## **EXHIBIT B**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

THE WEATHER UNDERGROUND, INC., )
a Michigan Corporation, )
Plaintiff, )

vs. ) Case No. 2:09-CV-10756
)
NAVIGATION CATALYST SYSTEMS, ) Volume I
INC., a Delaware corporation; )
BASIC FUSION, INC., a Delaware )
corporation; CONNEXUS CORP., a )
Delaware corporation; and )
FIRSTLOOK, INC., a Delaware )
corporation, )
Defendants. )

- CONFIDENTIAL - UNDER SEAL-

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF DONNIE J. MISINO

Los Angeles, California

Friday, August 20, 2010

Reported by: Judy Samson CSR No. 6916

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
 2
                    EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
 3
 4
      THE WEATHER UNDERGROUND, INC., )
 5
      a Michigan Corporation,
 6
                       Plaintiff,
 7
          vs.
                                          ) Case No. 2:09-CV-10756
 8
                                          ) Volume I
      NAVIGATION CATALYST SYSTEMS,
      INC., a Delaware corporation; )
 9
     BASIC FUSION, INC., a Delaware ) corporation; CONNEXUS CORP., a )
10
      Delaware corporation; and
      \begin{tabular}{ll} \hline {\tt FIRSTLOOK}, & \bar{{\tt INC.}}, & {\tt a Delaware} \\ \hline \end{tabular} 
11
      corporation,
12
                       Defendants.
13
15
16
              VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF DONNIE J. MISINO,
17
18
         taken on behalf of the Plaintiff, at 707 Wilshire
         Boulevard, Suite 3850, Los Angeles, California,
19
20
         beginning at 10:04 a.m. and ending at 5:39 p.m.,
21
         on Friday, August 20, 2010, before Judy Samson,
22
         a Certified Shorthand Reporter Number 6916.
```

232425

Page 2

- 1 domain gets proxied?
- 2 A I believe I may have been copied on some
- 3 e-mails where that topic was -- was brought up.
- 4 MR. SCHAEFER: I'm going to mark this.
- 5 Okay. 89 is a June 18th letter from
- 6 Mr. Delgado to me, concerning a variety of issues.
- 7 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 89 was marked
- 8 for identification by the deposition
- 9 reporter and is attached hereto.)
- 10 BY MR. SCHAEFER:
- 11 Q In the second -- number one, do you recall
- 12 seeing this letter before?
- 13 A I don't believe I've seen this one.
- 14 Q Okay. Mr. Delgado is indicating that he
- 15 needs more time to review e-mails before producing
- 16 the e-mail components of the discovery requests in
- 17 the order. And he notes that there are over 600,000
- 18 e-mails that are -- needed to be reviewed for
- 19 responsiveness.
- 20 Do you see that?
- 21 A Yes.
- Q Do you know where that 600,000 number came
- 23 from?
- 24 A I can assume, though I don't know.
- Q Okay. So you didn't have any personal

- 1 involvement in figuring out how many e-mail -- or
- 2 assembling e-mail databases?
- 3 A Not the ones that this refers to. I only
- 4 searched my own personal e-mail.
- 5 Q Okay. Did you have any discussions with
- 6 anyone about the process for accumulating e-mails?
- 7 A No.
- 8 Q Do you know how that occurred?
- 9 A I only know that Bob Falkenberg was
- 10 handling that. That's all I know.
- 11 Q Okay. Are you generally aware of the
- 12 e-mails that have been produced in this case as part
- 13 of the production?
- 14 A Beyond my own, no.
- 15 Q Okay. I want you to assume that there are
- 16 generally two categories of e-mails. One, as you'll
- 17 see in the order, the e-mails that went to the
- 18 parking pages concerning potential purchases of
- 19 domains; and, two, a category of e-mails related to
- 20 trademark issues.
- 21 Have you seen either category of e-mails,
- 22 or did you produce any e-mails in either of those
- 23 categories?
- MR. DELGADO: I'm going to object to that
- 25 characterization of the order.

- 1 THE WITNESS: I believe I sent some e-mails
- 2 to counsel.
- 3 BY MR. SCHAEFER:
- 4 Q And if only about 1,500 e-mails have been
- 5 produced in this case, do you have any understanding
- 6 as to what happened to the other 598,500 e-mails
- 7 that haven't been produced or the basis for
- 8 nonproduction?
- 9 A No, I don't know.
- 10 It appears that these were being reviewed
- 11 for responsiveness, and likely they were judged or
- 12 deemed not to be within that.
- 13 Q Do you know what search was run on those
- 14 e-mails to determine responsiveness?
- 15 A Only --
- MR. DELGADO: Objection; that calls for
- 17 attorney work product.
- 18 MR. SCHAEFER: Well, not privileged because
- 19 in this case, you and I are supposed to work that
- 20 out. And so I'm certainly entitled to know what was
- 21 the search that was run on it.
- 22 MR. DELGADO: I can tell you I reviewed
- 23 them. I reviewed every single one.
- MR. SCHAEFER: Would you -- would you
- $25\,$   $\,$  provide me with the search logic on that so I can

- 1 take a look and see if there's anything --
- 2 MR. DELGADO: On the 600- -- you want to go
- 3 off the -- let's go off the record. I'll tell you
- 4 what happened.
- 5 MR. SCHAEFER: Sure.
- 6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This marks the end of
- 7 videotape No. 2, Volume I, in the deposition of
- 8 Mr. Donnie J. Misino.
- 9 And the time is 1:50 p.m.
- 10 (Discussion held off the record.)
- 11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This marks the beginning
- of videotape No. 3, Volume I, in the deposition of
- 13 Mr. Donnie J. Misino.
- 14 And the time is 1:53 p.m.
- 15 BY MR. SCHAEFER:
- 16 Q Okay. Mr. Misino, could you take a look at
- 17 paragraph 4 of the order, which is Exhibit 87.
- 18 A Okay.
- 19 Q Okay. So this sets the relevant period for
- 20 the search of documents except if there was any more
- 21 narrow search time frame noted.
- 22 Did you recall reviewing this paragraph as
- 23 you went about your job of assembling documents?
- 24 A Yes.
- ${\tt 25}$   ${\tt Q}$   ${\tt And}$  was this the -- the time period that