1 2 3 4	LESTER L. LEVY (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) MICHELE F. RAPHAEL (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> WOLF POPPER LLP 845 Third Avenue New York, NY 10022 Telephone: (212) 759-4600 Facsimile: (212) 486-2093)
5	E-Mail: <u>llevy@wolfpopper.com</u> E-Mail: <u>mraphael@wolfpopper.com</u>	
6	WILLIAM M. AUDET (117456) AUDET & PARTNERS, LLP 221 Main Street, Suite 1460	
8	San Francisco, CA 94105-1938 Telephone: (415) 568-2555 Facsimile: (415) 568-2556 E-Mail: waudet@audetlaw.com	
10	MARC M. SELTZER (54534) SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.	
11	1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 950 Los Angeles, CA 90067-6029	
12	Telephone: (310) 789-3100 Facsimile: (310) 789-3150	
13 14	E-Mail: mseltzer@susmangodfrey.com	
15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
16	UNITED STATES D	ISTRICT COURT
17	NORTHERN DISTRIC	T OF CALIFORNIA
18	SAN JOSE I	
19 20	CLRB HANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC d/b/a INDUSTRIAL PRINTING, and HOWARD STERN, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,	Case No. C 05-03649 JW
21	Plaintiffs,	SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF
22	vs.	MARC M. SELTZER IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO
23	GOOGLE, INC.,	GOOGLE, INC.'S OPENING BRIEF RE THE COURT'S ORDER OF AUGUST 21,
24	Defendant.	2007
25		Date: February 25, 2008 Time: 9:00 a.m.
26		Place: Courtroom 8 Hon. James W. Ware
27	_814885v1/010480 1	
28	SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF MARC M. PLAINTIFFS' BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO GOOGLE RE THE COURT'S ODER OF AUGUST 21, 2007 CASE NO. C 05-03649 JW	

SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF MARC M. SELTZER IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO GOOGLE, INC.'S OPENING BRIEF

RE THE COURT'S ODER OF AUGUST 21, 2007

CASE NO. C 05-03649 JW

CLRB V GOOGLE-T

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
1	UNITED STATES DISTRI	כד (COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF C	ALII	FORNIA
3	SAN JOSE DIVISI	ON	
4	CLRB HANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC d/b/a)	٠
	INDUSTRIAL PRINTING and HOWARD)	C-05-03649-JW
5	STERN, on behalf of themselves and)	
	all others similarly situated,)	
6)	
	PLAINTIFFS,)	
7)	San Jose, CA
	vs.)	January 22, 2007
8)	
	GOOGLE, INC,)	•
9)	
	DEFENDANT.)	
10		_)	
11			
12	TRANSCRIPT OF PROC	EEDI	NGS
	BEFORE THE HONORABLE	JAME	S WARE
13	UNITED STATES DISTR	ICT	JUDGE
14			
	Page 1	-	

- CLRB V GOOGLE-T

 19 over-delivery credit was provided. And --
- 20 THE COURT: All right. I hesitate to ask this:
- 21 Anything further?
- 22 MR. LEVY: Well, I just want to do clarify just
- 23 where we are. They promote the daily budget, and the
- 24 pausing, as ways to control your costs -- on every given
- 25 day. This delivery of ads, that's something that Googles to

- 1 maximize their revenue. But the way they promote it to the
- 2 advertiser is: You are in charge of your own budget. You
- 3 are in charge of your own costs. And if you want to be
- 4 charged -- run your ad one day a month and your budget is
- 5 \$100; there is no way you should be charged more than \$100.
- 6 And they say they can charge you \$120. There's no way to Page 91

```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1,
              FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
                         SAN JOSE DIVISION
 3
 4
         CLRB HANSON INDUSTRIES, ) C-05-3649-JW
         ET AL.,
                                     JUNE 21, 2007
 б
                  PLAINTIFFS,
 7
                      V.
                                     PAGES 1-53
         GOOGLE, INC.,
                  DEFENDANT.
10
11
                  THE PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD BEFORE
12
               THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES DISTRICT
13
                         JUDGE JAMES WARE
14
       APPEARANCES:
15
16
       FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: WOLF POPPER,
                            BY: LESTER L. LEVY
17
                                 MICHELE FRIED RAPHAEL
                            845 THIRD AVENUE
18
                            NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022
19
                            AUDET & PARTNERS, LLP
                            BY: MICHAEL MCSHANE
20
                            221 MAIN STREET
                            SUITE 1450
21
                            SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105
22
             (APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE.)
23
24
       OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: IRENE RODRIGUEZ, CSR, CRR
                                 CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074
25
```

19:48:22 24

29:48:23 25

THE COURT: SO THE NEXT DAY, INDEED, 09:47:09 1 THERE ARE ONLY 6 CLICKS. AND IF ON THE ADDITIONAL) 117 2 DAY HE HAS 2 ADDITIONAL CLICKS TO HIM AND HE'S 39:47:24 3 BILLED \$12 AND ON THE SECOND DAY HE'S ONLY BILLED)9:47:29 4 \$10, HE HAS NOW ONLY SPENT MORE THAN HIS BUDGET BUT 19:47:34 5 IF THEY ONLY BILL HIM FOR \$6 THAT DAY HE'S UNDER 19:47:38 6 HIS DAILY BUDGET, THEY ALLOWED EXTRA CLICK THROUGHS 39:47:41 7 ON THE FIRST DAY. ARE YOU FOLLOWING ME? 19:47:45 8 MR, LEVY: I FOLLOW YOU.)9:47:47 9 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WOULD THERE BE A)9:47:48 10 CLAIM AGAINST GOOGLE IF, IF INDEED THAT WERE THE 19:47:50 11 SITUATION, NAMELY, MORE CLICK THROUGH ON THE FIRST)9:47:54 12 DAY THAN WAS BUDGETED BUT LESS FOR THE TOTAL OF THE)9:47:59 13 TWO DAYS? 1 02 14 MR. LEVY: ARE WE TALKING ABOUT PAUSING 19:48:02 15 NOW OR ARE WE TALKING ABOUT PAUSING AT ALL? 19:48:04 16 THE COURT: I HAVEN'T INTRODUCED HOW. IT)9:48:07 17 JUST HAPPENS THAT THOSE ARE THE EXPERIENCES FOR HIS 19:48:09 18 CLICK THROUGHS. 19:48:12 19 MR. LEVY: IF WE'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT 19:48:12 20 PAUSING, WHICH IS AN INTENTIONAL STATING I DON'T)9:48:15 21 WANT CLICKS AND TO BE CHARGED THAT DAY, IF WE'RE)9:48:18 22 JUST TALKING ABOUT EVENING OUT THE FLOW. 19:48:20 23 THE COURT: YES.

37

MR. LEVY; OKAY. WE BELIEVE THAT, THAT

J9:48:26 1 or :29 2)9:48:31. 3 19:48:34 4)9:48:37 5 39:48:38 6 39:48:40 7)9:48:43 8)9:48:46 9)9:48:49 10 19:48:52 11)9:48:55 12)9:48:59 13) 0114 19:49:02 15)9:49:04 16 39:49:08 17)9:49:10 18 19:49:13 19 19:49:15 20 39:49:17 21)9:49:19 22 19:49:21 23)9:49:23 24

)9:49:26 25

YOU SHOULD ONLY BE CHARGED YOUR DAILY BUDGET, WHAT YOU EXPECT AND WHAT YOU TOLD THEM YOU WANT TO BE CHARGED. IF THEY GIVE YOU MORE THAN THAT, BECAUSE THE SYSTEM GIVES THEM MORE THAN THAT, YOU SHOULDN'T BE CHARGED MORE THAN THAT.

THE COURT: NO, NO. ANSWER MY HYPOTHETICAL. WE HAVE TWO DAYS OF CHARGES. TOTAL ON THE FIRST DAY IS \$12 SO YOU DID GO BEYOND IT BUT THE TOTAL ON THE SECOND DAY IS ONLY \$6. THE TOTAL FOR THE TWO DAYS, YOU'RE UNDER YOUR, YOUR DAILY BUDGET IF YOU ADD THE TWO DAYS TOGETHER. YOU WOULDN'T WANT TO SPEND \$20 FOR THOSE TWO DAYS AND YOU INDEED YOU ONLY SPENT 18.

MR. LEVY: WE'RE TALKING.

THE COURT: I'M GIVING YOU THE HYPOTHETICAL. I WOULD SAY IF YOU GO BEYOND YOUR DAILY BUDGET, THAT THE AMOUNT THAT YOU TELL GOOGLE IS THE AMOUNT YOU WANT TO PAY FOR THAT DAY, THAT YOU SHOULD NOT BE CHARGED FOR THAT AND IF THEY GIVE YOU MORE, THEY SHOULDN'T CHARGE YOU THAT.

IT'S LIKE, AS I SAID.

THE COURT: YOU STILL HAVEN'T ANSWERED MY HYPOTHETICAL. I'M TALKING TWO DAYS WHERE YOU ARE CHARGED \$18. WOULD THERE BE A CHARGE OR A COMPLAINT AGAINST GOOGLE THAT IT HAS DONE SOMETHING

19:49:28 1 jr ⋅32 2 19:49:34 3 19:49:38 4 19:49:40 5)9:49:43 6)9:49:46 7)9:49:48 8 39:49:51 9)9:49:55 10 29:49:57 11 19:49:57 12 19:49:59 13) 02 14)9:50:04 15 19:50:07 16 19:50:10 17 9:50:11 18 39:50:13 19 09:50:16 20 39:50:20 21 19:50:23 22)9:50:25 23

19:50:27 24

)9:50:30 **2**5

UNFAIR IF YOU SAY THAT I HAVE A \$20 BUDGET FOR TWO DAYS. THE FIRST DAY THEY GIVE YOU 12, YOU ONLY WANTED 10. THE SECOND DAY YOU ONLY GET 6. YOU REALLY ONLY WANTED TO GET 10 THAT SAME DAY AND SPEND \$20 BUT YOU ONLY GET 6 AND THEY BILL YOU FOR THE, FOR THE 12 FOR THE FIRST DAY AND SECOND FOR THE SECOND. THEY HAVE ADDED 20 PERCENT IN THE FIRST DAY THAT YOU DIDN'T WANT AND YOU DIDN'T GET THERE ON THE SECOND DAY, YOU ARE BILLED \$18, IS THERE A BREACH OF CONTRACT OR SOMETHING UNFAIR ABOUT THAT?

MR. LEVY: I WOULD SAY YES. YOU WOULD SAY NO BECAUSE YOU LOOK AT IT AS AN AVERAGE BUDGET AND I'M LOOKING AT IT AS A DAILY BUDGET AND IF YOU GO BEYOND THE BUDGET THE DAY YOU SET YOU SHOULD NOT BE CHARGED FOR IT. I KNOW YOU'RE LOOKING AT IT AS AN AVERAGE.

THE COURT: SO YOUR ARGUMENT OR COMPLAINT IS THAT ONCE THE DAILY BUDGET IS SET, NO MATTER WHAT IS SET IN THE ABOUT 20 PERCENT OVERAGE, THAT SHOULD NEVER BE EXCEEDED ON A GIVEN DATE, THAT THEY SHOULD NOT -- THAT IT'S UNFAIR TO ALLOW THIS OVERAGE UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES?

MR. LEVY: NOT UNFAIR BUT YOU SHOULDN'T CHARGE FOR IT.

CONFIDENTIAL PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN JOSE DIVISION CONFIDENTIAL CURB HANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC) d/b/a INDUSTRIAL PRINTING, et) al.,) Plaintiffs,) vs.) No. C 05-03649 JW GOOGLE, INC.,) Defendant.) 13 14 15 CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY - PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
SAN JOSE DIVISION
CONFIDENTIAL CLEB HANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC) d/b/a INDUSTRIAL PRINTING, et) al.,) plaintiffs,) vs.) No. C 05-03649 JW foogle, INC.,) Defendant.) confidential Testimony - pursuant to protective order
CONFIDENTIAL CLRB HANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC) d/b/a INDUSTRIAL PRINTING, et) al.,) plaintiffs,) vs.) No. C 05-03649 JW CONFIDENTIAL Defendant.) Defendant.) CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY - PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
CLRB EANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC) d/b/a INDUSTRIAL PRINTING, et) al.,) plaintiffs,) vs.) No. C 05-03649 JW GOOGLE, INC.,) Defendant.) 13 14 15 16 CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY - PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
d/b/a INDUSTRIAL PRINTING, et) al.,) plaintiffs,) vs.) No. C 05-03649 JW GOOGLE, INC.,) Defendant.) 13
8 al.,) 9 Plaintiffs,) 10 vs.) No. C 05-03649 JW 11 GOOGLE, INC.,) 12 Defendant.) 13
9 Plaintiffs,) 10 vs.) No. C 05-03649 JW 11 GOOGLE, INC.,) 12 Defendant.) 13) 14 15 16 CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY - PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
10 vs.) No. C 05-03649 JW 11 GOOGLE, INC.,) 12 Defendant.) 13) 14 15 16 CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY - PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
11 GOOGLE, INC.,) 12 Defendant.) 13) 14 15 16 CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY - PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
Defendant.) 13) 14) 15 16CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY - PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
13 14 15 16 CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY - PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
14 15 16 CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY - PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
15 16 CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY - PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
16 CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY - PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
17 DEPOSITION OF HEATHER WILBURN
TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2007
19
20
21
22
23 PAGES 1 - 82
24
25

CONFIDENTIAL PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

		42
1.	BY MS. RAPHAEL:	
2	Q Okay.	i
3	Will Google allow an advertiser's ad to accrue	
4	charges up to 120 percent above its daily budget on any	
5	given day?	
6	MR. BIDERMAN: Objection; vague.	
7	THE WITNESS: Could you restate that?	
8	BY MS, RAPHAEL:	
9	Q Sure.	·
10	Will Google overdeliver an ad to up to	
11	20 percent above a daily budget on any given day?	
12	A Potentially deliver.	į
13	Q "Yes" or "no"? That's the question.	
14	A Potentially deliver.	
15	Q Correct, that's the question. Is the answer	
16	"Žež" or "uo _" ;	
17	MR. BIDERMAN: Objection; vague. The answer	
18	to what? Let's get a question.	
19	MS. RAPHAEL: Can you repeat the question?	
20	(Record read as follows:	
21	"Q Will Google overdeliver	
22	an ad to up to 20 percent above a	
23	daily budget on any given day?")	
24	THE WITNESS: Potentially, yes.	
25		

CONFIDENTIAL PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

67 THE WITNESS: Due to web fluctuations, it is 1 possible to accrue clicks, charges beyond 20 -- up to 2 20 percent beyond that daily budget limit. 3 But at the end of the month, when we charge, 4 we see if there is anything beyond. Anything being 5 charges beyond daily budget times the number of days in 6 the month will be given back as an overdelivery credit. 7 BY MS. RAPHAEL: 8 Does that accrual apply to any given day in 9 0 10 the billing cycle? MR. BIDERMAN: Objection; vague. 11 THE WITNESS: Accrual being any time the ad is 12 active. 13 14 BY MS. RAPHAEL: Okay. 15 Q. How does the Google AdWords system account for 16 days that an ad is paused when you look back at the end 17 18 of the month? How do we account for it? 19 Correct. 20 O MR. BIDERMAN: Objection; vague. 21 THE WITNESS: Whatever the number of days are 22 in that month, multiplied by whatever the daily budget 23 was during that time frame, is the amount that we're 24 assuming the advertiser wanted to spend during that time 25

M. SCHULMAN

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
               NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
2
                       SAN JOSE DIVISION
3
    CLRB HANSON INDUSTRIES,
4
    LLC d/b/a INDUSTRIAL
     PRINTING, and HOWARD
5
                                 ) Case No. C05-03649 JW
     STERN, on behalf of
     themselves and all others
6
     similarly situation,
7
                      Plaintiffs,
            vs.
8
     GOOGLE, INC.,
 9
                      Defendants.
10
11
12
13
14
                 DEPOSITION OF MICHAEL SCHULMAN
15
                    WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 2007
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
               REPORTED BY: SANDRA LEHANE, CSR 7372
 24
 25
```

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CONFIDENTIAL PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

62

longer." What's your understanding of what's meant by "hang on to it any longer"?

So if for, you know, the reasons that we talked about earlier, on -- let's say on the first day, by chance they served \$104.50 because of this time delay or some other issue. We won't charge them for that 4.50. What we will do is keep it in what I like to call limbo. And in that -- if, say, on the next day, they only served \$90 due to traffic patterns or other things like that, then that \$4.50 is then used to fill in that gap. So if, for some reason, which is, you know, very rare -- overdelivery itself is a very small amount of our delivery, or of our revenue, you know, at the end the delivery period that limbo at the end of the month or end of the delivery period is automatically considered overdelivery because it is now -- delivery period has ended and anything in limbo has to be overdelivery.

- Q. Overdelivery cannot be carried on to the next delivery period?
 - A. No.
- Q. I thought you had said earlier in the day a delivery period -- there was no end to a delivery period. Did I get that wrong?
 - A. So there is a set date, you know. Sometimes

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN JOSE DIVISION

CLRB HANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC, etc., et al., Plaintiffs, Case No. 05-03639 JW GOOGLE, INC., Defendant.

DEPOSITION OF HOWARD STERN

August 16, 2006

227871

Court Reporters

(310) 207.8000 Los Angeles (949) 955.0400 Orange County (415) 433.5777 San Francisco

(916) 922.5777 (408) 885.0550 (951) 686.0606

Sacramento San Jose Inland Empire (818) 702.0202 (858) 455.5444 San Diego

San Fernando Valley (760) 322.2240 Palm Springs

	1	H. Stern
L4:34	2	spreadsheet is showing.
4:34	3	Q. Right. And you believe you were
4:34	4	overcharged because you were charged more
L4:34	5	than 120 percent of your daily budget;
L4:34	6	correct?
4:34	7	A. Partially correct. I was
4:34	8	charged over my daily budget, which is often
4:34	9	not over 20 percent, but over the budget. So
.4:34	10	I definitely was charged both over my budget
.4:35	11	and 20 percent over my budget.
.4:35	12	Q. Right. Okay. Now, first, going
.4:35	13	back to this. With respect to okay.
.4:35	14	Putting that aside, do you know and
4:35	15	perhaps let me just ask the question again.
4:35	16	Do you know, as we sit here
.4:35	17	today, whether, in fact, you have been
.4:35	18	charged in excess of the amount of the daily
.4:35	19	budget times the number of days that your
.4:35	20	campaign was unpaused during the course of a
.4.:35	21	month?
4:35	22	A. I don't remember doing that
4:35	23	specific calculation.
4:35	24	Q. And whether you've done the
4;35	25	calculation or not, do you know, as we sit

	1	H. Stern
14:35	2	here today, whether you have been charged in
14:35	3	excess of that amount?
14:35	4	A. I don't know.
14:36	5	Q. And is there any reason you have
14:36	6.	not run such a calculation?
14:36	7	A. I was concentrating mainly on
14:36	8	the daily budget. So I didn't do any other
14:36	. 9	calculation. What struck me as being
14:36	10	something that shouldn't have occurred was
L4:36	11	the fact that on 97 days I was charged more
14:36	12	than I thought I was going to be charged. I
14:36	13	wasn't interested in multiplying it by the
14:36	14	number of days active.
14:36	15	On a day-by-day calculation,
.4:36	16	which is the way I view this charging to
.4:36	17	occur, I was charged more than my daily
.4:36	18	budget. I wasn't calculating things on a
,4:36	19	monthly basis. This whole thing was
.4:36	20	presented as a daily budget, and a daily
.4:36	21	calculation is what was important.
.4:36	22	Q. And have you ever received any
.4:36	23	assistance from anyone in terms of learning
.4:37	24	how to use the AdWords program?
.4:37	25	A. Nothing more than I figured out

	1	H. Stern
·		
1,5:06	2	daily budget specifies."
15:06	3	Do you see that?
15:06	4	A. Yes.
15:06	5	Q. And your understanding, that's
15:06	6	part of the FAQ's; correct?
15:06	. 7	A. Along with part one, "What is a
15:06	8	daily budget."
15:06	9	Q. Right.
15:06	10	A. Yes.
15:06	11	Q. And you understand that the
15:06	12	FAQ's are part of the terms and conditions of
L5:06	13	your relationship with Google; correct?
L5:06	14	A. Yes. They're part of the
L5:06	15	agreement.
L5:06	16	Q. And is it your position that,
L5:06	17	notwithstanding that language, if Google
L5:06	18	delivers and charges you for \$11 worth of
L5:06.	19	advertising on a day in which you have a
15:07	20	daily budget of 10, that even though that is
-5:07	21	less than 120 percent of your daily budget,
_5:07	22	it is your position today that Google has
.5:07	23	violated the terms and conditions of its
.5:07	24	relationship with you?
.5:07	25	A. Yes. For two reasons. One is,

		·
	1	H. Stern
15:18	2	credits. But apparently I might have
15:18	. 3	received some overdelivery credits. But
15:18	4	whatever they were, they obviously weren't
15:18	5 .	what I thought they would be.
15:18	6	Q. And then and is it your
L5:18	7	position that after this correspondence that
15:18	8	occurred on November culminating in the
L5:18	9	e-mail that's the top of Exhibit 3,
L5:18	10	November 20, 2003, is it your position that
l5:18	11	after that correspondence you continued to
L5:18	12	believe that your agreement with Google was
l5:18	13	that Google would never charge you on a daily
L5:19	14	basis more than your daily budget?
L5:19	15	A. Yes. I still believe it as I'm
.5:19	16	sitting here today, and it's still in the
.5:19	17	FAQ's that every day should have a daily
.5:19	18	budget that wouldn't be exceeded.
.5:20	19	MR. BIDERMAN: Why don't we take
.5:20	20	a five-minute break. I'll talk to
.5:20	21	Chris, we'll see where we are.
.5:20	22	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
.5:20	23	3:23 p.m. We're off the record.
.5:20	24	(Recess taken.)
.5:35	25	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is

	1	H. Stern
	•	
15:35		3:38 p.m. We're back on the record.
15:35	3	BY MR. BIDERMAN:
15:35	4	Q. Just so I have a clear record,
15:35	5	can you tell me every document oops. What
15:35	6	am I doing wrong?
L5:35	7	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Your
15:35	. 8	microphone.
15:35	9	(Discussion off the record.)
L5:35	10	Q. Can you tell me, sir, every
L5:35	11	reason why you believe that Google is
L5:35	12	violating the terms and conditions of its
L5:35	13	agreement with you when it charges more than
15:35	14	your daily budget?
.5:36	15	A. Well, the first is that they
.5:36	16	present themselves as allowing you to set a,
5:36	17	quote, daily budget. And you would think or
.5:36	18	at least I think, and still think today, that
.5:36	19	that's the most you're going to be charged
.5:36	20	that day. So when I get charged more than
.5:36	21	that I feel it's a violation.
.5:36	22	Second is that it seems that
.5:36	23	there are terms in the FAQ's as of today,
.5:36	24	although I can't recall what they were like
.5;36	25	when I signed up, that on the one hand say
	·	

	. 1	H. Stern
15:36	2	you have a daily budget that you're not going
15:36	3	to have exceeded in one paragraph, and then
15:36	4	in another paragraph they talk about a
15:36	5	monthly budget, which has nothing to do with
15:36	б	a daily budget. And they seem to be billing
15:36	7	you on their monthly billing interpretation,
15:36	8	when I'm looking at the daily budget
15:36	9	interpretation, which is what I key in on.
15:36	10	Q. What you personally key in on?
15:36	11	A. What I believe is the whole
15:36	12	point of this AdWords program is that it's a
15:36	13	daily type of complete-control advertising
L5:37	14	scheme, where you have very fine control over
L5:37	15	your charges down to the daily level, and
L5:37	16	that's what they present as as the main
. 5:37	17	feature of their program. And yet they, on
.5:37	18	the back end at the end of the month, they
.5:37	19	sort of throw that out and just charge you
,5:37	20	monthly.
.5:37	21	Q. Okay. And you will agree that
.5:37	22	after your correspondence in November 20th,
.5:37	23	2003, which is the last document we talked
.5:37	24	about, you understood that, notwithstanding
.5:37	25	what you believed to be the case, Google

	. 1	
	1	H. Stern
16:27	2	A. Yes.
16:27	3	Q. Is that an incentive for you to
16:27	4	sign up for AdWords?
16:27	5	A. Right. It's a good reason,
16:27	6	right.
16:27	7	Q. And then it goes on to say,
16:27	8	"This is the same no matter how you choose to
L6:27	9	pay for your advertising."
L6:27	10	Do you see that?
L6:27	11	A. Yes.
l6:27	12	Q. Okay. So why did you switch to
L6:27	13	Google from Yahoo?
.6:27	14	A. Because Yahoo had a monthly
.6:27	1.5	minimum that I needed to pay, whether or not
6:27	16	I even ran the ads.
6:27	17	Q. And Google?
.6:27	18	A. They had no minimum.
.6:27	19	Q. And, in fact, they told you they
6:28	20	had no minimum; correct?
.6:28	21	A. Right.
.6:28	22	MR. BIDERMAN: Objection.
.6:28	23	Assumes facts not in evidence.
. 6:28	24	MR. LEVY: Do you want to change
.6:28	25	the tape now?

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

CLRB HANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC,)
etc., et al.,)

Plaintiffs,)

V.) Case No.
) 05-03639 JW

GOOGLE, INC.,)

Defendant.)

CONFIDENTIAL PORTIONS

30 (b) (6) DEPOSITION OF BRETT R. HANSON

August 18, 2006

228010

BARKLEY Caurt Reporters

	1	
	1	B. Hanson
0:08	2	an AdWords program, and entered the
0:08	3	information that was requested of me.
0:08	4	Q. And this is sometime in
0:08	5	July 2002, as best as you recall?
0:08	6	A. Yes, sir.
0:08	7	Q. And did you review any materials
0:08	8	on the Google site before you made the
80:0	. 9	decision to join the AdWords program?
0:08	10	A. I remember the page the
0:09	11	sign-up page saying it was an easy-to-use
0:09	12	pay-for-click program. That it was a we
0:09	13	controlled the the program from a from
0:09	14	a budget standpoint. We controlled the cost
0:09	15	per click. We controlled the daily budget.
0:09	16	And that's what intrigued me to the value
0:09	17	proposition that Google offered at that time.
0:09	18	Q. And when did you first see the
0:09	19	page that you just described?
0:09	20	A. I think it's the first page that
0:09	21	was presented to me.
0:09	22	Q. Okay. As part of the AdWords
0:09	23	sign-in?
0:09	24	A. Yes, sir.
0:09	25	Q. And had you reviewed any

	1		
	1	B. Hanson	
0:20	. 2	has that button on it.	
0:20	3	MR. BIDERMAN: I'm asking if he	
0:20	4	remembers it.	
0:20	5	MR. LEVY: Okay.	
0:20	б	A. I do not recall a specific	
0:20	7	button.	٠.
0:21	8	Q. And do you otherwise recall in	
0:21	9	some manner signifying that you accepted the	
0:21	10	terms and conditions of the AdWords program?	
0:21	11	A. I do not.	**
0:21	12	Q. And in your mind, whether you	
0.21	13	have that recollection or not, did you	
0:21	14	understand that by signing on to the AdWords	
0:21	15	program that you were accepting the terms and	
0:21	16	conditions by which the AdWords program	
0:21	17	operated?	
0:21	18	A. In my mind, I was accepting the	
0:21	19	terms and conditions that controlled my daily	
0:21	20	budget. I controlled my cost per click. I	
0:21	21	could turn off and on my campaign, and I	
0:21	22	would not be charged more than my daily	
0:21	23	budget or my daily cost per click.	
0:21	24	Q. Okay. And did you believe that	
0:21	25	you were accepting anything else?	

•	1	B. Hanson
.0:44	2	MR. BIDERMAN: We've been going
0:44	3	about an hour. Do you want to take
0:44	4	like four, five minutes?
0:44	5	MR. LEVY: Sure.
0:44	6 - 1	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
0:44	7	10:44 a.m. We're off the record.
0:44	8	(Recess taken.)
0:55	9	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
0:55	10	10:55 a.m. We're back on the record.
3:59	11	BY MR. BIDERMAN:
0:55	12	Q. And just one question while
0:55	13	we're getting a document. With respect to
0:55	14	the daily budget, how what is your
0:55	15	understanding of how a daily budget works on
0:55	16	the Google AdWords program?
0:55	17	A. That whatever our budget is
0:55	18	we'll not be charged more than that certain
0:55	19	amount.
0:55	20	Q. Okay. And how did you come to
0:55	21	that understanding?
0:55	. 22	A. That's what was presented to me
0:55	23	by Google.
0:55	24	Q. In what form?
0:55	25	A. The on-line page. The initial

	. 1	B. Hanson	
2:01	2	there were let me just mark the others.	
.2:01	3	MR. BIDERMAN: Withdrawn.	
.2:01	4	Sorry, Amy.	
.2:01	5	Q. How did you select the days that	
.2:01	6	you selected for these particular exhibits,	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
.2:01	7	29, 28, 27?	
2:02	8	A. I believe I was asked by CLRB at	
2:02	9	the time why the budgets were going over,	
2:02	10	and and I think I wanted to show counsel	
2:02	11	that there was just a continual you know,	
2:02	12	no matter what we set the budget at, it	
2:02	13	always went over. It didn't matter if I set	
2:02	14	it at \$1, \$100. Would go over.	
2:02	15	Whatever the budget was, it went	
2:02	16	over. It seemed to be. And it was	
2:02	17	frustrating to convey that to the client,	
2:02	18	when the client says, I want to spend \$100	
2:02	19	and the client pulls up a report and it's	•
2:02	20	\$121 or it's always consistently over. I	
2:03	21	mean, it looks like I don't have a clue	
2:03	22	what's going on.	
2:03	23	Q. And when you say you were asked	
2:03	24	by CLRB, who asked you this question?	•
2:03	25	A. Cindy Hanson.	•

	. 1	B. Hanson
3:43	2	day we were going over budget.
3:43	3	Q. Right. I understand. Is it
3:43	4	fair to say that at some time in the second
3:43	5	quarter of 2004 you came to the understanding
3:43	б	that it was Google's practice under the
3:43	7	AdWords program to charge up to 20 percent
3:43	8	above the specified daily budget amount for a
3:43	9	given day?
3:43	10.	A. No, sir. No, sir.
3:44	11	Q. Okay. You did come to that
3:44	12	understanding at some point in time; right?
3:44	13	A. That wasn't the question you
3:44	14	asked me.
3:44	15	Q. Okay. Okay. Have you ever come
3:44	16	to an understanding that Google's policy and
3:44	17	practice under the AdWords program is to
3:44	18	charge up to 120 percent of the daily budget?
3:44	19	A. As recently as I've kind of
3:44	20	caved in and gave in that that's how Google's
3:44	21	going to treat their advertisers, is going to
3:44	22	screw them by 20 percent in the last, let's
3:44	23	say, last June, 2005. Because I wasn't
3:44	24	getting anywhere with asking them for, you
3.44	25	know, why is this happening. It didn't

	, I	B. Hanson
3:45	2	matter what I changed the daily budget to, it
3:45	3	always went over.
3:45	4	Q. Okay. So it's fair to say you
3:45	5	came to that understanding sometime, say,
3:45	6	June 2005?
3:45	7	A. Yes.
3:45	8	Q. And with respect to Exhibits 39
3:45	9	and 38, the communications with Tina, did you
3:45	10	speak to her by phone?
3:45	11	A. I don't know if Google has
3:45	12	phones. No. E-mail.
3:45	13	Q. And have you ever spoken to
3:45	14	anyone at Google by telephone?
3:46	15	A. Recently, I believe, I received
3:46	16	a voicemail. In fact, on Monday, thanking us
3:46	17	for our business from a Matt. I don't know,
3:46	18	Matt something left on my voicemail.
3:46	19	Q. And anything other than that
3:46	20	communication?
3:46	21	A. Not that I can recall.
3:46	22	Q. I thought have you ever
3:46	23	spoken to anyone by phone or otherwise at
3:46	24	Google about daily budget issues?
3:46	25	A. I think I let me refresh my
•		