EXHIBIT 24

Doc. 657 Att. 23

Page 243

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 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 :CA NO. 07-CV-01658 (MJJ)

V.

SAP AG, A GERMAN, :
CORPORATION, SAP AMERICA, :
INC., A DELAWARE CORPORATION, :
TOMORROWNOW, INC., A TEXAS :
CORPORATION, AND DOES 1-50, :
INCLUSIVE, :

Defendants

"HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL"
VIDEOTAPED AND ORAL DEPOSITION OF
TOMORROWNOW BY AND THROUGH SHELLEY NELSON
VOLUME 3
APRIL 18, 2008

VIDEOTAPED AND ORAL DEPOSITION Of SHELLEY NELSON, produced as a witness at the instance of Counsel for the Plaintiffs, and duly sworn, was taken in the above-styled and numbered cause on the 18th day of April, 2008, from 8:27 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., before JANE E. DEMARS, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, reported by machine shorthand, at the Law Offices of Graves, Dougherty, Hearon & Moody, 401 Congress Avenue, Austin, Travis County, Texas, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the provisions stated on the record or attached hereto.

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page3 of 22

SHELLEY NELSON April 18, 2008 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 363
11:45	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
•	6	
	7	
	8	Q And how about HR 7.02 REP? Do you know what
	9	that environment is?
•	10	A I believe so.
	11	Q What is that environment?
	12	A The R, the REP stands for replication, and it
	13	was a backup of the 7.02 environment that was used as
	14	part of the testing process for the tax update.
11:46	15	Q How would HR 7.02 REP be used in the testing
	16	process for tax updates?
	17	A I, I recall that it was used for the testers
	18	to set up, set up scenarios or test data in the
	19	environments, and then it was, it was backed up with the
:	20	name REP, and then that became the baseline, then,
:	21	that I'm trying to remember this. It's been many
:	22	years.
:	23	After this backup was took place, the,
2	24	the tester would continue to run process to try to
2	25	replicate issues, and then they would restore the tax
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page4 of 22

SHELLEY NELSON April 18, 2008 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 364
11:47	1	update environment using the REP backup, and then apply
	2	the development activity to that backup so that they
	3	wouldn't have to reenter test data after they had
	4	replicated.
	5	Q This was all part of the retrofit of tax
	6	update process at TomorrowNow?
	7	A Yes.
	8	Q Which client software was used to create
	9	HR 7.02 REP?
	10	A I'm not sure.
	11	Q Do you have any idea?
	12	A I have, I have an idea that it would be a 7.02
	13	commercial client.
	14	Q Okay. And would it have been TomorrowNow's
11:48	15	first HR 7.02 commercial client?
	16	A Potentially.
	17	MR. LANIER: Object to form. Sorry.
	18	Q (BY MR. HOWARD) Is that your belief, is that
	19	that's the customer's software that was used to create
	20	HR 7.02 IP, the first TommorrowNow HR 7.02 commercial
	21	client?
	22	A It's possible.
	23	Q Do you know who created HR 7.02 REP?
	24	A No.
	25	Q Was HR 7.02 REP used in the, for the testing

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page5 of 22

SHELLEY NELSON April 18, 2008 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

	Page 365
11:49 1	of more than one tax update?
2	A It's possible. Probably.
3	Q It was used for, repeatedly over the course of
4	several tax updates.
5	MR. LANIER: Object
6	Q (BY MR. HOWARD) Is that right?
7	MR. LANIER: Object to form.
8	THE WITNESS: It's possible.
9	Q (BY MR. HOWARD) How many clients received tax
10	updates that were tested using HR 7.02 REP?
11	MR. LANIER: Object to form.
12	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure. Less than
13	three. Three or less.
14	Q (BY MR. HOWARD) How many times did those
11:49 15	customers receive those tax updates using HR 7.02 REP?
16	MR. LANIER: Object to form.
17	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page6 of 22 SHELLEY NELSON April 18, 2008

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

	÷	Page 400
13:13	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
•	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
·	9	Q (BY MR. HOWARD) When, after SAP's acquisition
	10	of TomorrowNow, did you have a discussion with
	11	Andrew Nelson relating to the legality of the critical
	12	support model?
	13	A It was either I think it was Q2 of 2005.
	14	Q Was anybody else involved in that discussion
13:14	15	that you had in Q2 of 2005 with Andrew Nelson?
	16	A Yes.
	17	Q Who?
	18	A Legal counsel.
	19	Q And was that legal counsel for SAP?
	20	A Yes.
	21	Q And was that Mr. Faye?
	22	A Yes.
	2,3	Q Was anybody else, other than you, Mr. Nelson
	2,4	and Mr. Faye, involved in that discussion in Q2 of 2005?
	25	A No.

	Page 535
1	I further certify that I am neither attorney nor
2	coursel for, related to, nor employed by any of the
3	parties to the action in which this testimony was taken;
4	and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of
5	any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto
6	or financially interested in the action.
7	I further certify that the deposition transcript
8 .	was submitted on to the witness or
9	to the attorney for the witness for examination,
10	signature and return to me by;
11	The original deposition was/was not returned to the
12	deposition officer on;
13	If returned, the attached Changes and Signature
14	page contains any changes and the reasons therefor;
. 5	If returned, the original deposition was delivered
.6	to, Custodial Attorney;
7	That \$ is the deposition officer's
ĝ	charges to the Plaintiffs for preparing the original
3	deposition transcript and any copies of exhibits;
ĵ	WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL OF OFFICE, this 22

day of ______, 2008.

Jan Demars

Jane L. Demars, Texas CSR No. 2789
Expiration Date: 12-31-09
DepoTexas, Austin

Page 537

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, composition, and does 1-50,)

"HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY"

ORAL VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION

SHELLEY NELSON

VOLUME 4

SEPTEMBER 3, 2009

ORAL VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF SHELLEY NELSON, produced as a witness at the instance of the Plaintiffs and duly sworn, was taken in the above-styled and numbered cause on the 3rd day of September, 2009, from 8:04 a.m. to 12:26 p.m., before Dana Richardson, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, reported by computerized stenotype machine at the Jones Day, 717 Texas Avenue, Suite 3300, Houston, Texas 77002, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the provisions stated on the record or attached hereto.

Job No. 1603-92416

inclusive,

Defendants.

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page9 of 22

		Page 570
08:49:02	1	
08:49:04	2	
08:49:07	3	
08:49:11	4	
08:49:13	5	
08:49:16	6	
08:49:19	7	
.08:49:25	8	
08:49:28	9	
08:49:28	10	
08:49:30	11	
08:49:30	12	
08:49:33	13	
08:49:38	14	
08:49:41	15	÷
08:49:42	16	
08:49:48	17	Q. (By Mr. Howard) How did you determine that the
08:49:50	18	that referring to (a), how did you determine that the
08:49:53	19	download library was downloaded using the sign-on credentials
08:49:56	20	from Wendy's International?
08:50:01	21	A. We determined that Wendy's had sent credentials prior
08:50:08	22	to that date and that an assignment was made to do the
08:50:12	23	downloads with those credentials.
08:50:16	24	Q. Because because there's no way to actually verify
08:50:19	25	that that credential was used to download those particular

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page10 of 22

							Page	571
08:50:24	1	items, right?						
08:50:28	2	A. I do	on't know of a wa	ay.				
08:50:48	3							
08:50:50	4							
08:50:52	5							
08:50:54	6							
08:50:55	7							
08:51:00	8						*	
08:51:02	9							
08:51:03	10							
08:51:07	11							
08:51:11	12							
08:51:16	13							
08:51:16	14							
08:51:19	15							
08:51:31	16							
08:51:34	17					•		
	18							
08:52:09	19							
08:52:12	20							
08:52:18	21				•			
08:52:48	22							
08:52:51	23							
08:52:56	24							
08:52:58	25							
								, N. C.
·								5

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page11 of 22

	Page 574
08:56:52 1	
08:56:55 2	
08:56:58 3	
08:56:59 4	
08:57:00 5	
08:57:04 6	
08:57:07 7	
08:57:10 8	
08:57:11 9	•
08:57:16 10	
08:57:21 11	
08:57:22 12	
08:57:24 13	Q. (By Mr. Howard) Do you recall that you yourself
08:57:25 14	testified that at certain points in time, IDs such as Bear
08:57:32 15	Stearns were used to take downloads not specific to particular
08:57:33 16	customers?
08:57:34 17	MR. FUCHS: Objection, form.
08:57:35 18	A. At an earlier point in time, yes.
08:57:36 19	
08:57:43 20	
08:57:44 21	
08:57:45 22	
08:57:47 23	
08:57:54 24	
08:58:00 25	

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page12 of 22

		Page 579
09:05:41	1	
09:05:45	2	
09:05:48	3 .	
09:05:52	4	
09:05:53	5	
09:05:54	6	
09:05:57	7	
09:06:03	8	
09:06:05	9	
09:06:08	10	
09:06:11	11	
09:06:16	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
09:06:53		Q. You've, I think, referred to a policy at TomorrowNow
09:06:56		that people at TomorrowNow were not supposed to download
	23	materials from Oracle after a customer's maintenance end date; is that right?
09:07:04		A. I'm not sure if I referred to that policy.
09:07:09	23	n. I m not sure if I referred to that portey.

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page13 of 22

		Page 580
09:07:12	1	Q. Well, was there a policy at TomorrowNow that that
09:07:15	2	customers that start over.
09:07:18	. 3	Was there a policy at TomorrowNow that
09:07:19	4	TomorrowNow employees were not supposed to download materials
09:07:24	5	for a customer after that customer's maintenance end date?
09:07:28	6	A. I believe there was a there was something sent out
09:07:33	7	related to not downloading material posted after the end date.
09:07:41	8	Q. Material posted after the end date?
09:07:43	9	A. Yes.
09:07:43	10	Q. So, it was okay to download after the customer's
09:07:46	11	maintenance end date so long as you were only downloading
09:07:50	12	material posted before their maintenance end date?
09:07:52	13	A. In certain circumstances, yes.
09:07:54	14	Q. And that was that a a published policy at
09:07:58	15	TomorrowNow?
09:08:00	16	A. I'm not sure.
09:08:04	17	Q. When was that policy articulated at TomorrowNow for
09:08:07	18	the first time?
09:08:08	19	A. I'm not sure.
09:08:14	20	Q. And you're aware of instances, I take it, where a
09:08:17	21	customer's credential was used to download materials from
09:08:22	22	Oracle after the customer's maintenance end date?
09:08:24	23	A. Yes.
09:08:27	24	Q. And in your view, that would be acceptable?
09:08:30	25	MR. FUCHS: Objection, form.

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page14 of 22

		Page 581
09:08:32	1	A. It it depends on the circumstances around it.
09:08:35	2	Q. (By Mr. Howard) Why? Why does it depend?
09:08:37	3	A. Well, some of our clients, for instance, had
09:08:42	4	continued maintenance on some products but were ending
09:08:48	5	maintenance on on other products. So, their maintenance
09:08:53	6	end date might end for one product line or for one product but
09:08:57	7	continue for another. And in in certain circumstances,
09:09:04	8	the the customer might have given us the the information
09:09:07	9	late; and and we made sure that people only got information
09:09:13	10	up to the posted date matching the maintenance end date.
09:09:17	11	Q. So, focusing on that last part, assuming that
09:09:22	12	maintenance had ended for all products, it was acceptable at
09:09:24	13	TomorrowNow to use the customer's credential to download
09:09:33	14	materials from Oracle using that credential after the
09:09:35	15	maintenance end date so long as you were only downloading
09:09:41	16	products that had been posted before the maintenance end date?
09:09:44	17	Is that your testimony?
09:09:47	18	MR. FUCHS: Objection, form.
09:09:48	19	A. Only in certain circumstances.
09:09:49	20	Q. (By Mr. Howard) What circumstances?
09:09:52	21	A. When there there wasn't enough time, the customer
09:09:54	22	had given us the information late. But typically, in most
09:09:58	23	circumstances, it downloading would stop at or prior to the
09:10:04	24	maintenance end date.
09:10:04	25	Q. Well, if it was okay to do it in certain

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page15 of 22

	Page 582
09:10:06 1	circumstances, why wasn't it okay to do it in all
09:10:10 2	circumstances?
09:10:11 3	MR. FUCHS: Objection, form.
09:10:12 4	A. It just it wasn't necessary in most cases.
09:10:14 5	Q. (By Mr. Howard) But it was perfectly acceptable and
09:10:17 6	appropriate, so far as you're concerned, to download materials
09:10:20 7	after the customer's maintenance end date as long as those
09:10:23 8	materials were posted on Customer Connection before the
09:10:29	maintenance end date?
09:10:29 10	MR. FUCHS: Objection, form.
09:10:32 11	A. For a period of time, yes, and and only if we had
09:10:36 12	that customer's ID and it was still working.
09:10:50 13	Q. (By Mr. Howard) Was that a policy that you
09:10:53 14	communicated to others at TomorrowNow, that it was acceptable
09:10:55 15	to download materials from Customer Connection using a
09:10:58 16	customer's credential after that customer's maintenance end
09:11:02 17	date?
09:11:02 18	A. I don't know that I communicated that as a policy.
09:11:05 19	It may have been approved on a case-by-case basis.
09:11:11 20	Q. Why did it need to be approved on a case-by-case
09:11:13 21	basis if it was okay to do?
09:11:15 22	A. It it was not necessarily part of the process.
09:11:21 23	Typically, we downloaded we'd receive the credentials in
09:11:24 24	time, we downloaded and stopped downloads at the maintenance
09:11:29 25	end date. There were only certain circumstances where the

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page16 of 22

		Page 583
09:11:31	1	customer was delayed in in getting us the information.
09:11:38	2	Q. Did you view it as bending the rules at all to
09:11:41	3	download materials from Customer Connection using a customer's
09:11:49	4	ID after that customer's maintenance end date?
09:11:50	5	MR. FUCHS: Objection, form.
09:11:51	6	A. No.
09:11:51	7	Q. (By Mr. Howard) Let me show you what's been
09:11:52	8	previously marked as Exhibit 1454.
09:12:13	9	Ms. Nelson, is that an e-mail at the top from
09:12:15	10	you to Eric Marsh with a copy to Andrew Nelson, Greg Nelson
09:12:19	11	and others at TomorrowNow?
09:12:21	12	A. Yes, it appears to be.
09:12:22	13	Q. And it's dated January 20th, 2005?
09:12:24	14	A. Yes.
09:12:24	15	Q. And it's regarding downloads for Koontz-Wagner?
09:12:30	16	A. Yes.
09:12:34	17	Q. And it's responding to an e-mail from Eric Marsh down
09:12:41	18	at the bottom of the first page of Exhibit 1454?
09:12:45	19	A. Yes.
09:12:45	20	Q. Eric Marsh's e-mail identifies a maintenance end date
09:12:51	21	for Koontz-Wagner of December 31, 2004. Do you see that?
09:12:55	22	A. Yes.
09:12:56	23	Q. And in your e-mail, you say: "Given the
09:12:59	24	12/31/04 maintenance end date, please be prepared for the
09:13:07	25	Customer Connection ID to no longer be valid."

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page17 of 22

SHELLEY NELSON September 3, 2009

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Page 584
09:13:09 1	Those your words?
09:13:10 2	A. Yes.
09:13:10 3	Q. And then in the second paragraph, you say: "Wanda,
09:13:11 4	if the ID is still valid, please send an e-mail ASAP to John
09:13:16 5	Ludlow with the Customer Connection ID. He can coordinate
09:13:20 6	having the download team get all their Case Activity."
09:13:23 7	A. Yes.
09:13:24 8	Q. So, you were instructing your team to download from
09:13:26 9	Customer Connection using the Koontz-Wagner ID after the
09:13:31 10	Koontz-Wagner maintenance end date; is that right?
09:13:34 11	A. Yes.
09:13:38 12	Q. And did Andrew Nelson object at all in response to
09:13:42 13	this e-mail to your instruction?
09:13:45 14	A. I don't recall.
09:13:45 15	Q. Did Greg Nelson object at all to this instruction?
09:13:48 16	A. I don't remember.
09:13:50 17	Q. And as far as you know, these downloads for
09:13:51 18	Koontz-Wagner did occur after the maintenance end date?
09:13:56 19	A. I'm not sure.
09:13:56 20	Q. There was nothing wrong with this instruction on a
09:13:59 21	policy basis, as far as you were concerned at the time?
09:14:04 22	A. It was rare. And as as indicated, I I expected
09:14:10 23	that they may not be able to log in at all.
09:14:13 24	MR. HOWARD: Move to strike as nonresponsive.
09:14:16 25	Q. (By Mr. Howard) Did this instruction violate any

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page18 of 22

SHELLEY NELSON September 3, 2009

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

		Page (585
09:14:18	1	TomorrowNow policy?	
09:14:19	2	A. I don't believe it did.	
09:14:38	3	Q. Your testimony is that it did not violate any	
09:14:43	4	TomorrowNow policy on January 20th, 2005, to instruct the	
09:14:45	5	download team to download materials from Oracle's website	
09:14:50	6	using a customer's ID when that customer's support had ended	~
09:14:56	7	20 days earlier?	-
09:14:58	8	A. No. Because we based the downloads on the posted	• "
09:15:01	9	dates and the maintenance end dates.	
09:15:10	10	Q. Where is that in your instruction?	
09:15:18	11	A. I'm not sure. I don't see it.	
09:15:43	12	Q. So we're clear, as far as you're concerned, it did	
09:15:50	13	not violate any TomorrowNow policy to instruct the download	
09:15:52	14	team to download materials for a customer using that	
09:15:57	15	customer's ID 20 days after that customer's maintenance end	
09:16:03	16	date? That's your testimony?	
09:16:05	.17	MR. FUCHS: Objection, form.	
09:16:06	18	A. At this point in time, yes.	
09:16:10	19	Q. (By Mr. Howard) And did that ever change?	·, .
09:16:13	20	A. Yes, it did.	
09:16:15	21	Q. When did it change?	
09:16:15	22	A. I'm not sure.	
09:16:17	23	Q. Was it before the litigation was filed or after?	
09:16:21	24	A. I don't remember.	
09:17:18	25		:
-			

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-24 Filed03/03/10 Page20 of 22

SHELLEY NELSON April 18, 2008 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 533
17:01	1	CHANGES AND SIGNATURE
	2	PAGE LINE CHANGE REASON
	3	252 15 His was a year small typo
	4	251e 15-16 customer should be employed mis spoke 277 11 quoks around "what alpaxme" 279 3 dolete for
	5	319 17 7.02, 7.51, 8.31, 8.81
	6	320 6 seavel should by SQL 325 8,17 "
	7	328 19 11
	8	342 7 775 Should be 75
	9	342 10 dejete line. Add "of only Bois tables and no application tables" characters 355 1421 FG-75ZANC ENG-+ E4G
	10	448 19 Zieman
	11	TIO IT MOUTING TE
	12	I, SHELLEY NELSON, have read the foregoing deposition and hereby affix my signature that same is true and correct, except as noted above.
	13	Shelley holson
	14	SHELLEY NE'LSON
17:01	15	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TRAVIS)
	16	BEFORE ME, Shelley Nelson, on this day
	17	personally appeared, known to me (proved to me on the oath of
	18	through <u>Texas Nivershicense</u> (description of identity card or other document)) to be the person whose
	19	name is subscribed to the foregoing instrument and acknowledged to me that they executed the same for the
	20	purposes and consideration therein expressed.
	21	Given under my hand and seal of office this 6 day
	22	of May, 2008.
	23	Notary Public, In and For The State of Texas
	24	State of Susse
	25	

Merrill Legal Solutions



INSTRUCTIONS FOR READING/CORRECTING YOUR DEPOSITION

To assist you in making changes and /or corrections to your deposition testimony, please follow the directions below. If additional pages are necessary, please furnish them and attach the pages to the back of the errata sheet.

Please read your transcript carefully. If you find any errors or changes you wish to make, insert the changes and/or corrections on the errata sheet by listing the page and the line number reference and then the change you wish to make and the reason.

Please do not make any changes and /or corrections on the face of the transcript.

Please do NOT change any of the questions.

After completing your review, please sign the last page of the errata sheet, above the designated "Signature" line and return the Errata sheets to Merrill Legal Solutions at 135 Main Street, 4th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94105 or fax them to (415) 357.4301.

Errata sheet

Page	Line	
544	4	Change: add the at end of line
		Reason: <u>qrammak</u>
546	<u>(o</u>	Change: "question" should be "questions"
•		Reason:
549	12	Change: "though " should be "no!
		Reason: I Said "no" not "though"

Page	Line	
560	17	Change: "Was" should be "were"
		Reason: 5 Cimmor
·····		Change:
		Reason:
		Change:
		Reason:
		Change:
		Reason:
		Change:
		Reason:
		Change:
		Reason:
		Change:
		Reason:
_/	Subjec	ct to the above changes, I certify that the transcript is true and correct.
	_ No cha	anges have been made. I certify that the transcript is true and correct.
	hele	ey Dec 9-21-09
(signatur	e)	(date)