

EXHIBIT D

HASSO PLATTNER June 2, 2009
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 1

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,)	
)	
vs.)	No. 07-CV-1658 (PJH)
)	
SAP AG, a German corporation,)	
SAP AMERICA, INC., a Delaware)	
corporation, TOMORROWNOW,)	
INC., a Texas corporation, and)	
DOES 1-50, inclusive,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF
HASSO PLATTNER

TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 2009

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

REPORTED BY: HOLLY THUMAN, CSR No. 6834, RMR, CRR
(1-419913)

HASSO PLATTNER June 2, 2009
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 55

10:02:25 4 Q. Sure. We can only get so far with these
10:02:27 5 theoretical discussions.

10:02:29 6 So let me ask you to think about the
10:02:32 7 reverse situation, and assume that -- assume that
10:02:38 8 SAP is forced to license its own IP -- and to make
10:02:42 9 it equivalent, let's focus on it's ERP, its Business
10:02:48 10 Suite, and the IP used to support it -- to a
10:02:53 11 third-party provider.

10:02:55 12 You're required to do this license.

10:02:57 13 A. By law?

10:02:57 14 Q. By my hypothetical.

10:03:01 15 A. Now we are in two-tier hypothetical square?

10:03:08 16 Q. It's true, it's a hypothetical. But your
10:03:11 17 instructions are, you must license it. And I want
10:03:14 18 you to assume that the third party is owned by
10:03:18 19 Oracle, and that you understand that Oracle is going
10:03:24 20 to be subsidizing that third-party provider in a way
10:03:30 21 that will allow the provider to charge 50 percent of
10:03:35 22 what you would ordinarily charge for maintenance on
10:03:38 23 your own software. And, that the subsidiary may
10:03:49 24 charge nothing if the customers agree to switch from
10:03:56 25 SAP to Oracle.

Merrill Legal Solutions
(800) 869-9132

HASSO PLATTNER June 2, 2009
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 56

10:03:58 1 A. Maintenance.

10:03:59 2 Q. Maintenance. Well, and switch their

10:04:00 3 applications themselves. Zero for maintenance, yes,

10:04:07 4 if that was your question.

10:04:08 5 A. Then there is no business for us any more.

10:04:11 6 Then we lost the customer.

10:04:16 7 Q. Well, you are competing for the customer,

10:04:17 8 but you're licensing to Oracle to allow it to

10:04:20 9 compete with you.

10:04:21 10 A. Okay. Have we lost the customer, or we are

10:04:25 11 going to lose the customer, or it's still our

10:04:27 12 customer?

10:04:28 13 Q. It's still your customer, but you are

10:04:29 14 licensing the software to Oracle to allow it to

10:04:32 15 compete with you on essentially --

10:04:33 16 A. The maintenance?

10:04:34 17 Q. -- the maintenance, and also the software

10:04:36 18 itself.

10:04:37 19 MR. LANIER: Let him get his whole question

10:04:39 20 out.

10:04:39 21 MR. HOWARD: Q. Right. But it's okay. I

10:04:41 22 want it to be clear.

10:04:45 23 So in other words, I want you to have in

10:04:47 24 mind that Oracle is essentially launching a Safe

10:04:50 25 Passage program, but it has the SAP software through

HASSO PLATTNER June 2, 2009
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 57

10:04:53 1 its license with you to provide the support to the
10:04:56 2 customers to migrate them off of SAP and to Oracle.

10:05:05 3 In that situation, and you're negotiating a
10:05:07 4 license for that, I want to ask whether you would
10:05:11 5 consider the following factors:

10:05:13 6 Would you consider the research and
10:05:15 7 development that SAP expended to develop the
10:05:21 8 software it would then be licensing to Oracle?

10:05:24 9 MR. LANIER: Calls for speculation, lacks
10:05:25 10 foundation, incomplete and counterfactual
10:05:29 11 hypothetical, assumes facts not in evidence, calls
10:05:31 12 for an expert opinion -- I'm going to now -- you can
10:05:34 13 answer.

10:05:34 14 THE WITNESS: The price has to be lower
10:05:35 15 than the price we charge for maintenance, because
10:05:39 16 somebody else is doing the job for us. So it's net
10:05:42 17 income to us. So it's actually -- if this
10:05:46 18 hypothetical case would happen, it's actually an
10:05:48 19 interesting case, and it depends now what the
10:05:53 20 percentage is, but -- so it will be lower than what
10:05:57 21 we charge the customer, because it's an indirect
10:06:00 22 charge. It's like indirect software sales.

10:06:02 23 MR. HOWARD: Q. Okay. So if I understand
10:06:04 24 you, then, you would not -- in setting this fee, you
10:06:07 25 would not take into account the money that SAP spent

HASSO PLATTNER June 2, 2009
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 58

10:06:09 1 to develop the software in the first place?

10:06:12 2 A. No.

10:06:12 3 MR. LANIER: Same objections.

10:06:13 4 THE WITNESS: And actually, in this
10:06:15 5 hypothetical case, which has to have a legal
10:06:17 6 framework, I think part of the legal framework would
10:06:20 7 be that we are not allowed to charge a third party
10:06:24 8 more than we charge ourselves, which would be
10:06:28 9 probably antitrust.

10:06:31 10 MR. HOWARD: Q. Okay. Would you take
10:06:33 11 into --

10:06:33 12 A. At least -- excuse me, at least I think I
10:06:36 13 interpret the EU law like this.

HASSO PLATTNER June 2, 2009
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 65

10:16:23 19 Q. No, I'm perfectly fine.
10:16:24 20 Assume that you were one of the
10:16:26 21 decision-makers at Oracle, if that's possible to do.
10:16:30 22 And you've just acquired PeopleSoft. You've spent
10:16:38 23 18 months doing that. You've paid a lot of money
10:16:41 24 for it. And you are expecting to get at least a
10:16:47 25 1.2-billion-dollar-per-year maintenance revenue

Merrill Legal Solutions
(800) 869-9132

HASSO PLATTNER June 2, 2009
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 66

10:16:51 1 stream from that customer base. But now are going
10:16:56 2 to be forced to license the PeopleSoft software
10:17:00 3 to --

10:17:02 4 A. Maintenance.

10:17:02 5 Q. -- maintenance software -- well, all of it.
10:17:06 6 All software, to SAP's subsidiary TomorrowNow for it
10:17:14 7 to provide competing maintenance service at 50
10:17:18 8 percent off, and so that SAP can attempt to sell its
10:17:23 9 software to that same customer base.

10:17:27 10 In determining now -- and remember, in this
10:17:30 11 hypothetical, you're in the position of Oracle --
10:17:33 12 would you consider the purchase price that Oracle
10:17:36 13 has just paid to PeopleSoft in setting that license
10:17:40 14 fee?

10:17:40 15 MR. LANIER: Same objections.

10:17:42 16 THE WITNESS: No.

10:17:45 17 MR. HOWARD: Q. And for the reasons that
10:17:46 18 you've already given?

10:17:47 19 A. That's -- the history of the development of
10:17:54 20 cost at GM is not relevant to the price GM can
10:17:58 21 charge for a car now.

10:18:00 22 Q. And would you take into account the
10:18:02 23 18-month struggle that you've just gone through to
10:18:06 24 get that software and that customer base?

10:18:09 25 A. If they're --

HASSO PLATTNER June 2, 2009
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 67

10:18:10 1 MR. LANIER: Same objections.

10:18:11 2 THE WITNESS: If there is a legal umbrella

10:18:13 3 you described before, then this is not related.

10:18:16 4 MR. HOWARD: Q. And would you take into

10:18:20 5 account that by the acquisition, you have just

10:18:24 6 expanded your share of the applications business?

10:18:30 7 MR. LANIER: Same objection.

10:18:31 8 MR. HOWARD: Q. By acquiring the

10:18:32 9 PeopleSoft customers?

10:18:33 10 MR. LANIER: Sorry. Same objections. Go

10:18:34 11 ahead.

10:18:34 12 THE WITNESS: I don't understand the

10:18:35 13 question.

10:18:36 14 MR. HOWARD: Q. In other words, if you're

10:18:38 15 in Oracle's position, a rationale for the

10:18:40 16 acquisition is that you are increasing market share

10:18:43 17 in the software business. Right?

10:18:46 18 MR. LANIER: Same objections. Go ahead.

10:18:48 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.

10:18:48 20 MR. HOWARD: Q. And you're going to be

10:18:51 21 getting this maintenance revenue stream from those

10:18:53 22 customers.

10:18:54 23 Would you take those factors into account

10:18:56 24 in setting the license fee?

10:18:58 25 MR. LANIER: Same objections.

HASSO PLATTNER June 2, 2009
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 68

10:18:59 1 MR. HOWARD: Q. To TomorrowNow?

10:19:05 2 A. Okay. Again, if I'm forced to provide this
10:19:09 3 license to competitors, then there are rules under
10:19:11 4 which I am being forced, and I follow these rules.

10:19:15 5 And as I said several times, I do not
10:19:18 6 understand antitrust laws, but there is -- this is
10:19:23 7 derived from the position and the freedom of choice
10:19:27 8 of the customer.

10:19:29 9 Q. Well, let's say you're not being forced.
10:19:33 10 Let's say that the two sides are just sitting down
10:19:39 11 to try and negotiate that license under those
10:19:41 12 circumstances I just described.

10:19:44 13 Would you then be taking into account how
10:19:46 14 much you've paid?

10:19:47 15 MR. LANIER: Same objections.

10:19:53 16 THE WITNESS: Then I can do what I want.

10:19:58 17 MR. HOWARD: Q. And would you then --

10:20:00 18 A. And --

10:20:01 19 Q. Would you then take into account how much
10:20:03 20 you've paid if you're Oracle for the PeopleSoft
10:20:05 21 business?

10:20:05 22 A. Then we don't have to sit together.

HASSO PLATTNER June 2, 2009
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

11:13:19

1

Going off the record, the time is 11:13.

11:26:47

2

(Time noted, 11:13 a.m.)

3

--o0o--

4

I declare under penalty of perjury that

5

the foregoing is true and correct. Subscribed at


6

Walldorf, ^{GERMANY} California, this 01 day of

7

July 2009.

8



9

HASSO PLATTNER

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Merrill Legal Solutions
(800) 869-9132

Notarization

Notarielle Unterschriftsbeglaubigung

I, the undersigned Notary Public,

Ich, der unterzeichnende Notar,

Manfred G a u l

(Name of the Notary Public / Name des Notars)

hereby confirm that the proceeding
signature was
executed before me today
by Mr.

beglaubige hiermit die Echtheit der vorstehenden
Unterschrift,
vor mir heute vollzogen
durch Herrn

Prof. Dr. h.c. Hasso Plattner

(Name / Name)

January 21st, 1944 / 21. Januar 1944

(Date of birth / Geburtsdatum)

Röschbacher Hof 2, D- 69198 Schriesheim-Altenbach

(Residential adress / Privatanschrift)

who is personally known to me.

der mir persönlich bekannt ist.


In case of doubt, the German version of
this notarization shall prevail.

Im Zweifelsfalle ist die deutsche Übersetzung
dieses Beglaubigungsvermerks maßgeblich.

Walldorf (Germany), July 1, 2009 / Walldorf (Deutschland), 1. Juli 2009

(Place, date / Ort, Datum)

Notariat 5 Heidelberg



(Signature of the Notary Public/Unterschrift des Notars)

(Gaul, Notary Public / Notar)

(Seal / Siegel)

5UR 930/2009



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


CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, HOLLY THUMAN, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, hereby certify that the witness in the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the within-entitled cause; that said deposition was taken down in shorthand by me, a disinterested person, at the time and place therein stated, and that the testimony of the said witness was thereafter reduced to typewriting, by computer, under my direction and supervision;

That before completion of the deposition, review of the transcript was [] was not requested. If requested, any changes made by the deponent (and provided to the reporter) during the period allowed are appended hereto.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to the said deposition, nor in any way interested in the event of this cause, and that I am not related to any of the parties thereto.

DATED June 5, 2009.



HOLLY THUMAN, CSR No. 6834