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|  | Page 1 | (08:32:26-08:33:22) Page 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS | 1 (Commencing at approximately 8:32 a.m.) |
| 2 |  | 2 VIDEOGRAPHER: On the record. Today is |
| 3 | SKYHOOK WIRELESS, INC. | 3 October 14th, 2011. The time on the monitor is |
| 4 | vs. $\quad *$ Civil Action No. | 4 8:32. We're here at the Holiday Inn Express |
| 5 | GOOGLE INC. | 5 Hotel, White River Junction, Vermont, for a |
| 6 |  | 6 continued deposition of David Kotz in the |
| 7 | VIdeotaped | 7 matter of Skyhook Wireless versus Google Inc. |
| 8 | deposttion | 8 United States District Court, District of |
| 9 | of | 9 Massachusetts, Number 10-CV-11571-RWZ. |
| 10 | DAVId KOTz, Ph.d. - Volume il | 10 The videographer is Eric Fernald. The |
| 11 | Taken on behalf of the Defendant on Friday, October 14, 2011, at the | 11 court reporter is Lisa Hallstrom. |
| 12 | Holiday Inn Express, White River Junction, Vermont. | 12 Would counsel please introduce themselves |
| 13 | APPEARANCES: | 13 and state whom you represent today. |
| 14 | SAMUEL K. LU, ESO, of the firm Irell \& Manella, 1800 | 14 MS. MANNING: Good morning. Susan Baker |
| 15 | Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900, Los Angeles, California, 90067-4276, appeared and represented the | 15 Manning of the firm Bingham McCutchen. I |
| 16 | Plaintiff. | 16 represent Google Inc. in this action. |
| 17 | SUSAN BAKER MANNING, ESQ., of the firm Bingham | 17 MR. LU: Samuel Lu of Irell and Manella. |
| 18 | 20006-180', appeared and represented the' Defendant. | 18 I represent Skyhook Wireless, Inc. |
| 19 | VIDEOGRAPHER: Eric Fernald | 19 E X A M I N A T I O N |
| 20 | COURT REPORTER: Lisa M. Hallstrom, RPR, CRR, CCP | 20 BY MS. MANNING: |
| 21 |  | 21 Q Good morning, Dr. Kotz. |
| 22 |  | 22 A Good morning. |
| 23 |  | 23 Q Do you understand that you are still under oath |
| 24 |  | 24 after our break from the first session of your |
| 25 |  | 25 deposition? |
|  | Page 2 | Page 4 |
| 1 | INDEX | (08:33:23-08:34:42) |
|  | INDEX | 1 A Yes, I do. |
| 2 | PAGE | 2 Q And have you done anything more to prepare for |
| 3 | Examination by Ms. Manning . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3 | 3 your deposition since we broke on Wednesday? |
| 4 | Examination by Mr. Lu ........................... 59 | 4 A No. |
| 5 | Signature Page ................................... 61 | 5 Q You have with you this morning, I notice, the |
| 6 | Certificate .................................... 62 | 6 same green notebook, looks like the same green |
| 7 |  | 7 notebook you had on Wednesday. Can I just ask what's |
| 8 | EXhibits | 8 in it? |
| 9 | page line | 9 A Let's see. So there's a copy of my declaration |
| 10 | 1015 U.S. Paten Number 7474897 ( 3120 | 10 and there's a copy of the four patents and there's my |
| 11 |  | 11 vita. |
| 12 |  | 12 Q I wanted to ask you about arterial bias. Do you |
| 13 |  | 13 know one way or another whether arterial bias was a |
| 14 |  | 14 problem that was known prior to the invention of the |
| 15 |  | 15 patents in suit? |
| 16 |  | 16 A Certainly I had never heard that term before. In |
| 17 |  | 17 fact, I hadn't heard it before reading these patents. |
| 18 |  | 18 Q Okay. |
| 19 |  | 19 A I'm not aware of any -- I can't recall any papers |
| 20 |  | 20 or trade literature I had seen that referred to that |
| 21 |  | 21 concept. |
| 22 |  | 22 Q Okay. So you can't remember anything. Do you -- |
| 23 |  | 23 do you know one way or another whether it was a known |
| 24 |  | 24 concept in the art prior to the inventions of the |
| 25 |  | 25 patents in suit? |
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## (08:36:50-08:38:35)

1 and ambiguous. Calls for speculation.
A I -- I think the -- most war driving data is
collected in an unstructured, unplanned way and so the collection of access points that you've observed wouldn't likely lead to reference symmetry.
Q By your use of the word likely I take it you
would allow this, war driving could lead to reference symmetry in the data?

MR. LU: Same objections.
A It's possible but not probable.
Q Okay. Do you have a way of ballparking that
likelihood?
MR. LU: Same objections.
A Certainly not quantifying it, but I'll refer to
the common analogy of a monkey randomly typing on a typewriter. Eventually he writes all of Shakespeare so that there's always a chance that the data would be collected in a sufficient way as to produce reference symmetry, but it's unlikely.
Q So what are the factors that would -- that would
lead to reference symmetry in the claimed invention
that would -- would not allow you to achieve reference symmetry through war driving?
A I think the invention describes a planned,
25 structured method of collecting the information, such

08:38:38-08:40:22)
as driving all the streets and in an effort to observe
as many access points as possible from as many sides
as possible.
Q And can you not cover all of the streets through
5 a war driving method?
MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
Foundation. Calls for speculation.
A Like I said before, it's possible, but it's not likely.
Q And the likelihood depends on, among other factors, at least the number of scanning vehicles you -- you employed in your war driving project, right?

MR. LU: Same objections.
A Yes, it would correspond to that, and other factors related to how well planned the scanning drivers were.
Q Can you -- can you practice the claimed invention
of the 988 patent, Claim 1, without planning a route?
MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
Calls for speculation.
A I'm finding it difficult to think of any way you could accomplish this without planning the route because, otherwise, you wouldn't be able to say things like so that the multiple readings have reference
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## 40:25-08:42:06)

symmetry and so that the calculated position avoids arterial bias.
Q So if I'm understanding you correctly, the taking
of multiple readings at locations around the access
point with the result that you achieve reference
symmetry and avoid arterial bias, the achievement of those things depends on collecting the data in a planned way?

MR. LU: Same objections. BY MS. MANNING:
Q Is that a fair characterization of what you're trying to tell me?
A Reasonably fair. Of course, one would need to think about what it means to be planned. So planning could be preplanned from the start where you've mapped out your entire route before you start driving. One could imagine alternatives where you did some driving and then looked to see what you had missed and then went -- made a plan to go back and accomplish the missed parts. So planning could be an ongoing process, but it seems unlikely that you would accomplish these goals without some conscious effort to structure your scanning.
Q Okay. I believe we looked on Wednesday at some of the passages in the 988 patent that talk about

| (08:42:11-08:43:46) Page 9 | (08:45:41-08:47:28) Page 11 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 planning a route. One of those that I know we looked | 1 A Okay. |
| 2 at was column 8, lines 28 and following. | 2 Q So can you -- could you describe for me, you |
| 3 A That sounds famil | 3 know, the distinction you are -- you are drawing |
| 4 Q Okay. And you agree with me that that discusses | 4 between war drivers who would be planning a route and |
| 5 the planning of a rout | 5 systematically scanning an area versus someone who is |
| 6 A Yes | 6 practicing the claimed invention or is there no |
| 7 Q Is there | 7 distinction? |
| 8 this, what you describe as sort of an ongoing plan or | 8 MR.LU: Objection. Compound. Vague. |
| 9 an iterative plan as opposed to preplanning the route? | 9 A Well, I think the -- the term war drivers |
| 10 MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous | 10 generally means to me a collection of uncoordinated |
| 11 A Not that I reca | 11 volunteers who are not necessarily coordinating with |
| 12 Q Are there any reasons other than what we've bee | 12 each other or necessarily themselves planning their |
| 13 discussing why in your view war driving could not lead | 13 scanning efforts, but among this -- there may be a |
| 14 to reference symmetry? | 14 subset of those, as you implied, that are planning |
| 15 MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. | 15 their routes or perhaps coordinating their efforts, |
| 16 Calls for speculs | 16 and in that case I think they would be doing something |
| 17 A So are you referring | 17 similar to what's in this pat |
| 18 Q Y | 18 Q So back to my original question, which was Claim |
| 19 A -- is that your question? | 191 of the 988 patent cover a database that has |
| 20 Q Yes, sir. | 20 calculated position information based on access point |
| 21 A Okay. I can't think of any other reasons at thi | 21 readings that were gathered through war driving? |
| 22 tim | 22 MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. |
| 23 Q Okay. And you gave us your view a few moment | 23 Foundation. Calls for speculation. Asked and |
| 24 ago that war driving could not lead to the avoidance | 24 answered. |
| 25 of arterial bias within the meaning of Claim 1 of the | 25 A Well, my answer doesn't really change. It's the |
| Page 10 | Page 12 |
| (08:43:49-08:45:38) | (08:47:32-08:49:14) |
| 1988 patent -- patent. Why is that? | 1 same question and it relates to how one defines war |
| 2 MR. LU: Same objections. | 2 driving. |
| 3 A Well, war driving would tend to concentrate on | 3 Q Okay. So your definition of war driving |
| 4 the arteries -- concentrate the scanning effort on the | 4 isn't -- is necessarily an unplanned approach to |
| 5 arteries and, thus, the data collected would be on the | 5 scanning data, is that fair to say? |
| 6 artery side, as it were, of the buildings and so that | 6 A Generally, yes. |
| 7 would tend to bias the calculated positions toward | 7 Q Okay. Anything else important to your -- your |
| 8 those arteries. | 8 own definition that you're using as we talk here today |
| 9 Q One of the things we discussed during your first | 9 to what constitutes war driving? |
| 10 session of your deposition was your view that at least | 10 A Not that I'm consciou |
| 11 some war drivers made an effort to systematically | 11 Q Okay. And when we talked during the last session |
| 12 traverse areas in order to -- to have more complete | 12 of your deposition you drew a distinction between war |
| 13 scan data. Do you recall that discussion? | 13 driving and the random model -- the random method of |
| 14 A Yes. | 14 data collection that's discussed in the patent. Could |
| 15 Q And given your view that -- that that constitutes | 15 Claim 1 of the 988 patent cover a database that has |
| 16 war driving, why couldn't that kind of war driving | 16 calculated position information based on access point |
| 17 avoid arterial bias? | 17 readings that were gathered through the random method? |
| 18 MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. | 18 A No, and for largely the same reasons. |
| 19 Foundation. Calls for speculation. | 19 Q Okay. Any different reading -- reasons or |
| 20 A I think in that case if the war drivers were | 20 exactly the same as what we've been discussing? |
| 21 making plans to cover all of the streets, then | 21 MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous. |
| 22 effect they would be practicing this invention. I | 22 A So I was thinking of the same reasons, the fact |
| 23 know it's a question of terminology, right? What is | 23 that the random model wouldn't lead to reference |
| 24 war driving and what is -- what is not. | 24 symmetry or avoiding arterial bias. |
| 25 Q You have anticipated my follow-up question. | 25 Q And is that because it's -- does not employ |
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## (08:51:06-08:53:04)

driving would have the same -- would result in the
same problems in this case as well.
Q Okay. So -- so your answer is no, and for the
same reasons we've discussed with respect to the 988
patent?
A Yes.
Q Any different reasons?
A No, not -- not at first glance.
Q If you -- if you want a minute to think about it,
I'm -- I'm happy to give you that minute.
A No.
Q Okay. Could Claim 1 of the 694 patent cover a
database that has calculated position information
based on access point readings that were gathered
through the random method?
MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
Calls for speculation. Foundation. Also
object to the extent it's been asked and
answered.
A No, and for the same reasons.
25 Q With respect to Claim 1 of the 694 patent, I'd

Foundation. Calls for speculation. Also object to the extent it's been asked and answered. driving would have the same -- would result in the same problems in this case as well.
Q Okay. So -- so your answer is no, and for the
same reasons we've discussed with respect to the 988 patent?
A Yes.
Q Any different reasons?
A No, not -- not at first glance.
Q If you -- if you want a minute to think about it, I'm -- I'm happy to give you that minute.
A No.
16 Q Okay. Could Claim 1 of the 694 patent cover a
17 database that has calculated position information
18 based on access point readings that were gathered
19 through the random method?
20 MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
21 Calls for speculation. Foundation. Also
22 object to the extent it's been asked and
23 answered.
24 A No, and for the same reasons.
25 Q With respect to Claim 1 of the 694 patent, I'd

53:15-08:55:37)
like to ask you a hypothetical question about that.
I'm a competitor. Like not to get sued by Skyhook.
I'd like to design around Claim 1 of the 694 patent and, in particular, I'd like to not meet the avoids arterial bias limitation in Claim 1 of the 694 patent. How do I avoid meeting that limitation while practicing the rest of the claim?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
Foundation. Calls for speculation.
A I think that would be difficult to do because you still want to achieve the reference symmetry part of the claim without achieving the arterial bias part of the claim, if I understand your -- you correctly, and a method that accomplishes the reference symmetry goal would -- at least as far as I can imagine, would probably also avoid arterial bias, but I may have not thought of a method yet that somehow does that. Q If I understood your testimony on Wednesday, it's your view that reference symmetry in -- in the 694 patent is -- is about the general distribution of access points within the targeted area, is that right? A Yes.
Q Okay. Why couldn't you have reference symmetry in the target area by having broad distribution of calculated locations, all of which are exactly on the
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(08:55:42-08:57:17)
streets exactly on the locations of the scan vehicle as it traversed the area?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous. Also object to the extent it's been asked and answered.
A Well, so your earlier question was -- was about whether I could think of a way that one might accomplish that and this question is about assuming that one did accomplish that having arterial bias and yet achieving reference symmetry.
Q I'm asking why -- why -- why couldn't that happen? Why isn't that a possibility? And if you think it's not a possibility, I'd be interested in hearing why.
A Yeah, right.
MR. LU: Same objections.
A I suppose it is a possibility. If you drove all the streets and made no effort to calculate the position of access points simply recording the locations along the streets, you would -- you would have a form of reference symmetry. I think you would -- it would lead to poor accuracy.
Q Is arterial bias, at least in part, a function of the quality of the algorithm used to calculate the location of the access point?

## (08:57:19-08:59:00)

1 MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. 2 Foundation.
A Well, I -- it's -- I would say probably not. You know, my interpretation of arterial bias as a term is that it is a bias in the result of the calculation of the access point location caused by one scanning the arteries rather than enough points elsewhere. There, of course, are any possible number of algorithms one might use, but I don't think it would be a function of the algorithm that results in arterial bias.
Q Would you agree with me that the overall accuracy of the calculated location, how close it gets to the actual location of the access point, that's -- that's a function of the quality of the algorithm used, yes? A That's --

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. A That -- that is part of it.
Q Okay. And if you have a poor algorithm, one result of that could be that your access points are calculated quite close to the location of the scanning vehicle as opposed to closer to the actual point of the access point?

MR. LU: Same objection. Foundation.
A Right. So, I mean, it's -- it's a function of the collection process as well as the algorithm.
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## :59:03-09:01:38)

Q Okay. And that -- and that if there is, the
accuracy of the calculated location information is a function of both the scanning methodology and the algorithm used?

## A Correct.

Q The -- the question I asked about designing
around Claim 1 of the 694 patent by avoiding the arterial bias question, I'll ask you the same question in the context of the 988 patent. I'm a competitor and I want to design around Claim 1 of the 988 . In particular, I want to not meet the avoid arterial bias
limitation and I want to practice the rest of the
claim. Can I do that?
MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.
Also object to the extent it calls for speculation, and asked and answered.
A Yeah, I think the fundamentals are the same as the 6 -- as in the 694 patent so, you know, as I said there, I -- I -- I find it difficult to think of a way that one could achieve the reference symmetry without also avoiding arterial bias. Then in the follow-up question we imagined a situation where that might happen, but then you would end up with poor accuracy. Q Okay. In order to determine whether a given data set has arterial bias within the meaning of the 988

09:01:44-09:04:18)

1
opposed to
a wer an artery as opposed to any other street?
A Well, you know, I -- I had that impression to some extent when I was reading the -- their definition or their examples of arterial bias and, you know, my impression was that they -- they were defining arterial bias in the context of the - in the random model where the data collection -- the points that you collect occur from tracking randomly driving vehicles which tend to spend more time on arteries and that in a way -- in a way that defines arteries. I guess to come back to your question, in order to determine whether there's arterial bias does one need to determine -- you know, know where the arteries are? Q Right.
A I think you would.
Q And does the patent give us any -- any
information that would help us draw the line between what constitutes an artery and what doesn't constitute an artery?
A I vaguely remember something about the, you know, heavily trafficked routes or something to that effect. I don't remember exactly. So, for example, column 8, line 8 of the 988 patent.
Q Yes. So starting at line 4 of column 8 the 988
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4:34-09:05:57)
patent says, as a result, over time the random driving covers more and more ground by the cumulative coverage shows a bias to the main roads, comma, or arteries at the expense of the smaller and surrounding roads.

## A Right. So that's -- that's one definition of

 artery.Q The next sentence after -- after what I read in Figure 3, arteries 304 and 305 are heavily traversed by the scanning vehicles resulting in a heavy amount of scanning data for those streets.
A But the next sentence, at streets 306 and 307 are rarely, if ever, covered because there is no frequent destination of those streets and the arteries are more optimal travel roads.
Q Okay. So that, in your view, gives us at least some information to start with?
A Some.
Q Okay. So, again, my question goes -- goes back
to, where do we -- how do we actually draw the line between what constitutes an artery and what constitutes a road that is not an artery?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.
A I'm not sure that you can draw the -- a hard line in this case, and I'm not sure one needs to in this patent or -- because the idea is to come -- you know,
:06:05-09:08:46)
is to -- the invention describes a way of covering the -- all of the streets to avoid in general this -this form of bias that would happen if you didn't cover all the streets.
Q Is avoid a synonym for eliminate in your mind?
A Did you say is avoid a synonym for eliminate?
Q Yes.
A No. I think I actually addressed that point.
Q Is reduce a synonym for avoid?
A Well, in this context I think that's what avoid means. I think I said as much.
Q What's your basis for the contention that to avoid arterial bias is to reduce arterial bias?
A Well, I have some points in my declaration. So, for example, I mean, drawing on the specification itself in my paragraph 122, they use the word reduced in the specification, and for also example Figures 3 and 4 my paragraphs 123 and 124 show an example where the arterial bias is reduced but not necessarily eliminated.
Q Which one of those shows an example where it's reduced but not necessarily eliminated?
A Well, Figure 4 is showing -- is showing that the calculated locations are closer to the correct location than in Figure 3. Figure 3, as captioned, is
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## (08:52-09:11:05)

an example of arterial bias.
Q And is it your view that Figure 4 shows
calculated locations for the access points with reduced arterial bias but still some arterial bias?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Can you tell me why you think that there
is some arterial bias shown in Figure 4?
A Well, the -- the degree to which you can reduce arterial bias depends on a lot of factors, as I said in the declaration, and including the ability -- the distribution of roads and the distribution of access points and the strength of your antennas and so forth. And on reflection it might be difficult to tell simply by looking at Figure 4 that there is still some arterial bias as opposed to simply inaccurate location calculations, but I was thinking that -- I was thinking that in general you would still have some bias toward the arteries. I have to admit I'm having difficulty reconciling why that is because there's so many factors involved in the degree of arterial bias. Q Do -- does Figure 4 show arteries?
A It doesn't label any arteries. The Figure 3 -assuming that Figure 4 is meant to be the same city as Figure 3, Figure 3 labels the arteries and streets and so I guess by implication the same roads would be

09:11:09-09:13:20)
arteries and streets in Figure 4.
Q If -- if -- you're right that it doesn't say
that, but let's assume that that's true for the moment and that in that situation, given the assumption that the arteries identified in Figure 3 should be deemed to be arteries in Figure 4, in that case does Figure 4 show arterial bias?
A No, I guess it doesn't.
Q In -- well, strike that.
By how much does arterial bias have to be reduced in order to be avoided within the meaning of the 988 and 694 patents?
A I'm not sure one can quantify or -- I'm not sure one can quantify the degree to which it is reduced or needs to be reduced. I think that it's an imprecise term. The patent may not need that level of precision in the context of this claim. The goal is to collect the data and construct a database in a way that the calculated positions will reduce arterial bias and perform the invention, then you will -- it will result in reduced arterial bias.
Q And so I understand your last answer, when you say perform the invention, what exactly do you mean by that?
A I would mean collecting the scanning data using
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(09:13:25-09:16:03)
some kind of a planned route that covers all of the streets or substantially all the streets so that you can obtain a better sample of the access point and locations.
Q As you mentioned a moment ago, you have identified some factors in your declaration that relate to the degree by which arterial bias might be avoided or reduced in your view of that term, and that's what we see at paragraph 125, right?
A Right.
Q Could the capabilities of the scanning device -just to take one of the examples you give, could the capabilities of the scanning device be so limited that even when you collect the scan data using a planned route that covers substantially all -- all streets in the area, could the capabilities of the scanning device be so bad that you would, in fact, have arterial bias?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous. Foundation. Calls for speculation.
A I think if you used the same scanning device for all of your scanning and it had bad qualities you didn't -- you weren't precise about, let's assume we're talking about a weaker antenna, then if you're using that same device on the arteries as well as on


09:19:29-09:20:49)
A Arterial bias varies in the random method. I'm not sure what you mean.
Q Well, the amount of arterial bias present in, for example, the database that had been compiled through scanning using the random method of traversing the area, the amount of arterial bias for any given access point can vary --

MR. LU: Same objection.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q -- correct?
A Well, for any given access point. So now we're talking about a different situation than the general concept of arterial bias as a whole -- of your data set as a whole, but certainly the random method is -is going to lead to unpredictable coverage of your area and so some areas will have better coverage than others in terms of the set of streets and the degree to which you're getting observations around an access point. So, yes, some access points will have more bias than others.

MS. MANNING: Why don't we take a break. MR. LU: Okay.
VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 9:20 and we're going off the record.
(Recess taken)
(09:31:38-09:32:55)


Page 30
(09:34:18-09:35:31)
1 A That would be one way to avoid it.
2 Q Okay. And that would be outside the claims of
3
4
4
5 the patent?
(09:

Q And you're aware that the predefined rules
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scanner when redriving the street, are those ways of approaching the problem that would have been known to a person of ordinary skill in the art in late 2005?
A I just want to clarify. You say are those ways of approaching which problem?
Q Fair point. Let me ask you a different question.
In paragraph 133 they say there are -- there are any one of a number of techniques to reduce the effects of arterial bias and then you give two examples of ways to do that. Other than the two examples that you've identified here, there are no other ways that you can think of to do that, right?
A Right.
Q Okay. So my question is the -- the two examples you do give, were those two examples known to persons of ordinary skill in the art in late 2005, the time the patents were filed?
A I don't know.
Q Dr. Kotz, I've handed you what we have marked as Google Exhibit 1015. It is a copy of U.S. Patent Number 7474897 and it is Bates numbered GSHFED_0000061 through 74. And have you reviewed this document before, sir?
A Yes.

37:37-09:39:54)
limitation in Step C of Claim 1 is at issue in this case?
A Yes.
Q Sir, once again, I am a competitor and I'd like to practice Claim 1 of 897 except I would like not to infringe it, so I've identified a particular limitation I want to avoid practicing. The particular limitation I want to avoid practicing is in Step C. I would like to, in particular, determine whether an observed access point should be included or excluded from a set of WiFi access points, but I don't want to do it using predefined rules. How would I do that?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous. Incomplete hypothetical. Foundation.
A That would be difficult because even if you decided to, for example, exclude or include an access point based on a flip of a coin or other random method, that itself is a rule --
Q Right.
A -- and presumably predefined. So if there's a way, I don't see it right now.
Q Okay. Is a -- is a rule within the meaning of the 897 patent just any decision-making criteria?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
A Well, I mean, I -- I defined it in my declaration

40:08-09:41:14)
and so, for example, we used -- there's a citation here to a dictionary and a determinant method for obtaining a certain result, which sounds similar to what you're talking about, but more precise than your definition just now.
Q Okay. And you think this is an accurate
definition of the ordinary meaning of the rule that we see here in paragraph $89 ?$
A It's accurate to the extent that we're citing a well-known dictionary. It also seems reasonable to me.
$Q$ Is that the meaning of rule within Claim 1 of 897?
A That seems --
MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
Incomplete hypothetical. Do you want to read to him the whole claim limitation rather than selective portions of it?
MS. MANNING: I don't actually. I'm
asking about the meaning of the rule.
MR. LU: All right.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q And --
MR. LU: And just to be clear, all this testimony has been about the meaning of rule?
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## (09:41:17-09:42:41)

1 THE WITNESS: That's my understanding.
2 MS. MANNING: That is my understanding as well.
MR. LU: Okay. Fair enough.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q So as a predefined rule -- well, strike that.
What's a predefined rule?
A Well, I'm trying to remember if I actually opined on that specifically. Yeah. So, for example, I had said in paragraph 94 I understand predefined to refer to something that is determined prior to a specified occurrence.
Q So putting those together, a predefined rule
would be something that is determined prior to a specified occurrence, that something being a
determinant method for obtaining a certain result, right?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And those are the definitions you gave at paragraphs 94 and 89 of your declaration, Exhibit 1004, right?
A Correct.
Q Is a predefined rule that says I'm going to use
every observed WiFi access point to determine the location of user device a predefined rule within the
(09:

Q Why?
4 A Well, that's the way I read the claim. Using the 25 recorded location information in conjunction with
(09:45:25-09:47:01)
rules to determine whether to include or exclude.
Q You emphasize using in your answer just now.
A Yes.
Q All right. So to use something in conjunction
with the predefined rules means that the decisional
criteria relies on some -- something about the nature
of the calculated location information, is that right?
A It -- it relies on the recorded location
information in some way.
Q Why isn't the more natural reading of this just you've got a rule, it's predefined, whatever that rule is, you just apply that rule to the -- to the in or out decision on the calculated -- on using the calculated location information in -- in the set or out of the set?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
A I really think you should restate that question because I found it vague also.
Q Okay. Let me -- let me strike that last and I'll ask it a slightly different way.
Why can't you have a predefined rule that will allow you to determine whether to put an observed access point in the set you're going to use for a location or exclude it from that set? Why can't you have such a rule that does not depend on any quality
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## (47:09-09:48:16)

of the calculated location information?
A So --
MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous. Foundation.
A So I'm going to correct you again. This is about recorded location information.
Q Yes, I apologize for using the --
A That's fine.
Q -- other term. I do mean -- I do mean them to be synonymous.
A Well, they're not but --
Q Well, that is -- that is an issue but -- but if
you can answer with reference to the recorded location information.
A Right. So the -- if you had a rule that did not
use the recorded location information in some way in making the decision, then I don't feel that it would fall under the -- this -- this term of the claim.
Q Why not?
A Because to be simple about it, it's simply the
way I read it. You have -- the word in conjunction with means that the -- the rules are used in conjunction with this information, and if you have a rule that isn't used in conjunction with that information, then it's not covered by this language.

09:48:21-09:49:58)
1 Q Why doesn't in conjunction with simply mean that 2 the rule is applied to the various recorded location information as opposed to being -- as opposed to turning on some quality of the recorded location information?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague.
A That's a different distinction than I heard you make before. Sorry. Well, so quality of recorded location information is very vague. I'm not sure what you mean by that.
Q As I understand your testimony, it's that the decisional criteria, the predefined rule, has to relate in some way to some characteristic or quality of the recorded location information, is that -- is that right?
A It has to refer to the location information in some way, and I could imagine thinking mathematically that any function of that information could be used, and if you had a function that defined a characteristic of the location or a quality of the location, whatever -- however you might choose to define those functions because those words themselves are loose, then that would fit, but I wouldn't constrain it to quality or characteristic. Any use of the recorded location information fits.
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Q What if my predefined rule was I'm going to use every other recorded location information, every other piece of recorded location information for each WiFi access point -- withdrawn.
Let me try again. Why can't my rule be that I'm going to use the recorded location information for every other observed WiFi access point?
A Well, let's look at this carefully. So it says using the recorded location information for each of the observed WiFi access points. So as I read this rule, it is talking about a particular access point, and you're trying to decide whether it should be included or excluded from the set of access points, and so constraining our thought then to a particular access point, you're going to use the recorded location information for that access point in deciding about that access point, and so then your question is not quite phrased correctly because you talk about every other access point.
Q Why can't my predefined rule be -- strike that. Given your view that the rule must be applied to each owned WiFi access point on an individualized basis, which is what I just heard you testify, given that view, why can't my predefined rule be I'm going to use that access point --

(09:58:59-10:00:39)
1 A Let's see. I don't remember if I defined it in 45
2 my declaration.
3 Q You're welcome to review your declaration. If
4
5
5
6 you did, I didn't note it.
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## :00:46-10:02:53)

Q One definition that I found was in mathematics and computer science an algorithm is an effective method expressed as a finite list of well-defined instructions for calculating a function. Would that seem like a reasonable definition for you?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
Also objection to the extent it calls for a
legal conclusion.
A Well, from a computer scientist's point of view as opposed to a lawyer's point of view, it's a reasonable definition.
Q To -- to give an analogy to someone who, unlike yourself, is not a computer scientist, would it be fair to analogize an algorithm to something like the steps of a recipe, would that be a fair analogy?
A That's a common analogy, yes.
Q Okay. If you gave one of your graduate students the assignment of -- of stating for you an algorithm for determining a weighted centroid position for all position information reported for an access point and your student gave you the specification of the 988 patent, would you say that your student had in fact given you that algorithm?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. Foundation.

10:02:54-10:05:00)
A Well, first of all, I would expect any student to be able to simply write down that algorithm without having to look at the 988 patent. Weighted centroid is a fairly routine algorithm. Also the patent, of course, provides a lot more in it than the weighted centroid. I don't recall whether it provides a specific algorithm or description of that algorithm. On the other hand, I don't think it would need to. Q Why not?
A Because, as I said, any graduate student worth their salt would be able to do that in their sleep or undergraduate for that matter.
Q What do you understand the term logic in the claims of the 988 patent to refer to?
A Well, so let's see. I have quite a lot of opinions related to that term. In the -- in the context of these patents we're talking about computer implementing logic, and so I take the word logic to refer to computer hardware/software.
Q Is that an either/or, computer hardware or software?
A Yes.
MR. LU: I'm sorry. That was vague and ambiguous. Are you saying either A or B but not both $A$ or $B$ or it can be $A$, it can be $B$, or
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1 it can be A and B ?
2 MS. MANNING: Let me clarify that for you.
3 MR. LU: Just so you know, the reason why
4 I raise that is I spent quite a bit of time
5 litigating over that particular issue as to

Q With respect to the -- well, actually, why don't you take the 988 patent. I'm going to ask you a specific question about it. Could you look at column 12 , there's a passage from line 29 to roughly line 38.

| (10:06:27-10:08:23) Page 49 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Do you see that? |
| 2 | A Once the parsing process? |
| 3 | Q |
| 4 | Yes. |
| 4 | A |
| 5 | Qnce the parsing process. |
| 6 | There is a reference on line 34 of column 12 in the 988 patent, there's a |
| 7 | reference there to new access points being added to |
| 8 | the database? |
| 9 | A Right. |
| 10 | Q And would you agree with me that -- that that |
| 11 | tells you what to do, not how to -- how to actually |
| 12 | add them to the database? |
| 13 | MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous. |
| 14 | A True. |
| 15 | Q And in Claim 1, the limitation refers to logic to |
| 16 | add records to the database for newly discovered WiFi |
| 17 | access points. Would you agree with me that the |
| 18 | records referenced there have to have both |
| 19 | identification information for the access point and |
| 20 | calculated location information for the access point, |
| 21 | that's -- that's the record that's actually being |
| 22 | added? |
| 23 | MR. LU: Could you read that question |
| 24 | back? |
| 25 | (Pending question read back) |
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1 A So I'm -- oh, here we go. Well, it's not
2 immediately clear from the claim, but I think so.
3 Q The claim does refer to each record including
4 identification information for a corresponding WiFi
5 access point and calculated position information?
6 A Oh, you mean earlier in the claim?
7 Q Yes.
8
A Yeah, okay. I was just looking at that clause.
9
10 Sorry. Right. Okay. So I see that.

10:10:58-10:12:42)
yes. It has to do more than just generically save information to the database?
A Correct.
Q It has to do some work with the actual data before it's saved?
A Yes.
Q The sort of further limitation that you just
referenced where it starts said computer logic
including logic to recalculate position information,
goes on from there, at column 12, lines 33 and 34 , do you see there's a number 2 that says, and 2) existing access points are repositioned based on any new data recorded by the scanners?
A Yes.
Q Do you see that? That part of the specification there, that tells a person of ordinary skill in the art what they should do?
A Yes.
Q But not -- yes?
A Yes.
Q And would you agree with me that it doesn't tell them how to do it?

## A Not in that sentence, no.

Q Is there -- is there any place else in the -- in the patent that you think tells a person of -- of
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(10:15:35-10:17:24)
algorithm it's going to factor in number of records,
signal strengths, it's going to be weighting those
readings according to the signal strengths, and so I think there's -- you know -- and also the age of the records. So they're using all this information to calculate the location information or the estimated location. I think you would do the recalculation in the same way.
Q Okay. And just for the record, you were
referring to the paragraph at column 12, lines 29
through roughly 38 ?
A Yes. And the paragraph before that, lines 25
through 29 I guess.
Q Okay. It's your view that the -- the reverse
triangulation algorithm is the -- is the algorithm
that accomplishes that. Would you agree that the specification doesn't tell you what that algorithm actually is?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.
A Well, let's see. I mean, it -- it doesn't -- it
doesn't spell out the algorithm in detail, but it does provide -- I don't think it would need to. I mean, it provides some of the mathematics that are part of the reverse triangulation model and it provides the factors that the algorithm uses, the number of
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records, the signal strengths, the age of the records,
etc., but my understanding is that one need not spell
out an algorithm in detail in order to teach it
sufficiently as long as one of ordinary skill in the
art can construct an algorithm that accomplishes what's said in the claim.
Q Right. That's -- that's -- that's your
understanding of the legal requirement?
A Right. Right.
Q Right. So my -- my question's about whether
it -- whether the -- whether the patent actually
discloses the al -- regardless of your view about whether it needs to or not.
A Okay. Okay.
Q The question was does it disclose the algorithm?
A Not in detail, but there's a lot of information about the -- that is needed to understand their embodiment of an algorithm that would do that. Q Let me ask you about a limitation in Claim 2 of the 988 patent. You see that refers to logic to identify position information based on error prone GPS information?
A Yeah.
Q My first question is, what is error prone GPS information in your understanding?
(10:18:49-10:20:33)
1 A Well, it would be a GPS reading that has some error relative to your actual location.
Q Is it -- is it -- is -- is the phrase error
prone -- prone GPS information, is that some
commentary on the typical quality of GPS information or is it specific to I have a GPS -- I have this GPS reading and it appears to be erroneous?
A I see. Let's see the context here. I think --
GPS is -- information is typically erroneous, it's not perfect, and GPS devices are known to occasionally have large errors. I think in the context of this claim they're talking about this clustering logic and the purpose, as I recall from the specification, is that the clustering logic is enabling you to decide which readings are substantially erroneous and should be excluded.
Q Okay. And clustering logic --
MR. LU: We've reached seven hours so if you can finish up.
MS. MANNING: Let me just tell you what I'm hoping to do. I have, I think, a couple more -- a couple more questions. If we could take a quick break, make sure there's nothing else of great significance and we can figure out if we're done or if I need a couple of
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## (10:20:35-10:29:10)

1 questions.
2 MR. LU: Okay. And I may have one or two
follow-up questions. So let's take a short break.
VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 10:20 and we're going off the record.
(Recess taken)
VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 10:28 and we're on the record.
A So I wanted to start with a clarification about what we were just discussing with respect to the algorithm in the 988 patent.

## Q Sure.

A And so, you know, I -- I had some time to look at it a little more closely, and these mathematical equations close to the paragraphs we were looking at before lines 50 through 64, for example, are part of a -- it actually calls it this, applying the algorithm. So this is the algorithm for triangulating the position of an access point using latitude and longitude. It goes on. I mean, there's more detail on the next column as well. And it describes it in a sequence of steps so, for example, column 13, line 26 or 7 there's a paragraph, this final lat long is then used as the final centroid value for the location of

| (10:29:14-10:31:26) |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| 1 | that access point. So these two columns together at 57 |
| 2 | least provide, like I said before, sufficient detail, |
| 3 | I think, for one to construct an implementation of an |
| 4 | algorithm for calculating or recalculating the |
| 5 | positions of access points. |
| 6 | Q Since you've directed our attention to them, I do |
| 7 | have a question for you about them. In all cases it |
| 8 | refers to a lat subscript U and long subscript U, both |
| 9 | equations. I should probably say sets of equations |
| 10 | refer to that. In the text it says, if the |
| 11 | corresponding recorded GPS location of access point I |
| 12 | is denoted by lat I long I, what's the relationship |
| 13 | between lat I long I and lat U long U? |
| 14 | A So lat U, for example, is calculated using this |
| 15 | equation from a combination of all the lat I values, |
| 16 | and from the looks of it there are N, N as in Nancy, |
| 17 | lat I values that are being computed together to |
| 18 | produce lat U and, similarly, long U. And so the -- |
| 19 | the U subscript refers to the result and the I |
| 20 | subscript refers to the inputs. |
| 21 | Q In paragraph 70 of your declaration you note that |
| 22 | there are many possible ways to divide data points |
| 23 | into groups or clusters. Do the claims require |
| 24 | clustering by, for example, distance? |
| 25 | MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous. |


| $(10: 31: 32-10: 33: 03)$ |
| :---: |

A Talking about 988 claims?
Q Yes.
A And specifically Claim 2, clustering logic?
Q Yes.
A No.
Q Would any criteria for putting the data into
groups or clusters fall within the scope of that limitation?

MR. LU: And you're talking about the whole limitation? Could you read the limitation, otherwise I object to it being vague and ambiguous.

```
        BY MS. MANNING:
```

    Q In Claim 2 where it recites, clustering logic to
    identify position location based on error prone GPS
    information, would any -- any clustering logic that
    clustered based on any criteria fall within that
    claim?
        MR. LU: Other than error prone GPS
        information? I just want to make sure the
        claim -- the question is clear. Objection.
        Vague and ambiguous.
    A I would think so.
    Q Okay.
        MS. MANNING: I have no further questions
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1 for the witness at this time, though I do

MR. LU: No further questions.
MS. MANNING: I have no further questions.
VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 10:35, and this concludes the video deposition of David Kotz.
THE REPORTER: Same transcript orders as yesterday?
MS. MANNING: Yes, please.
MR. LU: Yes.
(WHEREUPON, the deposition was closed at approximately 10:36 a.m.)
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## T

talk (4) 8:25;12:8;40:18;41:23
talked (1) 12:11
talking (10) 24:24;27:12;30:5;33:4;40:11; 44:3;47:17;55:12;58:1,9
talks (2) 9:7;52:14
target (2) 15:24;25:4
targeted (1) 15:21
task (2) 45:16,25
taxis (1) 13:9
teach (1) 54:3
technique (3) 29:11,14;30:6
techniques (3) 29:9;30:24;31:8
technology (1) 30:17
tells (3) 49:11;51:16,25
tend (5) 10:3,7;13:10;19:10;28:18
term (16) 4:16;5:7;11:9;17:4;23:16; 24:8;26:13;38:9,18;45:6,7,13;

|  | $30: 7 ; 36: 1 ; 41: 7 ; 59: 6$ <br> turning (2) | V | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:20;30:14;31:1, 4, 10, } 12 \text {; } \\ & \text { 57:22 } \\ & \text { weaker }(\mathbf{2}) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { terminology (1) } \\ & 10: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { turning (2) } \\ 30: 25 ; 39: 4 \end{array}$ |  |  |
| terms (2) | twice (1) | Vague (43) | 24:24;52:17 |
| 27:17;44:3 | $29: 6$ | $5: 18,25 ; 7: 6,20 ; 9: 10,15 ; 10: 18$ | Wednesday (4) |
| testify (1) | two (11) | 11:8,22;12:21;13:25;14:20; | 4:3,7;8:24;15:18 |
| 40:23 | 28:10,12;29:3;30:23,24;31:9, | 15:8;16:3;17:1,16;18:14;20:22 | weighted (4) |
| testimony (3) | 10,14,15;56:2;57:1 | $24: 19 ; 25: 9 ; 26: 25 ; 29: 18 ; 32: 13,$ | 46:19;47:3,5;52:17 |
| 15:18;33:25;39:11 | typewriter (1) | 24;33:15;35:2;36:3;37:16,18; | weighting (1) |
| therefore (1) | 6:16 | 38:3;39:6,9;43:13;44:1;46:6,24; | 53:2 |
| 41:2 | typical | 7:23;49:13;50:19;53:19; | weights (1) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { thinking (6) } \\ & 12: 22 ; 22: 16,17 ; 25: 10 ; 28: 15 \text {; } \end{aligned}$ | typically | 57:25;58:12,22 | 52:16 <br> welcome (2) |
| 39:17 | typicaly | vaguely (1) $19: 21$ | $42: 23 ; 45: 3$ |
| though (1) | typing (1) | value (1) | well-defined (1) |
| 59:1 | 6:15 | 56:25 | 46:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { thought (4) } \\ & 15: 17 ; 40: 14 ; 43: 19 ; 45: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{U}$ | values (2) <br> 57:15,17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { well-known (1) } \\ & 33: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| thus (1) |  | vans (1) | weren't (2) |
| 10:5 | uncoordinated (1) | 13:9 | 24:23;28:16 |
| titled (1) | 11:10 | varies (2) | what's (8) |
| 59:21 | under (2) | 26:23;27:1 | 4:7;11:17;21:12;34:7;44:25; |
| Today (3) | 3:23;38:18 | various (1) | 48:19;54:6;57:12 |
| 3:2,13;12:8 | undergraduate (1) | 39:2 | WHEREUPON (1) |
| together (4) | 47:12 | vary (1) | 60:22 |
| 34:13;48:17;57:1,17 | understood (1) | 27:7 | White (1) |
| top (1) | 15:18 | vehicle (2) | 3:5 |
| 30:22 | United (1) | 16:1;17:21 | whole (4) |
| touched (1) | 3:8 | vehicles (4) | $27: 13,14 ; 33: 17 ; 58: 10$ |
| 26:8 | unlike (1) | $7: 11 ; 13: 10 ; 19: 9 ; 20: 9$ | WiFi (17) |
| toward (3) | 46:12 | Vermont (1) | 32:11;34:24;35:8,9,13;36:19; |
| 10:7;22:18;25:16 | unlikely (2) | 3:5 | 40:3,7,10,22;49:16;50:4,12; |
| town (1) | 6:19;8:21 | versus | 52:2,5;59:12;60:5 |
| 25:17 | unplanned (2) | $3: 7 ; 11: 5 ; 28: 24$ | Wireless (2) |
| towns (1) | 6:3;12:4 | video (1) | $3: 7,18$ |
| 25:10 tracking (1) | unpredictable (1) | $60: 16$ | withdrawn (1) |
| tracking (1) | $27: 15$ unstruct | VIDEOGRAPHER (7) | $40: 4$ |
| trade (1) | Onstruc $6: 3$ | 3:2,10;27:23;28:1;56:5,8; 60:15 | 9:25;15:21;18:25;23:11; |
| 4:20 | up (5) | view (17) | 25:12;29:16;30:9;32:22;33:12; |
| trafficked (1) | 13:12;18:23;44:16;50:10; | 9:13,23;10:10,15;15:19 | 34:25;35:3,21;44:23;58:7,17 |
| 19:22 | 55:19 | 20:15;22:2;24:8;26:4;40:21,24; | without (7) |
| transcript (1) | upon (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 15,12: 2,24.0 ; 20: 4,40: 14,24, \\ & 46: 9,10 ; 48: 14,19 ; 53: 14 ; 54: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 7:19,23;8:22;15:12;18:20; |
| 60:18 | 28:23 | views (1) | $26: 21 ; 47: 2$ |
| travel (1) | use (26) | $42: 8$ | WITNESS (4) |
| 20:14 | 6:6;17:9;21:16;34:23;35:4,8, | vita (1) | 34:1;43:6;48:7;59:1 |
| traverse (1) | 13,16;37:4,23;38:16;39:24; | $4: 11$ | witness's (1) |
| 10:12 | 40:1,6,15,25;41:2,4;43:24;44:8, | volunteers (1) | 43:14 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { traversed (2) } \\ 16: 2 ; 20: 8 \end{gathered}$ | 8,9;45:7;48:20;60:4,9 | $11: 11$ | word (6) |
| traversing (1) | 16:24;17:14;18:4;24:21;33:1; | W | 47:18 |
| 27:5 | 38:22,24;39:18;56:25 |  | words (2) |
| triangulating (1) | user (1) | war (25) | 35:25;39:22 |
| $56: 19$ | $34: 25$ | $5: 17,21 ; 6: 2,7,23 ; 7: 5,12 ; 9: 13$ | work (1) |
| triangulation (4) | uses (1) | $24 ; 10: 3,11,16,16,20,24 ; 11: 4,9,$ | $51: 4$ |
| $52: 13,25 ; 53: 15,24$ | 53:25 | $21 ; 12: 1,3,9,12 ; 13: 15,24 ; 14: 4$ | worth (1) <br> 47•10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { true (4) } \\ & 23: 3 ; 49: 14 ; 61: 2,15 \end{aligned}$ | using (23) $12: 8 ; 13: 24 ; 23: 25 ; 24: 14,25$ | way (29) | $47: 10$ write (1) |
| $\operatorname{try}(1)$ | 27:5;32:12;35:5,9,10;36:1,24; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4:13,23;6:3,11,18;7:22;8:8; } \\ & \text { 16:7;18:19;19:11,11;21:1; } \end{aligned}$ | write (1) $47: 2$ |
| 40:5 | 37:2,13;38:7;40:9;42:15;44:20; | $23: 18 ; 26: 15 ; 29: 12,15 ; 30: 1,9$ | writes (1) |
| trying (4) | 52:25;53:5;56:20;57:14;59:11 | 32:21;36:24;37:9,20;38:16,21; | 6:16 |
| 8:12;34:8;36:18;40:12 | utilize (1) | 39:13,17;43:20;44:21;53:8 |  |
| turn (4) | 52:3 | ways (7) |  |


| yesterday (1) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 60:19 |  |  |  |
| Y |  |  |  |

