

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
3	
4	Civil Action No. 10-CV-01546-REB-CBS
5	
6	The Direct Marketing Association,
7	Plaintiff,
8	v.
9	Roxy Huber, in her capacity as Executive
10	Director, Colorado Department of Revenue,
11	Defendant.
12	
13	DEPOSITION OF KEVIN LANE KELLER taken at Norwich,
14	Vermont, on October 21, 2010.
15	
16	APPEARANCES:
17	Matthew P. Schaefer, Esquire
18	Brann & Isaacson 184 Main Street, Fourth Floor
19	P.O. Box 3070 Lewiston, Maine, 04243-3070, on behalf of the
20	Plaintiff, The Direct Marketing Association.
21	Jack Wesoky, Esquire Senior Assistant Attorney General
22	1525 Sherman Street, 7th Floor Denver, Colorado, 80203, on behalf of the Roxy
23	Huber in her capacity as Executive Director, Colorado Department of Revenue.

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

1 Well --0 2 Α That I couldn't remember. This is the only one I 3 could remember having seen. Let's take a look at Exhibit 17, okay? If you 4 0 5 turn to the second page of that exhibit, it has 226 at the bottom. You have a couple markings on 6 7 that page? Α Right. 8 9 Could you tell me what those mean? 10 Α They don't mean a lot, to be honest. It's just a habit I have of when I read documents I mark them 11 12 up in part just to, it's just a way I do just to process things so it's just to delineate or just 13 14 something like that. I'll circle, I'll underline 15 and put things on the side and in this case I did 16 all three. Did you have any issues or problems with those 17 Q questions 2 and 3 that you kind of drew around? 18 Not at all. This was just, literally, just the 19 Α 2.0 way I read things. So I take it you had no problems with question 1, 21 0 question 2, question 3, or question 4? 22 23 That is correct. Α

1		put it.
2	Q	And then let's go to the last page on that exhibit
3		which is your page of notes. Would you tell me
4		what they say?
5	А	They're going to be hard. Okay. The top part has
6		DMA and NYC for New York City and it looks like it
7		has the name of a Senior Vice President perhaps.
8	Q	Did you speak with that individual?
9	А	No. And then it says Colorado legislation, state
10		revenue department, and looks like remote sales
11		and March 1.
12	Q	Do you know why you wrote those down?
13	А	I think there was some description of the case,
14		and I was just writing down words, I think, from
15		that description.
16	Q	Would that have been on your initial contact with
17		Mr. Isaacson and Mr. Schaefer? Because these
18		notes are undated. That's why I'm asking.
19	А	They are undated, and that would be my guess, but
20		I can't say for sure when and I also unfortunately
21		can't say that this was all from one phone
22		conversation. This could have been from multiple
23		phone conversations because it was in the file.

1	Q	Taking notes, Colorado legislation, state revenue
2		department, so forth. Then you have the word
3		nexus and something below that and I can't make
4		that out. Could you tell me what that is?
5	А	I got nexus, too. But below it it's really hard
6		to tell. So I'm sorry about that. It looks like
7		it could be high, but, you know, the first word,
8		but I'm not sure. It could be ruling or
9		something. You know, R, even though it doesn't
10		look like it, that second word underneath there,
11		it could be R U Y because a lot of times when
12		you're on a phone conversation you just don't have
13		time to get full words. You're just trying to get
14		as many of the letters as you can.
15	Q	Then I see over to the right there it's a little
16		arrow, physical presence, employees/facility?
17	А	Facilities, I think probably.
18	Q	And below that agents and then an arrow pointing
19		down, economic pressure?
20	A	Presence.
21	Q	Okay. Economic presence. State?
22	A	Tried.
23	Q	State tried. What does that mean?

1	A	I think these are just notes about the background
2		to the case and just talking about different, the
3		development of the case through, that they were
4		giving me as general background and I just was
5		taking notes that related to that.
6	Q	They meaning, I'll use your words, George and
7		Matt?
8	А	George and Matt. Correct.
9	Q	Giving you background about the case and what it
10		was about?
11	А	Descriptive background, correct.
12	Q	Could it be that they were describing their theory
13		of the case to you?
14		MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to the form. Go
15		ahead.
16	А	No. I think this was very much sort of an
17		historical account of what had happened in the
18		development in the case. As I recall it was very
19		historical and like a reporter kind of descriptive
20		account.
21	Q	Over on the right it says Tom Adler, RSG,
22		something below that?
23	А	Unbiased sample from and what I can't read is, it

1		may, from Colorado. Probably should be of
2		Colorado. That's CO, I think, in the bottom
3		right. So unbiased sample from Colorado. That
4		was going to be a survey that was going to be
5		conducted, I guess.
6	Q	So you were told by George and Matt that Tom Adler
7		from RSG was going to conduct an unbiased survey
8		from Colorado?
9	А	All I know is, I don't know when I was told this
10		because I don't know when I wrote this, but it is
11		just the fact that Tom Adler RSG and I've got
12		something about an unbiased sample from Colorado.
13	Q	And you knew Mr. Adler before this?
14	А	I don't think we actually ever met in person, but
15		I know of him.
16	Q	Then you have a line, it appears, and below that
17		are more notes?
18	А	Right. Right.
19	Q	Can you tell me what those notes are?
20	A	Looks like it says talks about noncollecting
21		retailer.
22	Q	And the one next to that looks like, is it
23		collecting retailer?

1	А	Yes. That's correct. In parentheses, yes.
2	Q	And over on the right the preliminary
3		injunction/damages, what does that mean?
4	А	Again, that's part of the chronicle I believe I
5		got about the, whether initially or subsequent
6		time about the nature of the case.
7	Q	And the terms noncollecting retailer and
8		collecting retailer were given to you by George
9		and Matt?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	There's, it looks like a little chain on the
12		right-hand side. I'm sorry. On the left-hand
13		side.
14	А	A list or
15	Q	Looks like there's, on the far left, a chain?
16		MR. SCHAEFER: Do you want to indicate it to
17		him?
18	Q	With an arrow?
19	А	Oh, yes. There's a name, there are two names
20		circled that go down, and one, there's an arrow
21		that goes down that says the word survey.
22	Q	What are those names?
23	А	Those were names of two other academics who also

_		
1		serve as experts so I suspect I wrote those down
2		in the context of thinking about other experts
3		that they may want to use.
4	Q	Who are they? Can you give me their names?
5	А	Eric Joachimsthaler. It's a German name so it's a
6		little hard. Actually was with him yesterday. J
7		O A C H I M S T H A L E R.
8	Q	And the other one below that?
9	А	That's actually hard, too. Dhruv, D H R U V, and
10		I believe the last name is Grewal. It's an Indian
11		name. G R E W A L.
12	Q	And you suggested them as experts to George and
13		Matt or you just wrote them down as possible
14		people to talk to?
15	А	I think, I'm not sure exactly the context. They
16		are ones who have, I know are experts on consumers
17		and retailing and certainly the facts of the case.
18	Q	You didn't consult with them regarding your expert
19		opinion, did you?
20	A	I did not.
21	Q	And you didn't refer them any work on this case, I
22		take it?
23	А	I don't believe so.

1	Q	Next is much of consumer privacy or something like
2		that?
3	А	It looks like invasion of consumer privacy.
4	Q	And whose words are those? Yours or George and
5		Matt's?
6	А	Could be mine.
7	Q	Could be. Could be George and Matt's then?
8	А	Well, I don't know at that point in time where we
9		are in terms of these notes. That's part of the
10		problem. As we go farther down, they may be, it's
11		harder to say exactly where they come from.
12	Q	Okay. And then there's a list of three things.
13	А	Correct.
14	Q	And are those notes you got from the statute or
15		are those notes that you got from your
16		conversation with George and Matt?
17	А	My guess is the conversation with George and Matt.
18		But whether I had the statute or read the statute
19		and I don't know where that fits into the picture.
20	Q	Over on the right, under preliminary
21		injunction/damages, threatened irreparable harm?
22	А	Threat of or threat of irreparable harm or
23		something like that. Yes.

1	Q	And the reason that's down there, is it because
2		that's what Matt and George wanted you to focus
3		on, that there would be irreparable harm to
4		retailers?
5	А	I don't know the exact context of that. My belief
6		it would be there's discussions about different
7		legal aspects and the implications and, again,
8		background context to the case.
9	Q	With regard to that exhibit, the survey
10		questionnaire, did you provide a copy of that to
11		anybody with your notes on it?
12	А	Not, I don't believe so.
13	Q	Did you discuss your editorial comments with
14		anybody?
15	А	I did.
16	Q	And who would that be?
17	А	I believe it would be someone from RSG and could
18		have also included, but I don't remember if it
19		did, I'm not sure it did, anyone from, Matt or
20		George from Brann & Isaacson.
21	Q	Was that a telephone conference?
22	А	Yes.
23	Q	Do you remember the person at RSG?