1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK VIACOM INTERNATIONAL, INC., COMEDY ) PARTNERS, COUNTRY MUSIC. TELEVISION, INC., PARAMOUNT PICTURES CORPORATION, and BLACK ENTERTAINMENT TELEVISION, LLC, Plaintiffs, ) NO. 07-CV-2203 VS. YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC, and GOOGLE, INC., Defendants. THE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION PREMIER LEAGUE LIMITED, BOURNE CO., et al.,) on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, ) NO. 07-CV-3582 VS. YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC, and GOOGLE, INC., Defendants. VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF MICHAEL SOLOMON PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 2009

JOB NO. 17576

		2
1	SEPTEMBER 1, 2009	
2	9:05 a.m.	
3		
4	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF MICHAEL SOLOMON,	
5	WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI,	
6	650 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, California,	
7	pursuant to notice, and before me, ANDREA M.	
8	IGNACIO HOWARD, CLR, RPR, CRR, CSR License	
9	No. 9830.	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS VIACOM INTERNATIONAL, INC.:
4	JENNER & BLOCK, LLP
5	By: MICHAEL DESANCTIS, Esq.
6	SARAH MAGUIRE, Esq.
7	1099 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 900
8	Washington, D.C. 20001
9	(202) 639-6000 mdesanctis@jenner.com
10	
11	FOR THE LEAD PLAINTIFFS AND PROSPECTIVE CLASS:
12	BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER & GROSSMANN LLP
13	By: BENJAMIN GALDSTON, Esq.
14	12481 High Bluff Drive, Suite 300
15	San Diego, California 92130-3582
16	(858) 720-3188 beng@blbglaw.com
17	
18	FOR THE DEFENDANTS YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC and
19	GOOGLE, INC.:
20	WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI, LLP
21	By: MICHAEL RUBIN, Esq.
22	650 Page Mill Road
23	Menlo Park, California 94304
24	(650) 493-9300 mrubin@wsgr.com
2.5	

	A R A N C E S (Continued.)  DEFENDANTS YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC and
	DEFENDANTS YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC and
	DEFENDANTS YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC and
GOOGLE,	
	INC.:
	MAYER BROWN, LLP
	By: MATTHEW D. INGBER, Esq.
	BRIAN WILLEN, Esq.
	1675 Broadway
	New York, New York 10019
	(212) 506-2146 mingber@mayer.com
ALSO	PRESENT: Kelly Truelove, Consultant
	Stewart Pettigrew, Videographer.
	000
	ALSO

- $^{2}\mid^{09:13:21}$  start working on it or when did it become a company
- $^{3}$  |  $^{09:13:25}$  and when did I start getting paid?
- $^{4}\mid^{09:13:26}$  Q Let's take it step by step.
- 5 09:13:28 When did you first start working at YouTube,
- $6 \mid 09:13:30$  whether paid or unpaid and whether or not it was a
- 7 | 09:13:33 company?
- 8 09:13:34 A Maybe May of 2005.
- 9 09:13:39 Q Okay. And was -- were you being paid in May
- 10 09:13:46 of 2005?
- 11 09:13:48 A No.
- 12 09:13:48 Q Okay. So in what capacity were you
- $13 \mid 09:13:51$  affiliated with YouTube in May of 2005?
- 14 09:14:02 A Steve would ask me how to solve problems. I
- $15 \mid 09:14:06 \text{ would give him the answers.}$
- 16 09:14:07 Q What's Steve's last name?
- 17 | 09:14:09 A Chen.
- 18 09:14:10 Q Okay. And he is one of the original founders
- 19 09:14:15 of YouTube; is that correct?
- 20 09:14:16 A Yes.
- 21 09:14:16 Q And there were two others; is that correct?
- 22 09:14:20 A Yes.
- 23 | 09:14:21 Q They were?
- 24 09:14:25 A Jawed Karim and Chad Hurley.
- Q = 09:14:30 Q Okay. So at that time, in May of 2005, when

- $^{2}\mid^{09:14:33}$  you started working with YouTube in a non- -- in an
- $3 \mid 09:14:40$  unpaid capacity, were there any other individuals
- 4 09:14:44 either employed at YouTube or working in the same kind
- $^{5\mid 09:14:46}$  of unpaid capacity other than you and the three
- 6 | 09:14:50 founders?
- 7 | 09:15:00 A Maybe Yu Pan.
- 8 09:15:04 Q Okay. Anybody else that you recall?
- 9 09:15:13 A Maybe Christina Brodbeck.
- 10 09:15:23 Q Was Cuong Do, D-O, affiliated with YouTube at
- 11 | 09:15:41 that time?
- 12 09:15:41 A No, I don't think so.
- 13 09:15:51 Q Okay. So at that time when it was the three
- $14 \mid 09:15:59$  founders, you, maybe Yu Pan, and maybe Christina
- 15 | 09:16:06 Broadbeck, were you the principal software engineer at
- 16 | 09:16:11 that time?
- 17 09:16:13 A You could say that.
- 18 | 09:16:19 Q Okay. So you started in May of 2005 in an
- $19 \mid 09:16:28$  unpaid capacity. Did that capacity ever change as
- 20 | 09:16:31 time went on?
- 21 09:16:34 A Yes.
- 22 09:16:34 Q When was that?
- 23 09:16:40 A I think October of that year.
- 24 09:16:43 Q And how did it change in October of 2005?
- 25 09:16:50 A The company was, you know, formally

- $2 \mid 09:16:52$  incorporated and we started getting paid.
- 3 09:16:57 Q Okay. In October of 2005, were there
- $4 \mid 09:17:10$  additional employees at YouTube other than you, the
- $5 \mid 09:17:12$  three fan -- founders, maybe Yu Pan, and maybe
- 6 09:17:18 Christina Broadbeck?
- 7 09:17:26 A I think so.
- 8 09:17:29 Q Do you recall their names?
- 9 09:17:36 A I think Chad -- Chad's brother Brent, had
- $10 \mid 09:17:41$  probably started working there by then, if -- very
- 11 | 09:17:46 soon after if not.
- 12 | 09:17:49 Q Anybody else?
- 13 09:17:50 A Right around the time that we incorporated, I
- $14 \mid 09:17:53$  don't really recall.
- 15 09:17:55 Q Okay. Is Brent a software engineer?
- 16 09:17:58 A No, he is not.
- 17 09:17:59 Q Okay. So when was the -- actually, let me
- $18 \mid 09:18:06$  strike that and back up.
- 19 09:18:07 Did there ever come a time when YouTube hired
- 20 | 09:18:10 another software engineer other than you?
- 21 09:18:13 A Yes.
- Q = 09:18:13 Q Who was the first software engineer other
- $^{23}$   $|^{09:18:17}$  than you to be hired by YouTube?
- 24 09:18:32 A Either Yu Pan or Cuong.
- 25 09:18:37 Q I'm sorry. What was the second name after Yu

- 2 | 09:18:40 Pan?
- 3 | 09:18:44 A Cuong.
- 4 09:18:45 Q Is that Mr. Do?
- 5 09:18:47 A I'm sorry. Yes.
- 6 09:18:56 Q What were your responsibilities in that
- 7 | 09:18:58 October 2005 time frame?
- 8 | 09:19:05 A Mostly just software development, general
- 9 | 09:19:08 operations work.
- 10 09:19:11 Q And when you say "software development" and
- 11 09:19:15 "operations work," was that all development and work
- 12 | 09:19:18 on developing the YouTube.com website?
- 13 | 09:19:23 A Yes, in the systems, you know, behind the
- 14 09:19:26 scenes that supported them.
- 15 | 09:19:27 Q Okay. Would you include what are known as
- $16 \mid 09:19:55$  the "admin websites" as part of the behind-the-scene
- 17 | 09:19:58 systems?
- 18 | 09:20:01 MR. WILLEN: Objection to the form; assumes
- 19 09:20:03 facts.
- 20 09:20:05 MR. DESANCTIS: Q. Are you familiar with
- 21 09:20:06 the -- with the admin websites that are part of the
- 22 | 09:20:09 YouTube system?
- 23 09:20:11 A I'm familiar with one website, yes.
- 24 09:20:14 Q Okay. Well, what is that website? What --
- 25 09:20:17 A That is the admin website.

- $2 \mid 09:20:20$  Q Do you know the URL for that?
- 3 09:20:23 A Yes.
- 4 09:20:23 Q What is that?
- 5 09:20:24 A Admin.YouTube.com.
- 6 09:20:34 Q Is that accessible by the public?
- 7 09:20:37 MR. WILLEN: Objection to the form; vague.
- 8 09:20:39 THE WITNESS: You'll have to be more specific
- 9 09:20:44 about what you mean by "public."
- 10 09:20:45 MR. DESANCTIS: Q. To -- is it available --
- 11 | 09:20:47 is it accessible by non-YouTube or non-Google
- 12 | 09:20:51 employees?
- 13 | 09:20:56 A No.
- 14 09:20:57 Q Okay. Can you tell me generally, not all the
- 15 | 09:21:01 specifics, but generally what the Admin. Youtube.com
- 16 | 09:21:05 website is?
- 17 | 09:21:06 A Generally, it's admin tools for the YouTube
- 18 | 09:21:09 website.
- 19 09:21:10 Q Okay. And is it right that those admin tools
- 20 | 09:21:25 are available only to YouTube and Google employees?
- 21 | 09:21:35 A I don't know the policies that are associated
- $22 \mid 09:21:37$  with admin these days.
- 23 09:21:39 Q Okay. And were you involved in developing
- 24 | 09:21:46 the admin. You Tube. com site?
- 25 09:21:50 MR. WILLEN: Objection to the form; vague.

- 2 09:23:02 A Almost all projects, regardless of who the
- 3 09:23:05 primary author, would normally have a discussion with
- 4 09:23:09 me.
- 5 09:23:14 Q I'm sorry. Your answer was, "Almost all
- $6\mid^{09:23:24}$  projects, regardless of who the primary author, would
- $^{7}\mid^{09:23:26}$  normally have a discussion with me."
- 8 09:23:30 They would normally have discussions with you
- $9 \mid 09:23:33$  about anything, about what?
- 10 09:23:35 A Technical direction, implementation details.
- 11 09:23:37 Q Okay. For all projects at YouTube?
- $12 \mid 09:23:40$  A Not for all, but for the majority.
- 13 09:23:45 Q Okay. So if not you, was there a different
- $14 \mid 09:24:00$  software engineer who was primarily responsible for
- 15 | 09:24:03 developing the admin. YouTube.com website?
- 16 09:24:06 A Yes.
- 17 | 09:24:07 Q Who was that?
- 18 09:24:15 A Probably Erik Klein.
- 19 09:24:28 Q Do you recall when Erik Klein first began
- 20 | 09:24:31 working at YouTube, approximately?
- 21 09:24:34 A 2006.
- 22 | 09:24:34 Q Early? Middle? Late?
- 23 09:24:40 A Early.
- 24 | 09:24:40 Q Before early 2006, was there an
- 25 | 09:24:55 admin. YouTube.com website?

- 2 10:33:20 What is being sent over these arrows from the
- 3 | 10:33:23 end user to these three various destinations?
- $4 \mid 10:33:27$  MR. WILLEN: Objection to the form.
- 5 | 10:33:34 THE WITNESS: This is just a conceptual
- 6 | 10:33:36 document. It doesn't really reflect reality.
- 7 | 10:33:40 MR. DESANCTIS: Q. Well, because it -- is it
- 8 | 10:33:49 a -- because it's a summary? I mean, it obviously
- 9 10:33:52 doesn't have all of the detail in the YouTube
- 10 | 10:33:54 network --
- 11 | 10:33:55 A Uh-huh.
- 12 10:33:55 Q -- but if we -- is it -- do you understand
- 13 | 10:34:00 what the document is portraying?
- $14 \mid 10:34:09$  A Only using my internal knowledge of the
- 15 | 10:34:11 system.
- 16 | 10:34:12 Q Okay. Well, that's -- that's good.
- 17 | 10:34:16 Using your internal knowledge of the system,
- 18 | 10:34:22 what is it that's being sent -- do you know what's
- 19 | 10:34:25 being sent over these arrows --
- 20 | 10:34:29 MR. WILLEN: Object.
- 21 | 10:34:29 MR. DESANCTIS: Q. -- over the three arrows
- $22 \mid 10:34:31$  running from the end user icon to the three
- 23 | 10:34:34 destinations, net scaler, video servers, and CDN?
- 24 10:34:38 MR. WILLEN: Objection to the form.
- 25 | 10:34:40 THE WITNESS: My understanding is not that --

- 1 SOLOMON, M.
- $^{2}$   $|^{10:34:46}$  is that this is just showing at a high level where
- 3 | 10:34:52 data comes from.
- 4 | 10:34:53 MR. DESANCTIS: Okay.
- 5 10:34:54 O Where data comes from from -- for what
- 6 | 10:34:57 purpose?
- 7 | 10:34:58 MR. WILLEN: Objection to the form.
- 8 10:35:07 MR. DESANCTIS: Let me suggest.
- 9 10:35:08 Q Is it when an end user requests a Watch Page?
- 10 | 10:35:11 A It doesn't seem to indicate that. It --
- 11 | 10:35:17 yeah.
- 12 | 10:35:17 Q So you don't know if it's --
- 13 | 10:35:19 A I don't know what it's referring to. It's
- 14 | 10:35:20 very generic.
- 15 10:35:23 Q Okay. Okay. I'm sorry to do this to you,
- $16 \mid 10:35:33$  but I just need to consult with my team for a minute,
- $17 \mid 10:35:36$  so can we have another three-minute break and --
- 18 10:35:38 MR. WILLEN: Sure. No problem.
- 19 10:35:40 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 10:35.
- 20 | 10:35:42 Off the record.
- 21 | 10:35:43 (Recess taken.)
- 22 | 10:41:46 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 10:42.
- 23 | 10:41:48 On the record.
- 24 10:41:49 MR. DESANCTIS: Okay.
- $25 \mid 10:41:52$  Q Mr. Solomon, when a -- when a user uploads a

- $2 \mid 10:41:57 \text{ video, YouTube stores that video; correct?}$
- $3 \mid 10:42:02$  MR. WILLEN: Objection to the form.
- 4 10:42:04 THE WITNESS: Yes, video is stored when you
- $5 \mid 10:42:14 \text{ upload it.}$
- 6 10:42:15 MR. DESANCTIS: Okay.
- 7 | 10:42:23 Q But it's not necessarily stored in the format
- $8 \mid 10:42:26$  that the user uploaded it in; correct?
- 9 10:42:33 A Yes, it is always stored in the format it's
- 10 | 10:42:36 uploaded in.
- $11 \mid 10:42:37$  Q Okay. Is it also -- is a video uploaded by a
- 12 | 10:42:43 user also transcoded into a format other than what the
- 13 | 10:42:48 user uploaded it in?
- 14 | 10:42:51 A Yes, a transcode is always attempted.
- 15 10:42:54 Q Okay. So there is the original copy uploaded
- $16 \mid 10:43:01$  by the user in the format uploaded by the user, and
- 17 | 10:43:04 then, if I understand correctly, YouTube transcodes
- $18 \mid 10:43:09$  that or attempts to transcode that and, if successful,
- 19 | 10:43:14 makes a second copy in a new transcoded format?
- 20 10:43:18 MR. WILLEN: Objection to the testimony.
- 21 | 10:43:21 THE WITNESS: When -- during the upload
- 22 | 10:43:23 process, the file that the user uploads is stored.
- $23 \mid 10:43:26$  The transcoder process attempts to convert that
- $24 \mid 10:43:32$  original uploaded file into a file playable by the
- 25 | 10:43:36 Website.

- 2 | 10:43:36 MR. DESANCTIS: Okay.
- 3 10:43:44 Q And if successful -- if the attempt to
- $^4\mid^{10:43:47}$  convert the original file is successful, does YouTube
- $5 \mid 10:43:54 \text{ make additional copies?}$
- 6 10:43:57 MR. WILLEN: Objection to the form.
- 7 | 10:44:00 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't understand
- 8 10:44:01 "additional copies."
- 9 10:44:02 MR. DESANCTIS: Okay.
- 10 | 10:44:03 Q Well, there's the original copy uploaded by
- $11 \mid 10:44:06$  the user in the format uploaded by the user.
- 12 | 10:44:09 A (Witness nods head.)
- 13 10:44:10 Q Then YouTube attempts to transcode that file.
- 14 10:44:13 A Uh-huh.
- 15 10:44:14 Q If successful, we then have two -- YouTube
- $16 \mid 10:44:18$  then has two copies, the original and the transcoded
- 17 | 10:44:20 copy; correct?
- 18 | 10:44:23 A They are different, completely different
- $19 \mid 10:44:26$  files. They have no -- like -- they are usually
- $20 \mid 10:44:30$  completely unrelated to the -- to each other.
- 21 | 10:44:32 Q Okay. Does YouTube make any copies of the
- 22 | 10:44:39 transcoded file?
- 23 | 10:44:42 MR. WILLEN: Are you done with the question?
- 24 10:44:44 Objection to the form of the question.
- 25 10:44:50 THE WITNESS: The process of transcoding

- 2 10:44:55 creates a new file.
- 3 10:44:56 MR. DESANCTIS: Right. The process of
- 4 | 10:44:58 transcoding creates one new file. That's good.
- 5 | 10:45:03 Q Does YouTube then create additional copies of
- $6 \mid 10:45:05$  that one file, or does YouTube maintain only one copy
- 7 | 10:45:11 of the transcoded file?
- 8 | 10:45:15 MR. WILLEN: Objection to the form; objection
- 9 10:45:18 to what's meant by "YouTube."
- 10 | 10:45:22 THE WITNESS: Also, I'm not exactly sure what
- 11 | 10:45:24 you mean by "copy."
- 12 10:45:27 MR. DESANCTIS: What's confusing about the --
- 13 | 10:45:33 when I say the copy of a -- of a -- I'm sorry. Let me
- 14 | 10:45:35 back up.
- 15 | 10:45:48 Q I had said the process of transcoding creates
- 16 | 10:45:54 one new file, and I then asked, does YouTube then
- 17 | 10:45:58 create additional copies of that one file, or does
- 18 | 10:46:01 YouTube maintain only one copy of the transcoded file?
- 19 10:46:05 So when I -- you asked me -- what is it about
- 20 | 10:46:07 copy that you don't understand?
- 21 | 10:46:10 A You mean -- well, copying mean -- meaning an
- $22 \mid 10:46:15$  exact identical copy of the -- of the file.
- 23 | 10:46:19 Q Yeah, I mean a duplicate file copy of the
- 24 | 10:46:22 same data.
- $25 \mid 10:46:24$  A Yes, there's -- there's a copy of the file.

- 2 | 10:46:30 Q Okay. So -- so the -- that I'm clear,
- 3 | 10:46:35 there's the original uploaded by the user.
- 4 | 10:46:37 A Uh-huh.
- 5 | 10:46:38 Q There is the -- let's call it the initial
- 6 10:46:41 transcoded file.
- 7 10:46:42 A Uh-huh.
- 8 10:46:42 Q And YouTube then makes an additional copy of
- $9 \mid 10:46:46$  the transcoded file, so there are in -- in total
- 10 | 10:46:50 three --
- 11 | 10:46:51 MR. WILLEN: Objection to the --
- 12 | 10:46:53 MR. DESANCTIS: Q. -- versions of -- well --
- 13 | 10:47:00 MR. WILLEN: So objection --
- 14 | 10:47:00 MR. DESANCTIS: Q. -- there are --
- 15 10:47:00 MR. WILLEN: Sorry, finish your question.
- 16 10:47:02 MR. DESANCTIS: Q. So there would be a total
- 17 | 10:47:03 of three files representing the video up -- uploaded
- 18 | 10:47:06 by the user?
- 19 10:47:07 MR. WILLEN: So just let me object.
- 20 10:47:11 THE WITNESS: Okay.
- 21 | 10:47:11 MR. WILLEN: So objection to the form of all
- $22 \mid 10:47:13$  of that. Particularly, to the recharacterization of
- $23 \mid 10:47:18$  Mr. Solomon's testimony that was embedded into the
- $24 \mid 10:47:21 \text{ question.}$
- 25 10:47:24 THE WITNESS: So I think to answer precisely,

- $2 \mid 10:47:27$  I need to know what time frame we're talking about
- $3 \mid 10:47:30 \text{ and } -- \text{ yeah.}$
- 4 | 10:47:35 MR. DESANCTIS: Okay.
- $5 \mid 10:47:35$  Q Let's talk about the middle of 2006.
- 6 10:47:44 A So in the middle of 2006, there would be the
- $7 \mid 10:47:55$  original file, the transcoded video, and either one or
- $8 \mid 10:48:07$  two backup copies, depending on which type of hardware
- 9 10:48:12 they're running on.
- 10 | 10:48:13 Q Okay. So let's focus for now on the
- $11 \mid 10:49:05$  transcoded copy and the one or two backups.
- 12 10:49:12 In the mid-2006 time frame, where were those
- 13 | 10:49:16 files stored by YouTube?
- $14 \mid 10:49:29$  A Are you asking the -- the physical location?
- 15 | 10:49:33 Q I'm -- let's -- let's -- I will, but let's
- $16 \mid 10:49:37$  take a step back.
- 17 | 10:49:38 Were -- were the trans- -- in the mid-2006
- $18 \mid 10:49:42$  time frame, were the transcoded copy and the one or
- $19 \mid 10:49:45$  two backups of uploaded videos stored on servers owned
- 20 | 10:49:50 and operated by YouTube?
- $21 \mid 10:49:55$  A I think the answer is maybe.
- 22 10:49:58 Q Why maybe?
- 23 | 10:49:59 A Because I don't recall when our first data
- 24 | 10:50:05 centers came online.
- 25 | 10:50:10 Q Okay. When you say the data server -- "data

- $2 \mid 14:02:38$  the right -- he may have had the right to do that at
- $3 \mid 14:02:41$  the time this e-mail was written, but a user would not
- $4 \mid 14:02:43$  have had the right to do that after you had the filter
- 5 | 14:02:46 in place; correct?
- 6 14:02:48 MR. WILLEN: Objection to the form.
- 7 | 14:02:51 THE WITNESS: Can you specify? I mean, it's
- 8 14:02:53 unclear of what the meaning of the word "right" is
- 9 14:02:58 here in this particular context.
- 10 | 14:02:59 MR. DESANCTIS: Sure. That's fair, and I
- 11 | 14:03:04 suppose we can't divine what a particular user meant
- $12 \mid 14:03:09$  by a particular word.
- 13 | 14:03:13 Q Let me ask it this way: Do you recall the
- $14 \mid 14:03:20$  blocking tool or filter, as you called it, ever having
- 15 | 14:03:22 been put in place?
- 16 14:03:24 A Yes.
- 17 | 14:03:24 Q Okay. Do you recall approximately when it
- 18 | 14:03:27 was put in place?
- 19 14:03:30 A I do not. No, not from memory.
- 20 14:03:34 Q And how did that filter work?
- 21 | 14:03:40 A The filter computes a hash of the uploaded
- $22 \mid 14:03:45$  file and compares it against the hash values of other
- 23 | 14:03:50 files that the user has uploaded.
- 24 | 14:03:53 Q Okay. And if it matches other files, what
- $25 \mid 14:03:59 \mid$  happens? First of all, if the hashes -- if the hash

- $^{2}$   $|^{14:04:03}$  of one file matches the hash of another file, what
- $3 \mid 14:04:07$  does that indicate about the two files?
- 4 | 14:04:10 A It means that there's a reasonable chance
- $5 \mid 14:04:13$  that they're the same, but it's not 100 percent.
- 6 14:04:15 There could be collisions.
- 7 | 14:04:19 Q Okay. So what happened -- how does your
- $8 \mid 14:04:24$  filter respond if there are two files with the same
- $9 \mid 14:04:31$  hash uploaded by the same user?
- 10 14:04:36 A It's been a while, so I can say generally,
- 11 | 14:04:38 but some of the specific actions, you know, I may not
- 12 | 14:04:41 recall.
- 13 | 14:04:44 Q That's fine.
- $14 \mid 14:04:45$  A But the general -- the general idea is to
- 15 | 14:04:47 mark subsequent files as -- as a duplicate rejection.
- 16 14:04:53 Q Okay. And are subsequent files marked as a
- $17 \mid 14:05:05$  duplicate rejection before they are sort of publicly
- 18 | 14:05:11 viewable on the website?
- 19 14:05:14 A Yes. It goes directly from the uploaded
- $20 \mid 14:05:17$  state to the rejected state.
- 21 | 14:05:19 Q Okay. And the reason it's rejected, when
- $^{22}$   $|_{14:05:24}$  this filter is being used, is not because it was
- $^{23}$   $|^{14:05:31}$  previously rejected or previously deleted or anything
- $24 \mid 14:05:35$  like that, it's simply because there are -- the same
- 25 | 14:05:39 user has already uploaded the identical video?

- 2 | 14:05:43 MR. WILLEN: Objection to form.
- 3 | 14:05:45 MR. DESANCTIS: I'm just trying to
- $4 \mid 14:05:47 \text{ understand.}$
- 5 | 14:05:47 THE WITNESS: The filter -- the purpose of
- 6 | 14:05:49 the filter is to prevent the same user from uploading
- $7 \mid 14:05:53$  the identical video again.
- 8 14:05:55 MR. DESANCTIS: Okay.
- 9 14:05:55 THE WITNESS: And so once he's uploaded it, a
- $10 \mid 14:05:59$  hash is computed, and then a subsequent file can be
- $11 \mid 14:06:02$  uploaded. If the -- if the hash matches, then that
- 12 | 14:06:06 subsequent file and any subsequent file from that --
- $13 \mid 14:06:09$  that matches the hash within that user, it's marked as
- 14 | 14:06:12 a -- as a reject, yeah.
- 15 | 14:06:16 MR. DESANCTIS: Okay.
- 16 | 14:06:20 Q Is that still in place today, that filter?
- 17 | 14:06:23 A I do not know.
- 18 | 14:06:24 Q Okay. When the filter was in place -- well,
- 19 | 14:06:27 was it in place ever?
- 20 14:06:29 A Yes.
- 21 | 14:06:29 Q Okay. When it was in place, if a user wanted
- $^{22}$  |  $^{14:06:34}$  to upload multiple copies of the same file, could they
- 23 | 14:06:41 have?
- 24 | 14:06:45 A It's vague as your -- I mean, in terms of
- 25 | 14:06:47 what do you mean by "user"?