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COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(Jury in.)
THE COURT: Please be seated.
Sorry, Ladies and Gentlemen. There's a
lot of up and down in here.
If you recall at the beginning of the
trial, $I$ gave you some instructions and said that
sometimes that I'd have to take up some matters outside
of your presence. And the reason that we do it that way
is so we don't waste a lot of your time in court bench
conferences, if we can avoid it. We've already had one
of those, so that's why I mention that.

Let's proceed on cross-examination. MR. VERHOEVEN: Yes, Your Honor. I have some exhibit binders.

May I approach and pass those out?
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Don't worry; I don't
intend to use all these exhibits, so it's not going to
take that long. This is for the witness.
May I proceed?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MICHAEL DEAN, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, PREVIOUSLY SWORN CROSS-EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)

BY MR. VERHOEVEN:
Q. Mr. Dean, you used to be Vice President of a company called CFN Financial Services, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What was CFN Financial Services?
A. It was a mortgage broker construction lender.
Q. What was your position there?
A. I managed the loan side of it.
Q. And what were your responsibilities? Could you describe them to the jury, please?
A. I was the broker for CFN Financial Services, and CFN arranged loans for contractors and developers and then sold those loans to private money lenders.
Q. And you were Vice President of CFN for about ten years; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You were in charge of dealing with borrowers?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, isn't it true, Mr. Dean, that in or about March of 1996 -- let me withdraw the question.

Where were you -- where were you living when you had this job at CFN?
A. Santa Cruz, California.
Q. California?
A. Yes.
Q. Isn't it true that in about March of 1996, the California Deputy Real Estate Commissioner filed an accusation against you and your company, CFN Financial Services?
A. Yes.
Q. And you personally were accused of accepting or receiving trust funds from lenders or investors in connection with mortgage loans and of depositing the trust funds into bank accounts without authorization?
A. Yes.
Q. And diverting those funds?
A. Yes.
Q. And isn't it true, sir, that in response to
that you filed a stipulation?
A. Yes.
Q. And isn't it true, sir, that in that stipulation, you admitted that you accepted or received trust funds from lenders or investors in connection with mortgage loans, and that you withdrew, diverted, or dispersed those funds from those trust accounts?
A. Yes.
Q. After that, did you cease being Vice President of CFN?
A. Yes.
Q. When was that approximately?
A. I believe that was 1994 -- '94.
Q. Then you subsequently moved to Dallas in '97?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you move to Dallas?
A. We moved to Dallas to -- we were in San Francisco, and the phones were ringing off the hook with our East Coast clients, et cetera. So we moved to be more centrally located.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Your Honor, may $I$ briefly approach the bench?

THE COURT: Yes.
(Bench conference.)
MR. VERHOEVEN: I think the evidence
shows that that's not why he moved to Dallas. Do you
want me to stop and --

THE COURT: I've given you as much
latitude as I'm giving you on this. Let's move on to something else, okay?

MR. VERHOEVEN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
(Bench conference concluded.)
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) You might want to move your mic a little closer. Justin tells me it's a little hard to hear over there.
A. Sorry.
Q. I'd like to switch subjects now, Mr. Dean, and talk about the conception of your invention.
A. Yes.
Q. You conceived of the inventions claimed in all of the asserted claims in the '025 patent by April 30th, 1998, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it correct that you didn't do anything to memorialize any conception that took place during the 1997 or 1998 time period?
A. That's correct.
Q. So there's nothing I could look at, if I
wanted to try and corroborate and confirm that you came
up with this idea, and confirm your recollection of when
your conception is, is there?
A. I believe -- I believe during discovery, we gave you a variety of documents supporting our conception.
Q. Well, let's look. You had your deposition taken the same day, as $I$ said before, September 9th, 2009. I asked you that in your deposition, Page 63, Lines 16 through 24. I'd like to play what you said at your deposition in response to that question.
A. Okay.
(Video clip played.)
QUESTION: If I wanted to try and
corroborate or confirm your recollection of your conception during this timeframe, is there anything I can look at that would memorialize it?

ANSWER: During the '97 and '98
timeframe?

QUESTION: That's correct.

ANSWER: Early '98?

QUESTION: That's correct, sir.

ANSWER: No.
(End of video clip.)

MR. NELSON: Completeness, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. NELSON: Let me ask the same question and let's broaden the timeframe to include 1999.

Is there any documentation or other -any other form of memorialization of your or Ms. Stone's concept that $I$ can find, if $I$ went looking for it?

ANSWER: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Proceed.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Okay. But my question to you is, your conception during 1997 and 1998. Did you understand that?
A. Yes.
Q. Not 1999. You've testified that you conceived of it prior to 1997 and 1998 , correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And I'm asking you, are there documents that exist from that timeframe that would corroborate your testimony that you conceived of it during that timeframe, and the answer is no, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Thank you.

Is it true that you can't identify anything in
Claim 1 of the -- well, let me back up.
MR. VERHOEVEN: Your Honor, may I move
this back over here again?
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Can you see this, Mr. Dean?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm going to ask you a question about Claim 1 of the '025 patent. I just have it here so you can look at it, if you need to.
A. Yes.
Q. Is it correct that you can't identify anything in Claim 1 of the ' 025 patent that you contributed to the invention as opposed to Ms. -- Ms. Stone?
A. No.
Q. I'm sorry. So you can't -- that is correct, you cannot identify anything that you contributed as opposed to Ms. Stone?
A. I cannot.
Q. So that is correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you can't identify anything that

Ms. Stone came up with in Claim 1 of the '025 patent that you did not, correct?
A. I cannot identify anything.
Q. Now, you testified that at one point you hired a gentleman by the name of Mohammed Hasan.

Do you remember that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. And you hired him for the purposes of helping you program the Virtual Cities product, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Remind me again, what was the name of that product?
A. Virtual Cities Reservation Network.
Q. And you hired Mr. Hasan because you were a fairly new programmer without much experience, and Mr. Hasan had a great deal of experience; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. You needed Mr. Hasan to help you finish the program -- the programming for your Virtual Cities Reservation Network, didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Hasan was working for you in 1998, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And he worked for you until at least 2002, correct?
A. I believe so.
Q. And did he work on anything else besides programming the Virtual Cities Reservation Network?
A. No.
Q. According to you, however, during those four
or five years that he worked on the Virtual Cities Reservation Network to program it because you needed help, he nevertheless didn't conceive even a single step or component of the claims of the patent.

Is that your testimony?
A. That's my testimony.
Q. Mr. -- does Mr. Hasan have a consulting agreement with either you or your counsel?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. You don't know?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Now, let's turn back to Claim 1 of the '025 patent.

When you filed Claim 1 of the '025 patent -when you filed Claim 1 of the '025 patent, there was no system or program that practiced every component of Claim 1, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you see the element up here that says the first interface?
A. Yes.
Q. Isn't it true that you never programmed Virtual Cities Reservation Network to have the interface for the different internet media venues?
A. That's correct.
Q. And is it correct that you and Ms. Stone never developed a media venue interface?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you never had a business or system that worked to incorporate inputs from internet websites and advertisers, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. You never -- you never had one, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And isn't it true that the Virtual Cities Reservation Network did not have a database for storing the presentation rules?
A. That's not correct. It did.
Q. Okay. Well, I'd like to take a look again at your deposition for the September 9, 2009, and let's play Page 61, Lines 23 through 62, Line 9 . (Video clip played.) QUESTION: How did that site deal with presentation rules, if it didn't store them?

ANSWER: When we -- we were applying the presentation rules manually when we -- when we wrote the -- when we took the information that had been given to us, we were then applying the presentation rules as we were building the presentations. So it was not driven from a database.

QUESTION: Did that site have a database? ANSWER: No.

QUESTION: It didn't have a database at
all?

ANSWER: No.
(End of video clip.)

MR. NELSON: Optional completeness, Your

THE COURT: Let's wait until redirect.
I'll allow you to get into that, okay?
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Now, you released the Virtual Cities Reservation Network -- maybe my choice of the word released is inaccurate, but you displayed it -you displayed the Virtual Cities Reservation Network in February of 2000 , right?
A. Yes.
Q. That was at a trade show?
A. Yes.
Q. And after you -- you attended that trade show and presented it, only two bed and breakfasts that you can remember actually used it, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You sent CDs that contained the Virtual

Cities' software to these bed and breakfasts, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you only sent $C D s$ to four bed and breakfasts, right?
A. I believe there were more, but -- but I can only think of four.
Q. Okay. You can only think of four right now?
A. Well, I'm not even sure $I$ can think of those four right now.
Q. You only sent it to a few?
A. Yes.
Q. And this was the final product you sent out to them, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And isn't it true that you had a great deal of difficulty with these bed and breakfast people operating your fine product, didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. It didn't work very well for them, did it?
A. No, it didn't.

Can $I$ explain?
Q. You can explain on redirect, sir.

In 2001 or 2002 , isn't it true that you
decided to give up on the Virtual Cities Reservation Network?
A. Yes.
Q. And since that time, isn't it true that
neither yourself nor Ms. Stone has ever considered
pursuing the Virtual Cities Reservation Network business again?
A. That's correct.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Your Honor, I may need to approach on this. I don't want to run into anything.

THE COURT: Okay.
(Bench conference.)
THE COURT: What's the issue?

MR. VERHOEVEN: He testified on direct that the virtualcities.com was very successful, and I would like to cross him on that by asking -- by inquiring into him that he sold or established the fact that he sold Virtual Cities for $\$ 4,000$ to Ms. Stone's brother-in-law, and then bought it back a few years later for $\$ 4,000$. It rebuts the notion that it was a very successful site, but $I$ don't want to go into it if Your Honor thinks it's out of bounds.

MR. NELSON: He also said it's still in business and --

THE COURT: Well, I'm going to allow you to go -- you can go into that.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you.

THE COURT: He testified that it was the longest running website and all that.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Yeah. Thank you.
(Bench conference concluded.)
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Now, Mr. Dean, do you remember testifying on direct examination this morning something to the effect that the virtualcities.com site was very successful?
A. Yes.
Q. Isn't it true, Mr. Dean, that in 1996 or 1997, you sold Virtual Cities to a man -- to a man named Robin Pimental, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you sold Virtual Cities to Mr. Pimental for \$4,000?
A. Yes.
Q. And then a few years later, 2003 or 4,
Ms. Stone bought Virtual Cities back from Mr. Pimental,
right?
A. Yes.
Q. And she paid $\$ 4,000$, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Isn't it true that you never used Virtual

Cities' own advertising technology to display ads on virtualcities.com, sir?
A. That's correct.
Q. So you have this great invention for

```
advertising, and you never even used it on your own
site. Isn't that true, sir?
    A. Yes.
    Q. You did use some advertising technology on the
Virtual Cities' site, though, didn't you?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And what you did use is you used Google's
    technology to display ads on your website for Virtual
    Cities, didn't you, sir?
    A. Yes.
    Q. All right. Let's take another look at Claim 1
of the '025 patent.
                            MR. VERHOEVEN: I think we can put it on
a chair here so we don't have to keep pulling that easel
out, if that's okay.
                            That's not going to work.
                            I apologize, Your Honor. It's a very
heavy easel. It takes a few minutes to -- we'll try to
get a lighter one in tomorrow.
                    All right. Put Claim 1 of the '025
patent up again.
    Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Okay. Now, you see the
    preamble up here, sir?
            A. Yes.
            Q. I don't know if you can read that.
```

A computer system for creating and publishing customized electronic advertisements for a seller to internet media venues owned or controlled by other than the seller.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, before you began working on your patents, networks of computers were well-known in the industry, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You didn't invent the idea of using a computer to both create and publish electronic advertising, did you, sir?
A. I'm sorry. What's the question again?
Q. Do you think you invented the idea of using a computer to both create and publish in electronic advertising?
A. No.
Q. Now, let's look at the first element. The first interface to the computer system through which each of the internet media venues is prompted to input presentation rules for the internet media venue for displaying electronic advertisements on the internet media venue.

Now, you would agree with me, sir, that software interfaces were known before your work on the '025 patent; isn't that true?
A. Yes.
Q. And self-serve interfaces where a user could interact with the software were well-known before your work on the '025 patent, weren't they, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. For example, text entry boxes as part of the software component of an interface were known before your work on the '025 patent; isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. The idea of interfaces that prompt users for inputting information to a computer system, that was known before your work on the '025 patent, wasn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, the hardware for actually doing the input was known before your work on the '025 patent, wasn't it, sir?
A. Hardware?
Q. The hardware for actually doing the input, that was also known before your work on the '025 patent, wasn't it?
A. Our '025 patent is a software program with a software interface. The hardware your -- I'm sorry. I don't understand.
Q. Well, let's -- when I asked you this question at your deposition, you understood it, so let me play -THE COURT: Well, let's try to rephrase it.

MR. VERHOEVEN: I will, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Tell them what you mean by hardware.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Well, this software works with hardware, doesn't it, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And the software has to have hardware, doesn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And the hardware that would be used to actually do the input, that was known before your work on the '025 patent, wasn't it, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, let's go to the next element right there, first database. Do you see it?
A. Yes.
Q. It says a first database storing the presentation rules input by the internet media venues through the first interface.

Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, databases were known before your work on the '025 patent, weren't they, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's go to the next element. This one talks about a second interface right there.

Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And I'll read it for the record.

A second interface to the computer system
through which a seller is prompted to input information to select one or more of the internet media venues and prompted to input information to create an electronic advertisement for publication to the selected internet media venues.
A. Yes.
Q. So sometimes we refer to this as the seller interface, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Because that's in your patent; that's where the seller comes in and puts in his or her ads, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you didn't consider seller interfaces to be new or unique when you had your idea for the patent, did you, sir?
A. By themselves, no.
Q. So you did not consider seller interfaces to be new or unique when you had your idea for the patent, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you did not consider internet advertising to be new or unique at the time you had your idea for the patent either, did you?
A. $\quad \mathrm{No}$.
Q. There were people out there doing internet advertising before, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you don't know whether the concept of a website that listed two or more media venues which a seller could choose to advertise on was new or unique, did you?
A. I'm sorry. Say that again.
Q. You don't know -- you aren't sure whether the concept of a website that listed two or more media venues which a seller could choose to advertise on was new or unique before you came up with your invention, do you?
A. I don't know.
Q. Would you agree with me that the concept of an advertiser advertising on multiple media venues was not something that was new or unique during this timeframe?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you please read the element that begins computer controller to yourself? That's the last one down here.
A. (Complies.)

Okay.
Q. You got it?

Computer controller, this is what we talked about, the processing and publishing.
A. Yes.
Q. Are you with me?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, computer controllers were well-known before the '025 patent, weren't they, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And you would agree with me that a central controller that publishes a single advertisement is certainly not something that would be new or unique prior to your invention, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you would agree with me that a central controller that published multiple advertisements was not something that was new or unique prior to your invention?
A. Yes.
Q. So a central controller that processes -processes and publishes electronic advertisements on the internet, that was around before your invention, wasn't it, sir?
A. I'm sorry. Say that again.
Q. A central controller?
A. A computer controller?
Q. I'm sorry. I misspoke. Thank you.

A computer controller that processes and publishes multiple advertisements for internet advertising, that was around before you came up with your invention, wasn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. You didn't consider that the publication of advertisements on the internet was something that was new or unique, did you?
A. No.
Q. And you would agree with me that the concept of a website serving as a media venue with presentation rules for advertisers, that that was not something that was new or unique prior to the time that you came up with your invention?
A. No.
Q. You agree with me, right?
A. I agree with you.
Q. Now, I believe you testified on your direct examination that no one had ever come up with the automated centralized system that you came up with before.
A. Yes.
Q. Did I hear that right?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Okay. Have you ever heard of Doubleclick?
A. Yes.
Q. You're aware of a system called Doubleclick?
A. Superficially, yes.
Q. You became aware of DoubleClick in at least 2001, right?
A. Just from a name standpoint.
Q. You became aware of a company called

DoubleClick by at least 2001, right?
MR. NELSON: Can we approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.
(Bench conference.)
MR. NELSON: This is -- I've let some of
this stuff go by, but this is clearly on the edge, if not over the line, on trying to say that he's committing fraud on the Patent Office, and, in fact, he's using the same quote that he's taken out of context that he had and we put it out for summary judgment motion on

Doubleclick.
THE COURT: He can testify or he can ask whether he's aware of the system and whether he disclosed it to the Patent Office, but beyond that, we're not going to go there.

MR. VERHOEVEN: I have no intention of going there.

THE COURT: That's the limit as to what you can do, but $I$ think he's entitled to ask those questions. Let's move on.
(Bench conference concluded.)
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Now, just to pick up the flow here before the interruption, I think I asked you if you became aware of that Doubleclick by at least 2001, right?
A. Superficially, yes.
Q. You became aware of the entity called --

THE COURT: Well, let's move on.
MR. VERHOEVEN: Move on, okay.
THE COURT: He's answered the question.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) You understood that agencies who wanted to advertise on the internet could sign up with DoubleClick, and then DoubleClick would serve banner ads, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you understood that DoubleClick would publish those banner ads on multiple media venues, didn't you, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And the agencies who advertised on

Doubleclick, they were third-party professionals, right?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Well --

MR. VERHOEVEN: Your Honor, I'd like to play from his deposition dated September 10th, 2009, if I may. This is Page 272, Lines 8 through 12.
(Video clip played.)
QUESTION: Those agencies would be
representing sellers, correct?
ANSWER: Yes.
QUESTION: Third-party professionals?
ANSWER: Yes.
(End of video clip.)
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) So the advertisers or the third-party professionals would create the ads on Doubleclick. You understood that, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you understood that DoubleClick had presentation rules, right?
A. I'm assuming so, yes.
Q. Is it -- is it your testimony that Doubleclick is not an automated system?
A. It's my testimony that DoubleClick is an automated -- I'm not familiar with -- with the internal workings of DoubleClick, but, yes, it would be an automated system.
Q. So you admit that Doubleclick is an automated system?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you admit that DoubleClick was prior to your invention?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you admit that Doubleclick was not disclosed to the Patent Office?
A. Actually, I'm not sure whether they were prior to our invention.
Q. So you don't know one way or the other?
A. No.
Q. Would you admit that Doubleclick was not disclosed to the Patent Office in the prosecution of your patents, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. The Patent Office didn't know about

DoubleClick when it was looking at your patents did it, sir?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now - -
A. Excuse me. Can I clarify that?

THE COURT: Yes.
A. Doubleclick is not cited in the patents. I don't know what the Examiner was aware of.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Did you know that everything the Examiner looks at gets listed on the face of the patent? Did you hear His Honor tell the jury that?
A. I believe it's a case of everything that the Examiner believes is pertinent to the -- to the technology.
Q. Is listed on the face of the patent?
A. Yes.
Q. And DoubleClick is not listed on the face of any of your patents, is it?
A. No, it's not.
Q. Fair to say the Patent Office wasn't aware of DoubleClick?
A. I don't mean to argue, but they were either not aware of it or they didn't consider it appropriate.
Q. Do you have any --
A. And I sincerely don't mean to argue.
Q. Do you have any basis --

THE COURT: Well, let's move along,

Counsel. He's testified --

MR. VERHOEVEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- he's not sure what the

Patent Office was or was not aware of, so let's move on.
MR. VERHOEVEN: Yes, Your Honor.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) So going back to your
testimony on direct that no one had created this automated system before, let me ask you another question.

You're aware of AdForce, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you became aware of AdForce in April of 2006, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And in April of 2006, you understood that AdForce was an internet advertising site, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you know whether AdForce existed prior to your invention?
A. I have no idea.
Q. Do you know whether AdForce was a fully automated system?
A. In 1996, I'm not sure that $I$ knew anything more than just the name then.
Q. You didn't even know how it worked?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Okay. Mr. Dean, are you familiar with an advertising system called Overture?
A. Yes.
Q. Overture was a search engine where a user would type in a key word?
A. Yes.
Q. And when the user typed in a search word, search results would appear, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And search results would be from advertisers, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the advertisers, they would pay Overture for placement, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And these are internet advertisers, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So if an advertiser paid enough, the advertiser would become high on the list of responses in response to key word searches by internet users, right?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. That's how Overture worked basically?
A. I believe so.
Q. These search results, they consisted of a oneto two-line description and a link to the advertiser's site, right?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. The advertisers created that link and submitted it to Overture, right?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Let's play your deposition testimony from September 10th, 2009, Page 320, Lines 20 to 23, please.
(Video clip played.)
QUESTION: You understood in September of 2004 that the advertiser created the link and submitted it to Overture?

ANSWER: Yes.
(End of video clip.)
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) The advertisers had also created a one- to two-line description and submitted that to Overture, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, Mr. Dean, you understood in 2004 that Overture did not allow advertisers to select particular media venues in which to have their ads published, didn't you?
A. I'm sorry. Ask that -- repeat that, please.
Q. Yes.

Mr. Dean, you understood in 2004 that Overture did not allow advertisers to select particular media venues in which to have their ads published, didn't you?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. In September of 2004 , let me try -- I think I may have misspoke on my question, and I apologize. Let me try it again.

In September of 2004, did you understand that Overture allowed advertisers to select particular media venues in which to have their ads published?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. You're not sure?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Let's go to --
A. As I sit here today, I'm not sure.
Q. Let's -- let's see -- we asked you that question at your deposition as well.
A. Okay.
Q. September 10th, 2009, Page 321, Lines 4 through 7.
(Video clip played.)
QUESTION: In September of 2004 , did you understand that Overture allowed advertisers to select particular media venues in which to have their ads
published?
ANSWER: No.
(End of video clip.)
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Does that refresh your recollection that as of September 2004 , Overture did not allow advertisers to select particular media venues in which to have their ads published?
A. Yes.
Q. And was it your understanding that Overture had a search engine and you submitted the advertising to that search engine, but there was no choice of media venues? Is that correct?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. Okay. Let me switch subjects now, Mr. Dean. I'd like to talk about the prosecution of your patents, generally.

First question: Would you agree with me that Ms. Stone's role in the prosecution of the Function Media patents was fairly limited?
A. Yes.
Q. She didn't help draft the claims of the patent, did she?
A. She reviewed and -- she reviewed the claims and reviewed all the prosecution, but, no, she didn't assist the attorneys in drafting them.
Q. Did she help draft the claims?
A. No.
Q. She didn't help draft the specification, did she?
A. The first draft of the specification, I did. And she and I would work on it, and that would -- that was turned over to -- to an attorney that we then worked on from there to get the final submission.
Q. So it's your testimony she did help draft the specifications?
A. I primarily drafted the specification.
Q. Did she help?
A. We collaborate on everything.
Q. So that's a yes?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Let's play your deposition testimony from March 16th, 2009 .

MR. VERHOEVEN: This is page -- for the record -- Charles, for the record, this is Page 83, Lines 2 through 3 .

Go ahead.
(Video clip played.)
QUESTION: Did she help draft the
specification?

ANSWER: No.
(End of video clip.)
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Can you turn in your binder -- $I$ have tabs in there, sir, and you can see there's DX numbers. Do you see those?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you turn in your binder to DX132, please?
A. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: And I believe this is in
evidence, Your Honor. May I put it on the screen?
A. My binder is blank.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Okay. I apologize for that.

MR. VERHOEVEN: May I approach, Your
Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Are the other copies
blank, too?
MR. NELSON: Can you tell us which one?
MR. VERHOEVEN: DX132.

Charles, let's put this up on the screen. And if you will, bring out the top half of the document, please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Mr. Dean, can you identify DX132 for the jury?
A. Yes. This is an interview summary in the
prosecution from the Examiner in the prosecution of the
'025 patent.
Q. Who attended this interview?
A. I believe myself and Henry Croskell.
Q. So this is an interview you had with the Examiner?
A. Yes. Henry Croskell, myself, and the Examiner, Andrew J. Fisher.
Q. He flew to Washington -- well, let me take that back.

The Examiner is in Washington, D.C., right?
A. Yes.
Q. So you flew to Washington, D.C., from -- from here?
A. Yes.
Q. So you flew to Washington, D.C., with

Mr. Croskell to attend this interview?
A. Yes.
Q. What did Mr. Fisher say during this interview?
A. I don't recall.
Q. What did you say?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Do you remember the substance of what you said?
A. No. We -- we interviewed all of our patents.
Q. You don't remember the substance of what you said?
A. No.
Q. Did you discuss any amendments of the claims?
A. It says claims discussed, claims of record.
Q. Do you remember discussing any of the -- any amendments to the claims during this interview?
A. I don't remember.
Q. What did Mr. Croskell say during this interview?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Did you take any notes of this interview?
A. No.
Q. Let's mark --
A. Actually -- well, I may have taken notes for Mr. Croskell.
Q. Were those notes -- do they still exist?
A. I don't know.
Q. Let's go to -- in your binder to DX133. This is in evidence as well.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Charles, can you put it on the screen and highlight the top portion?
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Can you identify this document for the jury, please, Mr. Dean?
A. This is another interview summary, and this is
in, $I$ believe, the '059 patent prosecution.
Q. So you went to washington again to interview the Patent Examiner in connection with what became the '059 patent, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So you flew from here to Washington with Mr. Croskell?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Can you please describe for me what was discussed in this interview to the extent you recall any of it?
A. Well, other than the notes here, I don't recall. I do note that they left Henry Croskell's name off of this, though.
Q. So you have no independent recollection of this interview?
A. No.
Q. You don't remember what you said during the interview?
A. No.
Q. Do you recall the gist of the interview?
A. It says applicant discussed in detail key differences between the invention and the reference Peckover.
Q. Okay. But beyond reading the document, do you
recall the gist of the interview?
A. No.
Q. Anything that Mr. Ade said, A-D-E.
A. No, I don't recall.
Q. What about Mr. Croskell; do you remember anything Mr. Croskell said during this interview?
A. No.
Q. Did you take any notes?
A. If I did, it was for -- for Henry Croskell.
Q. Do you know where they are?
A. No.
Q. Mr. Dean, you personally became aware of Google's AdSense for Content in or around August of 2004, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the reason you became aware of Google's AdSense for Content in or around 2004 is because Ms. Stone signed up for AdSense to put ads on the Virtual Cities website; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is it correct that in 2005 , Google was infringing your technology?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it true that in 2005, you had an intent to sue Google for patent infringement in the future?
A. In 2005, we were -- we took it to attorneys and we were discussing whether or not they actually infringed.
Q. Is it true that in 2005, you had an intent to sue Google for patent infringement in the future?
A. We were discussing with the attorneys whether infringement was in place and -- and whether or not we would sue.
Q. Did you have an intent in 2005 to sue Google for patent infringement in the future?
A. Our intent was to take it to the attorneys, discuss the possibility of suing.
Q. Let me play -- I asked you this question at your deposition, September 10th, 2009 .
A. Okay.
Q. I'd like to play your answer from that.

MR. NELSON: Your Honor, I'm not sure
there's anything -- if they're trying to play it for impeachment purposes, I think he gave an answer here, and I don't see any --

THE COURT: I'll overrule the objection.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) This is from the September 10th, 2009 transcript, Page 443, 17 through 24 .
(Video clip played.)
QUESTION: Did you have an intent as of
2005 with respect to whether or not you would be suing
Google for patent infringement in the future, yes or no?
ANSWER: Yes.
QUESTION: And your intent was that you
would be, right?
ANSWER: Yes.
(End of video clip.)
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Now, you never called
Google between 2005 and 2007 , did you, sir?
A. No.
Q. Never spoke to anyone at Google?
A. No.
Q. Never sent them any letters?
A. $\quad \mathrm{No}$.
Q. Instead, you sued Google on the very same day
your patent issued, didn't you, sir?
A. Yes, the day that the '025 patent issued.
MR. VERHOEVEN: No further questions.
THE COURT: Redirect?
MR. NELSON: Yes, sir.
MR. VERHOEVEN: If I could just have a
second to move this easel out of my way. Is that okay?
MR. NELSON: Yes, sir.
Charlie, are you ready? Are you ready?
VIDEO TECH: I am.

2 BY MR. NELSON: 2007. those.
A. Yes. that he asked you --

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

Q. Let's leave off actually directly where Mr. Verhoeven stopped your questioning.

In 2005, could you have sued on these patents?
A. No. These patents didn't issue until July of
Q. Now, Mr. Verhoeven spent some time, both right before lunch and after lunch, trying to catch you in some alleged inconsistencies, and I'd like to talk about

And, first of all, do you stand by what you said in the deposition?
Q. Okay. Now, he first asked you --

MR. NELSON: And could we go to --
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) He said whether you were programming. Do you recall that testimony about whether you were programming in April 1998?

MR. NELSON: Can we put up -- can we put
up that question on the board, please, Matt? It's Line 61, Page 61, and said --
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) And he said -- the question

MR. NELSON: And let's go down a little

1 bit more, please. Yeah, that. From 8 to 13, please.
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) Okay. Now, he asked you specifically about April 1998 and programming.

Now, first of all, this question is not the exact same question, right, because this question is talking about code, and the question that Mr. Verhoeven asked was about programming; isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Second of all, your answer was not as of April 1998; you specifically clarified that it was 1997 or 1998, correct?

MR. VERHOEVEN: Objection, form, leading.
A. Yes.

THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) Okay. Now, Mr. -- Mr. Dean, earlier in your deposition, had you previously explained when specifically in the 1997 and '98 period you had -you had come to programming?

MR. VERHOEVEN: Objection, leading.
THE COURT: Overruled.
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) Okay.

MR. NELSON: Can we put that on the
board, please? Let's go to your deposition, Page 29, Line 9.
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) And -- okay. So Question - could you -- could you read that aloud, please?
A. It says: And April '90 -- the QUESTION: And April '98 comes to mind, because that's when you started taking classes; is that right?

ANSWER: Well, I may have actually been taking classes earlier than that, but, you know -- and once again, this is 10 years ago, so I'm saying that, you know, late '97, early '98, was the timeframe that all of this was solidified in our minds.
Q. Now, was this testimony that you gave, was it almost right before the testimony that Mr. Verhoeven played to the jury?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, let's go -- right after that quote that he played, let's please go to Page 65 of your deposition, Lines 10 through 20, please.

Now, in this question, right after the clip
that he plays, you're talking about programming, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you see that that's Lines 10 through 17; is that right, Mr. Dean? Is that a fair statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Could you please read for me and the jury your answer talking about your programming?
A. My answer was: I started programming as soon as -- in fact, I actually started program -- started some programming before $I$ even started classes, because I -- you know, I started some of the self-help things just to familiarize myself with programming; then -then started taking the classes, and I -- and I worked very hard. I took -- I took almost every class there was at that college in programming.
Q. Okay. And, again -- now, he asked you -- and thank you, Mr. Dean.

MR. NELSON: And actually, let's go
higher up, on Page 64, please.
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) He asked you if you had been programming in 1998. Do you remember that?

And you said, I believe, yes, and then he played a deposition testimony out of context.

And -- and my question to you, sir, is, did you testify at your deposition that you actually had been programming in 1998?

MR. VERHOEVEN: Object to the characterization, Your Honor.
A. Yes.

THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) Okay. Let me rephrase. Did you testify in your deposition that you actually had started programming in 1998 , as you just testified on the stand?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. NELSON: Let's please go to Page 64, Line 7.
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) And this is, is it not, Mr. Dean, the very next question and answer after the completeness one that I read for the jury? Isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And could you please read that one aloud to the jury.
A. Well, there's -- there's various -- there's various databases and files, et cetera, that we were programming when we got started -- started programming in '98. I don't remember exactly which ones we're talking about, but we've produced them.
Q. Isn't that exactly what you testified on the stand just now?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, Mr. Verhoeven also testified -- and he said -- about databases, and he questioned your
recollection about databases. Do you recall that testimony?

MR. VERHOEVEN: Objection to the word
testimony. I didn't testify, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Well, overruled. The jury
will recall the question and answer.
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) Do you recall when

Mr. Verhoeven questioned you about databases and whether your system had a database?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Verhoeven said that you had testified
that it did not have a database. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. On the same --

MR. NELSON: Let's go to Page 62.
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) Is this the same page that Mr. Verhoeven was questioning you about?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay. Let's go to the bottom of the page, just a few lines down from what Mr. Verhoeven was questioning you about. Let's go to Line 22 through Line 60 -- Page 63 of the next page.

Could you please read that one -MR. NELSON: Just to Page -- the -- yeah. Okay.
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) Could you please read that aloud.
A. It starts out: Could consider. We actually have to -- you're right.
Q. Okay.
A. We actually have to clarify that, because from the standpoint of the presentations being stored, they were being stored in their entirety in a directory structure that could be considered a database by our broad definition of database.

So, yes, that site had a data -- had a database.
Q. Keep on going.
A. It's not -- it's not $S Q L$ access or anything like that or Oracle. All we're talking about is the -is the structure storage of the data that will then be served. So, yes, that site had a data -- had a database.
Q. Thank you.

And, Mr. Dean, you were deposed for how many days in this case?
A. I believe three.
Q. And, again, you stand by -- Mr. Verhoeven
asked you some questions, and today on the stand, you answered, I'm not sure to a couple of them; is that
right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you stand by what you said at your deposition at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you.

Now, Mr. Verhoeven also asked you, and he implied some things about some -- some conversion. What timeframe were we talking about when you had your job with CFN Financial?
A. I believe it was up to 1993.
Q. Okay. And, Mr. Dean, did you file a specific statement with the Commission explaining specifically why you did what you did?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can you please explain to the jury what happened.
A. These -- on construction loans, we would manage the disbursement of the -- of the funds. And many times you would have to -- there would be problems on the -- on the -- on the project or whatever, and you'd have to advance some of those disbursements.

I did that. I did that under the power of attorney that $I$ had representing the investors, and I did it solely to protect their interest, to try and get
project -- that project finished.
Q. Did you ever take any investor's money?
A. Never.
Q. Does real estate brokerage have anything to do with whether Google infringes these patents?
A. No.
Q. Now, at the beginning of Mr. Verhoeven's
testimony -- or excuse me -- his cross-examination of you, he asked you some questions and asked you to define some claim terms.

Do you recall that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know who is responsible for defining the claim terms?
A. The -- the Court is responsible.
Q. Has the Court given definitions of the claim terms that Mr. Verhoeven was asking you to define?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. NELSON: Do you have -- you can
actually go to your glossary. It's actually in the glossary of terms in the juror notebooks.

Could we pull up that glossary?
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) Now, Mr. Dean, I recall

Mr. Verhoeven asking you about internet media venues.

Does that have a definition, as given by the Court, on this page?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Okay.

MR. NELSON: Can we highlight that?
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) And can you read for the jury the definition of internet media venues, as given by the Court?
A. Yes. The term - the term is internet media venues, and the meaning is: Internet locations where presentations are placed or made available to present the information within the framework of the media so that it is accessible by the end-users, consumers, viewers, or buyers.
Q. And did the Court also define the word media --

MR. NELSON: Let's go to the next page, please.
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) Did the Court also define the word media venues?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. Could you please read for the jury the definition that this Court has given for media venues?
A. The term is media venues. The meaning is: Those physical or virtual locations where presentations
are placed or made available to present the information within the framework of the media so that it is accessible by the end-users, consumers, viewers, or buyers.
Q. Thank you.

Now, Mr. Verhoeven asked you about the sale of VC, Inc., to a particular person. Do you recall that testimony and what you stated?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. Did you recall the sale of Virtual Cities --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that -- that question and answer?
A. Yes.
Q. And he asked you about whether you sold it to a particular person.
A. Yes.
Q. Who was that person?
A. That was my brother-in-law.
Q. Uh-huh.

And did -- what was included in the sale of

Virtual Cities for that? Was it -- was it the URL itself?
A. Yes, and an agreement -- and an agreement that I would be able to purchase that back.
Q. Yes.

And were you operating your bed and breakfast website on other websites besides Virtual Cities at that time?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And Mr. Verhoeven asked you and went through some of the specific terms of -- specific elements of the patent Claim 1.

Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. What is your understanding of whether the claim has to be interpreted as a whole?
A. That is my understanding, that -- that any claim, you can't pick it apart piece by piece and -- and try to define what that means. You have to read the whole claim and -- and apply the whole claim to the conditions.
Q. Can you please -- I know you said that on your direct, but Mr. Verhoeven was questioning you. Could you please tell again for us and the jury what was new and unique about your inventions here?
A. What was new and unique about our inventions was the ability for a seller to go to one location, input information to create an ad, input -- also input information about where he wanted to -- where they 2 as raw text or nonformatted, just pure data, and have
wanted to display that ad, and have it -- have it input that information transmitted to a central controller that would contain a presentation generation program that would combine that information with the presentation rules and information from the various -from the media venues and would generate a customized advertisement that would be sent specifically to those media venues. That's what our invention was.
Q. Now, we showed a demo and a video of what you had done about the system and what you had implemented about the patent.

Do you recall that demo?
A. Yes.
Q. And we saw some features and places of the bed and breakfasts.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, is that equivalent to a seller putting in advertisement raw information into the seller interface?
A. Absolutely. That's an example of a complex ad. You can -- obviously, if you can do the complex, you can do the simple.

But that's an example of filling out check
boxes and -- and text boxes and drop-down lists and putting in raw information, pure data, no formatting.
Q. Now, Mr. Verhoeven asked you some questions about the operation of the Doubleclick system and the AdForce systems.

Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And, first of all -- I think you testified to this, but your knowledge of -- of those sites were -- I think you said superficial; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And is it fair to say that you will defer to the experts on both sides about whether Doubleclick and AdForce have any of the elements of the claims at issue here?
A. Yes.
Q. And with respect to DoubleClick and AdForce -let's take it one by one, actually.

With respect to Doubleclick, from what you know of, from your general understanding, is Doubleclick the same as your invention?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Same question for AdForce: From what you know, based on your understanding, is AdForce the same as your invention?

> A. It is not.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Objection, Your Honor.

The witness is testifying that he's deferring to the experts, and he has no knowledge.

THE COURT: Overruled.
Q. (By Mr. Nelson) Let me repeat that question.

From what you know on your personal knowledge, is AdForce the same as your invention?
A. No.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. VERHOEVEN: May I approach, Your

Honor?

THE COURT: Approach, yes.
(Bench conference.)

MR. VERHOEVEN: They opened the door on
this. Did you ever take any money from anybody?

There's default judgments against this
gentleman for fraud, and he's testified he never took any money from anybody. He's testified that -- that -that he didn't convert these funds for his own use; he did it for the benefit of them. That is flatly contradicted by all the other documents.

THE COURT: Well, no, it's not. He could
not have used it for his own benefit -- I'm going to stick with my prior ruling, because the testimony was
effectively within the scope of what the stipulation
was, and I'm going to stick with my prior ruling.
I've allowed you to go into it on cross, and I'm going
to -- but $I$ do not find that he's opened the door to go
any further than he's already gone.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Okay.
THE COURT: Do you have any other issues?
MR. VERHOEVEN: I do not.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
(Bench conference concluded.)
MR. VERHOEVEN: I have no further
questions.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you,
Mr. Verhoeven.

Okay. You may step down, sir.
Call your next witness.
MR. TRIBBLE: Your Honor, Plaintiff calls
Brian Axe by deposition.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. TRIBBLE: I have the times, if it would help the Court.

THE COURT: Well, why don't you give it to me at break.

MR. TRIBBLE: Very well.
THE COURT: All right. Ladies and
Gentlemen, recall my prior instructions this morning on
deposition testimony. The next witness will be
presented to you by means of deposition testimony.
(Video playing.)
QUESTION: Can you tell us your full
name.
ANSWER: Brian Axe, Brian Paul Axe.
QUESTION: And what is your work address?
ANSWER: 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway,
Mountain View, California, 94014 (sic). I'm not sure of
the zip, actually.
QUESTION: Are those Google offices?
ANSWER: Yes.
QUESTION: Can you just summarize for me
your positions you've held at Google?
ANSWER: Sure. Yeah. The next position
was the -- mentioned -- when I mentioned the AdSense for
Content lead, product manager lead. And I held that
from December 2002 until August of 2008 .
And then $I$ took a two-and-a-half-month
sabbatical, and when $I$ returned in November of 2008, I
joined the applica -- the apps group at Google and have
been working on our photo products.

QUESTION: Okay. Have you looked at the
patents asserted in this case?

ANSWER: No, I have not.
QUESTION: Okay. Now -- and publishers can publish ads via AdSense through an online interface, right?

ANSWER: Yeah. Publishers get code by which the code then executes and pulls in ad -- ads that are displayed to user.

QUESTION: But the publishers can use Google's system through an online interface. That's one way, right?

ANSWER: They can go to an online interface and pull code, which they put on their pages, yes.

QUESTION: Let's talk about the online users. How do they join AdSense, the publishers?

ANSWER: So the online publishers come through a browser interface that then displays code to them. They put in information. And they can pull code snippets that they then insert into their websites.

QUESTION: And who approves whether they become a publisher or not?

ANSWER: We have a mix of algorithms that look at the information that they input, as well as humans that look at different criteria, and then they're either approved through an automated or a manual
approval based on that flow.

QUESTION: But the automated or manual approval, that's approval by Google, right?

ANSWER: Correct.
QUESTION: Now, let's talk about the online interface.

Now, there is an online interface for ad feeds (sic) for content, right?

ANSWER: There's a web page that the publishers go to and pull information and look at reports.

QUESTION: Is there an online interface for ad feeds (sic) for content? Yes or no.

ANSWER: I guess I need more context.

What do you mean by interface?
QUESTION: Have you ever used the term
online interface?

ANSWER: Have I...
Probably. I can't remember specific
instances.

QUESTION: I mean, do you feel you can't answer the question yes or no? Is there an online interface for ad feed -- excuse me -- AdSense for Content?

ANSWER: So there's -- there's a web page
that publishers can go to and pull information. And whether that web page is described as an interface depends on if -- yeah. I don't know.

So there's a -- there's a page by which
publishers can pull information, both reports, as well as code for their pages.

QUESTION: I'll ask it again. Do you
feel you can't answer the question yes or no? Is there an online interface for AdSense for Content?

ANSWER: If I define interface in the way
that it -- let's see. So is there...
So there's a web page that people access
through a browser. Whether you call that an interface or not is -- is a judgment call that one could make.

QUESTION: Can you answer the question yes or no?

ANSWER: No.
QUESTION: Is there a term you're comfortable with?

How do people -- how do publishers enter
information into the AdSense system? Is there a form? ANSWER: Online forms -QUESTION: Okay.

ANSWER: -- feels like a term.
QUESTION: Okay. So let's talk about
online forms. There are online forms for publishers to
use for AdSense for Content, right?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: Now, the forms -- or excuse
me -- the reports -- you referred to reports being served up by Google for publishers, correct?

ANSWER: Yes. Yes.

QUESTION: That -- the serving of reports, that's a self-serve; it's an automated feature, correct?

ANSWER: Let's see, yes. We have -- so we have reports that are served when the publishers put in information.

We also have reports that -- for the larger publishers that we send out to the large publishers via e-mail and -- and Excel spreadsheets, et cetera.

QUESTION: But for the online users, those reports are served up -- they're self-served; they're served up automatically by the Google system, correct?

ANSWER: They are served up when a publisher puts in information without other human involvement, yes.

QUESTION: And they can enter in
information concerning the formatting of advertisements,
the way the ads will look on their website?

ANSWER: So they can configure the backgrounds, and now more recently, fonts, border colors, into this online form by which a script is returned that they put on their website.

QUESTION: And choose the color of the ads?

ANSWER: And choose the color of the ads. QUESTION: The ad unit size?

ANSWER: The ad unit size, yes.
QUESTION: Format?

ANSWER: Yeah. Can you describe format?

QUESTION: Length and width?

ANSWER: Length and width and size, yes.
QUESTION: Okay. Take a look at

Plaintiff's Exhibit 16. This is a page about AdSense published by Google, right?

ANSWER: Yeah. It has a URL here, so we believe that to be so.

QUESTION: And you see -- halfway down under products, do you see it says: AdSense lets you customize the appearance of ads to match the look and feel of your site? Correct?

ANSWER: It does say that.

QUESTION: You would agree with me that the ability to customize the look and feel of ads to be displayed on a publisher's website is an important aspect of AdSense, wouldn't you?

ANSWER: Yeah. So the ability to configure ads so that you could change the borders -the borders, the colors, the font size, where the ad appears within a site, all those things are important aspects.

QUESTION: And -- and you talked about configuring the -- the colors and borders and text and everything. That's part of the look and feel of the ad, right?

ANSWER: Those could be described as part of the look and feel of the ad, along with other elements, as we mentioned.

QUESTION: Google tells the publishers, if you want the biggest revenue impact for the smallest effort, we recommend optimizing your color palettes, correct?

ANSWER: That's what this statement says.

QUESTION: Choosing the right palettes can mean the difference between ads your users will notice and click and ads they'll skip right over.

ANSWER: That's what this says.

QUESTION: This is a page published by Google, correct?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: This is what Google is telling
its customers, right?

ANSWER: This is what a page on Google's site is telling its customers.

QUESTION: And Google is telling its customers that choosing the right color palettes can mean the difference between an ad getting noticed and clicked on and an ad just being skipped over, correct?

ANSWER: So Google employees who wrote this -- yeah -- specifically said: Choosing the right palettes can mean the difference between your ads your users will notice and click and ads they'll skip right over.

QUESTION: And that's a pretty important aspect, right?

ANSWER: So that's -- that's what's
stated in this document, and in my experience with ads and optimizing ads, the formatting and placement of ads are important aspects.

QUESTION: Do you know who at Google came up with the idea of allowing customization of look and feel by publishers for the AdSense system?

ANSWER: So I know that we've always -let me think about this. Yeah. I -- I don't recall who came up with the idea.

QUESTION: You just don't know, right?
ANSWER: I just don't know.
QUESTION: Okay.

ANSWER: Yeah.

QUESTION: Who was the architectural
person whose name you gave me with regard to the centralized system and the data centers?

ANSWER: Jeff Dean.

QUESTION: And let's look at the first sentence of the next paragraph. It says: Google AdSense refers to the online programs through which we distribute our advertisers' AdWords ads for display on the websites of our Google network members, as well as programs to deliver ads on television and radio broadcasts, right?

ANSWER: It says that, yes.

QUESTION: And, again, so the Google AdSense system, Google describes that as an online program through which Google distributes its advertisers' ads, right?

ANSWER: Yeah. It says what you first described.

1

QUESTION: And -- and it describes the AdSense system as distributing ads for display on the publishers' websites, right?

ANSWER: It says: Google AdSense refers to the online programs through which we distribute our advertisers' AdWords ads for display on the websites of our Google network members...

QUESTION: Talks about display on websites, right?

ANSWER: It says display on websites.

QUESTION: Okay. And Google is the one that distributes the ads that are displayed, right?

ANSWER: As we talked before, Google creates a code snippet which then gets put into the publisher's Web Server, which then gets executed by the browser by which ads are seen by users.

QUESTION: But the sentence that we're reading it says: Google AdSense refers to the online programs through which we distribute ads, right?

ANSWER: It says: Through which we
distribute our advertisers' AdWords ads.

QUESTION: And when it says: We
distribute the ads, the we refers to Google, right?

ANSWER: I think that's what's implied.

I didn't write this document, but that would be my
guess.

QUESTION: Well, that's -- that's how you would read the document, right? We refers to Google.

ANSWER: Through which we distribute our advertisers' ads.

I think so. I'm just -- you know, that's pretty comprehensive. There could be partners involved also with that. We have partners that help us display ads.

QUESTION: Well, when it says: We
distribute our advertisers' ads, do you see any reference to anyone other than Google there?

ANSWER: I don't see any reference to anybody else.

QUESTION: Does this appear to be an authentic Google e-mail?

ANSWER: Yes, it appears to be so.

QUESTION: Do you believe you received
this e-mail?

ANSWER: I believe so.

QUESTION: The -- the subject is the ASFE

UI -- separate word, UI -- road map meeting minutes, February $28 t h, \quad$ correct?

ANSWER: Correct.

QUESTION: And the ASFE, what does that

```
stand for?
```

ANSWER: I'm pretty certain it stands for AdSense front end.

QUESTION: These are the forms and reports that users use to use AdSense, right?

ANSWER: That's right.
QUESTION: And then it says UI. What does that stand for?

ANSWER: It must be user interface, would be my guess.

QUESTION: Does this refresh your recollection about whether Google refers to a user interface for AdSense?

ANSWER: Well, this is an example of where they use the term, yes.

QUESTION: So Google does use the term user interface?

ANSWER: It's in this document, and this is from Google, so yes.

QUESTION: If you got -- if you had a meeting with minutes sent to you every week from the user interface road map meetings, over five and a half years, that'd be -- it'd be over a few hundred of these minutes, right?

ANSWER: That's why I'm describing, is
that this is a format that Shirin was using, and it could have been a different format, a different description, a different team structure.

So this specific AdSense front end UI
road map meeting minutes, $I$ would suspect that it'd be less than the number that you're saying, and the title could have changed. Many times we refer to it as the front end versus the back end, so...

QUESTION: Didn't you just say the 250 would not be a bad approximation?

ANSWER: 250 -- let's see. So many core
team meetings of which there were weekly or monthly notes sent out, and different product managers would put different descriptions.

So I can't say that would be a good approximation of this specific line item. I imagine that if we look for other notes, there'd probably be a lot that were just -- of this potential weekly would have just been AdSense front end; AdSense back end. Different descriptions.

QUESTION: At any rate, as you sit here now, you don't deny that AdSense has a user interface, do you?

ANSWER: So one could refer to the front-end system as having a user interface.

QUESTION: Okay. How important is

AdSense to Google?

ANSWER: Yeah. In what -- in what
respect?
QUESTION: Well, let's take AdSense for

Content. While you were product manager, let's say for the year 2007 , was that an important product for Google?

ANSWER: How would you define importance?

If you define it by revenue, if you define it by --

QUESTION: Sure. Revenue.

ANSWER: -- users?

So by revenue, the majority of the
revenue comes through search, but a nontrivial amount of revenue --

THE REPORTER: A what?

ANSWER: -- a nontrivial amount of
revenue came through AdSense for Content, a nontrivial amount came through AdSense for Domains -- since saying AdSense is pretty broad -- a nontrivial amount also came through the direct AdSense online.

QUESTION: And nontrivial, is that another way of saying important, an important amount?

ANSWER: Yes. So was it revenue that Google or Google's management would care about? I would say, yes.

QUESTION: Would you say that AdSense for Content was huge for Google?

ANSWER: I would say that about search. I would say that about search. It's hard for me to say that about content.

QUESTION: You would not say that about content; is that right?

ANSWER: Well, $I$ could have said that, but if $I$ were to use my judgment now, I would say that it's -- it's been a good product offering in a good space with good traction, and it's been a good product for Google.

MR. TRIBBLE: Okay. Let's mark this as the next exhibit.

QUESTION: Is this part of the Google 2007 strategy review?

ANSWER: It appears to be so, yes.
QUESTION: And did you contribute to the substance of this report?

ANSWER: I'm listed as a contributor, so either this report or documents $I$ may have created likely were used in this report.

QUESTION: Can you turn to Page 15?

Do you see the first sentence where it says: AFC is huge, with 650,000 publishers, 2.2 million
websites, 4 billion daily page views, 13 billion daily
impressions, and about $\$ 5$ million in daily revenue?
Do you see that?
ANSWER: I see that.
QUESTION: Do those numbers sound correct
to you for 2007 when you were the product manager for
AdSense for Content?
ANSWER: That sounds about right.
QUESTION: When it says, AFC is huge,
that means AdSense for Content was huge for Google,
right?

ANSWER: No. It means the author of
this -- and specifically, I think -- if I were to
speculate, $I$ think it's Kim who wrote this, who
typically speaks in a bit of hyperbole, as described
here.
QUESTION: Kim Malone?
ANSWER: Yes.
QUESTION: What was her position?
ANSWER: She was the AdSense online
operations manager. When we talked about the manual,
plus the automated, many of her people were -- would
work on the manual side of the business.
QUESTION: Manual or online?
ANSWER: Well, manual review of mostly
the online.

QUESTION: Was she within your
department?

ANSWER: She's within the online sales operations group, which is not my department.

QUESTION: Okay. Did you get a copy of this strategy review back at the time?

ANSWER: I imagine I received this in e-mail. Whether $I$ read it in full detail, $I$ can't recall.

QUESTION: Well, you were the product manager for online for content, AFC, right?

ANSWER: That's correct.

QUESTION: And so on Page 15, if you had seen the statement, AFC is huge, would you have sent an e-mail to Kim Malone telling her that that's an overstatement, that that's just wrong?

ANSWER: Sometimes I would. In this case, I didn't.

QUESTION: How do you know that?
ANSWER: I don't know it for certain. I may have.

QUESTION: Why did you -- why do you believe you didn't?

ANSWER: Why do I believe I didn't? Because she's usually pretty responsive about changes that I ask her to make, and it would be changed in the document.

QUESTION: And isn't this a pretty fair statement: AFC is huge?

ANSWER: I think it's all relative. So if I were a startup company, I would think these numbers were huge. If I'm Google, then they're nontrivial. QUESTION: So you don't think \$5 million in daily revenue is huge?

ANSWER: So it's -- it's definitely a big number, and if it were 5 million for a company that $I$ was running, $I$ would be pretty excited about that. QUESTION: Don't you think Google was pretty excited about $\$ 5$ million a day in daily revenue from AdSense for Content?

ANSWER: Well, I'd say that -- yeah. I don't know how I can answer. So who at Google -- who would make that statement? I know that it was a product that was doing well and had a nontrivial amount of revenue that came up in many discussions.

QUESTION: You wouldn't call it huge?
ANSWER: Yeah. I just wouldn't use -- I wouldn't write -- I don't think that I would write that term directly myself.
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QUESTION: But somebody at Google wrote that, right?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: Okay. And this was an
internal document, correct?
ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: Internal document about Google's confidential strategy review in 2007 , right?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: Okay. This is an article from USA Today that we obtained online. Have you ever seen this article before?

ANSWER: Give me a moment.

Yes. I've -- this article looks familiar to me.

QUESTION: Was this circulated to you internally at Google around the time that it was created, or is this something you've seen recently?

ANSWER: No. This -- well, let's see.

So I think I remember seeing this possibly posted on one of the walls at Google in print form.

QUESTION: Posted on like a bulletin board?

ANSWER: On a bulletin board, yes.
QUESTION: And what's the date in the
bottom right?

ANSWER: Well - -

QUESTION: Is that the print date?

ANSWER: $\quad-\quad$ I think that's the print

QUESTION: Okay. That's --

ANSWER: Yeah.

QUESTION: -- the print date.

ANSWER: Yeah. That's why I was looking
for the date. This -- it doesn't seem to be in the document.

QUESTION: But you recall that this
article was posted on a bulletin board at Google back around the time it was published?

ANSWER: Yeah. It looks like -- the
article URL seems to have a date in it --

QUESTION: Uh-huh.

ANSWER: $\quad-\quad$ July 4, 2007 , which feels
about right for my memory of seeing this when $I \quad-\quad y e a h$, from the timeframe that $I$ recall this article.

QUESTION: That's your best recollection?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: Okay. Let's -- and take a
look at Page 2. I wanted to ask you about some quotes and statements about Ms. Wojcicki and AdSense.

could -- $I$ could guess at it.
QUESTION: Well, you were product manager
for AdSense back in 2003, right?

ANSWER: Uh-huh.

QUESTION: Yes?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: Was AdSense a really novel
idea back in 2003?

ANSWER: Well, $I$ know that people were not able to take ads at a very specific topic basis and find topics on web pages and match them, so I know that that was something that wasn't being done by others at that time.

QUESTION: So was it a novel idea at that time?

ANSWER: Yeah. So it wasn't being done by others, and advertisers, users, and publishers found value from them.
(End of video clip.)
THE COURT: Does that conclude the offer?

MR. TRIBBLE: It does, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Would you bring the
lights up?

MR. TRIBBLE: Plaintiff will also call

Angela Lai, a Google engineer, by deposition. Both
sides cuts together are under six minutes.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, we'll go ahead and hear the testimony and then take our afternoon recess.

MR. TRIBBLE: Okay.
(Video playing.)

QUESTION: Ma'am, could you please state your name and home address for the record?

ANSWER: My name is Angela Lai. Home address is 1190 Morton Court, Mountain View, California.

QUESTION: How long have you been working for Google, Ms. Lai?

ANSWER: Since August 2004 .

QUESTION: What is your current title?

ANSWER: Engineering director.

QUESTION: Advertisers are prompted to input various types of information through the user interface, correct?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: Now, the ads by Google that we've been talking about, say on flowers.com, these ads are displayed on the website, are they not?

ANSWER: They are displayed -- I -- we have -- we have been trying to be precise about that. When you say on the website, you're saying they're
displayed on the site with a particular URL that appears
to the user, and there are ads on the site that -- that
are rendered on the browser.
QUESTION: So is that your answer?
ANSWER: Yes.
QUESTION: So then it is displayed on a
website?
ANSWER: If you define it that way, yes.
QUESTION: And would you define it in any
other way?
ANSWER: So I think that -- I don't know
whether you're asking me the entering process, in which
case I think we need to be more precise about what is a
website.
QUESTION: I'm asking you just -- I
thought it was a simple question.
ANSWER: Yeah. I am -- I am trying to --
I am trying to understand. I -- it's just that we have
tried to be very precise about this earlier on this
display part, and $I$ think $I$-- I'm just trying to
understand what question you're asking me.
QUESTION: And I'm just asking sort of an
everyday Joe question.
ANSWER: Uh-huh.
QUESTION: And, you know, if my dad was
to come to me and say, you know, Jeremy, are ads by Google displayed by websites, or if he was to come to you and say, Ms. Lai, are ads by Google displayed on websites, what would your answer be?

ANSWER: So I would probably ask them, what do you mean?

QUESTION: Okay. So it's not clear to you what a website is in this context?

ANSWER: I understand you're asking me what somebody might ask me, but, I mean, you are asking me as -- as a lawyer in the case, also, so I --

QUESTION: Yes, ma'am. I mean, I am a lawyer, and $I$ am in this case, but I'm just - I'm just really trying to find out if ads are displayed on websites or they're not. They either are or they aren't, or you can't answer it.

ANSWER: I don't think I can answer that, because you're -- you haven't told me what is a website. A website on an URL, as rendered on a browser, ads are displayed on the page, yes.

QUESTION: So if I'm going to
www.flowers.com, is that a website to you, flowers.com?

ANSWER: Flowers.com is a URL. That's
the trouble that I'm having, at the same time, very precise about, you know, what -- what we ask customers
to input, and you are using the term website, and so I'm just still having trouble. People call website for different things, right?

QUESTION: So you're saying the answer to the question, whether an ad by Google is displayed on a website depends on how one defines a website?

ANSWER: Yes, because that question means different things, if you ask it differently.

QUESTION: Well, let's take a look at what Google says about this.

I'll hand you what's been previously marked as Exhibit 6. Exhibit 6 is a screen shot from a Google AdSense help file, correct?

ANSWER: Yes. And I -- I -- I just want to be clear, I am not responsible for Google AdSense at Google.

QUESTION: I understand, but you would agree with me that somebody at Google wrote this help file, right?

ANSWER: Yes.
QUESTION: And let's look at the very first sentence here. Under the bold headline, What is Google AdSense on Exhibit 6.

It says: Google AdSense is a fast and easy way for website publishers of all sizes to display
relevant, unobtrusive Google ads on their website's
content pages and earn money.
Do you see that?
ANSWER: Uh-huh, yes.
QUESTION: So Google is saying here, are
they not, that Google ads are displayed on publisher
websites, right?
ANSWER: So I think you are saying what
this page says, and $I \quad-\quad$ when you say Google says, I
don't want to say $I$ know what Google says.
QUESTION: I'm sorry. Did you --
ANSWER: This is a help page that
explains what AdSense does, right?
QUESTION: Right. And you just told us a
while ago that Google -- somebody at Google wrote this
page.
ANSWER: Yes.
QUESTION: And it wasn't, you know,
somebody without authority from Google writing this
page, right?
ANSWER: What do you mean by authority?
QUESTION: Well, Google allowed this page
to be placed on its website help file, right?
ANSWER: Yes.
QUESTION: And so Google is saying here,
are they not, that Google AdSense is a fast and easy way
for website publishers of all sizes to display relevant,
unobtrusive Google ads on their website's content pages.
ANSWER: Yes.
QUESTION: Do you have any reason to
disagree with what Google's saying there in its screen
shots?

ANSWER: I don't have reasons to
disagree.
(End of video clip.)
MR. TRIBBLE: That concludes that
submission, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Ladies and
Gentlemen, we're going to take our afternoon recess at
this time. Take 20 minutes. Be back ready to come in
the courtroom at 3:30.
Please remember my prior instructions,
and don't talk about the case. Have a nice recess.
COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(Jury out.)
THE COURT: All right. On Mr. -- y'all
have a seat.
On Mr. Axe's deposition, what amount of
time is charged to the Plaintiff?
MR. TRIBBLE: I have it here, Your Honor.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Mr. Axe, for the
Plaintiff, was 19 minutes and 32 seconds.

To the Defendant --
THE COURT: That's 20 minutes?
MR. GRINSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor.
To the Defendant was 11 minutes, 48
seconds, 12 minutes.

THE COURT: That's 12 minutes.

And for the other deponent?

MR. GRINSTEIN: Ms. Lai?

THE COURT: Ms. Lai.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Ms. Lai was 6 minutes, 5
minutes, 47 seconds, if you're counting.

THE COURT: Well, is that all for the

Plaintiff?

MR. GRINSTEIN: Six -- oh, I'm sorry,

Your Honor. Six minutes entirely to the Plaintiff.

THE COURT: All right. Be back at 3:30.

Court's in recess.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(Recess.)

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(Jury in.)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Call your next witness.
MR. GRINSTEIN: Your Honor, Plaintiff
calls Dr. Tom Rhyne.
THE COURT: Dr. Rhyne, please speak into
the microphone and please keep your voice up, sir.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Proceed.
VERNON THOMAS RHYNE, Ph.D., PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. GRINSTEIN:
Q. Could you please state your full name for the
jury.
A. Ladies and Gentlemen, my full name is Vernon
Thomas Rhyne, but as you just heard, I generally go by
Tom.
Q. And do you have a Ph.D. degree?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. All right. So $I$ will refer to you as
Dr. Rhyne.
A. Okay.
Q. Where do you live, Dr. Rhyne?
A. I live in Austin. I've lived there almost 30
years.
Q. Are you currently employed?
A. Not on a full-time basis. I'm retired as a
professor of electrical engineering from Texas A\&M
University, although I live in Austin. But $I$ do a good
bit of this expert witness kind of consulting work as
part of my retirement.
Q. Okay. I want to ask you a couple of questions about your resume. First of all, do you have a book of exhibits in front of you?
A. Actually, $I$ was provided with two big books of exhibits.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Your Honor, may I approach?

THE COURT: Yes.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Dr. Rhyne, I'd like to show you what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 91.
A. I have it.
Q. Can you tell us what that is?
A. It's the first page of about a 20 or so - 18 -page resume that summarizes my work experience and some of my technical background, the education that I've had. And at the first, it says a little bit about my family.
Q. I'd like to talk to you about your education first.

Can you describe to the jury what your education is?
A. I went to high school in La Marque, which is a
small town near Galveston. When I graduated there, as it shows there, I went to Mississippi State University and finished a bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering in 1962.

I then went to work for NASA out in Virginia.

And while $I$ was there, $I$ enrolled in the University of Virginia and completed a master's degree in electrical engineering in 1964. I was taking some classes on a part-time basis.

After several years at NASA, I took educational leave and went to Georgia Tech, and I finished a Ph.D. there with a focus -- it says electrical engineering, but my particular interest was in what's today called computer engineering using electrical engineering. I used to build computers, so it had both hardware and software in -- in my studies.
Q. What did you do after you received your Ph.D.?
A. I was offered an opportunity to teach at Texas A\&M, and I came back to Texas to College Station. And while $I$ was there, $I$ held a number of positions, including starting the computer engineering program as a specialty within the Electrical Engineering Department. I've also taught at a couple of other places. I was a professor -- I was an instructor at Georgia Tech during part of my time there. And I've also taught as a senior
lecturer, the very top bullet there, at the University of Texas after $I$ moved to Austin in 1984.
Q. What kind of classes did you teach at the University of Texas?
A. At the University of Texas, I taught two graduate classes in what's called the evening school. I was working full-time at a research company in Austin, and there are a lot of other people who work full-time at the technical companies there, like Motorola, IBM, Texas Instruments. And employees there would like to complete maybe a master's degree or a Ph.D.

So the University of Texas teaches classes that start usually about 5:30 or 6:00 at night. So I would finish my workday and drive down to the university. The other students would do the same. And most of my classes would be students who were full-time employees somewhere else, and I taught high-speed computer arithmetic, which is how to add, subtract, multiply, and divide real fast, and I taught computer architecture, which is the way you design the whole computer kind of from the view of the programmer, not so much -- a little bit down in the nuts and bolts and the transistors and stuff. But really kind of the external structure that the programmer sees.
Q. Now, you mentioned that some of your students
were in the industry -- excuse me -- in industry.
Have you ever worked in industry?
A. In my career, I'm about 50/50. I've worked full-time at a number of places. I mentioned NASA. I worked full-time for several years at Motorola in Austin. I worked about 12 years -- it's probably up there -- at a company with a really long name. It's called the Microelectronics and Computer Technology Corporation. It's abbreviated as MCC several times in that section of my resume.

It was a research company that was started by a bunch of other companies that are American companies who wanted to pool their money and some of their employees who actually moved to Austin. That's why I moved to Austin. And I directed an integrated chip design group there for a number of years. And the last three years I was there, I was the Vice President in charge of all the software development that was going on at that company.

In addition, every summer I was at A\&M. Almost every summer. I would move somewhere. I'd take my family and we would go to a fun place. We went to California; we went to Minneapolis, and $I$ would work in some industry there with the intent of knowing what's really going on out in fields.

And that way when $I$ came back and taught my students at A\&M, I had a better understanding of sort of the actual practice of engineering instead of just being overly theoretical.
Q. Dr. Rhyne, have you written any papers or written any books in the field of computer engineering?
A. I have. While I was at the University, I published about 30 papers in what are called archival reference journals. I presented a bunch of papers at conferences much like college professors do.

I also published a successful textbook that was adopted around 30 or 40 universities both in the United states and in the world, overseas. It actually won an award from the American Society for Engineering Education, and it was titled Fundamentals of Digital Systems Design. It was an introductory course on the basics of doing computer design.
Q. All right. Now, Dr. Rhyne, I think we've heard discussion that that case involves the internet.
A. Yes.
Q. Can you explain to us any particular experience you've got with the internet?
A. I have -- I can, I guess.

Actually, I started working with the internet before it was the internet. The predecessor to that was
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a communication system developed by the United States Department of Defense. It was called ARPANet, and that stood for the Advance Research Projects Agency administered out of Washington, D.C.

And if you had a research contract with the Department of Defense, you were authorized to be able to connect to that communication system. So it wasn't open like today's internet is, but it was strictly originally set up for people doing research under funding from the DOD.

And I brought ARPANet to A\&M. We had some researchers there who were doing DOD research. And then when I moved to Austin to work for MCC in 1983, we -- I sort of bootlegged off the University of Texas an ARPANet connection, and they agreed to let us come in through it because we were doing Department of Defense research as well.

And I've continued to do research and use the internet since that time. Also, I mentioned that I directed the software development at MCC. One of the projects that $I$ didn't actually direct but I directed all the testing of the results was a program called EINet. That stood for Enterprise Integration Networking.

And it was a business development program, and
it put together one of the first internet browsers. It was named Galaxy. It spun out and hasn't been nearly as successful as companies like Motorola -- excuse me -like Microsoft or Netscape, but it was an early web browser. And they also developed what's called a crawler, which is a piece of software that goes out around all the different places.

It would be kind of like having somebody drive around the town and look around and say where are all the restaurants. It goes out on this big network and looks for places that might have interesting information. I was responsible for all the testing for that for a couple of years.
Q. Dr. Rhyne, have you won any awards for your engineering work?
A. A few. I guess the two that I personally consider the most significant are awards that came from my peers in my profession. In 1980, I was identified as the Outstanding Young Electrical Engineering Educator in the United States by the American Society for Engineering Education. I was teaching at A\&M at the time.

And I think in 1990, I was selected by the IEEE as a fellow, which is the highest level of -- of honorary membership that that society offers.
Q. What is the IEEE?
A. It's the Institute for Electrical and Electronics Engineers. It's the largest professional society in the world, because it's international. And it's the professional society for electrical engineers, a variety of scientists who work in that general area, and also for computer scientists, although there is another society called the ACM that's also very successful and popular for computer sciences.
Q. Did the IEEE cite any bases for giving you the fellow status?
A. They did. They always give you what they call a citation. And mine says for my contributions to computer engineering and computer engineering education.
Q. And what's your current status at the IEEE?
A. I'm what's called a life fellow.
Q. How do you get to be a life fellow?
A. You don't die. If the number of years you were a member of the IEEE, and I date back to 1962, and your age equals a hundred, you become a life member. And they offer you the opportunity not to have to pay dues anymore, but $I$ usually do.
Q. Do you have any professional registrations?
A. I have two. I'm a registered professional engineer as an electrical engineer in the state of Texas
and have been since the $1960 s$. And I'm also what's called a registered patent agent.
Q. What's a patent agent?
A. Okay. I have to explain that often.

If you're an inventor and you have an idea for something, like Mr. Dean and Ms. Stone, it's a complicated process to go through all the back and forth and write all the papers and file all the forms and have those interviews and things.

You generally seek someone to provide assistance to you. And if -- if you go to the -- to the United States Patent Office and take a test that they offer every year, if you pass that test and it covers all the procedures that one goes through to get a patent in the first place -- if you pass it and you're an engineer or scientist, you're called a patent agent. If you're an attorney, and I'm sure there's several in this room, you become a patent attorney. But that means you have either a science or engineering degree as an agent or a law degree as a patent attorney, and you've passed that test.

And I took it and passed it, I guess, about 10 years ago.
Q. Now, did you prepare a report in this case?
A. I've actually prepared two reports.
Q. And are you being paid for your work as an expert in this matter?
A. I am as is typical for all people who work as testifying expert witnesses. I'm being paid by the hour, an hourly rate.
Q. Does how much you get paid depend on what happens in this case?
A. No. I get paid exactly the same amount either way that this case turns out.

MR. GRINSTEIN: At this point, Your

Honor, we'd move to qualify Dr. Rhyne as an expert in computer engineering and computer science.

MR. VERHOEVEN: No objection.
THE COURT: All right. The Court and jury will hear his opinion.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Dr. Rhyne, there's been a lot of technical jargon that's already come out in this case, and $I$ just want to make sure we're all on the same page, so I'd like to do just a real short internet 101 . And $I$ don't think -- we're not talking about the claims of the patents. We're just talking about what the internet is, so can you describe to the jury what is the internet?
A. Let me take just a few minutes. It was
interesting. I was trying to think about it. If my mom
were sitting here, were she still alive, $I$ think she'd
be having a little trouble with some of the terms. My
grandson wouldn't be having any trouble at all.

But let's just start with the internet. The internet is this worldwide connection of computers and communications linkages. People ask who pays for it; kind of everybody pays for it. There's no particular agency that funds it.

But a lot of different computer facilities are willing to let communications come in, figure out what to do with them, and send them on. And so it's like a big spider's web of communications and computer equipment.

The next thing that $I$ think you've been hearing a bit about are websites. When the first development ideas came out about putting together this network, one of the terms that was coined -- actually, I think in France or somewhere -- was the worldwide web. They were using that spider web idea. And in fact, www is the term you see in front of lots and lots of addresses on the internet, and that stands for the worldwide web.

Now, a website is a place on the internet where you can go and see information, and it's -- it's
identified at the lowest level with a number much like a phone number. And we have area codes and, you know, seven digits here in the United States. Some places they have eight digits for bigger areas.

But sort of on top of that number, there are these terms that you can understand a little better. I heard the phrase www.flowers.com. The com means it's a commercial institution. We've got a lot of other little things that go in, like org for organizations and things like that.

But when somebody talks about a place on the web or an internet place, they're talking about something you can go and seek out and get information from. And the way you tend to seek it out is on a computer or nowadays on a cell phone.

You can have an application program that's called a browser, and that browser is a piece of software that knows how to go out onto this internet and look for a particular place or a location and bring it back and put it on your screen.

And typically, what you'll see on the little phone or the big screen like this is text and graphics and animation and maybe you'll get sound; you can read your mail; you can check your bank balance, all those kinds of things.

So we're talking about websites on the internet. And you'll hear some discussion in my own remarks about browsers, okay?
Q. Okay. With that behind us, let me ask have you been asked to provide an opinion on the issue of infringement in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you also been asked to provide an opinion on the issue of validity?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you going to provide that validity opinion today?
A. No.
Q. When will you be providing that opinion to the jury?
A. I expect to do that after the witnesses for Google testify about the issue of whether the patents are, in fact, valid over the prior art or not.
Q. And why are we hearing you on validity again later?
A. Because the burden of proof for validity or invalidity, as Google will assert, as I understand it, lies with Google. And my responsibility will be to do what's called rebuttal, if -- if after I hear those opinions, I have different opinions. And I will explain
those at that time.
Q. So this is part one of your testimony?
A. This is the part for which Function Media bears the responsibility to prove.
Q. And, again, just so we're clear with the terminology, can you describe to the jury what it means to infringe a patent -- the understanding you applied in this case?
A. I will be very careful about this answer, because the person who will explain to you what the law of infringement means is not me. It will be Judge Everingham.

But in forming my opinions, the way $I$ have looked at it is that we'll be looking at claims and somebody characterized the claims as a deed to a piece of land. Some advantages about that; there's a little bit of disadvantage. That's not always the perfect analogy.

But if there is a claim and it has a certain scope of coverage and somebody either has a system or sometimes you can have -- we'll see one -- a claim on a method of doing something that falls within that scope and they either sell or offer to sell or make or use that system or method, then as I understand the law, they have infringed that claim.
Q. And just so we're clear when you're discussing infringement, you'll be discussing the claims of the patent?
A. I will deal with the claims and -- and the meanings of the terms in the claims in relation to what I have learned in my study happens with the Google system.
Q. Can you explain briefly to the jury what's the difference between the claims of a patent and the specification of a patent the understanding you applied in this case?
A. Okay. I probably can do that quickly, because it's been done sort of a couple of times. But if we could bring up Exhibit 1, which is the '025 patent. I'd like to spend a minute or two just talking about it. I believe the jury may have a copy of it, but we'll put it on the screen.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Your Honor, may I
approach the bench briefly?
THE COURT: Yes.
(Bench conference.)
MR. VERHOEVEN: I don't have any problem with this witness' testimony, except I don't think it's appropriate for him to go on long narratives. This should be a Q-and-A process.

MR. GRINSTEIN: He's only said one sentence sofar.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Well, I know, but in the background he's been going on and on about -- basically giving a lecture without any Q and A. And this should be a Q-and-A process.

THE COURT: Well, it needs to be done in question and answer, but it's direct examination now. The first witness, the inventor, when he was going through that -- that software video that he had, did not proceed in $Q$ and A. But there was no objection. I'm going to give him some latitude to explain on direct, but, you know, when you get a breaking point in his answer, follow up with the next question.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Yes, Your Honor. I don't want to interrupt unnecessarily, or should I object if I feel it is going on too long?

THE COURT: Well --

MR. GRINSTEIN: You can kick me.

MR. VERHOEVEN: I'll kick you?

THE COURT: Object if you feel that it's necessary.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Okay.

THE COURT: And I'll get involved, but
follow the instruction.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Thank you.
(Bench conference concluded.)
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) So, Dr. Rhyne, I think you have in front of you the '025 patent. And can you describe for us what you see on the first page of this patent as it relates to your understanding of the specification?
A. All patents that I've had any exposure to, certainly recently issued patents, Ladies and Gentlemen, look about the same on the first page.

And if $I$ can do this, $I$ have a little tremor that I've developed in my old age, but I'll try to do this. There's the number of this patent. This is the 7 millionth, 240 thousandth and 25 th patent issued by the United States Patent Office since it was formed many, many years ago.

We'll refer to it as the '025 patent, just using the last three digits. It's already been done that way several times.
Q. What day was it issued?
A. It was issued on July the 3rd of 2007 . Just for your interest, it's always a Tuesday. They issue all patents in the United States on Tuesdays, kind of a historical characteristic that happened back in the beginning days.
Q. What do we see on the left side?
A. Okay. On the left side, we've got the United States patent, okay? And you can see it's been issued to Stone and others. You've already heard from Mr.

Dean. It's my understanding that you'll hear from Lucinda Stone.
Q. Okay. And then what follows after this first page?
A. There's some -- some -- some important information about when it was filed. This particular application was filed -- we need to go up just a little bit higher, Matt.

Okay. Right there.
Okay. This was filed on September the 30 th, but because of formalities at the Patent Office and the fact that this is a continuation, it actually has the right to reach back to an earlier filed application that was filed on January the 10th of 2000 . That's what's called the priority date, as I understand it.
Q. Okay. And then what -- turning away from this first page, what are the pages that follow?
A. Immediately thereafter, although there's an intermediate page with some documents on it, there's all these drawings. And Mr. Dean went through those, Mr. Grinstein, and I think he said, as is shown, that
there are 35 of these.
Some are system diagrams and some are flow charts.
Q. What comes after the drawings?
A. Then comes what's commonly called the written part of the specification or the written description. And you can see that it's shown in two columns. That's always the case.

And the columns have numbers like 1 and 2, and there are always numbers down the middle. So if I wanted to refer to that line right there that says related to automated media creation and publication, I would say that's Column 1, Line 15.

And we may do some of that as we go through, or it may have with other testimony.
Q. And what follows after this specification section?
A. Eventually, you reach a point where the claims start. And in this patent, it's on Column 64, which -and you will always see a sentence that says something like we claim, or if there's only one inventor, $I$ claim. Or in this case, they use the phraseology what is claimed is.

And from that point on to the end of the patent are numbered paragraphs, some of which will have
indentations that make up each and every one of the claims.
Q. All right, Dr. Rhyne. As part of your work in this case, have you had the opportunity to review how Google's products operate?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And what materials did you review to gain that understanding of how Google's products operate?
A. A large number of documents that were produced by Google as part of the litigation and also documents that were found originally on the internet.

You saw some of them being discussed during those clips that we played a little while ago for the depositions.

I've also reviewed the other depositions for other individuals from Google besides the two that we saw. I have studied the software, at least portions of it that has been made available. It's a highly confidential, highly valuable piece of property that Google has. I have looked at that.

And I've also been given the opportunity by Google to participate as if $I$ were an advertising seller. They gave me an account and let me go in and make an ad and put it in. We were very careful to not let it accidentally show up on somebody's website and
have somebody click on it and want to come buy something
from me.
But I also served as a publisher, what's
called an internet media venue in the claims, and
successfully specified a set of constraints on what I
wanted my ads to look like on my website. And then I
actually successfully got my ad to show up on my
publisher website.
Q. And after looking at all those materials, what is your opinion on the issue of infringement in this case?
A. I believe that -- that Google infringes several of the claims of the '025 patent and one claim of the '059.
Q. Okay. We're going to get into the specifics of that later in great detail. But let me first ask you about the difference between independent claims and dependent claims.
A. Okay.
Q. And so if we can, can we take a look at this first demonstrative. What are we looking at here, Dr. Rhyne?
A. This is the first claim in the '025 patent.
Q. And what kind of claim is it?
A. It's an independent claim.
Q. Why do you say that?
A. Well, you can see in the first paragraph of this claim there's no reference to any other claim. It sort of starts out on its own: A computer system for creating and publishing.

And that's what an independent claim is. It doesn't make reference to any other claim in the '025 patent.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Can we take a look at the next demonstrative, Matt?
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) And, Dr. Rhyne, this demonstrative entitled Claim 20, can you tell us what you see here?
A. Let's start with the lower claim, which is not, as I understand, it's not actually being asserted, but it's in the root from Claim 1 to Claim 20 .

And what it says -- you can see in its very first line that it makes reference to Claim 1. So it says: The computer system of Claim 1 wherein the second interface is the self-serve interface. So it's a dependent claim. It says to infringe Claim 6, you have to infringe Claim 1. And if you do, you also have to do this other thing. And then if you do that as well, you infringe Claim 6 . And then when you go up to Claim 20, it says the computer system of Claim 6, and that means you don't
even get to Claim 20 unless you infringe Claim 1 and infringe the extra limitation of Claim 6. And then you have to do the extra thing added by Claim 20.
Q. So when you analyzed infringement of say Claim 20 in this case, what claims did you have to analyze?
A. I started with Claim 1, and having found infringement there, as $I$ will explain, $I$ then looked at the additional limitation of Claim 6, and I found infringement there, and that led me to Claim 20, and then I looked at the limitation of Claim 20 on top of that pile of other claims.
Q. Okay. Let's get some more background behind us.

In these claims, I see some technical terms, some jargon, things like that. What did you do to inform your understanding of what the terms in those claims mean?
A. I did four things.
Q. Okay.
A. Okay. First, there were some terms that the parties discussed amongst themselves, Google and Function Media and their attorneys. And they agreed on a definition.

If you hear somebody -- and I may say it -- a construction or meaning. They agreed that this term is
going to mean that. And Judge Everingham agreed with their agreement. And so for some terms, we had what are called agreed-upon definitions.

As you might expect, for other terms, there wasn't any agreement, okay? In that case, they were submitted to Judge Everingham, and he came up with the definition, and he issued what's called an opinion.

And in that opinion, he went down other terms and said, okay, when you look at this term, this is what it's going to mean. And you have a glossary of the terms, I understand.

I think somebody made reference to it earlier today. Those are the summation of the agreed-on terms and the terms that Judge Everingham specified meanings for.
Q. So what are the -- those sound like the ways that the Court -- that the parties have defined the terms.

Were there other ways that you looked at for term meaning?
A. Yes. There were some terms still left over, okay? And the patent itself provides a glossary, a set of internal definitions sort of acting as its own dictionary.

If you go to Column 7 at the bottom of that
column, around -- I guess it's about Line 63-- there's a heading that says patent application glossary, and there are a bunch of other terms. And for a few of the terms that turned up in the claims, I didn't have an agreed-on definition, and $I$ didn't have a definition from Judge Everingham.

And a good example of that is the term database. And it appears right at the bottom of Claim 8, and $I$ used in that case the definition that's -- that's put right there in the patent as to what the patent meant when it talks about a database.
Q. What if you couldn't find a definition in any of those places?
A. I didn't have many of those, but if anything like that came up, I used what would be considered the ordinary and customary meaning to someone who is skilled in this art, somebody who understands computers and the kinds of things that we're talking about here.

And those were the four things that $I$ did.
Q. Now, the two patents at issue in this case, the '025 and the 'O59, I think as we discussed, issued from the Patent Office in July of 2007 .

So what is your opinion about how long Google
has been infringing the claims of those patents that you've analyzed?
A. Well, based on my study of the Google systems and my reading of the testimony of the deponents for Google and certain documents that provided timelines, I believe that the infringement that Google has done starts with that issue date of -- in July of 2007 .
Q. Okay. Let's spend some time analyzing the first claim in this case that we're going to talk about which is Claim 1 of the '025 patent.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you see that up there?
A. I do.
Q. And $I$ want to just discuss with you some of the general structure of the claim, what's going on in it.

But $I$ just want to be clear, when we're talking about the claim, we'll be talking about it later, will you apply the Court's definitions and the agreed definitions and those other things that you've discussed?
A. I did that in my report, and $I$ will do that faithfully during my testimony here.
Q. Okay. So what we're going to do right now is just a high-level summary. And I want to ask you, looking at that claim, what are the different entities that are at least discussed in the claim?
A. Well, the claim is for a computer system, okay? But it deals with sellers, which is one entity. That would be also what we would call advertisers. It deals with publishers, okay? But the way it refers to publishers in the terminology of the claim is as a three-word term: An internet media venue. And the Court's given us a definition of that, and we'll look at it.

But we've got people who want to sell
something, people who have the capability of showing an advertisement for that seller, and then in between them, we have this last part here, which is a computer controller, which is the computer system that takes the information input by the seller and what are called presentation rules -- we'll get into that more specifically -- from the publishers or internet media venues, and kind of munches it together to produce -- at the bottom, it says -- the very last four lines:

The electronic advertisement is displayed on each of the one or more selected internet media venues in compliance with the presentation rules of the internet media venue.
Q. Okay. And I want to discuss the structure of this claim a little bit with you.

This first part up here right after the Number 1, that paragraph, what is that?
A. That's called the preamble. It's just the introductory part of the claim.
Q. Okay. And then these parts that follow afterwards, these indented paragraphs, how are you going to refer to those?
A. I'll refer to those as elements or limitations. They -- they set forth what the claim covers.
Q. Okay. Now, as far as the preamble is concerned, you see it's a computer system for creating and publishing.

Can you just summarize what you've seen there?
A. Well, it's a computer system for creating and publishing customized electronic advertisements for a seller to the internet media venues owned or controlled by other than the seller. That's just what it says.
Q. This phrase, owned or controlled by other than the seller, what's that referring to in your understanding?
A. Okay. What's excluded by that is -- is when an internet media venue, a website, shows advertisements for its own company.

For example, if you go to cnn. com to check the news, you might see an ad down on the bottom for Wolf Blitzer's show, which is on CNN.

Or if you go to Fox, you might see -- I can't remember the lady who does all the crime stuff. They advertise their own products on that -- on that website. That's not what this claim covers. You have to be looking at advertisements that are put on a web screen when you look at it for somebody other than the person who's putting up the web.

So when we talk about flowers.com, that's a place where you can go buy flowers. But if they also show you an ad, for example, for people who make pretty glass vases that they don't make, but they'd like you to take a look at, because they'll get paid a little bit if you look at that ad, then that's what we're talking about here.
Q. Okay. The first element of the claim talks about a first interface. And I think first interface is a defined term in this case, but for our purposes here, can you just describe to the jury what -- what is an interface for purposes of computers?
A. Well, I've got a very precise definition for you, but if $I$-- if $I$ just -- kind of what you just casually say, it's a place where you can get into and out of, get information from and put information into a computer program.

It's software that lets you interact in some way either by seeing something or sending something in to the computer.
Q. Now, in the language of this first element of the claim, what do these internet media venues do at that first interface?
A. Well, the interface must prompt them -- and we'll talk about that word -- to input what are called presentation rules for how the electronic advertisements will be displayed on those internet media venues, those websites.
Q. Can you give an example of a presentation rule?
A. Sure. Color. I think in the opening Mr. Tribble showed you a UT burnt orange website. And to be politically correct, he showed you a maroon A\&M website. Well, that's a good example: Color. Other examples are the font. If that -- a typeface, whether it's going to be italics or exactly what the characters are going to look like, how big they are, things like that are what the presentation rules will be.
Q. Okay. Following the claim down to the next limitation element, what happens to this information once it's in -- input by the internet media venues?
A. It's stored away so it can be used later, and
the term that the claim uses is a database, and we'll deal with the specific definition that the patent itself provides. It provides a very broad definition.

I think I heard Mr. Dean use that terminology earlier for what a database is.
Q. Okay. This next element of the claim, can we call that the seller interface?
A. Absolutely. I think I've already heard one of the attorneys for Google refer to it that way.
Q. And can you explain what the claim says a seller is prompted to do at the seller interface?
A. Two things, okay? They're prompted to input information, to select one or more internet media venues. So it's information to select where you'd like your ad to go, if you can get it there.

And the second thing, they're to input information to create an electronic advertisement for publication to those selected internet media venues.
Q. Let's talk about the information to create first.

Could you give us an example of what information to create might be?
A. Okay. I think I have an example of that, if we just -- I just made up one, okay? If I'm going to be a seller and I'm going to sell caps, okay, here's
information to create an ad. It's not really an ad yet,
because it's not exactly the way it might show up on a
website, but it's just some text.
My daughter, who was in the advertising
business, would say collateral. It's just some words
that are supposed to relate to Tom's Cap store, and I'm
just hypothesizing that maybe I sell what are called
give-me caps, just little caps that might have a logo
for a football or a baseball team or a business or
something on them, and they're the best.
So that's information that will be used
downstream to create the ad, but it's been customized to
me because it's my got my name and my caps, and in
reality, it probably would have a website address where
you would click to go find out more about my business.
But that's what is information to create.
Q. Okay. Following along with this hypothetical of Tom's Cap store, what information to select might you be prompted to enter?
A. Well, an example is, let me pick a place I'd like to have it go. I'd like to have it go specifically to some baseball website that $I$ found, like maybe the sportingnews.com or something.

Or $I$ could put in terms that $I$ think relate to websites, sometimes called key words, where $I$ would say,
if you've got some websites out there that tend to focus
on baseball or tend to focus on football, that would be
another place $I$ might want to put one of these ads.
It would be worth my while to potentially
invest some money in having that ad show up and be
clicked on on those websites.
Q. Okay. Following the logic of the claim, after we have been at the second interface and there's been a prompting to input, what happens to that information?
A. It's stored.
Q. Okay. And then in the final element of the claim -- it's a long one -- but using the examples that you've already discussed, could you put it all together for us?
A. Okay. Well, what this says is that we've got a computer controller, and it's going to do two things. It's going to process and then publish the electronic advertisement to one or more of these places, okay?

And it will make sure that the processed and published ad is in compliance with the rules of wherever it's going to go up.
Q. And have we created a demonstrative to sort of show --
A. We have.
Q. -- what happens with your cap ad?
A. I did, okay? And I had a maroon one, but we decided we just don't have time to do it. So here's -here's where $I$-- we found a website that's pretty much UT-oriented. It's www.mackbrown-texasfootball.com. I mean, this must be where people who are enamored with the UT football team go.

And you can see lots of planning here. They've got the Longhorn logo. They've got a picture of Colt McCoy, the Manning award here. They've got all this stuff.

But then if they provided a space for advertisements to be shown, they -- let's say they specified a rule that $I$ want the headline for any ads put on my website to be in burnt orange text.

So if you remember, I just entered: Buy Tom's caps. I might have entered a headline Tom's caps, but I didn't specify burnt orange. I didn't specify that my return address here -- it's kind of hard to see -- but it's in green.

That's making my ad be in compliance with the rules that mackbrown-football.com specified to allow an ad to show up on their website.
Q. And just to be clear,
mackbrown-texasfootball.com, in the language of the claim in your example, what is that?
A. That is an internet media venue.
Q. Okay. Now, we've been talking about here this morning -- or this afternoon -- excuse me -- about Claim 1 of the '025 patent.

Are there other claims of the '025 patent that you're going to analyze for us today?
A. There are seven other claims.
Q. And we'll talk about the specifics of them later?
A. There's one other independent claim, and there are six claims that depend on Claim 1 , and one claim that depends on Claim 179, which is the other independent claim.
Q. But we'll get there later?
A. You bet.
Q. Then let me ask you some really quick
questions about the other patent in the case, the '059 patent.

And I think we've got up here '059 patent,
Claim 1. And just very briefly, can you describe how this '059 patent, Claim 1, differs from the '025 patent, Claim 1, you just did five minutes ago?
A. Yes. It adds what's called a third-party professional.

So the first party is the seller; the second party is the internet media venue or publisher. This is a third-party professional who will manage, create, and publish customized electronic advertisements.

This is someone who maybe is in the advertising business. They're not selling caps. They're not putting up a website for football fans, but they go out and find people who need help in advertising, and they say: Look, let me work with your ad. I'll help you get it up in the right places.
Q. And how do the interfaces in this claim differ?
A. There's a first that's the same as before. There's a first database the same as before. Second interface, it's a little different, and we'll deal with that. There's a second database that stores a little bit different set of information.

And then we come down, and what's new here, primarily, is a third interface to the computer system through which the third-party professional is prompted to input information to select and information to create.

There's a third database for storing that information. And then we hit the computer controller. So it just adds this third guy.
Q. Okay. Let's switch gears --
A. All right.
Q. -- and talk about Google for a second.
A. Okay.
Q. And let me show you the next demonstrative. Up here, I think we've got a picture that we've seen already today.

What are we looking at?
A. This is a website, an internet media venue, known as -- I think it's www.cheese.com.
Q. People who really like cheese?
A. It's for cheese-o-philes. I guess you would say people who want to know cheese by name and cheese by countries.

And so this would be a place where if you really, really, really like cheese. I mean, I've seen stores that are devoted just to cheese. I'm sure you may have. That's where you would go, to cheese.com, and it would tell you a lot of stuff about cheese.
Q. And what do you see over on the right side of cheese.com website?
A. Well, what we've got here -- by the way, this was taken right off of a web browser picture on a computer. This is real, okay?

You can see it says sponsored links, Ads by

Google. So the people who operate cheese.com went into
a relationship with Google, were accepted as one of the publishers for Ads by Google.

And you can see here four advertisements -that's called an ad unit in Google terminology -- that have been placed on the right-hand side as a result of this relationship between cheese.com as a publisher and -- and Google as an advertising facilitator.
Q. What Google software program did cheese.com most likely have used to enter into that relationship?
A. Most likely one -- and there are two terms that sound a little bit alike, but we've got to be careful: AdSense, $S-E-N-S-E$.
Q. Okay. And these ads over on the right side, what Google software program did they likely use in order to have their ads displayed on cheese.com?
A. It's another Google service called AdWords.
Q. Okay. Now, in reaching your conclusions in this case, which we're going to talk about, did you experiment at all with the Google system?
A. I did. I mentioned earlier that Google provided an opportunity for me to use AdWords and actually create and submit an advertisement and to use AdSense and actually enter publication rules and then have that advertisement show up on the website that -that I had used as if I were cheese.com. We just had a

```
different one.
Q. And did you record the results of your experiments?
```

A. Yes. We used a computer program that as I moved the mouse around and did the things on the screen, it actually captured it as a movie.
Q. And I've got in my hand this DVD, Plaintiff's Exhibit 24. Is this what you recorded the results of your experiment on?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. Are we going to be talking about clips that you prepared in PX24?
A. Right. We'll go into it and pull out little pieces that $I$ think will help me explain my understanding of how the Google system operates.
Q. Okay. What we're going to do now is start talking about the claims of the '025 patent.

And, first of all, let me show you this demonstrative. Can you tell us what this demonstrative is telling us?
A. Those are the eight claims that -- that I will be discussing.

Claim 1, we've already looked at very briefly. It's an independent claim.

I showed you that between Claim 1 and Claim

20, there's a claim that really is not being asserted for infringement. That's Claim 6 .

But we will get to Claims $20,37,52,63$, and 90, as 20 through 90 are dependent claims that depend on Claim 1 .

And then we will also look at Claim 179, which is a different type of claim, and -- and it has one -one dependent claim, 231 .
Q. Now, are there two main Google products that you have analyzed for infringement in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. What are those products?
A. One of them Google refers to as AdSense for Content. I think you heard it referred to as AFC in one of those demonstrative -- clips that was played a little while ago.

And then there's a second product that's called AFM, which is AdSense for Mobile Phones. And I will talk about it as well.
Q. I didn't hear you mention AdWords. Is AdWords part of your infringement analysis in this case?
A. Absolutely, yes, it is. It's just that Google refers to the system that uses AdWords for the sellers to input the information to create and the other information to select as AdWords.

But when they talk about the composite between the sellers and the internet media venues, they just call that system AdSense for Content or AdSense for Mobile. But AdWords is part of my infringement analysis.
Q. Okay. I want to start our discussion today about the AdSense for Content product, and we will talk about AdSense for Mobile a little later.

Is that okay?
A. That's perfectly fine.
Q. Let me show you the next demonstrative we prepared in this case, and can you just describe what the structure of this is?
A. I -- I had a table made to break out all of the pieces of the claim. And some of -- one of you said earlier to the jury that in order to infringe a claim, you have to infringe everything. It's all or nothing. And so this is a -- kind of a demonstrative aid that will allow me to deal with each of the pieces of Claim 1, and then $I$ will show why I believe that the Google system meets each of them.

And at the end, I will offer an opinion that because the system meets each of these pieces, it infringes Claim 1.
Q. Now, up at the top, we have what you described
earlier as the preamble; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. In analyzing whether Google meets the discussion or the definitions of the preamble, did you apply any definitions that either this court has supplied or the parties agree to?
A. There are several here that have either been agreed to or the Court has set forth. MR. GRINSTEIN: Next demonstrative, please.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) First, we've got a definition of the word publishing that the court provided. Did you apply that?
A. I absolutely did.
Q. Next, we've got a definition of the word seller. Did you apply that?
A. I read that thing, and I said, I can't imagine anybody that's -- that's -- other than -- I mean, it's so complete in finding every possible seller, $I$ was just impressed with it, and I did. I did.
Q. And next, we've got claim term internet media venues. Did you apply that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the internet media venue agreed construction starts internet locations, and then it says
where presentations, and it's got some other
information.
What is an internet location?
A. Cheese.com; mackbrownfootball.com.
Q. So is that an internet location --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that we're looking at right now?
A. Yes. It's what you see when you point your
browser at one of these websites, and you get
information that is available to you at that location,
that that's what the Court's construction identifies.
Q. Okay. So let's go to the claim chart we've
got here again, and the first term $I$ see in the preamble
is a computer system.
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you understand that there's any controversy
or dispute in this case as to whether Google operates a
computer system?
A. I think there's no controversy, based on
something that I've seen, that Google has said about
themselves.
Q. Now, in the course of reviewing materials in
this case, did you review something called admissions?
A. I did.
Q. And just give your understanding that you applied as to what admissions are in a lawsuit.
A. Well, in doing this kind of work for nearly 30 years, I've learned that in a litigation, such as this, each party has the right to submit questions to the other party, and the other party is required to provide an answer in writing that someone at that other party -some official will say, yeah, that answers -- is what the answer is.
Q. Okay. Let's look at the next demonstrative. And this is Function Media's Request for Admission No. 1 .
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And Function Media asked Google: Admit that Google operates a computer system that creates advertisements referred to as ads by Google.

And what did Google respond?
A. They responded: Google admits that AdSense runs a computer system.
Q. So is there any -- do you think there's any dispute in this case that we're talking about a computer system?
A. I have not seen it, and I think this shows why.
Q. All right. Let's go back to our chart of the words.

The next thing that the preamble talks about is: Facilitating the creating and publishing of customized electronic advertisements.

Have you seen evidence that the Google system does that?
A. Yes.
Q. And are we going to get into that evidence later?
A. You have to kind of work your way through the rest of the claim to see the details of that, but, yes, I have.
Q. Okay. And lastly, there's a discussion there that says: Two internet medias owned or controlled by other than the seller.

And we discussed this earlier, but just to be clear, is AdSense a product that is intended for sellers who don't own AdSense websites?
A. That's not the only thing it can be used for, but that's certainly - that Adsense for content, that's what it's intended to do.
Q. Okay. And going back to our cheese.com demonstrative, this is cheese.com, and these are advertisements.

Do these advertisers own cheese.com?
A. No. No. Like here, it's Pillsbury, okay? They're selling Totino's pizza.

If you -- if you -- $I$ can't read it, but if $I$ could, those little purple internet locations, which I would say is a return address, those are for businesses other than the business that operates cheese.com.
Q. So if somebody owns cheese.com, somebody else owns who's supplying those advertisements?
A. Those are the ads that we're talking about.
Q. Okay. Back to the demonstrative, what's your opinion about whether or not Google meets the limitations of the preamble of Claim 1 of the '025 patent?
A. They do.
Q. All right.
A. That's why I've asked to have a check put on this slide.
Q. Great.

Now let's talk about the next limitation, a first interface.

Again, in analyzing this limitation, did you apply any definitions?
A. I applied a couple of definitions that -- that have shown up in the glossary of claim terms.
Q. And our next demonstrative, the definition
there of the word presentation rules, did you apply that?
A. Yes.
Q. And the next demonstrative, a definition of the claim term first interface to the internet system, did you apply that?
A. I would -- I would -- I did, and I would point out to the jury specifically that it talks about software, as opposed, for example, to hardware.
Q. And generally speaking, what is the name of the Google software that you say satisfies this claim limitation?
A. AdSense.
Q. Okay. And who uses AdSense?
A. Internet media venues, to use the phrase of the claim, but what -- they're what Google refers to as publishers, people who operate websites where Google, if they agree to it, can place an ad.
Q. Okay. And how do publishers get access to the AdSense interface? What do they do to get it?
A. They go to an internet media venue location. There's several ways to do it, but one of them is www.adsense -- no, there's no www -- it's just adsense.google.com.
Q. Let me show you the next demonstrative. Does
this illustrate some of the ways that a publisher could get access to AdSense?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell us what it's illustrating?
A. Sure. I've got three here, okay?

This represents somebody who is going to get on the internet and go to that adsense.google.com, and they will see on their screen a sequence of information screens that will allow them as -- in the first place, to apply to be a publisher and then further to specify presentation rules for ads to go on their public -- this is what's called an application programming interface or API, and then on the right-hand side is something that Google calls the direct interface where you call up, if you're big enough, and you get a specialist at Google who will do your ad for you -- do your presentation rules for.
Q. And in your opinion, which of these ways to access the AdSense system infringe the '025 patent Claim 1?
A. Only the left two.
Q. So AdSense online and the API?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Okay. And those are what we're going to
discuss today?
A. Yes. I will not -- and I've carefully excluded the direct.
Q. All right. Let's talk about online first. And I think you just said this, but let me just get it clear. How does somebody get access to AdSense online?
A. They get a browser, and they connect to the internet, and they use their browser to go to adsense.google.com. I think you can also go to google.com/adsense. As $I$ say, there are a couple of ways you can get there.
Q. And have you seen any testimony in this case that impacts your opinion as to whether AdSense qualifies, in the terms of the patent, as an interface?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I want to show you a clip from the deposition of Google's corporate representative about AdSense, Mr. Jason Miller. This is Miller, Page 104 , Lines 11 to 16.
(Video playing.)
QUESTION: Just thumbing through these, can you see, for example, on Page 2, that publishers can navigate throughout AdSense interface using various tabs, correct?

ANSWER: That's correct.
(End of video clip.)
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Does that clip bear on your opinion as to whether or not AdSense constitutes an interface?
A. Yes. And -- and what Mr. Miller was looking at -- and I went back and checked this -- is a set of printed pages that show a sequence of screen shots that are called from the AdSense interface.

And when he looked at them, he agreed, as I believe is the case, that that sequence of websites, web pages is the AdSense interface.
Q. Okay.
A. It's the first interface of Claim 1.
Q. Let's go back to our chart again. And we see that --

MR. VERHOEVEN: I'm sorry. May I
approach, Your Honor, real briefly?
(Bench conference.)

THE COURT: Yes?

MR. VERHOEVEN: I just want to make sure

I understand the rules of the road. I mean, this --
this is -- they're playing a different witness's testimony that's -- is this going to be designated as -MR. GRINSTEIN: $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ testimony.

Under Rule 32, $I$ can use it for any purposes.

MR. VERHOEVEN: But is it -- is it

MR. GRINSTEIN: To allay your concerns, this has all been designated testimony to which you had a chance to object.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Do you represent you're going to put it in the record then or --

MR. GRINSTEIN: Well, it's 30(b) -- I don't think $I$ have an obligation. Under Rule 32, $\quad$ can use it at any time for any purpose. I mean, I can put --

MR. VERHOEVEN: Here's my concern.
MR. GRINSTEIN: I can put a transcript in the record, if they'll make you feel better.

THE COURT: What's the concern?

MR. VERHOEVEN: My concern is playing -playing witness testimony that's not designated, it's not going to be in the record, and showing it to the jury like that.

If he's going to represent that he will -- that these excerpts are going to be designated and played as part of the record, I'll take that, and it will be a double -- two-way street for that then.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Well, I guess I don't understand the difference between playing it for any purpose with Dr. Rhyne and playing it again.

THE COURT: Well, the court reporter is going to have it in the record. I'm not going to mark it as an exhibit, but $I$ think it will be in the record, is what I'm telling you.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Okay. And that's --

THE COURT: She'll -- she'll put it in
the record. And to the extent, she doesn't, I'm directing you to file the portions that are displayed to the jury in the record. And that will apply for both sides.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. GRINSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor.
(Bench conference concluded.)
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Back on this claim chart.

We were talking about the first interface. And what happens to the internet media venues at the first interface? What does the interface do to them?
A. I guess I don't understand the --
Q. I mean, is -- there's an action that occurs.
A. Oh.
Q. The first interface does something. What does it do?
A. In accordance with the claim, it is -- it prompts the internet media venues to input presentation rules.
Q. And what is a prompt? I mean, what does that mean?
A. Well, I don't believe that there's a definition for it, but the -- I've used a definition that was provided, $I$ think, by Mr. Miller, in fact, that it's an instruction or a requirement that says you have to do something before you can go on, okay?

It essentially says, by either an instruction or a request, to ask for -- something you do before you proceed.
Q. Okay. And what's being prompted to be input are something called presentation rules. And does the patent divide presentation rules into different categories?
A. It deals with two types of presentation rules.
Q. Okay. And these types are mentioned in some of the dependent claims; is that right?
A. They're mentioned in the text or written part of the patent, but they're also mentioned later on in specific claims that say that -- Claim 1, where the presentation rules include design or style standards. And then there's a claim or two that say claim 1 where those presentation rules include distribution factors. So at the highest level, you're talking at least the possibility of having either one.
Q. Okay. And we'll look at some specific definitions of these later, but can you just provide examples of what design or style standards would be and what distribution factors would be?
A. Sure. I think I mentioned earlier it would be coloring of various parts of the advertisement.
Q. That's design or style?
A. Isn't that the one you asked -- I'm sorry.
Q. Yeah. I was asking design or style first.
A. Yes. Design or style. It would be coloring. It would be size. Under certain circumstances, it would be choice of what kind of typeface you want to use. Things that have to do with -- we heard it earlier -the look and feel that the ad will have when it shows up on your website.
Q. What are some examples of distribution rules?
A. One of the -- I think the most interesting is a blocked -- what's called a blocked URL.
Q. Okay. And what is -- what impact would that have?
A. Well, URL -- I told you earlier that each individual website has like a number, like a phone number, and that's -- in a way, that's -- that's referred to as a universal resource locator.

And so a blocked URL says, I don't want
anybody with that particular website in their ad to ever come here. It's generally a way that you would use to block competitors.

If you were Nike, and you had a website, and you agreed to accept ads by Google, the last thing you would want to see would be an ad from Adidas that said, hey, don't pay attention to those Nike guys. We've got much better shoes at much better prices.

And so you could go in -- and $I$ think many of the publish -- most of those do -- and say, I don't want to ever see an ad on my website that has as the return address www.nike.com or something -- adidas.com. It gives you the ability to protect yourself against somebody coming in that you don't want to come in.
Q. Now, you say that you experimented with the Google system; is that right?
A. I did.
Q. Did you get access to the AdSense online interface while you were doing your experiments?
A. I did.
Q. And is that experiment reflected in Plaintiff's Exhibit 24?
A. That's one of the things that's in that video.
Q. Okay. I'm going to show you a clip from Plaintiff's Exhibit 24 right now, and I would like you
to explain to us how this shows that you're accessing an
interface and being prompted to input information.
And I'm going to stop you periodically and ask you
what's happening next, but can you please start and just
explain what you see initially?
A. Okay. It -- let's take a look at it, Mr. Grinstein. And it may be that we need to turn the lights down. I'm not -- I'm not sure.

You can see a yellow spot right here. The way this video works is, it shows where my mouse is, my little -- that little pointer, and it shows where that is.

And to be totally frank, Mr. Grinstein, I can barely read that, but -- okay. Up here --
Q. It might be on your screen. It might be a little bit easier for you.
A. Oh, perfect. Okay. Yes. Thank you. MR. GRINSTEIN: So, Matt, can we stop that?
A. Okay. Yeah. Let's just start over again. And what you can see -- and maybe you can help me. While I'm reading here, you can --
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Sure.
A. What I've got --
Q. So right here, what are you doing? You're
entering something?
A. I'm entering the e-mail address of my mock publisher and the password that we assigned when we established that account as a Google publisher.
Q. Okay. Now you're navigating up to this toolbar. What are you doing up there?
A. I'm going to AdSense setup, and then $I$ just kind of went and --

THE WITNESS: Can we back up just a little bit. And I'm sorry we're going to have to do this.
A. I went to AdSense for Content --
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Uh-huh.
A. $\quad-\quad$ okay?

And if you'll freeze it, you'll see -- later on, we're going to take a look down at the bottom. It says, AdSense for Mobile Content. But right now, you asked me to talk about AdSense for Content.
Q. Okay. And then --
A. All right.
Q. -- you've clicked on AdSense for Content.

Then what happens?
A. Then it took me to another web page, okay?

And so here, the first thing I was able to do is, it gives me an opportunity to select the type of ad, okay?
Q. And so does that constitute --

THE WITNESS: Can we stop there for a minute?
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) -- prompting in your definition -- in your opinion?
A. It does. This is a menu-type prompt. It pulls down a little set of things, and there were three of them: Text only, that's only letters; image only, that's just a picture; or you can have text or image, okay -- or $I$ think it says and.

But now I decided I was going to focus on text, okay?
Q. Okay. And then we're going to continue?
A. We're going to continue. Okay.

Now, we need to stop here. This is a very
rich page that does a lot of things that let me choose presentation rules as a publisher, okay?

You want to ask me about some of those?
Q. Sure. What's that presentation rule right there?
A. That's color.
Q. Okay.
A. And over on the right-hand side, if you'll take me -- okay -- over there, you can see that $I$ get to choose a color for -- I can pick a palette, which means
somebody has already picked this white/blue, white/black/green, or $I$ can go in and specify a color for the border -- that's going to be around the ads -the text of the title, the background of the ad, the text of what's called the description, which is the second and third line of the ad, and the text of that URL, which is the return address that $I$ hope somebody clicks on to come buy my product --
Q. Okay.
A. -- all right?

And you can see the format. I can't -- I think $I$ went over it. I can pick size to some degree. Let's see where $I$ went next.
Q. Okay. Getting you there.
A. Having done some choice --

THE WITNESS: If you can stop it just for
a second.
A. On the left-hand side right here, what it does is, it gives me a feel for what a sample ad will look like. And notice, there's no -- no advertiser text. It's kind of like your ad here. It says add title, add text, add URL, and then it -- then in this case, it has a black border, a yellow background, green and purple text, and a black ads by Google with white writing on top of it so you can see it.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Okay.
A. So then we want to continue here. And that actually -- is that not the end of that clip?
Q. I think that might be the end of that clip.
A. Okay.
Q. All right. And so did that clip just demonstrate whether or not an AdSense user was being prompted?
A. It showed me, as a publisher, being prompted to input presentation rules into the form of colors; I can pick fonts; $I$ can pick how -- size -- big the text is and so forth, yes.
Q. Okay. We're done with the clip for now?
A. Yeah.
Q. And let me just ask a question.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Can we see the next demonstrative?
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Now, this demonstrative, I've entitled Google's Design or Style Standards Text Ads.

Earlier, what did you say about what the different types of presentation rules there are that are discussed in the Google -- that are discussed in the patents?
A. Well, the patents discuss color; they discuss size, those types of things.
Q. Okay. And I've entitled this Text Ads. Can you just tell us what a text ad is?
A. A text ad is like that thing I showed you earlier. It's Tom's hats; buy my hats; they're the best. It's raw text, to use a phrase I heard Mr. Dean use.

It's -- it's customized only in the sense that it tells who I am and what my product looks like, but it doesn't pick a particular typeface or size or color or anything. It's just text. And that's what I'm talking about here.
Q. What if an advertiser wants to use a picture?
A. Well, that would be an image ad, and $I$ just decided, because I didn't have a particular picture, I was not -- I was not going to go down to the image ad pathway, but certainly, AdSense allows publishers to image ad.
Q. Actually, will we discuss design or style standards for image ads in a minute?
A. Yes, we will.
Q. All right. So this demonstrative -- what is this demonstrative telling us about the options available in the Google system?
A. This is what AdSense lets you do, as far as entering, as an internet media venue or publisher, design or style standards: Color, size, what's called corner style for the border, and font, which is the type face.
Q. And just so we're totally clear, are these options that are being presented to the people who want to run advertisements and who are advertisers, or are these options being presented to people -- or to websites on which advertisements will be displayed?
A. This is not for the seller. The seller has no control over this, okay? All the seller does in a text ad is give me -- here are the characters that will be displayed. These are the options that the publisher specifies as to how they're willing to accept ads on their website.
Q. Let's talk about color first. Have you reviewed any Google documents that confirm your understanding that Google allows publishers to set color for their advertise --
A. Yes.
Q. -- for advertisements?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Let me show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 46. And can you just tell us what Plaintiff's Exhibit 46 is?
A. This is an AdSense sort of a help document.
You can see it says --
THE WITNESS: Just a little to the right,
Matt.
A. It says: Search for AdSense help. It's the kind of thing Google puts online for people who are trying to use AdSense just to help them understand how it works, what it does.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Okay.

MR. GRINSTEIN: And I'd like to go to the next page or the middle paragraph there.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) And what does the highlighted section there tell you about whether or not Google offers color as a design or style rule to publishers?
A. Okay. Well, I'm going to actually read the first sentence as well. I like it, okay?

It says: You spend lots of time perfecting your website's look and feel, and we want AdSense to fit in. So we let you customize the appearance of your ads to fully complement your site by choosing from over 200 colors and 200 preset color palettes.

That's -- that's color combinations that Google has already put together for you.
Q. And have you prepared a demonstrative that illustrates what these color options look like in the

AdSense system?
A. Yes, I have.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Let's take a look at the next one.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Dr. Rhyne, what are we looking at in this demonstrative, Presentation Rules: Color?
A. Well, if you remember when $I$ showed you the video, I kind of pointed over to the left side. We did it real quick, but when you pick your colors, they give you -- like $I$ said, your ad here, they make a little mock ad.

They don't have any text from a seller, so it always says: Add title, add text, add URL, ads by Google. But $I$ just experimented with four different combinations, and I've caught a lot of flack for those combinations.

But I've got a white with a black border; I've got pink. These are just different color combinations that a publisher, if they wanted to, could select.
Q. So there might be a publisher somewhere who really wants a purple ad with baby blue text?
A. I don't know. Okay.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Let's go back to the
demonstrative that lists the design or style standards of text ads.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) The next thing we see is size.
A. Yes.
Q. How is size a design or style rule for a publisher in the Google system?
A. Well, the publisher specifies how much of their page they're willing to have the ads take on. I mean, if you really were cheese.com, you wouldn't want somebody else to come in and splash an ad over 75 percent of your page and cover up your beautiful picture of a big slice of cheese, all the things you're trying to sell.

So they pick an area and they say, this is the amount, the area of my welo page I'm willing to have somebody come into. And what -- what then happens is that, for example, in the Google system, once you've picked that, if you have text, they'll wrap the text. If you get a little narrower, they'll make the text wrap.

If you had an image, they have a way of kind of squeezing the image down a little bit so that that border will fit on it. But it's something that the publisher specifies that it's how much of their web page they're willing to have an advertisement take.
Q. And have you seen any documents that confirm your understanding that Google lets publishers set design or size rules for size?
A. Yes, I have.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Let's look at Plaintiff's
Exhibit 69.
A. All right.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) And Plaintiff's Exhibit 69, is this another one of those Google online help files?
A. It is. It's a particular one that's entitled Quick Start Guide. So they're telling you if you're getting ready to use Google, here's the first few things you do as a publisher, and you're off and running.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Can we look at the second page of this one, Matt?
A. Okay.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) And this highlighted section, what does that tell you, Dr. Rhyne?
A. It's Step No. 3 in the quick start. Step No. 1 was to sign in; Step No. 2 was select an ad type; and now we're down to the point where it says: Take a moment to customize your ads, so they'll match the look and feel of your site.

Select the size you'd like from one of our
different ad formats keeping in mind that larger and
wider ad units tend to perform better.
Q. So is this the advertiser saying how big they want their ad to be or the website saying how big they want ads to be that they get?
A. It's the website saying: This is the size I'm allocating for the ads that are going to appear on my website.
Q. And have you prepared a demonstrative that shows the different ad size options for publishers of the Google system?
A. I have.
Q. And is that being showed right now?
A. Yes. What -- Ladies and Gentlemen, what this is, is if -- I kind of captured the menu. It talks about prompting. There're actually some ads that talk about prompting with a menu.

This is a list of things that when $I$ went in and said, I'd like to pick a size, it gave me this list. And there's some recommended size, medium and large rectangles.

A skyscraper is a tall, thin ad area kind of like we saw cheese.com over on the right-hand. Remember, there were four ads in a row over on the right? That's kind of like a skyscraper.

And a banner is something across the bottom.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Can we go back to the previous demonstrative?
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) The next one we're got is corner style.
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Dr. Rhyne, can you explain how that is a design or style rule offered to publishers in the Google system?
A. If you have a visible border around your ad area, you have choices of either having square, what Google calls slightly rounded, or rounded corners. Again, your call. You, as a publisher, get to decide. That's what corner style means.
Q. And have you seen any documents that confirm your understanding that Google offered corner styles or has offered corner styles to publishers as a design or style?
A. Right. I saw a document that dates that back to, I think, July of 2007 or something like that.
Q. Let me show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 1212 .
A. Okay.
Q. Can you tell us what Plaintiff's Exhibit 1212 is?
A. This is a Google blog. Now, I don't know if you've heard that term. That's -- it used to be called

1 a web blog -- oh, excuse me -- a web log, but nowadays, 2 it's become in the vernacular just a blog.
And it's just a collection of information that
people enter on a daily or weekly basis, and it's an
accumulation of information about how Google is working
inside AdSense, as it says there.
MR. GRINSTEIN: Matt, can we go to
Page 235 of this particular blog?
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) And on this particular page, was there a discussion that you saw that formed your opinion about corner style in the Google system?
A. Yes.
Q. Big document.
A. I have it. I marked it, because my pages are not numbered. But here's what it says, and this is just below a date of June the $28 t h$ of 2007 , so we're around that summer of 2007 .
Q. And this is Google writing this right here?
A. It's the blog guy.
Q. Okay.
A. Okay. It says: As you'll recall, we recently introduced new formats for AdSense ads. This week we've added a new dimension for publishers in customizing these ad formats.

You've long been able to customize the size
and colors of your ad units. Now you can also customize the shape by selecting between square, slightly rounded, or very rounded corners.
Q. Did you prepare a demonstrative that shows the corner styles that you can do in the Google system?
A. I -- I certainly did.
Q. Let's look at that.
A. Okay. Here I --
Q. And what are we looking at right here --
A. I'm sorry.
Q. -- on this corner demonstrative?
A. I'm going to wait till you come to the end. I apologize.

I went in to AdSense, and I left the color scheme the same, but $I$ set different types of border corners. The upper left is square; the upper right is slightly rounded; and the center bottom is very rounded.
Q. All right. Let's go back to our chart that we've been looking at. We've got one more I want to talk to you about, and that's font.

How is font a design or style rule in the Google system?
A. It's something that you, as a publisher, get to select as to what typeface and what size of typeface you would like to see in the text ads that you allow to
come to your website.
Q. And has font been a rule that's been around since the very beginning of AdSense?
A. I think so. I think so. I think I've seen a document that deals with that.
Q. Well, let me show you a clip of Mr. Jason Miller again --
A. Okay.
Q. -- Google's corporate representative for AdSense.

MR. GRINSTEIN: This is Miller, Page 149 , 18 to 19.
(Video playing.)
QUESTION: Can publishers choose font?

ANSWER: They can now.
(End of video clip.)
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) What does that tell you about whether or not publishers can choose font?
A. It tells me $I$ was wrong that they've been able to do it, but they can now. There's been a point in which that was changed.
Q. Okay. Let's go back to another demonstrative. Is this a demonstrative you prepared showing font choices in the Google system?
A. Yes. This is a prompt and menu form. And if
you go to font, you really only get three choices.
That's not a very rich set of fonts, but you get Aerial,
Times, and Verdana. Those are just three different
typefaces.

If you have any experience with anything like Microsoft Word or any of those kinds of text-editing programs, they will give you fonts as a choice. These are just the three that they currently offer on AdSense.
Q. All right. Well, we've had a lengthy discussion about text ads and the design or style rules that a publisher can set for text ads.

Have you seen evidence that publishers can set
design or style rules for image ads?
A. Yes.
Q. Let me show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 58,
please. Again --
A. Give me a moment.
Q. Sure. Sorry.
A. Okay.
Q. Again, what is Plaintiff's Exhibit 58?
A. It's an AdSense help page provided by

Google --
Q. Okay.
A. -- on the internet.
Q. What's the question that's being answered in
this AdSense help page?
A. Can $I$ customize the appearance of image ads on my site?
Q. And what does Google tell someone that's asking that question?
A. They say: The border color of image ads can be customized using your color palette options. The border color -- and it means for an image ad -- will be the same as the border color that you have selected for text ads.
Q. Can publishers in the Google system also input presentation rules affecting the display $U R L$ on an image ad?
A. Yes, they will. That would be overlaid on the image, and among other things, it's my understanding that Google will make sure that the color of the -- of the return address, that display URL, will be chosen so that if you happen to be on top of a dark image, it will be a lighter color, and if you're on top of a light image, it will be a darker color so you can see it.
Q. Let's hear from Mr. Miller again.

MR. GRINSTEIN: This is Page 158 of his deposition, Lines 15 to 20 .
(Video playing.)
QUESTION: Let's turn to image
advertisements, and $I$ realize we're only scratching the surface now. We'll get more into it a little later. But here with image advertisements, publishers are prompted to select colors for display URLs?

ANSWER: Yes.
(End of video clip.)
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Does that conform to your opinion about whether or not publishers can do that?
A. Mr. Miller and $I$ are in complete agreement.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Your Honor, we're about now to play another clip from PX24. It's one of those videos that will probably take five minutes to go through it. Would you like us to do that or --

THE COURT: Please proceed.
MR. GRINSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Now, did you experiment, in

Plaintiff's Exhibit 24, with entering different presentation rules as a publisher into the AdSense interface?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay. Let me show you the next clip from Plaintiff's Exhibit 24, and I'm going to ask you again to walk us through it and ask you to tell us how this shows you, as a publisher, entering presentation rules. MR. GRINSTEIN: So if we can fire up,
(Video playing.)
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) What are we seeing here?
A. Okay. We're picking the type of ad. And I've just sort of highlighted all the various choices and then selected text only.
Q. Is ad type a presentation rule?
A. Yes.

Then $I$ went -- and you can see this is where $I$ pulled out the menu. I'm just moving up and down -- I think down the menu, and I finally, I believe, selected a $120 \times 600$ skyscraper ad, a tall, thin ad.
Q. And is ad size a presentation rule?
A. Yes, it is, with certain restrictions.

Then $I$ went into the color palette or choice, and I began to choose some different colors. And you can see then that this is -- I'm looking over to the left at the color of the ad while I'm over on the right changing the colors. Here I've said yellow and green as the colors with a black border.
Q. And is ad color a presentation rule?
A. Yes, it is.

And here I think I changed the color of that return address $U R L$ from green to purple, if $I$ remember. That's what, you know, people have said didn't look very good, but $I$ just was picking something.

THE WITNESS: Okay. That went by very fast. Matt, do you think there's any chance you can back that up?

Go forward, Matt. Well --
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) I think the next clip was on fonts.
A. Okay. And then we -- then we go to fonts, and here you can see the choice of the three fonts. I believe I selected Times.
Q. And is font a presentation rule in the Google system?
A. Yes.

Then I got to check size. I always check large, okay, at my age.

I got to select corners. I believe I selected very rounded corners.

And so here you see an ad with yellow background, green text, purple URL, and rounded corners.
Q. Okay.
A. Then it --

MR. GRINSTEIN: Stop right here, Matt.
A. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Go up and forward.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Can you tell us what's
about to happen next?
A. I'm going to -- I'm going to go to continue, and it's going to allow me to save that set of publication rules out on the Google storage system, their database, and it gave me a name. This is the name. I could change the name if $I$ wanted.

That's a text box, but it's $120 x 600$ created on September the $19 t h$, which was when $I$ was doing this work.
Q. All right. Thank you, Dr. Rhyne.

What does this video show to you or
demonstrate to you about the ability of a publisher in the Google system to enter presentation rules into the AdSense interface?
A. It shows that the AdSense user interface is prompting me to enter presentation rules in a variety of areas and then to save them away.
Q. Now, we've talked a lot about design or style rules. We saw a bunch of different ones.

Have you seen any evidence, in your review of the Google materials in this case, suggesting to you whether or not those design or style rules are important to the operation of the Google ad system?
A. I have.
Q. I'd like to show you a video --
A. All right.
Q. -- which is Plaintiff's Exhibit 36. And this is Plaintiff's Exhibit 36. I'd like to tellyou -- I'd like us to watch it and then for you to tell us what this video is and how it impacts your opinion.
(Video playing.)
UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Colors play an
important part in keeping your ads looking professional and a relevant part of your site.

As text ads show, approximately 70 to 80
percent of the time, it's essential that they complement your site. There are several ways that you can do this. Simple things like blending in the background of the ad, the color of your site, and removing borders has proven in the past to have a significant impact upon click-through rate.

Just be careful of not blending the ads too much so they look like your site's content. You can also try to highlight the link and URL with shades that compliment your site's colors.
(End of video clip.)
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) What does this video --

MR. VERHOEVEN: Your Honor, I'm going to
object. This was not in the report, and there was no foundation laid before playing it.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Plaintiff's Exhibit 36 is in the report.

THE COURT: Well, tell you what, we'll take up there in the morning then.

All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm going to excuse you for the evening. Please remember my prior instructions, and don't talk about the case.

One final instruction is to drive safely on your way back to your homes this evening, and I'll see you promptly at 8:30 in the morning. If you'll be here 8:20, 8:25, it will help us to get started right on time.

Thank you very much, and you're excused for the evening.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(Jury out.)

THE COURT: You may step down, Dr. Rhyne.
All right. Y'all have a seat.
What is the exhibit that was just played?
MR. GRINSTEIN: It's Plaintiff's

Exhibit 36, I understand, from Mr. Brandon.
MR. BRANDON: It's cited in Footnote 84.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Excuse me?

MR. BRANDON: It's cited in Footnote 84.

MR. GRINSTEIN: In Footnote 84 , Dr. Rhyne
discusses it in his report, lays the foundation for --
THE COURT: What is it?
MR. GRINSTEIN: I'm sorry. It's a --
much like all these online AdSense help files that we've
been looking at, Your Honor, this is an online AdSense
help video telling you, here's all the things you can do
with AdSense.

THE COURT: Is it a Google video --
MR. GRINSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- Mr. Verhoeven?

MR. VERHOEVEN: I'm just checking, Your
Honor. If it's buried in a footnote, maybe I missed it.

I apologize, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's alright. Well -- but
is it a Google video? Do you dispute that?

MR. VERHOEVEN: Just bear with me, Your

Honor. I'm looking at it right now.
(Pause in proceedings.)
MR. VERHOEVEN: I apologize. I had bad information. It was buried in a footnote in the report, Your Honor. I withdraw the objection.

THE COURT: Well, buried in a footnote, but, nonetheless, it was in the report?

MR. VERHOEVEN: Yes, Your Honor, and I withdraw the objection.

MR. NELSON: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes. We'll pick up there
tomorrow. The objection will be overruled, and I assume I won't hear it in the morning.

Mr. Nelson?

MR. NELSON: There's a logistical issue. There are the acquisition documents that have not been preadmitted.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. NELSON: And based on Your Honor's ruling, I'm hoping to work it out with opposing counsel. I'm hoping that there won't be any issues, but Mr. Bratic is almost certainly going to go on the stand tomorrow.

Our thought is to redact anything that has to do with price when we publish it to the jury, but we'd just like to alert Your Honor, we would like to preadmit these exhibits before we talk to the jury tomorrow.

THE COURT: All right. Well, talk about them overnight. I'm inclined to preadmit them, if you've made the redactions indicated were appropriate with the rulings on the Daubert motion, but if not, I'll be in chambers at 8:00 o'clock in the morning.

And, you know, $I$ don't know exactly when

MR. NELSON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- to work through any issues that we've got, okay?

MR. NELSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. See you at 8:30
to start, but I'll be in chambers at 8:00 in case anybody needs anything.

Court's in recess.
COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(Court adjourned.)

*     *         *             *                 * 
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