30(b)(6) Deposition of Richard G. Frenkel 11/18/2008 CONFIDENTIAL - Subject to the Protective Order

Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

TYLER DIVISION

ERIC M. ALBRITTON,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 6:08-CV-00089

- (1) CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,
- (2) RICHARD FRENKEL, (3) MALLUN YEN and (4) JOHN NOH,

Defendants.

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

DEPOSITION OF RICHARD G. FRENKEL

Tuesday, November 18, 2008

SHEILA CHASE & ASSOCIATES
REPORTING FOR:
West Court Reporting Services
221 Main Street, Suite 1250
San Francisco, California 94105
Phone: (415) 321-2300
Fax: (415) 618-0743

Reported by: JANIS JENNINGS, CSR, CRP, CLR CRS-100282-023



```
Page 106
 1
     beginning of videotape No. 2, volume 1 in the
 2
     deposition of Richard Frenkel.
 3
                (Whereupon, Frenkel Exhibit 1 was marked
                 for identification.)
 5
     BY MR. PATTON:
 6
                I have handed you just a moment ago,
 7
     Mr. Frenkel, Exhibit 1. Correct?
 8
          Α.
                Yes.
 9
                Do you recognize that?
          Q.
10
          Α.
                Yes.
                Okay. Is this a blog that was posted on
11
          Ο.
12
     October the 18th, 2007?
13
          Α.
                No.
                When was this one, the one you have in
14
          0.
15
     front of you, Exhibit 1?
16
                This is the version of the blog as
          Α.
17
     modified by me on October 19th, 2007.
                Okay. Does it show up on there somewhere?
18
          0.
19
                Does what show up where?
          Α.
20
                That it was modified on the 19th.
          0.
21
          Α.
                No.
22
                (Whereupon, Frenkel Exhibit 2 was marked
23
                 for identification.)
24
     BY MR. PATTON:
                I want to hand you 2 and ask you: Is that
25
          0.
```

Page 107 1 the one that was posted on the 17th? 2 17th or 18th? MR. McWILLIAMS: 3 MR. PATTON: I'm sorry. The 18th. THE WITNESS: The part on the first page 5 of Exhibit 2 --6 BY MR. PATTON: 7 Q. Okav. -- is, I believe, what was attached to the complaint in this case. And I believe that is what 9 10 I posted October 18th, 2007. 11 There were two postings that Ο. Okay. indicate October 18th, and that's Exhibits 1 and 2; 12 13 correct? They both have the October 18th date on 14 Α. 15 them, yes. Okay. But Exhibit 2 is the one that was 16 Ο. filed first, and Exhibit 1 was modified, whatever 17 you want to call it, on the 19th? Is that what you 18 19 said? I believe I did modify it, alter it. 20 Α. Yes. Okay. So Exhibit 2 is the first one 21 22 filed -- posted? 23 It was the -- I believe that's true, yes. Α. Okay. Let's take a look at it, if we 24 Ο. 25

could, No. 2, first.

- A. Let me just modify that answer. Exhibit 1
- is a printout of the post that -- the printout was
- made sometime after the 19th.
- Q. Why do you say that?
- A. Because it has the edit line. I just want
- to make sure my testimony is accurate.
- Q. Well, I do, too. And I don't really care
- which one is which, but I want to make sure that I
- <sup>9</sup> understand.
- Where is the edit that you're talking
- about? Which one? On 1 or 2?
- 12 A. On 1.
- Q. All right. And where is that located on
- <sup>14</sup> 1?
- A. On the second page.
- 0. Where?
- A. Fourth line, third line.
- 18 Q. "You can't change history, but you can
- 19 change a blog"?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. I don't see the 19th there anywhere.
- A. It doesn't say the date, but I remember
- doing it on the 19th.
- Q. Okay. Where -- after edit? Is that what
- you're saying?

```
Page 109
 1
                Yes.
           Α.
 2
           0.
                Okav.
                       Now, that was done on 10/19, the
 3
     edit was done?
           Α.
                And other changes.
 5
                Okay. All right. Let's get the other
           Q.
 6
     changes.
                What else was changed?
 7
                I removed the sentence from the original
           Α.
 8
     post that referred to the Banana Republic.
                Okay. Anything else?
           0.
10
           Α.
                Yes.
11
                Okav. What else?
           0.
12
                The paragraph beginning "you can't change
           Α.
13
     history" was reworded.
14
           0.
                On Exhibit 1 was reworded?
                It was reworded between -- well, again --
15
           Α.
16
                Exhibit 2 is the first filed?
           0.
17
                That's right. And after that one, the
           Α.
     next day it was reworded -- or I reworded it.
18
19
                What was the other change?
           0.
20
                That's it.
          Α.
21
                Which?
          0.
22
                The paragraph being reworded.
          Α.
23
                The bottom paragraph on the first page was
          Q.
24
     reworded?
                On Exhibit 1, that's different than --
25
          Α.
```

- <sup>1</sup> Q. Right.
- A. -- Exhibit 2.
- Q. That "you can't change history" is how it begins?
- A. It begins the same way in both, but the rest of the words are somewhat different.
- Q. All right. What I'm trying to find out is
  where -- what are the alterations or the differences
  between Exhibit 1, which was the altered or changed
  document, and Exhibit 2? Where are the differences?
- A. I just told you. They're all in the -
  I'm looking at something else here.
- Q. "You can't change history" paragraph?
- <sup>14</sup> A. Yes.
- Q. All right. Well, give me the words that are different.
- A. Originally I said, "You can't change history, and it's outrageous that the Eastern District of Texas is apparently, wittingly or
- unwittingly, conspiring with a non-practicing entity
- to try to manufacture subject matter jurisdiction.
- This is yet another example of the abusive nature of
- litigating patent cases in the Banana Republic of
- east Texas."
- Q. That's what you said in the first file?

- A. Right. That was changed to, "You can't
- change history, and it's outrageous that the Eastern
- District of Texas may have, wittingly or
- 4 unwittingly, helped a non-practicing entity to try
- 5 to manufacture subject matter jurisdiction. Even if
- this was a 'mistake'" -- with "mistake" in quotes --
- "which I can't see how it could be, given that
- 8 someone emailed me a printout of the docket from
- 9 Monday showing the case, the proper course of action
- should be a motion to correct the docket."
- And then there was the edit addition that
- we just discussed.
- Q. About the Banana Republic?
- A. No. The edit says, "Edit: You can't
- change history, but you can change a blog entry
- based on information emailed to you from a helpful
- 17 reader."
- Q. Okay. But that -- you did --
- THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm sorry. Somebody's
- phone is on and invading the audio.
- MR. BABCOCK: Not me.
- MR. PATTON: It could be me. It is me --
- or it may be me.
- MR. BABCOCK: Bad, bad, bad.
- MR. PATTON: But it's me no longer.

- Okay. Back on the record.
- <sup>2</sup> BY MR. PATTON:
- Q. Why was the date not changed on this second posting on the next day?
- 5 A. The software I was using didn't have that 6 feature.
- Q. Okay. Could you have started the next
- 8 day's blog by telling every -- whoever read it, "I
- 9 am modifying what I said yesterday"?
- A. When I put the line in there saying
- "edit," that was my way of doing that. I could have
- said "edited 10/19/07." I didn't.
- Q. Okay. And you let the reader determine
- what the edits were?
- MR. McWILLIAMS: Objection. Form.
- 16 BY MR. PATTON:
- 17 Q. Is that what you're saying?
- A. I did not put in there what I was
- <sup>19</sup> altering.
- Q. Where did you get -- what is the basis of
- your assertion that the proper way to do this would
- be to file a motion to correct the docket?
- A. That was my opinion.
- Q. Did you base your opinion on anything,
- something you read or something someone told you, or