

# EXHIBIT 3

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

3 EDWARD CARRINGTON, et al., )  
4 Plaintiffs, )  
5 vs. ) Civil Action  
6 DUKE UNIVERSITY, et al., ) No. 1:08-CV-00119  
7 Defendants. )

-----x

8  
9  
10 \*Contains Confidential Portion\*

11 VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF

12 CHRISTOPHER TKAC

13 (Taken by Defendants)

14 July 20, 2012

15 New York, New York  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 Q. Right.

2 A. No. Or specifically addressed to other  
3 employers, no.

4 Q. Right. Like, for example, CPL 5 is  
5 addressed to Peter Carroll. You don't contend that  
6 reflects any amount that you were invoiced by Mr.  
7 Ekstrand; right?

8 A. No. I don't know. I would have to go  
9 through this again with Ekstrand & Ekstrand and my  
10 counsel because we do share the same pro rata invoice  
11 1 and 2, and I just -- I'm not -- I'm not positive  
12 right now.

13 Q. And in any event, you would defer to  
14 Mr. Ekstrand on which fees are attributable to having  
15 the subpoenas quashed?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. All right.

18 MR. SEGARS: I ask the court reporter to  
19 mark this as 14.

20 (Tkac Exhibit 14, Plaintiffs' Initial  
21 Disclosures Pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1), marked  
22 for identification, as of this date.)

23 Q. Have you ever seen Exhibit 14 before?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Okay.