

1 Robert A. Mittelstaedt (SBN 060359)
 Jason McDonell (SBN 115084)
 2 Elaine Wallace (SBN 197882)
 JONES DAY
 3 555 California Street, 26th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94104
 4 Telephone: (415) 626-3939
 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700
 5 ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com
 jmcdonell@jonesday.com
 6 ewallace@jonesday.com

7 Tharan Gregory Lanier (SBN 138784)
 Jane L. Froyd (SBN 220776)
 8 JONES DAY
 1755 Embarcadero Road
 9 Palo Alto, CA 94303
 Telephone: (650) 739-3939
 10 Facsimile: (650) 739-3900
 tglanier@jonesday.com
 11 jfroyd@jonesday.com

12 Scott W. Cowan (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
 Joshua L. Fuchs (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
 13 JONES DAY
 717 Texas, Suite 3300
 14 Houston, TX 77002
 Telephone: (832) 239-3939
 15 Facsimile: (832) 239-3600
 swcowan@jonesday.com
 16 jlfuchs@jonesday.com

17 Attorneys for Defendants
 SAP AG, SAP AMERICA, INC., and
 18 TOMORROWNOW, INC.

BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP
 DONN P. PICKETT (SBN 72257)
 GEOFFREY M. HOWARD (SBN 157468)
 BREE HANN (SBN 215695)
 Three Embarcadero Center
 San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
 Telephone: (415) 393-2000
 Facsimile: (415) 393-2286
 donn.pickett@bingham.com
 geoff.howard@bingham.com
 bree.hann@bingham.com

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
 DAVID BOIES (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
 333 Main Street
 Armonk, NY 10504
 Telephone: (914) 749-8200
 dboies@bsflp.com
 STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (SBN 144177)
 1999 Harrison St., Suite 900
 Oakland, CA 94612
 Telephone: (510) 874-1000
 sholtzman@bsflp.com

DORIAN DALEY (SBN 129049)
 JENNIFER GLOSS (SBN 154227)
 500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 5op7
 Redwood City, CA 94070
 Telephone: (650) 506-4846
 Facsimile: (650) 506-7114
 dorian.daley@oracle.com
 jennifer.gloss@oracle.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
 Oracle International Corporation

19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

20 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

21 OAKLAND DIVISION

23 ORACLE USA, INC., et al.,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 v.

26 SAP AG, et al.,

27 Defendants.

Case No. 07-CV-1658 PJH (EDL)

**JOINT STATEMENT REGARDING
 EXHIBIT OBJECTIONS**

PUBLIC REDACTED VERSION

1 Pursuant to the Court’s guidance at the May 24, 2012 pretrial conference and the Court’s
2 Final Pretrial Order (ECF No. 1171), Plaintiff Oracle International Corporation (“Oracle,” or
3 “Plaintiff”) and Defendants SAP AG, SAP America, Inc. (together, “SAP”) and TomorrowNow,
4 Inc. (“TomorrowNow”) (collectively, “Defendants”) submit this Joint Statement Regarding
5 Exhibit Objections. The Parties each present a short introductory statement about the issues to be
6 addressed. Defendants then present their issues for the Court to decide, followed in each instance
7 by Oracle’s response. Oracle then presents its issues for the Court to decide, followed in each
8 instance by Defendants’ response. The Parties jointly file this brief and separately submit the
9 exemplar documents and foundational materials discussed in their separate position statements.
10 To avoid burdening the Court with the need to make numerous rulings on confidentiality issues
11 and to permit the organization of the exemplar documents and foundational materials in a form
12 most convenient for the Court, the Parties are lodging, rather than formally filing, these other
13 materials. The Parties will work with the Court’s clerk to determine the best manner of filing
14 these materials to preserve their respective positions on appeal.

15 **I. ORACLE’S INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

16 Oracle understood the Court to permit briefing on only two categories identified by
17 Defendants at the pre-trial conference – the At Risk report and the evidence Defendants sought to
18 exclude through their second motion *in limine* – and a comparable number of categories identified
19 by Oracle (which had not identified any categories prior to or at the pre-trial conference). Dkt.
20 1171 at 5 (“The parties may also submit further briefing on the two evidentiary issues discussed
21 at the conference – the other portions of the At-Risk report not addressed during the first trial and
22 the evidence defendants believe is irrelevant to the remaining theory of damages.”). Rather than
23 restrict themselves to what they identified and the Court permitted at the pre-trial conference,
24 Defendants instead now present three categories (with seven subcategories and 18 individual
25 documents that supposedly exemplify these categories. Defendants’ briefing alone runs 32 pages,
26 and requires a comparable response from Oracle. As the Court will see as it reviews this lengthy
27 brief, Defendants’ categories merely collect long lists of individual documents that, by their
28

1 nature, mostly require individual consideration.¹ By contrast, Oracle has identified three
2 categories consisting of five total documents for the Court to consider. In comparison to
3 Defendants' 32 page submission, Oracle presents its evidence in 6 pages.

4 Despite all this, Oracle has not actually responded to each of Defendants' arguments. The
5 Parties agreed to exchange briefing on their affirmative categories the day before the Court-set
6 deadline, and their responses the following afternoon. Despite SAP's represented agreement to
7 the process - a process they initially proposed - at 8:00 pm on June 5, the night the filing was due
8 SAP sent Oracle 10 pages of new argument. As a result, Oracle will be prepared to respond to
9 any of Defendants' unanswered arguments at the June 8 hearing.

10 Oracle also proposed, for the Court's convenience, that the Parties jointly submit a single
11 set of the exemplar documents identified by each party so that the Court and the Parties could
12 work off of one highlighted copy of the documents at the hearing. Defendants refused this
13 proposal. In order to highlight for the Court the language in Defendants' exemplars to which
14 Oracle refers in its responsive sections of the accompanying brief, Oracle will submit an
15 accompanying set of materials with highlighted versions of each of the documents at issue. The
16 Parties' exemplars (i.e. the documents at issue) are labeled by Trial Exhibit number (e.g. A-
17 0059)), and Oracle's supporting documents are listed by exhibit letter.

18 In addition, SAP seeks relief on topics not permitted by the Court. In the final pretrial
19 order, the Court allowed the Parties to further brief their respective positions on objections to
20 *exhibits* and held that it will "rule on objections to *certain exhibits* at a further pretrial conference
21 on June 8, 2012." Dkt. 1171 at 5 (emphasis supplied). The Court's intent was clear, the June 8
22 conference (and the Parties' briefing) was limited to exhibits and, moreover, to the exhibits raised
23 by Defendants at the pre-trial conference. Nonetheless, SAP seeks exclusion of trial and

24 ¹ For example, even if the Court agrees that Oracle adopted a particular piece of customer
25 hearsay contained in one of the emails Defendants identify, that decision is necessarily specific to
26 the statements made in that particular email; that ruling cannot be extrapolated to cover different
27 statements in other documents. Thus, the Court should reject Defendants' requested relief as
28 overbroad, regardless of how it rules on a given document. The Court should not rule that all
"statements by Oracle's senior executives and sales/support employees concerning selling Oracle
software and support are party admissions" and all "statements by the relevant Oracle customers
about their then-existing state of mind are not hearsay or are excepted from the hearsay rule."
SAP's Introductory Statement. This is far too broad.

1 deposition testimony, and demonstratives Oracle used during its opening and with its expert.
2 Specifically, SAP asks the Court to exclude portions of: (a) Oracle’s opening statement; (b)
3 Oracle’s closing statement; (c) McDermott’s trial testimony; (d) Screven’s trial testimony; (e)
4 Ellison’s trial testimony; (f) Catz’s trial testimony; (g) Brandt’s deposition testimony; and (h)
5 Ritchie’s deposition testimony played at the last trial. Not only did the Court’s order not permit
6 argument on these topics, a separate process addresses many of these items (such as deposition
7 designations). There is no reason why these issues could not have been raised in SAP’s motions
8 *in limine*. Finally, Oracle only received notice about these additional items 24 hours before this
9 brief was due, in violation of the Parties’ agreed deadlines to exchange materials for the brief.

10 Oracle shares the Court’s desire to streamline the evidentiary issues in advance of trial.
11 However, Oracle does not believe the Court contemplated this volume of evidence, or the extent
12 of the briefing it would require, when the Court set the June 8 hearing or in its Final Pretrial
13 Order (Dkt. 1171). The process that the Defendants anticipate is not an efficient use of the
14 Court’s or the Parties’ time.

15 Thus, while Oracle will be prepared to wade through this morass on June 8, it respectfully
16 suggests that the Court may wish to order a reduction in the number of documents argued on June
17 8 to eight per side, and reject briefing that exceeds the scope permitted by the Final Pretrial Order
18 (that is, restrict Defendants’ briefing to exhibits and to the two categories Defendants identified at
19 the hearing from its trial brief and second motion *in limine*). However it proceeds, Oracle does
20 not expect the Court will need to make many evidentiary decisions at trial, just as the Court did
21 not need to do so at the last trial.

22 **II. DEFENDANTS’ INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

23 The June 8 hearing is necessary because Oracle persists in objecting to the most basic,
24 probative testimony about the core issue in this case—whether customers left Oracle support or
25 picked SAP software because of TomorrowNow.² By way of example, Oracle objects to

26 ² Although, at the May 24 hearing, Oracle’s counsel suggested that there would be ten or
27 fewer exhibits per side in dispute following meet and confer (*see* Vol. 3 (5/24/12 Hrg. Tr.) at
28 123:17-124:7), Oracle continues to object to 280 out of Defendants’ 345 exhibits (81%), asserting
hearsay objections for 267 exhibits. This is consistent with the last trial, in which Oracle objected
to hundreds of documents on hearsay grounds and is precisely why Defendants raised these
issues with the Court and Oracle nearly one and a half months ago in their April 26 Trial Brief.

1 statements made by its Chairman of the Board, other senior executives, and employees acting
2 within the scope of their duties—classic party admissions—as hearsay. Likewise, Oracle refuses
3 to concede that emails by Oracle employees plainly indicating acceptance of forwarded contents
4 are adoptive admissions. And Oracle inexplicably objects to admission of customer statements
5 reflecting their contemporaneous motives and intent, despite such evidence qualifying as non-
6 hearsay or under the “state of mind” exception to the hearsay rule. This evidence goes to the
7 heart of the case and comes from Oracle employees that work in software and support sales and
8 from Oracle’s customers.

9 The June 8 hearing is also necessary because, despite the Court’s repeated guidance to the
10 contrary (including rulings on the April 26 motions *in limine*), Oracle continues to offer exhibits
11 and testimony previously offered only in support of the now excluded “hypothetical license”
12 theory and/or impermissible evidence of SAP’s alleged willful infringement. In fact, up until
13 Oracle revised its exhibit list at 2:55 p.m. Pacific today, it still listed “hypothetical license” as a
14 purpose for 51 exhibits; Oracle’s belated change, after the Court’s repeated guidance, only
15 emphasizes Oracle’s true purpose in offering these exhibits—mislead the jury, inflame it with
16 alleged willfulness evidence, and incite it to punish, all to inflate damages.³

17 Given the volume of Oracle’s improper hearsay objections and the volume of Oracle
18 exhibits offered despite the Court’s rulings excluding such evidence, it is necessary to consider
19 issues by category—hearsay exceptions/exemptions, evidence of alleged willful infringement,
20 and evidence of excluded damages theories. For the “hearsay” category, Defendants identify four
21 types of exhibits (statements by Oracle senior executives, statements by Oracle sales and support

22 ³ Oracle complains that the June 8 hearing should not address the evidence Defendants
23 seek to exclude by their MIL No. 2 (filed April 26, and on which the Court partially deferred
24 ruling in the Final Pretrial Order). Not so. Covering those issues was specifically discussed at
25 the pretrial conference, with Oracle even suggesting that the issues it intended to raise
26 “overlap[ped]” with Defendants’ motion. Vol. 3 (5/24/12 Hrg Tr.) at 126:9-127:3. And despite
27 Oracle’s complaints to the contrary, it acknowledges that Defendants’ categories are significant;
28 Oracle postponed meet and confer regarding deposition designations on the premise that the
Court’s guidance will substantially affect whether Oracle will continue to designate certain
testimony. *See* Vol. 3 (6/4/12 email from N. Jindal to J. Fuchs) (stating “Oracle is committed to
efficiently completing the pre-trial tasks in preparation for trial. However, this Friday’s hearing
will address many of the issues raised in the parties’ deposition designation objections. As you
noted, the 2010 trial included too much needless effort related to objections. To avoid letting that
happen again, Oracle proposes that we begin the meet and confer process after the hearing.”).

1 employees, customer statements, and At-Risk Report statements), present the legal issue
2 underlying the objection, and then apply the legal principles to exemplar exhibits in each
3 category. Defendants also discuss foundational material lodged with the Court; although the
4 foundational materials submitted with this brief are voluminous, Oracle's hearsay objections
5 require filing basic information such as Oracle's organizational charts and deposition testimony
6 about job titles and responsibilities. Defendants then request a specific ruling on each exemplar
7 and category, as discussed in detail below. For Defendants' other two categories, Defendants ask
8 the Court to exclude the exemplars, with the understanding that such rulings should provide
9 Oracle guidance as to what will not be permitted at trial and will assist the Parties further narrow
10 their exhibit lists and deposition designations.⁴

11 **III. DEFENDANTS' CATEGORY ONE – HEARSAY EXCEPTIONS/EXEMPTIONS**
12 **DEFENDANTS' POSITION**

13 This case is about software customers and the business and economic factors that explain
14 their purchasing decisions, specifically their decisions to terminate Oracle support or purchase
15 SAP software. Statements by Oracle's senior executives and sales and support employees as to
16 specific customers and business activities related to selling software and support are relevant and
17 extremely probative, as are customers' own statements concerning their purchasing decisions.⁵
18 Oracle asserts that many of these highly probative, relevant documents are barred as hearsay.
19 Oracle is incorrect. For the reasons explained below, Defendants request that the Court admit the
20 exemplars offered by Defendants and specifically find:

21 _____
22 ⁴ Defendants understand that this approach is precisely what the Court had in mind for this
23 further pretrial hearing. At the May 24 pretrial conference the Court specifically stated, "What I
24 would like is representative exhibits or categories so I don't have to rule on each one, but that if
25 they fall within a certain type or have certain characteristics or fall within a certain subject area, I
26 would like to be able to make a sort of an umbrella ruling with regard to a set of documents. . . . I
27 just want you all to use your best judgment and give me the categories that are the most important
28 here." Vol. 3 (5/24/12 Hrg. Tr.) at 123:23-124:3, 124:8-12.

25 ⁵ Oracle's expert, Paul Meyer, concedes this, as he reviewed and considered most, if not
26 all, of the statements by Oracle employees and customers at issue, and Defendants may use these
27 documents to cross-examine him. Additionally, as both experts considered these statements, the
28 documents and materials at issue are the most reliable evidence and independently can be
admitted under Rule 703 because their probative value substantially outweighs any prejudicial
effect of the claimed hearsay. If the Court determines that any of the proposed evidence is
inadmissible hearsay, Defendants ask that the Court admit the evidence under Rule 703.

- 1 • **Statements by Oracle’s senior executives**, including, but not limited to, Larry Ellison
2 (CEO), Safra Catz (co-President and former CFO), Charles Phillips (then-co-
3 President), Jeff Henley (Chairman of the Board), Juergen Rottler (Executive Vice
4 President of Oracle Customer Services), and Keith Block (Executive Vice President of
5 North America Sales), concerning the selling of Oracle software and support are party
6 admissions.
- 7 • **Statements by Oracle sales and support employees**, including, but not limited to, Juan
8 Jones (Senior Vice President Customer Services North America Support), Richard
9 Cummins (Senior Direct Support Renewals), Robert Lachs (Senior Regional Manager
10 Support Sales), James McLeod (Regional Support Sales Manager), and other sales and
11 support sales managers and representatives concerning specific customers and
12 business activities regarding the selling of Oracle software and support are party
13 admissions.
- 14 • **Statements by Oracle’s customers** about their then-existing state of mind are not
15 hearsay or are excepted from the hearsay rule under Rule 803(3).
- 16 • As previously conceded by Oracle, the **At-Risk Report itself** is admissible as a
17 business record, including the lists of customers, contract revenue amounts, and
18 win/loss statistics. The **specific excerpts from the contested “notes” field** that
19 Defendants seek to admit also are admissible as party admissions.

20 Defendants believe that this guidance should resolve many of the Parties’ outstanding evidentiary
21 issues and help to streamline this case and the presentation of evidence at trial.

22 Additionally, although in its response below Oracle maintains that Defendants must lay
23 the proper foundation for each document Defendants seek to admit (forcing Defendants to
24 provide the Court with voluminous foundational materials referenced above), Oracle notably does
25 not challenge the foundation that supports admission of the proposed exemplars. Rather, Oracle’s
26 only objection appears to be to statements by customers—telling, in a case that centers on
27 customers’ reasons for leaving Oracle for TomorrowNow support or SAP software. To derive
28 maximum benefit from this objection, Oracle attempts to turn every statement *related to or*
concerning a customer into a statement *by* a customer, and objects on that basis. But Oracle’s
strategy misses an important point: For the hearsay exclusion to apply, there must be a
“statement” by an out-of-court declarant—that is, there must be an oral or written assertion by the
customer that is repeated by the Oracle employee. Fed. R. Evid. 801(a)-(c).

Oracle’s argument reads out this limitation and would make all of Oracle’s employees’
perceptions, understandings, beliefs, and analysis based on information received from a customer
a statement by a customer. This is simply not the law. Where an employee makes a statement

1 relating to the scope of his or her employment, that statement is admissible against the
2 employee’s employer, whatever the basis. *See, e.g., Arista Records LLC v. Lime Group LLC*, 784
3 F. Supp. 2d 398, 420 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (finding admissible under Rule 801(d)(2)(D) emails and
4 Internet forum postings by LimeWire employees concerning customer activities because “[t]he
5 emails and postings pertain to infringement being committed by LimeWire users, and thus relate
6 directly to matters within the scope of the employees’ employment with LW”); *Harris v. Itzhaki*,
7 183 F.3d 1043, 1054 (9th Cir. 1999) (finding real estate agent’s statement, “[t]he owners don’t
8 want to rent to Blacks,” was admissible against owners because it “relates to a matter within the
9 scope of the agency, *i.e.*, showing empty apartments”). Moreover, where there is an actual
10 customer statement that Defendants seek to admit, Defendants articulated the basis for support
11 and admission of the statement, including showing where the Oracle employee manifested a
12 belief in the truth and adopted any customer statement. Where Defendants contend that the
13 Oracle statement is direct and contains no customer statement, and Oracle contends that the
14 source of the statement must have been a customer, this statement would necessarily qualify as an
15 adoptive admission. *See, e.g., Vol. 1 (A-6329-1); Vol. 1 (A-5042); Vol. 1 (A-5997)*.

16 Further, Oracle’s responsive statement conflates theories of admissibility. There are three
17 different theories set forth and discussed at length below, each with its own independent
18 requirements: (1) employee party admissions, which are defined out of the hearsay rule and
19 require only that the admission be made by an employee acting within the scope of his or her
20 employment, (2) adoptive admissions, which are defined out of the hearsay rule and require only
21 that the employee have manifested a belief in the trust of the statement, and (3) state of mind
22 evidence, which qualifies as both non-hearsay and as an express exception to the hearsay rule.
23 The vast majority of what Defendants seek to admit are admissions, and, on this point, Oracle
24 provides no cogent rebuttal. Party admissions—including employee party admissions like those
25 at issue here—are admissible as substantive evidence against the party because “a party cannot
26 seriously claim that his or her own statement should be excluded because it was not made under
27 oath or subject to cross-examination. Moreover, the party is present in court to explain, deny, or
28 rebut the authored statement.” 801 Weinstein’s Federal Evidence § 801.30[1]. The same is true

1 here. Oracle is permitted to offer at trial “counterexamples” to rebut its employees’ admissions,
2 but this goes to the weight of the evidence and not admissibility.

3 **A. Statements by High-Level Oracle Employees.**

4 Statements by Oracle’s senior executives about software and support sales, customer
5 tracking, customer relations, and the impact of the third party support market, are admissions and
6 not hearsay. Yet Oracle objects to admission of statements by the likes of Jeff Henley
7 (Chairman of the Board), Charles Phillips (President), Keith Block (Executive Vice President of
8 North America Sales), and others. Oracle never has contended, and cannot contend, that the
9 statements were not made by Oracle employees, and it is beyond doubt that such statements
10 concern or relate to a senior executive’s responsibilities and thus are employee party admissions.

11 For a statement to be exempted from hearsay as an employee party admission under Rule
12 801(d)(2)(D), courts require only that: (1) the declarant was an employee of the party at the time
13 the statement was made; and (2) the statement “concern[s] a matter within the scope of the
14 agency or employment.” *Sea-Land Serv., Inc. v. Lozen Int’l, LLC*, 285 F.3d 808, 821 (9th Cir.
15 2002); *see also* 5-801 Weinstein’s Federal Evidence § 801.33[1]. The Ninth Circuit broadly
16 construes what “concern[s]” a matter within the scope of employment. *Itzhaki*, 183 F.3d at 1054;
17 *United States v. Kirk*, 844 F.2d 660, 663 (9th Cir. 1988); 5-801 Weinstein’s Federal Evidence §
18 801.33[2][c] (“Simply put, to qualify as nonhearsay under Rule 801(d)(2)(D), the statement need
19 only be related to the declarant’s duties”). The Ninth Circuit also has held that the foundational
20 threshold for Rule 801(d)(2)(D) can be met by as little as (1) an email signature showing a
21 declarant’s job title, (2) a list of employees including a declarant’s name, and (3) an email’s
22 contents indicating that it appeared to be a matter with the scope of a declarant’s employment.
23 *Sea-Land*, 285 F.3d at 821. These statements are important and enjoy generous treatment of
24 admissibility because they are statements made by an opponent’s employee concerning that
25 employee’s job—“Simply put, to qualify as an admission, the statement need only be related to
26 the declarant’s duties.” 5-801 Weinstein’s Federal Evidence § 801.33[2][c]. Admissions are
27 generally defined out of the hearsay rule, and the concerns underlying hearsay generally, as a
28 matter of estoppel and do not require or implicate any independent reliance. 5-801 Weinstein’s

1 Federal Evidence § 801.33[1] (“ . . . there is no additional requirement that the proponent show
2 that the statement is trustworthy, or that the declarant had personal knowledge of the facts
3 underlying the statement”).

4 Further, Rule 801(d)(2)(D) does not require evidence that an employee was “authorized”
5 to make the statement—that is the province of Rule 801(d)(2)(C). *In re Coordinated Pretrial*
6 *Proceedings in Petroleum Prods. Antitrust Litig.*, 906 F.2d 432, 458 (9th Cir. 1990); *Mendoza v.*
7 *Marriott Hotel Servs.*, No. CV 10-6384 (FFMx), 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 102946, at *7-8 (C.D.
8 Cal. Sept. 9, 2011). And, ultimately, Rule 801(d)(2)(D) does not even require a certain level of
9 seniority for employee statements to qualify as a party admission. *See MGM Studios, Inc. v.*
10 *Grokster, Ltd.*, 454 F. Supp. 2d 966, 972-74 (C.D. Cal. 2006); *EEOC v. Timeless Invs., Inc.*, 734
11 F. Supp. 2d 1035, 1043 & n.4 (E.D. Cal. 2010). Statements made by senior executives about
12 Oracle’s business are thus indisputably admissible, including:

13 ***Defendants’ Trial Exhibit A-6329-1***: This email chain contains a November 2, 2004
14 email from Jeff Henley to Keith Block titled “Re: ca/jeff clarke,” in which Henley states that, [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED]
16 [REDACTED]
17 [REDACTED]” Vol. 1 (A-6329-1) at ORCL00647146-47. This is
18 evidence that the jury is entitled to consider in deciding that SAP won CA’s business in 2004,
19 based on its superior software, not because of TomorrowNow (which SAP had not yet acquired).
20 Henley is Oracle’s Chairman of the Board and has held this position since 2004. *Id.* (Found. for
21 A-6329-1) at ORCL00034267; ECF No. 1141 (Joint Pretrial Statement) at 13. Oracle CEO Larry
22 Ellison testified that, to the extent he has a boss, it is Henley. Vol. 1 (Found. for A-6329-1) at
23 11/8/10 Trial Tr. at 781:10-14. Block was Oracle’s Executive Vice President of North America
24 Sales, and the email reported on Oracle’s chances of getting a sales deal with CA. *Id.* at
25 ORCL00034185; *id.* at 9/17/09 Block Tr. at 17:7-18:2, 21:4-21; *id.* at 7/23/08 Blotner Tr. at
26 18:10-18; *id.* at 2/23/10 Meyer Report at 37 n.129. Where Oracle’s Chairman of the Board
27 responds to the Executive Vice President of North America Sales and reports about the status of a
28 potential deal for Oracle software, both he and the vice president of sales are speaking within the

1 scope of their employment and, thus, these statements are admissible against Oracle.⁶

2 *Response to Oracle's Argument:* Defendants offer this document as an employee party
3 admission. Contrary to Oracle's assertion, the email does not contain customer "statements"
4 merely because Henley recites his interpretation of customer "feedback"; rather, Henley reports
5 facts and his beliefs about CA's evaluation of the two competing software vendors. Vol. 1 (A-
6 6329). Indeed, in reporting "[REDACTED]," Henley
7 demonstrates his interpretation and analysis. *Id.* Oracle does not even argue that any aspect of
8 Keith Block's email, which states Block's "belie[fs]" contain hearsay. *Id.* Just because the
9 underlying information comes from a third party does not convert an admission into hearsay.

10 **B. Statements by Oracle's Sales and Support Employees.**

11 Oracle has a sales group that markets and sells software and one year of support for that
12 software. Vol. 2 (Sales & Sppt. Found.) at 7/23/08 Blotner Tr. at 11:19-12:2 (Rule 30(b)(6)
13 testimony). Oracle also has a support group that attempts to secure customer support renewals.
14 *Id.* at 4/24/09 Jones Tr. at 25:3-20; *id.* at 9/16/09 Van Boening Tr. at 152:10-15. As part of this
15 process, and as evidenced by the documents below, these employees have internal discussions at
16 Oracle and with customers regarding the customers' status, purchase options, factors for deciding
17 to purchase more (or less) software, factors for deciding not to purchase support, and potential
18 market influences, including third party service providers. *See id.* at 9/16/08 Cummins Tr. at
19 27:16-23 (Rule 30(b)(6) deposition testimony) ("The general outline is that customers are
20 contacted regarding their renewal for the upcoming time frame. We then work with the customer
21 . . . and if there are any questions on contracts or questions about services, we answer those
22 questions."); *id.* at 8/7/09 Duggan Tr. at 23:16-24 (Rule 30(b)(6) deposition testimony) ("The
23 support sales representative, and in some cases the manager, would be in constant contact with
24 that customer and tracking the sales cycle, from quotation, to communications with the customer,

25
26 ⁶ *Defendants' Trial Exhibits A-0277 and A-0441:* In the mass of objections Oracle
27 served on Defendants, Oracle also initially objected on hearsay grounds to two emails from
28 Charles Phillips and Juergen Rottler, and withdrew these objections (without agreeing that the
documents are admissible without Oracle's consent) only when Defendants proposed to raise
them with the Court. These documents further demonstrate the basic point that such statements
by Oracle's senior executives are admissible.

1 to eventually getting a purchase order.”). Defendants seek to admit statements directly concerning
2 and relating to the responsibilities of sales and support employees—employees who deal with the
3 very factors and customers at issue—and also statements expressly adopted by these employees.

4 In addition to the employee party admissions discussed above, an adoptive party
5 admission is exempted from hearsay under Rule 801(d)(2)(B) where a party manifested that it
6 adopted a statement “or believed [it] to be true.” Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2)(B). This occurs where
7 the party “uses the statement or takes action in compliance with the statement.” *Sea-Land*, 285
8 F.3d at 821 (citing Weinstein’s Federal Evidence § 801.31[3][b] at 801.56 (2d ed. 2002)). The
9 Ninth Circuit has held that where a statement is sent via email to a party’s employee and that
10 employee “incorporates” and forwards the contents in compliance with the statement, it is an
11 adoptive admission. *Id.*; *see also Grokster*, 454 F. Supp. 2d at 973; *Wagstaff v. Protective*
12 *Apparel Corp. of Am., Inc.*, 760 F.2d 1074, 1078 (10th Cir. 1985). For example, a statement,
13 forwarded in its entirety via email by an employee with the prefacing statement “Yikes, Pls note
14 the rail screwed us up . . .” constituted an adoptive admission because the employee “manifested
15 an adoption or belief” in the truth of the information that she forwarded. *Sea-Land*, 285 F.3d at
16 821. The same rule applies to email attachments. *Boyer v. Gildea*, No. 1:05-CV-129-TLS, 2012
17 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21310, at *22-23 (N.D. Ind. Feb. 21, 2012).

18 Oracle refuses to concede the admissibility of the prototypical employee party admissions
19 or adoptive admissions; thus, Defendants seek the Court’s guidance on this category and ruling on
20 the following exemplars:

21 ***Defendants’ Trial Exhibit A-0367***: Admitted at the last trial (Vol. 1 (Found. for A-0367)
22 at 4/29/09 Jones Tr. (played on 11/15/10) at 96:18-22, 96:23-97:13), this is an email from Juan
23 Jones, Senior Vice President Customer Services North America Support for Oracle, regarding
24 support renewals. Vol. 1 (A-0367); Vol. 1 (Found. for A-0367) at ORCL00034304-5. Support
25 renewals are plainly within the scope of Jones’ responsibilities, which relate to support sales and
26 includes leading (1) the North American support sales team, (2) the North American customer
27 services management team, and (3) a small group that monitors acquisition and customer success.
28 *See id.* at 4/29/09 Jones Tr. (played on 11/15/10) at 24:10-18, 25:3-20, 43:7-10.

1 *Response to Oracle's Argument:* Defendants seek to admit this as a party admission. The
2 statements Defendants seek to offer contain no customer statements. Jones states “I am not
3 supportive of the proposal . . . for the following reasons,” and proceeds to list those reasons,
4 which are by definition his analysis. Vol. 1 (A-0367). That analysis is admissible against Oracle.

5 ***Defendants' Trial Exhibit A-5042:*** This Oracle email chain contains a June 19, 2006
6 email from Barbara Allario to Robert Lachs, in which Allario reports that [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED].” Vol. 1 (A-5042).

9 This is evidence that [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED]. Allario was an Oracle senior support
11 sales manager in 2006. Vol. 1 (Found. for A-5042) at 4/21/09 Cummins Tr. at 244:25-245:1; *id.*
12 at ORCL00034318. A support sales manager’s responsibilities relate to selling support and
13 include managing support sales representatives, participating in customers’ software support
14 renewals, reviewing sales representatives’ performance, creating support sales forecasts, and
15 overseeing customer communications, support sales tracking, and support sales negotiations. *Id.*
16 at 9/16/08 Cummins Tr. at 34:5-25; *id.* at 8/7/09 Duggan Tr. at 21:23-22:25, 23:16-24. Reporting
17 to the regional manager on why a customer planned to discontinue support was entirely within
18 Allario’s duties as a support sales manager, and such statements are admissible against Oracle.⁷

19 *Response to Oracle's Argument:* Defendants seek to admit this document as a party
20 admission. This document does not contain the “multiple levels” of hearsay that Oracle alleges—
21 it contains only Oracle statements. Here, an Oracle employee, Zeman, who is listed on an Oracle
22 organizational chart, reported his understanding that a customer had been instructed by its parent
23 company to migrate. All knowledge comes from somewhere; the important fact in this case is

24 _____
25 ⁷ Oracle argues that this document contains hearsay within hearsay. Although Allario
26 references a conversation with another Oracle employee, Derek Zeman, she does not quote or re-
27 count any statements from him. Further, Zeman is an Oracle sales representative, as indicated on
28 Oracle’s organizational chart, and statements about a customer on whose account he is working
would be within the scope of his employment. Vol. 1 (Found. for A-5042) at ORCL00034218.
At a minimum, Allario adopted any statements by Zeman, as she took the affirmative action of
reporting to the regional manager about this customer based on the conversation with Zeman, and
the email was then incorporated into the At-Risk Report. Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2)(B).

1 that Oracle’s employees reported their understanding, and statements reflecting that
2 understanding are admissible against Oracle. Oracle may, of course, present evidence challenging
3 the understanding and analysis, but that is a question of weight for the jury.

4 ***Defendants’ Trial Exhibit A-5997:*** This Oracle email chain contains a May 4, 2006
5 email from Craig Tate to Jeff Henley regarding Oracle customer Haworth. Tate stated:

6 [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED]

9 This shows that [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED]. Tate was the Oracle Group Vice
11 President, North Central Applications in 2006. Vol. 1 (Found. for A-5997) at ORCL00160564;
12 *id.* at 7/23/08 Blotner Tr. at 118:4-5. Tate’s sales team was specifically responsible for the
13 Haworth account. Vol. 1 (A-5995) (Oracle employee reporting that “Haworth has been a very
14 challenging account to retain . . . [t]his has been a combined effort between Craig Tate’s sales
15 team and ours.”). Reporting to his superiors on a customer for whom he was responsible was
16 manifestly related to the scope of Tate’s employment and thus is admissible against Oracle.⁸

17 ***Response to Oracle’s Argument:*** Defendants seek to admit this document as a party
18 admission. First, Oracle admits that it does not contain customer statements, arguing that the
19 “content” of Tate and Henley’s emails “necessarily” must come from the customer. But this is
20 not enough to establish that the statements themselves are hearsay. Both Henley and Tate are
21 reporting their understanding and belief about the status of the customer account; that their
22 understating is informed by the fact that Henley and Tate were participants in discussions with the
23 customer does not render their admissions “statements” from the customer.

24 ***Defendants’ Trial Exhibit A-6042-1:*** This is a PeopleSoft Executive Summary that
25 describes the timeline on which CA cancelled support. Betsy Steelman, an Oracle Services

26 ⁸ This document also is admissible as an adoptive admission. Here, Jeff Henley, Oracle’s
27 Chairman of the Board, expressly manifested a belief in the truth of the statements when he
28 incorporated the statements and responded, “[g]ot it. I agree we should try to salvage this account
and not lose it to SAP.” Vol. 1 (A-5997). Oracle objects on the grounds that the document
contains hearsay within hearsay, but it does not appear that there are any additional out-of-court
statements; even if there were, Tate and Henley adopted these statements.

1 Support Manager (Vol. 1 (Found. for A-6042-1) at ORCL00039277), is identified as the Oracle
2 employee who submitted the document for approval through Oracle’s OSSINFO group. Vol. 1
3 (A-6042-1) at ORCL00316128. According to Juan Jones, OSSINFO is part of Oracle’s
4 administrative approval process that reports to Jones’ boss, Juergen Rottler, Executive Vice
5 President Oracle Customer Services. Vol. 1 (Found. for A-6042-1) at Jones Tr. at 21:24-22:5,
6 29:12-17, 40:17-41:6, 41:20-42:2, 43:7-17. OSSINFO is an internal Oracle group that serves a
7 gate-keeping function at Oracle by deciding whether to approve special terms or other deviations
8 from the standard Oracle support offering. *Id.* at 5/13/09 Rottler Tr. at 22:5-21, 25:6-25, 31:8-
9 33:17. Therefore, materials prepared and sent through this process by support managers are done
10 within the scope of their employment and, here, are directly related to a then-Oracle customer,
11 CA, for which approval was needed to terminate support. Additionally, Allison Adams, a
12 Business Planning Manager in the OSSINFO group at Oracle (Vol. 1 (Found. for A-6042-1) at
13 ORCL00653682), sent the approval to Steelman; both Adams, acting on behalf of OSSINFO, and
14 Steelman manifested a belief in the truth of the statements by taking affirmative action and
15 seeking and receiving the required approvals for cancellation of support services. Vol. 1 (A-
16 6042-1); Vol. 1 (Found. for A-6042-1) at ORCL00034303; *id.* at Jones Tr. at 58:6-17. This and
17 similar approval documents are admissible against Oracle.

18 *Response to Oracle’s Argument:* Defendants seek to admit the statements in the
19 Executive Briefing document as party admissions and adoptive admissions. Oracle fails to
20 identify any customer “statements” reported in the Executive Summary. Rather, Betty Steelman
21 reports the fact that [REDACTED], which is what she
22 understood “per” her discussions with the customer. Vol. 1 (A-6042-1). Again, just because
23 facts originate, and are identified as originating, from the customer does not make them customer
24 statements. Further, by taking action based on the “justification” provided in the Executive
25 Summary, the OSSINFO email adopts those statements as true. *Id.*

26 *Defendants’ Trial Exhibit A-6205-1:* This is the “Maintenance At Risk Analysis”
27 presentation (not to be confused with Oracle’s “At-Risk” Report), which contains Oracle’s
28 internal analysis of customer concerns with Oracle products. Richard Cummins, Senior Director

1 of Support Renewals, authored the presentation and emailed it to his boss Chris Madsen, Vice
2 President of North America Support Sales and Juan Jones. Vol. 1 (Found. for A-6205-1) at
3 ORCL00034305; *id.* at 9/16/08 Cummins Tr. at 14:3-23, 14:25-15:11, 49:11-13. Providing this
4 presentation to senior support group members clearly was within the scope Cummins'
5 employment, whose responsibilities included assisting customers to renew support, contacting
6 customers about their renewal for the upcoming time frame, working with customers to ensure
7 that Oracle got a purchase order before the start date of the contract, and answering customer
8 questions. *Id.* at 9/16/08 Cummins Tr. at 27:6-23. This document is both an employee party and
9 adoptive admission, as Cummins manifests a belief in the truth of the statements in the
10 presentation by attaching and sending it to senior employees.

11 *Response to Oracle's Argument:* Defendants seek to admit this document as a party
12 admission; Oracle's description is misleading. The Power Point contains what Madsen
13 characterizes as "a thorough analysis" of "At-Risk" accounts, not a single customer statement.
14 Vol. 1 (A-6205-1). The "customer concerns" slide identified by Oracle is in fact merely a list of
15 factors that generally indicate a customer might be "at risk" of leaving Oracle support, which
16 arises out of that "thorough analysis." *Id.* The slide repeats no customer statements.

17 *Defendants' Trial Exhibit A-5193:* Admitted at the prior trial (Vol. 1 (Found. for A-
18 5193) at 11/16/10 Trial Tr. at 1625:9-10), this is an email from James McLeod to Richard
19 Cummins on the status of certain Oracle customers, to which Cummins responds with an action
20 plan. McLeod was a regional manager in the support sales group under Cummins. *Id.* at 9/16/08
21 Cummins Tr. at 82:22-83:2, 85:10-12. His statements all relate to Oracle customers at issue,
22 including Honeywell and Acushnet, and to his support sales responsibilities. *Id.* at Pls.' Resp. &
23 Objs. to Interrogatory No. 98 at 6, 18. Cummins was the Senior Director of Support Renewals at
24 Oracle and McLeod's boss at the time.⁹ *Id.* at 9/16/08 Cummins Tr. at 82:22-83:8. Thus, this
25 document and McLeod's statements are directly related to his responsibilities. Further, Cummins
26 affirmatively responds to McLeod's email and manifests a belief in the truth of his statements.

27 ⁹ Cummins oversaw regional support sales managers, including, but not limited to, James
28 McLeod, Robert Lachs, James Blackford, and Jordan Rowe-McCune. Vol. 1 (Found. for A-
5193) at 9/16/08 Cummins Tr. at 82:22-83:8.

1 *Response to Oracle's Argument:* Defendants seek to admit this document as a party
2 admission and do not seek to “circumvent” the Court’s previous rulings on the At-Risk Report.
3 Rather, the statements identified in this email—not the At-Risk Report—are recitations of facts
4 and beliefs about the customers. Here, an Oracle sales representative was reporting to his boss
5 the reasons he understood the identified customers cancelled Oracle support. Oracle’s
6 understanding is some evidence of why those customers cancelled.

7 **C. Statements by Customers.**

8 Contemporaneous communications and business records by customers provide relevant
9 evidence of the economic factors in play when customers chose to cancel Oracle support or
10 purchase SAP software. In addition to adoptive admissions, these statements by customers are
11 admissible either as non-hearsay evidence of state of mind or under the “state of mind” exception
12 to the hearsay rule. If the statement supports an inference about a customer’s state of mind, it
13 may be admitted for this non-hearsay purpose. *CytoSport, Inc. v. Vital Pharms., Inc.*, 617 F.
14 Supp. 2d 1051, 1074 (E.D. Cal. 2009) (finding consumers’ and dealers’ statements admissible
15 evidence of their “then-existing state of mind” and not hearsay). Or if the statement is a direct
16 “statement of the declarant’s then-existing state of mind . . . such as motive, intent, or plan,” it
17 may be admissible under the hearsay exception set forth by Rule 803(3). Fed. R. Evid. 803(3).
18 This hearsay exception rule has three requirements: (1) that the statement be contemporaneous
19 with the state of mind described, (2) that the declarant had no time or motive to misrepresent his
20 or her thoughts, and (3) that the declarant’s state of mind is relevant. *United States v. Ponticelli*,
21 622 F.2d 985, 991 (9th Cir. 1980); *Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co., Inc.*, 774 F. Supp. 1514, 1526
22 (E.D. Wis. 1991), *vacated in part and remanded in part on other grounds*, 56 F.3d 1538, 1555-56
23 (Fed. Cir. 1995). Courts frequently admit such statements to prove customers’ motivations for
24 ceasing to do business with a party. *Lahoti v. Vericheck*, 636 F.3d 501, 509 (9th Cir. 2011)
25 (affirming admissibility of testimony regarding substance of customer telephone calls “for the
26 truth of the matter asserted” under state of mind exception); *CytoSport*, 617 F. Supp. 2d at 1074;
27 *Inventory Locator Serv., LLC v. Partsbase, Inc.*, No. 02-2695 Ma/V, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
28 32680, at *21 (W.D. Tenn. Sept. 6, 2005). And, importantly, Defendants need only establish that

1 the declarants were Oracle customers at the time the statements were made; no other identifying
2 evidence is required. *See Callahan v. A.E.V., Inc.*, 182 F.3d 237, 252 (3d Cir. 1999) (“The
3 relevance of [customers’] statements depends only on the fact that they were the plaintiffs’
4 customers, not their particular identities . . . [and] we do not think that the admissibility of their
5 statements under [] Rule 803(3) . . . depends on [the individual declarants] being identified.”).
6 As illustrated in the exemplars below, these statements can take the form of communications with
7 Oracle or internal customer communications.

8 ***Defendant’s Trial Exhibit A-5995:*** This email chain contains a May 10, 2006 email from
9 Ann Harten, an employee of Oracle customer Haworth, to Craig Tate and others at Oracle, titled
10 “Haworth response to Oracle proposal.” Vol. 1 (A-5995). [REDACTED]

11 [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED] *Id.* Harten’s email was
13 forwarded up the Oracle chain to Juan Jones, who stated on May 12, 2006, [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED]” *Id.* Jones was a Senior Vice President of
16 Customer Services, North America Support at Oracle from at least 2005 to 2009; his
17 responsibilities related to support sales and included leading (1) the support sales team for North
18 America, (2) the customer services management team for North America, and (3) a small group
19 that monitors acquisition and customer success. Vol. 1 (Found. for A-5995) at ORCL00034305;
20 *id.* at 9/24/09 Jones Tr. (played 11/15/10) at 20:3-6, 24:10-18, 25:3-20, 43:7-10; *id.* at 9/24/09
21 Jones Tr. at 29:12-17. By forwarding the entire contents of Harten’s statements, Jones
22 incorporated them; by acting to assign temporary coverage to the account, he manifested an
23 adoption in the truth of them. His statement, [REDACTED]

24 [REDACTED],
25 and the entire document is admissible against Oracle.

26 ***Response to Oracle’s Argument:*** Defendants seek to admit the Haworth email as an
27 adoptive admission. Although Oracle’s argument about this document is unclear, Oracle misses
28 the fundamental point articulated above. The email from the customer signals its concerns about

1 its future with Oracle, and Jones manifests his belief that these threats are true by taking the
2 action of assigning employees to the account and indicating the need to “turn this account
3 around” fast. Vol. 1 (A-5995).

4 ***Defendants’ Trial Exhibit A-5058:*** This email chain contains a January 29, 2007 email
5 from Oracle customer Vanguard Managed Solutions to Oracle employee Lori Sanabria titled “Re:
6 VanguardMS – Oracle JDE Renewal.” Vol. 2 (A-5058). [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED]”; this is evidence that Vanguard had a motive to leave Oracle
10 support other than TomorrowNow. *Id.* Such statements are admissible under Rule 803(3) to
11 demonstrate the customer’s motive to leave: The customer’s state of mind is relevant to causation
12 of damages, the statements were made contemporaneously with the communication to cancel
13 support, and there is no evidence of an intent to misrepresent, given the casual and spontaneous
14 style of the email. *Id.*

15 ***Response to Oracle’s Argument:*** Defendants seek to introduce the customer email under
16 Rule 803(3). Oracle’s only argument is that the Oracle employee did not believe the customer
17 statements, but Defendants are not required to demonstrate a lack of “skepticism” from the person
18 who received a statement for the statement to be admissible under Rule 803(3).

19 ***Defendants’ Trial Exhibit A-5002-1:*** Oracle objects that this document is hearsay and
20 not authentic, but it is neither. The document, produced pursuant to a subpoena, contains internal
21 Amgen communications and communications with TomorrowNow regarding support service
22 negotiations.¹⁰ It is admissible as non-hearsay because Defendants seek to admit it not for the
23 truth of any statement, but for the purpose of demonstrating the date on which Amgen decided to

24 _____
25 ¹⁰ Regarding authenticity, Amgen’s Executive Director Enterprise Records Management,
26 Shelia Martin, submitted a Declaration of Custodian of Records establishing that the documents
27 produced in response to a subpoena are “true, correct, and complete copies and prepared by
28 Amgen’s personnel in the ordinary course of their duties at or near the time of the events
recorded.” Vol. 2 (A-5002-1) at 5. Because it is undisputed that these documents were produced
in response to a subpoena, they are deemed authentic under Rule 901. *MGM Studios*, 454 F.
Supp. 2d at 972-73; *FTC v. Willms*, No. C11-828, 2011 WL 4103542, at *13 (W.D. Wash. Sept.
13, 2011).

1 contract with TomorrowNow. Specifically, the emails demonstrate that, as of late October 2005,
2 Amgen was still choosing between Oracle and TomorrowNow for support. Vol. 2 (A-5002-1).

3 This is significant because [REDACTED]
4 [REDACTED]
5 [REDACTED].

6 Further, the customer statements in this email chain
7 are admissible under Rule 803(3) because they reflect the customer's then-existing state of mind.
8 These are internal Amgen employee statements, so there is no motive for fabrication, and the
9 information is directly relevant to when Amgen selected TomorrowNow.

10 *Response to Oracle's Argument:* Defendants seek to introduce this document as non-
11 hearsay or under Rule 803(3). First, contrary to Oracle's assertion, this evidence is relevant to
12 why customers such as Amgen should be excluded from the damages calculation, even though
13 Oracle's damages expert fails to exclude many customers with the same fact patterns. Further,
14 the document is being offered for the non-hearsay purpose of showing the date on which a
15 decision was pending, to show that the SAP decision came first. Finally, the state of mind
16 Defendants plan to show with the email is "undecided," which is entirely relevant to the question
17 of causation, as TomorrowNow did not cause the SAP sales where the customer remained
18 undecided on TomorrowNow even after purchasing SAP.

19 **D. At-Risk Report.**

20 The At-Risk Report contains several categories of information, such as the number of
21 customers at risk of leaving Oracle, contract revenue amounts, win/loss statistics, and a "notes"
22 field with Oracle employee statements and customer statements, both relating to customers'
23 reasons for leaving Oracle. Although it is now convenient for Oracle to cast doubt on the
24 trustworthiness of the At-Risk Report statements, during discovery, Oracle's counsel argued that
25 discovery regarding customers should be limited because the Report was sufficient and "ha[d]
26 enormous detail about all customers lost to third parties. This is a gift . . . [it] goes a very long
27 way in compiling, in one unit . . . the various customers that were actually in play; what happened
28 to them; what kind of financial losses on a one-year period were associated with them." Vol. 2
(At-Risk Found.) at 2/13/08 Hrg. Tr. at 152:24-153:3. Oracle further agreed that the Report is a

1 business record and previously objected only to “transcribed customer statements” in the “notes”
2 field. Vol. 2 (At-Risk Found.) at 9/30/10 Hrg. Tr. at 10:15-12:14 (stating “[w]e’re not contending
3 that the reports themselves are not . . . business records”).¹¹ Defendants will offer
4 (1) unchallenged portions of the Report (*i.e.*, all fields except the “notes” field), (2) portions on
5 which Meyer relied to form his opinions, which the Court previously found admissible (ECF No.
6 914 (9/30/10 Order) at 1-2), and (3) select excerpts of the “notes” field under the three evidentiary
7 bases discussed above.

8 With regard to the select excerpts of the “notes” field, contrary to Oracle’s assertion, this
9 is not a retread of previously presented issues. Before the first trial, Oracle moved *in limine* to
10 categorically exclude only the portions of the At-Risk Report containing “transcribed comments
11 from customers.” ECF No. 737 (O’s MIL) at 13-17; Vol. 2 (At-Risk Found.) at (9/30/10 Hrg. Tr.)
12 at 10:15-12:14 (“We’re focused on just this one part of the report which are transcribed comments
13 from customers.”). Oracle did not seek to exclude specific transcribed customer statements or
14 statements by Oracle employees recorded in the report. The Court granted Oracle’s motion to
15 categorically exclude “transcribed customer statements” in the Report on the basis that
16 Defendants had not “articulated any applicable exception to the hearsay rule.” ECF No. 914
17 (9/30/10 Order) at 1-2. The Court did not rule on the admissibility of any specific transcribed
18 customers statements or any Oracle employee comments contained in the report. *See id.*

19 At trial, Defendants filed a “Motion Regarding Admissibility of Plaintiff’s At-Risk
20 Report,” which asked the Court to revisit its motion *in limine* ruling and admit the Report in its

21 ¹¹ Oracle conceded that the At-Risk Report is a business record, as evidenced by Rule
22 30(b)(6) testimony from employees Cummins and Elizabeth Shippy, Special Programs Manager.
23 Shippy created report entries “at or near the time . . . from information transmitted by [] someone
24 with knowledge,” and did so as part of “a regularly conducted activity of a business.” Fed. R.
25 Evid. 803(6)(A)-(B); *see also* Vol. 2 (At-Risk Found.) at 9/25/08 Shippy Tr. at 88:12-23, 89:4-11.
26 The Report was kept in the course of “a regularly conducted activity of a business” because it was
27 “a regular practice” of the sales division to track cancellations. Fed. R. Evid. 803(6)(B)-(C); *see*
28 *also* Vol. 2 (At-Risk Found.) at 9/25/08 Shippy Tr. at 106:4-14. And “[n]either the source of
information nor the method or circumstances of preparation indicate a lack of trustworthiness.”
Fed. R. Evid. 803(6)(E); Vol. 2 (At-Risk Found.) at 9/23/08 Cummins Tr. at 305:7-18 (sales
representatives knew customer’s information “because it was . . . their account”). Indeed, Oracle
management required the data to be collected and regularly reported. Vol. 2 (At-Risk Found.) at
9/25/08 Shippy Tr. at 82:2-3, 82:5-12 (“The management team has requested that if a contract is
at risk that the renewal rep needs to document what’s been going on with the account, what steps
have been taken, and that once again goes in as notes . . .”).

1 entirety, including transcribed customer statements. *See* ECF No. 986 (Defs.’ Mot. re:
2 Admissibility of Pls.’ At-Risk Report). The Court denied this motion from the bench, explaining
3 that “the customer statements still, in my view, are hearsay” *See* Vol. 2 (At-Risk Found.) at
4 (11/16/10 Trial Tr.) at 1528:10-1529:1. The Court noted, however, that it “did not read the
5 voluminous documents that you all submitted because I didn’t have an opportunity to do so.” *Id.*
6 Consequently, the Court did not make a specific ruling as to the admissibility of any specific
7 entry, which is what Defendants now request, and Defendants will establish that those excerpts
8 qualify under applicable hearsay exceptions or exemptions, as described below. Notably, Oracle
9 does not challenge the information in the narrow entries Defendants now seek to admit as
10 untrustworthy or unreliable; rather, Oracle takes the position that they are not party admissions.

11 ***Party Admission—Merck Excerpt:*** This entry states, ‘ [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED].’ Vol. 2 (A-
15 0059 (Merck)). This excerpt is relevant because it tends to prove that TomorrowNow was not the
16 cause of Merck’s SAP software purchase. It does not record a “transcribed customer statement,”
17 but rather is an Oracle employee’s recitation of facts about Merck’s support renewal. Barbara
18 Sharp-Moore is identified as the support sales manager for this entry. *Id.* This is corroborated by
19 Oracle’s discovery response stating that Sharpe-Moore was involved with the Merck account.
20 Vol. 2 (A-0059 (Merck)) at Pls.’ Resp. & Objs. to Interrogatory No. 98 at 22. Because all of the
21 entries in the Report were provided by an Oracle support sales representative for the particular
22 account for which he or she was responsible, this entry is a statement made by an Oracle
23 employee related to the scope of his or her employment. Vol. 2 (At-Risk Found.) at 9/25/08
24 Shippy Tr. at 82:2-3, 82:5-12, 88:12-23, 89:4-11; *id.* at 3/5/09 Shippy Tr. at 40:3-41:10; *id.* at
25 9/23/08 Cummins Tr. at 303:15-304:3, 305:7-18, 309:21-23. Because the Report itself is
26 admissible as a business record, this entry is admissible under Rule 801(d)(2)(D).

27 ***Response to Oracle’s Argument:*** Oracle admits that this entry contains no customer
28 quotes, but nonetheless continues to argue that it is hearsay. However, as with many of the

1 admissions, the Oracle sales representative provides her understanding of the account's status.
2 The fact that this understanding comes from her conversations with the customer indicates only
3 that these admissions in fact were within the scope of her employment. Further, the case cited by
4 Oracle is inapposite. It does not concern the use of a party's own documents as party admissions,
5 which is the situation here, but rather the attempt to use a third-party's handwritten transcription
6 of a telephone conversation with the defendants as a party admission against the defendants. *See*
7 *In re Cirrus Logic Secs. Litig.*, 946 F. Supp. 1446, 1468-70 (N.D. Cal. 1996).

8 ***Adoptive Admission—Stora Enso Excerpt:*** This entry states:



17 Vol. 2 (A-0059 (Stora Enso)) (emphasis added). This excerpt is relevant because it tends to
18 prove that the customer purchased SAP software because of a parent company mandate, not
19 because of TomorrowNow. Importantly, the comments appear to originate from a June 19, 2006
20 Oracle email from Barbara Allario to Robert Lachs. Vol. 1 (A-5042). These statements are
21 employee party admissions. Lachs is identified as the support sale manager for this entry. Vol. 2
22 (A-0059 (Stora Enso)). This is consistent with Oracle's discovery response stating that he was
23 involved with the Stora Enso account. Vol. 2 (Found. for A-00591 (Stora Enso)) at Pls.' Resp. &
24 Objs. to Interrogatory No. 98 at 22. Incorporating these admissible comments into the Report
25 further shows they were "adopted" by Oracle. This illustrates a key point: The At-Risk Report
26 entries were taken directly from typical communications authored by support sales employees
27 about customer activities. That these communications were imported into a separate document
28 does not change their nature and admissibility; it reinforces the reliability and admissibility of the

1 information contained in them.

2 *Response to Oracle's Argument:* Oracle focuses on one specific line entry to argue that
3 this entire excerpt is inadmissible. The entry Oracle focuses on notes that the customer felt that
4 Oracle could not match the TomorrowNow offering was clearly adopted by Oracle as in a
5 subsequent entry (dated 7-14-06) the statement is that Oracle could not match the offering. Vol.
6 2 (A-0059 (Stora Enso)). For all of these reasons, this entry is admissible.

7 **E. Response to Oracle's Counter-Examples Below.**

8 Below, Oracle lists "counter-examples" to the At-Risk Report entries and the other
9 exemplars described above. With regard to the At-Risk entries cited by Oracle, Defendants are
10 not offering any of these as substantive evidence. Defendants, of course, reserve the right to use
11 the entries relied on by Meyer during his cross-examination, as allowed by the Court's prior
12 orders, but Oracle does not appear to dispute this point here. As for the other exemplars, Oracle
13 argues only that they are not adoptive admissions. Defendants briefly respond as follows:

14 *Defendants' Trial Exhibit A-5663:* Although Defendants do not agree with Oracle's
15 position, at this time, Defendants do not plan to offer this document in their case-in-chief. Should
16 Oracle open the door to the statements made in the document through cross-examination of
17 Defendants' witnesses or otherwise contradict the statements in the document, Defendants may
18 seek to admit this document at that time as impeachment or rebuttal evidence.

19 *Defendants' Trial Exhibit A-0225:* This is an email and list of customers that
20 "reinstated" Oracle support, generated from the At-Risk Report. Oracle's objection, therefore, is
21 the same as that discussed above regarding the "notes" fields. Defendants believe the Court's
22 guidance on whether the types of entries proposed above are admissible will resolve this issue.

23 *Defendants' Trial Exhibit A-4089:* As indicated on Defendants' exhibit list, the email
24 exchange Defendants seek to admit is the top exchange between Jeff Henley, Chairman of the
25 Board, and Safra Catz, Oracle's CFO. Even under Oracle's expansive theory of customer
26 statements, there are none here, as Oracle completely ignores this exchange and focuses on one
27 part of one earlier email from Richard Cummins and requests wholesale preclusion of the
28 document. Vol. 2 (A-4089). Although Defendants do not believe Oracle's reading of this email

1 is correct (the email shows that Cummins believes that there is not a legitimate concern for this
2 customer, as the customer “did not indicate a threat of TomorrowNow” and so adopts the
3 statement), Defendants are not seeking to admit this portion of the document.

4 ***Defendants’ Trial Exhibit A-6086:*** This document is admissible as an employee party
5 admission. Brian Mitchell is a Senior Vice President, License and Consulting, in Oracle’s Asia
6 Pacific region, and he is providing this information to Charles Phillips, Oracle’s then-co-
7 President. Vol. 2 (A-6080); Vol. 2 (Found. for A-6086) at ORCL00034188. Oracle identifies no
8 customer statement and what it does point to shows that this is Mitchell’s understanding and
9 analysis based on the information he has received. This objection underscores how the Court’s
10 guidance will help resolve additional disputes.

11 **ORACLE’S POSITION**

12 **A. The At Risk Report**

13 SAP asks the Court to admit into evidence instances of customer hearsay contained within
14 the “notes” column of the At Risk report. The Court has considered and rejected this same
15 motion twice before and should do so again.

16 In its motion *in limine* prior to the first trial – which this Court granted – Oracle detailed
17 the nature of the customer hearsay in the At Risk report notes column. Dkt. 737 (Pls.’ 8/5/10
18 Mot. *in Limine*) at 13-17. The At Risk report “only list[s] customers *who tell us* they are
19 evaluating other 3rd party support providers.” Motamed Decl. Ex. E at ORCL00132444 (internal
20 Oracle email from Elizabeth Shippy) (emphasis supplied). If a customer told an Oracle support
21 sales representative any reasons for dropping or considering dropping support, the representative
22 was supposed to email that information to Elizabeth Shippy, who then “cut and pasted it directly
23 from the e-mail into the database.” Motamed Decl. Ex. F (Cummins 9/23/08 Rule 30(b)(6)
24 Depo.) at 269:5-10, 269:16-18; *see also id.*, Ex. G (Shippy 3/5/09 Depo.) at 49:3-5, 54:19-22,
25 56:2-11. Customer comments in the notes field were simply a record of what the representative
26 reported the customer said. Oracle did not verify whether the comments were accurate, and they
27 were not particularly or uniformly reliable. Motamed Decl. Ex. F (Cummins 9/23/08 Rule
28 30(b)(6) Depo.) at 269:21-25 (“[T]he information came from customers as best we could get it.

1 Customers were not, you know, customers give you what they want -- want you to have. So
2 there's certainly limitations with that."). Customers sometimes gave inaccurate information to
3 Oracle on the subject. *E.g.*, Motamed Decl. Ex. H at ORCL00127354 (internal Oracle email from
4 Robert Lachs to Rick Cummins stating, "It turns out [customer] was purposefully dishonest (or
5 'vague' as they elect to phrase it) keeping us at bay while a) not telling us the renewal was at risk
6 . . .")); Motamed Decl. Ex. I at ORCL00033223 [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED]). The information in the
9 At Risk report notes column is classic, unreliable hearsay.

10 1. Procedural History

11 The Court previously ruled on two fully briefed requests on this issue, in which
12 Defendants made the exact same arguments as they do now. On both occasions, the Court
13 rejected SAP's request to admit customer hearsay, and the Court should do so again here.
14 Before the first trial, Oracle moved *in limine* to exclude customer hearsay contained in the At
15 Risk report. Dkt. 737 at 13-17. In their opposition, Defendants argued for admission of the At
16 Risk report because, according to them, the customer statements it contains are "adoptive
17 admissions and not hearsay; . . . offered for other non-hearsay purposes including the customer's
18 state of mind . . . ; and [because] Meyer relied on the At Risk report" Dkt. 791 at 7. The
19 Court rejected Defendants' arguments and held "[t]he customer statements are hearsay, and SAP
20 has not articulated any applicable exception to the hearsay rule." Dkt. 914 (9/30/10 Final Pretrial
21 Order) at 1.

22 During trial, Defendants asked for leave to move for reconsideration regarding the
23 admissibility of the notes section in the At Risk report, leading to this exchange:

24 Court: "My understanding was you were raising a different ground
25 than you raised before. I haven't had a chance to read it, but it
26 appears to me that you are now arguing that the appropriate hearsay
27 exception would be for adoptive admission?"

27 Mr. Lanier: That's correct, Your honor.

28 Court: Which is not something you argued before; is that the
position you are taking?

1 Mr. Lanier: Yes, Your Honor.”
2 Motamed Decl. Ex. J (11/15/10 Trial. Tr.) at 1510:3-10. Defendants’ statement to the Court was
3 untrue – in fact, Defendants’ opposition to Oracle’s motion *in limine* regarding the At Risk report
4 identified the adoptive admission exception as a basis for admissibility in an *argument heading*,
5 and the Court had rejected that argument. Dkt. 791 at 9-10. On Defendant’s motion for
6 reconsideration, the Court again denied Defendants’ request, holding “ these customer comments
7 weren’t adopted by Oracle . . . [s]o, therefore, the customer comments still, in my view, are
8 hearsay, and they’re not sufficiently reliable” Motamed Decl. Ex. J at (11/16/10 Trial Tr.) at
9 1528:18-1529:1.

10 Now, Defendants ask for a third time to admit the customer hearsay in the notes section of
11 the At Risk report.¹² See Section III(D); Dkt. 1139 (“Defs. Trial Brief”) at 17-20. As the Court
12 noted at the pre-trial conference, it has previously ruled on this very issue, and it should not
13 revisit its previous rulings excluding the customer hearsay. See Motamed Decl. Ex. K (5/24/12
14 Hrg. Tr.) at 127:19-128:5. However, even if the Court were to consider this issue a third time,
15 without requiring Defendants to meet the Local Rule 7-9 criteria to move for reconsideration,
16 Defendants’ arguments would still fail on the merits.

17 2. Hearsay within Hearsay

18 The customer comments in the At Risk report are hearsay within hearsay under Fed. R.
19 Evid. 805. See *United States v. Arteaga*, 117 F.3d 388, 396 n.12 (9th Cir. 1997) (“The problem
20 of customer-supplied information can be analyzed as ‘hearsay within hearsay.’ In such ‘double
21 hearsay’ situations, each statement must qualify under some exemption or exception to the
22 hearsay rule.”); see also *id.* at 395 (“Courts that have applied this principle to [business] records
23 have generally held that customer-supplied information on [the recorded forms], which is not
24 verified, should be excluded”).

25 Unlike the At Risk report itself, the customer comments in the notes column are not
26 business records because “[t]hat exception applies only if the person furnishing the information to

27 _____
28 ¹² Unlike during trial, this time Defendants have not asked the Court for leave to file a
motion for reconsideration and have violated Civil Local Rule 7-9 as a result.

1 be recorded is acting routinely, under a duty of accuracy, with employer reliance on the result, or
2 in short in the regular course of business.” *United States v. Pazsint*, 703 F.2d 420, 424 (9th Cir.
3 1983) (internal quotations omitted). As described above, there is no evidence that the various
4 (and sometimes unidentified) customer personnel who supplied the underlying information acted
5 under that duty, or that they had final or influential decision-making authority for that customer.
6 To the contrary, it is to be expected that in any negotiation in which millions of dollars are at
7 stake, customer representatives will bluff or exaggerate in an effort to obtain the most favorable
8 terms. *See, e.g.*, Motamed Decl. Ex. A (A-5663) at ORCL00131232 (internal Oracle document
9 discussing customer Quad/Graphics, stating “8-26-04: [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED].”) (emphasis supplied). In addition, Oracle did not verify the accuracy of customer
15 comments. Oracle employees simply pasted or paraphrased the customer statements into the
16 notes field of the At Risk reports, and the evidence shows that these customers’ comments may
17 not be truthful. The Court should not permit SAP to present this unreliable evidence to the jury.

18 In addition, in at least some cases, Defendants seek to admit untested hearsay regarding
19 customers that the Parties actually deposed. For example A-5002-1 relates to Amgen, and A-
20 5193 relates to Honeywell, both of whom gave deposition testimony in this case. If Defendants
21 want to submit evidence related to those customers’ motives and states of mind, they should rely
22 on their actual testimony, not second- or third-hand reports of what the customers may have said
23 or intimated during negotiations. Indeed, Judge Legge directed Defendants to do exactly that.
24 *See* Motamed Decl. Ex. L (2/13/08 Hrg. Tr.) at 112:21-113:01 (Judge Legge: “If you are going to
25 . . . raise lack of causation -- aren’t you going to have to go to the individual clients . . . ?
26 [T]hat’s where the evidence is going to be.”).

27 As before, Defendants only offer two hearsay exemptions or exceptions under which the
28 Court could admit this unreliable second level of hearsay: as an adoptive admission, or as state of

1 mind evidence.¹³ Neither applies here.

2 3. Adoptive Admissions

3 Last trial, this Court ruled that “these customer comments weren’t adopted by Oracle” and
4 “[i]n fact, to the extent that some of the comments were complaints, it would be odd to find that
5 Oracle adopted them as their own.” Motamed Decl. Ex. J (11/16/10 Trial Tr.) at 1528:20-22.
6 Defendants nevertheless resurrect this same argument, and it must fail again.

7 An Oracle employee does not “incorporate” or “adopt” customer hearsay merely by
8 forwarding customer comments in an email or compiling them in a chart; adoption requires an
9 affirmative acceptance of the statement. *See In re Oil Spill*, MDL No. 2179, 2012 WL 85447
10 (E.D. La. 2012) (“[A] forwarded email is only an adoptive admission *if it is clear* that the
11 forwarder adopted the content or believed in the truth of the content.”) (emphasis supplied);
12 *MGM Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.*, 454 F. Supp. 2d 966, 973 (C.D. Cal. 2006) (third-party
13 statements incorporated into a party’s emails are only admissible as vicarious admissions “*to the*
14 *extent the [party] agent expresses approval thereof*”) (emphasis supplied). Defendants cite as an
15 example a case where a party adopted, by forwarding with approving commentary, an email
16 written by its own employee (as opposed to an unverified third party statement). *See Sea-Land*
17 *Servs., Inc. v. Lozen Int’l, LLC*, 285 F.3d 808, 821 (9th Cir. 2002).¹⁴ Here, by contrast, Oracle
18 employees do not know whether what a customer said is true, especially in the context of
19 negotiations where customers often misrepresent facts. *See* Motamed Decl. Ex. F (Cummins
20 9/23/08 Rule 30(b)(6) Depo.) at 269:21-25; *id.*, Ex. H at ORCL00127354; *id.*, Ex. A (A-5663) at

21 ¹³ Defendants also argue that Oracle employees’ *own* statements are admissible as party
22 admissions under Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2)(D). Dkt. 1139 (Defs.’ Trial Brief) at 10-13. A
23 document does not qualify as a party admission under Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2) simply because it
24 was written by an Oracle employee. For each purported admission, Defendants must “lay a
25 foundation to show that an otherwise excludable statement relates to a matter within the scope of
26 the agent’s employment.” *Breneman v. Kennecott Corp.*, 799 F.2d 470, 473 (9th Cir. 1986); *see*
also Motamed Decl. Ex. O (11/12/2010 Trial Tr.) at 1209:9-12. Customer statements, however,
Even if Defendants can lay the foundation that an Oracle employee’s statement is an Oracle admission under Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2)(D), Fed. R. Evid. 805 prohibits the introduction of customer hearsay contained in the Oracle document unless Defendants can prove it falls within another applicable hearsay exception.

27 ¹⁴ The other case Defendants cite, *Boyer v. Gildea*, is inapposite. The adopted admission
28 at issue was a *party-authored* attachment, which a *party employee* had revised. Its inclusion as an
attachment to a third party’s email was irrelevant to the court’s holding. *See Boyer v. Gildea*,
Case No. 1:05-CV-129-TLS, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21310, at *22-23 (N.D. Ind. Feb. 21, 2012).

1 ORCL00131232. Thus, as the Court has acknowledged, it would be “odd” for Oracle to approve
2 of or adopt such unverified statements as its own. *Id.*, Ex. J (11/16/10 Trial Tr.) at 1528:19-22.

3 4. State of Mind

4 Like Defendants’ adoptive admission claims, the Court previously rejected the argument
5 that the At Risk notes constitute non-hearsay reflections of the customers’ state of mind or
6 admissible state-of-mind evidence under Fed. R. Evid. 803(3). Dkt. 914 at 1. The Court should
7 do so again, for four reasons.

8 First, as the Court previously recognized, Defendants offer state of mind evidence to
9 prove the truth of the matter asserted. Defendants intend to offer customer hearsay “to prove
10 customers’ motivations for ceasing to do business” with Oracle. Section III(C), *supra*; Dkt. 1139
11 (Defs. Trial Brief) at 16. In this case, because the customers’ reasons for leaving Oracle are a
12 central issue, offering a customer’s statement to show customer “motive” is simply offering it for
13 the truth of the matter. Motamed Decl. Ex. M (9/30/10 Hrg. Tr.) at 16:6-8 (Court observing that
14 “state of mind” and “truth of the matter” “tend[] to meld in these circumstances”).

15 Second, for the same reason, Defendants cannot invoke Fed. R. Civ. 803(3) to admit
16 factual assertions by customers under the auspices of “customer motive” statements. “The
17 exclusion of ‘statements of . . . belief to prove the fact . . . believed’ is necessary to avoid the
18 virtual destruction of the hearsay rule which would otherwise result from allowing state of mind,
19 provable to a hearsay statement, to serve as the basis for an inference of the happening of the
20 event which produced the state of mind.” Fed. R. Evid. 803(3) advisory committee note (citing
21 *Shepard v. United States*, 290 U.S. 96 (1933)). For example, Defendants cannot offer a
22 customer’s out-of-court statement that it was in the process of transitioning to SAP – a factual
23 assertion – as evidence of that customer’s “motive” to cancel Oracle support. *See* discussion re
24 A-5997 & A-6042-1. Otherwise, Fed. R. Evid. 803(3) would be an exception that swallows the
25 entire hearsay rule in a case like this where customer motive is at issue.

26 Third, Defendants concede that the state of mind exception requires evidence that the
27 declarant “had no . . . motive to misrepresent himself.” Section III(C); Dkt. 1139 (Defs. Trial
28 Brief) at 16 (citing *U.S. v. Ponticelli*, 622 F.2d 985, 991 (9th Cir. 1980)). However, these

1 statements occur in the context of renewal negotiations, where customers had a clear motive to –
2 and routinely did – posture and misrepresent their positions. *See, e.g.*, Motamed Decl. Ex. H at
3 ORCL00127354 (internal Oracle email from Robert Lachs to Rick Cummins stating, “It turns out
4 [customer] was purposefully dishonest (or ‘vague’ as they elect to phrase it) keeping us at bay
5 while a) not telling us the renewal was at risk . . .”); *id.*, Ex. A (A-5663) at ORCL00131232
6 (internal Oracle document doubting the veracity of a customer employee’s statements about their
7 intention to and stated reasons for wanting to leave Oracle).

8 Fourth, it is doubtful that individual employee statements can be used under Fed. R. Evid.
9 803(3) to prove the state of mind of corporate entities like the customers in this case. To the
10 extent they reflect anything, the comments in the At Risk report reflect at most only the *then-*
11 *existing* state of mind of a single customer employee. Defendants offer this evidence as proof of
12 a future or speculative event: whether the corporate customer entity *would have left or eventually*
13 *did leave Oracle support anyway*, for reasons unrelated to TN’s conduct. This makes the
14 comments even more attenuated, and even less reliable.

15 Moreover, Defendants’ cited authorities are inapposite. Their primary cases, *CytoSport*
16 and *Lahoti*, are trademark cases that discuss the unrelated narrow issue of whether customer
17 statements are admissible to prove the element of customer “confusion” in trademark cases. *See*
18 *CytoSport, Inc. v. Vital Pharms., Inc.*, 617 F. Supp. 2d 1051, 1074 (E.D. Cal. 2009); *Lahoti v.*
19 *Vericheck*, 636 F.3d 501, 509 (9th Cir. 2011). Furthermore, as the *CytoSport* court explains, most
20 courts that admit a customer statement as evidence of “customer confusion” do so because it is
21 “not being offered for the truth of the matter asserted by the confused customer . . . , but rather for
22 the fact that the confusing statement was observed by the employee.” *Cytosport*, 671 F. Supp. 2d
23 at 1074. That is not the case here; Defendants offer these statements for the truth of the matter
24 asserted by a customer employee – why the employer might have left Oracle – not the fact that a
25 customer was confused or considered leaving.

26 5. Defendants’ Examples

27 In their trial brief, Defendants cite two hand-picked “exemplars” from the At Risk report
28 notes. Even these examples – which do not fairly represent the overall customer comments in the

1 At Risk report – demonstrate why the Court should continue to exclude this hearsay.

2 **a. Entry Regarding Merck**

3 Defendants argue their first example is a party admission that contains no “transcribed
4 customer statement,” but rather is an Oracle employee’s recitation of the facts about Merck
5 support renewal.” Section III(D) (Party Admission—Merck Excerpt). Extensive testimony by
6 Oracle employees about the nature of At Risk reports and the source of its notes field contradicts
7 that characterization. Even in the absence of direct quotations, these are inadmissible notes
8 reflecting a sales rep’s conversations with customers. *See, e.g.,* Motamed Decl. Ex. N (9/25/08
9 Shippy Depo.) at 81:4-13 (asking where notes of “communications [that] have happened between
10 the sales rep and the customer” would be collected); *Id.* Ex. G (3/5/09 Shippy Depo.) at 92:15-17
11 (“[T]his report was as good as the information that we received from the rep, which then received
12 the information directly from the customer.”)

13 The language in the Merck entry supports this view. It describes a scheduled upcoming
14 conference call and details how an Oracle representative visited (and spoke with) Merck about the
15 renewal. A-0059 (Merck & Company Incorporated entry). Written notes that paraphrase
16 customer hearsay are just as unreliable as direct quotations by out-of-court declarants. *See, e.g.,*
17 *In re Cirrus Logic Securities Litigation*, 946 F. Supp. 1446, 1468-70 (N.D. Cal. 1996) (analyst’s
18 notes “representing his interpretation of what was said [by the other party to the conversation]
19 may not be considered trustworthy evidence of [the other party’s] statements” and are
20 inadmissible hearsay).

21 **b. Entry Regarding Stora Enso**

22 Defendants’ other exemplar, the Stora Enso entry, exemplifies the hearsay nature of the At
23 Risk report notes column. A-0059 (Stora Enso North America Corp entry). Contrary to
24 Defendants’ assertions, the May 22, 2006 entry identifies an email and a phone call with the
25 customer as the information source. Later updates reference more calls with the customer. *Id.*
26 (“ [REDACTED]
27 [REDACTED].”). This entry also demonstrates the unreliability of treating statements by an
28 individual customer contact as an indication of a customer’s state of mind; [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED]”) Moreover, this entry includes
4 references to a parent company and communications between the parent company and Stora
5 Enso, which implicates yet another level of unreliable hearsay.

6 Defendants’ argument that these statements are “adoptive admissions” fails for the reasons
7 set forth above. Defendants emphasize a “key point,” “[t]hat these communications were
8 imported into a separate document does not change their nature and admissibility. . . .” Section
9 III(D) (Adoptive Admission—Stora Enso Excerpt). Oracle agrees: merely compiling customer
10 hearsay into a report does not constitute an adoption. No evidence suggests Oracle employees
11 approved or adopted these statements; rather, evidence indicates Oracle regarded such statements
12 with suspicion. Defendants have the burden to lay the foundation that (a) the customer
13 representative had authority to make these statements and (b) Oracle verified or expressly
14 approved of them. Defendants have provided no evidence in support of either prong.

15 **6. Oracle’s Counter-Examples**

16 Many At Risk report notes include direct recitations of inadmissible customer statements
17 that were transcribed, paraphrased or copy-and-pasted by sales reps. *E.g.*, A-0059 (Vornado
18 Realty entry) (“ [REDACTED]
19 [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED]
21 [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED]
25 [REDACTED]
26 [REDACTED]

27 [REDACTED]) These examples further demonstrate why, the Court should
28 abide by its prior rulings and categorically exclude the At Risk report notes column as unreliable

1 hearsay that does not fit within any applicable exception.

2 **B. Defendants' Other Examples**

3 In addition to the At Risk report customer notes, SAP has identified ten other “examples”
4 of customer hearsay that it asks this Court to admit. To admit as much unverifiable, unreliable
5 customer evidence as possible, Defendants oversimplify the issue by effectively asking the Court
6 to consider only one question for most of their “exemplar” emails: did an Oracle executive or
7 sales person author an email about a customer? If so, Defendants ask the Court to admit that
8 entire email (and in some cases, multiple prior emails in the email thread) as a party admission.
9 By characterizing any and all content in Oracle internal emails as “party admissions,” Defendants
10 obscure the fact that many of these internal Oracle emails – just like the notes section of the At
11 Risk report – merely relay inadmissible customer hearsay. Such emails (or, at the very least, such
12 reported customer statements) are not admissible as party admissions, just as the notes section of
13 the at-risk report is inadmissible. *See* Section III(A)(1), above.

14 To the extent Defendants’ “exemplar” Oracle emails contain customer statements and/or
15 relay statements from customers, Fed. R. Evid. 805 requires Defendants to offer an independent
16 hearsay exception that permits the admission of the underlying customer hearsay. For this and
17 the other reasons set forth in detail above regarding customer hearsay in the At Risk report notes
18 column, the Court should exclude this inadmissible hearsay. *See* Section III(A)(2)-(4), above.

19 **1. Party Admissions & Adoptive Admissions**

20 **a. A-6329-1**

21 Defendants urge the Court to admit as a party admission a November 2, 2004 internal
22 Oracle email about customer Computer Associates (“CA”). A-6329. Defendants argue this email
23 is evidence that “SAP won CA’s business . . . not because of TomorrowNow.” Section III(A);
24 *see also* Dkt. 1139 (Defs. Trial Brief) at 12. As a general matter, a statement in an Oracle internal
25 email qualifies as a party admission only if it satisfies the foundational requirements of Fed. R.
26 Evid. 801(d)(2)(D). Defendants therefore urge the Court to admit this email in its entirety
27 because the Oracle executives in this email “are speaking within the scope of their employment . .
28 . . .” Section III(A). However, A-6329-1 includes five separate, specific assertions about the

1 customer, which are not – and cannot be – party admissions. The first line of the email indicates
2 that these assertions are “feedback” that the author of this Oracle internal email got from “Jeff,”
3 an unidentified individual who presumably worked in an unknown position at CA. A-6329 at
4 ORCL00647146-47. Just like the At Risk report notes, these paraphrased customer statements
5 are inadmissible hearsay for which Defendants have articulated no applicable hearsay exception.

6 **b. A-0367**

7 Exhibit A-0367 is another internal Oracle email that Defendants would have this court
8 admit as a party admission, even though it contains inadmissible customer hearsay. This email
9 contains relayed statements that a Home Depot employee made to Oracle: “ [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED]”).

15 Some statements by Oracle employees could, with proper foundation, be admitted as party
16 admissions. However, Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2)(D) does *not* extend to paraphrased, unverified out-
17 of-court statements by unidentified customer personnel, the veracity and basis of which Oracle
18 would have no opportunity to challenge, if admitted into evidence. The Court should not
19 categorically admit any and all customer hearsay just because it appears in the same email as a
20 statement by an Oracle employee about something within the scope of his or her employment.

21 **c. A-5042**

22 Exhibit A-5042 contains multiple levels of hearsay. This internal Oracle email about
23 customer Stora Enso is an out-of-court statement offered for the truth of the matter that contains
24 multiple levels of inadmissible hearsay under Fed. R. Evid. 805. The customer’s parent shop (in
25 Finland) spoke to the customer. *Id.* (“ [REDACTED]”).
26 The customer, in turn, passed along that statement to Derek Zeman, an Oracle employee. Like
27 the prior examples, these paraphrased customer statements are inadmissible levels of hearsay for
28 which Defendants have articulated no applicable exception, even if they can lay the foundation

1 for other statements in this Oracle internal email as party admissions. There is no evidence about
2 the customer representative’s authority or scope of responsibilities, and no evidence Oracle
3 verified the information (despite evidence that Oracle did not trust statements like this).

4 Defendants’ conclusory statement that “[a]t a minimum, Allario adopted any statements
5 by Zeman” because “she took the affirmative action of reporting to the regional manager about
6 this customer . . . and the email was then incorporated into the At-Risk Report” falls short.

7 Section III(B), n.3. As discussed above, the mere act of forwarding an email – the only act
8 Defendants identify to support their argument – does not constitute an adoption of its content; it
9 requires something more. *See In re Oil Spill*, no. 2179, 2012 WL 85447, at *4 (E.D. La. Jan. 11,
10 2012); *MGM Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.*, 454 F. Supp. 2d 966, 973 (C.D. Cal. 2006).

11 **d. A-5997**

12 A-5997 is another Oracle email that contains inadmissible customer statements and relays
13 un-adopted, customer-provided information. In an email to Jeff Henley, Craig Tate lists
14 descriptions of what an employee of customer Haworth told him about Haworth’s relationship
15 with Oracle and SAP. He discusses what Haworth believes and what it asked Oracle: content
16 that necessarily came from out-of-court statements by Haworth. *E.g., id.* at ORCL00272885 (“In
17 [REDACTED]”). These are not Oracle
18 party admissions; they are customer statements relayed by Oracle personnel.

19 Both Tate and Henley expressed skepticism that Haworth’s statements accurately
20 represented its position. Tate placed some of Haworth’s comments in quotation marks, explicitly
21 declining to adopt them. *E.g., id.* (“ [REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED]”). [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED]
25 [REDACTED]
26 [REDACTED]

27 [REDACTED]. These reactions further demonstrate that Oracle employees frequently doubted
28 customers’ statements during negotiations.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

e. A-6042-1

Defendants assert that A-6042-1 is an OSSINFO approval email that “adopts” an executive summary containing customer hearsay because it is attached to the approval email. This is not an adoptive admission, as explained above. Nothing in OSSINFO’s email indicates an adoption of the customer statements in the Executive Summary, which is unambiguous hearsay. A-6042-1 at ORCL00316127 (“ [REDACTED] [REDACTED].”) To the extent the email sent by OSSINFO constitutes a party admission, it merely indicates that the contract has been cancelled, and nothing more. Thus, Defendants have articulated no exception to justify admitting the customer statements in the Executive Summary (as distinct from the email) which, much like the At Risk report, contains inadmissible notes of unreliable and unverifiable customer statements.

f. A-6205-1

Defendants offer A-6205-1 in an attempt to circumvent the Court’s exclusion of the customer hearsay in the At Risk report notes column. This internal Oracle email attaches a PowerPoint presentation with At Risk report analysis. The final three slides include bullet-point summaries of “customer concerns” for JDE customers. A-6205 at ORCL00424025-27. These slides summarize inadmissible hearsay in the At Risk report notes column. Neither the slides, nor the email that forwards them, adopt the customers’ concerns as true or verify whether the stated concerns are legitimate. Furthermore, Defendants cannot attribute these summarized concerns to any customers relevant to this case. The “customer concerns” slides of this June 2005 document do not identify any customer by name, which means each described concern may come from customers not at issue in this lawsuit.

g. A-5193

Like A-6205-1, Defendants offer Exhibit A-5193 to circumvent the Court’s exclusion of the customer hearsay in At Risk report notes. This internal Oracle email between Rick Cummins and James McLeod includes notes about four At Risk customers. All four customer entries include statements that indicate Oracle received the information from out-of-court customer statements: “[REDACTED]”

1 [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED]
4 [REDACTED]” Neither Mr. Cummins’ nor Mr. McLeod’s statements adopt the truth of the
5 customers’ statements; rather, they merely identify these as At Risk accounts. Yet again, there is
6 no evidence about the customer representatives’ authority or the scope of their responsibilities,
7 and no evidence that Oracle verified the information (in contrast to the evidence cited multiple
8 times above that Oracle did not trust statements like these).

9 **h. A-5995**

10 Defendants argue that the customer statements in A-5995 – emails sent from customer
11 Haworth to Oracle representatives – are adoptive admissions because they were forwarded by
12 Oracle employees. Once again, the simple act of forwarding an email does not, without more,
13 constitute an adoption of the forwarded hearsay statement.

14 Further, statements in the Oracle emails indicate that Oracle employee Juan Jones’s
15 follow-up actions – which purportedly show that he adopted the customer statements – are not
16 necessarily based on the forwarded customer email. Juan Jones’ May 12, 2006 email to Yamilet
17 Torres, the last email in the thread, starts: “[REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED]” A-5995 at ORCL00272832 (emphasis supplied).

19 Ms. Torres did not receive of any of the prior emails and there is no evidence regarding the
20 conversation she had with Mr. Jones, or (contrary to Defendants’ assertions) whether that
21 conversation had anything to do with, or adopted or rejected, any of the statements in the original
22 Haworth email. Rather, [REDACTED]

23 [REDACTED],” but about which Defendants offer no information.

24 Similarly, Haworth’s May 10, 2006 email to Oracle indicates there were [REDACTED]

25 [REDACTED]” (*i.e.*, conversations) with Oracle (*id.* at ORCL00272834), but Defendants have no

26 evidence regarding the topics of the conversations or whether they influenced Oracle’s

27 subsequent actions or informed the conversation Mr. Jones had with Ms. Torres. It would be an

28 error to allow the jury to consider such unreliable hearsay evidence where there is no clear

1 indication that Oracle adopted these customer statements.

2 **2. State of Mind**

3 **a. A-5058**

4 Defendants only offer two examples of emails which they claim the Court should admit as
5 customer “state of mind” evidence. A-5058 contains a January 29, 2007 email from customer
6 Vanguard Managed Solutions (“VMS”) to Oracle. Despite the customer’s assertion [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED] (*id.* at ORCL00012139), [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED].” *Id.* at
10 ORCL00012138. This is another indication that, in the eyes of Oracle personnel, customer
11 statements are unreliable indications of the customer’s motivations.

12 In addition, Defendants’ argument that “there is no evidence of an intent to misrepresent
13 given the casual and spontaneous style of the email” is a speculative, unsupported assertion that
14 contradicts contrary evidence in the record, as discussed above.

15 **b. A-5002-1**

16 Unlike Defendants’ other examples, which are internal Oracle emails, A-5002-1 is an
17 email thread that includes emails spanning more than two months of customer Amgen’s
18 communications both internally and with TomorrowNow. Defendants offer this exhibit to
19 support their claim “that Amgen did not purchase SAP software because of TomorrowNow.”
20 Section III(C). Because Amgen was excluded from Oracle’s damages figures at the last trial (and
21 still is), A-5002-1 is not relevant if offered for this purpose. Fed. R. Evid. 401 & 402. It should
22 be excluded.¹⁵

23 To the extent Defendants offer this exhibit for any other purpose, it is inadmissible
24 hearsay in its purest form: unverified, unreliable, unchallengeable out-of-court statements offered
25 by a party to support its own case. These emails include numerous factual assertions about
26 pricing, proposed service terms, and the status of negotiations with TomorrowNow and Oracle.

27 ¹⁵ This is true of any exhibits that Defendants intend to introduce related only to customers
28 who have been excluded from Oracle’s damages calculations. They have no relevance and
should be excluded under Fed. R. Evid. 401 & 402.

1 Defendants make no representation of what “state of mind” they would offer these statements to
2 demonstrate. Rather, they seem to argue that any hearsay in this email thread (and, by extension,
3 any out-of-court statement made by customers in internal customer emails) is admissible under
4 Fed. R. Evid. 803(3) because this case concerns customer decision-making.

5 3. Oracle’s Counter-Examples

6 Defendants offer the examples discussed above as “prototypical” examples of emails that,
7 despite containing customer hearsay, they seek to admit as Oracle party admissions or state of
8 mind evidence. Section III(B). Close scrutiny of Defendants’ Trial Exhibit List (Dkt. 1136),
9 however, reveals that Defendants’ hand-picked examples (themselves inadmissible) are not
10 representative of their own proposed exhibits. To the contrary, Defendants seek to admit many
11 documents – including internal emails written by Oracle executives and sales reps – that contain
12 unambiguous, inadmissible customer hearsay to which Defendants’ offered hearsay exceptions
13 cannot apply.

14 The following counter- examples show that even where Oracle employees forwarded
15 emails relaying customers’ stated concerns or even recommended taking action in response to a
16 stated concern, Oracle did not adopt the statements or view them as reliable evidence of the
17 customer’s state of mind. *E.g.*, Motamed Decl. Ex. A (A-5663) at ORCL00131232 (internal
18 Oracle document discussing customer Quad/Graphics) (“8-26-04: [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED]
21 [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]

23 [REDACTED] Motamed Decl. Ex. B (A-0225) at p. 18/28 (11/1/06 internal Oracle email
24 from Elizabeth Shippy forwarding a reinstatement spreadsheet to Oracle personnel including
25 customer comments) (“ [REDACTED]

26 [REDACTED]

27 [REDACTED]”); Motamed Decl. Ex. C (A-4089) at ORCL00744447-48 (3/25/05 internal Oracle
28 email passing along customer concerns) (“ [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED]”); Motamed Decl.
3 Ex. D (A-6086) at ORCL00361642 (2/20/07 internal Oracle email from Brian Mitchell to Charles
4 Phillips) (“ [REDACTED]
5 [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED]”).

7 Defendants respond to these counter-examples and argue they have no current plans to
8 seek to admit several of these documents at trial. Yet this has no bearing on whether the
9 documents are inadmissible hearsay. Defendants do not deny what these documents illustrate -
10 that every document is unique and must be addressed individually. Defendants also argue
11 Oracle’s counter-examples are similar to the At Risk report, so “the Court’s guidance on whether
12 the types of entries proposed above are admissible will resolve this issue.” Oracle agrees; each of
13 these documents that relay or paraphrase customer statements are inadmissible hearsay just like
14 the notes column to the At Risk report.

15 Consequently, Oracle’s counter-examples demonstrate that, to the extent the Parties do not
16 agree on the categorical treatment of documents containing customer hearsay, the Court should
17 address admissibility on a document-by-document basis and deny Defendants’ request for
18 categorical rulings that apply to (1) all “statements by Oracle’s senior executives and
19 sales/support employees concerning selling Oracle software and support are party admissions”
20 and (2) all “statements by the relevant Oracle customers about their then-existing state of mind.”
21 Section I.

22 **IV. DEFENDANTS’ CATEGORY TWO – EVIDENCE OF ALLEGED WILLFUL**
23 **INFRINGEMENT**

24 **DEFENDANTS’ POSITION**

25 The Court’s Final Pretrial Order precludes Oracle from presenting a “willful copyright
26 infringement” case at the new trial. ECF No. 1171 (5/29/12 Order) at 2-3. Defendants stipulated
27 to liability, and only damages in the form of lost and infringer’s profits are at issue. As the Court
28 made clear, willfulness is not relevant to damages. *See id.* Nevertheless, Oracle’s exhibit list

1 reveals that Oracle still plans to present a “willfulness” case. This is also demonstrated in
2 Oracle’s deposition designations where, by Defendants’ count, Oracle has in excess of 8 hours of
3 designations solely related to “willfulness.” The Court should enforce its previous ruling and
4 exclude evidence of alleged willfulness as irrelevant under Rule 402, including, but not limited to,
5 the exemplars offered below and documents offered for a similar purpose. Vol. 3 (Chart of
6 Willfulness Evidence). The only plausible purpose for this irrelevant and inflammatory evidence
7 is to waste time, mislead the jury, and incite the jury to punish; thus, exclusion also is warranted
8 under Rule 403.

9 **A. Willfulness Plays No Role in Calculating Deductible Expenses.**

10 In its Motion *in Limine* No. 5, Oracle moved to exclude evidence of deductible expenses
11 on the theory that willful infringers may not deduct expenses. ECF No. 1145 (O’s MIL No. 5) at
12 15-16. Finding “no support for this proposition,” the Court denied the motion and granted
13 Defendants’ related motion on this issue. ECF No. 1171 (5/29/12 Order) at 2-3. Based on the
14 clear language of 17 U.S.C. § 504(b), the Court concluded that “[s]ection 504(b) makes no
15 distinction between willful and innocent infringers.” *Id.* Nor has any Ninth Circuit case or model
16 instruction adopted this distinction. *Id.* at 3.

17 Contrary to this Court’s ruling, Oracle persists in arguing that a penalty applies to willful
18 infringers—specifically, it requests an instruction that the jury ““should give extra scrutiny to the
19 categories of overhead expenses claimed by the infringer.”” Vol. 3 (5/24/12 Hrg Tr.) at 98:14-
20 99:22 (quoting *Hamil Am., Inc. v. GFI*, 193 F.3d 92, 107 (2d Cir. 1999)). Oracle seeks to use this
21 theory as a hook for introducing willfulness evidence to inflate the jury’s award, and to convince
22 the jury that Defendants’ alleged willfulness is directly tied to damages. Oracle’s theory is wrong
23 for four independent reasons.

24 *First*, Oracle’s theory is inconsistent with the text of Section 504(b) and with this Court’s
25 May 29, 2012 Order. Applying “extra scrutiny” to willful infringers, and not to non-willful
26 infringers, cannot be squared with the fact that “Section 504(b) makes no distinction between
27 willful and innocent infringers.” ECF No. 1171 (5/29/12 Order) at 2-3. There is no statutory
28 basis—nor is there any Ninth Circuit support—for Oracle’s theory. The careful statutory analysis

1 of this Court, and of the court in *ZZ Top v. Chrysler Corp.*, 70 F. Supp. 2d 1167, 1168-69 (W.D.
2 Wash. 1999), compels the conclusion that willfulness-based distinctions have no place in an
3 infringer’s profits calculation.

4 *Second*, even assuming that Section 504(b) permits “extra scrutiny” of some sort, such
5 scrutiny is a role for the Court, not the jury. *See* ECF No. 1171 (5/29/12 Order) at 3 (stating
6 “which categories of expenses can be deducted . . . is a matter for the court, not the jury, to
7 decide”). *Hamil* involved a bench trial, not a jury trial, *see* 193 F.3d at 97, and thus the Court had
8 no occasion to consider the implications of an “extra scrutiny” instruction in a jury case. Indeed,
9 Defendants are unaware of any court that has given this instruction in a jury case. The Ninth
10 Circuit’s Model Jury Instructions clearly state that “[t]he defendant has the burden of proving the
11 defendant’s expenses by a preponderance of the evidence.” Ninth Circuit Manual of Model Jury
12 Instructions, Instruction 17.24. Oracle’s request for an instruction on “extra scrutiny” would
13 undermine this standard and invite confusion.

14 *Third*, *Hamil* applied “extra scrutiny” only in determining whether “fixed” overhead
15 expenses may be deducted. 193 F.3d at 104. There is no dispute that “variable” expenses may be
16 deducted. *See Kamar Int’l, Inc. v. Russ Berrie & Co.*, 752 F.2d 1326, 1332 (9th Cir. 1984)
17 (discussing requirements for “deducting fixed overhead costs”); 6 Patry on Copyright § 22:141.
18 Through a sophisticated regression analysis, Clarke separated fixed and variable expenses, and he
19 made a conservative calculation that counted only variable expenses. Because Defendants do not
20 seek to deduct “fixed” overhead, *Hamil*, 193 F.3d at 104, this question is moot.

21 *Fourth*, as discussed in Defendants’ first motion *in limine* (*see* ECF No. 1142 at 1-12),
22 Oracle’s stark change in position on deductible expenses violates the disclosure requirements of
23 Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and triggers the automatic preclusive sanctions of
24 Rule 37. A party is required to disclose its damages calculations under Rule 26(a)(1)(iii) and to
25 supplement its damages calculations “in a timely manner,” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e)(1)(A). It is far
26 too late for Oracle to increase its damages calculation by presenting new theories of deductible
27 expenses, particularly given that deductible expenses never have been in dispute.

28 For all of these reasons, Oracle’s new theory of deductible expenses cannot justify the

1 admission of willfulness evidence in a case that is solely focused on lost and infringer's profits.

2 **B. Evidence of Alleged Willfulness Was Previously Offered Only to Support the**
3 **Now Excluded "Hypothetical" License Theory.**

4 At the first trial, Oracle offered evidence of alleged willful infringement in the guise of
5 SAP's alleged "Risk Acceptance," which it claimed was a factor weighing in favor of awarding
6 billions in hypothetical license fees. Vol. 3 (Oracle Opening) at 30; Vol. 3 (Meyer Demo.) at 4.
7 To prove "Risk Acceptance," Oracle offered evidence purporting to show that SAP knew the
8 consequences of acquiring TomorrowNow, *see, e.g.*, Vol. 3 (PTX 0008), willingly accepted the
9 risk of liability, *see, e.g.*, Vol. 3 (PTX 0014), and intended to use TomorrowNow as a "liability
10 shield," *see, e.g.*, Vol. 3 (PTX 0161). Oracle's only justification for admitting such evidence,
11 over Defendants' objection, was that it "relate[s] directly to Oracle's hypothetical license
12 damages." ECF No. 976 (Pls.' Opp. to Defs.' Mot. to Exclude Evidence) at 3. But with Oracle's
13 license theory out of the case, and evidence of alleged willful infringement having no relevance to
14 a lost and infringer's profits case, this evidence should be excluded. Fed. R. Evid. 402. Oracle's
15 purported reasons for introducing this evidence—causation, background, and context—do not
16 justify admitting evidence of willfulness, which will only distract the jury from the facts of the
17 case and ultimately result in an inflated, speculative damages award.

18 **C. Exemplars.**

19 Each exemplar is impermissible evidence of SAP's alleged willful infringement, which
20 Oracle previously offered solely in support of the hypothetical license to show "Risk
21 Acceptance." The Court should exclude each of these exhibits, as well as all other exhibits
22 offered for the same impermissible purpose. *See* Vol. 3 (Chart of Willfulness Evidence).

23 ***PTX 0008:*** This a December 22, 2004 email from SAP employee Arlen Shenkman to
24 SAP employee James Mackey, forwarding an email from SAP employee John Zepecki. At the
25 first trial, Oracle offered PTX 0008 through testimony of SAP executives Shai Agassi and
26 Gerhard Oswald; their testimony focused exclusively on portions of the exhibit relating to SAP's
27 knowledge of the legality of TomorrowNow service. Vol. 3 (1/5/09 Agassi Tr., played 11/4/10)
28 at 162:11-214:18 (testimony regarding portions of exhibit stating, "I'm not sure how

1 TomorrowNow gets access to PeopleSoft software, but it's very likely that TomorrowNow is
2 using the software outside the contractual use rights granted to them, and these use rights could be
3 terminated by Oracle" and "the liability of providing system access is pushed onto the PeopleSoft
4 customer"); Vol. 3 (12/10/09 Oswald Tr., played 11/4/10) at 34:7-35:13 (same). That Oracle has
5 designated identical deposition testimony for the new trial shows that it plans to offer PTX 0008
6 for the same purpose, *see, e.g.*, ECF No. 1175 at 2, 37, and Oracle's statement below confirms
7 that it will do so. The Court should exclude this email because Defendants' alleged willingness to
8 accept liability risk is irrelevant to calculating lost profits and infringer's profits, and its
9 prejudicial value far outweighs its minimal probative value. Moreover, any minimal probative
10 value is outweighed by the prejudicial effect of inflating the jury award, particularly given that
11 Defendants already have stipulated to liability.

12 **PTX 0014:** This is a December 30, 2004 email from Zepecki to Shenkman and Mackey
13 and SAP employee Torsten Geers. Oracle previously offered PTX 0014 during its examination of
14 Zepecki and focused on the portion of the exhibit relating to Zepecki's assessment of "legal
15 liability" and "legal issues" relating to the TomorrowNow acquisition. Vol. 3 (11/4/10 Trial Tr.)
16 at 621:11-623:2 (Oracle counsel asking witness "One of the comments you provided was a
17 comment that you didn't think that the prior version was strong enough in advising the Board
18 about the legal problems, correct, sir?"). Oracle again seeks to introduce this exhibit as evidence
19 of Defendants' alleged willingness to accept the risk of liability, and the Court should exclude
20 this email on the same grounds as PTX 0008.

21 **PTX 0161:** This is a January 2005 Power Point presentation titled "TomorrowNow
22 Integration Meeting." This exhibit contains SAP's assessment of the liability risk associated with
23 acquiring TomorrowNow, *see, e.g.*, Vol. 3 (PTX 0161) at SAP-OR00009808 ("[T]he liability of
24 providing system access is pushed onto the Peoplesoft customer"), SAP-OR00009810 ("The
25 access rights to the Peoplesoft software is very likely to be challenged by Oracle and past
26 operating issues may be a serious liability if Oracle challenges"), and refers to
27 TomorrowNow as a "liability shield." *Id.* at SAP-OR00009811. Oracle's latest deposition
28 designations confirm that Oracle intends, again, to present evidence of SAP's alleged knowledge

1 of risk and use of a “liability shield,” *see, e.g.*, ECF No. 1175 at 10-11 (11/12/08 Brandt Tr.) at
2 114:2-115:2, 120:19-121:2, and Oracle admits below that it intends to introduce this as evidence
3 of willful infringement.

4 This evidence should be excluded. It is not relevant to causation for lost and infringer’s
5 profits because Defendants’ alleged willingness to accept the risk of liability and purported intent
6 to use TomorrowNow as a “liability shield” have nothing to do with whether or why customers
7 left Oracle. Fed. R. Evid. 401. Further, its prejudicial effect outweighs its probative value. Fed.
8 R. Evid. 403. Injecting willfulness evidence into the case would distract the jury from the real
9 issues: the calculation of lost and infringer’s profits. Vol. 3 (5/24/12 Hrg. Tr.) at 89:1-2 (“This is
10 not a punitive damages trial. This is a copyright infringement trial.”). This is exactly the sort of
11 “speculative” evidence that Oracle used at the last trial to “urg[e] the jury to disregard evidence of
12 Oracle’s actual customer losses resulting from infringement.” ECF No. 1081 (9/1/11 Order) at
13 17; *see also, e.g.*, Vol. 3 (11/22/10 Trial Tr.) at 2054:14-16 (Mr. Boies arguing to jury that
14 “SAP’s willingness to assume risk of infringement liability is an admission of value.”), 2080:14-
15 16 (“[T]hey knew there were serious liability risks. Why did they take it on? They took it on
16 because of the value of the program. There’s no other explanation.”). And willfulness evidence
17 is wholly unnecessary given Defendants’ stipulation to liability. *Cf.* ECF No. 1171 (5/29/12
18 Order) at 4 (“Any evidence of willfulness that would be reflected by the guilty plea or conviction
19 is irrelevant to any issue being tried in the case in light of defendants’ stipulation to liability.”).

20 ***Trial Testimony Regarding Defendants’ Alleged Failure to Discipline and Defendants’***

21 ***Apology to Oracle:*** Oracle also should be precluded from eliciting trial testimony on willfulness.
22 At the last trial, Oracle elicited testimony regarding Defendants’ alleged failure to discipline
23 employees, as well as an apology to Oracle. Vol. 3 (11/15/10 Trial Tr.) at 1473:13-1479:21.
24 Specifically, Oracle’s counsel elicited testimony from SAP CEO Bill McDermott that he had not
25 yet disciplined SAP employees, officers, or directors for events relating to TomorrowNow. *Id.*
26 1473:13-1479:2. Oracle also asked Mr. McDermott for an apology:

27 Q: [H]as SAP ever apologized to Oracle for taking its software?

28 A: I am not aware of an apology.

Q: Would you like to do that now, sir?

1 A: I would. Yes, I am. I am sorry to Oracle.
2 Q: Okay. And I appreciate that. Because I think it's important . . . that that
3 sort of thing happen.
4 A: I agree with you.

5 *Id.* at 1479:12-21. Oracle cannot argue that this evidence is relevant to calculating lost and
6 infringer's profits; evidence of Defendants' actions *after* the infringement is not related to
7 damages. Whether and when SAP disciplined its employees or apologized to Oracle does not
8 relate to customers' decisions to leave Oracle. Further, the prejudicial effect of this evidence
9 outweighs its probative value. Fed. R. Evid. 403. It improperly suggests to the jury that
10 Defendants have not expressed sufficient remorse for their conduct and that the jury's damages
11 award is a proper vehicle for punishment. This testimony is the same sort of inflammatory
12 evidence that the Court previously excluded. *See, e.g.*, ECF No. 1171 (5/29/12 Order) at 5.
13 Furthermore, for the reasons Defendants discuss in Part VII below (Oracle's Category Two),
14 Oracle's intent to introduce evidence to undermine SAP's stipulations as a "ruse and a tactic,"
15 *infra*, proves why this evidence is irrelevant and highly prejudicial.

16 ***Evidence of Willfulness Is a Recurring Issue:*** Oracle's improper attempt to offer
17 willfulness evidence will resurface in the Parties' June 13 submission regarding deposition
18 designations. For example, Oracle has designated testimony of SAP AG CFO Werner Brandt
19 regarding the SAP Executive Board's alleged willingness to accept the risk of infringement
20 liability, decision to use TomorrowNow as a "liability shield," and certain disciplinary actions.
21 Vol. 3 (11/12/08 Brandt Tr.) at 113:22-25, 114:2-25, 115:2-21, 120:19-25, 121:2-7, 123:7-15;
22 Vol. 3 (11/13/08 Brandt Tr.) at 386:12-16, 390:6-20, 393:19-25, 394:2-7, 398:12-17. Oracle also
23 has designated deposition testimony of TomorrowNow employee John Ritchie to show alleged
24 willfulness, including testimony that Ritchie's superiors warned him not to put anything in
25 writing, that he "constantly" voiced his concerns about the legality of TomorrowNow's activities,
26 and that he was advised to "shut up and do [his] job or else look for other employment." Vol. 3
27 (12/2/09 Ritchie Tr.) at 16:15-17:3, 19:16-20, 21:10-14, 22:6-10, 29:8-11. This evidence is not
28 necessary to prove lost and infringer's profits; its only purpose is to prove Defendants' alleged
willfulness and inflate the jury's damages award. Because willfulness is not at issue in the case,

1 this Court should exclude Oracle’s evidence on this issue.

2 **ORACLE’S POSITION**

3 In its order, the Court granted in part Defendants’ first motion *in limine* “to preclude
4 plaintiff[] from reversing [its] approach to deductible expenses in connection with the infringers’
5 profits claim.” Dkt. 1171 at 3:22-233. The Court found that “17 U.S.C. § 504 (b) does not
6 support a rule that overhead expenses cannot be deducted from gross revenues to arrive at profits
7 where the infringement was deliberate or willful.” *Id.* at 2:19-21. However, contrary to
8 Defendants’ position, the Court *did not* categorically rule that willfulness has no relevance in this
9 case, nor did the Court exclude evidence that Defendants willfully infringed Oracle’s IP. In fact,
10 willfulness evidence relates to the scrutiny applied to Defendants’ burden regarding expenses, to
11 the causation Oracle must prove to recover damages, and for background and context.

12 To establish infringers’ profits, Oracle must identify “the gross revenue associated with
13 the infringement.” *Polar Bear*, 384 F.3d at 711 n.8. To recover infringer’s profits, there must be
14 “a causal nexus between the infringement and the gross revenue.” *Id.* at 711. A sufficient nexus
15 exists where there is “some evidence . . . [that] the infringement at least partially caused the
16 [revenue]” or where the “revenue stream . . . bear[s] a legally significant relationship to the
17 infringement.” *Id.* (recognizing sufficient nexus where infringing photographs were used to
18 promote sales of non-infringing watches).

19 Oracle’s position on retrial will be that all revenues related to TN, including Safe Passage
20 sales, other SAP sales, and TN sales themselves, are sufficiently associated with Defendants’
21 infringement to create the required nexus. To support its position, Oracle will inform the jury
22 what SAP long ago conceded: TN was built upon a foundation of infringement, it could not
23 compete against Oracle without taking Oracle’s IP, and SAP knew those facts and relied on them
24 (and the cost savings they enabled) to lure customers to SAP. Motamed Decl. Ex. O (PTX 0196)
25 at TN-OR02942463, TN-OR02942479); *id.* Ex. P (PTX 0035) at SAP-OR00156479. Oracle will
26 explain that SAP knew about TN’s infringement, and used it to make TN the centerpiece of its
27 Safe Passage program, designed to follow SAP’s “1-2-3” plan: commit customers to cheap TN
28 maintenance, cross-sell them into SAP applications, and up-sell them into other products.

1 Motamed Decl. Ex. Q (PTX 0006). TN’s ability to offer below-cost maintenance rested on its
2 infringement and other illegal conduct. SAP knowingly availed itself of TN’s model through
3 Safe Passage, recognizing the connection between TN and SAP revenues. By showing that
4 SAP’s business model (built on infringement) was central to its ability to generate massive
5 revenues, Oracle will meet -and exceed- *Polar Bear*’s causation standard.

6 **A. Willfulness Related to Infringers’ Profits**

7 The Court acknowledged that Defendants have the burden to “prove his or her deductible
8 expenses and the elements of profit attributable to factors other than the copyrighted work.” 17
9 U.S.C. § 504(b); Dkt. 1171 at 2:23-24. In the very case defendants cited to articulate the rule that
10 they may deduct overhead expenses, the court held that willfulness informs Defendants’ burden:

11 *When infringement is found to be willful, the district court should give*
12 *extra scrutiny to the categories of overhead expenses claimed by the*
13 *infringer to insure that each category is directly and validly connected to*
14 *the sale and production of the infringing product. Unless a strong nexus*
is established, the court should not permit a deduction for the overhead
category.

15 *Hamil v. GFI*, 193 F. 3d 92, 107 (2nd Cir. 1999) (emphasis supplied).¹⁶ In support of this
16 conclusion, *Hamil* cites the Ninth Circuit case *Kamar Int’l Inc. v. Russ Berrie & Co.*, 752 F.2d
17 1326, 1332 (9th Cir. 1984) for the proposition that an infringer can deduct expenses “only when
18 the infringer can demonstrate it was of actual assistance in the production, distribution or sale of
19 the infringing product.” Defendants acknowledge that *Hamil* is the latest Federal Circuit Court to
20 address the issue. Motamed Decl. Ex. K (5/24/12 Hrg. Tr.) at 12:13-21.

21 Therefore, under the very law Defendants (and the Court) rely on to allow Defendants to
22 deduct expenses at all, a willful infringer has a higher burden to prove that its expenses “directly
23 and validly” connect to the infringement. Accordingly, the Court should permit Oracle to present
24 willfulness evidence related to the calculation of infringers’ profits.¹⁷

25 ¹⁶ Defendants claim *Hamil* is inapplicable because Clarke does not deduct overhead
26 expenses, but instead uses a “sophisticated regression analysis” to deduct only variable expenses.
27 Contrary to Defendants uncited assertion, Clarke’s report states that “[r]elevant costs include
28 overhead expenses as well as direct and indirect costs.” Dkt. 1146-2 at 241. Whether Clarke did
in fact separate “fixed” overhead expenses is an issue in dispute and will be addressed at trial.

¹⁷ Contrary to Defendants’ position, regardless of whether the issue of which expenses are
deductible is one for the jury or for the Court, certainly the issue of whether Defendants’ have

1 **B. Defendants’ Cited Evidence Of Willfulness Is Also Evidence Of Causation**
2 **and Context**

3 Even if the Court disagrees that a willful infringer bears a higher burden in deducting its
4 expenses, the Court should nonetheless admit the evidence SAP seeks to exclude because it
5 provides critical causation and context evidence.

6 SAP argues in its trial brief (and will presumably argue at trial) that Oracle cannot meet its
7 “burden of proving a causal relationship between the infringement and lost [and infringers’]
8 profits that resulted from the infringement.” Dkt. 1139 at 9. The example documents that SAP
9 seeks to exclude on willfulness grounds help to answer that challenge. Among other things, the
10 documents establish that SAP itself specifically examined – and quantified – its own gains and
11 Oracle’s losses that would result from SAP’s exploitation of TomorrowNow’s infringing
12 business. Although SAP’s trial strategy is to argue that such a causal link is incredible, its
13 business strategy, beginning in 2005 and continuing for years, was based on SAP’s own
14 conclusion that very causal link was real and reliable. *See Andreas v. Volkswagen of Am., Inc.*,
15 336 F.3d 789, 796-97 (8th Cir. 2003) (evidence sufficient to uphold a jury verdict on causation of
16 infringer’s profits where, among other things, the defendant “enthusiastically presented the
17 commercial to its dealers as an important and integral part of its launch of the TT coupe into the
18 U.S. market.”). Further, SAP argues that evidence of willfulness should be excluded because it
19 relates only to the hypothetical license remedy. This is wrong. As discussed above, and as the
20 examples below illustrate, evidence of SAP’s acceptance of risk demonstrates its confidence in
21 the effectiveness of its strategy to convert Oracle customers through TN’s infringing business. As
22 SAP makes clear in its trial brief, it intends to argue at trial that it is not credible to believe that
23 significant numbers of Oracle customers would have switched to SAP as a result of the heavily
24 discounted support offering that SAP provided through TN. Dkt. 1139 at 8-10. Again, SAP’s

25
26 _____
(continued...)

27 met their burden is one for the jury. The authority on which Defendants rely provides that the
28 standard that governs that burden changes according to the degree of willfulness. *See Hamil*, 193
F.3d at 107. Thus, this evidence is still relevant and admissible.

1 business strategy, expressed in its contemporaneous documents, is contrary to its legal strategy,
2 expressed now. The fact that SAP accepted the risk of infringement in order to pursue the
3 TomorrowNow strategy provides further corroboration SAP reasonably believed that the strategy
4 would work. Contrary to Defendants argument, they will not be unfairly prejudiced if Oracle is
5 allowed to inform the jury what they did and why. Yet Oracle will be significantly prejudiced if
6 it is not permitted to submit relevant evidence of willfulness to meet its causation burden.¹⁸

7 The examples SAP identifies only illustrate these points, as each is directly relevant to
8 infringers' profits causation:

9 **1. PTX 0008: PeopleSoft 1-2-3**

10 SAP asks the Court to exclude PTX 0008. This is one of Oracle's most important
11 causation documents because it spells out the business plan that SAP then followed to convert
12 Oracle's customers to its own using the infringing TN business model. PTX 0008 demonstrates
13 that SAP had an initial plan to 1) offer support/maintenance to Peoplesoft Customers; 2) integrate
14 existing xApps and create new xApps/composites that integrate with Peoplesoft product; and 3)
15 provide upgrades from Peoplesoft to SAP. PTX 0008 at SAP-OR91726-27. This explains the
16 business strategy that SAP then followed, and which it measured by harm inflicted on Oracle (in
17 dollars) and customers gained by SAP over the ensuing years. Indeed, SAP executive board
18 member Shai Agassi's comments show that SAP's PeopleSoft 1-2-3 plan was "well thought out"
19 and the "recipe" for getting Oracle customers. *Id.* at SAP-OR91723; SAP-OR91725. For these
20 reasons, Meyer relies on a similar version of this same document in his lost and infringers' profits
21 portions of his report. *See* Motamed Decl. Ex. R (2/23/10 Meyer Report) at ¶¶ 361-362; 439
22 (explaining how SAP acknowledged that access and use of Oracle's proprietary Software and
23 Support Materials was necessary to provide the level of support that TomorrowNow offered and
24 that SAP's goal was to convert PeopleSoft customers to SAP applications).

25 The document also reveals SAP knew that "it's very likely that TomorrowNow is using

26 ¹⁸ Defendants also argue Oracle should be precluded from admitting evidence of
27 willfulness because, they claim, Oracle somehow violated the "disclosure rules of Rule 26 . . ."
28 But this issue was already argued at the May 24 hearing, and the Court did not agree Oracle was
somehow barred- instead the Court requested proposed jury instructions on the issue. *See e.g.*
Motamed Ex. K (5/24/12 Hrg. Tr.) at 100:20-21.

1 the software outside the contractual use rights granted to them” PTX 0008 (at SAP-
2 OR91724. Thus, the plan rested on knowing infringement from the beginning, providing further
3 evidence of the link between the infringement and SAP’s later measurements of the plan’s
4 success.

5 **2. PTX 0014**

6 SAP also asks the Court to exclude PTX 0014, an email in which SAP employee John
7 Zepecki notes that the acquisition of TN presents a “question of legal liability” and notes that it
8 will take “legal wrangling” to convert TN’s service delivery model into one that is “legally
9 sound.” Thus, it not only shows SAP was aware of TN’s infringement prior to the acquisition,
10 but also that customers converted through the 1-2-3 plan on which SAP based Safe Passage also
11 result from that same infringement. Thus, contrary to SAP’s assertion, PTX 0014 is not solely
12 relevant to the hypothetical license - it will rebut SAP’s assertion that TN was not a factor in the
13 revenues SAP generated, and that SAP never thought it would be. Accordingly, the Court should
14 not exclude this exhibit.

15 **3. PTX 0161: “TomorrowNow Integration”**

16 SAP also asks the Court to exclude Oracle’s PTX 0161 because it shows Defendants
17 willfully infringed Oracle’s software. It does, and it is therefore relevant to the case, but it is also
18 admissible for other, independent reasons as well. Oracle relies on this document to illustrate the
19 causal link between SAP’s Safe Passage plan, which had the illegal TomorrowNow business
20 model as its “major cornerstone” (according to this document), and the customers Oracle now
21 claims SAP converted to SAP’s software using this same plan. *Id.* at 4. Not surprisingly, Meyer
22 expressly relies on this document in the infringers’ profits section of his report. *See* Motamed
23 Decl. Ex. R (2/23/10 Meyer Report) at ¶ 439 (incorporating § IV.B.3 of his report, which
24 references PTX 0161 (Meyer’s n.144)). For example, this document states that as of January
25 2005, SAP believed it could convert 2000 or 4000 customers to TN by 2009, and that this was 2.5
26 to 5 times Defendants’ original projections. PTX 0161-0001 at 24. In other words (and contrary
27 to what SAP now argues), SAP’s plan to generate infringing revenues was so successful, SAP
28 increased its expectations of TN’s success during the execution phase of the plan. SAP’s

1 assessment of TomorrowNow as a successful part of its strategy to convert Oracle customers
2 stands in sharp contrast to the four customers SAP's expert, Clarke, now claims bought software
3 from SAP related to the infringement.

4 Further, the document evidences the single most important reason that TN's customers left
5 Oracle for TN: "[s]upport fees [were] 50% of the PeopleSoft support price." *Id.* at 15. Since TN
6 could only offer this discount because it infringed Oracle's intellectual property on a massive
7 scale, this document provides a direct link between the infringement and Oracle's losses and
8 SAP's gains. The Court should allow this document because it shows willful infringement, and
9 also because it relates directly to Oracle's causation case and provides helpful context for the
10 jury.

11 **4. McDermott trial testimony on willfulness**

12 SAP also wants to "preclude [Oracle] from eliciting trial testimony" on willfulness. For
13 the reasons discussed above, any testimony on willfulness that Oracle wishes to present at trial is
14 proper and relevant to calculating infringers' profits. Further, despite the fact that SAP
15 identified this trial testimony for the first time 24 hours before Oracle had to prepare a response,
16 this testimony directly corroborates the arguments raised in Oracle's section VII below. SAP
17 claimed in the first trial, and will likely argue again, that it intends to take responsibility for its
18 misdeeds. *See, e.g.,* Motamed Decl. Ex. J (11/2/10 Trial Tr.) at 385:10-12. However, evidence
19 that SAP apologized but has not yet disciplined the responsible employees rebuts this assertion
20 and further supports the theory that SAP stipulated to liability solely as a ruse and trial tactic. *See*
21 *id.* (11/15/10 Trial Tr.) at 1473:13-1479:21. This evidence rebuts SAP's assertions of
22 responsibility which it has placed at the heart of its damages defense.

23 **5. Deposition designations on willfulness**

24 Finally, SAP's attempt to exclude deposition designation testimony is an issue that is not
25 ripe for consideration by the Court. The Parties have agreed to a separate procedure for resolving
26 deposition designations and objections. Any disputes related to those designations will come
27 before the court when the designations are filed with the Court. The June 8, 2012 evidentiary
28 hearing is not the appropriate time for SAP to dispute these deposition designations for the first

1 time, particularly since (as also happened with the trial brief), Oracle had no notice that this
2 category would come before the Court. For the reasons above, the mere fact that the testimony
3 relates to willfulness is not a reason to exclude it.

4 **V. DEFENDANTS' CATEGORY THREE – EVIDENCE RELATING TO**
5 **EXCLUDED DAMAGES THEORIES**

6 **DEFENDANTS' POSITION**

7 Despite the Court's May 18, 2012 Order instructing the Parties to narrow their exhibit and
8 witness lists "[s]ince no evidence relating to the hypothetical license measure of damages will be
9 permitted at the upcoming trial," ECF No. 1164, Oracle continues to list as potential trial exhibits
10 numerous documents that it offered at the first trial solely to support its license theory, including
11 evidence of Defendants' so-called "Risk Acceptance" (addressed above), alleged "Risk to
12 Oracle's Investment in PeopleSoft [and Siebel]," the Parties' purported "Expected Financial
13 Benefits/Impacts" from the license, and the "Scope and Duration of the License." Vol. 3 (Meyer
14 Demo.) at 4, 16, 38; Vol. 3 (Oracle Opening) at 30.

15 Although Oracle claims that it will offer such evidence at the new trial to support its lost
16 and infringer's profits theories, none of this evidence is probative of the key issue to be tried—
17 why customers left Oracle to purchase TomorrowNow support or SAP software. Thus, it does
18 not provide "context" or "background" for the stipulated claims. The link that Oracle attempts to
19 draw between its "license factors" evidence and Oracle's actual losses is speculative at best. The
20 real purpose of this evidence is not to help the jury determine which customers Oracle lost to
21 TomorrowNow and SAP because of the infringement, but to present inflated, inflammatory, and
22 unrelated dollar and customer figures to the jury in the hopes that it will disregard the evidence of
23 actual customer losses in favor of a large, punitive damages award. The Court should preclude
24 Oracle from offering such irrelevant and unfairly prejudicial evidence at the new trial, including
25 the exemplars offered below, as well as all other exhibits offered for the same purpose. *See Vol*
26 *3. (Chart of "Hypothetical" License Evidence).*

27 **A. "Risk to Oracle's Investment" Evidence.**

28 At the first trial, Oracle used its license claim to rationalize introducing evidence of

1 Oracle’s research and development (“R&D”) costs and the PeopleSoft and Siebel acquisition
2 prices, claiming that such evidence was relevant to show investment risks Oracle would have
3 considered in negotiating a license price. Vol. 3 (11/2/10 Trial Tr.) at 339:20-340:4; Vol. 3
4 (Oracle Opening) at 12; Vol. 3 (11/22/10 Trial Tr.) at 2093:13-24; Vol. 3 (Meyer Demo.) at 38,
5 42. Not only is such evidence unrelated to computing Oracle’s actual customer losses due to the
6 infringement, but also—as at the first trial—it would have the unfairly prejudicial effect of
7 inflating the damages claim. ECF No. 1081 (9/1/11 Order) at 17 (vacating award where, *inter*
8 *alia*, “[r]ather than providing evidence of SAP’s actual use of the copyrighted works, and
9 objectively verifiable number of customers lost as a result, Oracle presented evidence of the
10 purported value of the intellectual property as a whole”); *cf. Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*,
11 632 F.3d 1292, 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (finding that disclosure of large but irrelevant figures
12 “cannot help but skew the damages horizon for the jury”). Specifically, Oracle’s claimed purpose
13 for such evidence at the new trial—namely, to show “how and why SAP believed it could use TN
14 to damage Oracle and drain its profits” and to show that both sides valued software customers—
15 has no connection to determining why specific customers opted to leave Oracle. The real effect
16 that such evidence would have on the jury would be to distract from, not help resolve, that narrow
17 issue and to confuse the jury about the type of harm for which Oracle is entitled to compensation
18 (*i.e.*, actual lost support and software customers versus alleged, undisclosed harm to R&D and
19 acquisition efforts). Such excludable evidence includes:

20 ***Counsel Argument and Witness Testimony Regarding Oracle R&D Costs and***

21 ***Acquisition Prices:*** At the first trial, Oracle’s counsel and witnesses repeatedly referenced the
22 billions that Oracle spends on R&D. Vol. 3 (11/2/10 Trial Tr.) at 339:20-340:4, 452:6-12
23 (Screven testifying regarding Oracle’s \$4 billion R&D budget), 453:12-455:1 (same); Vol. 3
24 (11/8/10 Trial Tr.) at 760:13-22 (Ellison testifying that Oracle has invested \$4 billion in R&D);
25 Vol. 3 (11/19/10 Trial Tr.) at 1886:1-11 (Catz testifying that one of the harms from infringement
26 was that “we can’t pay for existing R&D”); Vol. 3 (11/22/10 Trial Tr.) at 2093:13-24; Vol. 3
27 (Oracle Opening) at 12. They also mentioned the PeopleSoft purchase price no less than 77
28 times. Vol. 3 (11/2/10 Trial Tr.) at 341:15, 341:23; Vol. 3 (11/4/10 Trial Tr.) at 522:20-22; Vol. 3

1 (11/8/10 Trial Tr.) at 846:17, 846:18, 846:21; Vol. 3 (11/22/10 Trial Tr.) at 2087:10. Oracle’s
2 deposition designations continue to reference the amounts Oracle spends on R&D and the price it
3 paid to acquire PeopleSoft, as they relate to the excluded license claim. *See, e.g.*, ECF No. 1175
4 at 42 (11/4/10 Phillips Tr. at 531:21-532:24) (testifying that Oracle would not license software, as
5 it would be tantamount to “giving the thing you just bought for \$11 billion away to your largest
6 competitor”). Oracle should not be permitted to advance argument and elicit testimony on this
7 irrelevant, unfairly prejudicial topic.

8 **PTX 4809:** This is a January 26, 2005 e-mail from Oracle employee Judith Sim to various
9 Oracle employees, attaching Power Point presentations relating to the PeopleSoft acquisition.
10 The exhibit references “Oracle’s \$1.3B annual R&D investment” and the PeopleSoft purchase
11 price.¹⁹ *See, e.g.*, Vol. 3 (PTX 4809) at ORCL00229123, ORCL00229211, ORCL00229216.
12 This document, which Oracle claims reflects Oracle’s “intention[s]” and “expectation[s]” at the
13 time of the PeopleSoft acquisition, has no bearing on customers’ motives for leaving Oracle and
14 thus is wholly irrelevant to calculating lost and infringer’s profits. Any probative value is
15 outweighed by the prejudice of misleading the jury and improperly inflating damages.

16 **PTX 4819:** This is a demonstrative titled “Billions of Dollars in R&D Investment Each
17 Year,” which purports to reflect the amount Oracle invests in R&D by year. Oracle essentially
18 concedes that the sole purpose for this demonstrative is “context.” But this document does not
19 provide context—it invites confusion. Oracle’s claimed R&D costs over the years has nothing to
20 do with lost and infringer’s profits and could serve only to impermissibly inflate damages.

21 **B. “Expected Financial Benefits/Impacts” Evidence.**

22 To support its license claim at the first trial, Oracle also offered evidence of Defendants’
23 alleged projections of potential customer conversions, which Oracle argued was relevant to the
24 parties’ expected financial gains or losses when negotiating a license. *See, e.g.*, Vol. 3 (Meyer
25 Demo.) at 24, 28, 29, 55-56. Even if such evidence actually reflected Defendants’ expected

26 _____
27 ¹⁹ The exhibit also makes a prohibited reference to cross-sales and up-sales, which the
28 parties redacted from the previously-admitted version of the exhibit and which the Court should
exclude again based on its previous orders. Vol. 3 (PTX 4809) at ORCL00229216; *see also, e.g.*,
ECF No. 1162 (5/15/10 Order).

1 customer gains (as opposed to mere hopes or aspirations), Defendants' expectations are irrelevant
2 to prove Oracle's actual, limited customer losses. Evidence of lofty (but ultimately unrealized)
3 hopes, aspirations, assumptions, or expectations could serve only to confuse and mislead the jury
4 as to the proper method to calculate lost and infringer's profits and to improperly inflate the
5 damages award. Such excludable evidence includes:

6 **PTX 0012:** This is a December 23, 2004 document titled "A Roadmap for PSFT
7 Customers to SAP." Oracle's expert relied on this document as supposed proof that SAP
8 expected to obtain 3,000 software customers from PeopleSoft as a result of the TomorrowNow
9 offering. *See, e.g.*, Vol. 3 (11/9/10 Trial Tr.) at 978:6-980:3, 996:19-997:19; Vol. 3 (Meyer
10 Demo.) at 17, 21, 24, 31-32, 34-36, 44-46, 60, 61, 66. Oracle's current deposition designations
11 make clear that it intends to use this document to show SAP's so-called expectations at the new
12 trial as well. *See, e.g.*, ECF No. 1175 at 58 (9/30/08 Ziemen Tr. at 77:16-77:23).

13 **PTX 0024:** This is a January 2005 document titled "Safe Passage: Winning Customers
14 and Markets from Oracle-PeopleSoft-J.D. Edwards." Oracle's expert relied on this document as
15 evidence that SAP expected to convert 450 PeopleSoft customers in the first 30 days of Safe
16 Passage, and then 50% or a "majority" thereafter. Vol. 3 (11/9/10 Trial Tr.) at 984:10-986:12,
17 988:23-990:10; Vol. 3 (Meyer Demo.) at 17, 21, 28, 31, 34, 44.

18 **PTX 0161:** This is a January 25-26, 2005 document titled "TomorrowNow Integration
19 Meeting." Oracle's expert relied on this document as evidence that SAP believed TomorrowNow
20 could attract and convert 2,000 to 4,000 PeopleSoft customers. *Id.* (11/9/10 Trial Tr.) at 990:11-
21 991:9; Vol. 3 (Meyer Demo.) at 17, 21, 29-31, 34, 44. Oracle claims that the alleged projections
22 in this exhibit are relevant to show that TomorrowNow "was working" to drive software sales.
23 But Oracle's point underscores how this exhibit will confuse the jury: Oracle plans to offer
24 guesses about SAP's expectations to prove actual customer losses—a wholly speculative and
25 unsupportable basis for a damages award.

26 **PTX 0960:** This is a document titled "Siebel Safe Passage Program Playbook." Oracle's
27 expert relied on this document as evidence that SAP expected to convert 300 Siebel customers.
28 Vol. 3 (11/9/10 Trial Tr.) at 1028:5-14; Vol. 3 (Meyer Demo.) at 54-55. As with Oracle's other

1 evidence of alleged customer projections, this exhibit will encourage speculation about what
2 Oracle might have lost and SAP might have gained, not help the jury determine what Oracle
3 actually lost and SAP actually gained.

4 **C. “Scope and Duration of the License” Evidence.**

5 At the first trial, Oracle also offered evidence of the “Scope and Duration of the License”
6 as a “negotiation factor” bearing on the license price. Vol. 3 (Meyer Demo.) at 4. There can be
7 no question that evidence of the purported scope and duration of a hypothetical license is
8 irrelevant to lost and infringer’s profits and could serve only to mislead and confuse the jury.
9 Such excludable evidence includes:

10 ***PTX 7028***: This is a document prepared by Oracle expert Paul Meyer to set forth, in
11 Oracle’s words, “a list of rights Meyer determined Defendants would have needed to do what
12 they in fact did.” Vol. 3 (11/18/10 Trial Tr.) at 1863:1-8. The scope of rights of a hypothetical
13 license is irrelevant to calculate lost and infringer’s profits and cannot help but confuse the jury.

14 **ORACLE’S POSITION**

15 In its second motion *in limine*, SAP asked the Court to exclude evidence “previously
16 offered solely to support the hypothetical license theory or any other excluded theory of
17 damages.” Dkt. 1142 at 16. In support of its motion, SAP identified certain categories of
18 evidence it contended Oracle previously offered solely to support the hypothetical license theory
19 of damages. *Id.* at 16-18. SAP was wrong. As explained in Oracle’s opposition to SAP’s
20 motion, each of SAP’s categories is directly relevant to infringers’ and/or lost profits, as well as
21 provides necessary context to the jury. *See* Dkt. 1154 at 15-20. In fact, several of the exhibits
22 SAP cites were referenced in the sections of Meyer’s report related to lost or infringers’ profits.

23 SAP attempts to prove its claim that Oracle cites this evidence solely to support the
24 hypothetical license by claiming that, until today Oracle “listed ‘hypothetical license’ as a
25 purpose” for offering 51 exhibits on its Amended Trial Exhibit List. Defendants’ Introductory
26 Statement. SAP argues this somehow proves Oracle’s true purpose “in offering these exhibits [is
27 to] mislead the jury . . .” *Id.* SAP neglects to mention that every single such document had at
28 least one other stated purpose, and most had even more. Furthermore, Oracle informed SAP that

1 the reference to the hypothetical license was mistakenly left over from before the Court’s most
2 recent rulings on that subject and that there are other purposes for each of these exhibits. Yet,
3 Defendants persisted in their efforts to ask the Court to exclude these documents, and referenced
4 the hypothetical license language so, for the sake of clarity, Oracle re-filed its exhibit list to
5 remove the hypothetical license reference. Consequently, SAP’s claim that Oracle proposes to
6 admit these documents “solely” to support the hypothetical license is affirmatively false. These
7 documents simply relate to multiple theories.

8 At the pre-trial conference, the Court observed that it could not address SAP’s motion in
9 the general, non-document specific manner in which SAP presented its argument. Motamed
10 Decl. Ex. K (5/24/12 Conf. Tr.) at 80:11-17 (“This is a waste of time I need to see a list of
11 what specific evidence it is that there’s an objection to . . .”). In response, SAP argued it had
12 identified certain specific documents, and that the Court could rule on those. SAP also clarified
13 that it sought to exclude only evidence that relates “solely” to the hypothetical license theory. *See*
14 *id.* at 76:10-15 (where SAP’s counsel argued “[i]t’s entirely appropriate to say . . . don’t offer a
15 piece of evidence that relates solely to the hypothetical license theory.”). However, the Court
16 should admit each of these documents because none relates “solely” to the hypothetical license;
17 each also provides crucial causation evidence, as well as important background and context. In
18 fact, Meyer cites many of these documents in the portions of his report related to lost and
19 infringers’ profits. As the Court recognized, no rule precludes Oracle from using the same
20 evidence it used last time to support a different theory. *See* Dkt. 1154 at 15-20.

21 Finally, both sides previously agreed that liability evidence is admissible as “background
22 or context” and as “relevant to damages,” and further agreed not to object on the basis of Rule
23 402 or 403:

24 Subject only to the trial time limits set forth in paragraph 8 below, the Parties may
25 present evidence at trial related to the stipulated claims as background or context .
26 . . . as relevant to damages *The Parties will not object to evidence related to*
27 *the stipulated claims pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 401-403 (including*
that the evidence is irrelevant, cumulative, unduly time consuming or prejudicial)
on grounds that the evidence relates to the stipulated claims.

28 Dkt. 965 (JTX 4) at 2 (emphasis supplied). Accordingly, the Court should deny SAP’s requests.

1 **A. Evidence of Risk to Oracle’s Investment**

2 SAP argues that, as a category, the Court should exclude exhibits and testimony of
3 Oracle’s R&D costs and the PeopleSoft acquisition price, although it concedes the evidence “may
4 be relevant.” Dkt. 1142 at 17-18. Indeed it is. This evidence shows how and why SAP believed
5 it could use TN to damage Oracle and drain its profits. It also explains why both sides valued the
6 customers that SAP sought to convert through the Safe Passage plan using TN as the
7 “cornerstone.” On the Oracle side, it based the PeopleSoft purchase price on the \$1.2 billion
8 annual maintenance revenue from the 9,920 PeopleSoft customers. Oracle was able to justify the
9 PeopleSoft acquisition price because exclusive ownership of the copyrighted intellectual property
10 ensured that – absent infringement – Oracle would remain the only company able to support those
11 customers and earn that revenue stream. These were the same customers, and the same dollars,
12 that SAP sought to take from Oracle through TN’s infringement. On the SAP side, SAP sought
13 to use TN not just to gain customers for itself, but to take revenue away from Oracle to prevent it
14 from reinvesting that money in R&D to develop more competitive products. Thus, this evidence
15 provides crucial causation links to both lost profits and infringers’ profits, it explains SAP’s
16 motives in undertaking the Safe Passage program, and it helps explain why infringement would
17 cause customers who would normally be expected to stay with Oracle to leave instead. This
18 evidence is not unfairly prejudicial, as SAP claims, instead it will be used to show SAP’s
19 executives believed in the very causation its attorneys now dispute.

20 Thus, the Court should allow PTX 0970, in which TN CEO Andrew Nelson forecasted
21 that over 10 years, TN “would takeaway approximately \$1.1 billion from Oracle” and that every
22 dollar of business TN won would represent “\$20 taken from any 10-year maintenance-based
23 justification for the PeopleSoft/JDE takeover.” Motamed Decl. Ex. S (PTX 0970). Similarly, the
24 Court should permit Oracle to inform the jury that SAP AG Board Member Shai Agassi said,
25 “these customers represent [a] potential future set of customers for SAP applications [whose]
26 value was estimated by Oracle . . . as \$10 billion . . . this customer base is not necessarily captive
27 by Oracle.” Motamed Decl. Ex. T (PTX 0023) at 14. This evidence demonstrates that SAP
28 believed (contrary to what it argues now) the TN acquisition would cause Oracle customers to

1 defect to SAP, and is therefore relevant to lost and infringers' profits causation. These facts are
2 critical to understanding Oracle's lost profits claim and the Court should permit them. *See, e.g.*,
3 Dkt. 1143 (Lanier Decl. Ex. 18 at 339:20-340:4 (explaining that maintenance revenues pay for
4 future R&D); *Id.* Ex. 12 at 12 ("Oracle's Business Relies On Innovation, Research, and
5 Development"))).

6 **1. PTX 4809**

7 SAP also argues PTX 4809 should be excluded because it supposedly relates solely to the
8 hypothetical license theory. However, this document reflects one of Oracle's reasons for the
9 acquisition – the reliable, renewable maintenance stream. *See, e.g.*, PTX 4809 at
10 ORCL00229123. This is important lost profits evidence because it was this revenue stream SAP
11 sought to derail, and the Court should permit to so inform the jury. *See, e.g.*, PTX 0970 ("In
12 replacing Oracle maintenance with 50% savings, this component of TomorrowNow's business
13 translates to nearly \$20M in lost Oracle revenues in 2005. Over 10 years time, this lost annual
14 revenue adds up to \$200M [for Oracle].")

15 PTX 4809 also is relevant to rebut SAP's argument that customers left Oracle because of
16 uncertainty surrounding the PeopleSoft acquisition, and not because of its infringement. *See, e.g.*,
17 Motamed Decl. Ex. J (11/15/10 Trial Tr.) at 1466:15-25 ("If a customer invested in PeopleSoft
18 and JDE and had those systems, liked those systems . . . when they realized that they were
19 uncertain what Oracle's intentions might be [after the acquisition], they then were in a situation of
20 exploring their options.")). For example, the document reflects Oracle's contemporaneous
21 intention to reassure customers that its support infrastructure would remain unchanged, as well as
22 its expectation that 95% of customers would remain with Oracle. PTX 4809 at ORCL00229072,
23 ORCL00229124.

24 Finally, PTX 4809 provides important context evidence that will help inform the jury of
25 the events of January 2005, and why SAP felt Oracle was vulnerable at that time.

26 **2. PTX 4819**

27 SAP asks the Court to exclude PTX 4819 related to Oracle's considerable research and
28 development investments, on the grounds that it is relevant solely to the hypothetical license

1 theory. However, this information provides crucial context. SAP sought to harm Oracle by
2 taking its maintenance revenue (causing Oracle to lose profits) precisely so Oracle could not
3 reinvest those revenues in research and development for new products to compete with SAP, and
4 also so that Oracle could not pay for the PeopleSoft and Siebel acquisitions. *See, e.g.*, Motamed
5 Decl. Ex. U (PTX 0141) at SAP-OR00092050 (“SAP will siphon off the cash flow that Oracle
6 needs to build or acquire its next generation applications.”). *See also* PTX 0024 at SAP-
7 OR00299500 (“The goal” of Safe Passage was to “disrupt Oracle’s ability to pay for the
8 acquisition out of cash flow.”). Those were SAP’s motives, the reasons it hatched its plan to use
9 TN to convert customers from Oracle. The jury needs to understand this critical piece of the story
10 to further understand why Oracle expends enormous sums each year on research and development
11 to remain competitive, and to understand how the loss of support revenues undermines Oracle’s
12 ability to make the investment necessary to earn profits in the first place. This information is not
13 irrelevant, or unfairly prejudicial, it is a key piece of the story and the Court should permit it.

14 **B. SAP’s Expected Financial Benefits/Impacts**

15 SAP also argues the Court should exclude a category of evidence it describes as the
16 financial gains SAP expected to receive from TN. SAP’s expectation that TN would generate
17 revenues for SAP relates directly to causation for infringers’ profits. Oracle will show SAP
18 acquired TN and capitalized on its infringing business model to lure away customers and generate
19 revenues. Though SAP argues now that its scheme to generate large infringers’ profits was
20 neither successful nor credible, its contemporaneous documents contradict that litigation position.

21 The specific documents SAP cites emphasize this point.

22 **1. PTX 0012**

23 SAP asks the Court to exclude PTX 0012, a document entitled “A Roadmap for PSFT
24 Customers to SAP.” This document is literally a “roadmap” of how SAP planned to use TN and
25 its infringing business model to convert customers to SAP. As a result, it relates directly to
26 Oracle’s infringers’ profits claim that SAP used TN to convert customers to SAP and generate
27 license revenues. In a trial that SAP argues is primarily about causation, the document contains
28 the theory of causation developed by SAP’s most senior executives. It also shows SAP believed

1 this process would work (contrary to what it argues now). For example, this document lists
2 SAP's expected ability to "upswitch" and "cross sell" the customers SAP took from Oracle to
3 SAP products and therefore it relates directly to the causation Oracle must show to meet its
4 burden on infringers' profits. *Id.* at SAP-OR00253288. Consequently, and contrary to SAP's
5 assertion, this document is not "solely" related to the hypothetical license. In fact, Meyer
6 references this document in the section of his report related to infringers' profits. *See* Motamed
7 Decl. Ex. R (2/23/10 Meyer Report) at n.819 (citing PTX 0012). *See also id.* ¶ 439 (incorporating
8 § IV.B.3 of Meyer's report, which references PTX 0012 (Meyer's n.147 & n.154).

9 2. **PTX 0024**

10 PTX 0024 also relates to causation. The document explicitly states that SAP's goal in
11 safe passage was "to convert approximately 50% of the PeopleSoft and J.D. Edwards customer
12 installations to SAP." *Id.* at SAP-OR00299500. It is therefore directly relevant to infringers'
13 profits causation as it shows SAP believed the Safe Passage program (based around TN) would
14 cause customers to migrate to SAP and generate infringers' profits. The same page reflects that
15 another of SAP's goals was to disrupt Oracle's ability to pay for the acquisition out of cash flow.
16 It is therefore relevant to lost profits causation as well. *See also id.* at SAP-OR00299501 ("The
17 Safe Passage Strategy . . . customer care is the entry point for the discussion . . . nurture the
18 customer into a migration discussion.").

19 Finally, contrary to SAP's assertion that Oracle used this document solely to support the
20 hypothetical license, Meyer references this document in the infringers' profits section of his
21 report. *See* Motamed Decl. Ex. R (2/23/10 Meyer Report) at ¶ 439 n.815. *See also id.*
22 (incorporating § IV.B.3 of his report, which references PTX 0024 (Meyer's n.140, n.151 &
23 n.158)).

24 3. **PTX 0161**

25 SAP also asks the Court to exclude PTX 0161, the SAP "TomorrowNow Integration"
26 presentation. This is a crucial causation document. It demonstrates that SAP planned to integrate
27 TN to generate additional revenues for SAP, and to harm Oracle by taking away maintenance
28 revenue, and the document reflects SAP's admission that TN was a "major cornerstone" to this

1 Safe Passage program by which it sought to achieve both goals. *See id.* at 4, 15, 17, and 18; *see*
2 *also* Section IV(B)(3), above.

3 SAP argues the document should be excluded because it reflects SAP's expectation that
4 its infringement would generate enormous financial benefits. *See, e.g.*, PTX 0161 at 24 (stating
5 that as of January 2005, SAP believed it could convert 2000 or 4000 customers to TN by 2009,
6 and that this was 2.5 to 5 times Defendants' original projections.). However, this fact only
7 establishes that this document is relevant to causation. Defendants were increasing their
8 expectations of TN's success *because it was working*. Thus, this document is direct evidence that
9 SAP's infringing plan was successful (contrary to Defendants' assertions at the last trial).

10 Also, contrary to SAP's assertion that this document was used "solely" to support the
11 hypothetical license theory, Meyer specifically references this document in the portion of his
12 report related to infringers' profits. *See* Motamed Decl. Ex. R (2/23/10 Meyer Report) at ¶ 439
13 (incorporating § IV.B.3 of his report, which references PTX 0161 (Meyer's n.144). Accordingly,
14 this document is relevant to causation, lost and infringers' profits, and will provide helpful
15 context to the jury. The Court should not exclude it.

16 **4. PTX 0960**

17 SAP also seeks to exclude PTX 0960, the "Siebel Safe Passage Program Playbook".
18 However, the Court should permit Oracle to admit this document because it is relevant to
19 infringers' profits and causation. It shows SAP believed expanding TN's services to cover Siebel
20 products presented an "opportunity . . . to move the 300+ SAP customers SAP and Siebel have in
21 common and migrate them to mySAP CRM." *Id.* at SAP-OR00790354. It therefore shows SAP
22 believed (contrary to what it now says) that its plan to harm Oracle and generate its own revenues
23 from these customers was working so well it should expand the scheme when faced with a new
24 competitive threat. It also shows SAP believed it could use TN in the future to generate license
25 revenues for Siebel TN customers. *Id.* at SAP-OR00790355 ("Program objectives . . . Generate
26 new enterprise license opportunities targeted at Siebel customers where there is an existing SAP
27 footprint.") *See also id.* ("It is important to sell the value that SAP brings to these targeted
28 customers and not simply push the financial incentive of the program.") This is directly relevant

1 to causation and the Court should permit Oracle to use this document.

2 **C. Evidence of Scope and Duration of Licenses (PTX 7028)**

3 Defendants also ask the Court to exclude evidence of the scope and duration of the license
4 SAP would have required to license the rights it infringed. Specifically, SAP asks the Court to
5 exclude PTX 7028, a list of the rights Meyer determined Defendants would have needed to
6 legally do what they in fact did. Clarke agreed with this list. *See, e.g.*, Motamed Decl. Ex. V
7 (6/8/10 Clarke Depo. Tr.) at 176:11:17 (“Q: “You’re saying there’s no meaningful distinction
8 between Mr. Meyer’s [description in PTX 7028] and your description on page 116 [of Clarke’s
9 report]? . . . A: I don't see -- I don't see much difference between the two.”)

10 The scope of the license SAP and TN required is, by definition, the scope of SAP’s and
11 TN’s infringement. The scope of the infringement is relevant, not just for context, but also to
12 prove damages. Pursuant to the Court’s orders, Oracle will not present evidence of what would
13 have transpired in a hypothetical negotiation. However, Defendants have criticized Oracle for
14 purportedly failing to tie damages directly to TN’s infringing conduct. Indeed, Clarke previously
15 sought to remove customers from his calculations on the ground that there supposedly is no
16 evidence of infringement related to those customers. *See e.g.*, Motamed Decl. Ex. V (Clarke
17 Depo. Tr.) at 178:8-18 (“[B]ecause I took out the [customers] that had no accused conduct. So
18 yes, those that remained were the ones with accused conduct.”).

19 PTX 7028 makes clear that *everything* TN did infringed Oracle’s IP. That is, there is no
20 category of accused conduct by which TN acquired or retained customers that does not fall within
21 this admitted scope of license. *See also* Motamed Decl. Ex. W (6/4/12 Clarke Supplement) at n.1
22 (“Based on the assumption that *the entire TomorrowNow business model was infringing*, all of
23 TomorrowNow’s expenses are deductible and TomorrowNow Infringer’s Profits are zero.”)
24 (emphasis supplied). The Court should allow Oracle to use this document to demonstrate that
25 TN’s entire business model was built upon infringement, and that this how it could offer 50%
26 maintenance. This is the activity that caused the loss, and it is therefore directly relevant to
27 causation and context.

28 In fact, the only reason SAP can have for asking the Court to exclude the document is to

1 hide the full extent of its infringement – and the harm it caused – from the jury. Because Clarke
2 adopted the document, and because the jury will hear no argument and receive no instructions
3 related to hypothetical license, there is no risk that this document will confuse the jury or unfairly
4 prejudice SAP. SAP has already stipulated that it would not object to liability evidence entered
5 for context. Dkt.965 (JTX 4) at 2 (“The Parties will not object to evidence related to the
6 stipulated claims pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 401-403 (including that the evidence is
7 irrelevant, cumulative, unduly time consuming or prejudicial) on grounds that the evidence relates
8 to the stipulated claims.”). Accordingly, the Court should not exclude this document, or other
9 evidence of the scope of Defendants’ infringement.

10 **D. The Court Should not Make Any Categorical Ruling on this Issue**

11 Finally, even if the Court disagrees with Oracle and excludes any of the above documents,
12 its ruling should not extend to additional documents as there is no way to make the determination
13 SAP asks for without examining each exhibit. The Court has already ruled as much. Motamed
14 Decl. Ex. K (5/24/12 Hrg. Tr.) at 80:11-17 (“I need to see a list of what specific evidence it is that
15 there's an objection to, then I need to hear you out, and then make a decision. But theoretically,
16 any bit of evidence could arguably be used to support one theory or another. I need to be able to
17 put it in context.”)

18 **E. SAP Improperly Includes Arguments Regarding Oracle’s Demonstratives**

19 SAP also asks the Court to exclude certain of Oracle’s demonstratives (many of which
20 excerpt the documents discussed above) because, it claims, they relate “solely” to the hypothetical
21 license. However, each of the demonstratives SAP cites is relevant to lost and infringers’ profits,
22 and helpful background and context. For example, SAP asks the Court to exclude Oracle’s
23 opening slide 12, which relates to Oracle’s considerable research and development investments.
24 Dkt. 1143 (Lanier Decl. Ex. 12) at 12. This information provides crucial context. SAP sought to
25 harm Oracle by taking its maintenance revenue (causing Oracle to lose profits) precisely so
26 Oracle could not reinvest those revenues in research and development for new products to
27 compete with SAP, and also so that Oracle could not pay for the PeopleSoft and Siebel
28 acquisitions. *See, e.g.*, Motamed Decl. Ex. U (PTX 0141) at SAP-OR00092050 (“SAP will

1 siphon off the cash flow that Oracle needs to build or acquire it's next generation applications.");
2 *see also* PTX 0024 at SAP-OR00299500 ("The goal" of Safe Passage was to "disrupt Oracle's
3 ability to pay for the acquisition out of cash flow.") Those were SAP's motives, the reasons it
4 hatched its plan to use TN to convert customers from Oracle. The jury needs to understand this
5 critical piece of the story, and further understand why Oracle expends enormous sums each year
6 on research and development to remain competitive.

7 **VI. ORACLE'S CATEGORY ONE – ORACLE INCOME STATEMENTS AND**
8 **CANCELLATIONS REPORTS**

9 **ORACLE'S POSITION**

10 Oracle offers its business records that it: (a) made at or near the time of the occurrence of
11 the matters set forth in them, by, or from information transmitted by, a person with knowledge of
12 those matters; (b) kept in the course of regularly conducted business activity; and (c) made by the
13 regularly conducted business activity as a regular practice. Fed. R. Evid. 803(6). Oracle intends
14 to offer such documents at trial, including, but not limited to, the following categories:

15 **Income statements.** To support its lost profits claim, Oracle may introduce detailed
16 income statements that document OIC's quarterly profit margins. *E.g.*, PTX 8040 (DIS
17 SUPPORT TOTAL 110909.XLS). Meyer relies on these documents to calculate lost profits. *See*
18 Motamed Decl. Ex. R (2/23/10 Meyer Report) at ¶¶ 430-432, n.799; *id.* at Schedule 40.2. If
19 Defendants persist in their objection to admission of these exhibits, Oracle will produce a sworn
20 business records declaration by a qualified Oracle employee that lays the foundation required by
21 Fed. R. Evid. 803(6). *See generally* Motamed Decl. Ex. X (11/20/09 Claire Sebti Rule 30(b)(6)
22 Depo.) at 40:08-67:02 (testifying at length about the information contained in PTX 8040); *id.* at
23 70:09-15 (identifying PTX 8040 and a related income statement as Oracle business records ("Q: .
24 . . by the way, all these reports are reports that you just pull off the system in the normal course of
25 business. These were not specially created for this case or anything. Is that right? A: This is
26 correct.") (objections omitted).²⁰ *See also* *S.E.C. v. Leslie*, No. 5:07-cv-03444-JF, 2012 WL

27 ²⁰ Defendants' arguments below, do not challenge whether Oracle's two exemplars are
28 business records. Rather, Defendants argue only that the *cited deposition testimony*, standing
alone, is not sufficient to satisfy Fed. R. Evid. 803(6)'s foundational requirements. This cited
deposition testimony, which includes questions by SAP's counsel aimed at identifying the

1 116562, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 13, 2012) (holding a company’s “restated financials . . . are
2 admissible as business records” and distinguishing between “special audit reports prepared in
3 anticipation of litigation” and “restated quarterly and annual reports . . . prepared in the ordinary
4 course of business.”) (internal citations omitted).

5 **Renewal rate reports.** To support its lost profits claim, Oracle may introduce renewal
6 rate reports that document the renewal rates of Oracle customers for the relevant products at issue
7 in this case. *E.g.*, PTX 2582. Meyer relies on these documents to calculate lost profits and
8 infringers’ profits figures. *See* Motamed Decl. Ex. R (2/23/10 Meyer Report) at ¶ 388; *id.* at
9 Schedule 34.2. If Defendants persist in their objection to admission of these exhibits, Oracle will
10 produce a sworn business records declaration by a qualified Oracle employee that lays the
11 foundation required by Fed. R. Evid. 803(6). *See generally* Motamed Decl. Ex. Y (8/12/09 Eileen
12 McMillan Rule 30(b)(6) Depo.) at 22:01-18, 23:04-23 (“Q: Same question with respect to
13 cancellation reports. . . . Are those reports that you work with in your normal job? A: Yes. Q:
14 In what way do you work with them? A: I produce those reports for the business as the end of
15 every quarter. . . . Q: So is there a cancellation report that’s specific to PeopleSoft products? A:
16 Yes. Q: Is there also a regular quarterly report that you prepare with respect to JD Edwards
17 products? A: We split PeopleSoft out by PeopleSoft and JD Edwards, yes. Q: And is there also
18 a split of the Siebel product line? A: Yes. Q: To whom do you provide those on a quarterly
19 basis? A: I provide them to Gary Miller and to Linda Hartig.”) (objections omitted).

20 _____
(continued...)

21 document as a business record, is simply illustrative. This testimony demonstrates that, if
22 needlessly forced to produce a sworn business records declaration laying proper foundation,
Oracle can and will do so.

23 In addition, Defendants’ insistence that Oracle can resolve Defendants’ objections by stipulating
24 to the admissibility of SAP’s purportedly “comparable” business records is besides the point.
SAP did not identify its documents as part of this process and is unwilling to clarify whether it
25 contends Oracle’s documents are objectionable. In fact, Oracle is unable to stipulate to the
admissibility of Defendants’ documents because there is no deposition testimony, much less Rule
26 30(b)(6) corporate testimony, identifying them, how they were created, or what they purport to
be. They were simply produced by Defendants without foundation. Therefore they are hearsay.
27 This has nothing to do with Oracle’s documents, which are supported by ample foundation.
Though Defendants are wrong about their documents, Defendants’ assertion that their purportedly
28 comparable documents are admissible is an implicit acknowledgment that Oracle’s two exemplars
are, in fact, proper business records under Fed. R. Evid. 803(6).

1 **DEFENDANTS' POSITION**

2 The Parties continue to engage in ongoing meet and confer on potential fact stipulations,
3 including stipulating to the admissibility of each side's proposed business records, and have
4 reached agreements on several documents. As part of that ongoing meet and confer, Defendants
5 requested additional information about both of the purported business records that Oracle now
6 presents to the Court to understand the basis for admission. The foundational support is not
7 readily apparent from the documents themselves, and these are complex materials.

8 Defendants do not believe that the deposition testimony Oracle cites herein satisfies the
9 requirements of Rule 803(6). Specifically, the renewal rate report (PTX 2582) does not appear to
10 be the same document used in the cited McMillan 30(b)(6) deposition and may be a compilation
11 of summary sheets of cancellation rates without the back-up data that was in the materials
12 discussed in the deposition. *See* Vol. 3 (8/12/09 McMillan Tr.) at 41:21-43:12. With regard to
13 the income statement, although there is a lengthy discussion regarding this document (now
14 labeled PTX 8020) in the Sebti 30(b)(6) deposition, among other things, the testimony does not
15 establish that the entire record was made at or near the time by—or from information transmitted
16 by—someone with knowledge, as the witness testified that she did not know the origin of at least
17 some of the underlying information. *See, e.g.*, 11/20/09 Claire Sebti Rule 30(b)(6) Depo. at
18 53:18-21, 56:13-17, 58:21-59:11, 62:10-23 (lodged by Oracle).

19 Nevertheless, and as Defendants explained to Oracle in meet and confer communications,
20 Defendants will agree to admission of these two purported business records without requiring
21 Oracle to prove the business records foundation, so long as comparable SAP exhibits also are
22 admitted as business records. Specifically, the substance of the income statement above (*i.e.*,
23 Oracle financial statement purportedly used to calculate Oracle's profit margin) is similar to
24 certain financial statements from SAP—namely, SAP's "trial balances" (SAP financial statements
25 used to calculate SAP's profit margin), which are exhibits A-6623 to A-6643. Vol. 2 (A-6624
26 excerpt). SAP's trial balances are standard, regularly maintained reports of the company's
27 accounting data. Trial balances are simply lists of the balances in companies' general ledger
28 accounts at a given point in time. Most companies, including SAP, produce trial balances on a

1 routine basis as part of the companies' financial management and accounting process. These are
2 classic business records under Rule 803(6).

3 Oracle has been unwilling to accept this mutually fair proposal. Although Defendants
4 agree that the parties may present business record declarations as contemplated by Rule
5 803(6)(D) (and Defendants can meet their obligations with a declaration), for convenience and to
6 streamline presentation of the evidence, Defendants would stipulate to the Court pre-admitting
7 PTX 8040 and PTX 2582, provided that A-6623 to A-6643 also are admitted as business records.

8 **VII. ORACLE'S CATEGORY TWO – POST-TRIAL STATEMENTS BY SAP**
9 **EXECUTIVES**

10 **ORACLE'S POSITION**

11 At the last trial, SAP claimed it intended to take responsibility for its misdeeds. *See, e.g.,*
12 Motamed Decl. Ex. J (11/2/10 Trial Tr.) at 385:11-12 (“We admit all of that. And more
13 important, we acknowledge responsibility for it.”). Oracle expects SAP to make the same
14 argument at the coming trial, and SAP has confirmed that it will do so. It is a common enough
15 strategy for a defendant that cannot avoid liability to claim that it accepts responsibility for the
16 harm it has caused. The purpose of that time-honored tactic is to build credibility with the jury by
17 establishing that the defendant is not hiding anything, and asks only that it be held to a just
18 account. SAP is entitled to tell the jury that story. But trials are about credibility, and Oracle is
19 entitled to tell the jury the different story that SAP's top two executives have told the world (and
20 what SAP reconfirms below): SAP does not really accept responsibility, but stipulated to liability
21 as a litigation tactic to minimize damages.

22 For instance, at an SAP Shareholders' Meeting on May 25, 2011, SAP's Co-CEO, Bill
23 McDermott, claimed SAP decided to admit “vicarious and contributory liability” as a tactical
24 maneuver “to limit the litigation to the question of damages, which we hoped would result in a
25 lower amount of damages.” PTX 8112 (SAP S'holders' Mtg. Tr. at 4, *available at*
26 [http://www.sap.com/corporate-en/investors/governance/meetings/pdf/2011-05-25-](http://www.sap.com/corporate-en/investors/governance/meetings/pdf/2011-05-25-ShareholderMeeting-e-mcdermott.Pdf)
27 [ShareholderMeeting-e-mcdermott.Pdf](http://www.sap.com/corporate-en/investors/governance/meetings/pdf/2011-05-25-ShareholderMeeting-e-mcdermott.Pdf) (last visited May 8, 2012)). At the same meeting, Hasso
28 Plattner, a founder of the company and the Chairman of SAP AG's Supervisory Board, claimed

1 that SAP admitted to contributory copyright infringement as a mere legal tactic: “SAP accepted
2 responsibility on the advice of our lawyers primarily in order to be able to concentrate on the
3 question of damages in the civil proceedings in the USA.” PTX 8111 (SAP S’holders’ Mtg.
4 Webcast at 20:16, *available at* [http://www.sap.com/company/media/110525_](http://www.sap.com/company/media/110525_ShareholdersMeeting_EN_250.aspx)
5 [ShareholdersMeeting_EN_250.aspx](http://www.sap.com/company/media/110525_ShareholdersMeeting_EN_250.aspx) (last visited May 8, 2009)). Mr. Plattner also claimed the
6 press “often interpreted this procedural admittance, wrongly, I might add, to mean that the SAP
7 executive board had admitted it had known about TN’s breaches of copyright in the USA,” and
8 that, in fact, “the ongoing investigations have not uncovered any signs that any duty was
9 breached.” *Id.* at 20:40.

10 The Court should allow Oracle to challenge the credibility of SAP’s assertion, which is a
11 cornerstone of its defense, that the damages it claims it owes represent “taking responsibility” for
12 its admitted infringement. In fact, that assertion is false. Outside of Court, when they thought
13 trial had ended, SAP’s executives boasted publicly that SAP’s offer to take responsibility for its
14 misdeeds is nothing more than a self-serving gambit to reduce the damages it owes. Thus, these
15 out of court statements directly contradict the positions SAP took at the last trial and will take
16 again at the coming trial. This evidence relates directly to SAP’s primary defense at trial, and to
17 its executives’ credibility. Accordingly, the Court should allow these statements into evidence as
18 admissions.

19 **DEFENDANTS’ POSITION**

20 Oracle’s focus on these post-trial statements confirms that Oracle plans to present a case
21 about liability and punishment, not damages. Descriptions of Defendants’ business and legal
22 reasons for stipulating to liability are not probative of any issue related to damages. *See* Fed. R.
23 Evid. 401. They do not concern whether, why, or how many customers left Oracle as a result of
24 the infringement. SAP executives made these statements after trial in the course of explaining a
25 strategic legal decision to an audience of German shareholders at a meeting in Germany pursuant
26 to German law. The statements relate to that legal decision, not to the facts underlying the
27 litigation. They do not change the fact that Defendants stipulated to liability—they merely cite
28 strategic reasons for that decision, consistent with Defendants’ previous representations to this

1 Court. *See, e.g.*, ECF No. 727 (Defs.’ Trial Brief) at 2 (proposing liability stipulations to “focus
2 on . . . damages” because “Plaintiffs’ damages claims are untethered to the facts or law”); Vol. 3
3 (11/8/10 Trial Tr.) at 831:13-14 (stipulations were made for “business or legal reasons”).

4 Moreover, these statements would cause unfair prejudice, confuse the issues, and mislead
5 the jury. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 403. Oracle will use these statements to conflate the issues of liability
6 and damages, and it will attempt to convince the jury that liability has not been fully resolved—
7 all in an effort to increase the jury’s award.

8 **VIII. ORACLE’S CATEGORY THREE – STATEMENTS FROM THE**
9 **TOMORROWNOW PLEA AGREEMENT**

10 **ORACLE’S POSITION**

11 At the pre-trial conference, the Court granted SAP’s motion to exclude evidence of TN’s
12 criminal plea agreement. However, at that conference, the Court noted the distinction between
13 the facts and statement contained within the plea, and the fact of the plea itself. Motamed Decl.
14 Ex. K (5/24/12 Hrg. Tr.) at 85:3-5 (“The conviction doesn’t, in and of itself, doesn’t establish the
15 causation. It’s the actual admissions made at the time of the plea that go to that effect.”)
16 Accordingly, the Court should allow Oracle to introduce the admissions relating to causation
17 contained within the plea agreement without referencing that the admissions came from the guilty
18 plea.

19 For example, in the plea agreement, TN admitted that “[d]uring approximately the 2005-
20 2007 time period, TOMORROWNOW was engaged in an effort to convince Oracle customers
21 that had licensed Oracle’s software to terminate their use of Oracle’s maintenance and support
22 services for that software and instead to retain TOMORROWNOW to provide those maintenance
23 and support services. *As a result of these efforts, a number of Oracle customers did switch from*
24 *using Oracle’s maintenance and support services to using TOMORROWNOW for such services.”*
25 PTX 8108 at 3 (emphasis supplied). This evidence relates directly to lost profits and the
26 causation that Defendants and their expert contest. Oracle should be allowed to tell the jury that
27 Defendants have admitted the very facts they now deny, without referencing the fact that this
28 admission came in a criminal plea.

1 The Court has already provided a mechanism for this. At the pretrial conference, the
2 Court approved referring to testimony from the first trial as coming from a “previous proceeding.”
3 Motamed Decl. Ex. K (5/24/12 Hrg. Tr.) at 93:15-24. The admissions from the plea agreement
4 can be handled in a similar fashion, and Oracle should be allowed to inform the jury, for instance,
5 that TN previously admitted that “it willfully infringed the copyrights of Oracle’s copyrighted
6 works . . . and that it did so for the purpose of commercial advantage and private financial gain.”
7 PTX 8108 at 5.

8 Consequently, the Court should allow Oracle to reference these admissions without
9 referencing the plea agreement itself. This will avoid causing any undue prejudice or potential
10 confusion, and allow Oracle to fairly dispute Defendants’ contentions contrary to their plea.

11 **DEFENDANTS’ POSITION**

12 The Court should reject Oracle’s back-door attempt to introduce evidence of
13 TomorrowNow’s guilty plea. The Court already has excluded evidence of the guilty plea and
14 conviction, *see* ECF No. 1171 (5/29/12 Order) at 4, and this ruling naturally encompasses
15 “admissions relating to causation contained within the plea agreement,” *supra*. As Oracle
16 recently argued, the conviction and the admissions in the plea agreement “are wrapped up in each
17 other,” and the Court should not “separate the basis for the conviction from the conviction itself.”
18 Vol. 3 (5/24/12 Hrg. Tr.) at 85:6-12.

19 The same considerations that justify excluding the conviction also warrant excluding
20 admissions in the plea agreement. As the Court ruled, admitting the TomorrowNow guilty plea
21 would “be unduly prejudicial to SAP who did not enter a plea of guilty.” *Id.* at 88:14-16. The
22 statements in the plea agreement were made by TomorrowNow, not SAP. Admitting these
23 statements in a trial about SAP’s infringer’s profits, creates a serious risk of confusing the issues
24 and misleading the jury. These statements would cause undue prejudice to SAP, which did not
25 make them and did not plead guilty. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 403.

26 The dangers far outweigh the minimal probative value of the statements. *See id.* The plea
27 agreement contains only general statements of causation about unnamed “customers,” without
28 attempting to quantify the number of customers that left Oracle for TomorrowNow or the

1 damages at stake. But Defendants agree that a “number” of customers left Oracle for
2 TomorrowNow maintenance support, resulting in some amount of damages. The dispute in this
3 case, and the focus of the new trial, is *which* customers should be counted. The statements in the
4 plea agreement provide no insight into those disputed issues in the new trial and are cumulative of
5 the broader causation point. Given the inextricable link between these statements and the guilty
6 plea, the unfairly prejudicial effect of TomorrowNow’s statements to SAP, and their minimal
7 probative value, these statements should be excluded under Rule 403.

8 DATED: June 5, 2012

JONES DAY

9 By: /s/ Tharan Gregory Lanier
10 Tharan Gregory Lanier

11 Counsel for Defendants
12 SAP AG, SAP AMERICA, INC., and
TOMORROWNOW, INC.

13 In accordance with General Order No. 45, Rule X, the above signatory attests that
14 concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the signatory below.

15 DATED: June 5, 2012

Bingham McCutchen LLP

17 By: /s/ Geoffrey M. Howard
18 Geoffrey M. Howard
19 Attorneys for Plaintiff
20 Oracle International Corporation
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28