.
- 17 Q. YOU DON'T CARE, RIGHT?
- 18 A. CORRECT.
- 19 THE COURT: NOW, AGAIN, NOW IT SEEMS LIKE THE
- 20 | OBJECTION HAS SOME VALIDITY.
- 21 MR. KATZ: WHICH OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR?
- 22 THE COURT: THIS IS AFTER THE PERIOD OF THE
- 23 | LIMITATIONS PERIOD; IS THAT RIGHT?
- 24 | MR. KESSLER: THAT'S CORRECT, YOUR HONOR.
- 25 MR. CLARK: YES, YOUR HONOR.

1	MR. KESSLER: THIS IS DISCUSSION IS ALL AFTER THE
2	LIMITATION
3	MR. KATZ: RIGHT. BUT THE RULES APPLY IN FANTASY
4	FOOTBALL, YOUR HONOR, YOU DON'T USE OFFENSIVE LINEMEN. YOU ONLY
5	USE PEOPLE WHO SCORE.
6	MR. CLARK: HE'S TESTIFYING, YOUR HONOR.
7	MR. KATZ: THAT'S WHAT THIS SHOWS.
8	THE WITNESS: NOT TRUE. YOU USE DEFENSE, AS WELL.
9	THE COURT: WELL
10	MR. KATZ: I CAN MAKE A MORE GENERAL POINT, YOUR
11	HONOR.
12	THE COURT: I JUST NEED TO THE ENTIRE UNIVERSE OF
13	TIME IS NOT OPEN. WE HAVE A VERY SPECIFIC WHAT IS OUR EXACT
14	PERIOD? FEBRUARY 14 '04 TO FEBRUARY 14 '07, RIGHT?
15	WILL ONE OF THE MANY LAWYERS IN THE COURTROOM PLEASE
16	LISTEN TO ME?
17	WHAT IS OUR LIMITATIONS PERIOD OPEN IN THIS CASE?
18	MR. KATZ: IT ENDS ON FEBRUARY 14, 2007, YOUR HONOR.
19	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THERE'S A VERY SPECIFIC
20	LIMITATIONS PERIOD. IN CONTRACTS THERE CAN'T BE ANY LAWSUIT
21	BASED ON A CLAIM TO GET MONEY FOR CONTRACTS THAT WERE ONE DAY
22	LATER OR ONE DAY EARLIER.
23	I'LL GIVE YOU MORE INSTRUCTIONS ON THIS LATER. BUT
24	THE KEY TIME PERIOD FOR OUR CASE IS FEBRUARY '04 TO FEBRUARY
25	'07.

1 NONETHELESS, I'M GOING TO LET YOU HAVE SOME 2 FLEXIBILITY HERE, BECAUSE MAYBE THIS HAS SOMETHING TO DO WITH 3 THE TIME PERIOD THAT WE'RE INVOLVED WITH. BUT I ASK YOU NOT TO 4 DWELL ON IT TOO MUCH. 5 MR. KATZ: I WILL NOT, YOUR HONOR. 6 THE COURT: GO AHEAD. 7 BY MR. KATZ: THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS, SIR, YOU DON'T CARE WHAT PI 8 DOES WITH THE MONEY YOU PAY TO THEM. THAT'S THEIR BUSINESS, NOT YOUR BUSINESS, RIGHT? 10 11 A. SURE. AND IF THEY WANTED TO PAY IT ALL TO MR. ADDERLEY HERE, 12 THAT WOULD BE OKAY WITH YOU. YOU WOULDN'T CARE? 13 14 A. CORRECT. 15 O. THANK YOU. NOW, YOUR COMPANY, SIR, SELLS HISTORICAL DATA 16 17 RELATING TO RETIRED PLAYERS, DOES IT NOT? MR. CLARK: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. 18 MR. KATZ: IT'S RELEVANT --19 THE COURT: WHAT'S THE RELEVANCE? 2.0 MR. KATZ: THE ISSUE OF THE VALUE OF RETIRED PLAYERS. 21 22 HOW MANY TIMES HAVE WE HEARD: 23 "NOBODY WANTS THEM. NOBODY CARES ABOUT THEM." 24 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. OVERRULED. 25 PLEASE ANSWER.

1 BY MR. KATZ:

- 2 Q. YOU SELL THEIR DATA, DON'T YOU, SIR?
- 3 A. WE SELL OUR DATA.
- 4 Q. ABOUT RETIRED PLAYERS?
- 5 | A. WE SELL HISTORICAL DATA. HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH FANTASY
- 6 OR THESE LICENSES.
- 7 | Q. YOU SELL DATA ABOUT RETIRED PLAYERS, DON'T YOU, SIR?
- 8 A. NOT RELATED TO FANTASY.
- 9 | THE COURT: WELL, DO YOU OTHERWISE DO IT?
- 10 THE WITNESS: YES, SIR.
- 11 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
- 12 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 13 Q. AND YOU SELL DATA RELATED TO RETIRED NFL PLAYERS, DON'T
- 14 YOU, SIR?
- 15 **A.** YES.
- 16 Q. AND, ACTUALLY, YOU'VE SOLD DATA RELATED TO MR. HERB
- 17 ADDERLEY'S FAMOUS TEAMS, THE GREENBAY PACKERS, HAVEN'T YOU,
- 18 | SIR?
- 19 **A.** SURE.
- 20 Q. BECAUSE HE IS ONE OF THE MOST FAMOUS FOOTBALL PLAYERS OF
- 21 | ALL TIME, ISN'T HE?
- 22 A. I'D NEVER HEARD OF HIM BEFORE YOU JUST SAID HIS NAME.
- 23 | Q. AND THE GREENBAY PACKERS ARE ONE OF THE MOST FAMOUS
- 24 | FOOTBALL TEAMS OF ALL TIME, AREN'T THEY, SIR?
- 25 **A.** SURE.

AND YOUR CUSTOMERS ARE INTERESTED IN THEM, AREN'T THEY, 2 SIR? 3 THE COURT: MR. KATZ, YOU'RE ALARMING THE JURY --4 MR. PARCHER: SOUNDS LIKE HE'S FROM BROOKLYN. 5 THE COURT: -- WITH THE VOLUME OF YOUR VOICE. 6 YOU'VE EITHER GOT TO TURN DOWN THE VOLUME OR YOU HAVE 7 TO TURN DOWN YOUR VOLUME. MR. KATZ: I ALWAYS HEAR YOUR HONOR SAY: 8 9 "ADJUST THE MICROPHONE SO IT CATCHES YOUR VOICE." THE COURT: WELL, IT'S CATCHING YOUR VOICE BIG TIME. 10 ALL RIGHT. 11 MR. KATZ: COULD I HAVE THE LAST QUESTION READ BACK? 12 13 THE COURT: PLEASE. 14 MR. KATZ: IN A SOTTO VOCE. 15 BY MR. KATZ: YOUR CUSTOMERS GIVE VALUE TO THE RETIRED PLAYERS LIKE 16 MR. ADDERLEY, AND THEY WANT TO BUY HIS IMAGE; ISN'T THAT RIGHT? 17 18 A. NO. WE DON'T LICENSE THE IMAGE. WE LICENSE HISTORICAL 19 FACTS WHICH ARE NEWS, WHICH WE OWN THAT ARE NOT UNDER ANY LICENSE. 2.0 Q. RIGHT. AND, IN FACT --21 22 MR. KATZ: MAY I APPROACH, YOUR HONOR? 23 THE COURT: GO AHEAD. 24 | BY MR. KATZ: Q. DID YOU REMEMBER THAT YOU INCLUDED PICTURES AND 25

- INFORMATION ABOUT THE PACKERS BIG WIN IN SUPER BOWL II? DO YOU 2 REMEMBER THAT? 3 I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT. 4 Q. WELL, LET ME SHOW YOU SOMETHING FROM --5 MR. CLARK: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. I'VE NEVER SEEN 6 THIS BEFORE AND I --7 MR. KATZ: WELL, TAKE A LOOK. TAKE A LOOK. MR. CLARK: IT HASN'T BEEN DISCLOSED --8 9 MR. KATZ: THIS IS TO REFRESH HIS RECOLLECTION, YOUR HONOR. 10 11 (COUNSEL AND THE COURT SPEAKING SIMULTANEOUSLY, WHICH WAS NOT REPORTABLE.) 12 13 THE COURT: WELL, THEN, IT'S NOT GOING TO GO INTO 14 EVIDENCE. 15 MAKE NO REFERENCE WHAT TO IT WHATSOEVER, EXCEPT SHOW IT TO THE WITNESS TO SEE WHETHER -- IS YOUR MEMORY NOW 16 17 REFRESHED ON THE SUBJECT OF WHICH YOU SAID YOU HAD NO 18 KNOWLEDGE? 19 THE WITNESS: THIS HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH --
- 20 | THE COURT: WELL, IS YOUR MEMORY NOW REFRESHED ABOUT
- 21 | SOMETHING THAT IT WASN'T -- THAT YOU HAD FORGOTTEN?
- 22 | THE WITNESS: I'M NOT EXACTLY SURE WHAT THIS IS
- 23 SUPPOSED TO MEAN.
- 24 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 25 Q. WELL, DOES YOUR --

1 THE COURT: DO NOT DISPLAY THAT OR --2 (COUNSEL AND THE COURT SPEAKING SIMULTANEOUSLY, WHICH 3 WAS NOT REPORTABLE.) THE COURT: -- BECAUSE IT WAS NOT PROVIDED TO THE 4 5 OTHER SIDE. 6 MR. KATZ: IT'S TO REFRESH RECOLLECTION, YOUR HONOR. 7 THE COURT: IT HASN'T DONE SO. YOU CAN ASK A QUESTION, BUT REFRESHING MEMORY DOESN'T MEAN IT SAILS INTO 8 EVIDENCE OR GETS SHOWN TO THE JURY. MR. KATZ: I'M NOT SAYING IT DOES, YOUR HONOR. MAY I 10 ASK HIM A QUESTION? 11 12 THE COURT: YOU MAY ASK QUESTIONS, BUT DON'T MAKE IT 13 SOUND LIKE IT'S IN THE DOCUMENT. MR. KATZ: RIGHT. 14 15 BY MR. KATZ: Q. DO YOU RECALL THAT YOUR COMPANY PROVIDES INFORMATION ABOUT 16 THE PACKERS' BIG SUPER BOWL WIN IN 1968? 17 A. WE LICENSE AP IMAGES AND STORIES, WHICH CERTAINLY WOULD 18 INCLUDE HISTORICAL INFORMATION SUCH AS THE PACKERS WINNING THE 19 20 SUPER BOWL. Q. THANK YOU. 21 22 AND ISN'T IT A FACT, SIR, THAT YOU BELIEVE THAT, IN 23 || ESSENCE, ANYTHING THAT HAS RESULTS CAN BE TRANSLATED INTO

25 **A.** CERTAINLY, SIR.

24 | FANTASY GAMES?

- 1 Q. AND THAT WOULD INCLUDE PAST GAMES THAT WERE NEVER PLAYED,
- 2 | LIKE THE 64 CLEVELAND BROWNS LIKE THE 89 49ERS. THAT'S A
- 3 | FANTASY, ISN'T IT, SIR?
- $4 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. NO.
- 5 Q. WELL, IT DIDN'T HAPPEN, DID IT?
- 6 A. NO. ANYTHING THAT HAS RESULTS THAT'S GOING ON NOW IS
- 7 GOING TO PLAY FANTASY AGAINST. IF IT ALREADY HAPPENED, YOU
- 8 CAN'T MAY FANTASY AGAINST IT.
- 9 Q. WELL, SIR, YOU'RE FAMILIAR WITH YOUR INDUSTRY, RIGHT?
- 10 | RIGHT?
- 11 **A.** SURE.
- 12 Q. SO HAVE YOU HEARD -- CERTAINLY YOU'VE HEARD OF FOX SPORTS,
- 13 RIGHT? THEY'RE A BIG OUTFIT IN YOUR INDUSTRY, AREN'T THEY?
- 14 **A.** YES.
- 15 Q. THEY HAVE FANTASY, DON'T THEY?
- 16 **A.** YES.
- 17 | Q. AND DON'T THEY HAVE A -- A DIVISION CALLED "THE WHAT-IF
- 18 | SPORTS"? HAVE YOU HEARD OF WHAT-IF SPORTS?
- 19 A. I'VE HEARD OF IT.
- 20 | Q. AND ISN'T WHAT-IF SPORTS ABOUT PREVIOUS TEAMS, VINTAGE
- 21 | TEAMS, PLAYING EACH OTHER?
- 22 A. I BELIEVE SO, YES.
- 23 Q. AND DON'T THEY CALL THAT "FANTASY"?
- 24 **A.** NO.
- 25 Q. WELL, LET ME SHOW YOU SOMETHING TO REFRESH YOUR

RECOLLECTION. 2 MR. KATZ: MAY I APPROACH, YOUR HONOR? 3 THE COURT: PLEASE. GO AHEAD. 4 MR. CLARK: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T HAVE A COPY OF THIS 5 YET. 6 CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT IT IS, PLEASE? 7 THE COURT: DON'T SAY IT IN FRONT OF THE JURY. THINGS THAT ARE FOR REFRESHING MEMORY ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO BE 8 COMMUNICATED TO THE JURY UNLESS IT'S IN EVIDENCE OR IT'S GOING TO BE OFFERED IN EVIDENCE, AND IT WAS PROPERLY NOTICED TO THE 10 11 OTHER SIDE. 12 THINGS THAT ARE JUST TO REFRESH THE MEMORY, YOU JUST 1.3 LAY IT BEFORE THE WITNESS, HE SILENTLY READS IT. IF IT REFRESHES HIS MEMORY, GREAT. IF IT DOESN'T, THAT'S GREAT, TOO. 14 MR. KATZ: OKAY. 15 BY MR. KATZ: 16 17 Q. DOES THIS REFRESH YOUR RECOLLECTION ABOUT WHETHER VINTAGE TEAMS PLAYING EACH OTHER CAN BE CONSIDERED FANTASY SPORTS? LET 18 ME DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO THIS SENTENCE HERE (INDICATING). 19 I HAVE ALWAYS REFERRED TO IT AS "SIMULATION." 2.0 21 Q. NO. MY QUESTION IS: DOES THIS REFRESH YOUR RECOLLECTION? 22 MR. CLARK: OBJECTION. YOUR HONOR, THIS CAN'T BE --23 MR. KATZ: LET ME FINISH MY QUESTION.

THE COURT: YES, LET'S HEAR THE QUESTION FIRST.

25

BY MR. KATZ:

- 2 | Q. DOES THAT REFRESH YOUR RECOLLECTION THAT THERE ARE PEOPLE
- 3 | IN THIS INDUSTRY WHO CONSIDER -- YOUR INDUSTRY, WHO CONSIDER
- 4 | VINTAGE TEAMS PLAYING ONE ANOTHER TO BE FANTASY SPORTS?
- 5 MR. CLARK: OBJECTION.
- 6 | THE WITNESS: I DON'T BELIEVE THEY DO, NO.
- 7 | MR. CLARK: OBJECTION. THIS DOCUMENT --
- 8 | THE COURT: WHETHER IT DOES OR NOT, THINK ABOUT
- 9 | THE -- FOR A SECOND.
- 10 THE WITNESS IS THE ONE WHO'S UNDER OATH. NOTHING
- 11 THAT YOU LAWYERS SAY IS EVIDENCE, PERIOD. I WANT THE JURY TO
- 12 EXPUNGE IT FROM YOUR MIND. IT'S WHAT THE WITNESS SAYS THAT
- 13 COUNTS UNDER OATH.
- 14 SO THIS BUSINESS ABOUT SOME DOCUMENT AND WHAT IT
- 15 | SAYS, YOU CANNOT START SPECULATING THAT IT SAYS SOMETHING
- 16 INCONSISTENT WITH WHAT THE WITNESS SAYS.
- 17 | IT'S IMMATERIAL. EITHER IT REFRESHED HIS MEMORY OR
- 18 IT DID NOT. THERE ARE RULES OF EVIDENCE, AND I'M GOING TO
- 19 INSIST THAT WE FOLLOW THE RULES OF EVIDENCE.
- 20 THE WITNESS IS TESTIFYING FROM HIS OWN MEMORY AND
- 21 KNOWLEDGE. HE DOESN'T -- HE'S NOT RELYING ON THIS DOCUMENT.
- 22 ALL RIGHT. GO AHEAD.
- 23 MR. KATZ, I THINK YOU'RE -- I THINK WE MAY HAVE TO
- 24 | HAVE A CONFERENCE OUT OF THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY SOON, SO I
- 25 WANT YOU TO -- CAN WE MOVE TO SOMETHING ELSE?

- 1 MR. KATZ: YES, YOUR HONOR.
- 2 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
- 3 BY MR. KATZ:
- 4 | Q. ARE YOU -- DO YOU PAY A COMMISSION TO PLAYERS INC FOR THE
- 5 | IMAGES THAT THEY PROVIDE TO YOU?
- 6 A. WE -- WE DON'T GET IMAGES FROM PLAYERS INC.
- 7 | Q. YOU GET -- WHAT DO YOU LICENSE FROM PLAYERS INC?
- 8 A. CURRENTLY, NOTHING.
- 9 Q. WHAT HAVE YOU LICENSED FROM PLAYERS INC?
- 10 A. THE RIGHTS TO HAVE AN NFL PLAYER NAMES IN FANTASY FOOTBALL
- 11 | PRODUCTS.
- 12 Q. AND DO YOU PAY SOME PERCENTAGE COMMISSION OF YOUR SALES
- 13 | FOR THOSE RIGHTS?
- 14 **A.** WE DID.
- 15 Q. OKAY. AND WHAT WAS THAT PERCENTAGE?
- 16 A. UHM, I BELIEVE -- IT'S IN THE DOCUMENT. I BELIEVE IT WAS
- 17 8 AND A HALF PERCENT.
- 18 Q. AND DO YOU THINK 8 AND A HALF PERCENT IS A REASONABLE
- 19 PERCENTAGE TO PAY?
- 20 **A.** IT'S WHAT WE NEGOTIATED.
- 21 Q. DO YOU THINK IT'S REASONABLE?
- 22 **A.** YES.
- 23 | Q. WOULD YOU HAVE BEEN WILLING TO PAY 69 PERCENT?
- 24 | A. NO.
- 25 Q. WOULD YOU HAVE BEEN WILLING TO PAY 63 PERCENT?

- $1 \parallel \mathbf{A}_{\bullet}$ NO.
- 2 | Q. OKAY. DID YOU GO TO THE -- YOU WERE A MEMBER OF THE FSTA,
- 3 | THE FANTASY SPORTS TRADE ASSOCIATION; IS THAT RIGHT?
- $4 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. I WAS, YES.
- 5 | O. DID YOU GO TO THEIR MEETING IN LAS VEGAS IN 2005?
- 6 A. I DON'T RECALL.
- 7 MR. CLARK: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS ALL
- 8 | BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DIRECT EXAMINATION.
- 9 | MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, HE'S HERE FOR ONE DAY. WE ARE
- 10 ACCOMMODATING THEM. I ASKED YOUR HONOR THE OTHER DAY
- 11 | SPECIFICALLY: "CAN WE GO BEYOND THE SCOPE?" AND YOU SAID I
- 12 COULD.
- 13 | THE COURT: YES, BECAUSE -- IT IS BEYOND THE SCOPE,
- 14 BUT HE COULD BE CALLED BACK IN THE REBUTTAL CASE. AND SINCE --
- 15 | I'M GOING TO ALLOW THIS BECAUSE OTHERWISE WE ARE GOING TO HAVE
- 16 TO BRING THE WITNESS BACK IN THE REBUTTAL CASE.
- 17 | THAT MEANS YOU WILL NOT BE ABLE TO GO ON YOUR
- 18 | IMPORTANT BUSINESS TRIP. YOU HAVE TO HANG AROUND THE HALLWAY
- 19 UNTIL THE REBUTTAL CASE COMES. AND I KNOW YOU DON'T WANT TO DO
- 20 | THAT.
- 21 THE WITNESS: I SURE DON'T.
- 22 | THE COURT: SO I AM GOING TO LET HIM ASK HIS
- 23 QUESTIONS NOW.
- 24 | THE WITNESS: THAT'S FINE.
- 25 | MR. KATZ: I JUST HAVE A COUPLE MORE.

1 THE COURT: GO AHEAD. 2 BY MR. KATZ: 3 Q. DID YOU GO TO THAT AWARDS BANQUET IN LAS VEGAS IN 2005, OF 4 THE FANTASY SPORTS TRADE ASSOCIATION? 5 I DON'T RECALL. I'VE BEEN TO SOME OF THE FSTA 6 CONFERENCES. I HAVEN'T BEEN TO ALL OF THEM. 7 Q. WERE YOU AN OFFICER OF THE FSTA? AT ONE POINT I WAS, YES. 8 9 Q. SO YOU KNEW WHAT THEIR PROGRAMS WERE, RIGHT? SURE. 10 A. 11 Q. DID YOU WHO WAS THE KEYNOTE SPEAKER IN 2005 AT THIS FANTASY SPORTS CONFERENCE? 12 1.3 MR. CLARK: OBJECTION. FOUNDATION. THE COURT: HE'S ASKING IF HE DOES KNOW. 14 15 THE WITNESS: NO. BY MR. KATZ: 16 17 Q. DO YOU KNOW IT WAS WARREN MOON, YOUR HONOR? DO YOU KNOW IT WAS WARREN MOON, SIR? 18 19 THE COURT: WAIT, WAIT. DISREGARD THAT. 2.0 YOU'RE TESTIFYING, MR. KATZ. HE SAYS HE DOESN'T KNOW, AND NOW YOU'RE BLURTING IT 21 OUT IN FRONT OF THE JURY. 22 23 DISREGARD THAT STATEMENT ABOUT WARREN MOON. 24 MR. KATZ, THAT WAS IMPROPER. 25 MR. KATZ: I APOLOGIZE, YOUR HONOR.

- BY MR. KATZ:
- 2 | O. DO YOU KNOW WHETHER WARREN MOON WAS THE SPEAKER?
- 3 MR. CLARK: SAME OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR.
- 4 | THE COURT: DO YOU REMEMBER OR DO YOU KNOW IF WARREN
- 5 MOON WAS THE SPEAKER?
- 6 THE WITNESS: I DON'T REMEMBER.
- 7 BY MR. KATZ:
- 8 | **Q.** OKAY.
- 9 THE COURT: IT DOES NOT REFRESH HIS MEMORY.
- 10 MR. KATZ: MAY I SHOW HIM SOMETHING TO REFRESH HIS
- 11 | RECOLLECTION?
- 12 | THE COURT: IS IT THAT YOU NEVER KNEW OR YOU DID KNOW
- 13 AND YOU HAVE FORGOTTEN? IN OTHER WORDS, WAS THERE EVER A POINT
- 14 IN TIME WHEN YOU DID KNOW THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION AND YOU
- 15 | HAVE JUST FORGOTTEN?
- 16 THE WITNESS: SURE. IF I WAS AT THAT CONFERENCE, I
- 17 JUST DON'T REMEMBER IF I --
- 18 | THE COURT: WERE YOU AT THAT CONFERENCE?
- 19 | THE WITNESS: I DON'T KNOW IF I WAS AT THAT
- 20 PARTICULAR ONE.
- 21 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I'LL LET COUNSEL SHOW YOU
- 22 SOMETHING TO SEE IF IT REFRESHES YOUR MEMORY THAT YOU WERE AT
- 23 | THE CONFERENCE AND/OR THAT WHO WAS THE SPEAKER, IF YOU WEREN'T.
- 24 NOW, IT HAS TO ACTUALLY REFRESH YOUR MEMORY. DON'T TAKE THE
- 25 WORD OF THE DOCUMENT.

1 THE WITNESS: RIGHT.

2 THE COURT: THE DOCUMENT COULD BE IN ERROR. SO IT

3 | HAS TO BE SOMETHING THAT WOULD ACTUALLY CAUSE YOUR MEMORY:

4 | "AH, YES. THE LIGHT WENT OFF. NOW I REMEMBER."

THE WITNESS: I HONESTLY DON'T THINK I WAS AT THAT

6 ONE, SO I DON'T REMEMBER THAT.

7 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. HE DOESN'T REMEMBER.

8 BY MR. KATZ:

- 9 $||\mathbf{Q}|$ IN 2005, WAS WARREN MOON A RETIRED FOOTBALL PLAYER? DO
- 10 YOU KNOW THAT?
- 11 A. PROBABLY. I DON'T REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN HE RETIRED, BUT
- 12 PROBABLY.
- 13 Q. AND ISN'T IT A FACT THAT RETIRED FOOTBALL PLAYERS SPEAK AT
- 14 MANY FANTASY SPORT CONVENTIONS?
- 15 | A. THEY SPEAK AT TRADING CARD SHOWS, A LOT OF DIFFERENT
- 16 EVENTS. SO I'M SURE THEY ALSO SPEAK AT FANTASY CONVENTIONS.
- 17 Q. BECAUSE THE PEOPLE WHO GO TO FANTASY CONVENTIONS ARE
- 18 | INTERESTED IN RETIRED FOOTBALL PLAYERS, AREN'T THEY, SIR?
- 19 | A. THE PEOPLE THAT GO TO THESE CONVENTIONS ARE JUST PEOPLE IN
- 20 | THE INDUSTRY. THEY ARE NOT CONSUMERS.
- 21 | Q. THEY'RE INTERESTED IN RETIRED FOOTBALL PLAYERS, AREN'T
- 22 THEY, SIR?
- 23 A. I'M NOT, BUT SOME OF THEM MAY BE.
- 24 MR. KATZ: THANK YOU, SIR.
- 25 | THE COURT: ANYTHING MORE ON REDIRECT?

1	MR. CLARK: YES, YOUR HONOR, JUST A COUPLE OF
2	QUESTIONS.
3	COULD WE GET TRIAL EXHIBIT 1109 BACK UP, PLEASE,
4	LAUREN? CAN WE GO BACK TO PARAGRAPH 10B, MR. KATZ ASKED ABOUT
5	ON PAGE 5.
6	(DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
7	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. CLARK:
9	Q. MR. BYRD, DOES THIS PARAGRAPH HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH
10	THIS CASE TODAY?
11	MR. KATZ: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR.
12	THE COURT: HOW IS HE SUPPOSED TO KNOW WHAT THE CASE
13	IS? HE HASN'T BEEN HERE SITTING AROUND HERE LIKE THE JURY HAS
14	BEEN. I DON'T THINK THAT'S A FAIR QUESTION.
15	SUSTAINED.
16	BY MR. CLARK:
17	Q. IF YOU LOOK AT THE SECOND LINE THERE, IT SAYS:
18	"PROTECTION OR TO PROTECT ANY OF THE RIGHTS
19	CONVEYED HEREUNDER."
20	WHAT RIGHTS WERE BEING CONVEYED IN THIS AGREEMENT,
21	MR. BYRD?
22	MR. KATZ: OBJECT, YOUR HONOR.
23	THE COURT: NO. THAT'S THAT'S SOMETHING THAT BOTH
24	SIDES HAVE GONE INTO. AND YOU RAISED THIS VERY PROVISION
25	YOURSELF. SO THE OBJECTION IS OVERRULED.

- 1 YOU MAY ANSWER.
- 2 | THE WITNESS: THIS AGREEMENT WAS FOR LICENSING OF
- 3 | ACTIVE NFL PLAYERS FOR FANTASY FOOTBALL GAME.
- 4 BY MR. CLARK:
- 5 | O. IS IT YOUR UNDERSTANDING THAT THIS PROVISION OBLIGATES YOU
- 6 TO BE HERE IN ANY WAY?
- 7 MR. KATZ: OBJECT.
- 8 BY MR. CLARK:
- 9 O. DO YOU HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING --
- 10 | THE COURT: NOW, WAIT. WAIT. YOU, YOURSELF,
- 11 MR. KATZ, YOU BROUGHT IT UP.
- 12 MR. KATZ: I DIDN'T ASK A LEADING QUESTION, YOUR
- 13 HONOR.
- 14 THE COURT: WHAT?
- 15 MR. KATZ: HE'S ASKING A LEADING QUESTION. I'M NOT
- 16 OBJECTING ON ANY GROUNDS EXCEPT THAT IT'S LEADING.
- 17 | THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WHY DON'T YOU ASK THIS
- 18 QUESTION: WHAT -- TO WHAT EXTENT IS HE APPEARING HERE TODAY ON
- 19 ACCOUNT OF THAT CLAUSE IN THE AGREEMENT?
- 20 BY MR. CLARK:
- 21 Q. MR. BYRD, TO WHAT EXTENT, IF ANY, ARE YOU APPEARING HERE
- 22 TODAY BECAUSE OF THIS CLAUSE IN THE AGREEMENT, 10B?
- 23 A. NONE AT ALL.
- 24 (THEREUPON, AN ALARM SOUNDED.)
- 25 THE COURT: SOMETIMES THAT GOES OFF AT 10 O'CLOCK.

1	I'VE BEEN ON THIS JOB ALMOST 10 YEARS, AND I STILL
2	HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO FIND OUT WHY. BUT FIRST WE WERE ALARMED
3	AND WONDERED WHETHER WE HAD TO EVACUATE THE BUILDING. AND
4	ABOUT ONE OUT OF FIVE TIMES THEY WILL COME ON ABOUT TWO MINUTES
5	LATER ON THE SPEAKER AND EXPLAIN WHY IT WENT OFF.
6	BUT 80 PERCENT OF THE TIME WE GET NO CLUE. AND WE
7	SIT HERE WAITING FOR THEM TO INTERRUPT US TO TELL US IF THEY
8	HAVE A MESSAGE FOR US. USUALLY THEY DON'T.
9	SO FROM EXPERIENCE, I'M JUST TELLING YOU IT MEANS
10	NOTHING. IT IS YOUR THE GOVERNMENT SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
11	DOING ITS THING, AND WE CAN'T GET THEM TO EXPLAIN IT OR TO STOP
12	IT.
13	(LAUGHTER)
14	SO I'M GOING TO SUGGEST WE CONTINUE WITH YOUR
15	EXAMINATION. AND THERE'S A SMALL CHANCE THEY WILL INTERRUPT US
16	IN ABOUT 30 MORE SECONDS.
17	MR. CLARK: HOPEFULLY, I CAN GET IT DONE BEFORE THAT
18	HAPPENS, IF IT HAPPENS, YOUR HONOR.
19	THE COURT: GO AHEAD.
20	BY MR. CLARK:
21	Q. MR. BYRD, WOULD AS THE NEGOTIATOR FOR STATS IN 2006,
22	WOULD YOU HAVE BEEN WILLING TO PAY ANY EXTRA MONEY TO GET
23	RETIRED PLAYER RIGHTS?
24	MR. KATZ: OBJECT. LEADING.

MR. CLARK: HE BROUGHT IT UP, YOUR HONOR.

1	MR. KATZ: HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH LEADING, YOUR
2	HONOR.
3	THE COURT: I KNOW. BUT TRY NOT TO LEAD SO MUCH. IT
4	IS REDIRECT. YOU GET A LITTLE MORE LATITUDE. I'M JUST GOING
5	TO OVERRULE IT.
6	THE JURY WILL TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THIS IS A LEADING
7	QUESTION. BUT GIVEN THAT IT'S REDIRECT I'M GOING TO LET YOU
8	ASK THIS QUESTION.
9	THE WITNESS: NO. THERE IS NO VALUE FOR RETIRED
10	PLAYERS IN FANTASY FOOTBALL. SO, NO, WE WOULD NOT HAVE.
11	MR. CLARK: NO MORE QUESTIONS, YOUR HONOR.
12	THE COURT: THANK YOU. ALL RIGHT.
13	ANYTHING MORE?
14	MR. KATZ: NO, YOUR HONOR.
15	THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING TO CAN THIS
16	WITNESS, MR. BYRD, BE EXCUSED?
17	MR. KATZ: YES, HE MAY, YOUR HONOR.
18	MR. KESSLER: HE MAY, YOUR HONOR.
19	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU ARE GOING TO BE
20	DISCHARGED FROM THE SUBPOENA, IF THERE WAS ONE.
21	I'M GOING TO EXCUSE YOU FOR GOOD.
22	THE WITNESS: OKAY.
23	THE COURT: YOU CAN GO ON YOUR TRIP.
24	THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. I APPRECIATE THAT.
25	THE COURT: YOU ARE NOT SUBJECT TO RECALL.

```
1
             THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. THANK YOU. THANK YOU.
 2
             THE COURT: THANK YOU, SIR, FOR COMING.
 3
             SEEMS LIKE -- GO AHEAD. I'M JUST THINKING TO MYSELF.
 4
   HAVE WE HAD OUR BREAK THIS MORNING YET? WE STARTED LATE,
 5
   DIDN'T WE? IT'S TIME FOR A BREAK, THEN, ISN'T IT?
 6
             NOW, I WANT TO MAKE SURE OF SOMETHING. HAVE ANY OF
 7
   YOU BEEN READING ANY NEWSPAPER ACCOUNTS OR LOOKING AT ANY TV OR
   ANYTHING THAT HAS ANYTHING TO DO WITH THIS CASE?
 8
 9
              (THEREUPON, THE JURORS RESPONDED IN THE NEGATIVE.)
             THE COURT: EVERYONE IS INDICATING "NO."
10
             IT'S VERY IMPORTANT. OCCASIONALLY, THERE IS GOING TO
11
   BE SOMETHING ABOUT THIS CASE IN THE PAPERS OR ON TV OR THE
12
   RADIO. AND YOU HAVE JUST GOT TO TURN IT OFF AND NOT LISTEN TO
13
   IT. I DON'T WANT YOU TO GET CONTAMINATED BY ANY -- ANYTHING
14
   YOU MIGHT HEAR OUT THERE, BECAUSE YOU HAVE AN IMPORTANT JOB TO
15
   DO, WHICH IS TO DECIDE THIS CASE BASED ON THE EVIDENCE HERE.
16
17
             SO REMEMBER THAT. IF ANYBODY TRIES TO TALK TO YOU
   ABOUT THIS CASE, INCLUDING ONE OF YOUR LOVED ONES, YOU HAVE TO
18
   TELL THEM NOT TO DO SO. AND THEN, YOU'VE GOT TO TELL ME THAT
19
   SOMEBODY IS TRYING TO TALK TO YOU.
2.0
             ALL RIGHT. REMEMBER THE ADMONITION. DON'T TALK TO
21
22
   EACH OTHER. KEEP AN OPEN MIND.
             WE'LL SEE YOU BACK HERE IN 15 MINUTES.
23
24
             THE CLERK: ALL RISE.
25
             (THEREUPON, THE JURY LEFT THE COURTROOM.)
```

```
1
              THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. EVERYBODY HAVE A SEAT.
 2
              LISTEN, THE -- I WANT YOU TO KNOW FROM HERE ON OUT
 3
   I'M GOING TO START ENFORCING THIS. THE PROPER WAY TO USE
 4
  REFRESHING RECOLLECTION -- IT'S A MUCH ABUSED THING BY LAWYERS.
 5
              THE ONLY PROPER WAY TO DO IT IS AFTER THE WITNESS
 6
   SAYS "I DON'T REMEMBER," THEN -- YOU CAN'T JUST SAY, "I WANT TO
 7
   REFRESH YOUR MEMORY." YOU HAVE TO THEN SAY -- WELL, YOU CAN
   THEN SAY:
 8
 9
                   "ALL RIGHT. I'M GOING TO SHOW YOU SOMETHING."
             AND YOU HAVE WIDE LATITUDE HERE, BUT YOU CANNOT
10
11
   COMMUNICATE TO THE JURY WHAT IT IS. AND THEN, YOU SAY:
12
                   "READ THAT SILENTLY TO YOURSELF."
1.3
              THEN, ASK THE QUESTION:
                   "DOES THAT NOW REFRESH YOUR RECOLLECTION?"
14
              AND IF THE WITNESS SAYS "NO," THEN YOU HAVE TO DROP
15
   IT. IF THE WITNESS SAYS "YES," YOU CAN THEN ELICIT FROM THEM
16
17
   THEIR REFRESHED RECOLLECTION.
             MANY LAWYERS TRY TO USE IT IF THEY SAY -- IF THE
18
19
   OUESTION IS:
                   "WAS THE LIGHT RED," AND THEY SAY:
20
                   "NO, IT WAS GREEN," THEN THE LAWYER TROTS UP
21
22
   THERE WITH A DOCUMENT AND SAYS:
23
                   "LET ME REFRESH YOUR MEMORY."
24
             THAT'S TOTALLY IMPROPER. THAT'S JUST AN ATTEMPT TO
25
   IMPEACH.
```

```
1
             BUT IMPEACHMENT CAN ONLY BE ALMOST ALWAYS THROUGH
   ONLY A SIGNED STATEMENT, AN E-MAIL THAT THEY SENT, SOMETHING
 2
 3
   THEY THEMSELVES WROTE. IT CAN'T BE JUST SOME GENERALIZED
 4
   DOCUMENT THAT CONTRADICTS WHAT THEY SAID. IT HAS TO BE
 5
   SOMETHING THEY SAID. THAT'S TRUE IMPEACHMENT. YOU CAN'T USE
 6
   IT -- YOU CAN'T -- LET'S SAY THERE'S ANOTHER WITNESS WHO
 7
   HAPPENED TO SAY THE LIGHT WAS A DIFFERENT COLOR. YOU CAN'T
   TROT THAT IN FRONT OF THE WITNESS AND SAY:
 8
 9
                   "AH-HA. I'M IMPEACHING YOU WITH SOMEBODY ELSE'S
   STATEMENT THAT THE LIGHT WAS A DIFFERENT COLOR."
10
             NOW, IF THE WITNESS SAID:
11
                   "I CAN'T REMEMBER WHAT COLOR THE LIGHT WAS," AND
12
13
   THEY -- THERE MIGHT BE -- THERE MIGHT BE SOMETHING THAT -- IT
   DOESN'T HAVE TO BE A SIGNED STATEMENT. LOTS OF THINGS MIGHT
14
15
   REFRESH THEIR MEMORY. BUT YOU HAVE TO -- YOU HAVE TO WAIT
   UNTIL THEY SAY:
16
17
                   "I DON'T REMEMBER."
             YOU HAVE TO SHOW IT TO THEM. DO NOT READ IT ALOUD.
18
   DO NOT INFER TO THE JURY WHAT IT IS. AND THEN, WAIT AND ASK:
19
                   "DOES IT NOW REFRESH YOUR MEMORY?"
2.0
              IF THE ANSWER IS "YES," YOU CAN GET THE TESTIMONY.
21
   IF THE ANSWER IS "NO," YOU'VE GOT TO DROP IT. SO THAT'S THE --
22
             NOW, AND THEN TO SAY -- BLURT OUT "WARREN MOON WAS
23
2.4
   IT, " THAT -- YOU KNOW, THAT'S THE LAWYER TALKING AGAIN. I'M
   TRYING TO IMPRESS ON YOU THAT IT'S THE WITNESSES WHO GIVE THE
25
```

TESTIMONY, NOT THE LAWYERS. 2 SO YOU SHOULD NOT -- YOU SHOULD NOT HAVE SAID IT WAS 3 WARREN MOON. THAT WAS NOT THE CORRECT THING TO DO. 4 MR. KATZ: I APOLOGIZE TO THE COURT FOR THAT. ALSO, 5 MY UNDERSTANDING, YOUR HONOR, OF RULE 8035 IS THAT IF HIS 6 MEMORY IS REFRESHED -- AND I ADMIT I DIDN'T HAVE MUCH LUCK ON 7 THAT -- THEN YOU'RE ALLOWED TO READ PORTIONS OF THE DOCUMENT INTO THE RECORD. 8 9 THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. MR. KATZ: IT'S NOT ACCEPTED AS AN EXHIBIT, BUT YOU 10 11 ARE ALLOWED TO READ IT INTO THE RECORD. 12 THE COURT: NO. WAIT A MINUTE. 8035? 13 MR. KATZ: 8025. 8025, EXCUSE ME. THE COURT: YOU MEAN, 8035. NO --14 MR. KATZ: 8035. 15 16 THE COURT: NO RECORDED RECOLLECTION IS A TOTALLY DIFFERENT THING. RECORDED RECOLLECTION HAS TO BE SOMETHING HE 17 18 WROTE. 19 MR. KATZ: RIGHT. THE COURT: HE WROTE. HE NO LONGER HAS A MEMORY OF 2.0 IT, THAT HE WROTE IT AT THE TIME WHEN HIS MEMORY WAS FRESH. 21 22 AND THAT IN HIS PRACTICE AND SO FORTH IT WOULD HAVE BEEN -- SO 23 IT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE ACTUALLY A BUSINESS RECORD, JUST A 24 MEMORANDUM IN THE FILE THAT HE WROTE WHEN IT WAS FRESH.

THAT CAN COME INTO EVIDENCE. BUT THAT'S GOT TO BE

SOMETHING HE WROTE. 2 NOW, ON REFRESHING MEMORY IT COULD BE -- IT COULD 3 EVEN BE A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE. 4 MR. KATZ: IT COULD BE ANYTHING, REALLY. 5 THE COURT: IT COULD BE HIS FAVORITE SONG. SO -- BUT 6 YOU'VE GOT TO HAVE A GOOD FAITH BELIEF REASON FOR THINKING THAT 7 IT MIGHT REFRESH HIS MEMORY. BUT WHAT YOU CAN'T DO IS PUBLISH IT TO THE JURY. 8 9 MR. KATZ: RIGHT. THE COURT: IT'S JUST KIND OF A SECRET COMMUNICATION 10 11 BETWEEN YOU AND THE WITNESS: 12 "HEY, DOES THIS REFRESH YOUR MEMORY?" 13 IF THE ANSWER IS "NO," MOVE ON. MR. KATZ: I HAD A GOOD FAITH BELIEF, YOUR HONOR. I 14 15 HAD THE DOCUMENT. AND I SHOULDN'T HAVE SAID "WARREN MOON." BUT, IN FACT, I DID ASK HIM LATER ON IF WARREN MOON 16 IS A RETIRED FOOTBALL PLAYER. 17 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ANYTHING FOR ME? WE ARE 18 GOING TO TAKE OUR BREAK. 19 2.0 MR. KATZ: NOTHING, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: HEARING NOTHING, ALL RIGHT. 21 OH, I NEED SOMETHING. WHAT IS THE ALLOCATION ON 22 23 THE -- ON THE READ IN OF MR. EYRICH, WHICH WAS A TOTAL OF 47 2.4 MINUTES? 25 MR. CHARHON: WE HAVE YET TO CONFER ON THIS ISSUE,

BUT WE WILL AT THE BREAK, YOUR HONOR. 2 MR. KESSLER: WE'LL TO IT AT THE BREAK. WE HAVEN'T 3 HAD A CHANCE, YOUR HONOR. 4 THE COURT: I'M GOING TO LOSE TRACK OF IT. I'M GOING 5 TO ALLOCATE IT ARBITRARILY MYSELF, IF YOU DON'T TELL ME WHAT IT 6 IS. 7 MR. KESSLER: WE'RE GOING TO DO IT RIGHT NOW ON THE BREAK. 8 9 THE COURT: WERE THERE OTHER EXHIBITS YOU WANTED TO MOVE IN? 10 11 MR. KATZ: THERE WERE. DO YOU OBJECT TO ANY OF 12 | THESE? 13 MR. KESSLER: WE'LL REVIEW THAT AT THE BREAK, TOO. 14 WE JUST WERE BUSY WITH THE WITNESS. THE COURT: THANK YOU. I'LL SEE YOU BACK HERE IN 15 15 16 | MINUTES. 17 (RECESS TAKEN FROM 10:08 TO 10:21 A.M.) THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SHALL WE GO BACK TO WORK? 18 19 WHAT IS THE TIME ON ALLOCATION ON MR. EYRICH? MR. CHARHON: WE'VE CONFIRMED IT'S GOING TO BE 20 65 PERCENT TO THE PLAINTIFFS, 35 PERCENT TO THE DEFENDANTS. 21 THE COURT: 47 MINUTES TIMES TWO-THIRDS IS 31 MINUTES 22 TO PLAINTIFF AND 16 MINUTES TO THE DEFENDANT. 23 24 ALL RIGHT. WHAT ELSE? MR. CHARHON: AS FAR AS EXHIBITS GO, PLAINTIFFS OFFER 25

```
19.
 2
             THE COURT: 19. ANY OBJECTION?
 3
             MR. KESSLER: NO.
 4
              THE COURT: IT'S ALREADY IN.
 5
             MR. CHARHON: 85.
 6
             THE COURT: 85.
 7
             MR. CHARHON: AND I --
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ALREADY IN.
 8
 9
             MR. CHARHON: -- THINK 85 SHOULD ALREADY BE IN, TOO.
             96.
10
              THE COURT: IT'S NOT IN YET, BUT I WILL PUT IT IN.
11
12
              (TRIAL EXHIBIT 96 RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)
13
             MR. CHARHON: AND 97.
             THE COURT: RECEIVED. ALL RECEIVED.
14
15
              (TRIAL EXHIBIT 97 RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)
             MR. CHARHON: THANKS.
16
17
             THE COURT: READY TO GO WITH THE NEXT WITNESS?
             MR. KATZ: MR. ADDERLEY.
18
19
             THE COURT: MR. ADDERLEY IS NEXT?
             MR. KATZ: YES.
2.0
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I'LL BRING IN THE JURY.
21
             OH, BEFORE I DO THAT, I WANT TO BRING UP SOMETHING
22
23
   ABOUT THE JURY.
24
             MR. KESSLER: I'M SORRY, YOUR HONOR?
25
             THE COURT: THE COMMENT THAT I MADE TO THE JURY ABOUT
```

THE PRESS AND SO FORTH MUST HAVE PROVOKED ONE OF THE JURORS TO 2 ASK DAWN A QUESTION. AND THAT WAS WHETHER OR NOT WE HAD GIVEN 3 OUT THE NAMES OF THE -- THEIR NAMES TO THE -- ADDRESSES TO THE 4 PRESS. 5 AND THE ANSWER, OF COURSE, IS: NO. BUT THE NAMES 6 ARE PUBLIC. SO THE NAMES WOULD HAVE BEEN KNOWN. 7 THIS JUROR SAID SOMEONE DROVE BY HER HOUSE AND TOOK A PHOTOGRAPH. SHE'S NOT ACCUSING ANYBODY HERE OF HAVING DONE 8 THAT, BUT SHE -- I THINK SHE, IN FACT, WAS WONDERING IF MAYBE THE PRESS DID THAT. 10 I'M ASKING EVERYONE HERE, AS OFFICERS OF THE COURT TO 11 LET ME KNOW BY THE END OF TODAY IF EITHER SIDE HAS HAD ANYBODY 12 1.3 GO OUT TO TAKE PHOTOGRAPHS OF ANYBODY'S HOUSES ON THE JURY. MR. KESSLER: WE CAN LET YOU RIGHT NOW, WE HAVE NOT 14 DONE ANYTHING LIKE THAT, YOUR HONOR, AND WOULD NOT DO ANYTHING 15 LIKE THAT. 16 MR. KATZ: AND WE CAN ALSO CONFIRM THAT NOT ONLY DID 17 WE NOT DO THAT, BUT WHEN YOUR HONOR MADE THE GAG ORDER THE 18 OTHER DAY WE SENT OUT A MAILING TO THE CLASS WHICH CONVEYED 19 2.0 YOUR GAG ORDER TO THE CLASS. 21 THE COURT: WELL, I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT THE GAG 22 ORDER.

MR. KATZ: I UNDERSTAND.

AN INVESTIGATION ON ANY OF THE JURORS?

THE COURT: I'M TALKING ABOUT IS ANYONE TRYING TO DO

23

24

```
1
             MR. PARCHER: NO.
 2
             MR. KESSLER: ABSOLUTELY NOT, YOUR HONOR.
 3
             MR. PARCHER: ABSOLUTELY NOT.
 4
             THE COURT: WELL, I BELIEVE THAT YOU ALL BELIEVE THAT
 5
   YOU ARE CORRECT, BUT I WANT YOU TO DOUBLE-CHECK WITH YOUR
 6
   CLIENTS, BECAUSE MAYBE YOUR CLIENTS HAVE BEEN DOING SOMETHING
 7
   YOU DON'T KNOW ABOUT. AND IF -- THEY OUGHT TO STOP IT IF THEY
   HAVE DONE ANYTHING LIKE THAT. AND I NEED TO KNOW IF THERE'S
 8
   BEEN ANY -- ANYTHING -- ANYTHING CLOSE TO THAT, I WANT TO KNOW
   ABOUT IT.
10
11
             ALL RIGHT. IT COULD HAVE JUST BEEN A REAL ESTATE
   AGENT TAKING PICTURES OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD. WHO KNOWS WHAT IT
12
13
   IS?
             ALL RIGHT. WE'LL CALL THE JURY IN.
14
15
             (THEREUPON, THE JURY RETURNED TO THE COURTROOM.)
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. BE SEATED EVERYONE. NEXT
16
17
   WITNESS.
18
             MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT, THE
   PLAINTIFF CALLS MR. HERBERT ANTHONY ADDERLEY.
19
2.0
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MR. ADDERLEY. WELCOME.
   PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND. WE'LL SWEAR YOU IN.
21
             (THEREUPON, THE WITNESS WAS SWORN.)
22
23
             THE WITNESS: I DO.
24
             THE CLERK: OKAY. THANK YOU.
25
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ARE YOU ABLE TO MAKE IT UP
```

1	THERE ON YOUR OWN?
2	THE WITNESS: YES, SIR. GOT ONE MORE BIG PLAY LEFT.
3	THE COURT: DID WHAT?
4	THE WITNESS: I HAVE ONE MORE BIG PLAY LEFT IN THIS
5	OLD BODY.
6	THE COURT: THAT'S GREAT.
7	HAVE A SEAT. WATCH THE MICROPHONE THERE. IT'S
8	CAUGHT IN YOUR JACKET.
9	BY NOW YOU KNOW THE DRILL. WE NEED TO TAKE YOUR
10	PICTURE.
11	THE WITNESS: OKAY TO SMILE?
12	THE COURT: PLEASE DO.
13	THE CLERK: OKAY.
14	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
15	MAKE SURE THE MIC CATCHES YOUR VOICE.
16	GO RIGHT AHEAD.
17	HERBERT ADDERLEY,
18	A PLAINTIFF HEREIN, HAVING BEEN FIRST DULY SWORN, WAS EXAMINED
19	AND TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS:
20	DIRECT EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. KATZ:
22	Q. GOOD MORNING, MR. ADDERLEY.
23	A. GOOD MORNING, SIR.
24	Q. WOULD YOU PLEASE TELL THE JURY YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS, FOR
25	THE RECORD.

- 1 A. HERBERT ANTHONY ADDERLEY, 1058 T-R-I-S-T-R-A-M, TRISTRAM,
- 2 | CIRCLE, MANTUA, M-A-N-T-U-A, NEW JERSEY, 08051.
- 3 Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN, SIR?
- 4 | A. YES, SIR, I DO.
- 5 | Q. DO YOU HAVE A SON OR A DAUGHTER OR BOTH?
- 6 A. I HAVE A DAUGHTER.
- 7 Q. WHAT DOES SHE DO?
- 8 | A. SHE'S A DENTIST -- DOCTOR OF DENTAL SURGERY IN WASHINGTON,
- 9 D.C.
- 10 Q. IS SHE MARRIED?
- 11 **A.** YES.
- 12 Q. WHAT DOES HER HUSBAND DO?
- 13 A. HE'S A PHYSICAL SCIENTIST, WORKS FOR FBI, WASHINGTON, D.C.
- 14 Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY GRANDCHILDREN, SIR?
- 15 **A.** YES, I DO.
- 16 | **Q.** HOW MANY?
- 17 | A. TWO.
- 18 Q. DID YOU GO TO COLLEGE, SIR?
- 19 **A.** YES, SIR.
- 20 Q. DID YOU GET YOUR DEGREE?
- 21 **A.** YES.
- 22 Q. WHERE DID YOU GO?
- 23 A. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY.
- 24 | Q. DID YOU PLAY FOOTBALL THERE?
- 25 A. YES, I DID, FOOTBALL SCHOLARSHIP.

- 1 Q. AND ARE YOU A RETIRED NFL PLAYER?
- $2 | \mathbf{A}$. YES.
- 3 | Q. WERE YOU DRAFTED INTO THE NFL?
- $4 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. YES, I WAS.
- 5 O. CAN YOU TELL US ABOUT THE DRAFT?
- 6 | A. I WAS THE NUMBER ONE DRAFT CHOICE OF THE GREENBAY PACKERS
- 7 | AS A RUNNING BACK, WHICH IS AN OFFENSIVE PLAYER, OUT OF
- 8 MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY IN 1961.
- 9 | Q. AND WHAT TEAMS DID YOU PLAY FOR?
- 10 | A. PLAYED FOR THE GREENBAY PACKERS FROM 1961 THROUGH '69.
- 11 AND THE DALLAS COWBOYS FROM 1970 THROUGH '72.
- 12 Q. OKAY. AND YOU SAID YOU WERE DRAFTED AS AN OFFENSIVE
- 13 | PLAYER. WHAT POSITION DID YOU PLAY IN THE PROS?
- 14 | A. I WAS A DEFENSIVE BACK SPECIALIZED AT THE LEFT CORNER
- 15 | POSITION.
- 16 Q. OKAY. AND HAVE YOU RECEIVED ANY AWARDS AS A RESULT OF
- 17 YOUR PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL CAREER?
- 18 A. WELL, DURING MY PLAYING DAYS I WAS VOTED BY THE COACHES ON
- 19 | FIVE DIFFERENT OCCASIONS TO PLAY IN THE ALL STAR GAME, A PRO
- 20 BOWL GAME. AND I WAS ELECTED BY THE AP OR UPI EIGHT TIMES AS
- 21 AN ALL PRO.
- 22 | AND IN 1980 I WAS ELECTED TO THE PRO FOOTBALL HALL OF
- 23 | FAME.
- 24 | Q. I NOTICE, SIR, THAT YOU'VE BEEN WEARING THAT YELLOW JACKET
- 25 TO COURT. DOES THAT HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH THE HALL OF FAME?

- 1 A. YES, IT DOES. IT'S GIVEN TO ALL THE HALL OF FAMERS. ONCE
- 2 YOU ARE ENSHRINED AND ONCE YOU PUT THE JACKET ON THAT MEANS YOU
- 3 ARE OFFICIALLY A HALL OF FAMER ALL TIME.
- 4 | O. AND OF THE THOUSANDS OF PLAYERS THAT HAVE PLAYED
- 5 | PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL, APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY ARE IN THE HALL
- 6 OF FAME?
- 7 A. OH, I'D SAY ABOUT 239, JUST TAKING A GUESS.
- 8 Q. SO SOMETHING UNDER A QUARTER OF 1 PERCENT OF THE PLAYERS?
- $9 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. YES.
- 10 | Q. OKAY. AND DID YOU WIN ANY CHAMPIONSHIPS WHEN YOU PLAYED?
- 11 A. GREENBAY PACKERS, WE WON FIVE CHAMPIONSHIPS, INCLUDING THE
- 12 | FIRST TWO SUPER BOWLS. AND THE DALLAS COWBOYS I PLAYED IN TWO
- 13 SUPER BOWLS. WE WON ONE AND LOST ONE.
- 14 Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY CHAMPIONSHIP RINGS?
- 15 $\|\mathbf{A}_{\bullet}\|$ SIX.
- 16 Q. ARE YOU WEARING ANY OF THEM?
- 17 A. YEAH, I'M WEARING MY FAVORITE RING.
- 18 Q. WHICH ONE IS THAT?
- 19 A. FROM SUPER BOWL II.
- 20 Q. CAN YOU JUST SHOW THAT TO THE JURY?
- 21 | A. (INDICATING.)
- 22 | Q. OKAY. AND DO YOU HAVE YOUR HALL OF FAME RING, TOO?
- 23 **A.** YES, SIR.
- 24 Q. OKAY. WHAT WAS THE WON-LOSS RECORD OF THE TEAMS THAT YOU
- 25 | PLAYED ON?

- 1 A. DURING MY 12 YEARS THE WORST TEAM I PLAYED ON ENDED UP --
- 2 | WE PLAYED 14 GAMES AT THAT PARTICULAR TIME, AND THE WORST
- 3 | RECORD I HAD FOR THE TEAM WAS 8 AND 6.
- 4 | O. DID ANY PLAYER HAVE A BETTER -- PLAY ON TEAMS THAT HAD A
- 5 | BETTER WON-LOSS RECORD THAN YOU DID OVER YOUR 11- OR 12-YEAR
- 6 | CAREER?
- 7 A. I WOULD SAY ONLY MY TEAMMATES.
- 8 Q. WHEN YOU WERE A PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL PLAYER, DID YOU HAVE
- 9 TO HOLD ANOTHER JOB DURING THE OFF SEASON?
- 10 **A.** YES.
- 11 Q. WHY WAS THAT?
- 12 A. BECAUSE THE SALARIES WERE SO LOW AT THAT PARTICULAR TIME,
- 13 WE HAD TO HAVE TWO JOBS IN ORDER TO SUPPLEMENT OUR SALARY TO
- 14 MAKE ENDS MEET.
- 15 Q. OKAY. AND WHAT WAS YOUR SECOND JOB?
- 16 A. I ALWAYS WORKED IN SOME TYPE OF COMMUNICATIONS, BECAUSE I
- 17 MAJORED IN COMMUNICATIONS IN COLLEGE. SO I WOULD DO A COLUMN
- 18 FOR THE PHILADELPHIA DAILY NEWS, MY HOMETOWN. I WOULD DO A
- 19 COLUMN FOR THE PAPER. I HAD SPORTS TALK SHOW, RADIO, CABLE
- 20 | TELEVISION SHOW WHERE I INTERVIEWED THE PHILADELPHIA EAGLES
- 21 | BEFORE GAMES, AFTER GAMES, AND THEIR OPPONENTS BEFORE AND AFTER
- 22 GAMES.
- 23 $\|\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}\|$ How much practice did you have to put in to be a good
- 24 | PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL PLAYER?
- 25 | A. WELL, ADDING HIGH SCHOOL, COLLEGE AND THE PROS, IT WAS 19

- 1 YEARS OF MY LIFE PLAYING FOOTBALL. SO I WOULD SAY IT WAS MUCH,
- 2 | MUCH LONGER THAN THAT IN PRACTICE. SO IT HAD TO BE, I DON'T
- 3 | KNOW, HALF MY LIFE JUST WORKING OUT AND BEING IN TREMENDOUS
- 4 | PHYSICAL CONDITION TO BE ABLE TO PERFORM IN THE PROS.
- 5 Q. AND CAN YOU GIVE THE JURY SOME IDEA OF WHAT A WORKOUT DAY
- 6 WOULD BE LIKE WHEN YOU WERE IN EXHIBITION, IN PRACTICE CAMP?
- 7 IN TRAINING CAMP, EXCUSE ME.
- 8 | A. WELL, DURING THE OFFSEASON, EVERY DAY I WOULD RUN FIVE
- 9 | MILES IN THE MORNING, A.M., AND I WOULD RUN FIVE MILES IN THE
- 10 EVENING FOR MY PHYSICAL CONDITIONING.
- 11 SO ONCE WE GOT BACK TO GREENBAY, TRAINING CAMP LASTED
- 12 TWO WEEKS. AND IT WAS PRETTY RUGGED TRAINING CAMP, WHAT WE HAD
- 13 | TO GO THROUGH ON THE BODY. WE HAD TO RUN, I'D SAY, A QUARTER
- 14 MILE BEFORE PRACTICE.
- 15 AND WE HAD SOMETHING CALLED "GRASS DRILLS," WHICH YOU
- 16 STAND IN PLACE AND YOU RUN UP AND DOWN. THEY'D BLOW THE
- 17 WHISTLE, YOU'D HIT THE GROUND AND GET UP. AND WE WOULD DO THAT
- 18 ABOUT 50 TIMES OF GRASS DRILLS, AND THEN WE'D RUN ANOTHER
- 19 QUARTER MILE, AND THEN PRACTICE WOULD START.
- 20 AND THIS WAS FOR TWO WEEKS, TWO-A-DAY PRACTICE
- 21 | SESSIONS.
- 22 | Q. WERE THE PACKERS KNOWN FOR HAVING HARD TRAINING CAMPS?
- 23 | A. I THINK WE HAD THE MOST DIFFICULT TRAINING CAMP IN THE
- 24 | HISTORY OF THE NFL.
- 25 Q. OKAY. AND WHAT HAVE YOU DONE SINCE YOUR PROFESSIONAL

- 1 | FOOTBALL -- WHEN IT DID IT END, FIRST OF ALL, WHAT YEAR?
- 2 **A.** 1972.
- 3 | Q. WHAT HAVE YOU DONE SINCE THEN?
- 4 | A. WELL, AFTER I STOPPED PLAYING I WAS STILL INVOLVED IN
- 5 COMMUNICATIONS, AND I ENDED UP PART OWNER AND PRESIDENT OF A
- 6 CABLE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, CABLE TELEVISION CONSTRUCTION
- 7 COMPANY.
- 8 Q. AND WHAT DO YOU DO NOW?
- 9 A. I'M RETIRED. I RETIRED THREE YEARS AGO.
- 10 | Q. OKAY. AND SINCE YOU RETIRED, HAVE YOU ATTEMPTED TO
- 11 | SUPPLEMENT YOUR INCOME BY MARKETING THE IMAGE AND REPUTATION
- 12 YOU BUILT UP AS A PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL PLAYER?
- 13 **A.** NO.
- 14 Q. HAVE YOU GONE TO CARD SHOWS OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?
- 15 | A. YES.
- 16 Q. CAN YOU TELL THE JURY WHAT A CARD SHOW IS, PLEASE?
- 17 A. WELL, THE CARD SHOWS, MEMORABILIA SHOWS -- FIRST OF ALL, I
- 18 | STOPPED FLYING IN 2001. AND I HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO GO TO
- 19 | MANY, MANY MEMORABILIA SHOWS AROUND THE COUNTRY, WHICH I HAD TO
- 20 TURN DOWN.
- 21 AND THE LAST SHOW -- OR THE FIRST SHOW I WENT TO IN
- 22 | SEVEN YEARS WAS THIS YEAR, MARCH 18, 2008. AND THE ONLY REASON
- 23 | I WENT, BECAUSE IT WAS DRIVING DISTANCE FROM MY HOME IN
- 24 | NEW JERSEY DOWN TO CHANTILLY, VIRGINIA.
- 25 AND A CARD SHOW IS WHEN FANS COME TO THE BUILDING

- 1 WHERE THE CARD SHOW IS GOING ON, AND THEY BRING MEMORABILIA
- 2 WITH THEM, TRADING CARDS, HELMETS, FOOTBALLS, JERSEYS. I EVEN
- 3 | SIGNED A GOLF BALL, AND THAT'S DIFFICULT.
- 4 | AND THEY WAIT IN LINE TO GET THE SIGNATURE. AND
- 5 THAT'S ABOUT THE SIZE OF IT.
- 6 | Q. OKAY. AND WERE THERE STILL PEOPLE INTERESTED IN GETTING
- 7 YOUR AUTOGRAPH AT THIS SHOW?
- 8 **A.** YES.
- 9 Q. HOW MANY DID YOU SIGN IN ONE DAY?
- $10 | \mathbf{A} \cdot 700$.
- 11 | Q. AND HOW MUCH DID YOU GET PAID FOR SIGNING THOSE?
- 12 A. FIFTEEN DOLLARS PER AUTOGRAPH. THAT'S FOR FLATS. FLATS
- 13 ARE 8 BY 10 PHOTOGRAPHS, 16 BY 20, OR ANYTHING FLAT. AND THEN,
- 14 | THEY HAD PREMIUM ITEMS, WHICH WOULD BE HELMETS, FOOTBALLS,
- 15 | JERSEYS WITH MY NAME ON THE BACK, AND MY NUMBER 26. AND WE
- 16 WOULD GET FIVE DOLLARS MORE FOR THOSE TYPE ITEMS. SO I GOT \$20
- 17 | FOR THOSE.
- 18 Q. AND HOW MUCH DOES THE CARD SHOW CHARGE THE ATTENDANT, THE
- 19 | PERSON ATTENDING THE CARD SHOW, FOR THAT AUTOGRAPH? DO THEY
- 20 CHARGE MORE THAN \$15?
- 21 | A. YES, THEY CHARGE MORE THAN 15, BUT I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY
- 22 HOW MUCH.
- 23 Q. FINE. HAVE YOU MADE ANY ATTEMPTS TO MARKET YOURSELF TO
- 24 | EA, TOPPS OR UPPER DECK OR SOME OF THE OTHER NAMES WE HAVE
- 25 | HEARD HERE?

- $1 | \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{NO}$.
- $2 \parallel \mathbf{Q}$. WHY NOT?
- 3 | A. IT'S DIFFICULT FOR AN INDIVIDUAL TO GO OUT AND TRY TO
- 4 | MARKET YOURSELF TO THE LARGE COMPANIES THAT DEAL WITH PLAYERS
- 5 | INC, BECAUSE THEY WON'T TALK TO US AS INDIVIDUALS. AND I THINK
- 6 THEY ARE PROHIBITED FROM TALKING TO US, ALSO, BECAUSE IT HAS TO
- 7 GO THROUGH PLAYERS INC IN ORDER TO GET ANY TYPE OF DEAL WITH A
- 8 | LICENSEE.
- 9 | O. DO YOU STILL GET TRADING CARDS IN THE MAIL EVERY WEEK FROM
- 10 | FANS?
- 11 | A. WELL, NOT NECESSARILY TRADING CARDS. I GET SOMETHING IN
- 12 | THE MAIL EVERY WEEK. IT COULD BE A HELMET, FOOTBALL. I'VE
- 13 | RECEIVED JERSEYS WITH -- GREENBAY PACKER JERSEYS AND DALLAS
- 14 COWBOY JERSEYS WITH MY NAME ON THE BACK, MY NUMBER 26, REEBOK
- 15 LOGO, AND AT THE BOTTOM PLAYERS INC LOGO.
- 16 Q. AND DO YOU CHARGE ANYTHING FOR SIGNING THOSE?
- 17 **A.** NO.
- 18 Q. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN INVITED TO COME BACK TO VISIT GREENBAY?
- 19 $\|\mathbf{A}.\|$ YES, OFTEN.
- 20 Q. AND HAVE YOU SIGNED SOME INDIVIDUAL DEALS? WE'LL GET TO
- 21 | THE GROUP LICENSING IN A MOMENT. HAVE YOU SIGNED SOME
- 22 | INDIVIDUAL DEALS SINCE YOU RETIRED?
- 23 **A.** YES.
- 24 | Q. OKAY. AND DID YOU NEGOTIATE THOSE DEALS ON YOUR OWN OR
- 25 WERE THEY NEGOTIATED THROUGH PLAYERS INC?

- A. THROUGH PLAYERS INC.
- 2 Q. DID YOU EVER SIGN THE GLA?
- $3 \mid \mathbf{A}$. YES.

- 4 | Q. LET ME SHOW YOU EXHIBIT 110, WHICH IS IN EVIDENCE.
- 5 MR. KATZ: MAY I APPROACH, YOUR HONOR?
- 6 THE COURT: PLEASE.
- 7 | MR. KATZ: I'M GOING TO BRING EACH ONE. DO YOU WANT
- 8 ME TO ASK EACH TIME?
- 9 | THE COURT: NO. NOW THAT YOU'VE ASKED ONCE, I GIVE
- 10 YOU PERMISSION TO -- LET ME EXPLAIN TO THE JURY WHY THAT'S A
- 11 CUSTOM THAT I LIKE TO SEE HONORED.
- 12 IN THE OLD DAYS, THE LAWYERS WOULD GO UP BEHIND THE
- 13 WITNESS, STAND THERE, OFTEN AFTER HAVING EATEN A HAMBURGER WITH
- 14 ONIONS, AND BASICALLY HARASS THE WITNESS AND BERATE THEM INTO
- 15 ADMITTING ANYTHING THEY WANTED.
- 16 (LAUGHTER.)
- 17 | SO TO PROTECT THE WITNESSES WE HAVE A RULE YOU CAN
- 18 ONLY APPROACH THE WITNESS WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE COURT.
- 19 REALLY THE LAWYERS DON'T DO THAT KIND OF CONDUCT ANY
- 20 MORE, ANYWAY, BUT AS A -- IT'S A TRADITION THAT IS STILL
- 21 | HONORED IN THE COURTROOM. AND THAT'S WHY YOU HEAR LAWYERS ASK
- 22 THAT NOW AND THEN.
- 23 | SO THESE LAWYERS WOULD NOT MISBEHAVE IN THAT WAY, BUT
- 24 | STILL IT'S A NICE TRADITION.
- 25 BUT YOU HAVE PERMISSION TO GO BACK AND FORTH WITH

- 1 THIS WITNESS. SO THANK YOU FOR ASKING.
- 2 MR. KATZ: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
- 3 BY MR. KATZ:
- 4 | Q. IS THAT YOUR SIGNATURE, SIR?
- $5 | \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{YES}$
- 6 Q. OKAY. FINE. LET ME SHOW YOU EXHIBIT 19.
- 7 MR. KATZ: CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE.
- 8 | (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
- 9 I DON'T THINK EXHIBIT 19 IS IN YET, SO PLEASE TAKE IT
- 10 | OFF.
- 11 BY MR. KATZ:
- 12 Q. IS THIS THE GLA THAT YOU SIGNED, SIR?
- 13 | **A.** YES.
- 14 MR. KATZ: I OFFER 19, YOUR HONOR.
- 15 MR. KESSLER: NO OBJECTION.
- 16 THE COURT: 19 IS IN EVIDENCE ALREADY. BUT GO RIGHT
- 17 AHEAD. YOU MAY PUT IT UP.
- 18 | (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
- 19 MR. KATZ: ALL RIGHT. FINE. THANK YOU.
- 20 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 21 | Q. WHAT WAS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE GROUP LICENSING
- 22 | AUTHORIZATION, SIR, WHEN YOU RECEIVED IT?
- 23 A. WELL, AFTER READING OVER THIS GROUP LICENSING AGREEMENT
- 24 | SEVERAL TIMES, IT REMINDED ME OF A HIGHLY-SKILLED ATTEMPT TO
- 25 CONFUSE US. AND I WAS TOTALLY CONFUSED.

- 1 AND THEN I READ IT AND READ IT. AND WHAT I GOT OUT
- 2 | OF IT WAS THE FACT IT WAS SIX OR MORE PRESENT OR RETIRED
- 3 | PLAYERS WHO WAS INVOLVED IN A DEAL WITH A THIRD PARTY, THERE
- 4 WOULD BE SOME MONIES FROM THE ROYALTIES RECEIVED GOING INTO AN
- 5 | ESCROW ACCOUNT AND SHARED AMONG THE RETIRED PLAYERS.
- 6 Q. OKAY. AND HOW DID YOU RECEIVE THE GLA?
- 7 **A.** THROUGH THE MAIL.
- 8 | Q. OKAY. AND DID YOU ALSO RECEIVE FROM TIME TO TIME LETTERS
- 9 WITH THE GLA'S?
- 10 **A.** YES.
- 11 Q. AND WHAT WERE THOSE LETTERS ASKING YOU TO DO, IF ANYTHING?
- 12 A. WELL, THEY WERE SOLICITING US AND ENCOURAGING US TO SIGN
- 13 THE GLA'S.
- 14 Q. OKAY. AND DID YOU RECEIVE A RETIRED PLAYERS DIRECTORY
- 15 | FROM THE NFLPA?
- 16 **A.** YES.
- 17 Q. ARE YOU A MEMBER OF THE UNION?
- 18 | A. NOT NOW.
- 19 Q. BUT YOU WERE A MEMBER OF THE UNION?
- 20 A. YEAH, I WAS A PAYING MEMBER. I PAID DUES FOR MANY YEARS.
- 21 **Q.** OKAY.
- 22 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, IF WE CAN JUST GET WHICH
- 23 YEARS SINCE WE HAVE SPECIFIC YEARS AT ISSUE IN THIS CASE.
- 24 THE COURT: PLEASE ASK THAT.

BY MR. KATZ:

- 2 Q. WHAT YEARS WERE YOU A MEMBER, SIR?
- 3 | A. I WAS A MEMBER OF THE PLAYERS' UNION UP UNTIL THEY CHANGED
- 4 | THE DUES FROM \$50 UP TO \$100.
- 5 O. WHAT YEAR WAS THAT?
- 6 A. I HAVE NO IDEA. ABOUT THREE OR FOUR YEARS AGO.
- 7 \mathbf{Q} OKAY. LET ME SHOW YOU WHAT'S BEEN MARKED AS EXHIBIT 64.
- 8 DO YOU RECOGNIZE THAT, SIR?
- 9 **A.** YES.
- 10 | Q. CAN YOU TELL US WHAT IT IS?
- 11 | A. IT'S A NFL PLAYERS ASSOCIATION RETIRED MEMBERS DIRECTORY
- 12 FROM YEARS 2004 TO YEARS 2006.
- 13 | MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD OFFER THIS.
- 14 | I WOULD NOTE FOR THE RECORD THAT IN THE INTEREST OF
- 15 | SAVING SOME TREES WE DIDN'T PRINT EVERY NAME OF THE DIRECTORY.
- 16 WE DO HAVE A FULL COPY OF THE DIRECTORY HERE, IF YOUR HONOR
- 17 WANTS THAT TO BE THE EXHIBIT. THIS IS LIKE THE FIRST TEN PAGES
- 18 AND LAST TEN PAGES.
- 19 THE COURT: IF YOU WILL ALL AGREE THAT'S FINE WITH
- 20 ME. SO YOU WANT TO HAVE A REDUCED VERSION OF 64 RECEIVED?
- 21 MR. KATZ: YES.
- 22 THE COURT: ANY OBJECTION TO THAT?
- 23 | MR. KESSLER: I HAVEN'T LOOKED AT WHAT THEY'VE CUT
- 24 OUT OR WHAT THEY'VE PUT IN, BUT I GUESS IT'S A PLAYERS
- 25 ASSOCIATION DOCUMENT, SO I HAVE NO OBJECTION.

```
1
             MR. KATZ: WE HAVE THE FULL DOCUMENT, YOUR HONOR,
 2
   TOO.
 3
              THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IT'S RECEIVED. RIGHT NOW ALL
 4
   THAT'S RECEIVED IS THE PAGES YOU'RE OFFERING.
 5
             MR. KATZ: THAT'S RIGHT.
 6
             THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.
 7
              (TRIAL EXHIBIT 64 RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)
             (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
 8
 9
   BY MR. KATZ:
10
        SO THIS WAS AN OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE UNION, SIR?
   Q.
11
       YES.
   A.
12
   Q. OKAY. I'D LIKE TO DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO PAGE 7.
13
             MR. KATZ: IF WE CAN PUT THAT UP.
14
             AND CAN WE ENLARGE THE TOP PART, NFLPA, RETIRED
15
   PLAYERS CHAPTERS.
16
             (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
17
             LET ME READ THAT INTO THE RECORD -- OH, NO, PAGE 7.
                   "NFLPA RETIRED PLAYERS LICENSING PROGRAMS."
18
19
             YES. ENLARGE THE TOP. THANK YOU.
             (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
20
                   "NFLPA RETIRED PLAYERS LICENSING PROGRAMS.
21
   PLAYERS INC, THE FOR-PROFIT LICENSING COMPANY OF THE NFL
22
   PLAYERS ASSOCIATION, IS CONSTANTLY WORKING TO DEVELOP RETIRED
23
2.4
   PLAYERS PROGRAMS. THE NFLPA RETIRED PLAYERS DEPARTMENT HAS
   OBTAINED GROUP LICENSING ASSIGNMENT AGREEMENTS, GLA'S, FROM
25
```

- 1 MORE THAN 2900 RETIRED NFL PLAYERS, AND IS IN THE PROCESS OF
- 2 | BUILDING UP OUR LIST SO THAT PLAYERS INC CAN PROVIDE MORE
- 3 OPPORTUNITIES TO RETIREES."
- 4 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 5 Q. WAS THAT YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROGRAM AT THE TIME,
- 6 || SIR?
- 7 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, THE ONLY THING THAT YOUR
- 8 HONOR'S RULED ADMISSIBLE WAS HIS UNDERSTANDING AT THE TIME HE
- 9 | SIGNED HIS GLA'S. THIS DOCUMENT --
- 10 MR. KATZ: I SAID "WAS THAT YOUR UNDERSTANDING," YOUR
- 11 HONOR.
- 12 MR. KESSLER: THIS DOCUMENT THAT WAS JUST DISPLAYED
- 13 IS WAY PAST THE TIME HE SIGNED HIS RETIRED PLAYER GLA. I DON'T
- 14 KNOW IF THE WITNESS EVEN HAD THE DOCUMENT. SO I THINK HE'S
- 15 TRYING TO ARGUE FROM THE DOCUMENT TO HIS UNDERSTANDING.
- 16 WE SHOULD GET NONLEADING QUESTIONS ABOUT WHAT HIS
- 17 UNDERSTANDING WAS AT THE TIME HE SIGNED, NOT FROM THIS
- 18 POST-SIGNING DOCUMENT.
- 19 | THE COURT: IS THIS DOCUMENT AFTERWARDS?
- 20 MR. KATZ: MAY I RESPOND?
- 21 THE COURT: YES.
- 22 MR. KATZ: THIS DOCUMENT, AS IT SAYS ON ITS FACE, IS
- 23 FROM 2004 TO 2006. I THINK IT DOES ENCOMPASS --
- 24 | MR. KESSLER: HE SIGNED IN 2002, YOUR HONOR.
- 25 MR. KATZ: I WOULD SUBMIT TO YOUR HONOR THAT IT IS

- 1 | RELEVANT FOR STATING --
- 2 THE COURT: SUSTAINED. THIS IS A FORM OF LEADING THE
- 3 WITNESS.
- 4 | SO YOU HAVE GOT TO ASK HIM TO SAY IN HIS OWN WORDS
- 5 WHAT HE THOUGHT IT MEANT. THIS DOCUMENT CAME ALONG AFTER THE
- 6 FACT.
- 7 MR. KESSLER: I WOULD ASK YOUR HONOR THAT IT NOT BE
- 8 DISPLAYED WHILE HE'S ASKING THE QUESTIONS --
- 9 MR. KATZ: IT'S IN EVIDENCE, YOUR HONOR.
- 10 MR. KESSLER: -- BECAUSE IT CAN'T BE RELEVANT TO HIS
- 11 QUESTION OF HIS UNDERSTANDING AT THE TIME.
- 12 THE COURT: IT'S A FORM OF LEADING TO JUST HAVE IT UP
- 13 THERE, SO IT'S EASY FOR THE WITNESS TO GLANCE OVER THERE AND
- 14 | SAY:
- 15 | "THAT'S WHAT I MEANT."
- 16 THAT'S A FORM OF LEADING.
- 17 ASK NONLEADING QUESTIONS. THIS IS YOUR WITNESS. SO
- 18 | PLEASE TAKE THAT DOWN.
- 19 AND IF YOU'RE ASKING QUESTIONS ABOUT THE -- ABOUT
- 20 WHAT HIS INTENTION WAS AND UNDERSTANDING WAS OF THE GLA AT THE
- 21 TIME THAT HE SIGNED IT.
- 22 MR. KATZ: I CAN ASK A NONLEADING QUESTION.
- 23 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 24 Q. DID YOU READ THE LANGUAGE THAT I JUST READ TO YOU AT THE
- 25 TIME THAT YOU RECEIVED THIS DOCUMENT?

- A. YES.
- 2 **Q.** OKAY.
- 3 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, THAT WASN'T THE TIME WHEN
- 4 HE SIGNED THE GLA'S.
- 5 | (COUNSEL SPEAKING SIMULTANEOUSLY, WHICH WAS NOT
- 6 REPORTABLE.)
- 7 | THE COURT: STOP. MR. KATZ, I'LL SAY IT ONE MORE
- 8 | TIME. WHAT MATTERS IS WHEN HE SIGNED THE GLA, NOT -- AFTER HE
- 9 | SIGNED IT, IT'S A DONE DEAL.
- 10 MR. KATZ: RIGHT. AND I'M NOT SPEAKING TO THE TIME
- 11 THAT HE SIGNED IT, YOUR HONOR. I'M JUST SPEAKING TO -- THIS IS
- 12 A DOCUMENT THAT YOUR HONOR HAS NOW ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE, AND
- 13 | IT DESCRIBES THE PROGRAM. AND I'M JUST ASKING: DID HE RECEIVE
- 14 IT? DID HE READ IT?
- 15 THAT'S NOT LEADING.
- 16 THE COURT: PUT IT BACK UP THERE, AND LET ME SEE WHAT
- 17 WE'RE FIGHTING OVER. RETIRED MEMBERS DIRECTORY.
- 18 | MR. KATZ: PAGE 7.
- 19 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AS LONG AS WE'RE TALKING
- 20 ABOUT AFTER -- DID HE READ THE -- WHAT YOU HAVE UP ON THE
- 21 SCREEN, EVEN THOUGH IT WAS AFTER THE GLA, DID HE READ THAT
- 22 | LATER ON?
- 23 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 24 | Q. DID YOU READ THIS WHEN YOU RECEIVED THE DOCUMENT, SIR?
- 25 A. YES. ONE OF THE --

- 1 \mathbb{Q} . "YES" IS FINE.
- $2 | \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{YES}$
- 3 | Q. AND DID YOU -- DID ANYONE FROM THE NFLPA EVER TELL YOU
- 4 | THAT THE PROGRAM WAS ANYTHING DIFFERENT FROM THIS?
- $5 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. NO.
- 6 Q. THANK YOU.
- 7 MR. KATZ: WE CAN TAKE IT DOWN, YOUR HONOR.
- 8 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
- 9 BY MR. KATZ:
- 10 | Q. WHAT MONIES, IF ANY, DID YOU EVER RECEIVE AS A RESULT OF
- 11 | SIGNING THESE TWO GLA'S?
- 12 **A.** NONE.
- 13 Q. WHY DID YOU KEEP SIGNING THE GLA'S, THEN?
- 14 A. WELL, I CONTINUED TO SIGN THE GLA'S BECAUSE I HAD FAITH
- 15 AND TRUSTED IN THE UNION TO IMPLEMENT WHAT THE GLA STATED.
- 16 Q. DID YOU EXPECT TO RECEIVE MONEY?
- 17 **A.** YES.
- 18 Q. OKAY. DO YOU KNOW OF ANY ACTIVITIES THAT THE UNION
- 19 | ENGAGED IN TO PROMOTE THIS GLA PROGRAM?
- 20 **A.** NO.
- 21 | Q. DID YOU EVER RECEIVE ANY REPORTS ABOUT WHAT THE UNION WAS
- 22 | DOING ABOUT THIS PROGRAM?
- 23 **A.** NO.
- 24 Q. DID YOU EVER ATTEND RETIRED PLAYERS' CONVENTIONS?
- 25 **A.** NO.

- 1 | Q. DID YOU HIRE A LAWYER TO ADVISE YOU BEFORE YOU SIGNED
- 2 | THESE AGREEMENTS?
- $3 \| \mathbf{A}_{\bullet} \|$ NO.
- $4 \parallel Q$. WHY NOT?
- 5 | A. BECAUSE I TRUSTED AND HAD FAITH IN THE UNION, AND THEY
- 6 HAVE ENOUGH ATTORNEYS TO TAKE CARE OF WHAT THE GLA STATED. I
- 7 | DIDN'T THINK THERE WAS A NEED FOR ME TO HIRE AN ATTORNEY TO
- 8 LOOK AFTER IT.
- 9 Q. AT THIS TIME YOU SIGNED THE AGREEMENT, HOW DID YOU
- 10 | DETERMINE WHAT THE AGREEMENT MEANT?
- 11 A. BY READING OVER IT.
- 12 **Q.** OKAY.
- 13 A. AND INTERPRETING FOR MYSELF.
- 14 Q. ALL RIGHT. DID YOU SUGGEST ANY OF THE WORDS IN THIS
- 15 | AGREEMENT?
- 16 **A.** NO.
- 17 Q. DID YOU HAVE ANY CONTROL OVER THE NFLPA WITH RESPECT TO
- 18 | THIS AGREEMENT?
- 19 | **A.** YES.
- 20 Q. AND WHAT CONTROL DID YOU HAVE, SIR?
- 21 A. WELL, IF THERE WAS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND THEY WANTED
- 22 | TO USE ME IN A PROMOTION, FOR EXAMPLE, IF I WAS DOING SOMETHING
- 23 FOR NIKE AND THEY WANTED ME TO DO SOMETHING FOR REEBOK, I COULD
- 24 | SAY:
- 25 | "WAIT. THIS IS CONFLICT OF INTEREST."

1 OR IF THEY ASKED ME TO COME IN AND DO SOMETHING WITH 2 ALCOHOL OR TOBACCO, I COULD SAY: 3 "NO, I DON'T WANT ANY PARTS OF IT." Q. OKAY. LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT THE SECOND PARAGRAPH --4 5 MR. KATZ: WHY DON'T YOU PUT UP 110. 6 (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.) 7 BY MR. KATZ: Q. LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT THE SECOND PARAGRAPH. IT SAYS: 8 9 "GROUP LICENSING PROGRAMS ARE DEFINED AS PROGRAMS IN WHICH A LICENSEE UTILIZES A TOTAL OF SIX OR MORE 10 PRESENT OR FORMER NFL PLAYER IMAGES IN CONJUNCTION WITH OR ON 11 PRODUCTS THAT ARE SOLD AT RETAIL OR USED AS PROMOTIONAL OR 12 13 PREMIUM ITEMS." DID ANYONE FROM THE NFLPA EVER TELL YOU THAT THAT 14 MEANT ANYTHING OTHER THAN WHAT IT SAYS? 15 16 A. NO. Q. NOW, LET'S LOOK AT THE PARAGRAPH WITH THE ESCROW ACCOUNT, 17 THE SECOND TO THE LAST PARAGRAPH. YEAH. 18 19 (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.) THIS IS THE ONE THAT WE TALKED ABOUT, THAT TALKS 20 ABOUT THE CREATION OF AN ESCROW ACCOUNT. 21 22 TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, SIR, WAS SUCH AS ESCROW ACCOUNT 23 EVER CREATED? 24 A. NO. 25 Q. DID YOU EXPECT FOR AN ESCROW ACCOUNT TO BE CREATED?

- L A. YES.
- 2 | Q. DID ANYONE FROM THE NFLPA EVER TELL YOU THAT AN ESCROW
- 3 ACCOUNT HAD NOT BEEN --
- 4 | MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, WE ARE HAVING A LOT OF
- 5 | LEADING HERE.
- 6 THE COURT: YOU ARE LEADING. VERY LEADING QUESTIONS.
- 7 BY MR. KATZ:
- 8 | Q. WHAT, IF ANYTHING, DID ANYONE FROM THE NFLPA EVER TELL YOU
- 9 ABOUT THE ESCROW ACCOUNT?
- 10 A. NOTHING.
- 11 | Q. WERE YOU IN COURT ON MONDAY WHEN MR. ALLEN TESTIFIED THAT
- 12 WHAT THE SIX OR MORE LANGUAGE ACTUALLY MEANS IS THAT ALL 2100
- 13 | PLAYERS WERE LICENSED TOGETHER?
- 14 | A. YES.
- 15 Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH THAT?
- 16 **A.** NO.
- 17 MR. KESSLER: I OBJECT, BECAUSE HE MISSTATED THE
- 18 TESTIMONY OF MR. ALLEN. BUT THE JURY WILL JUDGE THAT.
- 19 THE COURT: FINE.
- 20 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 21 Q. HOW MUCH DID YOU EXPECT TO GET PAID FROM THIS AGREEMENT,
- 22 | SIR?
- 23 | A. I DIDN'T HAVE A FIGURE IN MIND. I HAD NO IDEA. I JUST
- 24 | THOUGHT THAT I WOULD GET A SHARE OF THE MONEY THAT WAS
- 25 | DEPOSITED IN THE ESCROW ACCOUNT.

- 1 Q. OKAY. THIS PARAGRAPH THAT'S UP THERE TALKS ABOUT ELIGIBLE
- 2 | NFLPA MEMBERS.
- 3 WHEN YOU SIGNED THESE TWO AGREEMENTS, SIR, DID YOU
- 4 | BELIEVE THAT YOU WERE AN ELIGIBLE NFLPA MEMBER?
- $5 | \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{YES}$
- 6 Q. WERE YOU DEPOSED IN THIS MATTER, SIR?
- $7 \mid \mathbf{A}. \quad \text{YES}.$
- 8 Q. CAN YOU TELL THE JURY WHAT A DEPOSITION IS, PLEASE?
- 9 | A. IT'S A QUESTION-AND-ANSWER SESSION UNDER OATH, DOCUMENTED,
- 10 ABOUT THE CASE, THAT IS ADMINISTERED BY THE DEFENDANTS!
- 11 | LAWYERS.
- 12 Q. OKAY. AND AT THE TIME THAT YOU WERE DEPOSED, WERE YOU
- 13 | PERMITTED TO SEE THE DEFENDANTS' DOCUMENTS IN THIS CASE?
- 14 | A. NO.
- 15 | Q. WHY NOT?
- 16 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, I OBJECT TO THE QUESTION.
- 17 | THE COURT: WHAT'S THE RELEVANCE?
- 18 | MR. KATZ: RELEVANCE IS IT HAS TO DO WITH HIS STATE
- 19 OF KNOWLEDGE AT THE TIME THAT HE WAS DEPOSED. THERE WAS A
- 20 PROTECTIVE ORDER. HE WAS NOT PERMITTED TO SEE HUNDREDS OF
- 21 THOUSANDS OF DOCUMENTS IN THIS CASE.
- 22 | HE WAS -- HIS OWN COMPLAINT WAS MOSTLY BLANKED OUT.
- 23 AND THAT HAD AN EFFECT ON HIS DEPOSITION TESTIMONY. HE HAD NO
- 24 | KNOWLEDGE.
- 25 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T THINK THIS IS

1	RELEVANT. AND HE'S TRYING TO REHABILITATE THE WITNESS BEFORE I
2	EVEN EXAMINE HIM?
3	I DON'T THINK THIS IS APPROPRIATE.
4	MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, THEY ASKED FOR THE PROTECTIVE
5	ORDER THAT PROHIBITED THIS MAN FROM SEEING THE DOCUMENTS IN HIS
6	OWN CASE.
7	MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, I
8	MR. KATZ: THEY BROUGHT THIS ON THEMSELVES.
9	MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD NOW LIKE AN
10	INSTRUCTION, PLEASE, TO THE JURY THAT THE PROTECTIVE ORDER WAS
11	A COURT ORDER, AND IT WAS TOTALLY APPROPRIATE IN THIS CASE.
12	IT'S NOW BEEN SUGGESTED THERE'S SOMETHING INAPPROPRIATE ABOUT A
13	PROTECTIVE ORDER.
14	COULD YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN IT TO THE JURY AT THIS TIME?
15	MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, THEY ASKED FOR THAT PROTECTIVE
16	ORDER. WE WERE FINE WITH HAVING EVERY DOCUMENT SHOWN.
17	MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, IT WAS A STIPULATED
18	PROTECTIVE ORDER
19	(COUNSEL AND THE COURT SPEAKING SIMULTANEOUSLY, WHICH
20	WAS NOT REPORTABLE.)
21	THE COURT: I'M GOING TO DO THIS IN MY OWN WAY.
22	THERE ARE TWO THINGS THAT NEED TO BE MADE CLEAR HERE. ONE IS
23	THAT IN THE COURSE OF PREPARING FOR THE CASE, BOTH SIDES I
24	TOLD YOU ABOUT THIS INVESTIGATION PERIOD BEFORE THE TRIAL
25	BOTH SIDES CAN ASK THE OTHER SIDE TO PRODUCE DOCUMENTS. YOU'VE

- SEEN A LOT OF THEM ALREADY. AND A LOT MORE WERE PRODUCED THAN

 YOU'LL EVER SEE IN THIS CASE, BECAUSE IT'S JUST A LOT OF

 DOCUMENTS WERE PRODUCED.
- IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN THE BUSINESS CONFIDENTIALITY OF

 THOSE DOCUMENTS AND THEIR PRIVACY, THE LAWYERS ENTERED INTO AND

 ASKED ME TO SIGN, AND I DID -- THIS WAS STIPULATED TO, NOT

 IMPOSED ON THE PARTS -- A PROTECTIVE ORDER.
- 8 BOTH SIDES WANTED IT. THEY STIPULATED TO IT, RIGHT,
 9 MR. KATZ?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

- MR. KATZ: WE STIPULATED TO IT, BUT THERE'S ANOTHER
 PORTION WHERE YOU ACTUALLY DESIGNATE DOCUMENTS THAT ARE
 CONFIDENTIAL. WE DID STIPULATE TO IT.
- THE COURT: UNDER THAT PROCEDURE THEY COULD DESIGNATE DOCUMENTS THAT WOULD BE KEPT PRIVATE AND JUST FOR THE ATTORNEYS TO SEE. AND, APPARENTLY, SOME DOCUMENTS WERE DESIGNATED BY THE DEFENDANTS AS ONLY FOR THE LAWYERS TO SEE. THERE'S NOTHING WRONG WITH THAT.
 - NO ONE EVER CAME TO ME AND SAID:
- "HEY, UNSEAL THESE DOCUMENTS SO MR. ADDERLEY CAN
 LOOK AT THEM." THAT'S A FACT.
 - NOW, I DON'T KNOW WHAT I WOULD HAVE DONE IF THAT

 MOTION HAD BEEN MADE OR NOT. BUT THAT'S -- THAT'S WHAT

 HAPPENED. THAT'S POINT ONE.
- 24 POINT NUMBER TWO IS: I'M ANTICIPATING FROM WHAT IS
 25 BEING SAID HERE THAT -- THAT MAYBE SOME QUESTIONS ARE GOING TO

- BE ASKED BY THE OTHER SIDE TO MR. ADDERLEY ABOUT WHAT HE SAID IN HIS DEPOSITION.
- 3 AND WHAT HE SAID IN HIS DEPOSITION IS WHAT HE SAID IN
- 4 | HIS DEPOSITION. AND IT'S GOING TO BE UP TO YOU TO EVALUATE
- 5 | WHETHER OR NOT HE WOULD HAVE SAID SOMETHING DIFFERENT IF HE HAD
- 6 | HAD ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS THAT HE DIDN'T SEE BEFORE HIS
- 7 DEPOSITION.

- THAT'S THE BEST I CAN DO WITH THIS. SO I -- I -YOU'RE GOING TO NOW MOVE ON TO YOUR NEXT QUESTION.
- 10 MR. KESSLER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
- 11 MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU WANT TO
- 12 ADD THAT NOW THE DOCUMENTS ARE UNSEALED, BASICALLY, BECAUSE OF
- 13 THIS PUBLIC NATURE OF THIS PROCEEDING.
- 14 | THE COURT: WELL, THE DOCUMENTS THAT ARE COMING INTO
- 15 EVIDENCE ARE UNSEALED. THAT'S ABOUT THE TIP OF THE ICEBERG.
- 16 THERE'S STILL HUNDREDS AND HUNDREDS OF DOCUMENTS THAT NO ONE IS
- 17 EVER GOING TO LOOK AT, EXCEPT THE LAWYERS.
- 18 SO, YES, THAT'S TRUE. THE DOCUMENTS THAT YOU'RE
- 19 | SEEING ARE PART OF THE PUBLIC RECORD, WITH ONE EXCEPTION, WHICH
- 20 YOU WILL SEE, BUT THE PUBLIC WON'T SEE.
- 21 BY MR. KATZ:
- 22 | Q. HAVE YOU LEARNED ANY NEW THINGS SINCE YOUR DEPOSITION BY
- 23 VIRTUE OF BEING ABLE TO SEE THE DOCUMENTS?
- 24 | A. YES.
- 25 | MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, ALL THAT'S GOING TO BE

- 1 RELEVANT IS HIS UNDERSTANDING AT THE TIME HE SIGNED THE GLA.
 2 SO IF HE LEARNED OF THINGS SUBSEQUENTLY THAT CAN'T BE RELEVANT
- 3 | TO HIS UNDERSTANDING. THIS IS GOING TO THAT ISSUE.
- 4 | THE COURT: I'M GOING TO ALLOW THIS LINE OF 5 | QUESTIONS. BUT, HERE'S A WORD OF CAUTION.
- WHEN PEOPLE REMEMBER THINGS, THEY WERE THERE. THEY

 REMEMBER IT. EITHER THEY HAD A CERTAIN UNDERSTANDING OR THEY

 BUIDN'T HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING. AND IF SOMETHING WAS FILED AWAY

 IN THE FILES OF SOME OTHER PARTY, AND THEY DIDN'T KNOW IT, THEY

 DIDN'T KNOW IT THEN, AND THEY DIDN'T KNOW IT NOW.
 - AND IF THEY FIND IT AFTER THE FACT, YOU HAVE TO DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT THAT WOULD HAVE INFLUENCED WHAT THEY THEMSELVES THOUGHT AT THE TIME THEY SIGNED THE CONTRACT.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- BECAUSE YOU WILL HAVE TO BE EVALUATING WHEN YOU

 EVALUATE THIS CASE WHAT, IN PART, AMONG A LOT OF OTHER THINGS,

 WHAT EACH SIDE OF THE CONTRACTUALLY THOUGHT IT MEANT AT THAT

 TIME.
- SO IT WILL BE UP TO YOU TO DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT THAT SOMEHOW CHANGES THE HISTORICAL FACTS OF WHAT THIS WITNESS FELT AT THE TIME.
- I DO THINK THERE'S -- THIS IS TURNING INTO AN ARGUMENTATIVE -- OCCASION FOR ARGUMENT, MR. KATZ. I FAIL TO SEE HOW THINGS THAT HE LEARNED ABOUT AFTER THE FACT, THAT HE DIDN'T EVEN KNOW ABOUT AT THE TIME THAT HE SIGNED THE AGREEMENT, COULD POSSIBLY CHANGE THE -- WHAT HE ACTUALLY

1	THOUGHT	ΑT	THE	TIME
2		I	WOF	COULD

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

HOW COULD THAT BE?

MR. KATZ: WELL, FOR EXAMPLE, IF HE HAD KNOWN THAT PLAYERS, ACTIVE PLAYERS, WERE PAID REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THEIR IMAGES WERE USED, THAT WOULD HAVE POSSIBLY CHANGED HIS TESTIMONY ABOUT WHETHER HE SHOULD HAVE BEEN PAID WHETHER OR NOT HIS IMAGE --

THE COURT: THAT'S AN ARGUMENT. THAT DOESN'T GO --WHAT HE THOUGHT AT THE TIME, WHAT WAS IN HIS MIND AT THE TIME HE SIGNED -- I'M NOT SAYING HE WAS FOOLED. MAYBE HE WAS COMPLETELY DEFRAUDED. I'M NOT SAYING THAT.

BUT IT STILL DOESN'T CHANGE THE FACT OF WHAT WAS IN HIS MIND AT THE TIME. SO HE CAN'T -- HE CAN'T GO BACK AND REWRITE HISTORY AND SAY:

"HERE'S WHAT I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT IF I HAD" --THAT WOULD BE A FRAUD CLAIM. BUT THAT'S NOT IN THE CASE. WHAT'S IN THE CASE IS FIDUCIARY DUTY AND BREACH OF CONTRACT.

I'M GOING TO LET YOU ASK A COUPLE OF THESE QUESTIONS AND SEE IF I ANTICIPATE CORRECTLY WHERE I THINK YOU'RE GOING WITH THIS. BUT I QUESTION WHETHER OR NOT THIS IS GOING TO BE ADMISSIBLE.

MR. KATZ: SINCE DISCRETION MAY BE THE BETTER PART OF VALOR, YOUR HONOR, I'M GOING TO GO ON WITH THE NEXT PART OF MY EXAMINATION.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. ALL RIGHT.

```
BY MR. KATZ:
```

- 2 Q. WERE YOU HERE, SIR, WHEN MR. KESSLER READ A PORTION OF
- 3 | YOUR DEPOSITION TESTIMONY IN HIS OPENING STATEMENT?
- 4 | **A.** YES.
- 5 | MR. KATZ: I'D LIKE TO PUT THAT ON THE BOARD, YOUR
- 6 HONOR.
- 7 THE COURT: GO RIGHT AHEAD. I DON'T SEE IT.
- 8 (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
- 9 MR. KATZ: THERE WE GO. OKAY.
- 10 BY MR. KATZ:
- 11 | Q. AND THE FIRST QUESTION, SIR, READS AS FOLLOWS:
- 12 "SIR, DO YOU BELIEVE, AS A RETIRED PLAYER,
- 13 YOU'RE ENTITLED TO ANY MONEY THAT'S GENERATED BY THE LICENSING
- 14 OF ACTIVE PLAYERS?
- 15 | "ANSWER: NO."
- 16 WHY DID YOU GIVE THAT ANSWER, SIR?
- 17 A. I SAID "NO," BECAUSE I THOUGHT THEY WAS TALKING ABOUT AD
- 18 HOC AGREEMENTS.
- 19 O. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT YOU'RE ENTITLED TO ANY MONEY FROM
- 20 ACTIVE PLAYER INDIVIDUAL OR AD HOC CONTRACTS?
- 21 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, I NEED A QUESTION AT THE
- 22 | TIME HE SIGNED THE GLA, IF HE'S GOING TO ASK THAT QUESTION; DID
- 23 HE HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING ABOUT THAT.
- 24 | THE COURT: READ THE QUESTION FOR ME. GIVE ME THE
- 25 QUESTION.

1	MR. KATZ: SURE.
2	THE COURT: SO I CAN HAVE IT IN MIND.
3	MR. KESSLER: HE ASKED IN THE PRESENT TENSE.
4	THE COURT: WELL, YOU DID, TOO. YOU ASKED THAT
5	QUESTION, THAT FIRST QUESTION IS IN THE PRESENT TENSE, AND WHEN
6	YOU ASKED IT IN THE DEPOSITION
7	MR. KESSLER: NO, YOUR HONOR, ACTUALLY THERE WERE
8	PREVIOUS QUESTIONS, AND THEN AT THE BOTTOM SUBSEQUENT
9	QUESTIONS. I KEPT ASKING HIM OVER AND OVER AGAIN:
10	"WAS THAT YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE AGREEMENT?"
11	SO IT'S VERY CLEAR FROM CONTEXT THAT'S WHY YOUR HONOR
12	ALLOWED THIS TESTIMONY WHEN YOU REVIEWED IT ALL.
13	MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS WHAT HE ASKED HIM. HE
14	SHOWED THIS TO THE JURY IN HIS OPENING STATEMENT. I DON'T KNOW
15	HOW MR. KESSLER CAN DENY THIS.
16	THE COURT: HERE'S WHAT I'M GOING TO LET YOU DO, ON
17	THE ASSUMPTION MR. KESSLER IS GOING TO GO BACK INTO THAT.
18	I'M GOING TO LET IN HIS OWN WORDS, WITHOUT YOU
19	LEADING HIM I'M GOING TO LET HIM COMMENT ON WHETHER OR NOT
20	HE STANDS BY THAT TESTIMONY THAT'S UP ON THE SCREEN. YOU CAN
21	DO THAT.
22	PRESENT TENSE, PAST TENSE, FUTURE TENSE. I'M GOING
23	TO GIVE YOU THIS ONE OPPORTUNITY. BUT YOU CAN'T LEAD HIM
24	THROUGH THIS.
25	YOU CAN ASK LET MR. ADDERLEY IF HE WANTS TO SAY

WHETHER HE STANDS BY THAT TESTIMONY OR NOT, AND IF NOT WHY NOT, 2 I'LL LET YOU DO THAT. 3 BY MR. KATZ: SIR, WHAT IF ANY THOUGHTS HAVE YOU HAD, FROM THE BEGINNING OF TIME TO RIGHT NOW, ABOUT WHETHER YOU COULD SHARE ANOTHER 5 6 PLAYER'S, AN ACTIVE PLAYER'S INDIVIDUAL AD HOC AGREEMENTS? 7 MR. KESSLER: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR, "FROM THE BEGINNING OF TIME TO RIGHT NOW." HE'S TRYING TO GET IN 8 TESTIMONY ABOUT WHAT HE THINKS RIGHT NOW AS OPPOSED TO AT THE TIME OF THE GLA. AND YOUR HONOR'S RULED THAT'S INADMISSIBLE. 10 THE COURT: ARE YOU GOING TO ASK HIM ABOUT THE AD HOC 11 12 | AGREEMENTS? 13 MR. KESSLER: I'M GOING TO ASK HIM ONLY ABOUT HIS INTENTION AT THE TIME HE SIGNED THE GLA'S. 14 15 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SINCE YOU'RE NOT TAKING MY PROPOSAL, MR. KATZ, I'M GOING TO STICK BY MY EARLIER RULING. 16 YOU'VE GOT TO ASK ONLY -- YOU REJECTED MY PROPOSED QUESTION. 17 MR. KATZ: ACTUALLY, I DIDN'T. I MAY NOT HAVE 18 19 UNDERSTOOD. 2.0 THE COURT: I WILL ASK THE QUESTION. MR. KATZ: THAT WOULD BE GREAT, YOUR HONOR. 21 THE COURT: I'LL JUST ASK IT. 22 23 MR. ADDERLEY, CAN YOU SEE WHAT'S UP ON THE SCREEN? 24 THE WITNESS: YES.

MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, JUST TO BE CLEAR -- I JUST

```
WANT TO MAKE SURE I WAS CLEAR -- I'D ASK ABOUT AD HOC
 2
   AGREEMENTS, BUT NOT RELATING TO THE -- NOT RELATING TO THE GLA,
 3
   WHICH ARE THESE QUESTIONS RELATING TO.
 4
             THE COURT: I'M OFF OF THAT NOW.
 5
             MR. KESSLER: OKAY.
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WAS
 6
 7
   QUOTED FROM IN THE OPENING STATEMENT, AND THIS IS FROM YOUR
   DEPOSITION.
 8
 9
             CAN YOU READ THAT TO YOURSELF, THAT TESTIMONY UP
   THERE? I'LL JUST READ IT OUT LOUD SO IT WILL BE PART OF THE
10
11
   RECORD.
12
              "QUESTION: SIR, DO YOU BELIEVE, AS A RETIRED
13
             PLAYER, YOU'RE ENTITLED TO ANY MONEY THAT'S
14
             GENERATED BY THE LICENSING OF ACTIVE PLAYERS?
15
              "ANSWER: NO."
16
             THEN, THERE'S A BREAK --
17
             MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, THEY ARE SEPARATE. APPRECIATE
   IF YOU COULD DO IT IN TWO SEPARATE -- THEY ARE SEPARATE. THEY
18
19
   ARE SEPARATE CITES.
2.0
             THE COURT: I'LL STOP THERE.
             DO YOU STAND BY THAT TESTIMONY, AND IF NOT, WHY NOT.
21
              THE WITNESS: I STAND BY THE TESTIMONY "NO."
22
23
              THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, NEXT:
24
              "QUESTION: AND, WHAT YOU THOUGHT YOU WERE
25
             AGREEING TO GET" --
```

2 OVER. 3 "QUESTION: AND WHAT YOU THOUGHT YOU WERE 4 AGREEING TO GET WAS THAT IF YOUR RIGHTS WERE 5 LICENSED AND USED, YOU WOULD GET SOME MONEY; 6 CORRECT? 7 "ANSWER: CORRECT. 8 "QUESTION: AND THAT WAS YOUR UNDERSTANDING	ТS
AGREEING TO GET WAS THAT IF YOUR RIGHTS WERE LICENSED AND USED, YOU WOULD GET SOME MONEY; CORRECT? "ANSWER: CORRECT.	
LICENSED AND USED, YOU WOULD GET SOME MONEY; CORRECT? "ANSWER: CORRECT.	
6 CORRECT? 7 "ANSWER: CORRECT.	
7 "ANSWER: CORRECT.	
8 "OTTESTION · AND THAT WAS VOTED TIMESPRANDING	
ACTOTION - WIND LITTLE MAD LOOK ONDERSTANDING	
9 OF THIS AGREEMENT?	
10 "ANSWER: YES."	
DO YOU STAND BY THAT TESTIMONY?	
12 THE WITNESS: YES.	
THE COURT: DO YOU WANT TO AMEND IT OR MODIFY IT IN	
14 SOME WAY?	
15 THE WITNESS: WELL, YES.	
THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. HOW WOULD YOU AMEND IT OR	
17 MODIFY IT?	
THE WITNESS: WELL, WHEN I SAID "NO," I WASN'T AWAR	3
19 OF THE GROUP LICENSING STATEMENT ABOUT "SIX ACTIVE PLAYERS OR	
20 SIX RETIRED PLAYERS."	
SO I GOT CONFUSED WITH THE AD HOC AND THE LICENSING	
22 ACTIVE PLAYERS. SO THE ANSWER WOULD BE "NO," IF IT'S AN AD	
HOC; "YES," IF IT'S ACTIVE PLAYERS WHO SIGNED THE GLA ALONG	
24 WITH THE SIX RETIRED PLAYERS.	
THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO IF YOU COULD GO BACK AND	

- 1 | MODIFY THAT TESTIMONY TO, IN YOUR VIEW, MAKE IT MORE ACCURATE,
- 2 | THAT'S THE WAY YOU WOULD ANSWER IT TODAY?
- 3 | THE WITNESS: YES, SIR.
- 4 | THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. CAN WE NOW MOVE TO SOMETHING
- 5 | ELSE?
- 6 BY MR. KATZ:
- 7 Q. SIR, IN THE SECOND QUESTION THERE:
- 8 WHAT YOU THOUGHT YOU WERE AGREEING TO GET WAS
- 9 | THAT IF YOUR RIGHTS, " UNDERLINED, "WERE LICENSED AND USED YOU
- 10 WOULD GET SOME MONEY, CORRECT?"
- 11 NOW, YOU HAVE YOUR DEPOSITION IN FRONT OF YOU, SIR.
- 12 I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TURN TO THE PAGE OF THAT TESTIMONY, WHICH
- 13 IS PAGE 92, LINES 8 THROUGH 17. I HAVE MARKED IT THERE.
- 14 NOW, ON THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF YOUR DEPOSITION -- DO
- 15 YOU HAVE IT?
- 16 A. WHICH LINES?
- 17 Q. 8 TO -- 8 TO 17.
- 18 **A.** OKAY.
- 19 Q. NOW, ON THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF YOUR DEPOSITION, THERE'S
- 20 NO UNDERLINING UNDER "YOUR RIGHTS," IS THERE, SIR?
- 21 **A.** NO.
- 22 Q. THAT'S SOMETHING THAT MR. KESSLER ADDED IN THERE WITHOUT
- 23 | TELLING THE JURY HE WAS ADDING THAT; IS THAT RIGHT?
- 24 | **A.** YES.
- 25 | Q. OKAY. AND WHY DID YOU GIVE THAT ANSWER THAT IT WAS

- 1 || CORRECT? WHAT WERE YOUR RIGHTS THAT YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT?
- 2 A. THE ONLY RIGHTS I HAD WERE WHAT THE GLA STATED, THAT SIX
- 3 OR MORE RETIRED PLAYERS.
- 4 Q. AND THAT'S WHAT YOU MEANT BY YOUR RIGHTS?
- $5 | \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{YES}$
- 6 Q. OKAY. NOW, AT THE TIME YOU SIGNED THESE AGREEMENTS, DID
- 7 | YOU BELIEVE THAT YOU -- NOW, I'M GOING TO TALK ABOUT AD HOCS
- 8 FOR A SECOND, OKAY?
- $9 \| \mathbf{A}_{\bullet}$ OKAY.
- 10 Q. AT THE TIME YOU SIGNED THIS AGREEMENT, WHAT, IF ANY,
- 11 | BELIEF DID YOU HAVE ABOUT WHETHER YOU HAD TO SHARE YOU ARE AD
- 12 HOC MONEY WITH ANYBODY ELSE?
- 13 **A.** NONE WHATSOEVER.
- 14 Q. DO YOU BELIEVE YOU HAD TO SHARE OR DIDN'T HAVE TO SHARE?
- 15 A. I DIDN'T HAVE TO SHARE.
- 16 Q. WHAT, IF ANY, BELIEF DID YOU HAVE ABOUT WHETHER ANYONE
- 17 | ELSE, ACTIVE OR RETIRED, HAD TO SHARE THEIR AD HOC MONEY WITH
- 18 | YOU?
- 19 $\|\mathbf{A}\|$ NO, NOTHING.
- 20 Q. DO YOU MEAN THEY HAD TO SHARE IT OR DIDN'T HAVE TO SHARE
- 21 | IT?
- 22 | A. THEY DIDN'T HAVE TO SHARE IT.
- 23 Q. FINE. THANK YOU.
- 24 | NOW, YOU WERE HERE IN THE COURTROOM WHEN MR. MCNEIL
- 25 AND MR. BEACH AND MR. LAIRD TESTIFIED ABOUT THEIR IMAGES BEING

- 1 | SCRAMBLED. DO YOU RECALL THAT?
- $2 \| \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{YES} \|$
- 3 | Q. OKAY. AND THEY ALL TALKED ABOUT SOME RELATIVE OF THEIRS
- 4 WHO TOLD THEM:
- 5 | "HEY, GRANDPA, I SAW YOU IN THE GAME" OR
- 6 WHATEVER. DID YOU HAVE A SIMILAR EXPERIENCE?
- $7 | \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{YES}$.
- $8 \parallel \mathbf{Q}$. WHAT WAS THAT?
- 9 | A. MY SON-IN-LAW AND MY GRANDSON SHOWED ME ONE OF THE GAMES
- 10 WHERE THEY HAD THE DALLAS COWBOYS 19 -- I THINK IT WAS THE '71
- 11 SUPER BOWL, AND THE PACKERS '66 TEAM SUPER BOWL. AND THEY WERE
- 12 PLAYING AGAINST EACH OTHER. AND THAT WAS THE FIRST TIME I WAS
- 13 AWARE OF IT.
- 14 Q. AND SINCE THEN, HAVE YOU ACTUALLY SEEN YOUR SCRAMBLED
- 15 | IMAGE IN THE MADDEN GAME?
- 16 **A.** YES.
- 17 Q. HOW DO YOU KNOW IT WAS YOU?
- 18 A. BECAUSE GREENBAY PACKERS BETWEEN 1961 AND '69, I WAS THE
- 19 ONLY PLAYER WHO PLAYED THE LEFT CORNERBACK POSITION. AND THE
- 20 | SAME WITH THE DALLAS COWBOYS. FROM 1970 TO '72, I WAS THE ONLY
- 21 PERSON WHO PLAYED THE LEFT CORNERBACK POSITION.
- 22 Q. COULD IT BE THE 1967 GREENBAY PACKERS IF HERBERT ANTHONY
- 23 | ADDERLEY WERE NOT PLAYING LEFT CORNERBACK?
- 24 | **A.** NO.
- 25 Q. COULD IT BE THE 1971 DALLAS COWBOYS IF HERBERT ANTHONY

- 1 | ADDERLEY WERE NOT PLAYING CORNERBACK?
- 2 **A.** NO.
- 3 Q. DID YOU SEE YOUR HEIGHT AND WEIGHT ON THERE?
- 4 | A. YES.
- 5 Q. DID YOU SEE YOUR AGE?
- 6 **A.** YES.
- 7 Q. DID YOU SEE YOUR YEARS IN THE LEAGUE?
- 8 **A.** YES.
- 9 | Q. WERE THEY ALL CORRECT?
- $10 \| \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{YES} \|$
- 11 Q. NOW, YOU HAVE BEEN NAMED THE CLASS REPRESENTATIVE FOR
- 12 2,062 OTHER PLAYERS. DOES THAT NUMBER HAVE ANY SIGNIFICANCE TO
- 13 YOU, THE 2,062?
- 14 A. YES. 26 INVOLVED MY LUCKY NUMBER.
- 15 Q. THAT'S YOUR NUMBER, YOUR UNIFORM NUMBER?
- 16 **A.** YES, SIR.
- 17 Q. THE ONE THEY SCRAMBLED IN THE MADDEN GAME?
- 18 **A.** YES.
- 19 Q. AND DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT THAT MEANS?
- 20 **A.** YES.
- 21 Q. TELL US -- TELL THE JURY WHAT THAT MEANS TO YOU?
- 22 A. WELL, IT MEANS THAT IT ISN'T ABOUT ME. IT'S ABOUT THE
- 23 | 2,062 CLASS MEMBERS, INCLUDING MYSELF. AND THAT I'M HERE TO
- 24 | SEEK JUSTICE FOR ALL OF US.
- 25 $\|\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}\|$ AND DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHY ALL THE 2061 OTHER MEMBERS ARE

- 1 | IN THE SAME SITUATION AS YOU ARE?
- 2 **A.** YES.
- 3 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, I'M GOING TO OBJECT. HE
- 4 | HAS NO PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE OTHER 2,000 PLAYERS.
- 5 MR. KATZ: YES, HE DOES, YOUR HONOR. IN ONE RESPECT
- 6 HE DOES.
- 7 | THE COURT: LET'S HEAR THE ANSWER FIRST. IF I THINK
- 8 IT'S TOO SPECULATIVE, I WILL STRIKE IT OUT.
- 9 GO AHEAD AND ANSWER.
- 10 BY MR. KATZ:
- 11 Q. WHY ARE YOU IN THE SAME SITUATION AS THEY ARE, SIR?
- 12 A. BECAUSE WE ALL SIGNED THE GLA.
- 13 Q. THANK YOU.
- 14 NOW, YOU WERE IN COURT THE OTHER DAY WHEN A REQUEST
- 15 | FOR ADMISSION WAS READ OUT ABOUT MR. UPSHAW SAYING SOMETHING
- 16 ABOUT DOG FOOD?
- 17 **A.** YES.
- 18 **Q.** OKAY.
- 19 MR. KATZ: AND IF I MAY READ THAT AGAIN, YOUR HONOR,
- 20 TO REFRESH.
- 21 THE COURT: FINE. GO AHEAD.
- 22 MR. KATZ: "REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19. ADMIT THAT
- 23 GENE UPSHAW HAS SAID IN REFERENCE TO LICENSING OF IMAGES OF THE
- 24 | RETIRED PLAYERS, QUOTE: 'WE COULD HAVE THE GREATEST DOG FOOD
- 25 IN THE WORLD, BUT IF THE DOGS DON'T LIKE IT, WE CAN'T SELL IT,'

- $1 \parallel \texttt{CLOSED} \text{ QUOTE.}$
- 2 "RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NUMBER 19:
- 3 | SUBJECT TO AND WITHOUT WAIVER OF THE FORGOING OBJECTS, REQUEST
- 4 NUMBER 19 IS ADMITTED."
- 5 BY MR. KATZ:
- 6 Q. DID YOU SEE THAT LANGUAGE WHEN MR. UPSHAW SPOKE IT, SIR?
- $7 \mid \mathbf{A}. \quad \text{YES}.$
- 8 Q. WHAT WAS YOUR REACTION TO IT?
- 9 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION. HIS REACTION TO
- 10 | IT IS NOT EVIDENCE OF ANYTHING.
- 11 | THE COURT: WHY IS THAT RELEVANT?
- 12 MR. KATZ: IT'S RELEVANT BECAUSE THEY HAVE MADE A BIG
- 13 CASE: NOBODY WANTS THESE GUYS, NOBODY LIKES THESE GUYS. THEY
- 14 ARE DOG FOOD. AND THEY ACTUALLY ARE SAYING THAT WHEN THEY ARE
- 15 | IN A FIDUCIARY POSITION TO THESE PEOPLE. CALLING THEM "DOG
- 16 FOOD," I THINK HIS REACTION TO WHAT HIS FIDUCIARY SAYS ABOUT
- 17 | HIM --
- 18 THE COURT: YOU CAN ASK WHETHER OR NOT -- THERE IS NO
- 19 | CLAIM FOR EMOTIONAL DISTRESS IN THIS CASE. WHAT YOU CAN ASK IS
- 20 WHETHER OR NOT HE AGREES WITH MR. UPSHAW THAT THE RETIRED
- 21 | PLAYERS ARE DOG FOOD.
- 22 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 23 Q. WOULD YOU ANSWER HIS HONOR'S QUESTION?
- 24 | MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, THE QUOTE IS --
- 25 MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, IS HE OBJECTING TO YOUR

- 1 QUESTION NOW, YOUR HONOR?
- 2 THE COURT: I WANT -- I'LL REPHRASE IT.
- 3 DOES HE AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT --
- 4 MR. KESSLER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
- 5 | THE COURT: -- THAT WAS ADMITTED TO IN THE REQUEST
- 6 | FOR ADMISSION?
- 7 YOU CAN ASK THAT.
- 8 BY MR. KATZ:
- 9 Q. WOULD YOU ANSWER HIS HONOR'S QUESTION.
- 10 | A. DO I AGREE WITH WHAT UPSHAW SAID?
- 11 | **Q.** RIGHT.
- 12 **A.** ABOUT THE DOG FOOD?
- 13 **Q.** RIGHT.
- 14 **A.** NO.
- 15 **Q.** WHY NOT?
- 16 A. BECAUSE IT'S HUMILIATING AND HEARTBREAKING FOR THE
- 17 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE UNION TO DIRECT A STATEMENT AT
- 18 RETIRED PLAYERS LIKE MYSELF AND THOUSANDS OF OTHERS WHO HELPED
- 19 BUILD THE GAME.
- 20 Q. LET ME READ TO YOU SOME SWORN TESTIMONY FROM MR. UPSHAW'S
- 21 DEPOSITION.
- 22 MR. KATZ: IT'S PAGE 58, LINES 1 THROUGH 16, YOUR
- 23 | HONOR. I THINK YOU HAVE THE DEPOSITION UP THERE.
- 24 | THE COURT: I DO. ALL RIGHT.
- 25 MR. KATZ: OKAY.

1	"QUESTION: OKAY. FINE. SO DIRECTING YOUR
2	ATTENTION TO THE SECOND PAGE OF EXHIBIT 117,
3	IT QUOTES YOU AS FOLLOWS. WELL, IN THE FIRST
4	PARAGRAPH IT SAYS: 'UPSHAW, 60, WHO HAS BEEN
5	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NFLPA SINCE 1987,
6	SAYS HE STANDS BY HIS RECORD AND REJECTS A
7	SUGGESTION HE'S SUPPOSED TO BE THE RETIREES'
8	REPRESENTATIVE.' QUOTE: 'THE BOTTOM LINE IS
9	I DON'T WORK FOR THEM,' CLOSE QUOTE, HE SAID.
10	QUOTE: 'THEY DON'T HIRE ME, AND THEY CAN'T
11	FIRE ME. THEY CAN COMPLAIN ABOUT ME ALL DAY
12	LONG. THEY CAN HAVE THEIR OPINION. BUT THE
13	ACTIVE PLAYERS HAVE THE VOTE. THAT'S WHO
14	PAYS MY SALARY,' CLOSED QUOTE.
15	"DID YOU SAY THOSE WORDS?
16	"ANSWER: I SAID THOSE WORDS DIRECTED AT ONE
17	INDIVIDUAL, JOE DELAMIELLEURE."
18	D-E-L-A-M-I-E-L-L-E-U-R-E.
19	JUST AS AN ASIDE, YOUR HONOR, I SPOKE TO
20	MR. DELAMIELLEURE THE OTHER DAY, AND TOLD HIM I HAD A HARD TIME
21	SPELLING HIS NAME. AND HE SAID:
22	"WHAT? IT'S J-O-E."
23	(LAUGHTER.)
24	THE COURT: OKAY. WHAT'S THE QUESTION?
25	

```
BY MR. KATZ:
```

- 2 | Q. THE QUESTION IS: WHAT WAS YOUR REACTION? DID YOU READ
- 3 | THOSE WORDS WHEN HE SPOKE THEM?
- 4 | **A.** YES.
- 5 | O. WHAT WAS YOUR REACTION TO THOSE WORDS?
- 6 | MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, HE SAW THEM IN A DEPOSITION
- 7 | AND --
- 8 MR. KATZ: NO.
- 9 MR. KESSLER: -- WE'RE ASKING FOR HIS REACTION NOW
- 10 | AFTER HE READ THEM IN A DEPOSITION? THIS IS COMPLETELY
- 11 | ARGUMENTATIVE.
- 12 (COUNSEL AND THE COURT SPEAKING SIMULTANEOUSLY, WHICH
- 13 WAS NOT REPORTABLE.)
- 14 THE COURT: THIS IS ARGUMENT. SUSTAINED.
- 15 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 16 Q. DID YOU READ THOSE WORDS WHEN -- IN THE CHARLOTTE OBSERVER
- 17 WHEN THEY WERE UTTERED IN JANUARY OF 2006?
- 18 **A.** YES.
- 19 | Q. AND WHAT WAS YOUR REACTION?
- 20 MR. KESSLER: SAME OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR.
- 21 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 22 Q. AT THAT TIME?
- 23 | MR. KESSLER: IT'S NOT EVIDENCE. HE'S JUST GOING TO
- 24 GIVE ANOTHER SPEECH.
- 25 THE COURT: SOUNDS LIKE IT, BUT ALL RIGHT.

- 1 NOVERRULED.
- 2 GO AHEAD AND ANSWER.
- 3 | THE WITNESS: IT WAS HEARTBREAKING TO KNOW THAT I WAS
- 4 | A DUES-PAYING MEMBER, HAD A DISTINGUISHED CAREER, TOUGH CAREER
- 5 AND HARD YEARS IN THE NFL, AND TO REALIZE THAT WE DIDN'T HAVE A
- 6 | VOTE WAS REALLY SHOCKING BECAUSE I THOUGHT WE WERE PAYING DUES
- 7 TO BE REPRESENTED BY THE UNION.
- 8 BY MR. KATZ:
- 9 | Q. DID YOU CEASE BELONGING TO THE UNION AT THAT TIME?
- 10 **A.** REPEAT THAT, PLEASE.
- 11 | Q. DID YOU CEASE BELONGING TO THE UNION AROUND THAT TIME?
- 12 A. I DID BEFORE THAT.
- 13 Q. WERE YOU IN THE COURTROOM, SIR, WHEN MR. ALLEN TESTIFIED
- 14 ABOUT AN ISSUE OF TOUCHBACK MAGAZINE?
- 15 **A.** YES.
- 16 **Q.** OKAY.
- 17 MR. KATZ: IT'S IN EVIDENCE, YOUR HONOR.
- 18 COULD WE PUT 2046 UP?
- 19 (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
- 20 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 21 | Q. I'M GOING TO READ TO YOU A PORTION -- DID YOU READ
- 22 TOUCHBACK MAGAZINE?
- 23 **A.** NO.
- 24 | Q. DID YOU CONSIDER TOUCHBACK MAGAZINE TO BE ANY SORT OF
- 25 | REPORT TO YOU ABOUT THE GLA'S?

1	A. NO.
2	Q. LET ME READ TO YOU FROM PAGE 4.
3	MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, I OBJECT. IF HE NEVER READ
4	TOUCHBACK MAGAZINE, WHICH WAS JUST IN SWORN
5	MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS JUST ARGUMENT. THIS
6	IS REALLY NOT AN OBJECTION. IT'S WORSE THAN A SPEAKING
7	OBJECTION, BECAUSE IT'S NOT AN OBJECTION. IT'S JUST SPEAKING.
8	THE COURT: WHAT IS THE OBJECTION, LEGAL OBJECTION?
9	WHAT IS IT?
LO	MR. KESSLER: NO FOUNDATION FOR THIS WITNESS TO
L1	TESTIFY ABOUT A DOCUMENT HE JUST STATED HE NEVER READ.
L2	MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR
L3	(COUNSEL AND THE COURT SPEAKING SIMULTANEOUSLY, WHICH
L4	WAS NOT REPORTABLE.)
L5	THE COURT: MAYBE THE SUBJECT MATTER IS SOMETHING HE
L6	CAN COMMENT ON.
L7	WHAT IS THE PART YOU WANT TO ASK HIM ABOUT?
L8	MR. KATZ: THIS IS WHAT YOU RULED ON YESTERDAY
L9	MORNING, YOUR HONOR.
20	THE COURT: YOU HAVE TO FORGIVE
21	(COUNSEL AND THE COURT SPEAKING SIMULTANEOUSLY, WHICH
22	WAS NOT REPORTABLE.)
23	MR. KATZ: YOU GAVE ME SPECIFIC PERMISSION TO ASK
24	THESE QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PENSION, THE INCREDIBLE, AMAZING
25	INCREASES IN THE PENSION.

- 1 | THE COURT: I GUESS I DID. ALL RIGHT. GO AHEAD.
- 2 MR. KATZ: THANK YOU.
- 3 BY MR. KATZ:
- 4 Q. IF WE LOOK AT PAGE 4 OF THIS DOCUMENT --
- 5 MR. KATZ: IF YOU COULD HIGHLIGHT THE LANGUAGE AT THE
- 6 | BOTTOM, BEGINNING WITH THE NFLPA'S REPRESENTATION OF RETIRED
- 7 | PLAYERS. YEAH.
- 8 (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
- 9 THIS WAS READ IN TO THE JURY BY MR. KESSLER. IT
- 10 | SAYS, QUOTE:
- 11 | "THE NFLPA'S REPRESENTATION OF RETIRED PLAYERS
- 12 IS FUNDED MOSTLY BY ROYALTIES FROM PLAYERS INC LICENSING
- 13 | PROGRAMS INVOLVING CURRENT PLAYERS. THIS REPRESENTATION HAS
- 14 DELIVERED AMAZING GAINS IN PLAYER PENSIONS, ESPECIALLY OVER THE
- 15 LAST 10 YEARS."
- 16 BY MR. KATZ:
- 17 Q. DO YOU SEE THAT, SIR?
- 18 **A.** YES.
- 19 Q. DID YOU RECEIVE A GAIN IN YOUR PENSION IN RECENT YEARS?
- 20 **A.** YES.
- 21 || Q. FROM WHAT TO WHAT?
- 22 A. WELL, I WAS RECEIVING \$126.85 BEFORE THE LAST CBA
- 23 | AGREEMENT.
- 24 | Q. 126.85 PER MONTH?
- 25 **A.** YES.

- 1 \mathbf{Q} . OKAY.
- $2 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. AND MY PENSION WENT UP \$50, TO 175.86.
- 3 Q. OKAY. AND DO YOU CONSIDER THAT TO BE AN AMAZING GAIN IN
- 4 YOUR PENSION?
- $5 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. NO.
- 6 Q. DO YOU CONSIDER YOUR PENSION TO BE ADEQUATE IN ANY WAY,
- 7 | SHAPE OR FORM?
- 8 **A.** NO.
- 9 Q. THEN, IT SAYS A LITTLE BIT FURTHER ON:
- 10 | "DURING THE LAST COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT
- 11 EXTENSION, FOR EXAMPLE, ALL PLAYER BENEFIT CREDITS PRIOR TO
- 12 | 1977" -- YOU PLAYED PRIOR TO 1977, SIR, RIGHT?
- 13 **A.** YES.
- 14 Q. -- "INCREASED TO A MINIMUM OF \$200 PER MONTH, CAUSING 50
- 15 | 100 PERCENT INCREASES IN SOME OLDER PLAYERS' PENSIONS."
- 16 YOUR PENSION IS NOT \$200 A MONTH, SIR, IS IT?
- 17 **A.** NO.
- 18 | MR. KATZ: NOTHING FURTHER AT THIS TIME, YOUR HONOR.
- 19 | THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. BEFORE WE START THE -- I
- 20 WANT -- LEAVE THAT UP THERE FOR A SECOND SO THAT I CAN -- I
- 21 JUST WANT THE JURY TO KEEP STRAIGHT WHAT THE ISSUES IN THE CASE
- 22 ARE.
- 23 AND BOTH SIDES HAVE DONE THIS, SO I'M NOT BLAMING
- 24 | ANYBODY. BOTH SIDES HAVE VEERED OUTSIDE THE STRICT ISSUES
- 25 YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE TO DECIDE.

1 THE ISSUES IN THIS CASE COME DOWN TO THREE WORDS: 2 GLA AND WHETHER OR NOT THE GLA WAS VIOLATED AND ANY FIDUCIARY 3 RIGHTS ARISING OUT OF THE GLA WERE VIOLATED. 4 IT DOES NOT INVOLVE THE BROADER ISSUES OF WHETHER OR 5 NOT THE LABOR UNION HAS ADEQUATELY REPRESENTED ITS UNION 6 MEMBERS IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING OR IN ANY OTHER WAY. 7 BOTH SIDES HAVE VEERED OUTSIDE THE NARROWER ISSUES IN THIS CASE FOR WHATEVER REASONS THAT YOU CAN IMAGINE. BUT I 8 WANT YOU TO BE AWARE THAT AT THE END OF THE DAY IT MAKES NO DIFFERENCE WHETHER THE PENSION IS A HUNDRED DOLLARS OR \$600. 10 11 THAT'S NOT THE ISSUE IN THE CASE. I'M NOT BLAMING MR. KATZ FOR BRINGING THIS UP, 12 13 BECAUSE MR. KESSLER BROUGHT THIS UP. SO HE'S ENTITLED TO PUT HIS POINT OF VIEW BEFORE YOU, AS WELL. BUT THAT'S NOT YOUR 14 15 ISSUE. YOU JUST BE THINKING "G-L-A." 16 NOW, WE'VE GOT ENOUGH ON OUR PLATE WITH JUST THAT, 17 BECAUSE YOU'VE GOT ALL THESE OTHER AGREEMENTS, ELECTRONIC ARTS, 18 19 AND HOW THEY FIT INTO THE GLA, AND SO FORTH. BUT AT THE END OF THE DAY THAT'S WHAT YOU'RE GOING TO 2.0 HAVE TO PIECE TOGETHER. AND YOU'RE NOT GOING TO BE OUT THERE 22 TRYING TO FIGURE OUT WHETHER OR NOT AS A GENERAL MATTER THE 23 UNION AND THE LEAGUE HAVE TREATED FORMER FOOTBALL PLAYERS FAIRLY OR NOT. THAT IS NOT THE ISSUE BEFORE YOU. 24

SO WHEN MR. KESSLER MAKES IT SOUND LIKE THEY HAVE

- 1 DONE SO, IGNORE THAT.
- 2 WHEN MR. KATZ TRIES TO MAKE IT SOUND LIKE THEY HAVE
- 3 | NOT DONE THAT, IGNORE THAT. AND FOCUS ON THE REAL ISSUE THAT
- 4 YOU HAVE TO DECIDE IN THE CASE. ALL RIGHT.
- 5 CROSS EXAMINATION.
- 6 MR. KESSLER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

CROSS EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. KESSLER:

- 9 Q. GOOD MORNING, MR. ADDERLEY.
- 10 A. GOOD MORNING, SIR.
- 11 Q. MR. ADDERLEY, I JUST WANT TO GET RID OF THIS IRRELEVANT
- 12 PENSION ISSUE, WHICH SHOULD NOT BE IN THE CASE, BUT SINCE
- 13 MR. KATZ ASKED YOU THIS, I JUST HAVE TO ASK YOU ONE OR TWO
- 14 QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS, SIR, SO PLEASE FORGIVE ME FOR THIS. I
- 15 DON'T WANT TO INVADE YOUR PRIVACY.
- MR. ADDERLEY, YOU VOLUNTARILY DECIDED TO TAKE YOUR
- 17 PENSION AT THE PAGE OF 45 YEARS OLD; IS THAT CORRECT?
- 18 **A.** YES.
- 19 | Q. AND AS A RESULT OF MAKING THAT DECISION, WHEN YOU WERE
- 20 YOUNGER YOU WERE GETTING A PENSION OF \$761 A MONTH, \$856 A
- 21 MONTH WHEN YOU WERE YOUNGER, BUT NOW IT HAS DECREASED.
- 22 | IS THAT TRUE?
- 23 | A. I DON'T REMEMBER GETTING THAT AMOUNT.
- 24 | Q. OKAY. DO YOU REMEMBER YOU GOT A LOT MORE MONEY WHEN YOU
- 25 | WERE YOUNGER, SIR?

- 1 | A. THE NUMBER YOU JUST CALLED OUT?
- $2 | \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{YES}$, SIR.
- 3 | A. NO, I DON'T REMEMBER THAT.
- 4 | Q. WHAT NUMBER DO YOU REMEMBER YOU WERE GETTING WHEN YOU WERE
- 5 | YOUNGER?
- 6 | A. THE HIGHEST I RECEIVED THAT I REMEMBER IS \$548 A MONTH.
- 7 | Q. OKAY. SO YOU REMEMBER GETTING -- YOU GOT 548 A MONTH.
- 8 NOW, MR. ADDERLEY, DID YOU KNOW THAT IF YOU HAD
- 9 WAITED UNTIL 65 YEARS OLD TO RETIRE, THE NORMAL RETIREMENT AGE,
- 10 AND IF YOU HAD WAITED FOR ALL THAT, THAT TODAY WITH ALL THE
- 11 AMAZING GAINS THAT WERE DESCRIBED IN THIS ARTICLE, YOU WOULD BE
- 12 HAVING A PENSION TODAY OF MORE THAN \$80,000 A YEAR?
- 13 | MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS JUST TESTIMONY. THIS
- 14 IS REALLY JUST TESTIMONY.
- 15 THE COURT: JUST A SECOND.
- 16 DO YOU KNOW THAT OR NOT?
- 17 THE WITNESS: NO.
- 18 | THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THAT IS NOT EVIDENCE IN THE
- 19 | CASE. MR. KESSLER, WITH GREAT FLOURISH, WAS READING FROM
- 20 | SOMETHING. AND MAYBE IT'S TRUE. MAYBE IT'S NOT TRUE. IT IS
- 21 | ZERO EVIDENCE RIGHT NOW.
- 22 MR. KESSLER IS ENTITLED TO BRING IN ANOTHER ACTUARY
- 23 | FROM THE METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY. THEY CAN FIGURE
- 24 | OUT WHAT HE WOULD HAVE GOTTEN IF HE HAD WAITED.
- 25 SO DON'T TAKE -- THIS IS A CLASSIC EXAMPLE. BOTH

- 1 | SIDES ARE DOING THIS. REMEMBER THAT'S NOT EVIDENCE.
- 2 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 3 | Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY FRIENDS WHO WAITED UNTIL THEY WERE 65 TO
- 4 GET THEIR PENSIONS?
- 5 | A. I HAVEN'T SPOKEN TO ANYBODY AT -- THAT I KNOW OF.
- 6 | Q. DO YOU STILL HAVE FRIENDS IN THE LEAGUE FROM THE PACKERS?
- $7 \mid \mathbf{A}. \quad \text{YES}.$
- 8 | Q. YOU HAVE NEVER SPOKEN TO THEM ABOUT THOSE WHO CHOSE TO
- 9 WAIT, HOW GENEROUS THEIR PENSIONS ARE?
- 10 | A. I HAVE ONLY SPOKEN TO THE GUYS WHO ELECTED THE EARLY
- 11 | RETIREMENT. AND IF I MAY EXPLAIN WHY I ELECTED THE EARLY
- 12 | RETIREMENT.
- 13 Q. YOUR COUNSEL CAN ASK YOU THAT QUESTION.
- 14 MR. KATZ: HE ASKED THE QUESTION. HE OPENED THE
- 15 | DOOR.
- 16 THE COURT: NOT YET, NO.
- 17 LOOK. THE BASIC QUESTION HE'S TRYING TO ASK IS THAT
- 18 MR. ADDERLEY, IF YOU HAD WAITED UNTIL YOU WERE 65 WOULD YOU
- 19 HAVE GOTTEN MORE MONTHLY PENSION THAN YOU'RE GETTING NOW?
- 20 THE WITNESS: DID I KNOW THAT?
- 21 | THE COURT: IS THAT THE WAY IT WORKED, THAT IF YOU
- 22 HAD WAITED, INSTEAD OF DOING IT AT 45, YOU HAD WAITED UNTIL YOU
- 23 | WERE 65 WOULD YOU HAVE GOTTEN A BIGGER PENSION THAN YOU ARE
- 24 GETTING RIGHT NOW?
- 25 THE WITNESS: YES.

BY MR. KESSLER:

- 2 | Q. IN FACT, MR. ADDERLEY, ONE LAST QUESTION ON THIS. DO YOU
- 3 || RECALL THAT WHEN YOU DECIDED TO TAKE YOUR PENSION AT 45, YOU
- 4 | ACTUALLY SIGNED THE FORM, AN OFFICIAL FORM FROM THE PENSION
- 5 | FUND, SAYING:
- 6 | "I KNOW I'M GIVING UP MY RIGHTS TO A MUCH LARGER
- 7 | PENSION, BUT THAT'S WHAT I WANT TO DO"?
- 8 DO YOU REMEMBER SIGNING THAT FORM?
- 9 | A. IT WAS A MISLEADING FORM. IT DIDN'T STATE EVERYTHING.
- 10 Q. YOU REMEMBER YOU SIGNED THE FORM FROM THE PENSION FUND,
- 11 | CORRECT, TO DO THAT?
- 12 A. I SIGNED SOMETHING. I DON'T REMEMBER WHAT THE FORM WAS.
- 13 | Q. I DON'T WANT TO TALK ABOUT PENSIONS ANYMORE. THE JUDGE IS
- 14 RIGHT. THAT'S NOT THE ISSUE IN THE CASE. LET'S TALK ABOUT THE
- 15 ISSUES IN THIS CASE.
- MR. ADDERLEY, DO --
- 17 | MR. KESSLER: DID WE GIVE THE WITNESS A COPY OF HIS
- 18 DEPOSITION?
- 19 MR. KATZ: HE HAS ONE.
- 20 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 21 Q. DO YOU HAVE ONE UP THERE, A COPY OF YOUR DEPOSITION,
- 22 MR. ADDERLEY? IF YOU COULD LOOK AT THAT, PLEASE.
- 23 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, MR. ADDERLEY IS A PARTY SO
- 24 I'M GOING TO FIRST READ IN HIS DEPOSITIONS.
- 25 | IF YOU LOOK, MR. ADDERLEY, AT THE TRANSCRIPT ON PAGE

```
100 OF YOUR DEPOSITION. AND I'M GOING TO READ OVER TO PART OF
   101. I'LL TELL YOU THE LINES IN A SECOND. I'M READING FROM
 2
 3
   LINE 22, MR. ADDERLEY, ON PAGE 100.
              AND THEN I'M GOING TO READ TO LINE 12 ON PAGE 101.
 4
 5
              "QUESTION: PLEASE TELL ME, PRIOR TO FILING
 6
              THIS ACTION AND RECEIVING THE COPIES OF THE
 7
              GLA'S PRODUCED BY DEFENDANTS IN THIS ACTION,
 8
              WHAT SPECIFIC TERMS OF THE GLA DID YOU KNOW
 9
              OR REMEMBER?
10
              "ANSWER: THAT I SIGNED THE GLA, I REMEMBER,
11
              AND I WAS UNDER THE IMPRESSION THAT I WAS
12
              SEEING SOME COMPENSATION FOR SIGNING IT.
13
              "QUESTION: IF YOUR IMAGE WAS USED?
14
              "IF IT WAS USED?"
15
              THE COURT: YOU LEFT OUT "ANSWER."
16
              MR. KESSLER: SORRY. LET ME READ THAT AGAIN.
17
              "ANSWER: THAT I SIGNED THE GLA, I REMEMBER,
              AND I WAS UNDER THE IMPRESSION THAT I
18
19
              RECEIVED SOME COMPENSATION FOR SIGNING IT.
              "QUESTION: IF YOUR IMAGE WAS USED?"
2.0
2.1
              MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, HE'S NOT READING IT.
              MR. KESSLER: "IF YOUR IMAGE WAS USED?"
22
23
              I GUESS I STUTTERED.
24
              "IF IT WAS USED.
25
              "AND THAT'S ALL YOU KNEW AT THE TIME?"
```

1 THE COURT: QUESTION.

2 MR. KESSLER: YES.

3 | "QUESTION: AND THAT'S ALL YOU KNEW AT THE

TIME?

"ANSWER: YES."

6 BY MR. KESSLER:

4

5

- Q. SO, MR. ADDERLEY, IT'S TRUE, ISN'T IT, THAT AT THE TIME
- 8 YOU SIGNED YOUR GLA, BEFORE YOU EVER FILED THE LAWSUIT, WHEN
- 9 YOU SIGNED YOUR GLA WAY BACK, THE ONLY THING YOU KNEW WAS THAT
- 10 | IF YOUR IMAGE WAS USED YOU EXPECTED TO GET PAID, RIGHT?
- 11 **A.** YES.
- 12 Q. OKAY. AND IT'S ALSO TRUE THAT WHEN YOUR IMAGE WAS USED IN
- 13 | A TRADING CARD OR ANY KINDS OF PRODUCT -- AND BY "YOUR IMAGE,"
- 14 I MEAN YOUR NAME OR YOUR PICTURE -- WHEN THAT WAS USED YOU GOT
- 15 | PAID FOR THAT, RIGHT?
- 16 **A.** NO.
- 17 Q. OKAY. WHEN WAS YOUR NAME USED ON A PRODUCT SINCE YOU'RE A
- 18 | RETIRED PLAYER THAT YOU DIDN'T GET PAID FOR IT SINCE YOU SIGNED
- 19 THE GLA?
- 20 | A. WELL, I'VE RECEIVED TRADING CARDS THAT I DIDN'T GET PAID
- 21 | FOR. THERE ARE FIGURINES OF MYSELF AND DEION SANDERS THAT WAS
- 22 | PACKAGED IN A COLLECTIBLES AS DOUBLES, THAT DEION SANDERS WAS
- 23 | PAID FOR, AND I DIDN'T GET A DIME. IT WAS MARKETED.
- 24 | THEY SENT ME A BOX WITH A DOZEN OF THOSE ITEMS IN IT,
- 25 WITH NO MONEY.

- 1 Q. MR. ADDERLEY, SINCE YOU'RE A RETIRED PLAYER, IT'S TRUE,
- 2 ISN'T IT, THAT PLAYERS INC HAS NEVER LICENSED YOUR -- YOUR
- 3 | PERSONAL IMAGE WHERE YOU DID NOT GET PAID FOR IT? THAT'S TRUE,
- 4 | ISN'T IT?
- 5 A. NO, IT ISN'T TRUE.
- 6 | Q. MR. ADDERLEY -- OKAY. LET ME GO NEXT -- NOW, YOU SAID YOU
- 7 | WERE USING THE TRADING CARD. WHAT TRADING CARD DO YOU THINK
- 8 YOUR IMAGE WAS USED IN?
- 9 | A. I GET TRADING CARDS ALL THE TIME THAT I DON'T GET PAID
- 10 | FOR. I DON'T KNOW. TOPPS OR -- I DIDN'T LOOK AT THAT. I JUST
- 11 | SIGN THE CARDS AND SEND THEM BACK.
- 12 Q. WHAT DO YOU MEAN YOU GET TRADING CARDS ALL THE TIME? ARE
- 13 YOU TALKING ABOUT IN THE MAIL?
- 14 **A.** YEAH.
- 15 Q. OLD TRADING CARDS?
- 16 **A.** YES.
- 17 Q. FROM WHEN YOU WERE AN ACTIVE PLAYER?
- 18 | A. YES.
- 19 || Q. SIR, I'M ASKING YOU A DIFFERENT QUESTION. PLEASE WORK
- 20 | WITH ME, OKAY?
- 21 A. WELL, MAKE THE QUESTION CLEAR.
- 22 | Q. I'LL TRY TO MAKE IT SO CLEAR. AND IF I DON'T CLEAR TELL
- 23 ME YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND ME, TELL ME YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND ME,
- 24 OKAY? BECAUSE I'M REALLY GOING TO TRY.
- 25 DO YOU BELIEVE YOU HAVEN'T BEEN PAID FOR SOMEONE

- 1 USING YOUR NAME OR PICTURE ON A PRODUCT, OKAY, SINCE YOU'VE
- 2 | BEEN RETIRED? NOT A TRADING CARD THAT WAS MADE WHEN YOU WERE
- 3 AN ACTIVE PLAYER, OKAY?
- 4 | IS THAT QUESTION CLEAR?
- $5 \| \mathbf{A}_{\bullet} \|$ OKAY.
- 6 | Q. OKAY. SO FOCUSING SINCE YOU'VE BEEN RETIRED, DO YOU KNOW
- 7 | OF ANY PRODUCT THAT USED YOUR NAME WHERE YOU DIDN'T GET PAID?
- 8 | A. I HAVE A REEBOK JERSEY WITH MY NAME ON THE BACK, MY NUMBER
- 9 ON IT, THAT I DIDN'T GET PAID FOR.
- 10 Q. ANYTHING ELSE?
- 11 A. MR. KATZ HAS SEVERAL ITEMS THAT I DIDN'T GET PAID FOR.
- 12 Q. MR. KATZ HAS?
- 13 **A.** YES.
- 14 | Q. OKAY. YOU'RE SITTING HERE TESTIFYING NOW. MR. KATZ IS
- 15 | NOT TESTIFYING. DO YOU KNOW OF ANY OTHER ITEM BESIDES THE
- 16 | REEBOK JERSEY?
- 17 A. I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY. I KNOW THERE ARE SOME OTHER ITEMS.
- 18 Q. SO LET'S TALK ABOUT THE REEBOK JERSEY, THE ONLY ONE YOU
- 19 | SEEM TO KNOW ABOUT NOW. THE REEBOK JERSEY WAS NEVER SOLD; IS
- 20 | THAT CORRECT?
- 21 A. I DON'T KNOW.
- 22 **Q.** OKAY.
- 23 | A. IT HAD TO BE SOLD, BECAUSE I GOT IT FROM A FAN IN
- 24 | COLORADO. THEY SENT IT TO ME.
- 25 || Q. THE FAN WHO SENT YOU IN COLORADO, YOU TESTIFIED TO AT YOUR

- DEPOSITION, MR. ADDERLEY, WAS THAT THEY SENT YOU A JERSEY. IT 2 COULD HAVE BEEN THAT THE FAN JUST PUT A NAME ON IT. YOU DON'T KNOW WHETHER IT WAS PRODUCED BY REEBOK OR NOT WITH YOUR NAME ON 4 IT, RIGHT? 5 THAT'S WHAT YOU SAID? 6 I SAID THAT THE JERSEY HAD A REEBOK LOGO ON IT AND ALSO A 7 PLAYERS INC LOGO ON IT. Q. RIGHT. 8 9 MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE THE JERSEY HERE, IF YOU WOULD LIKE THE WITNESS TO INSPECT IT. AND IT DOES HAVE THOSE 10 LOGOS ON IT. 11 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, THE WITNESS OPENED UP THIS 12 REEBOK ISSUE. YOUR HONOR ACTUALLY ISSUED A PRETRIAL DECISION 13 TO EXCLUDE REEBOK, BUT I'LL GO INTO IT SINCE HE'S GONE INTO IT. 14 15 BUT THIS JERSEY SHOULDN'T COME IN. THERE'S NO CLAIM ABOUT THIS REEBOK PROGRAM IN THE CASE, AS YOUR HONOR KNOWS. 16 17 THE COURT: MR. KESSLER, YOU ASKED A VERY BROAD 18 QUESTION. 19 MR. KESSLER: OKAY. THE COURT: THE WITNESS IS GIVING YOU AN ANSWER THAT 20 CALLS THAT OUT. I THINK NOW --21 22 MR. KESSLER: OKAY. 23 (JUROR COUGHING.)
- 25 YOU'VE GOTTEN MRS. HART UPSET. WE'RE GOING TO TAKE

THE COURT: I'M SORRY, MRS. HART.

```
A -- WE'RE GOING TO DO THIS. WE'RE GOING TO TAKE A 15-MINUTE
 2
   BREAK, ALL RIGHT.
 3
              IF YOU NEED A COUGH DROP, I'VE GOT ONE.
 4
              THE CLERK: ALL RISE.
 5
              THE COURT: PLEASE REMEMBER THE ADMONITION.
 6
             THE CLERK: ALL RISE.
 7
              THE COURT: ARE YOU FEELING ILL?
             JUROR MS. HART: NO.
 8
 9
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
              (THEREUPON, THE JURY LEFT THE COURTROOM.)
10
              THE COURT: TAKE OUR LAST BREAK A LITTLE EARLY RIGHT
11
  NOW. ANYTHING YOU NEED ME FOR?
12
13
             MR. KESSLER: YES, YOUR HONOR. MR. KATZ DISPLAYS A
   JERSEY, OKAY? OFFERS IN FRONT OF THE JURY TO SHOW IT. IT WAS
14
15
   NEVER IDENTIFIED IN THIS CASE AS AN EXHIBIT. IT WAS NEVER
   PRODUCED. IT WASN'T SAID THAT.
16
17
             HE OBVIOUSLY PLANNED ON DOING WITH IT, CAME ARMED, IF
   YOU WILL, TO LIE IN THE WEEDS WITH THIS.
18
19
             HE OBVIOUSLY PREPPED THE WITNESS TO MENTION THE
2.0
   REEBOK IN RESPONSE TO MY QUESTION, BECAUSE PREVIOUSLY YOUR
   HONOR HAD AGREED -- WHEN I WANTED TO USE SOMETHING ABOUT
21
22
   REEBOK, YOUR HONOR AGREED AT THEIR REQUEST THAT REEBOK
23
   SHOULDN'T BE MENTIONED IN THE CASE, BECAUSE IT WAS A CLAIM THAT
24
   WASN'T IN THE CASE ABOUT REEBOK.
25
             AND THIS IS OBVIOUSLY AN ORCHESTRATED PLAN, AND I
```

DON'T THINK IT'S RIGHT, YOUR HONOR. 2 MR. KATZ: MAY I RESPOND, YOUR HONOR? 3 THE COURT: YOU CAN. BUT BEFORE YOU RESPOND, LET ME 4 SEE THIS JERSEY. 5 ALL RIGHT. WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE? EVERYONE ELSE CAN 6 SIT DOWN. 7 MR. KATZ: EXCUSE ME. MR. ADDERLEY NEEDS NO PREPARATION WITH RESPECT TO THE 8 REEBOK JERSEY. HE IS VERY ANGRY ABOUT THAT JERSEY, AND HE'S BEEN ANGRY FOR YEARS AND YEARS. HE DOESN'T NEED RON KATZ TO 10 11 TELL HIM WORD ONE ABOUT THAT. 12 IT'S NOT AN ISSUE IN THE CASE, BUT BECAUSE I KNEW 13 THAT MR. KESSLER, IN HIS INSISTENCE ABOUT ALL THE WONDERFUL THINGS THAT THE DEFENDANTS HAVE DONE FOR THE RETIRED PLAYERS, 14 15 WOULD ASK THIS VERY OUESTION ABOUT: "HAVEN'T YOU GOTTEN PAID FOR EVERYTHING?" 16 YES, I DID BRING IT TO COURT ON THAT HUNCH. AND I 17 18 GUESS MY HUNCH PAID OFF. THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU SAY TO THAT, MR. KESSLER? 19 MR. KESSLER: I SAY TO THAT, YOUR HONOR, I WAS NOT 20 GOING TO ASK ANYTHING ABOUT REEBOK. WHEN YOUR HONOR ISSUES A 22 RULING I THINK GENERALLY THE RULINGS ARE GOING TO BE FOLLOWED.

THE COURT: HE HASN'T USED IT YET. AND THE -- YOU

DISCLOSE IT AS AN EXHIBIT UNDER YOUR HONOR'S RULES.

AND IF HE WANTED TO USE IT WITH THE WITNESS HE STILL HAD TO

23

2.4

```
1
   BROUGHT IT UP.
 2
             MR. KESSLER: BUT IT WAS IMPROPER FOR HIM TO STAND
 3
   UP, IN MY CROSS-EXAMINATION TO STAND UP WHEN YOU DON'T ALLOW
 4
   SPEAKING OBJECTIONS.
 5
             THE COURT: THAT PART IS TRUE.
 6
              (COUNSEL AND THE COURT SPEAKING SIMULTANEOUSLY, WHICH
 7
             WAS NOT REPORTABLE.)
             MR. KESSLER: HE MADE A WAVING OBJECTION.
 8
 9
             THE COURT: MR. KATZ MADE A DEMONSTRATION IN FRONT OF
   THE JURY BY BRINGING THIS OUT AND SHOWING IT TO THEM, WHICH WAS
10
11
   NOT THE PROPER THING TO DO.
             BUT, ON THE OTHER HAND, YOU DID BRING IT UP. AND I
12
13
   WOULD HAVE ALLOWED THIS TO BE USED AS EVIDENCE ON REDIRECT
   BECAUSE YOU BROUGHT IT UP.
14
15
             NOW, MR. KATZ FIGURED, MADE A HUNCH THAT YOU WOULD
   ASK A BROAD QUESTION LIKE THAT. AND, YES, HE WAS LYING IN THE
16
17
   WEEDS, BUT IT WAS NOT IMPROPER.
             THE ONLY THING YOU DID THAT WAS IMPROPER WAS
18
19
   FLOURISHING THIS IN FRONT OF THE JURY. THAT'S NOT THE RIGHT
   WAY TO DO IT.
2.0
21
             MR. KATZ: I AGREE, YOUR HONOR.
22
             THE COURT: YOU SHOULD NOT HAVE DONE THAT. BUT ON
23
   REDIRECT EXAMINATION YOU CAN GET INTO THIS.
```

25 MR. KATZ: I AGREE WITH THAT, YOUR HONOR, BUT IT

HOWEVER, IT'S NOT PART OF THE CASE, IS IT?

- l || REALLY BOTHERS ME --
- 2 | THE COURT: I'M CURIOUS TO KNOW: DID PLAYERS INC
- 3 | LICENSE THIS?
- 4 MR. KATZ: YES.
- 5 MR. KESSLER: NO, YOUR HONOR. WHAT HAPPENED, YOUR
- 6 HONOR, IS AS FOLLOWS. AND WE HAVE NO IDEA WHERE THAT JERSEY
- 7 | COMES FROM. THERE WAS A LICENSE BETWEEN PLAYERS INC AND
- 8 REEBOK.
- 9 | SOME SAMPLE JERSEYS WERE PREPARED OF RETIRED PLAYERS.
- 10 MR. ADDERLEY SIGNED AN AGREEMENT, SO DID MR. UPSHAW. YOU'LL
- 11 | FIND OUT WHY I MENTION MR. UPSHAW.
- 12 | REEBOK LOOKED AT THEM AND THOUGHT WHICH ONES WOULD
- 13 | SELL OR NOT. THEY REJECTED MR. ADDERLEY OR CONCLUDED IT
- 14 WOULDN'T SELL. THEY REJECTED MR. UPSHAW, CONCLUDED IT WOULDN'T
- 15 | SELL.
- 16 SO THEY NEVER PUT ANY OF THESE ON SALE. PLAINTIFFS
- 17 KNOW THAT.
- 18 MR. KATZ: IT SAYS "REEBOK." IT SAYS "REEBOK." I
- 19 DON'T KNOW THAT.
- 20 THE COURT: LOOK, HERE'S THE THING. YOU CAN GO INTO
- 21 REEBOK ALL YOU WANT. I'M GOING TO TAKE BACK WHATEVER MOTION I
- 22 HAD ON REEBOK BEFORE. YOU CAN BRING IN YOUR WITNESSES TO
- 23 EXPLAIN THAT THIS ONE A ONE-TIME THING. IT WAS REJECT, AND IT
- 24 | NEVER WENT ANYWHERE. THAT'S ONLY FAIR NOW, MR. KATZ.
- 25 | MR. KATZ: WE WOULD LOVE IT IF HE DOES THAT.

```
1
             THE COURT: YOU CAN DO THAT.
 2
             SO IT SOUNDS LIKE THIS WAS AN ABORTED ATTEMPT TO COME
 3
   UP WITH A WAY TO LICENSE A RETIRED PLAYER'S NAME.
 4
             MR. KESSLER: SOME RETIRED PLAYERS THEY ACCEPTED.
 5
   THEY LIKED SOME. THEY SAID: "THOSE WE'LL SELL."
 6
             THEY DIDN'T SELL THE OTHERS.
 7
             THE COURT: MR. KATZ, YOU INJECTED THIS INTO THE
   CASE, SO I'M GOING TO LET BOTH SIDES GO REEBOK ALL THEY WANT.
 8
9
   WE'RE GOING TO TAKE A BREAK NOW FOR A FEW MINUTES.
10
             MR. KATZ: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
11
             (RECESS TAKEN FROM 11:36 TO 11:50 A.M.)
12
             (DISCUSSION HELD OFF THE RECORD)
13
             THE COURT: LET'S BRING IN OUR JURY.
             THE CLERK: ALL RISE.
14
15
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. PLEASE HAVE A SEAT.
16 MR. KESSLER, GO RIGHT AHEAD.
17
             MR. KESSLER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
   BY MR. KESSLER:
18
19
      MR. ADDERLEY, IF YOU COULD PLEASE OPEN YOUR DEPOSITION AND
   TAKE A LOOK AT PAGE 117, LINE 6.
2.0
21
             DO YOU HAVE IT, SIR?
22
       YES.
   A.
23
   Q. OKAY.
             "QUESTION: OKAY. SO FOCUSING NOW JUST ON
24
25
             THE REEBOK AGREEMENT, DO YOU AGREE THAT YOU
```

1 WOULD ONLY BE ENTITLED TO 6 PERCENT ROYALTY 2 IF YOUR ITEMS WERE SOLD AND THERE WAS 3 SOMETHING TO TAKE 6 PERCENT OF?" 4 MR. KESSLER: ANSWER BY THE WITNESS: 5 "YES." 6 "QUESTION: SO IF REEBOK NEVER SOLD YOUR 7 JERSEY THERE WOULD BE NOTHING DUE TO YOU, CORRECT?" 8 9 MR. KESSLER: ANSWER BY THE WITNESS: "CORRECT." 10 11 BY MR. KESSLER: 12 Q. LET'S STOP THERE FOR A MOMENT. 13 I TAKE IT, MR. ADDERLEY, YOU STILL AGREE TODAY --MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, UNDER THE RULE OF 14 15 COMPLETENESS, WE WOULD AS FOR THE NEXT QUESTION --16 MR. KESSLER: I INTEND TO READ ON. 17 THE COURT: HE'LL GET. OVERRULED FOR NOW. MR. KESSLER: I UNDERSTAND --18 19 MR. KATZ: I HAD AN OBJECTION TO THE LAST QUESTION, YOUR HONOR, IF YOU WANT TO RULE ON THAT OR NOT. IT CALLS FOR A 2.0 LEGAL CONCLUSION. 21 THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE OBJECTION IS OVERRULED. 22 23 BY MR. KESSLER: Q. MR. ADDERLEY, I TAKE IT THAT STILL TODAY YOU AGREE THAT 24 25 WHEN YOU SIGNED THE AD HOC LICENSE ABOUT REEBOK, IF THEY DIDN'T

SELL YOUR JERSEY YOU WEREN'T ENTITLED TO ANY MONEY, RIGHT? 2 I HAD NO PROOF THAT THEY SOLD OR DIDN'T SELL. THEY DIDN'T 3 ACKNOWLEDGE ME WHEN I TRIED TO FIND OUT WHETHER THE JERSEY WAS 4 SOLD. 5 Q. I UNDERSTAND, SIR. I'M ASKING A DIFFERENT QUESTION. 6 A. NO. 7 Q. NOW WOULD THIS BE CLEAR: IF THEY DIDN'T SELL YOUR JERSEY, 8 THEN YOU WOULDN'T BE ENTITLED TO ANYTHING, RIGHT? 9 CORRECT. Α. NOW, READING ON, ON LINE 21, AS YOUR COUNSEL WANTED ME TO: 10 Q. 11 "QUESTION: OKAY. AND AS YOU ARE SITTING 12 HERE NOW, DO YOU KNOW WHETHER REEBOK EVER 13 SOLD YOUR JERSEY?" 14 MR. KESSLER: THE WITNESS: 15 "ANSWER: YES. 16 "QUESTION: DID THEY EVER SELL IT? 17 "ANSWER: YES. "QUESTION: TO WHO? 18 19 "ANSWER: WELL, ONE FAN IN PUEBLO, COLORADO 2.0 SENT ME THE JERSEY WITH REEBOK'S LOGO AND 21 PLAYERS INC LOGO, AND MY NAME ON THE BACK, 22 WITH MY NUMBER 26 ON THE FRONT. 23 "QUESTION: WHEN DID YOU RECEIVE THAT, SIR? 24 "ANSWER: SHORTLY AFTER I SIGNED THE 25 AGREEMENT WITH THE REEBOK DEAL.

1	"QUESTION: AND DID THAT FAN TELL YOU HOW
2	THEY GOT THAT JERSEY?
3	"ANSWER: YES.
4	"QUESTION: WHAT DID THE FAN SAY?
5	"ANSWER: I CONTACTED HIM TO FIND OUT WHERE
6	HE GOT THE JERSEY. HE PURCHASED IT IN A
7	SPORTING GOODS STORE IN COLORADO.
8	"QUESTION: AND DID HE TELL YOU WHETHER OR
9	NOT HE PAID TO HAVE YOUR NAME ADDED
10	"ANSWER: NO.
11	"QUESTION: TO THE JERSEY?
12	"ANSWER: NO.
13	"QUESTION: DO YOU KNOW WHETHER HE PAID TO
14	HAVE YOUR NAME ADDED TO THE JERSEY?
15	"ANSWER: I DON'T KNOW.
16	"QUESTION: YOU'RE AWARE, ARE YOU NOT, SIR,
17	THAT STORES AROUND THE COUNTRY WILL ADD
18	PLAYER NAMES TO JERSEYS AT THE REQUEST OF
19	CUSTOMERS FOR A FEE? ARE YOU AWARE OF THAT?"
20	MR. KATZ: AND I OBJECTED, YOUR HONOR. NO
21	FOUNDATION.
22	THE COURT: I SEE LATER ON HE ANSWERS IT. SO
23	OVERRULED. GO AHEAD.
24	MR. KESSLER: THE WITNESS ANSWER:
25	"WITH THE REEBOK LOGO?

```
"QUESTION: WITH ANY JERSEY."
 1
 2
              THE WITNESS ANSWERS --
 3
              MR. KATZ: SAME OBJECTION.
 4
             MR. KESSLER: "YES."
 5
             MR. KATZ: NO FOUNDATION.
 6
              THE COURT: THE WITNESS ANSWERS, "YES," HE DOES KNOW
 7
   THAT. SO THAT'S FOUNDATION.
 8
             MR. KATZ: WELL --
 9
              THE COURT: OVERRULED.
10
             MR. KESSLER: (READING)
11
              "QUESTION: THAT HAPPENS, CORRECT?
12
              "ANSWER: YES.
13
              "QUESTION: YOU DON'T KNOW WHETHER THAT FAN'S
14
              JERSEY WAS SOMETHING THAT CAME WITH YOUR NAME
15
              WITH REEBOK OR WHETHER THE FAN ADDED THE
16
             NAME, CORRECT?"
17
              ANSWER FROM THE WITNESS:
18
              "OKAY."
19
              "QUESTION: OTHER THAN THAT ONE FAN AND ONE
2.0
              JERSEY, DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER INFORMATION
21
              WHETHER REEBOK EVER SOLD YOUR JERSEY WITH A
22
              NAME ON IT?
23
              "ANSWER: NO."
24 BY MR. KESSLER:
25
       NOW, MR. ADDERLEY, THE JERSEY THAT COUNSEL WAS WAVING
```

- 1 AROUND IS THE SAME --
- 2 | MR. KATZ: I WOULD BE HAPPY TO PUT IT IN EVIDENCE,
- 3 YOUR HONOR.
- 4 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 5 | Q. -- THAT I ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT AT THE DEPOSITION,
- 6 | CORRECT?
- 7 THE COURT: YOU'LL HAVE YOUR CHANCE ON THE JERSEY.
- 8 | LET'S LET MR. KESSLER FINISH.
- 9 THE WITNESS: CORRECT.
- 10 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 11 Q. RIGHT. AND SO AS YOU'RE SITTING HERE TODAY, YOU STILL
- 12 DON'T KNOW WHETHER REEBOK EVER SOLD ONE JERSEY WITH YOUR NAME
- 13 ON IT, RIGHT?
- 14 A. THERE'S ONE RIGHT THERE BEHIND YOU THAT SOLD --
- 15 O. YOU DON'T KNOW WHETHER WHEN REEBOK SOLD IT IT HAD YOUR
- 16 NAME OR WHETHER THE FAN ADDED THE NAME. YOU DON'T KNOW?
- 17 **A.** NO.
- 18 Q. OKAY. AND, SIR, HAVE YOU EVER SEEN ANY OTHER JERSEYS FROM
- 19 | REEBOK, ANYWHERE IN THE COUNTRY, WITH YOUR NAME ON IT, SOLD BY
- 20 | REEBOK?
- 21 **A.** NO.
- 22 Q. OKAY. NOW, WHEN YOU FIRST BROUGHT THIS LAWSUIT,
- 23 MR. ADDERLEY, THE ONLY COMPLAINT YOU HAD, YOU THOUGHT, ABOUT
- 24 | LICENSING AGAINST PLAYERS INC WAS THIS REEBOK JERSEY ISSUE,
- 25 | CORRECT?

1 (COUNSEL SPEAKING SIMULTANEOUSLY, WHICH WAS NOT 2 REPORTABLE.) 3 MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, I OBJECT. YOU RULED ON THE 4 MOTION IN LIMINE. 5 THE COURT: THIS IS OUT OF THE BAG NOW. YOUR OWN 6 CLIENT BROUGHT UP REEBOK, AND I'M GOING TO ALLOW THIS LINE OF 7 OUESTIONS. 8 MR. KESSLER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 9 THE COURT: MR. KATZ --10 MR. KATZ: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 11 THE COURT: -- YOU CAN'T HAVE IT BOTH WAYS. 12 ALL RIGHT. PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTION. 13 BY MR. KESSLER: 14 O. WHEN YOU BROUGHT THIS LAWSUIT AS THE NAMED PLAINTIFF IN 15 THIS CLASS, THE ONLY CLAIM YOU PERSONALLY HAD, SIR, WAS YOU THOUGHT MAYBE YOUR REEBOK JERSEY WAS SOLD AND YOU WEREN'T 16 17 GETTING PAID FOR IT. THAT WAS YOUR ONLY COMPLAINT, RIGHT? I HAD OTHER ITEMS ALSO --18 Q. OKAY. 19 A. -- BESIDES THE JERSEY, THAT I DIDN'T GET PAID FOR. AND I 2.0 WANTED TO. 21 LET ME READ FROM YOUR DEPOSITION, SIR, ON PAGE 77, 22 23 TRANSCRIPT 13: 24 "QUESTION: OKAY. WHAT DID YOU THINK WHEN 25 YOUR LAWSUIT WAS FILED, FIRST FILED? WHAT

1	CLAIM DID YOU THINK YOU WERE ASSERTING, SIR?
2	"ANSWER: I WAS THINKING THAT THIS REFERRED
3	TO THE AGREEMENT THAT I SIGNED WITH PLAYERS
4	NAMED WITH REEBOK THAT I DIDN'T GET PAID FOR.
5	I COULDN'T GET ANY ACKNOWLEDGMENT FROM THE
6	BEGINNING.
7	"QUESTION: THAT'S WHAT YOU THOUGHT THIS WAS
8	ABOUT?
9	"ANSWER: YES.
10	"QUESTION: BUT THERE'S NOTHING IN HERE ABOUT
11	THAT, RIGHT?
12	"ANSWER: RIGHT.
13	Q. MR. ADDERLEY, IT'S TRUE THAT WHAT YOU THOUGHT WAS THE
14	REASON YOU FILED THIS LAWSUIT, THE REEBOK CLAIM, YOU'RE NOT
15	MAKING ANY CLAIM ABOUT REEBOK IN THIS CASE, RIGHT?
16	A. RIGHT.
17	Q. OKAY. NOW
18	THE COURT: NOW, JUST A SECOND. THAT PART IS
19	CORRECT. THE CLAIMS THAT ARE GOING TO GO TO YOU TO DECIDE ARE
20	NOT REEBOK CLAIMS. IT'S THE GLA. THE GLA.
21	AND YOU CAN TAKE INTO ACCOUNT WHAT MR. ADDERLEY
22	THOUGHT OR DID NOT THINK AT THE TIME THAT HE FILED THE LAWSUIT.
23	THAT'S EVIDENCE FOR YOU TO WEIGH.
24	BUT AT THE END OF THE DAY, YOU'VE GOT TO DECIDE
25	WHETHER THE OVERALL TOTALITY OF THE EVIDENCE EITHER CARRIES THE

- BURDEN OF PROOF OR IT DOES NOT CARRY THE BURDEN OF PROOF ON THE

 CLAIMS THAT ARE ACTUALLY FOR YOU TO DECIDE.

 I'M GOING TO TRY TO HELP YOU KEEP YOUR EYE ON THE
- 4 BALL EVEN THOUGH BOTH SIDES IN THIS CASE, BOTH SIDES, HAVE A
 5 STRONG TENDENCY TO WANT TO VEER OFF INTO LEFT FIELD OR RIGHT
 6 FIELD, TO USE A BAD ANALOGY.
- 7 ALL RIGHT. GO AHEAD.

8 BY MR. KESSLER:

- 9 Q. MR. ADDERLEY, LET ME DIRECT YOU NEXT TO THE TRANSCRIPT OF
- 10 YOUR DEPOSITION, 89, IF WE CAN.
- 11 **A.** PAGE 89?
- 12 Q. PAGE 89, SIR. THANK YOU. LINE 13. ACTUALLY -- YES.
- 13 SORRY. MAYBE I GAVE YOU THE WRONG THING.
- 14 LET'S GO TO 89, YEAH, STARTING LINE 13:
- 15 | "QUESTION: WHAT YOU THOUGHT, SIR, IS THAT IF
- 16 YOUR NAME WAS USED" --
- 17 THE COURT: IMAGE.
- 18 | MR. KESSLER: I'M SORRY. TROUBLE READING.
- 19 | "QUESTION: WHAT YOU THOUGHT, SIR, IS THAT IF
- 20 YOUR IMAGE WAS USED, YOU SHOULD GET SOMETHING
- 21 FOR THAT, RIGHT?
- 22 MR. KATZ: AND I OBJECTED --
- 23 MR. KESSLER: "ANSWER" --
- 24 | MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, I OBJECT THAT IT CALLED FOR A
- 25 | LEGAL CONCLUSION.

```
THE COURT: NO. ASK WHAT HE THOUGHT AT THE TIME.
 1
 2
   THAT'S WHAT ALL THE WITNESSES HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT. IT'S
 3
   JUST AS FAIR FOR HIM TO TESTIFY ON THIS AS ANYONE ELSE.
 4
   OVERRULED.
 5
              THE ANSWER IS WHAT?
 6
             MR. KESSLER: THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS:
 7
              "YES.
 8
              "QUESTION: PRIOR TO THIS LAWSUIT YOU NEVER
 9
              THOUGHT THAT YOU SHOULD GET SOMETHING IF
10
             NOBODY USED YOUR IMAGE, RIGHT?"
11
             MR. KATZ: I OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. IT'S A DOUBLE
12
   NEGATIVE, MAKES A VERY UNCLEAR QUESTION.
13
              THE COURT: WHATEVER IT'S WORTH, OVERRULED. YOU
   CAN -- THE ANSWER IS GOING TO COME IN.
14
15
              MR. KESSLER: THE WITNESS ANSWER:
16
              "THAT'S CORRECT.
17
              "QUESTION: THAT NEVER OCCURRED TO YOU BEFORE
              THIS LAWSUIT, RIGHT?"
18
19
              THE WITNESS:
2.0
              "THAT'S CORRECT.
2.1
              "QUESTION: YEAH, I WANT TO TAKE A LOOK AT
              THIS GLA YOU SIGNED. AND, SIR, WHEN YOU READ
22
23
              THIS GLA THAT YOU SIGNED, YOU BELIEVE YOU
24
              UNDERSTOOD WHAT IT MEANT, CORRECT?
25
              "ANSWER: YES.
```

1 "QUESTION: OKAY. AND THAT WOULD BE TRUE OF 2 ALL THE GLA'S THAT YOU SIGNED, CORRECT? "ANSWER: YES. 3 4 "QUESTION: I TAKE IT YOU READ THEM BEFORE 5 SIGNING IT? YOU JUST DIDN'T JUST SIGN YOUR 6 NAME TO SOMETHING WITHOUT READING IT, RIGHT? 7 "ANSWER: YES." BY MR. KESSLER: 8 NOW, AGAIN, MR. ADDERLEY, IT'S CORRECT, ISN'T IT, THAT 10 BEFORE THIS LAWSUIT WAS FILED, WHAT YOU BELIEVED WAS IF SOMEONE 11 USED YOUR IMAGE YOU SHOULD GET PAID FOR IT, BUT IF SOMEBODY DIDN'T USE YOUR IMAGE YOU DIDN'T HAVE ANY RIGHT, CORRECT? 12 13 A. CORRECT. 14 SO THAT WOULD MEAN IF ONLY OTHER RETIRED PLAYERS' IMAGES 15 WERE USED, BUT NOT HERB ADDERLEY'S IMAGE, YOU DIDN'T EXPECT TO GET PAID FOR THIS, RIGHT? 16 17 MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, I OBJECT. HIS LEGAL VIEWS ARE NOT RELEVANT. 18 BY MR. KESSLER: 19 I'M ASKING, SAY, AT THE TIME YOU SIGNED THE GLA, AT THE 2.0 TIME YOU SIGNED THE GLA, YOU DIDN'T THINK IF OTHER RETIRED 21 PLAYERS WERE USED, NO MATTER WHAT THE NUMBER, IF THEY DIDN'T 22 USE HERB ADDERLEY'S IMAGE YOU DIDN'T THINK YOU WERE ENTITLED TO 23 24 THAT UNDER THE GLA, RIGHT?

IF SIX OR MORE RETIRED PLAYERS WERE USED IN A PROMOTION, I

```
EXPECTED TO GET PAID FROM THE ESCROW ACCOUNT.
 2
        MR. ADDERLEY, I'LL READ TO YOU NOW FROM PAGE -- DID I READ
   Q.
 3
   THIS ALREADY? PAGE 92. PAGE 92, LINE 8, OF YOUR TRANSCRIPT:
 4
              "QUESTION: AND WHAT YOU THOUGHT YOU WERE
 5
             AGREEING TO GET WAS THAT IF YOUR RIGHTS WERE
 6
             LICENSED AND USED YOU WOULD GET SOME MONEY,
 7
              CORRECT?
 8
              "ANSWER: CORRECT.
 9
              "QUESTION: AND THAT WAS YOUR UNDERSTANDING
10
             OF THIS AGREEMENT?
11
              "ANSWER: YES."
12
             YOU STAND BY THAT TESTIMONY DON'T YOU, SIR?
13
             MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, UNDER THE RULE OF
   COMPLETENESS, I WOULD ASK FOR PAGE 91, LINE 7 THROUGH 14, THE
14
15
   PRECEDING PAGE, TO BE READ. OR I'LL BE GLAD TO READ THEM.
16
             MR. KESSLER: OKAY. "QUESTION" --
17
             THE COURT: GO AHEAD AND READ IT ALL THEN.
             MR. KATZ: I HOPE HE READS IT AS DRAMATICALLY AS HE
18
19
   READS THE OTHERS.
2.0
             MR. KESSLER: (READING)
21
              "QUESTION: WHEN YOU READ THIS, YOU
             UNDERSTOOD IT WAS ONLY TALKING ABOUT MONEY
22
23
             GENERATED BY LICENSING OF RETIRED PLAYERS,
24
             CORRECT?
25
              "ANSWER: I UNDERSTOOD IT TO MEAN ALL
```

1	PLAYERS, ACTIVE AND RETIRED PLAYERS.
2	"QUESTION: OKAY. AT THE TIME YOU READ THIS
3	DOCUMENT IN 2002, IT'S YOUR I'M SORRY
4	IN 2001, IT'S YOUR SWORN TESTIMONY THAT YOU
5	THOUGHT THIS REFERRED TO THE LICENSING OF
6	ACTIVE PLAYER RIGHTS?"
7	THE WITNESS:
8	"NO.
9	"QUESTION: YOU THOUGHT IT ONLY REFERRED AT
10	THE TIME"
11	MR. KATZ: I THINK HE HAS READ IT BEFORE, YOUR HONOR.
12	MR. KESSLER: "TO RETIRED PLAYER RIGHTS."
13	THE COURT: GO AHEAD AND READ THE WHOLE THING AGAIN
14	SO IT WILL ALL BE IN CONTEXT.
15	MR. KESSLER: I'LL DO IT ALL IN CONTEXT, YOUR HONOR.
16	THE WITNESS: WHAT PLACE ARE YOU ON?
17	MR. KESSLER: (READING)
18	"YOU THOUGHT IT ONLY REFERRED AT THE TIME TO
19	RETIRED PLAYER RIGHTS?
20	"CORRECT."
21	THE COURT: ANSWER.
22	MR. KESSLER: (READING)
23	"ANSWER: CORRECT."
24	THE WITNESS:
25	"YES."

1 HE ANSWERED TWICE. 2 "QUESTION: AND WHAT YOU THOUGHT YOU WERE 3 AGREEING TO GET WAS THAT IF YOUR RIGHTS WERE 4 LICENSED AND USED, YOU WOULD GET SOME MONEY, 5 CORRECT? 6 "ANSWER: CORRECT. 7 "QUESTION: AND THAT WAS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THIS AGREEMENT? 8 9 "ANSWER: YES." BY MR. KESSLER: 10 11 DO YOU STAND BY THAT TESTIMONY, SIR? YES, IF SIX OR MORE RETIRED PLAYERS ARE USED. 12 13 THANK YOU. WELL, MR. ADDERLEY, LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT PAGE Q. 96 OF YOUR DEPOSITION TESTIMONY. QUESTION, LINE 13: 14 15 "SIR, DO YOU BELIEVE AS A RETIRED PLAYER 16 YOU'RE ENTITLED TO ANY MONEY THAT'S GENERATED 17 BY THE LICENSING OF ACTIVE PLAYERS? "ANSWER: NO." 18 19 YOU STAND THAT BY THAT TESTIMONY, CORRECT, SIR? I WAS CONFUSED AT THE TIME BETWEEN ACTIVE PLAYERS, AD HOCS 2.0 AND IN SIX OR MORE ACTIVE PLAYERS WHO SIGNED THE GLA. 21 SO YOU SAY YOU WANT TO CHANGE YOUR TESTIMONY, SIR? 22 Q. 23 A. NO. 24 SIR, DID YOU KNOW THAT IN A DEPOSITION YOU HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY AFTER THE DEPOSITION IS ALL TYPED UP TO REVIEW THEM 25

- 1 AND MAKE ANY CORRECTIONS YOU WANT TO? DID YOU KNOW THAT, SIR?
- 2 **A.** YES.
- 3 | Q. AND DID YOU REVIEW YOUR DEPOSITION IN THIS CASE?
- 4 | A. YES.
- 5 | O. AND YOU DIDN'T MAKE EVEN ONE CORRECTION ABOUT ANY OF THE
- 6 | TESTIMONY I READ, DID YOU?
- 7 A. I NEED TO SEE THE CORRECTIONS.
- 8 MR. KATZ: THERE'S AN ERRATA SHEET, YOUR HONOR.
- 9 | MR. KESSLER: THERE'S NO CORRECTIONS ABOUT THE
- 10 | TESTIMONY I READ, YOUR HONOR, OR I WOULD HAVE READ THE
- 11 | CORRECTIONS.
- 12 | THE COURT: IS THAT --
- 13 MR. KATZ: THERE WAS NO CORRECTION ON THIS TESTIMONY,
- 14 YOUR HONOR, THAT'S RIGHT.
- 15 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
- 16 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 17 Q. NOW, MR. ADDERLEY, LET'S LOOK NOW AT PAGE 92 OF YOUR
- 18 TRANSCRIPT. I THINK WE COVERED THIS ALREADY. OKAY.
- 19 MR. ADDERLEY, IT'S TRUE THAT YOU UNDERSTOOD THAT THE
- 20 GLA YOU SIGNED WAS NOT EXCLUSIVE, CORRECT?
- 21 | A. YES.
- 22 Q. AND YOU KNEW THAT THAT MEANT YOU COULD LICENSE YOUR RIGHTS
- 23 TO ANYBODY ELSE YOU WANTED TO, CORRECT?
- 24 | A. YES.
- 25 Q. AND DESPITE THAT FACT, MR. ADDERLEY, YOU NEVER MADE ANY

- 1 | EFFORT AT ALL TO MARKET YOUR NAME TO BE USED ON ANY PRODUCT,
- 2 | DID YOU?
- $3 \| \mathbf{A}_{\bullet} \|$ NO.
- 4 | Q. YOU NEVER MADE ANY EFFORT TO FIND ANY LICENSE TO A COMPANY
- 5 YOURSELF, DID YOU?
- $6 \parallel \mathbf{A}_{\bullet} \quad \text{NO}_{\bullet}$
- 7 | Q. NOW, YOU MENTIONED THE LANGUAGE IN THE GLA, WHICH SAID
- 8 | "SIX OR MORE FORMER OR PRESENT PLAYERS." RECALL THAT?
- 9 **A.** YES.
- 10 | Q. OKAY. NOW, THAT LANGUAGE EXISTED IN THE GLA WHEN YOU
- 11 | SIGNED IT, RIGHT?
- 12 **A.** YES.
- 13 Q. AND DESPITE THAT FACT, YOUR BELIEF WAS THAT YOU WOULD ONLY
- 14 GET PAID IF YOUR IMAGE WAS USED, CORRECT?
- 15 **A.** AT THAT PARTICULAR TIME, YES.
- 16 MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, I OBJECT. THIS IS ASKED AND
- 17 ANSWERED. GONE OVER THIS A NUMBER OF TIMES ALREADY. IT'S THE
- 18 SAME ISSUE.
- 19 THE COURT: WHY ISN'T THIS THE SAME POINT?
- 20 | MR. KESSLER: I WAS REFERRING NOW IN THE CONTEXT OF
- 21 THE LANGUAGE WHICH MR. KATZ BROUGHT OUT WITH HIM ON THE SCREEN,
- 22 YOUR HONOR.
- 23 THE COURT: WHICH LANGUAGE?
- 24 | MR. KESSLER: THE LANGUAGE OF SIX OR MORE FORMER OR
- 25 PRESENT. AND I WANTED TO ESTABLISH DESPITE THAT LANGUAGE THAT

- 1 WAS HIS BELIEF AT THAT TIME. AND I THINK THE WITNESS JUST
- 2 ANSWERED: "YES."
- 3 MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, FIRST OF ALL, THE WITNESS IS
- 4 | NOT TO ANSWER UNTIL I OBJECT. THAT IS MY UNDERSTANDING, YOUR
- 5 | HONOR.
- 6 AND, SECONDLY, THIS IS JUST ALL THE EXCERPTS THAT HE
- 7 | JUST READ AND THE THING THAT WAS FLASHED UP THERE. WE'VE GONE
- 8 OVER THIS FOUR TIMES ALREADY.
- 9 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, IT'S MY LAST QUESTION ON
- 10 THIS. I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE AN ANSWER, BECAUSE HE RAISED THAT
- 11 | LANGUAGE.
- 12 MR. KATZ: I DON'T THINK HE'S ALLOWED TO GO OVER IT
- 13 | FIVE TIMES, YOUR HONOR, WHETHER IT'S HIS LAST OR SECOND TO
- 14 | LAST.
- 15 | THE COURT: WELL, IT'S AN IMPORTANT POINT IN THE
- 16 CASE. AND SOMETIMES THE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS HAVE NOT BEEN A
- 17 HUNDRED PERCENT CLEAR. SO I'M GOING TO OVERRULE THE OBJECTION
- 18 AND ALLOW MR. KESSLER TO ASK -- YOU HAVE ONE MORE QUESTION ON
- 19 | THIS.
- 20 | MR. KESSLER: ONE MORE ON THIS SUBJECT.
- 21 THE COURT: GO AHEAD.
- 22 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 23 Q. MR. ADDERLEY, TO BE VERY CLEAR, DESPITE THE FACT THAT YOUR
- 24 GLA AT THE TIME HAD THE LANGUAGE IN PARAGRAPH 2 OF "SIX OR MORE
- 25 FORMER OR PRESENT PLAYERS, " AT THE TIME YOU SIGNED THE GLA YOU

- 1 | DIDN'T THINK YOU WERE ENTITLED TO ANY ACTIVE PLAYER LICENSING
- 2 MONEY.
- 3 A. IS THAT 2001 WHEN I FIRST SIGNED?
- $4 \mid \mathbf{Q}$. YES.
- $5 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. NO.
- 6 | Q. YOU ONLY CAME TO THAT UNDERSTANDING SOMETIME AFTER THIS
- 7 | LAWSUIT, CORRECT?
- 8 A. WHEN THE THEORY WAS CHANGED.
- 9 | Q. IT WAS AFTER THIS LAWSUIT WAS FILED, CORRECT?
- 10 **A.** YES.
- 11 Q. OKAY. AND, MR. ADDERLEY, YOU NEVER COMPLAINED TO ANYONE
- 12 IN THE UNION FROM 2001 -- I THINK YOU SIGNED YOUR GLA IN 2002.
- 13 | I'M SORRY, SIR. WHEN YOU SIGNED YOUR GLA GOING FORWARD YOU
- 14 | NEVER COMPLAINED TO ANYONE AT THE UNION ABOUT NOT GETTING MONEY
- 15 | UNDER YOUR GLA UNTIL AFTER THIS LAWSUIT WAS FILED, CORRECT?
- 16 A. CORRECT.
- 17 Q. AND MR. ADDERLEY, IT'S ALSO TRUE THAT YOUR GLA MAKES -- AT
- 18 THE TIME YOU DIDN'T UNDERSTAND IT TO REFER TO ANY KIND OF EQUAL
- 19 | SHARE, RIGHT? YOU HAD NO UNDERSTANDING WHEN YOU SIGNED IT IN
- 20 | 2001?
- 21 | A. WELL, I KNEW THAT IT SAID THERE WAS ESCROW ACCOUNT SET UP.
- 22 Q. RIGHT. BUT YOU HAD NO IDEA HOW THE MONEY WOULD BE PUT IN
- 23 OR HOW IT WOULD BE DIVIDED AT THE TIME YOU SIGNED IT, CORRECT?
- 24 | A. WELL, I READ WHAT IT SAID. AND IT SAID "SIX OR MORE
- 25 ACTIVE PLAYERS." THAT HASN'T CHANGED.

SIR, I'M JUST ASKING NOW ABOUT THE MONEY. 2 AT THE TIME YOU SIGNED IT, YOU HAD NO IDEA WHEN MONEY 3 WOULD BE PUT IN THE ESCROW ACCOUNT OR HOW IT WOULD BE DIVIDED 4 UP, RIGHT? 5 THAT'S CORRECT. 6 Q. OKAY. AND DESPITE THAT FACT, YOU SIGNED MULTIPLE GLA'S; 7 IS THAT CORRECT? 8 YES. A. 9 Q. NOW, MR. ADDERLEY, I WOULD LIKE TO READ NOW FROM PAGE 98 10 OF YOUR DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT. AND I'M READING FROM LINE 23. 11 IT SAYS: . 12 "QUESTION:" 13 MAYBE I SHOULD READ EARLIER, FROM LINE -- FROM LINE 14 1: 15 "QUESTION: HOW DID YOU HAVE AN ABILITY TO 16 CONTROL PLAYERS INC? 17 "ANSWER: IF THERE WAS SOME TYPE OF CONFLICT, FOR EXAMPLE, IF I WAS DOING SOMETHING FOR 18 19 NIKE AND THEY TRIED TO USE ME OR WANTED TO 2.0 USE ME IN REEBOK, IT WOULD BE A CONFLICT. OR 21 IF THEY USED ME IN SOME TYPE OF PROMOTION THAT I DIDN'T AGREE TO, THAT I WOULD HAVE THE 22 23 AUTHORITY TO ASK THEM NOT TO USE IT. 24 "QUESTION: DID YOU EVER DO THAT? 25 "ANSWER: NO.

"QUESTION: OKAY. AND WOULD YOUR -- WHAT 1 YOUR TESTIMONY IS, IF YOU HAD AN INDIVIDUAL 2 3 AGREEMENT THAT CONFLICTED WITH SOMETHING THEY 4 DID, YOU COULD ASK NOT TO BE INCLUDED IN WHAT 5 THEY WERE DOING, RIGHT? 6 "ANSWER: YES. 7 "QUESTION: BUT YOU NEVER HAD ANY SUCH 8 AGREEMENT, INDIVIDUAL AGREEMENT, CORRECT? 9 "ANSWER: CORRECT. 10 "SO APART FROM THAT, DID YOU HAVE ANY ABILITY TO 11 CONTROL PLAYERS INC USE OF YOUR GLA RIGHTS? 12 "ANSWER: NO." 13 AND YOU STAND BY THAT TESTIMONY, SIR, DO YOU NOT? 14 CORRECT. A. 15 OKAY. NOW, MR. ADDERLEY, LET ME SHOW YOU A COPY OF AN 16 EXHIBIT THAT'S IN EVIDENCE, TRIAL EXHIBIT 2056. THE 17 COMPILATION. DO I HAVE THAT HERE? I'M SORRY. 18 19 MR. KESSLER: MAY I APPROACH, YOUR HONOR? 2.0 THE COURT: GO AHEAD. BY MR. KESSLER: 21 Q. MR. ADDERLEY --22 23 MR. KATZ: CAN YOU GIVE US A MOMENT? WE DON'T SEEM 24 TO HAVE IT. 25 (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)

1 MR. KESSLER: IT'S THE COMPILATION ALREADY IN 2 EVIDENCE. 3 MR. KATZ: THE --MR. KESSLER: COMPILATION. 4 5 BY MR. KESSLER: 6 Q. THIS, MR. ADDERLEY, IS A COMPILATION OF DATA. 7 MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T BELIEVE THIS WAS DISCLOSED. 8 9 MR. KESSLER: IT'S IN EVIDENCE, YOUR HONOR. MR. KATZ: IT STILL HAS TO BE DISCLOSED, BY YOUR 10 11 HONOR'S RULES. THE COURT: DID YOU -- YOU MEAN, AS AN EXHIBIT TO BE 12 13 USED WITH THE WITNESS? 14 MR. KATZ: YES. 15 THE COURT: DID YOU DO THAT, MR. KESSLER? MR. KESSLER: I DON'T KNOW. 16 17 DID WE DISCLOSE THE COMPILATION? MR. KATZ: THEY DIDN'T DISCLOSE IT TO ME. I CAN TELL 18 YOU THAT. 19 BY MR. KESSLER: 2.0 Q. MR. ADDERLEY, DON'T LOOK AT THAT EXHIBIT. LET ME ASK YOU 21 22 QUESTIONS ABOUT SOME DATA. THE COURT: JUST A SECOND. HAVE I LET THE OTHER SIDE 23 24 USE A DOCUMENT THEY DIDN'T DISCLOSE?

MR. KESSLER: YOU DID, YOUR HONOR. AND I WOULD

```
APPRECIATE THE SAME COURTESY, IF POSSIBLE.
 2
             MR. KATZ: WAIT. I DON'T KNOW WHICH ONE IT WAS. I'M
 3
   NOT RECALLING IT.
 4
             THE COURT: SEEMS LIKE I DID, BUT I DON'T --
 5
             MR. KATZ: I'M NOT RECALLING IT.
 6
             MR. KESSLER: YOU DID, YOUR HONOR.
 7
             MR. KATZ: WELL, MAYBE YOU COULD TELL ME THE
   DOCUMENT. THAT WOULD HELP.
 8
 9
             MR. GREENSPAN: THE JERSEY.
             MR. KESSLER: WELL, BEFORE THE JERSEY --
10
11
             (COUNSEL AND THE COURT SPEAKING SIMULTANEOUSLY, WHICH
12
             WAS NOT REPORTABLE.)
13
             THE COURT: IT WAS SOMETHING EARLIER. I'M GOING TO
14 | LET YOU GO AHEAD AND USE THIS COMPILATION.
15
             MR. KESSLER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. I APPRECIATE
16 | THAT.
17
            MR. KATZ: ELEMENT OF SURPRISE, YOUR HONOR. I'M
18
  SURPRISED.
19
             (LAUGHTER)
             THE COURT: YOU'RE A BIG GUY, AND YOU CAN HANDLE
20
   YOURSELF.
21
             MR. KESSLER: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT THE SECOND PAGE OF
22
   THIS DOCUMENT.
23
             BLOW UP AT THE TOP WHERE IT SAYS: "HERB ADDERLEY."
24
25
            (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
```

BY MR. KESSLER:

- 2 | Q. MR. ADDERLEY, I JUST WANT TO GET YOUR MEMORY AND
- 3 | RECOLLECTION ON THIS. THIS IS DATA FROM THE DATABASE THAT
- $4 \parallel$ PLAYERS INC HAS, A COMPUTERIZED DATABASE OF PAYMENTS MADE TO
- 5 | PLAYERS.
- 6 AND IT STATES HERE THAT HERB ADDERLEY WAS PAID \$6,800
- 7 | FROM UPPER DECK, 1,600 FROM UPPER DECK, AND \$3,820 FROM UPPER
- 8 | DECK, PURSUANT TO AD HOC LICENSE AGREEMENTS THAT YOU ENTERED
- 9 INTO THROUGH PLAYERS INC; IS THAT TRUE?
- 10 **A.** YES.
- 11 Q. OKAY. AND YOU RECEIVED ALL THAT MONEY, SIR, CORRECT?
- 12 **A.** YES.
- 13 Q. AND YOU KNEW, SIR, THAT THE UPPER DECK PROGRAM INVOLVED
- 14 TRADING CARDS, CORRECT?
- 15 **A.** YES.
- 16 Q. YOU SIGNED TRADING CARDS, AND THEY HAD AN IMAGE OF YOU IN
- 17 THOSE CARDS YOU SIGNED, AND IT WAS IN THE UPPER DECK PACKS,
- 18 | CORRECT?
- 19 **A.** NO.
- 20 Q. EXPLAIN WHERE THE TRADING CARDS WERE SOLD, SIR?
- 21 A. THEY SENT ME STRIPS OF ABOUT MAYBE THREE INCHES LONG AND A
- 22 QUARTER INCH WIDE.
- 23 Q. AND YOU SIGNED THEM?
- 24 A. I SIGNED THE STRIPS.
- 25 Q. AND YOU KNEW WHAT UPPER DECK DID IS THEY TOOK THOSE AND

- 1 | THEY PUT THEM INSIDE THE PACKS OF TRADING CARDS WITH THE ACTIVE
- 2 | PLAYERS. YOU KNEW THAT, DIDN'T YOU?
- 3 MR. KATZ: OBJECT. NO FOUNDATION.
- 4 | THE WITNESS: I DIDN'T KNOW UNTIL THEY SENT THEM BACK
- 5 TO ME. SO, YES, I KNEW AFTER I GOT THEM BACK, SAMPLES.
- 6 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 7 Q. YOU LEARNED THAT?
- $8 | \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{YEAH}$
- 9 Q. OKAY. SO YOUR IMAGE WOULD BE MIXED IN WITH THE IMAGES OF
- 10 ALL THE ACTIVE PLAYERS, CORRECT?
- 11 A. I DON'T KNOW.
- 12 Q. WELL, IF IT WAS IN THE SAME TRADING CARD PACK WITH THE
- 13 ACTIVE PLAYERS IT WOULD BE MIXED TOGETHER, WOULDN'T IT?
- 14 A. I SAID I DON'T KNOW. THEY SENT ME BACK THE SAMPLES OF
- 15 WHAT I SIGNED. I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT WAS IN THE PACKS.
- 16 Q. YOU KNEW MANY MORE THAN SIX RETIRED PLAYERS ENTERED INTO
- 17 | THESE DEALS, RIGHT?
- 18 A. I DIDN'T KNOW. I HAD NO WAY OF KNOWING THAT. THEY DIDN'T
- 19 | TELL ME THAT.
- 20 Q. MR. ADDERLEY, LET ME ASK YOU THIS. IT'S CORRECT, ISN'T
- 21 | IT, YOU DIDN'T BELIEVE AT THE TIME YOU ENTERED INTO THESE
- 22 | AD HOCS THAT ANY OF THIS MONEY SHOULD HAVE GONE INTO AN ESCROW
- 23 ACCOUNT, RIGHT?
- 24 | A. NOT A DIME.
- 25 Q. NO. AND THAT'S BECAUSE THESE WERE AD HOC DEALS THAT YOU

- 1 | ENTERED INTO OUTSIDE OF YOUR GLA, CORRECT?
- 2 A. CORRECT.
- 3 | Q. AND SO EVEN THOUGH YOU HAD A GLA IN EFFECT, YOU THOUGHT IT
- 4 | WAS PERFECTLY PROPER FOR YOU TO HAVE SEPARATE AD HOC DEALS
- 5 THROUGH PLAYERS INC, ALSO?
- $6 \, || \mathbf{A}. \quad \text{YES}.$
- 7 | Q. OKAY. IT'S ALSO CORRECT, MR. ADDERLEY, IS IT NOT, THAT
- 8 YOU HAD A DEAL WITH EA --
- 9 MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, I'M GOING TO OBJECT. I THINK
- 10 | THIS IS OUTSIDE OF THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.
- 11 | MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, THIS MONEY WAS PAID IN THE
- 12 | STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN 2003.
- 13 | '3 OR '4?
- 14 MR. KATZ: YOU'VE GOT THE WRONG STATUTE.
- 15 MR. KESSLER: IT WAS PAID IN 2003. BUT I'LL ASK YOU
- 16 THAT.
- 17 MR. KATZ: IT'S OUTSIDE THE CURRENT STATUTE, YOUR
- 18 HONOR, REMEMBER? WE'RE IN A DIFFERENT JURISDICTION NOW.
- 19 THE COURT: THIS IS NOT OFFERED FOR DAMAGES. IT'S
- 20 | OFFERED FOR STATE OF MIND, IS THAT --
- 21 | MR. KESSLER: ABSOLUTELY, YOUR HONOR.
- 22 | THE COURT: IT GOES TO -- IT GOES TO THE COURSE OF
- 23 | DEALING AFTER HE ENTERED INTO THE GLA. AND THAT'S SOMETHING
- 24 | THE JURY CAN LOOK AT TO DETERMINE HOW TO INTERPRET THIS
- 25 | CONTRACT.

1 SO THE OBJECTION IS OVERRULED.

- 2 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 3 | Q. MR. ADDERLEY, YOU HAD A DEAL WITH ELECTRONIC ARTS THAT YOU
- 4 | ENTERED INTO, ANOTHER AD HOC AGREEMENT, IN WHICH YOU RECEIVED
- 5 | \$750 IN 2003, CORRECT?
- 6 **A.** YES.
- 7 | Q. AND, IN FACT, YOU RECEIVED MORE MONEY FROM EA FOR THAT
- 8 | EVEN BEFORE 2003?
- 9 \mathbf{A} . FROM WHAT?
- 10 | Q. FROM EA FOR THAT SAME DEAL. DIDN'T YOU GET TWO PAYMENTS
- 11 | OF \$750 THEN?
- 12 A. I DON'T REMEMBER.
- 13 Q. YOU JUST REMEMBER THIS ONE PAYMENT?
- 14 **A.** YES.
- 15 Q. OKAY. NOW, MR. ADDERLEY, IN THE EA DEAL, THAT WAS TO
- 16 INCLUDE YOU WITH A GROUP OF OTHER RETIRED PLAYERS IN A SPECIAL
- 17 | EDITION OF AN EA GAME; WAS THAT CORRECT?
- 18 A. I DON'T KNOW.
- 19 MR. KATZ: OBJECT, NO FOUNDATION.
- 20 THE WITNESS: I DON'T REMEMBER.
- 21 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 22 Q. YOU DON'T REMEMBER?
- 23 **A.** NO.
- 24 || Q. NO?
- 25 A. IT WASN'T STATED.

- 1 Q. OKAY. WHEN YOU GAVE YOUR RIGHTS TO EA, YOU DIDN'T CARE
- 2 HOW MANY RETIRED PLAYERS THEY WERE GOING TO USE YOU WITH OR
- 3 | NOT, DID YOU?
- 4 A. I GAVE THE RIGHTS TO PLAYERS INC, NOT EA.
- 5 | Q. YOU GAVE IT TO PLAYERS INC TO GIVE TO EA, RIGHT?
- $6 \| \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{O}(\mathbf{A}) \|$
- 7 | Q. YOU DIDN'T CARE HOW MANY RETIRED PLAYERS THEY MIXED YOUR
- 8 | IMAGE WITH, DID YOU?
- $9 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. NO.
- 10 MR. KATZ: OBJECT, YOUR HONOR.
- 11 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 12 Q. AND WITH RESPECT TO THE UPPER DECK DEALS WHEN YOU GAVE --
- 13 | SIGNED THE CARDS AND GAVE THE RIGHTS FOR YOUR IMAGE TO BE IN
- 14 THE CARDS, YOU DIDN'T CARE HOW MANY OTHER RETIRED PLAYERS
- 15 | SIGNED SIMILAR DEALS, DID YOU?
- 16 **A.** AD HOC DEALS?
- 17 **Q.** YES.
- 18 **A.** NO.
- 19 $\|\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}\|$ OKAY. NOW -- AND YOU DIDN'T CARE IF YOUR CARD WAS MIXED
- 20 WITH ACTIVE PLAYERS, EITHER, FOR AD HOC DEALS?
- 21 **A.** NO.
- 22 | Q. AND EVEN THOUGH IT COULD HAVE BEEN MIXED WITH ACTIVE
- 23 | PLAYERS, YOU DIDN'T THINK THIS MONEY SHOULD GO INTO AN ESCROW
- 24 | FUND AT THE TIME YOU SIGNED THE DEAL.
- 25 A. NOT IF IT WAS AN AD HOC.

NOT IF IT WAS AN AD HOC? 2 CORRECT. A. 3 Q. VERY GOOD. NOW, MR. ADDERLEY, LET ME SHOW YOU NEXT A DOCUMENT THAT'S BEEN MARKED AS TRIAL EXHIBIT 2336. IN FACT, 5 II'M GOING TO GIVE YOU THREE EXHIBITS AT THE SAME TIME. 6 MR. KESSLER: MAY I APPROACH, YOUR HONOR? 7 THE COURT: PLEASE. BY MR. KESSLER: 8 Q. MR. ADDERLEY, DO YOU RECOGNIZE EXHIBIT 2336 AS AN AGREEMENT THAT YOU HAD HAD WITH PLAYERS INC ABOUT THE UPPER 10 11 DECK DEAL? 12 | **A.** YES. 13 MR. KESSLER: OKAY, YOUR HONOR, I MOVE 2336 INTO 14 | EVIDENCE. 15 MR. KATZ: NO OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.) 16 17 THE COURT: SAY IT AGAIN. MR. KESSLER: 2336, YOUR HONOR. 18 19 THE COURT: VERY WELL. RECEIVED. (TRIAL EXHIBIT 2336 RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.) 2.0 MR. KESSLER: IF WE CAN DISPLAY, LAUREN, PLEASE THE 21 FIRST PARAGRAPH, AND THEN WE'LL GO TO THE "GRANT OF RIGHTS" 22 23 PARAGRAPH. 24 (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.) 25 IT SAYS:

- 1 "DEAR HERB: THANK YOU FOR AGREEING TO 2 PARTICIPATE IN THE PLAYERS INC PLAYER MARKETING PROGRAM. THE 3 PURPOSE OF THIS LETTER AGREEMENT IS TO SET FORTH THE 4 UNDERSTANDING WHICH HAS BEEN REACHED BETWEEN YOU, HERB 5 ADDERLEY, PLAYER, AND NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE PLAYERS 6 INCORPORATED WITH REGARD TO THE UPPER DECK COMPANY, A NEVADA 7 CORPORATION." AND THEN, IT SAYS: 8 9 "OUR UNDERSTANDING IS SET FORTH IN THE FOLLOWING NUMBERED PARAGRAPHS." 10 11 BY MR. KESSLER: Q. NOW, LET ME DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO "GRANT OF RIGHTS." 12 13 IT SAYS: 14
 - "PLAYER AGREES THAT PLAYERS INC SHALL GRANT COMPANY THE RIGHT, BUT NOT THE OBLIGATION, TO PRODUCE TRADING CARDS BEARING PLAYER'S NAME, LIKENESS, IMAGE, AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION IDENTITY TO INSERT INTO ITS 2005 FOOTBALL PRODUCTS."
- 19 DO YOU SEE THAT?
- 2.0 YES. A.

15

16

17

- 21 AND THE COMPANY BEING REFERRED TO HERE IS UPPER DECK,
- 22 RIGHT? THAT'S THE COMPANY WHO'S GETTING THE RIGHTS?
- 23 A. YES.
- 24 Q. OKAY. SO YOU KNEW WHEN YOU SIGNED THIS YOU WERE GRANTING
- 25 YOUR RIGHTS TO BE IN FOOTBALL PRODUCTS IN 2005 THAT UPPER DECK

- 1 WOULD BE SELLING, CORRECT?
- $2 \| \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{YES} \|$
- 3 | Q. OKAY. AND AT THIS TIME, IF UPPER DECK ALREADY HAD THE
- 4 | RIGHTS TO HERB ADDERLEY TO PUT INTO ITS FOOTBALL PRODUCTS,
- 5 WOULD THERE BE ANY REASON TO PAY HERB ADDERLEY A SECOND TIME
- 6 | FOR THOSE RIGHTS?
- 7 MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, OBJECT. IT'S AN IMPROPER
- 8 HYPOTHETICAL. NO FOUNDATION.
- 9 | THE COURT: IF THE WITNESS FEELS HE CAN ANSWER THE
- 10 QUESTION, I'M GOING TO ALLOW IT.
- 11 OVERRULED.
- 12 THE WITNESS: REPEAT THE QUESTION.
- 13 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 14 O. IF UPPER DECK ALREADY HAD THE RIGHTS TO USE HERB ADDERLEY
- 15 | IN THEIR PRODUCTS, THERE WOULD BE NO REASON FOR THEM TO ENTER
- 16 INTO AN AGREEMENT TO PAY YOU AGAIN, RIGHT?
- 17 A. CORRECT.
- 18 | Q. OKAY. LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT THE COMPENSATION. AND YOU
- 19 | WERE PAID HERE, SIR, A TOTAL OF \$6,800; IS THAT CORRECT?
- 20 A. CORRECT.
- 21 | Q. OKAY. AND YOU RECEIVED THAT MONEY?
- 22 **A.** YES.
- 23 | Q. OKAY. LET'S TAKE A LOOK NOW, IF YOU CAN TURN TO TRIAL
- 24 EXHIBIT 2087. AND IS THIS, SIR, THE SECOND UPPER DECK
- 25 AGREEMENT YOU ENTERED INTO? IF YOU CAN JUST LOOK AT THAT,

```
PLEASE?
 2
             MR. KATZ: WHAT NUMBER IS THIS, MR. KESSLER?
 3
             MR. KESSLER: 2087.
 4
             THE WITNESS: YES.
 5
             MR. KESSLER: OKAY. I MOVE INTO EVIDENCE 2087, YOUR
 6
   HONOR.
 7
             MR. KATZ: NO OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR.
             THE COURT: 2087 RECEIVED.
 8
 9
             (TRIAL EXHIBIT 2087 RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)
             (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
10
11
  BY MR. KESSLER:
12
  Q. AND THIS AGREEMENT, WHICH IS DATED JULY 8, 2005, THIS IS A
   SECOND AGREEMENT WITH UPPER DECK YOU ENTERED INTO THAT SAME
   YEAR, CORRECT?
14
15
   A. YES.
  Q. OKAY. AND THIS WAS TO HAVE YOU SIGN A DIFFERENT IMAGE
16
   THAT THEY WERE NOW GOING TO USE OF YOU, RIGHT?
17
   A. WRONG.
18
   Q. OKAY. WHAT WAS THIS ONE?
19
   A. IT WAS -- ORIGINALLY, IT WAS ONE DEAL FOR ME TO SIGN 1700
2.0
   STRIPS. AND THEY DIDN'T WANT TO SEND THEM ALL TO ME AT THE
   SAME TIME. SO THEY SENT THEM TO ME IN INCREMENTS. SO IT
22
23
   WASN'T ANYTHING DIFFERENT. IT WAS THE SAME DEAL.
24
             AND THIS ONE LETTER THEY SAY THE SAME EXACT THING.
   THEY JUST SPLIT THEM UP.
25
```

- 1 Q. FOR THIS ONE YOU GOT PAID \$1,600. WE CAN SEE THE
- 2 | COMPENSATION, CORRECT?
- $3 \mid \mathbf{A}$. YES.
- 4 | Q. AND YOU RECEIVED THAT MONEY?
- 5 **A.** YES.
- 6 Q. AND, FINALLY, IF WE CAN LOOK AT TRIAL EXHIBIT 2089. THIS
- 7 | IS THE THIRD AGREEMENT, MR. ADDERLEY, THAT YOU SIGNED WITH
- 8 UPPER DECK; IS THAT CORRECT?
- $9 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. YES.
- 10 MR. KESSLER: OKAY. I WOULD MOVE INTO EVIDENCE TRIAL
- 11 | EXHIBIT 2089.
- 12 THE COURT: IT'S ALREADY IN EVIDENCE.
- 13 | MR. KESSLER: HAS IT BEEN ADMITTED, YOUR HONOR?
- 14 | THE COURT: IT'S ALREADY BEEN ADMITTED.
- 15 MR. KESSLER: IF WE COULD SHOW THE EXHIBIT.
- 16 THIS IS THE THIRD ONE. AND IF WE CAN LOOK AT THE
- 17 COMPENSATION PARAGRAPH.
- 18 (DOCUMENT DISPLAYED.)
- 19 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 20 Q. YOU GOT ANOTHER \$3,820 FOR THIS, CORRECT?
- 21 **A.** YES.
- 22 Q. NOW, THEY IF THEY DIDN'T GIVE YOU ALL THIS ADDITIONAL
- 23 MONEY, THEY COULDN'T HAVE KEPT PUTTING MORE CARDS WITH YOUR
- 24 NAME ON IT, COULD THEY?
- 25 **A.** REPEAT THAT, PLEASE.

- 1 | Q. THEY HAD TO GIVE YOU THIS MONEY SO YOU WOULD SIGN MORE
- 2 CARDS AND THEY COULD USE MORE CARDS?
- $3 \mid \mathbf{A}$. YES.
- 4 | Q. IF THEY DIDN'T HAVE THAT, THEY COULDN'T DO IT UNDER THE
- 5 | FIRST AGREEMENT. THEY HAD TO GIVE YOU MORE MONEY EACH TIME?
- $6 \| \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{R} \|$ RIGHT.
- 7 | Q. OKAY. NOW, MR. ADDERLEY, YOU MENTIONED IN YOUR TESTIMONY
- 8 ABOUT HOW YOU WORKED HARD TO PREPARE FOR A FOOTBALL GAME, SIR;
- 9 I IS THAT CORRECT?
- 10 **A.** YES.
- 11 Q. YOU SPOKE ABOUT TWO-A-DAYS?
- 12 A. CORRECT.
- 13 Q. HOW MANY TIMES DID YOU MEET WITH YOUR COUNSEL TO GO OVER
- 14 YOUR TESTIMONY TO PREPARE FOR TODAY?
- 15 A. UHM, EVERY DAY.
- 16 Q. EVERY DAY SINCE YOU'VE BEEN HERE YOU'VE BEEN GOING OVER
- 17 YOUR TESTIMONY?
- 18 | A. YES.
- 19 | Q. SO IT'S BEEN AT LEAST TEN TIMES ALREADY, SIR, SOMETHING
- 20 | LIKE THAT?
- 21 A. YES, WHATEVER NUMBER OF DAYS, EXCEPT FOR SATURDAY AND
- 22 SUNDAY.
- 23 Q. AND WHAT YOU DID IS YOU MET WITH YOUR COUNSEL AND YOU
- 24 | REHEARSED THAT TESTIMONY OVER AND OVER AGAIN, SIR, DIDN'T YOU?
- 25 MR. KATZ: OBJECTION.

1 THE WITNESS: I DON'T KNOW ABOUT REHEARSING, YOU KNOW. CONVERSATION ABOUT THE LAWSUIT. 2 3 BY MR. KESSLER: 4 YOU REVIEWED THE QUESTIONS YOU'D BE ASKED AND HOW YOU 5 WOULD ANSWER THEM, OVER AND OVER AGAIN, SIR, ISN'T THAT TRUE? 6 MR. KATZ: OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. 7 THE COURT: WAIT. THE WITNESS: YES. 8 9 THE COURT: WAIT. MR. KATZ: I'M NOT ON TRIAL HERE. HE'S NOT ON TRIAL 10 HERE. IT'S MALPRACTICE NOT TO PREPARE YOUR WITNESS. HE 11 PREPARES HIS WITNESSES. 12 1.3 WHAT'S THE PROBLEM HERE? THE COURT: WELL, SOMEBODY -- I BELIEVE ON YOUR SIDE 14 15 IT WAS MR. HUMMEL -- DID KIND OF THE SAME THING. IT IS NORMAL FOR LAWYERS TO MEET WITH THEIR CLIENTS 16 TO GO OVER EVIDENCE IN THE CASE AND INTERVIEW THEM AND SO FORTH 17 BEFORE THEY TESTIFY. IT'S ALSO PROPER FOR COUNSEL TO BRING TO 18 YOUR ATTENTION THE EXTENT TO WHICH HE HAS BEEN PREPARED TO 19 TESTIFY. SO BOTH SIDES HAVE A POINT TO MAKE HERE. 2.0 21 BUT REMEMBER, THIS IS PROTECTED BY THE 22 ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE FOR THE MOST PART. SO ARE YOU DONE 23 WITH THIS LINE OF QUESTIONS? 24 MR. KESSLER: I AM, YOUR HONOR. 25 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. LET'S MOVE ON TO SOMETHING

1 | ELSE.

- 2 | MR. KESSLER: OKAY. JUST HAVE TWO MORE SUBJECTS.
- 3 FORGIVE ME, MR. ADDERLEY, MAKING A MESS.
- 4 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 5 | Q. MR. ADDERLEY, AT ONE POINT DID YOU ENTER INTO AN AD HOC
- 6 | LICENSE AGREEMENT WITH THE HALL OF FAME?
- $7 \mid \mathbf{A}. \quad \text{YES}.$
- 8 | Q. AND THAT WAS A LICENSE TO CREATE A MADDEN HALL OF FAME
- 9 GAME; IS THAT CORRECT?
- 10 A. I BELIEVE SO.
- 11 Q. AND YOU WERE SOLICITED DIRECTLY BY THE HALL OF FAME FOR
- 12 | THAT; IS THAT CORRECT?
- 13 **A.** YES.
- 14 Q. OKAY. AND YOU ENTERED INTO A LICENSE WITH THE HALL OF
- 15 | FAME, AND YOU AGREED UPON HOW MUCH MONEY YOU WOULD BE PAID FOR
- 16 YOUR IMAGE AND NAME, CORRECT?
- 17 **A.** REPEAT THAT.
- 18 Q. YOU AGREED WITH THE HALL OF FAME HOW MUCH THEY WOULD PAY
- 19 YOU TO PUT YOU IN THAT GAME?
- 20 **A.** YES.
- 21 | Q. AND YOU WERE SATISFIED WITH HOW MUCH THEY WERE GOING TO
- 22 PAY YOU TO PUT YOU IN THAT GAME, CORRECT?
- 23 | A. NO.
- 24 | Q. BUT YOU AGREED TO IT?
- 25 A. I CAN'T TURN DOWN MONEY.

- 1 Q. OKAY. THAT'S FAIR ENOUGH. OKAY. AND DO YOU RECALL HOW
- 2 | MUCH YOU WERE PAID?
- 3 | A. IT WAS \$8,000. AND IT WAS SEPARATED \$2,000 PER YEAR. SO
- 4 | THEY STILL OWE ME \$2,000. IT'S A 4-YEAR DEAL. AND THEY GAVE
- 5 US \$2,000 EACH YEAR.
- 6 Q. OKAY. NOW, FOR THAT -- THAT WAS AN AD HOC AGREEMENT WITH
- 7 | THE HALL OF FAME, CORRECT?
- 8 A. AS FAR AS I KNOW, YES.
- 9 Q. RIGHT. IN OTHER WORDS, PLAYERS INC DIDN'T NEGOTIATE THAT
- 10 | \$2,000 WITH YOU, DID THEY? THAT WAS DIRECTLY THE HALL OF FAME?
- 11 **| A.** YES.
- 12 Q. AND, IN FACT, THE HALL OF FAME TOLD YOU IN A LETTER THEY
- 13 | SENT YOU THAT THIS WAS GOING TO BE A DEAL NOT JUST TO HELP
- 14 | INDIVIDUAL PLAYERS, BUT THERE WAS GOING TO BE MONEY GIVEN TO
- 15 | THE WHOLE HALL OF FAME IN THAT DEAL. YOU KNEW THAT, RIGHT?
- 16 MR. KATZ: OBJECT, YOUR HONOR.
- 17 THE WITNESS: THEY DIDN'T SAY THAT TO ME.
- 18 MR. KATZ: OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. IF HE WANTS TO SHOW
- 19 | HIM THE BEST EVIDENCE OF THIS LETTER, LET HIM SHOW IT TO HIM.
- 20 | I THINK IT'S PROBABLY SOMETHING HE HAS TO DISCLOSE.
- 21 | THE COURT: WELL, THE -- YOU DON'T HAVE TO ALWAYS USE
- 22 THE BEST EVIDENCE, QUOTE THE BEST EVIDENCE.
- 23 YOU CAN BRING IN EVIDENCE IN OTHER WAYS. AND THAT'S
- 24 WHAT MR. KESSLER IS TRYING TO DO HERE.
- 25 THE OBJECTION IS OVERRULED.

- 1 NOW, JUST BECAUSE COUNSEL SAYS IT DOESN'T MEAN IT'S NECESSARILY TRUE. SO YOU FEEL FREE TO ANSWER EXACTLY THE WAY 2 3 YOU FEEL IS THE MOST ACCURATE ANSWER. AND IF YOU DON'T KNOW 4 THE ANSWER, THEN YOU SHOULD SAY: 5 "I DON'T KNOW." OR YOU CAN SAY: 6 "I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE LETTER. IF YOU HAVE THE 7 LETTER, LET ME LOOK AT IT, AND I CAN TELL YOU EXACTLY WHAT IT SAID, " BECAUSE MAYBE COUNSEL IS SUMMARIZING IT. 8 9 SO YOU HAVE ALL THOSE OPTIONS. THE QUESTION ITSELF IS OKAY. GO AHEAD. 10 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, I'LL APPROACH THE WITNESS. 11 I HAVE A COPY OF THE FORM OF LETTER THAT WAS SENT OUT. I 12 13 DIDN'T DISCLOSE --THE COURT: YOU DON'T HAVE TO MAKE A SPEECH. 14 MR. KESSLER: NO, THE REASON I'M ASKING IS BECAUSE 15 MR. KATZ WILL SAY I DIDN'T DISCLOSE IT FOR THIS WITNESS. BUT I 16 DON'T KNOW IF HE WANTS ME TO USE THE LETTER OR NOT. IT'S UP TO 17 18 HIM. 19 MR. KATZ: I WANT HIM TO FOLLOW THE RULES, YOUR 2.0 HONOR, WHICH MEANS DISCLOSE, AND THEN YOU CAN USE IT. 21 THE COURT: WELL, THEN JUST ASK THE QUESTION YOU 22 ASKED EARLIER. IF THE WITNESS WANTS TO SEE IT BEFORE HE 23 ANSWERS THE QUESTION, I AM GOING TO LET YOU USE IT.
- 24 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 25 Q. I'LL ASK YOU, MR. ADDERLEY, OKAY, DID YOU SIGN A LETTER --

- 1 | THE ONE I HAVE, BY THE WAY, IS NOT THE ONE SENT TO YOU, OKAY?
- 2 | IT'S A FORM. IF YOU ASK FOR IT, IT'S NOT GOING TO HAVE YOUR
- 3 NAME ON IT, JUST SO YOU KNOW.
- 4 || DID YOU SIGN A LETTER WITH THE HALL OF FAME, OKAY, IN
- 5 WHICH THE HALL OF FAME ASKED YOU TO -- TO SUPPORT THE HALL OF
- 6 | FAME AND YOUR FELLOW MEMBERS BY PARTICIPATING IN THE HALL OF
- 7 | FAME PROGRAM, BECAUSE SOME OF THE MONEY WOULD GO TO THE HALL OF
- 8 | FAME?
- $9 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. YES.
- 10 MR. KATZ: YOUR HONOR, NOW I'D LIKE IT SEE THE LETTER
- 11 | SINCE APPARENTLY IT'S NOT THE ONE TO MR. ADDERLEY.
- 12 THE COURT: NO. THE QUESTION STANDS WITHOUT REGARD
- 13 TO THE LETTER ITSELF.
- 14 MR. KATZ: ALL RIGHT. I'M GOING TO WITHDRAW MY
- 15 | DISCLOSURE OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR, AND LET HIM DISCLOSE THIS
- 16 DOCUMENT.
- 17 THE COURT: VERY WELL. THANK YOU. ALL RIGHT.
- 18 MR. KESSLER: OKAY.
- 19 THE COURT: BUT THE WITNESS SAID "YES," ANYWAY,
- 20 || RIGHT? DIDN'T YOU SAY "YES"?
- 21 THE WITNESS: YES.
- 22 | THE COURT: SO NOW YOU'VE MADE YOUR POINT. LET'S
- 23 MOVE ON.
- 24 | MR. KESSLER: OKAY. I WILL, YOUR HONOR.
- 25

BY MR. KESSLER:

- 2 Q. I JUST HAVE ONE LAST QUESTION, MR. ADDERLEY.
- 3 I IS IT TRUE, MR. ADDERLEY, THAT YOU HAVE MADE PUBLIC
- 4 | STATEMENTS THAT THE REASON -- THAT THIS LAWSUIT YOU VIEWED AS
- 5 YOUR CHANCE TO GET SOME ACKNOWLEDGMENT?
- 6 **A.** YES.
- 7 MR. KESSLER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR, MR. ADDERLEY.
- 8 | THE COURT: OKAY. MR. KATZ. ANY REDIRECT?
- 9 MR. KATZ: OKAY. THANK YOU.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. KATZ:

- 12 Q. MR. ADDERLEY, WHAT DID YOU WANT TO GET ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF
- 13 | WITH THIS LAWSUIT?
- 14 A. I WANT TO GET ACKNOWLEDGMENT THAT THIS CASE WAS NOT
- 15 BASELESS AND THAT IT HAD NO MERIT.
- 16 Q. AND WHY DID YOU WANT TO GET THAT ACKNOWLEDGMENT?
- 17 A. BECAUSE I DIDN'T THINK IT WAS TRUE.
- 18 Q. AND WHO SAID THAT?
- 19 | A. GENE UPSHAW SAID IT WHEN WE FILED THE LAWSUIT FEBRUARY 14,
- 20 | 2007.
- 21 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR?
- 22 THE WITNESS: AND I'VE HEARD MR. KESSLER ALSO SAY THE
- 23 | SAME EXACT THING.
- 24 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, I THINK THOSE QUESTIONS
- 25 | PUT --

1 MR. KATZ: HE ASKED FOR IT. 2 MR. KESSLER: PUTTING IN STATEMENTS ABOUT ME AND ALL 3 THE PREPARATION THAT THEY'VE DONE, YOUR HONOR, I DON'T THINK 4 THAT WAS AN APPROPRIATE RESPONSE. CERTAINLY HEARSAY ABOUT ME. 5 THE COURT: WELL, YOU DID ASK HIM ABOUT THE VERY 6 POINT. HE'S ENTITLED TO EXPLAIN IT. 7 MR. KESSLER: OKAY. THE COURT: SO THAT OBJECTION IS OVERRULED. 8 9 MR. KATZ: AND I WILL STIPULATE, YOUR HONOR, THAT I PREPARE MY WITNESSES VERY WELL. THAT'S WHAT I'M PAID FOR. 10 BY MR. KATZ: 11 Q. NOW, MR. ADDERLEY, ON THE SUBJECT OF PREPARATION, YOU 12 ACTUALLY DIDN'T TELL THE WHOLE TRUTH, DID YOU? BECAUSE YOU 13 SAID WE DIDN'T PREPARE ON SATURDAYS AND SUNDAYS. IS THAT TRUE? 14 WELL, NOT AS MUCH AS WE DID DURING THE WEEK. 15 16 WE WERE TOGETHER LAST SUNDAY, WEREN'T WE? 17 YES. IN CHURCH. 18 Q. OKAY. AND WE DID SOME PREPARATION? 19 AFTER CHURCH. Α. 20 Q. OKAY. AND WITH RESPECT TO --21 THE COURT: WE'RE NOT TRYING TO BRING GOD INTO THIS, 22 ARE WE? 23 (LAUGHTER)

THE COURT: I'M GOING TO TELL YOU THAT GOD HAS

NOTHING TO DO WITH THIS CASE, AND GOD IS ON NOBODY'S SIDE IN

```
THIS CASE.
 2
             THE WITNESS: I WOULDN'T BE HERE WITHOUT GOD.
 3
             THE COURT: HE IS NOT ON ANYBODY'S SIDE IN THIS CASE.
 4
  THIS IS FOR -- WE ARE GOING DECIDE THIS CASE UNDER THE LAW, AND
 5
   OUR JURY IS GOING TO DECIDE IT ON THE EVIDENCE.
 6
             SO LET'S NOT BRING CHURCH INTO THIS.
 7
   BY MR. KATZ:
   Q. NOW, DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU WERE DOING ANYTHING ILLEGAL OR
 8
   IMMORAL OR UNETHICAL BY CONSULTING WITH ME TO PREPARE FOR YOUR
10
   TESTIMONY?
11
             MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, I OBJECT TO THAT QUESTION.
12
             THE COURT: YOU BROUGHT IT UP.
13
             MR. KESSLER: OKAY.
             THE COURT: I MEAN, MY GOODNESS --
14
15
             MR. KESSLER: IT'S ARGUMENTATIVE.
16
             THE COURT: WELL, NO.
17
             ANSWER THE QUESTION.
18
             THE WITNESS: NO.
19
   BY MR. KATZ:
       AND MR. KESSLER ASKED YOU ABOUT THE FACT YOU DIDN'T
2.0
   COMPLAIN. DID YOU FEEL YOU WERE DOING ANYTHING ILLEGAL,
21
   IMMORAL OR UNETHICAL BY NOT COMPLAINING TO YOUR UNION AND
22
   TRUSTING YOUR UNION?
23
```

24 **A.** NO.

25 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, IT'S LEADING. I'LL GO THAT

1 || WAY.

- 2 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU ARE LEADING THE WITNESS.
- 3 BY MR. KATZ:
- 4 | Q. THE -- NOW, IN TERMS OF COMPLAINING, YOU DID COMPLAIN
- 5 | ABOUT THAT REEBOK DEAL, OR YOU TRIED TO COMPLAIN ABOUT THE
- 6 | REEBOK DEAL, DIDN'T YOU?
- 7 **A.** FOR THREE YEARS.
- 8 Q. YEAH. WELL, LET ME SHOW YOU -- I FEEL LIKE PERRY MASON
- 9 HERE -- EXHIBIT A, THE SMOKING JERSEY.
- 10 MR. KATZ: I THINK WE NEED TO HAVE THIS MARKED FOR
- 11 | IDENTIFICATION. WE DON'T DO THIS MUCH ANYMORE.
- 12 THE COURT: FINE. MARK IT FOR IDENTIFICATION,
- 13 | PLEASE. WHAT THAT MEANS --
- 14 | MR. KATZ: I THINK YOUR CLERK --
- 15 | THE COURT: THAT MEANS THAT MR. ADDERLEY IS NOT GOING
- 16 TO HAVE IT ANYMORE. IT'S GOING TO BE IN THE COURT FILES FOR
- 17 | THE NEXT UMPTEEN YEARS.
- 18 MR. KATZ: WELL, WE WILL NOT SEND AN INVOICE TO THE
- 19 COURT, YOUR HONOR.
- 20 THE COURT: I'M SORRY. IF YOU WANT IT MARKED, IT'S
- 21 GOING TO STAY MARKED.
- 22 MR. KATZ: YES, I DO WANT IT MARKED.
- 23 IS THAT OKAY, MR. ADDERLEY?
- 24 THE WITNESS: YES.
- 25 MR. KATZ: HE NEVER GOT ANY MONEY OUT OF IT, ANYWAY.

1	THE WITNESS: CORRECT.					
2	MR. KATZ: WHAT NUMBER ARE WE ON?					
3	THE CLERK: IT'S 1326.					
4	(TRIAL EXHIBIT 1326 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)					
5	THE COURT: NOW, JUST WHILE THEY'RE MARKING IT,					
6	PERHAPS THE REEBOK THING HAS SOME SOMETHING TO DO WITH THIS					
7	CASE. THOUGH NOT MUCH.					
8	WHAT, AGAIN, I REMIND YOU IS THE GLA, THE					
9	GLA.					
10	IF THIS THING WAS SOLD UNDER THE GLA AND THE MONEY					
11	WAS RECEIVED, AND SO FORTH, AND IT WAS A GROUP DEAL AND ALL OF					
12	THAT, THEN, YES, THEN IT WOULD HAVE SOMETHING TO DO WITH THIS					
13	CASE.					
14	BUT YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE TO DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT ANY					
15	OF THIS HAVING TO DO WITH REEBOK PROVES A THING ON THE ISSUES					
16	THAT YOU HAVE TO DECIDE.					
17	THE ONLY REASON THIS IS EVEN GOING INTO NOW IS					
18	BECAUSE MR. KESSLER ASKED A VERY BROAD QUESTION, SOMETHING					
19	LIKE:					
20	"DID THEY EVER USE YOUR IMAGE OR NAME WITHOUT					
21	YOU BEING PAID FOR IT?"					
22	AND WHAMMO, THIS COMES UP. THIS INCIDENT COMES UP.					
23	SO HERE WE ARE. I'M LETTING BOTH SIDES GET INTO THE					
24	REEBOK, EVEN THOUGH IT MAY AT THE END HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH					
25	THE ISSUE YOU HAVE TO DECIDE.					

1 SO GO AHEAD.

- 2 BY MR. KATZ:
- 3 Q. CAN YOU TELL THE JURY WHAT THIS IS, SIR?
- 4 | A. THIS IS A REPLICA OF THE JERSEY THAT I WOULD BE WEARING IF
- 5 || I WAS PLAYING. AND IT'S THE SAME JERSEY THAT THE NFL PLAYERS
- 6 TODAY WEAR. AND IT HAS EVERYTHING ON THERE THAT THE NFL
- 7 | PLAYERS, THE CURRENT PLAYERS, ARE WEARING TODAY.
- 8 | IT INCLUDES THE NFL LOGO, THE REEBOK LOGO, PLAYERS
- 9 INC LOGO, MY NAME ON THE BACK, WITH NUMBER 26.
- 10 AND THAT'S ALSO ON THE FRONT (INDICATING).
- 11 | THIS DID NOT COME FROM A THIRD-WORLD COUNTRY.
- 12 Q. CAN YOU POINT OUT TO THE JURY WHERE THE PLAYERS INC LOGO
- 13 | IS?
- 14 A. FIRST OF ALL, THIS IS THE REEBOK LOGO (INDICATING). AT
- 15 | THE BOTTOM OF THE JERSEY IS PLAYERS INC LOGO (INDICATING).
- 16 THIS JERSEY COULD NOT HAVE BEEN MADE IN A THIRD-WORLD
- 17 COUNTRY.
- 18 MR. KATZ: I OFFER EXHIBIT 1326, YOUR HONOR.
- 19 MR. KESSLER: NO OBJECTION AT THIS POINT, YOUR HONOR.
- 20 | THE COURT: OKAY. 1326 IS IN.
- 21 | (TRIAL EXHIBIT 1326 RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)
- 22 | BY MR. KATZ:
- 23 | Q. NOW, DID YOU TRY TO COMPLAIN TO YOUR UNION, SIR, ABOUT HOW
- 24 | THEY HANDLED THIS REEBOK SITUATION?
- 25 **A.** YES.

- $1 \parallel \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}$ WHAT DID YOU DO?
- 2 A. I CALLED A GENTLEMAN BY THE NAME OF HOWARD SKALL,
- 3 | S-K-A-L-L. AND HE'S THE ONE THAT CONTACTED ME ABOUT DOING THE
- 4 | PROMOTION BETWEEN PLAYERS INC AND REEBOK.
- 5 O. DID YOU EVER HEAR BACK FROM HIM?
- 6 | A. NO. I HEARD BACK FROM A GENTLEMAN BY THE NAME OF SETH
- 7 | WYMAN AND MUNEER MOORE. BOTH OF THOSE MARKETING REPS AT THE
- 8 TIME FOR PLAYERS INC.
- 9 || Q. HOW LONG DID IT TAKE THEM TO GET BACK TO YOU?
- 10 A. BETWEEN SIX MONTHS AND A YEAR.
- 11 Q. OKAY. AND DID YOU ALSO WRITE THEM LETTERS?
- 12 A. YEAH, I WROTE LETTERS TO MR. SKALL AND NEVER HEARD BACK
- 13 | FROM HIM. IN FACT, I NEVER TALKED TO HIM OR HEARD BACK
- 14 ANYTHING FROM HIM.
- 15 Q. AND WHO CALLED YOU, MR. MUNEER MOORE?
- 16 A. WELL, I CALLED. AND THE SECRETARY OR THE RECEPTIONIST
- 17 || SAID:
- 18 U "JUST A MINUTE."
- 19 AND ONE TIME THERE WAS A GUY NAME SETH WYMAN THAT
- 20 CAME ON, AND HE SAID HE KNEW ABOUT IT, AND THAT HE WOULD TAKE
- 21 CARE OF IT, AND HE WOULD TALK TO HOWARD SKALL CONCERNING THE
- 22 | PROMOTION.
- 23 AND THE NEXT TIME I TALKED TO HIM HE TOLD ME HE WAS
- 24 | IN HAWAII AND DIDN'T HAVE TIME TO TALK TO MR. SKALL.
- 25 AND THEN, MUNEER MOORE, HE CALLED AND SAID THERE WAS

- 1 A MEMO ON HIS DESK TO CONTACT ME CONCERNING THE DEAL. AND HE 2 SAID:
- "REEBOK IS GOING TO SEND YOU A CATALOG. AND THAT
 4 YOU'RE ENTITLED TO GET \$1,000 WORTH OF MERCHANDISE."
- AND THERE WAS NO COVER LETTER. NO ONE FOR ME TO

 CONTACT TO TALK TO ABOUT THIS \$1,000. AND I IMAGINE IT WAS TO

 MAKE UP FOR THEM NOT HONORING THE AGREEMENT.
- AND TO ME, IT WAS AN INSULT. AND I LET IT GO AT THAT.
- IN FACT, ON THE CATALOG THAT THEY SENT ME HAD A

 11 PICTURE OF ONE OF MY FAVORITE BASKETBALL PLAYERS, ALLEN

 12 IVERSON, ON THE COVER. IT WAS MOSTLY BASKETBALL STUFF. IT

 13 WASN'T EVEN FOOTBALL STUFF.
- SAID, OKAY, GO AHEAD AND PICK OUT A THOUSAND DOLLARS

 WORTH OF MERCHANDISE.
- 16 Q. WHAT, IF ANY, CONNECTION DID THAT EXPERIENCE HAVE WITH
 17 YOUR FAILURE TO COMPLAIN ABOUT THE GLA?
- 18 A. WELL, I KNEW IF I HAD SIGNED THE AGREEMENT, AND IT DIDN'T
 19 HONOR THAT, THAT THE CHANCES OF ME HEARING FROM THEM CONCERNING
- 20 | THE GLA WAS SLIM TO NONE.
- 21 Q. SIR, MOVING TO THE UPPER DECK AUTOGRAPHS, YOUR UNION
- 22 | NEGOTIATED FOR YOU A DEAL AT FOUR DOLLARS PER AUTOGRAPH. DID
- 23 YOU THINK THAT WAS A GOOD DEAL?
- 24 **A.** NO.
- $25 \, | \, \mathbf{Q}$ WHY NOT?

- 1 A. BECAUSE I GET \$15 GOING TO CARD SHOWS AND MEMORABILIA
- 2 | SHOWS FOR PER AUTOGRAPH.
- 3 || Q. DO YOU THINK THEY WERE MAKING THEIR BEST EFFORTS FOR YOU?
- $4 \parallel \mathbf{A}$. NO.
- 5 | O. FOR THE HALL OF FAME DO YOU THINK YOU GOT THE APPROPRIATE
- 6 AMOUNT OF MONEY, \$8,000?
- $7 \| \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{NO} \|$
- 8 | Q. WHY NOT?
- 9 A. BECAUSE WE WERE UNDERSOLD. THEY UNDERSOLD OUR IMAGES TO
- 10 | THE HALL OF FAME.
- 11 Q. DO YOU THINK THEY MADE THEIR BEST EFFORTS FOR YOU ON THAT
- 12 ONE?
- 13 **A.** NO.
- 14 Q. NOW, ON THIS EARLY PENSION THAT YOU TOOK, DO YOU THINK
- 15 | THAT YOU GOT THE CORRECT INFORMATION WHEN YOU TOOK THAT?
- 16 **A.** NO.
- 17 Q. WHAT INFORMATION DID YOU GET?
- 18 A. WELL, THE UNION HAD REPRESENTATIVES GOING AROUND TO ALL OF
- 19 | THE NFL TEAMS AT THAT PARTICULAR TIME AND TELLING US THAT NFL
- 20 | PLAYERS' LIFE SPAN WAS 55 YEARS OF AGE.
- 21 | THAT SCARED A LOT OF FELLOWS. THAT'S WHY SOME OF US
- 22 | TOOK THE EARLY RETIREMENT. THERE WAS DIFFERENT REASONS WHY WE
- 23 TOOK THE EARLY RETIREMENT.
- 24 | IF I HADN'T TAKEN THE EARLY RETIREMENT, MY DAUGHTER
- 25 WOULD NOT BE A SUCCESSFUL DENTIST, THE WAY SHE IS NOW, BECAUSE

- I NEEDED THE MONEY TO PUT HER THROUGH COLLEGE.
- 2 MR. KATZ: THANK YOU, SIR.
- 3 NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.
- 4 THE COURT: ANYTHING MORE?
- 5 MR. KESSLER: VERY BRIEFLY, YOUR HONOR. I WILL A
- 6 | FINISH BEFORE THE END OF THE DAY.

RECROSS EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. KESSLER:

- 9 Q. MR. ADDERLEY, YOU JUST TESTIFIED WITH YOUR COUNSEL'S
- 10 OUESTIONS ABOUT THAT YOU WERE DISSATISFIED WITH THE AMOUNT OF
- 11 MONEY FROM THE HALL OF FAME AD HOC, CORRECT?
- 12 A. CORRECT.
- 13 Q. BUT YOU NEGOTIATED THAT WITH THE HALL OF FAME, NOT PLAYERS
- 14 | INC, CORRECT?
- 15 | A. I DID NOT NEGOTIATE ANYTHING. THEY SENT A LETTER, AND
- 16 ASKED ME WHETHER WOULD I BE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE IN THE
- 17 PROGRAM. I SIGNED THE LETTER, AND I SENT THE LETTER BACK.
- 18 | Q. IT CAME FROM THE HALL OF FAME, NOT PLAYERS INC, CORRECT?
- 19 A. CORRECT.
- 20 Q. OKAY. AND WITH RESPECT TO THE REEBOK JERSEY, IF WE MAY,
- 21 WHEN REEBOK DID PUT OUT SOME RETIRED PLAYERS WHOSE PRODUCTS
- 22 | THEY THOUGHT COULD SELL, DID THEY USE CURRENT JERSEYS LIKE
- 23 | THIS, OR DID THEY USE VINTAGE JERSEYS; DO YOU KNOW?
- 24 MR. KATZ: OBJECT.
- 25 THE WITNESS: YOU HAVE TO CONTACT REEBOK.

- 1 MR. KATZ: FOUNDATION.
- 2 || THE COURT: IF YOU DON'T KNOW THE ANSWER SAY YOU
- 3 | DON'T KNOW.
- 4 | THE WITNESS: I DON'T KNOW.
- 5 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 6 | Q. THIS YOU IDENTIFIED AS A CURRENT JERSEY, CORRECT?
- 7 | A. I SAID AT THE TIME THEY WERE WEARING THE SAME TYPE OF
- 8 JERSEY.
- 9 | Q. IT WAS CURRENT WHEN YOU GOT THIS IN THE MAIL --
- 10 **A.** YES.
- 11 | **Q.** -- RIGHT?
- 12 AND THIS STRIP THAT SAYS "ADDERLEY" HERE, THERE ARE
- 13 | STORES ALL OVER THE COUNTRY WHO WILL ADD ANYBODY'S NAME. THEY
- 14 WOULD EVEN ADD THE NAME "KESSLER," IF I PAID FOR IT AT A STORE,
- 15 | CORRECT?
- 16 MR. KATZ: OBJECT. ASKED AND ANSWERED.
- 17 | THE WITNESS: I DON'T KNOW.
- 18 THE COURT: THIS WAS ON REDIRECT.
- 19 OVERRULED.
- 20 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 21 || Q. YOU DON'T KNOW THAT?
- 22 A. NO. I DO KNOW THAT THEY WON'T ADD REEBOK'S LOGO AND
- 23 | PLAYERS INC'S LOGO.
- 24 | Q. IF YOU BUY A BLANK JERSEY -- I CAN READ YOUR DEPOSITION
- 25 | TRANSCRIPT AGAIN -- YOU KNOW THAT YOU CAN CUSTOMIZE THAT JERSEY

- 1 ANY WAY YOU WANT IN THE STORE, CORRECT?
- 2 A. I DON'T KNOW.
- 3 | MR. KATZ: OBJECT. ASKED AND ANSWERED.
- 4 | MR. KESSLER: IT'S AN EXHIBIT. WHERE SHOULD I PUT
- 5 | IT, YOUR HONOR?
- 6 THE WITNESS: PUT IT ON.
- 7 (LAUGHTER)
- 8 MR. KESSLER: I WOULD NEVER DO THAT, SIR.
- 9 MR. KATZ: THE KESSLER JERSEY HAS NOT SOLD VERY WELL.
- 10 MR. KESSLER: YOUR HONOR, IT WOULD NOT SELL AT ALL.
- 11 | EVEN TO MY FAMILY.
- 12 BY MR. KESSLER:
- 13 Q. JUST ONE LAST QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO THE PENSION ISSUE
- 14 THAT YOUR COUNSEL WENT INTO AGAIN. AND, SIR, I GREATLY RESPECT
- 15 | THE CHOICE YOU MADE FOR YOURSELF AND YOUR FAMILY WHEN YOU
- 16 DECIDED TO MAKE A DECISION TO ACCEPT YOUR RETIREMENT AT 45 AND,
- 17 | THEREFORE, GET LESS MONEY.
- 18 BUT THAT WAS A CHOICE YOU MADE YOURSELF, RIGHT, SIR?
- 19 A. I HAD NO CHOICE EXCEPT TO MAKE IT.
- 20 Q. I KNOW.
- 21 | A. YES.
- 22 Q. IT WAS YOUR DECISION, RIGHT?
- 23 **A.** YES.
- 24 MR. KESSLER: THANK YOU, SIR.
- 25 | THE COURT: MAY WE HAVE MR. ADDERLEY STEP DOWN?

WE'RE DONE WITH HIM, RIGHT? 2 MR. KATZ: WE ARE, YOUR HONOR. I THINK THAT HE'LL BE 3 HERE FOR THE REMINDER OF TRIAL. 4 THE COURT: OF COURSE. 5 MR. KATZ: BUT IF HE HAS TO LEAVE, MAY HE BE EXCUSED? 6 THE COURT: WELL, MR. ADDERLEY, IF YOU NEED TO BE 7 EXCUSED TO GO SOMEPLACE, YES, OF COURSE YOU CAN. BUT YOU ARE THE CLASS REPRESENTATIVE. I'M EXPECTING YOU TO BE HERE 8 THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE TRIAL. SO YOU'LL HAVE TO HAVE A GOOD REASON FOR NOT BEING HERE. 10 WE'LL TAKE THAT UP OUT OF THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY, 11 ALL RIGHT? 12 13 MR. KATZ: I'M NOT SAYING HE'S LEAVING, YOUR HONOR. I'M JUST SAYING IF SOMETHING CAME UP. 14 15 THE COURT: OF COURSE I WOULD CONSIDER THAT. BUT LET'S SEE IF ANYTHING COMES UP. 16 17 MR. KATZ: SURE. NO, NO. HE INTENDS TO BE HERE. THE COURT: HE HAS BEEN HERE EVERY DAY. HE IS THE 18 CLASS REPRESENTATIVE, AND I EXPECT HE WOULD BE HERE THROUGHOUT 19 THE TRIAL. 2.0 21 OKAY. JUST STAY FOR THEIR FOR A MOMENT. WE'RE 22 ALMOST DONE FOR THE DAY. 23 IS THERE A QUICK STIPULATION OR ANYTHING YOU WANT TO

OTHERWISE, WE ARE GOING TO BREAK EARLY TODAY.

2.4

25

HAVE READ IN?

```
1
             MR. KESSLER: THERE IS NOTHING WE CAN DO IN THE FIVE
 2
   MINUTES.
 3
             THE COURT: JUST INFORM THE JURY IN THE MINUTES THAT
 4
   WE HAVE HERE --
 5
             MR. KATZ: WE CAN START MR. BERTHELSEN IF YOU WANT.
 6
             THE COURT: NO. HOW MANY MORE WITNESSES DO YOU HAVE
 7
   ON THE PLAINTIFFS' CASE?
             MR. HUMMEL: FOUR.
 8
 9
             THE COURT: FOUR? YOU TOLD ME YOU WERE GOING TO REST
   TODAY. SOMEBODY TOLD ME YOU WERE GOING TO REST TODAY. YOU'VE
10
11
   GOT FOUR MORE WITNESSES? ARE WE GOING TO REST TOMORROW?
             MR. HUMMEL: THAT'S OUR HOPE, YOUR HONOR, DEPENDING
12
1.3
   ON WHAT THE CROSS IS.
             THE COURT: MAYBE TOMORROW WE WILL BE AT THE HALFWAY
14
15
   POINT. AND, REALLY, I THINK WE'LL BE A LITTLE MORE THAN
   HALFWAY BECAUSE YOU CAN SEE HOW IT WORKS. THE DEFENSE PUTS IN
16
17
   PART OF THEIR CASE AS THEY GO ALONG.
             SO I SUSPECT THE DEFENSE CASE WILL NOT BE AS LONG AS
18
19
   THE PLAINTIFF CASE HAS TAKEN. ALL RIGHT.
             REMEMBER THE ADMONITION. PLEASE DON'T PAY ATTENTION
2.0
   TO ANY NEWS STORIES. DON'T TALK WITH ANYONE. DON'T LET ANYONE
21
22
   TRY TO TALK TO YOU. KEEP AN OPEN MIND. WE'LL SEE YOU BACK
   HERE TOMORROW AT 7:45.
23
24
             THE CLERK: ALL RISE.
```

(THEREUPON, THE JURY LEFT THE COURTROOM.)

```
1
             THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. ADDERLEY, DO YOU NEED
 2
  HELP AGAIN?
             THE WITNESS: NO, SIR. I'M OKAY.
 3
 4
             THE COURT: YOU OKAY?
 5
             THE WITNESS: YES.
 6
             THE COURT: EVERYONE HAVE A SEAT. I DON'T KNOW WHAT
 7
   YOU'RE TRYING TO GET AT THAT MR. ADDERLEY IS LEAVING.
             MR. KATZ: NO, NO. HE MAY HAVE A MEDICAL REASON. IF
 8
   HE HAD A MEDICAL REASON. HE HAS A BAD BACK, YOUR HONOR.
   SITTING IS VERY HARD FOR HIM. HE DOESN'T INTEND TO. IF
10
11
   SOMETHING COMES UP --
             THE COURT: IF THERE'S GOOD CAUSE, OF COURSE HE CAN
12
   GO TO THE DOCTOR, WHATEVER HE HAS TO DO.
             MR. PARCHER: JUDGE, HE'S GOING TO BE HERE. BUT HE
14
  NEEDED AN EPIDURAL SHOT FOR HIS BACK, AND HE THOUGHT HE COULD
15
   GET IT IN SAN FRANCISCO.
16
17
             THE COURT: OF COURSE HE CAN BE EXCUSED FOR MEDICAL
18
  REASONS.
19
             MR. PARCHER: EVERYBODY WANTS HIM TO BE HERE.
             THE COURT: OTHERWISE, I HOPE HE'S HERE.
2.0
21
             MR. KATZ: ABSOLUTELY, YOUR HONOR.
22
             THE COURT: HE IS AN IMPORTANT PERSON IN THIS CASE.
23
             MR. KATZ: ABSOLUTELY.
24
             THE COURT: OKAY. YOU CAN GO BACK TO THE COUNSEL
25
   TABLE, MR. ADDERLEY.
```

```
1
             I HAVE GOT A COUPLE OF ITEMS TO BRING UP WITH
   EVERYBODY. I THINK THE JURY MAY BE WONDERING, I'M JUST
 2
 3
   SPECULATING HERE, BUT YOU KNOW THESE GLA'S WERE SENT OUT BY
 4
  MAIL. WAS THERE A COVER LETTER THAT EXPLAINED IT?
 5
             MR. KATZ: ONE OF THEM IS IN, YOUR HONOR. I THINK
 6
   IT'S NUMBER 63, THE DOUG ALLEN LETTER THAT SAYS "PAST, PRESENT,
 7
   FUTURE."
             THE COURT: WAS THAT INCLUDED WITH THE FORM THAT WENT
 8
   OUT TO THE PLAYERS?
             MR. KATZ: WE BELIEVE IT WAS, YOUR HONOR.
10
   MR. ADDERLEY DIDN'T HAVE A SPECIFIC RECOLLECTION OF THAT
11
   LETTER. MR. ALLEN TESTIFIED TO IT.
12
13
             THE COURT: I MISSED THAT WHEN IT CAME THROUGH.
             AGAIN, I REMIND YOU THAT ANY VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITIONS
14
15
   THAT ARE PLAYED ARE NOT TRANSCRIBED BY THE COURT REPORTER. IF
   YOU WANT TO CITE THAT IN THE COURT OF APPEALS YOU BETTER WORK
16
   IT OUT WITH THE OTHER SIDE TO HAVE SOME WAY TO STIPULATE TO
17
   WHAT WAS SHOWN.
18
             OTHERWISE, YOU WON'T BE ABLE TO RELY UPON THAT FOR
19
2.0
   ANY APPEAL.
             I'M NOT GOING TO SAY ANYTHING MORE ABOUT IT BECAUSE
21
   IT'S YOUR JOB, NOT MINE, TO MAKE SURE THE RECORD IS DONE THE
22
23
   WAY IT SHOULD BE DONE.
24
             ANYTHING YOU WANT TO BRING UP WITH ME TODAY?
25
             MR. KESSLER: JUST, YOUR HONOR, ON SCHEDULE. IF
```

- 1 PLAINTIFFS DO CLOSE TOMORROW, WHICH I DON'T KNOW IF THEY WILL
 2 OR WON'T BECAUSE THEY DID SAY THEY'D CLOSE TODAY, AND WE WERE
 3 SKEPTICAL ABOUT THAT GIVEN THE WITNESSES.
 - IF THEY DO CLOSE TOMORROW I ANTICIPATE DEFENDANTS

 WOULD PROBABLY CLOSE ON WEDNESDAY. IN OTHER WORDS, I THINK OUR

 CASE WOULD JUST BE ABOUT THREE DAYS, INCLUDING MR. ALLEN WHO

 THEY STILL INTEND TO CALL PAT ALLEN AS PART OF THAT.
- 8 SO I JUST WANTED TO LET YOUR HONOR KNOW FOR PURPOSES
 9 ABOUT THINKING WHENEVER YOU WANT TO SCHEDULE EXTRA TIME FOR A
 10 CHARGING CONFERENCE OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT, THAT YOUR HONOR BE
 11 AWARE OF THAT.
 - MR. HUMMEL: THAT'S ACTUALLY RIGHT. WHEN I SAID

 "FOUR," MR. KESSLER CORRECTED ME. WE DO WANT TO CALL PAT ALLEN

 IN OUR CASE. SO WE WILL BE RESTING SUBJECT TO CALLING PAT

 ALLEN, WHO YOU EXCUSED AND WE'LL CALL NEXT WEEK.
 - THE COURT: SO IT'S THREE?
- 17 MR. HUMMEL: IT'S FIVE.

4

5

6

7

12

13

14

15

16

2.0

21

22

23

24

- 18 MR. KESSLER: THEY HAVE FOUR MORE TOMORROW, AND IF
 19 THEY GET THROUGH --
 - MR. HUMMEL: AND MS. ALLEN, RIGHT.
 - THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I DON'T KNOW THAT I WILL BE
 IN A POSITION TO GIVE YOU A DRAFT SET OF INSTRUCTIONS TOMORROW,
 BUT I'M GOING TO TRY TO GIVE YOU THE FIRST CUT AT IT SO YOU CAN
 HAVE IT OVER THE WEEKEND. AND THEN, NEXT WEEK WE'LL HAVE A
 CHARGING CONFERENCE SOME AFTERNOON.

1 MR. KESSLER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. MY OTHER 2 QUESTION IS -- AND YOUR HONOR --3 THE COURT: ACTUALLY, LET ME AMEND THAT. WHAT 4 I'LL -- I'LL DO IT IN TWO STEPS. IF I DO GIVE IT TO YOU 5 TOMORROW, THEN ON MONDAY AT 5:00 A.M. OR SOONER, BECAUSE I WILL 6 BE ABLE TO SEE IT. I GET HERE AT 5:30 IN THE MORNINGS. I WANT 7 YOU TO FILE A -- DO WHATEVER YOUR FIRST CUT COMMENTS ARE ON THE INSTRUCTIONS. 8 9 MR. KESSLER: OKAY. THE COURT: AND THEN, IN ADDITION, WE WILL HAVE YET 10 11 ANOTHER MORE FULL-BLOWN FULL-DRESS OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE ANOTHER SHOT AT A DIFFERENT SET OF INSTRUCTIONS. 12 13 BUT THIS IS MY -- IT IS VERY USEFUL FOR ME, AND I JUST WANT FIVE PAGES. FIVE PAGES ON WHAT YOU GET TOMORROW. 14 15 YOU GIVE ME FIVE PAGES. SO THAT WAY I KNOW YOU ARE TELLING ME THE ONES YOU HAVE THE GREATEST HEARTBURN OVER, AND NOT JUST A 16 MILLION BIG-FIRM-LAW-FIRM POINTS. 17 I WANT THE THINGS THAT YOU REALLY CARE ABOUT. AND 18 19 THOSE ARE THE ONES I CAN GET -- AND THEN, I WILL GO BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARDS, LOOK AT IT AGAIN, AND THEN GIVE YOU A VERSION 2.0 21 THAT YOU CAN WAX ELOQUENT ABOUT LATER. 22 MR. KESSLER: OKAY. 23 THE COURT: THAT'S MY PLAN. I'M NOT THERE YET. I'VE

GOT THE INSTRUCTIONS ABOUT TWO-THIRDS DONE. BUT JUST FOR A

24

25

FIRST CUT IS WHAT I MEAN.

1 WHAT ELSE? 2 MR. KESSLER: ONE OTHER QUESTION. YOUR HONOR, AGAIN, 3 YOU ALLUDED TO THIS PREVIOUSLY. BECAUSE MS. ALLEN WILL 4 ACTUALLY BE DEFERRED UNTIL IN OUR CASE, JUST TO PRESERVE OUR --5 YOU KNOW, OUR RULE 50 RIGHTS, SHOULD WE NOT RAISE THAT ISSUE 6 UNTIL AFTER MS. ALLEN'S TESTIFIED? I GUESS THAT WOULD BE 7 APPROPRIATE. EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE GOING TO CLOSE --THE COURT: I THINK WHAT YOU SHOULD BE DEEMED TO DO 8 IS TO MAKE YOUR RULE 50 MOTION AS SOON AS THEY REST. BUT IT CAN ONLY BE ONE SENTENCE. 10 AND THEN, WE CAN BRIEF IT OUT OVER TIME. THEN YOU 11 CAN MAKE IT AGAIN AFTER SHE TESTIFIES. 12 13 MR. KESSLER: VERY GOOD, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: BUT JUST FOR THE RECORD YOU CAN MAKE IT 14 15 MAYBE A TWO-SENTENCE. BUT IF WE DO HAVE TIME AND WE CAN GET TO YOUR FIRST WITNESS, WE WILL PROCEED IMMEDIATELY TO THAT WITHOUT 16 DELAYING WITH ANY MOTION PRACTICE. 17 18 MR. KESSLER: WE'LL HAVE A WITNESS READY TOMORROW, ALTHOUGH, FRANKLY, SINCE TWO OF THEIR WITNESSES TOMORROW ARE 19 EXPERTS, I THINK IT'S EXTRAORDINARILY UNLIKELY THAT WE'RE GOING 2.0 TO GET TO OUR WITNESS TOMORROW. 21 22 THE COURT: PROBABLY SO, BUT HAVE ONE READY, ANYWAY. 23 MR. KESSLER: I WILL. THAT'S IT. 24 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. LET'S SEE WHAT ELSE I'VE GOT

ON MY LIST. ALL RIGHT. SEE YOU TOMORROW AT -- I HAVE HEARINGS

1	ALL AFTERNOON SO BE SURE YOU CLEAR AWAY THE COUNSEL TABLE.					
2	MR. HUMMEL: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.					
3	MR. KESSLER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.					
4	MR. PARCHER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.					
5	MR. KATZ: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.					
6	(THEREUPON, THIS TRIAL WAS CONTINUED UNTIL FRIDAY,					
7	OCTOBER 21, 2008 AT 7:30 O'CLOCK A.M.)					
8						
9						
10						
11	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER					
12	I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT					
13	FROM THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.					
14	DATE: TUESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2008.					
15						
16	S/B KATHERINE POWELL SULLIVAN					
17						
18						
19						
20	KATHERINE POWELL SULLIVAN, CSR #5812, RPR, CRR U.S. COURT REPORTER					
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

]			
1	INDEX		
2	PLAINTIFFS' WITNESSES	PAGE	VOL.
3	EYRICH, GLEN		
4	DEPOSITION EXCERPTS READ BY MR. CHARON AND MR. GARZA	1412	7
5	ADDERLEY, HERBERT ANTHONY	1 4 0 0	П
6	(SWORN) Direct Examination by Mr. Katz	1490 1490	7
7	CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. KESSLER Redirect Examination by Mr. Katz	1536 1587	
8	CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. KESSLER	1596	7
9	DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES	PAGE	VOL.
10	BYRD, STEVEN Direct Examination by Mr. Clark	1438	7
11	Cross Examination by Mr. Katz	1449	7
12	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CLARK	1477	7
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1		EXHIBITS			
2	TRIAL EXHIBITS	<u>IDEN</u>	VOL.	EVID	VOL.
3	102 103			1428 1430	7 7
4	104 105			1432 1433	7 7
5	19			1435	7
6	2000 96			1461 1487	7
7	97 64			1487 1503	7 7
8	2336 2087			1576 1579	7 7
9	1326	1591	7	1592	7
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					