UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER, JUDGE PRESIDING

ECHOSTAR SATELLITE CORP., et)
al.,)

Plaintiffs,)

vs.) No. SACV 03-950 DOC

Day 3, Volume IV

NDS GROUP PLC, et al.,)

Defendants.)

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Jury Trial

Santa Ana, California

Friday, April 11, 2008

Debbie Gale, CSR 9472, RPR
Federal Official Court Reporter
United States District Court
411 West 4th Street, Room 1-053
Santa Ana, California 92701
(714) 558-8141

EchoStar 2008-04-11 D3V4

```
1
    APPEARANCES:
2
3
    FOR PLAINTIFF ECHOSTAR SATELLITE CORPORATION, ET AL.:
4
               T. WADE WELCH & ASSOCIATES
5
               BY: CHAD M. HAGAN
                    CHRISTINE D. WILLETTS
6
                    WADE WELCH
                    Attorneys at Law
7
               2401 Fountainview
               Suite 700
               Houston, Texas 77057
8
               (713) 952-4334
9
10
11
    FOR DEFENDANT NDS GROUP PLC, ET AL.:
12
               O'MELVENY & MYERS
13
               BY: DARIN W. SNYDER
                    DAVID R. EBERHART
14
                    Attorneys at Law
               275 Embarcadero Center West
15
               Suite 2600
               San Francisco, California 94111
16
               (415) 984-8700
17
               -and-
18
               HOGAN & HARTSON
               BY: RICHARD L. STONE
19
                    KENNETH D. KLEIN
                    Attorneys at Law
20
               1999 Avenue of the Stars
               Suite 1400
21
               Los Angeles, California 90067
               (310) 785-4600
22
23
    ALSO PRESENT:
24
               David Moskowitz
               Dov Rubin
25
```

		14900
1	INDEX	
2	PROCEEDINGS	PAGE
3	Court statements regarding witnesses	4
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, APRIL 11, 2008 2 Day 3, Volume IV 3 (4:38 p.m.)4 (Outside the presence of the jury.) 5 THE COURT: All right. The Court has all counsel 6 present. The jury, of course, is not present. 7 I made a very inarticulate comment before lunch, 8 which I want to clarify, which was out of the presence of 9 the jury; and that is, I'm going to anticipate some problems 10 that might occur so that all counsel are forewarned, in 11 fairness, and that three or four weeks from now no one is 12 caught by surprise. 13 This Court's already made the statement to counsel 14 that it believes that, coequally finding no fault, that 15 there's been a tremendous attempt at insulation by, 16 generally speaking, the parties involved. I have been 17 extremely concerned in the past that pirates would literally 18 dictate when they had their deposition taken, what they were 19 going to say, many of them choosing not to come to court, 20 but still either literally employed or seeking employment 21 for one or either of these companies. 22 I've also recognized that this is a small group of 23 companies at the present time, and that even some of these 24 pirates, in their self-interest, have slid and can slide 25 between these two litigants, NDS and NagraStar/EchoStar, and on occasion DirecTV.

In listening to this trial, I'm concerned that

Mr. Mordinson epitomizes some of the difficulties involved.

He is an engineer who has described to the jury his efforts,

but he's not management. And I think that I've allowed

counsel a wide latitude in seeking where he got direction.

But as he stated, and I think future witnesses will state

for both sides -- if these kinds of witnesses continue to be

called, we'll never know if these allegations are true on

both sides in the claims and counterclaims, you know, where

these kinds of directions come from, assuming, if there was

satellite piracy, a direction from NDS; and if there was the

theft of NDS's 26,000 confidential documents, the direction

from EchoStar.

This could be entrepreneurs in the pirate industry. This could be, though, middle management, higher management. But I'm concerned, eventually, that the jury may believe that leadership takes all forms; that, from the President to federal courts, to Generals in the Marine Corp., the top of the echelon and pyramid should be responsible for the organization. They may not do the specific act, but responsibility and leadership usually should be perceived to fall at the top of the ladder.

But in our society, and generally speaking, this concept of plausibility/deniability has grown up, where the

top of these various institutions are somewhat insulated by those who work in different capacities, who, in a sense make the everyday decisions and oftentimes end up or sometimes end up in court.

It's a difficult position to foresee, but with the allegations involved in this rather small competitive market, that I may be approached four weeks from now by EchoStar, wishing to argue that not only is this a satellite piracy, but this has to have occurred at the highest levels of NDS's management structure. And since the Court is not bifurcating liability and punitives and is going to the jury at one time, there is only one opportunity during your cases in chief, on behalf of EchoStar and NDS, to put your best foot forward in front of this jury.

If liability was found, in that same argument, you'll probably seek to argue that not only is this egregious, but it could only be conducted over this period of time -- with these stakes -- not by middle management, but by the very top of the NDS power structure. And perhaps you'll pick names, and I don't know that that's fair. I haven't heard the evidence yet. I don't know how far I'll let those arguments go. But there's every possibility.

And the same thing on NDS's behalf. It's been represented to me that they're going to be able to show that 26,000 pages of NDS documents were literally stolen, that

has great weight to NDS; and that that's transferred in some airport near the North Pole or someplace in Canada in the middle of the night to one Mr. Ereiser, who then gets that back to EchoStar.

Now, those are horrendous allegations on both sides. And I assume you're going to be arguing, if not Mr. Ergen, somebody else had to know at the very top of this power structure of EchoStar that that kind of activity and those kinds of documents that you rely upon carry great weight. And this couldn't be carried out, quite frankly, without somebody if not condoning it or ordering it, certainly becoming aware of it, even at the topmost part of the structure, and doing something about it.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ STONE: The CEO actually was the person involved. The CEO actually went to the airport.

THE COURT: I've already heard it. I mean, you can see where this is going.

And the reason I raise this is, besides the legal rulings a Court makes, I want to make sure this trial is as fair as I can make it. That's why I've been leaning on Counsel. And I'll state it again. These are exemplary counsel who have had tremendous pressure applied to them by the Court: The threat of adverse inferences to force these pirates, who still have tentacles, to come into court and literally the top management structures of each company, and

the salient witnesses so this jury isn't faced with pirates who pick and choose when to testify, what to say, and then claim that they're outside the jurisdiction of the United States; and management, quite frankly, who can't get to court 'cause it inconveniences them.

So you've had tremendous pressure on you, and you have my compliments, including some of the counsel sitting here who have been the forebearer of the Court's news.

Mr. Ergen has testified. I have no opinion, nor state any opinion concerning his testimony. But I would assume from EchoStar's perspective he's been an excellent witness for you. And because of that, he's been able to deny any knowledge of these 26,000 documents. He's looked the jury right in the eye and said, "I know nothing about it." He's also been able to tell how aggrieved the company was from a nonengineering standpoint, and so has the other gentleman.

And Mr. Kudelski, I assume, will be every bit as good a witness when he comes into court. You previously asked the Court to order Mr. Murdoch into court and to order Mr. Peled into court.

I'll say the same thing to you that I said to

EchoStar, but maybe not with the same strength. Since

they're asking for money, as the plaintiff, and

significantly more sums than you are, they have a real duty

to get people here. But so do you.

And I'll ask you this without casting an opinion:

I'm not going to hear later on that there's any unfairness,
because you have the opportunity of bringing Mr. Peled and
having him make the same presentation, and you have the
opportunity of bringing Mr. Murdoch and making the same
presentation. You have the right to have him look this jury
in the eye and say, "I not only didn't know about this, but
I have no subsequent knowledge of it."

Here's why it's was important: The worst position for either of you is that liability is found and you're into the punitive phase. If you get to the punitive phase, and any one of these jurors assume that the top of the organization had any information concerning this or had information and didn't act upon it, I can promise you that most jurors are going to drive those punitive damages up as they get towards the top of the pyramid. And that's the danger. That could be hundreds of millions of dollars.

So NDS is almost -- or EchoStar's almost done with your presentation. Mr. Kudelski's coming also. I know there's two Kudelskis.

But I throw back to you, you know, be careful on NDS's part. There's no adverse inferences that I'll draw from that, by the way. I will not instruct the jury with an adverse inference. But without the ability of Mr. Murdoch

and Mr. Peled to get on the stand and briefly say, "I didn't do it," and "I didn't know about it," there's a real risk that this jury, if they do find liability and they get to the punitive phase, may inflict a much more cost problem.

And, of course, the reverse works: I never want to leave out EchoStar with the NDS claims.

I well understand that DirecTV, for a significant period of time, was concerned about NDS's activities. And Mr. Murdoch, for instance, may not be as relevant as Mr. Peled. The difficulty, though, that may need to be sorted out is that, at some point, News Corp., through Mr. Murdoch, purchased NDS. And when that occurred, of course, it killed the lawsuit that was taking place between DirecTV and NDS. There's no reason to continue it.

MR. WELCH: Well, he purchased --

THE COURT: No. Shhh...

So right now, by putting you on warning -- I'm saying that it will occur -- but I don't know that I'm going to limit your arguments in terms of making the accusation that there's some inference. I don't know that absolute proof is needed if there's a logical inference. "Argument, by law, can give flight to imagination." There's a pretty good law that uses that exact quote.

And the same -- I'm not gonna preclude you from that revenge factor that you stated. Did he say revenge?

No. Can you argue revenge? Of course, you can, on Mr. Ergen's part.

I think that that's enough said about that. And the reason I chose to put that on the record is protecting each of you as counsel, quite frankly. By making this, I protect myself, because you're forewarned about arguments and how expansive they can be on both sides.

The second thing, it gives you the chance to reach out to anybody you want to, knowing the Court's thoughts about how expansive this could be. You may want both Kudelskis here.

And third, if there is liability on either side, you've got punitives, and it can act as a mitigating factor. You know, maybe this is some manager that does this for either side, or makes the decision; maybe this is an entrepreneur. But if it is a manager, maybe it never reached the top of either one of your power structures. Maybe these poor CEO's and presidents, quite frankly, are absolutely in the dark about some of the stuff that's occurring.

I'm almost done. Let me check my notes.

By making this statement, it gives you the power of counsel to go back with a transcript and waive it in front of your respective clients, quite frankly, and say, "The Court's not kidding." Because, otherwise, you have to

go out of here and say, "I had a discussion with

Judge Carter and he thinks the following -- because he said

it on a Saturday and we don't have a transcript, and this is

how dangerous it could be." So it's a way of protecting all

you as counsel to let you take that back.

Do you understand that? It's really a courtesy.

Now, normally, I wouldn't make that comment. But this could
go pretty far in terms of the far-reaching arguments that
are going to ensue.

They're going to be accusing you of revenge, the \$600 million paid, you know, Ergen striking back, the swap was vindictive, it was an outmoded system, it should have been paid for anyway by EchoStar, and you sloughed it off on NDS. But NDS is going to be arguing just as strongly that, if this isn't the top of the pyramid, how couldn't it be, with this period of hacking and the people involved; and that, when you start hiring these kinds of people, et cetera, that this has to reach all the way to the top, and it doesn't just stop with some security adviser, you know, in Haifa; that this is serious stuff when the industry is that small and there's billions on the line in competitive advantage.

Okay. So everybody's forewarned. I'm not saying what I'm going to do. I'll let the evidence develop. But now, there can't be any disagreement about what's occurred.

```
1
                 Okay. We'll go off the record.
 2
            (At 4:43 p.m., proceedings were adjourned.)
 3
                                       -000-
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	-000-				
2					
3	CERTIFICATE				
4					
5	I hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753,				
6	Title 28, United States Code, the foregoing is a true and				
7	correct transcript of the stenographically reported				
8	proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and that the				
9	transcript page format is in conformance with the				
10	regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.				
11					
12	Date: April 12, 2008				
13					
14					
15					
	DEBBIE GALE, U.S. COURT REPORTER				
16	CSR NO. 9472, RPR				
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

	Attorneys 2:6,14	claim 8:3	courtesy 12:6	
<u>A</u>	2:19	claims 5:10 10:6	courtesy 12.0	<u>E</u>
ability 9:25	Avenue 2:20		Court's 4:13 8:8	E 3:1
able 6:24 8:12,15		clarify 4:8		EBERHART
above-entitled	aware 7:12	clients 11:24	11:9,25	2:13
14:8	B	Code 14:6	CSR 1:21 14:16	echelon 5:20
absolute 10:20	back 7:4 9:22	coequally 4:14	D	EchoStar 1:5,25
absolutely 11:19	11:23 12:5,11	come 4:19 5:11	$\overline{\mathbf{D}}$ 2:5,19 3:1	2:3 5:14 6:8,13
accusation 10:19	-	7:24	damages 9:16	7:4,8 8:23 10:6
accusing 12:10	becoming 7:12	comes 8:19		12:13
act 5:22 9:15	behalf 6:13,23 believe 5:18	coming 9:20	danger 9:18	EchoStar's 8:11
11:13		comment 4:7 12:7	dangerous 12:4	9:19
activities 10:8	believes 4:14	companies 4:21	DARIN 2:13	efforts 5:4
activity 7:8	best 6:13	4:23	dark 11:19	egregious 6:17
adjourned 13:2	bifurcating 6:11	company 7:25	Date 14:12	either 4:20,21
advantage 12:22	billions 12:21	8:15	David 1:3 2:13,24	9:11 11:12,15
adverse 7:23 9:23	bit 8:18	competitive 6:6	Day 1:8 4:2	11:17
9:25	briefly 10:1	12:22	Debbie 1:21 14:15	Embarcadero
adviser 12:19	bringing 9:4,6	compliments 8:7	decision 11:15	2:14
aggrieved 8:15		concept 5:25	decisions 6:3	employed 4:20
airport 7:2,15		concerned 4:17	DEFENDANT	employment 4:20
al 1:5,8 2:3,11	California 1:2,16	5:2,17 10:8	2:11	engineer 5:4
allegations 5:9	1:23 2:15,21 4:1	concerning 8:10	Defendants 1:9	ensue 12:9
6:6 7:5	called 5:9	9:14	deny 8:13	entrepreneur
allowed 5:5	Canada 7:2	condoning 7:11	deposition 4:18	11:16
Ana 1:16,23 4:1	capacities 6:2	conducted 6:17	described 5:4	entrepreneurs
Angeles 2:21	careful 9:22 carried 7:10	Conference 14:10	develop 12:24	5:15
anticipate 4:9		confidential 5:13	dictate 4:18	epitomizes 5:3
anybody 11:9	carry 7:9 Carter 1:3 12:2	conformance	different 6:2	Ereiser 7:3
anyway 12:13	cases 6:12	14:9	difficult 6:5	Ergen 7:7 8:9
APPEARANCES		continue 5:8	difficulties 5:3	12:11
2:1	casting 9:2	10:14	difficulty 10:10	Ergen's 11:2
applied 7:22	caught 4:12 cause 8:5	Corp 1:5 5:20	direction 5:6,12	et 1:5,8 2:3,11
approached 6:7	Center 2:14	10:11	5:13	12:18
April 1:17 4:1	CENTRAL 1:2	CORPORATI	directions 5:11	eventually 5:17
14:12		2:3	DirecTV 5:1 10:7	everybody's
argue 6:8,16 11:1	CEO 7:14,15 CEO's 11:18	correct 14:7	10:14	12:23
arguing 7:6 12:14	certainly 7:12	cost 10:4	disagreement	everyday 6:3
argument 6:15	CERTIFICATE	counsel 4:5,10,13	12:25	evidence 6:21
10:21	14:3	5:6 7:21,22 8:7	discussion 12:1	12:24
arguments 6:22	certify 14:5	11:5,23 12:5	District 1:1,2,22	exact 10:23
10:19 11:6 12:8	cetera 12:18	counterclaims	DOC 1:7	excellent 8:11
asked 8:20	CHAD 2:5	5:10	documents 5:13	exemplary 7:21
asking 8:24	chance 11:8	course 4:6 10:5	6:25 7:9 8:13	expansive 11:7,10
ASSOCIATES	check 11:21	10:13 11:1	doing 7:13	extremely 4:17
2:4	chief 6:13	court 1:1,21,22	dollars 9:18	eye 8:14 9:8
assume 7:6 8:11	choose 8:2	3:3 4:5,5,19 6:4	Dov 2:24	
8:18 9:13	choosing 4:19	6:10 7:16,19,23	draw 9:23	F
assuming 5:11	chose 11:4	7:24 8:5,19,20	drive 9:16	faced 8:1
attempt 4:15	CHRISTINE 2:5	8:20,21 10:16	duty 8:25 D3V4 1:25	factor 10:25
		14:15	D3 V 4 1.23	11:13
			<u>'</u>	•

		I	I	
fair 6:20 7:20	grown 5:25	jurors 9:13,16	looked 8:13	notes 11:21
fairness 4:11		jury 1:15 4:4,6,9	Los 2:21	
fall 5:23	<u>H</u>	5:4,17 6:11,14	lunch 4:7	0
far 6:21 12:8	hacking 12:16	8:1,14 9:7,24	7.7	O 1:3
far-reaching 12:8	HAGAN 2:5	10:3	<u> </u>	occasion 5:1
fault 4:14	Haifa 12:20		M 2:5	occur 4:10 10:18
federal 1:21 5:19	HARTSON 2:18	<u>K</u>	making 9:6 10:19	occurred 6:9
find 10:3	hear 9:3	KENNETH 2:19	11:5,22	10:12 12:25
finding 4:14	heard 6:21 7:16	kidding 11:25	management 5:5	occurring 11:20
flight 10:22	held 14:8	killed 10:13	5:16,17 6:10,18	Official 1:21
following 12:2	higher 5:16	kind 7:8	7:25 8:4	oftentimes 6:3
foot 6:14	highest 6:9	kinds 5:8,11 7:9	manager 11:14,16	Okay 12:23 13:1
force 7:23	hiring 12:17	12:17	Marine 5:19	oOo 13:3 14:1
forebearer 8:8	HOGAN 2:18	KLEIN 2:19	market 6:7	opinion 8:9,10 9:2
foregoing 14:6	HONORABLE	know 5:9,10 6:20	matter 14:8	opportunity 6:12
foresee 6:5	1:3	6:21 7:7 8:14	mean 7:16	9:4,6
forewarned 4:10	horrendous 7:5	9:8,20,22 10:2	middle 5:16 6:18	order 8:20,20
11:6 12:23	Houston 2:8	10:18,20 11:14	7:3	ordering 7:11
format 14:9	hundreds 9:18	12:11,20	million 12:11	organization 5:21
forms 5:18		knowing 11:9	millions 9:18	9:14
forward 6:14	<u> </u>	knowledge 8:13	mitigating 11:13	outmoded 12:12
found 6:15 9:11	imagination	9:9	money 8:24	outside 4:4 8:3
Fountainview 2:7	10:22	Kudelski 8:18	Mordinson 5:3	O'MELVENY
four 4:11 6:7	important 9:10	Kudelskis 9:21	Moskowitz 2:24	2:12
Francisco 2:15	inarticulate 4:7	11:11	Murdoch 8:20 9:6	P
frankly 7:10 8:4	including 8:7 inconveniences	Kudelski's 9:20	9:25 10:9,12	
11:5,18,24	8:5	L	MYERS 2:12	page 3:2 14:9
Friday 1:17 4:1	industry 5:16	$\frac{\mathbf{L}}{\mathbf{L} 2:18}$	N	pages 6:25
front 6:14 11:24	12:20	ladder 5:23	$\overline{\mathbf{N}3:1}$	paid 12:11,13 part 7:12 9:23
future 5:7	inference 9:25	latitude 5:6	NagraStar/Ech	11:2
G	10:20,21	law 2:6,14,19	4:25	parties 4:16
	inferences 7:23	10:22,23	names 6:20	Peled 8:21 9:4
Gale 1:21 14:15	9:23	lawsuit 10:13	NDS 1:8 2:11 4:25	10:1,10
generally 4:16	inflict 10:4	leadership 5:18	5:12 6:13,19,25	people 9:1 12:16
5:24	information 9:14	5:22	7:1 9:19 10:6,12	12:17
Generals 5:19	9:15	leaning 7:20	10:14 12:14,14	perceived 5:23
gentleman 8:17	instance 10:9	leave 10:5	NDS's 5:13 6:10	period 6:17 10:8
give 10:22	institutions 6:1	legal 7:18	6:23 9:23 10:8	12:16
gives 11:8,22	instruct 9:24	levels 6:9	near 7:2	person 7:14
go 6:22 11:23 12:1,8 13:1	insulated 6:1	liability 6:11,15	need 10:10	perspective 8:11
going 4:9,19 6:11	insulation 4:15	9:11 10:3 11:12	needed 10:21	phase 9:12,12
6:24 7:6,17 9:3	involved 4:16 5:3	limit 10:19	never 5:9 10:5	10:4
9:16 10:18 12:9	6:6 7:15 12:16	line 12:21	11:16	pick 6:20 8:2
	IV 1:8 4:2	listening 5:2	news 8:8 10:11	piracy 5:12 6:9
12:10,14,24 gonna 10:24		literally 4:17,20	night 7:3	pirate 5:15
gonna 10:24 good 8:19 10:23	J	6:25 7:25	nonengineering	pirates 4:17,24
great 7:1,9	Judge 1:3 12:2	litigants 4:25	8:16	7:24 8:1
great 7.1,9 group 1:8 2:11	Judicial 14:10	logical 10:21	normally 12:7	place 10:13
4:22	jurisdiction 8:3	look 9:7	North 7:2	plaintiff 2:3 8:24
7.22	· =			r
	•	•	•	•

EchoStar 2008-04-11 D3V4

DI ' 4'00 1 (l	7.17	(10.10	4.25.0.21
Plaintiffs 1:6	R	see 7:17	structure 6:10,19	two 4:25 9:21
plausibility/den	R 2:13	seek 6:16	7:8,13	U
5:25 PLC 1:8 2:11	raise 7:18	seeking 4:20 5:6 self-interest 4:24	structures 7:25 11:17	understand 10:7
point 10:11	reach 11:8 12:18		stuff 11:19 12:20	12:6
Pole 7:2	reached 11:17	sense 6:2 serious 12:20		unfairness 9:3
poor 11:18	real 8:25 10:2		subsequent 9:9	United 1:1,22 8:4
position 6:5 9:10	really 12:6	Shhh 10:16 show 6:24	Suite 2:7,15,20 sums 8:25	14:6,10
-	reason 7:18 10:14	side 11:12,15	sums 8.23 sure 7:19	uses 10:23
possibility 6:22 power 6:19 7:8	11:4	sides 5:8,10 7:6	surprise 4:12	usually 5:22
11:17,22	recognized 4:22	11:7	swap 12:11	U.S 14:15
preclude 10:24	record 11:4 13:1	significant 10:7	swap 12:11 system 12:12	
presence 4:4,8	regarding 3:3	significantly 8:25	System 12.12	V
present 2:23 4:6,6	regulations 14:10	sitting 8:7	T	various 6:1
4:23	relevant 10:9	slid 4:24	T 2:4	vindictive 12:12
presentation 9:5	rely 7:9	slide 4:24	take 12:5	Volume 1:8 4:2
9:7,20	reported 14:7	sloughed 12:13	taken 4:18	vs 1:7
President 5:19	Reporter 1:21 14:15	small 4:22 6:6	takes 5:18	***
presidents 11:18	REPORTER'S	12:21	tell 8:15	W
PRESIDING 1:3	1:14	SNYDER 2:13	tentacles 7:24	W 2:13
pressure 7:22 8:6	represented 6:24	society 5:24	terms 10:19 12:8	WADE 2:4,6
pretty 10:22 12:8	respective 11:24	somebody 7:7,11	testified 8:9	waive 11:23
previously 8:19	responsibility	someplace 7:2	testify 8:2	want 4:8 7:19
probably 6:16	5:22	somewhat 6:1	testimony 8:10	10:5 11:9,10
problem 10:4	responsible 5:21	sorted 10:11	Texas 2:8	warning 10:17
problems 4:9	revenge 10:25,25	speaking 4:16	theft 5:13	way 9:24 12:4,18 weeks 4:11 6:7
proceedings 1:14	11:1 12:10	5:24	thing 6:23 8:22	weight 7:1,10
3:2 13:2 14:8	reverse 10:5	specific 5:22	11:8	WELCH 2:4,6
promise 9:15	RICHARD 2:18	stakes 6:18	think 5:5,7 11:3	10:15
proof 10:21	right 4:5 8:14 9:7	stand 10:1	thinks 12:2	went 7:15
protect 11:6	10:17	standpoint 8:16	third 11:12	West 1:22 2:14
protecting 11:4	risk 10:2	Stars 2:20	thoughts 11:9	we'll 5:9 13:1
12:4	Room 1:22	start 12:17	threat 7:23	wide 5:6
punitive 9:12,12	RPR 1:21 14:16	state 5:7 7:21	three 4:11	WILLETTS 2:5
9:16 10:4	Rubin 2:24	8:10	throw 9:22	wishing 6:8
punitives 6:11	rulings 7:19	stated 5:7 10:25	time 4:23 6:12,18 10:8	witness 8:12,19
11:13		statement 4:13	Title 14:6	witnesses 3:3 5:7
purchased 10:12	S	11:22	top 5:20,23 6:1,19	5:8 8:1
10:15	SACV 1:7	statements 3:3	7:7,25 9:13,17	work 6:2
pursuant 14:5	salient 8:1	States 1:1,22 8:4	11:17 12:15,18	works 10:5
put 6:13 11:4	San 2:15	14:6,10	topmost 7:12	worst 9:10
putting 10:17 pyramid 5:20	Santa 1:16,23 4:1	stenographically 14:7	transcript 1:14	wouldn't 12:7
9:17 12:15	satellite 1:5 2:3 5:12 6:8	stolen 6:25	11:23 12:3 14:7	
p.m 4:3 13:2	5:12 6:8 Saturday 12:3	STONE 2:18 7:14	14:9	X
p·m ¬.J 1J.2	saturday 12.3 saying 10:18	stop 12:19	transferred 7:1	X 3:1
Q	12:23	Street 1:22	tremendous 4:15	\$
quite 7:10 8:4	second 11:8	strength 8:23	7:22 8:6	\$600 12:11
11:5,18,24	Section 14:5	striking 12:11	trial 1:15 5:2 7:19	φυυυ 14.11
quote 10:23	security 12:19	strongly 12:14	true 5:9 14:6	0
_	555dily 12.17			

Page 4

				rage -
03-950 1:7				
03-950 1./				
1				
1-053 1:22				
11 1:17 4:1				
12 14:12				
1400 2:20 1999 2:20				
1999 2.20				
2				
2008 1:17 4:1				
14:12				
2008-04-11 1:25				
2401 2:7 26,000 5:13 6:25				
8:13				
2600 2:15				
275 2:14				
28 14:6				
3				
3 1:8 4:2				
31. 8 4.2 310 2:21				
4				
43:3				
4th 1:22				
4:38 4:3 4:43 13:2				
4:43 13.2 411 1:22				
415 2:16				
5				
558-8141 1:23				
7				
700 2:7				
713 2:8				
714 1:23				
753 14:5				
77057 2:8 785-4600 2:21				
703-4000 2.21				
9				
90067 2:21				
92701 1:23				
94111 2:15				
9472 1:21 14:16 952-4334 2:8				
984-8700 2:16				
20.002.10				
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>