1	INTER CHARG DIGERTON	COLIDE
1 2 3	UNITED STATES DISTRICT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF	
	VIACOM INTERNATIONAL, INC., COMEDY )	
4	PARTNERS, COUNTRY MUSIC. )	
5	TELEVISION, INC., PARAMOUNT ) PICTURES CORPORATION, and BLACK )	
J	ENTERTAINMENT TELEVISION, LLC, )	
6	)	
	Plaintiffs, )	
7	)	NO. 07-CV-2203
8	VS. )	NO. 07-CV-2203
9	YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC, ) and GOOGLE, INC., )	
	)	
10	Defendants. )	
11		
	THE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION PREMIER )	
12	LEAGUE LIMITED, BOURNE CO., et al.,)	
1 0	on behalf of themselves and all )	
13	others similarly situated, )	
14	Plaintiffs, )	
	vs.	NO. 07-CV-3582
15	)	
16	YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC, and ) GOOGLE, INC.,	
	)	
17	Defendants. )	
18	)	
10	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF R	OELOF BOTHA
19	MENLO PARK, CALIFO	RNIA
	WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5,	2009
20	JOB NO. 17298	
21	00D NO. 17250	
22		
23		
24		
25		

Figueira Decl. Tab 205

1	R. BOTHA
2	But largely speaking, the three cofounders of
3	YouTube had individual contributor roles for the bulk
4	of their time at PayPal before they founded
5	cofounded YouTube. So that was one concern around the
6	team.
7	Another concern was whether or not the site
8	would ever gain a significant audience, gain
9	significant traffic or traction, given the focus on
10	user-generated videos. There was a concern that the
11	market opportunity for the company may be limited.
12	There were concerns around the costs of
13	delivery, given that bandwidth prices at the time were
14	high. They have been decreasing, but they're still
15	relatively high.
16	There were concerns around the costs of
17	storage of videos to be served on the YouTube service,
18	and there were questions around ability to generate
19	advertising revenue with the service.
20	Q Were there concerns or questions raised with
21	respect to potential copyright liability?
22	A I don't recall a specific discussion around
23	the issue of copyright liability, given the company
24	had presented a vision of building a user-generated
25	video service. My own use of the service was

```
1
                             R. BOTHA
2
     regards to copyrighted matters.
             Now, was this after the financing closed?
3
            I don't recall. As I mentioned before -- I'm
4
5
      sorry, I don't -- because it was such an unusual
     situation to have the reincorporation and just -- I
6
     don't recall the date. Normally, things are a lot
7
     smoother.
8
         Q Now, tell me what you recall about these
9
10
     discussions in the fourth quarter of 2005 with regards
     to copyright matters.
11
12
             MR. TANGRI: And I'm just going to caution
     you at this point that if any of those discussions
13
     were with or relayed advice or communications had with
14
15
     lawyers, exclude the substance of any legal
     communications from your answer as a privileged basis.
16
17
             MR. KRAMER: Join.
             THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?
18
19
             MR. KRAMER: I join in that instruction.
              THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. But it's permissible
20
     you can identify a discussion, but not the content?
21
             MR. TANGRI: Correct, correct.
22
23
              THE WITNESS: I just want to make sure I
24
     understand.
25
             MR. TANGRI: You -- you -- yes. If the
```

```
1
                             R. BOTHA
     answer -- yes, you can identify a discussion and the
2
     participants, but not to disclose the substance of the
3
     discussion, if the substance was --
4
5
              THE WITNESS: Understood.
             MR. TANGRI: -- infected with lawyer
6
      communications, for want of a better word.
7
             THE WITNESS: Understood.
8
9
              So at -- at some point in the fourth quarter
10
     of 2005, Chad Hurley and myself met with an attorney
     at Wilson Sonsini.
11
             MS. CUNHA: Q. And who was that attorney?
12
         A I believe it's Cathy Kirkman. I can't recall
13
     her -- I hope I got her last name correct.
14
15
            And what was discussed at that meeting?
         Q
             MR. TANGRI: And at this point, I'm going to
16
     instruct you not to answer the question based on
17
18
     attorney-client privilege.
19
             MR. KRAMER: Join.
             THE WITNESS: Understood.
20
             MS. CUNHA: Q. And are you going to follow
21
     your attorney's advice and not answer the question?
22
23
         А
             Yes.
24
            Now, do you know how YouTube came to be
         Q
25
     represented by Cathy Kirkland and Wilson Sonsini?
```

1	R. BOTHA
2	A I don't recall the specific connection
3	between so at the time that we invested or
4	the at the time that I first met with the team,
5	they had, I think, self-incorporated. Maybe they'd
6	used, you know, a website or some other service to do
7	their incorporation. They didn't have outside counsel
8	representation, and so we suggested that, as a matter
9	of good sort of standard practice, the company should
10	seek company counsel in the same fashion that we would
11	seek investor counsel when making an investment.
12	And I may have introduced them to a few
13	different law firms. I don't recall specifically
14	whether I was the one to introduce them to Stephen
15	Wells, who ended up being the company's outside
16	corporate counsel.
17	Q Did you know Ms. Kirkland prior to this time
18	period?
19	A I did not know Ms. Kirk Mrs. Kirkland?
20	MR. KRAMER: Kirkman.
21	THE WITNESS: Kirkman.
22	MR. KRAMER: Yes, K-I-R-K-M-A-N.
23	THE WITNESS: Yeah, Kirkman.
24	I did not know Cathy Kirkman before this.
25	MS. CUNHA: Let's mark this as the first

```
1
                             R. BOTHA
2
     Exhibit.
              (Document marked Botha Exhibit 1
3
              for identification.)
4
5
             MS. CUNHA: And while we're there, let's just
     mark this as the second exhibit.
6
7
             MR. TANGRI: Thank you.
              (Document marked Botha Exhibit 2
8
              for identification.)
9
             MS. CUNHA: Q. Showing you what's been
10
     marked as Exhibit 1 and 2, have you had an opportunity
11
     to look at those documents?
12
            I have looked at the documents.
13
         А
            Okay. Do you recognize them?
14
         Q
         A I do recall these documents.
15
         Q And you --
16
             Well, I obviously saw them electronically as
17
         А
18
      e-mails, not these specific printouts, but...
19
          Q But you recognize them as printouts of -- of
     e-mail chains in which you were one of the recipients?
20
21
         A I do recognize.
             And does seeing these two documents refresh
22
     your recollection as to when this meeting that you
23
24
     described with Cathy Kirkman took place?
25
             MR. KRAMER: Objection to the extent it
```

```
1
                             R. BOTHA
2
      mischaracterizes the prior testimony, and it's vaque.
              THE WITNESS: As I mentioned before, I do not
3
      recall the specific date of the meeting with Cathy
4
5
      Kirkman, but these e-mails do specify the specific
      date that was scheduled for a meeting.
6
7
              I don't know whether the meeting actually
      took place on that date without consulting a calendar.
8
9
      It may have been rescheduled. I do not know.
10
             MS. CUNHA: Q. And does seeing these two
      documents refresh your recollection as to whether or
11
      not that meeting took place prior to the closing of
12
      Sequoia's investment in YouTube?
13
         A Unfortunately, neither of these documents
14
15
      cite the actual closing date of the investment in
      YouTube, and as such, I cannot conclude whether or not
16
      they occurred before or after.
17
18
          Q Now, directing your attention to Exhibit 1,
19
      there is an e-mail, the second from the top, from you
      to Mr. Hurley, dated September 21st, 2005, at
20
21
      2:54 p.m.; do you see that e-mail?
          A I do see that.
22
23
             And do you see you write to Mr. Hurley that,
24
      "I will get you the contact information for two
25
      different IP strategists, including the attorney at
```

```
1
                             R. BOTHA
2
      mischaracterizes his prior testimony.
              THE WITNESS: Yeah, I think I -- I'll stick
3
4
      to what I said the previous time. I gave a detailed
5
      explanation.
             MS. CUNHA: Q. Now, other than the Nike
6
      video, do you recall if any of the other videos that
7
      were amongst the most -- the most viewed in this
8
9
      distribution analysis were professionally produced
10
      content?
11
              MR. TANGRI: Objection; mischaracterizes his
12
      prior testimony and vaque.
              THE WITNESS: I recall the Nike video being a
13
     professionally produced video, because we went to meet
14
15
      with the people who produced and uploaded that video
16
     on YouTube.
              MS. CUNHA: Q. When did you do that?
17
18
             I do not recall the specific date, but I
      believe -- I believe it was at the end of 2005.
19
          Q So in 2005, you were aware that companies
20
      were creating content for promotional purposes and
21
22
      posting it on the YouTube website; is that fair to
23
      say?
24
          A It's fair to say that I was aware that Nike
25
      had uploaded a video that they wanted to distribute
```

1	R. BOTHA
2	for promotional purposes for a new shoe.
3	Q Were you aware of any other companies posting
4	promotional content on the YouTube website in the 2005
5	time period?
6	A I do not recall being aware of other
7	companies.
8	Q At some point, did you become aware of other
9	companies posting promotional content on the YouTube
10	website?
11	A At some point, I did become aware of of
12	other companies using YouTube for promotional purposes
13	for uploading content.
14	Q And, in fact, early on when Sequoia first
15	decided to invest, was part of the revenue model for
16	YouTube the notion that companies would use the
17	website to post promotional content?
18	A Sorry. Could you repeat the question,
19	please?
20	Q Sure.
21	When Sequoia was deciding to invest in
22	YouTube and was looking at potential revenue models,
23	was part of what Sequoia envisioned for the website in
24	the future was that the site would be used by
25	companies who would post promotional content?

1	R. BOTHA
2	Lazy Sunday gained a lot of popularity and significant
3	video views. Chad Hurley noticed that this was a very
4	popular video and sent a message to Saturday Night
5	Live, or I don't know which specific media company
6	parent to whom he sent the communication, notifying
7	them that this video was on the service.
8	We, YouTube, did not know who the individual
9	was who uploaded the video clip, nor whether that
10	individual had the authority to upload that particular
11	video, but we notified the owners of that show that
12	this clip was available on YouTube and we didn't know
13	if it was authorized and if it was not authorized,
14	that they should please notify the company so that we
15	could take it down in compliance with the company's
16	takedown policies, and the company did not receive any
17	reply for six weeks thereafter.
18	MS. CUNHA: Q. Were you copied on that
19	communication?
20	A I do not believe I was copied on that
21	communication.
22	Q But somebody told you about the
23	communication?
24	A Chad Hurley reported this incident to me,
25	yes.