# **EXHIBIT B**

50 59	
UNITED STATES DIS	STRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFOR	NIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION
INTERSERVE, INC., dba	)
TECHCRUNCH, a Delaware	)
corporation, and CRUNCHPAD,	)
INC., a Delaware	)
corporation,	)
Plaintiffs,	):
vs.	)No. 09-CV-5812 RS
FUSION GARAGE PTE. LTD, a	<b>)</b> :
Singapore company,	)
Defendant.	)
VIDEOTAPED DEPO	SITION OF
INTERSERVE, INC. d	ba TECHCRUNCH
MICHAEL ARRI	NGTON
Redwood Shores,	California
Tuesday, April	20, 2010
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL AT	TORNEYS' EYES ONLY
REPORTED BY:	
JAY W. HARBIDGE, CSR NO. 409	0

1	ambiguous, unintelligible, calls for a legal
2	conclusion, foundation, competence.
3	BY MR. STERN:
4	Q. Let's start with patents. Can you tell
5	me what patents are associated with the JooJoo that
6	TechCrunch or CrunchPad claims it owns?
7	MR. BRIDGES: Objection, lacks
8	foundation, competence, legal conclusion.
9	BY MR. STERN:
10	Q. You can answer.
11	A. I'm not comfortable making legal
12	conclusions.
13	Q. Can you tell me what patentable
14	inventions are associated with the JooJoo that
15	TechCrunch or CrunchPad claims it owns in whole or
16	in part?
17	MR. BRIDGES: Objection, lacks
18	foundation, competence, calls for a legal
19	conclusion.
20	THE WITNESS: I'm not comfortable
21	drawing legal conclusions.
22	BY MR. STERN:
23	Q. Can you tell me what features or aspects
24	of the JooJoo are either intellectual property or
25	proprietary rights of TechCrunch or CrunchPad?
	136

1	MR. BRIDGES: Objection, lacks	
2	foundation, competence, calls for a legal	
3	conclusion, compound.	
4	BY MR. STERN:	
5	Q. You can answer.	
6	A. I'm not comfortable making legal	
7	conclusions.	
8	Q. Can you describe to me any aspect of the	
9	JooJoo software or hardware that is owned in whole	
10	or in part by either TechCrunch or CrunchPad?	
11	MR. BRIDGES: Objection, foundation,	
12	competence, legal conclusion.	
13	THE WITNESS: I'm not comfortable making	
14	legal conclusions.	
15	BY MR. STERN:	
16	Q. Can you tell me any aspect of the JooJoo	
17	operating system that is owned in whole or part by	
18	either TechCrunch or CrunchPad?	
19	MR. BRIDGES: Objection, vague and	
20	ambiguous, potentially calls for a legal conclusion	
21	and foundation and competence.	
22	THE WITNESS: I'm not comfortable making	
23	legal conclusions.	
24	BY MR. STERN:	
25	Q. Can you tell me any property at all that	
		137

1	Fusion Garage or anybody associated with Fusion	
2	Garage appropriated or took from TechCrunch or	
3	CrunchPad?	
4	MR. BRIDGES: Objection, vague and	
5	ambiguous, calls for a legal conclusion, foundation	
6	competence.	
7	THE WITNESS: I'm not comfortable making	
8	legal conclusions.	
9	BY MR. STERN:	
10	Q. Can you tell me any feature of the	
11	JooJoo that was contributed to in whole or in part	
12	by either TechCrunch or CrunchPad?	
13	MR. BRIDGES: Objection, foundation,	
14	competence in part, and vague and ambiguous.	
15	But you may answer.	
16	THE WITNESS: We obviously the	
17	project, CrunchPad project began before Fusion	
18	Garage entered the picture. It began with our	
19	initial post in July with progress from there	
20	through the various prototypes.	
21	Once Fusion Garage did enter the picture	
22	and started working with us, we worked	
23	collaboratively as a team. There was no difference	
24	between what we were doing and what they were doing.	
25	They were in our office working with us directly,	
		138

1	mixing and mingling with my employees.
2	It was a purely an awesome
3	collaborative project where we were working together
4	constantly. Decisions were made at high levels,
5	passed through me; low-level suggestions were made,
6	passed right back up, and it was kind of how the
7	product was developed.
8	BY MR. STERN:
9	Q. Can you tell me the high-level
10	suggestions that were made by anybody at TechCrunch
11	or CrunchPad to anybody at Fusion Garage? No, let
12	me change that question.
13	Can you please list for me all the
14	high-level suggestions that were made by anybody at
15	TechCrunch or CrunchPad to anybody at Fusion Garage
16	where those high-level suggestions were proprietary
17	rights of TechCrunch or CrunchPad?
18	MR. BRIDGES: Objection, calls for a
19	legal conclusion.
20	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm uncomfortable
21	forming legal conclusions.
22	BY MR. STERN:
23	Q. Can you tell me the high-level
24	suggestions that were made by anybody at TechCrunch
25	or CrunchPad to anybody at Fusion Garage?
	130

1	A. All of them. I mean, every aspect of
2	the product was something we discussed constantly.
3	Q. Okay. Tell me.
4	A. Examples, what the case was made out of,
5	what color it would be, where buttons would be, what
6	kind of touch technology we could afford, what kind
7	of touch technology was possible.
8	Q. Could you just slow down for the court
9	reporter.
10	A. Sure, but I'm going to list every
11	feature that was there because it was a
12	collaborative project that we worked on constantly
13	all day long every day.
14	Q. I want to make this very clear. I did
15	not ask for what was all of the features of the
16	project. I have asked, and I want to make this
17	clear for the judge, I asked, can you tell me the
18	high-level suggestions that were made by anybody at
19	TechCrunch or CrunchPad to anybody at Fusion Garage?
20	I'm asking about high level. We'll get to low
21	level, but I'm asking about the high-level
22	suggestions that were made by anybody at TechCrunch
23	or CrunchPad to anybody at Fusion Garage. I'm not
24	asking about collaboration; I'm asking about I'm
25	looking for a list of specific suggestions.
	140

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA )	
2	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO )	
3		
4	I, JAY W. HARBIDGE, Certified Shorthand	
5	Reporter, do hereby certify:	
6	That prior to being examined, the	
7	witness in the foregoing proceedings was by me duly	
8	sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and	
9	nothing but the truth;	
10	That said proceedings were taken before	
11	me at the time and place therein set forth and were	
12	taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter	
13	transcribed into typewriting under my direction and	
14	supervision;	
15	I further certify that I am neither	
16	counsel for, nor related to, any parties to said	
17	proceedings, nor in anywise interested in the	
18	outcome thereof.	
19	In witness whereof, I have hereunto	
20	subscribed my name.	
21	Dated: April 22, 2010	
22	116	
23	Just 12	
24	JAY W. HARBIDGE	
25	CSR No. 4090	e
		392