

EXHIBIT I

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
No. 1:10-cv-00569-RJA

-----)
PAUL D. CEGLIA,)
))
Plaintiff,)
))
vs.)
))
MARK ELLIOT ZUCKERBERG,)
Individually, and)
FACEBOOK, INC. ,)
))
Defendants.)

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher
200 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10166-0193
July 16, 2012
10:06 A.M.

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF
Walter John Rantanen, II

Reported by:
DEBRA SAPIO LYONS, RDR, CRR, CCR, CPE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

July 16, 2012

Videotaped deposition of Walter John Rantanen, II, held at the offices of Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, 200 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10166-0193, before Debra Sapio Lyons, a Registered Diplomat Reporter, a Certified Realtime Reporter, a Certified LiveNote Reporter, an Approved Reporter of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, a Certified Court Reporter of the State of New Jersey, a Notary Public of the States of New Jersey, New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

1 APPEARANCES:

2 BOLAND LEGAL

3 BY: DEAN BOLAND, ESQUIRE

4 1475 Warren Road #770724

5 Lakewood, Ohio 44107

6 216.236.8080

7 dean@bolandlegal.com

8 Counsel for Paul D. Ceglia

9 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER

10 BY: MATTHEW BENJAMIN, ESQUIRE

11 ALEXANDER H. SOUTHWELL, ESQUIRE

12 AMANDA AYCOCK, ESQUIRE

13 200 Park Avenue

14 New York, New York 10166-0193

15 212.351.4079

16 212.351.3981

17 212.351.2347

18 mbenjamin@gibsondunn.com

19 asouthwell@gibsondunn.com

20 aaycock@gibsondunn.com

21 Counsel for Mark Elliot

22 Zuckerberg, Individually, and

23 Facebook, Inc.

24 ALSO PRESENT:

25 JAMES THOMPSON

Gibson Dunn

DEVERELL WRITE, Videographer

Veritext New York

1 Walter J. Rantanen, II
2 recollection of the samples other than
3 generally what was on the request form
4 and what was in the report.

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. So you don't know who
7 extracted the samples or when or how or
8 anything like that; right?

9 A. Not for certain. I -- I
10 guess I would assume that Mr. Stewart
11 would have. I...

12 Q. But that's just an
13 assumption; right?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Okay. Was there any ink on
16 the samples?

17 A. Not that I recall.

18 Q. Was there any toner
19 printing?

20 A. Not that I recall.

21 Q. And your report doesn't
22 indicate that the samples were anything
23 other than plain white paper; right?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. You have no reason to think

1 Walter J. Rantanen, II

2 that there were any inconsistencies or
3 anomalies regarding the color of the
4 samples; right?

5 A. No.

6 Q. So the color was consistent
7 on both sides of the paper samples;
8 right?

9 A. From what I could see with
10 the very small piece, but we did notice
11 those little specks on one side versus
12 the other side.

13 Q. Right. Other than the
14 specks, there was consistent coloration
15 on the front and backs of the samples;
16 right?

17 A. From what I could tell, yes.

18 Q. Did you examine the
19 samples -- you examined the samples
20 visually before they were dissolved;
21 right?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Did you examine them under a
24 microscope?

25 A. Yes.

1 Walter J. Rantanen, II

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Now, here you're noting that
4 the paper contains optical brightening
5 agents, chemicals used to whiten it;
6 right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. What does strong mean?

9 A. It came up brightly on
10 the -- with the -- when you put the
11 lamp over there, it -- basically if
12 you've ever seen it, it lights up. To
13 me it lit up strongly.

14 Q. And your report indicates
15 strong UV fluorescence in both samples;
16 right?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. No indication that the
19 fluorescence differs across the samples
20 or from front to back or anything like
21 that; right?

22 A. I didn't -- I didn't notice
23 any detectable difference.

24 Q. In your third sentence you
25 report, "In the small punch outs

1 Walter J. Rantanen, II

2 significant fluorescence differences
3 were not detected"; right?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. You say you didn't observe
6 any significant fluorescence
7 differences. Did you observe any?

8 A. There may have been some
9 slight appearance, but I -- to me that
10 may not have been. It -- when you're
11 dealing with little, little pieces like
12 that it's hard to get a good comparison
13 on -- on some of them.

14 Q. Right. And as I think
15 you've testified repeatedly today, you
16 didn't observe any difference in the UV
17 characteristics across the samples
18 front to back, one to the other?

19 A. Not that I could detect, no.

20 Q. Right. Now, you also noted
21 that significant differences were not
22 detected, quote, in the small punch
23 outs. Now, that -- it seems like a
24 sensible limitation because obviously
25 those punch outs came from only certain