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SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 2008 DAY 8 - VOLUME I
(8:31 a.m.)
(The following proceedings is taken outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: We are on the record. We're out of the presence of the jury. All counsel are present.

MR. SNYDER: The deposition of Mr. Ereiser --
(Interruption in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: Ereiser.

MR. SNYDER: They left the deposition after less than an hour.

THE COURT: Why?

MR. NOLL: We -- 55 minutes, your Honor. The
first 30 minutes were spent asking questions that were reasked in the past. They spent 15 minutes on the issue of where Mr. Ereiser got the documents, and then they went into DirecTV documents. Our understanding was that they had 30 to 45 minutes to ask questions about the receipt of the CDs. And we asked, "Do you have any more questions on the CDs?"
"Maybe, I'm not sure," and so we adjourned the deposition --

THE COURT: So everybody walked out?

MR. NOLL: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, we know why those are conducted here in the courtroom, don't we? Because you could have come down the hallway last night at 7:30 or 8:00 -- we were here until 9:00 -- and told me that. So guess where we are tonight? We are right back here with Mr. Ereiser. And you are not going to have video equipment. I'm not going to allow it to be brought in. Mr. Ereiser comes in, you can do that on the record and --

Now, I've got to teach tonight from 6:00 to 9:30 at UCI, but I'll be back at 10:00. You're ordered to be back here, get Mr. Ereiser in here, and they're not going to ask redundant questions. I'll resolve it at 10:00 tonight.

MR. NOLL: You want us to put Mr. Ereiser on second, still the same order that we've got --

THE COURT: Yes, exactly. We will reserve cross-examination for you two.

MR. NOLL: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. Or Darin can start, whatever you choose.

Okay. We are going to get the jury out.

One of the jurors just informed me, the gentleman up in the back row, they've taken all his vacation, all his sick -- sick leave time. You know, he wants to sit. He made the comment, "Can we get this thing going?" So the gentleman up here who is literally volunteering his time,
you know who he is, he's serving gratis right now. So just
be aware of it when you are asking redundant questions,
et cetera, that we're going to have a problem.
Okay. Would you go get the jury?
THE CLERK: Okay.
(The following proceedings is taken in the
presence of the jury.)
THE COURT: All right. We are back in session on
EchoStar versus NDS. The jury is present, all counsel are
present.
Counsel, call your next witness, please.
MR. WELCH: Your Honor, at this time -- for the
record, my name is Wade Welch.
At this time, we'd like to resume with the direct
examination of Mr. Dov Rubin for NDS.
THE COURT: Mr. Dov Rubin.
Thank you very much, sir. If you'd be kind enough
to retake the witness stand.
DOV RUBIN, PLAINTIFFS' WITNESS, RECALLED
THE COURT: Mr. Rubin, we administered an oath to
you last week. Do you recall that oath?
THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
THE COURT: The same oath applies. If you'd
please be seated.
Ladies and gentlemen, when we were introduced to

Dov Rubin, he was on the witness stand, I believe, last Thursday --

MR. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- if I'm not mistaken. We were in the middle of direct examination. We needed to interrupt that direct examination by agreement of counsel. He's been brought back as the first witness this morning.

Good morning, sir.

Counsel?

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued.)

BY MR. WELCH:

Q Good morning, Mr. Rubin.

A Good morning.
Q Just to refresh the jury's recollection, could you once again tell us what your job title is with the defendants, NDS?

A I am the vice president and general manager of NDS Americas located here in Costa Mesa.

Q Okay. And I'm just going to recap a few things that we went over in -- the last time you testified on Thursday.

Let me try and go through that fairly quickly, okay, just to kind of get the jury back into the swing of your -- your testimony, okay?

A Okay.

Q And what I've done is I've prepared Plaintiffs'

Demonstrative Number 14. The first thing I want to talk about is basically the corporate structure, okay?

A Okay.

Q Now, we've heard of various companies. NDS Group is one of the defendants in this case, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And NDS Americas is one of the defendants in this case, correct?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And we've talked about a company called "NDS

Israel." You're familiar with that company, correct?

A Yes, I'm familiar.

Q Okay. NDS Israel is the company that Mr. Mordinson worked for, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And NDS Americas is the company that you work for?
A Yes.

Q And NDS Americas is the company that Mr. Tarnovsky works for, correct?

A Worked for.

Q Okay. Yes, sorry about that. But he worked for NDS Americas between 1997 and when you fired him, or when he was fired in approximately March of 2007, correct?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. So I'm going to draw a line right here between

NDS Americas and Mr. Tarnovsky, okay?

Now, have you ever heard of a company called
"HarperCollins"?

A Yes, I have.
Q Could you tell the jury what HarperCollins is?
A HarperCollins is a book company, also a subsidiary of

News Corporation.

Q I'm just going to put "book."
I don't have the world's best handwriting.
So HarperCollins is a subsidiary of News Corporation?

A Yes.

Q So I can draw that line there.

Now, News Corp -- or if we talk about the NDS Group, that's a subsidiary of News Corporation as well, correct?

A Yes, it is.

Q And in fact, I believe your testimony was that News Corporation appoints the majority of the board of directors for NDS Group?

A They do.

Q And I think we looked in the 10-K, which was

Exhibit 2010, and we saw that there was a statement in there that News Corporation actually controls NDS Group?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. And so indirectly, it control -- News

Corporation controls NDS Americas and NDS Technologies

Israel, correct?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. So I'm just going to draw me some lines right here (indicating).

Now, to your knowledge, Mr. Tarnovsky doesn't work for HarperCollins, right?

A Not at this time.
Q Okay. And he didn't -- has he ever worked for NDS

Technologies Israel, been employed --
A No, he has not.

Q Have you ever worked for HarperCollins?
A No, I have not.

Q Have you ever received any money from HarperCollins?

A No.

Q Now, your paycheck comes from NDS Americas --

A Yes, it does.
Q -- correct?

And you don't receive -- have you ever received money for NDS -- from NDS Technologies Israel?

A I have.

Q You have.

And when was that?

A That was when $I$ was working in Israel.

Q And so what time period would that be?
A That was from 1988 when the company started through
1998.

Q Through '98, okay.

And after '98, have you -- has there ever been an occasion for you to receive money from NDS Israel?

A No.

Q Okay. And the only reason you were receiving money from NDS Israel prior to '98 was because you were actually working for them?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And we know Mr. Tarnovsky never worked for NDS Israel, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And he didn't work for HarperCollins, he worked for NDS

Americas, correct?

A That's not exactly correct.
Q Well, does Mr. Tarnovsky write books?
A No.

Q I didn't think so.

Okay. So I just wanted to walk the jury through the

News Corporation. And actually, the chairman and CEO of

News Corporation, that's Mr. Murdoch, correct?
A Mr. Murdoch.

Q Okay. So I'm going to put Mr. Murdoch up here (indicating).

THE COURT: Why don't you put his first name,
also. We have Charles Ergen, whose already testified on the plaintiffs' side.

BY MR. WELCH:

Q Okay. We've got Rupert Murdoch. He's chairman and CEO of News Corporation, correct?

A Correct.

Q Okay. Who -- who is the big chief at NDS Group?

A Abe Peled, P-e-l-e-d.

Q Who is the big chief at NDS Israel?
A Raffi, R-a-f-f-i, Kesten, K-e-s-t-e-n.

Q And who is the big chief at NDS Americas, yours truly?

A You are looking at him.

Q Okay.
(Laughter.)

BY MR. WELCH:

Q Now, these are all three separate corporations, correct?

A It's four --

Q If we talk about HarperCollins --

THE COURT: Four.

BY MR. WELCH:

Q -- NDS Americas, NDS Group, NDS Israel, they are all
four separate corporations, correct?

A Yes.

Q And they all operate independently?

A Yes, they do.

Q But they are all controlled in some form or fashion by News Corporation?

A Yes.

Q Thank you.

THE COURT: Now, Counsel, out of the presence of the jury, if you'd like, on NDS's side, we can produce the same chart so the NDS -- strike that -- the EchoStar -- we can do that out of the presence of the jury and present that to you, and I think that's very helpful so you start seeing a tie-in. And if both counsel will stipulate, I will allow one chart for each to come in so you -- you'll see the tie-in of the corporate entities. All right, Counsel. MR. WELCH: Thank you. BY MR. WELCH:

Q Now, one of the things we talked about last week was the DirecTV relationship with NDS; do you recall that?

A Yes.
Q And we talked about the fact that NDS supplied conditional access Smart Cards and services to DirecTV, and that it was pretty much consistently compromised between the period of '95 and 2004; do you recall that?

A $\quad$ I do.

Q Okay. What I want to do is I want you to take a look
at Exhibit 1540 .
Could you tell the jury what this is?
A This is a -- the second conditional access license
agreement signed between NDS and DirecTV in August of 1999.
Q Okay. This is -- this is the actual agreement itself
that we had talked about, kind of in general, on Thursday,
correct?
A Yes.
MR. WELCH: Your Honor, at this time, we'd move to
admit Exhibit 1540 .
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. SNYDER: No.
THE COURT: Received.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 1540 is received
into evidence.)
BY MR. WELCH:
Q Now, do you recall in your testimony on Thursday that
we talked about the different types of harms that could come
from anybody pirating or hacking a conditional access
system, correct?
A That's correct.
Q And we talked about it could harm the subscription
television provider, it could harm the conditional access
provider, either through business interruption, lost
profits, or you know, harm to the reputation of the company.

A All of those are factors.

Q Yes.

And you also recall that we talked about the fact that Mr. Tarnovsky was hired by NDS in 1997, and that at the time Mr. Tarnovsky was hired, NDS knew he was a hacker, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And you knew that there was some risk that he could continue his hacking ways?

A Yes.

Q Both of your system, as well as competitors' systems, correct?

A Yes.

Q We also discussed the fact that DirecTV was concerned about NDS's tactics of hiring hackers and keeping them on the payroll, correct?

A Yes.

Q And that DirecTV asked NDS to take Mr. Tarnovsky and Mr. Norris off the DirecTV projects; do you recall that?

A Yes, at some point later in this agreement.

Q Okay. Now, I'm going to move forward to today --

A Okay.
Q -- now that we've got everybody situated.
When we left off last time, we were talking about a document that related to business standards of News -- at News Corporation and NDS, correct?

A Yes.

Q Well, we got the actual color copies now, so I'd like to launch into that using a new exhibit, which is going to be Exhibit 2021.

Can you hand Exhibit 2021, please.

THE COURT: Counsel, the same admonition I gave to NDS. We're not going through this paragraph by paragraph. Get into the specifics of those documents, or I'll find it's unduly consumptive of time.

MR. WELCH: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very limited time in this area.
BY MR. WELCH:

Q Have you seen that document before, sir?
A Yes, I have.

Q Could you tell us what it is?

A This is a document of standards of business practice that was originally authored by News Corporation, which NDS adopted for itself for use within its companies.

Q So News Corp prepares that document, and it filters down through all the various entities?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And this handbook or business standards or business ethics, this is supposed to be given to all the employees in the News Corp or the NDS chain, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And they should be given that document up front when they are employed, correct?

A That's correct.
Q And they should review that document during the course of their employment?

A Yes.

Q I'd like you to take a look at Exhibit 2017.

Your Honor, at this time, we'd like to offer

Exhibit 2021.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. SNYDER: None, your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 2021 is received
into evidence.)

THE COURT: Counsel?

BY MR. WELCH:

Q Could you tell us what Exhibit 2017 is, sir?

A 2017 is also another version of standards of business
conduct. There is no specific date. I'd have to look
through this to try to determine the date based on my
reconstruction over the last week as I've been requested by the Court.

THE COURT: Well, look at the bottom of the first page. Turn it over, and you'll see a date at the bottom.

THE WITNESS: Oh, yes, there it is. Thank you.

THE COURT: What's the date?

THE WITNESS: It's February 1996.

BY MR. WELCH:

Q Okay. So the copy the jury is going to have is actually going to have the orange cover?

A Okay.
Q So this is the original News Corp policies and guidelines on how employees should conduct themselves, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And we didn't get a new one of these until you see the -- Exhibit 2021, which came out in 2004, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And so if we want to talk about conduct that occurred between '97 and the end of 2000, this is the operative document, isn't it?

A This would have been the operative document for the United States, yes.

Q Did this also apply -- this applied to NDS Americas? A Yes, it did.

Q This applied to News Corporation Affiliates, such as HarperCollins?

A I believe so.

Q Okay. Are you saying that it doesn't apply to NDS Israel?

A This did not apply to Israel. This was not given out in Israel in those years, no.

Q Was there any document like this given out to NDS Israel?

A There was not -- we didn't have a standard business of conduct document in Israel. We had a starter kit for employees.

Q That didn't happen until 2002, though, correct?
A That's correct. When the direct -- actually, it was 2004 when the directive came from News Corp to send this document to all of the divisions within News Corp. Until then, there was no uniform policy.

Q So am I hearing you correctly that between '96 and 2004, there was no uniform policy to govern the employees in NDS Israel?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. Now, should Mr. Tarnovsky have been provided with this '96 business standards, the one with the orange cover?

A At -- at the time that he would have joined NDS, yes, he would have been provided that document.

Q So he should have been given this in '97, this Exhibit 2017, correct?

A I'd like to just formally correct the -- Mr. Tarnovsky formally joined NDS Americas probably -- I'm not exactly
sure of the date, 2000, 2001. Prior to that, as an employee
of HarperCollins, he would have been given this document as
well.
Q So whoever he worked for, whatever companies he moved
through, he should have been given this when he started,
correct?
A Yes.
Q And he should have been reviewing this throughout the
years, correct?
A Yes.
Q And would you have a problem if he wasn't given this?
A I would expect human resources' standard policy was
that they give it to all employees, and I -- there was no
reason to assume otherwise.
Q Now, Mr. Norris was his direct boss. Mr. Norris was
the one that hired him. Should Mr. Norris have given him
this?
A It would have come from our human resources department.
MR. WELCH: Your Honor, at this time, we'd like to
offer Exhibit 2017.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. SNYDER: None, your Honor.
THE COURT: Received.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 2017 is received
into evidence.)

BY MR. WELCH:

Q Now, in addition to the lawsuit brought by EchoStar, you are aware that this is not the first time NDS has been sued over its operations, correct?

A Are you referring by DirecTV or --
Q DirecTV or Canal+.

MR. SNYDER: Objection. Irrelevant.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Could you repeat the question, please?

BY MR. WELCH:

Q In addition to the lawsuit brought by EchoStar, this is not the first time that NDS has had another company complain or file a lawsuit about NDS's business practices in relation to providing conditional access services?

A That's correct.

Q In fact, DirecTV, NDS's client, brought some claims against NDS, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And another company called Canal+ that provided conditional access services in Europe, they filed a claim against your company, correct?

A That's correct.

MR. SNYDER: Objection. Irrelevant.
THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. SNYDER: May I have a continuing objection to this line of questioning, your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

BY MR. WELCH:

Q Canal+ was a competitor of NDS, correct?

A That's correct.

Q I want to focus you on page 15 of Exhibit 2017.

THE COURT: Now, let me caution you concerning those last two areas.

Whatever inference or non-inference you draw from this will depend upon the evidence you hear. A simple allegation is not evidence. If there is any same or similar methodology or activity, that's for you to decide. There may not be, there may be. And I'll further instruct you on that at the end of the case, but I've allowed counsel on both sides to get into some limited areas, and those were apparently the last -- well, strike that.

Counsel?

MR. WELCH: Thank you, your Honor.

BY MR. WELCH:

Q Are you focused on page 15 of Exhibit 2017?

A Yes.

Q And the -- and the title of this section is
"Relationships with competitors and other trade practices," correct, sir?

A That's correct.

Q Now, if we look at the first paragraph. I am not going to have you read, I'm just going to basically summarize it for you, okay? And you just tell me if I'm right on this.

It talks about other competitors may have proprietary rights, patents and other property rights in their materials, correct?

A Correct.

Q And it states in there "Company employees and consultants, especially any persons having direct contact with competitors, have a clear responsibility to know and obey the law," correct?

A That's correct.

Q And then the next paragraph it summarizes propriety and sensitive information; do you see that?

A Yes.

Q And what it says, basically, is "The acquisition of trade secrets or other proprietary information" --

THE COURT: Slower, slower. You can put that up on the board, Counsel, so the jury can read along with you. That's 2017, page 15.

All right. Now, read slowly.
MR. WELCH: Okay. I have to figure out how to zoom this thing.

THE COURT: No, that's all right. You can slide
the paper. BY MR. WELCH:

Q On relationships, proprietary and sensitive information, it says "A company will not acquire another company's trade secrets or other proprietary information by improper means or permit the unauthorized use for third parties' patents, copyrights or trademarks. The acquisition of trade secrets or other proprietary information by other than an open, independent" -- for example, reverse engineering -- "or owner authorized means" -- for example, agreements or written releases of suppliers -- "may subject individuals and entities to criminal or civil liability."
"Additionally, means such as reverse engineering may be prohibited by contractual arrangement or may violate certain patent or other proprietary rights"; do you see that? A Yes, I do.

Q And that's what News Corp was trying to tell all its employees, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And then if you go underneath that, you have a paragraph entitled "Fair competition"; do you see that?

A Yes.

Q And it says "The company will compete fairly for business, respecting the rights of other parties. This includes respect for legitimate business relationships of
competitors with the company's perspective customers,"
correct?
A That's correct.
Q And one of those customers would be DirecTV?
A Yes.
Q And one of your competitors would be the client's
conditional access provider, correct?
A That's correct.
Q Now, going back to Mr. Tarnovsky for a second.
Now, it's your understanding that Mr. Tarnovsky was
terminated for activities or basic -- certain actions that
he may have taken in connection with hacking EchoStar's
conditional access system, correct?
A That wasn't my understanding.
Q Well, it was your understanding that he was terminated
for being a little less than honest, correct?
A With regard to the receipt of some monies inside of a
VCR player.
Q So he lied to you?
A We felt that he wasn't being honest.
Q Okay. Now, Mr. Tarnovsky reported directly to
Mr. Norris; we established that. Has the company done
anything to reprimand Mr. Norris for any of his activities?
A Not to my knowledge.
Q Now, I want to talk about Mr. Tarnovsky's friend,

Mr. Al Menard. Are you aware of who Mr. Al Menard is?

A I am not.

Q Okay. Are you aware that your company, NDS, hired Mr. Menard after my clients brought the original lawsuit in September of 2002?

A That would be something that I would have to defer to our operations security officer, Reuven Hasak.

Q Okay. Are you aware that they kept him on the payroll and paid him approximately $\$ 380,000$ up until March of $2007 ?$

A I learned that here at the trial.

Q Did you have a problem with the fact that NDS hired this known pirate, Al Menard, and paid him $\$ 380,000$ during the pendency of the claims?

THE COURT: Well, Counsel, he said he didn't know about this. This is unduly consumptive of time and argumentative, quite frankly. Let's move along, now. BY MR. WELCH:

Q Please take a look at Exhibit 1270 for us.

THE COURT: And also, I remind you, Mr. Rubin, you are the corporate representative. You speak on behalf of the corporation. You should know these answers. If not, I will simply call you back until you do. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. WELCH:

Q Sir, could you tell us what Exhibit 1270 is?

A This is a marketing competitive intelligence document comparing NDS to Nagra's conditional access system from a technical and business perspective.

Q Okay. Did you see this document shortly after you came back; it's dated May 13, 2001, correct?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And this is a sensitive internal document of NDS, correct?

A Yes, it is. It's marked "confidential."

Q Okay. And why would you have reason to see this document?

A This would provide my salesmen with information, competitive intelligence information, that they may be facing when they go into potential customers and maybe being brought objections or claims of a competing system. So this document would help them have those answers.

Q So was -- was this prepared by somebody at NDS, it was kind of like a collection of information so that your salespeople could go out and have ready answers to the customers if they had any questions about NDS or competitors?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. Did you ever have occasion to use any of the
information in Exhibit 1270 in your discussions with various people?

A No, I did not.

Q Okay. But you expected your salespeople to be familiar with it?

A I expected them to be familiar and use it only if they had to.

Q Okay. So it was basically a handy reference guide?

A Informational, yes.
Q Now, one of the jobs that Mr. Tarnovsky had was to keep his ear to the ground, so to speak, on what was going on in the piracy world, correct?

A Correct.

Q Would you consider Mr. Tarnovsky to be one of your field agents for gathering competitive intelligence?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And then what Mr. Tarnovsky would do is he would provide that competitive intelligence?

THE COURT: A little slower. MR. WELCH: Sorry, your Honor.

BY MR. WELCH:

Q He would provide that competitive intelligence to the hierarchy in NDS, correct?

A Probably just to the internet competitive intelligence division of operational security.

```
Q And NDS relied upon him for that, correct?
```

A He was one source, only one source.
Q Okay. And so Mr. Tarnovsky's information could very
well easily for the -- for the Americas standpoint, very
well easily end up in a document such as 1270 , correct?
A Yes.
MR. WELCH: Your Honor, at this time, we'd like to
move the admission of Exhibit 1270 .
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. SNYDER: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: 1270 is received.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 1270 is received
into evidence.)
BY MR. WELCH:
Q Now, I want to direct your attention to the page that's
Bates label number ESC013-5963.
THE COURT: Counsel?
MR. WELCH: If we could go down to the last
paragraph of Section 5.1 and blow that up. It starts -- the
last paragraph, 5.1, 5.2.
Thank you.
BY MR. WELCH:
Q Now, this is information that NDS wanted to arm its
marketing staff with in connection with their sales
activities, correct?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And I'm just going to read for you briefly. It says "As of the end of January 2001, both EchoStar, Nagra, and DirecTV, NDS, in the United States were hacked. NDS successfully countered a DirecTV pirate attempt in the U.S. on what is being called Black Sunday by the hacker community. NDS countermeasures were sent right before the Super Bowl."

And I'll represent to you that was January 21st, 2001 is when the Super Bowl was that year.
"According to external literature, over 200,000 pirated devices were disabled." That would be NDS pirate devices, correct?

A Correct.
Q And then it says "NDS field contacts." Now, that could be Mr. Tarnovsky, correct?

A Could be.

Q "Confirmed that Nagra did not start sending an ECM until after the game was over. Anyone with a pirated NagraCard saw the game for free. Our estimate is that this commercial loss to EchoStar probably accounted for over 100,000 non-paying subscribers"; do you see that?

A I see that.

Q What we are talking about there is 100,000 pirate devices in the field for EchoStar, correct?

A Not necessarily. That could also include what are called "gray pirates" in Canada and Mexico, who bought legitimate EchoStar devices and were looking at them outside of the territory of the United States as well.

Q But -- but we know you were pretty comfortable there was over 100,000 pirate devices out there?

A That was just Chris's estimate, and as it says at the beginning of this document, the information is dynamic and subject to change. And in this particular instance, we weren't able to verify that from a second source. It was just simply Chris's guesstimate.

Q If you'd go to the page that ends with the Bates label 55.

THE COURT: So are you saying, then, that these field contacts are Mr. Tarnovsky?

THE WITNESS: In this particular instance, it should have been "field contact" if they were being precise. We did not verify -- we had not verified this information from a second source.

THE COURT: I just heard you say "Chris,"
referring to Tarnovsky. Is this Tarnovsky?
THE WITNESS: Yes, yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
BY MR. WELCH:

Q Sir, could you go to the page that ends in the Bates
label 955 of Exhibit 1217 -- or 1270, sorry.
A Yes.
Q If you could go down to the last paragraph. It's
entitled "Important note."
A Yes.
Q I'm going to read to you the second sentence.
"NDS marketing competitive intelligence believes this
information" -- the information is contained in 1270,
correct?
A Yes.
Q -- "to be accurate as of the date of publication."
A Yes.
Q Do you agree with that statement?
A Yes, and as it -- as it says in the next sentence as
well.
Q Okay. And what we know is as of the date of this
publication, this is May 13th, 2001, correct?
A Yes.
Q And the reason you wanted -- that when you put
information in here, the reason you want it to be accurate
is you know you're sending your sales force out into
America, and you want to make sure they're giving you
accurate information, correct?
A That's correct. However, everything on the incident --
Q Thank you, sir.

A -- is not necessarily accurate.

Q Okay. Now, I want you to go back to section 5.1, which is Bates labeled ending 5963.

A Yes.

Q Do you see the first paragraph of 5.1?
A Nagra is not --

Q I'm going to read it for you. It says "Nagra is not capable of successfully launching electronic countermeasures to fight a hack." That would be an ECM, correct?

A That's correct.

Q That was your view?
A That was my view in 1997 as well.
Q And it says "In the United States, pirates have found Nagra's electronic countermeasures easy to overcome"; do you see that?

A Yes, I do.

Q So if the system was hacked, they could try to have countermeasures, but it may ultimately end up would have to switch out the system, correct, because ECMs may not be effective?

A There are ways to circumvent that, as I discussed in 1997 in my testimony and my presentation to EchoStar engineers and personnel.

Q And then if the ECMs aren't effective, maybe they -sometimes ECMs can be effective up front, correct?

A They could, initially.
Q And then as pirates and hackers begin to understand the system better and better, it can overrun the ECMs, correct?

A That's only one instance.
Q But my -- I'm talking about generally, hackers can eventually overrun an ECM, correct, or ECMs?

A It -- it depends on the ECM.
Q Okay. And if your ECMs are not effective after a period of time, that can lead a conditional access provider or a satellite provider to have to swap out their conditional access stream, correct?

A If the ECMs are not effective or they're not designed properly, yes.

Q Now, we talked about the agreement, 1540, which is the 1999 agreement. That agreement ran from August '99 to August 2003, correct?

A That -- that's correct.

Q And you are aware that EchoStar was in the midst of swapping out its cards or having a soft swap, so to speak, in 2003, correct?

A I only heard that from the testimony during the trial.
Q Okay. Did there come a time in 2002 when DirecTV filed
a lawsuit against NDS?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And one of the things that DirecTV was looking
to do was potentially get out of the contract with NDS, correct?

A They were looking to exercise a clause, an exit clause in the contract, but for a specific purpose.

Q Okay. Now, a new contract was entered into in 2004, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And were you involved in the negotiations surrounding that new contract?

A No, I was not.

Q Okay. But you have general knowledge about it, because you're -- you're the chief at NDS Americas, correct?

A I have general knowledge.

Q Okay. And we'll just short-circuit things. That agreement was entered into in March 2004, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And it was for six years?
A Yes.

Q Okay. And March 2004, does that refresh your recollection that that's the time when News Corporation was able to consummate its transaction for purchasing the controlling shares of DirecTV?

A Yes.

Q So at the same time, we've got News Corporation purchasing DirecTV or the controlling interest in DirecTV,
and we have a new contract for conditional access for DirecTV, correct?

A That's correct.
Q And right after that DirecTV became secure, correct?

A They took decisions that we had been pushing the old management to take for a long time, so yes, they did become secure.

Q Now, we talked about the claims that DirecTV's made, we talked about claims of Canal+, generally, we talked about the claims that plaintiffs have made. Those are some pretty serious allegations, aren't they?

A That's a matter of opinion.
Q You don't think they are serious?
A Any -- any litigation is serious.

Q Your largest customer sues you, one of your largest competitors we established in -- in the case -THE COURT: Counsel, you are not asking questions now.

## MR. WELCH: Okay.

## BY MR. WELCH:

Q The allegations that were leveled by DirecTV and Canal+ and EchoStar span a number of years, don't they?

A Yes.

Q And they are serious allegations with potential ramifications in the hundreds of millions of dollars,
correct?

A On the surface, they are serious allegations.

Obviously each one is a case unto itself.
Q Now, have you ever had the opportunity to have conversations with Mr. Murdoch about the operation of NDS Americas?

A I've had many conversations with Mr. Murdoch, but he's never talked to me about the operations of NDS Americas or NDS at all.

Q Have you had conversations with Mr. Murdoch about these allegations of piracy?

A No, I have not.
Q You never told him about it?

A No.

Q He never asked you?

A Nope, never came up in a conversation.
Q Now, if Mr. Murdoch gave you or Mr. Peled or Mr. Norris direction, you all would follow that, correct?

A Repeat the question, please.
Q If Mr. Murdoch gave you --
A Is that -- did you say "if"?

Q Yes, sir.
A Okay.
Q If Mr. Murdoch gave you, Mr. Norris and Mr. Peled direction, you would follow that?

A Hypothetically, yes, but it never happened.
Q Now, you are aware that we've requested Mr. Murdoch's presence in this trial, correct?

MR. SNYDER: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

You can answer the question.

THE WITNESS: I've heard requested by the Court.
BY MR. WELCH:

Q Do you know if Mr. Murdoch is going to be here? Because I'd like to have a conversation with him in front of the jury --

MR. SNYDER: Objection, your Honor.
MR. WELCH: -- about these allegations.
THE COURT: Yeah. I haven't formed an opinion yet as a judge whether Mr. Murdoch or Mr. Peled --

MR. WELCH: Peled, yes, your Honor.

MR. SNYDER: Peled.

THE COURT: -- are appropriate witnesses, and I'm not requiring them to come from the NDS side, nor have I formed an opinion whether Andre Kudelski or Charles Ergen on the EchoStar, plaintiffs' side, were appropriate witnesses, nor have I ordered them to come to court. But I've counseled both counsel outside of your presence, and now I counsel you, you may find it relevant that all or none of those people appear. There may be no liability; there may
be liability. If you find liability, there may or may not be punitive damages. And how decisions are made or by whom, whether they are at lower levels at EchoStar or NDS or middle management or the top levels will be for you to determine. So let me just say all four persons are invited. (Laughter.)

THE COURT: If they don't come, that's their choice. I'm going to give both counsel for each side the ability to argue that corporate decisions may be made at the highest level; they may not be. This gentleman is the corporate representative. There will be corporate representatives for EchoStar, but you'll decide if these people should be appearing or not, and if so, what inference of their non-appearance or appearance you attach to it. But I'm not going to preclude either counsel from either side arguing that on behalf of EchoStar's part, these decisions may have been made at the highest level regarding allegations of satellite piracy.

And on the other side, NDS's counterclaim, some of their vital documents were -- were stolen from them, and those corporate decisions might have been made at the highest levels on plaintiffs' side as far as Charles Ergen. I don't know if Andre Kudelski will appear. I don't know if Rupert Murdoch will appear. I don't know if Mr. Peled will appear. They're invited.

Counsel?

BY MR. WELCH:

Q Now, Mr. Rubin, you've been sitting here for all the testimony with the exception of Thursday afternoon and Friday, correct?

A Correct.

Q And you know there's two plaintiffs in this lawsuit, correct; there's EchoStar, and then there's NagraStar, correct?

A Correct.

THE COURT: And by the way, at least I've talked with counsel, also, that it may or may not be beneficial if these persons appear and look you in the eye and tell you what's occurred, because you have a multitude of corporations, some with different ownership interests. And how you find corporate responsibility or who is in charge of decision making may not lie with lower level members of management or even, you know, corporate representatives. And you may attach no significance to their non-appearance, you may attach significance, but counsel has been on forewarning for a significant period of time on both sides that they can have these people appear or not. And then you can judge credibility if they decide to or not, because these are serious allegations on both sides. Counsel?

MR. WELCH: Thank you, your Honor.

BY MR. WELCH:

Q Now, Mr. Rubin, EchoStar brought its top of the line, Mr. Ergen, didn't it, gave your -- your counsel the opportunity to cross-examine Mr. Ergen on the stand; he was the first witness?

A He did.

Q And we brought Mr. Lenoir, the CEO of NagraStar, the other plaintiff, put him on the stand second and let the NDS attorneys cross-examine him, correct?

MR. SNYDER: Objection, your Honor. This is an issue that --

THE COURT: Sustained.

Is Mr. Andre Kudelski going to be appearing,

Counsel?

MR. WELCH: Henri Kudelski is going to be here.
THE COURT: Andre Kudelski will be here?

MR. WELCH: Henri, Henri.

THE COURT: Well, that's Henri. Is Andre
Kudelski, the primary owner of the Kudelski Group,
et cetera, going to be here?
No, no, Counsel, I'm asking you.

MR. WELCH: As of this time, they have not put him on the witness list, and we haven't put him on --

THE COURT: No, no. I'm sorry, Counsel. I've
invited him.

MR. WELCH: Okay.
THE COURT: I've invited corporate America and
international to appear. So let me be very clear, I've extended a warm invitation.
(Laughter.)

THE COURT: You can judge their appearance or non-appearance, whether they're international figures or national figures, the Court has limited jurisdiction. I am not going to order somebody in from Israel or -- or Switzerland. And both sides can choose to put on the stand who they choose, but as a jury, I've counseled outside your presence and now counsel in your presence that with these kinds of allegations, satellite piracy on one side and stealing of vital documents on the other side, that if these did occur, you are going to have to decide if these are lower level people for either party making these decisions, middle management or the very top of the structure. You have the right to have people appear and look you in the eye and tell you, you know, that they did or didn't or have knowledge or not, and so they're warmly invited.

BY MR. WELCH:
Q Could you please take a look at Exhibit 1065 for us.
It's just housekeeping, your Honor.
Can you tell us what this is, sir.

A It says "Form 20-F, filed by NDS Group PLC."

Q And that's one of the defendants in the lawsuit, correct?

A That's correct.
Q And this is the securities filing that's filed with the government --

THE COURT: Slower, slower. You are slurring your words.

BY MR. WELCH:

Q And this is a securities filing that's filed with the government?

A That's correct.

MR. WELCH: Your Honor, at this time, we move to admit 1065.

THE COURT: Any objection, Counsel?

MR. SNYDER: No objection.

THE COURT: Received.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 1065 is received
into evidence.)

BY MR. WELCH:

Q Now, I'd like to take a look at Exhibit 2011.

Could you please tell us what Exhibit 2011 is.

A This is Form 10-Q that every public company needs to file on a quarterly basis, and this one is for NDS Group PLC.

MR. WELCH: Your Honor, at this time, we'd like to move the admission of Exhibit 2011.

THE COURT: Any objection, Counsel?

MR. SNYDER: No objection.

THE COURT: 2011 is received.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 2011 is received into evidence.)

MR. WELCH: Now, if there's any need for the jury to assess the revenues or the net worth of the Defendant NDS, these are two documents, 20 -- 2010 and 2011.

MR. SNYDER: Objection, your Honor. It's argument. There is no question.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. WELCH:

Q Those two documents, 2010 and 2011, they reference revenues and net worth of the defendant, correct?

A That's correct.

MR. WELCH: Your Honor, at this time we have no further questions for Mr. Rubin.

THE COURT: Thank you.

This is cross-examination by Mr. Snyder on behalf of NDS.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, your Honor. Darin Snyder for the defendants.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SNYDER:

Q Good morning, Dr. Rubin.

A Good morning.
Q You've been on the stand a couple of times now, but the jury hasn't really had a chance to hear very much about you. Could you tell the jury a little bit about your family?

A Okay. I've been married 32 years. We have six children, five boys and one girl.

Q Do you have any grandchildren, Dr. Rubin?
A I have. I have 11 grandchildren.

Q I'm sure people noticed that you had to leave on
Thursday. Could -- could you tell the jury where you went?
A Yes. I raced out of the courtroom here and made my flight to Tel Aviv, the last flight into Tel Aviv 20 minutes before flight time. I spent the two days with my -Passover with my family and had a chance to finally see two granddaughters who were born a week apart.

Q Dr. Rubin, could you briefly describe for the jury your educational background?

A Okay. I have a bachelor of science degree from the Jerusalem College of Technology. It's in electro-optical engineering and applied physics.

Q Do you have any other degrees?
A Yes, I have a master of science degree in system
engineering from Case Western Reserve University in

Cleveland, Ohio, and I have a Ph.D in biomedical engineering. That's actually a dual degree in medicine and engineering right here from southern California, USC.

Q Are you typically addressed as "Dr. Rubin"?
A It depends where. Certainly not by my wife.
(Laughter.)

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q Well, I don't know how many lawsuits have had two
Dr. Rubins as witnesses, but -- but I'll go ahead and address you as Dr. Rubin, since we -- we try to be a little bit formal here for obvious reasons.

A Dov would work, too, but as you please.
Q Okay. Dr. Rubin, before getting involved with NDS, did you do work in the biomedical field in which you've been educated?

A Yes. I know at this point, my father was a physician. He wanted me to go into medicine, but yes.

Q Could you describe your work in the biomedical field for the jury, please?

A Yes, when I was at Case Western Reserve, I co-developed a very neat life-saving device. It's called -- it was called a transcutaneous oxygen sensor. It sounds like a mouthful, but it actually is very vital for the survival of premature infants. If you want to know the oxygen tension
in any premature infant, you have to actually sample the blood, which then puts them in a life-threatening situation. THE COURT: Just a little slower. I can see that that's breaking out a little bit. Say that again slower. THE WITNESS: With premature infants, you need to monitor their oxygen tension as frequently as possible, and the typical method is to sample blood and then measure the oxygen. The act of sampling the blood actually affects the infants' health, and so we came up -- I came up with a method that allowed to monitor it continuously by putting a sensor right on the premature infants' skin. That became a model for something that's used today all over the world. You probably see this not only in premature infants, just every hospital around the world, they put a little sensor on your finger, and they monitor your oxygen, the carbon dioxide without having to take blood. It's noninvasive, and that's a very nice life-saving device used millions of times around the world.

BY MR. SNYDER:

Q Can you give the jury any other example of the work that you did in the biomedical field before joining NDS?

A I worked for the City of Hope up in Duarte where I invented a computer system for early detection of lung disease. We are talking several years to be able to detect
the onset of lung disease, long before traditional methods can actually spot it. The results are published and still used clinically today up in the City of Hope.

Q Dr. Rubin, it seems like quite a jump from testing the blood and saving the lives of premature babies to working on conditional access systems. Can you tell the jury how you went from the biomedical field to conditional access. A Something that I -- I and my wife feel is important is making a difference in different ways and maybe some examples where we felt we are contributing in the medical field, but around 1983, we felt we wanted to make a difference by moving our family. We were a little smaller then, we only had three children, but moving to Israel to try to make a difference there maybe in a different way. It was certainly my vision, our vision, that I'd like to be involved -- I'd like to start a company in which we have a spectrum of people, all races, all nationalities, sort of be a model, a beacon in the Middle East for what -how people can work harmoniously together. And I'm pretty proud of the fact that -- that after a few years there, I was able to have the opportunity of -- of starting NDS and fulfill that dream.

Q Were you involved in the founding of NDS?
A Yes, I was. At the time, I had a -- a company -- I had started a company of my own that was working in computer
communications. I wish there were other biomedical companies in the field in Israel at the time, but there weren't. But along that period of time, I did come across a -- a technology called encryption technology or
cryptography developed by Professor Shamir, Professor Adi
Shamir, from the Weizmann Institute of Science.
Q I need you to slow down, Dr. Rubin.
A I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Adi Shamir?

THE WITNESS: S-h-a-m-i-r.

THE COURT: For my own protection for the record, this Court's going to state that the conversation's too quick. I am not going to interrupt you, Doctor, but if there was a review in court in this matter, that court should be put on notice that it's impossible for the court reporter to take accurate notes. And unless counsel can control that by taking a pause or you can control that, the Court can only make that statement that it's trying to get a record.

THE WITNESS: Okay, your Honor.

BY MR. SNYDER:

Q So you discovered the -- or you learned about the cryptographic algorithms of Dr. Shamir?

A Yes.

Q And then can you finish describing how NDS was founded,
again, speaking slowly, Dr. Rubin.
A I recognized that the future of technology, the way the world was going to be moving in 1988 was electronically. There would be electronic funds transfers, documents that needed to be proved to be unforgeable, and this cryptographic technology had perfect applications. And after some meetings with -- with Professor Shamir, we felt that we had some very good ideas in which to start a -- a joint venture. The only thing that we lacked was money, and somehow we were actually able to make a connection with News Corporation, who invested the first $\$ 5$ million in our venture.

Q And when was NDS founded?

A February of 1988.

Q And has NDS helped you achieve this idea of creating a company in the Middle East with various races and nationalities?

A Yes, they have. The company today supports over a thousand families in Jerusalem. We are the largest high-tech employer in Jerusalem, and we've been visited and commended for our work by prime ministers and dignitaries.

I certainly feel -- my wife and I certainly feel that we've fulfilled that goal.

Q And what is your current role with NDS?
A My current role has been here in California since 1998.

I am the vice president and general manager of NDS Americas right down the road in Costa Mesa.

Q What other roles have you had at NDS since it's founded?

A Well, I officially started out as technical manager, general manager, vice president of sales, but you know, with startups, you sort of have to do everything. You even have to do windows. And so titles doesn't necessarily say everything, but yes, I've had a number of titles.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, Counsel. I'm unclear about something.

You said you're vice president of NDS Americas? THE WITNESS: Vice president and general manager of NDS Americas.

THE COURT: Who is the president of NDS Americas? THE WITNESS: There is none.

THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. SNYDER:

Q Is the vice president and general manager of NDS Americas essentially what you're responsible for, Dr. Rubin?

A I'm responsible for supporting existing customers, responsible for seeking out new sales, responsible for making sure that our Smart Card manufacturing plant, also located here, operates and delivers functionally, and any other divisions of NDS, any other functional divisions of
NDS that reside -- that need to work in the United States
receive the proper administrative functions.
Q And who do you report to?
A I report to the CEO and chairman, Dr. Abe Peled.
Q Now, last Thursday you referred to a matrix
organizational structure, but you weren't given an
opportunity to explain that. Does -- does NDS have a matrix
organizational structure?
A Yes, we do.
THE COURT: Does NDS Americas?
BY MR. SNYDER:
Q Does NDS Americas have an organizational structure?
A Yes, we do, as does the rest of NDS worldwide.
Q And could you describe briefly for the jury what you
mean by a matrix organizational structure?
A Most engineers, most personnel actually have two
managers. On one hand, they need a functional manager who
has areas of expertise who can assign their proper tasks
that they need to do -- need to perform from an engineering
standpoint. On the other hand, every region or every
employee has a regional manager in which their
administrative matters are met, salary, bonuses, benefits,
just day-to-day type of needs, make sure that they are
adhered to, supported.
Q And are you the lead local manager for all of the
employees of NDS Americas?

A Yes, I am.

Q Are you the functional manager for all of the employees at NDS Americas?

A No, I'm not.

Q Let's take a couple of examples. What is your role in operational security?

A My role in operational security is we have an
operational security division located in the Americas, and the person reporting to me is John Norris. And under him are a number of other operatives who also reside in the United States.

Q Excuse me.

And does John Norris have a functional manager?
A Yes, John Norris's functional manager is Reuven Hasak, $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{s}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{k}$.

Q And who is Mr. Hasak?

A Mr. Hasak is the senior vice president of worldwide operational security.

Q Now, last week you -- in response to one of Mr. Welch's questions, you said that you would not have expected to hear from Mr. Norris when money was sent to Chris Tarnovsky and found inside of some packages, and I think that might have struck some people as strange. Why did you say you would not have expected to be told about that?

A I would -- the person I would have expected to be told immediately would have been his functional manager, Mr. Hasak.

Q And why did you think you would not be told about that?

A I wouldn't be told about that immediately. That would come up more during our management forum or during conversations I would have with our CEO, but for myself, I really have none -- very little or if -- no actual understanding of the true meaning of operational security, and so it's not my area of expertise.

Q What role did you have in research and development?
A Here in the United States, I have a large number of research and development engineers whose functional manager resides in Israel, and he gives them their functional direction.

Q Now, let's take a -- take a step back for just a moment to the founding of the company. When -- when NDS was originally founded, what was the technology used for?

A The original use was what we call secure funds
transfer. That was how you transfer money electronically between banks, between an individual and the banks, between foreign currency traders maybe on two sides of the world who don't know or have never seen each other, and how do they trust each other, and these were the cryptographic techniques that we developed.

Q And how did that technology evolve into NDS's current business of supplying conditional access systems for television operators?

A About a year into the company, there was a system in England called Sky Television that was looking to broadcast, and they were told by all of the studios that they needed to scramble or encrypt their movie content before they would have the right to broadcast it. And we were known in many places around the world as being experts in the area of cryptography.

Q Does NDS's technology have any current uses beyond paid television?

A Yes. We haven't really exploited all. It has military application. It has applications -- new applications that are coming out in the future like electronic paper, electronically erasable paper that you actually hold and treat like paper, but change the images on it.

Q Now, you mentioned earlier this morning, Dr. Rubin, that NDS is a publicly traded company?

A Yes.

Q What does that mean?
A Well, that means that we are regulated by all sorts of government offices, regulations and the notorious Sarbanes-Oxley rules called "SOX," which is a headache every year that we have to face from an accounting perspective.

Q When did NDS become a publicly traded company?

A November of 1999.
Q And was there -- why did NDS go public in November of 1999?

A Well, it was a process that we had discussed and actually begun a long time before 1999 for a very simple reason, or two reasons. One is always to provide share incentives to employees to keep their motivation and keep them staying on in the company, as was the practice in the high-tech industry in those years.

But more importantly for me, and more important for the company, we found ourselves in many situations where we were going in for -- to bid on a system that was competing to ourselves, competing maybe to a News Corporation entity that we applied in technology for, and we wanted to show the customers that you can't have these shenanigans. We really have to -- we really have to perform. We have public accountability, and we wanted to give them the comfort that -- that they were getting the best deal possible. Q Now, Dr. Rubin, you were asked last week about the timing of NDS's public offering, selling its shares to the public, and the timing of renewing your contract with -with DirecTV; do you recall that testimony?

A Yes, I do.

Q Did the timing of the contract or renewal of the
contract with DirecTV have anything to do with the timing of NDS for the first time selling shares to the public?

A Well, as I said before, the -- the process of going public is a lot of documentation, and it takes a lot of time. It's like a slow-moving ship. You can't really predict when and how fast you can turn. So the timing did not have anything to do directly with the DirecTV contract, closing of the DirecTV contract, but I can sure say it didn't hurt us.

Q Now, Dr. Rubin, how many -- does -- does NDS have customers beyond DirecTV now?

A Yes.
Q Who is DirecTV's largest customer? I'm sorry, who was NDS's largest customer? I misspoke, excuse me.

A NDS's largest customer is DirecTV. (Laughter.)

BY MR. SNYDER:

Q Now, when did -- when did NDS begin its relationship with DirecTV?

A I actually began the relationship with DirecTV in the sales -- in the sales period back in February of 1991, and proceeded negotiating that deal through I think it was January of 1992.

Q Was NDS DirecTV's original conditional access provider?

A Yes, we were.

Q How long did that contract last?
A Well, the original contract was called to last for six years, but we had an extension in the middle.

Q Okay. Was that extension in 1998?

A Yes. We began negotiations I believe it was the summer of 1998, and they were taking a long time, and the original contract was -- was due to expire, so both sides agreed we should issue an extension, it would be both our benefits.

Q What was the -- the primary issue in the discussions between NDS and DirecTV when that contract was being renegotiated?

A The major point was that DirecTV wanted more insight or control over our technology.

Q Was -- did you know at that time that DirecTV was talking to other competitors?

A We were told at the first session, the opening session of negotiations, that this would be treated like an open contract like any other contract with any other vendor, and yes, there would be other bidders for the contract. Q Did DirecTV ever tell you the names of any of the other bidders for DirecTV's business?

A Absolutely not. They were very discrete, and they were fastidious and meticulous about not telling that to us.

Q Now, last week you were asked whether you new whether or not Nagra was one of the competitors for DirecTV's
business; do you recall that testimony?
A I do.
Q And I believe you said you assumed they were, but you
didn't know that they were?
A That's correct. I was, first of all, referring to my
deposition when $I$ was asked a question about assuming, and I
said, yes, I assumed that Nagra would be one of the possible
conditional access suppliers. The question that came to me
last week was "Did you know," and clearly, I did not know.
Q Okay. Why do you say -- why did you assume that Nagra
would be one of the competitors?
A Well, there's only a handful of large conditional
access providers. There were smaller ones that DirecTV
could have chosen, but there's Motorola, Scientific Atlanta,
Nagra, Detto, even Microsoft, who could have bid -- been the
potential bidders for that contract, who we did have no way
of knowing.
Q Did DirecTV at any time during those negotiations
mention Nagra or any other possible competitors for the
DirecTV business?
A Never.
Q Were you aware at the time of those negotiations that
DirecTV had had some discussions with Nagra?
A I wasn't aware of it.
Q When was the first time you became aware that DirecTV
in the '98, 1999 time frame had had discussions with Nagra about becoming DirecTV's conditional access provider?

A It may have been during my deposition when the question was put to me.

Q At the time that you were renegotiating the contract in 1988 and 1999 with DirecTV, was the NDS system supplied to DirecTV hacked?

A Yes, it was.

Q What was NDS doing to respond to the piracy of the DirecTV system?

A Well, first of all, we were developing countermeasures. We were putting out our operational security personnel in the field trying to locate pirate devices, to shut down pirate websites and other sources such as that.

Q Has NDS ever changed the cards that are used by the DirecTV system?

A Yes, we have.

Q When was the first of those card changes?

A The first of the card changes, late 1995, beginning of '96, but it wasn't exactly a card change. We introduced a new card to the field, and DirecTV chose to leave the older card still in the field.

Q And what was that new card called?

A That new card was called P2, period two.

Q And at some point, did NDS supply DirecTV with a card

```
called the P3 card?
```

A Yes, we did.
Q And when was that, approximately?
A That was probably July -- June, July of 1999. We
worked on that with DirecTV for quite a while.
Q And was that card -- was that -- the introduction of
that card a card swap?
A No, that wasn't a card swap. That was just introducing
a -- yet another card into the system.
Q And was there another card after the P3 card?
A Yes, there was. In the Spring of 2002, we developed
P4, period four card.
Q And was -- was the introduction of the $P 4$ card a card
swap?
A No, that wasn't either.
Q Did DirecTV -- before News Corp purchased an interest
in DirecTV, were you ever engaged in a card swap?
A No, they weren't.
Q Has NDS encouraged DirecTV to engage in a card swap?
A We definitely did. That was a source of discussion
probably from the period two card. When we introduced that
card in 1996, it was always a point of discussion, but
DirecTV, for their reasons, chose not to do that swap.
Q Why did NDS want DirecTV to engage in a card swap after
the P4 card was introduced?

A We felt adamant that the $P 4$ card was as close as you could call an ultimate card in terms of its security, its ability to perform. And we felt that it -- it had met and solved all of the previous problems that we'd encountered in -- in previous hacks.

Q Has the P4 card ever been pirated?
A Not since -- not since its introduction in 2002.

Q At some point, did DirecTV engage in a card swap?
A Yes, they did.

Q And when was that?

A Well, that was when new management came in, and we once again presented to them the pros and cons of remaining with the status quo versus the benefits of going forward and cutting -- making a clean cut.

Q And was that new management that was put in place after News Corp purchased an interest in DirecTV?

A Yes, it was.

Q So can you explain to the jury why -- what relationship there was between News Corp purchasing an interest in DirecTV and DirecTV ending its piracy problems?

A I can only quote a coincidental. It's something that we had lobbied, and it's something that made sense just about -- to just about everybody. And we're just fortunate that this new management understood the benefits of doing that, and $I$ think they reaped the benefits in the years
going forward.
Q And in the years before that card swap, had the P4 card
already been introduced?
A It had been in the field for two years with no problems
whatsoever. We did, however, have to operate the system at
what we call the lowest common denominator, meaning the
lowest level of security that would satisfy all the cards,
including the hacked cards that were in the field.
Q Let's make sure that everybody understands that. When
you say "the lowest common denominator," you mean that a
signal that would be broadcast had to be encrypted by the
P2, P3 and P4 card?
A That's correct.
Q And after the card swap was completed to go to the $P 4$
card, what was NDS and DirecTV able to do?
A We disabled any old cards, any P1, P2 or P3 cards that
were in the field. They became inoperative, and today $P 4$ is
the only card that's out there, or the variance thereof.
Q Now, you mentioned earlier, Dr. Rubin, that DirecTV
is -- is an important customer. And I believe that last
week you showed -- the jury was shown some revenue figures
from DirecTV; do you recall that?
A Yes.
MR. SNYDER: Mike, could you show the witness
Exhibit 1597.

BY MR. SNYDER:

Q Dr. Rubin, can you explain, briefly, to the jury what is Exhibit 1597.

A This is an analysis of revenue and profit that NDS received from DirecTV.

Q And is this a summary that was being prepared based on NDS's regular books and records?

A Yes, this was something that was prepared at the request of counsel late last week and -- yes.

Q And does this reflect the amount of operating profit associated with DirecTV for the years 1999 through 2005?

A Yes, it is.

MR. SNYDER: I move Exhibit 1597.

MR. WELCH: Your Honor, we object to the
introduction of 1597. We were not provided with the underlying data, although we requested it during discovery.

THE COURT: Overruled. It's received.
(Defendants' Exhibit No. 1597 is received
into evidence.)

THE COURT: You can look at that underlying data tonight, tomorrow night, Friday night, Saturday and Sunday. (Laughter.)

BY MR. SNYDER:

Q Dr. Rubin, in response to --
THE COURT: And they've been with me all day

Saturday and Sunday, so we are working outside of your presence -- or half a day Sunday. BY MR. SNYDER:

Q Dr. Rubin, in response to one of plaintiffs' counsel's questions, you were asked whether that spreadsheet of revenue numbers was the amount that -- that NDS made from DirecTV; do you recall that testimony?

A Yes, that was both in my deposition and in my testimony.

Q And when you said that that was the amount that NDS made, could you explain what you mean?

A That would be the total revenue that DirecTV paid us without accounting for any expenses, so expenses like card costs, how much it costs us to manufacture a card, things like royalties that we had to pay third parties for the technology that we use. And our operating expenses, meaning the manpower, the research and development, not only here in the Americas, but in -- in all of our $R$ and $D$ centers around the world, those are all expenses for us.

Q Okay. And did you include all of those expenses in Exhibit 1597, the calculation of profit from the DirecTV account?

A Yes, I did.

Q In preparing Exhibit 1597, did you notice any errors in the listing of the revenue that was on Exhibit 650?

A Yes, there was a -- a single error.
Q And what was that?
A In 2005, the revenue received was $\$ 161.2$ million.
Q And what accounts for that discrepancy with

Exhibit 650?

A When we calculated -- the year 2005 was the year that NDS switched its general accounting principles, GAP, as it's called, from general accounting principles UK to general accounting principles U.S. And so, in addition, up until that point, all of our accounts were held in British pounds, in the currency British pounds, and in 2005, we switched to U.S. dollars.

So those two factors caused a bit of confusion in calculating the underlying revenue or just to calculate that revenue, so this is the correct number that -- that appears. Q And when you say "this is the correct number," are you referring to the number that's printed on Exhibit $1597 ?$

A Yes, 1597, page 7.
Q Thank you, Dr. Rubin.

Now, there was some testimony on Thursday and this morning about News Corporation's relationship to NDS; do you recall that?

A Yes.

Q What is -- what control does News Corporation exercise over NDS?

A From a management perspective, News Corporation appoint four board members. They also have the right to appoint three outside board members and the chairman.

Q Now, does -- does Mr. Rupert Murdoch occupy a seat on the board of NDS?

A No.

Q Does Mr. Murdoch have any role in the operations or business of NDS?

A I can talk personally to this one, because since day one, 20 years ago, he has never given instruction to me or anyone within NDS about the operation of the company or to favor one customer over another customer. Q Is NDS permitted to sell its products to competitors of News Corp or News Corp companies?

A Absolutely, yes.

Q And does anyone at News Corp ever provide any instruction on what kind of business arrangements NDS should have with competitors of News Corp companies?

A Nothing.

Q Has anyone at News Corp ever provided you with any instructions or directions on how NDS should behave towards its competitors?

A Also not other than the standards of business conduct.

Q Now, who are NDS's direct competitors?

A Well, that depends on the region. Maybe you could help
me.

Q Okay. Well, you were asked last week whether Nagra or NagraStar was NDS's biggest competitor; do you recall that? A I do.

Q Is NagraStar NDS's biggest competitor?
A No, they are not.

Q Okay. Is there any region in which NagraStar is NDS's biggest competitor?

A Maybe in Europe.
Q Who are NDS's biggest competitors in the United States?
A The largest competitors, just so that you understand, we consider conditional access competition not only related to satellite --

Q Slow down, Dr. Rubin, please.
A -- not only relating to satellite, but conditional access works and cable and telephony over the internet. So our biggest competitors here in the United States consist of either Motorola or Scientific Atlanta simply by virtue of the fact that there are 65 million cable homes in the United States. Assume a $50 / 50$ split, and that gives you 32 million for each of them, so they are our largest competitor here. Q And for how many homes in the United States does NDS supply conditional access?

A I can probably answer that in terms of active cards. I don't know exactly how many homes. Some homes have multiple
cards.

Q I wasn't trying to ask a trick question, Dr. Rubin; you're right. What's the number of active cards, actually cards NDS has in the United States?

A We have probably maybe 35 or 40 million active cards here.

Q And what is the number of active cards worldwide for NDS?

A About 82 million.

Q Now, did Canal+ used to be one of NDS's competitors in
the Smart Card market?
A Yes, they were.

Q Does -- is Canal+ still in the Smart Card business?
A No, they are not.

Q Who purchased the Canal+ Smart Card business?
A The Nagra company, the Nagra Kudelski company.
THE COURT: And when you say "Kudelski," that would be Andre Kudelski, not his brother Henri?

THE WITNESS: Andre.

THE COURT: Andre, thank you.

BY MR. SNYDER:

Q Dr. Rubin, I know you've been sitting here for -THE COURT: And just so the jury knows, he's in

Switzerland; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: That's my understanding, yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Rupert Murdoch is in Australia? THE WITNESS: No, he usually resides, besides on the airplane, in New York, New York and Los Angeles.

THE COURT: And Mr. Peled is in the UK?

THE WITNESS: He is in the UK, yes.

THE COURT: They are all invited.

BY MR. SNYDER:

Q Dr. Rubin, you've -- during the testimony in this case, you've heard reference to the Black Hat Team and the Haifa research center?

A Yes, I have.

Q What, if any, is your role with the Haifa research center?

A I have no direct role with the -- with the research center.

Q Were you aware of the creation of the Haifa research center at the time?

A Yes, I was.

Q And how -- in what capacity were you aware of the Haifa research center?

A I'm a member of the management forum, which are the senior executives in the company who meet with Dr. Peled, and this was discussed, that we needed to have an additional engineering facility, something beyond our regular engineering abilities.

Q And what was -- why was it considered important to have another research facility beyond the traditional NDS research facilities in Jerusalem? A We wanted to have a set of engineers that looked at a product, whether it was our own or any other product, in an unbiased way without the benefit of getting information, looking at it sort of as a black box, where the Black Hat name comes from, where they don't have the benefit of -- of documents or winks and nods or hearing hallway conversations about any given product.

Q Are you familiar with the term "Black Hat team"?
A Yes, I am.

Q And what does Black Hat Team refer to?

A It's a term that $I$ heard referred to within IBM where they established a team of engineers whose job it was to break into, hack into, reverse engineer, understand IBM's own systems, and hence, they got the term "Black Hat team." Q Now, if you -- since the creation of the Haifa research center, have you been told what kind of projects they undertook?

A No.

Q Have you ever been given the reports of any of those projects?

A No, I have not.

Q I'm sure you've heard, as you've sat here through the
trial, a lot of reference to this document called the Headend Report?

A Correct.

Q Before this litigation, had you ever seen a copy of the Headend Report?

A No.

Q Have you been sent the reports on any of the reverse engineering projects at the Haifa research center?

A None.

Q You were asked on Thursday whether you were aware of any direct benefits to NDS from reverse engineering; do you recall that testimony?

A Yes.

Q And -- and I believe you said that you were not aware of any of those benefits?

A That's correct.

Q Why is it you're not aware of any direct benefits to

NDS from these reverse engineering projects?

A The way the process was to work was that the Haifa research center makes their conclusions, makes their recommendations about maybe mistakes that should be avoided, maybe makes suggestions of things to do, but all those suggestions really get incorporated by the chip design team located in Jerusalem. So that's just input for them about what to do, what not to do, pitfalls to avoid, so I
certainly -- I don't think it's a one-to-one relationship.
It certainly isn't a one-to-one relationship of saying,
"Well, we've discovered this, therefore, that."
What -- about the only thing that -- that I learned in
talking to some of the people in Jerusalem was that their
one conclusion was not to use the ST chip.
Q Now, Dr. Rubin, is developing better chips one of the
ways that NDS tries to fight piracy?
A Absolutely.
Q Is one of the ways that NDS fights piracy through its
operational security group?
A Yes.
Q And is one of the ways that NDS fights piracy in the
operational security group by hiring former pirates?
A Yes.
Q Why does NDS hire former satellite pirates?
A It's -- the reason is we learned the hard way. We
learned from experience in the early years of the company.
Those first six or eight years were quite demanding, and I
would say educational for us in the sense that I came to the
conclusion, and we came to the conclusion, that our
straightforward thinking engineers, who think straight, who
think in grids, are definitely not representative of the
other forces and the other smart brains that are out there.
And there are people that attack the system in ways we just
couldn't even imagine.

Q And was hiring former satellite pirates one way of gaining that knowledge?

A Yes, it was.
Q Now, Mr. Welch asked you some questions about DirecTV and the use of former satellite pirates, and $I$ believe you mentioned that DirecTV at one point objected to, in particular, Mr. Tarnovsky working on DirecTV projects; do you recall that?

A Yes.

Q Was that -- did DirecTV object to Mr. Tarnovsky's involvement when NDS hired Mr. Tarnovsky?

A No. In fact, we had discussed with DirecTV that we would be using pirates, and they were fine with that through those early years, '95, '96, and certainly gave no objection for us hiring Mr. Tarnovsky.

Q When did DirecTV object to Mr. Tarnovsky's role in

DirecTV projects?

A After the incident where it was written up in the press that -- that he -- Mr. Tarnovsky had received money in a DVR or DVD at a post office box and all those other details, DirecTV said that they really couldn't afford to have the bad publicity. I think I mentioned last week in my testimony this negative publicity, the old "where there's smoke, there's fire" is bad for everybody in this business.

And DirecTV felt that they did not want to be associated with it, guilt or no guilt, but we just couldn't pay the price of having association with him, and they asked me to remove him from the account.

Q And what did you do?
A I did just that. I removed -- I told Chris -- I told John to please instruct Chris that he was off of the account.

Q When you say "John," you're referring to John Norris?
A That's correct.

Q And the Chris you're referring to is Chris Tarnovsky?

A That's correct.

Q And was that in the year 2001?

A Yes, it was.

Q At that point, had Mr. Tarnovsky been assisting NDS and DirecTV in fighting piracy for several years?

A Yes.

Q And before that time, had DirecTV ever objected to Mr. Tarnovsky's involvement with NDS in fighting piracy? A No. In fact, they certainly benefited from the fruits of his labor in their own prosecutions of -- of criminals. Q Now, you are aware, aren't you, Dr. Rubin, that the EchoStar system has also been pirated for several years; isn't that right?

A Yes.

Q And is it hopeful to NDS if its competitors' systems are pirated?

A No, it's not.

Q Why not? That -- that seems a little bit strange to me. Why isn't it good for NDS if its competitor is pirated? A If -- if you are a viewer -- and I know Mr. Ergen said that most Americans are honest, but if you're a viewer and can find a system that's available for free, chances are you're going to go buy that free system. And that means not only loss of revenue for the system that's hacked, that also means a lost potential subscriber for the competitor.

Q When you are selling to potential customers, is whether or not a system is pirated the most important consideration? A It's not; it really isn't.

Q Why is that?
A Customers -- the first and foremost importance for the company -- for the customer is does the system function operationally well. Customers know that piracy is not necessarily their biggest problem. It's not their biggest loss, their biggest financial problem. They want to know, can they deliver instant response time.

If any of you have satellite, you know on DirecTV you can get a response in three seconds. If you have a problem, call up the operator. If you want to order a channel, order a movie, you can have that within three seconds.

The -- our customer, in this case, DirecTV, wants to know that the system is supporting legitimate subscribers, the 15 to 20 million subscribers that are paying for legitimate television. They want to know that the service is uninterrupted, or as they say, the show must go on. And those are the most important criteria.

Q Let me take a step back for a moment to DirecTV's request about Mr. Tarnovsky, Mr. Norris. I believe you mentioned that DirecTV also asked that Mr. Norris be removed from DirecTV projects?

A Yes.

Q Did -- did DirecTV later rescind or remove that request?

A They didn't formally rescind. I got a request maybe probably less than a month later for assistance that their operational security team needed, and I continued to get such similar requests for Mr. Norris's assistance in the months ahead as well.

Q So Mr. Norris continued to assist DirecTV with its piracy problems?

A Yes.

Q Does NDS ever assist its competitors with their piracy problems?

A Yes, we do.

Q Has NDS ever offered to assist EchoStar with its piracy
problems?

A Yes, we have.
Q Have you ever been involved in any of those offers of assistance?

A I certainly have.
Q When?
A Well, in -- I can recall a couple of instances. First of all, in March of 2000, I had requested a meeting with Mr. Ergen, and there were some other engineers. I believe Mike Dugan, $D-u-g-a-n$, is present, Dave Kummer, $K-u-m-e-r$ (sic), and of course, Mr. Ergen.

Q What was discussed in that meeting as it relates to EchoStar piracy?

A Well, if I may, the meeting -- I actually called the meeting to -- to discuss other products that I thought

EchoStar would be interested in, things relating to interactive applications, gains, middleware.
(Interruption in the proceedings.)

THE WITNESS: Middleware, yes.

However, the meeting began by Mr. Ergen telling
me, "Dov, I have a piracy problem here; what can we do?"

And I said to him -- I said I would be more than happy to have our operational security people meet with his to meet that problem, and I did reiterate the same slogan, that piracy for one hurts us all.

BY MR. SNYDER:

Q And this meeting was when, Dr. Rubin?
A March of 2000 .

Q At any point during that meeting, did Mr. Ergen suggest
in any way that NDS might be involved in some way in

EchoStar's piracy problem?

A No, no, to the contrary.

Q At that meeting, did anyone from EchoStar who attended the meeting suggest in any way whatsoever that NDS might be involved in some way with EchoStar's piracy problems?

A No.

Q There was no mention of that at all?
A Not at all. It was a friendly meeting and a friendly discussion.

Q Now, let me change topics for just a few minutes, Dr. Rubin, and ask you about Chris Tarnovsky. When did you first meet Chris Tarnovsky?

A I had a hard time pinpointing the date. It must have been sometime in 1998.

Q What interaction have you had with Chris Tarnovsky over the years?

A I treat Chris -- or treated Chris while he was an employee -- I treated Chris no different than any other employee in my company. I make it a point to sit with every individual at least twice a year, ask them how they are
doing, talk about their work, make sure that they are comfortable and make sure our employment benefits and just their whole surroundings are to their liking.

In Chris's case, I usually would meet him outside the company. We would have lunch right outside our offices, and so I would meet with Chris twice a year for lunch. Q When you met with Chris during these -- these meetings, did you talk about any of his undercover work?

A We -- we did. We talked -- typically, from my perspective, what I would try to stress to Chris was that, as I said the analogy before, "where there's smoke there's fire," we as a company, our only reason for existence and ability to sell to companies is if we are perceived as an honest company. And I always have tried from the beginning of this company until today to maintain that image, because it's more than an image. It -- it's a reality from how we operate. And I tried to convey that to Chris, that $I$ know he's working on -- on the dark edge, but that -- that anything that he would do or get misconstrued that he was doing something wrong would be devastating for us, and yeah. Q Did Chris Tarnovsky ever mention to you that he had a mailbox in San Marcos, Texas?

A No, he did not.

Q When was the first time that you, as the vice president and general manager of NDS Americas, learned that

Mr. Tarnovsky had received some packages with money inside them at a mailbox in San Marcos, Texas?

A I learned that from the newspaper. I think it was the Los Angeles Times.

Q Are you aware that there was an investigation conducted as a result of those packages that were found?

A Yes, yes.
Q Was NDS ever charged with any crimes?

A $\quad$ No.

Q Was NDS ever indicted?

A No.

Q Were any search warrants ever executed against NDS?

A No.

Q Was Chris Tarnovsky ever charged with any crime?

A No, he was not.

Q Was Mr. Tarnovsky indicted?

A No.

Q Were any search warrants ever executed against

Mr. Tarnovsky?

A No.

Q Now, I assume that as a security company, Dr. Rubin, NDS also secures its own facilities?

A Yes.

Q Could you describe, generally, what kind of security NDS uses?

A Well, first of all, we have physical security of the premises, video cameras, access control systems with only badged employees. We maintain 24 by 7 security guards who patrol the facility, and then we have the actual internal security of our data.

Q And is the internal security of your data also protected?

A Yes, it's protected in multiple ways. First of all, we only communicate on our internal network. That means our internal wide area network that connects the NDS offices around the world, and that communication is encrypted.

In addition, we also make sure that every personal computer that is used has a resident encryption system so that the contents of the disk, if the disk ever gets stolen, are encrypted and unintelligible.

And then, thirdly, as an added precaution, in case there is highly sensitive material, we also use, as had been mentioned before in the trial, PGP, which is the Pretty Good Privacy or pretty good protection. I am not sure, I heard them both here. I don't know what it stands for.

Q Could you please take a look at Exhibit 391.
Do you recognize this exhibit, Dr. Rubin, Exhibit $391 ?$
A Yes, I do.

Q Could you tell the jury briefly what this document is?
A This document represents a written summary of meetings,
a series of meetings that were held between senior DirecTV engineers and senior NDS engineers to discuss card history, Smart Card history and various technical discussions around Smart Cards.

Q Is this a document that was prepared by NDS and DirecTV in the regular course of their business?

A Yes, it was.

MR. SNYDER: Your Honor, I move Exhibit 391. MR. WELCH: No objection, your Honor. THE COURT: Received.
(Defendants' Exhibit No. 391 is received into evidence.)

MR. SNYDER: Could you just blow up the title and the authors, please.

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q Dr. Rubin, who are the authors of this document?

A The authors are one DirecTV person, Ron Cocchi, and one NDS person, Perry Smith.

Q And who is or was Ron Cocchi at DirecTV?

A Ron Cocchi was -- I don't know if his precise title was the lead engineer or -- or chief engineer for DirecTV at the time.

Q And who was Perry Smith?

A Perry Smith is the vice president of security at NDS.
Q Is this document marked to indicate that it's
confidential?

A Yes, it says "DirecTV Proprietary II."

Q And does that -- does that designation appear on every page?

A Yes, it does.

Q What is the purpose of marking a document like this as proprietary?

A And proprietary II in this case, this -- this is actually DirecTV's methodology, but that means extremely and highly confidential.

Q What -- what was the purpose of this document?
A This document represented probably the most honest and open discussion that we had ever had to date with a customer to explain all of the hacks that were known previously to the customer, and as I mentioned before, as part of the working towards the second agreement in the spirit of openness where we shared with DirecTV previous failures so that DirecTV could learn from them.

THE COURT: Counsel, tell me when a good time for
a recess would be.

MR. SNYDER: If I could have three more minutes, it would be a very good time, your Honor. THE COURT: Any logical breaking point. MR. SNYDER: Thank you.

BY MR. SNYDER:

Q Does this document contain confidential NDS
information?

A Very much so.

Q Can you give the jury an example of the kind of confidential NDS information that this document contains?

A Can we turn to page 091.

Q So you are referring to the Bates number.
A The ESC number.

Q Page 6 of the exhibit.
A Oh, sorry, 391-006. I'm sorry.
(Interruption in the proceedings.)
THE WITNESS: 391-006.

BY MR. SNYDER:

Q If you could pull out just the top couple of boxes, please.

And can you describe for the jury what about this is confidential NDS information, Dr. Rubin?

A I'd say everything, but I'll be specific.

It contains every -- the name, the manufacturer of every chip that we had ever produced for Sky or for DirecTV, its exact architectural structure, and more importantly, how it was hacked or how others attempt to hack that card, or the mistakes or the flaws in each one of those cards. Q If the information in this document, Exhibit 391, were
in the hands of NDS's competitors, would that harm NDS?

A I'd say a little stronger. If -- if this document were here, I -- I won't say which one of our customers would be irreparably harmed today.

Q Would it also irreparably harm NDS?

A Yes.

MR. SNYDER: This would be a good time for a break, your Honor.

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

Why don't we come and get you in 20 minutes.
(Recess.)
-OOO-
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| years 19:2 20:9 | 1983 48:11 | 22 1:18 4:1 | 8 |
| 35:17 36:22 | 1988 10:25 50:3 | 23 87:11 | 8 1:10 4:2 |
| 45:8 47:25 | 50:14 60:6 | 24 82:3 | 8:00 5:3 |
| 48:20 56:10 | 1991 57:21 | 2401 2:7 | 8:31 4:3 |
| 58:3 62:25 63:2 | 1992 57:23 | 2600 2:16,23 | 82 69:9 |
| 63:4 64:11 | 1995 60:19 | 275 2:16,22 | 83 3:16 |
| 67:10 73:18,19 | 1996 18:2 61:22 | $2887: 5$ | 9 |
| $74: 15$ 75:16,23 $79: 21$ | 1997 8:22 15:4 33:12,22 | 293:18 | 9:00 5:4 |
| York 70:3,3 | 1998 11:1 50:25 | 3 | 9:30 5:9 |
|  | 58:4,6 79:19 | 30 4:15, 19 | 92701 1:23 |
| Z | 1999 14:4 34:15 | 32 45:8 68:20 | $93161: 2187: 15$ |
| zoom 23:24 | $56: 2,4,660: 1,6$ $61: 464 \cdot 11$ | $3569: 5$ $\mathbf{3 9 1}$ 3:16 82:21, | 94111-3305 2:17 |
| \$ | 61:4 64:11 | 83:8,11 85:25 | 95 13:23 74:15 |
| \$161.2 66:3 | 2 | 391-006 85:11,13 | 952-4334 2:9 |
| \$380,000 26:9,12 | 203:22 44:10 |  | 955 32:1 |
| \$5 50:11 | 45:15 67:10 | 4 | 96 19:13,18 60:20 |
| 0 | 77:3 86:12 | 4th 1:23 | 74:15 |
|  | 20-F 43:1 | 40 69:5 | $9718: 15$ 19:22 |
| 03-0950-DOC 1:8 | 200,000 30:11 | 411 1:23 | 98 11:2,3,7 60:1 |
| 08-04-22 1:25 | 2000 18:15 20:1 | 415 2:17,24 | 984-8700 2:17,24 |
| 091 85:7 | 78:8 79:3 | $433: 17$ | $9934: 15$ |
| 1 | 2001 20:1 27:7 | $443: 21$ $453: 84$ |  |
| 1-053 1:23 | 30:3,9 32:17 $75 \cdot 13$ | 45 3:8 4:19 |  |
| 10-K 9:20 | $2002 \text { 19:8 26:5 }$ | 5 |  |
| 10-Q 43:23 | 34:22 61:11 | 5.1 29:19,20 33:2 |  |
| 10:00 5:10,12 | 62:7 | 33:5 |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 100,000 30:22,24 } \\ 31: 6 \end{array}$ | 2003 34:16,20 | 5.2 29:20 |  |
| 31:6 $\mathbf{1 0 6 5 ~ 3 : 1 7 ~ 4 2 : 2 3 ~}$ | 2004 13:23 18:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{5 0} / \mathbf{5 0} 68: 20 \\ & \mathbf{5 5} 4: 1431: 13 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 43:14,18 | 19:10,14 $35: 5$ $35 \cdot 15,19$ | 558:14 $\mathbf{5 5 8}-77551: 13$ $\mathbf{5} \mathbf{1}$ |  |
| 1145:11 | $2005 \text { 64:11 66:3,6 }$ | 5963 33:3 |  |
| $121732: 1$ 1270 3:18 26:18 | 66:11 | 6 |  |
| 127:2 28:1 29:5,8 | 2007 8:23 26:9 | 685:10 |  |
| 29:11,12 32:1,8 | $20081: 18$ 87.1 87 2010 | 6:00 5:9 |  |
| 13 27:7 | $2010 \text { 9:21 44:10 }$ | 64 3:20 |  |
| 13th 32:17 | $44: 15$ | 65 68:19 |  |
| 143:19 8:1 | 2011 3:21 43:21 | 650 65:25 66:5 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 154: 16 ~ 22: 7,21 \\ 23: 21 ~ 77: 3 \end{gathered}$ | 43:22 44:2,5,6 | 7 |  |
| 1540 3:19 14:1,10 |  | 73:7 66:18 82:3 |  |
| 14:14 34:14 | $20173: 2217: 7,17$ $17 \cdot 1819 \cdot 23$ | 7:30 5:3 |  |
| 1597 3:20 63:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:18 19:23 } \\ & \text { 20:20,24 22:7 } \end{aligned}$ | $7002: 8$ |  |
| 64:3,13,15,18 | $22: 21 \quad 23: 21$ | 713 2:9 |  |
| 65:21,24 66:17 | $2021 \text { 3:23 16:4,5 }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{7 1 4} 1: 24 \\ & \mathbf{7 5 3} 87: 4 \end{aligned}$ |  |

