EXHIBIT 9

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

CERTIFIED COPY

ERIC M. ALBRITTON)
)
v.)
) C.A. NO. 6:08-CV-00089
CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,)
RICK FRENKEL, MALLUN YEN &)
JOHN NOH)

ORAL AND VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF
CYNTHIA PAAR
NOVEMBER 3, 2008
VOLUME I

ORAL AND VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF CYNTHIA PAAR, produced as a witness at the instance of the Defendant, and duly sworn, was taken in the above-styled and numbered cause on the 3rd day of November, 2008, from 6:46 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., before April R. Eichelberger, CSR in and for the State of Texas, reported by machine shorthand, at the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, 211 West Ferguson Street in the City Tyler and the State of Texas, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the provisions stated on the record or attached hereto.

()

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

22

23

24

PROCEEDINGS

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the oral and videotaped deposition of Cindy Paar, taken in the suit styled Eric M. Albritton versus Cisco Systems, Inc., et al., Cause Number 6:08-CV-00089. Today's date is November the 3rd, 2008. We are located at the Federal Courthouse Eastern Division, 211 West Ferguson Street, Tyler, Texas. We are now on the record. The time is approximately 6:36.

Will the court reporter please swear in the witness.

CYNTHIA PAAR,

having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

EXAMINATION

BY MR. BABCOCK:

- Q. Would you state your name, please?
- A. Cynthia Paar.
 - Q. And, Ms. Paar, do you reside here in Tyler?
- 19 A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. Okay. And for whom do you work?
- 21 A. For the United States District Court.
 - Q. And that would be the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas?
 - A. District of Texas.
 - Q. And are you in the Tyler division or do you



conversation that you had with -- with Shelley Moore in October of 2007. Do you recall that conversation?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

- Q. Tell me what Shelley said to you.
- A. Well, I don't remember word for word, but --
 - Q. Well, I know, but generally.
- A. -- basically she stated the facts as to what happened, that she had gotten a call from an attorney and they had filed it on the 15th and the -- but the date was -- and it had two different dates, but the NEF was showing the 16th and it was supposed to show the 16th on both of them. And she was wondering -- thinking it was a system problem, asked me, you know, what -- what the deal -- would I look into it.
 - Q. Okay. And did you agree to look into it?
- 16 A. I did.
 - Q. And did you look into it?
- 18 A. I did.
 - Q. And what did you find when you looked into it?
 - A. I found that there was not a system problem, that it did exactly what it was supposed to do.
- Q. Okay. And did -- did Shelley think that there
 might have been a system problem or --
 - A. Yes, I think she thought that.
- 25 Q. Okay.

- A. That's why they usually call me.
 - Q. Okay. Did she describe what -- what she thought the system problem was?
 - A. No, they don't say. They just say, "I don't -- we don't understand why that -- the dates are different."
 - Q. Okay.

- A. And so could I, you know, look into that.
- Q. All right. And she says in this e-mail that -- that "I was a little leery about changing the dates, and after talking with Cindy, I was even more -- I was" -- well, she left out the word "was," but "I am more leery."
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. What did you tell Shelley Moore to make her more leery about changing the dates?
- A. Well, I just -- I felt like the system had done what it was supposed to do and that I didn't -- I didn't think that, you know, changing a file date was something that I could do without someone higher up telling me to do that.
- Q. Okay. And the system obviously assigned the date on the docket sheet of October 15th of 2007 to the date the complaint was filed, correct? I mean, that's what you learned? Or did you?

1 | take --

4

9

10

- 2 A. I -- I really don't know for sure.
- 3 Q. Okay. All right.
 - A. I just don't deal with that part of it.
- Q. Okay. In any event, you were told by Shelley that Mr. Albritton's office had started filing this complaint before midnight and finished it after midnight?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. Is that what you were told?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And -- and your conclusion was if
 the -- under those circumstances, the system would give
 you exactly what the Notice of Electronic Filing shows
 here, that is, the transaction is being received,
 entered on one date, the 10/16 date, but filed on the
 10/15 date, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. And why is the system set up that way?
- 20 A. What way?
- Q. The way so that if I'm filing -- if I want to
 file a complaint and I want to -- because I want to have
 a race to the courthouse, I want to get there first and
 I'm uploading it but I don't hit the "send" button until
 like 12:01 on the next day, why does it give me the

| 10/15 filing date?

- A. Well, you would have to ask our administrative office, which we are sent -- we're sent a basic dictionary, what we call, of events. A complaint is a very basic dictionary event.
 - Q. Sure.
- A. I did not create that event. I do create events, but that was not one that I created.
 - Q. Okay. Well --
- A. So I could not tell you why they structured it that way.
 - Q. Okay. All you know --
 - A. I'm given that event.
 - Q. All you know is that under these set of circumstances, the system worked the way it was supposed to work?
 - A. Correct. I can go in and look at each of the functions that it's supposed to do, like, you know, when you're pulling in the file -- the filer and who it's against and things like that, I can just look at the event the way it's structured and see that it pulls the file date first, you know, and just so forth.
 - Q. Okay. Did you share Shelley Moore's sense that -- that you would be leery about changing the dates?

Page 17

- A. Correct.
- Q. (BY MR. HOLMES) Is that what you were telling
- 3 | me?

- A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. So when you say the system did what it was supposed to do, you're saying that it recorded both those dates the way you would have expected it?
- 8 A. Right.
- Q. Okay. Has anyone ever told you that someone accused our clerk's office of conspiring with Eric

 Albritton to alter these documents with the intent of creating subject matter jurisdiction?
- MR. BABCOCK: Object to the form.
- MR. McWILLIAMS: Objection, form.
- 15 A. Do I answer?
- Q. (BY MR. HOLMES) Yeah.
- 17 A. No.
- Q. Have you heard about these articles that this fellow that called himself the "Troll Tracker" wrote about us?
- 21 A. I've heard about it.
- 22 | Q. What have you heard?
- A. Oh, just basically that -- I had read the article, I think, when Texas Lawyer came out.
- 25 Q. Okay.

	Page 32	
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS	
2	TYLER DIVISION	
3	ERIC M. ALBRITTON)	
4	v.)) C.A. NO. 6:08-CV-00089	
5	CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,) RICK FRENKEL, MALLUN YEN &)	
6	JOHN NOH)	
7		
8	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION DEPOSITION OF CYNTHIA PAAR	
9	NOVEMBER 3, 2008	
LO	I, April Eichelberger, Certified Shorthand Reporter	
L1	in and for the State of Texas, hereby certify to the	
12	following:	
13	That the witness, CYNTHIA PAAR, was duly sworn by	
14	the officer and that the transcript of the oral	
15	deposition is a true record of the testimony given by	
16	the witness;	
17	That the deposition transcript was submitted on	
18	to the witness or to the attorney	
19	for the witness for examination, signature and return to	
20	me by;	
21	That the amount of time used by each party at the	
22	deposition is as follows:	
23	MR. BABCOCK12 minutes	
24	MR. McWILLIAMS1 minute	
25	MR. HOLMES8 minutes;	
	· ·	

1 That pursuant to information given to the deposition 2 officer at the time said testimony was taken, the for fowing includes counsel for all parties of record: FOR THE PLAINTIFF: Mr. James A. Holmes FOR THE DEFENDANT CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.: EOR THE DEFENDANT RICHARD FRENKEL: Charles L. Babcock, Ms. Crystal J. Parker George L. McWilliams 10 Thómas E. Gibson, Mr. Bob Wells 11 /is the deposition officer's charges 12 to the Defendant for preparing the original deposition 13 transcript and any Copies of exhibits; 14 I further certify that Lam neither counsel for, 15 related to, nor employed by any of the parties or 16 attorneys in the action in which this proceeding was 17 taken, and further that I am not financially or 18 19 otherwise interested in the outcome of the action. Certified to by me this , day of 20 21 22 23 24 April Eichelberger Texas CSR No. 7495 25 December 31, 2009 Expiration Date: