LANSKY DECLARATION EXHIBIT C

```
Page 1
                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
                       SAN JOSE DIVISION
 3
 4
     DIGITAL ENVOY, INC.,
 5
               Pl@aset5i04fc/-01497-RS ) Document 368-4
                                                  Filed 11/14/2005 Page 2 of 5
               Counterdefendant,)
 6
                                   )No. C 04 014997
               VS.
 7
     GOOGLE INC.,
 8
               Defendant/
 9
               Counterclaimant.
10
11
12
13
                       HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL
14
                      ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
15
                           DEPOSITION OF
16
                            MARISSA MAYER
17
18
                       PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA
                            AUGUST 5, 2005
19
20
21
22
23
     REPORTED BY: JANE H. STULLER, CSR NO. 7223, RPR
      (370450)
```

Page 119 THE WITNESS: I don't know exactly what 1 2 it's saying. BY MR. WADDELL: Do you know generally what it's saying? MR. KRAMER: Calls for speculation, the Case 5:04-cv-01497-RS Document 368-4 Filed 11/14/2005 Page 3 of 5 document speaks for itself. Lacks foundation 6 7 because she didn't write it or even see it. THE WITNESS: It seems that they ran a test 8 9 with a company named Table for Six. They previously 10 had run ads including a location key word, ala 11 San Francisco, California. They removed that key 12 word from their campaign and used regional targeting 13 instead. 14 And overall, the balance between where the 15 clicks came from shifted. They received fewer 16 clicks from the nationally -- from around the 17 nation, and more from the regional, and also that didn't increase. 18 19 BY MR. WADDELL: 20 How much increase does this letter appear Ο. 21 to suggest --22 MR. KRAMER: Come on, Robert. You know 23 what, she didn't write it, she didn't read it. She -- you are asking her questions about a document 24

that's sitting right in front of you. You guys can

25

Page 120

- 1 interpret this document as well as she can. And it
- 2 is not fair to ask the witness questions about a
- 3 document that she has never seen before and
- 4 interpret -- asking her to interpret it on the fly.
- 5 BY MR. WADDELL:
- Case 5:04-cv-01497-RS Document 368-4 Filed 11/14/2005 Page 4 of 5 Q. You can answer the question.
- 7 A. 117 percent.
- 8 Q. Okay.
- 9 MR. KRAMER: Let the record reflect that
- 10 the witness is reading from the document and has no
- 11 insight into this document, other than what it says
- 12 on its face.
- 13 BY MR. WADDELL:
- 14 Q. Is that true, that you have no insight into
- 15 this document, other than what it says on its face?
- 16 A. I have never seen this case study before.
- 17 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with case studies
- 18 such as this one being conducted by Google?
- 19 A. Only very peripherally.
- Q. What do you mean by that?
- 21 A. It is operated by another department, and
- 22 products I don't generally work on or work in close
- 23 proximity to.
- Q. And I should be clear. When I said case
- 25 studies such as this one, case studies that study

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, JANE H. STULLER, HEREBY CERTIFY:

That I am a Certified Shorthand

Reporter, Case 5:04-cv-01497-RS Document 368-4 Filed 11/14/2005

Reporter, Dicense No. 7223, in and for the State

Page 5 of 5

6 of California;

That said proceeding was taken by me at the time and place therein set forth and was taken down by me in stenotype and thereafter transcribed into typewriting under my direction and supervision.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither of counsel nor related in any way to any party to said action or otherwise interested in the result or outcome thereof.

Date: August 8, 2005

JANE H. STULLER

Certified Shorthand Reporter