EXHIBIT 3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA CASE NO. 11-20427-WILLIAMS/TURNOFF

DISNEY ENTERPRISES,
INC., TWENTIETH CENTURY
FOX FILM CORPORATION,
UNIVERSAL CITY STUDIOS
PRODUCTIONS LLLP,
COLUMBIA PICTURES
INDUSTRIES, INC., and
WARNER BROS.
ENTERTAINMENT, INC.,

Plaintiff,

V.

HOTFILE CORP., ANTON TITOV, and DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

HOTFILE CORP.,

Counterclaimant,

v.

WARNER BROS ENTERTAINMENT INC.,

Counterdefendant.

VOLUME I

 $$\rm H\ I\ G\ H\ L\ Y\ C\ O\ N\ F\ I\ D\ E\ N\ T\ I\ A\ L\$ (Pursuant to protective order, the following transcript has been designated highly confidential)

30(b)(6) DEPOSITION OF ANTON TITOV
Radisson Blu Hotel
Sofia, Bulgaria
Monday, December 5, 2011
Job Number: 44174

- 1 (Exhibit Titov 26 re-marked for identification.)
- 2 BY MR. FABRIZIO:
- 3 Q. Mr. Titov, I take it that you have no issues reading
- 4 this document in Bulgarian?
- 5 A. No, I don't.
- 6 MR. THOMPSON: His counsel does.
- 7 Mr. Fabrizio, let me also just state while he's
- 8 reading that, we have become aware in the last week or
- 9 two or some inadvertent produced documents that were
- written in Bulgarian that contained work product
- information. And I'd ask -- have asked for their
- return. I don't know if this is among them or not, not
- being able to read the Bulgarian.
- 14 MR. FABRIZIO: Well, then, we can deal with that afterwards.
- 15 MR. THOMPSON: And I'd just like to -- I'll allow this to
- 16 continue, but I want to reserve a potential objection to
- the extent this has any work product.
- 18 MR. FABRIZIO: Okay. Fair enough. You preserve the
- objection. Obviously, until we see what it is, I can't
- say whether we agree or not.
- 21 MR. THOMPSON: But you agree there's no waiver by
- 22 letting me --
- 23 MR. FABRIZIO: No, not by letting him answer the following
- 24 question.
- 25 BY MR. FABRIZIO:

- 1 A. No, they did not.
- 2 Q. Hotfile had identified what it believed to have been
- mistakes in the notices by Warner throughout
- 4 February, March, April and even May of 2001; is that not
- 5 correct?
- 6 MR. THOMPSON: I'm going to object to the extent that it
- 7 calls for work product information which commenced after
- 8 the date of early March 2011.
- 9 To the extent you can answer without revealing work
- 10 product information, you can do so.
- 11 A. I don't think I can answer.
- 12 BY MR. FABRIZIO:
- 13 Q. Okay. Well, you identified what you believed to have
- been mistakes made by Warner prior to early March 2001;
- is that not correct?
- 16 A. Yeah, I believe so.
- 17 Q. Okay. Did you ever bring those mistakes to the
- attention of Warner prior to filing your counterclaim?
- 19 A. Not directly, no.
- 20 O. Indirectly?
- 21 A. It is my belief that at some point our counsel
- communicated with Warner, who knew.
- 23 MR. FABRIZIO: Let me ask the court reporter to mark as
- 24 Titov exhibit 27 a document bearing the Bates number
- 25 HF02866338 through 369.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA CASE NO. 11-20427-WILLIAMS/TURNOFF

DISNEY ENTERPRISES, INC., TWENTIETH CENTURY FOX FILM CORPORATION, UNIVERSAL CITY STUDIOS PRODUCTIONS LLLP. COLUMBIA PICTURES INDUSTRIES, INC., and WARNER BROS. ENTERTAINMENT, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

HOTFILE CORP., ANTON TITOV, and DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

HOTFILE CORP.,

Counterclaimant.

v.

WARNER BROS ENTERTAINMENT INC.,

Counterdefendant.

VOLUME II

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL (Pursuant to protective order, the following transcript has been designated highly confidential)

> 30(b)(6) DEPOSITION OF ANTON TITOV Radisson Blu Hotel Sofia, Bulgaria Tuesday, December 6, 2011 AT: 9:10 a.m. Job No: 44175

- 1 VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the beginning of tape 1, volume II,
- and a continuation in the deposition of Mr. Anton Titov.
- 3 On the record, 9:10.
- 4 MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Fabrizio, as we've been discussing off
- 5 the record, the defendants have informed you and now
- 6 inform the court reporter that exhibits 26 and 27 were
- 7 inadvertently produced documents that contain work
- 8 product information, and we ask for their return.
- 9 I would also ask you to work with me after the
- deposition to strike the testimony that was given
- 11 pursuant -- about those documents yesterday. We'll not
- do that now; I won't take your time.
- The reason for pulling them back is that beginning
- on March 2nd, 2011, Hotfile undertook work product
- investigation of its potential counterclaim against
- Warner Brothers. These documents were both generated
- 17 after that date.
- We provided you a list on Saturday; I recognize you
- 19 were in transit and may not have seen it. Exhibit 26
- was among the documents that were on that list.
- 21 Exhibit 27 was not, but on further investigation, it's
- 22 dated March 10 and is also protected work product.
- 23 I'd like to work with you going forward today to the
- 24 extent you have documents that you want to use with this
- witness that are dated or generated after March 2nd.

But please give me a chance to examine them to make sure that they're not also work product before we examine the witness.

With that, and not to belabor the record, I'd like
to formally request the return of exhibits 26 and 27 and
have them removed from the record.

MR. FABRIZIO: Right. I won't belabor our disagreement on this on the record. We'll have plenty of time to discuss it when we're back in the States. But as you out, exhibit 27 wasn't on any -- any list, and that list did come Saturday before a Monday deposition, and I have told you I wouldn't have had a chance to look at it, and didn't and still haven't.

So, going forward, I am happy to give you, you know, time to look at the document before we begin questioning the witness; but as for the documents that have already been marked, the only thing I can tell you is that we will -- without waiving -- either party waiving any rights or privileges, we'll see what the situation is and address them when we get back home.

I can tell you right now, by way of fair warning, that -- well, exhibit 26 was a document in Bulgarian, and if you can demonstrate that a waiver was or the disclosure was inadvertent, I don't think we'll have issue with it.

Page 198

On the other hand, exhibit 27 appears plainly from the testimony yesterday not to be work product, and it is not a document that was produced in Bulgarian; it was produced in English. It was a long document, so could not easily have been missed, and we don't think that the production of it was inadvertent. And moreover, the witness, with counsel present, testified fairly extensively about the document yesterday, so we believe that the document was never privileged to the extent it might have been waived on production. And to the extent it wasn't waived on production, it was certainly waived at this point.

a challenge to that, and we will just deal with that in the normal course when we're back in the United States.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Fabrizio, very briefly, as I told you off the record, you should update yourself of the law. When a document is requested to be pulled back, there is no burden; you have no choice but to give it back to us. There's no longer any need to show that we waived any privilege by inadvertent production. We produced something inadvertently; you are required to provide the documents back to us. You can challenge it later court.

But we recognize that you have every right to make

With respect to exhibit 26, as you've noted, that's in the Bulgarian language, and we don't speak Bulgarian;

we can't read every document before it was produced.

With respect to exhibit 27, the record will speak for itself. I made very clear to you yesterday that I was concerned about a work product privilege with respect to any document dated after late March, and I would check overnight to get a particular date, and I indulged with you a courtesy, and I expected to have the courtesy returned, of you proceeding with the examination, subject to my objection.

Now, what I would ask again today is before you mark any document dated after March 2nd, 2011, pertaining to the Warner Brothers counterclaim, that you give me a chance to check to see if we have in fact asserted that the document is privileged — which is something, frankly, you and your team should have done. We've issued many other emails with document numbers to be taken back, just as your team has. It wasn't only on Saturday. I just want us both to make sure we don't make the same mistake today of allowing examination on a document that should never have been used.

MR. FABRIZIO: Well, we -- I will do whatever I can to reasonably give you an opportunity to look at documents today, as I think I did yesterday, and the record will speak for itself. But as to exhibit 27, there was no objection raised, no concern raised. As to exhibit 26,

.19

Page 200

there certainly was, because it was in Bulgarian, and neither one of us knew what the full document said, and you specifically asked me whether I would consider your allowing the witness to be examined on it, a waiver, and I specifically said that I would not consider the fact that Mr. Titov answered questions about that document at his deposition to be a waiver; that we did not have anywhere near — anything, any agreement as to exhibit 27, and hopefully the record will reflect any objections raised as to exhibit 27.

But going forward, we can deal with it. And as for the rules and what I need to educate myself on, the protective order in this case spells out the procedures for requesting back a document that you believe was inadvertently produced. And I believe the protective order is what governs this request, and we are honoring the protective order, and that gives us some number of business days to address it, which, fortunately, lets us conclude this deposition and get back to the United States to address it. And frankly, I am not sure how the protective order or the rules apply once a document has been marked at a deposition and the witness has —has testified extensively on it. That's something we'll have to look at.

25 MR. THOMPSON: I can tell you right now. How it works is