Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document369-3 Filed07/28/09 Page1 of 12

EXHIBIT C

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
ORACLE CORPORATION, a
    Delaware corporation, ORACLE )
USA, INC., a Colorado
    corporation, and ORACLE
INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION, a )
    California corporation,
             Plaintiffs, )
                     ) No. 07-CV-1658 (PJH)
            VS.
    SAP AG, a German corporation, )
SAP AMERICA, INC., a Delaware )
     corporation, TOMORROWNOW,
INC., a Texas corporation, and )
     DOES 1-50, inclusive,
             Defendants. )
VIDEOTAPED 30(b)(6) DEPOSITION OF
ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
THROUGH ITS DESIGNEE
UYEN NGOC ANN KISHORE
TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 2009
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
REPORTED BY: HOLLY THUMAN, CSR No. 6834, RMR, CRR
(1-417372)
```

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document369-3 Filed07/28/09 Page3 of 12

e_SAP	Kishore, Ann - OIC 30(b0(6) - Final 4/14/20
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	Q. Okay. So does that mean of the well,
19	what's the PeopleSoft application revenue and
20	related support? Is that a calculated number that
21	you have to calculate under the agreement?
22	A. So "PeopleSoft Application Revenue" is
23	defined here in the agreement. And it means net
24	revenue received from the following product lines:
<i>L</i> -1	PeopleSoft Enterprise and J.D. Edwards

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document369-3 Filed07/28/09 Page4 of 12

Oracle_SAP	<u> </u>	Kishore, Ann	- OIC 30(b0(6) - Final		4/14/2009
1	EnterpriseOne.			•	
. 2					
3					
4					
5	\$.*·				
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19				,	
20			,		
21					
22	,				
23					·
24	:				
25					

None Page 122

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document369-3 Filed07/28/09 Page5 of 12

Oracle_SAP	Kishore, Ann - OIC 30(b0(6) - Final	·	4/14/2009
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7		•	
8 .			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19	Q. Okay. Did you track the R&D costs related		
20	to JDE World as part of the administration of the		
21	Cost Sharing Agreement?		
22	A. Yes.	·	
23	Q. And why?		
24	A. Because JDE World is not part of the		
25	definition of "research activity."		

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document369-3 Filed07/28/09 Page6 of 12

Oracle_SAP	Kishore, Ann - OIC 30(b0(6) - Final		4/14/2009
1			
2			
. 3			
4			
5		•	
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12		. *	
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18	Q. Was Baker & McKenzie serving as counsel to		
	someone in connection with this matter, matter I		
19			
20	mean being the setting of that royalty rate?		
21	A. Baker I don't know the answer to that		
22	question. Could you maybe rephrase it?		
23	Q. Was Baker & McKenzie representing some		
24	Oracle entity in connection with the computer		
25	software buy-in agreement you mentioned?		

4/14/2009 Kishore, Ann - OIC 30(b0(6) - Final Oracle_SAP 1 A. I don't know. Q. Was Baker and -- what is your understanding 2 3 as to why Baker & McKenzie provided you with a spreadsheet of financial information? 4 A. Sure. So we asked Baker & McKenzie to 5 assist us in determining the appropriate royalty 6 rate associated with this particular agreement. 7 Q. In that capacity, did you understand Baker 8 & McKenzie was representing some Oracle entity? 9 10 A. No. Q. Okay. Well, what is your understanding of 11 why they were doing what they were doing if they 12 13 weren't counsel? A. Well, we asked them to assist us with 14 determining the appropriate royalty rate hereunder. 15 They did assist us as well in drafting the 16 agreement, and we asked them to assist us in 17 determining the dollar amount associated with the 18 royalty payment hereunder. 19 Q. And -- but they were not acting as your 20 21 attorneys in that capacity? A. I'm sorry, I thought you were asking if I 22 knew which entity Baker was acting in its capacity 23 as, and I -- to be honest, I don't know which Oracle 24 25 entity.

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document369-3 Filed07/28/09 Page8 of 12

Oracle_SAP		Kishore, Ann - OIC 30(b0(6) - Final	4/14/2009
1	Q.	But it was some Oracle entity?	
2	A.	Yes, because Oracle asked them.	
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			,
8		1	
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Oracle_SAP	Kishore, Ann - OIC 30(b0(6) - Final 4/1	4/2009
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	MR. McDONELL: Q. So you've told us that	
7	there is some license between OIC and a third party	
8	of intellectual property. Right?	
9	A. Yes.	
10	Q. Did that information get told to you by an	
11	attorney?	
12	MR. HOWARD: You can answer that "yes" or	
13	"no."	
	THE WITNESS: Yes.	
14		
15	MR. McDONELL: Q. Who was the attorney?	
16	A. T.J.	
17	Q. When was that told to you?	
18	A. Within this year.	
19	Q. Did he tell you that the information the	
20	fact of there being such a license with a third	
21	party was privileged and confidential?	
22	MR. HOWARD: I'm going to instruct you not	
23	to answer that question on grounds of	
24	attorney-client privilege.	
25	Now you are getting into the content of the	

None

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document369-3 Filed07/28/09 Page10 of 12

Oracle_SAP	Kishore, Ann - OIC 30(b0(6) - Final	4/14/2009
1	communication, Counsel.	
2	MR. McDONELL: I have to test whether it's	
3	really privileged.	
4	MR. HOWARD: Well, you've laid your	
5	foundation as to the participants in the	
6	conversation.	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document369-3 Filed07/28/09 Page11 of 12

acle_SAP	Kishore, Ann - OIC 30(b0(6) - Final	4/14/2009
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13	MR. McDONELL: Q. Was the memo given to	
14	you by Baker & McKenzie?	•
15	A. Yes.	
16	Q. Did it contain legal advice, or was it just	
17	a quantitative calculation?	
18	A. It does contain legal advice.	
19	Q. Did you consider it to be confidential at	
. 20	the time they gave it to you?	
21	A. Yes.	
22	Q. Have you kept it confidential since the	
23	time you received it?	
24	A. Yes.	
25	Q. Was it your expectation when you received	

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document369-3 Filed07/28/09 Page12 of 12

Oracle_SAP	Kishore, Ann - OIC 30(b0(6) - Final	4/14/2009
1	it that you might have to turn it over to auditors	
2	from the State of California Franchise Tax Board?	
3	MR. HOWARD: Objection. Calls for	
4	speculation.	
5	THE WITNESS: It was not my expectation.	
6	MR. McDONELL: Q. Was it your expectation	
7	that you might have to turn it over to any taxing	
8	authorities?	
9	A. Yes.	
10	Q. Okay. Which taxing authorities?	
11	A. The Internal Service Revenue.	
12	Q. Have you turned it over to the IRS?	
13	A. No. I'm sorry, it's Internal Revenue	
14	Service. I'm sorry.	
15		·
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		•
23		
24		•
25		