1

```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
            FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE
LEADER TECHNOLOGIES, ) Trial Volume 1
INC.,
          Plaintiff,
                        ) C.A. No. 08-862-JJF-LPS
v.
FACEBOOK, INC., a
Delaware corporation,
           Defendant.
                       July 19, 2010
                       9:00 a.m.
BEFORE: THE HONORABLE LEONARD P. STARK
        United States District Court Magistrate
APPEARANCES:
         POTTER, ANDERSON & CORROON, LLP
         BY: PHILIP A. ROVNER, ESQ.
                  -and-
         KING & SPALDING, LLP
         BY: PAUL ANDRE, ESQ.
         BY: LISA KOBIALKA, ESQ.
         BY: JAMES HANNAH, ESQ.
```

Hawkins Reporting Service
715 North King Street - Wilmington, Delaware 19801
(302) 658-6697 FAX (302) 658-8418

Counsel for Plaintiff

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
2	·······
3	
4	BLANK ROME, LLP BY: STEVEN L. CAPONI, ESQ.
5	-and-
6	
7	COOLEY, GODWARD, KRONISH, LLP BY: MICHAEL RHODES, ESQ.
8	BY: HEIDI L. KEEFE, ESQ. BY: JEFFREY T. NORBERG, ESQ.
9	BY: MARK WEINSTEIN, ESQ. BY: MELISSA KEYES, ESQ.
10	BY: ELIZABETH STAMESHKIN, ESQ.
11	Counsel for Defendant
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	THE CLERK: All rise. Court's now
2	in session. The Honorable Leonard P. Stark
3	presiding.
4	THE COURT: Good morning,
5	everybody.
6	(Everyone said, Good morning, Your
7	Honor.)
8	THE CLERK: Please be seated.
9	THE COURT: I see we have a big
10	crowd this morning. We're here, of course, for
11	start of trial.
12	Let's begin by having you all note
13	your appearances on the record this morning.
14	MR. ANDRE: Good morning, Your
15	Honor. Paul Andre representing Leader
16	Technologies.
17	And with me today is Lisa
18	Kobialka.
19	MS. KOBIALKA: Good morning, Your
20	Honor.
21	MR. ANDRE: Phil Rovner.
22	MR. ROVNER: Good morning, Your
23	Honor.
24	MR. ANDRE: And James Hannah.

1	MR. HANNAH: Good morning.
2	THE COURT: Good morning.
3	MR. RHODES: Good morning, Your
4	Honor.
5	THE COURT: Good morning.
6	MR. RHODES: I'm Michael Rhodes.
7	I'm from Cooley. I represent Facebook, the
8	defendant.
9	With me at counsel table, of
10	course, is Mr. Caponi. I brought senior
11	executive and general counsel of Facebook, who
12	will set with us at table with the Court's
13	indulgence. This is Ted Ullyot. It's spelled
14	U-L-L-Y-O-T.
15	You know my partner Heidi Keefe,
16	of course.
17	MS. KEEFE: Good morning, Your
18	Honor.
19	
20	Jeff Norberg.
21	MR. NORBERG: Good morning, Your
22	Honor.
23	MR. RHODES: And Mr. Kotarski who
24	will be running the technology in the courtroom.

1	THE COURT: Thank you. Good
2	morning.
3	MR. KOTARSKI: Good morning.
4	THE COURT: Let's just make sure
5	we're all on the same page as to what happened
6	over the weekend, of course.
7	Well, yesterday, the Court denied
8	Facebook's motion to admit through an oral order
9	that was docketed this morning. I'm sure you
10	all saw yesterday.
11	On Saturday, the Court overruled
12	Leader's objections to Facebook's proposed
13	opening statement demonstratives. It was not in
14	the nature of any explanation. I did want to
15	give you the benefit of a little bit of
16	explanation for that ruling.
17	Having reviewed the
18	demonstratives, I concluded that the statements
19	of law that are in the demonstratives are
20	accurate and I felt not inappropriately
21	argumentative.
22	With respect to claim
23	construction, I thought that the proposed slides
24	appear to adequately reflect the Court's ruling

as understood by Facebook's expert and explained what Facebook therefore believes the evidence is going to show. And fundamentally the Court, of course, instructs on the law and I'm confident that the jury will understand that the legal instructions that they are to apply are the instructions that the Court gives today at the end of trial.

2.

2.0

And I'm also aware of my ability to instruct them throughout the trial if necessary. So I'm confident that the jury will not be confused as to what law to apply.

Let me next move on to the deposition designations which was an issue that also arose over the weekend. I'm afraid that I may have created some ambiguity as to the process I wanted you all to follow. I don't want or need any further argument, narrative, or anything with respect to the deposition designations. The potential designations are fixed with what you all gave me last week, so if what you gave me last week is not highlighted, then it's not in.

The only maximum designations that

will be allowed are those that were at least highlighted. I think the ambiguity arose because I anticipated that it may happen as did happen that the party designating testimony might decide to reduce what they ultimately offer, and that raises the question as to what does the other side get to do in that instance.

I just want to be clear, the other side does not get to write to me a whole bunch of stuff and try to explain what I should do.

What I want to happen is, and it will make this -- I'll give you until the end of the lunch break two days before the testimony is going to be offered, so you have until the end of the lunch break today to work this out for Wednesday.

What I need to know and I'll put the burden on the party that's offering the witness, all I need to know is the witness's name, the pages that are being designated to actually be put into evidence on Wednesday, and the counter-designation pages, so you'll have to confer with the other side in advance so you'll know what counter-designation pages to refer me

to.

2.0

So list for me all of the pages that are now being offered as designations as well as counter-designations and highlight for me where among those pages I can find objections so I can give you rulings on the objections.

What I can let you know and you'll see in my rulings I'm going to give you in a minute if what happens is the party offering the witness is no longer offering as much testimony as they originally designated, and the opposing party now wants to counter-designate some portion of what was originally designated by the offering party, you can do that as the opposing party, but only if you did not object to the portion of the testimony that the offering party originally offered.

So for instance, today, if

Facebook wants to now counter-designate some of
the yellow highlighted text that was previously
designated by Leader, that's fine, unless

Facebook had previously objected to that
testimony, in which case you're not going to be
permitted to counter-designate it. Hopefully

that's sufficiently clear and I trust that counsel will work together to make sure you comply with what I have directed.

2.0

With respect to the witnesses for Tuesday, let me give you my rulings. First, Mr. Zuckerberg, I am sustaining Facebook's objections. I found that the designated testimony lacks relevance to issues in this case.

Mr. Rose, Facebook's objections are overruled. The testimony goes to tracking, which is relevant. Facebook can put Mr. Rose's testimony and his purported lack of knowledge into context through other evidence.

Mr. Wang, there are no objections by Facebook to Leader's reduced designations.

Facebook now seeks to designate portions of Leader's previous designations specifically at Page 15, Lines 4 to 17. I am sustaining Leader's objections to Facebook' counter-designation because that portion of the testimony was previously objected to by Facebook.

The other counter-designations of

1	Facebook are at Page 19 and Page 23. I'm also
2	sustaining Leader's objections because that
3	testimony is not any longer relevant.
4	There were originally lots of
5	other portions of Mr. Wang's testimony that had
6	been counter designated. That is, they were in
7	blue highlighting.
8	Since they weren't mentioned in
9	the email this weekend, I assumed that meant
10	that Facebook was no longer counter designating
11	that portion of the testimony.
12	MR. RHODES: We can confirm that.
13	THE COURT: If you're going to
14	confirm that, then stand up so the court
15	reporter can hear you.
16	MR. RHODES: My apology, but yes,
17	you're right.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
19	So that takes us to Mr. Weissman.
20	There was only one specific Facebook objection
21	to the new reduced designations of Leader that
22	was at Page 91 and 92.
23	I'm overruling Facebook's
24	objections. The witness appears to have

1 adequate knowledge to give that testimony. There were three Facebook new 2 3 counter-designations, all of which were 4 previously designated by Leader. Only one of 5 which Leader objects to. That's at Page 110 to 111. 6 7 I'm sustaining Leader's objections to Facebook's new counter-designation because 8 Facebook had previously objected to this portion 9 10 of testimony. 11 Finally, Mr. Bosworth, the only 12 objection is at Page 121. That objection is 13 overruled. The witness appears to have adequate 14 knowledge to give the answer there. 15 All right. That's it on the 16 deposition designations. 17 One final thing from my 18 perspective, on the voir dire, I'm going to add 19 a question at the end, just a general catchall question whether the potential jurors think they 20 21 have any other impairment or concern about 22 serving on the jury. 23 Is there anything else that Leader 24 wants to raise at this time?

MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, there's just a couple issues about the witness list that we sent to Your Honor yesterday. And with one particular issue with who will be looking at source code?

As you probably remember, Leader was concerned that Facebook would try to bring some percipient witnesses in and bring them as quasi experts. We believe that their actual expert, Dr. Kern, did not cite much of the source code in his expect report. In fact, very little.

They said they're going to bring in Mr. Cox and they're going to show him source code. Mr. Cox, I asked counsel this morning, what would it be shown, and they said not sure.

But Mr. Cox was an engineer from 2005 to 2007. And then he went into the HR department at Facebook. And then he's now a product developer.

He's not actually writing source code from what he told me in his deposition. So we're concerned that they're going to try to bring in the source code through a lay witness

and have a lay opinion expressed on it.

2.0

To the extent they limit it to the source code he actually wrote, then I think that's fair game. But anything other than that, I think would be prejudicial.

And not allowing Facebook to couch a expert witness in -- I'm sorry. The court reporter at our last trial here she told me I speak too fast. I'm sorry.

The other issue we have with the witnesses and I'm just a little bit more confused than anything else was the Court's policy regarding Mr. McKibben and counsel's case that they informed us they wanted to bring Mr. McKibben live.

They've also designated substantial portions of their deposition to be played as well. And I don't know that it's appropriate to have Mr. McKibben basically present twice in counsel's case in chief if they can go over the same exact questions that they asked him in deposition and use the deposition to impeach him if he changes his answer, obviously.

But it seems to be a way to try to project Mr. McKibben somehow in an awkward light for the jury because he'll be on the stand during some of the testimony and then they'll take him off the stand and play his video. To me that gives an impression of impropriety that something that he would not be wanting to testify to live or something. It just seems a bit unusual and somewhat prejudicial.

2.

2.0

And the second one is the designation of Mr. Lamb. Deposition testimony played also during Facebook's case. Mr. Lamb is going to be to be here live tomorrow as a witness and we are more than willing to let Facebook examine Mr. Lamb on the topics that they have designated in their deposition. In fact, they plan on covering it as well. So I don't know that having that type of redundancy, obviously it's their case and it's their time ticking away, but it would appear to be once again a way to try to project Mr. Lamb in a less than positive light.

That's all we have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's hear a response

to that, please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. RHODES: Good morning, Your Upon Mr. McKibben I believe the rules Honor. establish without much dispute that we can play his deposition without any adverse party, the Court had ruled that we just put him on for all purposes at one time, they didn't want to do that. I think that's entirely permitted. looked at what we designated last night, it's like eighteen minutes or something. It's not terribly long. With respect to Mr. Lamb, he's legally unavailable to us. He was beyond the power of the Court. We properly designated his deposition in all of the prior trial pleadings, we sent that to them, we intend to play it in our case in chief. I don't think there is an objection to that.

They have voluntarily gotten him here. It's a bit of a catch 22 because before the trial he was legally unavailable to us, so he would satisfy the legal requirement of unavailability.

With respect to Cox, we are going to try to lay a foundation, Your Honor, that he

did, in fact, author portions of the source code. I suppose we should deal with this on the fly because if we go beyond that we can't lay the foundation. It sounds like you would sustain an objection that he's talking about code that he didn't write.

So I think Mr. Andre is correct that we're just trying to deal with the source code and we haven't decided if we are going to do it with him. But if we do it with him, it's only with respect to the code that he developed.

I have other things to raise with you.

THE COURT: Let me deal with these first and then we'll come back. On Mr. Cox, we will have to deal with that as it comes up. The Court agrees with both counsel that his testimony with respect to source code should not go beyond source code that he was personally involved in, and hopefully that's all that will be elicited with respect to source codes.

On the issue of whether witnesses can testify live and by deposition, I'm going to permit both to be done under the circumstances

here. If I develop a concern that any unfair
adverse inference is going to be drawn from the
fact that at times questions are being asked
live and at other times somebody is pressing
play on a machine, then I can always instruct
the jury that they shouldn't draw such
conclusions.

Let's move on to the issue that Facebook wants to raise. Another issue, Mr. Andre.

MR. ANDRE: Just a housekeeping issue, Your Honor. Are the objections to exhibits deemed admitted at this point when counsel offers exhibits up for admission, we had put objections on the record on the exhibit list obviously, are those deemed preserved for that purpose or do we need to make objections as they go in as well?

THE COURT: I believe I ruled on all of the objections, and so you made them at the time, they're all now ruled on, and you're free to offer the evidence into evidence.

MR. ANDRE: And then that just brings up the next issue, I guess would be an

issue, the publishing of the exhibits, we don't have moved in before we publish it to the jury on the screens and on the monitors.

THE COURT: Right. You need to present the evidence through a witness, but I have ruled on the objections so you know what's admissible and what is not.

Thank you. Mr. Rhodes.

MR. RHODES: Your Honor, I had a couple of probably stupid questions, but I wanted to ask your permission about various things. During the openings, what is the Court's policy about staying at the lectern? I would like to go to the screen sometimes. I won't go in that direction, but if the Court would allow, I would like to go to the screen sometimes to point out certain things if the Court will allow me.

THE COURT: Right. I don't want you to encroach on the jury which looks like it would be pretty difficult to do given the setup. It's fine as long as my court reporter is going to be able to hear you and I'm sure you're going to want the jury to be able to hear you.

1	MR. RHODES: Thank you, Your
2	Honor. A couple of other things. The first
3	witness in the case is Dr. Herbsleb. I have
4	been mispronouncing his name. And he had two
5	records, a very short one which I think they're
6	going to sponsor first and then a much longer
7	one on invalidity.
8	We would like to separate those
9	two records. I had intended to take him with
10	respect to the very small report. I'm not smart
11	enough to do the big one. And Mr. Weinstein
12	will do the big one, that will be in the
13	rebuttal case. Does the Court have any
14	objection to that?
15	THE COURT: Meaning that he would
16	be examined by two different attorneys?
17	MR. RHODES: At two different
18	times on two completely different reports.
19	THE COURT: Well, I'm going to
20	give Leader a chance to respond to that. Hold
21	on a second, though. Did you have any other
22	issue you wanted to put on the table?
23	MR. RHODES: Yes. The only other
24	issue I had with respect to examination is my

1 continuing objection to the so-called white 2 paper. I think you probably heard me adnauseum on the subject at the moment, but this is the 3 4 issues that we talked about on Friday. Mr. Andre indicated that these two white papers 5 from 2003 went to reduction of practice. 6 7 record prior to before the trial is that the reduction of practice took place not later than 8 9 December 11, 2002, and we have been provided at various times over the weekend versions of one 10 11 of the white papers without the legend that indicates it postdates the patent. 12 13 So I renew my objection to that. 14 I suspect I know what the Court's answer is, but 15 I renew my objection to that. 16 THE COURT: Thank you. 17 Mr. Andre. 18 MR. ANDRE: With respect to Dr. 19 Herbsleb, we have no objection to having 20 counsel, different counsel examine him during 21 the different time periods because it is during 22 our case in chief during the tutorial and then 23 in our rebuttal case as giving an expert witness 24 on validity, so we have no objection to that,

Your Honor.

2.0

With respect to the white papers, counsel has taken a position that reduction of practice did not occur until 2003, December 2003, that's their position. Our position is December 2002. We have the benefit of the provisional application. They say that we don't. So at the very least we have the right to show the reduction to practice in the alternative if it happened to go to their side that the reduction of practice act took place in December 2003.

Your Honor's ruled on this, and I
think that we can use it for the limited
purposes of showing, evidencing what you know
Mr. McKibben did to demonstrate that he actually
did reduce this invention to practice.

THE COURT: Thank you. With respect to Dr. Herbsleb, there is no objection and it will be fine to use the two attorneys at the different points in the case as is intended by Facebook.

With respect to the objections to the white paper, I'm not modifying my previous

1 rulings. The parties' positions have been well 2 stated and we'll proceed according to my 3 rulings. 4 Any further issues at this time 5 before we bring the jury in, Mr. Rhodes? 6 MR. RHODES: I apologize, Your 7 Honor, I had two, again somewhat lame questions. I know you alluded to this on Friday. How do 8 9 you intend to advise us on time keeping? 10 And somebody asked me on my side 11 of the house, how the counter-designations of 12 depositions would or would not count. 13 if we're getting down to that level of minutiae, 14 we're probably in trouble. 15 I had a question about closing 16 arguments, Your Honor. Are you going to 17 instruct the jury before or after the closing 18 argument? 19 THE COURT: Do you have a position 2.0 or recommendation on that at this point? 21 MR. RHODES: Given the 22 complexities of these kinds of issues, my 23 preference would be that you instruct them 24 before closing arguments. Both counsel would

1 have the opportunity to map the evidence of what the instruction would be, but that would be my 2. 3 recommendation, Your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Andre, do you have 4 5 a position on that last point? 6 MR. ANDRE: I tend to agree with 7 Mr. Rhodes on that point, but you know, I defer to Your Honor's discretion. 8 9 THE COURT: Thank you. My plan 10 right now would be to instruct before closing 11 arguments. If my plan on that changes, I'll 12 certainly let you know. 13 With respect to time keeping, my 14 deputies up here are keeping track of everything that happens. You can confer with them I'm sure 15 16 occasionally during the day. They don't want 17 you to be bugging them all the time. And then I would think that it 18 19 would make sense at the end of the day as we're 2.0 double-checking which evidence has been admitted 21 for the day that you can also ask where 22 everybody stands in terms of time. 23 With respect to deposition 24 designations, what we're going to do is charge

1 the counter-designations against the party that 2 has counter designated. My hope is that we're 3 not on such a tight margin that that turns out 4 to be important. But if it does turn out to be 5 important, then that's how we're going to charge the time. 6 7 Anything further before we break to bring the jury in? 8 9 MR. ANDRE: One last thing, Your 10 Honor. Once again, housekeeping. 11 We do have a small board we want 12 to put up for opening statement and there's not 13 really a good place to put it. I don't like 14 blocking counsel's table, but I think the only 15 place I can put it - here Your Honor wouldn't be 16 able to see it. We'll have it projected at 17 certain points. 18 But I'd like to keep it up and 19 refer to it as other slides come up. I don't 20 know if you have a -- we normally put it over 21 there, but I don't know if I can make it over to 22 the corner there. 23 THE COURT: I can't even see 24 everybody that's in here.

1	Well, I'm going to ask you to see
2	what you can do. And before we come in to
3	actually do the openings, we'll revisit that
4	issue with my staff one more time. And we'll
5	see if we can come up with a better place
6	MR. ANDRE: That would be great.
7	THE COURT: for you. Thank
8	you.
9	Anything else, Mr. Rhoades?
10	MR. RHOADES: No, Your Honor.
11	Just on the board, I don't want to be I'm
12	small enough as it is. I don't want to be
13	hiding behind a board.
14	THE COURT: Right. Right.
15	MR. RHOADES: I'm sure we can
16	figure something out in this area.
17	THE COURT: I'm going to trust we
18	can figure something out.
19	MR. RHODES: Nothing further.
20	THE COURT: There's a large number
21	of other folks in the back of the courtroom.
22	I'm going to we have a very large jury pool,
23	I think close to 70 people. And so I'm going to
24	have to ask all the folks in the back that when

1	the jury pool comes in, you all wait outside,
2	let them all settle.
3	There may be seating for some or
4	all of you, but it's of primary importance, no
5	offense to all of you, that we get our jury pool
6	in here so we can process them. And there will
7	be plenty of room, I think, in the courtroom
8	after we get through jury selection.
9	We'll take a brief recess to bring
10	the jury pool in.
11	THE CLERK: All rise.
12	(Whereupon a brief recess was
13	taken.)
14	THE CLERK: All rise. Court's now
15	in session. The Honorable Leonard P. Stark
16	presiding.
17	THE COURT: Good morning,
18	everybody.
19	(Everyone said, Good morning.)
20	THE CLERK: Please be seated.
21	THE COURT: Good morning to our
22	counsel and our potential jurors. My name is
23	Leonard Stark.
24	I am the judge who has been

2 the reason we	
	e've called you all in here. We
3 appreciate yo	ou being here and participating in
4 this very imp	portant civic duty that we all have
5 as citizens.	
6	We're going to be selecting a jury
7 this morning.	. And before we begin that process,
8 I need to fir	est ask my deputy to swear all of
9 you in.	
10	THE CLERK: Members of the jury
11 panel, please	e stand and raise your right hands.
12	Do each of you affirm that you
13 will answer t	cruthfully any questions you are
14 asked pertain	ning to the matter now before the
15 Court? The p	proper response is I do.
16	THE JURY PANEL: I do.
17	THE CLERK: Please be seated.
18	THE COURT: Thank you.
19	Now, what's going to happen first
20 in this proce	ess is I'm going to read out and ask
21 you all colle	ectively a series of questions.
22 They're all i	in the form of yes or no.
They're all i	In the form of yes or no. If your answer to any of these

hand just so we can get a sense as to how many of you are saying yes to that question.

2.

I'll ask you to keep as best you can in your mind track of what questions you had a yes answer to. Then after I get through all of the questions, we will call back one by one into our jury room, which is behind me, so that we can have one-on-one discussions with any of you who had a yes answer to any of the questions.

And after that, we'll all return to the courtroom and we'll continue with the jury selection process. So I'm now going to read the questions.

There's a total of 17. And again,
I'll ask you to raise your hand if you have a
yes answer to the question, and then try to do
your best to keep track as to what that question
was about.

Let me first tell you this is an action for patent infringement. The parties in this case are Leader Technologies, Inc. and Facebook, Inc.

In this case, Facebook is accused

1 of infringing Leader's patent. Counsel will now introduce themselves and their clients and list 2. the names of their potential witnesses. 3 4 After they do, I will ask you 5 whether you or any member of your immediate family know of or have any current or former 6 7 relationship with any of the attorneys, their law firms, their clients or their witnesses. 8 9 Let me first turn to Leader. 10 MR. ANDRE: Thank you, Your Honor. 11 May it please the Court, ladies and gentlemen, 12 my name is Paul Andre. I'm the lead counsel for 13 Leader Technologies. I am with the law firm of 14 King & Spalding. 15 With me at counsel table is my 16 partner Lisa Kobialka with King & Spalding. 17 colleague, Phil Rovner, who's a partner at 18 Potter, Anderson & Corroon. 19 Representing Leader Technologies, 2.0 it is their founder and CEO, Michael McKibben. 21 And at the end of the table is my colleague 22 James Hannah, who's also with King and Spalding. 23 We also have people in the 24 audience here. Some of our attorneys are Shawn

1 Boyle, Yuri Caire, Michael Lee and Jonathan --2 Jonathan Choa. They are all associates. We 3 will see them go throughout the case. 4 We also have representing Leader 5 Technologies, Deb Weckerly, who is the financial 6 officer and Steve Nester, who's their chief 7 engineer. The witnesses we expect to call in 8 9 this case will be Mr. McKibben, his co-inventor 10 Jeff Lamb. We have expert witnesses Dr. Don 11 Vigna and Dr. James Herbsleb. THE COURT: I'll call Facebook 12 13 now. 14 MR. RHODES: Good morning, Your 15 Honor. May it please the Court. Good morning 16 to all of you. 17 My name is Michael Rhodes. lawyer in the firm called Cooley. And I am 18 19 going to introduce everybody that's up here. 20 This is my partner, Heidi Keefe. 21 With me at counsel table is Mr. Ted Ullyot as a 22 senior executive with Facebook. 23 Over here is Steve Caponi. He's a 24 lawyer right here in Wilmington. He works at

1	the law firm of Blank Rome.
2	Over here is Mark Weinstein. Mark
3	is also one of my partners.
4	This is our technology guy who
5	runs all the stuff in the courtroom. This is
6	Ken Kotarski. And this is Sam Lore, another
7	executive with Facebook.
8	Let me read you the names of our
9	staff who may come in and out of the courtroom
10	in the next couple of days just to see if any of
11	these names ring a bell. And I apologize for
12	turning my back to the court reporter.
13	Jeannine Douglas, Cassandra Reed.
14	Jocelyn McIntosh. Mary LeVan.
15	L-e-V-A-N.
16	Patti with an I Clark. And Yuval,
17	Y-U-V-A-L Newman.
18	Our witnesses will be Christopher
19	
	Cox. He is a senior Facebook employee.
20	Cox. He is a senior Facebook employee. Joshua Wiseman, W-I-S-E. He is an
20	Joshua Wiseman, W-I-S-E. He is an
20 21	Joshua Wiseman, W-I-S-E. He is an engineer at Facebook.

1	the University of Pennsylvania. He will be one
2	of our expert witnesses.
3	Daniel Chai, C-H-A-I, who will be
4	by videotape. Oh, we struck him?
5	Oh, okay. Well, I'm the first to
6	know, Your Honor.
7	That one's okay; right?
8	It's always a good thing when the
9	list gets shorter.
10	Dan rose, R-O-S-E. And finally,
11	James Wang, W-A-N-G.
12	Thank you, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Thank you. I'll now
14	ask the jury panel: Do you or any member of
15	your immediate family know of or have any
16	current or former relationship with any of the
17	attorneys, their law firms, their clients or
18	their witnesses? I just need a show of hands.
19	Okay.
20	MR. RHODES: Your Honor I missed
21	one name. I
22	THE COURT: Thank you. I'll now
23	ask the jury panel, do you or any member of your
24	immediate family know of or had have any current

1	or former relationship with any of the
2	attorneys, their law firms, their clients or
3	their witnesses? I just need a show of hands.
4	MR. RHODES: Your Honor, I missed
5	one name.
6	THE COURT: You can add it now.
7	MR. RHODES: Counsel reminded me
8	of that, Professor Greenberg.
9	Thank you.
10	THE COURT: Thank you. Let me ask
11	again. Do any of you have, you or members of
12	your immediate family have a relationship now or
13	previously with any of the attorneys, the
14	witnesses, or the law firms. By a show of hands
15	again. Thank you.
16	Next question is have you heard or
17	read anything about this case?
18	Have you or a member of your
19	immediate family ever had a personal or a
20	business relationship of any kind with either
21	Leader or Facebook?
22	Do you have any opinions about
23	either of these parties that would affect your
24	ability to be a fair and impartial juror?

1	We're up to question five. This
2	trial is expected to last approximately six
3	days. Does the length of the trial present any
4	special problem for you?
5	Question six. Do you have a user
6	account for the Facebook website?
7	Question seven. Do you typically
8	use Facebook at least once a day?
9	Question eight. Jurors in this
10	case will not be permitted to use or access the
11	Facebook website during the length of the trial.
12	Does that present any special problem for you?
13	Do you hold any opinions about
14	Facebook, its policies or practices or the
15	Facebook website that might keep you from being
16	a fair and impartial juror?
17	Do you own stock in or have any
18	financial interest in either of these parties?
19	Have you or anyone in your
20	immediate family ever participated in a lawsuit?
21	Do you have any reservations about
22	serving on a jury in a case that will involve
23	issues related to computer software and social
24	networking?

1 Have you had any experience either 2. personal or through business involving 3 inventions and patents? 4 Have you or any of your immediate 5 family members ever invented anything or applied 6 for a patent? 7 Have you or any member of your family ever been employed by the United States 8 9 Patent and Trademark Office? 10 Do you hold any opinions about 11 patents or the United States Patent and 12 Trademark Office that might keep you from being a fair and impartial juror? 13 14 And finally, do you have any other 15 concern that might prevent you from serving on 16 this jury? 17 Okay. What we're going to do now 18 is some of the attorneys and my staff and a 19 court reporter and I are going to return to the 20 jury room and we will, my staff will help usher 21 you in one by one, any of you who answered yes 22 on one or more of the questions and I and the 23 attorneys will probably have a few additional 24 questions for you back in the jury room.

1	(A brief recess was taken.)
2	THE COURT: Good morning. Have a
3	seat here, please. Tell us first your jury
4	number.
5	THE JUROR: 53.
6	THE COURT: 53. So you are
7	Mr. Reighart?
8	THE JUROR: That's right.
9	THE COURT: Tell us what questions
10	you had yes answers to.
11	THE JUROR: The first one had to
12	do with personal or business and I do have a
13	Facebook account, which is why I raised my hand.
14	And then that very question was asked later, do
15	you have a Facebook account and I do. And there
16	was a question, do you go on Facebook at least
17	once a day and I typically do.
18	THE COURT: Is there anything
19	about your daily Facebook use that you think
20	would prevent you from being a fair and
21	impartial juror?
22	THE JUROR: No.
23	THE COURT: No.
24	Any questions from Leader?

37

1	MR. ANDRE: How many friends do
2	you have on Facebook, approximately?
3	THE JUROR: Compared to my
4	brother's kids, who have 800 plus, I think I
5	have like 312, or something like that.
6	MR. ANDRE: Do you store a lot of
7	photographs on Facebook?
8	THE JUROR: Very few.
9	MR. ANDRE: That's all I have.
10	THE COURT: From Facebook.
11	MR. RHODES: No questions, Your
12	Honor.
13	THE COURT: No questions. Thank
14	you very much. You may return to the jury room.
15	THE JUROR: Thank you.
16	THE COURT: Are there any motions
17	with respect to Mr. Reighart?
18	MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor.
19	MR. RHODES: Pass for cause. No
20	challenge.
21	THE COURT: No challenge. Thank
22	you.
23	MR. RHODES: I apologize, Your
24	Honor. My vernacular is probably geographic.

1	THE COURT: We'll work this out.
2	We're not striking Mr. Reighart for cause, then.
3	You can bring the next person in.
4	Good morning.
5	THE JUROR: Good morning.
6	THE COURT: What is your jury
7	number?
8	THE JUROR: 11.
9	THE COURT: That would make you
10	Mr. Dailey?
11	THE JUROR: That's correct.
12	THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Dailey,
13	what questions did you have yes answers to?
14	THE JUROR: I had yes answers to
15	if I did business with Facebook. Yes answers to
16	if it would be a hardship to be on a six-day
17	trial. If I could go six days without being on
18	Facebook. Have I ever applied for or knew
19	someone that applied for a patent or a
20	trademark.
21	THE COURT: Tell us some more
22	about the hardship and your use of Facebook.
23	THE JUROR: I am self employed. I
24	run a home building company down in Lewes,

Delaware. The home building market is very challenging. To be here for six days and not be able to run the operation, it would be very difficult.

We have a lot of business we use Facebook targeted advertising, which in our world we monitor that very frequently. We also use a couple of Facebook sites pretty heavily as part of our marketing campaign and a blog that updates regularly. I'm trying to think what my -- -- I'm also running for the Sussex County Recorder of Deeds. I have an announcement set for Thursday at The Circle in Georgetown. And again, that also relates to Facebook is one of the announcements is made on a Facebook campaign.

THE COURT: And tell us just briefly about the patent experience that you or a family member.

THE JUROR: My sister had, she works -- it was my stepsister. Excuse me.

Works at the University of California San Diego in their computer science department and at points she had worked on a patent, I couldn't

1	explain it to you. It had to do with a router
2	that was in the mid '90s. She has her Ph.D. in
3	computer science and speaks languages. I build
4	houses.
5	So that and also my company was
6	involved in is currently ongoing involved in
7	attempting a patent. I'm not sure if the patent
8	is as relevant just to brand our logo, or
9	trademark, I guess that would be a trademark.
10	THE COURT: Any questions from
11	Leader?
12	MR. ANDRE: No questions, Your
13	Honor.
14	THE COURT: Any questions from
15	Facebook?
16	MR. RHODES: No, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
18	You can return to the courtroom.
19	I think we should let Mr. Dailey
20	go.
21	MR. ANDRE: Yes.
22	MR. RHODES: Your Honor, I'm
23	shocked.
24	THE COURT: We'll let him run for

1	office.
2	Before we bring the next juror in,
3	I believe there were eight or so jurors that
4	didn't show up, so I want counsel to know who
5	they are.
6	MR. RHODES: Thank you, Your
7	Honor.
8	MR. ANDRE: Do you have a list of
9	them?
10	THE CLERK: Juror Number 1 is
11	absent. Juror Number 6 actually has a different
12	last name, it's actually Polecaro,
13	P-O-L-E-C-A-R-O.
14	MR. RHODES: I'm sorry, P-O-L-E.
15	THE CLERK: P-O-L-E-C-A-R-O, she
16	still has the same juror number.
17	MR. RHODES: And she's not here?
18	THE CLERK: She is here, just the
19	name is different.
20	Juror Number 10 is absent. Juror
21	Number 13 is absent, Debnam. Juror number 17,
22	Finnical, absent. Juror Number 30, Juror Number
23	31, absent. Juror Number 51 and Juror Number
24	54.

1	THE COURT: Okay. You can bring
2	the next person in.
3	Good morning.
4	THE JUROR: Good morning.
5	THE COURT: What is your jury
6	number?
7	THE JUROR: 27.
8	THE COURT: So you are
9	Ms. Hurling?
10	THE JUROR: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Tell us what questions
12	you had yes answers to.
13	THE JUROR: I do have a Facebook
14	online account.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Is that the
16	only one?
17	THE JUROR: Yeah. I believe I
18	answered yes to on it every day, but I'm not.
19	THE COURT: About how often do you
20	use Facebook?
21	THE JUROR: I probably go on it
22	maybe every other, every couple days or so.
23	There are some days it's consecutive, but not
24	every day.

1	THE COURT: Is there anything
2	about your use of Facebook that you think would
3	make you unable to be a fair and impartial
4	juror?
5	THE JUROR: No.
6	THE COURT: Any questions from
7	Leader?
8	MR. ANDRE: How many photographs
9	do you have stored on your Facebook account?
10	THE JUROR: Maybe twenty oh,
11	gosh, no more than fifty.
12	MR. ANDRE: What do you primarily
13	use Facebook for?
14	THE JUROR: I'm like a Facebook
15	creeper. I'm on my IPod a lot, and it takes so
16	long to post, so I'll post not often, but I'll
17	just look on just to see what's going on, family
18	and friends.
19	MR. ANDRE: Thank you.
20	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
21	MR. RHODES: We have no questions,
22	Your Honor. Thank you.
22 23	Your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you. I'll ask

1	THE JUROR: Okay.
2	THE COURT: Any motions?
3	MR. ANDRE: No motions, Your
4	Honor.
5	THE COURT: Any motions?
6	MR. RHODES: No.
7	THE COURT: Bring in the next
8	juror.
9	Have a seat here, please. Good
10	morning. What is your jury number?
11	THE JUROR: 12.
12	THE COURT: Mr. Davis.
13	THE JUROR: Yes.
14	THE COURT: And what questions did
15	you answer yes to?
16	THE JUROR: Facebook.
17	THE COURT: You have an account?
18	THE JUROR: Yes.
19	THE COURT: Is there anything
20	about the fact that you have an account that
21	would prevent you from being a fair and
22	impartial juror in this case?
23	THE JUROR: No.
24	THE COURT: Any questions from

1	you, Mr. Andre?
2	MR. ANDRE: What do you primarily
3	use Facebook for?
4	THE JUROR: Primarily I use it to
5	keep in contact with some friends of mine that
6	are soldiers over in Afghanistan and different
7	places around the world.
8	MR. ANDRE: Do you use any other
9	type of account other than Facebook.
10	THE JUROR: Most of the time I use
11	MySpace and Facebook, but most of my friends
12	that are overseas, they're all Facebook.
13	MR. ANDRE: I have no further
14	questions.
15	MR. RHODES: I have no questions.
16	Thank you.
17	THE COURT: Thank you. You can
18	return.
19	Any motion with respect to
20	Mr. Davis?
21	MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
23	MR. RHODES: No motion, Your
24	Honor.

1	THE COURT: Okay. Tell us your
2	juror number.
3	THE JUROR: Sixty-three.
4	THE COURT: Ms. Steele?
5	THE JUROR: Mm-hmm.
6	THE COURT: Which questions did
7	you answer yes to?
8	THE JUROR: I have a Facebook user
9	account. And my father when I was probably
10	three years old tried to patent something
11	before.
12	THE COURT: Did he get the patent?
13	THE JUROR: No.
14	THE COURT: Okay. And tell us a
15	little bit about your Facebook use.
16	What do you primarily use Facebook
17	for?
18	THE JUROR: Socially, not for any
19	networking or anything like that or business.
20	Social.
21	THE COURT: Okay. Any questions,
22	Mr. Andre?
23	MR. ANDRE: How often do you log
24	on to your Facebook account?

1	THE JUROR: Sometimes every day.
2	Sometimes once a week. It's very sporadic.
3	MR. ANDRE: Okay. How many
4	photographs do you have uploaded on your
5	Facebook account approximately?
6	THE JUROR: Forty maybe.
7	THE COURT: Anything else?
8	MR. ANDRE: No further questions.
9	THE COURT Mr. Rhodes.
10	MR. RHODES: Just one question.
11	Any understanding as to why your dad didn't get
12	the patent in the end?
13	THE JUROR: No.
14	MR. RHODES: Got you.
15	THE COURT: I think you said you
16	were about three years old.
17	MR. RHODES: I'm assuming you
18	weren't following it daily. But I appreciate
19	your answer.
20	No further questions. Thank you,
21	Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Thank you. You may
23	return to the courtroom.
24	THE COURT: Any motions, Mr.

1 Andre? MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, I strike 2 3 her for cause. I think her reaction when I asked the question about Facebook was --4 appeared that she was a little more married to 5 6 it then she led on to in my mind. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes. MR. RHODES: That's not a basis 8 9 for cause, number one. And I was actually going 10 to suggest to you at a break, I am a little 11 troubled by some of the questions that are being 12 asked by Leader about how many photographs are 13 on the website. 14 I am not sure that would go to a 15 cause determination and I'm worried this is 16 going to start to kind of become indoctrination. 17 But putting that to the side, I don't think the fact that she has a Facebook account alone 18 establishes cause. 19 2.0 THE COURT: Well, on the 21 questioning, I think the questioning is fair 22 because I think we're here to explore, with some 23 leeway, what the extent of the Facebook use is.

Why Leader wants to emphasize

24

1	photos, I'm sure will become clear. But rather
2	than have them ask a hundred questions, if they
3	have only one, I'm happy about that.
4	I did not have the same view that
5	Mr. Andre did about whether Ms. Steele was in
6	any way troubled by the questioning. I think
7	she just was struggling to remember how many
8	photos she may have had.
9	So I'm going to deny the motion to
10	strike for cause. Let's bring in the next
11	juror.
12	Have a seat here, please.
13	THE JUROR: Oh, okay. Thank you.
14	Hello.
15	THE COURT: Good morning.
16	THE JUROR: Hi. Good morning.
17	THE COURT: What is your juror
18	number?
19	THE JUROR: Forty-four.
20	THE COURT: So you are Ms.
21	Melancon?
22	THE JUROR: Yes.
23	THE COURT: Tell us what questions
24	you had yes answers to, please.

1	THE JUROR: The Facebook. I don't
2	personally have an account, but my children do
3	and my family does. And I'm thinking about
4	starting one.
5	And the other thing was the
6	lawsuit. I inherited a house that had
7	structural damage, and my sister and I went
8	before a binding arbitration with the home
9	warranting company.
10	And we just did that last year.
11	And I went through that process.
12	And then I was involved in a car
13	accident, and I had an injury and I went to
14	Court with that in March.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	THE JUROR: Those are my answers.
17	THE COURT: And generally
18	speaking, were you satisfied with the outcome in
19	your case?
20	THE JUROR: Yes.
21	THE COURT: Is that true of both
22	of your cases?
23	THE JUROR: Yes, both of them.
24	THE COURT: Anything about those

1	experiences that would cause you not to be able
2	to sit fairly in judgment in this case?
3	THE JUROR: I don't think so.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Andre, any
5	questions?
6	MR. ANDRE: You said you're
7	thinking about opening a Facebook account.
8	THE JUROR: Mm-hmm.
9	MR. ANDRE: For what purpose would
10	you be doing that?
11	THE JUROR: For socializing.
12	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
13	MR. ROVNER: Your Honor, I have
14	one question. You mentioned some litigation.
15	Do you know the firms, the Delaware firms that
16	were involved?
17	THE JUROR: Seitz and the other
18	one was I'm trying to think. It's in
19	Wilmington. It was Timothy Lengkeek.
20	I'm
21	MR. ROVNER: It wasn't either
22	Potter Anderson or Blank Rome?
23	THE JUROR: No, it wasn't.
24	THE COURT: I think Mr. Lengkeek's

1	at Young Conaway.
2	THE JUROR: Mm-hmm. Yes.
3	THE COURT: Any questions from Mr.
4	Rhodes?
5	MR. RHODES: Yes. Lawyers always
6	get nervous when we hear about lawsuits. Can
7	you just tell us little bit more about not
8	what happened, but how did you feel about, you
9	know, being in a lawsuit? And do you think that
10	there's anything about the lawyers, the process
11	itself that would make you kind of lean one way
12	or the other?
13	THE JUROR: Well, with the binding
14	arbitration, I mean, I was satisfied. We won.
15	I felt like we were you know,
16	the house had sunk four inches, and I'm not
17	sure I don't know if I can I was satisfied
18	with the outcome.
19	But I'm not sure I know what
20	you're saying. It could possibly affect my
21	decision.
22	MR. RHODES: Let me ask you just
23	one more and then I'll leave you be.
24	I'm a defense lawyer, and so if

1	you've been a plaintiff a couple of times
2	THE JUROR: Yeah, twice in this
3	past year.
4	MR. RHODES: Will you give me the
5	same fair shake that you give the other side?
6	You go into it with an open mind.
7	You have to follow the judge's
8	instruction. He will tell you that.
9	I'm just concerned do you look
10	at defense lawyers differently than plaintiff's
11	lawyers? That's all I'm asking you.
12	THE JUROR: Possibly, because I
13	got questioned up and down, you know. So maybe
14	I could have a slight sympathy for the other
15	side.
16	MR. RHODES: I really appreciate
17	your honesty.
18	THE JUROR: Mm-hmm. Yeah.
19	MR. RHODES: Okay.
20	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very
21	much.
22	THE COURT: Motion?
23	MR. RHODES: Please.
24	THE COURT: Okay. We'll strike

54

1	Melancon for cause.
2	MR. RHODES: Thank you, Your
3	Honor.
4	THE CLERK: What name are you
5	saying?
6	MR. RHODES: Juror 44.
7	THE CLERK: Oh, Melancon.
8	THE COURT: Vernacular.
9	MR. RHODES: Some of these are
10	pretty stuff.
11	THE COURT: That's okay. She
12	didn't hit me at least when I pronounced it that
13	way.
14	THE CLERK: Yeah. That's why I
15	was asking.
16	THE COURT: Good morning. Have a
17	seat here, please.
18	What is your juror number?
19	THE JUROR: Three.
20	THE COURT: Three. That would
21	make you Ms. Bromels?
22	THE JUROR: That's correct.
23	THE COURT: Okay. And tell us
24	what questions you had a yes answer to.

1	THE JUROR: Your first question.
2	I work for DuPont. I'm a patent attorney and I
3	know some of the attorneys from Potter Anderson.
4	THE COURT: And you know something
5	about patents, I'm guessing.
6	THE JUROR: Something.
7	THE COURT: Okay. Questions?
8	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions,
9	Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Questions?
11	MR. RHODES: I represent the folks
12	that have been accused of infringing a patent.
13	Obviously, you're very educated.
14	If you were in my shoes, would you
15	want me on your panel?
16	THE JUROR: I well, actually I
17	think maybe it's not such a bad thing to have
18	somebody who knows something about patents on
19	the panel because it's complicated. And the
20	issues of infringement are not so easy for
21	everyone to understand.
22	So, and depending on what the
23	issues are here, you know, I think I could be
24	impartial.

1	MR. RHODES: I appreciate your
2	answer. Thank you.
3	THE COURT: Do you you don't
4	know right now what the issues are or what the
5	evidence is, but are you confident that you
6	could be fair and impartial, you know,
7	regardless of what issues and what evidence come
8	up?
9	THE JUROR: Yes. I think so. And
10	since it it seems that it was an electronics,
11	computer sort of case, I don't practice in that
12	field. I practice in the chemical field.
13	So I certainly wouldn't have a lot
14	of built-in prejudices because of cases I've
15	prosecuted myself.
16	THE COURT: Are you going to be
17	able to follow my instructions even if you think
18	I got the law wrong?
19	THE JUROR: Yes, I think so. I
20	also should tell you that I myself have been
21	involved in patent infringement trials and as
22	in-house counsel. And I have testified myself
23	as well.
24	So I'm familiar with that.

1	THE COURT: Anything about that
2	experience that would make you be anything other
3	than fair and impartial?
4	THE JUROR: I don't think so. No.
5	I think I could be impartial.
6	THE COURT: Any follow-up
7	questions as a result of those answers?
8	MR. ANDRE: No.
9	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
10	MR. RHODES: Just one. If you sat
11	on the jury, you wouldn't judge Mr. Andre or me
12	by the standards that you've seen in other cases
13	I hope.
14	I have nothing further, Your
15	Honor.
16	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very
17	much for your time.
18	You can return to the courtroom.
19	THE COURT: Any motion?
20	MR. ANDRE: For cause. She has
21	association with Mr. Rovner's law firm. They
22	worked with DuPont.
23	I think that would be basis alone,
24	plus the fact that she's a patent attorney.

1	MR. ROVNER: I checked with my
2	firm. She has a relationship with a number of
3	attorneys, an ongoing relationship.
4	THE COURT: I think that's enough.
5	We will strike her for cause.
6	That was Mrs. Bromels.
7	You can bring in the next one.
8	Good morning. What is your juror
9	number.
10	THE JUROR: Thirty-six.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Kovacs?
12	THE JUROR: Yeah.
13	THE COURT: Tell us what questions
14	you had yes answers to.
15	THE JUROR: I have a Facebook
16	account. I'm usually on it almost every day.
17	I have a patent. And you asked a
18	question about whether or not I had any
19	immediate family that's ever been part of a
20	trial. My mother's a paralegal. Whether or not
21	she's been part of a trial; I don't know.
22	But that's about it.
23	THE COURT: Is your mother a
24	paralegal here in Delaware?

1	THE JUROR: No, over out by
2	Pittsburgh somewhere.
3	THE COURT: And tell us a little
4	bit about your patent.
5	THE JUROR: It's a patent with
6	DuPont. It is for a fungicide.
7	Yeah. I'm a chemist, so there you
8	go.
9	THE COURT: Did you have
10	interaction with the Patent Office as you were
11	prosecuting the patent?
12	THE JUROR: It was I don't even
13	think it's been through prosecution yet. It's
14	been published and that the patent itself has
15	not yet been issued.
16	But the only interaction I
17	only I never had nothing with the Patent
18	Office, just with the attorneys and the
19	iteration of the patent.
20	THE COURT: Is there anything
21	about that experience that would make you unable
22	to fairly and impartially weigh in evidence?
23	THE JUROR: No. No.
24	It's actually rather thorough, but

1	that's about it.
2	THE COURT: And with your Facebook
3	account, what do you primarily use your Facebook
4	account for?
5	THE JUROR: Every once in awhile,
6	see what a friend is doing or, you know, I play
7	Mafia Wars or whatever it is. That's about it.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Any questions,
9	Mr. Andre?
10	MR. ANDRE: How long have you had
11	a Facebook account?
12	THE JUROR: A year, year and a
13	half.
14	MR. ANDRE: And do you store a lot
15	of photographs on the Facebook account?
16	THE JUROR: No. I've only got
17	three, maybe four. That's about it.
18	MR. ANDRE: That is all I have.
19	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
20	MR. RHODES: Is there I
21	represent the defendant, the party accused of
22	the infringement. It sounds like you've been
23	part of the process of trying to get a patent.
24	THE JUROR: Somewhat.

1	MR. RHODES: Is there anything
2	about the process about trying to get a patent
3	that makes you really, like the idea of patents,
4	would you hold any of that against folks at
5	Facebook?
6	THE JUROR: No. I mean, most of
7	it is you know, was away from me. It was
8	behind the scene, people, attorneys, patent
9	liaisons, whatever doing that sort of work. My
10	job was, you know, I was sitting in the hood
11	doing my job most of the time.
12	My interaction was just primarily,
13	you know, this is what I did. Here you go. And
14	that was it.
15	I mean, that's no big deal.
16	MR. RHODES: All right. I thank
17	you for your time.
18	THE COURT: Okay. All right.
19	Thank you. You can return to the
20	courtroom.
21	Any motion?
22	MR. ANDRE: No motion.
23	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
24	MR. RHODES: No motion, Your

1	Honor.
2	THE COURT: Okay. We're ready for
3	the next one.
4	Good morning.
5	THE JUROR: Hi.
6	THE COURT: Hi. Please tell us
7	what your juror number is.
8	THE JUROR: Six.
9	THE COURT: I understand we have
10	the name incorrect.
11	THE JUROR: Correct.
12	THE COURT: What is your name?
13	THE JUROR: Polecar,
14	P-O-L-E-C-A-R.
15	THE COURT: If we knew that, you'd
16	be lower down than six because I think we're
17	alphabetical here.
18	THE JUROR: That is right. I
19	messed it all up.
20	THE COURT: No. No. it was
21	not.
22	Can you tell us what questions you
23	had yes answers to?
24	THE JUROR: Just the one about

1	Facebook. I have a Facebook page.
2	THE COURT: Okay. And what do you
3	primarily use Facebook for?
4	THE JUROR: I don't really. I
5	really rarely use it.
6	Once in awhile I go on there if
7	somebody says I put something on there. I don't
8	use it at all on a regular basis.
9	THE COURT: About how long have
10	you had the Facebook page?
11	THE JUROR: Maybe a year.
12	THE COURT: Okay. Was there a
13	time that you used to use it more than you do
14	now?
15	THE JUROR: No. I just did it
16	because a friend was like, You should go on. I
17	didn't just really ever do anything with it.
18	THE COURT: Mr. Andre.
19	MR. ANDRE: I don't have any
20	questions.
21	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
22	MR. RHODES: What kind of computer
22 23	MR. RHODES: What kind of computer do you have at home?

1	not Mac.
2	MR. RHODES: And have you ever
3	used your Facebook account to promote your yoga
4	business in any respect?
5	THE JUROR: No.
6	MR. RHODES: Okay. Thank you,
7	Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Thank you. You can go
9	back to the courtroom.
10	Mr. Andre.
11	MR. ANDRE: No motion.
12	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
13	MR. RHODES: No motion.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Good morning.
15	Have a seat here.
16	THE JUROR: Right here?
17	THE COURT: No over here. Come on
18	and join us.
19	What is your juror number?
20	THE JUROR: Forty-seven.
21	THE COURT: Mr. Moore?
22	THE JUROR: Right.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Tell us what
24	questions you had yes answers to, please.

1	THE JUROR: The only one was the
2	Facebook account. I'm not on it every day, but
3	I do have a Facebook account.
4	THE COURT: And about how long
5	have you had a Facebook account?
6	THE JUROR: Say like a year.
7	THE COURT: And when you are on
8	it, what are you typically doing.
9	THE JUROR: It's networking.
10	Basically networking, that's all.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Andre?
12	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions,
13	Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes, any
15	questions?
16	MR. RHODES: Do you belong to any
17	groups on Facebook?
18	THE JUROR: No, no groups.
19	MR. RHODES: Okay. Thank you.
20	THE COURT: That's it. Thank you.
21	You can go back to the courtroom.
22	Thank you.
23	MR. ANDRE: No motion.
24	THE COURT: No motion.

1	MR. RHODES: No motion.
2	THE COURT: No motion. Okay.
3	Good morning. What is your juror
4	number.
5	THE JUROR: Fifty-eight.
6	THE COURT: Fifty-eight. So
7	you're Mr. Sharp?
8	THE JUROR: Yes.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Tell us what
10	questions you had a yes answer to, please.
11	THE JUROR: I answered yes to the
12	relationship question. I've been a client of
13	Potter, Anderson & Corroon and have known a
14	number of people there, although not
15	THE COURT: Not Mr. Rovner.
16	THE JUROR: Not the gentleman
17	here. And also I have a Facebook account
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	THE JUROR: for what that's
20	worth.
21	THE COURT: Well, given your
22	relationship with Potter, Anderson, I think it's
23	not worth much, no offense.
24	Any questions, Mr. Andre?

1	MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
3	MR. RHODES: No.
4	THE COURT: No. Thank you very
5	much. You can return to the courtroom.
6	We're going to strike Mr. Sharp.
7	Good morning.
8	THE JUROR: Good morning.
9	THE COURT: What is your juror
10	number?
11	THE JUROR: Sixty-seven.
12	THE COURT: Sixty-seven. Ms.
13	Watkins?
14	THE JUROR: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Tell us what questions
16	you had a yes answer to.
17	THE JUROR: I'm Facebook just like
18	everybody else there. I'm also teaching summer
19	school.
20	So six days, this is the last week
21	of summer school. We have a lot of assessments
22	going on. So that might be kind of hard.
23	I mean, I could get out, but I
24	would hate to have my kids testing with somebody

1	else.
2	THE COURT: What age kids are you
3	working with?
4	THE JUROR: Kids going into fifth
5	grade.
6	THE COURT: All right. Any
7	questions?
8	MR. ANDRE: How often do you go on
9	Facebook?
10	THE JUROR: Every day.
11	MR. ANDRE: Every day?
12	THE JUROR: Every morning.
13	MR. ANDRE: Like a morning
14	routine?
15	THE JUROR: Morning routine.
16	Right after I get out of the shower, I log on to
17	Facebook while my hair's drying.
18	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
19	MR. RHODES: Do you ever use your
20	Facebook for my sister is a teacher. Did you
21	ever use Facebook for the stuff you do at
22	school?
23	THE JUROR: No. It's just
24	personal.

1	MR. RHODES: Okay. Thank you.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
3	You can go back to the courtroom.
4	I think this is going better than
5	I anticipated. We're trying to end up with 18.
6	I think we're on track to do that.
7	So I think given the summer
8	school, we should let her go.
9	MR. ANDRE: I agree, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Okay. We're going to
11	strike Ms. Watkins then for cause.
12	MR. RHODES: She was 67?
13	THE COURT: Sixty-seven, yes.
14	Tell us please what your jury number is.
15	THE JUROR: 35.
16	THE COURT: So you are
17	Ms. Kirchner?
18	THE JUROR: Yes.
19	THE COURT: And then tell us what
20	questions you had a yes answer to, please.
21	THE JUROR: Yes, I have a Facebook
22	account. Yes, I am usually on it every day.
23	And yes, I have a problem because I live so far
24	away. I'm all the way at the bottom of the

1	state. It takes me about two-and-a-half hours
2	to get here, five hours a day driving, it's a
3	lot.
4	THE COURT: So the length of the
5	trial would pose a problem?
6	THE JUROR: Yes.
7	THE COURT: Tell us what you do on
8	your Facebook account.
9	THE JUROR: I don't use it that
10	often. I go on it every day, but usually just
11	to look at my friends' pictures and chat with
12	them. I don't do like games or anything.
13	THE COURT: About how long have
14	you had your Facebook account?
15	THE JUROR: Two years.
16	THE COURT: Any questions,
17	Mr. Andre?
18	MR. ANDRE: No questions.
19	MR. RHODES: No questions.
20	THE COURT: Thank you.
21	Any motion?
22	MR. ANDRE: I have a motion.
23	Other than the fact that she seems to have a
24	problem, a two-and-a-half drive is quite a

1	burden, five hours on the road every day, so I
2	say we should let her go.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
4	MR. RHODES: I'm not sure how I
5	feel about that. That is a burden, but I'm
6	worried about what we end up with. We'll just
7	defer to Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: I'm just going to
9	reserve ruling on her. It certainly is a
10	burden. It's one that I'm willing to impose if
11	
	I have to, but if I don't have to, I won't.
12	MR. ROVNER: As a personal aside,
13	the traffic from Bethany to Rehoboth is just
14	incredible, so I don't doubt that it's
15	two-and-a-half hours.
16	THE COURT: It's hard to go
17	two-and-a-half hours in our state, but in the
18	summer with beach traffic you can do it.
19	MR. ANDRE: And my issue, Your
20	Honor, I once had a juror in a similar situation
21	and we were delayed on trial almost every
22	morning.
23	MR. RHODES: That's a good point.
24	Why don't we see where we come out.

1	THE COURT: I'm going to reserve,
2	but if we don't need her, I will strike her.
3	Next one. Good morning.
4	THE JUROR: Hi.
5	THE COURT: Tell us what your
6	juror number is.
7	THE JUROR: 55.
8	THE COURT: Mr. Schwendeman.
9	THE JUROR: Yes.
10	THE COURT: Tell us what questions
11	you had a yes answer to, please.
12	THE JUROR: The first one my
13	mother has an oral surgery on Wednesday,
14	eighty-nine years old. She's on Coumadin, and I
15	am her only source of transportation. However,
16	my problem at this point is she's got problems
17	in her legs that we have got to get taken care
18	of between now and Wednesday so she can have
19	that surgery, but with the Coumadin, it scares
20	me.
21	THE COURT: Were there other
22	questions you had a yes answer to?
23	THE JUROR: Yeah. My wife has one
24	of those damn Facebook accounts and she doesn't

1	get anything done around the house. And I'm
2	really not happy with that at all.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Andre.
4	MR. ANDRE: We like him.
5	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes, any
6	questions.
7	MR. RHODES: Well,
8	Mr. Schwendeman, when you use the epithet that
9	you did with Facebook, since I represent
10	Facebook, while I sympathize with you, I worry
11	if you were on the box you might be looking at
12	me, that's the guy that's responsible for the
13	fact that my dinner is cold or something is
14	late.
15	THE JUROR: Yeah, between that and
16	eBay, I'll tell you.
17	MR. RHODES: I represent them,
18	too. I have nothing further, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: All right.
20	Mr. Schwendeman, you can go back in the
21	courtroom. Thank you.
22	I'm willing to strike him.
23	MR. RHODES: Please, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: At least based on the

1	medical reasons.
2	MR. RHODES: Yes, make the record
3	the medical reasons.
4	MR. ANDRE: I thought he was
5	great.
6	MR. RHODES: Sorry, Paul.
7	THE COURT: Good morning.
8	THE JUROR: Good morning.
9	THE COURT: Please tell us what
10	your juror number is.
11	THE JUROR: 52.
12	THE COURT: Ms. Pleasant.
13	THE JUROR: Yes.
14	THE COURT: And what questions did
15	you have a yes answer to?
16	THE JUROR: I'm having medical
17	issues with my stomach and I have a colonoscopy
18	on Thursday, so I know the six days, I can
19	always reschedule, but I know I have that. And
20	I sued and I was sued before with car insurance.
21	THE COURT: Car insurance.
22	THE JUROR: For a car accident.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Were you
24	generally satisfied with how those litigations

1	ended up?
2	THE JUROR: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Were you the plaintiff
4	in those cases?
5	THE JUROR: One I was the
6	plaintiff and then I worked with a company that
7	was sued and I was the driver.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Did you have
9	any other questions that you answered yes to?
10	THE JUROR: I have an eighteen and
11	a twenty-three year old and both of them are on
12	Facebook, so I don't know who they are
13	associated with.
14	THE COURT: Are you on Facebook
15	yourself?
16	THE JUROR: No.
17	THE COURT: Do you have any
18	feelings about Facebook as a result of your kids
19	having Facebook accounts?
20	THE JUROR: No. And my
21	twenty-three year old, I know he makes music, so
22	I don't know if he patented anything. I'm
23	almost sure he has, but I don't know for sure.
24	THE COURT: All right. Any

1	questions, Mr. Andre?
2	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions,
3	Your Honor.
4	MR. RHODES: Would it be I know
5	that sometimes when you get these health plans,
6	you got to go through all this rigamarole to get
7	reschedule. Is that the problem you face
8	Thursday?
9	THE JUROR: If I reschedule, it's
10	going to be a month away probably to get another
11	appointment.
12	MR. RHODES: The only thing I'll
13	say is you have my sympathy on having an
14	eighteen and twenty-three year old. I'm right
15	there with you.
16	THE JUROR: I'm willing to
17	reschedule, but I would need to reschedule
18	tomorrow in order not to be hit for a hundred
19	dollars because I had to cancel forty-eight
20	hours before.
21	THE COURT: And you said you have
22	been experiencing some pain?
23	THE JUROR: Yes, and bleeding.
24	THE COURT: Thank you very much.

1	You can go back into the courtroom.
2	I'm going to strike her for the
3	colonoscopy issue.
4	Next.
5	Good morning.
6	THE JUROR: Good morning.
7	THE COURT: What is your juror
8	number?
9	THE JUROR: 60.
10	THE COURT: Ms. Shorb.
11	THE JUROR: Yes.
12	THE COURT: And what questions did
13	you answer yes to?
14	THE JUROR: That I have a Facebook
15	account, that I'm on there once a day. And if
16	there was any issues with being here every day.
17	It's not during the day, but I go to school at
18	night and I take two classes down at Dover at
19	Del Tech, and I don't know if I could get there.
20	THE COURT: You would be leaving
21	Court we would be finishing at 4:30 every
22	day. What time is your class?
23	THE JUROR: We have to be there by
24	6:15, so I guess that would be

1	THE COURT: It's doable. It's
2	doable. It would depend. And tell us about
3	your use of Facebook. What do you primarily do
4	on it?
5	THE JUROR: Connect with family
6	and friends.
7	THE COURT: About how long have
8	you had your Facebook account?
9	THE JUROR: I guess it's just been
10	like since January.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Andre.
12	MR. ANDRE: How many friends do
13	you have on Facebook?
14	THE JUROR: I don't know, like
15	maybe about 150.
16	MR. ANDRE: You say you go on
17	every day?
18	THE JUROR: Uh-huh.
19	MR. ANDRE: That is your primary
20	mode of communication with a lot of your
21	friends?
22	THE JUROR: Yeah.
23	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
24	MR. RHODES: I have no questions.

1 Thank you. THE COURT: 2 Thank you. You can go 3 back to the courtroom. 4 THE JUROR: Thank you. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Andre. I'll make a motion to 6 MR. ANDRE: 7 strike for cause. I think the school issue is one thing obviously and also that her pretty 8 9 consistent use of Facebook would also bias her 10 if it's her primary mode of communication with 11 friends. MR. RHODES: I don't think the 12 13 second issue is a basis for cause because 14 otherwise just the use of Facebook alone. the first issue, I'll defer to the Court's 15 16 instinct about whether it's appropriate to 17 excuse somebody for cause based on the logistics 18 of getting from Court to school. I don't have a feel for that, Your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: It certainly is a very 21 tight fit and she's going to be awful busy, but 22 I'm going to put her in the category of the 23 earlier one that has a two-hour trip and reserve

ruling. I'm not going to strike her on the

1	basis of her Facebook use, but I am going to
2	consider striking her based on the schedule.
3	Next.
4	Good morning.
5	THE JUROR: Good morning.
6	THE COURT: Have a seat there,
7	please. Tell us what your juror number is.
8	THE JUROR: 22.
9	THE COURT: Ms. Gibson.
10	THE JUROR: Yes.
11	THE COURT: And which questions
12	did you have a yes answer to?
13	THE JUROR: I think well, I
14	know it was do you use Facebook? Yes. Do you
15	know anybody that's been in a lawsuit? Yes.
16	And would it be a hardship if you couldn't use
17	Facebook? I use it for class for my discussions
18	sometime, so that might be a bit of a problem
19	because we're coming up on the last week of
20	class and I want have to
21	THE COURT: Are you a student or a
22	teacher?
23	THE JUROR: Student and teacher.
24	THE COURT: And your class is

1	ongoing right now?
2	THE JUROR: Yes. It doesn't end
3	until Friday. So I would need to use it this
4	week to finish up the last of my projects
5	papers.
6	THE COURT: Would you be missing
7	class if you're here all day?
8	THE JUROR: No, they're online,
9	that's why I need it to communicate with my
10	classmates, that's why I had that issue.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Andre.
12	MR. ANDRE: Do you also use
13	Facebook for social reasons?
14	THE COURT: Yes.
15	MR. ANDRE: I have no further
16	questions, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
18	MR. RHODES: Are you going to
19	school online?
20	THE JUROR: Well, I'm taking my
21	summer classes online. Typically I would be in
22	the classroom.
23	MR. RHODES: I didn't follow. The
24	use of Facebook is they post the course stuff on

Facebook?

THE JUROR: When we have group projects because I'm in education, we'll correspond because we have group projects and we have to submit them online. Everything we do is computer based. It's easier for people to get on Facebook, like people are on Facebook all day, so it's easier for us to correspond with each other on Facebook because for some reason e-mail takes too long. We're always on, pop ups, chats, we do most of our corresponding on Facebook.

MR. RHODES: Are you using the chat surface or are you writing on people's walls?

THE JUROR: We'll write on people's walls, send me such and such slide, or you know, check out this book. We'll be also --we'll talk on chat, say this is how far I have gotten, look at it, check your e-mail.

MR. RHODES: And the last question is, did you say you were finishing school this week, and would be in trial for the week pose any personal hardship to you, pose any time

1	commitment?
2	THE JUROR: Well, my classes are
3	online, so I don't have to per se be in class
4	this week, but I'm finishing up classes end
5	on Friday, so I'm finishing up projects and
6	papers this week, so not being able to get on my
7	Facebook would pose a problem with that.
8	MR. RHODES: I see. So if you
9	were told you couldn't get to Facebook for the
10	week.
11	THE JUROR: That would be the part
12	that might cause an issue because I need to
13	correspond with my team members on projects.
14	MR. RHODES: Thank you for your
15	time.
16	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
17	You can return to the courtroom.
18	THE JUROR: Thank you.
19	THE COURT: I'm going to strike
20	her for cause. I think that's an example of the
21	use of Facebook that really would impose a
22	hardship this week.
23	Next. Good morning.
24	THE JUROR: Good morning.

1	THE COURT: What is your juror
2	number?
3	THE JUROR: 23.
4	THE COURT: Ms. Giles.
5	THE JUROR: Yes.
6	THE COURT: And which questions
7	did you answer yes to?
8	THE JUROR: Do I have a Facebook
9	account and I am on it daily.
10	THE COURT: What kind of things do
11	you do on it?
12	THE JUROR: I play Fishworld, keep
13	in touch with my friends, that's basically it.
14	THE COURT: How long have you had
15	your account?
16	THE JUROR: About six months.
17	THE COURT: Is there anything
18	about not being able to access the account for a
19	week that would make you unable to be fair?
20	THE JUROR: Yes, I would be.
21	THE COURT: You would be able to
22	be fair.
23	THE JUROR: I would be able to be
24	fair.

1	THE COURT: I apologize for the
2	poorly asked question.
3	Mr. Andre.
4	MR. ANDRE: How many photos do you
5	have uploaded on your Facebook account?
6	THE JUROR: About three.
7	MR. ANDRE: And what games did you
8	say you play?
9	THE JUROR: Fishworld.
10	MR. ANDRE: Fishworld, is that it?
11	THE JUROR: That's it.
12	MR. RHODES: And if you can't get
13	to Facebook this week, none of the fish will
14	die?
15	THE JUROR: Probably.
16	MR. RHODES: I know the game,
17	that's why I was worried.
18	THE JUROR: The tank will be
19	clean, but they wouldn't be able to eat.
20	MR. RHODES: I'm worried that
21	you're going to be fretting about those fish.
22	THE JUROR: No, not at all.
23	MR. RHODES: Thank you.
24	THE COURT: Thank you. You can go

1	back in the courtroom.
2	MR. RHODES: That's like a virtual
3	aquarium thing.
4	THE COURT: Any motion?
5	MR. ANDRE: I have no motion, Your
6	Honor.
7	THE COURT: Any motion?
8	MR. RHODES: No motion, Your
9	Honor.
10	THE COURT: Good morning.
11	THE JUROR: Good morning.
12	THE COURT: What is your juror
13	number?
14	THE JUROR: 66.
15	THE COURT: Ms. Vanhorn.
16	THE JUROR: Yes.
17	THE COURT: And which questions
18	did you answer yes to?
19	THE JUROR: Just the one about
20	Facebook.
21	THE COURT: You have an account?
22	THE JUROR: Yes.
23	THE COURT: And about how often do
24	you use it?

1	THE JUROR: Probably just once a
2	week.
3	THE COURT: What kind of things do
4	you do on it typically?
5	THE JUROR: Actually just
6	e-mailing friends back and forth, but nothing
7	consistently. Sometimes I don't even look at it
8	for like five minutes.
9	THE COURT: Could you be a fair
10	and impartial juror in a case involving
11	Facebook?
12	THE JUROR: I think so, yes.
13	THE COURT: You have some
14	hesitation about that.
15	THE JUROR: Not really, no, no.
16	THE COURT: Mr. Andre.
17	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions,
18	Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
20	MR. RHODES: On behalf of the
21	Facebook side of the ledger, has Facebook's
22	service made you mad or disappointed you in any
23	respect? I sense a tiny bit of hesitation.
24	Sometimes people are nervous to actually say it.

1	And you just need to tell us.
2	THE JUROR: No. The only thing I
3	do have which is my son won't friend me.
4	MR. RHODES: He won't friend you?
5	THE JUROR: No.
6	MR. RHODES: The reason why there
7	is a cartoon on South Park said never get
8	friended, and my seventy-eight year old dad
9	friended me.
10	THE JUROR: My neighbors do it,
11	but my son won't. Holding out.
12	MR. RHODES: I'm sorry. I have no
13	further questions.
14	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
15	You can return to the courtroom.
16	Mr. Andre, any motion.
17	MR. ANDRE: I don't have any
18	motions for that witness. I am going to ask
19	Mr. Rhodes, I know he's trying to build a
20	rapport with the jurors here and a personal
21	relationship with the jurors, I don't think
22	that's appropriate. He's a seasoned lawyer. I
23	
	would ask that he quit.

1	is gambling in Vegas I guess, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: First with
3	Ms. Vanhorn, any motions?
4	MR. RHODES: No.
5	THE COURT: I will ask all
6	counsel, particularly Mr. Rhodes, let's try to
7	tone it down and refrain from so much personal
8	back and forth, as enjoyable as it may be, we'll
9	keep focused on the task here.
10	Bring the next one in. Good
11	morning.
12	THE JUROR: Good morning.
13	THE COURT: What is your juror
14	number?
15	THE JUROR: 37.
16	THE COURT: Mr. League.
17	THE JUROR: Yes.
18	THE COURT: And tell us which
19	questions you answered yes to, please.
20	THE JUROR: The Facebook account.
21	THE COURT: You have an account?
22	THE JUROR: Yes.
23	THE COURT: And about how often do
24	you use it?

1	THE JUROR: We opened it for my
2	daughter's trip and so we used it quite
3	frequently for the posting of pictures from that
4	trip, but not so much since.
5	THE COURT: Is there anything
6	about that experience that would prevent you
7	from being a fair juror in a case involving
8	Facebook?
9	THE JUROR: No.
10	THE COURT: Mr. Andre.
11	MR. ANDRE: No questions, Your
12	Honor.
13	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
14	MR. RHODES: No questions, Your
15	Honor.
16	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
17	You can go back to the courtroom.
18	Any motions?
19	MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor.
20	MR. RHODES: No, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Okay. Good morning.
22	THE JUROR: Good morning.
23	THE COURT: What is your juror
24	number?

1	THE JUROR: Two.
2	THE COURT: Ms. Botero.
3	THE JUROR: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Tell us which
5	questions you answered yes to.
6	THE JUROR: The last questions,
7	and when I use Facebook, but my English is not
8	really good, that's my point, you know, I think
9	I no really going to be good enough to be a
10	judge, that's my point.
11	THE COURT: Did you have any
12	trouble following the questions that I was
13	asking?
14	THE JUROR: A little bit.
15	THE COURT: A little bit?
16	THE JUROR: A little bit.
17	THE COURT: You say you have a
18	Facebook account?
19	THE JUROR: Yeah.
20	THE COURT: How often do you use
21	your Facebook account?
22	THE JUROR: Like almost every day.
23	THE COURT: What kind of things do
24	you do on it?

1	THE JUROR: Family, pictures,
2	friends, everything like that.
3	THE COURT: About how long have
4	you had the account.
5	THE JUROR: Like a
6	year-and-a-half.
7	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Andre.
8	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions,
9	Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
11	MR. RHODES: This is going to be
12	kind of a technical case. If experts were
13	testifying in technical terms in English, I
14	apologize, I mean no disrespect at all, would
15	you have difficulty following?
16	THE JUROR: The technical things?
17	MR. RHODES: By virtue of the
18	language is really what I'm saying, would that
19	be an issue for you?
20	THE JUROR: Yes. If something
21	really serious, I think you have to be really
22	clear, understand everything, right, so don't
23	take the wrong choice, that's my point.
24	THE COURT: Thank you.

1	MR. RHODES: Thank you.
2	THE COURT: You can return to the
3	courtroom.
4	I'm going to strike her for cause.
5	I'm a little concerned about her being able to
6	follow due to the language issues.
7	MR. RHODES: Thank you, Your
8	Honor.
9	THE COURT: Good morning. What is
10	your juror number?
11	THE JUROR: 24.
12	THE COURT: Ms. Ginn.
13	THE JUROR: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Which questions did
15	you answer yes to?
16	THE JUROR: Just that I have a
17	Facebook account.
18	THE COURT: And about how long
19	have you had it?
20	THE JUROR: Since November.
21	THE COURT: And what do you
22	typically use it for?
23	THE JUROR: Social networking,
24	games, basically.

1	THE COURT: Okay. And you don't
2	get on it on a daily basis?
3	THE JUROR: Yes, every day.
4	THE COURT: Every day?
5	THE JUROR: Every morning. I have
6	farms to tend and fields to dig.
7	THE COURT: Is there anything
8	about your use of Facebook that would prevent
9	you from fairly weighing the evidence?
10	THE JUROR: Not that I'm aware of.
11	I'm not involved in it, just play games and talk
12	back and forth, instant messaging occasionally.
13	THE COURT: Do you understand
14	Facebook is the defendant here and they're
15	accused of infringing a patent, so I just want
16	to be sure that your experience with Facebook
17	wouldn't make you either favorable or
18	unfavorable to Facebook as a party.
19	THE JUROR: No, it doesn't.
20	THE COURT: Mr. Andre.
21	MR. ANDRE: So I take it you play
22	Farmville?
23	THE JUROR: And Frontierville.
24	And Bejeweled.

1	MR. ANDRE: And I don't you
2	have to play those games on a pretty regular
3	basis in order to sustain your farms; is that
4	correct?
5	THE JUROR: It just depends on
6	what you plant, I mean, honestly, yes.
7	MR. ANDRE: Would it cause you
8	would it be difficult for you to not go on
9	Facebook for a week or so.
10	THE JUROR: I didn't plant
11	anything this morning. They're plowed fields so
12	we're good.
13	MR. ANDRE: No further questions.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
15	MR. RHODES: I'll just follow-up
16	on Mr. Andre's question. If you're playing
17	daily, if the trial were to last six or seven
18	days, would it give you any heartburn?
19	THE JUROR: No.
20	MR. RHODES: If you don't get to
21	it.
22	THE JUROR: No, because I'm good.
23	I don't have any fields that need to be tended.
24	MR. RHODES: Thank you, Your

1	Honor.
2	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
3	You can return to the courtroom.
4	THE JUROR: You're welcome.
5	THE COURT: Mr. Andre.
6	MR. ANDRE: No questions.
7	MR. RHODES: No motions, Your
8	Honor.
9	THE COURT: Next. Good morning.
10	Right there, please. What is your juror number?
11	THE JUROR: Number 40.
12	THE COURT: Ms. Lewis.
13	THE JUROR: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Tell us what questions
15	you answered yes to, please.
16	THE JUROR: I answered yes on
17	number one. I'm a former legal administrator
18	with a firm that sublets space from Blank Rome,
19	and I just had some interaction, limited, but
20	some.
21	THE COURT: With some of the Blank
22	Rome folks?
23	THE JUROR: Yes, the
24	administrative people mostly.

1	THE COURT: Is there anything
2	about that experience that would prevent you
3	from being a fair juror in a case that involves
4	Blank Rome?
5	THE JUROR: No.
6	THE COURT: Were there other
7	questions you had yes answers to?
8	THE JUROR: I think I have a
9	Facebook account.
10	THE COURT: Tell us about how long
11	you have had your Facebook account.
12	THE JUROR: My kids made me do it.
13	It's probably about six months or so.
14	THE COURT: How often do you use
15	it?
16	THE JUROR: Maybe once, twice a
17	month.
18	THE COURT: And when you get on
19	it, what kinds of things are you doing with it?
20	THE JUROR: Just reading, you
21	know, things that people post.
22	THE COURT: Is there anything
23	about that experience that would make it hard
24	for you to be a fair judge of the allegations

1	against Facebook?
2	THE JUROR: No.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Andre.
4	MR. ANDRE: You said you had some
5	interaction with Blank Rome. Was it with any of
6	the lawyers or just the administrative staff?
7	THE JUROR: The administrative
8	staff.
9	MR. ANDRE: Was that a favorable
10	or unfavorable interaction you had with them?
11	Was it neutral?
12	THE JUROR: I mean, just cordial,
13	professional.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
15	MR. RHODES: Just to follow-up on
16	that, do you still have that interaction?
17	THE JUROR: No, I'm no longer
18	employed with the firm as an administrator.
19	MR. RHODES: Just give us a time
20	period, when was that interaction? A while ago?
21	THE JUROR: Yes. I left that, the
22	firm that I was year-and-a-half ago, so probably
23	for two years prior to that, two or three years.
24	MR. RHODES: But nothing right

1	now?
2	THE JUROR: No.
3	MR. RHODES: Thank you.
4	MR. ROVNER: What firm were you
5	with?
6	THE JUROR: Maron, Marvel, Bradley
7	& Arronsohn.
8	THE COURT: Thank you. You can
9	return to the courtroom.
10	Any motion?
11	MR. ANDRE: No motion.
12	MR. RHODES: No.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Fine.
14	Good morning. What is your juror
15	number?
16	THE JUROR: 32.
17	THE COURT: Mr. Jones.
18	THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
19	THE COURT: Tell us what questions
20	you had yes answers to.
21	THE JUROR: I have a Facebook
22	account.
23	THE COURT: And about how often do
24	you use it?

1	THE JUROR: Probably once a day.
2	THE COURT: Okay. And what kind
3	of things do you do on it?
4	THE JUROR: Just with my friends
5	and that's it.
6	THE COURT: Okay. And do you
7	think you could be a fair and impartial juror in
8	a case involving Facebook?
9	THE JUROR: Yeah.
10	THE COURT: Mr. Andre.
11	MR. ANDRE: How many photos do you
12	have uploaded on your Facebook account?
13	THE JUROR: Right now I have
14	thirty-seven.
15	MR. ANDRE: How many friends do
16	you have on your Facebook account?
17	THE JUROR: Like fifty-three.
18	MR. ANDRE: That's all I have.
19	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
20	MR. RHODES: I have no questions.
21	Thank you.
22	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
23	Mr. Andre.
24	MR. ANDRE: No objection, Your

1	Honor.
2	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
3	MR. RHODES: No motion.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Good morning.
5	THE JUROR: Good morning.
6	THE COURT: What is your jury
7	number?
8	THE JUROR: 38.
9	THE COURT: Mr. Lecompte. And
10	which questions did you answer yes to?
11	THE JUROR: My questions is about
12	the patent, I had been in a deposition before in
13	Playtex.
14	THE COURT: You dealt with
15	patents?
16	THE JUROR: Before. The other
17	questions.
18	THE COURT: Tell us more about
19	that. What kind of experience did you have with
20	patents while you were at Playtex?
21	THE JUROR: Basically I had been
22	deposition a couple of times with our attorney
23	regarding patent infringement with other cases.
24	THE COURT: I'm not sure what you

1	mean by this position.
2	THE JUROR: Meaning lawyers
3	deposition me for a case.
4	THE COURT: Have you been deposed?
5	THE JUROR: Yes, deposed.
6	THE COURT: Somebody has taken
7	testimony from you?
8	THE JUROR: Yes.
9	THE COURT: They put you under
10	oath and asked you questions?
11	THE JUROR: Yes.
12	THE COURT: About patent issues?
13	THE JUROR: Yes. We were being
14	sued or suing.
15	THE COURT: What's your position
16	at Playtex.
17	THE JUROR: I'm QA manager in the
18	R & D group.
19	THE COURT: What is that?
20	THE JUROR: Quality assurance
21	within the company's research and development
22	group.
23	THE COURT: Is there anything
24	about that experience that would make it hard

1	for you to be a fair and impartial juror?
2	THE JUROR: I don't think so.
3	THE COURT: Were there other
4	questions that you answered yes to?
5	THE JUROR: Only I had a planned
6	trip to Malaysia on the 2nd of August. You
7	mentioned it being longer than six days, that's
8	greater than six days. I just need to
9	understand that. And the Facebook question also
10	was the other one, I am on Facebook.
11	THE COURT: We certainly expect to
12	be done before August 2nd. And tell us about
13	your Facebook use.
14	THE JUROR: It's I have only
15	had an account for two months, basically to
16	monitor my daughter's account. I don't use it a
17	lot, but I do have one.
18	THE COURT: And is there anything
19	about your interaction with Facebook over the
20	last couple of months that would make it hard
21	for you to be a fair and impartial juror?
22	THE JUROR: No, I don't think so.
23	THE COURT: Mr. Andre.
24	MR. ANDRE: Just a couple of

1	questions about the deposition you went through.
2	Were you on the plaintiff's side or the
3	defendant's side, do you know?
4	THE JUROR: I believe we were
5	being sued, so I was on the defendant's side.
6	It's been a while.
7	MR. ANDRE: Was it only one
8	deposition?
9	THE JUROR: Yes, for me.
10	MR. ANDRE: And during that
11	experience, did you interact with Playtex's
12	counsel.
13	THE JUROR: Yes.
14	MR. ANDRE: And how did that
15	lawsuit turn out?
16	THE JUROR: I believe we won.
17	MR. ANDRE: And did that leave any
18	kind of an impression on you one way or the
19	other about patent litigation?
20	THE JUROR: No, just be careful
21	what you write.
22	MR. ANDRE: No further questions.
23	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
24	MR. RHODES: No questions, Your

1	Honor. Thank you.
2	THE JUROR: You and I know each
3	other. Once I saw your face.
4	THE COURT: Well, if you know how
5	we know each other, you can tell us. I
6	apologize, you look familiar.
7	THE JUROR: That's okay,
8	University of Delaware, Dickinson, freshman
9	year.
10	THE COURT: How about that, 1987.
11	THE JUROR: That's right.
12	THE COURT: Anything about that
13	experience.
14	THE JUROR: No, until I saw your
15	face.
16	THE COURT: But you could still be
17	a fair and impartial juror and follow my
18	instructions?
19	THE JUROR: Obviously.
20	THE COURT: Not withstanding your
21	memory of me your freshman year.
22	THE JUROR: Twenty-five years is
23	twenty-five years.
24	THE COURT: Thank you for

1	disclosing that. I did think he looked
2	familiar, but
3	MR. CAPONI: It took courage to
4	ask the question.
5	THE COURT: I don't know what he
6	was going to say. But Mr. Andre, any questions,
7	or any motion?
8	MR. ANDRE: No on motion, Your
9	Honor.
10	MR. RHODES: No motion, but I had
11	a lot more questions for him. Those can be
12	deferred. We're not going to strike him.
13	THE COURT: Good morning. Have a
14	seat there, please. And what is your jury
15	number?
16	THE JUROR: 29.
17	THE COURT: Ms. Hypolite.
18	THE JUROR: That's correct.
19	THE COURT: I apologize if I
20	mispronounced your name. What questions did you
21	have a yes answer to?
22	THE JUROR: Only that I do have a
23	user account with Facebook.
24	THE COURT: Okay. And about how

1	long have you had it?
2	THE JUROR: Probably about ten
3	months or so.
4	THE COURT: And what kinds of
5	things do you do when you're on it?
6	THE JUROR: I play mostly like the
7	game applications and talk with family, friends.
8	THE COURT: And about how often
9	would you say you use it.
10	THE JUROR: Currently, mostly on
11	the weekends, probably like twice a week.
12	THE COURT: And would you be able
13	to be a fair and impartial judge of issues
14	relating to Facebook?
15	THE JUROR: Yes.
16	THE COURT: Mr. Andre.
17	MR. ANDRE: I have had no
18	questions, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
20	MR. RHODES: I have no questions,
21	Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
23	You can return to the courtroom.
24	No motions?

1	MD ANDDE: No
1	MR. ANDRE: No.
2	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
3	MR. RHODES: No motions. I'm
4	sorry, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Okay. Good morning.
6	What is your juror number?
7	THE JUROR: 16. The lovely number
8	16.
9	THE COURT: Ms. Ferm.
10	THE JUROR: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Which questions did
12	you have yes answers to?
13	THE JUROR: Well number one
14	hardship on my time for this week. I would love
15	to come next week, but I have a staff person who
16	is on vacation this week. Generally I cover for
17	her.
18	I have been involved in litigation
19	beforehand. My ex-husband was involved in an
20	accident, breaking ribs. That was not that big
21	of a deal.
22	THE COURT: Tell us about, it's
23	your employment would be a hardship?
24	THE JUROR: Yes. I manage a

1	pharmacy department. I have two pharmacists
2	underneath of me, one is on vacation for the
3	rest of the week. I would normally call in
4	someone else, because twelve hour days for one
5	sixty-year-old pharmacist is a long time without
6	having backup help, so generally I work with him
7	at least eight hours a day, but my limited
8	part-time staff are all on vacation this week,
9	too.
10	I'm a little stuck for help. If
11	you would like to do it another time, I would
12	love to come and help, but this is not my week.
13	THE COURT: And the litigation
14	experience of your ex-husband, was he a
15	plaintiff or a defendant.
16	THE JUROR: He was a plaintiff.
17	THE COURT: He was the injured
18	party?
19	THE JUROR: He was the injured
20	party, yes.
21	THE COURT: And how did that
22	litigation end up? Were you happy with the
23	result?
24	THE JUROR: I actually tried not

1	to get involved. His attorney tried to get me
2	involved with loss of consortium or something.
3	Apparently it was a hardship for me to put his
4	socks on when he broke six ribs. But fighting
5	with the attorneys not to be involved.
6	MR. ANDRE: Did you say you had a
7	Facebook account?
8	THE COURT: I don't. Probably one
9	of the few people that doesn't. My children do.
10	MR. ANDRE: When you had the
11	involvement with the attorneys, it sounds like
12	you weren't particularly happy to interact with
13	them. Is that a correct analysis?
14	THE JUROR: That's correct,
15	uh-huh.
16	MR. ANDRE: Do you generally have
17	a negative impression of any particular type of
18	attorney, plaintiff versus defendant attorney,
19	or anything like that?
20	THE JUROR: I would probably say
21	it's equal on both sides.
22	MR. ANDRE: I have no further
23	questions.
24	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.

1	MR. RHODES: I don't mean to
2	insinuate, but it sounds like if the feelings
3	about attorneys and the facts that you will be
4	stressed of what's happening at work this
5	particular week would mean you would be
6	distracted this particular week if you had to
7	serve?
8	THE JUROR: Yes. Right now my
9	boss, yes, it would make me very distracted to
10	not be there. I had two people that wanted to
11	take vacation this week already and I had to
12	deny one, so yes, I would be distracted.
13	MR. RHODES: Thank you.
14	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
15	You can return to the courtroom.
16	I'm going to strike Ms. Ferm based
17	on the hardship at work. I'm not sure that I
18	would strike everyone who has negative feelings
19	about all lawyers.
20	MR. RHODES: That's a pretty big
21	group.
22	THE COURT: Good morning. What is
23	your juror number.
24	THE JUROR: Forty-two.

1	THE COURT: Ms. Martin?
2	THE JUROR: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Tell us which
4	questions you had a yes answer to.
5	THE JUROR: If I had a Facebook
6	account.
7	THE COURT: So you do have one?
8	THE JUROR: Yes.
9	THE COURT: And about how long
10	have you had it?
11	THE JUROR: About a year and a
12	half. I seldom use it, though.
13	THE COURT: Seldom. Okay.
14	THE JUROR: Mm-hmm.
15	THE COURT: When you are on it,
16	what do you do on it typically?
17	THE JUROR: Email my good friends,
18	and yeah, that's it. Not very long.
19	THE COURT: Do you have any
20	feelings about Facebook that would make it hard
21	for you to be a fair
22	THE JUROR: No.
23	THE COURT: Mr. Andre?
24	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions,

1	Your Honor.
2	MR. RHODES: No questions. Thank
3	you.
4	THE COURT: Thank you for your
5	time. You can go back to the courtroom.
6	THE JUROR: I have one more thing.
7	At the end, if there was anything.
8	THE COURT: Right.
9	THE JUROR: I have a sinus
10	infection right now. Right now I have a
11	pounding headache.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	THE JUROR: I am on antibiotics.
14	I don't know how the rest of the week could
15	affect this, but
16	THE COURT: You're concerned that
17	the infection might become worse or distract
18	you?
19	THE JUROR: Well, it's just the
20	headaches.
21	THE COURT: The headaches.
22	THE JUROR: So, you know,
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	THE JUROR: it's time for me to

1	make an Advil right now, but you know, because I
2	have that.
3	THE COURT: I appreciate you
4	sharing that. You should have time to go take
5	your medication right now.
6	Okay?
7	THE JUROR: Okay. Thank you.
8	MR. ANDRE: Maybe reserve. I
9	don't have a motion per se.
10	MR. RHODES: I will move. I mean,
11	we're all kind of uncomfortable when someone's
12	telling you they have a headache. I worry
13	because the case is technical.
14	They need to I mean it's hard
15	enough to keep people awake.
16	THE COURT: Yeah. I will grant
17	the defense's motion.
18	MR. RHODES: Thank you. And I'm
19	sorry, was that 42?
20	THE COURT: Yes. That was Ms.
21	Martin.
22	I think just given the way she
23	raised that concern and evidently she's in some
24	pain with her headache, so I am striking her for

1	cause.
2	Good morning.
3	THE JUROR: Good morning, Judge.
4	THE COURT: How are you doing?
5	Have a seat there, please.
6	THE JUROR: Thank you, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: What is your juror
8	number?
9	THE JUROR: Fifty-nine. Winthrop
10	Shaw.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Shaw. Great.
12	Tell us which questions you
13	answered yes to.
14	THE JUROR: The very last one. I
15	have health problems.
16	THE COURT: Health problems.
17	THE JUROR: I have severe asthma.
18	I wanted to I came in today so I could do my
19	civic duty, but it's not doing good. I even
20	bought my machine, which I'm about ready to use.
21	But it's up to you what you guys do.
22	THE COURT: Is this type of
23	weather
24	THE JUROR: It literally kills me.

1	Yeah.
2	THE COURT: Okay. All right.
3	Any questions, Mr. Andre?
4	MR. ANDRE: No questions, Your
5	Honor.
6	MR. RHODES: No questions, Your
7	Honor.
8	THE COURT: We will be striking
9	you, but I need you to return to the courtroom
10	and stick around for a bit. We'll let you know
11	when you can go.
12	THE JUROR: Is there a way I can
13	step outside to use the machine in the meantime?
14	THE COURT: Certainly. You can do
15	that.
16	THE JUROR: Thank you very much.
17	THE COURT: All right. So we've
18	stricken Mr. Shaw, Number 59.
19	Good morning.
20	THE JUROR: Good morning.
21	THE COURT: What is your juror
22	number?
23	THE JUROR: Forty-three.
24	THE COURT: Ms. McCabe?

1	THE JUROR: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Tell us which
3	questions you answered yes to.
4	THE JUROR: Any on Facebook. I
5	just signed up maybe a month ago.
6	THE COURT: Okay. And about how
7	often have you used it over the last month?
8	THE JUROR: Maybe three.
9	THE COURT: Three times. And what
10	kinds of things do you do on it?
11	THE JUROR: I found an old
12	classmate. That's it.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Anything about
14	that experience that would make you either too
15	favorable or too unfavorable towards Facebook?
16	THE JUROR: I don't think so.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Any other
18	questions you answered yes to?
19	THE JUROR: No, that was it.
20	THE COURT: Mr. Andre?
21	MR. ANDRE: Why did you join
22	Facebook?
23	THE COURT: Curiosity.
24	MR. ANDRE: Have you uploaded

1	photographs on the site?
2	THE JUROR: No. I don't even
3	think I put my profile up there.
4	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions.
5	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
6	MR. RHODES: I have no questions.
7	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
8	You can return to the courtroom.
9	THE COURT: Mr. Andre, any motion?
10	MR. ANDRE: No motion.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes, any
12	motion?
13	MR. RHODES: No motion.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	Good morning.
16	THE JUROR: Good morning.
17	THE COURT: What is your juror
18	number?
19	THE JUROR: Twenty-one.
20	THE COURT: That would make you
21	Ms. Giambi?
22	THE JUROR: Yes.
23	THE COURT: Tell us which
24	questions you had yes answers to.

1	THE JUROR: Just the one about
2	Facebook. I do have an account.
3	THE COURT: And about how long
4	have you had it?
5	THE JUROR: A year.
6	THE COURT: And what about how
7	often do you get on it?
8	THE JUROR: At least once a day
9	during the workday.
10	THE COURT: We won't tell anyone.
11	And what kind of things do you do on it?
12	THE JUROR: Mostly to keep up with
13	family and friends. I find out things about my
14	younger relatives that I am surprised at at
15	times. Nice surprises.
16	THE COURT: Nice surprises. Good.
17	THE JUROR: Mm-hmm.
18	THE COURT: Anything about that
19	that would make you feel favorably or
20	unfavorably towards Facebook?
21	THE JUROR: No. I don't think so.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Andre?
23	MR. ANDRE: When you say you get
24	on at least once a day, are there days you go on

1	multiple times a day?
2	THE JUROR: There may be, yes. I
3	mean, if it's as an example, yesterday we had
4	a family gathering and my younger cousins, and
5	nieces and nephews were joking about the fact
6	that I was actually on Facebook. And you have
7	to put your picture up there, which I don't have
8	yet. And those kinds of discussion.
9	And I said, That's how I found out
10	Cousin X got engaged and, you know, so it's on
11	that level. But I don't use it professionally,
12	at least not yet.
13	MR. ANDRE: No further questions.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
15	MR. RHODES: If you had to be off
16	of it for a week, would you survive?
17	THE JUROR: Absolutely.
18	MR. RHODES: Okay. Thank you.
19	THE COURT: Okay. We have no
20	other questions.
21	Thank you. You can go back to the
22	courtroom.
23	Any motion?
24	MR. ANDRE: No motion.

1	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes, any
2	motion?
3	MR. RHODES: No motion, Your
4	Honor.
5	THE COURT: Good morning.
6	THE JUROR: Good morning.
7	THE COURT: What is your juror
8	number?
9	THE JUROR: Four.
10	THE COURT: Ms. Brown?
11	THE JUROR: Yeah.
12	THE COURT: Okay. Tell us what
13	questions you answered yes to.
14	THE JUROR: The only ones I
15	answered yes to is I have a Facebook and I do go
16	on it every day.
17	THE COURT: Okay. About how long
18	have you had your account?
19	THE JUROR: Like three years.
20	THE COURT: And what kinds of
21	things do you do when you get on it?
22	THE JUROR: Just socializing on
23	it. That's it.
24	THE COURT: Do you think you could

1	be a fair judge of issues related to Facebook?
2	THE JUROR: Yeah.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Any questions,
4	Mr. Andre?
5	MR. ANDRE: You said you go on
6	every day. Do you go on multiple times per day?
7	THE JUROR: No. I don't have
8	time, but I would if I could.
9	MR. ANDRE: How many friends do
10	you have on your Facebook account?
11	THE JUROR: A lot.
12	MR. ANDRE: Approximately?
13	THE JUROR: I don't even know. I
14	really don't.
15	Like a lot.
16	MR. ANDRE: Do you play the games
17	on Facebook?
18	THE JUROR: No.
19	MR. ANDRE: Do you just post
20	photographs on Facebook?
21	THE JUROR: Yeah.
22	MR. ANDRE: How many photographs
23	do you have on Facebook?

1	MR. ANDRE: Okay.
2	THE COURT: When you say "a lot"
3	of friends, more than 500?
4	THE JUROR: Probably.
5	THE COURT: Probably. Mr. Rhodes?
6	MR. RHODES: Do you ever use
7	Facebook on like an iPhone or mobile phone?
8	THE JUROR: No. I don't have
9	internet on my phone.
10	MR. RHODES: Okay. And if you
11	were told by His Honor that you can't access
12	Facebook for a week, would you survive?
13	THE JUROR: Yeah.
14	MR. RHODES: Okay. Thank you.
15	THE COURT: Do you have any
16	concerns about not being able to access it for a
17	week?
18	THE JUROR: No.
19	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
20	You can wait in the courtroom.
21	Any motion?
22	MR. ANDRE: I am going to move to
23	strike for cause. I think she's too committed
24	to Facebook use.

1	She's been using it since she's 16
2	years old. She's 19 now.
3	And she has more friends than she
4	can count on it. So I think it's a primary mode
5	of communication for her and it would be even
6	though she says she doesn't have leanings one
7	way or another, I think it would be very
8	difficult for her to be impartial.
9	MR. RHODES: I oppose. I think
10	she's just a typical Facebook user.
11	I think she said, unless I'm
12	mistaken, she only had six photos up.
13	THE COURT: Yes.
14	MR. RHODES: So that part of the
15	use is very small. I don't think that's either
16	here nor there.
17	THE COURT: I'm going to deny the
18	motion. I think I'm persuaded by her responses
19	that she can be fair and impartial, that she
20	won't find it an undue burden to not be on
21	Facebook for a week. So she's not stricken.
22	Good morning.
23	THE JUROR: Good morning.
24	THE COURT: What is your juror

1	number?
2	THE JUROR: Sixty-five.
3	THE COURT: Ms. Turner?
4	THE JUROR: Yes.
5	THE COURT: Okay. Which questions
6	did you answer yes to?
7	THE JUROR: I do have a Facebook
8	account. I use it roughly once a day, and it
9	would be hard for me to miss if it goes into
10	next week.
11	THE COURT: What do you have going
12	on next week?
13	THE JUROR: Our church vacation of
14	Bible school and I'm one of the leaders for
15	that.
16	THE COURT: What day does that
17	start, Monday?
18	THE JUROR: Next Monday, yes.
19	THE COURT: All right. With
20	respect to your Facebook use, what types of
21	things do you do on it?
22	THE JUROR: Not very much. I
23	don't have any pictures on it yet.
24	It's just basically communication

1	with family and friends that I don't see often.
2	THE COURT: Okay. And about how
3	often do you use it?
4	THE JUROR: Maybe once a day.
5	THE COURT: Mr. Andre?
6	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions.
7	Thank you.
8	MR. RHODES: No questions. Thank
9	you.
10	THE COURT: Thank you.
11	THE JUROR: Thank you.
12	THE COURT: I don't need to make
13	her miss the church vacation. I'm going to
14	strike her.
15	Good morning.
16	THE JUROR: Good morning.
17	THE COURT: What is your juror
18	number?
19	THE JUROR: Nineteen.
20	THE COURT: Mr. Frank?
21	THE JUROR: Yes.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Which questions
23	did you answer yes to?
24	THE JUROR: Four questions. I

1	have a good friend who started a company based
2	on a patent. He had to defend that.
3	His company had to defend that
4	patent. They prevailed. He sold the company
5	and retired.
6	I have another good friend who
7	holds over a hundred patents.
8	I do have a Facebook account, and
9	I do look at that just about every day.
10	THE COURT: Let's start with the
11	Facebook account. About how long have you had
12	it?
13	THE JUROR: Less than a year.
14	THE COURT: And what kinds of
15	things do you do when you're on it?
16	THE JUROR: Very little. I'm up
17	there.
18	I have a few friends I correspond
19	with. I'm in the and new people find me and
20	we friend each other. I guess that's the word.
21	So
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	THE JUROR: I would not call
24	myself an active user.

1	THE COURT: And anything about
2	that experience that would make it hard for you
3	to be a fair judge of issues related to
4	Facebook?
5	THE JUROR: I don't think so. No.
6	THE COURT: And the friends who
7	have patents and that experience, anything about
8	that that would make it hard for you to be an
9	impartial juror in a patent-related case?
10	THE JUROR: Possibly. Especially
11	the good friend who had to defend his patent and
12	prevailed. I'm on his side.
13	So, I mean, by virtue of the fact
14	that he's my friend. So I can't say for certain
15	that that would make it difficult for me, but I
16	suspect it might.
17	THE COURT: And again, he was the
18	
	patent holder?
19	patent holder? THE JUROR: Yes. Yes. It was his
19 20	
	THE JUROR: Yes. Yes. It was his
20	THE JUROR: Yes. Yes. It was his invention.
20 21	THE JUROR: Yes. Yes. It was his invention. THE COURT: And he was do you

1 I think so. 2 Well, no. I don't know that for a 3 fact. I really don't know. 4 THE COURT: You do know that he 5 won the lawsuit? 6 THE JUROR: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Andre? MR. ANDRE: With respect to your 8 9 friend who had the patent, you said it may make 10 it difficult for you to be a fair juror in this 11 case? 12 THE JUROR: It is difficult to 13 say. It's a close friendship. 14 I don't know. To whatever extent 15 I might identify with any party in this action. 16 I hope I would be above that, but it would be a 17 question in my mind at least. 18 MR. ANDRE: I have no further questions, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Mr. Rhoades? 20 21 MR. RHODES: Was there -- your 22 friend, did he go through litigation over the 23 patent? THE JUROR: I believe so. Yes. 24

1	MR. RHODES: And were you
2	communicating with him kind of, you know, what's
3	happening and he was telling you?
4	THE JUROR: No. Only that it was
5	happening. That as a matter of fact, some
6	parts of it took place in Europe.
7	And I only know that because he
8	says, Hey, I'm going here to do this, but he
9	didn't tell me the details.
10	MR. RHODES: Was there something
11	about that experience that gave you feelings
12	about the patent system or people who bring
13	patent suits or people who defend them?
14	THE JUROR: No.
15	MR. RHODES: When you and I
16	appreciate your candor. When you said that
17	there was an open question in your mind, what
18	did you mean by that?
19	THE JUROR: Well, if I try to
20	analyze it, I would say here's a close friend
21	who was involved in one side of a patent
22	litigation.
23	And one, he's my good friend. We
24	have a good relationship.

1	Here's an action between two
2	parties who have an issue, I assume, related to
3	a patent. I think I've been told that.
4	There is some commonality of
5	experience there. Logic would tell me that
6	there are some circumstances under which my
7	previous experience might have an influence on
8	how I view those proceedings.
9	I don't know that. I can't say
10	that.
11	I would trust myself to be fair
12	and objective in my dealings, but I can't say
13	that. I cannot say that that experience would
14	not influence me.
15	MR. RHODES: The Court in this
16	case will instruct you on the law. Whatever
17	that experience was, would you be able to put
18	that to the side and follow what His Honor tells
19	you the law is on patents?
20	THE JUROR: I would certainly hope
21	so. Yes.
22	THE COURT: Let me make sure I
23	heard you. You said you would trust yourself to
24	put aside

1	THE JUROR: Yes.
2	THE COURT: your prior
3	experience?
4	THE JUROR: I would I would
5	we're human. I cannot say with perfect
6	certainty that I would be able to completely
7	distance myself from my personal experience in
8	this matter.
9	However, I would assure you that I
10	would do everything in my power to do so.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very
12	much.
13	You can return to the courtroom.
14	THE JUROR: Thank you.
15	THE COURT: Any motion?
16	MR. ANDRE: No motion, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: No.
18	MR. RHODES: I'll defer to you on
19	this one. I'm trying to I was trying to
20	create a record that he would be neutral, but he
21	kept introducing into his discussion his own
22	angst or gestalt over this process.
23	So I'll defer to you. I just
24	don't know.

1	THE COURT: I'm not going to
2	strike him. The way I viewed it as he's being
3	excessively thoughtful and sharing his inner
4	concerns, which I appreciate and understand.
5	But he's going to do everything he can to put
6	those concerns aside.
7	Good morning.
8	THE JUROR: Good morning.
9	THE COURT: Have a seat there.
10	What's your juror number?
11	THE JUROR: Eight.
12	THE COURT: Could you pronounce
13	your last name for me?
14	THE JUROR: Ciszkowski.
15	THE COURT: Ciszkowski.
16	THE JUROR: Mm-hmm. Thank you.
17	Tell us which questions you
18	answered yes to.
19	THE JUROR: The one pertaining to
20	the lawsuit. You know, something about this
21	lawsuit.
22	THE JUROR: No.
23	THE COURT: You've been involved
24	in some other lawsuit?

1	THE JUROR: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Tell us a little bit
3	about that.
4	THE JUROR: It was workmen's comp
5	for my husband. He fell on ice at work.
6	THE COURT: And were you satisfied
7	with the outcome of that litigation?
8	THE JUROR: Yes. It didn't go to
9	Court or anything. It just
10	THE COURT: It settled?
11	THE JUROR: Well, it was I am
12	not going to say I don't think it was
13	mediation.
14	I don't remember.
15	THE COURT: Maybe arbitration?
16	THE JUROR: Exactly. Mm-hmm.
17	THE COURT: Was there anything
18	about that experience that would make it hard
19	for you to be a fair and impartial judge of what
20	you hear in this Court?
21	THE JUROR: No. It was pretty
22	straight forward.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Were there any
24	other questions you answered yes to?

1	THE JUROR: No.
2	THE COURT: No. Mr. Andre?
3	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions,
4	Mr. Rhodes.
5	MR. RHODES: No questions.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
7	THE JUROR: Thank you.
8	Mr. Andre, any motion?
9	MR. ANDRE: No motion.
10	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
11	MR. RHODES: No motion.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	THE JUROR: Hello, all.
14	THE COURT: Good morning. Have a
15	seats, please.
16	What is your juror number?
17	THE JUROR: Nine.
18	THE COURT: Mr. Conte?
19	THE JUROR: Yes.
20	THE COURT: Which questions did
21	you answer yes to?
22	THE JUROR: The questions
23	pertaining to patents. I do own one patent.
24	I've had patent education at work,

1 that kind of thing. 2 THE COURT: What kind of patent do 3 you have? 4 THE JUROR: Design patent through 5 my previous company. I'm a mechanical engineer, so it was called Box Launch. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. And were you ever involved in any litigation or dispute over 8 9 your patent? 10 THE JUROR: No. 11 THE COURT: And who do you work 12 for now? 13 THE JUROR: Right now I work for 14 It's a motor company in West Chester. Portacap. 15 THE COURT: What's your position 16 there? THE JUROR: Mechanical engineer. 17 You are involved with 18 THE COURT: 19 patents in that job? 20 THE JUROR: If one would arise, 21 yes. But they're hard --22 THE COURT: Anything about your 23 experience with patents that would make it hard 24 for you to be fair and impartial?

1	THE JUROR: No. No.
2	THE COURT: No. Did you answer
3	yes to any other question?
4	THE JUROR: Facebook account. I
5	may have one, I'm not really sure.
6	I don't really use it if I do.
7	THE COURT: Okay. All right.
8	The lawyers may have some
9	questions for you.
10	THE JUROR: Sure.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Andre?
12	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions.
13	Thank you.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
15	MR. RHODES: The patent that you
16	got, were you named as one of the inventors?
17	THE JUROR: There was a head
18	designer. Mostly to him.
19	I was part of the yes, I think
20	to answer your question, yes, I was.
21	MR. RHODES: Were you part of a
22	team of people?
23	THE JUROR: A team of people.
24	Exactly.

1	MR. RHODES: And did that patent
2	then get assigned or transferred as a piece of
3	property to the company that you worked for?
4	THE JUROR: I believe it did, yes.
5	I had left the company after everything was
6	finalized. So I believe it would have, yeah.
7	MR. RHODES: I represent the party
8	accused of infringing a patent.
9	THE JUROR: Okay.
10	MR. RHODES: Is there anything
11	about the experience that you went through to
12	get that patent that would make you more
13	inclined to want to protect the patent?
14	THE JUROR: No. I don't think so.
15	I mean, everything was handled
16	through our corporate office. I was in more of
17	the manufacturing factory floor.
18	So I didn't see a lot of the
19	day-to-day stuff that went through other than
20	every now and again, Sign these forms. So I
21	don't think there was any disputes or I don't
22	know of any, let's put it that way.
23	MR. RHODES: You anticipated my
24	next question. Was there any lawsuits filed

1	that involved that patent?
2	THE JUROR: Not that I know of.
3	MR. RHODES: Just is there
4	anything that would make you more inclined to
5	protect people who get patents then people who
6	are accused of infringing them?
7	THE JUROR: I suppose. I mean,
8	I'm not really sure.
9	You know, it would be interesting
10	to hear this, see how this plays out. But I'm
11	not really sure, to be honest.
12	I mean, being on being an
13	engineer, I would guess, you know I don't
14	know. I'm not really sure how to answer your
15	question.
16	I don't really have a feel either
17	way.
18	MR. RHODES: We all bring things
19	to any process. Would you be able to set aside
20	whatever it is you know about patents and the
21	process and defer completely to what His Honor
22	would instruct you on the law
23	THE JUROR: Sure.
24	MR. RHODES: and be fair to both

1	sides?
2	THE JUROR: Absolutely.
3	THE COURT: And the patent holder,
4	as maybe somebody who aspires to have more
5	patents in the future, would you go into this
6	case sort of rooting for the patent holder?
7	THE JUROR: No, not necessarily.
8	No. Sorry.
9	THE COURT: I'm just looking for
10	the truthful answer.
11	THE JUROR: No.
12	THE COURT: No?
13	THE JUROR: No, I would not.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
15	You can return to the courtroom.
16	Mr. Andre?
17	MR. ANDRE: No motion.
18	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
19	MR. RHODES: I don't think it's
20	enough for cause, Your Honor, but his answers
21	troubled me.
22	THE COURT: I'm not going to
23	strike him for cause. It's similar to the
24	previous individual.

1	Maybe I don't want to say less
2	articulate, but in a different way saying the
3	same thing. So, and I trust he would put aside
4	his prior experience and be a fair judge of the
5	fact.
6	Take the next person.
7	Good morning.
8	THE JUROR: Hi. Good morning.
9	THE COURT: What is your juror
10	number?
11	THE JUROR: Thirty-three.
12	THE COURT: Mr. Keene?
13	THE JUROR: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Which questions
15	did you answer yes to?
16	THE JUROR: The last one. I
17	believe it's the last one about is there any
18	other reason.
19	I've got severe health problems.
20	I have a pacemaker for afib.
21	And I have varicose veins that I
22	have to wear a support stocking up to here. I
23	have it on now, but I can't sit or stand for
24	very long.

1	And in the last four months, I've
2	been in the hospital twice for falls, because I
3	have low blood pressure. It drops 40 points
4	when I stand up if I've been sitting down for a
5	long time or laying down.
6	And another thing is I'm being
7	treated with antidepressants for post-traumatic
8	stress syndrome disorder by the VA. So I just
9	felt like, you know, I don't know if I could sit
10	there through the trial and
11	THE COURT: Right. I appreciate
12	you sharing all of that with us. I am going to
13	excuse you from
14	THE JUROR: Okay.
15	THE COURT: serving.
16	But you'll have to go back into
17	the courtroom for now. We will let you know
18	when you can leave.
19	THE JUROR: Okay. Thank you very
20	much.
21	Thank you.
22	That was Mr. Keene; right?
23	THE CLERK: Mm-hmm.
24	THE COURT: Good morning. Have a

1	seat here, please.
2	What's your juror number?
3	THE JUROR: Twenty-six.
4	THE COURT: Mr. Grubb?
5	THE JUROR: Yes.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Which questions
7	did you answer yes to?
8	THE JUROR: I was on two civil
9	jurors in Maryland probably 25 years ago.
10	THE COURT: Okay. What kind of
11	cases were they; do you recall?
12	THE JUROR: One was a rental case
13	between a builder and the tenant that he had.
14	The other one was an accident case
15	in Ocean City where a lady had been injured and
16	the driver of the car was there. They were
17	seeking damages.
18	THE COURT: And did the jury
19	ultimately reach a verdict in both of those
20	cases?
21	THE JUROR: Oh, yeah.
22	THE COURT: Do you remember if the
23	plaintiff or the defendant won in each of them?
24	THE JUROR: I think the defendant

won in the first one and the plaintiff won in
the second one.
THE COURT: Was there anything
about that experience that would make it hard
for you to be a fair and impartial juror a third
time here?
THE JUROR: I don't think so.
THE COURT: Okay. Did you answer
yes to any other questions?
THE JUROR: No.
THE COURT: No? Okay.
Mr. Andre?
MR. ANDRE: It's noted here on the
jury list that you're from Milford.
THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
MR. ANDRE: Is that a hardship to
get to court every morning on time from that
distance?
THE JUROR: Well, being retired,
it's a little tough to get up that early, but I
can do it.
can do it.

1	MR	. ANDRE:	I have no further
2	questions.		
3	MR	. RHODES:	I have no questions.
4	TH	E COURT:	Okay. Thank you very
5	much.		
6	An	y motion?	
7	MR	. ANDRE:	No.
8	ТН	E COURT:	Mr. Rhodes?
9	MR	. RHODES:	No. Okay.
10	ТН	E COURT:	Good morning.
11	ТН	E JUROR:	ні.
12	ТН	E COURT:	What is your juror
13	number?		
14	ТН	E JUROR:	Forty-eight.
15	ТН	E COURT:	Forty-eight. You can
16	have a seat.		
17	Th	ank you.	Ms. Nathanson.
18	ТН	E JUROR:	That's me.
19	ТН	E COURT:	Which questions did
20	you answer yes t		
21	ТН	E JUROR:	Number five.
22	тн	E COURT:	You will have to
23	remind me what t	hat is.	
24	тн	E JUROR:	It is time.
			l l

1	THE COURT: Oh, the length of the
2	trial, six days.
3	THE JUROR: Six days is not a
4	problem, but I will be out of town for the 25th
5	for the whole week. And there's other
6	questions, too, but that was the one I
7	remembered.
8	THE COURT: The 25th is next
9	Monday?
10	THE JUROR: Next Sunday.
11	THE COURT: So you're leaving next
12	Sunday for
13	THE JUROR: New York.
14	THE COURT: For vacation?
15	THE JUROR: No my daughters have
16	appointments there.
17	THE COURT: Up in New York. And
18	you expect it to be much of the week?
19	THE JUROR: All week.
20	THE COURT: All week. And there
21	were other questions, too?
22	THE JUROR: Opinion, I believe. I
23	think there's an opinion question.
24	THE COURT: Do you have any

1	opinions about Facebook?
2	THE JUROR: I only know that
3	preachers advise using anything like that.
4	You're not supposed to be on the computers by
5	ourselves, stuff like that.
6	It's just it's a dangerous
7	place. That's what they say.
8	THE COURT: So you haven't used
9	Facebook?
10	THE JUROR: I've never been on it.
11	I have no interest.
12	THE COURT: Right. Okay.
13	Mr. Andre, any questions?
14	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions.
15	Thank you.
16	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes, any
17	questions?
18	MR. RHODES: No, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
20	You can return to the courtroom.
21	THE JUROR: Thank you.
22	THE COURT: I'm going to strike
23	for cause. What was her I lost track of her
24	name.

1	MR. RHODES: Number 48.
2	THE COURT: I'm going to strike
3	miss Nathanson for cause.
4	Good morning. Have a seat,
5	please. What is your juror number?
6	THE JUROR: Eighteen.
7	THE COURT: Eighteen. Mr.
8	Foraker?
9	THE JUROR: Yes.
10	THE COURT: Okay. Which questions
11	did you answer yes to?
12	THE JUROR: I have a Facebook
13	account.
14	THE COURT: About how long have
15	you had it?
16	THE JUROR: A year or two.
17	THE COURT: And about how often do
18	you get on it?
19	THE JUROR: More frequently now
20	because where I work they've actually encouraged
21	us to do that, so
22	THE COURT: So you use it for work
23	as well as personal use?
24	THE JUROR: Yeah, for keeping in

1	contact with my students.
2	THE COURT: You're a teacher?
3	THE JUROR: At the college level.
4	THE COURT: Okay. And is there
5	anything about your experience with Facebook
6	that would make it hard for you to be impartial
7	in judging issues related to Facebook?
8	THE JUROR: Not that I can think
9	of.
10	THE COURT: Did you answer yes to
11	other questions?
12	THE JUROR: Maybe an issue with
13	the length of the trial. I have a seminar group
14	coming that I'm supposed to host Monday.
15	THE COURT: That's a week from
16	today?
17	THE JUROR: Yeah.
18	THE COURT: And is that during the
19	day?
20	THE JUROR: Yes.
21	THE COURT: Okay. And where is it
22	that you do that?
23	THE JUROR: At Delaware Technical
24	Community College.

1	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Andre?
2	MR. ANDRE: You stated that you
3	used Facebook for your work. Is it required
4	that you go on a certain amount of times a day
5	or week?
6	THE JUROR: No. We were strongly
7	encouraged to use Facebook and other
8	applications of that nature in order to keep in
9	contact with our newer students, with the older
10	students.
11	MR. ANDRE: Would it cause a
12	hardship on you if you couldn't communicate with
13	the students for a week or so through Facebook?
14	THE JUROR: Give me a reason not
15	to do it.
16	MR. ANDRE: Fair enough. Do you
17	use it for any personal reasons outside of work,
18	Facebook?
19	THE JUROR: Primarily work.
20	MR. ANDRE: Okay. That's all I
21	have.
22	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes.
23	MR. RHODES: No questions.
24	THE COURT: No. Okay.

1	Thank you. You can return to the
2	courtroom.
3	Mr. Andre?
4	MR. ANDRE: Other than his
5	conflict that he may have to show up on Monday,
6	I know the trial will go Monday. We were
7	talking earlier that we think probably rest our
8	case on Tuesday the way it's setting up. So,
9	that may be a problem, I think.
10	So
11	THE COURT: I am concerned about
12	it, especially if it's if they're
13	deliberating, he might try to rush through to
14	get to his seminar.
15	MR. RHODES: That's what I'm
16	worried about. I see us closing a week from
17	today and then they're deliberating Tuesday,
18	maybe Wednesday.
19	So I don't know. I don't have a
20	motion, though.
21	THE COURT: I'm going to strike
22	him for cause. I'm concerned about the schedule
23	conflict.
24	Good morning.

1	THE JUROR: Good morning.
2	THE COURT: What is your juror
3	number?
4	THE JUROR: Sixty-eight.
5	THE COURT: Ms. Willey?
6	THE JUROR: Yes.
7	THE COURT: Tell us which
8	questions you said yes to, please.
9	THE JUROR: The six days and an
10	account.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Tell us what
12	your conflict is with the length of the trial.
13	THE JUROR: I work in the office
14	at the school, The Charter School, and we're
15	preparing for the next year. It's me and
16	another girl.
17	She's actually trained for
18	financing, so it's pretty much me and the
19	principal.
20	THE COURT: The other person is in
21	training this week?
22	THE JUROR: Yes, with financing.
23	She's on medical leave, our main person. And
24	she has a doctor's note to come in half days

1	this week to train her.
2	THE COURT: So there wouldn't be
3	anybody there?
4	THE JUROR: Just me and the
5	principal.
6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	THE JUROR: Yeah.
8	THE COURT: And you say you have a
9	Facebook account, also?
10	THE JUROR: I do, but I activate
11	and deactivate it. I can't remember the last
12	time I posted on there.
13	I just get on there, look at
14	things and then get off.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Andre?
16	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions.
17	Thank you.
18	MR. RHODES: No questions.
19	THE COURT: Okay. You can return
20	to the courtroom.
21	MR. ANDRE: No motion.
22	THE COURT: No motion?
23	MR. RHODES: No motion.
24	THE COURT: I'm not going to

1	strike her at this time. I think if need be,
2	she could get here, but we'll see.
3	All right. The next juror.
4	Good morning.
5	THE JUROR: Good morning.
6	Impressive crowd.
7	THE COURT: What is your juror
8	number, please?
9	THE JUROR: Thirty-nine.
10	THE COURT: Mr. Lewandowski?
11	THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
12	THE COURT: And it is 39. What
13	questions did you answer yes to?
14	THE JUROR: The six days is a
15	problem for me.
16	THE COURT: How is it a problem?
17	THE JUROR: Well, I work for a
18	small company. I lead the department in
19	construction.
20	And it will set me back on my bids
21	and project management. Give an example, we're
22	doing one of the renovations upstairs and
23	THE COURT: In this building?
24	THE JUROR: In this building and

1	I'm in constant conversation with the electrical
2	contractor on the job. And they need my support
3	and getting material quickly.
4	So I'd love to do it. Six days is
5	a problem.
6	I'm flying out to Ohio Friday
7	afternoon.
8	THE COURT: Job related?
9	THE JUROR: Stepson is getting
10	married.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	THE JUROR: I mean, like I'd love
13	to do it.
14	THE COURT: He's not planning to
15	reschedule?
16	THE JUROR: Well, I don't know.
17	It would be a problem, so
18	THE COURT: Okay. Any questions?
19	MR. ANDRE: No questions.
20	MR. RHODES: No.
21	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
22	THE JUROR: Thanks, everybody.
23	THE COURT: I'm going to strike
24	based on the wedding in Ohio this weekend.

1	Good morning.
2	THE JUROR: Hi.
3	THE COURT: Have a seat here,
4	please. What is your juror number?
5	THE JUROR: Five.
6	THE COURT: Ms. Carisch?
7	THE JUROR: Carisch.
8	THE COURT: Tell us which
9	questions you answered yes to.
10	THE JUROR: Five. I think it was
11	the
12	THE COURT: The length of the
13	trial?
14	THE JUROR: Of the trial.
15	THE COURT: Anything else?
16	THE JUROR: No.
17	THE COURT: Okay. What's the
18	concern about the length of the trial?
19	THE JUROR: Well, the main reason
20	is I have a eight-year-old son that my husband
21	stayed home to watch today. And I also have a
22	Court appearance on Wednesday that I'm due for.
23	THE COURT: In Family Court?
24	THE JUROR: Yes.

1	THE COURT: It's your lucky week.
2	THE JUROR: Yeah. So I didn't
3	know whether I would be required to be at this
4	as well.
5	THE COURT: Certainly you can't be
6	in two places at once.
7	THE JUROR: Right.
8	THE COURT: But the putting
9	aside the Family Court obligation, your concern
10	is care of your eight-year-old son?
11	THE JUROR: He's taking off today
12	and Wednesday so I can do this. And we're out
13	of vacation days, so I don't have anybody else
14	to watch him.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Any questions?
16	MR. ANDRE: No questions, Your
17	Honor.
18	MR. RHODES: Would it impose a
19	financial hardship if you had to have your
20	husband stay home and watch your son?
21	THE JUROR: Yes, it would.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
23	You can go back to the courtroom.
24	THE COURT: Mr. Andre?

1	MR. ANDRE: Motion to strike for
2	cause.
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MR. RHODES: Join.
5	THE COURT: Okay. I will grant
6	it.
7	Good morning.
8	THE JUROR: Good morning.
9	THE COURT: You can have a seat
10	here. Please tell us what your juror number is.
11	THE JUROR: Sixty-one.
12	THE COURT: Mr. Spicer?
13	THE JUROR: Mm-hmm.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Tell us which
15	questions you answered yes to, please.
16	THE JUROR: Six. I believe that
17	was the Facebook account.
18	THE COURT: Yes. You have a
19	Facebook account?
20	THE JUROR: Yes.
21	THE COURT: About how long have
22	you had it?
23	THE JUROR: Less than a year.
24	THE COURT: And about how often do

1	you use it?
2	THE JUROR: Maybe four to five
3	times a week.
4	THE COURT: And what kinds of
5	things do you typically do on it?
6	THE JUROR: Just social networking
7	with friends.
8	THE COURT: Anything about that
9	that would make it hard for you to be a fair
10	judge of issues related to Facebook?
11	THE JUROR: No.
12	THE COURT: Okay. Did you have
13	any other yes answers?
14	THE JUROR: No.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Andre?
16	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions.
17	Thank you.
18	MR. RHODES: Thank you. I have no
19	questions, either.
20	THE JUROR: Thank you.
21	THE COURT: Thank you. Any
22	motion?
23	MR. ANDRE: No motion.
24	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?

1	MR. RHODES: No motion.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Good morning.
3	THE JUROR: Hello. Good morning.
4	THE COURT: You can have a seat
5	there. What's your juror number?
6	THE JUROR: Fifty-six.
7	THE COURT: That would make you
8	Ms. Sentman?
9	THE JUROR: You've got it.
10	THE COURT: Which questions did
11	you answer yes to?
12	THE JUROR: Facebook account.
13	THE COURT: You have one?
14	THE JUROR: I do.
15	THE COURT: About how long have
16	you had it?
17	THE JUROR: November last year.
18	THE COURT: And about how often do
19	you use it?
20	THE JUROR: Twice a week.
21	THE COURT: What kind of things do
22	you usually do?
23	THE JUROR: Look up old friends.
24	THE COURT: Look up old friends?

1	THE JUROR: Mm-hmm.
2	THE COURT: And do you remember
3	what caused you to get an account last November?
4	THE JUROR: School. I go to Del
5	Tech, so
6	THE COURT: And what about school
7	led you to do it?
8	THE JUROR: Classmates. To get on
9	there to actually talk about homework, what
10	we've missed, notes, stuff like that.
11	THE COURT: And would you be
12	other than this trial, would you be using it
13	this week for school?
14	THE JUROR: No.
15	THE COURT: You're not in school
16	this week?
17	THE JUROR: Well, I am, but we're
18	actually only on tests this week. So
19	
	THE COURT: Okay. And would it
20	THE COURT: Okay. And would it pose a hardship for you to stay off of Facebook
20 21	
	pose a hardship for you to stay off of Facebook
21	pose a hardship for you to stay off of Facebook this week

1	TI	IE COURT:	Any questions,
2	Mr. Andre?		
3	MF	R. ANDRE:	No.
4	TI	HE COURT:	Mr. Rhodes?
5	MF	R. RHODES:	No.
6	TI	HE COURT:	Okay. Any motion, Mr.
7	Andre?		
8	MF	R. ANDRE:	No motion.
9	TI	HE COURT:	Mr. Rhodes?
10	MF	R. RHODES:	No.
11	TF	IE CLERK:	Just take a seat by
12	the Judge, plea	se.	
13	TH	HE COURT:	Good morning.
14	TI	IE JUROR:	Good morning, Your
15	Honor.		
16	TH	HE COURT:	You can have a seat
17	there.		
18	TH	IE JUROR:	Ladies and gentlemen.
19	TI	HE COURT:	What is your juror
20	number?		
21	TH	IE JUROR:	Sixty-four.
22	TH	HE COURT:	Mr. Sullivan?
23	TH	IE JUROR:	Yes, sir.
24	TH	HE COURT:	Tell us what questions

1	you answered yes to.
2	THE JUROR: Your Honor, I've been
3	trying to remember the name of the question.
4	I'm very sorry.
5	THE COURT: That's fine.
6	THE JUROR: It was do I have any
7	prejudice or anything against Facebook or the
8	plaintiff. And my only problem, and I want to
9	be totally honest is that my stepson's daughter,
10	so my step-granddaughter was approached by a
11	older man on Facebook. And luckily my stepson
12	got wind of it and got the police involved and
13	put an end to it.
14	So I just wanted to be honest
15	about it.
16	THE COURT: That was certainly a
17	traumatic family experience.
18	THE JUROR: Yes, sir. But
19	THE COURT: Do you think you
20	could put aside that experience and judge
21	Facebook fairly in this case?
22	THE JUROR: Yes, I could. I just
23	thought that you should know.
24	THE COURT: I appreciate you

1	letting us know. Certainly.
2	Were there any other concerns or
3	questions that you had?
4	THE JUROR: No, sir.
5	THE COURT: No. Okay.
6	Mr. Andre?
7	MR. ANDRE: I have no questions.
8	Thank you.
9	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes?
10	MR. RHODES: No questions. Thank
11	you.
12	THE COURT: Thank you. You can
13	return to the Court.
14	MR. ANDRE: No motions.
15	MR. RHODES: I would move he
16	felt strongly enough to disclose the story, to
17	come in here, relay it and obviously it was a
18	traumatic event in the family. I worry it's a
19	prejudice he wouldn't be able to overcome.
20	THE COURT: I'm going to grant
21	that motion. It's just the nature of that type
22	of experience, while he says he can put it
23	aside, I know he will do his best.
24	I am concerned.

1	So we'll strike Number 64.
2	THE CLERK: They tell me that's
3	all of them.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Let's take a
5	moment and make sure we're all on the same page
6	as to who's in and who's out.
7	Do you need some time?
8	THE CLERK: No. I'm good.
9	I'll just mention the ones that
10	are out or do you
11	THE COURT: Whatever is easiest
12	for you.
13	THE CLERK: I'll just go through
14	the whole list. And one is absent. Two is
15	stricken.
16	Three is stricken. Four is in.
17	Five is stricken. Six through
18	nine are in.
19	Ten is absent. Eleven is
20	stricken.
21	Twelve is in. Thirteen is absent.
22	Fourteen and 15 are in. Sixteen
23	is stricken.
24	Seventeen is absent.

1	Eighteen stricken. Nineteen
2	through 21 are in.
3	Twenty-two is stricken.
4	Twenty-three through 29 are in.
5	Thirty and 31 are absent.
6	Thirty-two is in. Thirty-three is
7	stricken.
8	Thirty-four through 38 are in.
9	Thirty-nine is stricken. Forty
10	and 41 are in.
11	Forty-two is stricken.
12	Forty-three is in.
13	Forty-four is stricken.
14	Forty-five through 47 are in.
15	Forty-eight is stricken.
16	Forty-nine and 50 are in.
17	Fifty-one is absent. Fifty-two is
18	stricken.
19	Fifty-three is in. Fifty-four is
20	absents.
21	Fifty-five is stricken. Fifty-six
22	and 57 are in.
23	Fifty-eight and 59 are stricken.
24	Sixty through 63 are in.

```
1
       Sixty-four and 65 are stricken.
                     Sixty-six is in. Sixty-seven is
 2
 3
       stricken. And 68 is in.
 4
                     THE COURT: How many are still in
       by your count, please.
 5
                     THE CLERK: I believe I have 40.
6
7
                     THE COURT: It looks like 40 to me
       as well.
8
9
                     MR. CAPONI: Your Honor, do you
10
       have one or two reserved?
11
                     THE COURT: Thirty-five and 60 is
12
       reserved on my list.
13
                     MS. KEEFE:
                                 An 68.
14
                     THE CLERK: I have 68 as well.
15
                     THE COURT:
                                 Sixty-eight was
16
       reserved as well.
17
                     THE CLERK: That was the teacher
       lady with the blond hair at the end.
18
       Thirty-five, 60 and 68 as reserved.
19
20
                     I think given that we have 40, I'm
21
       comfortable taking it down to 37. I had
22
       concerns with each of them with scheduling, so
23
       we will strike 35, 60 and 61.
24
                     Neal, anything else before I send
```

1	counsel back into the courtroom?
2	THE CLERK: No. I don't think so.
3	THE COURT: Okay. You all can
4	return to the courtroom. We'll be in shortly to
5	complete jury selection.
6	(A brief recess was taken.)
7	THE CLERK: All rise. Please be
8	seated.
9	THE COURT: I appreciate your
10	patience and we'll ask your continued indulgence
11	and patience as we move into the next and near
12	final stages of jury selection.
13	What's going to happen next is
14	that one of my deputies is going to randomly
15	select 18 jury numbers. If you hear your number
16	called, I'll need you to come forward and the
17	deputy will direct you where to sit in or around
18	
±0	the jury box.
19	the jury box. After we have randomly selected 18
19	After we have randomly selected 18
19 20	After we have randomly selected 18 of you, the parties are entitled to what is
19 20 21	After we have randomly selected 18 of you, the parties are entitled to what is called preemptory challenges where they can each

1	You might see a clipboard being
2	passed back and forth between the parties and my
3	staff. And I'll just need to again ask for your
4	indulgence to sit there quietly and be patient
5	as counsel is doing the work that they have to
6	do on behalf of their clients.
7	After they're done with that, we
8	will read off the numbers of the eight of you
9	who are going to be on the jury. And at that
10	point, we'll be able to excuse the rest of you.
11	So I'll now call on my deputy to
12	select 18 numbers randomly, please.
13	THE CLERK: Juror Number 20,
14	please take the first seat in the first row of
15	the jury box.
16	Juror Number 50, second seat in
17	the first row.
18	Juror Number 45, third seat in the
19	first row.
20	Juror Number 4, fourth seat in the
21	first row.
22	Juror Number 41.
23	Juror Number 57.
24	Juror Number 6.

1	Juror Number 63, first seat in the
2	second row, please.
3	Juror Number 14, second seat in
4	the second row.
5	Juror Number 38.
6	Juror Number 23.
7	Juror Number 25.
8	Juror Number 29.
9	Juror Number 21.
10	Juror Number 43, please take one
11	of the seats in the front.
12	Juror Number 12.
13	Juror Number 24.
14	Juror Number 46.
15	THE COURT: Counsel, are there any
16	objections to the striking process?
17	MR. ANDRE: No, Your Honor, there
18	is no objection.
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	MR. RHODES: No, Your Honor. We
21	thank you.
22	THE COURT: Thank you.
23	THE CLERK: The following jurors
24	return to the back of the courtroom, please.

1	Juror Number 20.
2	Juror Number 50.
3	Juror Number 45.
4	Juror Number 4.
5	Juror Number 41.
6	Juror Number 6.
7	Juror Number 63.
8	Juror Number 25.
9	Juror Number 23. Ma'am, stay
10	there, sorry.
11	Juror Number 29.
12	Juror Number 43.
13	THE COURT: All right. Those of
14	you who are not in the jury box are now excused
15	and free to go. I appreciate you for being here
16	and doing your civic duty and thank you for your
17	time and your patience.
18	We're now going to swear our
19	jurors and then I'll have a few comments for you
20	and then we'll take a break for lunch.
21	THE CLERK: Can you stand and
22	place your right hands on the bible. Do you
23	swear or affirm that you will well and truly try
24	the issue joined wherein Leader Technologies,

Inc., is plaintiff and Facebook, Inc., is defendant and that you will a true verdict render according to the evidence, so help you God, those of you who swear, and those of you who affirm, you do so affirm.

THE JUROR: I do.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, welcome again. I will have plenty of instructions for you over the course of the trial, beginning very briefly now.

Now that you have been sworn as jurors, it's important that you understand you are not to deliberate or talk about this case until the evidence is closed, and we'll tell you when that time is. So even now as we're getting ready for your first lunch break at which you really don't know anything about the case, you still should not be talking about the case.

You need to keep a fair and open mind until the case is given to you at the end of the evidence.

We will be taking a break for lunch. We'll start up again at 1:30. You will have to go through security again, so keep that

1 in mind and please get back to the building in 2 time that you can be back in the jury room in 3 time to start promptly at 1:30. 4 It is also important that you keep 5 those jury stickers on that you have on now, 6 that's so that everybody in the building knows 7 that you're a juror. None of us who are involved in the case should be talking to you 8 9 during the course of the case and your stickers 10 help us to identify you and keep track of you. 11 So with that, my deputy will show 12 you where the jury room is and get you settled 13 there and then you'll be free to go, but be back 14 in time to start at 1:30. So I ask you now to 15 show the jury out, please. 16 (Jury leaving the courtroom at 17 12:22 p.m.) THE COURT: Are there any matters 18 19 that counsel need to address before we break for 20 lunch? 21 MR. ANDRE: None for the 22 plaintiff, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Okay. 24 MR. RHODES: No, Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: When we get back,
2	we'll start with the preliminary instructions,
3	including play the video, and then we'll do the
4	openings and see if we get any further than the
5	openings this afternoon.
6	We'll take a break.
7	(A luncheon recess was taken.)
8	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
9	Please be seated. I think you all should have
10	some deposition designations for me. Do you
11	have that? Pass it up.
12	MR. RHODES: May I approach, Your
13	Honor.
14	THE COURT: You may. This gives
15	me information for both parties for Wednesday;
16	is that correct?
17	MR. ANDRE: That's correct.
18	THE COURT: Anything else before
19	we bring the jury in?
20	MR. ANDRE: Nothing.
21	MR. RHODES: No.
22	THE COURT: We'll bring the jury
23	in, please.
24	(Jury entering the courtroom at

1 1:35 p.m.) 2 THE CLERK: You may be seated. 3 THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies 4 and gentlemen of the jury. Welcome back. 5 time now for me to read you some preliminary instructions. 6 7 Now that you have been sworn, I am going to give you some preliminary instructions 8 9 to guide you in your participation in the trial. These instructions will give you some of the 10 11 general rules and guidance that might apply to 12 any civil case. Also because this is a patent 13 trial, which will deal with subject matter that 14 is not within the everyday experience of most of us, I will additionally give you some 15 16 preliminary instructions regarding patents to assist you in discharging your duties. 17 Before I begin with those 18 instructions, however, allow me to give you an 19 20 overview of who the parties are and what each 21 contends. 22 You may recall that during the 23 process this morning that led to your selection

as jurors, I advised you that this is a civil

action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States. The plaintiff is Leader Technologies, Inc., which I will refer to as Leader. The defendant is Facebook, Inc., which I will refer to as Facebook.

Leader owns one United States

patent which it alleges that Facebook infringes.

U.S. Patent Number 7,139,761. Because these

numbers are so long, patents are usually

referred to by their last three digits. For

example, U.S. Patent Number 7,139,761 is simply

called the '761 patent.

Leader contends that Facebook infringes the '761 patent. The '761 patent issued on November 21st, 2006. Leader is the assignee of all ownership rights, title and interest in the '761 patent.

Facebook owns and operates the

Facebook website which is currently located at

www.facebook.com and was formally located at

www.thefacebook.com. Facebook provides a

developer wiki at

http://wiki.developers.facebook.com/index.php/

Main_Page and

http://developers.facebook.com./docs/.

Leader does not contend that all of the claims of the patent are infringed by Facebook. Instead, Leader asserts that only certain claims are infringed. They may be called asserted claims. I and the attorneys and witnesses may refer to the product accused of infringement as an accused product.

You, of course, will determine whether or not the accused product infringes the asserted claims of Leader's patent. Persons or companies sued for allegedly infringing a patent can deny infringement. They can also defendant a charge of infringement by proving the patent is invalid.

In this case, Facebook denies that it infringes Leader's patent and asserts that the patent is invalid. I will tell you more about infringements in a few minutes. I will also instruct you as to invalidity in my instructions to you at the close of the evidence.

So let me begin with general rules that will govern the discharge of your duty as

jurors in this case.

2.0

It will be your duty to find from the evidence what the facts are. You and you alone will be the judges of the facts. You will then have to apply those facts to the law as I give it to you both during these preliminary instructions and at the close of the evidence. You must follow that law whether you agree with it or not.

In addition to instructing you about the law, at the close of the evidence I will provide you with instructions as to what the claims of the patents mean. Again, of course, you are bound by your oath as jurors to follow these and all the instructions that I give you, even if you personally disagree with them.

All the instructions are important, and you should consider them as a whole.

Perform these duties fairly. Do not let any bias, sympathy or prejudice that you may feel toward one side or the other influence your decision in any way.

Also, do not let anything that I may say or do during the trial influence you.

Nothing that I may say or do is intended to indicate or should be taken by you as indicating what your verdict should be.

2.0

The evidence from which you will find the facts will consist of the testimony of witnesses. The testimony of witnesses consist of the answers -- of the witnesses to questions posed by the attorneys or by the Court, you may not ask questions.

Evidence will also consist of documents and other things received into the record as exhibits, and any facts that the lawyers agree to or stipulate to or that I may instruct you to find. Certain things are not evidence and must not be considered by you. I will list them for you now.

Statements, arguments and questions by lawyers are not evidence.

Objections to questions are not evidence.

Lawyers have an obligation to their clients to make objections when they believe evidence being offered is improper under the rules, under the

1 rules of evidence.

2.0

You should not be influenced by the objection or by the Court's ruling on it.

If the objection is sustained, ignore the question. If it is overruled, treat the answer like any other.

If you are instructed that some item of evidence is received for a limited purpose only, you must follow that instruction.

Testimony that the Court has excluded or told you to disregard is not evidence and must not be considered.

Anything that you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be disregarded. You are to decide the case solely on the evidence presented here in the courtroom.

There are two kinds of evidence, direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is direct proof of a fact such as testimony of an eye witness. Circumstantial evidence is proof of facts from which you may infer or conclude that other facts exist.

As a rule, the law makes no

distinction between these two types of evidence, but simply requires that you find facts from all of the evidence in the case whether direct or circumstantial, or a combination of the two.

2.

You are the sole judges of each witness's credibility. You should consider each witness's means of knowledge, strength of memory, opportunity to observe, how reasonable or unreasonable the testimony is, whether it is consistent or inconsistent, whether it has been contradicted, the witness's bias, prejudices or interest, the witness's manner or demeanor on the witness stand and all circumstances that according to the evidence could affect the credibility of the testimony.

If you find the testimony to be contradictory, you must try to reconcile it if reasonably possible so as to make one harmonious story of it all, but if you can't do that, then it is your duty and privilege to believe the testimony that you in your judgment believe is most believable and disregard any testimony that in your judgment is not believable.

This instruction applies to the

testimony of all witnesses, including expert witnesses.

2.

2.0

As I have already told you in this case, Leader is the owner of one patent, which it contends Facebook infringes. Leader, therefore, has the burden of proving infringement by what is called a preponderance of the evidence.

This means that Leader has to produce evidence which considered in the light of all the facts leads you to believe that what the patent owner alleges is more likely true than not.

To put it differently, if you were to put Leader's and Facebook's evidence on opposite sides of the scale, the evidence supporting Leader's allegations would have to make it tip somewhat on its side. If Leader fails to meet this burden, the verdict must be for Facebook.

In this case, Facebook asserts that Leader's patent is invalid. The patent, however, is presumed to be valid. Accordingly, the party challenging the patent has the burden

of proving by clear and convincing evidence that the patent is invalid. Clear and convincing evidence is evidence that produces an abiding conviction that the truth of a factual contention is highly probable.

2.

Proof by clear and convincing evidence is thus a higher burden of proof than proof by a preponderance of the evidence of the evidence.

Q. These of you who have sat on criminal cases will have heard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt. That requirement does not apply to civil cases, therefore, you can put it out of your mind.

At this time we'll move on to some general guidance regarding patents and patent litigation and we'll begin by showing you a video that has been produced by the Federal Judicial Center.

(Videotape:)

As you probably know by now, this is a patent case. So you may be wondering how can I sit in judgment on a case like this when I'm not entirely sure what a patent is.

We hope to answer that concern with this brief video which will give you some of the background needed to do your job.

2.

2.0

This case will involve some special issues that the judge and lawyers will explain to you, but all patent cases involve some basics that you will learn about.

This video will discuss what patents are, why we have them, how people get them, and why there are disputes that require us to call in a jury like you.

We'll also show you what patents look like.

The United States Constitution gives congress the power to pass laws relating to patents. It allows congress to promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

A patent, then, is an official grant by the United States government that gives its owner certain rights to an invention. Those include the right to keep others from making,

using, selling, or offering for sale the invention that is described in the patent.

A patent last for a specific period of time, usually twenty years, and represents a bargain made between the government and the inventor.

In return for the right to keep others from using the invention, the inventor must enhance the public knowledge of what we sometimes call the state of the art by adding something new and useful to it.

An example is Thomas Edison's invention of the lightbulb. During the lifetime of the patent, its disclosure may inspire new inventions, and after it expires the invention is free for anyone to use. It is this giving of something new and valuable to the public that justifies giving a patent to the inventor.

A patent is in many ways like a deed to a piece of property. It grants the owner the right to keep people off the property or to charge them a fee like rent for using it. Just as a deed indicates limitations on the rights of a landowner, a patent sets limits on

the rights of an inventor.

The patent system works because the inventor is required to describe the invention in clear and specific terms so that the public knows what the boundaries of the invention are.

Once a patent is issued by the government, it becomes available for public inspection. And that way anyone who learns of the patent and is interested can read it and understand exactly what the inventor has claimed to have invented.

Now that we understand what a patent is, let's take a closer look at the term invention. An invention is a new way of solving a problem.

The patent process begins in the mind of the inventor, and in particular, when the invention is formulated in the mind of the inventor. Patent lawyers call this conception.

This is when the idea occurs to the inventor clearly enough that he or she can write it down and explain it to someone. To qualify for a patent, the invention needs to be

new and useful.

Also, it must not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the field. If the inventor believes these requirements are met, he or she will prepare an application for filing with the United States Patent & Trademark Office in Washington D.C.

The Patent and Trademark Office, often called the PTO, is the agency of the federal government whose job it is to examine patent applications to make sure they are in proper form and comply with the requirements of the law.

The inventor can prepare the application for filing with the PTO, but usually it's drafted by an attorney who specializes in this work or by a patent agent who is not an attorney.

The attorney or agent works with the inventor to be sure the invention is described and claimed in a way that complies with the law and the regulations of the PTO.

As you can see, the application is basically a typewritten document in which the

inventor describes the invention he or she is trying to protect.

When the PTO receives the inventor's application, it assigns a patent examiner, a staff person with a background in the field or art the invention falls within to examine the application and decides whether a patent can be granted.

You've been given a sample patent to refer to as you watch this video, so you already have a sense of what a patent looks like. But now let's take a closer look at the three main parts to a patent.

To begin with, there's some basic identifying information on the first page. This material is highlighted in your handout.

On the upper right side of the page is the number assigned to the patent by the government. And on the left side is a title that describes the invention, the names of the inventors and sometimes the company they have assigned the patent to, and the date when the patent application was filed.

There is also more detailed

information on the first page, including a list of numbers following the caption Field of Search. These numbers identify previously issued patents the examiner looked at or searched to make sure the applicant's claimed invention really is something new, not obvious, and thus patentable.

Also listed on the first page are what we call references. That is, previous patents or articles that describe the technology or prior art known at the time the application was filed.

It may seem strange to you that we call this preexisting technology prior art even though it has nothing to do with artists. We use the word art in the broadest sense to include inventions and other subject matter reasonably related to the claimed invention.

We also refer to the latest technology as state of the art. And we say of someone who can understand and apply the technology, that he or she is skilled in the art.

The second major part of the

patent is what we call the specification or written description. As is the case in your sample, it's usually the longest part of the patent. It includes an abstract, which is a brief summary of the invention, a background section that describes the nature of the problem the invention is supposed to solve, one or more drawings called figures that illustrate various aspects of the invention, and a detailed description of one or more embodiments of the invention.

2.0

An embodiment is a specific device or method that uses the invention such as a particular form of light bulb.

The third and most important part of the patent is the claims. These are the numbered paragraphs that appear at the end.

The claims are what give the public notice of the boundaries of the invention. They are similar to the description of property you may have seen in a deed referring to precise measurements taken on the ground.

Now that we've discussed the main

parts of a patent, let's take a look at how the PTO processes patent applications. This process, which is called prosecution of the patent application, begins when the inventor's application arrives at the PTO mailroom.

2.0

There it receives a stamp that establishes its filing date. Every year the PTO receives over 300,000 applications and issues more than 150,000 patents. Applications go from the mailroom to the office of initial patent examination, which looks them over to make sure all the required parts are there.

This office also decides what field of technology an application relates to and assigns it to the appropriate examining room. Soon it is assigned to an individual patent examiner for handling.

It then gets put in a stack to wait its turn for examination. The reason is that examiners have to review the applications assigned to them in the order in which they have been filed.

In time, the examiner turns to our inventor's application and begins by reading it,

especially the specification and claims, in order to come to a conclusion about whether the invention described in the claims are patentable.

2.

A patent might contain one claim or many claims, and the examiner must make this conclusion about each individual claim. In order to make that decision, the patent examiner usually looks at patents that have been issued previously in the same or very closely related fields of art.

In most areas of technology, the examiner also has computer databases that contain limited additional information. Another part of the job is to decide if the inventor's description of the invention is complete and clear enough to meet the requirements for a patent, including the requirement that the description enables someone of ordinary skill in the field to actually make and use it.

It's important to note that the process of patent examination is private. That is, the public does not know that someone has applied for a patent on an invention until the

patent issues or in some cases until the application has been pending for at least 18 months.

The reason for this secrecy is to give the inventor a chance to get the examiner's reaction to the application and decide whether to withdraw it for whatever reason and keep the invention as confidential information. However, because the process occurs mostly in private and because the job of examining so many applications is very challenging, the law requires the applicant to tell the examiner whatever he or she knows about the prior art that might be important to the examiner's decision on whether to allow the patent.

We call this the applicant's duty of candor. One way the applicant can satisfy this duty is by bringing certain prior art to the attention of the examiner, either in the original application or in other submissions called information disclosure statements.

In this way, the decisions of the examiner are based on both the information provided by the applicant and on the information

the examiner is able to find during the examination process.

Sometimes the examiner concludes the application meets all the requirements we've discussed and allows the patent to issue at this first stage.

But more frequently, the examiner will reject the application as deficient in some respect. At that point, the applicant usually prepares a written response, either agreeing or disagreeing with the examiner.

An applicant who agrees with the examiner can submit amendments to the application designed to overcome the examiner's objection. And an applicant that disagrees with the examiner can explain the reasons for the disagreement.

This exchange of office actions and responses goes on until the examiner issues a final office action, which may reject or allow some or all of the applicant's claims. Once a final PTO office action has occurred and one or more claims have been allowed, the applicant is required to pay an issuance fee, and the patent

is granted.

Then on the date shown in the upper right corner of the first page of the patent, it is issued by the PTO. The inventor receives all the rights of a patent. That date is highlighted on your sample.

By the time a patent issues and the public can take a look at it, the record of what the examiner did is also made public. This is the patent's file, which we call the prosecution history.

The file history contains the original application and all the communications between the applicant and the patent examiner, including a record of any rejections, the applicant's responses and any amendments.

Once the patent has issued, the inventor or the person or company the inventor has assigned a patent to can enforce the patent against anyone who uses the invention without permission.

We call such unlawful use infringement. But the PTO, the examiners do not decide infringement issues. If there is a

dispute about infringement, it is brought to the Court to decide.

2.

Sometimes in a court case, you are also asked to decide about validity. That is, whether the patent should have been allowed at all by the PTO.

A party accused of infringement is entitled to challenge whether the asserted patent claims are sufficiently new or non-obvious in light of the prior art or whether other requirements of patentability have been met. In other words, a defense to an infringement lawsuit is that the patent in question is invalid.

You may wonder why it is that you would be asked to consider such things when the patent has already been reviewed by a government examiner. There are several reasons for this.

First, there may be facts or arguments that the examiner did not consider such as prior art that was not located by the PTO or provided by the applicant. Another reason may be the failure by the applicant to disclose the best way of making or using the

invention, which is another requirement for getting a patent.

2.0

In addition, there is, of course, the possibility that mistakes were made or important information overlooked. Examiners have a lot of work to do and no process is perfect.

Also, unlike a Court proceeding, prosecution of a patent application takes place in private without input from people who might later be accused of infringement. So it is important that we provide a chance for someone who is accused of infringement to challenge the patent in Court.

In deciding issues of infringement and validity, it is your job to decide the facts of the case. The judge will instruct you about the law which may include the meaning of certain words or phrases contained in the patent.

But it is up to you as exclusive judges of the facts to apply the facts as you find them to the law and decide the questions of infringement and validity in the case before you.

To prove infringement, the patent holder must persuade you that it is more likely than not that the patent has been infringed. To prove that a patent is invalid, the law requires a higher standard of proof since the PTO is presumed to have done its job correctly.

The party accused of infringement must persuade you that it is highly probable that the patent is invalid. Good luck with your task and thank you for your service.

(Conclusion of patent video.)

THE COURT: Now that you have seen the video, I'm going to give you, nonetheless, a general overview of what a patent is and how one is obtained. A lot of what I say you will have just heard and you'll hear it again from me at the close of the trial.

But it's important and I want to make sure that you get to hear it. So with that, let me give you a general overview of what a patent is and how one is obtained.

The United States Constitution

Article 1, Section 8 grants the Congress of the

United States the power to enact laws to promote

the progress of science and the useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

The United States Patent and

Trademark Office is responsible for reviewing

patent applications and granting patents. Once

the Patent Office or PTO has issued a patent,

the patent owner has the right to exclude others

from making, using, selling, or offering for

sale the invention throughout the United States

for the length of the patent term. If the

invention covered by the patent is a method, the

patent law gives the patent owner the right to

exclude others from using the method throughout

the United States or making or selling

throughout the United States any product made by

the patented method anywhere in the world.

A person who without the patent owner's authority makes, uses, sells, or offers to sell a product or employs a method that is covered by one or more claims of a valid patent infringes the patent.

The person can also induce others

to infringe a patent by suggesting to other persons or companies that they undertake acts that constitute infringement. This is called inducing infringement.

I will next briefly describe the parts of a patent and some of the procedures followed by those attempting to obtain patents.

Many of the terms I will use in this description are contained in a glossary of patent terms which I will give to you along with the copy of these preliminary instructions. Feel free to refer to the glossary throughout the trial.

For an invention to be patentable, it must be new, useful and at the time the invention was made must not have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains.

Under the patent laws, the patent office examines patent applications and issues patents. A person applying for a patent must include a number of items in his or her application, including one, a detailed description of the invention in terms sufficiently clear, full, concise and exact to

enable any person skilled in the art to which the invention pertains to make and use the invention.

Two, the disclosure of the best mode of carrying out the invention known to the inventor at the time of filing. And three, one or more claims.

The application includes a written description of the invention called a specification. It may include drawings that illustrate the invention. The specification concludes with one or more claims that particularly and distinctly define the subject matter that the inventor regards as his or her invention.

When a patent application is received at the patent office, it is assigned to an examiner who examines the application, including the claims, to determine whether the application complies with the requirements of the U.S. patent laws.

The examiner reviews the prior work of others in the form of voluminous files of patents and publications. This type of

material is called prior art. Prior art is generally technical information and knowledge that was known to the public either before the invention by the applicant or more than one year before the filing day of the application.

Documents found in the search of prior art are called references. In concluding the search of prior art, the examiner notes in writing on the file the classes or subclasses of art searched.

The compilation of the papers concerning the proceedings before the patent office is called the prosecution history, file wrapper, or file history. The patent office does not have its own laboratories or testing facilities.

The examiner may reject the patent application claims if he or she believes that their applications for inventions that are not patentability in light of the prior art or because the patent specification does not adequately describe the claimed inventions. The applicant may then amend the claims to respond to the examiner's rejections.

maintained at the patent office the examiner concludes that the claims presented by the applicant define the applicant's claimed invention over the most relevant known prior art in a manner that is patentable, and that the patent meets the other requirements for patentability, the application is granted as a U.S. patent.

In this case, you must decide several things according to the instructions that I will give to you at the end of the trial. Those instructions will repeat this summary and will provide more detail.

One thing you will not need to decide is the meaning of the patent claims.

That is one of my jobs, to explain to you what the patent claims mean.

By the way, the word claims is a term of art. And I will instruct you on its meaning at the end of the trial. Meanwhile, you will find a definition in the glossary attached to these preliminary instructions. In essence what you must decide is one, whether Leader has

proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Facebook infringes one or more of the asserted claims of the '761 patent. And two, whether Facebook has proven by clear and convincing evidence that the asserted claims of the '761 patent are invalid.

Now, a few words about your conduct as jurors. First, I instruct you that during the trial you are not to discuss the case with anyone or permit anyone to discuss it with you. Until you have retired to the jury room at the end of the case to deliberate on your verdict, you simply are not to talk about this case. If any lawyer, party or witness does not speak to you when you pass in the hall or ride the elevator or the like, remember, it is because they are not supposed to talk to you, nor you with them.

In this way any unwarranted or unnecessary suspicion about your fairness can be avoided. If anyone should try to talk to you about the case, please bring it to my attention promptly.

Second, do not read or listen to

anything touching on this case in any way.

Third, do not try to do any research or make any investigation about the case on your own, hence, in this case, you are not to use or access

Facebook at any time during this trial.

Finally, do not form any opinion until all the evidence is in. Keep an open mind until you start your deliberations at the end of the case.

2.

During the trial, you may, but are not required to take notes regarding testimony, for example, exhibit numbers, impressions of witnesses or other things related to proceedings, but word of caution, however, is that in order there is generally a tendency to attach undue importance to matters which one has written down. Some testimony which is considered unimportant at the time presented and thus not written down takes greater importance later in the trial in light of all of the evidence presented.

Therefore, you are instructed that your notes are only a tool to aid your own individual memory, and you should not compare your notes with other jurors in determining the

content of any testimony or in evaluating the importance of any evidence. Your notes are not evidence and by no means are a completed outline of the proceedings or a list of the highlights of the trial.

Also, keep in mind that you will not have a transcript of the testimony to review, so above all, your memory will be your greatest asset when it comes time to deliberate and render a decision in this case.

If you do take notes, you must leave them in the jury deliberation room which is secured at the end of the day. And remember, they are for your own personal use. I will give you detailed instructions on the law at the end of the case and those instructions will control your deliberation and decision.

This trial, like most jury trials, comes in seven stages or phases. We have already been through the first phase which is to select you as jurors. The remaining stages are two, read these preliminary instructions to you. Three, opening statements which are intended to explain to you what each side intends to prove

and are offered to help you follow the accident.

The lawyers are not required to make opening statements, but they may do so either at this time or at a later time when it is their turn to present evidence.

2.

Four, the presentation of the evidence, which will include live witnesses and may also include previously recorded testimony as well as documents and things.

Five, my final instructions on the law to you. Six, the closing arguments of the lawyers which will be offered to help you make your determination. And finally, seven, your deliberations, where you will evaluate and discuss the evidence among yourselves and determine the outcome of the case.

Please keep in mind that evidence is often introduced somewhat piecemeal, so as the evidence comes in, you as jurors need to keep an open mind. We will begin shortly, but first I want to outline the anticipated schedule of the trial.

You may have heard me say this earlier today. I want to again outline the

1 schedule that I expect to maintain. I'm not 2 sure that I told you earlier today. But the case is expected to take about six days to try. 3 4 We will normally begin the day at 9:00 a.m. 5 promptly. We will go until around 12:30 p.m. and after a one-hour break for lunch, from 1:30 6 7 to about 4:30. There will be a fifteen-minute break around 11:00 a.m., and another 8 9 fifteen-minute break around 3:00 p.m. 10 The only significant exception to 11 this schedule may occur when the case is 12 submitted to you for deliberations. On that 13 day, the proceedings might last beyond 5:00 p.m. 14 We will post a copy of this schedule for your convenience in the jury 15 16 deliberation room. The final thing for me before we 17 18 ask for opening statements is I want to read to 19 you a glossary of patent terms which again will 20 be provided to you and which you can refer to 21 during the trial. 22 The glossary of patent terms 23 begins with the definition of applicants. 24 named inventors who are applying for the patent. Assignment is defined as transfer of ownership rights in a patent or patent application from one person or company to another.

2.

Claims. Claims are the part of the patent that defines the limits of the invention. These are found at the end of the patent specification in the form of numbered paragraphs.

Disclosure of invention is the part of the patent specification that explains how the invention works and usually includes a drawing.

The file wrapper, also known as the file history, also known as prosecution history, is the written record of proceedings between the applicant and the United States Patent and Trademark Office, also known as the patent office or the PTO, which includes the original patent application and later rejections, responses to the rejections, and other communications between the patent office and the applicant.

The patent application is the

papers filed in the patent office by in order to obtain a patent. These papers typically include a specification, drawings, claims and the oath or declaration of the applicant. This application is also called a nonprovisional patent application.

The patent examiner is personnel employed by the patent office having expertise in various technical areas who review or examine patent applications to determine whether the claims of a patent application are patentable and whether the disclosure adequately describes the invention.

Prior art is any information which is used to describe public technical knowledge prior to the invention by the applicant or more than one year prior to his or her application.

Prior art references are any item of prior art, a publication or patent, used to determine patentability.

A provisional patent application is a document filed with the patent office by an applicant. It is not examined by the patent office and will not lead to the issuance of a

patent. It may be filed up to one year before the filing of a patent application. A patent that issues from a patent application is only entitled to the date of filing of a provisional patent application if every element of the issued claims of a patent is fully disclosed in the provisional patent application as originally submitted.

Finally, the specification is defined as the part of the patent application or patent that describes the invention which includes drawings and concludes with one or more claims. The specification does not define the invention, only the claims do.

And that concludes the preliminary instructions. The Court will now call on Leader. You have an opportunity to make an opening statement if you wish.

MR. ANDRE: Thank you, Your Honor. May it please the Court.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury,
my name is Paul Andre. I met you a little bit
earlier when we were selecting the jury. My
colleagues and I represent Leader technologies.

1 Leader Technologies is a small 2 software company located in Columbus, Ohio. 3 They've been doing business the last 13 years. 4 Our client representatives will be 5 here every day during the trial. Ms. Deb Weckerly. Deb is the financial officer and the 6 7 controller of Leader. I also want to introduce Mr. Mike 8 9 McKibben. Mike is actually the founder and CEO 10 and chairman of Leader technologies. 11 And Mike is going to be a witness 12 a couple times in this case. So he can't sit 13 here during the case, so he's going to have to 14 leave after I do my statement. 15 And finally, Steve Nester is our 16 chief engineer. You are going to see him quite a bit as well. 17 18 I want to start off by saying 19 thank you on behalf of my team and Leader as 20 well for your service here today. The next week 21 is going to be an important week to Leader, and 22 we appreciate your attention and the time you 23 put into it. 24 As the judge has stated, this is a

patent case. And you've seen the video of what a patent is, the parts of the patent. And the judge has also told you, so I'm not going to tell you that again.

But what I do want to talk about is the '761 patent. The '761 patent is a culmination of years and years of hard work by the team at Leader. This patent is about the architecture or the platform that websites use in collaborating and networking.

Now, I'm not going to sugarcoat things here. The technology involved in these type of patents is very complex.

The terminology sometimes sounds like a foreign language. We're going to do our best to try to explain that to you.

We'll have experts on the stand who will also explain that to you as well. But while the technology is complex, the facts of this case are really simple.

And we're going to go through those facts and tell you how this all happened, how it all began. And one thing that we're going to show you about this case is that the

evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of Leader.

Now, I am -- in my opening statement here, I'm going to show you the actual evidence we're going to use. This stack of documents sitting on the table here is just some of the documents we're going to be using throughout the case. And we will be handing

those out to you in jury binders as well.

But before I get into much of the technology, I do want to start with a little bit of a time line to give you some perspective of when things happened. Now, I am also going to put a board up over here as well so you can look at that, if you can't see the screen as well.

So back in the 1994 to 1997 time period, Mike McKibben and his team of people were working with AT&T, and they were putting in the AT&T email systems in their -- one of their first websites ever.

While he was working at AT&T doing that work, that cutting-edge technology back in the mid-'90s, he saw a lot of the common problems that companies were having with networking and collaborating. And the more he

saw of it, the more he started thinking about solutions for it.

2.

So in 1997, he founded Leader to try to address these problems. Now, what was the overriding concern here, what was the overriding issue was the collaborations were done in a very inefficient way. And what Mike saw back in 1997 was that the internet was going to be the answer.

Now, you've got to put things in some time context here. The internet in 1997, we all take it for granted today, but if you look at growth of the internet from 1995 to 1997, 15 years, in 1995 there was approximately nine million users of the internet. Today there's over 1.8 billion. That's over a 20,000 percent increase in 15 years.

In 1997, when Mike founded Leader, email was cutting edge. It was the rage.

In fact, there was a movie that came out in 1998 starring Tom Hanks and Meg Ryan called, You've got mail. And it was all about how people got excited when they get mail.

Now, today when we get mail, it's

too much. We're getting spammed all the time.

It's just the opposite. That's where the

technology was.

In 1997, when Leader was founded, you couldn't Google somebody. Google wasn't found in 1998. The defendant, Facebook, they didn't come around until seven years later in 2004.

So under that backdrop, Mr.

McKibben and his team that he put together

started trying to solve the problems that he saw
in networking and collaboration. And at the

same time he was doing some fundraising like all

start-up companies have to do. You have to get
the money to pay the salaries and do the

research.

After about two years of trying to figure out solutions to the problem, in the summer of 1999, he and another one of his colleagues, Jeff Lamb, came up with the solution. The uh-huh moment occurred when they put all the pieces of the puzzle together and figured out how to build a network, an architecture for a website that would allow

people to network and collaborate with complete efficiency.

2.

They evidenced that conception with Exhibit 768. This is the what's called the Leader Project Functional Specification. You can see on the right-hand side, it's the roughest of drafts. This is a draft of a document where they were coming up with the ideas and this was attached to an email. And this email is dated August 19th, 1999.

So on this time line, we have the invention date listed as 1999. That's when Leader Technologies came up with the invention that resulted in the '761 patent.

So now they have the idea in their mind. They've written it down on a piece of paper. Now, they have to build it.

Well, back in that time period, building something for the internet was not that easy. There was not a lot of internet software. In fact, there was hardly any.

But Leader, nonetheless, started plowing through it. And for the next three years, up through 2002, the team worked on

1 building the product. 2 From 1997, from the founding of 3 the company, to 2002, the people at Leader spent 145,000 man hours, over \$10 million. And it had 4 5 a team of over 20 people working on finding the solution. 6 7 Now, in 2002, they're getting close to getting it done. They got close a 8 9 couple of times in the summer of 2002, then they 10 ran into road blocks. 11 But by the end of 2002, they got it. And late 2002, they had it built and the 12 13 product was working at their facilities. 14 The first thing they did was they 15 knew they had to protect the invention. 16 had to do it as soon as possible. 17 The technology was evolving at 18 lightning speed. So they put together a 19 provisional patent application and you're going to see that as Exhibit 3. 20 21 Now, as Judge Stark said, 22 provisional patent application is a patent

to get that priority date. Now, in this

application you can file with the Patent Office

23

24

application, because they had to do it so quickly, they took about nine or ten pages of writing and text and tried to describe their invention. But they wanted to make sure they actually had the invention covered.

So what they did, they actually took the computer code that they wrote when they built the product and they submitted it along with the provisional application. And you can see the code here.

This was drafted over all those years. And there's several pages of this code.

It's called -- it's a version of pseudo code.

It's written in a way that people can actually understand it.

So they filed this with the patent office to make sure they had their invention protected. And there's about nine or ten pages of this pseudo code that's here. Software engineers can look at it. To me, it looks like Greek. But an engineer can look at it and build something.

Now, evidencing the fact that they actually had built this in 2002, they went out

to the public with their invention. And they published papers on this technology that they were so excited about.

Exhibit 771, was a paper that described the concept that -- what they had done here. And this is kind of a user friendly document, one that you could actually get marketing people to look at. They were very excited about this.

The second paper, they published in 2003 was more of a technical paper. If you look at the figure on the front page of this, you see that's actually a figure from the patent itself.

They actually made it into the final patent application. And then if you look to what -- the back of this paper, they actually put in the platform requirements to build this.

And you look at the platform requirement, you see things like it needs a Linksys. So server a Tomcat web server, the different type of server hardware that is required.

And they also put forward the

platform standards. Platform standards are being JAVA, XML markup language, various SQL data. Because all this type of stuff was put into these papers to evidence the fact that they did, in fact, build the invention.

2.

2.0

Well, after nearly four years of going back and forth with the Patent Office on these patent applications, the Patent Office granted the '761 patent. If you look at the '761 patent, the cover of it, you'll see that Mike McKibben and Jeff Lamb are the two inventors. And the patent is assigned to Leader Technologies.

You will hear from Mike. I don't know if we're going to get to him today, because we're running late but you will hear from him for sure tomorrow.

And Jeff as well. Both of the inventors are going to be here to talk about their invention.

Now, from this patent, we are asserting four independent claims and a few dependent claims from those.

Claim 1 is what we call a system

1	claim. This is on a computer system.
2	The server is sitting and
3	someone's at someone's facilities. And if you
4	look at Claim 1, you'll see that it has two
5	elements. A computer-implemented context
6	component and computer-implemented tracking
7	component. Those are the two components of
8	Claim 1.
9	We're also asserting Claim 9.
LO	Claim 9 is a method claim. And this claim has
L1	four elements, as you can see here.
L2	Creating data, dynamically
L3	associating metadata. They have some tracking
L 4	here and some more updating on the fourth
L5	element.
L6	Claim 21 is the third type of
L7	claim called computer readable media. And
L8	that's just speaking for some type of code that
L9	machines can read.
20	And this element this patent,
21	excuse me. This claim has five elements.
22	You can see here creating the
23	data, the dynamically associating metadata,
24	tracking, dynamically associating the data and

then indexing. Those are the five elements of Claim 21.

2.

And then the last independent claim we're asserting, Claim 23, which is another system claim. And it has two claim elements as well. A context component and tracking component.

And these claims are what brings us here today. We're asserting that Facebook's website infringes these claims along with their dependent claims.

And that they are using this technology without our permission or even asking us for it. So those are the simple facts. The timeline I talked about, the patent issuing and all this.

Now, for the complex technology.

Computer science is very difficult and the terminology that's used especially in the fast evolving world of the internet, computer science, it changes constantly. We're going to do everything we can to explain it and we'll have experts on the stand to walk you through it.

One thing that's going to be very certain is that when we're done next week, you're going to see overwhelming evidence of Facebook's infringement. We're going to go through seven sources of information to prove our infringement cases, seven different sources.

2.

2.0

The first one is going to be their confidential documents. These are documents that are kept confidential within Facebook, most of them what they call their wiki, internal wiki. I didn't know what a wiki was about a year-and-a-half ago. That's an internal space where developers write their notes to.

You're also going to see the public documents, the ones they make available to the public on their website and also what they use for marketing and such.

You're going to see a third type of documents. It's called the developers platform documents. One of the things that Facebook has been very successful in is putting in applications and letting outside developers use their platform to put on things. You may have heard of Farmville or Mafia Wars. If you

ever used Facebook, that's what that is about.

You're going to see those developer platform documents. The fourth source of information is going to be the actual application that our expert developed based on those instructions.

The fifth part or the fifth source of information is going to be a website in action. We're going to show you Facebook's website, but we're going to show you behind the curtain, not what you see on the front. You're going to see how it operates on the back side. You're going to see it in action.

And finally, not finally, one more thing, the sixth source is the testimony.

You're going to hear from four of Facebook's engineers and you're going to hear from the horse's mouth how that website works and you're going to hear it ticks right along the claims.

And finally, you're going to see the source code, this is like the DNA of computer science. You're going to see Facebook source code. We're going to show you it and how it operates and how it includes files and how it

performs the functions that it does.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now, I want to walk through some of this evidence. I want to use Claim 1 as an example. We are going to use a lot of this for a lot of different claims. If you go back up to Claim 1, you'll see the first elements that I talked about, this context component.

If you look at patent claims, you can tell they're written by lawyers who are engineers as well. Both of them write in legales and engineer speak. It's almost hard to read these things. But what this element is talking about is capturing context information about user defined data and storing it in metadata. You capture context information, that's just environmental information. You hear people say it depends on the context, it depends on the environment you're in. You capture the context information about user defined data and then store it in metadata. User defined data can be anything, can be photos, it can be videos, any kind of image files.

In this particular case we're going to focus on photos. Facebook uploads a

lot of photos so they're going to use say the user defined, you can pick what photos you want to upload, that user defined data. The context about those photos are stored in metadata.

What is metadata? Metadata is just data about data. You're going to see how that transpires and why that's important throughout this case. And you're going to here Facebook engineers talk about how they store the user defined data and that the context information about that is stored from metadata.

Now one of the documents you're going to see is Exhibit 208. 208 is a Facebook document in which they talk about photo storage. It talks about each photo uploaded by a user stored on disks as several different files of several different sizes. They talk about storing these photos on a storage component.

If you look at Exhibit 904, this talks about that what you actually do to the photos, it returns metadata about all the photos and is uploaded by the specified user. Once again, metadata specified by the year, that's user defined data, and the metadata is a return

for it.

2.0

Exhibit 907, this is a document that talks about tables of how the metadata is kept about photos. If you look, so if you query this table to return information about a photo, and what type of information can you get, well, you can get the I.D. of the photo being talked about, you can talk about the I.D. of the album containing the photo, the user I.D. of the owner of the photo, the date when the photo was being added, and date when the photo was modified. That's the type of metadata that we're going to show you.

And at the end of the day, the first element concerning context of updating the metadata, there isn't going to be much of a contest there. There isn't much of a dispute between the parties. You won't see much of a dispute.

The second component, the tracking component, this calls for tracking a user's movement from one page to another, and then updating that metadata when a user accesses data

from his previous page.

You're going to see this in PTX

1001 -- Exhibit Number 1001. This is a Facebook privacy policy. And you see when they tell you on the second page, they're pretty upfront about it, we keep track of the actions taken on Facebook such as adding a friend, becoming a fan of a page, joining a page or a group or creating a photo.

Facebook will admit they track their users. That's not going to be a point of issue. You can also see that in Exhibit 300, here they talk about you'll be able to see how many comments fans make on your posts and you'll also be able to track how many Facebook users start and stop viewing your posts in News Feed. Once again, telling the world that they're going to track.

What the issue about the tracking components is going to come up, though, is their experts are going to say that part of the tracking component should not be read, it should be ignored, that's what the evidence that's going to be put forward.

All you have to do is just read the claim. But what happens in this case, what you're going to see in this case is that Facebook experts who are going to testify that they don't infringe, they just don't respond to this part of the claim. The big issue in this case is when does metadata get updated and tracked. That's the old -- that's where the rubber meets the road.

2.

2.0

It's our position you have to read the entire claim. And metadata gets updated when a user accesses information from the second page.

Facebook is going to say that a metadata is automatically updated when a user goes from one page to another page, one context to another context, and that's all.

Well, there are several problems with this position. And probably the clearest problem with the position is what you see in the prosecution history, or the file history, the discussion that went back and forth with the patent office.

Now, with this process you're

going to see this is the kind of communication that goes back and forth between the patent office. And at the end of this document, you'll see a notice of allowance, or notice of allowability, that's where the examiner says okay we're going to allow your patent, you have proven that you have an invention.

2.

2.0

But, the examiner says there has to be an amendment to the claims. It's called an examiner's amendment. The examiner herself went in and amended the claims. And what she did was she put in that tracking a change of the user from the first context or the first website page to a second context of a network based system and dynamically updating the stored metadata based on the change wherein the user accesses the data from the second context.

She added the second part, the dynamic and wherein the user accesses the data from the second context and that was required. How the claim originally looked was tracking a change of the user from the first context to the second context of a network based system and updating the stored metadata based on the

change. The examiner didn't allow that language. But that's exactly the same language that Facebook is trying to say the claim says now. They're saying that this is the language that should be used.

2.0

The fact of the matter is the examiner did make the change. And you cannot ignore what the examiner put in.

Another problem with that type of

-- this position Facebook has if you look at

Claim 9, Claim 9 actually takes the tracking

aspect and breaks into two different elements.

You talk about tracking movement of a user from

the user environment of the web-based system and
then on the second element, you dynamically

update the metadata when you access the files

from the second page. That is the claim

interpretation that is in the actual claim

itself.

Facebook experts will say that dynamically update the stored metadata when you track movement up here. Now, Facebook experts are also going to say that all the independent claims have three elements. Exhibit 1105 is an

example of how they break out the elements.

This is their expert's handwriting, one, two,
three.

As I just showed you, none of the claims have three elements. Claim 1 has two elements. Claim 9 has four. Claim 21 has five. Claim 23 has two. So none of them have three elements. But this is their position, this is how they think the claim should be read.

Because that is the position they have, they're not going to challenge the technology, what the technology does or doesn't do, it's taking the claims and contorting them, the noninfringement case is nonexistent.

So they're going to come after the patent on validity grounds. They're going to say the patent is invalid. The evidence that they're going to put forward, they are going to throw everything but the kitchen sink at us to try to show that the patent is invalid.

If you look at the timing of the patent once again, the invention date, 1999.

Provisional patent was filed in 2002. Most of the references that they're going to cite, I

don't know what references they're going to put forward on the prior art, it's going to be anywhere from two to ten references. Most of them come after the invention date.

2.

A few don't. But of the ten we saw, most of them do, so therefore, they're not really even prior art.

Some of the prior art that they're going to show you have similar words, but the concepts are completely different. In fact, the prior art, the evidence is going to show in this case is that the prior art that they're putting forward were the exact problems that Mike

McKibben and his team solved that they wanted to fix, and that's what they did. I would say it's apples to oranges, it's more like apples to pineapples. There are some similar words, the concepts are completely different.

Now, it may get to the point, I'm not sure once again on the invalidity case, they may try to show that the invention was sold or demonstrated more than one year prior to the patent application.

That would have been a nice trick

because it wasn't done until he filed the patent application here in 2002. As soon as they got it done, they ran to the patent office. But nonetheless, they're going to try to show that the invention was made or sold or demonstrated even prior to that date.

One of the things that you're going to hear from Facebook is that they ignore the provisional application, PTX 3 that I showed you. This Exhibit 3 that has the computer code in it, they're going to claim it doesn't cover the invention.

So in one sense they're saying that we filed our patent application in 2002 with our code in it, that didn't cover our invention today. But they're going to try to say back in 1999 we had the invention and we were demonstrating to other folks, we were trying to sell it before that, there is no logical sense there.

The fact is in this case none of the patent technology were sold or offered for sale until 2003. The evidence is going to show the very first sale of this technology was July

2003 to Boston Scientific so they could do some clinical trials. And even then it was experimental. It was called beta testing.

So in 2003 when they actually sold the second technology that's in the '761 patent it was for beta testing. As I said, they also might try to make claims that the invention or the technology was publicly demonstrated as well.

One thing that I'll say about
Mr. McKibben is that he's paranoid. He wasn't
going to do anything public. He knew what he
had. He signed -- had everyone sign NDAs. If
you had any confidential information about the
company you're going to sign a nondisclosure
agreement. Nothing was going to be publicly
disclosed.

You're going to hear he had over 2,000 NDAs signed. He has his wife, his wife signed an NDA. He had his kids sign NDAs. He didn't want this invention to be going public.

If you look at Exhibit 1051, this is an example of the nondisclosure agreement with Boston Scientific. You see November 2002.

That's when they first started getting their product ready. And they finally got it to sale in July 2003 to that very company.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Facebook is going to try to say that a product or actually it's product suite branded Leader2Leader, was the product that had the technology in it. The fact of the matter is that product suite did not have the technology in it until 2003. They started branding some of their products Leader2Leader back in 1998. Now, it's a great brand name, Leader2Leader. like having a brand Corvette or Ford Mustang. don't think if you said a Corvette infringed my patent you could say that a 1957 Corvette is the same thing as a 2010 Corvette. They're just different. It evolves over time. Leader 2Leader evolves over time as well. The product that was in 1998 and the product that is in 2010 is very, very different.

What you won't hear from any witnesses in this case, not a single witness and you won't see a single shred of evidence is that the claimed technology that's in the '761 patent, you know, the context component, the

1	tracking components, the updating the metadata,
2	that was never disclosed. The technology was
3	never disclosed, demonstrated, sold, offered for
4	sale, nothing, until they got the patent filed
5	in 2002. No one will say otherwise. It's all
6	innuendo and twisting the facts.
7	I want to thank you again for your
8	time. We're going to have a lot of stuff coming
9	at you in the next week. I appreciate your
10	attention, and we'll be talking to you soon.
11	Thank you.
12	MR. ANDRE: Thank you, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: We'll take our
14	15-minute afternoon break at this time and then
15	get back to continue.
16	THE CLERK: All rise.
17	(A brief recess was taken.)
18	THE CLERK: All rise. Court is
19	now in session.
20	THE COURT: Bring the jury in.
21	(Jury entering the courtroom at
22	3:08 p.m.)
23	THE CLERK: You may be seated.
24	THE COURT: Mr. Rhodes, do you

1	wish to make an opening statement?
2	MR. RHODES: With the Court's
3	permission, I do, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: You may.
5	MR. RHOADES: Good afternoon. May
6	I proceed?
7	THE COURT: You may.
8	MR. RHODES: Welcome. I am sure
9	when you woke up this morning, this is not what
10	you thought you'd be spending your afternoon
11	doing. I'm Michael Rhodes. I am a lawyer for
12	Facebook.
13	Let me make a couple of brief
14	introductions and then I'll get to the meat of
15	my remarks. Something we did this morning, but
16	I'd like to refamiliarize yourself.
17	This is my partner, Heidi Keefe.
18	Heidi Keefe is going to be putting on a number
19	of our witnesses during the course of the trial.
20	So at various points in time, I
21	will be getting up and talking to you. At
22	various points in time, Ms. Keefe will talk to
23	you and examine a witness.
24	In the back is my partner, Mark

1	Weinstein. Mr. Weinstein will also be handling
2	some of the witnesses. So we're going to divide
3	the case up among the three of us.
4	This is Ted Ullyot. Ted is a
5	senior executive with Facebook.
6	MR. ULLYOT: Good afternoon.
7	MR. RHODES: Sam O'Rourke. He's
8	also an executive with Facebook.
9	They're going to be with us during
10	the course of the trial, so you may see us
11	talking with each other. I have members of my
12	staff as well in the audience and you may see us
13	commencing with them.
14	This is Steve Caponi, who's a
15	lawyer from Delaware.
16	Now, during Mr. Andre's remarks,
17	you might have been left thinking, Well, why are
18	we here then? To overwhelming evidence is what
19	he said.
20	And we picked you out of all those
21	people that came in this morning. You're going
22	to decide this.
23	Not Mr. Andre and not me. Because
24	you know what, everything I'm about to tell you

1 is not evidence.

Remember the judge said that in the opening remarks that His Honor gave to you. What lawyers say in the courtroom is not evidence.

So as much as I want you to believe what I'm going to say to you now, I want you to know that what I say to you now is really not evidence. Evidence is what you're going to hear from the witness stand in the form of documents that His Honor let in. You're going to be the deciders of this case.

And I'm lucky enough to have kids that are somewhat out of the house and adults. I've spent much of my job as a parent arbitrating disputes between two parties. One kid says one thing, one kid says the other.

There's always two sides of the story. So I have to ask you a favor, because you took an oath this morning, a solemn oath.

You promised both of us. You promised Mr. Andre's client. You promised the Court and you promised me that you would listen to all of the evidence, and you would give us

1	both a fair shake.
2	And I know you can do it. I have
3	every confidence in you.
4	I represent Facebook. I'm
5	assuming that you know what Facebook is.
6	Facebook is a social network. And
7	the evidence is going to show you that
8	Leader-to-Leader is a business and enterprise
9	software company. Social networking, business
10	and enterprise software.
11	During the entirety of the trial,
12	it's going to be one version and another
13	version. I'll give you two simple ideas. You
14	can adopt them if you want, if you don't come up
15	with your own.
16	Generalities, specifics.
17	Confusion, clarity. You choose.
18	As you listen to the arguments of
19	the lawyers and this overwhelming evidence,
20	think for yourself, listen to what I say.
21	Please take it into consideration, but you think
22	for yourself.
23	You make up your own minds about
24	what that patent covers, what Facebook does and

whether that patent is valid. Because we believe and we will attempt to show you that Facebook does not infringe the patent.

Remember the video they showed you where the man expressed the idea of a patent being like a deed. We sometimes use a surveying term, the metes and the bounds of the patent.

Well, if you have a corner lot and kids run over the corner of your lot all the time, you have a right, as the property owner, to control that. But the deed confines your property rights to the deed. That's what a patent is like.

And everything Mr. Andre said could be true about the inventive process on their side of the house. But it could be just as true that we do not trespass on that property.

So the question you're going to have to be grappling with is, not listening to a bunch of snippets of things thrown at you: What does the patent cover? What does Facebook do?

And are you satisfied at the end of the day that they have carried their burden

1 to show that Facebook practices the invention? 2 The power of the patent holder is to exclude 3 anyone from using it. That's a weighty 4 decision. That's a weighty decision. 5 If Facebook infringes the patent, it cannot use that invention. Please give us 6 7 your full, and fair and undivided attention. I think it's going to be an 8 9 interesting week for you. This is the patent. 10 I know you've seen it, but I want to actually 11 take some time to go through it. 12 That's a big number. You know 13 what that number means? Seven million other 14 patents out there. Remember the video where you saw 15 16 the guy run it through the mail room of the 17 patent office, stuff was everywhere. It's a 18 busy office. There's a lot of things that have 19 been invented. 20 This is the title of the patent. 21 And as I was listening to the tape, I wrote this 22 The man on the tape said a title that 23 describes the invention. 24 Look at the title. Nothing about

1 It refers to the Dynamic networking. Association of Electronically Stored Information 2 3 with Iterative Workflow Changes. That describes what this invention 4 is about. It says nothing about social 5 6 networking. 7 There are the two inventors, Mr. McKibben and Mr. Lamb. There are these figures 8 9 in the patent, and they are intended to show you 10 the logic, if you will, of the invention or the 11 way you could put together a system or a method. 12 And as you listen to the evidence 13 come in, think about when you go deliberate 14 looking back at this evidence and looking at 15 these figures for yourself and looking for 16 things. 17 As the Court has instructed you, 18 the next section of the patent is called a 19 specification. Now, this is where they describe 20 what was leading to the invention, what the 21 background is, how they got there, what they

And then as you heard, there are

were trying to accomplish, another good place to

22

23

24

look.

these things called claims. You see the numbers at the top, the 21 and the 22, we call those columns. And sometimes you'll hear witnesses from the box talk about Column 4, Column 5.

That's what they're referring to if you want to follow along, the columns.

And the claims start at the top of -- actually the prior page. They go the entirety of Columns 21 and 22.

But those are the claims that are actually being asserted in this claim. And I put the numbers up for you. You don't have to write it down. We'll give it to you later in the case.

Like Mr. Andre, I want to look for a minute at Claim Number 1. Now, he said to you that there were only two elements. He said everything from there to there was one and everything from there to there was two.

Well, whether it's two or it's 20 when you break it into the pieces, the bottom line is every element, every element of every claim being asserted has to be infringed. Now, I use kind of a silly analogy to explain this.

Think about the bowling pins and I want you to think as you go through the case, if I could get you to take every phrase of those patented claims and affix them in your mind to one of those pins, they have the burden of proof to show that every one of those pins went down.

I'm not a very good bowler. If I bowled and I get eight or nine of them, I'm usually pretty happy. To win a patent infringement case, all ten have to go down.

They've got to roll a strike.

So you're going to see evidence around certain central issues. And the fact that we may not talk about certain elements of the claim themselves doesn't mean that they're irrelevant. You have to find every element of each claim is present. All of the pins have to get knocked down.

And if one pin is standing, even if it's wobbling, I have to have your verdict.

Now, His Honor instructed you a few hours or an hour ago, I suppose, that he tells you what the claim language means.

Remember that? I don't get to do

1 That's a function of the Court. that. And he did that and he issued an 2 3 order in writing. And what he did was he took 4 certain words of the claims and he said, Here's 5 what they mean. I'm going to give you a couple 6 examples of those. 7 Now, what are we talking about? Facebook is a social networking site. 8 9 free. 10 You start at your own computer at 11 Sometimes you have -- you can do it your house. now on your mobile phone, your iPhone, your --12 13 you know, your Smart Phones, I guess they call 14 them. You access the website through the 15 16 internet using something called a web browser 17 and you go to Facebook. And you don't have to 18 join. 19 You can search it. There's some 20 publicly-facing information. 21 You can join as a user. So you 22 typically would give an email, come up with a 23 password and then you're in. 24 Once you're in, you can go

wherever you want. Facebook, the evidence will show doesn't tell you where you have to go, what you have to do, whether you want to put a picture up, whether you want to email somebody overseas, whether you want to send an IM.

2.

You can do what you want. It's up to you at that point. The service is free.

The question in this case will be:
What does that patent claim and does Facebook
practice it? And you're going to hear
generalities.

I want you to be thinking specifics, because we said that that patent is like a deed. You can only infringe it if it and every element in it on every claim asserted is found. It's not just tracking and context and some of these computer terms. It's more specific than that.

So, for example, I think Mr. Andre actually highlighted this word dynamically for you and he highlighted this language. This is what the Court tells us. And you have to follow this, what dynamically means. It means two things. I'm pointing at myself. Automatically

and you see where it says and in response to the preceding events.

Not the subsequent event, the preceding event. Preceding is before, right.

So if we take that claim language just of Claim 1 and we hunt for dynamically, we see it in two places. Do you see that?

That's what it means according to the Judge. The word dynamically means automatically and in response to the prior event, preceding event. So if you take that dynamically word, you could put that in its place.

And as you think about what this patent covers, you're going to have to do that with a number of different concepts here. What do those words mean?

Mr. Andre was very general, ran through a bunch of exhibits. This is specific stuff. This is not web browsing and tracking. The evidence is going to show you that Mr. McKibben, he didn't invent the internet. He didn't invent web browsers. He didn't invent tracking. The evidence is going to show you

that he didn't invent a lot of things. There were companies like eBay, Yahoo out there way before, and the question then becomes what does this language mean.

His Honor will tell you the claim language, what it means, and then you have to apply that to the Facebook system. And I know this is not the easiest stuff, but we're going to try to explain to you why when you look for each and every bowling pin in that language there are things missing.

Let me show you another piece of language. Remember Mr. Andre just got up and told you that we were going to try to pull the wool over your eyes with this language because this is was something to do with how the Patent and Trademark Office ended up with the language.

Tracking a change of the user from the first context to a second context. The evidence will show you that change is modifying a context to context movement of something called a user.

The second context of the network-based system. And then what happens,

dynamically, automatically, remember that, and in response to the preceding event, what happens? Updating occurs to what? The stored metadata. The stored metadata. Keep your eye on that bowling pin. The stored metadata.

There will be lots of evidence about lots of metadata, but what's in stored metadata?

The stored metadata is the metadata that was created by virtue, user-defined data, that's like content, created by the user interaction of a user in a first context. This context component dynamically, automatically, and in response to the prior event, the interaction of the user created content stores that information, stores that information. Not any information.

The stored metadata. What Leader will argue to you is when the word dynamically appears, which means automatically and in response to the last event, a change of the user from context to context, the automatically updating occurs based on the change, the change in context to context, wherein, so that, the

user can access the data. They will argue up and down that the word "wherein" means when and "dynamically" means subsequently, not preceding.

And that in a nutshell is one of the hearts of the disagreement. Don't rely on me, you're smart enough, you're capable enough, you figure it out for us. There is the language. A change of the user based on the change.

Component. There is another word that was asked by the parties to be construed by His Honor, and he did. This is what the Court will instruct you that word means. A computer-related entity, hardware, software, software in execution, that means it's running.

Where do we see that language?

Here is the storage component, the word

component was the one I just showed you that the

Judge interpreted for us. Okay. What goes on

the storage component? User-defined data and

metadata. User-defined data and, not or, and

metadata is stored on a storage component.

The evidence will show you that Facebook stores the content, the metadata, the

logs, throughout a disparate system, and I'm going to illustrate that for you in a second.

I emphasized this point before, the stored metadata. What metadata? Any metadata, or a particular metadata that in the terms of the patent we call the stored metadata? What is it? Well, you have to decide. I want you to hunt for it.

There is the patent again. There is a section of the invention called the background of the invention. We will show you testimony from Mr. McKibben where he says that's a pretty good summary. A summary of what? Read that first sentence. Digital communications presently supply solutions to users in ways that are completely divorced from their business context. Leader2Leader is a business and enterprise software company. Facebook is a social utility, social networking. The words of the patent do not include social networking.

I showed you these figures. Now, let me tell you what we think the evidence will show through our experts. We're going to start

with Dr. Kearns who is a professor at Penn, computer science professor. We believe the evidence will show you that the invention of the patent works like this. And this is my crude way to draw an illustration to demonstrate it.

We start in the first context, we have a person up there, we'll call that person the user.

That user creates data in context.

I know it's silly, but there is the happy face.

That happy face is content, and the language of the patent, that's the user created data. Where does it go? It gets stored on a server. Well, what's a server? A fancy word for a computer, just a big one. We represent these in these drawings, they look like drums. And whenever you see server, think big computer, business computer.

It gets stored there, and remember the dynamically updating the metadata about the user defined data. What does the computer do? It creates metadata and associates it with the context.

What's metadata? Mr. Rhodes

updated a piece of text, he created a word document, he created a word document at home on his PC on such and such a date with such and such a title. Information about the word document, about my text, that cataloging information is metadata, the content is what it's describing.

The invention of the '761 wraps the content with the metadata. They stay together. Now, I go to a different context.

Now, I did that at home, I'm at my work office and I'm now doing work on a different computer that I pull up my old document. I'm at a second context. The computer system tracks that I moved from context A to context B. That's the tracking component that we're talking about.

And the system knows I'm in a different context and says it would be useful for Mr. Rhodes to know that his green created content is now associated with the second context. And that's the heart of what the '761 invents.

It didn't invent tracking. It didn't invent metadata. You'll hear testimony

from that. The very first expert you'll hear on cross-examination, I think that he will admit that none of these things were invented in this patent. The patent is a very specific way of handling metadata.

I'm talking about. What I just showed you is what the invention of the patent is. This is how Facebook works. You're going to have to find whether there are these multiple context of Facebook. You'll get instruction on that.

They're going to tell you what it is. I'm going to let you find it for yourself. They're going to argue that looking at pages is a different context.

Do you know how many pages of
Facebook get viewed every day, all around the
world? Twenty billion, every single day. And I
want you to be thinking as you listen to the
evidence, if Facebook implements this invention
of the patent, are they really creating all of
this metadata every time somebody moves from one
context to another within Facebook? Do they
really do that?

Chris Cox who actually is one of the senior engineers who wrote the code is going to get up on the stand in the next day or two and is going to tell you no, and he's going to explain why we would never do that. Twenty billion individual page views per day. Two billion photographs are uploaded a month.

The first context of Facebook. I create a photograph of this handsome lad.

You'll notice that this is the picture of me when I'm much younger. What happens when I upload that photograph on Facebook. It gets stuck in one of these big computers we call a server. Does metadata get created about the photograph? Sure.

We have one, a separate computer, creates what's called a recent activity log.

You'll notice that it's not unique to me. I'm not that important where I get my own computer.

No offense, neither are you. We all go into a big computer. And you'll see different users have different entries. This is mine.

I uploaded a profile photo. In yet another computer system there is a photos

table. They log how big the photo is, who the user was. There is me. And then they give it a number. 537 is the number we're going to use for this example.

But again, that table is not unique to me, those are just photos that get updated all the time, billions during the year.

I go to a different context within Facebook. Remember they have to explain to you what that means. Assume for sake of argument that I go to a different context in Facebook. I started in one context, went to another one.

Remember the language of the claim? I moved from context one to context two, and the metadata was automatically updated based on the change, the change in context movement.

In the Facebook system, the stored metadata, the stored metadata doesn't change. I go over there, nothing happens to it. What they're going to do is they're going to say oh well, it's something else.

A bunch of metadata and something changes and something gets written, they're going to lump it altogether. Generalities,

1 specifics, confusion and clarity. So let's look at Facebook. 2 3 is what it looks like when you create -- you 4 join, this is your profile page, and you'll see 5 that there is this here. You'll see down here, I'm listed as having only one friend. I have 6 7 more than that, but for purposes of this illustration, we're going to have only one. 8 9 see who it is. I picked somebody that you might 10 know. 11 So let's say I want to upload a photograph for my profile. What would I do? 12 13 There's -- you move your mouse 14 over to that shaded area where the photograph 15 would go. And then it asks you: Do you want to 16 upload a photograph? You get this box. 17 It says you choose a file. That 18 means: Now, where are you going to get the 19 photograph? 20 I choose a file, and then stuff 21 that's in my hard drive on my personal computer 22 comes up. There's a photograph. 23 Now, I'm going to pick this one 24 here because as a die-hard Chargers fan, that

1	one gives me bad memories. We're going to go
2	over this one and pick this one.
3	And there it is. It's uploaded.
4	User defined data. Get a first
5	context.
6	Where does that photograph go? It
7	goes on the server as I showed you.
8	Photo table is another log in a
9	different computer. It writes that information
10	down. Now, my I.D. profile dimension is 537.
11	Now, I go to my friend's profile
12	page. Remember I said I had one friend.
13	So now I go over there. Second
14	context, second context.
15	The user moved from the first
16	context to the second context. A change of
17	context to context, remember that language based
18	on the change, the metadata about the user
19	defined content did what? Absolutely nothing.
20	There was no automatically and in
21	response to the prior event, me going there,
22	change in that stored metadata.
23	20 billion page views a day.
24	Imagine having tables that are constantly

1 saying, Now, he's over here. Now, he's over 2. there. Now, he's over there. 3 These stored metadata stay 4 constant. That's why it's important to know 5 what the stored metadata in the patent is. 6 Now, you'll see in this area up 7 here, we see this box right here. This is called the wall. And it's just sort of like 8 9 where you can put content for the people. 10 And you see how there's this open 11 area here, this dialogue box. I can write comments on Heidi's wall. And if I type 12 13 something, it will go there. 14 So you can see I started typing 15 in, Can't wait till Friday. In this case, I 16 mean it literally. 17 I push share and now you see that 18 that comment there, I uploaded my uploaded 19 photograph, Can't wait till Friday. I'm a user. 20 I'm in a second context. I'm interacting with 21 the website. 22 I created content. See that text. 23 And what happened to metadata that was created 24 from the first context? The stored metadata

1 about the content created in the first context, 2 nothing changed. Even though my photograph is 3 there now, nothing changed. 4 Now, I go back to my profile, 5 complete the loop. You with me? Started with 6 mine, went to Heidi's. Now I'm back to my site. 7 Does the stored metadata about my 8 photograph change because I've gone back to 9 mine? No. 10 Stays the same. Data is stored 11 separately from metadata in the Facebook system. 12 They're not in the same place. They're not in 13 the same place. 14 Easier, this is called co-location architecture. It's a fancy way of saying put 15 16 all the pictures in one place. Put the logs 17 about the pictures in a different place. Put 18 the activity about the users in yet a different 19 place. 20 Server one is called a filer. 21 You'll hear some of the engineers talk about 22 filers. It's a computer where they stick the 23 photographs. 24 Logs user activity logs. It goes

in a different computer. And then these tables, photo tables, a different computer.

And you can see here that this represents other people are uploading photographs. And this table is not unique to me.

So what the evidence is going to show you is that Facebook never automatically updates the stored metadata. You, the user, have to do something.

Automatically means the system is doing it without more. You have to do something to that content to create additional data.

And secondly, Facebook never automatically updates the stored metadata based on user movement between first and second context, based on the change of the user from one context to another in the language of the patent.

Now, that's the case, from our perspective, on infringement. Up to now, everything I've been talking about, the burden rests over here. They have the burden on all this.

1 I don't have any burden to show 2. that we do not infringe. I'm going to try to 3 convince you through our evidence that we don't. But they have the burden on that. We don't. 4 5 Now, I'm going to talk about validity. On validity, I have a burden. And 6 7 guess what, it's higher than theirs. My burden is tougher than theirs. 8 9 So I want you to be clear that 10 when we talk about validity, you've got to put 11 the burden on my back over here. And it's more of a burden than what's on their back. 12 13 The patent can be invalidated by a 14 jury. Remember that from the tape? Somewhat 15 counterintuitive, goes through the whole Patent and Trademark Office. 16 And as counsel in this case, 17 18 they'll show you the red ribbon on it. The patent bears a presumption of validity. 19 20 So I have to convince you to a 21 slightly higher standard that it should be 22 invalidated. 23 There are three ways we say the 24 patent is invalid. Number one, we're going to

try to prove that Leader was offering to sell a product covered by the invention more than one year before the patent application was filed.

Two separate and independent grounds. We're going to try to show you that they publicly demonstrated the product covered by the patent without confidentiality.

You remember when Mr. Andre showed you the Boston Scientific non-disclosure agreement, and it was dated, I believe, November 26th of a given year? It turns out that the facts are going to show you that they actually demonstrated the product the day before. There was no confidentiality agreement in place then.

And the same thing happened with regard to the Wright Patterson Air Force Base.

They went up there and demonstrated there and got a confidentiality agreement after the fact.

The evidence will show you that when they made the demonstrations, there was no confidentiality agreement in writing in place.

The last basis is that the invention is described in what was explained to you as called prior art. Prior art consists of

1	earlier patents and earlier publications.
2	Earlier patents, earlier publications.
3	Now, you remember the time line
4	that they showed you? Remember that time line
5	they showed you during the opening?
6	I don't know if you noticed this,
7	that time line never stated when the patent
8	application was filed. They showed you
9	something called a provisional patent
LO	application. The provisional was filed on
L1	December 11, 2002.
L2	They never showed you when the
L3	final patent application was filed. It's not on
L4	his chart. I can turn around. They won't
L5	disagree with me. It's not on there. The
L6	actual application was filed December 10, 2003.
L7	The reason we're talking about the
L8	provisional is the rules all key off of a date
L9	that is one year before the patent application.
20	You with me?
21	You file a patent application and
22	then there's this one-year grace period. I've
23	got to get behind the one year on my invalidity
24	case in terms of offers to sell, public

1 demonstrations and prior art. So they will want to try to 2 3 convince you that the date that starts the 4 one-year clock is the provisional application, 5 not the final. 6 Can they do it? Here's what the 7 judge read to you a little while ago about a 8 provisional. There's the language. Look at 9 this. 10 If the patent tries to claim 11 priority back to that provisional, it can only 12 do it -- see that word only if every element, 13 not some, not most, every element of the issued 14 claims of the patent, what ultimately came out of the Patent Office, is fully disclosed. 15 16 partially disclosed, not mostly disclosed, but 17 fully disclosed. 18 We're going to put an expert up to 19 walk you through this, but let me give you a 20 preview. Let's just put them side by side. 21 Mr. Andre was talking about 22 something called pseudo code and all. We had

This is what he didn't tell you.

23

24

the pseudo code.

1	How long is the provisional versus the final?
2	There are 22 figures in the final.
3	Zip in the provisional.
4	The provisional has no mention of
5	storing context data or metadata. Those two
6	terms are in every single claim of the final.
7	There's no mention of updating
8	metadata in response to tracking user movement.
9	That's in every single claim of
10	the final patent. That provisional is only
11	operative if every element of the issued claims
12	of a patent is fully disclosed.
13	Every element fully disclosed.
14	You will have to decide whether
15	every element is fully disclosed. Here's a time
16	line.
17	If you took the final actual
18	operative patent application December 10, 2003,
19	go back one year, you get to December 11th,
20	2002. That's what that red line, that big red
21	line is.
22	So for my invalidity case, I have
23	to talk to you about stuff that's older than
24	that. You follow?

1 One year before the patent 2 application is that red line. These are 3 examples of offers to sell the product. 4 And I'm going to ask Mr. McKibben 5 up here to explain what he said in writing to 6 the Air Force and have him explain to you 7 whether or not he made an offer to sell. And I want you to listen to that testimony very 8 9 carefully when you consider his credibility in 10 this case, what he said then and what he says 11 now. 12 These are examples. We're going 13 to go through them. 14 I'll give you a few right now. 15 This is a sales document that they prepare and 16 they submitted to the government, Wright 17 Patterson Air Force Base almost two years before 18 the date of the patent application. 19 What was the objective? То 2.0 implement a new Leader2Leader enterprise-wide 21 collaboration environment at the Air Force Base. 22 And I will present evidence to you 23 where they state under oath that Leader2Leader 24 practices the invention of the patent. And this

1	is what they're proposing to sell to the air
2	force base January 2002.
3	You know what they're going to
4	say? Not an offer to sell. Just talk. Just
5	talking.
6	Sales is a spectrum. It's a
7	spectrum.
8	He offered a particular price,
9	\$8.4 million. The product is licenses to the
10	product. That's how you sell software.
11	Another company called The
12	Limited, retail outfit, more than one year
13	before the date of the final patent application.
14	Did Leader2Leader make an offer to
15	sell? "I'd like to offer the following
16	sweetheart deal:"
17	These are rhetorical questions.
18	Do not answer them.
19	Do you see the word offer? Do you
20	see the word deal? And what does a sweetheart
21	deal mean? Is that an offer to sell? You'll
22	have to decide.
23	A price was provided. A product
24	was provided. Number of units. Period of time.

The evidence will show you that these are offers to sell and you will be instructed that if the owner of the patent tries to sell it more than one year before the patent application, the patent is invalid.

2.

Work it down to \$20.83 a month.

Mr. McKibben will testify that this is a spectrum, we're just not at the end of the spectrum yet. You will decide whether that's credible.

Public demonstrations are another way you can invalidate your patent. The red line is one year before the date of the final patent application. These are examples of demonstrations of the product and we will try to prove, we will try to prove that there was a public demonstration of the product in this time period and that renders the patent invalid.

Last, let's talk about prior art.

The red line represents one year before the patent application was filed more than one year are a variety of prior art references. If you look at the face of the patent, remember when the guy in the video was showing you where you

could look to see what the examiner considered, the list of prior art references on the face of the patent, you won't see these there. He didn't consider these.

The first one is iManage. iManage was a business that was involved with information management. They were a product, they were a system, they were a business.

They date from a period more than one year before the patent application. And this is from their product materials that we'll show you. And we'll show you that when you talk about users, using applications with metadata in a context that iManage had a system in the market before they ever filed for a patent application trying to do the same thing, trying to solve the same problem. Our expert will testify to that.

Swartz is a -- remember the guy in the video said you can actually use prior patents to invalidate a patent. He filed this in June 29th, 1998. He filed the patent before they claimed to have ever invented. Remember he said '99 was the aha moment. Swartz is behind

1 that. His patent issued before they filed 2 anything in 2001. 3 How similar is what Swartz 4 invented to how similar it is to what McKibben 5 invented? 6 I just, I'm not going to give you 7 everything, but here is an example. Side-by-side. Look at the language. 8 9 Dynamically storing context, metadata, metadata 10 stored, data, context, tracking, tracking, 11 context, context. Just putting the documents 12 side-by-side. 13 Here is more. Dynamically, 14 dynamic, same word, different conjugations. 15 User accesses data context. Access user data 16 context. Our expert will tell you that this is 17 spot on, same thing that McKibben was trying to invent. It was not cited in the references on 18 19 the face of the patent, not considered, and it 20 predates it. This is invalidating prior art, 21 ladies and gentlemen. 22 Another patent, Hubert, this one 23 published overseas but publicly. There is the 24 date from 2001. Here is a diagram, and what you

1 have is in the same storage component, you got 2. the data information, processing, the metadata, 3 the tool or the application that created it all within the same field. 4 5 And our expert will explain to you 6 why that is also a separate and distinct piece 7 of prior art that invalidates. Remember, it's not all these 8 9 pieces together, it's any one of them is enough. 10 Anyone offering to sell, anyone offering to 11 sell, any public demonstration and any piece of prior art. They don't have to be combined, it's 12 13 any single instance. 14 I guess you're glad to see that. 15 I have concluded my remarks. 16 know I have worn you out. I appreciate your 17 attention. I look forward to your decision in 18 this case. As I said at the outset, we believe 19 in you. I'm not going to tell you what to do or 20 what to decide. My faith is in you, but listen carefully. Confusion, clarity. Generality, 21 22 specificity. 23 Thank you. 24 Thank you, Your Honor.

276

1 THE COURT: Thank you. 2 Mr. Andre, you can call your first 3 witness. 4 MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, Leader 5 Technology calls as its first witness Dr. James 6 Herbsleb. 7 JAMES HERBSLEB, Ph.D., 8 9 the deponent herein, having first 10 been duly sworn on oath, was 11 examined and testified as follows: 12 THE COURT: Good afternoon, 13 Dr. Herbsleb. 14 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. 15 THE COURT: You may proceed, 16 Mr. Andre. 17 MR. ANDRE: Thank you, Your Honor DIRECT EXAMINATION. 18 19 BY MR. ANDRE: 20 0. Dr. Herbsleb, would you please 21 tell us about your educational background? 22 Yes. I have a bachelors degree in Α. 23 psychology and economic application from Monmouth College, about 1976. I have a JD 24

1	degree, University of Nebraska about 1980. I
2	have a Ph.D. in cognitive social psychology,
3	University of Nebraska 1984. And I have a
4	masters degree in computer science from the
5	University of Michigan which I got in 1991.
6	Q. What exactly is a lot of
7	equipment here, Your Honor.
8	What exactly is cognitive social
9	psychology?
10	A. Well, cognitive social psychology
11	is basically understanding how people think
12	about, you know, social things, relationships,
13	social situations and so on.
14	Q. And what did you do immediately
15	after you received your degree in computer
16	science?
17	A. After I received my degree in
18	computer science, I took a position as a post
19	doctoral research fellow at the University of
20	Michigan. That was about two-and-a-half years.
21	Q. And what kind of research were you
22	doing at the University of Michigan at that
23	time?
24	A. Well, I was doing research on

collaborative software engineering. We were trying to understand what kind of collaboration technologies software engineering teams needed and observed them using technologies, that sort of thing.

2.0

- Q. What did you do after that?
- A. So after University of Michigan, I took a position at the Software Engineering
 Institute at Carnegie Mellon University, where I did research. The Software Engineering
 Institute has developed a model for software which describes how software companies should organize their processes and develop software.

 I was doing research on that model.
- Q. And after you finished your stint at Carnegie Mellon, what did you do next?
- A. After Software Engineering

 Institute I joined Bell Labs which is a part of

 Lucent Technologies. I led what we call the

 Bell Labs collaborative research program. We

 were trying to address the problems of

 geographically distributed software development

 teams. Lucent had teams that were spread all

 over the world. We were developing, designing,

1 deploying technologies to sort of help these teams communicate, coordinate more effectively. 2. 3 And after that what did you do? O. 4 Α. So after Bell Labs, I took my 5 current position as a professor in the School of Computer Science at the Carnegie Mellon 6 7 University. How long have you been there? 8 Ο. 9 Α. I have been there since 2002, so 10 about eight years. 11 And did you say what position you Ο. hold at this time? 12 13 Α. Professor. 14 And what does that involve being professor at Carnegie Mellon? 15 16 Well, my main responsibilities are 17 teaching. I teach courses in computer science, 18 mainly software engineering, computer sorted 19 cooperative work. I perform research in those 20 areas. Software engineering and collaboration, 21 collaboration technologies. I supervise and 22 direct the research of my Ph.D. students and

Those are the main responsibilities.

postdoctoral research fellows who work with me.

23

1	Q. And how is Carnegie Mellon rated
2	for its program?
3	A. Well, I'm very happy to say that
4	U.S. News & World Report recently rated us as
5	having the number one graduate program in
6	computer science in the country. Although I
7	have to admit we tied with MIT and Berkley and
8	Stanford.
9	Q. None the less nice to be number
10	one?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. What are your areas of
13	specialization?
14	A. I specialize in the collaboration
15	technology in how it's used, in sort of new
16	directions, trying to devise new kinds of
17	technology to solve new problems and support
18	interaction on larger scales with more facility
19	and so on.
20	Q. We're talking about collaboration.
21	Is that another word for networking and
22	communicating with each other?
23	A. Yeah, more or less, except that it
24	often provides specific support for things that

people want to do, so it connects them together, allows them to communicate, share things, work together more effectively, share documents and so on.

2.

- Q. And have you authored any publications regarding that type of collaborative technology?
- A. Yes, depending on how you want to count, it's about sixty or seventy peer reviewed publications in this area.
- Q. Can you give us an example of one such publication?
- A. Yeah, just this last year with a postdoctoral research fellow and a graduate student we published a paper at the International Conference of Software Engineering describing a tool that we called Tesseract, which provides a view of the coordination and collaboration on a research project to sort of facilitate people working together more effectively.
- Q. Have you received any awards for your work?
 - A. I would say I have received about

1	a half a dozen or so.
2	Q. And anything recently?
3	A. Well, the most recent one was in
4	May of this year, my coauthors and I received
5	what's called The Most Influential Paper Award.
6	That's awarded at the International Conference
7	on Software Engineering. They look back to ten
8	years before and pick the paper that was the
9	most influential over the last decade and they
10	awarded that to me and my coauthors.
11	MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, at this
12	time I would like to proffer Dr. Herbsleb as an
13	expert in computer science.
14	THE COURT: Any objection?
15	MR. RHODES: No, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Okay. You may
17	continue.
18	MR. ANDRE: Thank you.
19	BY MR. ANDRE:
20	Q. Dr. Herbsleb, would you tell us
21	why you're here today?
22	A. Well, I was asked to describe the
23	technology in the '761 patent and to provide any
24	background that would be sort of necessary for

1	understanding what that technology is.
2	Q. I'm going to show you what is
3	marked as the Exhibit 1 in this case, the '761
4	patent. It will show up on the screen in front
5	of you there. Is this the Leader patent you
6	were referring to?
7	A. Yes, it is. Uh-huh.
8	MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, at this
9	point I would like to move Exhibit 1 into
10	evidence.
11	THE COURT: Any objection?
12	MR. RHODES: No objection.
13	THE COURT: It's admitted.
14	MR. ANDRE: Thank you.
15	BY MR. ANDRE:
16	Q. Dr. Herbsleb, are you familiar
17	with the collaboration and networking technology
18	that's taught in the '761 patent?
19	A. Yes, I am. I have been
20	encountering these kind of technologies in my
21	own research as well as teaching courses,
22	graduate and undergraduate courses that involve
23	technology such as this.
24	Q. Generally speaking, not getting

1	too far in the weeds here, but generally
2	speaking what is the technology of the '761
3	patent?
4	A. Well, the technology is designed
5	to sort of help people share things, share
6	electronic documents, pictures, all sorts of
7	electronic things. To communicate, coordinate
8	and do the work in a very sort of simple natural
9	way. That's kind of the goal of the technology.
10	Q. And is all that done on the
11	internet?
12	A. Yes. That all is done on the
13	internet.
14	Q. And before we get in too deep into
15	the specifics of the '761 patent, let's discuss
16	some of the general background of the
17	technology. And I believe we have some slides
18	you've prepared?
19	A. Yes. Yes.
20	Yeah. This first slide is just
21	showing, you know, just I assume everyone has
22	seen a computer like this.
23	And in the days when this was at
24	the forefront of technology, sharing was, you

1 know, a little bit painful. If you were 2. familiar with floppy disks, you had to take a 3 floppy disk and put it into the CPU and save 4 your work to the floppy disk. And then take 5 that floppy disk and walk down the hall and hand 6 it to someone. 7 We used to call that sneaker net. Sneaker net like shoes? 8 Ο. 9 Like shoes. Put on shoes and walk Α.

- A. Like shoes. Put on shoes and walk down the hallway.
- Q. And back in the early days, PC life, how was data organized on the computer?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A. Well, I think if you go to the next slide, we have a picture of that. So as you can see over here in the top left-hand side, these are just old-fashioned manilla file folders.

Those are the sort of folders that people have used for a long time to organize paper documents. Right.

So to organize your paper documents into folders, you have to pick, you know, what do we want to name these folders?

You have to pick some name that makes sense to

you.

Then after you pick the names for the folders, when you have various items that you want to file away, you have to decide, you know, which folder each item goes into.

Well, the organization in most computer systems of data, as you can see on the right-hand side, is, you know, very much based on that analogy. It works in a very similar way.

Number 3121 and that has been placed into a folder called Item Number 3120. I usually find better names than this for my folders, but that's included in folder Item Number 3100 and so on.

So you can have a hierarchy of folders. The point is much like the old manilla folders, I, as the user, have to figure out what I want to call my folders. I have to have some, you know, set of folders that I name.

And then I have to decide, you know, which folder each item goes into. And so the organization is sort of similar to the old

1	paper-based item.
2	Q. Now as computers evolved, did the
3	collaboration of computers get better?
4	A. Yeah. I think we can go to the
5	next slide here.
6	As network technology improved,
7	you know, as it became easier to set up
8	networks, which allowed you to move data from
9	one computer to another, we can see that a lot
LO	of offices and universities and other
L1	organizations began to adopt computer networks.
L2	As you can see around the outside here, if I can
L3	find the right button, there you go, these are,
L4	you know, different users computers that are all
L5	now linked up to a network.
L6	On the network, as showing here in
L7	the middle by this cube, you can have special
L8	computers. They're just computers, but they're
L9	set up with special software to kind of provide
20	services to the other computers on the network.
21	One common example would be something that we
22	might call a file server.

is I can take -- if I'm on one of these

And the point of the file server

23

individual computers in my office, I could
either save a file on my own computer there or I
could use the network and save that file on file
server.

Okay. Now, if I put it on the

Okay. Now, if I put it on the file server, then other people on other computers can come over the network and get that file and perhaps use it. We can share it that way.

So that makes it a little bit easier, more convenient than, you know, just having to run floppy disks all around the office. So this is a big improvement in sharing.

- Q. And how is data organized on these types of local networks?
- A. If we can go to the next slide.

 You can see here, this looks familiar over here because data is typically organized in the same kind of way by these file servers in a hierarchial structure of folders.

And as you can imagine, now as you start to get a lot of users, creating a lot of folders and a lot of files, different users have

different ways that they think about, you know, their categories of things that they want to file away. So if I'm filing my correspondence, for example, letters I get in, I might want to file them, you know, month by month. So I have a folder for January, folder for February and so on.

And I put the letters that I get each of those months into that folder. But maybe you find it more useful to file things by the sender. Right.

So you have folders this person A sent me, this person B sent me, this business Z sent me that, and you put your correspondence into those folders. And someone else might organize them around projects or something else. Different people have different ways they think about their documents and their other electronic materials.

So what you find is that with a whole bunch of people putting things on a file server, typically what you get is a confusing variety of folders all organized in different kinds of ways. And so it becomes kind of

difficult if you want to share a document or put a document out there that might be useful to someone else. They have to kind of figure out. Well, how does this set of, you know, folders work? Where is it going to be? How do I find something?

It can all be rather confusing. So it does run into those kinds of problems.

- Q. Now, earlier you mentioned that the '761 patent was an on-line collaboration or internet collaboration tool. What did you mean by that?
- A. So it's a collaboration tool that; lives on the internet. The internet, as I think we can see on the next slide.

So you can think of the internet as just a collection of all those networks we saw earlier. The earlier network was just in one office.

The internet is basically a collection of a whole bunch of different networks sort of combined together into one network that spans the whole world basically. There are hundreds of millions or possibly

billions of computers connected to the internet.

So what we're seeing here, this is a very, very simplified diagram, obviously. But what we're trying to illustrate here is that you cannot only get to some kind of local server via the internet, but because all these things are hooked together from any of these computers, you can get to any of these servers. So that creates the capability of making something that you put on a server much more widely available. Basically any place in the world, it's on line or hooked up to the internet.

- Q. And we will go to the next slide.

 If you could just show what you're seeing when
 you're actually on your computer looking at the
 internet?
- A. Sure. So what I'm going to show here now, this is just illustrating a static website. This is kind of the simplest case.

 Right.

You think of it as a little bit like watching TV. You know, on TV you select a channel and then you get a particular channel or some information that comes into your TV. Your

1 TV displays it and you can look at it. 2 You can't really do anything with 3 it, interact with it. You can just watch it. 4 A static web page, you can think of as a little bit like that. I picked the web 5 page that I want to look at. All right. 6 7 I request that page from the server. The server provides it to my computer, 8 9 which they display the information on the page. 10 And that's all I can do. I just 11 sort of look at that page and see what's there. Now, are all websites static? 12 13 Α. No. On the next slide, we're 14 showing a more interactive website, as 15 technology is improved, to allow some kinds of 16 interactivity. 17 The notion here -- we're trying to 18 illustrate here is imagine that this is a person who wants to conduct some business with the Bank 19 of America website. So the person then goes to 20 21 the website and the website probably asks the 22 person to log in. Provide your user name and a 23 password.

24

And that kind of assures the

1	server that, Gee, this really is this person.
2	Okay.
3	So it then gives you access to
4	your web page, your information. And that
5	starts what we call a session.
6	All right. You have now started a
7	session with this interactive website. You've
8	been authenticated.
9	In other words, it believes you
10	are who you say you are because you had the
11	password. And now that you started a session,
12	you can interact with this website.
13	You can, if you want, transfer
14	money between accounts, for example. You can
15	pay your bills. You can do a number of things.
16	And then when you're done,
17	typically you would log out and that would end
18	the session. And you're no longer kind of
19	interacting.
20	Q. Let's talk a little bit about the
21	technology of the '761 patent.
22	A. Sure.
23	Q. You stated earlier that the '761
24	patent utilizes the internet to permit the user

1 to organize data and collaborate network content 2. that they want to share. How does it do that? 3 Well, this slide is an Α. 4 illustration of that. So we can see here that we 5 have several work spaces, as we're calling them. Now, think of a workspace, imagine your desk at 6 7 work or at home. Okay. Okay. On your desk, you have 8 9 probably a bunch of different things that you 10 need to get something done. 11 You might have some, you know, 12 pencil, paper, some books, some notebooks. You 13 know, a calender, a telephone, a variety of 14 things that you need right there. And that's 15 kind of your workspace. 16 Well, what we're -- think of one 17 of these workspaces as sort of like that, except 18 on-line on your computer. So on your computer, 19 on your computer screen it will show you an 20 example of how this looks in a moment. 21 You have a whole set of things 22 that you need, you know, to get something done. 23 A set of different tools all there together. 24 It's your workspace.

1 So what we're seeing here is five 2 workspaces like that and a couple things to 3 notice. One is that all these work spaces 4 5 are stored on a web server. So they're stored 6 on a server on the internet. 7 Okay. That's important, because they can be accessed then over the internet. 8 9 And we're showing also that these 10 workspaces can be linked together. So if I am 11 in Jim's work space, I might want to have Alice 12 as one of my contacts. 13 So I might create a link to 14 Alice's workspace in my workspace, sort of 15 joining them together. So that's what these 16 lines are attempting to show. 17 Ο. Now, these workspaces reside on these web servers are on the left; correct? 18 19 Α. That is correct. They all reside 2.0 on a web server over there. 21 Ο. And the '761 patent, does it 22 permit those workspaces to be distributed to 23 several of the servers? 24 Yes. Of course, it does.

1	Say that storage the storage
2	component can consist of one or more computers,
3	sort of would often be built as a distributor
4	system. So you often have more than one server
5	in that role.
б	Q. Go to the next slide.
7	With this type of arrangement,
8	what does it permit you to do as far as
9	networking collaborating?
10	A. Mm-hmm. Okay.
11	So here in the middle, we see the
12	same five workspaces we had in the slide before.
13	And what this is trying to show is
14	that all around the outside here, we have a
15	bunch of different computers that are all hooked
16	up to the internet. They're all on-line.
17	So what I'm trying to show here is
18	that suppose this is my office computer down in
19	the lower left-hand corner, I could access my
20	workspace over the internet.
21	In my office computer, I can
22	upload things. I can download things. I can
23	engage my tools and do work.
24	I also can do that from my home

computer, access the same work space, you know, upload things, download things, do work there.

Or maybe I'm traveling, you know, and I have my laptop, I upload in a hotel or somewhere.

If I'm hooked up to the internet,
I can access my workspace. I can upload things
to my workspace and download things and do
whatever I can do in my workspace.

That's what this is intending to show is you can access it from essentially any computer that is hooked up to the internet.

- Q. And do you have -- in order to have this type of networking collaboration in these workspaces, they reside on a system server; correct, web servers?
 - A. Right.

2.0

- Q. Do you have to have any type of special applications on the computers? Do they all have to have the same application on the outside?
- A. Typically for the '761 technology, all you need on the computer is some kind of a web browser. And these days almost any computer, including our mobile phone or, you

1	know, any sort of device like that that is
2	hooked up to the internet typically has some
3	kind of a browser.
4	Q. Now, what are we looking at at
5	this level?
6	A. Okay. So what I'm trying to show
7	here is over on the left hand we have that same
8	set of five workspaces.
9	And we're trying to sort of drill
LO	down a little bit on Jim's workspace in the
L1	middle here. So this is what's on the server,
L2	and we're focusing on Jim's workspace.
L3	Over here on the right-hand side,
L 4	this is what it looks like to Jim. This is what
L5	it looks like to the user when the user accesses
L6	this workspace. This is one way it could look.
L7	So this is Jim's kind of profile
L8	page. It has some tools that could be,
L9	obviously, many kinds of tools here, but this
20	just shows, you know, the way that Jim could
21	access messages.
22	He could access his calender. He
23	could access notes that he's made. He could
24	access files and upload files.

1 And down here it shows Jim's contacts. As we saw before, they're Alice. 2 3 Bob, Steve and Betty. And so this has that 4 workspace, looks like, you know, when Jim's 5 actually using it. This is what it shows, him on his 6 7 computer. And how is the data organized on 8 Ο. 9 it with the '761 patented technology? 10 Α. Okay. So I think the easiest way 11 to show that is by contrasting it with what we 12 saw over here. 13 Of course, what we saw over here, 14 the traditional hierarchial system where you 15 have to name folders. Then you have to decide 16 what folder each item goes into. And we have all these problems we 17 18 talked about of, you know, different people 19 having different sets of folders and being --20 how somebody else thinks about their stuff, so it's hard to find it. 21 22 In contrast to that, over here the 23 '761 technology organizes things very 24 differently. Here when you create an account on

1 server, it establishes for you metadata. metadata is -- I know it's sort of a confusing 2 3 sounding term, when the explanation is also 4 confusion as well. 5 Metadata is sort of data about data, if you will. But, it's really not that 6 7 confusing if you think about uploading something, say a document, or a picture, for 8 9 example. 10 Okay. If I upload a picture, then 11 that's data. 12 And I might want to have some 13

descriptions of that picture. All right.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So I want -- I might want, for example, to store the fact that I was the one who uploaded that picture, not somebody else. And I might want to store the fact that it was uploaded at 10 o'clock Sunday morning, not some other time. And there might be other things that might be useful to store about that picture.

So those kind of descriptions of the data are what we call metadata. And in the '761 technology when I upload something,

automatically this sort of information about who uploaded it, when it was uploaded, that's what we call context information. And that updates the metadata that was established when I started my account.

2.0

That's one of the ways that metadata gets updated. According to this technology, also, there's also a tracking component.

So I can also move from my page to other people's pages. If I have a link to Alice, I might want to move over to Alice's page.

And since my system kind of has to know where I am, so it kind of tracks my movements, I can also go over from my page to Alice's page and access my data from Alice's page. When I do that, this tracking information is then used also to update the metadata.

- Q. Can you walk through an example how one can share data using the on-line networking in collaboration invention of the '761 patent?
 - A. Sure. Sure.

1 All right. So here's sort of the 2 starting point. 3 Let's just say that I have kind of 4 a manilla profile page. I haven't put much up 5 there yet, so it just says profile page and has a few tools. And I'd like to upload a photo to 6 7 it. So I might go down here to where 8 9 it says file if that's the place that I upload 10 files. I could click on that and select the 11 option to upload a photo. 12 And then it would let me sort of 13 look around on my computer and find the photo I 14 wanted to upload. When I found it, excuse me --15 when I found it, I would select it. Push a 16 button that would probably say something like 17 upload. 18 And at that point, the picture would go from my computer. The data would be 19 20 copied. Right. 21 It would be data now on the server 22 that would represent that picture. Okay. 23 it would be in my workspace. 24 And so that would show up like

this on my on-line workspace. But this is now really data on the server. This is the copy o the server as opposed to the one that's on my local machine. So that's the way I can upload a photo.

Okay. And as I do that, the context information, as I mentioned concerning the picture updates, is used to update the metadata. So things like, you know, it was I who uploaded it, and maybe the size of the picture, and perhaps the time it was uploaded and other kinds of information are automatically added over here in the system and metadata is updated.

So at this point, the picture that I'm observing and the metadata about that picture are all on the server.

- Q. What's this slide representing?
- A. This is another kind of interaction that I could have in this system.

 So here let's assume I am Jim, I might want to navigate over to Alice's workspace.

So I click on the Alice link here and it takes me over to Alice's workspace, and

now that I'm at Alice's workspace I might actually want to access some of my own data over there.

So here is one reason I might want to do that. I might want to say leave a message for Alice, say hey, Alice, check out my new picture and I could place my picture accessing data from my workspace. I'm getting a little carried away, I'm afraid, accessing data from my workspace and placing it here on Alice's page.

Now at this point, when I actually place data here, access data from my workspace while I'm in Alice's workspace, that triggers the change in metadata that this tracking information that I am accessing my data from a different work space, that information is used to update the metadata. And that's how that transaction happens.

- Q. And all this, the metadata itself and the context information and the tracking information, that's all stored on the back end; correct?
- A. That's all stored to the back end.

 That's all on the storage component of the

1	system on this server or some set of servers.
2	MR. ANDRE: That's all we have,
3	Your Honor. Thank you.
4	THE COURT: That's the end of the
5	direct?
6	MR. ANDRE: Yes.
7	THE COURT: Okay. I think that
8	will be a good place to stop for the day since
9	we're letting the jury go at 4:30.
10	Dr. Herbsleb, you can step down at this point.
11	We'll excuse the jury at this
12	point. One second, bear with me. There are a
13	few things I need to tell the jury before I let
14	you go.
15	First off, we're starting at nine
16	o'clock tomorrow morning, so please arrive at
17	the building in time so that you can be up here
18	in your seats at nine o'clock.
19	Also, as I told you before, you're
20	not to discuss the case with anybody, amongst
21	yourselves or with anybody else at this point.
22	I don't know if there will be any
23	media coverage of this case, but if there is,
24	you're not to read it or view it. Also, you're

to refrain from using Facebook as we said for the length of the trial.

And also, temperature control in this building leaves a lot to be desired as you may have already figured out. It can range from too hot to too cold in the course of one day. So my only suggestion, I see some of you have already figured it out, is bring layers and you may find over the course of the day that you want to put a jacket or sweater on and then later take one off. I wish I had control over it, but I don't, and that's it.

With that, I will now at this point excuse the jury for the day.

(Jury leaving the courtroom at 4:28 p.m.)

THE COURT: You can have a seat.

I just want to talk with counsel about the designations that you provided earlier with respect to the depositions. Unless I'm misreading it, I don't see where the objections are. I need for you to specifically flag for me the pages at which I can find objections that I need to rule on. Perhaps I'm misreading.

1	MR. HANNAH: Your Honor, it's in
2	the highlighted copy, but we're glad to note
3	those objections as well in another document.
4	THE COURT: I have multiple
5	copies, one of those that's highlights on it.
6	MR. HANNAH: The version that was
7	sent to Your Honor had this yellow highlighting
8	and the blue highlighting and had the written
9	margin.
10	THE COURT: Right. Okay. I
11	understand that. I need you to put on the list
12	telling me which pages to go look to in there to
13	find the objections. So just file something
14	later, say by six o'clock today just giving me
15	that guidance.
16	All right. We'll see counsel at
17	nine o'clock tomorrow morning.
18	(Court recessed at 4:30 p.m.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	State of Delaware)
2	New Castle County)
3	
4	
5	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
6	
7	I, Heather M. Triozzi, Registered
8	Professional Reporter, Certified Shorthand Reporter,
9	and Notary Public, do hereby certify that the
LO	foregoing record, Pages 1 to 308 inclusive, is a true
L1	and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes
L2	taken on July 19, 2010, in the above-captioned
L3	matter.
L4	
L5	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
L6	hand and seal this 19th day of July, 2010, at
L7	Wilmington.
L8	
L9	
20	
21	Heather M. Triozzi, RPR, CSR
22	
23	
24	