EXHIBIT 29

Doc. 657 Att. 28

Page 321

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.

DEPOSITION OF

ARLEN R. SHENKMAN

VOLUME 2; PAGES 321 - 496 THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 2008

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

REPORTED BY: HOLLY THUMAN, CSR No. 6834, RMR, CRR (1-409545)

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-29 Filed03/03/10 Page3 of 10

ARLEN R. SHENKMAN June 5, 2008 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

	Page 383
10:27:12 1	MR. PICKETT: Q. Before I turn to
10:27:13 2	Exhibit 245, let me ask you to look at another page
10:27:15 3	of Exhibit 244. It's the page ending 021.
10:27:24 4	This is a part of a section under 6.23,
10:27:28 5	Software and Intellectual Property. These are
10:27:30 6	representations being made by TomorrowNow.
10:27:32 7	A. Okay.
10:27:32 8	Q. (c) on that page states that:
10:27:36 9	Schedule 6.23(c) contains a complete and
10:27:40 10	accurate list of all company contracts,
10:27:43 11	excluding off-the-shelf software licenses,
10:27:46 12	pursuant to which the company or any seller
10:27:48 13	is authorized, licensed, permitted or granted
10:27:50 14	any right to exercise any right, title or
10:27:53 15	interest, including, without limitation, the
10:27:57 16	right to use, hold for use, distribute,
10:27:59 17	reproduce, display, perform, modify, enhance,
10:28:03 18	improve, prepare derivative works based upon,
10:28:08 19	make, sell or offer for sale into or under
10:28:11 20	any intellectual property owned by any person
10:28:13 21	other than the company (third-party
10:28:17 22	intellectual property).
10:28:19 23	Why did SAP want to get a complete and
10:28:24 24	accurate list of all contracts authorizing
10:28:28 25	TomorrowNow to use third-party intellectual

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-29 Filed03/03/10 Page4 of 10

ARLEN R. SHENKMAN June 5, 2008 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

·		Page 384
10:28:30	1	property?
10:28:32	2	A. To my knowledge
10:28:33	3	MR. McDONELL: Don't disclose privileged
10:28:34	4	information, if there is any, of course.
10:28:37	5	THE WITNESS: To my knowledge, this is a
10:28:38	6	clause that's in most asset purchase and stock
10:28:41	7	purchase agreements.
10:28:42	8	MR. PICKETT: Q. And why is it in most
10:28:44	9	agreements?
10:28:44	10	MR. McDONELL: Same instruction to you.
10:28:46	11	THE WITNESS: To obtain a list.
10:28:48	12	MR. PICKETT: Q. Well, why do you want to
10:28:50	13	obtain a list?
10:28:51	14	A. To understand the business.
10:28:52	15	Q. Aren't you isn't it a little more
10:28:54	16	specific than that, Mr. Shenkman?
10:28:56	17	Isn't it that you want to make sure what
10:28:59	18	whatever third-party intellectual property they're
10:29:00	19	using, you as buyer want to know what rights they
10:29:03	20	have to that intellectual property?
10:29:04	21	A. Yes.
10:29:06	22	Q. And did TomorrowNow comply with that; that
10:29:10	23	is, providing a complete and accurate list of all of
10:29:13	24	its authorization for third-party intellectual
10:29:15	25	property?

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-29 Filed03/03/10 Page5 of 10

ARLEN R. SHENKMAN June 5, 2008 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 385
10:29:16	1 A	I assume the answer is in here. I don't
10:29:18	2 specif:	cally recall.
10:29:19	3 Q	Let's look at Schedule 6.23(c), which is
10:29:22	4 referen	nced in that prior paragraph. That's in
10:29:26	5 Exhibit	245, and you have to cross-reference it
10:29:29	6 back, 1	unfortunately, the way it's done.
10:29:33	7	First look at page ending in 102.
10:29:36	8 A	Yep.
10:29:37	9 . Q	And you'll see that that schedule, 6.23(c),
10:29:44	10 there's	s a cross-reference.
10:29:46	11 A	Okay.
10:29:46	12 Q	Do you see that?
10:29:47	13 A	I do.
10:29:47	14 Q	It says, see Schedule 6.20(a)(iv).
10:29:53	15 Correct	:?
10:29:54	16 A	Yes.
10:29:55	17 Q	All right. Let's look at 6.20(a)(iv).
10:29:58	18 That's	on page ending 083. You got to love the
10:30:10	19 corpora	ate lawyers.
10:30:12	20	If you look at 6.20(a)(iv), you'll see
10:30:16	21 there a	are two software contracts listed. Correct?
10:30:21	22 A.	I'm sorry. In (iv)? Yes.
10:30:24	23 Q	And what are those two contracts?
10:30:26	24	MR. McDONELL: Can you bear with me one
10:30:28	25 minute	while I catch up? Oh, okay. Thank you.

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-29 Filed03/03/10 Page6 of 10 ARLEN R. SHENKMAN June 5, 2008 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 386
10:30:36	1	MR. PICKETT: Q. There are two contracts
10:30:36	2	listed. Do you see that?
10:30:38	3	A. Yes.
10:30:38	4	Q. And they are a 2004 contract between
10:30:40	5	TomorrowNow and Micro Focus, a Server Express
10:30:48	6	development license; and a 2002 agreement between
10:30:53	7	TomorrowNow and Micro Focus to obtain NetExpress
10:31:00	8	from Micro Focus.
10:31:02	9	Do you see that?
10:31:03	10	A. Yes.
10:31:03	11	Q. And that's the entirety of the contracts
10:31:09	12	that TomorrowNow held to authorize it to use
10:31:15	13	third-party intellectual property. Correct?
10:31:18	14	MR. McDONELL: Argumentative, calls for a
10:31:19	15	legal conclusion.
10:31:20	16	THE WITNESS: That is what it says.
10:31:21	17	
10:31:24	1,8	
10:31:27	19	
10:31:29	20	
10:31:31	21	
10:31:33	22	
10:31:38	23	
10:31:43	24	
10:31:48	25	

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-29 Filed03/03/10 Page7 of 10

ARLEN R. SHENKMAN June 5, 2008 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

·		Page	493
13:16:56	1		
13:16:57	2		
13:16:58	3		
13:17:01	4		
13:17:04	5		
13:17:04	6		
13:17:04	7	Q. If SAP found that TomorrowNow was	
13:17:07	8	performing illegal downloads and infringing IP, did	
13:17:10	9	SAP have the ability to terminate that activity?	
13:17:13	10	MR. McDONELL: Calls for a legal	
13:17:13	11	conclusion, improper hypothetical, calls for	
13:17:17	12	speculation.	•
13:17:20	13	THE WITNESS: It is my understanding of	
13:17:21	14	corporate law that the shareholder of an entity has	
13:17:23	15	control over that entity and can appoint a board of	
13:17:26	16	directors as well as a management team.	
13:17:28	17	MR. PICKETT: Q. Well, it was more than a	
13:17:29	18	shareholder, SAP. It had a majority on the board of	
13:17:32	19	directors. Correct?	
13:17:33	20	A. I think that's irrelevant.	
13:17:34	21	Q. So the board of directors wouldn't have the	
13:17:36	22	ability to terminate illegal activity under your	
13:17:39	23	view?	
13:17:39	24	MR. McDONELL: Calls for a legal	
13:17:39	25	conclusion. Object to the form of the question.	

Merrill Legal Solutions (800) 869-9132

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document657-29 Filed03/03/10 Page8 of 10

ARLEN R. SHENKMAN June 5, 2008 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

	Page 494
13:17:41	THE WITNESS: No. My point is, is that the
13:17:43	company, again, going back to corporate governance
13:17:46	and law, a company that owns 100 percent of a
13:17:49	company can appoint or, you know, can appoint a
13:17:52	brothers or not appoint a board of directors. It's
13:17:55	up to the shareholder.
13:17:56	MR. PICKETT: Q. And then the board can
13:17:57	take action?
13:17:58	A. That would be true.
13:17:58 1	Q. And that's what SAP did. It was the
13:18:00 1	shareholder, and then it appointed the board of
13:18:02 1	directors?
13:18:02 1	A. That would be true.
13:18:09 1	
13:18:10 1	
13:18:13 1	
13:18:15 1	
13:18:20 1	} }
13:18:22 1	
13:18:25 2)
13:18:30 2	
13:18:32 2	· •
13:18:35 2	} ·
13:18:36 2	
13:18:38 2	

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
	I, HOLLY THUMAN, a Certified Shorthand
	Reporter, hereby certify that the witness in the
4	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
8	time and place therein stated, and that the testimony of
2	the said witness was thereafter reduced to typewriting,
10	by computer, under my direction and supervision;
11	That before completion of the deposition,
12	review of the transcript $[X]$ was $[\]$ was not requested.
13	If requested, any changes made by the deponent (and
14	provided to the reporter) during the period allowed are
15	appended hereto.
16	I further certify that I am not of counsel or
17	attorney for either or any of the parties to the said
18	deposition, nor in any way interested in the event of
19	this cause, and that I am not related to any of the
20	parties thereto.
21	
22	DATED 6908
23	
24	John Thum
25	HOLLY THUMAN, CSR No. 6834

Corrections to the Transcript of the Deposition of

Arlen Shenkman

Taken on June 4, 2008

Volume 1, Pages 1-320

age I	Line(s)	Reads	Should Read
15	1/	TARKETING	arantecting
14 -	2/	LAUACE	WALLES
8	8	BEGLIN	bibun
			
·-			
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			
		/	
			2/1/0X
			1//////
Witne	ess Signature	-	Date
			/ /
			′ /