## EXHIBIT 38




| 1 | * * * | 1 | Air-Conditioning Engineers. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | (Jarosz Exhibit 1 marked for | 2 | THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Today our |
| 3 | identification.) | 3 | court reporter is Debbie Leonard with |
| 4 | * * * | 4 | Veritext. Would you please swear in |
| 5 | THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now | 5 | the witness. |
| 6 | on the record. | 6 | * ** |
| 7 | Please note that the | 7 | JOHN C. JAROSZ, |
| 8 | microphones are sensitive and may pick | 8 | having been first duly sworn, testified as |
| 9 | up whispering and private | 9 | follows: |
| 10 | conversations. | 10 | *** |
| 11 | Please turn off all cell phones | 11 | EXAMINATION |
| 12 | or place them away from the | 12 | * * * |
| 13 | microphones, as they can interfere | 13 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 14 | with the deposition audio. | 14 | Q. Good morning, Mr. Jarosz. |
| 15 | Recording will continue until | 15 | A. Good morning, Mr. Bridges. |
| 16 | all parties agree to go off the | 16 | Q. What do you do for a living? |
| 17 | record. | 17 | A. I'm an economist. |
| 18 | My name is Jonathan Perry. I'm | 18 | Q. What types of work do you do as |
| 19 | here representing Veritext. Today's | 19 | an economist? |
| 20 | date is August 27th, 2015. The time | 20 | A. I'm not exactly sure what |
| 21 | is approximately 10:09 a.m. | 21 | you're asking. I am employed at an economic |
| 22 | We are at the offices of | 22 | consulting firm, and I am involved in applied |
| 23 | Veritext, located at 1250 I Street |  | microeconomics and industrial organization, |
| 24 | Northwest in Washington, D.C. | 24 | among other things. |
| 25 | The caption on the case is the | 25 | I apply much of my expertise to |
|  | Page 6 |  | Page 8 |
| 1 | American Society for Testing and | 1 | the valuation and evaluation of intellectual |
| 2 | Materials, et al., versus | 2 | property rights. Some of that work is in the |
| 3 | Public.Resource.Org, Incorporated, | 3 | context of damages assessments. Some of it |
| 4 | case filed in the US District Court |  | outside such contexts. Some of my work is in |
| 5 | for the District of Columbia, Case | 5 | litigation, and some of my work is not. |
| 6 | Number 1:13-cv-0215 [sic] TSC-DAR. | 6 | Q. Have you valued any of the |
| 7 | The name of the witness is | 7 | intellectual property at issue in this case? |
| 8 | John C. Jarosz. | 8 | MR. FEE: Objection. Form. |
| 9 | Would counsel present please | 9 | MR. REHN: And -- |
| 10 | introduce themselves and state whom | 10 | MR. FEE: Wait. Before we go |
| 11 | they represent. | 11 | any further, should -- do you want to |
| 12 | MR. BRIDGES: This is Andrew | 12 | get into a stipulation that they don't |
| 13 | Bridges of Fenwick \& West for the | 13 | have to join every objection that one |
| 14 | defendant, and with me is Matthew | 14 | or the other plaintiffs makes, or do |
| 15 | Becker. | 15 | you want us to make them all seriatim? |
| 16 | MR. FEE: Kevin Fee from Morgan | 16 | MR. BRIDGES: I'll stipulate to |
| 17 | Lewis on behalf of ASTM. | 17 | that. |
| 18 | MR. REHN: Thane Rehn from | 18 | MR. FEE: Okay. |
| 19 | Munger, Tolles \& Olson on behalf of | 19 | THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly |
| 20 | the National Fire Protection | 20 | sure what you mean by "value," but I |
| 21 | Association. | 21 | haven't done a formal valuation of any |
| 22 | MR. CUNNINGHAM: Blake | 22 | of the IP. I have evaluated the |
| 23 | Cunningham of King \& Spalding on | 23 | intellectual property rights, and I |
| 24 | behalf of the American Society for | 24 | have done the assessment that you see |
| 25 | Heating, Refrigerating, and | 25 | in my expert report. |
|  | Page 7 |  | Page 9 |

## BY MR. BRIDGES:

Q. Have you made any attempt to put a value on any of the intellectual property rights claimed by the plaintiffs in this case?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: What do you mean
by "value"?
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. I mean by "value" what you referred to earlier when you stated that among your activities is the valuation of intellectual property rights.
A. I have not done a formal valuation, and I have not assigned a dollar amount to any of the intellectual property rights at issue here.

I have evaluated the rights and determined issues associated with harm and irreparable harm. You see my results contained in my report.
Q. What do you mean by "evaluating the intellectual property rights"?
A. I have looked at, from an economist's perspective, the rights and the
impact of having IP protection or not having
IP protection for the subject matter at issue.
Q. Have you done anything else to evaluate the intellectual property rights of the plaintiffs?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I've done the
analyses underlying my report, but the summary of the work that I've done and the conclusions that I've drawn are contained in my report. I don't have other conclusions that are not contained in those -- in that report. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. What intellectual property
rights of plaintiffs have you evaluated?
A. The copyrights at issue here.

I'm sorry. Let me be -- let me
alter that by saying I have evaluated the
alleged copyrights at issue here, and I have evaluated the trademark rights at issue here.
Q. Why did you change your testimony to refer to "alleged copyrights" instead of "copyrights"?
A. I don't know that there -- I -let me start this over again.

I believe there are fights
about whether the plaintiffs are entitled to
these copyrights. I don't know that there's
been a conclusion by this Court that they are valid rights. I'm working under the assumption that they are, but I believe the defendant is disputing those rights.
Q. What did you do to evaluate trademark rights in this case?
A. What I've done is summarized in my report. I have an understanding that there are marks and logos at issue that are important to the plaintiffs and that Public Resource activities impair the rights of the plaintiffs in those trademarks and may possibly cause confusion in the marketplace.
Q. What work did you do to determine whether any activities of the defendant does or may cause confusion in the marketplace?
A. The work that you see is summarized in my report. I haven't done anything beyond that which is summarized
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here.
Q. And by the "report," you're referring to Exhibit 1 that I've marked and placed before you?
A. Yes.
Q. Where did you state your conclusions in your report regarding trademark rights of the plaintiff -- of the plaintiffs?
A. In part, I think it's covered in paragraphs 150 and 151. It may be covered in other sections.
Q. Take the time and let me know what other sections trademark rights are covered in.

MR. FEE: Objection. Are you asking him to read the whole report and answer that now?

MR. BRIDGES: No. Presumably
he's relatively familiar with it, so
it wouldn't require him to read it and spend a great deal of time. I don't -- he's referred to his report in his answer, so I just want to make sure that I have a complete

|  | understanding. | from the facts. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. FEE: All right. Well, | 2 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
|  | ake as long as you need to answer | Q. All right. I would like to |
|  | that, then. | 4 know where in the report your report reveals |
|  | THE WITNESS: In part, you see | 5 any observations or conclusions by you about |
|  | addressed in paragraph 30. | 6 the evaluation of the trademark rights. |
| 7 | Right now, those are the | MR. FEE: Just so the record is |
|  | ctions that I see that touch on | 8 clear, you're withdrawing the previous |
|  | topic. There may be others that I'm | question now? |
| 10 | 0 overlooking right now. | 10 MR. BRIDGES: No. It's a new |
| 11 | BY MR. BRIDGES: | 11 question. |
| 12 | Q. And do you need mo | 12 MR. FEE: Okay. Well, he |
| 13 | MR. FEE: Objection. Asked and | 13 didn't -- |
| 14 | answered. | 14 Are you finished going through |
| 15 | THE WITNESS: I don't think so | 15 the entire report and identifying |
| 16 | I've looked through at a fairly | 16 everywhere where you've evaluated the |
|  | ursory level. If you want me to read | 17 trademarks? |
| 18 | 8 the whole report to make absolutely | 18 Or do you not want him to keep |
| 19 | re, I will, but I'm not sure if | 19 doing that? |
| 20 | - you're asking me to do that, but -- | 20 MR. BRIDGES: I just -- I just |
| 21 | MR. BRIDG | 21 asked him a question. I'd like an |
| 22 | 2 Q. No, I wouldn't want to take the | 22 answer to the question. |
|  | e, unless counsel is willing to give m | 23 MR. FEE: Okay. |
|  | 4 lots of extra time or if you want to do it | 24 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
|  | 5 during a break. But if you're confident that Page 14 | 25 Q. I'd like to know where in Page |
|  | se are the paragraphs that cover the | 1 the -- in the report your report reveals any |
|  | 2 evaluation of trademark rights, then we can | 2 observations or conclusions by you about your |
|  | proceed. | 3 evaluation of the trademark rights of the |
|  | 4 A. I'm not sure if there's a | 4 plaintiffs. |
|  | 5 pending question, but I didn't say I was | 5 MR. FEE: Objection. And I |
|  | 6 confident that those are the only places. | 6 think it would be misleading if it's |
|  | 7 Q. Oh, then take more time, | 7 not stated for the record that he has |
|  | ase. | 8 not gotten past paragraph 2 in |
|  | A. I think -- | responding to the prior question, and |
| 10 | Q. Then please -- | 10 you've instructed him not to further |
| 11 | A. -- that those are the three | 11 proceed with respect to that question. |
| 12 | 2 that address it | 12 You can go ahead and answer the |
| 13 | 3 Q. Well, what else reflects your | 13 current question. |
| 14 | 14 evaluation of trademark rights in this case? | 14 THE WITNESS: So right now, I'm |
| 15 | 5 A. Okay. If you'd like, I'll take | 15 working under the assumption that |
| 16 | 16 a little bit more time looking at the report. | 16 there's only one pending question, and |
| 17 | 17 I think in paragraph 2, I | 17 that is your most recent question. |
|  | 18 believe part of the copying is the marks | 18 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 19 | 9 and/or logos. | 19 Q. Yes. |
| 20 | 0 Q. And that paragraph 2 reflects | 20 A. Part of the implications of |
|  | 1 your evaluation? | 21 loss -- I'm sorry. |
| 22 | 2 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 22 Part of the |
| 23 | 3 THE WITNESS: Yes. My | 23 trademark infringement are reflected in |
| 24 | 4 evaluation includes understanding the | 24 paragraph 6, though they're not stated there. |
| 25 | 5 issues and then drawing conclusions | 25 That is when I address harm. That |

encompasses both the harm of loss of
copyright protection and the repercussions of trademark infringement.

Same answer with regard to paragraph 7.

There are also counterpart
paragraphs at the end of the report that I
think are identical to 6 and 7, so I won't
identify those numbers.
Though I didn't say it in a
number of paragraphs, I make reference to
conclusions with regard to the copyright
infringement.
I understand that the copyright infringement is associated with certain actions that, in part, encompass trademark infringement, though I don't think I explicitly said that in every section in which I discover -- in which I discussed the copyright protection and the conclusions flowing from that.

I don't think I have anything else to add besides what I have discussed already.
Q. What conclusions do you see
about a likelihood of confusion in the
marketplace arising from the defendant's use of the marks?
A. I haven't drawn any conclusions with regard to that topic.
Q. And what conclusions have you drawn about the economic value or dollar value of the plaintiffs' trademarks?
A. I have not assigned a dollar value to the plaintiffs' trademarks.
Q. What conclusions have you drawn about any harm to the plaintiffs arising from the defendant's alleged use of the plaintiffs' marks?
A. I've drawn the conclusion that there could be harm if the materials, in fact, are inaccurate use -- inaccurate copies, therefore impacting the reputation of either the materials or the organizations in the marketplace.
Q. What studies did you rely upon for that conclusion?

MR. FEE: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: Nothing other
than what you see reflected in my
report.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. What facts did you rely upon for that conclusion?
A. Well, I understand that there has been some inaccurate copying and dissemination of plaintiff materials. I don't recall exactly where I got that information from, but I believe that there's some materials, for instance, that have been copied and disseminated that are upside-down. There are other materials that are difficult to read. There may be materials that are disseminated with the thought that those are the most recent standards when, in fact, they may not be.
Q. You have no idea how you learned that information?
A. I don't recall --

MR. FEE: Objection. Vague.
And form.
THE WITNESS: I don't recall, sitting here right now. I may have seen representations in some of the written materials, but I don't recall
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what those written materials are.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Have you seen any upside-down
pages in any of the defendant's materials?
A. I don't recall seeing that
personally, no.
Q. Have you seen any difficult-to-read materials produced by the defendant?
A. I don't recall that right now.
Q. Do you know what rationale the defendant has for disseminating materials that are not the most recent standards?

MR. FEE: Objection. Form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not sure that
I know, no.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. On what information -- I'd like for you to recall all the information on which you relied for the determination that the defendant may have engaged in activities that may have caused any harms to the plaintiffs' reputation.

MR. FEE: Could you read that
back -- oh, I have it here. Forget
Page 21

|  | 1 beyond the document production to verify that |
| :---: | :---: |
| asking him to recall, without having | 3 Q. But you don't recall seeing any |
| 4 all the materials in front of him? | 4 defective materials yourself, correct? |
| MR. BRIDGES: Yeah. | 5 A. That's correct. I do not. |
| MR. FEE: Okay. | 6 Q. You just relied upon the word |
| THE WITNESS: It's all laid | 7 of others, correct? |
| my report, and the sources are | 8 MR. FEE: Objection. Vague. |
| provided in my report. I've not | Mischaracterizes his testimony. |
| 10 memorized all those. | 10 THE WITNESS: I relied upon |
| 11 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 11 written documents I saw and |
| 12 Q. But I don't think your report | 12 conversations that I had. |
| 13 refers to upside-down materials, does it | 13 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 14 A. I don't recall for sure, but I | 14 Q. What written documents did you |
| 15 thought some of the documents that I cited | 15 see that discussed these issues? |
| 16 make reference to those materials. I'm not | 16 MR. FEE: Objection. Asked and |
| 17 sure that I cited the, for instance, | 17 answered. |
| 18 upside-down materials, but I think I have | 18 THE WITNESS: And I'm sorry. I |
| 19 discussions about that phenomenon. | 19 can't point you to the particular |
| 20 Q. With whom? | 20 ones. Perhaps, through the course of |
| 21 A. In written materials that I've | 21 the day, my memory will be refreshed |
| 22 cited. | 22 |
| 23 Q. Have you had oral discussions | 23 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 24 about what you have referred to as that | 24 Q. If you relied upon those |
| 25 phenomenon? | 25 written documents, would you have cited to |
| Page 22 | Page |
| A. Yes. | 1 those written documents in your report? |
| Q. With whom? | 2 A. Perhaps. |
| A. Counsel here. | 3 Q. Why do you say "perhaps"? |
| 4 Q. With anybody else? | 4 A. I can't say with absolute |
| 5 A. I don't think so. It's | 5 certainty what I do. But often, if something |
| 6 possible, but I'm not recalling anything | 6 is a direct support for a factual |
| 7 else. | 7 observation, I will often cite tha |
| 8 Q. And when you say discussions | 8 but not always. |
| 9 with "counsel here," you're referring to the | Q. What previous -- strike that |
| 10 counsel at the table here today at the | 10 What training or education have |
| 11 deposition? | 11 you ever received with respect to standards |
| 12 A. Corre | 12 development organizations? |
| 13 And we should add to th | 13 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 14 Jordana Rubel, who's been a person that I've | 14 THE WITNESS: I don't recall if |
| 15 had conversations with over the last several | 15 I've had a course in standard |
| 16 months. | 16 development. Probably it has been |
| 17 Q. What did you do to verify any | 17 part of some of the economics courses |
| 18 of the statements to you from counsel about | 18 that I've taken over the years. |
| 19 these facts you've referred to about the | 19 In my profession and the work |
| 20 materials that the defendant has | 20 that I've done in the last 30 years, |
| 21 disseminated? | 21 I've had occasion to look at and |
| 22 A. I don't think I did separate | 22 evaluate standards organizations and |
| 23 verification. I may have seen some documents | 23 the output from those organizations. |
| 24 that provide or provided confirmation of that | 24 So it is among the topics that |
| 25 fact, but I don't recall separately going out | 25 I've investigated in the course of my |
| Page 23 | Page 25 |
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| g career. | 1 standards development organization that |
| :---: | :---: |
| BY MR. BRIDGES: | 2 you've worked on? |
| Q. In what context? | 3 A. Again, I'd have to go back and |
| A. There have been several matters | 4 look at my records. I can't right now recite |
| I've had, litigations, that have involved | 5 any, but there very well could be one or |
| standard setting organizations and the |  |
| outputs from those organizations. | Q. Did you review any of your work |
| Q. What organizations? | 8 in -- from earlier copyright cases involving |
| A. Well, some that come to mind | 9 standards development organizations in |
| 10 are ETSI, IEEE, the Blu-ray Association, | 10 connection with your work in this case? |
| 11 MPEG, MPEG L.A., the Philips 6C and Philips | 11 A. Not to the best of my memory, |
| 12 3C organizations. Those are among the ones | 12 no |
| 13 that come to mind. | 13 Q. What background do you have in |
| Q. And what types of litigat | 14 the creation of standards by standard |
| 15 did your work relating to those standar | 15 development organizations? |
| setting organizations involve? | 16 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 17 MR. FEE: Objection to | 17 THE WITNESS: In the context of |
| HE WITNESS: It was almost all | 18 some of my consulting assignments, I |
| intellectual property litigation, with | 19 have examined processes undertaken by |
| ably the bulk of the analyses | 20 |
| 21 undertaken with regard to patent | 21 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 22 right | 22 Q. Anything else? |
| 23 BY MR. BRIDGES | 23 A. Nothing else comes to mind. |
| Q. Do you reca | 24 I've certainly looked at the output |
| 25 A. I guess I should -- there were | 25 associated with those processes, but there's |
| Page 26 | Page 2 |
| bably some breach of contract matters as | 1 nothing else that comes to mind. |
| 2 well. | Q. What processes undertaken by |
| Q. Did you work on any matters | 3 standards development organizations did |
| involving copyright law where you became | 4 examine? |
| familiar with the work and outputs of | 5 MR. FEE: Objection. Are you |
| 6 standards setting organizations before this | 6 asking prior to the report still? |
| 7 case? | MR. BRIDGES: Yes. |
| A. Probably, but I cannot say | MR. FEE: Okay. |
| h absolute certainty. I've been involved | THE WITNESS: I'm not quite -- |
| 10 in several matters over a course of many | 10 MR. BRIDGES: Or other than in |
| 11 years. | 11 this c |
| Q. Can you name any copyrig | 12 MR. FEE: Okay. |
| atter involving a standards developm | 13 THE WITNESS: I'm not quite |
| 14 organization that you recall? | 14 sure what you're asking. I've seen |
| 15 A. Not now, without going back and | 15 discussion of the some of the |
| oking at my records. | 16 processes of various organizations. |
| 17 Q. Would they be listed | 17 I'm not -- I'm not quite sure what |
| es attached | 18 you're asking. Perhaps you could ask |
| 19 A. That would summarize some of my | 19 it somewhat differently. |
| 20 records. The cases that are embodied in my | 20 |
| 21 tab 1 are those that led to deposition or | 21 Q. Well, no. You said, q |
| l testimony. I've been involved in many | 22 have examined processes underta |
| 23 matters beyond those. | 23 So my question is, what |
| 24 Q. But sitting here, you cannot | 24 processes undertaken by standards developmen |
| 25 recall any copyright case involving a | 25 organizations did you examine? |
| Page | Page |
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```
question to me.
```

Q. Specifically, what processes did you examine?
A. That still sounds like the same question, but let me try to answer it by saying I've looked, for instance, at the mechanisms that ETSI undertook in developing standards. So I am familiar generally with the processes that it follows. Similarly with regard to other standard setting organizations.
Q. What other standard setting organizations?
A. Well, I think I identified those a few moments ago. Do you want me to repeat those?
Q. Well, if -- are you saying that, for all of those organizations, you examined their processes?
A. In some dimension, probably for most of the organizations, I had at least some knowledge of the process. I can't say that I investigated in depth all of the processes for all of the organizations that
have been involved in my consulting
assignments that are standards oriented.
Q. What do you recall about your investigation of the processes by which standards development organizations create their standards?
A. I should say I -- SDO is probably not the right term to use. I should probably say standards setting organizations. There may be a distinction between an SSO and an SDO.

But, generally, each SSO has a
process that's unique to its organization.
Some solicit input from a wide range of
constituents; some from a more narrow range.
The ones that I have examined have all been fairly careful in the work that they've done, seeking input at many steps along the way.

Some organizations, like SDOs
at issue here, seek a broader array of inputs than do others.

Some organizations, standards setting organizations, include primarily or only manufacturers and sometimes large

1
2
manufacturers only. Others include a wider array of companies.

In all instances, though, the
companies are trying to -- the standards
setting organizations are trying to develop
at least some form of consensus -- sometimes
it's very broad consensus; sometimes it's
more narrow consensus -- about what would be good for that standards setting organization.

Sometimes the SSOs are interested in what's best for the manufacturers and the ability for them to supply in an interoperable environment. In some cases, the SSOs are very alert to the needs of consumers and users of products and services that comply with standards.
Q. You've distinguished between standards setting organizations and standard development organizations. What is the distinction that you -- that you identify between the two?
A. I think I said I didn't know if there is for sure a distinction, but I think an SSO is perhaps a broader concept than an SDO, but I might be wrong on that.
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I know the companies -- I --
the plaintiffs here are SDOs. The
associations are, among other things, in the
business of creating and developing standards.

There could be other SSOs that have different constituents that are of interest to them. I don't know for sure that an SSO is a broader concept than an SDO, but it could be.
Q. What do you understand to be the constituents of the plaintiffs in this case?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I laid that out
in my report. In summary, I believe they try to include in the process both those -- both supply-side entities and demand-side entities.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Who else are plaintiffs'
constituents?
MR. FEE: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: I can't think of anything that doesn't fall within
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| they have both supply-side and | 1 | The Web sites and information |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| demand-side interests that they | 2 | that I looked at for each of the |
| consider. | 3 | plaintiffs certainly give more detail. |
| BY MR. BRIDGES: | 4 | But, in essence, a need for a |
| Q. Don't they also have regulatory | 5 | standard is brought to the attention |
| 6 interests aside from being supply side or | 6 | of the group. That need can be |
| mand side? | 7 | identified from any number of places. |
| MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 8 | And then a group is chartered |
| THE WITNESS: What do you mean | 9 | with assessing what that need is and |
| 10 by "regulatory interest | 10 | how best to respond to that need. |
| BY MR. BRIDGES: | 11 | That group often comes up with |
| 12 Q. You don't understand the term? | 12 | oposals to respond to the issue and |
| 13 A. No, I don't know what you mean | 13 | adjusts that proposal as it gets more |
| 14 by that term. | 14 | input and gives more thought. |
| 15 Q. Do they have public interests | 15 | Ultimately consensus is arrived |
| 16 other than supply or demand side interests? | 16 | for each of the organizations, and |
| 17 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 17 | standard is developed and published. |
| 18 THE WITNESS: I don't know that | 18 | The processes are slightly |
| would be "other than," because I | 19 | fferent for each of the |
| 20 think of the public interest as being | 20 | organizations but generally follow |
| either demand or supply side. I don't | 21 | t rout |
| 22 know what might not be included. | 22 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 23 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 23 | Q. How do the processes |
| 24 Q. What about somebody that has a | 24 | mong the three plaintiff organizations? |
| 25 safety interest? How do you classify them as Page 38 | 25 | MR. FEE: Objection to form. Page |
| nstituent of the plaintiffs? | 1 | NESS: I don't know all |
| MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 2 | f the differences. They may have, in |
| 3 THE WITNESS: It depends on who | 3 | part, been summarized in my report. I |
| that is. I have an interest in my | 4 | see, for instance, on page 29, |
| 5 house being safe, for instance, and I | 5 | paragraph 70, I have identified the |
| consider myself as part of the | 6 | four steps that I saw that NFPA |
| demand-side constituency. | 7 | follows in developing standards. |
| I think that there could be | 8 | Y MR. BRIDGES: |
| companies that are in the business of | 9 | Q. I'm just asking you -- you |
| 10 manufacturing smoke detectors, for |  | n't need to spend time going through the |
| 11 instance. I would think of them |  | port. I just want to know, sitting here |
| 12 primarily as being on the supply side, | 12 | day, how you understand the processes |
| 13 although they're certainly alert to | 13 | fer. |
| 14 the demand-side considerations. | 14 | MR. FEE: Object to form, to |
| 15 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 15 | the extent you are asking him not to |
| 16 Q. How do you understand the | 16 | look at his report. I think he should |
| 17 plaintiffs here -- strike that. | 17 | be permitted to do that. |
| 18 What do you understand to be | 18 | THE WITNESS: Just by -- just |
| 19 the process by which the plaintiffs develop | 19 | ing by memory, I don't recall |
| 20 standards? | 20 | bstantial differences in the |
| 21 MR. FEE: Objection to form | 21 | rocesses. I understand each one to |
| 22 THE WITNESS: I don't know all | 22 | follow the general scheme that I |
| 23 the steps. I've summarized some of | 23 | identified a few moments ago. I'm |
| steps that I understand in the | 4 | quite sure that there are differences |
| 25 report. | 25 | in each plaintiff's implementation of |
| Page 39 |  | Page 41 |


instance, the fire at the shirt factory in
New York a hundred years ago, it was
identified that we didn't want those
disasters to occur in the future and that we
would like to investigate avenues to minimize such risks.
Q. What do you mean by "avenues to minimize such risks"?
A. Well, consideration is given to determining whether there should be quality standards that manufacturers should comply with in order to reduce the disastrous outcomes that occur because of fires, for instance.
Q. And what do you mean by "quality standards"?
A. Just by way of example, to have more ingress and egress available to employees and to have that as a requirement or have a standard that may eventually be incorporated into law so that buildings are erected in such a way to allow employees to leave the building rather than be engulfed in flames.
Q. And what do you mean by
"incorporated into law"?
MR. FEE: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. Form.

THE WITNESS: As an economist,
I generally understand it to be that
there's some federal, state, and local
laws that make reference to certain
standards and have that reference as
part of the law.
The legal implications I am
certainly not an expert in, and I
hesitate to characterize any more than I have.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Well, you, in fact, have a law degree, correct?
A. I have a law degree. I am not now, nor have I ever been a practicing attorney.
Q. Okay. But you have a juris doctor degree, correct?
A. Is that different from a law degree?
Q. It's a type of law degree.
A. I -- I didn't know that, but I
do have a JD.
Q. You don't have a Ph.D. in economics, correct?
A. Correct. I was in the Ph.D. program and have completed most of the requirements for my Ph.D. but not all.
Q. What interests do you understand the plaintiffs to have -- strike that.

What interests do you understand the plaintiffs to have in having standards incorporated into law?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I think that's laid out in my report in a variety of ways; but generally, the plaintiffs are interested in effectuating their charters, and that is they want to address certain problems in an effective way. And if those solutions get incorporated into standards and those standards get incorporated by reference into law, that can be an effective way for dissemination of a solution.
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BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. What do you mean by "effectuating" the plaintiffs' charters?
A. Well, each plaintiff has a goal or set of goals it would like to achieve, whether that's safety or interoperability. But generally, they want to achieve a socially good purpose and one that is good for members of the industry.
Q. In your answer, you're referring specifically to these plaintiffs?
A. Yes.
Q. Do these plaintiffs have an interoperability goal?
A. I don't think explicitly, but I think -- I don't think as part of the charter for the plaintiff, but I think with regard to certain topics that they address interoperability helps achieve some of those goals of the individual topics that help achieve the overall goals of the organization.
Q. What are some of the goals of interoperability that you've identified for plaintiffs?

| A. That I've identified in my | 1 the problems that they are trying to address? |
| :---: | :---: |
| report? | MR. FEE: Same objection. |
| Q. In your work on -- in your work | THE WITNESS: Generally, ASTM |
| on this matter for the plaintiffs. | 4 is addressing problems associated with |
| 5 A. I'm not exactly sure what | public health and safety; support -- |
| 6 you're asking, but I talked about the merits | 6 protection and sustainability of the |
| 7 of interoperability and why these | 7 environment; overall quality of life; |
| 8 organizations -- why certain standards ar | 8 the reliability of materials, product |
| 9 oriented toward interoperability. | systems, and services; and |
| 10 I think one of the specific | 10 facilitating international, regional, |
| 11 illustrations is -- of the need for and | 11 and national |
| 12 achieving of interoperability goals is the | 12 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 13 NEC. That allows one to safely and | 13 Q. Now, those are problems? |
| 14 effectively receive power across the world | 14 A. They are trying to achieve |
| 15 That's good for manufacturers, and it's good | 15 their mission by addressing problems that may |
| 16 for consumers. | 16 stand in the way of achieving those missions. |
| 17 Q. You said that plaintiffs | 17 Q. So please give me an example of |
| 18 interested, I believe, in addressing certai | 18 some problems that the plaintiffs are trying |
| 19 problems in an effective way. Do you recal | 19 to address. My questioning has been focused |
|  | 20 on problems. You've been responding about |
| 21 A. Generally I recall that, yes | 21 mission, but I -- I'd like for you to |
| 22 Q. And, generall | 22 identify some of the problems, generally |
| 23 referring to these plaintiffs, what are the | 23 speaking, that you understand the plaintiffs |
| 24 problems you understand them to be trying | 24 are trying to address. |
| 25 address? | 25 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| Page 50 | Page 5 |
| MR. FEE: Objection to form. | ompound. |
| THE WITNESS: I've laid that | THE WITNESS: I thought I did, |
| out in my report. In page 64 I've | 3 so I'll try with some different words. |
| laid out, in essence, the ASTM | 4 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| mission, as I understand it. | 5 Q. Can you answer without |
| In paragraph 68 I've laid out | 6 reference to your report -- |
| the NFPA mission, as I understand it. | 7 A. I'd rather -- |
| And in paragraph 73 I've laid | Q. -- based on your general |
| out the ASHRAE mission, as I | 9 knowledge? |
| 10 understand it. | 10 A. I'd rather not. |
| 11 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 11 Q. Well, I'd rather that you tell |
| 12 Q. So now my question is, what are | 12 us what you can recall about the -- about the |
| 13 the problems that you understand the | 13 problems that plaintiffs are trying to |
| 14 plaintiffs are trying to address in an | 14 |
| 15 effective way? | 15 A. So you don't - |
| 16 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 16 MR. FEE: Objection. |
| 17 THE WITNESS: Well, generally, | 17 THE WITNESS: -- want me to |
| 18 they're addressing the mission that | 18 look at my report? This is just a |
| 19 they have here and their individual | 19 memory contest? |
| 20 problems that are brought to the SDOs' | 20 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 21 attention that, if addressed | 21 Q. No, it's not a memory contest. |
| 22 effectively, would help each | 22 I'd like to know what you happen to know, |
| 23 organization fulfill its mission. | 23 sitting here. |
| 24 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 24 A. I'd like to do that by looking |
| 25 Q. So generally speaking, what are | 25 at my report. |
| Page 51 | Page 5 |



| THE WITNESS: I don't know that | corporated into law, that can be an |
| :---: | :---: |
| I've seen that. I think that they are | 2 effective way for dissemination of a |
| 3 consensus based, and what one party | 3 solution. |
| 4 may define as optimum may be different | 4 What makes incorporation into |
| 5 from what another party defines as | 5 law an effective way for dissemination of a |
| 6 optimal. | 6 solution with respect to the plaintiffs' |
| But I think they're the result | 7 activities? |
| a variety of parties coming | 8 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| gether and sometimes balancing | THE WITNESS: I -- I'm |
| 10 interests and opinions. | 10 certainly not -- |
| 11 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 11 MR. FEE: It mischaracterizes |
| 12 Q . And recommending certain | 12 his prior testimony. |
| 13 procedures for accomplishing certain | 13 THE WITNESS: I -- I'm not a |
| 14 outcomes? | 14 legal expert, and I'm not an expert of |
| 15 A. By way -- | 15 an -- on the topic of incorporation by |
| 16 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 16 reference into law. |
| 17 THE WITNESS: By way of | 17 But if a particular statute |
| 18 example, yes. | 18 lays out that legally someone must |
| 19 Are we at a point for a break? | 19 follow what's laid out in certain |
| 20 We've been going a little over an | 20 standards, I would expect that, |
| 21 hour | 21 because most people are interested in |
| 22 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 22 lawful rather than unlawful activity, |
| 23 Q. I'd like to go a little | 23 that people would follow that dictate. |
| 24 further to conclude a line of questioning. | 24 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 25 It will be about ten more minutes. | 25 Q. And that incorporation into law |
| Page 58 | Page |
| MR. FEE: Are you okay with | 1 would be effective for dissemination of a |
| that? | 2 standard? |
| THE WITNESS: I'm okay with | 3 MR. FEE: Same objections. |
| that. I don't know what you mean by | 4 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| "a little bit further." | 5 Q. Is that your testimony? |
| 6 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 6 A. It's not necessarily the most |
| 7 Q. About ten more -- about ten | 7 effective way, but it -- as -- as far as I |
| 8 more minutes. | 8 know, it would be an effective way. |
| 9 A. I'd rather keep it closer to | 9 Q. What are other effective ways |
| 10 now than ten minutes from now. | 10 for dissemination of a standard? |
| 11 Q. Well, let me just finish a | 11 A. I -- I haven't given that any |
| 12 couple of things here. | 12 thought. I would just be speculating. |
| 13 MR. FEE: Well, you take a | 13 MR. BRIDGES: Okay. We can |
| 14 break whenever you want to take a | 14 take a break. |
| 15 break. | 15 THE WITNESS: Thank you. |
| 16 MR. BRIDGES: Well, I -- I'm in | 16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the |
| 17 the middle of a line of questioning. | 17 record at 11:12. |
| 18 MR. FEE: There's no question | 18 |
| 19 pending. He can take a break now if | 19 (Recess from 11:12 a.m. to |
| 20 he wants. If he's willing to give you | 20 11:23 a.m.) |
| 21 a couple more minutes, then that's | 21 * |
| 22 great, too. | 22 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: On the |
| 23 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 23 record at 11:23. |
| 24 Q. You said that if solutions get | 24 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 25 incorporated into standards and standards get Page 59 | 25 Q. Mr. Jarosz, have you evaluated |

any harms that the plaintiffs have actually
suffered to date as a consequence of the defendant's activities?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: To the extent I
have, it's embodied in my report.
You'll see there's a little bit of evidence of actual tangible harm to date, and there's certainly more discussion of harm. The tangible evidence I have is reflected in my report.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. And what do you understand that evidence to be?
A. I believe the number of downloads from the Public Resource dissemination have been fairly substantial. I believe that the purchase of publications has declined some at the plaintiffs -- at the various plaintiffs. It certainly has not risen. Those are among the things that come to mind.

I think I discuss the topic in more depth in paragraph, among other thing --
among other places, in paragraph 133 of my report.
Q. Have you been able to quantify any financial losses to plaintiffs as a consequence of defendant's activities?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Not with any great certainty.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, I don't have the records that would allow me to do that. Moreover, I am not sure that the impact from the past will be close to the impact that will occur in the future if the Court finds that there has been no copyright or trademark infringement.
Q. Why do you make the statement you just did? What's your basis for it?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I think there
were a few things in my statement.
Which would you like me to expound on?
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Just that sentence. I'd like to know what the basis is for the sentence
you just said, quote, "I am not sure that the impact from the past would be close to the impact that will occur in the future if the Court finds that there has been no copyright or trademark infringement."
A. It's everything laid out in my report. I -- it's really the -- at the heart of what I did.
Q. And please summarize for me what data you base that statement on.
A. That's identified in my report.
Q. Okay. Show me, please, in the report.
A. It's all of what's in Exhibit 1.
Q. No, I want -- I want the basis for your statement that the impact from conduct to date -- strike that -- that you're not sure that the impact from the conduct to date would be close to the impact that will occur in the future if the Court find -makes a certain finding, right?
A. Correct.
Q. So please identify for me something specific that forms the basis of

Page 64
that statement.
MR. FEE: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: Among other
things, paragraphs 112 through 155. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. So these are the "Costs of Losing Copyright Protection"; is that correct?
A. That's the title of this section, and then there's some discussion of trademark protection as well.
Q. And those would be the harms that you identify that would flow from a decision by the Court that the plaintiffs cannot enforce their copyrights against the defendant, correct?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: What I can say --
I'm sorry.
MR. FEE: I just objected to
form.
THE WITNESS: What I can say
with a reasonable degree of certainty. BY MR. BRIDGES:
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| Q. So those would be harms caused | think basically what I'm saying is |
| :---: | :---: |
| by a court decision? | hat would -- or addressing, is what |
| MR. FEE: Same objection | would be the harm to the plaintiffs if |
| THE WITNESS: By continuing | there's no permanent injunction. |
| activities by the defendant that are | 5 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| not halted by the Court. | 6 Q. Well, what did you mean by |
| BY MR. BRIDGES: | 7 "losing copyright protection" in the |
| Q. Well, it comes across, frankly | 8 paragraph -- in the heading VI on page 48? |
| in your report as though you're identifying | 9 A. In essence, you can think of it |
| 10 harms that would flow from a court decision. | 10 as what would happen if there's no permanent |
| 11 MR. FEE: Objection | 11 injunction. In other words, what the |
| 12 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 12 defendant has done in the past and what it's |
| 13 Q. Is that correct or n | 13 likely to do in the future is allowed to |
| 14 A. No, I think you -- | 14 continue. |
| 15 MR. FEE: Mischaracterizes the | 15 Q. And you immediately go into |
| 16 report. | 16 paragraph 112 talking about Emily Bremer, |
| 17 THE WITNESS: -- you misread | 17 correct? |
| 18 it. I don't think I said that or | 18 A. I don't know what you mean by |
| 19 meant to say that. | 19 "immediately." It's the first paragraph |
| 20 BY MR. BRIDG | 20 Section VI. |
| 21 Q. So what harm | 21 Q. Right. Was Emily Bremer in the |
| 22 from the -- from | 22 passage you referred to referring |
| 23 date? | 23 presence or absence of a permanent injunction |
| 24 A. At th | 24 in this case? |
| 25 myself, some of that is summarized in | 25 A. I don't think explicitly she |
| Page | Page |
| agraph 133, with regard | s addressing that issue, no. |
| vidence on harm. With regard to other | Q. Do you think implicitly she was |
| idence, it's throughout the report. | 3 referring to this case? |
| Q. So why would it make a | 4 A. No. I thought you were asking |
| fference to what the defendant's | 5 about permanent injunction. I don't think |
| -- strike -- strike that. | 6 she was addressing the -- an injunction |
| Why would it make a defendants | 7 issue. She was addressing the concept of |
| 8 [sic] to the plaintiffs' harms if the | 8 copyright protection. |
| plaintiffs' harms were continue wi | 9 Q. And that's what you quoted her |
| 10 strike that. | 10 for, right, was for the concept of copyright |
| 11 Is it your testimony that harms | 11 protection for standards? |
| 12 to plaintiffs would be different depending o | 12 MR. FEE: Objection. You're |
| 13 the particular basis of the Court's ruling? | 13 referring just to paragraph 112? |
| 14 MR. FEE: Objection. Vague. | 14 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 15 THE WITNESS: I -- I don't | 15 Q. You may answer. |
| 16 understand your question | 16 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 17 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 17 THE WITNESS: I -- I don't |
| 18 Q. It looks as though you're | 18 understand the question. |
| 19 stating what the harms would be if the Court | 19 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 20 found that incorporation by reference would | 20 Q. You quoted her |
| 21 cause the plaintiffs to lose copyright | 21 paragraph 112, correct? |
| 22 protection; is that correct? | 22 A. Yes. From one of her two |
| 23 A. I don't -- | 23 articles, yes. |
| 24 MR. FEE: Objection. Vague. | 24 Q. Right. Regarding the concept |
| 25 THE WITNESS: -- think so. I | 25 of copyright protection? |
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| A. Generally. I think she's | Q. "Such products" -- |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 talking about standards development and | A. And in the next two sentences. |
| 3 incorporation by reference. I don't remember | Q. And these are other products |
| 4 if she said at the very beginning of the | 4 that "could include more sophisticated |
| 5 article that it was about copyright | 5 Web-based availability, published |
| 6 protection, but she certainly talks about | 6 compilations of incorporated standards, and |
| 7 copyright protection. | 7 other ancillary products that incorporate the |
| 8 Q. And you're quoting her about | 8 standards"; isn't that correct? |
| 9 losing copyright protection, and you're | A. You didn't read that right. It |
| 10 placing it in the context of harms of the | 10 starts "such products cou |
| 11 loss of copyright protection, correct? | 11 Q. Okay. Otherwise, that reading |
| 12 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 12 is correct, correct? |
| 13 THE WITNESS: This excerpt | 13 A. I think so. |
| 14 doesn't specifically talk about losing | 14 Q. You consider that to be harm to |
| 15 copyright protection, but it talks | 15 the plaintiffs? |
| 16 about the concept of it. If there was | 16 MR. FEE: Objection. Vague. |
| 17 no longer copyright protection granted | 17 THE WITNESS: It could be, yes. |
| 18 to the SDOs, what would be the | 18 It's likely to be, if the copyright |
| eercussions. | 19 infringement or the assumption of a |
| 20 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 20 copyright infringement continues. It |
| 21 Q. And that's the context that you | 21 could broaden. |
| 22 identified in the first line of | 22 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 23 paragraph 112, correct? | 23 Q. Right. But the fact that these |
| 24 A. Yes. | 24 other types of products would enter the |
| 25 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 25 marketplace is part of the harm that you |
| Page 70 | Page |
| MR. BRID | vision from the defendant in this case? |
| 2 Q. Let me direct your attention to | MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 3 paragraph 35 of your report. It says, "With | THE WITNESS: It's potential -- |
| 4 regard to expansion beyond the specific | 4 there's a potential that the defendant |
| 5 actions of Public Resource here, the | 5 could do that. There's also the |
| 6 'product' offerings of Public Resource - | potential that other parties could do |
| 7 scans of paper copies of standards with some | that. |
| 8 rekeying of text and some redrawing of | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 9 diagrams (with some containing errors) - | Q. What -- |
| 10 represent a rudimentary first step in the use | 10 A. I don't know |
| 11 of Plaintiffs' standards that is likely to | 11 defendant has in mind. |
| 12 become much more sophisticated if the Court | 12 Q. Why did you take into account |
| 13 holds that third parties are free to use | 13 harms caused by other parties in this case? |
| 14 Plaintiffs' standards with impunity after | 14 A. Because -- |
| 15 they are incorporated by reference into law." | 15 MR. FEE: Objection. Lack of |
| 16 Do you see that? | 16 foundation. |
| 17 A. Yes, I | 17 Go ahead. |
| 18 Q. That is your statement, | 18 THE WITNESS: If no copyright |
| 19 correct? | 19 protection is allowed here, in other |
| 20 A. Yes. | 20 words, there's no permanent |
| 21 Q. What are the steps that you're | 21 injunction, Public Resource and other |
| 22 envisioning there beyond the rudimentary | 22 parties like it will have freedom to |
| 23 first step that you identify? | 23 do what the plaintiffs believe they |
| 24 A. I think they're laid | 24 should not have freedom to do. |
| 25 next sentence. | 25 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| Page 71 | Page 73 |

Q. In other words, if the Court makes a decision in a certain way, there will be harms from persons or entities other than Public.Resource.Org to the plaintiffs? Is that your testimony?

MR. FEE: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: You used the phrase "in a certain way." I don't know what you mean by that. I'm addressing the issue of whether there should be a permanent injunction or not.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. So your view is that, if the Court does not enter a permanent injunction, the plaintiffs will suffer harms from parties other than Public.Resource.Org. Is that your testimony?
A. That potential exists. I don't know for sure. That's, in part, why the harm is irreparable or very difficult to quantify.
Q. The -- what harm?
A. Continuing activity of Public

Resource and others. I don't know exactly what will happen, but the potential is that Page 74
there could be very broad dissemination of the standards, which would impact these SDOs tremendously.
Q. What harm would

Public.Resource.Org cause to plaintiffs if there is no permanent injunction?
A. A permanent injunction would -lack of a permanent injunction would harm the SDOs.
Q. That wasn't my question. My question was, what harm would Public.Resource.Org cause to plaintiffs if there is no permanent injunction?
A. At the very least, it's associated with its historical dissemination of these standards, and there would be, in essence, a carte blanche for other organizations or individuals to access those.

So my expectation is that the dissemination of the materials that have already been disseminated will expand.

It could also be the case that Public Resource will undertake further activities that would disseminate either already disseminated standards or other

## standards.

Q. What further harm would Public.Resource.Org cause to plaintiffs with respect to the standards at issue in this case if no -- if the Court does not permanently enjoin Public.Resource.Org?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: If there's no
permanent injunction, there will, in essence, be a message sent to the marketplace that the standards that have already been disseminated are out there and can be used by others. So right now my expectation is that some number of consumers of the standards have been reluctant or unknowing as to the standards disseminated by Public Resource. Now there will be more knowledge about that and more approval of that activity. That is if there's no permanent injunction.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. What harms will plaintiffs suffer if the Court rules that the plaintiffs
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do not own the copyrights in this case?
MR. FEE: Objection. Calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: In essence, you're asking if there's no copyright infringement? BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. No. What harms -- have you identified what harms the plaintiffs would suffer if the Court rules that the plaintiffs do not own the copyrights at issue, that there are no copyrights that the plaintiffs own --

MR. FEE: Objection to form. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. -- at issue in this case?
A. I haven't addressed or thought about that issue. There are also, don't forget, trademark issues.
Q. I'm asking about copyright, so I ask you to confine your answers to my questions.

My question is, what -- you
assume for purposes of your analysis that
plaintiffs own valid copyrights, correct?
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| Right. Or approximately | NESS: Again, I don't |
| :---: | :---: |
| \$3 million? | have an estimate. |
| A. Are you limiting it just to | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 90.1 or all its standards? | Q. Do you know -- did ASHRAE pay |
| Q. Well, that's a good question. | 5 for the time, the hotel bills, and the plane |
| What -- what's -- what did you intend the | 6 fares of its volunteer members in updating |
| last sentence in paragraph 76 to refer to? | the ASHRAE 90.1 standard? |
| All of its standards or 90.1? | A. I would expect rarely. It's |
| A. I think it's all of its | ssible that there are certain instances in |
| 10 standards, but we could visit the screenshot | 10 which there was some set of out-of-pocket |
| 11 from the Web site to confirm that. | 11 expenses covered, but I would imagine the |
| 12 Q. Okay. | 12 bulk of the time it's the volunteer's |
| 13 A. I -- I could be wrong. I don't | 13 employer. |
| 14 think I am, but I could be. | 14 MR. BRIDGES: Sorry. How long |
| 15 Q. Okay. In the previous | 15 have we been going? I didn't get when |
| 16 sentence, you say, "ASHRAE and its volunteer | 16 we went back on. |
| 17 members devoted more than 86,400 man-hours, | 17 MR. FEE: 34 minute |
| 18 3,600 hotel nights, and 1,200 round-trip | 18 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 19 flights as part of the process." | 19 Q. Did you speak with Emily Bremer |
| 20 And that -- "the process" | 20 at any point in this case? |
| 21 appears to refer to updating the ASHRAE 90.1 | 21 A. No. |
| standard, correct? | 22 Q. How did you become acquainted |
| 23 A. Yes. | 23 with her writings? |
| 24 Q. When you say "ASHRAE and its | 24 A. I think Kevin Fee and/ |
| 25 volunteer members," and then you give those Page 90 | 25 Jordana Rubel brought to my attention that |
| istics, those statistics refer primarily | she had written on this topic. I don't |
| the man-hours, hotel nights, and | 2 recall whether then we separately obtained |
| round-trip flights of the volunteer members? | 3 her two articles or Mr. Fee slash Ms. Rubel |
| MR. FEE: Objection. Vague. | 4 provided those to |
| THE WITNESS: Probably. As | Q. What independent work did you |
| opposed to ASHRAE-employed staff. | 6 do to research writings regarding the |
| BY MR. BRIDGES: | onomics of standards development? |
| Q. Do you know how much ASHRAE's | MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| olunteer members and their employe | THE WITNESS: We did |
| 10 strike that. | 10 independent research in the sense that |
| 11 Do you know how much ASHRAE's | 11 people that work with me did a |
| 12 volunteer members and their employers spent | 12 literature search to determine what |
| 13 in salaries and disbursements for the | 13 writings had been done in the area. |
| 14 man-hours, hotel nights, and round-trip | 14 I was previously aware of some |
| 15 flights that were part of the process of | 15 amount of the scholarship to begin |
| 16 updating the ASHRAE 90.1 standard? | 16 with |
| 17 A. I don't know, but it -- I would | 17 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 18 imagine it's a noticeable amount, but I don't | 18 Q. How is that literature search |
| 19 know the amount. | 19 reflected in any documents? |
| 20 Q. What would be your best | 20 A. The results are shown in my |
| 21 estimate? | 21 tab 2, and in particular it is page 2 of my |
| 22 A. I don't have a best estimate. | 22 tab 2, at the bottom. |
| 23 Q. Would it be probably over | 23 Q. And were these items found by |
| 24 \$10 million? | 24 you or your team? |
| 25 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 25 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| Page 91 | Page |



```
BY MR. BRIDGES:
```

Exhibits 2 and 3 ?
personnel.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
recall.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. In your report --
referring to those conversations?
BY MR. BRIDGES:
recall.
Q. In your report -referring to those conversations?

BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Mr. Jarosz, I'm handing you
Exhibits 2 and 3. I'll represent that these
were furnished to us by e-mail last night, I
think around 6 p.m. Eastern or thereabouts.
Can you please identify
MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: To the best of my
knowledge, Exhibit 2 is notes that
Mr. Chapman took in conversations that
we had with various people, and
Exhibit 3 is notes that Mr. Hamasaki
took in conversations with plaintiff
Q. Did you take any notes of
conversations with plaintiffs' personnel?
A. I believe I did, but I did not
keep those notes. Those were -- I followed
my normal procedure. And by the time we got
to the report, I had not kept those notes.
Q. Did you have those -- did you
refer to those notes in drafting your report?
MR. FEE: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: Not that I
A. Well, I guess I should say, I
looked back at the notes at some time, and
the report was done over a period of time.
So I guess in some dimension I did, but as it
came toward the final stages, I did not.
Q. Well, I'm just curious, because
your report indicates, among a number of the
footnotes, there's citations to conversations
with various persons. And I'm trying to
figure out how -- on what you drew to cite
specifically to various conversations in your
report. And I'll give you examples.
Footnotes 193, 194, and 196 through 200.

On what were you relying in
MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Conversations
with Mr. Chapman and/or Mr. Hamasaki.
Q. So you were relying on
conversations with Messrs. Chapman and
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THE WITNESS: Not that I
A. Well, I guess I should say, I
looked back at the notes at some time, and the report was done over a period of time.
So I guess in some dimension I did, but as it came toward the final stages, I did not.
Q. Well, I'm just curious, because
your report indicates, among a number of the
footnotes, there's citations to conversations
figure out how -- on what you drew to cite
specifically to various conversations in your
Footnotes 193, 194, and 196 through 200.

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Conversations
with Mr. Chapman and/or Mr. Hamasaki.
Q. So you were relying on
conversations with Messrs. Chapman and

```
Hamasaki?
    MR. FEE: Objection. Vague.
    THE WITNESS: Yes, in part.
```

BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. What else, other than relying upon conversations with them?
A. And the memory that I had of the conversations with the individuals.
Q. And you -- but you didn't rely upon your own notes?
A. Not at the point that I was drafting up footnotes, no.
Q. Why would you take notes and then dispose of them before you wrote your report?
A. Well, I find it -- I find it useful to follow along in a conversation by taking notes so that I can follow up with certain points. I find it useful to write things down. It helps in the memory process. But I did not keep those notes in the final drafting of the report.
Q. Why would you -- when you had those conversations, did you anticipate that you were going to prepare a report?
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A. I thought that there was a very good possibility, yes.
Q. Why did you not retain notes of conversations to have on hand for the preparation of your report?
A. I followed my normal procedure. I don't typically take notes. I'm not a great note-taker, and my handwriting leaves much to be desired. So I tend to find my notes themselves to be of limited assistance.
Q. And that's your normal procedure, is to throw away notes that reflect conversations that you rely on?
A. No. My normal procedure is to keep materials that I do rely upon and not keep materials that I don't need to rely upon.
Q. And you didn't need to rely
upon any of your notes to recall your conversations, so you went and discussed the conversations with two other persons?
A. Yes.
Q. Did -- I see -- it's my
understanding that your report sites conversations with Stephen Comstock 17 times,
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conversations with Jim Thomas 11 times, conversations with Jim Pauley seven times, conversations with John Pace four times, conversations with Stephanie Reiniche four times, and conversations with Mark Owen three times.

Did you make the citations to those conversations in the report based on your memory?

MR. FEE: Objection. Lack of foundation.

THE WITNESS: In part, and I think in part the citations were put there based on the memory and knowledge of Mr. Chapman and Mr. Hamasaki.

```
BY MR. BRIDGES:
```

Q. Did you get any materials from

Mr. Chapman and Mr. Hamasaki other than
Exhibits 2 and 3 on which you relied in preparing this report?

MR. FEE: Objection. Lack of foundation. Mischaracterizes his testimony.

THE WITNESS: Actually, as a
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factual matter, this is the very first time I've seen these notes. I've never seen these before.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. What did you rely upon in making all of the detailed references to conversations in the report?
A. My --

MR. FEE: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: My memory of conversations with those individuals and conversations that I had with Mr. Hamasaki and Mr. Chapman. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Did anyone else prepare the language regarding that -- the information from those conversations that you relied upon in creating your report?
A. No, not to my knowledge. Now, lawyers did look at draft of the report, although we're not going into the substance of it. But that was -- we could, in part, be refreshed if we were wrong as to any cite, but I don't think we were.
Q. Did you rely upon the writing of the language by other people in deciding to include language regarding information learned from conversations in your report?

MR. FEE: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: I can answer that by saying Mr. Hamasaki, Mr. Chapman, and I were all involved in this project and the report. It was the case that we all had some input in the writing of the words, though I was responsible for and directly supervised all of it.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. And did you rely upon input
from Mr. Hamasaki and Mr. Chapman in the form of written input, such as drafts?

MR. FEE: Objection.
THE WITNESS: As I --
MR. FEE: Hold on a second.
I don't believe that you're

> entitled to discovery regarding his
drafts, and I'll instruct him not to answer that --

MR. BRIDGES: I --
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MR. FEE: -- unless you have -unless there's something in there that makes this subject to an exception of Rule 26, as limitation on discovery from experts, which I'm not aware of.

MR. BRIDGES: I am entitled to discovery about materials he relied upon --

MR. FEE: Okay. That's fair.
MR. BRIDGES: -- and that is my question.

MR. FEE: Okay.

## BY MR. BRIDGES:

Q. And I'd like to know if you relied upon drafts prepared by other persons regarding the statements and facts for which conversations are mentioned in the citations.

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know how to answer that besides what I said a moment ago, and let me perhaps say it a little bit differently and see if that's responsive.

Mr. Hamasaki, Mr. Chapman, and I were all involved in this project

Page 105

|  | and in this report. We were all | 1 | go behind him or vice versa. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | involved in writing and rewriting and | 2 | So I don't know if that answers |
| 3 | talking and questioning one another. | 3 | your question, but that's the process |
| 4 | BY MR. BRIDGES: | 4 | that we followed. |
| 5 | Q. And were you relying, in part, | 5 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 6 | upon the memories or recorded memories of | 6 | Q. And did the process include |
| 7 | Mr. Hamasaki and Mr. Chapman? | 7 | eir writing the facts that corresponded to |
| 8 | MR. FEE: Objection. Vague as | 8 | e conversations with plaintiffs' employees |
| 9 | 'relying." | 9 | d your reviewing and revising what they had |
| 10 | And if you're asking him if | 10 | written? |
| 11 | he's relied upon those conversations | 11 | MR. FEE: Objection. |
| 12 | as the basis for facts or assumptions, | 12 | To the extent that question |
| 13 | you can answer it. If you mean relied | 13 | calls for responsive information that |
| 14 | in any other context, you shouldn't | 14 | is unrelated to bases that form your |
| 15 | wer it. | 15 | opinions or conclusions or assumptions |
| 16 | THE WITNESS: I certainly | 16 | that you made, I would instruct you |
| 17 | n't rely on any recordings of | 17 | not to answer that portion of the |
| 18 | conversations. I had not seen any | 18 | question. You can otherwise respond. |
| 19 | tes. This is the first I've seen | 19 | THE WITNESS: We all reviewed |
| 20 | notes from Mr. Chapman and | 20 | nd revised the document. I don't |
| 21 | Mr. Hamasaki. | 21 | ink that there were any facts that |
| 22 | We talked about virtually | 22 | me only from one of them that I |
| 23 | hese topics. I don't know if you | 23 | n't aware of. |
| 24 | would call that "relying" or not. But | 24 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 25 | we worked together on this project. | 25 | Q. Were there recollections that |
|  | Page 106 |  | Page 10 |
| 1 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |  | m |
| 2 | Q. Did they prepare draft language | 2 | eating your report? |
| 3 | Q | 3 | MR. FEE: Same objection and |
| 4 | nversations with citations to those | 4 | same instruction. |
| 5 | conversations that you relied upon in | 5 | THE WITNESS: There may have |
| 6 | completing the report? | 6 | been confirmations of things that I |
| 7 | MR. FEE: Objection. Vague as | 7 | recalled or knew, but I don't think |
| 8 | to "relied." | 8 | hat they brought to my attention |
| 9 | To the extent that should b | 9 | things that I didn't previously know. |
| 10 | interpreted as meaning relied upon | 10 | Y MR. BRIDGES |
| 11 | reaching any conclusions in your | 11 | Q. And what types of confirmations |
| 12 | report or relied upon for assumption |  | ere there things that you relied upon in |
| 13 | you can answer it. You shouldn't | 13 | proving this report? |
| 14 | answer it otherwise. | 14 | MR. FEE: Same objection and |
| 15 | THE WITNESS: I just don't know | 15 | astructio |
| 16 | how to answer that question besides | 16 | THE WITNESS: Virtually |
| 17 | saying, at various points in time, one | 17 | everything you see in the report, all |
| 18 | or the other -- others of us were | 18 | three of us were involved in it, and |
| 19 | involved in the Word document that | 19 | all three of us were confirming and |
| 20 | created. So it was almost never the | 20 | denying things or evaluating things |
| 21 | case that the three of us were in the | 21 | along the way. |
| 22 | ord document at the same | 22 | MR. BRIDGES: I think |
| 23 | So there were times that, for | 23 | pause for a change of media, so why |
| 24 | tance, Mr. Hamasaki was doing some | 24 | don't we take a break. |
| 25 | work in the document and then I would | 25 | THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the |
|  | Page 107 |  | Page 109 |


| ecord at 12:17. This is the end of | you interview? |
| :---: | :---: |
| media unit number 1. | 2 A. I don't think I interviewed any |
| 3 | 3 members of the public either. |
| (Recess from 12:17 p.m. to | 4 Q. What steps did you do to |
| 12:32 p.m.) | 5 ascertain the views of the members of the |
| 6 *** | 6 organizations, other than the employees? |
| THE VIDEOGRAPHER: On the | $7 \quad$ A. I read the materials that were |
| ord at 12:32. This is the | 8 produced here. I read the deposition |
| ginning of media unit 2 in | 9 testimony of the various individuals. I read |
| 10 deposition of John Jarosz. | 10 the articles published by Ms. Bremer. And I |
| 11 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 11 read the other academic literature and |
| 12 Q. Mr. Jarosz, your report, as I | 12 practical literature that I had. |
| 13 referred to earlier, cites a number of | 13 Q. Which of those sources stated |
| 14 conversations with employees of the | 14 the views of the non-employee members of the |
| 15 plaintiffs. For what purpose did you have | 15 various organizations? |
| 16 conversations with the plaintiffs' employees? | 16 A. I don't know that views of -- |
| 17 A. To learn more about the | 17 that their views were explicitly addressed in |
| 18 organization and their view as to the impact | 18 my report or represented. I understood what |
| 19 of continued copyright protectio | 19 the impacts of the lack of honoring the |
| 20 continued copyright infringement and | 20 copyrights and trademarks would have, but I |
| 21 trademark infringement. | 21 don't know that I saw non-employee member |
| 22 Q. What view did you learn from | 22 views explicitly summarized. |
| 23 them? | 23 Q. So what steps did you do to |
| 24 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 24 ascertain the views of the members of the |
| 25 THE WITNESS: Well, I solicited | 25 organizations -- |
| $\text { Page } 110$ | Page 112 |
| learned many | R. FEE: Objection. |
| organizations. I also learned that | 2 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 3 each one of them viewed continued | 3 Q. -- other than their employees? |
| 4 copyright infringement and trademark | MR. FEE: Asked and answered. |
| 5 infringement as quite detrimental to | THE WITNESS: Well, I talked to |
| 6 their organizations, detrimental to | the employees, and they interact with |
| 7 the members, detrimental to the | the members on a very regular basis, |
| 8 public. | 8 so they gave me some sense of what the |
| They viewed continued | views of the members were. |
| 10 infringement as potentially | 10 It also could be th |
| 11 devastating to their organizations. | 11 the perspectives of the members are |
| 12 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 12 reflected in some of the documents I |
| 13 Q. These were their views? | 13 identified in tab 2 |
| 14 A. Yes. I'm just paraphrasing, of | 14 BY MR. BRIDGES |
| 15 course. | 15 Q. Well, I'm just trying to find |
| 16 Q. What members did you interview? | 16 out where -- it sounds as though -- strike |
| 17 A. None, other than the employees. | 17 that. |
| 18 I don't know if you call those "members" or | 18 It sounds as though a minute |
| 19 not. But the volunteer membership, I didn't | 19 ago you said you couldn't recall anything |
| 20 go to. | 20 specifically calling out view |
| 21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Excuse me. | 21 non-employee members, correct? |
| unsel, could you move your | 22 A. Correct. I think that's right. |
| 23 microphone to your lapel? Thank you. | 23 Q. What did you do to verify the |
| 24 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 24 statements that employees of the plaintiffs |
| 25 Q. What members of the public did | 25 made about the views of the non-employee |
| Page 111 | Page 113 |

```
members of their organizations?
    A. I did what I normally do in an
assignment like this and look at the produced
materials.
    Q. And the produced materials did
not call out specifically any views of
non-employee members of the plaintiff
organizations, correct?
    A. I don't recall any specific
views being summarized. My memory may not be
perfect on that, though.
    Q. What research, if any, did you
do among members of the public about whether
lack of copyright protection for the
plaintiffs' standards would be detrimental to
the -- to the public?
    A. The information that I reviewed
is in tab 2. I didn't have material beyond
what is identified in tab 2.
    Q. So what in tab 2 reflects your
steps to ascertain the views of members of
the public?
        MR. FEE: Objection to form.
        THE WITNESS: I think the
    Bremer articles, in part, address
```
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    that. I think some of the federal
    government's circulars that I
    identify, in part, reflect the
    reviews, in particular the NTTAA of
    1995 and OMB Circular A-119. I think
    they, in part, reflect public views.
    There are probably other things.
    BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Did you review OMB Circular
A-119 personally?
A. Yes. As I recall, I did.
Q. Did you review any materials
pertaining to the discussions or
deliberations of the Administrative
Conference of the United States in connection
with your research or analysis?
A. What particular materials or
meetings are you referring to?
Q. Any.
A. I don't recall, but it's
possible.
Q. Does tab 2 refer you to any
documents that would provide you information
about the discussions or deliberations of the
Administrative Conference of the United

States other than law review articles by Emily Bremer?
A. As I sit here right now, I'm not aware of any documents that discuss the deliberations, but my memory is not perfect.
Q. Do you know if there was a consensus in any relevant committee of the Administrative Conference of the United States regarding the conclusions that Ms. Bremer states in her law review articles?
A. I don't.

MR. FEE: Objection. Vague. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Do you know whether there was any dissent in any relevant committee of the Administrative Conference of the United States regarding the conclusions that Ms. Bremer states in her law review articles?

MR. FEE: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: I don't.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Do you know why persons get appointed to the Administrative Conference of the United States?
A. I may have known that, but I
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don't recall that sitting here now.
Q. Do you know whether

Ms. Bremer's articles -- strike that.
Do you know whether
Ms. Bremer's law review articles reflect a view of the Administrative Conference of the United States --

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. -- or of any of its committees?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not aware
that they officially reflect that. I
believe she gathered information, and
they may, in fact, represent the views
of some or all members, but I don't
think that's -- that either article is
an official representation --
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Are you --
A. -- of that body.
Q. Are you aware of the fact that her articles -- her law review articles specifically disclaim her articles as the views of any government entity and indicate
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that they are her personal views?
A. I wouldn't be surprised and may -- I may have read that, but I would expect that that would be in the first footnote of one or both articles.
Q. What did you do to examine the alleged facts that the representatives of
plaintiffs stated to you in their conversations with you?

MR. FEE: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: I looked at -MR. FEE: Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I
looked at the document production and
the other materials shown in tab 2.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. You looked at the document production that the plaintiffs' counsel furnished you?
A. In part. There were other things in tab 2 that were not provided to me by plaintiffs' counsel.
Q. What other materials in tab 2 -- strike that.

Please identify for me in tab 2
the materials that plaintiffs' counsel
furnished you.
A. I don't know with absolute
certainty, but let me give you my best guess.
I believe all the depositions that are shown on page 1. I believe the Bates ranges at the very top of the page were provided by counsel.

The deposition transcripts and exhibits were provided by counsel. I believe the financial statements and plans were provided by counsel. I believe the legal documents were provided by counsel. I believe the miscellaneous items were provided by counsel.

I don't know about the cases
and laws. I just don't remember if we
separately gathered those or were provided those.

The analyst reports, articles, books, and presentations, I think we gathered all of those, with the possible exception of the two Bremer articles. I don't recall if counsel provided that or we obtained those separately.

I believe counsel did not
provide the Web site screenshots, but I might be wrong on that.
Q. And did you do anything -what, if anything, did you do to test the validity of the factual assertions that the plaintiffs made to you in your conversations with their employees?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
Asked and answered.
THE WITNESS: Well, we looked
at materials. If we found things that
conflicted with what we learned, that
would prompt us to investigate
further. But I don't recall seeing
any documentary evidence that
conflicted with facts that were
provided by plaintiff personnel, but I
might be wrong.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Did you investigate
independently whether documents existed that contradicted plaintiffs' statements of facts?
A. Not with that in mind. We looked at the documents and were mindful of Page 120
whether there were conflicts within documents
or conflicts between documents and other
information, but I don't recall that we saw anything that gave us substantial pause.

There were probably some things where there were some uncertainties whether there was a conflict or not and some where there were insignificant conflicts, but I think mostly the information we saw did not conflict with the information we learned from plaintiff personnel.
Q. Did you investigate independently whether other documents, apart from the documents plaintiffs furnished you, existed that contradicted plaintiffs' statements of facts --

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. -- in conversations with you?
A. Yes, in the sense that we gathered some information that we did not receive from plaintiffs' counsel, but all of that is identified in tab 2.
Q. Which part of tab 2?
A. Well, as I said, I think the

```
Web sites we gathered ourselves, and I think
the reports and articles, with the exception
of the Bremer articles, we gathered
ourselves.
    Q. Do you know why you got no
documents from NFPA, no Bates range documents
from NFPA?
    MR. REHN: Object to form --
    THE WITNESS: I don't know why
    we did not receive Bates documents --
        THE REPORTER: Wait.
        MR. REHN: Sorry. Object to
    the form. Lacks foundation.
        THE WITNESS: I don't know for
    sure that we didn't receive
    Bates-stamped documents, but I believe
    some of the documents we received were
    NFPA documents.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
    Q. Do you recall seeing any NFPA
documents that -- in which NFPA personnel
stated that they could not show any harm from
the defendant's activities?
    A. Received any documents that
said that?
```

Q. Uh-huh.
A. Perhaps you would have
something that would refresh my memory. I
don't recall, sitting here right now, but
it's possible.
Are you talking about
historical -- historically no harm, or are
you talking about prospectively?
Q. Either one. Did you -- do you
recall seeing any internal NFPA documents
that call into question where NF -- whether
NFPA has suffered any harm from the
defendant's activities?
A. I don't recall documents on it.
There may have been some deposition testimony
about past activities, but I don't know if it
was activities prior to Public Resource
actions here or after.
Q. Do you recall learning about
any litigation that NFPA had engaged in
pertaining to standards and copyright?
A. I think I heard that there's
some overseas litigation involving Public
Resource. Whether that involves NFPA, I
don't know.
Page 122
Q. What did you hear about overseas litigation involving Public

## Resource?

A. I think I heard that there was a German -- or a suit in Germany, but I'm not sure that I learned much more than that. I don't recall what status that suit -- what the status of that suit is.
Q. Do you recall anyone disclosing to you litigation involving NFPA in the United States that pertained to standards and copyright?
A. It's possible, but I don't recall any, sitting here right now.
Q. Do you recall inquiring about public statements of fact that NFPA has made regarding copyright and standards in litigation other than this litigation in the United States?

MR. FEE: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: I do not.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Are you familiar with a case called Veeck, V-E-E-C-K?
A. I'm familiar with an opinion in Page 124
the Veeck case.
Q. What do you know about that opinion?

MR. FEE: Objection.
I would instruct you not to
disclose anything you know about that
opinion that was a result of
communications with counsel and that
did not form the basis of any of the
opinions in your report or any of the
assumptions that you relied upon in
reaching your conclusions.
THE WITNESS: I did talk with counsel about that case, and that case didn't form any basis for any of my observations or conclusions here. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Why did the Veeck case not form any basis for any of your observations or conclusions here?
A. I don't know how to answer that question. I -- it didn't present any facts that were specific to this case, as far as I recall.
Q. What do you recall of the facts
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```
of that case?
```

A. I recall generally it had to do with activities of certain municipalities using what was copyrighted or what was claimed to be copyrighted material by a group
that developed materials explicitly to be put
into the law.
Q. Do you recall what the decision was in the opinion you seem to be familiar with?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I think, generally, that copyright protection was not available. I'm sure there was more to it, but that's my general
opinion, my general memory. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. And copyright protection was not available for what?
A. Well, the asserted copyrights in that matter.
Q. And do you recall what the matter was that was at issue in Veeck?
A. Well, as I said, I think it was certain municipalities were using certain
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standards and using the materials from
certain standards and perhaps disseminating
it. I -- I forget the facts.
Q. Do you recall what kind of standards they were?

MR. FEE: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: They may
generally have had to deal with
building codes, but I could be wrong
on that.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. What analysis did you do of harms suffered by the code developers of those building codes as a consequence of the Veeck decision?
A. I didn't do any analysis associated with the facts of that case.
Q. Why not?
A. Because those facts are
different than the facts here, including what the organization was.
Q. Are the facts -- what -- what case studies are you familiar of -- are you familiar with regarding measurements of harms suffered by entities that develop codes when Page 127
a court rules that those codes are not subject to copyright?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
Vague. Lack of foundation.
THE WITNESS: What case studies? Are you talking about something akin to a business school case study? I don't know what you mean by that term.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. I'm just -- what opportunities
do you -- have you identified for finding comparable circumstances where a court has made a ruling that building codes are not subject to copyright in order to study what the consequences were --

MR. FEE: Objection.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. -- what the economic consequences were of the Court's decision?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
Vague as to "comparable." Lack of foundation.

You can answer.
THE WITNESS: I don't know that Page 128

I can answer. I don't -- I don't under -- I don't know how to answer your question. I read that court case.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. And did you stop to say at some
point -- strike that.
Why did you read the court
case?
A. Because I understand that Public Resource believes it's of some significance to this case.
Q. Do you believe that that -- do you have an understanding as to whether the Veeck case is of any significance to this case?

MR. FEE: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: I don't know.
I'm not a legal expert.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. What steps did you take to ascertain what economic harms flowed from the Court's decision in the Veeck case?

MR. FEE: Objection. Asked and Page 129

| answered. | 1 A. Not sitting here right now, I |
| :---: | :---: |
| THE WITNESS: Again, I read the | 2 don't. |
| case. I didn't do any analysis beyond | Q. Do you know whether ASHRAE took |
| 4 that of that particular case. | 4 over development of what became standard 90.1 |
| 5 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 5 from any other group or entity? |
| Q. What steps did you take to | A. No, I do not. |
| ertain what public harms flowed from | Q. Have you ever quantified the |
| Court's decision in the Veeck case? | 8 value of the contributions made by the |
| A. Other than reading the case, | 9 volunteers of the various organizations to |
| 10 the opinion in the case, I didn't do anything | 10 the standards at issue in this case? |
| 11 beyond that to understand the implications of | 11 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 12 that holding. | 12 THE WITNESS: Not other th |
| 13 Q. You didn't do any investigation | 13 having some sense of hours or a |
| 14 as to the economic consequences to any | 14 limited sense of dollars, but not |
| 15 entity, industry, or person as a consequence | 15 beyond that, no. |
| 16 of the decision in the Veeck case, correct? | 16 BY MR. BRID |
| 17 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 17 Q. Can you put a rough dollar |
| 18 THE WITNESS: I think that's | 18 value on the time and expenses of the |
| 19 correct, yes. | 19 volunteers with respect to any of the |
| 20 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 20 standards in this case? |
| 21 Q. How has the | 21 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 22 standards development changed in the last 100 | 22 THE WITNESS: Not sitting here |
| 23 years, to your knowledge? | 23 right now. That would entail a little |
| 24 A. I don't know the specifics, and | 24 bit of a study. I have not done that. |
| 25 I don't know that there is one standa | 25 BY |
| Page 130 | Page |
| velopment process. I think there are a | Q. What -- what would be required? |
| 2 variety of processes pursued by a number of | A. To understand basically the |
| 3 SSOs or SDOs. I'm sure that there have been | 3 out-of-pocket expenses incurred and the |
| 4 changes on the margin. There may have been | 4 opportunity costs incurred. So among other |
| 5 larger changes. I just don't know. I have | 5 things, one would want to look at time |
| 6 not studied the trend in the standard | 6 records, have an understanding of |
| 7 development process over time. | 7 compensation, have an understanding of the |
| 8 Q. What changes are you aware of | 8 activities of those individuals. Those |
| 9 in the standards development process of NFPA | 9 are -- would be among the inputs. |
| 10 over the past 100 years? | 10 Q. What changes are you aware of |
| 11 A. I don't know. I've not studied | 11 in the distribution of standards in the past |
| 12 that topic. | 12100 years by the plaintiffs? |
| 13 Q. What changes are you aware of | MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 14 in the standards development process of the | THE WITNESS: I haven't |
| 15 ASHRAE 90.1 standard? | 15 investigated that particular issue, |
| 16 A. I don't know. I've not studied | 16 but I understand that some of the |
|  | 17 standards today are distributed |
| 18 Q. How did ASHRAE come to develop | 18 through the Internet that certainly |
| 19 the 90.1 standard? | 19 didn't exist 100 years ago. |
| 20 A. I think, generally, a need was | 20 Some of the standards |
| 21 identified and a group of constituents | 21 distributed for free with limitations |
| 22 convened to derive a standard, but I don't | 22 I don't know if that was true 100 |
| 23 know the specifics beyond that. | 23 years ago, but it might have been. |
| 24 Q. Do you know who identified the | I would expect some of the |
| 25 need? | 25 copying and dissemination capabilities |
| Page 131 | Page 133 |


|  | are much greater today than they were |  | the right to reproduce, copy, or |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 1915, but I don't know that the |  | disseminate those standards but can |
| 3 | general methods of -- I don't know how | 3 | look at them online. |
| 4 | the general methods of distribution | 4 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 5 | have changed. | 5 | Q. Have you used the reading rooms |
| 6 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |  | of any of the plaintiffs? |
| 7 | Q. What changes are you aware of | 7 | A. No, I have not. |
| 8 | sales trends over the past 20 years? | 8 | Q. Have you reviewed the interface |
| 9 | MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 9 | that the -- have you reviewed the interfaces |
| 10 | THE WITNESS: I don't have data | 10 | that the plaintiffs offer to persons wishing |
| 11 | going back as far as 20 years ago. I | 11 | to view materials for free online? |
| 12 | have some information on publication | 12 | A. No, I don't think |
| 13 | sales, for instance, in tabs 3, 4, and | 13 | Q. Do you know what effect, if |
| 14 | 5. They only -- that information only | 14 | any, the presence of those free materials on |
| 15 | goes back a few years, however. | 15 | he plaintiffs' Web sites has had on the |
| 16 | BY MR. BRIDGES: | 16 | aintiffs' revenues? |
| 17 | Q. Did you review any information | 17 | MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 18 | lier than the dates shown in the documents | 18 | THE WITNESS: No, I don't. |
|  | tabs 3, 4, and 5? | 19 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 20 | MR. FEE: Objection. Vague | 20 | Q. Have you -- ha |
| 21 | THE WITNESS: It's possible | 21 | vestigated that? |
| 22 | that some of the source documents had | 22 | MR. FEE: Same objection |
| 23 | earlier information, but I don't | $23$ | THE WITNESS: I've be |
| 24 | recall that. I would need to look at | 24 | opening -- I've been open to learning |
| 25 | those source docun | 25 | about that, but I haven't learned that |
|  | Page 134 |  | Page 13 |
| 1 | MR. B |  | ere's a direct or |
| 2 | Q. And those source documents | 2 | There might be, but I haven't seen |
| 3 | ould be within the Bates ranges identified | 3 | idence of that. |
| 4 | in tab 2 of your report? | 4 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 5 | A. Within the Bates ranges | 5 | Q. My question was, have you |
| 6 | identified elsewhere in tab 2. For instance, | 6 | investigated that? |
| 7 | e AS team -- ASTM audited -- audited | 7 | MR. FEE: Same objection. |
| 8 | onsolidated financial statements, I think, | 8 | THE WITNESS: Perhaps you could |
| 9 | may not all be Bates-stamped. I could be | 9 | read back my answer. |
| 10 | rong on that. But I would look in that set | 10 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 11 | financial documents. | 11 | Q. I've heard the answer. It was |
| 12 | Q. What do you know about what you | 12 | not responsive to my question. The -- you |
| 13 | id -- strike that. | 13 | said you did not know what effect, if any, |
| 14 | You said earlier that some | 14 | the presence of those free materials on the |
| 15 | andards are distributed for free with some | 15 | laintiffs' Web sites has had on the |
| 16 | limitations; is that correct? | 16 | laintiffs' revenues. |
| 17 | A. Yes, that's my understanding | 17 | And my question is, have you |
| 18 | Q. What do you know about that? |  | nvestigated that? |
| 19 | MR. FEE: Objection. Vague | 19 | MR. FEE: Same objection. |
| 20 | THE WITNESS: I've written | 20 | THE WITNESS: No, I've not |
| 21 | about that in my report. I believe | 21 | undertaken a separate investigation. |
| 22 | that each one of the plaintiffs has | 22 | I've been alert to that topic, but I |
| 23 | provided what is sometimes called a | 23 | en't assigned myself that |
| 24 | "reading room" so that people can look | 24 | investigation. |
| 25 | at those standards but are not given | $25$ | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
|  | Page 135 |  | Page 137 |


| 1 Q. Was something that was - | SDOs, but the standard setting organizatio |
| :---: | :---: |
| remained pending at the time you wrote this | 2 that are the candidates are the ones that I |
| 3 report as something that you expected to do | 3 identified earlier today. |
| 4 in the future? | 4 Q. Which SDOs do you recall |
| A. No. | 5 treating copyright protection of their |
| 6 MR. FEE: Objection. Vague | 6 standards as very important? |
| THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. | 7 A. I just don't recall right now. |
| No. | 8 I -- I have some vague recollection that |
| MR. BRID | 9 copyright considerations are addressed by |
| 10 Q. Did your | 10 ETSI, but I could be wrong on that. |
| standards development organizations | 11 Q. What do you know about polic |
| 12 other than the plaintiffs, for purposes of | 12 or practices of the Blu-ray organization with |
| 13 your work in this case? | 13 respect to copyright protection? |
| MR. FEE: Objection. Vague | 14 A. I assume you're talking |
| 15 THE WITNESS: Not that I | 15 the Blu-ray Association? I may have known |
| call. I saw reference to other SDOs | 16 when I was involved in that matter. I do n |
| 17 in the Bremer articles, for instance, | 17 remember, sitting here now. |
| 18 but I didn't undertake a separate | 18 Q. Do you recall that your |
| 19 investigation of the practices of any | 19 actually refers to the Blu-ray Association? |
| 20 other SDOs for purposes of my | 20 A. I think I refer to Blu-ray |
| 21 assignment here. | 21 standards. I don't recall if I refer to |
| 22 BY MR. BRIDGES | 22 Blu-ray Association, but perhaps you could |
| 23 Q. Are you aware | 23 refresh my memory. |
| 24 policies of other SDOs with reference | 24 Q. I believe you point it out |
| 25 either copyright or free availability | 25 the bottom of page 62. "While certain SDO |
| Page 1 |  |
| ateria | 1 (e.g., the Blu-ray disc association) provide |
| 2 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 2 unrestricted access to their standard |
| THE WITNESS: I may have been | 3 publications for free, the Plaintiffs here do |
| 4 aware through other assignments I've | 4 not." |
| 5 undertaken in the past, but I didn't | 5 Do you recall that |
| 6 undertake any separate investigation | 6 A. Now I do. Thank you for |
| 7 for purposes of this matter. | 7 refreshing my memory |
| 8 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 8 Q. What economic effects are you |
| Q. What awareness do you have | 9 aware of the fact that the Blu-ray Disc |
| 10 the practices or policies of other SDOs | 10 Association provides unrestricted access |
| 11 through other assignments you've undertaken | 11 its standard publications for free? |
| 12 in the past? | 12 A. I have not investigated that |
| 13 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 13 issue, so I don't know. |
| 14 THE WITNESS: I can only recall | 14 Q. What other SD |
| 15 most generally that they view | 15 identified that provide unrestricted access |
| 16 intellectual property protection as | 16 to their standards for free? |
| 17 being very important, but I can't b | 17 A. I do |
| 18 any more specific than that. | 18 any others in my report. |
| 19 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 19 Q. Did you look for any others? |
| 20 Q. Which SDOs you -- do you recall | 20 A. Not that I recall. |
| 21 treating intellectual property protection as | 21 Q. Why not? |
| 22 very important? | 22 A. I don't know how to answer |
| 23 A. Well, again, I've -- I've dealt | 23 that. I was aware of the Blu-ray Disc |
| 24 with standards setting organizations. I | 24 Association's policy in this regard, so I |
| 25 don't know if any of those are technically | 25 wrote about it here. |
| Page 1 | Page 141 |


| Q. Why did you not consider the | spective. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 economic effects of free distribution of | 2 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 3 standards with respect to other | Q. And what is the relevance of |
| 4 organizations? | 4 economic analysis to that question, as you |
| 5 A. I didn't quite see the | 5 understand it? |
| 6 relevance to this matter. | MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 7 Q. Why? | Vague. Might also be construed to |
| 8 A. I don't know how to prove a | require a legal conclusion. |
| 9 negative. | THE WITNESS: Economists have a |
| 10 Q. What's the negative you were | 10 view and perspective at looking at |
| 11 thinking of that would need to be proved or | 11 issues that some courts have found to |
| 12 disproved? | 12 be useful. |
| 13 A. That something is not relevant. | 13 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 14 Q. You just didn't see the | 14 Q. Well, I'm asking, with specific |
| 15 relevance? | 15 relevance to this case, what do you |
| 16 A. I don't understand how that | 16 understand the importance of economic |
| 17 would be helpful in the assignment that I had | 17 analysis to be in this case -- |
| 18 here. | 18 MR. FEE: Objection. Calls -- |
| 19 Q. And what was the assignment you | 19 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 20 had here? | 20 Q. -- as you have purported to |
| 21 A. Well, I've laid it out -- | 21 practice it? |
| 22 Q. I can read the report. I'm not | 22 MR. FEE: Calls for a legal |
| 23 asking you to read -- read the report. I'd | 23 conclusio |
| 24 like your own words now, sitting here. | 24 Also, to the extent that |
| 25 MR. FEE: Objection. | 25 responding to that would require you |
| Page 142 | Page 144 |
| MR. BRIDG | sclose communications with |
| 2 Q. How do you -- how do you | counsel that did not form the basis |
| 3 view -- | for any of your opinions or |
| 4 A. I'd like to answer it by | conclusions and did not provide any |
| 5 looking at my report. | assumptions that were the basis for |
| 6 Q. No, I'd like for you to give me | your opinions or conclusions, you |
| 7 a straight answer, because if you're just | should not answer that portion of the |
| 8 going to refer to the report, the report will | uestion. |
| 9 speak for itself, and I don't need you to | THE WITNESS: I understand |
| 10 read it to me. | 10 that, generally, economists like me |
| 11 I'd like for you to tell me | 11 are quite helpful in determining |
| 12 what you understand, sitting here, to have | 12 questions of harm, particularly harm |
| 13 been your assignment in this case. | 13 as it relates to infringement of IP |
| 14 MR. FEE: Objection. | 14 rights. |
| 15 You can answer the question | 15 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 16 however you deem appropriate. | 16 Q. How do you distinguish between |
| 17 THE WITNESS: I've aptly laid | 17 harms that are caused by an infringement by |
| 18 it out in my report, so I defer to the | 18 the defendant versus harms that might be |
| 19 words in my report. | 19 caused by a court decision that plaintiffs |
| 20 But I've, in essence, looked at | 20 lack copyrights? |
| 21 the topic of the impact of copyright | 21 MR. FEE: Objection to the |
| 22 and trademark infringement here, and | 22 extent it calls for a legal |
| 23 asked myself the question whether a | 23 conclusion. |
| permanent injunction would be | THE WITNESS: I don't know how |
| 25 appropriate from an economic | 25 to answer that question. I didn't ask |
| Page 143 | Page 145 |


|  | myself the question of ownership or |  | under the assumption that the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | impact of ownership. I asked myself |  | activities violate the law. |
| 3 | the question here of impact of | 3 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 4 | infringement. | 4 | Q. If the activities -- do you |
| 5 | BY MR. BRIDGES | 5 | believe -- do you understand that your |
| 6 | Q. If it turns out that the Court |  | analysis is relevant to a determination of |
| 7 | rules that the plaintiff -- sorry. Strike | 7 | whether the defendant has violated the law? |
| 8 | at. |  | MR. FEE: Objection. Calls for |
| 9 | If it turns out the Court rule | 9 | legal conclusion. |
|  | re that the defendant has engaged in fair | 10 | To the extent that your |
|  | , is it your understanding that none of | 11 | derstanding is based upon |
| 12 | ur harms analysis is relevant -- | 12 | communications with counsel, you |
| 13 | MR. FEE: Objection. | 13 | shouldn't disclose them, unless they |
| 14 | MR. BRIDGES: | 14 | formed the basis for your opinions or |
| 15 | Q. -- because of a finding of | 15 | conclusions or provided assumptions |
| 16 | n -infringement? | 16 | that you relied upon in reaching your |
| 17 | MR. FEE: Calls for a legal | 17 | onclusions. |
| 18 | conclusion. | 18 | THE WITNESS: I don't know |
| 19 | To the extent answering that | 19 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 20 | question would require you to disclose | 20 | Q. Do you have an |
|  | communications you had with counsel |  | hether the defendant has violated copyright |
| 22 | that don't form the basis for any of | 22 | aw? |
|  | your opinions or conclusions and don't | 23 | MR. FEE: Objection. Calls for |
| 24 | provide any assumptions that you | 24 | a legal conclusion. |
| 25 | relied upon, you shouldn't disclose | 25 | THE WITNESS: No, I've not |
|  | Page 146 |  | Page 1 |
| 1 | ose communications. |  | taken on that assignment. |
| 2 | THE WITNESS: You're asking for | 2 | Y MR. BRIDGES: |
| 3 | a legal conclusion. I'm not an expert | 3 | Q. Do you have any view as to |
| 4 | on that. |  | whether the defendant's activities constitute |
| 5 | Y MR. BRIDGES: |  | air use? |
| 6 | Q. I'm understanding your | 6 | MR. FEE: Objection. Calls for |
| 7 | derstanding -- I'm asking for your |  | a legal conclusion. |
|  | understanding of the relevance of your | 8 | THE WITNESS: No, I've not |
| 9 | ontributions to this | 9 | taken on that assignment. |
| 10 | MR. FEE: Objection. Asked and | 10 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 11 | answered. Plus all the prior | 11 | Q. If a court determines that the |
| 12 | objections and instructions. | 12 | defendant has not infringed upon plaintiffs' |
| 13 | THE WITNESS: I believe my |  | copyrights, do you understand that the |
| 14 | testimony and report are relevant to | 14 | decision would result in economic harm to the |
| 15 | the issue of harm and potential harm. | 15 | plaintiffs? |
| 16 | BY MR. BRIDGES: | 16 | MR. FEE: Objection to the |
| 17 | Q. From what? | 17 | extent it calls for a legal |
| 18 | A. From continuing -- the | 18 | conclusion. |
| 19 | continuing activities and possible expanded | 19 | THE WITNESS: I'm not following |
| 20 | activities of the defendant here. | 20 | your question. Could you ask it a |
| 21 | Q. From activities or from | 21 | little bit differently, please? |
| 22 | olations of law? | 22 | BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 23 | MR. FEE: Objection. Vague. | 23 | Q. No, I'll restate it if you just |
| 24 | Calls for a legal conclusion. | 24 | need to rehear it. |
| 25 | THE WITNESS: I -- I'm working | 25 | A. No, I don't need to rehear it. |
|  | Page 147 |  | Page 149 |

```
If you could recast it, please.
    Q. No. Then please answer my
question.
    MR. FEE: Objection.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
    Q. I get to ask the questions.
        MR. FEE: He just said he
    couldn't answer it.
        THE WITNESS: I don't
    understand the question.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
    Q. What is it you don't
understand?
    A. I understand each word but not
how you put them together.
    Q. If a court determines that the
defendant has not infringed upon the
plaintiffs' copyrights, do you believe that
that decision would result in economic harm
to the plaintiffs?
    MR. FEE: Objection to the
    extent it calls for a legal
    conclusion. Plus asked and answered.
    THE WITNESS: It sounds like
    exactly the same words, so I'm not
            Page 150
    sure how to answer that question.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
    Q. Would a decision that the
defendant has not infringed upon plaintiffs'
copyrights result in economic harm to the
plaintiffs?
    MR. FEE: Objection. Calls for
    a legal conclusion.
        THE WITNESS: I'm just not
    following. I under -- I'm worked --
    I'm working under the assumption that
    the activity here represents a
    copyright infringement. I'm -- and
    I'm being asked and answering the
    question of the impact of that and
    whether there would be harm and what
    kind of harm and whether that's
    reparable harm.
    So I'm focusing on what has
    been done and what may continue to be
    done by the defendant.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
    Q. That's non-responsive. I'll
ask you to answer my question. And if you
just don't want to answer the question,
that's fine.
    A. I want to, but I cannot.
    Q. Well --
    A. I do not understand the
question.
    Q. I'll say it again.
    Would a decision by the Court
that the defendant has not infringed upon the
plaintiffs' copyrights result in economic
harm to the plaintiffs?
MR. FEE: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. Asked and answered.
THE WITNESS: I --
MR. FEE: Vague.
THE WITNESS: I cannot answer it any differently. I'm sorry. Is this a good time for a break, or do you want to keep going?
MR. BRIDGES: Sure. We can take one if you want.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record at 1:17.
(Recess from 1:17 p.m. to
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THE VIDEOGRAPHER: On the record at 2:12.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Jarosz.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Could you outline for me, please, what steps you took in your engagement in this case? What are the different activities you engaged in?
A. Generally, I had a discussion with counsel about the matter. Then we examined documents that would -- were provided to us to give us background. We then proceeded to gather our own information from third-party sources, primarily through Internet searches.
We obtained information that had been produced as part of discovery. We had conversations with people at the various plaintiff organizations.
We outlined the report and summarized some of the information that you see in the tabs. We had discussions with
counsel. And then we finalized the report, submitting it to counsel on June 5th, 2015.
Q. Do you know how many standards of each plaintiff are at issue in this case?
A. How many -- I'm sorry -standards are at issue?
Q. Yes.
A. I have that number written
down. It's in the hundreds, and I forget, as
I sit here right now, precisely the number.
I will look it up. And I was giving you an answer that was a cumulation across the three plaintiffs.

I am not seeing that number right now. I'll keep looking.
Q. Do you know what --
A. You may be able to point me quicker than I recall where it was.
Q. Do you -- do you know what proportion of plaintiffs -- of each plaintiffs' standards is at issue in this case?
A. Are you asking me the ratio of the standards at issue versus the total standards developed by the organizations?
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Q. Yes.
A. I think it's less than a
majority for each organization. I'm fairly
certain of that with regard to ASTM. I think
that's true with regard to NFPA. I think
it's true with regard to ASHRAE.
Q. Do you have any better information than less than a majority --
A. Well, I --
Q. -- for each of them?
A. The precise numbers are in the report. Let's see here. One can figure that out. You may remember where I summarized the number of standards. I just don't remember.
It's easy to determine because the data are
all here.
Q. Have you analyzed differences
in sales trends between standards that are at
issue in this case and plaintiffs' other
standards?
A. No, I don't think I have those data at my disposal.
Q. Did you ever ask for those data?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Have you analyzed any differences in sales trends between those of plaintiffs' standards that have been incorporated into law and those of plaintiffs' standards that have not been incorporated into law?
A. I don't think so. I don't think I have those data, and I'm not sure that each plaintiff knows precisely how many have been incorporated into law.
Q. Did you ask for any data regarding the distinction between standards incorporated by reference and standards not incorporated by reference in the law?
A. I don't --

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I
don't recall.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. You made observations about sales trends earlier in your deposition. I think you said that there's been a reduction in sales of certain of plaintiffs' standards; is that correct?
A. I'm not quite sure what the
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earlier testimony was, but I think I was
pointing you to paragraph 133 with regard to downloads of -- and other measures of activity, as I had at my disposal.
Q. Well, I'm trying to find out what changes you have studied in plaintiffs' economics that you attribute to defendant's activities.
A. I'm not quite sure what your question is.
Q. Well, I'm trying to find out what information you have studied to determine what changes in the finances of each of the plaintiffs have occurred as a consequence of the defendant's activities. MR. FEE: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: I'm still not sure that I'm hearing a question. But to the extent that I had information on changes in activity level, I summarized that in paragraph 133. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. My question is, what information did you study to determine any changes in finances of each of the
```

plaintiffs?
MR. FEE: Same objection.
THE WITNESS:It's reflected in
paragraph }133\mathrm{ and in the tabs,
particularly 3, 4, and 5. But the
tabs are not at the granular level
that I think are of interest to you.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. What do you mean by the
"granular level" that would be of interest to
me?
A. I don't think it breaks out
publications by standard, for instance.
Q. Does it break out publications
by whether a standard has been incorporated
by reference or not?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Does it break out by whether a
standard has been publicly made available by
defendant or not?
A. I don't think so. Not in
tabs 3, 4, and 5.
Q. How do you establish causation
between defendant's activities and any of the
data that you provide in section -- in

```
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paragraph 133 ?
        MR. FEE: Objection. Calls for
    a legal conclusion. Form.
            THE WITNESS: One can and
    should look at all evidence available,
    including circumstantial evidence. I
    don't have direct information about
    the precise impact of defendant's
    activities, but I have important
    information that bears on that issue,
    including information that's in
    deposition transcripts.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
    Q. So my question is, how do
you -- do you -- strike that.
    Are your conclusion -- are you
making conclusions in paragraph 133 about the
cause of changes in sales of the plaintiffs'
products?
    MR. FEE: Objection to form.
    THE WITNESS: Not definitively.
    I have observations about the
    magnitude and trend of the downloads
    of -- through defendant's sites. I
    have some information on the downloads
of certain of the standards. I've presented that.

I don't have direct evidence of the precise impact historically of defendant's activities on plaintiffs' financials.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. What evidence of any kind do
you have of any kind of impact historically
of the defendant's activities on plaintiffs'
financials?
MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: That which is reported in paragraph 133, that of which is contained in deposition testimony, and that of which I summarized in other parts of the report.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. So when you're referring to deposition testimony, you're referring to the citations to the footnotes in paragraph 133 ?
A. No, I don't think it's just limited to that. I think there's some other deposition transcripts that talk about the Page 160
impact or potential impact of defendant's activities on each one of the plaintiffs.
Q. Did you make any independent
assessment of causation of any financial
effects on plaintiffs by the defendant's activities?

MR. FEE: Objection to form. Calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: What do you mean by the term of "independent assessment of causation"?
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. You, as an expert, not relying just on what other people have said or speculated or thought.

MR. FEE: Same objections.
Plus compound.
THE WITNESS: We experts rely on other information to draw the conclusions that we do, and then we bring our training to it. So our observations shouldn't be in a vacuum. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. But they should be objective, correct?

```

NEC -- NEC 2011?
A. I can look, and I will.
No, it doesn't answer that
question, I don't think.
Q. Can you make a prediction as to
when the defendant posted NEC 2008 and
NEC 2011, based on the data attached to your
report in Exhibit 1?
MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: No, I don't
think, based on just those data.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Can you make -- give an
estimate as to when the defendant posted
NEC 2008 and NEC 2011, based on the data
attached to your report as Exhibit 1?
MR. FEE: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: No, I don't
think, based on just that information.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Well, just looking at your
report, can you tell when defendant posted
NEC 2008 and NEC 2011?
A. My answer hasn't changed. I
still don't know precisely when those were
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Q. But that doesn't make a
difference to your economic analysis of the
effects of defendant's activities on the
plaintiffs?
A. Well, I would be curious --
MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: -- curious about
that information, but I don't have any
reason to think it would change the
conclusions that I drew, and that is
that a permanent injunction is
appropriate here.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Is it your job to determine
whether a permanent injunction is
appropriate? Is that what you were hired to
do?
A. No.
MR. FEE: Objection. Calls for
a legal conclusion. Form. Compound.
THE WITNESS: I think it's
ultimately the Court's decision to
make, but I've been asked what my
economic view is as to the

```
posted.
```

```
posted.
```

```
Q. But that doesn't make a
```

        21
    appropriateness of a permanent injunction here.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Is the appropriate of -- is the
appropriateness of a permanent injunction an
economic question?
A. I think, in part, economic considerations can be and often are taken
into account in answering that question.
Q. Is it an economic question?

MR. FEE: Objection.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. That was my question.

MR. FEE: Asked and answered.
THE WITNESS: Again, in part.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. The propriety of
a preliminary -- of a -- strike that.
It's your testimony that the propriety of a permanent injunction is, in part, an economic question?

MR. FEE: Objection. Asked and answered. Form. Calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: Yes. As I
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understand it, one factor to consider is the reparability or irreparability of harm. I believe, at its core, that's an economic question.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. And what economic theories did you rely upon to conclude that, as an economic matter, a preliminary -- strike that.

What economic theories did you rely upon to conclude that, as an economic matter, a permanent injunction is appropriate in this case?

MR. FEE: Same objections.
THE WITNESS: I don't know what candidates you have in mind for economic theories.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Whichever ones you relied upon.
A. I --

MR. FEE: Same objections.
THE WITNESS: -- used all of my
training and applied it to the facts
of this case and drew the conclusions that I did.
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```
BY MR. BRIDGES:
    Q. And are there any particular
aspects of training that you have beyond what
a first-year college student would have
gotten in a first-year economics course that
you have brought to bear by applying
particular economic theories to this case?
    A. I think my training makes me
who I am and has helped me in assignments
like this. I have beyond a first-year-in-
college understanding of basic economics, but
they're very important concepts that are
taught and learned in first-year economics.
    Q. Well, I want to know if there
are any economic concepts beyond first-year
economics that you have brought to bear in
rendering your conclusions in this case.
    MR. FEE: Objection to form.
    Asked and answered.
        THE WITNESS:Generally, there
    are, yes.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
    Q. What economic concepts have you
brought to bear in your report and analysis
in this case?
    Page 170
    A. I'm sorry, because I don't know
what you mean by "economic concepts." We get
trained in things like quantitative methods
and intermediate microeconomics, in price
theory, in econometrics, in consumer
behavior. All those things are beyond the
first year. I don't know if you're calling
those economic theories. Your -- your
questioning confuses me.
    Q. Well, you referred to the
important concepts in response to my question
to you about particular aspects of training
that you have beyond what a first-year
college student would have gotten in a
first-year economics course that you brought
to bear by applying economic theories to this
case, and your answer refers to very
important concepts that are taught and
learned.
    And so I'm asking you, what
very important economic concepts have you
brought to bear in your analysis of this
case?
    MR. FEE: Objection to form.
    Lack of foundation.
```

THE WITNESS: We learn about price theory. We learn about consumer behavior. We talk -- we learn about manufacturer and supplier actions. We learn about game theory. We learn about econometrics. We learn more broadly about quantitative methods. We learn about a variety of aspects of industrial organization. There are many things that we learn beyond the first year of economics training. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. No, I'm asking what you brought to bear in your analysis in this case.
A. All those.
Q. Okay. What aspect of price theory did you bring to bear in this case?
A. I don't know how to answer that question besides I understand basic price theory and have researched it much and applied that to the facts here.
Q. What was the specific application of price theory that you brought to bear in this case?
A. I can't be any more specific
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than that. I don't understand your question.
Q. What aspect of training about consumer behavior did you bring to bear in this case?
A. I can't be any more specific than saying that.
Q. What aspects of your training about game theory have you brought to bear in your work on this case?
A. I can't be any more specific than that.
Q. What aspects of econometrics in your training have you brought to bear on this case?
A. I can't be any more specific than that.
Q. What inform -- what aspects of training in qualitative methods have you brought to bear on this case?
A. I didn't say "qualitative methods," and so it may have been mis-keyed in. I said "quantitative methods."
Q. All right. What aspects of quantitative methods of your training did you bring to bear on this case?
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| A. I can't be any more specific | just on this information. |
| :---: | :---: |
| than that. | 2 Q. What else would you need? |
| Q. What aspect of your training | 3 A. I don't know, because I think |
| 4 regarding aspects of industrial organization | 4 it's probably a very easy factual question to |
| 5 have you brought to bear on this case? | 5 determine when the downloading first |
| 6 A. I can't be any more specific | 6 occurred, so I don't know why one would need |
| that. | 7 to back into it. |
| Q. But you did bring the theory of | 8 Q. Well, when -- would one be able |
| reveal -- revealed preferences to bear on | 9 to use sales trends as a way of identifying |
| 10 this case, correct? | 10 likely effects of a posting of each standard |
| A. Yes. | 11 by the defendant? |
| 12 Q. What other economic theories do | 12 MR. FEE: Objection. Vague. |
| 13 you recall bringing to bear on this case? | 13 Compound. |
| 14 MR. FEE: Objection. Asked and | 14 THE WITNESS: Maybe; maybe not. |
| 15 answered. | 15 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 16 THE WITNESS: Everything that | 16 Q. Why do you say "maybe; maybe |
| I've -- | 17 not"? |
| 18 MR. FEE: And vague. | 18 A. I just wouldn't think to do it |
| Go ahead. | 19 that way, so I don't know what you exactly |
| 20 THE WITNESS: -- I've learned | 20 have in mind. |
| 21 in my training, both educational | 21 Q. Do you associate the posting |
| 22 training and career training. | 22 standards by defendant with changes in sales |
| BY MR. BRIDG | 23 volume of the standards that the defendant |
| 24 Q. Can you be more specific than | 24 has posted? |
| 25 that? | 25 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| Page 174 | Page 17 |
| A. | 1 THE WITNESS: I don't know what |
| 2 | 2 you mean by that q |
| (Jarosz Exhibit 4 marked for | 3 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| identification.) | 4 Q. You don't understand the |
| $5 \quad * * *$ | 5 question? |
| BY MR. BRIDGES: | 6 A. I do not. |
| 7 Q. Mr. Jarosz, do you recognize | $7 \quad$ Q. Can you correlate the posting |
| Exhibit 4 as a document that you produced in | 8 of standards by defendant with any changes in |
| response to a subpoena in this case? | 9 sales volumes of the standards that the |
| 10 A. Yes. | 10 defendant has posted? |
| 11 Q. What is this document? | 11 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 12 A. It appears to be a summary over | 12 THE WITNESS: I don't think |
| 13 the years 2009 through 2013 of dollars and | 13 I've attempted to compute the |
| 14 quantity of NFPA standards that were sold in | 14 correlation coefficient here |
| 15 the marketplace. | 15 associated with postings. |
| 16 Q. Based upon the trends that you | 16 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 17 see in this exhibit, can you estimate when | 17 Q. I'm not asking for a specific |
| 18 you believe it is most likely that the | 18 correlation coefficient. I'm just asking, |
| 19 defendant first published -- strike that. | 19 generally, can you correlate the posting of |
| 20 Based upon the trends that you | 20 standards by defendant with any changes in |
| 21 see in this Exhibit 4, can you estimate when | 21 sales volumes of the standards that |
| 22 you believe it is most likely that the | 22 defendants has -- that the defendant has |
| 23 defendant first posted each of the standards | 23 posted with reference to Exhibit 4? |
| 24 identified here? | 24 A. I don't know -- |
| 25 A. I don't think so, not based | 25 MR. FEE: Objection. Form. |
| Page 175 | Page 177 |


| THE WITNESS: I don't recall | Q. Have you determined in any way |
| :---: | :---: |
| attempting to do that. And I wouldn't | 2 the dates at which defendant posted various |
| necessarily think that the historical | 3 standards to its Web site or to the Internet |
| 4 impact would -- is the end of the | 4 Archive? |
| story as to the harm here. | 5 A. I don't recall doing a separate |
| BY MR. BRIDGES: | 6 analysis of that, no. |
| Q. Is historical impact part of | 7 Q. How did you learn about the |
| story as to the harm here? | 8 dates at which defendant posted various |
| A. Yes. | 9 standards to its Web site or to Internet |
| 10 Q. What -- what can you say by | 10 Archive? |
| 11 looking at Exhibit 4 about the historical | 11 A. I had conversations with |
| 12 impact of the posting of the defendant -- of | 12 counsel on that topic, and I may have seen |
| 13 the plaintiffs' standards by the defendant? | 13 that information contained in certain |
| 14 A. I don't know that I can say | 14 documents like the Complaint, but I don't |
| 15 much, because I believe the postings largely | 15 recall. |
| 16 occurred in late 2012, and I only have one | 16 Q. Did you rely upon information |
| 17 period after that. | 17 regarding those dates from conversations with |
| 18 Q. If it turns out that | 18 counsel? |
| 19 defendant's postings were well before 2012, | 19 MR. FEE: In arriving at his |
| 20 would that affect your analysis of the trends | 20 opinions, you're asking? |
| 21 in sales data of the plaintiffs' | 21 MR. BRIDGES: Arriving at his |
| 22 publications? | 22 understanding of the facts. |
| 23 MR. FEE: Objection to form | 23 THE WITNESS: I don't know that |
| 24 Compound. Vague. | 24 I did, because I don't recall |
| 25 THE WITNESS: Maybe. I would $\underset{\text { Page } 178}{ }$ | 25 reporting those specific dates Page 180 |
| nsider that informati | anywhere in my report. |
| conjunction with these data if you | 2 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| wanted me to. | 3 Q. Do you recall taking specific |
| BY MR. BRIDG | 4 dates into account in analyzing the effect of |
| 5 Q. How -- what -- what would | 5 defendant's actions? |
| 6 change? | MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| A. I don't know. I haven't done | Vague. |
| 8 that analysis. | THE WITNESS: I don't recall |
| Q. Have you verified the dates on | one way or the other. |
| 10 which plaintiffs -- strike that. | 10 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 11 Have you verified the dates | 11 Q. Do you know how -- strike that. |
| 12 which defendant posted the various standards | 12 Do you know how much revenue |
| 13 to its Web site or to Internet Archive? | 13 each plaintiff derives from the standards at |
| 14 A. I don't -- | 14 issue in this case? |
| 15 MR. FEE: Objection. Vague. | 15 A. I don't |
| 16 THE WITNESS: I don't recall | 16 precise number. |
| 17 verifying it. | 17 Q. Did you -- did you ever know |
| 18 And are you asking did I | 18 that number? |
| 19 separately go out and determine what | 19 A. I don't think so |
| 20 that date is and see if that was the | 20 Q. Did you ever know how much |
| 21 same as what was represented in the | 21 revenue each plaintiff derives from standards |
| 22 Complaint, for instance? | 22 that have been incorporated into law? |
| 23 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 23 A. As opposed to those that have |
| Q. Yes. | 24 not been incorporated? Is that -- |
| 25 A. No, I don't recall doing that. | 25 Q. Well, I'm -- I'm asking about |
| Page 179 | Page 181 |

those standards that have been incorporated in the law. I'm asking if you know how much revenue each plaintiffs derives -- each plaintiff derives from those standards.
A. I don't --

MR. FEE: Objection. Form.
THE WITNESS: -- think I know
that number, and I'm not sure the
plaintiffs know that number.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Do you know the percentage of revenue that each plaintiff derives from standards that have been incorporated into law?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't think I
do, and I don't believe the plaintiffs
do.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Are you aware of any difference in profitability to plaintiffs between those standards that have been incorporated into law and those standards that have not been incorporated into law?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.

THE WITNESS: I don't believe
so.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Do you know -- strike that.

Are you aware of any difference
in profitability to plaintiffs between those
standards that defendant has posted to the Internet and those standards that defendant has not posted to the Internet?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't believe
so. And as with the previous question, I don't think the plaintiffs
have that information at their
disposal.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. For each plaintiff, what do you understand to be the percentage of gross revenue from the sale of standards?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I -- I've
reported that in my report. My memory is that it's something on the order of
66 percent for ASTM and for NFPA. And if you add in memberships, it's

| MR. FEE: Objection to form. |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Page 182 |  |

something just north of 50 percent for
ASHRAE.

## BY MR. BRIDGES:

Q. What do you mean by "if you add in memberships"?
A. I'm not -- I'm not quite sure what you're asking me to define.
Q. I'm asking you to explain the phrase that you just used, "if you add in memberships." What did that mean?
A. I talked about that in my report. Membership fees are a fairly good recollect -- a fairly good reflection of amount that would have been paid for publications. In other words, publication fees -- it -- let me start this over again. It makes about as much sense to become a member of ASHRAE as it is to buy some of the individual publications. As a result, many people choose to become members rather than just buying the publication, as I understand it.
Q. How did you learn that?
A. Having knowledge of the -- of the price difference and through discussions Page 184
with people at ASHRAE.
Q. How did you learn about the price difference?
A. I don't recall how I learned it, but I report it in my report based on certain documents I've seen. Perhaps I learned it from their Web site.
Q. Did you do any surveys of ASHRAE members to validate that assumption?
A. I'm sorry. Validate what assumption?
Q. About purchase of a membership instead of buying the publication.
A. I'm not sure that there's an assumption in there. My understanding is that ASHRAE people are of the belief that many people buy membership rather than individual publications.
Q. And in your work, did you assume that?
A. I didn't assume that. I worked
on that -- under that understanding.
Q. Oh, it's an understanding, but not an assumption?
A. Yes.

| Did that understanding make a | 1 are to copyrighted publications, correct? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 difference to your analysis? | 2 A. With the exception of number 3, |
| 3 A. It was a factual underpinning. | 3 which refers to copyrighted publications and |
| 4 Q. An underpinning, but not an | 4 memberships. |
| 5 assumption? | 5 Q. Okay. So my question wasn't |
| 6 A. It was not an explicit | 6 about copyrighted publications. My question |
| 7 assumption. | 7 is, what percentage do you understand of |
| 8 Q. But it was an underpinning | 8 plaintiffs' revenues comes from the sale of |
| assumption, is your testimony? | 9 standards at issue in this case? |
| 10 MR. FEE: Objection. Asked and | 10 A. Thank you for that |
| 11 answered. | 11 what the question is. |
| 12 THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't | 12 I don't think I know that |
| 13 know what or why you're arguing with | 13 precise percentage. |
| 14 me on this. | 14 Q. What percentage of plaintiffs' |
| 15 BY MR. BRIDG | 15 revenues, to your knowledge, comes from the |
| 16 Q. I'm not arguin | 16 sale of standards incorporated into law? |
| 17 A. I don't understan | 17 A. I don't know that number |
| 18 Q. I'm just trying to understand | 18 Q. What percentage of plaintiffs' |
| 19 your testimony. That's all. So I'm asking | 19 revenues, to your understanding, comes from |
| 20 some follow-up questions. | 20 the sale of all standards? |
| 21 You stated earlier some | 21 A. I'm sorry. I thought you asked |
| 22 percentages of revenue from the sale of | 22 that question. I thought the immediate on |
| 23 standards. Did you mean to be identifying | 23 before that was standards. |
| 24 what you thought were the percentages of | 24 Q. No. It was standards at issue |
| 25 revenue from the sale of standards or from Page 186 | 25 in this case. Then -- Page 1 |
| sale of all p | A. The one before that. |
| A. Let me -- let me double-chec | 2 Q. -- standards incorporated into |
| that. | 3 law. And now it's all standards. |
| Well, in the case of ASTM, for | 4 A. Right. Thank you. |
| 5 instance, I believe it's copyrighted | 5 I don't know that number |
| 6 publications. | 6 either. |
| Q. What page are you referring to | 7 Q. What percentage of |
| 8 in your report? | 8 plaintiffs' -- strike that. |
| A. Right now I'm looking at | What dollar value do you |
| 10 page 36, but I think I talk about it at other | 10 associate with the investments that eat |
| 11 | 11 plaintiff has made in the development of the |
| 12 Q. So page 36, you're talking | 12 standards at issue in this case? |
| 13 about which paragraph? | 13 A. I don't think I attributed a |
| 14 A. Well, right now | 14 dollar amount to that precise activity, |
| 15 Q. 83? | 15 because I don't know that amount. |
| 16 A. -- I was looking at 83, but I'm | 16 Q. What percentage of plaintiffs' |
| 17 turning back to, for more reliable | 17 operating expenses do you associate with the |
| 18 information, to paragraph 15 , for instance, | 18 plaintiffs' development of the standards at |
| 19 which says in $2014,67.1$ percent of the | 19 issue in this case? |
| 20 revenue was generated by the sale of | 20 A. I don't think I know th |
| 21 copyrighted publications. For NFPA, that | 21 number. |
| 22 information is shown in paragraph 18. And | 22 Q. What percentage of plaintif |
| 23 for ASHRAE, that information is shown in | 23 operating expenses do you associate with the |
| 24 paragraph 22. | 24 plaintiffs' development of standards |
| 25 Q. All three of those references | 25 incorporated into law? |
| Page 187 | Page 189 |
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| A. I don't think I know that | Have you ever had access to any |
| :---: | :---: |
| number. | 2 information that I've asked in the last |
| Q. What percentage of plaintiffs' | 3 several questions? |
| 4 operating expenses do you associate with the | 4 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 5 plaintiffs' development of standards | THE WITNESS: I don't believe |
| 6 generally? |  |
| A. I don't think I know th | 7 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| mber. | 8 Q. Do you know whether plaintiffs |
| Q. Do you have any estimates of | 9 prepare standards through joint sponsorship |
| 10 any of those numbers that you just said you | 10 with any other organizations? |
| 11 don't think you know? | 11 MR. FEE: Objection. Vague. |
| 12 MR. FEE: Objection to form | 12 THE WITNESS: I think I may |
| 13 THE WITNESS: Not sitting here | 13 have seen a reference to that. I |
| 14 right now. | 14 don't know the extent to which |
| 15 BY MR. BRIDGES | 15 occurs, but I wouldn't be surprised to |
| 16 Q. Did you at one point eve | 16 be reminded that it does occur. |
| 17 determine those numbers? | 17 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 18 A. Not that I recall. | 18 Q. Are you aware of any, as you |
| 19 Q. Do you know what percentage of | 19 sit here? |
| 20 the staff or employees of each plaintiff has | 20 A. No |
| 21 worked on the development of standards at | 21 but I think I'm aware that it has occurred |
| 22 issue in this case? | 22 Q. Do you know whether plaintiffs |
| 23 MR. FEE: | 23 receive grants, revenue, or stipends from |
| 24 THE WITNESS: I don't think I | 24 governments that use, reference, or adopt |
| 25 know that number. | 25 their standards? |
| Page 190 | Page 1 |
| MR. BRID | MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 2 Q. Do you know what percentage -- | THE WITNESS: There are grant |
| 3 do you have an estimate? | monies that go to NFPA. I don't know |
| 4 A. No. | the source of those grants. I don't |
| 5 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | see a line for grant revenues for the |
| THE WITNESS: Not as I sit | other two organizations. |
| 7 here, no. | 7 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 8 BY MR. BRIDGES | Q. Did you ask any of the |
| Q. Do you know what percentage of | 9 plaintiffs about the revenues or expenses |
| 10 the staff or employees of each plaintiff has | 10 they have specifically attributable to the |
| 11 worked on the development of standards | 11 standards that defendant has posted to the |
| 12 incorporated into law? | 12 Internet? |
| 13 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 13 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 14 THE WITNESS: Not as I sit here | 14 THE WITNESS: We generally |
| 15 right now. | 15 talked about that topic with each |
| 16 BY MR. BRIDGES | 16 plaintiff, and I don't think the |
| 17 Q. Do you have an estimate? | 17 plaintiffs know that amount. They |
| 18 A. Not as I sit here right now. | 18 undertake activities that are |
| 19 Q. Do you know what percentage of | 19 standards oriented. They don't know |
| 20 the staff or employees of each plaintiff has | 20 which of those standards will be |
| 21 worked on the development of standards in | 21 incorporated by reference. |
| 22 general? | 22 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 23 A. Not as I sit here right now. | 23 Q. Did you -- |
| 24 Q. Do you have an estimate? | 24 A. Or which have been. I don't |
| 25 A. Not as I sit here right now. | 25 think they systematically track those. |
| Page 191 | Page 193 |


| Q. I guess my question didn't have | 1 the plaintiffs told you in this case? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 anything to do with incorporated by | 2 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 3 reference. My question is, did you ask any | 3 THE WITNESS: Well, I kept an |
| 4 of the plaintiffs about the revenues or | 4 open mind to the facts that I was |
| 5 expenses that they have had that are | 5 given over the phone and sought to |
| 6 specifically attributable to the standards | 6 determine if I learned things that |
| 7 that the defendant has posted to the | 7 conflicted or not with that |
| 8 Internet? | 8 informa |
| MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 9 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 10 THE WITNESS: I think we | 10 Q. Where did you |
| 11 generally talked about that topic, and | 11 A. But -- |
| 12 I don't believe they have information | 12 Q. I'm sorry. I didn't realize |
| 13 at that level. | 13 you were still -- |
| 14 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 14 A. But I didn't separately go out |
| 15 Q. Did you ask the plaintiffs to | 15 and write down the facts and attempt to get |
| 16 estimate revenues or expenses specifically | 16 separate verification of each fact. |
| 17 attributable to the standards at issue in | 17 Q. So you were looking for |
| 18 this case? | 18 internal inconsistencies in the |
| 19 MR. FEE: Objection to form | 19 communications that plaintiffs had with you |
| 20 THE WITNESS: Not that I | 20 in order to determine whether to question any |
| 21 recall. We may have asked whether | 21 of the facts that the plaintiffs' employees |
| 22 they are collected, but we didn't ask | 22 related to you? |
| 23 for the plaintiffs to separately | 23 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 24 estimate those numbers, as I recall. | 24 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 25 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 25 Q. Is that your testimony? |
| Page 194 | Page 1 |
| Q. In paragraph 49, you state that | MR. FEE: Mischaracterizes the |
| 2 ASHRAE standard 90.1 was first published in | stimony. |
| 3 1974. What's your basis for that statement? | THE WITNESS: I'm not sure if |
| 4 A. I don't recall. It may have | it is. Let me try and answer and see |
| 5 been in a produced document. It may have | if that's responsive. |
| 6 been in conversations. I just don't recall. | I was aware of the information |
| $7 \quad$ Q. Did you attempt to verify that | we received over the telephone, and in |
| 8 information independently? | the process of looking through the |
| A. Not that I recall. | documents that we had, I kept an open |
| 10 Q. Do you know if ASHRAE standard | 10 eye toward learning things that |
| 11 90-75 was first published in 1975? | 11 conflicted with those oral |
| 12 A. I don't happen to know, sitting | 12 conversation |
| 13 here now. | 13 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 14 Q. You cite to an article in | 14 Q. And the documents -- what |
| 15 footnotes 73, 74 of your report. Did you | 15 are -- what were the documents that you're |
| 16 review that article? | 16 saying you had? |
| 17 A. Yes. | 17 A. Everything that's in tab 2 |
| 18 Q. Did you independently verify | 18 Q. Most of which, apart from the |
| 19 the information in it? | 19 Web-based resources and the articles other |
| 20 A. Not that | 20 than Ms. Bremer's law review articles, the |
| 21 Q. You just took it at face value? | 21 plaintiffs' counsel furnished to you, |
| 22 A. I think so. I didn't have | 22 correct? |
| 23 reason to question any of the facts there. | 23 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 24 Q. Did you ever have reason to | 24 THE WITNESS: I think that's |
| 25 question any of the facts that anybody from | 25 right. They didn't author those |
| Page 195 | Page 197 |


| documents, but they provided them as | I looked at some parts of it. |
| :---: | :---: |
| part of the discovery process. | 2 I don't recall that I looked at all aspects |
| MR. BRIDGES | 3 of the database. |
| Q. Did you ask them for any | Q. Did you verify how many |
| cuments that they had not provided? | 5 standards were incorporated by reference |
| A. I think we generally described | 6 according to that database? |
| kinds of information that we find useful | A. No, I did not. |
| or typically find useful in matters like | 8 Q. What do you mean by, "This |
| 9 th | 9 database reports nearly 13,000 instances of |
| 10 Q. Afte | 10 incorporation by reference"? |
| 11 from plaintiffs' counsel, did you ask them | 11 A. I don't know what you're asking |
| 12 for any more? | 12 me to define |
| 13 A. That -- that's possible. I | 13 Q. I'm not asking you to define |
| 14 don't recall tha | 14 anything. I'm asking you to explain what you |
| 15 Q. You don't recall. Did you - | 15 meant by that clause, "This database |
| 16 do you have any understanding as to the | 16 reports" |
| 17 dollar value of staff time and expenses that | 17 A. I'm sorry. I'm just -- I'm |
| 18 the plaintiffs have incurred in promoting | 18 going to be just rearranging words a little |
| 19 incorporation of their standards into law? | 19 bit. There were 13,000 times that there was |
| 20 MR. FEE: Objection to form. | 20 incorporation by reference of a standard. |
| k of fou | 21 I -- I don't -- I'm sorry |
| 22 THE WITNESS: I don't think I | 22 don't understand what your confusion is. |
| 23 have that number | 23 Q. I'm not confused. I'm just |
| 24 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 24 asking you questions. Okay? So please don't |
| 25 Q. Do you have an estimate? | 25 understand -- please don't assume that I'm |
| Page 1 | Page 20 |
| EE: Same | nfused. I'm try |
| THE WITNESS: Not as I sit her | 2 meant by that. |
| now, no. | 3 You mean separate instances? |
| MR. BRIDGE | 4 You mean separate laws? What do you mean? |
| Q. Did you discuss that issue with | 5 A. Yes. Separate instances slash |
| nyone representing the plaintiffs? | 6 separate laws. |
| MR. FEE: Same objection | Q. What did |
| THE WITNESS: It's possible | 8 instance |
| I don't recall having that | A. Me |
| 10 discussion | 10 a standard |
| 11 BY MR. BRIDGES | 11 Q. Did you or anybody working with |
| 12 Q. In paragraph 57 of your re | 12 you attempt to determine the number of |
| 13 you refer to "thousands of private-sector | 13 standards that those 13,000 instances of |
| 14 standards." Was your sole support for the | 14 incorporation by reference referred to? |
| 15 statement in paragraph 57 the Bremer article | 15 A. Not entirely. But if you read |
| 16 you cited in footnote 88 ? | 16 on that -- in that same section, it talks |
| 17 A. No. You see I discu | 17 about the number of ASTM standards, the |
| 18 provide support for that in subsequent | 18 numbers of -- the number of NFPA standards, |
| 19 paragraphs in that section. | 19 and the number of ASHRAE standards. |
| 20 Q. And that includes | 20 Q. Well, please tell me where it |
| 21 paragraph 58? | 21 refers to the number of standards |
| 22 A. | 22 A. It says, "Including more than |
| 23 Q. And did you review the | 23 2,400 instances involving ASTM standards." |
| 24 Standards Incorporated by Reference Databas | 24 So you're right. It doesn't |
| 25 that you refer to in paragraph 58? | 25 have the number of standards. It just has |
| Page 199 | Page 201 |

mentions of standard. You're absolutely right.
Q. And the same thing is true of the NFPA standards and ASHRAE standards?
A. You're absolutely right, yes.
Q. Do you know how many standards
that database shows as having been
incorporated by reference?
A. Not sitting here right now.

One could perhaps look at what I cited to answer that question, but I don't know right now.
Q. Do you know whether anyone working for you ever did that work to make that determination?
A. I don't recall that being done.
Q. Paragraph 59, you say, "At the state level, privately-developed standards are incorporated by reference as part of the exercise of a range of governmental functions."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you mean by "governmental functions" in that statement?

## Page 202

A. Things that government agencies do.
Q. And you give a couple of examples, but speaking broadly, what are governmental functions that involve incorporation by reference of privately developed standards at the state level?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I can only answer generally. Health and human services, things that are related to that, safety, driving rules and regulation.
Those are among the things that come to mind.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. What are the governmental functions related to health and human services that you have in mind?
A. I don't have any particular ones in mind.
Q. What are the governmental
functions relating to safety that you have in mind?
A. I don't have any particular ones in mind.

1
Q. What are the governmental functions with respect to driving that you have in mind?
A. I don't have any particular ones in mind.
Q. In paragraph 59, you say, "At least 44 states and territories have adopted ASHRAE 90.1 as part of the commercial building energy code."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And that also has footnote 95 associated with that as well, correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. How do you explain the fact that that reference in footnote 95 shows that those 44 states, in fact, adopted the
International Energy Conservation Code that merely has a reference to an option to use ASHRAE 90.1?

MR. FEE: Objection. Lack of foundation.

THE WITNESS: I don't have any
explanation for that.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
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Q. Did you verify that?
A. I did not, no.
Q. Who did?
A. I'm sorry. Who verified what?
Q. On what -- on what did you rely
to make that statement with that footnote?
A. I may not understand your
question. I relied on what's identified in footnote 95.
Q. But you didn't review foot -what's in footnote 95 , right?

MR. FEE: Objection. Lack of
foundation.
THE WITNESS: I did.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. You -- you reviewed that Web site?
A. Yes.
Q. Personally?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. Do you have an explanation as to why the resource cited in footnote 95 actually shows that the 44 states adopted the International Energy Conservation Code?

MR. FEE: Objection. Lack of


| Q. What other benefits do | a particular period. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 plaintiffs gain from incorporation by | 2 Q. And then you do the same for |
| 3 reference of their standards? | 3 NFPA documents, correct? |
| A. I think that generally covers | 4 A. Yes. |
| 5 it. I may be forgetting things that are laid | 5 Q. What do you calculate as the |
| 6 out in my report, but that's what covers it, | 6 dollar value of harm to the -- to ASTM from |
| 7 to the best of my memory right now. | 7 the accesses and do |
| 8 Are we at a good point for a | 8 in paragraph 133? |
| eak? | A. I haven't calculated that harm. |
| 10 Q. If you want. Sure | 10 Q. Why not? |
| A. Thanks. | 11 A. I'm not sure if I can at this |
| 12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off th | 12 stage. One estimate would be those number of |
| ord at $3: 12$. This is the end of | 13 downloads times the -- well, actually, no, |
| ia unit number 2. | 14 let me take that back. I just don't know how |
| 15 * * * | 15 to do it. |
| 16 (Recess from 3:12 p.m. | 16 Q. Can you be certain that these |
| 3:41 p.m.) | 17 accesses or down -- and downloads referred to |
| * | 18 in paragraph 133, in fact, resulted in |
| THE VIDEOGRAPHER: On the | 19 economic loss to ASTM? |
| 20 record at 3:41. This is the beginning | 20 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| media unit number 3 in the | 21 THE WITNESS: Not with absolute |
| 22 deposition of John Jarosz. | 22 certainty, but with reasonable |
| 23 * * * | 23 certainty I can say some -- in some |
| 24 (Jarosz Exhibit 5 marked for | 24 number of these instances, it's likely |
| 25 identificatio | 25 the case that the -- that the |
| Page 210 | Page 21 |
| 1 * ** | mation would have been obtained |
| BY MR. BRIDGES: | om ASHRAE in -- or ASTM, rather, |
| Q. Mr. Jarosz, I've handed you | 3 in -- through legal means. |
| 4 Exhibit 5. This is an article that you cited | 4 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 5 in your report, correct? | Q. Would that -- in those |
| 6 A. Yes, I believe so | 6 instances where you say that the information |
| 7 Q. Do you recall how this article | 7 would have been obtained from ASTM through |
| came to your attention? | 8 legal means, can you put a dollar value on -- |
| A. I do not. | 9 or even an estimate of the increased revenue |
| 10 Q. Is this an article that you | 10 that ASTM would have gotten from those |
| 11 understand to have been published by | 11 instances where people obtained the |
| 12 plaintiff ASHRAE in its journal? | 12 information from ASHRAE -- sorry -- from |
| 13 A. Yes, that's my understanding | 13 AST -- |
| 14 Q. And this is an article you | 14 MR. FEE: Object -- |
| 15 relied upon with respect to the development | 15 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 16 of standard 90 , which became standard 90.1, | 16 Q. -- from ASTM |
| 17 correct? | 17 MR. FEE: Objection to form. |
| 18 A. Y | 18 THE WITNESS: No, not based on |
| 19 Q. In paragraph 133 of your | 19 the information I have. I don't think |
| 20 report, you talk about a number of | 20 I have any indication of who was doing |
| 21 downloads -- strike that -- you talk about | 21 the downloading and why. |
| 22 number of documents accessed through Public | 22 BY MR. BRIDGES: |
| 23 Resource's Web site. Do you see that? | 23 Q. And do you know what |
| A. I talk about the number of ASTM | 24 alternatives persons who were doing the |
| 25 documents that are -- that were accessed over | 25 downloading may have had for obtaining the |
| Page 211 | Page 213 |

information?
A. Not with certainty, because I don't know who those persons were, but I would expect one alternative would be to obtain it properly, directly from ASTM.
Q. Would that have resulted in more revenue to ASTM?
A. It may have. If they're
materials that were taken improperly that would have been paid for, then that would represent a loss of revenue to ASTM.
Q. Do you know whether any of the persons who obtained this information from defendant would have paid for the information from ASTM?
A. No, not with certainty, because I don't know the identity of the downloaders or the reasons for their downloading.
Q. Moreover, those persons might have accessed the standards from ASTM's reading room for free and with no revenue to ASTM, correct?
A. You mean in a but-for world? Had they not done what they actually did, alternatively they could have gone to the
$\qquad$
free reading room?
Q. Right.
A. That's a possibility, yes.
Q. Do you have an understanding as to why persons would want to download a file of a standard instead of viewing it at one of the plaintiffs' reading rooms?
A. Not with absolute certainty, but I would imagine downloading would allow more flexibility in referring to the standard and using it and sharing that information with others, whereas reading it in -- through an Internet site is somewhat less flexible, provides less flexibility for the use of that information.
Q. What did -- what do you understand to be the difference in flexibility between possession of a download and access to a standard through a reading room?
A. Well, I think that a download typically has a document that's in hard-copy form. Copies can made -- be made of that and distributed. Reading things just online doesn't allow for the wide distribution and
paragraph 107, which spills into page 108.
Page 216
MR. FEE: Page 108 ?
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
Page 108 or paragraph?
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. I'm sorry. Paragraph -- strike
that.

Let me ask you to turn
paragraph 107 on pages 45 to 46 .
A. Okay. I'm there.
Q. I just want to make sure I
understand your language correctly at the
bottom of page 45 and the top of page 46 .
Is it your opinion that the
copyright that the plaintiffs assert in their
standards drives sales of other publications
other than the standards themselves?

MR. FEE: Objection. Form.
Vague.

THE WITNESS: I think they're important for driving sales of publications that embody those standards. I don't know that I've drawn a conclusion that it drives the sale of other products, but that makes some sense.

```
BY MR. BRIDGES:
    Q. Well, doesn't that sentence at
the bottom of 45 and going on to 46 say that
copyright on plaintiffs' standards drive
sales of "handbooks that provide commentary
on the standards by referring to them"?
    A. You haven't read --
    MR. FEE: Objection.
    Mischaracterizes the document.
    THE WITNESS: You haven't read
    the whole sentence. I see that
    sentence to which you refer.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
    Q. Right. I know I haven't read
the whole sentence, but didn't I fairly
capture one part of it, which is the sales
of -- strike that -- that copyright on
plaintiffs' standards drives sales of, among
other things, "handbooks that provide
commentary on standards by referring to
them"?
    MR. FEE: Same objection.
    THE WITNESS: I think you have
    generally paraphrased it accurately,
    yes.
```
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    BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. And that plaintiffs' copyright
protection -- this is the top of -- strike
that.
And turning to the top of
page 46, plaintiffs' copyright protection on
their standards provides plaintiff with a
competitive advantage with respect to what
you call value-added publications, correct?
A. You've read part of a sentence,
but I do see that sentence, yes.
Q. And I've fairly paraphrased it
correctly, correct?
MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I think,
generally, yes.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Do plaintiffs, to your
understanding, have separate copyrights in
those value-added publications, such as
commentaries and handbooks?
A. I don't know.
Q. You don't know?
A. Correct. I do not know.
Q. Is it important to you to know
Page 219
whether plaintiffs have copyright in --
rights in their value-added publications?
MR. FEE: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: I would be
curious to know that, but I'm not sure
of the significance. I don't think it
would change my conclusions, but I
would be curious to know that.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Do you know whether
incorporation into law drives -- strike that.
Do you know whether
incorporation into law of plaintiffs'
standards drives sales of plaintiffs'
standards?
MR. FEE: Objection to form.
Vague.
THE WITNESS: I don't know with
absolute certainty, but it would make
some sense to me.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Is it your understanding that
it does?
MR. FEE: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: It would make
Page 220
some sense to me, yes.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Are you aware that, in some
instances, at least one plaintiff uses the
legal status of its code to promote the sale
of handbooks?
MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know one
way or the other. I don't have reason
to dispute it, but there's not a
particular instance that comes to mind
right now. Maybe you have something
to refresh my memory.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Can you provide a dollar value
benefit that plaintiffs receive economically
from the incorporation of their standards by
reference?
MR. FEE: Objection. Vague.
Form.
THE WITNESS: I want to make
sure that I'm understanding. Could
you read that back, please?
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. I'll restate it.

| Can you provide a -- can you | Q. What else? |
| :---: | :---: |
| put a dollar value, even an estimate, on the | A. That's what comes to mind. |
| economic benefit that plaintiffs receive from | Q. Anything else? |
| 4 incorporation of their standards into law? | A. Not this moment, no. I guess, |
| MR. FEE: Objection to form. | potentially, when I think some more about it, |
| THE WITNESS: I have not. And | 6 training and seminars, for |
| not sure how one would do that, | Q. Providers of training and |
| ubject to thinking more about 1 | 8 |
| MR. BRIDGES: | A. Yes. So that's broader than |
| 10 Q. At the top of | 10 value-added publications, but there |
| 11 "The Plaintiffs' copyright protection on | 11 potentially alternative providers of training |
| 12 their privately-developed standards provide | 12 and seminars |
| 13 a competitive advantage with regard to the | 13 Q. In paragraph 109, you say, "In |
| 14 sale of these value-added publications as the | 14 addition to direct sales of copyrighted |
| 15 copyright protection limits the ability of | 15 materials, the Plaintiffs' materials |
| 16 others to sell those publications unless they | 16 associated with their privately-developed |
| 17 are unwilling [sic] to compensate the | 17 standards provide a competitive advantage |
| 18 Plaintiffs for such use." | 18 with regard to the sale of downstream |
| 19 MR. FEE: Objectio | 19 ancillary/complementary services and |
| 20 Mischaracterizes the statement | 20 products." |
| 21 BY MR. BRIDGES: | 21 Do you see that? |
| 22 Q. Is there something unfair abo | 22 A. Yes. That's what I had in |
| 23 my characterization of that staten | 23 mind |
| 24 A. I think you read it wrong. You | 24 Q. And who are the competitors you |
| 25 read "willing" to read "unwilling" for some | 25 have in mind in paragraph 109? |
| Page 222 | Page 22 |
| 1 reason. | A. I don't know particular names, |
| Q. Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. | 2 but -- at least I don't recall any sitting |
| restate the sentence. | 3 right now -- sitting here right now, but I |
| 'In particular, the Plaintiffs' | 4 think there are other providers of these |
| 5 copyright protection on their | 5 downstream services and products. |
| 6 privately-developed standards provides a | Q. And please give me exampl |
| 7 competitive advantage with regard to the sale | 7 what you're calling "downstream services and |
| 8 of these value-added publications as the | 8 products." |
| 9 copyright protection limits the ability of | A. Again, seminars and training, |
| 10 others to sell those publications unless they | 10 for instance |
| 11 are willing to compensate the Plaintiffs for | 11 Q. Anything else? |
| 12 such use." | 12 A. That's what comes to mind right |
| 13 Do you see that statement? | 13 |
| 14 A. I do, yes. | 14 Q. Turning to paragraph 110, you |
| 15 Q. And the competitive advantage | 15 state, "I understand that the ability to |
| 16 you've identified there, whom do you | 16 control these downstream products and |
| 17 understand to be the competition? | 17 services is particularly important to the |
| 18 A. Other potential | 18 Plaintiffs here because the barriers to entry |
| 19 these so-called value-added publications | 19 in the marketplace for downstream product |
| 20 Q. And what -- when you say | 20 such as training and user manuals, are |
| 21 "value-added publications," please give me | 21 relatively low. For example, according to |
| 22 more examples of what types of things fall | 22 Mr. Comstock of ASHRAE, it is relatively easy |
| 23 into that category, as you use the term. | 23 for unauthorized instructors to read a |
| 24 A. Examples would be handbooks | 24 standard and become (or think that they have |
| 25 that provide commentary on the standards. | 25 become) qualified to provide training or |
| Pag | Page |

        Do you see that?
    A. I do, yes.
    Q. What do you understand -- what
    did you mean by "unauthorized instructors"?
A. People that have provided or
trying to provide services to the marketplace
that have not been explicitly approved by,
for instance, ASHRAE.
Q. What do you understand the --
the nature of -- strike that.
You called them "instructors,"
correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that mean that you
envision that these persons are providing
some kind of instruction?
A. Yes.
Q. What instruction do you
understand -- what instruction did you have
in mind when you referred to "unauthorized
instructors"?
A. Generally, how best to
implement standards or provisions of certain
standards.

```
```

```
guidance on that standard."
```

```
```

guidance on that standard."

```
```

A. People that have provided or trying to provide services to the marketplace that have not been explicitly approved by, for instance, ASHRAE.
Q. What do you understand the -the nature of -- strike that.
You called them "instructors,"
correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that mean that you some kind of instruction?
A. Yes.
Q. What instruction do you
understand -- what instruction did you have instructors"?
A. Generally, how best to
standards.

```
    Page 226
    A. Nothing else comes to mind
right now.
    Q. Would your understanding of
"unauthorized instructors" include persons
who were instructing the public as to what
the standards require?
        MR. FEE: Objection to form.
    Vague.
        THE WITNESS: I didn't have
    that in mind. I guess that's a
    possibility.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
    Q. And would it be relatively easy
for unauthorized persons like that to read a
standard and think that they have become
qualified to provide training or guidance on
that standard?
    MR. FEE: Objection. Vague.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
    Q. Is that your understanding?
    A. According to Mr. Comstock, I
believe that's correct.
    Q. What do you believe?
    A. I have no reason to doubt him.
```

    Q. What else?
    Q. What else?

```
A. Nothing else comes to mind
Q. Would your understanding of
"unauthorized instructors" include persons
who were instructing the public as to what the standards require?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
Vague.
THE WITNESS: I didn't have
that in mind. I guess that's a
possibility.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. And would it be relatively easy
standard and think that they have become qualified to provide training or guidance on that standard?

MR. FEE: Objection. Vague. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Is that your understanding?
A. According to Mr. Comstock, I believe that's correct.
Q. What do you believe?
A. I have no reason to doubt him.
Q. You're just parroting what

Mr. Comstock said, or did you have an independent view?
A. No, I heard what he said, and it made sense to me.
Q. So you put it in your report?
A. Yes.
Q. What independent thought or investigation did you do before you put that in your report?

MR. FEE: Objection. Vague.
Compound.
THE WITNESS: I can't point to
anything in particular.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Would a law-school course on the law and regulation of building construction provide instruction to law students?

MR. FEE: Objection. Vague.
Calls for speculation.
THE WITNESS: I guess it could.
I have a hard time imagining there would be much demand for such a course, but I'm in general agreement Page 228
that that, in concept, could occur.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Would it be possible to envision that, in the course of such teaching, a teacher may wish to analyze some of plaintiffs' standards that have been incorporated into law as law and as regulation?

MR. FEE: Objection. Calls for speculation. Vague. Form.

THE WITNESS: I guess that's
possible, but I would expect a law
professor would be talking about legal
implications, not the technical
aspects of a standard. I think they
might talk about the implication in a
business that's different from a
vendor business.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Well, what about the legal
implications of a code for contractors?
MR. FEE: Objection.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Is that -- is that fair ground for a law professor to discuss with law
```

students?

```

MR. FEE: Objection. Compound. Form. Vague.

THE WITNESS: I guess, in -- in concept. I'm having a hard time imagining that that would, in fact, occur at any law school, but it might.
I somehow doubt that the law professor would be talking about the substance of the standard as opposed to the process or implications of a standard. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. You're not familiar with courses in construction law?
A. I'm generally aware that there are courses in construction law.
Q. Is it your view that, for a law professor to provide a copy of, let's say, the National Electrical Code to students for their study would require permission of the National Fire Protection Association?

MR. FEE: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: I don't know. That seems to be a legal question. I Page 230
```

    do not know.
    ```
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Is it your view that a law
professor who does not get any permission
from NFPA or who does not purchase a copy of
the National Electrical Code would be an
unauthorized instructor --

MR. FEE: Objection.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
    Q. -- by using that code with his
or her students as part of a law-school
course?

MR. FEE: Objection to form. Compound. Calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: Again, that seems to be a legal question. I'm not sure it would be authorized, but I'm also not sure that it would be improper.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Well, you've used the term
"unauthorized" in your report, so I'm asking you, given the term "unauthorized" as used -you have used it in the report, would the scenario I have described mean that the law
professor was an unauthorized instructor?
MR. FEE: Objection. Form.
Compound. Calls for a legal conclusion. Vague.

THE WITNESS: That seems to be a legal question. Just as an economic proposition or just as a matter of the English language, I would think that they might be an unauthorized user but not an improper user.

I don't think they've gotten explicit authorization; therefore, they're unauthorized. But I'm not sure if it's illegal for them to refer to a standard.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. What about making copies of the standard and furnishing it to students? MR. FEE: Same objections. THE WITNESS: Same answer. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Do you have any opinion about the economic harms that plaintiffs would suffer if a law professor were to provide an -- a copy of the National Electrical Code Page 232
to each student in a construction law class
without having purchased those copies?
MR. FEE: Objection.
Incomplete hypothetical. Form.
You can answer, if you know.
THE WITNESS: I don't know. I have not investigated or even thought about that issue.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. In paragraphs 117 through 119 , I see no footnotes referencing sources of your conclusions or referencing facts on which your conclusions are based.

What studies, if any, did you rely on for your assertions in paragraphs 117 to 119 ?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
Lack of foundation.
THE WITNESS: The study that's summarized in Exhibit 1.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. I'm referring specifically to paragraphs 117 to 119 .
A. I thought you were. I was answering that question.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Q. You can't point to any & Q. What probability do you assign \\
\hline particular investigation or fact that you're & 2 to the likelihood that you refer to in the \\
\hline relying on in paragraphs 117 to 119 ? & 3 first sentence of paragraph 121? \\
\hline MR. FEE: Objection to form. & 4 MR. FEE: Objection to form. \\
\hline Asked and answered. & Lack of foundation. \\
\hline THE WITNESS: Everything that's & THE WITNESS: I don't have a \\
\hline embedded in Exhibit 1 is, in part, a & particular quantitative likelihood \\
\hline basis for the observations that I draw & measur \\
\hline in those paragraphs. & 9 BY MR. BRIDGES: \\
\hline 10 BY MR. BRIDGES: & 10 Q. Can you give an estimate? \\
\hline 11 Q. What probability do you assign & 11 MR. FEE: Same objection. \\
\hline 12 to your prediction in the first sentence of & 12 THE WITNESS: No. \\
\hline 13 paragraph 119? & 13 BY MR. BRIDGES: \\
\hline 14 MR. FEE: Objection. Form. & 14 Q. Turning to paragraph 126, you \\
\hline 15 Lack of foundation. & 15 refer to an "option available to Plaintiffs \\
\hline 16 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure that & 16 to respond to the loss of protection for \\
\hline 17 I've used the term "prediction," but I & 17 incorporated standards." \\
\hline 18 wouldn't assign a particular & 18 Is it your belief that, if the \\
\hline 19 quantitative probability. & 19 plaintiffs lose this case, they will shut \\
\hline 20 BY MR. BRIDGES: & 20 down their creation of new standards? \\
\hline 21 Q. Can you give an estimate? & 21 A. I think that's a possibility. \\
\hline 22 A. No. & 22 Q. What probability do you assign \\
\hline 23 Q. Why n & 23 to that? \\
\hline 24 A. I don't have a basis for that & 24 MR. FEE: Objection to form. \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
25 estimate. I have reasoning underlying it, \\
Page 234
\end{tabular} & 25 Lack of foundation. \\
\hline I don't have a basis to provide a & THE WITNESS: I don't have a \\
\hline 2 quantitative estimate of my level of & articular quantitative measure of \\
\hline confidence. & 3 probability for that. \\
\hline Q. You refer to "uncertainties" in & 4 BY MR. BRIDGES: \\
\hline 5 the second sentence of paragraph 119, & 5 Q. What's your best estimate? \\
\hline orrect? & MR. FEE: Same objection. \\
\hline A. I do, yes. & THE WITNESS: I don't have a \\
\hline Q. What probability do you assign & quantitative best estimate. \\
\hline 9 to the likelihood that you refer to with the & 9 BY MR. BRIDGES: \\
\hline 10 word "likely" in the first sentence of & 10 Q. Is it more or less than \\
\hline 11 paragraph 120? & 1150 percent? \\
\hline 12 MR. FEE: Objection. Form. & 12 MR. FEE: Same objections. \\
\hline 13 Lack of foundation. & 13 THE WITNESS: I still don't \\
\hline 14 THE WITNESS: I don't have a & 14 have a quantitative estimate. \\
\hline 15 particular quantitative measure of & 15 BY MR. BRIDGES: \\
\hline 16 that. And are you referring to my use & 16 Q. Is it more or less than \\
\hline 17 of the term "likely"? & 1780 percent? \\
\hline 18 BY MR. BRIDGES: & 18 MR. FEE: Same objections. \\
\hline 19 Q. Yes. & 19 THE WITNESS: Still don't have \\
\hline 20 A. Yes, I don't have a particular & 20 a quantitative estimate. \\
\hline 21 quantification of that. & 21 BY MR. BRIDGES: \\
\hline 22 Q. What particular facts are you & 22 Q. Is it more or less than \\
\hline 23 relying on for that paragraph? & 235 percent? \\
\hline 24 A. Everything that you see & 24 MR. FEE: Same objections. \\
\hline 25 reported in Exhibit 1. & 25 THE WITNESS: Still don't have \\
\hline Page 235 & Page 237 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline a quantitative estimate. I think that & 1 to see what alternatives there are among \\
\hline there -- with reasonable probability I & 2 standards development organizations currently \\
\hline can draw this conclusion, but I can't & 3 in existence to carry forward the work of \\
\hline be any more precise than that. & 4 plaintiffs if plaintiffs chose to stop \\
\hline BY MR. BRIDGES: & 5 standards development as a result of the loss \\
\hline Q. What do you mean, "with & 6 of this case? \\
\hline Qonable probability"? & MR. FEE: Same objection. \\
\hline A. Based on the information that I & THE WITNESS: Not that I \\
\hline have and the training and logic I bring to & recall, but I am of the understanding \\
\hline 10 it, I think there is a -- I say with some & 10 that each SDO has a different charter, \\
\hline 11 confidence what I have said here. & 11 so I don't know that any SDO has an \\
\hline 12 Q. And when you say "likely," do & 12 identical charter to that of any of \\
\hline 13 you mean more than 50 percent likely? & 13 the three plaintiffs. \\
\hline 14 A. Not necessarily, no. & 14 BY MR. BRIDGES: \\
\hline 15 Q. Are you aware of other & 15 Q. Are you aware that these \\
\hline 16 standards development organizations active & 16 plaintiffs compete with other SDOs in the \\
\hline 17 the same field as the plaintiffs? & 17 creation of standards in particular fields? \\
\hline 18 MR. FEE: Objection. Vague. & 18 MR. FEE: Objection to form. \\
\hline 19 Form. & 19 Vague. \\
\hline 20 THE WITNESS: Perhaps you could & 20 THE WITNESS: What do you mean \\
\hline 21 tell me what you have in mind & 21 by the term "compete with" \\
\hline 22 your use of the term "fields." & 22 context? \\
\hline BY MR. BRIDGES: & 23 BY MR. BRIDG \\
\hline 24 Q. Well, are you familiar with & 24 Q. That they consider others \\
\hline 25 AHRI? & 25 rivals for the same market, in part. \\
\hline Page 238 & Page 2 \\
\hline A. I have perhaps seen reference & MR. FEE: Objection to form. \\
\hline hat. & Vague. \\
\hline Q. Do you know with which of these & THE WITNESS: I don't recall \\
\hline 4 plaintiffs it -- do you -- do you know what & seeing reference to that, but my \\
\hline 5 field it's in? & memory is not perfect. \\
\hline A. I don't recall, sitting here & BY MR. BRIDGES: \\
\hline 7 right now, no. & 7 Q. The -- in paragraph 131, you \\
\hline Q. Are you familiar with NFRC? & 8 say, "Simply put, freely-distributed, \\
\hline A. I may have seen reference to & 9 unrestricted versions of Plaintiffs' \\
\hline 10 that acronym. & 10 standards that are or could be incorporated \\
\hline 11 Q. Do you know what field it's in? & 11 by reference can be expected to adversely \\
\hline 12 A. Not sitting here right now. & 12 impact the market for Plaintiffs' standards \\
\hline 13 Q. Are you familiar with ICC? & 13 that are incorporated by reference and to \\
\hline 14 A. I have seen reference to that. & 14 displace sales of these standards by the \\
\hline 15 I don't recall what it is, sitting here now. & 15 Plaintiffs - which can be expected to have a \\
\hline 16 Q. Do you know whether other & 16 material adverse effect on Plaintiffs' \\
\hline 17 standards developments organizations would be & 17 revenues." \\
\hline 18 in a position to step forward and to continue & 18 Do you see that? \\
\hline 19 the maintenance and preservation and further & 19 A. Yes \\
\hline 20 development of the standards of plaintiffs & 20 Q. By "expected," do you mean more \\
\hline 21 here if plaintiffs lose this case? & 21 than 50 percent likely? \\
\hline 22 MR. FEE: Objection to form & 22 A. Not necessarily. I don't have \\
\hline 23 THE WITNESS: I don't know. & 23 a quantitative assessment of what I mean by \\
\hline 24 BY MR. BRIDGES: & 24 "expected." \\
\hline 25 Q. Have you done any investigation & 25 Q. Do you mean more than 5 percent \\
\hline Page 239 & Page 241 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

likely?

```
A. I haven't quantified that, but

I would expect that it's -- more than
5 percent would be a reasonable definition of
"expected."
Q. More than 10 percent?
A. I don't know. I've not
quantified that number.
Q. And what amount of an effect on plaintiffs' revenues have you identified as "material"?
A. I haven't --

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: -- been able to
quantify the specific effects, so I
don't know the amount.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Well, what -- I'm not asking for your quantification of a specific effect, but how large would an effect have to be for to you consider it "a material adverse effect on Plaintiffs' remedies"?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know that
I have a particular quantitative
Page 242
guideline in mind.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Have you ever -- are you
familiar with audit inquiry letters regarding litigation?
A. Generally, yes.
Q. And you're familiar with the
fact that auditors will often specify to
those they send the letters to what amounts
would be material for purposes of the audit response?
A. Yes.
Q. So you understand the concept of certain amounts being material to certain companies or entities?
A. Yes, for certain purposes.
Q. So I'd like to know what amount you have identified as being material as an adverse effect on plaintiffs' revenues for each of the three plaintiffs, please.

MR. FEE: Objection. Compound.
Asked and answered.
THE WITNESS: I have not
considered a particular amount.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Do you consider \(\$ 100,000\) to be material as an adverse effect on plaintiffs' revenues?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
Compound.
THE WITNESS: I haven't
considered that question. I don't
know the answer to it.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Have you considered whether 50,000 is a material amount as an adverse effect on plaintiffs' revenues?

MR. FEE: Same objections.
THE WITNESS: Same answer.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Starting at page -- sorry.

Strike that.
Starting at paragraph 139 , you
make several references to Mr. Malamud's theory.
A. I'm sorry. To -- I missed a word that you said. References to his what?
Q. To Mr. Malamud's theory --
A. Okay.
Q. -- T-H-E-O-R-Y. You refer to
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it in paragraph 139;140;144, with the word
"theorized"; 145, "theory"; 146, "theory."
What facts do you have that have disproved the theory in paragraph 139 ?
A. Perhaps most important is the revealed preference information. If the plaintiffs believed they were better off by lack of copyright protection, they would have pursued such a model.

They don't believe they're better off. Moreover, they're expending tremendous resources in bringing and pursuing this litigation to halt the activity at issue.
Q. What other facts, if any, do
you have that have disproved Mr. Malamud's theory in paragraph \(139 ?\)
A. That's what comes to mind right now.
Q. What facts do you have or are you aware of that have disproved Mr. Malamud's theory as you refer to it in paragraph 140 ?
A. That's the same theory that's being referenced in 139, so there's nothing
new in terms of a theory.
Q. Do you have the same answer
with respect to -- strike that.
What facts do you have --
strike that.
What facts are you aware of to
disprove -- to disprove Mr. Malamud's theory
that you refer to in paragraph 144 ?
A. Again, it's the same theory that's being referenced, but there's additional facts; and that is, the downstream products and services aren't particularly substantial to these plaintiffs and don't appear to be enhanced by a lack of copyright protection; that is, the plaintiffs have had copyright protection and have said -- had some downstream products and services. It's hard to imagine that elimination of that copyright protection will enhance that business.
Q. It's hard to imagine, but are you aware of any studies to disprove Mr. Malamud's theory?
A. No. MR. FEE: Objection. Vague.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Have you conducted any studies to disprove Mr. Malamud's theory?

MR. FEE: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: Not other than
what's reflected here in Exhibit 1.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. What academic literature have you relied upon to criticize Mr. Malamud's theory in paragraph 144 ?
A. Nothing specific comes to mind.
Q. In paragraph 145 , you state
that, "Mr. Malamud's suggestion that the sale of downstream products and services represents an untapped and undeveloped opportunity for the Plaintiffs is incorrect."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And then you go on and make
some statements for the rest of the
paragraph, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What studies did you engage in to determine the facts that you stated in the
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rest of that paragraph?
MR. FEE: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: I looked at the
financial information, and I talked to people at the various plaintiffs.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. You talked to people at the various plaintiffs?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you do to verify the truth and accuracy of the things that various plaintiffs said to you in their conversations?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I looked at the
financial information, and I kept my eyes and mind open to the information in the rest of the record to determine if it conflicted with what I learned from the company personnel.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Whose financial information did you look at?
A. All three of the plaintiffs. It's summarized in tabs 3,4 , and 5 .
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```

Q. Did you look at the financial
information of any entities other than the
plaintiffs?
A. I looked at Public Resource financial information.
Q. Apart from Public Resource and the plaintiffs, did you look at the financial information of any other entities in making the assertions that you made in paragraph 145 ?
A. Not in undertaking my assignment here.
Q. Did you consider the business models of any entities other than the plaintiffs and the defendant in making the statements criticizing Mr. Malamud's theory in paragraph 145 ?
A. Nothing in particular comes to mind. I understand that there are front-loaded business models, but -- at DIN, for instance, but I don't recall undertaking an investigation of the downstream activities that they have.
Q. Did you undertake any investigation of downstream activities of
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```
other US-based standards development organizations that make their standards freely available to the public?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Would that have been relevant to your analysis?
A. It wasn't necessary to do my
analysis, but I would be curious if I had
that information. If I -- if I had the
ability to examine that information, I would be curious as to what that shows.
Q. In paragraph 146, you state, "The loss of publications here will likely reduce the Plaintiffs' sales of those downstream products and services."

Do you see that?
MR. FEE: That's in 146 ?
THE WITNESS: Is that the last
sentence you were reading from?
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.
Q. Paragraph 146.
A. Yes, I do see that.
Q. Did you mean the loss of
copyright in the publications here?
A. Certainly the loss of publications, but I believe it would probably
be better to put the loss of copyright in the publications as more reflective of the assignment that I undertook here.
Q. What probability do you assign to the likelihood that you refer to in that sentence?

MR. FEE: Objection to form.
Lack of foundation.
THE WITNESS: I haven't
assigned a quantitative probability to that.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Have you any estimate? MR. FEE: Same objections. THE WITNESS: I do not. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Have you any estimate as to the magnitude of the likely reduction of plaintiffs' sales of downstream products and services?

MR. FEE: Same objections.
THE WITNESS: No, I have been
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unable to quantify that with great accuracy.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Have you considered any
comparable circumstances apart from this case
that would provide guidance for your
prediction in the last sentence of
paragraph 146 ?
MR. FEE: Objection to form.
Vague.
THE WITNESS: I kept my mind and eyes open to that, but I didn't see information of a good comparator. BY MR. BRIDGES:
Q. Did you research whether there might be good comparators?
A. I --

MR. FEE: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: I did in the
sense of reading through the literature and information to see if I could learn of something that would be a good comparator, but I didn't learn of such comparator.
BY MR. BRIDGES:
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\hline capabilities 133:25 & cause & 105:24 106:7,20 & codes 127:9,14,25 \\
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\hline carl 3:13 & & 12 & collection 209:23 \\
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\hline 104:10 107:21 & 243:14,14,16 & 159:6 & 224:2 225:12 227:2 \\
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\hline 219:21 & compound 37:13 & 169:24 170:17 & consequences \\
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\hline 33:1 34:13 35:19 & 69:7,10,24 70:16 & 235:3 238:11 & 164:11 165:14 \\
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\hline 243:15 & 256:4 & 15:6 & 252:4 \\
\hline company 34:9 42:15 & concepts 170:12,15 & confine 77:21 & consolidated 135:8 \\
\hline 42:17 248:20 & 170:23 171:2,11,18 & confirm 90:11 & constituency 39:7 \\
\hline comparable 128:13 & 171:21 & confirmation 23:24 & constituent 37:23 \\
\hline 128:22 252:5 & concern 45:12 & confirmations 109:6 & 39:1 \\
\hline comparator 252:13 & conclude 58:24 & 09:11 & constituents 31:15 \\
\hline 252:23,24 & 169:7,11 & confirming 109:19 & 33:7,12,22 34:2,4 \\
\hline comparators 252:16 & conclusion 12:6 & conflict 121:7,10 & 36:1 37:7 82:10,14 \\
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\hline complementary & 16:5 17:2 18:12,20 & 115:15 216:8,17 & contained 10:21 \\
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\hline 17 37:2 42:8 & 87:25 88:1,2 215:23 & 65:17 66:13 67:22 & 111:15 170:5 \\
\hline 14 70:10,21 & 232:17 233:2 & 68:17 69:21 70:11 & 171:15 228:16,25 \\
\hline 106:14 240:22 & copy 136:1 \(215: 22\) & 70:23 71:19 72:8,12 & 229:4 231:12 \\
\hline ntexts 9:4 & 230:18 231:5 & 72:12 77:25 86:8,12 & courses 25:17 \\
\hline continue 6:15 & 232:25 & 90:22 94:10 113:21 & 230:14,16 \\
\hline 68:14 151:20 & copying 15:18 20:6 & 113:22 114:8 & court 1:1 7:4 8:3 \\
\hline 162:25 239:18 & 133:25 & 130:16,19 135: & 12:6 63:14 64:4, \\
\hline continued 2:19 & copyright & 156:24 161:25 & 65:15 66:2,6,10 \\
\hline 0:19,20 111:3,9 & 18:14,20 27:4,12 & 162:5 163:12 & 67:19 71:12 74:1,15 \\
\hline continues 72:20 & 28:8 & 174:10 188:1 & 76:5,25 77:10 81:4 \\
\hline continuing 66:4 & 65:8 & 197:22 204:13, & 128:1,13 129:3,8 \\
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\hline 17 & 223:5,9 245:8 & costs 65:789:9 & reates 82:19 83 \\
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\(3: 107: 14 \quad 12: 9,21\)
21:9,12,21 \(23: 20\)
65:17 \(66: 5 \quad 68: 12\)
\(73: 1,4,11 \quad 145: 18\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
denying 109:20 \\
depending 67:12 \\
depends 39:3 \\
deponent 260:4,6
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\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{66:10 74:2 126:8} & definition 55: & 248:18 255:6 & 84:25 185:3 186 \\
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\hline 254:11,14 255:3,24 & posted 164:14,21 & preliminary 168:18 & 251:3 \\
\hline 256:16 257:11,13 & 165:8,18,25 166:6 & 169:8 & problem 45:19,22 \\
\hline plane 92:5 & 166:14,22 167:1 & preparation 101 & 85:4 \\
\hline plans 119:11 & 175:23 176:24 & prepare 100:25 & problems 48:19 \\
\hline please 6:7,11 7:9 8:4 & 177:10,23 179:12 & 103:16 107:2 192:9 & 50:19,24 51:13,20 \\
\hline 15:8,10 52:17 64:9 & 180:2,8 183:7,9 & prepared 105:15 & 52:1,4,13,15,18,20 \\
\hline 64:12,24 78:22 98:6 & 193:11 194:7 & preparing 102:21 & 52:22 53:13 54:12 \\
\hline 118:25 149:21 & 256:17 & presence 68:23 & 54:16 55:5,21 56:5 \\
\hline 150:1,2 153:9 & posting 176:10,21 & 95:18 136:14 & 82:16 \\
\hline 200:24,25 201:20 & 177:7,19 178:12 & 137:14 & procedure 98:21 \\
\hline 216:24 221:23 & 254:15 257:5 & present 3:127:9 & 101:6,12,14 \\
\hline 223:21 225:6 & postings 177:15 & 95:22 125:22 & procedures 57:10 \\
\hline 243:20 & 178:15,19 & presentation 56:21 & 57:23 58:13 \\
\hline plus 79:4 147:11 & posts 254:12 & presentations & proceed 15:3 17:11 \\
\hline 150:23 161:17 & potential 35:21 & 119:21 & proceeded 153:16 \\
\hline pocket 92:10 133:3 & 55:21 56:4 73:3,4,6 & presented 160:2 & process 30:23 31:13 \\
\hline point 24:19 43:7 & 74:19,25 147:15 & preservation 239:19 & 33:17 39:19 42:4 \\
\hline 58:19 84:1 92:20 & 161:1 223:18 257:1 & presumably 13:19 & 44:18,22 45:4,8 \\
\hline 100:11 129:7 & potentially 111:10 & previous 16:8 25:9 & 81:21 82:3,4 84:8 \\
\hline 140:24 154:17 & 224:5,11 254:20 & 90:15 183:12 & 85:19 87:3,15 90:19 \\
\hline 190:16 210:8 & 256:20 257:2 & previously 93:14 & 90:20 91:15 100:20 \\
\hline 228:13 234:1 & power 50:14 & 109:9 & 108:3,6 130:21 \\
\hline pointing 157:2 & practical 45:17 & price 171:4 172:2,16 & 131:1,7,9,14 197:8 \\
\hline points 100:19 & 112:12 & 172:19,23 184:25 & 198:2 230:11 \\
\hline 107:17 & practice 55:19,20,20 & 185:3 & processes 28:19,25 \\
\hline policies 138:24 & 56:2,3,3,6 144:21 & primarily 31:24 & 29:2,16,22,24 30:3 \\
\hline 139:10 140:11 & practices 55:23 & 39:12 91:1 153:17 & 30:10,20,25 31:4 \\
\hline policy 141:24 & 138:10,19,23 & print 88:1 255:25 & 40:18,23 41:12,21 \\
\hline portion 108:17 & 139:10 140:12 & 256:5,9,14,18 257:6 & 131:2 \\
\hline 145:7 & practicing 47:18 & prior 17:9 29:6 & produce 87:18 \\
\hline positing 206:4 & precise 155:11 & 60:12 123:17 & produced 21:8 \\
\hline position 239:18 & 159:8 160:4 165:15 & 147:11 & 112:8 114:3,5 \\
\hline possession 215:18 & 181:16 188:13 & private 6:9 199:13 & 153:20 175:8 195:5 \\
\hline possibility 57:14 & 189:14 238:4 & privately 202:18 & product 52:871:6 \\
\hline 101:2 215:3 227:12 & precisely 154:10 & 203:6 222:12 223:6 & production 5:6 24:1 \\
\hline 236:21 & 156:9 166:25 & 224:16 & 118:14,18 \\
\hline possible 23:6 92:9 & prediction 166:5 & probability 234:11 & products 32:15 \\
\hline 96:8 115:21 119:22 & 234:12,17 252:7 & 234:19 235:8 236:1 & 34:14 35:21 72:1,3 \\
\hline 123:5 124:13 & preexisting 83:15 & 236:22 237:3 238:2 & 72:7,10,24 82:11,15 \\
\hline 134:21 147:19 & prefer 163:12,15 & 238:7 251:7,13 & 159:19 217:24 \\
\hline 198:13 199:8 216:9 & preference 163:1,7 & probably 25:16 & 224:20 225:5,8,16 \\
\hline 216:18 229:3,12 & 245:6 253:22 & 26:20 27:1,8 30:21 & 225:19 246:12,17 \\
\hline & & 31:8,9 43:5,21 & 247:15 250:15 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
[products - questions]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 251:22 & 115:23 120:2 141:1 & publications 62:19 & quantitative 171:3 \\
\hline profession 25:19 & 141:15 145:4 & 141:3,11 158:13,14 & 172:7 173:22,24 \\
\hline professor 229:13,25 & 146:24 158:25 & 178:22 184:15,19 & 209:7 234:19 235:2 \\
\hline 230:8,18 231:4 & 199:18 218:5,19 & 185:18 187:1,6,21 & 235:15 236:7 237:2 \\
\hline 232:1,24 & 221:15 222:1 & 188:1,3,6 217:15,21 & 237:8,14,20 238:1 \\
\hline profit 85:6,8 & 223:25 224:17 & 219:9,20 220:2 & 241:23 242:25 \\
\hline profitability 182:21 & 225:25 226:7 & 222:14,16 223:8,10 & 251:13 \\
\hline 183:6 & 227:17 228:18 & 223:19,21 224:10 & quantity 175:14 \\
\hline program 48:5 & 230:18 232:24 & 250:13 251:1,3,5 & question 15:5 16:9 \\
\hline project 104:9 & 235:1 252:6 & 253:7,19,24 & 16:11,21,22 17:9,11 \\
\hline 105:25 106:25 & provided 22:9 23:24 & publicly 158:19 & 17:13,16,17 29:23 \\
\hline promote 221:5 & 93:4 118:21 119:7 & published 40:17 & 30:2,6 35:8,10,11 \\
\hline promoting 198:18 & 119:10,12,13,14,18 & 72:5 112:10 175:19 & 36:11,16,19,25 \\
\hline prompt 120:14 & 119:24 120:18 & 195:2,11 211:11 & 37:12,19,22 51:12 \\
\hline properly 214:5 & 135:23 148:15 & purchase 62:19 & 54:8 55:25 57:20 \\
\hline property 9:2,7,23 & 153:15 198:1,5 & 185:12 231:5 & 59:18 67:16 69:18 \\
\hline 10:4,13,16,23 11:5 & 226:6 256:13 & purchased 233:2 & 75:10,11 77:23 \\
\hline 11:16 26:19 139:16 & providers 223:18 & purely 88:22 & 80:22 90:5 95:8 \\
\hline 139:21 & 224:7,11 225:4 & purported 144:20 & 105:11 107:16 \\
\hline proportion 154:20 & provides 141:10 & purpose 49:8 110:15 & 108:3,12,18 123:11 \\
\hline proposal 40:13 & 163:8 215:14 219:7 & purposes 77:24 & 125:22 129:3 137:5 \\
\hline proposals 40:12 & 222:12 223:6 & 138:12,20 139:7 & 137:12,17 143:15 \\
\hline proposed 83:22 & providing 87:14 & 243:10,16 254:2 & 143:23 144:4 145:8 \\
\hline 85:23 86:4 & 88:11 209:20 & pursuant 260:3 & 145:25 146:1,3,20 \\
\hline proposition 232:7 & 226:16 253:6 257:2 & pursued 131:2 & 149:20 150:3,10 \\
\hline propriety 168:17,20 & provisions 226:24 & 245:9 & 151:1,15,24,25 \\
\hline prospectively 123:8 & public 3:13 12:15 & pursuing 245:12 & 152:5 157:10,18,23 \\
\hline protection 1:7 2:12 & 38:15,20 52:5 62:17 & put 10:3 102:13 & 159:14 165:20 \\
\hline 7:20 11:1,2 18:2,20 & 71:5,6 73:21 74:23 & 126:6 132:17 & 166:4 168:6,9,10,13 \\
\hline 52:6 65:8,12 67:22 & 75:23 76:18 111:8 & 150:15 213:8 222 & 168:21 169:4 \\
\hline 68:7 69:8,11,25 & 111:25 112:3 & 228:6,9 241:8 251:4 & 171:11 172:19 \\
\hline 70:6,7,9,11,15,17 & 114:13,16,22 115:6 & q & 173:1 176:4 177:2,5 \\
\hline 73:19 79:13 80:1,23 & 123:17,23 124:2,16 & & 183:13 188:5,6,11 \\
\hline 80:25 110:19 & 129:11 130:7 & & 188:22 194:1,3 \\
\hline 114:14 126:13,18 & 211:22 216:9,18 & qualitative 173 & 195:23,25 196:20 \\
\hline 139:16,21 140:5,13 & 227:6 249:4,6 250:3 & \[
173: 20
\] & 202:11 205:8 \\
\hline 219:3,6 222:11,15 & 257:15 260:3,15 & & 207:10,17,21 \\
\hline 223:5,9 230:21 & public.resource.org & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ality } 46: \\
& 52: 782: 16
\end{aligned}
\] & 230:25 231:17 \\
\hline 236:16 245:8 & 1:14 7:3 74:4 75:5 &  & 232:6 233:25 244:7 \\
\hline 246:15,16,19 & 75:12 76:3,6 165:18 & \[
235: 21 \quad 242: 19
\] & 253:11 257:22 \\
\hline prove 142:8 & public.resource.org. & quantified \(132: 7\) & questioning 52:19 \\
\hline proved 142:11 & 4 &  & 58:24 59:17 106:3 \\
\hline provide 23:24 34:14 & publication 4:16 & & 171:9 \\
\hline 55:18 56:1 87:17,20 & 134:12 184:15,21 &  & questions 5:15 \\
\hline 87:22 88:25 89:1 & 185:13 & & 77:22 95:1,5 145:12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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[questions - refresh]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 50:6 186:20 192:3 & \multirow[t]{12}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { realize } 196: 12 \\
& 207: 16 \\
& \text { really } 64: 7 \\
& \text { realtime } 1: 23 \\
& \text { rearranging } 200: 18 \\
& \text { reason } 165: 3 \quad 167: 10 \\
& \text { 195:23,24 } 221: 9 \\
& 223: 1227: 25 \\
& 258: 10 \\
& \text { reasonable } 65: 24 \\
& 212: 22 \quad 238: 2,7 \\
& 242: 4
\end{aligned}
\]} & recalled 109:7 & 53:6 60:16 67:20 \\
\hline 200:24 258:14,15 & & recalling 23:6 & 70:3 71:15 138:16 \\
\hline quicker 154:18 & & recast 150:1 & 138:24 156:13,14 \\
\hline quite 29:9,13,17 & & receive 50:14 & 158:16 177:23 \\
\hline 41:24 80:20 111:5 & & 121:22 122:10,15 & 192:13,24 193:21 \\
\hline 142:5 145:11 & & 192:23 221:16 & 194:3 199:24 200:5 \\
\hline 56:25 157:9 163:2 & & 222:3 & 200:10,20 201:14 \\
\hline 84:6 257:24 & & received & 202:8,19 203:6 \\
\hline quote 29:21 64 & & 82:13 122:17,24 & 204:16,19 209:5,11 \\
\hline quoted 69:9,20 & & 197:7 198:10 & 209:18 210:3 \\
\hline quoting 70:8 & & recess 61:19 110 & 221:18 239:1,9,14 \\
\hline r & & 152:25 210:16 & 241:4,11,13 254:13 \\
\hline r 244:25 & reasoning 234: & & referenced 245:25 \\
\hline range \(31: 1\) & reasons 214 & recognize 175:7 & 246:10 \\
\hline 122:6 202:20 & recall \(20: 8,19,22,25\) & recollect 184:13 & references 103:6 \\
\hline ranges 119:6 135:3 & 21:5,10,19 22:3,14 & recollection 140:8 & 187:25 244:19,22 \\
\hline 135:5 & 23:25 24:3 25:14 & recollections 108:2 & referencing 233:11 \\
\hline ely & 26:24 27:14,25 31:3 & recommending & 233:12 \\
\hline tio 154:23 & 41:19 42:7 50:19,21 & 58:12 & referred 10:11 \\
\hline rationale 21:1 & 53:12 55:11 93:2 & record 6:6,17 16:7 & 13:23 22:24 23:19 \\
\hline ray \(26: 10140: 12,15\) & 96:7,16 99:2 101:19 & 17:7 35:5 61:17,23 & 36:21,22 68:22 \\
\hline 140:19,20,22 141:1 & 113:19 114:9 & 110:1,8 152:23 & 84:11 110:13 \\
\hline 141:9,23 253:5,13 & 115:11,20 117: & 153:4 210:13,20 & 171:10 201:14 \\
\hline 253:22 & 119:23 120:15 & 248:18 258:22 & 212:17 226:21 \\
\hline r 260: & 121:3 122:20 123: & 259:3 260:8 & eferring 13:3 23:9 \\
\hline reaching & 123:10,14,19 124:7 & recorded 106:6 & 49:11 50:23 68:22 \\
\hline 125:12 148:16 & 124:9,14,15 125:24 & 260:6 & 69:3,13 99:19 107:3 \\
\hline read 13:17,21 14:17 & 125:25 126:2,8,22 & recording 6:15 & 115:18 160:20,21 \\
\hline 20:13 21:8,24 55:24 & 127:4 134:24 & recordings 106:17 & 163:20,22 187:7 \\
\hline 72:9 78:21 112:7,8 & 138:16 139:14,20 & records 27:16,20 & 215:10 218:6,20 \\
\hline 112:9,11 118:3 & 140:4,7,18,21 141:5 & 28:4 63:10 133:6 & 233:22 235:16 \\
\hline 129:3,8 130:2 137:9 & 141:20 154:18 & redrawing 71:8 & refers 22:13 140:19 \\
\hline 142:22,23,23 & 155:25 156:18 & reduce 46:12 250: & 71:17 188:3 \\
\hline 143:10 201:15 & 4:13 178 & reduction 156:2 & 201:21 \\
\hline 218:7,10,14 219:10 & 179:16,25 180:5,15 & 251:21 & reflect 101:13 115:3 \\
\hline 221:23 222:24,25 & 180:24 181:3,8 & refer 11:24 90:7,21 & 115:6 117:5,13 \\
\hline 222:25 225:23 & 185:4 190:18 & 91:1 98:24 115:22 & reflected 17:23 \\
\hline \[
22
\] & 194:21,24 195:4,6,9 & 140:20,21 143:8 & 19:25 62:11 93:19 \\
\hline cading & 195:20 198:14,15 & 199:13,25 212:7 & 113:12 158:3 247:7 \\
\hline 135:24 136: & 199:9 200:2 202:16 & 218:12 232:14 & reflection 184:13 \\
\hline \[
214: 21215
\] & 206:18 207:22 & 235:4,9 236:2,15 & reflective \(251: 5\) \\
\hline \[
215: 19,24250: 19
\] & 211:7 225:2 239:6 & 244:25 245:22 & reflects 15:13,20 \\
\hline \[
252: 20
\] & 239:15 240:9 241:3 & 246:8 251:8 & 114:20 \\
\hline & 249:21 250 & reference 18:11 & refresh 123:3 \\
\hline & 253:10 255:19 & 22:16 47:7,8 48:23 & 140:23 165:24 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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[refresh - resource]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 221:13 & relevance 142:6,15 & repeating 66:24 & reports 119:20 \\
\hline refreshed 24:21 & 144:3,15 147:8 & repercussions 18:2 & 122:2 200:9,16 \\
\hline 103:24 & relevant 79:12 & 70:19 & represent 7:11 \\
\hline refreshing 141:7 & 116:7,15 142:13 & report 4:12 9:25 & 71:10 98:3 117:15 \\
\hline refrigerating 7:25 & 146:12 147:14 & 10:21 11:9,12,14 & 214:11 \\
\hline refrigeration 1:11 & 148:6 250:5 & 12:13,24 13:2,7,17 & representation \\
\hline 2:17 & reliability 52:8 & 13:23 14:18 15:16 & 117:18 206:17 \\
\hline regard 18:4,12 19:5 & reliable 187:17 & 16:4,4,15 17:1,1 & representations \\
\hline 26:21 30:11 49:17 & reliance 258:7 & 18:7 20:1 22:8,9,12 & 20:24 44:7 \\
\hline 67:1,2 71:4 78:3,7 & relied 21:20 24:6,10 & 25:1 29:6 33:16 & representatives \\
\hline 82:5 141:24 155:4,5 & 24:24 43:8 102:20 & 39:25 41:3,11,16 & 42:16,17 43:11,16 \\
\hline 155:6 157:2 165:21 & 103:18 105:7,15 & 48:15 50:2 51:3 & 43:20 94:22 97:4 \\
\hline 222:13 223:7 & 106:11,13 107:5,8 & 53:6,18,25 54:10,22 & 118:7 \\
\hline 224:18 255:7 & 107:10,12 109:1,12 & 62:6,12 63:2 64:7 & represented 112:18 \\
\hline regarding 13:7 & 125:11 146:25 & 64:11,13 66:9,16 & 179:21 \\
\hline 69:24 93:6 95:1 & 148:16 169:19 & 67:3 71:3 79:19 & representing 2:6,12 \\
\hline 103:17 104:3,22 & 205:8 211:15 & 89:5 96:4 98:22,24 & 2:17 3:6,10 6:19 \\
\hline 105:16 116:9,17 & 247:10 & 99:4,7,11,16 100:15 & 42:9 45:15 199:6 \\
\hline 124:17 127:24 & reluctant 76:16 & 100:22,25 101:5,24 & represents 151:12 \\
\hline 156:12 174:4 & rely 19:21 \(20: 3\) & 102:8,21 103:7,19 & 247:16 \\
\hline 180:17 208:24 & 100:9 101:13,15,16 & 103:21 104:4,9 & reproduce 136:1 \\
\hline 243:4 & 101:18 103:5 104:1 & 106:1 107:6,12 & reputation 19:18 \\
\hline regardless 35:19 & 104:15 106:17 & 109:2,13,17 110:12 & 21:23 \\
\hline regional 52:10 & 161:18 169:7,11 & 112:18 125:10 & request 5:6 \\
\hline registered 1:22 & 180:16 205:5 & 135:4,21 138:3 & require 13:21 144:8 \\
\hline regular 113:7 & 233:15 & 140:18 141:18 & 144:25 146:20 \\
\hline regulation 203:12 & relying 99:18,24 & 142:22,23 143:5,8,8 & 227:7 230:20 \\
\hline 228:17 229:8 & 100:5 106:5,9,24 & 143:18,19 147:14 & required 133:1 \\
\hline regulator 37:4 & 161:13 162:3 234:3 & 153:23 154:1 & requirement 46:19 \\
\hline regulators 36:9,12 & 235:23 & 155:12 160:18 & requirements 48:6 \\
\hline 36:24 37:6 & remainder 254:7 & 165:23 166:8,16,22 & research 93:6,10 \\
\hline regulatory 38:5,10 & remained 138:2 & 170:24 181:1 & 94:13 114:12 \\
\hline rehear 149:24,25 & remedies 242:22 & 183:22 184:12 & 115:16 162:5,13 \\
\hline rehn 2:97:18,18 9:9 & remember 70:3 & 185:5,5 187:8 & 252:15 255:12,20 \\
\hline 122:8,12 258:16 & 119:17 140:17 & 195:15 199:12 & researched 172:20 \\
\hline reiniche 102:4 & 155:13,14 & 207:5 209:13 210:6 & reserve 254:7 258:4 \\
\hline rekeying 71:8 & remembering 96:9 & 211:5,20 216:22 & resolution 45:13 \\
\hline related 196:22 & reminded 192:16 & 228:6,10 231:22,24 & resolve 82:17 \\
\hline 203:11,17 & reminder 188:10 & reported 160:14 & resource 3:13 12:16 \\
\hline relates 145:13 & rendering 170:17 & 164:6 183:22 207:5 & 62:17 71:5,6 73:21 \\
\hline relating 26:15 & reparability 169:2 & 235:25 & 74:24 75:23 76:18 \\
\hline 203:22 & reparable 151:18 & reporter 1:22,23 8:3 & 123:17,24 124:3 \\
\hline relatively 13:20 & repealed 163:5 & 122: & 129:11 205:22 \\
\hline 225:21,22 227:14 & repeat 30:17 & reporting 180:25 & 206:10 216:9,18 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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[resource's - sections]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline resource's 211:23 & 193:5,9 194:4,16 & 11:5,17,22 12:7,9 & 224:14 241:14 \\
\hline resources 86:1,21 & 241:17 242:10 & 12:11,16 13:8,14 & 250:14 251:22 \\
\hline 87:18,21 197:19 & 243:19 244:3,12 & 15:2,14 16:6 17:3 & san \(2: 4,103: 4\) \\
\hline 206:22 207:11 & review \(28: 754: 6,7\) & 26:22 81:5 145:14 & satisfy 209:20 \\
\hline 245:12 & 94:10,19 115:9,12 & 220:2 & saw 24:1141:6 \\
\hline respect 17:11 \(25: 11\) & 116:1,10,18 117:5 & risen 62:22 208:8,10 & 112:21 121:3,9 \\
\hline 55:17 60:6 76:4 & 117:23 134:17 & risk 66:24 & 138:16 \\
\hline 79:16 80:17 95:5 & 195:16 197:20 & risks 46:6,8 & saying 11:20 30:7 \\
\hline 132:19 140:13 & 199:23 205:10 & rivals 240:25 & 30:18 36:23 68:1 \\
\hline 142:3 204:2 208:12 & reviewed 108:19 & room 135:24 214:21 & 104:7 107:17 173:6 \\
\hline 211:15 219:8 246:3 & 114:17 136:8,9 & 215:1,20 & 197:16 \\
\hline respond \(40: 10,12\) & 162:17,20 205:16 & rooms 136:5 215:7 & says 71:3 89:7 \\
\hline 54:8 108:18 236:16 & 216:6 & rough 132:17 & 187:19 201:22 \\
\hline responding 17:9 & reviewing 108:9 & round 90:1891:3,14 & scans 71:7 \\
\hline 52:20 144:25 & 2:13 & route 40:2 & scenario 231:25 \\
\hline response 171:11 & reviews 115:4 & routes 255:2 & scheme 41:22 42:1 \\
\hline 175:9 243:11 & revised 108:20 & rubel 23:14 92:25 & scholarship 93:15 \\
\hline responsible 104:12 & revising 83:16 108:9 & 93:3 & school 128:7 228:16 \\
\hline responsive 105:23 & revision 89:1 & rudimentary 71:10 & 230:7 231:11 \\
\hline 108:13 137:12 & rewriting 106:2 & 71:22 & scope 95:23 \\
\hline 151:23 197:5 & rides 54:14 & rule 81:4 105: & screenshot 90:10 \\
\hline rest \(247: 21248: 1,18\) & right \(14: 2,7,1016: 3\) & rules 76:25 77:10 & screenshots 120:2 \\
\hline 258:4 & 17:14 20:23 21:10 & 128:1 146:7,9 & sdo 31:7,11 32:25 \\
\hline restate 149:23 & 28:4 31:8 54:20 & 203:12 & 33:9 42:18 45:24 \\
\hline 221:25 223:3 & 64:22 68:21 69:10 & ruling 67:13 128:14 & 83:10,22 88:7 \\
\hline result 57:10 58:7 & 69:24 72:9,23 76:14 & S & 240:10, \\
\hline 125:7 149:14 & 90:1 95:16 97:8,15 & S & sdos 28:20 29:22 \\
\hline 150:19 151:5 152:9 & 97:21 113:22 116:3 & safely 50:13 & 31:20 33:2 42:19 \\
\hline 184:20 240:5 & 123:4 124:14 132:1 & safety \(38: 2549: 6\) & \[
51: 2070: 18 \text { 75:2,9 }
\] \\
\hline resulted 212:18 & 132:23 136:1 140:7 & 52:5 54:13 203:12 & \[
131: 3138: 16,20,24
\] \\
\hline 214:6 & 154:10,15 165:10 & \[
203: 22
\] & \[
139: 10,20140: 1,4
\] \\
\hline results 10:20 57:24 & 173:23 187:9,14 & salaries \(87 \cdot 1688: 12\) & 140:25 141:14 \\
\hline 93:20 & 189:4 190:1 &  & 240:16 254:2 \\
\hline retain 101:3 & 191:15,18,23,25 & sale 183:19 186:22 & seal 260:1 \\
\hline reveal 174:9 & 192:20 197:25 & \[
186: 25187: 1,20
\] & search 93:12,18 \\
\hline revealed 163:1,7,11 & 201:24 202:2,5,9,11 & \[
188: 8,16,20217: 24
\] & searches 153:18 \\
\hline 174:9 245:6 253:22 & 205:11 206:4,7 & \(221: 5222: 14223: 7\) & second \(2: 354: 25\) \\
\hline reveals 16:4 17:1 & 210:7 215:2 218:14 & 224:18 247:14 & 104:20 235:5 254:8 \\
\hline revenue 181:12,21 & \(221: 12225: 3,3,12\) & \[
\text { sales } 4: 16134: 8,13
\] & section 18:18 65:11 \\
\hline 182:3,12 183:19 & 227:3 239:7,12 & \[
155: 18 \text { 156:2,21,23 }
\] & 68:20 158:25 \\
\hline 186:22,25 187:20 & 245:18 253:3 & \[
159: 18 \text { 176:9.22 }
\] & 199:19 201:16 \\
\hline 192:23 208:5 213:9 & 256:15 257:9 & \[
177: 9.21 \text { 178:21 }
\] & 209:14 \\
\hline 214:7,11,21 & 258:21 & \[
208: 1 \text { 217:15,20 }
\] & sections 13:12,14 \\
\hline revenues 136:16 & rights 9 & \[
218 \cdot 5.16 .18 \quad 220 \cdot 14
\] & 14:8 \\
\hline 137:16 188:8,15,19 & 10:13,17,18,23,25 & 218:5,16,18 220:14 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
[sector - specific]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 199:13 & sentence 63:24,25 & shut & sold 175:14 \\
\hline see 9:24 10:20 12:23 & 71:25 89:7 90:7,16 & sic 7:6 54:15 67 & sole 199:14 \\
\hline :5,8 18:25 19:25 & 218:2,11,12,15 & 222:17 & olicit 31:14 \\
\hline :15 41:4 62:7 & 219:10,11 223 & side 33:18,19 34:12 & licited 110:25 \\
\hline 71:16 89:11 101:23 & 234:12 235:5,10 & 34:17,21 35:12,18 & olution 45:18 48:25 \\
\hline 105:22 109:17 & 236:3 250:19 251:9 & 1,22 37:4,5 & 55:10,16 60:3,6 \\
\hline 142:5,14 153:25 & 252: & 16,21 & solutions 1:19 48:20 \\
\hline 155:12 162:18 & tence & 14 82:9,14 & 5:6,14 59:24 \\
\hline 165:24 175:17,21 & separate 23:22 & 83:12,13 84:11,12 & somebody 38:24 \\
\hline 179:20 193:5 197:4 & 137:21 138:18 & signature 260:14 & 56:9,11,18 \\
\hline 199:17 202:22 & 139:6 180:5 196 & significance 129:12 & somewhat 29:19 \\
\hline 204:10 211:23 & 201:3,4,5,6 219 & 129:15 220:6 & 215:13 \\
\hline 218:11 219:11 & separat & il & sophisticated 71:12 \\
\hline 223:13 224:21 & 93:2 119:18,2 & :24 & 72:4 \\
\hline 226:2 233:11 & 179:19 194:23 & :10 & sorry 11:19 17:21 \\
\hline 235:24 240:1 & 196:14 208:2 & simply 87:14 241 & 24:18 36:10 56:15 \\
\hline 241:18 247:18 & sept & sit 84:4,19 116:3 & 57:19 65:20 84:9 \\
\hline 250:16,24 252:13 & seriatim 9:15 & 54:10 191:6,14,18 & 89:3 92:14 118:13 \\
\hline 252:21 & serve 85:25 86 & 192:19 & 122:12 138:7 1 \\
\hline seeing 21:5 \(24: 3\) & ervices & 192:20 199:2 & 152:17 154:5 \\
\hline 120:15 122:20 & 35:22 52:9 82:12,1 & site 90:11 120:2 & 156:17 163:5 \\
\hline 123:10 154:14 & 203:10,18 209:20 & 164:15,22 179: & 164:10 171:1 \\
\hline 241:4 & 224:19 225:5, & 0:3,9 185:7 & 185:10 188:21 \\
\hline ek & 226:7 246:12,17 & 205:17 206:7 & 196:12 200:17,21 \\
\hline eking & 247 & 211:23 215 & 205:4 213:12 217:2 \\
\hline seen 20:24 21:3 & 25 & sites 40:1 101:2 & 217:5 223:2 244:16 \\
\hline 23:23 29:14 43:5 & set & 122:1 136:1 & 244:21 247:1 \\
\hline 58:2 103:2,3 106:1 & 92:10 135 & 137:15 & sought 196:5 \\
\hline 106:19 137:2 & setting 26:6, & sitting 20:23 27:24 & sounds 30:1,5 \\
\hline 180:12 & 30:11,13 31:9,2 & 53:23 117 & 113:16,18 150:24 \\
\hline 192:13 209:6 & 32:5,9,18 139:24 & 123:4 124:14 132:1 & source 25:7 134:22 \\
\hline 216:13 239:1,9, & 140:1 & 140 & 134:25 135:2 193:4 \\
\hline Il 222:16 223:10 & se & 142:24 143:12 & urces 22:8 112 \\
\hline selling 82:11 & shared 87:2 & 190:13 195:12 & 7 \\
\hline seminars 224:6,8,12 & sharing & 225:2,3 & , \\
\hline 5:9 & & 239:12,15 & \(2 \cdot 19143\) \\
\hline nd & & & \\
\hline sense 81:25 & show & slash 93:3 & 1:25 52:23 \\
\hline 113:8 121:20 & shown 93:20 11 & slightly 40:1895: & 203:4 \\
\hline 132:13,14 & 9:5 134:18 & 208:9 & specific 50:10 64:25 \\
\hline 217:25 220:20 & 187 & small & 71:4 114:9 125:23 \\
\hline 221:1 228:5 252:20 & shows 202:7 204 & sn & 139: \\
\hline tive & 205:23 20 & socially 49: & 164.19 172 \\
\hline sent 76:10 & 250:11 & society 1:3,9 2:6,17 & 173:5,10,15 174:1, \\
\hline & & 7:1,24 & 174:24 177:17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 180:25 181:3 & 195:2,10 200:20 & 156:13,23 160:1 & 195:3 199:15 \\
\hline 242:15,19 247:12 & 201:10 202:1 & 175:14,23 176:22 & 202:25 205:6 \\
\hline 255:20 & 206:24 207:14 & 176:23 177:8,9,20 & 222:20,23 223:13 \\
\hline specifically 30:3 & 211:16,16 215:6,10 & 177:21 178:13 & statements 23:18 \\
\hline 49:11 70:14 99:15 & 215:19 225:24 & 179:12 180:3,9 & 105:16 113:24 \\
\hline 113:20 114:6 & 226:1 227:16,18 & 181:13,21 182:1,4 & 119:11 120:23 \\
\hline 117:24 193:10 & 229:15 230:10,11 & 182:13,22,23 183:7 & 121:16 124:16 \\
\hline 194:6,16 233:22 & 232:15,18 253:7,19 & 183:8,19 186:23,25 & 135:8 162:14 \\
\hline specifics 130:24 & 253:24 254:12,15 & 188:9,16,20,23,24 & 247:21 249:16 \\
\hline 131:23 & 254:17,23,25 & 189:2,3,12,18,24 & states 1:1 115:15 \\
\hline specify 243:8 & 255:25 256:5,17 & 190:5,21 191:11,21 & 116:1,9,10,17,18,24 \\
\hline speculated 161:15 & 257:6,12 & 192:9,25 193:11,19 & 117:7 124:11,19 \\
\hline speculating 61:12 & standards 20:15 & 193:20 194:6,17 & 204:7,17 205:23 \\
\hline speculation 77:3 & 21:13 25:11,22 27:6 & 198:19 199:14,24 & 206:11 \\
\hline 78:15 228:21 & 27:13 28:1,9,14 & 200:5 201:13,17,18 & stating 67:19 \\
\hline 229:10 257:18 & 29:3,24 30:9 31:2,5 & 201:19,21,23,25 & statistics 91:1,1 \\
\hline spend 13:22 41:10 & 31:6,9,23 32:4,9,16 & 202:4,4,6,18 203:7 & status 124:7,8 221:5 \\
\hline 96:11 97:3 & \(32: 1833: 534: 15\) & 208:17 209:1,24 & statute 60:17 \\
\hline spent 89:8,22 91:12 & 35:23 39:20 41:7 & 210:3 214:20 216:3 & step 71:10,23 239:18 \\
\hline 97:16 & 42:5,6 44:10 45:4,7 & 217:15,16,22 218:4 & stephanie 102:4 \\
\hline spills 216:25 & 46:11,16 47:8 48:12 & 218:6,18,20 219:7 & stephen 101:25 \\
\hline sponsorship 192:9 & 48:21,22 50:8 55:7 & 220:14,15 221:17 & steps 31:18 39:23,24 \\
\hline spreadsheet 4:16 & 55:7,15 56:1 57:5 & 222:4,12 223:6,25 & 41:6 71:21 112:4,23 \\
\hline Sso 31:10, \(1232: 24\) & 57:17,22 59:25,25 & 224:17 226:24,25 & 114:21 129:22 \\
\hline 33:9 & 60:20 69:11 70:2 & 227:7 229:6 236:17 & 130:6 153:9 \\
\hline \(\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s s o s }} 32: 10,1433:\) & 71:7,11,14 72:6,8 & 236:20 238:16 & stipends 192:23 \\
\hline 131:3 & 75:2,16,25 76:1,4 & 239:17,20 240:2,5 & stipulate 9:16 \\
\hline staff 86:688:14,21 & 76:11,16,17 78:12 & 240:17 241:10,12 & stipulation 9:12 \\
\hline 91:6 190:20 191:10 & 79:1 80:2 81:5,20 & 241:14 250:1,2 & stipulations 5:11 \\
\hline 191:20 198:17 & 82:19 83:7,15,16 & 255:16 256:22 & stop 129:6 240:4 \\
\hline stage 212:12 & 84:8,24 85:14,15,24 & standing 260:3 & story 178:5,8 \\
\hline stages 99:9 & 86:4 87:3,19 88:1,1 & start 12:2 184:16 & straight 143:7 \\
\hline stamped 122:16 & 88:2,5,16 89:10,24 & starting 244:16,18 & street 1:19 2:3,9 3:3 \\
\hline 135:9 & 90:4,8,10 93:7 & starts 72:10 209:15 & 3:8 6:23 \\
\hline stand 52:16 & 114:15 123:21 & state 7:10 13:644:2 & strike 25:9 39:17 \\
\hline standard 4:19 25:15 & 124:11,17 127:1,2,5 & 47:6 195:1 202:18 & 48:8 64:18 67:6,6 \\
\hline 26:6,15 28:14 30:11 & 130:22,25 131:9,14 & 203:7 206:11 & 67:10 91:10 94:8 \\
\hline 30:13 32:18 40:5,17 & 132:10,20 133:11 & 225:15 247:13 & 113:16 117:3 \\
\hline 42:12 44:6,15 45:25 & 133:17,20 135:15 & 250:12 & 118:24 129:7 \\
\hline 46:20 61:2,10 82:2 & 135:25 136:2 & stated 10:11 17:7,24 & 135:13 146:7 \\
\hline 89:15 90:22 91:16 & 138:11 139:24 & 112:13 118:8 & 159:15 163:5,18,20 \\
\hline 92:7 131:6,15,19,22 & 140:6,21 141:16 & 122:22 186:21 & 168:18 169:8 \\
\hline 132:4 140:1 141:2 & 142:3 154:3,6,21,24 & 247:25 & 175:19 179:10 \\
\hline 141:11 158:13,15 & 154:25 155:14,18 & statement 63:17,21 & 181:11 183:4 189:8 \\
\hline 158:19 176:10 & 155:20 156:3,5,12 & 64:10,17 65:171:18 & 211:21 217:5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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[strike - testimony]

[testimony - trend]

[trends - value]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ```
trends 134:8 155:18
    156:2,21 175:16,20
    176:9 178:20
trial 27:22
trip 90:18 91:3,14
true 133:22 155:5,6
    202:3 260:7
``` &  & 211:13 215:4
219:19 220:22
221:22 227:4,21
240:9
understood \(112: 18\)
undertake \(75: 23\)
138:18 139:6 & ```
useful 100:17,19
    144:12 198:7,8
user 225:20 232:9
    232:10
users 32:15 35:20,21
    42:15
uses 221:4
``` \\
\hline truth 248:11 260:5,5 & 86:4 & 193:18 249:24 & v \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 260: 5 \\
& \text { try } 30: 633: 1753: 3 \\
& 197: 4
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { understand } 18: 14 \\
20: 533: 1135: 4 \\
36: 15,18,2538: 12
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { undertaken } 26: 21 \\
28: 1929: 2,22,24 \\
137: 21 \quad 139: 5,11
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
v \(124: 24\) \\
vacuum 161:22 \\
vague 19:23 20:20
\end{tabular} \\
\hline trying 32:4,5 50:24 & 39:16,18,24 41:12 & 207:7 257:20 & 24:8 34:6 43:23 \\
\hline 51:14 52:1,14,18,24 & 41:21 47:5 48:8,11 & undertaking 207:23 & 6:12 67: \\
\hline 53:13 99:13 113:15 & 50:24 51:5,7,10,13 & 249:11,21 253:11 & 72:16 80:10 81:2 \\
\hline 157:5,11 186:18 & 52:23 62:14 67:16 & 255:20 & 86:10 91:4 98:25 \\
\hline 201:1 226:7 & 69:18 78:11,24 & undertook 30:8 & \[
100: 2 \quad 104: 5 \quad 106: 8
\] \\
\hline tsc 1:47:6 & 79:10 82:7 84:23 & 251:6 & 107:7 116:12 127:6 \\
\hline turn 6:1189 & 85:13,22 87:2,13 & undeveloped 247:16 & 128:4,22 134:20 \\
\hline 216:24 217:7 & 88:20 129:10 & unfair 222:22 & 135:19 138:6,14 \\
\hline turning 187:17 & 130:11 133:2,16 & unique 31:13 & 140:8 144:7 147:23 \\
\hline 219:5 225:14 & 142:16 143:12 & unit 110:2,9 210:14 & \[
152: 15162: 16
\] \\
\hline 236:14 & 144:5,16 145:9 & 210:21 258:23 & 163:13 174:18 \\
\hline turns 78:10 146:6,9 & 148:5 149:13 & united 1:1 115: & \[
176: 12178: 24
\] \\
\hline 178:18 & 150:10,13,14 152:4 & 115:25 116:8,16,24 & \[
79: 151
\] \\
\hline two 32:21 & 169:1 172:19 173:1 & 117:7 124:11,19 & \[
92: 1121
\] \\
\hline 69:22 72:2 93:3 & 177:4 183:18 & unknowing 76:17 & \[
20: 3,172
\] \\
\hline 96:24,25 97:18,19 & 184:22 186:17,18 & unlawful 60:22 & 27:9,19 228:11,20 \\
\hline 97:20 101:21 & 188:7 200:22,25 & unrelated 108:14 & 229:10 230:3 232:4 \\
\hline 119:23 193:6 & 201:1 205:7 206:3 & unrestricted 141:2 & \[
238: 18240: 19
\] \\
\hline type 47:24 87:13 & 207:3 209:9 211:11 & 141:10,15 241:9 & \[
241: 2 \text { 246:25 } 248: 2
\] \\
\hline types 8:18 26:14 & 215:17 217:1 & 253:6,18,23 & \[
52: 10256: 2
\] \\
\hline 43:22 72:24 82:22 & 223:17 225:15 & untapped 247:16 & \[
\text { valid } 12: 777: 25
\] \\
\hline 83:6 87:7,9,9,13 & 226:4,10,20 243:13 & unwilling 222:17,25 & validate 185:9, \\
\hline 109:11 223:22 & 249:19 255:23 & updated 89:18 & validity \(120: 6\) \\
\hline typical 89:14 & 256:4,11,16 257:10 & updating \(89: 10,24\) & valuation 9:1,21 \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { typically } 45: 23 \text { 83:5 } \\
\text { 101:7 198:8 } 215: 22
\end{gathered}
\] & understanding & 90:21 91:16 92:6
upside 20:11 \(21: 3\) & \[
10: 12,15
\] \\
\hline u & 43.1,2,4 & 22:13,18 & 19:7,8,10 132:8,18 \\
\hline uh & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 101: 24129: 14 \\
& 133: 6,7 \quad 135: 17
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { use } \quad 19: 2,13,1731 \\
71: 10,13146: 11
\end{gathered}
\] & 189:9 195:21 \\
\hline ultimately 40:15 & 146:11 147:6, & \[
149: 5 \quad 176: 9 \quad 192: 24
\] & 198:17 212:6 213:8 \\
\hline 7: & 146:11 147 & 204:19 215:14 & 219:9,20 220:2 \\
\hline & ):11 180:2 & 216:1 222: & 221:15 222:2,14 \\
\hline unauthorized & 185:15,22,23 186:1 & \[
223: 12,23235: 16
\] & 223:8,19,21 224:10 \\
\hline 225:23 226:5,21 & 188:19 198:16 & 238:22 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
[valued - witness]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ed 9 & 143:3 144:10 & 51:15 52:16 54:11 & 6:4,17 \\
\hline variety 48:15 58:8 & 148:20 149:3 & 4:15,18 55:5,9 & 67:15,25 69:17 \\
\hline 131:2 172:8 & 167:25 228:3 & 56:19 58:15,17 60:2 & 70:13 72:17 73:3,18 \\
\hline various 29:16 45:6 & 230:17 231:3 & 60:5 61:7,8 74:2,8 & 74:7 76:877:4 \\
\hline 62:21 86:5,23 88:15 & viewed 111:3,9 & 79:7,21,25 80:5 & 78:21 79:6,20 80:4 \\
\hline 96:1,22 98:12 99:13 & viewing 215:6 & 109:21 176:9,19 & 80:11,20 81:9,15,24 \\
\hline 99:15 107:17 112:9 & views 111:13 112 & 180:1 181:9 221:9 & 82:21 83:9 84:1,3 \\
\hline 112:15 132:9 & 112:14,16,17,22,24 & ways 48:1661:9 & 85:1,18 86:11 87:5 \\
\hline 153:21 179:12 & 113:9,20,25 114:6 & we've 58:20 & 87:12 91:5 92:1 \\
\hline 180:2,8 248:5,8,11 & 114:10,21 115:6 & web 40:1 72:5 90:11 & 93:9 94:1 97:6 98:9 \\
\hline veeck 124:24 125:1 & 117:15,25 118:1 & 120:2 122:1 136:15 & 99:1,21 100:3 \\
\hline 125:18 126:23 & 162:3,9,14 & 137:15 164:15, & 102:12,25 103:11 \\
\hline 127:15 129:15,2 & olate 148:2 & 179:13 180:3, & 104:6,19 105:19 \\
\hline 130:8,16 & violated 148:7, & 185:7 197:19 & 106:16 107:15 \\
\hline vendor 229:18 & violations 147:22 & 205:16 206: & 108:19 109:5,16 \\
\hline verification 23:23 & virtually 106 & 211:23 & 110:25 113:5 \\
\hline 196:16 & 109:16 & went 92:16 101 & 114:24 116:20 \\
\hline verified 179:9 & visit & west \(3: 2,7\) & 117:12 118:11,13 \\
\hline 205:4 & me & whichever 169:19 & 120:11 122:9,14 \\
\hline verify & me & whispering 6:9 & 124:21 125:13 \\
\hline 3:23 195:7,18 & volunteer 90:16, & wide 31:14 42:13,20 & 126:12 127:7 128:5 \\
\hline 200:4 205:1 248: & 91:3,9,12 92:6 & 15:25 216:3 & 128:25 129:19 \\
\hline verifying 179:17 & 111:19 & widely & 130:2,18 132:12,22 \\
\hline veritext 1:18 6:19 & volunteer' & ider 32:1 & 133:14 134:10,21 \\
\hline 6:23 8:4 & volunteers 132:9 & willing 14:23 & 135:20 136:18,23 \\
\hline versa 108:1 & vs \(1: 14\) & 222:25 223:11 & 137:8,20 138:7,15 \\
\hline version 164:14 & w & 9:5 & 139:3,14 143:17 \\
\hline 165:18 254:16 & & , & 144:9 145:9,24 \\
\hline 7 & & thdrawing & 147:2,13,25 148:18 \\
\hline versions 85:23 86:4 & & witness 4:3 7:7 8:5 & 148:25 149:8,19 \\
\hline 86:6 241:9 255:16 & \[
1635:
\] & 9:19 10:7 11:8 14:5 & 150:9,24 151:9 \\
\hline versus 7:2 145:18 & 46:3 48:18 49:7 & 4:15 15:23 17:14 & 152:14,16 156:17 \\
\hline 154 & & 19:24 20:22 21:1 & 157:17 158:3 159:4 \\
\hline vi & & 22:7 24:10,18 25:14 & 159:21 160:13 \\
\hline vice 108:1 & & 26:18 28:17 29:9,13 & 161:9,18 162:7,17 \\
\hline videographer 3:15 & & 33:15,24 34:7,19,24 & 163:14 164:4 165:1 \\
\hline 6:5 8:2 61:16,22 & & 35:15 36:3,14 37:14 & 166:10,18 167:8,22 \\
\hline 109:25 110:7 &  & 37:19 38:9,18 39:3 & 168:15,25 169:15 \\
\hline 111:21 152:22 &  & 39:22 41:1,18 43:25 & 169:22 170:20 \\
\hline 153:3 210:12,19 & wants & 44:14 45:10 47: & 172:1 174:16,20 \\
\hline 258:21 & w & 48:14 51:2,17 52:3 & 176:14 177:1,12 \\
\hline videotaped 1:17 & & 53:2,17 54:11 56:13 & 178:1,25 179:16 \\
\hline view 3:9 74:14 & & 57:1,7,12,19 58:1 & 180:23 181:8 182:7 \\
\hline 110:18,22 117:6 & 48:20,24 50:19 & 58:17 59:3 60:9,13 & 182:16 183:1,11,21 \\
\hline 136:11 139:15 & 48.20,24 50.19 & 61:15 62:5 63:20 & 186:12 190:13,24 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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[witness - york]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 191:6,14 192:5,12 & 93:5,11 107:25 \\
\hline 193:2,14 194:10,20 & 138:13 173:9 \\
\hline 196:3 197:3,24 & 185:19 202:14 \\
\hline 198:22 199:2,8 & 240:3 \\
\hline 203:9 204:23 & worked 28:2 106:25 \\
\hline 205:14 206:2,16 & 151:10 185:21 \\
\hline 207:2,16 208:19 & 190:21 191:11,21 \\
\hline 209:3 212:21 & working 12:7 17:15 \\
\hline 213:18 216:12,21 & 83:14 147:25 \\
\hline 217:2,19 218:10,23 & 151:11 201:11 \\
\hline 219:15 220:4,18,25 & 202:14 \\
\hline 221:8,21 222:6 & world 50:14 214:23 \\
\hline 227:10 228:13,22 & write 100:19 196:15 \\
\hline 229:11 230:4,24 & writing 84:8 104:1 \\
\hline 231:16 232:5,20 & 104:11 106:2 108:7 \\
\hline 233:6,19 234:6,16 & writings 92:23 93:6 \\
\hline 235:14 236:6,12 & 93:13 162:20 \\
\hline 237:1,7,13,19,25 & written 20:25 21:1 \\
\hline 238:20 239:23 & 22:21 24:11,14,25 \\
\hline 240:8,20 241:3 & 25:1 43:6 93:1 \\
\hline 242:14,24 243:23 & 104:17 108:10 \\
\hline 244:6,14 247:1,6 & 135:20 154:8 \\
\hline 248:3,15 250:18 & wrong 32:25 90:13 \\
\hline 251:12,18,25 & 103:24 120:3,19 \\
\hline 252:11,19 254:20 & 127:9 135:10 \\
\hline 255:9,19 256:3,20 & 140:10 222:24 \\
\hline 257:19 258:20 & wrote 100:14 138:2 \\
\hline 259:1 260:8,10 & 141:25 \\
\hline witnesses 4:1 & y \\
\hline word 24:6 42:3 & y 244:25 \\
\hline 107:19,22 150:14 & yeah 22:5 250:22 \\
\hline 235:10 244:22 & year 89:8 164:13 \\
\hline 245:1 & 165:17 170:4,5,10 \\
\hline words 36:15 53:3 & 170:13,15 171:7,13 \\
\hline 68:11 73:20 74:1 & 171:15 172:11 \\
\hline 82:22 83:3,7,19 & 208:8,9 \\
\hline 96:19 104:11 & years 25:18,20 \\
\hline 142:24 143:19 & 27:11 46:2 89:13,19 \\
\hline 150:25 184:15 & 89:20 130:23 \\
\hline 200:18 256:24 & 131:10 133:12,19 \\
\hline work 8:18 9:2,4,5 & 133:23 134:8,11,15 \\
\hline 11:10 12:19,23 & 175:13 208:2,4 \\
\hline 25:19 26:15 27:3,5 & york 46:2 \\
\hline 28:7,10 31:17 50:3 & york 46.2 \\
\hline 50:3 80:24 81:2,18 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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Rule 30
(e) Review By the Witness; Changes.
(1) Review; Statement of Changes. On request by the deponent or a party before the deposition is completed, the deponent must be allowed 30 days after being notified by the officer that the transcript or recording is available in which: (A) to review the transcript or recording; and (B) if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement listing the changes and the reasons for making them.
(2) Changes Indicated in the Officer's Certificate. The officer must note in the certificate prescribed by Rule \(30(f)(1)\) whether a review was requested and, if so, must attach any changes the deponent makes during the 30 -day period.
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