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SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, APRIL 18, 2008 DAY 7 - VOLUME I
(8:01 a.m.)
(The following proceedings is taken in the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Morning.

THE WITNESS: Good morning.

THE COURT: Sir, if you'd please retake the stand. PAUL ORBAN, PLAINTIFFS' WITNESS, RESUMED

THE COURT: Mr. Orban has returned to the witness stand.

And Counsel, thank you very much for your courtesy.

And Counsel, if you'd like to begin this morning with questions on behalf of EchoStar.

MS. WILLETTS: Thank you, your Honor. It's

Christine Willetts for Plaintiffs EchoStar and NagraStar. REDIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued.)

BY MS. WILLETTS:

Q Good morning, Mr. Orban. Thank you for rejoining us today.

I want to first focus your attention on an exhibit we talked about yesterday, Exhibit 402.

Do you have that?

A Yes.

Q And I just want to make sure that -- that the jury is clear on exactly what we are calculating here in

Exhibit 402. We have a list of subscriptions. Can -- can you explain for the jury how you got to the total subscription cost in the first subsection.

A The 1,942 number?
Q Correct.

A Yes, what that is, if -- if the box is pirated, all programming that we transmit is -- is able to be viewed by the -- the pirate. So what we did is we took some of the more common packages that people would see, which would be America's Everything Packet, \$75, essentially, and multiplied it times 12 to get an annual cost of $\$ 900$ in that case, and we did it for all of the services that are shown in that table.

Q So these are all the package that they would have been available to see but they were not paying for --

A Correct.

Q -- is that correct?

A Correct.

Q And you are not purporting that this is, in fact, actually what they're -- what one of the pirates is viewing; is that correct?

A No, we -- we don't know what they actually viewed.

Q Because the pirates don't call in and tell you what
they're doing, right?
A No, they -- they clearly don't call us and tell us.
Q So just to be certain in the jury's mind, Exhibit 402,
the piracy cost calculation, that's a calculation of the
value of services that are actually being pirated, the
potential --
A Yes.
Q Now, Mr. Stone questioned you yesterday about a
purchase order for the card swap, cards that were exchanged
out, and he questioned you about one that was from
NagraStar. Do you have that exhibit in front of you?
A Would that be Exhibit 1584?
Q That is correct.
And I think that you had testified that the -- that the
"C" at the bottom of Exhibit 1584, that you thought that may
have been Charlie Ergen's signature?
A Yes.
Q If you'll turn to page 2 of 1584 and look at the
bottom, do you know whose signature is down on -- at the
bottom of that purchase order?
A Yeah, I was incorrect. That's Alan Guggenheim, there,
and on the front page, that's an "A" and a "G" put together
that sort of looks like a "C."
Q So that's consistent with this being a NagraStar
invoice, because Mr. Guggenheim was the CEO at the time?

A Yes.

Q I going to show you what we have labeled Exhibit 2013.

Can you get that to the witness.

Can you tell us what Exhibit 2013 is.

A Exhibit 2013 is EchoStar's PO to NagraStar for the 4 million cards that we just talked about on Exhibit 1584. So EchoStar gives NagraStar PO for 4 million, and then NagraStar has to give Nagra, who makes the cards, a PO, so this is the first $P O$ in that chain.

MS. WILLETTS: And your Honor, at this time, plaintiffs would offer Exhibit 2030 into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. STONE: Is it 2013 or 2030?

MS. WILLETTS: 2013, I'm sorry.

MR. STONE: No objection.

THE COURT: Received.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 2013 is received in
evidence.)

BY MS. WILLETTS:

Q If we look up in the upper right-hand corner of Exhibit 2013, what is the date on this purchase order?

A January 5th, 2004.

Q And you said this was a purchase order for 4 million cards, and is that found on page 3?

A Yes, at the -- at the middle of the page.

Q And what is the price that EchoStar paid for those cards?

A It's \$7.50.
Q And how does that total out for this purchase order?
A It's $\$ 30$ million.

Q Now, there are additional purchase orders; is that correct, Mr. Orban?

A Yes.

Q Okay. I want to show you what we have marked as Exhibit 2014.

Can you identify Exhibit 2014, please.

A Yes, that's another PO for the swap cards from EchoStar to NagraStar.

MS. WILLETTS: Your Honor, at this time, we'd like
to offer Exhibit 2014 into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. STONE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 2014 is received
into evidence.)

BY MS. WILLETTS:

Q And can you tell us the date of this purchase order that's identified, here, in Exhibit 2014?

A Yes, it's January 20th, 2004.

Q And how many cards being purchased are reflected in

Exhibit 2014?

A As it shows at the bottom of the PO, there, on page 1, there were 11,000 swap cards on this PO.

Q Is it the same price that EchoStar paid on the -- on the previous PO?

A Yes, it's \$7.50.
Q And what is the total amount that was paid in connection with this purchase order by EchoStar?

A $\$ 82,500$.
Q I'd like to direct your attention now to Exhibit 2015.

Mr. Orban, can you identify Exhibit 2015 for the jury.
A Yes, this is another PO dated January 15th, 2005, for 4 million more swap cards at $\$ 7.50$. MS. WILLETTS: Your Honor, we'd like to -plaintiffs would offer Exhibit 2015 into evidence. THE COURT: Any objection? MR. STONE: I just need a clarification on the date of that one, please. MS. WILLETTS: January 15th, 2005. THE COURT: Any objection? MR. STONE: I don't believe we have a copy. I have no objection, but if $I$ can get a copy at some point. THE COURT: You have a copy. Those were given out last evening. In fact, the Court xeroxed them. MR. STONE: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Received.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 2015 is received
into evidence.)

BY MS. WILLETTS:

Q And I believe you said this is another PO for another

4 million cards; is that correct?

A Correct, another 4 million swap cards at \$7.50.

Q For -- what is the total amount that EchoStar paid in connection with this purchase order?

A $\$ 30$ million.

Q I'll direct your attention to one more PO, and it's
Exhibit 2016.

Can you identify Exhibit 2016 for the jury.

A Yes, this is a -- another PO from EchoStar to NagraStar dated April 8th, 2005 for 700,000 swap cards at $\$ 7.50$ each.

MS. WILLETTS: Your Honor, plaintiffs offer

Exhibit 2016 into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. STONE: No objection.

And that's April 8th?

THE COURT: Received.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 2016 is received
into evidence.)

MS. WILLETTS: Correct.

THE COURT: April 8th, 2005.

MR. STONE: Thank you.

BY MS. WILLETTS:

Q And can you tell the jury how much EchoStar paid, total, in connection with the April 8th, 2005 purchase order that's reflected in Exhibit 2016.

A Yes, it's \$5,250,000.

THE COURT: What was the rate per card?

THE WITNESS: \$7.50.

BY MS. WILLETTS:

Q So the card swap, the number of cards that's reflected in Exhibit 406 that we talked about yesterday, the damage summary, the purchase orders that we just discussed, the four purchase orders, those reflect the total number of -in the card swap that we discussed yesterday; is that correct, Mr. Orban?

A Yes, these were the POs that we put in place to support the swap.

Q I want to talk to you a little bit about what Mr. -Mr. Stone referred to yesterday. I believe it was Exhibit 1585-A. Do you have that exhibit in front of you? A Yes.

Q And I believe that you said that this was more likely than not a draft of the final damage summary that EchoStar prepared?

A Yeah, to be clear, I have not seen this before, but it appears to be a draft of the -- the damage summary. Q And is that something typical that your accounting department would do, is prepare drafts before preparing a final version of -- of any accounting documentation? A Yes, depending on what we're producing, there's multiple drafts before $I$ review and approve the final version. And in fact, I may look at three or four versions myself before, you know, I approve it, and there might have been who knows how many drafts before I got it, even. Q And if we'll look back at Exhibit 406, the damage summary we discussed yesterday --

THE COURT: 15 -- what's the number?

MS. WILLETTS: 406, your Honor.

MR. WELCH: It's 406, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

BY MS. WILLETTS:

Q And we discussed on page 5 in Exhibit 406 , and that reflects the total damages that -- that your accounting department came up with in connection with the card swap, correct?

A Yes.

Q What did you --

THE COURT: Just a moment, Counsel.

Please continue, please continue.

BY MS. WILLETTS:

Q So we've talked about the -- the number of cards that are exchanged and that those were reflected in the purchase orders we just discussed. How did you derive or come up with the other lines that are reflected on page 5 of Exhibit 406?

A Well, like I described yesterday, in anticipation of the swap, we put in -- things in place in our accounting system to help track the costs that we incurred to do the swap. And as costs were incurred, they were recorded to our general ledger, which then ends up in our financial statements.

In the case of this, what $I$ did to verify all of the EchoStar numbers, not the -- the IT or the engineering cost numbers, because we received those from NagraStar, I literally personally reviewed every calculation and saw how it reconciled into our general ledger, which is part of our audited financial statements that our auditors audit. Q So in your mind -- withdrawn.

So how are you satisfied that Exhibit 406, the damage summary that we're -- that's been reviewed here by the jury, how are you satisfied that that's a final and accurate number?

A Well, I'm satisfied, because I've literally reviewed it and reconciled it to what's in our general ledger, which are

```
financial statements, which is our -- our -- you know, which
go into our 10-Qs and 10-Ks, and then are audited by our
auditors. So it's -- it's generally reflecting what our
expense was.
```

MS. WILLETTS: Pass the witness, your Honor.
THE COURT: Excuse me. Thank you.
Mr. Stone on cross-examination.
MR. STONE: Thank you, your Honor.
RECROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. STONE:
Q Good morning, Mr. Orban.
A Good morning.
Q If we could start off, first, and take a second and
look at Exhibit 402, please.
And looking at these various subscription services and
pay-per-view packages, can you tell us how many hours of
programming per day this represents?
A These would be services that were available all day
long in the top part section for the $\$ 1,942$. Those channels
are up 24 hours a day.
Q Well, I take it you can't watch Ecstasy and Playboy at
the same time, right?
A Correct, but you can switch between them all throughout
the day.
Q Well, how much total hours of programming are
represented by these monthly costs per day; do you know?

A Again, each one of those channels are up full-time, so you can switch back and forth between them.

Q But this would represent more than 24 hours of programming each day, correct?

A Yes. However, when someone orders a package from us, whether they watch it one minute or 24 hours a day, they have to pay the same price.

Q You can't watch two different movies at the same time on your service, correct?

A If you have a DVR, yes, you can.
Q And is that revenue accounted for in the average revenue per unit?

A Yes.

Q And that -- what's the average of that, again?

A Of ARPU for what period?
Q For 2001.

A ARPU was $\$ 49.63$ for 2001.

Q And that's the average of all subscribers and how much they order on a monthly basis?

A Yes.

Q And this document, Exhibit 402, doesn't take into account any costs of the programming, does it?

A No, it does not.

Q Okay. Now, let's go to Exhibit 406, page 5, I think it
is.

Okay. If you go to the top third of the page under "subscriber equipment."

A Yes.

Q I know it's a little hard to read. It says "replacement of able boxes," correct?

A Yes.

Q And those would be the set-top boxes that are on top of the TV?

A It would be one of the models that we have, yes.

Q And those were replaced for what reason?

A The able boxes did not have enough memory, flash or RAM memory, to be able to support the card swap, so in order to secure the system, we literally had to replace that version of set-top boxes.

Q So those boxes were obsolete at that point in time?

A They would be when we perform the swap, yes.

Q And so those boxes were upgraded, correct?

A Yes.

Q And did they have additional functionality that

EchoStar wanted?

A I believe we gave them the -- the -- a newer generation box that had the same low-level or the baseline
functionality that our baseline receiver has.

Q Did it have any additional functionality beyond the
prior boxes?
A I don't believe it did.
Q And turning -- I'm sorry.
Turning back to the column that says "other direct
costs."
A Yes.
Q And am I correct, the only support for the
approximately 10 million or 9.5 million, I guess, of direct
costs is the printout that's attached to Exhibit 406?
A Yes, that's the support we gave.
Q So there are no underlying invoices; is that correct?
A This is a detail printout of our general ledger system
of the invoices that were paid. We could pull actual
invoices if you'd like for each one of those.
Q And do you know who made the decision that a particular
cost was related to the card swap?
A Like I stated earlier, $I$ put in place coding and a
process in place that we could quantify all these costs. So
what I did is $I$ only gave certain people in our organization
authority or signing authority over certain accounts so we
could restrict who could code things to this account. So
there was a handful of people, and it was only the people
working on the swap that could code to this account, so we
quantified it.
On top of it, my team went through and literally looked
at every invoice to make sure it was a swap related cost,
and if things were not included, they were taken out of
the --
Q And who was it who made that -- I'm sorry, who was it
who made that decision?
A That made what decision?
Q That a particular code belonged in the card swap
category.
A I looked at some, my team. We would review everything
on a monthly basis when we closed the books.
Q Was there any particular person on your team whose job
it was to determine whether a particular cost should be
coded for the card swap?
A There would have been a few different people, a few
different people do it. Barbara Alec (phonetic) and
probably Kristen Arnold (phonetic) did the majority of it.
Q And do you recall which ROM cards were to be used in
the new set-top boxes?
A In the new set-top boxes --
Q Correct.
A -- what do you mean by that?
Q Well, which cards worked in the able boxes; do you
recall?
A I'm not sure what -- it -- it would have been a -- one
of the pirated cards clearly were the ones that worked in
the able boxes.

Q Did the ROM 10 card work in the able box?

A I am not quite sure what the ROM 10 card is. If it --
if it was a swap card, no, it did not.
Q Was the ROM 10 card pirated as of 2001?

A I don't know what the ROM card is, so I can't answer that.

Q All right. So you don't have any idea which ROM cards could work in those able boxes; is that a fair statement?

A That -- that is a fair statement.
Q Now, if we could go back to Exhibit 1585-A, please.
Now, it's your testimony this was a draft?
A Like I stated earlier, I am not quite sure. I've never seen this before. As it appears to have some of the same descriptions and numbers of the final document, my assumption, and again, it's my guess, that it was probably a draft.

Q Well, on this document underneath "capital investment," it has a column "construction for the room." It's about the top third of the page. There's an amount of 100,000 next to it.

A Yes.

Q And it says "somewhat of a guess," correct?
A That's what this document says, yes.
Q And because it was somewhat of a guess, there are no

```
invoices relating to the room; is that correct?
```

A No.
Q And are those invoices attached to Exhibit 406?
A The actual invoices are not attached to 406. However,
if you'd like, I -- I'm more than able to get the -- the
invoices out of our fixed assets system that tied to the
hundred thousand dollars.
Q Now, where it says "IT costs, 2 million, complete
guess," do you know who was in charge of determining the IT
costs?
A Like I stated earlier, the IT costs and the engineering
costs that are on Exhibit 406, I believe 406, we received
those from the NagraStar accounting department.
Q And do you know who -- who in particular was in charge
of determining those IT costs?
A I believe Theresa Barnhard (phonetic) at NagraStar
prepared those.
Q And under "fulfillment costs," it says "\$740,000."
Would that be based on payroll records?
A Again, this is a draft. I know in Exhibit 406, that I
reviewed and approved, the rates that are used for the
salaries were based on us taking a look at the departmental
cost for the fulfillment group that was preparing this, and
on average, the rates were for the -- depending on whether
it was an employer or a manager, the rates were
approximately $\$ 25,000$ and 60,000.
Q Now, the 600,000 in $I T$ support that's about in the middle of the page, is that somewhat of a guess, or is that part of the "complete guess" column; do you know?

A Again, sir, I have not seen this. The -- in

Exhibit 406, the IT costs of 600,000 was provided to us by the NagraStar accounting department.

Q Now, if you go down to the bottom of the page of 1585-A, there is a Bates stamp number or production number.

And this copy's -- this document is a bit hard to read, as you can see. Are you aware that we asked for a better copy of this document?

A I have never seen this before, so no, I'm not aware of that.

Q Okay. Well, if you could look at Exhibit 1585, please. And this is entitled "Analysis of EchoStar damages," correct?

A That's what the title says, yes.
Q And this is something the folks in your department would have prepared?

A Again, I'm not sure. I know that with Exhibit 406, page 5, that's what my people prepared and I reviewed and tied to our general ledger.

MR. STONE: Okay. Your Honor, I would move 1585 at this time.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. WILLETTS: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.
(Defendants' Exhibit No. 1585 is received
into evidence.)
BY MR. STONE:

Q Looking at 1585, it looks like it has the same columns as we saw on the version that was difficult to read, 1585-A, correct?

A It would appear to be similar.

Q And if you go down to the -- the bottom of the page at 1585, there should be a production number.

And then if we could split screen with 1585-A, if possible?

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, your next question, please. BY MR. STONE:

Q Sir, the -- the better copy that we asked for has the same production number, but this document appears to be missing all of the comments like "complete guess," "somewhat guess," correct?

A There are no comments on the 1585 exhibit.

MR. STONE: And looking at Exhibit 1585 in full, please.

MS. WILLETTS: Your Honor, objection. I think

Mr. Stone is mischaracterizing what's occurred here. The Bates number appears just to be --

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much, Counsel. You'll have another opportunity. There are no speaking objections.

MS. WILLETTS: Thank you.
BY MR. STONE:
Q All right. Looking at 1585, this has, for example, the same amount for replacement of able boxes, 2 million, as we saw on the hard to read copy with the comments, right?

A Again, that ties to this document, but that's nothing that I've reviewed or approved. Our final document that ties to our general ledger and is the right reflection of our cost is on Exhibit 406. This was some draft or something at some point in time. I've never seen it, and in the world of accounting, when people do drafts and you have low-level staff people starting to do calculations, there could be, you know, like I said before, 5, 10 different drafts of a final document. And -- and until I review it and I approve it and I was able to tie it into our general ledger, was $I$ comfortable with it, which is what Exhibit 406 is. So I'm not quite sure where this came from, and I -I've never seen it before.

Q To be clear, on 1585-A, where is says "total guess for replacement set-top boxes," the amount is 2 million, right?

A Yeah, and that would be inaccurate. The number is $\$ 3,873,045$.

Q And the same number is carried forward on this better copy of 1585, which is now Exhibit 1585-A, correct?

A Well, I wouldn't characterize this as a better copy. These are both inaccurate copies and inaccurate analyses. The analyses on Exhibit 406 is the correct calculation. Q All right. Is the -- are the IT costs the same as between all three of those exhibits?

A It appears to be.
Q And what is FTE?

A Full-time equivalent.
Q Pardon?
A Full-time equivalent, full-time equivalent employee.

Q And that number is the same as between the three exhibits, correct?

A Yes, it is.
Q Now, am I correct, you haven't seen or produced a
document that describes the reason for EchoStar's decision to spend tens of millions of dollars to engage in a card swap in 2004?

A We -- we did the swap, because we were hacked, and we had to secure our system.

Q Have you seen any document that outlines the reasons for that card swap?

A I believe you showed me a document yesterday that said we had been hacked.

Q Have you seen any memo or report that says "We need to do a card swap" for a particular reason?

A I'm sure I've seen a document, and it was discussed many, many times that we were hacked, and we had to swap out the Smart Cards to secure our system.

Q And you've seen multiple documents like that?
A I said I'm sure I've seen documents like that or been in meetings where that has been discussed.

Q So it should exist, then, correct?

A (No audible response.)

Q Such a document should exist, correct?

A Well, if $I$ was in meetings, there wouldn't be a document of a meeting, but $I$ can't recall if $I$ actually specifically saw a document or was given a document, but $I$ can assure you I've been in multiple meetings where it was discussed that we had been hacked and we needed to swap out our Smart Cards in order to secure our system and protect our revenue stream.

Q Have you seen a single document that attributes the card swap to any compromise of the ROM 3 cards?

A Again, I didn't get into the technicalities. I know the -- our Smart Cards were hacked, and we had to replace them, and I'm not sure what ROM version was hacked or not
hacked, but $I$ know the swap cards, which we talked about in the POs earlier were the ones that we used to replace all our other cards that were hacked.

```
Q Okay. But my question is a little more focused. I
```

understand you don't understand the differences between all
the ROM versions. I am just asking you if you have any
recollection of seeing a document that attributed the card
swap to a compromise of the ROM 3 card, whether you
understood what a ROM 3 was from a ROM 10 or not?
A Ask that question again.
Q Sure.
Do you recall seeing any document that attributed the
reason for the card swap in 2004 to a compromise of
something called the ROM 3 card?
A I can't recall that $I$ saw an actual document that said
that, but again, $I$ was in numerous meetings where we
discussed as a company we had to replace the Smart Cards,
since we were hacked.
Q Did you see any document that attributed the reason for
the card swap in 2004 to anything that occurred on the
internet in December 2000?
A Can you rephrase that question again, please.
Q Sure.
Do you recall seeing any document that attributed the
reason for the card swap in 2004 to something that occurred
on the internet in December 2000?
A Yes, I can remember being in meetings where it was discussed that the -- the way or the -- however you can hack a card was out on the internet.

Q And -- and when did you first hear that?
A At some point in that general time frame.
Q You mean 2004?

A In general. I can't recall the specific conversations, but yes.

Q Okay. And 2004 would be after the lawsuit was filed, correct?

A Again, it was in the general time frame, so I'm not sure when -- and I'm not sure even when the lawsuit was filed, quite frankly.

Q You discussed yesterday a mass swap or a mass exchange; do you recall that?

A Yes.

Q Are there other kinds of swaps that can be done other than a mass swap?

A Yeah, we did a service swap like I talked about yesterday. The mass swap is where we actually mailed the cards and put them in the -- the mailers and mailed them to people where they actually had to take out the card and stick it in their set-top box and destroy the other card. We, at the service swap, when we actually got a box that was
broken, we would actually do the swap at that point in time.

Q Have you ever heard of a soft swap?
A Yes, I've heard that -- that terminology used.

Q And what's a soft swap?
A I think it relates to at some point we had swapped out some of the service set-top -- or the Smart Cards in some of the service units.

Q And what are the business --
A We did that to just make sure that it would work and -kind of like a beta test, if you will. We wanted to make sure with the limited quantities --

THE COURT: Slower, slower.
THE WITNESS: We wanted to make sure that it would work, so with limited quantities, we actually did swap with service units that we got back to make sure they worked. I mean, the last thing we wanted to do is put, you know, 8 million cards out there and have everyone's box blow up or have a situation where they couldn't get programming, so we -- we, with limited numbers, beta tested it.

BY MR. STONE:
Q Sir, if you could go to Exhibit 2013, please. This is the first purchase order you saw from EchoStar.

A Exhibit --

Q $\quad 2013$.

THE COURT: While you are doing that, will you
excuse me for just a moment. I'll be right back.
MR. STONE: Okay.
(Interruption in the proceedings.)
THE COURT: Thank you very much, Counsel. You may
proceed.
BY MR. STONE:
Q Okay. Sir, looking at Exhibit 2013 on the first page
just about smack-dab middle where it says "For four years,
NagraCard will replace for free the SO1 cards," about the
fourth line down.
Thank you, sir.
A Yes.
Q And that's similar to the language we saw on the
NagraStar invoices, correct -- or purchase orders, I should
say?
A Yeah, it appears to be identical.
Q And then go to the second page, if you would, please,
of Exhibit 2013. And I'm focusing on the first sentence of
the second -- or the first full paragraph, there.
It says "EchoStar, NagraStar and NagraCard will, in
good faith, negotiate the terms of a new business model for
the rental of security modules and warranty conditions
before the release of the first Smart Card listed within";
do you see that?
A Yes.

Q And the Smart Card listed within would be the swapout cards, correct?

A Correct.

Q And you -- you said that you now understand that signature to be Mr. Guggenheim's on the other purchase order for NagraStar?

A (No audible response.)
Q I think it's 1584.

A Yeah, just I want to be clear here.

Q Sure.

A Exhibit 1584, that is Alan Guggenheim's initials. It's an "A" and a "G" that are overlaid each other. That kind of looks like a "C," and then you can see on the very last page, page 3, that it has his name, and clearly, that's Alan Guggenheim's name on page 3.

Q And who did Mr. Guggenheim report to?

A Alan -- I'm not -- Alan Guggenheim, I guess to the board of NagraStar. He was the CEO of NagraStar.

Q And the board members were comprised of EchoStar and Kudelski?

A I'm not quite sure who was on the board, but it was 50 percent owned by EchoStar and 50 percent owned by Kudelski.

Q And who do you understand to be having these good faith negotiations about a new business model before the swapout
cards?

A I'm not sure who had those discussions, because I was not privy to them; someone else would have. What I can say, though, is we did not come to an agreement with a rental model with NagraStar or Nagra.

Q Did you have an understanding that those negotiations were taking place at the highest level?

A Again, I wasn't privy to those, so I'm not quite sure. I know there was discussion that we had talked about that, and since it did not happen, clearly, you know, we didn't feel it was the right thing to do.

Q Do you know whether there were any other arrangements made that were different from what was discussed in those meetings?

A Since $I$ was not in those meetings and was not privy to those conversations, I'm not -- I can't opine one way or the other.

Q So you don't know what the give-and-take was to end up with free replacement cards as set forth in the purchase order, do you?

A I believe this phrase, here, is referring to the purchase of Smart Cards for new production going forward. It had nothing to do with the actual swapout itself.

Q Right, and those would be free cards for the swapout that's occurring in 2008 , correct?

A It would be free swap cards for cards that were purchased under these POs that were compromised.

Q And it's fair to say you don't know what all the give-and-take was in those negotiations that occurred prior to this purchase order, right?

A Correct, I was not privy to that.

Q Okay.

Sir, if you could look at Exhibit 828 again, very briefly.

A What -- what did it look like?

Q It was a letter from EchoStar's counsel.

Your Honor, do you have a copy? If not, I have an extra.

We talked a little bit yesterday about this letter, and I'm not going to go through the whole thing, but the -- the letter is dated July 2nd, 1999, correct?

A Correct.

Q And you'll notice in the second paragraph, first sentence, there is a demand for a swapout of cards to be completed in the next six months; do you see that?

A What paragraph was that, again?
Q The second paragraph, first sentence.
A Yes.

Q And it --

A Well, it says "We discussed involving a swapout."

Just to be clear, it says "Kudelski, NagraStar and EchoStar have also discussed a fix involving the swapout of Smart Cards to be completed in the next six months. I wouldn't call that a demand, but -Q Well, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the corporate counsel's next statement, which is "The fix, of which the Smart Card swapout is only one piece, is extremely important and must be accomplished as soon as possible"? Do you have any reason to doubt those words? A No. We -- we clearly would want it performed as -- as fast as possible to secure our system and protect our revenue stream.

Q Now, six months after July of 1999 would be, roughly, early 2000, correct?

A Yes.

Q And in this case, there's been testimony that the ROM 10 card was produced in February or March of 2000 ; were you aware of that?

A No, again, I don't know the ROM or the versions.
Q If we could show you, please, Exhibit 1593, and this document is entitled "Activation data by year"; do you see that?

A Yes.

Q And can you tell us what activation means.
A This is the first time I've seen this document, and --
and our term "activation" means the turning on of the
subscriber to see programming.
MR. STONE: Your Honor, I would move 1593 subject
to connection.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MS. WILLETTS: No objection, your Honor.
THE COURT: Received --
MR. STONE: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Now, Counsel, we could receive that
document, but it could have a bearing on a lot of other
issues before the Court. So as long as that's understood by
all parties.
All right. It's received.
(Defendants' Exhibit No. 1593 is received
into evidence.)
MR. STONE: Thank you, your Honor.
BY MR. STONE:
Q Is there a department within EchoStar that you are
aware of that tracks when cards are activated?
A Specific cards are activated or when a subscriber
activates?
Q When a subscriber activates a card.
A Yes.
Q Okay. And is the company able to track which ROM
version of the card is activated?

A I'm not sure $I$ know when a subscriber activates. We can -- we have a billing system that says it's an active subscriber, and they're -- we know what programming they're receiving. So I'm not sure if it has that data in it or not.

Q Okay. Well, looking at this Exhibit 1593, where it says "DN10," would that refer to the DNASP ROM 10 version?

A Sir, like I said, I've never seen this before, and I'm not an expert on versions or names, so I don't know.

Q All right. Did you ever become aware of a mass shipment of ROM 10 cards in 2000 and 2001? Did that ever come to your attention in performing your job duties?

A In what period?

Q $\quad 2000,2001$.

A No. First of all, I don't know what a ROM time -- ROM 10 card is, and if we -- we every year get many, many Smart Cards shipped to us from NagraStar, so we -- we would have orders coming in every month for new production. So yes, there would have been shipments, but I have no idea if it was ROM 10 or ROM whatever.

Q And if a card is compromised, is it your understanding that EchoStar has the ability to stop activating those cards?

A No. I think if it's compromised, we have no ability to control that card anymore, and then the pirates get whatever
they want.

Q Now, as you were saying, an activation is when a subscriber first activates a new service or new account?

A Yes, or it could be a reactivation, but yes, it's when we provision in our billing system the right for them to see the programming that they subscribe to, whether it's, you know, our basic package like America Top 100 or HBO or whatever the case may be.

Q And would your department have tracked the costs of purchasing of ROM 10 cards?

A We track the purchase of all smart -- Smart Cards, so we actually have to pay for them, and so we have details and invoices of cards purchased and what we paid for them. So I'm assuming that the ROM 10 is one of those, so we would have that data.

Q And sir, I just want to be clear, are you aware of any document that states that the reason for the card swap in 2004 was because of any internet postings in December 2000?

A Like I stated earlier, I was in numerous meetings where we had discussed that as a management team.

Q These are meetings in 2004?
A In that general time frame.
Q Do you recall seeing any document?
A I don't recall exactly if $I$ saw a document or not. MR. STONE: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions, Counsel?

MS. WILLETTS: Brief redirect, your Honor.
THE COURT: By stipulation of both counsel, we've reopened this to give each counsel two more rounds.

Is that correct for my record on behalf of EchoStar?

MR. HAGAN: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: And NDS?

MR. STONE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. WILLETTS:

Q Mr. Orban, Mr. Stone had a -- a brief line of questioning on one of the purchase orders, Exhibit 2013. Do you have that in front of you?

A Yes.
Q And he alluded to a reference in here that talked about
a future swapout if the cards do not remain secure for at least four years. You understood this provision to be a forward looking provision; isn't that correct?

A Yeah, absolutely. It has nothing to do with the swap that we performed a few years ago, yes.

Q So EchoStar doesn't get a refund for the $\$ 94$ million that it spent on the card swap?

A Oh, absolutely not, no.

MS. WILLETTS: Thank you.

THE COURT: And recross?

MR. STONE: Just a few questions, sir.

FURTHER RECROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. STONE:

Q Getting free swap cards is significantly better than the warranty that we saw, the warranty agreement we saw yesterday, correct, that provided for direct marginal manufacturing costs?

A This was the agreement that the two parties bargained for, for this agreement.

Q As part of the swapout in 2004 , correct?

A Yes.

Q And you've never seen an agreement before like this where the swapout cards are provided for free, have you, sir?

A No, but we enter into new agreements with companies all the time, and the terms are always different -- or usually different.

Q Depending on the business conditions that exist at the time of those negotiations?

A Yeah, two parties negotiate at arms' length, and terms could be different, could be the same. It just depends on how the two parties come to an agreement.

Q And am I correct, those negotiations took place after
this lawsuit was filed?
A I don't know when this lawsuit was filed --

Q Thank you.

A -- so I can't answer that question.

MR. STONE: Thank you.

THE COURT: And the exhibit you, once again,

```
referred to is which Exhibit Number?
```

MR. STONE: 2013.

THE COURT: 2013. Thank you very much.
Now, sir, we are going to place you on call, as we are all of the other witnesses, at least within the continental United States. From the time you receive notice from the counsel through the court, we expect you to be back in court within 48 hours.

Thank you very much, sir. You may step down. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thanks.

THE COURT: Your next witness, please, Counsel.

MR. HAGAN: Thank you, your Honor. Plaintiffs
call Allen Menard by video deposition.

THE COURT: You are going to hear a video
deposition at this time. The next person being presented to you would be Allen Menard.

And are you prepared to play that video? MR. HAGAN: (No audible response.) THE COURT: You are.

And if you'd please play the video. MR. HAGAN: Thank you, your Honor. ALLEN MENARD, PLAINTIFFS' WITNESS, VIDEO DEPOSITION (Videotape played of Plaintiffs' witness, Allen Menard, and inserted below.)

Insert

MR. HAGAN: That's the remainder of our clips, your Honor. I believe the defense has their designation.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Each side has designated a portion of Mr. Menard's deposition. These will be the portions presented by NDS, the defendant.
(Videotape played of Plaintiffs' witness, Allen Menard, and inserted below.)
*******

Insert

Page Range:254:18-254:21

254:18 Q Have you ever had the experience where anyone has

254:19 posted pretending to be DR7 or

Allen Menard who

254:20 was not you?

254:21 A Yeah.

Page Range:254:24-257:13

254:24 Q MR. STONE:

```
many occasions has
```

    254:25 that occurred?
    255: 255
    255: 1 A I'm not sure.
    255: 2 Q Now, you also testified that
    there I think
255: 3 two things were going on with
your website if I
255: 4 recall correctly after your
accident.
255: 5 A Mm-hmm.
255: 6 Q If I recall correctly you
injured your hip
255: 7 sometime in spring of 2000.
255: 8 A It was I believe May of 2000
when I had first
255: 9 moved to Vancouver I was
rollerblading and broke
255:10 off my femoral head.
255:11 Q Okay. And if I understand it
correctly
255:12 two things happened after that
point in time.
255:13 Your website was attacked by people hacking into

255:14 it.

255:15 A Well, at that time $I$ was on a lot of medication.

255:16 At first I was prescribed a drug called laratene

255:17 (phonetic). It's basically a synthetic morphine,

255:18 then I was given Dilaudid. I asked

255:19 Charles Perlman if he could help out kind of 255:20 administer the site. He had basically passwords

255:21 for all the administration.
He had my TELNET
255:22 passwords. He had my SQL passwords.

255:23
basically had
255:24 complete control of my
website. In some of the
255:25 evidence that me and Grant
have been given here,
256: 256

256: $1 \quad$ Charles says that he ran my website

256: 2 single-handedly for over a
year. So you know,
256: 3 he's admitted he ran it. He got really mad when

256: 4 I finally started coming off
the drugs -- well, I
256: 5 temporarily came off the drugs. I did have a bit

256: 6 of a drug addiction. I was on these painkillers.

256: $7 \quad$ Like, I got the first
operation in May and then I
256: 8 had to get the other one. My
hip started dying
256: 9 off, so I had to get another operation.

256:10
So yeah,
Charles ran the
256:11 site. And while he was
running the site he got
256:12 Reg Scullion to help out.

256:13 Q Now, when you say "run the site," am I correct to

256:14 understand that Charles

Perlman would have had

256:15 administrator privileges --

256:16 A Correct.

256:17 Q -- on DR7? Tell me exactly what does that mean

256:18 to have administrator privileges?

256:19 A Total control. He could basically make up fake

256:20 user names. Another thing he could do is he

256:21 could go in there and he could take my name DR7

256:22 and he could change my mail to
address to an

256:23 address that he used, a

Hotmail address, send my

256:24 password to him and then he can get my password

256:25 and then he could change it
back and I would

257: 257

257: 1 never know.

257: 2 Q And did Mr. Scullion also have administrative

257: 3 privileges --

257: 4 A He did.

257: 5 Q And did that continue through

257: 6 A Charles Perlman, though, had more control than

257: 7
Scullion. Perlman had all the TELNET passwords,

257: 8 the FTP passwords. He had full control. Reg as

257: 9 far as I knew only had administration privileges,

257:10 where he could look at IPs and he could edit

257:11 certain things within the site, delete posts,

257:12 stuff like that. Charles

Perlman had direct

257:13 access to the database.

Page Range:258:9-258:12

258: 9 Q Now, was Mr. -- did Mr.

Perlman have

258:10
administrator rights all the way up through the

258:11 end of 2000?

258:12 A To the best of my knowledge he did. I don't know

Page Range:259:12-259:15

259:12 Q Now, is it correct, then, that

Mr. Perlman would

259:13 have had administrator rights
at the time of

259:14 these so-called Nipper
postings on December 23rd

259:15 and 24th, 2000?

Page Range:259:19-260:5
259:19 A As far as $I$ know he would have.

259:20 Q MR. STONE: And as an administrator at

259:21 the instant those things were posted, he would

259:22 have had the ability to see whatever data related

259:23 to those postings, whether it was an IP address

259:24 or something else, correct?

259:25 A I believe so.

260: 260

260: 1 Q And did you know who Mr.
Perlman was working for
260: 2 during the period from the
summer of 2000 to the
260: 3 end of 2000 when he had
administrator rights on
260: 4 DR7?
260: 5 A Best of my knowledge Charles works for EchoStar.

Page Range:261:11-261:16
261:11 Q MR. STONE: Now, I
believe you
261:12 testified that you thought
that Mr. Ereiser and
261:13 Mr. Perlman had reasons to
either set you up or
261:14 get back at you, I can't
remember your exact
261:15 phrase, but it sounded as if you had some dispute

261:16 with him.
Page Range:261:19-262:2
261:19 A Can I go ahead? The way it
all started with Ron

261:20 and me becoming enemies in the beginning was Ron

261:21 was a commercial dealer. He made his money off

261:22 DSS. Once Internet came alive, and I started one

261:23 of the very first educational sites dealing with

261:24 satellite. And once any files were posted Ron

261:25 took offense to that. I was taking part of his

262: 262

262: 1 money by giving files for free to people he was

262: 2 losing money, so he didn't like me.

Page Range:276:11-277:4

276:11 Q MR. STONE: Now, if I understand it

276:12 correctly, in July of 2000 you
received a

276:13 threatening letter from NDS
and Direct TV about

276:14 your website.
276:15 A Yeah. That's correct. They sent it to my ISP in

276:16 Vancouver.
276:17 Q And do you have a recollection that attorneys for

276:18 NDS also took the deposition of Mr. Ianello,

276:19 your --
276:20 A Yes, they did. I actually -I believe I also

276:21 may have paid his legal fees.
276:22 Q And so in the early summer of 2000 NDS was

276:23 aggressively trying to shut down your website?

276:24 A They were.
276:25 Q Did EchoStar ever send you any letters demanding

277: 277

277: 1 you shut down --
277: 2 A Not that I'm aware of.
277: 3 Q Did they ever take any depositions of any of your

277: 4 ISP providers?

Page Range:277:7-277:7

277: 7 A Not that I'm aware of.

Page Range:249:4-250:4

249: 4 Q MR. STONE: And you understand that

249: 5 the allegation is is that you established some

249: 6 network of piracy dealers at the direction of

249: 7 NDS, you understand that's the claim?

249: 8 A I understand that's the claim.

249: 9 Q Is there any truth whatsoever to that claim?

249:10 MS. WILLETTS:
Objection
to form.

249:11
OBJECTION TO QUESTION

249:12 A Sorry. The only truth is I did post files on my

249:13 website, files that were donated to me. People

249:14 may have taken them and altered them, and they

249:15 may have went and
commercialized stuff. That's

249:16 what happened. Anything else alleged in the

249:17 fourth amended complaint I don't agree with at

249:18 all.

249:19 Q MR. STONE:
So did
anyone from NDS

249:20 ever direct you to engage in

EchoStar piracy --

249:21 MS. WILLETTS:

Objection. Form.
$249: 22$
OBJECTION TO QUESTION

249:23 A Never.

249:24 Q MR. STONE: Did Chris

Tarnovsky ever

249:25 try to recruit you to engage in EchoStar piracy?

250: 250

250: 1 A No --

250: 2 MS. WILLETTS:
Form.

250: 3

250: 4 A -- he did not.

Page Range:250:17-252:8

250:17
So did

Chris Tarnovsky

250:18 ever try to recruit you to
engage in EchoStar

250:19 piracy at any time?

250:20 MS. WILLETTS: Objection to form.
$250: 21$
OBJECTION TO QUESTION

250:22 A No.

250:23 Q MR. STONE:
Did Chris

Tarnovsky ever

250:24 provide you with any money so
that you were

250:25 supposed to engage in EchoStar piracy?

251: 251

251: 1 MS. WILLETTS:
Same objection.

251: 2

251: 3 A No.

251: 4 Q MR. STONE:
Did NDS
ever provide you

251: 5 with money so that you would engage in EchoStar

251: 6 piracy?

251: 7 MS. WILLETTS:
Same objection.

251: 8
OBJECTION TO QUESTION

251: 9 A No.

251:10 Q MR. STONE:
Did Mr.

Tarnovsky ever

251:11 provide you with any black boxes or other devices

251:12 to reprogram EchoStar access cards?

251:13 MS. WILLETTS: Form.
251:14 OBJECTION TO QUESTION
251:15 A No.

251:16 Q MR. STONE:
Did
anyone from NDS ever

251:17 provide you with any devices
to engage in

251:18 EchoStar piracy?

251:19 MS. WILLETTS: Form.

251:20 OBJECTION TO QUESTION

251:21 A No.

251:22 Q MR. STONE: Did you
ever send any

251:23 money to Chris Tarnovsky in
return for services

251:24 for engaging in EchoStar piracy?

251:25 MS. WILLETTS: Form.

252: 252

252: 1
OBJECTION TO QUESTION

252: 2 A No.

252: 3 Q MR. STONE:
Did you
ever send money to

252: 4 anyone for services for
engaging in EchoStar

252: 5 piracy?

252: 6 MS. WILLETTS:

Objection. Form.

252: 7
OBJECTION TO QUESTION

252: 8 A No.

Page Range:244:12-244:20

244:12 Q And has NDS or anyone from NDS told you to

244:13 testify in any particular way here today?

244:14 A No.

244:15 Q Has anyone from NDS promised you anything in the

244:16 future?

244:17 A No.

244:18 Q And if $I$ understand you
correctly, we might have

244:19
Exhibit 980 out there. It's
this consent order.

244:20 A Yeah.

Page Range:245:5-245:9

245: 5 Q MR. STONE: It looks like as part of

245: 6 the consent order that EchoStar has agreed to

245: 7 release you from any and all claims as long as

245: 8 you come here and testify, correct?

245: 9 A Yeah.

Page Range:245:23-246:2

245:23 Q MR. STONE:
So you
understood that by

245:24 entering into that agreement with EchoStar you

245:25 weren't admitting to liability for anything,

246: 246

246: 1 right?

246: 2 A Exactly.

Page Range:246:10-246:16

246:10 Q And if I understand you correctly is that as you

246:11 understand with your agreement with EchoStar, no

246:12 matter what you say here today, no matter how you

246:13 testify, there won't be any adverse consequences

246:14 from EchoStar as a result of your testimony. Is

246:15 that the way you understand the deal?

246:16 A That's the way I understand it.

Page Range:246:18-247:3

246:18 A And that includes, like, when I mention that I

246:19 may have tried to program a card or nothing, you

246:20 guys aren't going to come back
later and sue me,

246:21 right?

246:22 Q And so nobody's threatened you to testified any

246:23 particular way here today; is
that a fair

246:24 statement?

246:25 A No. I'm here -- I came here voluntarily.

247: 247

247: 1 Q What you have testified here today is the truth,

247: 2 correct?

247: 3 A Yes, it is.

Page Range:10:15-11:12

10:15 Q So you decided you wanted to go work for NDS?

10:16 A Yeah.

10:17 Q Why did you want to do that?

10:18 A Because $I$ had some info that $I$
felt they might

10:19 want.

10:20 Q What information was that?

10:21 A It was some classified info
that was posted

10:22 online that $I$ found, and it
seemed like they

10:23 didn't know where it was from
and I did.

10:24 Q This was information relating
to Direct TV; is

10:25 that correct?

11: 11

11: 1 A Yeah.

11: 2 Q How did you know where that information came

11: 3 from?

11: 4 A I found the files online. They were confidential

11: 5 files. I took them apart with a hex editor. I found some info in there that somebody didn't realize was in there, and I began an Investigation. From there I asked a lawyer to set up a meeting with John Norris, and she said, What would he want to talk to you about? And I said, Let him know I have something he needs to see.

Page Range:8:9-9:02

8: 9 Q What type of work did you do for NDS during that 2003 to 2007 time frame?

8:11 A I was a consultant.

8:12 Q What did you do as a consultant?

8:13 A I did online investigations.

8:14 Q Online investigations
concerning satellite

8:15 piracy?

8:16 A Correct.

8:17 Q Did you do anything else other
than online

8:18 investigations?

8:19 A I assisted various law enforcement agencies,

8:20 US customs which I guess later turned into the

8:21 DHS, secret service, Direct

TV.

8:22 Q How did you provide assistance
to the law enforcement agencies?

8:24 A Through John Norris, director of special operations. He asked me to do work. He passed on my work to them. Later on some of them wanted to meet me.

Page Range:33:9-33:23

33: 9 Did NDS put any limits on --
limitations on how you were to perform your
33:11 job and how you were to
collect data for them?

33:12 A I don't know what you mean by
"limitations."

33:13 Q Were you free to go to any site you wanted to go

33:14 to?
33:15 A Best of my recollection, yes.
33:16 Q Were you free to post on any site you wanted

33:17 to --

33:18 A No, I wasn't.
33:19 Q Did that instruction come specifically from NDS?

33:20 A I was told at the beginning of my employment not

33:21 to post on any forums.
33:22 Q Who told you that?
33:23 A That came from John Norris.

Page Range:283:14-283:17
283:14 Q Now, when you worked at -- for NDS as a

283:15 consultant, did they tell you
to obey all the
283:16 laws while you --
283:17 A Of course.
Page Range:284:5-284:16
284: 5 Q MR. STONE: Now, when you worked with

284: 6 the folks at NDS did you find them to be

284: 7 professional?

284: 8 A Very professional. And they taught me a lot

284: 9 about, you know, like -- you know, maybe in here

284:10 I'm getting a bit excited today, but yeah, they

284:11 taught me, like, you know, when you're going in

284:12 the meetings, Al, this is how you want to dress,

284:13 this is how you want to act. And you know, they

284:14 just slowly were, you know -they did a lot for

284:15 me. I have a lot of respect
for them. They

284:16 treated me well over the years, you know.

Page Range:278:20-280:1

278:20 Q Now, did you work directly with some US

278:21 government agencies and Direct

TV on some

278:22 investigations?

278:23 A Yes, I did.

278:24 Q Did you ever meet with the secret service in
$278: 25$
Houston?

279: 279

279: 1 A Yes, I did.

279: 2 Q And was part of that meeting so that you could

279: 3 explain your methods of investigation?

279: 4 A Yeah, as long as I'm not going to -- as long as

279: 5 the secret service ain't going
to come back on me

279: 6 or you are not going to ask
what this was all

279: 7 about or nothing or . . .

279: 8 Q No. No. I'm not going to go into the details.

279: 9 A All right. Yeah. Basically I was working on

279:10 some stuff, and they wanted to

279:11 doing it. And then they ask
if I come down there

279:12 and show them what I was
doing. So I agreed to

279:13 go down to Houston, and we
went to, like, some

279:14 nondescript building and went up there. And,

279:15 yeah, I met all these secret service guys, and

279:16 they took me in their lab and, yeah, had a sit

279:17 down. And they treated me really well, you know.

279:18 It was great. It was -- it felt good to meet

279:19 them, you know.

279:20 Q Now, did you also compile a database of various

279:21 pirate websites?

279:22 A I did.

279:23 Q And was that also used in
investigations on

279:24 behalf of Direct TV?

279:25 A It was. I helped take down
probably over

280: 280

280: 1 approximately 230 websites since working for NDS.

Page Range:188:24-189:19

188:24 Q MS.WILLETTS: Showing you what's been

188:25 labelled Exhibit 988. An email that appears to

189: 189

189: 1 be from
discsat@compusmart.ab.ca. You understood

189: 2 that to be Dave Dawson, correct?

189: 3 MR. DUNLOP: Did you
say from?

189: 4 Q MS. WILLETTS:

189: 5 discsat@compusmart.ab.ca.

189: 6 A I don't remember JD having
that address.

189: 7 Q Discsat, was that short for

Discount Satellite?

189: 8 A I don't know. I don't recall
that address.

189: 9 Another thing that seems very
odd about this

189:10 document is my PGP signature isn't in there.

189:11 Q Do you typically send PGP --

189:12 A Yeah.

189:13 Q Did you always send things with PGP?

189:14 A Not always, but when I sent to

JD I signed with

189:15 my PGP signature. That way if any of the text

189:16 was edited here and you went
to verify later you

189:17 could tell. I notice his
signature isn't in

189:18 here. Is this an original
document? Do you have

189:19 a different one?

Page Range:189:22-190:2

189:22 A Okay. I'm just asking you whether there is a

189:23 different document because maybe there is with a

189:24 key and, you know, we'd have verification that
$189: 25$
as I can tell this

190: 190

190: 1
just a typed up

190: 2 text document.

Page Range:190:18-190:24

190:18 Q MS. WILLETTS: You
stated earlier that

190:19 you didn't always use your PGP signature when you

190:20 emailed.

190:21 A Depended on who I emailed.

190:22 Q Can you exclude the possibility that you may have

190:23 forgotten to include --

190:24 A I'd rather not exclude that.

Page Range:191:8-192:5

191: 8 Q Okay. Well, let's go through the contents of the

191: 9 document and see if it
refreshes your

191:10 recollection whether you sent it.

191:11 A Sure.

191:12 Q It says (quoted):
191:13
forwarded him and I
191:14
and mentioned the

191:15
that he is sending
191:16
should have it this

191:17
happy...thinks i killed this

191:18
hehe."
191:19
week...he's
one from overuse
another box and we

You
referred to

191:20 Mr. Tarnovsky as Von; isn't
that correct?
191:21 A Well, we explained -- we talked about that

191:22 earlier. I may have called
Von, Von on IRC. I

191:23 don't recall if I ever called
him that in email.
191:24 But like I said once again,
the PGP signature

191:25
isn't in here. There's a
reason why it's

192: 192

192: 1 missing. I never --

192: 2 Q Did you ever call Mr. Tarnovsky to tell him you

192: 3 were having a problem with the box he was

192: 4 providing you?

192: 5 A Not that I remember. What box?

Page Range:192:8-192:12

192: 8 Q So it's your testimony that
this whole email is a

192: 9 fabrication?

192:10 A I've already stated to you
that I find something

192:11 very odd about this here, and
you really have no

192:12 explanation for it.

Page Range:193:9-193:15

193: 9 Q MS. WILLETTS: My
question is whether or

193:10 not you recall ever having any
conversation with

193:11
Mr. Dawson in an email or
otherwise in which you

193:12 told him that the box provided to you by Von or

193:13 Tarnovsky was killed by overuse and that

193:14 Mr. Tarnovsky would be sending you a new one?

193:15 A Not that I remember.

Page Range:193:16-193:20

193:16 Q Did Mr. Tarnovsky ever send you a box?

193:17 A Not that I recall.

193:18 Q What's your understanding of what the box is

193:19 referred to here in this email?

193:20 A How would I know?

Page Range:194:15-195:4

194:15 Q MS. WILLETTS: I'm showing you what's

194:16 been labelled Exhibit 989. It
appears to be

194:17 another email from
dr7@mail.v-wave.com to the

194:18
same discsat@compusmart.ab.ca.

Is it your

194:19
position here that there's no
way to verify if

194:20 this email is a true and
correct copy as well?

194:21 A Once again I'll mention for the record it's a

194:22 text file. It doesn't have a

PGP signature. I

194:23 can't verify that it's real.

I could type this

194:24 out on her laptop right now.

I also don't see an

194:25 IP in here.

195: 195

195: 1 Q Do you remember sending an email to

195: 2 discsat@compusmart.ab.ca containing the substance

195: 3 that's contained in this Exhibit 989?

195: 4 A No, sorry. I don't remember.

Page Range:195:5-195:6

195: 5 Q Do you know what the

AVR2E3M.E3M file is?

195: 6 A No, I can't say I do.

Page Range:195:16-196:17

195:16 Q The exhibit states (quoted):

195:17
"Load this and will
run for about 1 week

195:18 or more, be sure to
tell them, 'when

195:19 this dies, you should
just load the

195:20 AVR2E3M.E3M again
until you hear from

195:21 us.' vonnie is on
the job so we should

195:22 be fine soon."

195:23
You
understood Vonnie to

195:24 be Christopher Tarnovsky,
correct?

195:25 A I don't believe I said that.

I believe I said I

196: 196

196: 1 heard the name Von before, but

I don't recall

196: 2 saying Vonnie. And once again
this is a text

196: 3 file. I don't see a PGP signature here. Another

196: 4 thing I'd like to mention is all --

196: 5 Q We --

196: 6 MR. REDMOND: Go ahead.

196: 7 THE WITNESS:
Thank
you.

196: 8 A Another thing I'd like to mention, all

196: 9 communication with Dave Dawson back then were PGP

196:10 encrypted, I don't know. You say this is the

196:11 evidence you have. I guess JD
would have had to

196:12 have decrypted it, correct?

196:13 Q MS. WILLETTS: Do you
have any copies of

196:14 these PGP encrypted emails
that you communicated

196:15 with Mr. Dawson with?

196:16 A Well, no. I already told you

I deleted all my

196:17
emails. You think Mr. Dawson would have them.

Page Range:197:11-197:17
197:11 Q MS. WILLETTS: Handing you what's been

197:12 labelled Exhibit 990. An
email from the same

197:13 DR7@mail.v-wave.com to the
197:14 discsat@compusmart.ab.ca
address. At the bottom
197:15 it lists X-Factor Web Design.

That was your
197:16 company, correct?
197:17 A That was my company name, yes, it was.

Page Range:198:15-199:16
198:15 Q The file -- or the exhibit states (quoted):

198:16 "things are ready for
you..install PGP

198:17 or call me
celly..also get come koin
198:18 together I gotta ship
to von this week

198:19
yet."

198:20 A I can't see I'd be telling JD to install PGP. JD

198:21 used PGP all the time.

198:22 Q So typically you would
correspond with Dawson

198:23 using PGP?

198:24 A As far as I know all of our communication for PGP

198:25 encrypted.

199: 199

199: 1 Q And the email states -- or the person that's

199: 2 asking discsat to install PGP
so that you could

199: 3 communicate with them,
correct?

199: 4 A That's what it looks like. It looks like whoever

199: 5 gave you these emails just
typed them up and

199: 6 said, Hey, look.

199: 7 Q They must have known your practice of PGPing --

199: 8 A Or maybe they accepted a bribe for these emails.

199: 9 Q Do you have any evidence that someone accepted a

199:10 bribe to fabricate --

199:11 A Yeah, I do, actually. Not these emails, but I do

199:12 know about some bribes.

199:13 Q I'm asking you whether or not you have any

199:14 evidence --

199:15 A I don't have evidence of bribes related to these

199:16 emails.

Page Range:199:19-199:21

199:19 Q Did you ever ask Mr. Dawson to get koin together

199:20 because you had to ship to

Von?

199:21 A No. I don't recall doing that.

Page Range:199:22-199:24
199:22 Q Are you certain of that?
199:23 A Yeah. I think every one of
these emails here is
199:24 fake.

Page Range:268:7-268:10

268: 7 Q Let me, if $I$ could, have you look at these --

268: 8 these text files that were Exhibit 989, 990, and

268: 9 991. Yeah. It's 989, 990, and 991 are the --

268:10 just the three that I picked out.

Page Range:268:18-268:23

268:18 Q MR. STONE: Correct.

You testified

268:19 earlier these are text files
and --

268:20 A Yeah.

268:21 Q And it's your belief these are not valid emails;

268:22 is that a fair --

268:23 A It's my opinion.

Page Range:269:1-269:6

269: 1 Q MR. STONE: Okay.

Now, one thing that

269: 2 I was noticing, if you look at 991 it has

269: 3 dr71.txt up at the top.

269: 4 A Yeah.

269: 5 Q This text file or whatever it is appears to have

269: 6 a date of July of 2000 up at the top.

Page Range:269:14-270:1

269:14 Q MR. STONE: Right now it just says

269:15 dr71.txt, and says July 27, 2000, on it, right?

269:16 A Yeah.

269:17 Q Now, if you look at Exhibit 990, it's dr72.txt,

269:18 right?

269:19 A Yeah.

269:20 $Q$ What's the date on that?

269:21 A The date I see further down says March 1st, 2000 .

269:22 Q So this text file is
supposedly several months

269:23 before - -

269:24 A This other one.

269:25 Q -- Exhibit 991, but it says
dr72 versus dr71.txt,

270: 270

270: 1 correct?

Page Range:270:19-270:22

270:19 A One thing I do notice for sure about these

270:20 documents is this very first one here, 991 has

270:21 quite a significant chunk for the header. This

270:22 one here you notice something's missing.

Page Range:271:2-271:11

271: 2 Q Time out. Time out. When you say "this here,"

271: 3 you are saying 991 has message information in the

271: 4 header, correct?

271: 5 A Yeah. Like, look at the message header. It's

271: 6 got IPs and stuff in here.

271: 7 Q Okay. Now what was the other one you were

271: 8 pointing to?

271: 9 A 990 and 989 don't have the same sort of IPs in

271:10 here. Why not?

271:11 Q What does that tell you?

Page Range:271:14-271:15

271:14 Q MR. STONE: What does that indicate to

271:15 you?

Page Range:271:18-272:14

271:18 A I don't know, man. Something funky's going on.

271:19 Like I said, there's no PGP signatures on here.

271:20 Is there any -- all I'm asking
is somebody show

271:21 the EML files for these actual
-- let's see the

271:22 EML files.

271:23 Q MR. STONE: What's an

EML file? I'm

271:24 sorry.

271:25 A Like if you have got Outlook and then you export

272: 272

272: 1 an email it should have the

EML file. It should

272: 2 be original. You think that might prove that

272: 3 they are the original. Even
that could be

272: 4 edited. But it just seems doesn't seem right

272: 5 here.

272: 6 Q Look at a document that says dr74.txt, which is

272: 7 Exhibit 989 .

272: 8 A Yeah.

272: 9 Q What's the date on that?

272:10 A October 1999.

272:11 Q And based on your practice, had you sent an email

272:12 to Mr. Dawson during this time period, one of

272:13 Your emails should contain PGP signature and an

272:14 IP return.

Page Range:272:18-273:11

272:18 A Basically the emails that I
sent to Dave Dawson

272:19 should have been encrypted
with PGP. If

272:20 Dave Dawson actually gave you
these emails he

272:21 would also be able to give you
the PGP encrypted

272:22 copy, not just the plain text copy; he'll give

272:23 you the PGP copy.

272:24 There's
no reason Dave

272:25 would just have the unencrypted copy; he would

273: 273

273: 1 also have the encrypted. Why would he just keep

273: 2 the unencrypted copy all that long and not the

273: 3 encrypted one. I have a feeling that these

273: 4 emails came from somebody else, and I have a

273: 5 feeling that they retyped them up. And I think

273: 6 they removed my PGP signature from here. That

273: 7 way they could edit this text and put whatever

273: 8 they want. That's my thoughts on the matter.

273: 9
I have
been using PGP, by

273:10 the way, since 1994. I know
quite a bit about

273:11 it.

Page Range:247:4-247:7

247: 4 Q Now, one thing I notice just sitting here

247: 5 watching the testimony, I'll be honest with you,

247: 6 sir, you seemed a bit upset and angry as you were

247: 7 testifying. Is that a fair statement?

Page Range:247:13-247:18

247:13 A Well, basically, yeah. I'm choked.

247:14 Q MR. STONE:
right. Why is that?

247:15 I mean I noticed you were kind
of angry

247:16 throughout the whole process.

I'm just curious,

247:17 why are you angry?

247:18 A I feel I'm being --

Page Range:248:17-249:1

248:17 A Okay. Basically, like, I feel that this was set

248:18 up by a few people, Ron
Ereiser, Reg Scullion,

248:19 Charles Perlman. They all had beefs against NDS,

248:20 Ron the biggest one. He was out to get NDS, he's

248:21 always been out to get NDS. He told me I was

248:22 going down. Whatever, you
know. I just kind of

248:23 laughed it off. I didn't think it was serious

248:24 until I start getting, like, threatened with

248:25 lawsuits. Like I said, I'm pretty well bankrupt

249: 249

249: 1 now.

Page Range:263:10-263:13

263:10 Q MR. STONE: So was it
your impression

263:11 that Mr. Ereiser was trying to

```
pressure you to
    263:12 make false statements --
    263:13 A He was.
    Page Range:263:16-263:20
    263:16 Q MR. STONE: And am I
correct that you
    263:17 told Mr. Ereiser that you
weren't aware of any
    263:18 piracy activity by either
Chris Tarnovsky or
    263:19 John Norris?
    263:20 A I believe --
        Page Range:263:23-263:23
        263:23 A I believe I told him that
right away.
            Page Range:266:12-267:6
        266:12 Q MR. STONE: At some
point did that
        266:13 fear turn into a bit of anger
about the process
    266:14 and the lawsuit that you got
dragged into?
    266:15 A I just -- this has been a long
time, seven years.
    266:16 It's -- you know what I mean?
```

I started up that
266:17 website as a hobby. I made money. But that's

266:18 not my calling in life.
That's not what I want

266:19 to do. I do graphic design, stuff like that. I

266:20 went into consulting, doing investigating stuff.

266:21 But, you know, I wasn't there
like looking to be

266:22 a criminal or nothing. I
don't want to be a
266:23 criminal. I just wanted to run that website.

266:24 You know, it was -- I was new
to the web. But
266:25 they took me right away, and
they were like --
267: 267
267: 1 they made me out to be
somebody -- anybody that
267: 2 reads that fourth amended complaint would think, 267: 3 like, you know, this is Tom

Clancy novel. It
267: 4 sounds like something almost
-- look on the net.

267: 5 Search for Allen Menard plus piracy. My name's

267: 6 ruined for life.

Total Length - 00:26:10
(Videotape concluded.)

THE COURT: Why don't we take a recess.

You are admonished not to discuss this matter
amongst yourselves, nor form or express any opinion
concerning this case.

We'll see you in about 20 minutes.
(The following proceedings is taken outside
the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Counsel, then, 20 minutes, so about 25
after. Thank you.
(Recess.)
(The following proceedings is taken in the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: We are on the record. All counsel are present, the parties are present, the jury is present.

And Counsel, if you'd like to call your next witness, please.

MR. HAGAN: Certainly, your Honor. Plaintiffs
call Alan Guggenheim.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Thank you, sir. Would you be kind enough to raise your right hand, please. The clerk will administer the oath to you.

ALAN GUGGENHEIM, PLAINTIFFS' WITNESS, SWORN

THE WITNESS: I do.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. If you'd please be seated in the witness box to my left.

Thank you. And after you are comfortably seated, would you state your full name to the jury, please.

THE WITNESS: My name is Alan Guggenheim.
THE COURT: I'm going to ask the clerk if you'd be kind enough to move that microphone closer to Mr. Guggenheim so we can hear you.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Now, what's your name, sir?

THE WITNESS: My name is Alan Guggenheim.

THE COURT: And how do I spell your first name?

THE WITNESS: A-l-a-n.

THE COURT: And your last name, sir?
THE WITNESS: G-u-g-g-e-n-h-e-i-m.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
This is direct examination by Mr. Hagan on behalf of EchoStar and NagraStar.

MR. HAGAN: Thank you, your Honor. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HAGAN:

Q Good morning, Mr. Guggenheim.

A Good morning.

Q Before we get started, can you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury a little bit about yourself, where you're from, a little bit about your family.

A I was born and raised in France, in Paris. I got an engineering degree. My first job was an expatriate job in Martinique in Guadeloupe, later in French Antilles. And then in 1982, I came to the United States, became a citizen about 10 years later.

Q Can you tell us a little bit about your educational background?

A Yes, I got engineering degree from the -- one of the top school in France.

Q And Mr. Guggenheim, have you had any military experience?

A Yes, I was -- I was an officer in the French Army in recon and intelligence training.

Q Now, have you assisted any government agencies or provided any consulting work with government agencies --

THE COURT: Move the microphone closer to you and speak slower.

```
BY MR. HAGAN:
```

Q -- here in the United States?
THE COURT: Start the question again; speak
slower.
MR. HAGAN: Thank you, your Honor.
BY MR. HAGAN:
Q Mr. Guggenheim, have you assisted any government
agencies or consulted with any government agencies here in
the United States?
A Yes. As a part of my CIS consulting business, I was a
consultant for an entity called the SGDN in France and --
(Interruption in the proceedings.)
THE WITNESS: SGDN. It -- translation would be
general secretary for national defense. It's about the
equivalent of the U.S. NSC. And I was working with the Rank
Corporation, for example, in Santa Monica, with Congress,
both the Senate and -- and the House committees, as well as
the government, helping on the transatlantic relations
between France and -- and the U.S., especially at the time
between the first Gulf War --
BY MR. HAGAN:
Q Have you attended any meetings at the White House here
in the United States?
A Yes, I did. Actually, one of the meeting with -- with
the then national security adviser Bob Gates, which is now
secretary of defense and --
Q Mr. Guggenheim, you are the former CEO of the
plaintiff, NagraStar; is that correct?
A That's correct, yes.
Q And when did you step down from that role?
A In March of '07.
Q And Mr. Lenoir became the new CEO at that time?
A Yes.
Q Now, I understand that you are going to come back later
in the trial and testify about a number of other issues, but
today we are focused just on a couple of things that you did
during your investigative work for NagraStar.
Prior to attaining the title of CEO, you provided
consultancy work for NagraStar; is that correct?
A Yes, that's correct.
Q And what was the name of the company that you worked
for providing those services?
A My company is called CIS.
Q And in fact, you still have a consultancy relationship
with NagraStar through CIS; is that correct?
A Yes, that's correct.
Q And can you describe for the ladies and gentlemen of
the jury what type of investigative work CIS engaged in for
NagraStar?
A At the beginning, we are talking of late '98, and we
set up what I call the "filibration" to gather technical intelligence on hacking and piracy of the Nagra system. Q Now, you also provided some of those services to some of the Kudelski entities; is that correct?

```
A Yes, at the time, actually, in '98 and '99 and early
```

2000, I am -- CIS was actually in contract with Kudelski,
and I had very little contact at the beginning with -- with
EchoStar, yet I developed the field intelligence and
operation for all of NagraVision, NagraStar, as well as the
other entities to see what was happening in North America,
U.S. and especially Canada.
Q Now, as I understand it, you are currently suing
Kudelski. You're in a litigation dispute with him; is that
correct?
A Yes, that's correct.
Q Do you believe that your lawsuit against Kudelski will
impact your testimony in any way for purposes of this
litigation?
A No. I'm here to tell the truth about what I did and
what I heard and done in the last 10 years.
Q And any grudge that you may hold against Kudelski is --
is not going to reflect on the plaintiffs in this case?
A I will say right things.
Q Now, Mr. Guggenheim, turning back to your work for
NagraStar, was part of that work to investigate the piracy
and hacking of the plaintiffs' DNASP-II security system? A Yes.

Q And can you describe for us, just in general terms, what you did to investigate that piracy.

A So at the beginning, there was -- there was not much, so I started by learning about piracy, in general. So I started where I could -- I had my own contacts, obviously, law enforcement, FBI, Secret Service, NSA, other people that I had met through my other consulting. And I also contacted DirecTV, because at the time when Nagra got hacked in -- in late '98, the -- the big piracy in the U.S. was on DirecTV, several people I knew, and a lot of people were starting to pirate DirecTV. So I contacted John Norris at NDS, I contacted Larry Reisler at DirecTV. I joined groups like the NCTA, Anti-piracy Task Force and the SBCA to learn about what was happening, and I got a little advice from these people on how they were going about it, and I proposed, then, to share information. And at the beginning, I was very friendly with them, because I thought we were all fighting pirates.

So one of the things that I did then was to set up methods to listen to what the pirates were saying, and at the time, they were mostly communicating on the ISC channels, so we set up ISC monitoring in -- because we are in California, it's almost in the garage. Actually, I had a
big -- a big utility room above my garage, so I set up there several computers to do ISC monitoring, and I got Kudelski to give me an increased budget. And I asked my wife to help in the monitoring and -- and the bringing the monitoring down to an acceptable size, because you get 99 percent garbage and only 1 percent information, and produce reports daily.

The second thing we did was to look for some investigators, private investigators. So I had a good friend at the rotary who was an ex-FBI, pretty high up in the FBI, and he was running an investigation firm at the time. So I talked to him, and I hired them, the Emerald Group to start investigation, and he had two or three investigators who started to -- to work for me and gather intelligence and -- and information.

THE COURT: All right. Now, let me stop for just a moment.

Counsel.

BY MR. HAGAN:

Q Now, Mr. Guggenheim, I understand that both you and your wife, Suzanne Guggenheim, are going to be back later in the trial, and we'll go through all of those issues then, but today I want to focus just on one part of your investigation, and that is the collection of certain documents and evidence.

As part of your work for NagraStar and -- and CIS, investigating this piracy, is it fair to say that you gathered a -- a number of documents?

A Yes, sure.

Q And I want to talk just today about three categories of those documents, the first being the Hays County Narcotics Task Force, the second being documents from Giles Kaehlin and Canal+ --

THE COURT: I'm sorry, from? MR. HAGAN: Giles. THE COURT: Spell it. MR. HAGAN: G-i-l-e-s, Kaehlin, $K-a-e-h-l-i-n$. THE COURT: And the third? MR. HAGAN: And the third category of documents were received from Mr. Ereiser. THE WITNESS: Okay. BY MR. HAGAN:

Q So let's -- let's start with the first category. Did there come a point in your investigation that you received documents from the Hays County Narcotics Task Force?

A Yes, we received them at NagraStar.

Q And can you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury how you received those documents.

A I think NagraStar had to hire at that time an investigator called JJ Gee, and he was in contact with both
the law enforcement, the AUSA and the task force, and he requested every document. We were helping them with the investigation, and we were giving them everything they wanted, and they -- they send us these documents. Q And as you understand it, those documents were turned over to the lawyers and produced in this case?

A Yes.

Q Now, did there come a point in time where you received documents in evidence from Canal+?

A Yes.

Q And can you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury about those documents.

THE COURT: Now, is this -- are these the Giles Kaehlin document?

MR. HAGAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HAGAN: And maybe let's lay some foundation.

BY MR. HAGAN:

Q Who is Mr. Kaehlin, Giles Kaehlin?

A Giles Kaehlin was the head of general services for the Canal+ Group, and he was also in charge of the security for the Canal+ Group.

Q And who is Canal+?

A Canal+ is -- is a large TV operator and movie producer and media conglomerate in -- in Europe.

Q And can you tell us when the first time is you received documents from Canal+?

A Sir, we had a meeting with Canal+'s lawyers and -- and EchoStar lawyers, and I was invited at that meeting and decided to do whatever shared defense agreement with them. And they were investigating illegal conduct, which they believed came from people like Chris Tarnovsky and NDS. And they had a lot of investigation that was done in Europe mostly, in Israel, and they disclosed that to us, and I disclosed to them what we had done as an investigation mostly in the U.S. and Canada. So there was a complimentarity in the -- in the type of things we had done, but each of us had only pieces of the puzzle.
Q And after this meeting that you attended -- well, let's
back up.
Where did this meeting take place?
A At EchoStar -- in EchoStar building in Inglewood where
the NagraStar building is, I mean, the same building.
Q The meeting wasn't secret or anything like that, right?
A No. It was in the boardroom of EchoStar.
Q Formal meeting?
A Yes.
Q Attended by attorneys?
A A lot of attorneys.
Q Some of the attorneys representing Canal+?

A Yes, absolutely. Jamie Diboise from Wilson Sonsini, I think, was the lead attorney --
(Interruption in the proceedings.)

THE WITNESS: Jamie from Wilson, W-i-l-s-o-n. I
think it's -- Sonsini is -- I'm not sure. I think you will have to check that. It's a big firm in California.

THE COURT: Do you want to spell it?
MR. WELCH: I think it's W-i-l-s-o-n, S-o-n-c-i -MR. SNYDER: S-i.

THE COURT: S-i. MR. WELCH: -- s-i-n-i. THE COURT: S-i-n-i. Thank you.

BY MR. HAGAN:

Q Mr. Guggenheim, at the time that you attended this meeting, did you understand that Canal was investigating the defendants' involvement in piracy of their system?

A Yes, absolutely, yes.

Q And then after this meeting in Denver, did you have an occasion to go meet with the representatives of Canal at their offices?

A Yes, I did stay in contact with Giles Kaehlin, who was driving the investigation and later driving the lawsuit of Canal+ against NDS, and I -- I did go to their headquarters in -- in Paris, and $I$ met with Giles in Paris.

Q And that meeting was at their headquarters?

A Yes.
Q Nothing secretive about that meeting?
A No, no.

Q And during that meeting, did Canal+ and Mr. Kaehlin provide you with evidence?

A Yes, he showed me some of the documents he had produced himself like a big chart, a color chart with all the pirate players, including NDS on one side and the Canadians and all that.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, NDS on one side and the -THE WITNESS: The Canadians.

THE COURT: Canadians.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, the Canadian pirates on -- on the other, and Chris Tarnovsky and some of the other pirates. And he had a -- his own internal report with management and a lot of the evidence that he had collected during the -- the -- either the trial or the investigation before the trial for Canal+ that was very interesting to us. BY MR. HAGAN:

Q As I understand it, you provided -- you turned those documents and that evidence over to the lawyers?

A Yes.

Q And then, as you understand it, they were produced in the course of this litigation?

A Yes, that's correct.

Q Now, did -- did you have any understanding how Canal+ got those documents and that evidence?

A I mean, there were investigation documents as well as documents that they collected for their lawsuit and produced in the lawsuit, so --

Q But they never told you specifically where they came from?

A No.

Q You just -- it was your understanding that they came through the lawsuit and investigation that Canal+ was doing?

A Absolutely.
Q Now, the third category of the documents and evidence came to you from Mr. Ereiser; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall approximately when that was?
A Yes, I think it was around the -- several years later,

I think, in 2005 .

Q During the course of this litigation?
A Yes.

Q And you went with -- did you go with Mr. Gee up to -to meet Mr. Ereiser?

A Yes, I did.

Q And did Mr. Ereiser provide you any documents or evidence at that meeting?

A Yes, he did. These were on CDs.

Q Did you open those CDs at the meeting?

A No.

Q And that meeting took place where Mr. Ereiser lives up in Canada; is that correct?

A Yes, I think it was in Vancouver. THE COURT: Just a second. (Interruption in the proceedings.) THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel. BY MR. HAGAN:

Q Now, Mr. Guggenheim, going back to the -- the CDs that you received from Mr. Ereiser, did Mr. Ereiser tell you generally what he believed was on those CDs?

A Yeah, I mean, we all knew what it -- it was, and maybe I should explain.

When I saw Giles Kaehlin, he gave me his -(Interruption in the proceedings.)

THE WITNESS: He gave me his documents. They were specific to his lawsuit, which was Canal+ against NDS, and they were related to the actions against his system. So I ask Giles if he had more documents, and he told me, "Oh, yes, I have tons of them."

And I said, "Well, did you look to see if there were some that would be more specific to all action in the U.S. against NDS," and he said, "No, I did not have time to look for, but I will."

And after that, several facts happen that Giles was not cooperating with us as much and was dragging and all that, and he said, yes, he would give us the rest of the documents, but he did not give them to us. So several of the people who were working for Giles Kaehlin like -- like Ron Ereiser or some others in the CK2 company, knew that I needed these documents, if possible, and that Giles had said he would give them to me, but was not coming. So when Ron called me and said, "Oh, I finally got the rest of the documents, I think that's what you were looking for, so" -Q And you understood these to be documents to be used as evidence in this case against the defendants?

A Yes, sure.

Q You didn't have any understanding that there were some type of confidential documents or documents with technical information about the defendants, correct?

A No.

Q Were you even interested in that type of information?

A No.

Q Now, when you spoke with Mr. Ereiser and he gave you these CDs, did he tell you where he got the documents?

A No, he did not.

Q Did you have any understanding as to where those documents may have came from?

A I mean, for me, they had the documents that -- where
the rest of the documents that were supposed to come from Giles Kaehlin and the Canal+ investigation and lawsuit, so that was obvious that $I$ was hoping that's where they were. Q And then once you got those CDs, did you ever open them?

A I think JJ opened them, and we checked two or three documents to see if it was indeed the kind of things that was Giles Kaehlin cannot press lawsuit, and it looked like it was, so I said, "That's great."

Q And then ultimately you turned those CDs over to the lawyers?

A Yes, we did like everything else.
THE COURT: Excuse me. I want you to take a breath in between questions, okay?

You mentioned JJ. Explain to the jury who JJ is; give them a full name.

THE WITNESS: Okay. The name is JJ Gee, G-e-e, and he was the investigator for NagraStar, the head of the security investigation.

THE COURT: Thank you.

BY MR. HAGAN:

Q Now, once you and Mr. Gee determined that the documents on the CD was the type of evidence that you were looking for, you turned those CDs over to the attorneys, correct?

A Yes. Yes, we did.

Q And it's your understanding that the attorneys provided that information to the defendants?

A Yes, that's what the attorneys told us.

Q And it's also your understanding that the attorneys lodged those CDs with the Court under seal?

A Yes.

Q Now, Mr. Guggenheim, you understand that the defendants have asserted some counterclaims in this case; is that correct?

A Yeah, I've seen some statement which were kind of outrageous to me.

Q And you understand that they are claiming that you stole these documents?

A Yeah, that's ridiculous.

Q Did you ever steal any documents or information from the defendants?

A No, absolutely not.

Q Did you ever have possession of any of the defendants' computers that you accessed to try to get this evidence?

A No.

Q Did you ever ask Mr. Ereiser or Canal+ or anyone else to steal any evidence or documents from the defendants?

A No, absolutely not.

Q Do you have any understanding as to why the defendants would make these allegations about you?

A Well, I think the documents are the -- are the key paper elements, you see, in this case, where there are a lot of people talking a lot of things that were not that solid. So these documents show clearly -- and the ones I saw in more details were the one that Canal+ used in their lawsuit against NDS, and they were clearly showing that NDS was driving the whole piracy operation and the whole piracy network a lot more than $I$ even imagined myself. So they were very strong evidence for me of their illegal activities, and so -- and they were proofs, and it was very important.

Q Now, Mr. Guggenheim, you had an opportunity to review some of the Pleadings that were filed against the defendants in this lawsuit, correct?

A Yes, I did.

Q And those Pleadings included the Complaints, the actual lawsuit itself; is that right?

A Yes.

Q And you understood that some of the evidence that you got from Canal+, that you got from Mr. Ereiser, and that you got from the Hays County Narcotics Task force was cited to or quoted from in the lawsuit against the defendant; is that correct?

A Yeah.

MR. HAGAN: Pass the witness, your Honor.

THE COURT: Cross-examination by Mr. Stone on behalf of NDS.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. STONE:

Q Good morning, Mr. Guggenheim.

A Good morning, Mr. Stone.

Q I think we've met before, haven't we?

A I'm sorry, I did not get you.

Q We have met before, haven't we?

A Yes, we have.

Q You remember me?

A I sure do.

Q I thought you might.

I'd like to ask you a few questions just to sort of get an understanding of the relationship to some of the players here.

You mentioned Canal+, and at the time you met with Canal+, it was part of Vivendi media conglomerate, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And do you recall that Vivendi was making a significant investment with EchoStar to acquire DirecTV at that time?

A Yes, that's correct.

Q And how much money was that?

A \$1 billion.

Q Did you say 1 billion?

A $\quad 1$ billion, yes, with a "b."

Q And did you testify that Mr. Ereiser worked for some company affiliated with Canal+ at the time as well?

A I don't know at what time exactly, but $I$ know at some time he did, yes.

Q And then he -- then he worked for NagraStar, or was he working for NagraStar at the same time he was working for Canal+?

A He might have been working at the same time for both.
Q And was Mr. Ereiser an investigator?
A No.

Q Was Mr. Ereiser a satellite pirate as far as you knew?

A Yes.

Q And, sir, you testified that you have a consulting arrangement currently with NagraStar?

A That's correct.

Q And that was after you began your legal proceedings against Kudelski?

A No.

Q When was -- when did that consultancy relationship begin?

A The contract was signed on the 1st of October, '07.

Q And that was before your last --

THE COURT: Excuse me, of '07?

THE WITNESS: '07.

THE COURT: 2007.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

BY MR. STONE:

Q And you worked for OpenTV after NagraStar, correct?

A Yes, that's correct.

Q And then you were terminated by Mr. Kudelski from OpenTV, as I understand it?

A Yes, that's correct.
Q And then the -- the claims between you and Kudelski began at that point?

A Yes.

Q And that was right around the time you entered into this consulting arrangement, correct?

A Well, my -- I filed this -- a Complaint for whistle-blower in late -- later in the year. I think it was either October or November finally it was filed, so the consulting agreement was actually before.

Q Okay. Well, I thought you said the consulting agreement was October as well?

A 1st of October.

Q The 1st of October?

A Yes.

Q And then you entered into a consulting agreement with NagraStar, correct?

A That's the one that was signed on the 1st of October. Q Which is 50 percent owned by Kudelski, correct?

A And that's correct.

Q And how much have you been paid under that consulting agreement up until the point of your testimony here today?

A I did not look at the exact total, but I would say it's -- it's about $\$ 300$ an hour for the last six months. It's probably around 80 or $\$ 90,000$, total, including some reimbursement of expenses.

Q I looked at them. That's about 90,000; does that sound right?

A Yeah.

Q And your invoices refer to -- well, what are you doing for the $\$ 90,000$ ?

A I'm doing anti-piracy research and work, and preparation and helping on the -- on preparation of the case.

Q "The case" meaning you are doing litigation work?
A I -- I don't know, it's a technical, legal word. I don't know it's litigation work, but no, it's more looking for data, and I have a lot of history in that whole 10 years of searching the truth.

Q Now, do you know how long after you got the documents from Mr. Ereiser they were produced to defendant?

A No, I don't know for sure.

Q Can you tell the folks on the jury when you got the documents from Mr. Kaehlin?

A From Mr. Kaehlin, I think it was late 2002 or 2003. Q Would it surprise you to learn that defendants did not receive those documents until April of 2007?

A All the evidence in all of the cases at NagraStar were locked in the evidence room, and that's where we -- we put the things, and they will turn to their lawyers at the time when it was appropriate, as far as I understand. Q Now, NagraStar was a competitor of NDS at the time you obtained the documents, correct?

A NagraVision more than NagraStar, really, but -Q And just to be clear, Mr. Ereiser was on the NagraStar payroll at the time he provided the documents to you, correct?

A Most likely. I know he was on and off, as I said already, so most likely he was at least a consultant paid by NagraStar to provide information on piracy, yes.

Q And am I correct that when NagraStar competes against NDS in the marketplace, NagraStar doesn't share with NDS documents regarding customer proposals?

A As I said, we are not really competing against NDS. NagraVision is competing against NDS directly, but -Q So are you telling this jury in this lawsuit that we've got going that NagraStar doesn't compete with NDS?

A No, it's -- NagraStar's scope is more limited to DISH Network, EchoStar, Bell ExpressVu and the affiliates of -Q So if there were a claim for unfair competition by NagraStar against NDS in this lawsuit, that wouldn't make sense to you, because they don't compete, correct?

MR. HAGAN: Object to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: So as I said, they compete to some extent. NagraStar doesn't have the freedom to compete everywhere in the world.

BY MR. STONE:

Q Well, they compete in the United States, don't they?
A Yes.

Q And in that competition, NagraStar doesn't typically share documents with NDS about NagraStar's technology, does it?

A No, that's correct.

Q It typically doesn't share documents with NDS about weaknesses or possible hacks of the NagraStar system, right?

A Well, actually, at the beginning of the relationship
with DirecTV and NDS, we did exchange some information on --
on piracy and on -- on other things. I mean, we had sometimes some friendly calls about an ECM that was successful in one system or the other --
(Interruption in the proceedings.)

THE WITNESS: An ECM, sorry. Electronic
countermeasure.

BY MR. STONE:

Q Would you share with NDS technical information about what's on the chip in the Smart Cards?

A No.

Q Would you share information about specific ways to hack NDS or NagraStar cards with NDS?

A No, for sure not.

Q And what's the reason you wouldn't share those kind of documents with NDS?

A Which document are you talking about sharing?
Q Regarding the technology of the Smart Cards?
A Sorry, I lost you there. I don't recall either you or me saying that $I$ shared technology documents regarding Smart Cards with NDS.

Q No, I believe you were clear that you would not do that. My question is, is there a reason why you would never share those kinds of documents with NDS?

A Well, I mean, each company has to keep its own secrets.

Q Let me show you one of the documents you got from Mr. Kaehlin, Exhibit 391.

And I'll represent to you, sir, based on the production number, counsel has stipulated that this is one of the
documents obtained from Mr. Kaehlin, and it bears Bates Stamp Number ESC32086 through 32115. And what's the title of this document?

A It's DirecTV -- it looks like "DirecTV proprietary II." Q Did you say "proprietary"?

A Yes.

Q Does Nagra ever use the words "proprietary" on its confidential documents?

A They might, yes.
Q Was there ever any litigation between NagraStar and NDS relating to the $P 3$ card developed by NDS?

A I don't think so.

Q So no lawsuits between NagraStar and NDS relating to the P3 technology; is that correct, sir?

A Yeah, that's correct.

MR. STONE: Your Honor, I would move at this time 391.

THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. HAGAN: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: 391 is received.
(Defendants' Exhibit No. 391 is received into evidence.)

BY MR. STONE:

Q Okay. And if we could go to the top of the document, it should show "DirecTV proprietary." Is that what you were
referring to?
A Yeah, that's -- that's probably the first time I see
the document, so that -- you told me -- you asked me to read
the top of the document. I read the top of the document.
Q And what's the title of the document?
A Below the logo, it says "DirecTV and NDS card history
and technical discussion."
Q And then down below, it says "DirecTV proprietary II"
near the bottom?
A Yes.
Q And I don't see -- well, if you turn to the next page,
391, page 2.
I don't see any --
A Okay.
Q -- production number at the bottom of this page that
relates to any other lawsuit, do you?
A It's becoming legally complicated for me. I don't know
what you mean by that.
Q Well, if NDS had produced this in some other
litigation, it should have an NDS production number. You
don't see that anywhere on this document, do you, sir?
A No, I don't.
Q Now, looking at just the table of contents on this
page, looking at item number 6.
A Okay.

Q What's the title of that portion of the document?
A It says "card technical details."
Q Card technical details are the kind of information you would never share with NDS, correct?

A Well, probably, yes.

Q Probably, yes.

Do you have any doubt that that is information that you would never voluntarily share with NDS when competing against it?

A Well, I don't know what is in this document, so just a title enough is not -- not enough to tell me, but most likely that's correct.

Q Well, why don't we look at the introduction, which is on the next page.

A Okay.

Q And looking at the first paragraph.
A Okay. Let me read it.

Q It says "This document was written to review the security and integrity of the $P 3$ card"; do you see that?

A Yes.

Q And that's the kind of information that you would not share with NDS in the marketplace, right?

A That's correct.

Q And if you go to the fourth paragraph down that begins with the second area.

A Okay.

Q And I'm focusing on what $I$ think is the fourth sentence
if $I$ counted correctly, beginning with "NDS has contracted."
It says "NDS has contracted with TNO to review the security
and integrity of the hardware aspects of the card. The
details of this report will be discussed in this document";
do you see that?
A Yeah, I see that.
Q And again, that's the kind of information NagraStar
would never divulge to NDS in the marketplace, right?
A Yeah, that's correct.
Q Now, if you could turn to page 391-7.
A Okay.
Q There is a paragraph that begins with "The DirecTV P3
card architecture"; do you see that?
A I'm reading it.
Q It says "It is the only NDS card produced by TI and has
different operational codes, op codes. Op codes of the TI
chip were modified to create a truly unique operating
environment for the P3 card"; do you see that?
A Yeah, and as I read that, that document now reminds me
if maybe it came also from the -- there is a lot of NDS
document that were made public on the internet at some
point; maybe that was one of them. That's --
Q So you flew to France to meet with Giles Kaehlin to get
documents that were available on the internet?

A Well, I did not know what documents he had, so there was a lot of documents that he had used in these lawsuits.
I don't know if that was one of them or not.
Q Sir, you don't have any evidence this document was ever
on the internet, do you?
A I -- I have not searched. Maybe it is, maybe it is
not. We'll have to look.
Q Now, if you look at the last paragraph on this page,
391-07, it says "The P3 features several security techniques
not included in previous cards. The techniques used in P3
are far superior to those used in prior cards. These
measures make it extremely difficult to reverse engineer the
logic. The following provides a summary of these
techniques. Security measures and techniques will be
disclosed" -- excuse me -- "be discussed in detail later in
this document"; do you see that?
A Yeah, I see.
Q And then it goes on to mention as Item Number 1,
"Circuit camouflage, including hiding logic gates to trick
uneducated observers"; do you see that?
A Yeah.
Q Would you agree that if that kind of information fell
into the wrong hands, that could be harmful to NDS and
DirecTV?

A There is not much there, just the generic statement, but --

Q Well, it would tell an attacker, wouldn't it, that there was circuit camouflage being used that would be hard to reverse engineer unless you knew it, correct?

```
A Yeah, and when you are on security, you know that you
```

have to do everything to protect your secrets, including
doing circuit camouflage, so just a statement saying that
it -- that they exist doesn't tell you much, actually.
Q Would certainly give a hacker a head start, wouldn't
it, sir?
A No. They are much more advanced than that.
Q Do you think this would be valuable to the DSS pirate
community if this information got out?
A I'm pretty sure it was already, because they were
talking about it on the internet, anyway.
Q Well, you said you got these documents in 2002,
correct?
A I said either late 2002 or 2003.
Q I believe your prior testimony was 2002; does that
sound about right?
A It -- it might be right, and I said at the time I was
not sure of the exact date.
Q Well, let's look at page 391-10, please.
By the way, do you know who the company TNO is?

A I've heard the name, yes.

Q And did you understand that this is a report of TNO's attempt to break the P3 card?

A No, I -- I don't know that. I -- you are telling me that. I thought it was a DirecTV report.

Q Well, who made the $P 3$ card for DirecTV?
A The P3 card was an NDS card.

Q Okay. Looking at page 391-10, up at the top where it says "TNO reported."

A Okay.
Q Where it says "TNO reported that manipulation of the power supply voltage during a read cycle from ROM or EEPROM could return fetch-op code of data to have all $1 s$ on the data bus. When descrambled, this could result in an illegal jump instruction or other intended" -- "unintended action"; do you see that?

A Yes, I do.

Q Now, that would be an example of a way for an attacker to use manipulation of the power supply to obtain valuable op code data, correct?

A That's what it looks like, yes.
Q And sometimes that's referred to as glitching, correct?
A Yes.

Q This report reveals a vulnerability in the P3 card that it was subject to glitching, right?

A Yeah, everybody knew that DirecTV's cards were weak and very subject to glitching, yeah.

Q And if this information fell into the wrong hands, it would be very harmful, correct, sir?

A Well, I think we knew that already. I mean, I don't know what the date is of that report, but that was common knowledge.

Q And this document relates to the lawsuit that we are here on today; is that your testimony?

A No. I said I've never seen the document before. I just got a lot of documents, and I turn them over to the lawyers. I've never seen the document before.

Q Let's go to page 391-12, please.
I'm looking at the first full paragraph up at the top of the paragraph.

A Okay.
Q It says "The P3.2 card is physically different than the other cards and will be supplied only to the owners of HNA" -- "HNS A-boxes"; do you see that?

A Yeah, I see that.
Q Now, did you understand that there were various versions of the P3 card that were issued over time, P3.1, P3.2, et cetera?

A I -- I don't recall knowing that detail.
Q Okay. Going down a few sentences where it says "The
P3.2 metal layer fix holds the reset low"; do you see that?
A Not yet.
Okay. Yeah, I found it.
Q "For a fixed number of clock cycles after voltage
starts to be applied. This protects against card failures
in HNS A-boxes, but this makes it easier for hackers to vary
voltage levels when trying to hack the card"; do you see
that?
A Yeah, I see that.
Q That would be valuable information to the DSS pirate
community; would it not?
A It's getting too -- too technical for me at that point,
So --
Q Well, do you understand that this information about the
metal layer in the chip is not something that can be seen
with the naked eye?
A Yeah, that's probably true.
Q You would agree that if this information fell into the
wrong hands, it could be harmful?
A Yes, depending on the timing. If it is after the fact,
that it's already hacked --
Q Well, do you know when the vulnerability identified on
this page was ever used against the P3 card?
A No, I have no idea.
Q And so you don't know whether it was after 2002, do
you?

A Correct.
Q Now, let's go to page 391-16, please.

Up at the top, we can see a heading, "Internal
analysis."

A Yes.

Q And this would be an internal analysis of the chip in the P3 card, correct?

A I don't know.

Q Well, look at down at the very bottom where it says "chip information."

Do you see where it says "NDS revealed the processor type to TNO, although it's expected an attacker will have trouble determining the manufacturer"?

A Yeah, I see that.
Q And it says "TNO confirmed that this information would have been difficult to extract from the chip"; do you see that?

A Okay.

Q So this report is identifying information that could be used from an attacker that would be very difficult to extract from the chip even using reverse engineering, correct?

A I don't if -- here, they don't say which information, so I don't know if it is in the report or not. They just
say that some information, if revealed, would be useful. I
don't know if it is in the report.
Q Yes, it does reveal that it's a Texas Instrument chip
with special op codes.
A Okay.
Q And that's something, according to this report, that
you could not even learn if you reverse engineered the chip,
correct?
A That's what it says here, yeah.
Q Do you agree that would be very valuable information to
the DSS pirate community?
A Yes, probably.
Q And it would be very harmful if that fell into the
wrong hands, correct?
A Yeah, sure.
Q Sir, if you could go to page 391-22.
There is a column entitled "Time manipulation."
A What column?
Q "Time manipulation."
A Okay.
Q It's near the top of the page, third paragraph. It
says "TNO reports the chip is susceptible to manipulation of
the power supply during read cycles of internal memories. A
dip in the power supply during a read cycle from ROM results
in incorrect data transfer from the memory to the bus"; do
you see that?
A Yeah, I see that.

Q Now, that's another example of a vulnerability that could be used to attack the P3, correct?

A I guess it looks maybe like the same one they mentioned before; I don't know.

Q And down below it says "TNO writes that this timing attack was effective in reading $R O M$ and EEPROM. RAM is not affected. The consequences are different for each type of memory"; do you see that?

A Yeah, I do see that.

Q And then it lays out the consequences for each type of memory.

Now, if you'll recall, the prior vulnerability and attack that we saw in this document was dropping the voltage for a glitch. Do you understand that a timing manipulation is different from that?

A Very high level only.
Q If you'd go to the next page, please, 391-23.

In the second -- excuse me, first paragraph, it
discusses "A manipulation of the power supply might also cause instructions to be skipped, which can create unforeseen instruction execution sequences and access to protect a code"; do you see that?

A I see that.

Q Now, that's information that, if it fell into the wrong hands, would be very harmful, right?

A Probably.
Q Next paragraph discusses in detail what happens on a single power glitch, correct?

A Okay, yes.

Q It says "It is an issue with a ROM code, which cannot be changed easily, because it is constructed with physical transistors. Jumps to EEPROM can be solved more easily"; do you see that?

A Not yet.
Q And is this the kind of information that NagraStar would never disclose to NDS in the marketplace?

A NagraStar would not even have that information, so -but that's correct.

Q Do you know, did anyone call up NDS after these documents were obtained and inform NDS that card technical details had been acquired?

A Nobody read these documents as far as I know, so -- the first time I see that document. I know you are trying to imply a lot of things, but --

Q So it's correct, nobody called up NDS and informed them, not you, not the lawyers. Nobody called up and said, "We have card technical details, here, in the year 2002"?

A Yeah, we did not know that.

Q Well, how many pages of documents did you get from Mr. Kaehlin? The stipulation says it's a little over 400; does that sound right?

A I -- yeah, that could be. I mean, I don't -- it was some time ago. I mean, $I$ know it was a pretty big pile, yes.

Q Well, there is a bigger pile from Mr. Ereiser that I'm going to get to, but the stack for Mr. Kaehlin --

A From Mr. Ereiser was a disk, so as you know, you can have a lot more documents on a disk than on paper.

Q 26,000 pages to be exact, correct?
A That's what I've heard, yes.

Q Now, from Giles Kaehlin, however, it was a little over 400 , correct?

A I did not count the pages.

Q And it's your testimony you didn't read those 400 pages?

A Yeah, that's correct.
Q Look at page 391-24, please, at the bottom.

Do you see at the bottom where it says "primary attack scenarios"?

A Yes.

Q Have you ever heard that phrase before in the security industry, "attack scenarios"?

A Yeah, I mean, it makes sense, yeah.

Q What's your understanding?

A It's different ways you could mount an attack.
Q Against the card?
A Yeah.

Q And that would be very harmful if that got out, correct?

A Sure.

Q And that's not the kind of information Nagra or NagraVision would ever share with a competitor, correct?

A Yeah, that's correct.

Q If you would go to 391, 26, please.
Your Honor, may we approach with a demonstrative?
THE COURT: (No audible response.)

MR. STONE: For the record, I've put before the witness and the jury just a blowup of this page, 391-26. BY MR. STONE:

Q Now, this is entitled "strong and weak aspects"; do you see that?

A Yes, I do.

Q And it goes into some fairly detailed information about the design of the P3 card, correct?

A I don't know. I have not read it, yet.
Q Well, you'll notice in the second paragraph under that it says "The following have been identified as" --

THE COURT: Excuse me for just a moment. I -- I
think you're going to get a continuing -- he doesn't know the technical answers. This is almost approaching argument. MR. STONE: Okay. THE COURT: This is going to be summarized very quickly.

MR. STONE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And so under 403, I am going to find that this is unduly consumptive of time.

MR. STONE: Okay.
THE COURT: You can either move along, or I'll give you the chance to summarize those very quickly, and now move along.

MR. STONE: Okay.
BY MR. STONE:

Q One thing you notice at the very bottom, it's the last topic there, is this reference to an ASIC, the very bottom where it say "defense is not uncovered"; A-S-I-C.

A Okay.
Q Now, an ASIC is something that Nagra had not started developing as of 2002, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And that came later in, roughly, 2005 time frame; is that your best recollection?

A Not even sure in 2005, actually. I've been pushing for that for a long time.

Q What is your best recollection as to when Nagra first began developing an ASIC for its cards?

A I think the first ASIC that Nagra sold was actually what they acquired from Canal+ technology when they acquired Canal+ technology with doing an ASIC in their own card, so --

Q Now, let me understand the -- the process here. You flew to France twice to meet Mr. Kaehlin to obtain documents, correct?

A Yes.

Q And is there a reason Mr. Kaehlin did not simply FedEx the 400 pages to you?

A Well, sure. I thought these were a lot of documents, and they were confidential, and he also wanted to discuss the case. I mean, it's always the same. He wanted to get involved in pursuing NDS after he had pursued NDS and the Canal+ technology and Canal+ Group. So he wanted to help us, and at the same time help himself with a -- with a new job or something like that. So he was very interested in talking to me and to us about leading that new litigation against NDS.

Q And you never asked Mr. Kaehlin how he obtained these internal NDS documents, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And he didn't tell you; isn't that correct?

A That's correct.

Q And at the time you obtained these, you never called up anyone at NDS and told them you had those documents, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And I didn't see any mention of Canal+ in that

Exhibit 391 that we just went through, did you?
A I did not read the whole thing, but obviously this -this one document is a DirecTV and NDS document. I don't know why they would mention Canal+.

Q Now, am I correct that after your trips to France to obtain these documents, you went to NagraVision in Switzerland and shared some of the documents that Mr. Kaehlin had provided?

A Yes.

Q And you gave some of the documents to Andre Kudelski, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And copies were made of some of the documents, correct?

A Of the documents I gave to Andre Kudelski, you mean?

Are you trying to imply --
As far as I recall, there's two documents I gave to Andre Kudelski, and he might have made a copy, because his lawyer was there, which were the chart, the color chart with all the pirating -- showing how NDS was driving the piracy
and -- and -- and driving the network, and the report that
Giles Kaehlin had prepared for his management for the
lawsuit, kind of a summary of his case.
Q Now, let me talk a little bit about how you obtained
documents from Mr. Ereiser.
A Okay.
THE COURT: Well, just a moment. Can we find out
what documents were given to Andre Kudelski.
MR. STONE: Yes. I thought he testified to that.
I'm sorry, your Honor.
THE COURT: What --
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: -- documents?
THE WITNESS: The two documents. One was a color
chart showing all the pirating, including the NDS action in
the pirate network. And the second was a Giles Kaehlin
report to his management about his case, kind of a summary
of the case.
THE COURT: Okay. No technical documents were
given?
THE WITNESS: No, and --
THE COURT: I want to make sure.
THE WITNESS: Okay. So --
THE COURT: No, no. You haven't heard the
question yet, have you?
(Laughter.)

THE COURT: 391, was 391, this document presented
to you, given to Mr. Kudelski, Andre Kudelski?
THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

All right, Counsel?

MR. STONE: Thank you, your Honor.

THE WITNESS: Actually, if I --

THE COURT: No. Thank you very much, sir.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

BY MR. STONE:

Q Now, at the time you got the documents from

Mr. Ereiser, that was in early 2005?

A Yes, I think so.

Q And he was a paid consultant to NagraStar?

A I think so.

Q And how much was he being paid at that point in time?

A I would -- I would not be certain, but I would say it was between 3 and 5 or 6,000 a month, in that range.

Q And you went to get these documents at the Vancouver airport with JJ Gee?

A Yeah, I think so.

Q And did you get there by car, train or plane?
A No, we flew.

Q And did you take the corporate jet, commercial jet?

A There was no corporate jet. I don't know why you come back with that all the time, but we flew commercial.

Q Well, I thought you testified you did take the corporate jet at one point as part of your investigation?

A Okay. Maybe I did. First, there was no corporate jet at EchoStar.

THE COURT: Just a moment. Before we get into this long explanation, did you take a corporate jet or not to fly to British -- Vancouver?

THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: Okay.
Counsel, your next question.
BY MR. STONE:

Q And so you, as the CEO of NagraStar, went, and did anyone accompany you?

A You -- you just said several time, I think, that JJ Gee was with me, so --

Q I haven't had an opportunity --
A Is that the same question or --
Q I haven't had an opportunity to ask you about that, yet, sir.

A Okay. Well, I thought I remember that. So, yes, I went there with JJ Gee.

Q And Mr. Ereiser handed you two CDs?

A As I remember, yes, he handed us two CDs.

Q And was there a reason why Mr. Ereiser couldn't have FedExed those to you?

A I think for -- for one thing, there is always a risk of losing. When it's critical evidence in -- in your trial in your case, you'd much rather get it personally than put it in the mail and lose it.

Q On how many occasions have you flown to Canada to obtain documents?

A Many times. I would say dozens of times.
Q Now, at the time you met with Mr. Ereiser in the airport, you understood that Mr. Ereiser had been pursued by NDS as a satellite pirate, correct?

A Yeah, that's correct.

Q And you understood that Mr. Ereiser had pretty strong feelings against NDS, correct?

A Yes.

Q He felt that he had been brutally treated by John

Norris while John Norris was pursuing him, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And you never asked Mr. Ereiser how he obtained the NDS internal documents, correct?

A Well, these were the -- for me, these were the rest --

THE COURT: Sir, answer the question.

THE WITNESS: No, I did not.

THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. STONE:

Q And Mr. Ereiser never told you how he got internal NDS documents, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And I believe it's your testimony you never completely trusted Mr. Ereiser; isn't that right?

A Yeah, that's right.

Q And you always had doubts about Mr. Ereiser's truthfulness and trustworthiness, correct?

A Sure, they all are pirates.

Q Let me show you Exhibit 366, please.
And for the record, sir, this document has a production number of ESC155785 through 155816.

A Okay.
Q And I'll represent to you that counsel have stipulated that that means that this is one of the documents that Mr. Ereiser provided.

A Okay.

Q And did you become aware at some point in time that the CDs that Mr. Ereiser provided contained 26,000 pages of NDS internal documents?

A The first time I saw a number was on your documents.
Q Did you ever become aware that that would fill almost

13 boxes?

A I did not do the math, yet, but --

THE COURT: We are going to strike the question and strike the answer.

MR. STONE: Okay. Looking at Exhibit 366, your Honor, I'd move it at this point in time.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. HAGAN: No objection.

THE COURT: Received.
(Defendants' Exhibit No. 366 is received into evidence.)

BY MR. STONE:

Q And the title of the document is "NDS overview for a digital ATV system."

A Yeah, I see that.

Q And it's dated January 25th, 2002, correct?

A Yeah.

Q And as far as you know, that's not a document that's relevant to this litigation, correct?

A That's probably correct, yeah.
Q And right in the middle of the first page I think it says "confidential"?

A Yeah.

Q And this is the type of document that NagraStar would not share with NDS, correct?

A I don't know. Just the title "NDS overview of DirecTV system" is typical of a proposal we give to customers, and
we are in a small business where just an overview of the TV system might be or might not be very confidential.

Q Well, let's look at the bottom. There is a legend at the bottom of the first page.

A Yeah.

Q It says "This document and the information contained in it is the property of NDS, Limited, and may be the subject of patents pending and granted. It must not be used for commercial purposes, nor copied, disclosed, reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, whether in whole or in part, without NDS, Limited's prior written agreement"; do you see that? A Yeah.

Q And it is correct that you never obtained NDS's written agreement to possess this document?

A Sorry, can you repeat?

Q It is correct that you've never obtained NDS's written permission to possess this document?

A Yeah, that's correct.
Q If you'd go to the next page, 366-2, under "Table of Contents," please.

THE COURT: Now, Counsel, if we are going to go through the same process, I'll certainly allow you to do that, but it's too consumptive of time. My suggestion is
that we do this out of the presence of the jury, that you show this gentleman all of these passages and paragraphs that you believe would be confidential. This could be easily summarized in literally a minute.

MR. STONE: No, I was just going to show the table of contents, and that was it, your Honor.

THE COURT: Show the table of contents.

BY MR. STONE:

Q Let me show you one other document that I believe comes from Mr. Ereiser, and that's Exhibit 1270, and we'll just --

THE COURT: I'm sorry, you can go back to the table of contents. Go back and --

MR. STONE: Oh, okay, your Honor. I didn't know if you wanted me to --

THE COURT: But if we are going to go through the same process, I'm not precluding you --

MR. STONE: No, no, no.

THE COURT: -- we are just laboriously going

```
through --
```

MR. STONE: No, no --

THE COURT: -- this section.

MR. STONE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: We can show these to these
witnesses --

MR. STONE: No --

THE COURT: No, I don't know, but listen very carefully. We can show these to witnesses out in the hallway before they come in or during a recess. I'm not
precluding you. We're just not walking through --

MR. STONE: I understand.

THE COURT: There are 26,000 documents.

MR. STONE: No, no.
(Laughter.)

MR. STONE: I understand, your Honor.
THE COURT: Here is the table of contents for 366.

Point out the sections.

MR. STONE: All right.
THE COURT: Ask him if he thinks that they are confidential.

MR. STONE: Very well, your Honor.

```
BY MR. STONE:
```

Q Look at number 3, NDS system components.
A Okay.
Q Again, that's the type of information that NagraStar
maintains is confidential, correct?
A Just -- again, just reading the table of content, I
cannot tell how confidential it is.

THE COURT: Mr. Guggenheim, why don't you exit the witness stand, sir; wait out in the hallway. We are going to go through these documents, because apparently you --

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- don't know, and I'm not going to preclude counsel.

So guess what we are doing tonight. We're going over all these documents. We'll summarize these in about five minutes on Tuesday, at which time you will be ordered back --

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: -- first thing in the morning.
We can do this outside the presence of the jury. Thank you very much, Counsel.

MR. STONE: Thank you.
THE COURT: Your next witness, please.
MR. HAGAN: Your Honor, plaintiffs call Stanley

Frost by video deposition.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. Mr. Frost.

You may step down.

Counsel, remember, I am not precluding you from this area, but this could be quickly summarized during the recess if we have time, and I'll give the jury 20 minutes. Mr. Guggenheim will remain available out in the hallway. If we can quickly show him those documents, we'll go back over those and then continue on. So thank you very much.

MR. STONE: Your Honor, I have one other -- two
other topics to cover when Mr. Guggenheim returns.

THE COURT: Certainly. I mean, we'll take all of those, but --

MR. STONE: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- if we're going through this in summary fashion, I need to know. And you're not precluded, but I think this could be easily summarized. It just has to be shown to him outside the presence of the jury, and then he can get on the stand and say that he's looked at these sections. He can do it quickly. Otherwise, what he's doing is taking our time by reading them in the presence of the jury, and it could be easily accomplished another way.

Your next witness, please.

MR. HAGAN: Thank you, your Honor. These are the video deposition clips of Stanley Frost.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

This would be Stanley Frost's video deposition you are about to listen to.
(Videotape played of Stanley Frost, Plaintiffs' witness.)

THE COURT: All right. Why don't we stop the tape at that point. Just a moment.

MR. HAGAN: All right.

THE COURT: I am going to ask you to go take about a 20-minute recess. Go take a bathroom break, or whatever. We'll come back in 20 minutes. And you had to recess at

1:00, didn't you, today?
(No audible response.)

THE COURT: We'll see you about 12:20. Have a
nice recess. Please don't discuss this matter, nor form or express an opinion.

And Counsel, if you'd remain for a moment concerning Mr. Guggenheim. I think there is a way we can approach this very quickly.
(The following proceedings is taken outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: The jury is no longer present.
Mr. Stone, let my record be clear. I'm not going
to preclude you in any way from this examination, but there's a strong argument that this goes outside why Mr. Guggenheim was presented in this area. This is really part of your defense. Have a seat.

This is really part of your defense. This is really part of the -- not the obtaining of the documents, but the contents of the documents, and that's far different than why, in my opinion, EchoStar called Mr. Guggenheim at this point.

Now, what it does is -- is it is unduly consumptive of time, but it's not a preclusion. If you wish to proceed in this manner, I would suggest you do that during your case. And I would also suggest, and I said
something, I think, last night about, you know, bringing this case down to manageable size, but this can easily be accomplished by showing Mr. Guggenheim those sections, all 26,000 if you want, you're in no way precluded, and we can go through those documents very carefully.

Now, I gave you the first opportunity in Exhibit Number 361, I believe. Let me turn to my notes.

MR. WELCH: 366, your Honor.
THE COURT: 366, to go through it laboriously, and you can probably have one or two more documents to go through the same type of methodical section by section reading to the jury, but from that point, I expect a summary.

MR. STONE: That was -- that was not my intent, your Honor.

THE COURT: That -- that's fine. I am not accusing you. I'm just telling you it's unduly consumptive of time. It's going to be conducted in a different way. Now, you can either continue on with Mr. Guggenheim after we're done with the playing of Mr. Frost's tape, or you can talk to Mr. Guggenheim during the recess, or we can do that this afternoon or this evening, but he'll come back Tuesday if you'd like to. I'd just suggest to you that this is really part of your defense. This isn't a wise call.

Now, let me hear your thoughts.

MR. STONE: Your Honor, respectfully, I disagree. They said they were calling him specifically to deal with the stolen documents. They've obviously tried to front a bad issue for their case, but I have a right to cross-examine him when they have fronted like that. Otherwise, it dissipates in front of the jury, which was the intent of fronting the issue, so we're simply -THE COURT: I respectfully disagree with you. I think that he was called specifically to lay the foundation of how these documents were obtained and from whom. The contents about how -- and how dangerous those were to NDS is really part of your counterclaim.

I think we've concluded this discussion, but I'll still use my forbearance. I disagree with you.

MR. STONE: I understand --

THE COURT: But in an abundance of caution, if you want to continue along this line, so be it, but you're going to do that in a summary fashion at this point. And $I$ don't know that I'm going to let you come back to this in NDS's case. That's what I'm trying to warn you about. I think that this is really NDS's defense on the counterclaim, and if you want to go after that methodically now, I'll probably open the door, but we're not hearing this twice. MR. STONE: Fair enough. THE COURT: Think about that over the next 20
minutes. Mr. Guggenheim is at your disposal.

Counsel, 12:20, please.

MR. HAGAN: Thank you, your Honor. (Recess.)
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