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SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 2008

Day 9, Volume I
(8:18 a.m.)
(Outside the presence of the jury.)
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Shelton, if you would retake the stand.

All right. We're back on record with NDS and EchoStar.

Counsel are present. Mr. Shelton's on the witness stand.

JAMES SHELTON, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, PREVIOUSLY SWORN

RESUMED THE STAND

THE COURT: Counsel.

MS. WILLETTS: May I approach, Your Honor, with an exhibit?

THE COURT: You may.

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Shelton. The last time you were here to testify, you had identified some handwritten notes from which you took certain numbers in order to come up with your total piracy card calculations as well as total FTA piracy calculations.

Exhibit 2031 that I've just handed you: Were those the handwritten notes that you were referring to?
A. Yes. It's some of 'em, yes.
Q. Some of them. Are there any additionals?
A. I could -- my wife could not find 'em that night when I had her search the records.
Q. And what did you do to locate all of your handwritten notes underlying the piracy calculations that you provided in this case?
A. What I did was, the handwritten notes were in back of a file with the typewritten schedules. And she was able to identify these as laying out on the table from discovery when I pulled all the records and sent 'em.
Q. And can you tell us -- and these are records for what years, Mr. Shelton?
A. '99 through 2004.
Q. Can you tell us when -- on the first page of Exhibit 2031, it says August 1999 -- when you created these notes?
A. In the fourth quarter, for a report that went to

Bell ExpressVu.
Q. In the fourth quarter of 1999?
A. Correct. August of '99.
Q. And why were they created?
A. I was tasked with an analysis of the NagraStar system at the request of Bell ExpressVu in order to obtain the NFL Sunday Ticket.
Q. How did you come up with the figures that are listed on Page 1 of Exhibit 2031?
A. I'd been tracking the activity on NagraStar as far as some of the early activity in '98 posting, so all I did was recap as to what $I$ saw and provided information to Bell ExpressVu.
Q. If you'll look at Page 2 of Exhibit 2031, can you tell us what Page 2 is?
A. It's year-end, 2000 .
Q. When did you create the notes that appear on Page 2 of Exhibit 2031?
A. It would have been right around November in preparation for a security working group meeting with the Satellite Broadcasting Communication Association.
Q. And is the information on Page 2 -- the figures for Discount Satellite, PiratesDen, MoreSat, High-Tech Satellite, and Xtreme Satellite -- are those figures the same as -- did you get those figures in the same manner that you did for 1999? Is it a recap of what you had prepared and looked at over the year?
A. Yes, it is, from the pirate websites.
Q. And can you tell me what again you prepared this for, in preparation for what?
A. The Satellite Business Communication Association had formed in 1997 a security working group which was tasked to
coordinate activity among all the security vendors and programmers that were specializing in security in order to jointly combat theft.
Q. And were you a member of the security working group?
A. I was the chairman of that security working group from '97 through 2004 when SPCA disbanded -- or not completely disbanded, but scaled down.
Q. So what was the purpose of you creating the notes on Page 2 of Exhibit 2031?
A. We openly discussed in the security working group the activity that we were monitoring and seeing going on in the marketplace, and these were some of the notes that $I$ used for that meeting along with just ongoing tracking as to the progress -- what was happening on the NagraStar system. Q. And if you'll turn to the next page, it is for the year 2000. Can you tell me when about did you create the notes that appear on Page 3 of Exhibit 2031?
A. It would also have been right around the fourth quarter in October/November time frame.
Q. Of 2001?
A. Correct.
Q. And what was the purpose of you creating the notes that appear here on Page 3 ?
A. Once again, just from ongoing tracking. And then the security working group met twice a year, usually in the
spring and the fall. And it's -- we had ongoing discussions about the activity as to what was happening.
Q. And how did you arrive at the figures that appear here on Page 3 for year 2001?
A. Their post actually should be stated as threads. It's just the activity in the section of the pirate forums that was discussing the Nagra system.
Q. And at this point in time, were there any FTA piracy that you were tracking?
A. No, there was not.
Q. If you look at the next page for year 2002, can you tell us approximately what date you prepared the notes for year 2002 that appear on Page 4 of Exhibit 231?
A. That was also year-end.
Q. Year-end 2002?
A. Correct.
Q. And how did you come up with the figures that appear on the page for year 2002?
A. Just from threads in the pirate website that had a section for NagraStar hack.
Q. Is that the same for year 2003 and 2004 that appear on the following pages?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And when did you create the notes that appear on the page that says 2003?
A. That was also year-end, and it also started tracking the al7bar.net, which was dedicated only to free-to-air. Q. And what did you prepare the notes on the 2003 page -what did you prepare those for?
A. That was also security working group along with just my ongoing tracking as to what activity was occurring.
Q. And you said that al7bar.net, that was a purely FTA site?
A. Correct.
Q. So at this time you also began tracking threads and activity on FTA websites?
A. The other pirate websites, such as Discount Satellite, PiratesDen, High-Tech Sat, did not have free-to-air activity. It was only the one, the al7bar.net, that was dedicated solely for free-to-air.
Q. And if you look at the following page for year 2004, approximately when did you create the notes that appear here?
A. That was also year-end.
Q. Year-end 2004?
A. Correct.
Q. And how did you arrive at the numbers that appear here for the year 2004?
A. That was just from tracking the subsection of the websites dedicated to Nagra Smart Card hacks.
Q. And at that point in time, that was Discount Satellite and PiratesDen, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And what did you use the information contained on the 2004 page -- what did you use that information for?
A. It was the security working group.
Q. And was NDS a member of that security working group or employees of NDS members of the security working group?
A. Not throughout the complete time period of '99. They were in '99. They were excluded in 2001 because of a conflict they had with DirecTV and NDS security, and the SBCA, the Satellite Broadcasting Communication Association, dropped their name from the security working group. MS. WILLETTS: May I approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: You may.

BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. I've handed you what has previously been marked as Exhibit 1603 that we discussed the last time you testified. Can you identify this document again for the record?
A. It's an internal document. Basically compares my numbers with the various Carmel reports that $I$ worked on in 2003 and 2007. And then it recaps as far as just the Smart Card at the bottom, and free-to-air, separating the numbers. Q. And if you look at the second page, can you tell us what the second page of Exhibit 1603 represents?
A. That is just basically a summary of the different websites, particularly the free-to-air starting in 2003 and tracking the migration from Smart Card into free-to-air piracy.
Q. And we just discussed your handwritten notes. Is the information contained on Page 2 of Exhibit 1603 -- was that information obtained from the handwritten notes that we just discussed in Exhibit 2031?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Is there any other information that you considered when preparing Exhibit 1603?
A. The free-to-air growth and those websites, and that was in reference to the files $I$ had my wife search for, the free-to-air websites.
Q. And the last time you testified, I believe there was a question as to why there was some discrepancy or difference in the numbers -- your numbers, the Shelton numbers -- in Exhibit 1603 and the final total piracy numbers at the bottom of Exhibit 1603. Do you recall that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And do you know why there's a difference in those two numbers?
A. Yes. I went back, took a look, and, of course, what I'm tracking is the total activity on websites, not breaking out Canada, because it's almost impossible to do. Some --
some registered members will put their location as Canada, but it's not reliable.

The number at the bottom where it's April -- the April 2007 report, that's only U.S. numbers.
Q. So the difference accounts for you backing out Canadian piracy; is that correct?
A. Correct.

THE COURT: Just one moment.

Thank you, Counsel. Please continue.
BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. How are you able to back out the Canadian piracy?
A. Canada typically is 10 percent the size -- TV
households -- 10 percent the size of U.S. TV households.
Currently right around 12 million $T V$ households are in

Canada compared with 112 million in the U.S. So we did it on a percentage basis as to what I had was tracking, backed out that 10 percent -- actually, it was 10 to 13 percent that we backed out.

MS. WILLETTS: I have no further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Counsel on behalf of NDS, do you have any questions, or would you like to reserve.

MR. SNYDER: I have a couple questions.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. Mr. Shelton, you have your handwritten notes in front of you that have been marked as Exhibit 2031?
A. Correct.
Q. And you also have Exhibit 1603, which is your spreadsheet?
A. Correct.
Q. I'd like your help making sure I understand some aspects of those.

Could you turn, please, to the fourth page of your handwritten notes?
A. Okay.
Q. Actually, I'm sorry.

Let's go one more page to the next page, to the year 2003. Do you have that page in front of you?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. And is it your testimony now that the numbers on this page were transferred to the second page of Exhibit 1603, your table called, "Pirate Member

Projections"?
A. Correct.
Q. So I'm clear, what are these? What are these numbers?

Are these members or posts or threads or something else?
A. They're threads.
Q. So maybe you can correct me if I'm wrong. Did you testify previously that you were tracking members?
A. Yes, in regards to the free-to-air pirate websites, they were members.
Q. So when you track free-to-air, you're tracking members; and when you're tracking something else, you're tracking threads?
A. Correct. It migrated from DirecTV pirate websites into -- once DirecTV went secure in April of 2004, that's when the growth of free-to-air websites started changing and dropping off the DirecTV activity and just to coordinate, adding the free-to-air activity.
Q. And so for 2003, you assumed that the website, al7bar.net, was all FTA piracy?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And so you have assumed that that was the number for that year of FTA pirates?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Could you look at the first page of Exhibit 1603, please.
A. Okay.
Q. For 2003, what's the number of FTA pirates you estimated?
A. 100,000 .
Q. Okay. That's not the same as the number of members or
posted or whatever it is you tracked on al7bar, is it?
A. It's actually discounted by 20 percent from that al7bar.
Q. Okay. And why did you discount it 20 percent?
A. Because you'd have multiple members of a household registering as a member of a website, and it's not a scientific number. It's something that I felt needed to be discounted because of the fact that you could have multiple members sign on.
Q. So that's your normal 20 percent discount to try to avoid duplication?
A. Correct.
Q. And you don't believe that that 20 percent is scientific?
A. No.
Q. That's just your best guess?
A. It's actually just from reading as to the comments and what they're stating.
Q. Okay. Let's look at 2004 for a moment. Your notes on 2004 -- so I'm looking at the last page of Exhibit 2031. And could we compare that, please, to the second page of Exhibit 1603.

On the last page of Exhibit 2031, you have two
entries: Discount Sat and PiratesDen. Do I read that correctly?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, looking at the second page of Exhibit 1603, you got a whole bunch of websites listed.
A. Correct.
Q. There's no entry on there for Discount Satellite in 2004, is there?
A. No, there's not.
Q. Okay. And there's no entry on your pirate member projections on Exhibit 1603 for PiratesDen, is there?
A. No, there's not.
Q. And there -- but you do have entries on your pirate member projections for a whole bunch of other websites. Let me see -- looks like 15 or so?
A. Correct.
Q. And none of those are listed on your notes, are they?
A. No, sir.
Q. And you don't list on your notes -- and again, that's Exhibit 2031 -- any information related to FTA piracy, do you?
A. No, sir.
Q. And you don't have any notes for 2005?
A. Correct.
Q. So we don't know where any of the 15 or 18 or so websites that you list on the second page of Exhibit 1603 come from, do we?
A. Correct.
Q. And we don't know how many of those would be FTA
related or something else?
A. The bulk was all FTA. The pirate card was a subsection
of the FTA websites at that point in time.
Q. But you don't have any notes or records to underlie those numbers, correct?
A. Correct.

MR. SNYDER: No, more questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Just a moment.

Do you have any more questions, Counsel?

MS. WILLETTS: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I'm doing this from memory.

On 1603, look over at the 1999 column for a
moment.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: On the 1999 column, Mr. Snyder had asked you before about this disparity of 70,000. Do you recall that?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: Now, look at your new Exhibit 2031, the first page. And look at the top of the first page, and it says "August"; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct. THE COURT: Okay. August 1999. The first page
doesn't match with 1603 with that column. Why is that? Is it because you've got a nine-month total on your worksheet and you show 40,000 there? In other words, explain that disparity to me.

THE WITNESS: Plus it is all of North America on the first page, whereas if you compare it with the April 2000 report or just the Smart Cards, that's just U.S. at the request of counsel in 2007.

THE COURT: If I followed your methodology in the transfer from your notes to 1603 --

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: -- and I took the explanation that you had given to NDS's counsel a few moments ago, then $I$ should be able to apply that across the board for each year with uniformity; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: Now, by my question, I don't want to insult you. It's going to sound like I'm insulting you. I'm going to forewarn you.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Let me begin by telling you that I expect that you're monitoring pirate sites. That's your business.

THE WITNESS: Correct. THE COURT: So in a while counsel for both sides
will tell you that you are or you aren't. And you had previously testified that in your deposition you had made the statement that you did "more than"; and one of those "more than's" was you monitored pirate sites. And counsel had brought to the Court's attention that you were right. Back in 2007, you'd said that at a deposition. That's --

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: -- now of no concern to me.

But I've expressed my frustration on more than one time about all of the last-moment documents -- and to keep my statements neutral -- for both sides that have come in. And, of course, we appreciate the fact that an effort's been made to find these year-end summaries. I've been told that these year-end summaries will arrive today.

MS. WILLETTS: They arrived at our hotel at 10:00, and we have someone bringing them over.

THE COURT: I want to be absolutely certain. The obvious question has to be asked.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Did you or anybody else recently
prepare these photocopies that I have in front of me, or were these documents prepared -- now, listen carefully to me -THE WITNESS: Okay. THE COURT: -- or were these documents prepared at
or near the time and date of the year? In other words, the 1991 -- 1999 was prepared in August, the 2000 was prepared in October or November -- and be very careful. I'm literally, when $I$ get these documents, probably going to order both parties to undertake a forensic analysis and make
certain for my record --

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: -- that this ink is not outdated. And, quite frankly, I've got the capability of doing that.

THE WITNESS: I understand.

THE COURT: With all the --

THE WITNESS: I understand.

THE COURT: -- with all the shenanigans I think that's gone on now in this case between the corporate entities, I'm not going to take any chance that there's any problem with these records. So be very careful.

Were these prepared in 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004? And I'm not a soft judge. If I find a lack of credibility, I'm going to make sure that you're indicted, and I'll put you in prison. I want to be that direct with you.

THE WITNESS: I understand.

THE COURT: Okay. What's your answer?

THE WITNESS: My only concern is that these documents should have been with all my other year-end
documents.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: These were laying out on a table in a basement, and I asked my wife to go ahead, fax it, and send 'em. I checked my other files that I produced, and these should be the documents, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: It's just the concern I had was that they should have all been together and produced with the other ones, too.

THE COURT: Do you want to look at those originals when they come in to be absolutely sure?

THE WITNESS: That would be great.
THE COURT: I'm going to afford you that courtesy. I'm not going to be soft about this. I'm tired of the --

THE WITNESS: I understand.

THE COURT: -- of the Court being in this
frustrating position of trying to ferret out, you know, who's destroying documents at the last moment, producing documents at the last moment, and, quite frankly, having people tell part of the truth and the other half not. I'm going to afford you that courtesy.

Second, when you're monitoring -- and I really forewarn you -- be very careful with that answer. I'm not playing with what $I$ just said at all.

THE WITNESS: I understand.

THE COURT: Love this system, and if $I$ think it's being tampered with, there will be severe problems.

That's enough said about that. You've got the message.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: When you're monitoring these websites -- once again, let me repeat that I expect to you monitor websites -- are you taking notes on a monthly basis, weekly basis, to end up with the year-end compilation that you have?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. I do snapshots sometimes on a monthly basis, yes.

THE COURT: Now, when $I$ do my taxes, I don't want my credibility to ever be called into line both as an American citizen and because of my position.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: So I've got not only my tax returns, I've got every scrap of every deduction I've ever taken, I think, back to 1972. Now, I know I'm only required to keep those for three years.

THE WITNESS: Right.

THE COURT: But as a professional in your position, I would think that when you are, you know, being paid these sums of money, and retained in this kind of a
milieu where you know you're going to be called upon in a dispute involving multiple companies before this, you being one of the alleged experts in this area, I would think that you would be keeping the underlaying documentation someplace. That you would just willy-nilly throw that to the wind and give me a one-page summary -- do you keep that documentation, or are you one of those -- I'm going to kid you for a moment, but I'm not kidding at all -- taxpayers who just throw away the underlying documentation and keep the summaries? Are you one of those experts that just throw away the underlying documents?

THE WITNESS: I'm one of those that throw away, Your Honor, because --

THE COURT: Why? You're a professional. You're going to be called into court on this ongoing dispute. Why? Why throw it away?

THE WITNESS: Well, because of the volume. And basically I felt that once I recapped it electronically, then I had a more permanent, accurate record. And the paper documents became meaningless, and I've never had to produce the paper documents before.

THE COURT: How does somebody go back -- I want to put you in the position being an expert -- and the expert from the other side's testimony -- you're sitting in the audience listening to this. How does somebody go back and

```
reconstruct these figures?
```

    THE WITNESS: You can -- that's -- there's
    historical documents in the marketplace that have a lot of
these figures.
THE COURT: Tell me how. I mean, walk me through
that process so that I would have some comfort level --
maybe not to the figure --
THE WITNESS: Right.
THE COURT: -- but some comfort level. If I was
opposing counsel or the Court, I would have some ability to
go back and say, "Well, gee, it's just not Mr. Shelton
sitting there writing it down and then click and burn and
here's my summary."
THE WITNESS: There's actually media reports.
THE COURT: Excellent. Tell me where.
THE WITNESS: Satellite Business News is one of
the better ones because he's always been tracking piracy
since the $C-b a n d$ days.
THE COURT: Now, it wouldn't be difficult -- since
I'm not letting you get on the stand right now --
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: -- I don't know if you're ever getting
on the stand -- it wouldn't be difficult for you to go out
today while you're sitting there and track that, would it?
THE WITNESS: No. If you got his -- Bob Sherman
is editor and owner of Satellite Business News.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: If you got his publications,
historical publications, you could go back and reconstruct
everything from the C-band days.
THE COURT: And how would I get those?
THE WITNESS: You can order --
THE COURT: Better yet, how would you get those?
THE WITNESS: You can order 'em online from his
website.
THE COURT: Okay. So I would go to a computer,
order it online, which wouldn't be too difficult, and it
would pop up on my screen?
THE WITNESS: Actually, he ships 'em to you. It's
in the hard copy, large tabloid format.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: And he charges per publication.
It's not a whole lot. I believe it's like \$18.
THE COURT: We'll bill EchoStar and NagraStar for
it. I'm not too concerned.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: Now, I don't know what his methodology
is or his numbers, but at least I'd have a cross-reference.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: At least I would know that there's a
ballpark figure and --
THE WITNESS: Correct.
THE COURT: -- individual independent
corroborating entities.
THE WITNESS: Other than the 2002 story that he.
Did, where it said "satellite TV pirates go mainstream," I
worked with him on that story, so some of the numbers in the
story came from me.
THE COURT: That's fair enough. But not 1999, not
2000, not 2001, not 2002 .
THE WITNESS: Well, that was 2002.
THE COURT: Not 2003, not 2004, not 2005.
THE WITNESS: Correct. And there were other
stories in 2002 that I didn't work with him on.
THE COURT: Okay. Just a moment.
(Pause in the proceedings at 8:57 a.m.)
THE COURT: All right. I want you to take 1603.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: We tried to implement your
methodology.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: I want to go back to NDS's counsel's
examination.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: And I want to start with your notes in
1999. From memory, $I$ think that's 2031.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: And in 2031, the 1999 figures, there's no transference of the Discount Sat and the PiratesDen on Page 2 of 1603 -- from your notes, on Page 1 of 2031.

I'm baffled by that. Look over -- better yet, let's take your -- better yet, let me go to 2004.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: Let me go to 2004 for a moment. That was my confusion. There's absolutely no transfer of the Discount Sat or the PiratesDen 2004, which all of us know is going to be the critical year.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: Why?

THE WITNESS: That's the year that DirecTV went secure in April of 2004. At that point in time, a lot of the other old DirecTV pirate websites such as PiratesDen, Discount Sat then started transferring everything over to free-to-air because that was the popular method of -- the only hack available in the market. DirecTV was gone. A lot of the old DirecTV pirate websites simply disappeared, and they were replaced by the free-to-air websites that had a subsection in those websites for pirating Nagra Smart Cards, and that's when I started tracking those subsections. THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Remember, Your Honor, in -historically it was all primarily DirecTV piracy, and there was just a small piece of Nagra in the pirate websites. That all changes in 2004.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, I haven't had time to actually get a calculator. I'm going to guesstimate this.

THE WITNESS: That's fine.
THE COURT: I want you to turn to 2000, 2001, 2002, and just jump, then, to 2004 on 1603, Page 1.

You told me in 2000 that there was approximately 190,000, but you had a discount rate of about 20 percent. That's how you end up with the 150,000 under "Total EchoStar Smart Card Pirates."

See that?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: Actually, it's 21 percent. It doesn't matter.

I go over to 2001, and on a percentage basis
you've got about a 19 percent reduction. So I'm not quibbling with a percentage, anyway. You're in the ballpark in terms of your methodology.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: Then I go over to 2002, and roughly speaking, that's about an 8 percent reduction.

THE WITNESS: From Page 2, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Well, I'm using your numbers off of 1603.

THE WITNESS: Okay. You're looking at the front page.

THE COURT: Okay. At the front page.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, at that 8 percent -- hold on -- and that's a reduction.

Now I get to the critical year where damages can flow. In 2004, I've got a 15 percent increase. My numbers absolutely reverse themselves. When you think about that, that's like a 35 percent swing.

You have to understand I'm a little suspicious about --

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: -- the very year the damages are supposed to flow. What's going on?

THE WITNESS: Okay. At the top, I'm tracking all of North America, which includes Canada, and then at bottom it's just the U.S.

THE COURT: Well, I know that, but I'm using your reduction figures. I'm using the EchoStar Smart Card Pirates.

THE WITNESS: At the very bottom? Okay.
THE COURT: I'm coming up with 150,000. I'm
coming up with 2001, 400,000; 2002, 492 -- I can't quite read that.

THE WITNESS: 492.

THE COURT: 492. My point is, however you calculate it, in looking at your top numbers, I've got a minus 21 percent in 2000, a minus 19 percent in 2001, a minus 8 percent in 2002, and I get over to 2004 and I've got a plus 15 percent.

THE WITNESS: Where my number at 2004 is ". 97 "at the top?

THE COURT: You figure it out. You're the one that came up with the chart.

THE WITNESS: It was explained that the U.S. market -- the only numbers we reported on at the very bottom of the page, not all of North America.

THE COURT: And this number on 2004 doesn't correspond to your handwritten notes. But here, there's a jump in damages.

THE WITNESS: No, sir, it doesn't. Because it's just two pirate websites that remained out of all the other free-to-air.

THE COURT: So here we are at the big damage year.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: Your notes don't check.

THE WITNESS: 'Cause they're incomplete.

THE COURT: No. Or you're messing with them, quite frankly. What's going on here?

THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Then explain it to me.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: I don't understand it.

THE WITNESS: These are incomplete notes.
THE COURT: Okay. Where are the rest of them?
THE WITNESS: My wife was unable to find them.
THE COURT: Whose responsibility was that?

THE WITNESS: Recordkeeping would be my
responsibility.
THE COURT: You're an expert, and you come into court, and you have a summary sheet. Shouldn't you have these underlying notes?

THE WITNESS: To be honest with you, Your Honor, once I put it in an electronic format, then the written became useless.

THE COURT: And how do I reproduce that? That's your responsibility. When I say "I," I'm referring to you.

You want to get on the stand as an expert. How do you reproduce that?

THE WITNESS: I've never been asked to reproduce the handwritten --

THE COURT: Well, it starts at the top. This is
your responsibility.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: All right.
Counsel, you know my concerns. Get busy.

MS. WILLETTS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, do you have any additional questions?

MS. WILLETTS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. On behalf of NDS, Mr. Snyder?

MR. SNYDER: Can I just ask one more area to clarify, Your Honor?

THE COURT: That's why we're here. You can have all day.

FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. Look at Exhibit 1603, Mr. Shelton.
A. Yes.
Q. I want to make sure I understand how and why numbers are being moved from one category to the other.

At the bottom of the second page of 1603, you've got a row called "gross total."
A. Correct.
Q. And then you subtract 20 percent. Why do you subtract 20 percent?
A. Because of the overstate of registered members.
Q. And after you subtract 20 percent, you then come up with a net total?
A. Correct.
Q. And you transferred that net total to the top of the first page of 1603. That's the Shelton Net Piracy Total, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And when you look at the very bottom row of 1603 , Total EchoStar Pirates, Cards Plus FTA"?
A. Correct.
Q. How do you go from Shelton Net Piracy Total to Total EchoStar Pirates Cards Plus FTA?
A. Okay. If -- let's take 2004 as an example. Where it's got the .97, that includes cards, FTA for all of

North America. Where we drop down into 2004 at the bottom, we're separating out just the cards for the U.S. market and just the free-to-air for the U.S. market.
Q. Let me interrupt for just a second. I want to make sure I understand you.

I'm looking at the very bottom row, which is "Cards Plus FTA." So that includes FTA pirates, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And your top row, the Shelton Net Piracy Total, that also includes FTA piracy, correct?
A. For North America.
Q. Let me take it a piece at a time 'cause this is important.
A. Okay.
Q. The top row, Shelton Net Piracy Total, is all of North America?
A. Correct.
Q. And the bottom row, Total EchoStar Pirates Cards Plus FTA, is something different. I'm going to get to that in just a second. But both of those include cards and FTA piracy; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. So could you explain for us how you go from the numbers in the top row of the first page of 1603 to the very bottom row of the first page of 1603, Total EchoStar Pirates Cards Plus FTA?
A. Could you repeat that?
Q. Sure. Let me take it a piece at a time so you can follow.
A. Okay.
Q. The very top row on the first page of 1603 is the Shelton Net Piracy Total, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that includes cards and FTA piracy?
A. Correct.
Q. And your testimony now is that's all of North America?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then on the very bottom row, there's a row called total EchoStar Pirates Cards Plus FTA. Do you see that line?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's cards and FTA as the label says, correct?
A. Just for the U.S.
Q. But those -- that bottom row is not the same as the top row that was all of North America?
A. That's correct.
Q. So can you explain how you went from the top row of 1603, which is all of North America, cards and FTA, to the bottom row, Total EchoStar Pirates Cards Plus FTA.
A. That's where we back out the percent of TV households in Canada compared with the TV households in the U.S. That's how we derive what allocated portion would be in just Canada versus the U.S.
Q. And I just want to be clear. Your testimony now is that that difference is only to account for the difference between U.S. piracy and North America piracy --
A. Correct.
Q. -- is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And the methodology that you used to do that was to
deduct 10 percent?
A. It averaged around 10 percent, right around -- let me do the calculation real quick.
Q. Well, I'll tell you it doesn't average to 10 percent. Well, $I$ don't know what it averages, but in each year it's not 10 percent.

So that's why I want to understand, Mr. Shelton, what did you do to go from the top row to the bottom row where one is North America and one is the United States, but everything else is equal?
A. That's where Sean Badding basically plugged in and percentage to subtract out, but my number, what would be just Canada, in order to get to the U.S. market.
Q. And Sean batting did that work?
A. Yes, he did the spreadsheet.
Q. That's someone at the Carmel Group?
A. Correct. I'm not proficient in spreadsheets.
Q. Do you know what methodology Mr. Badding used to go from your estimate of Card Plus FTA pirates in North America to Cards Plus FTA pirates in the United States?
A. He used a percentage basis, which is historically what we always have done in order to estimate how much would be in Canada. And I don't have his backup sheets.
Q. Other than a percentage -- and that percentage was of households?
A. TV households.
Q. TV households. So the percentage didn't have anything to do with piracy?
A. No, no.
Q. It's just how many households in the two countries have televisions?
A. The size of the market.
Q. Can we walk across just so we can see this?

THE COURT: Do you have the electronic authority to put this up on the screen?
(Document displayed.)
BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. Mr. Shelton, this is not exactly -- I'm going to get rid of a bunch of lines by taking two pieces of paper and folding them over in the hopes that we can actually see this.
A. That's okay.
Q. Okay. Can you see those numbers?
A. Yes, I can.
Q. Okay. So what I'm asking about is this line at the top of the first page of 1603, the Shelton net piracy total.
A. I see that.
Q. Okay. And where we've been comparing that to the bottom line, Total EchoStar Pirates Cards Plus FTA.
A. Correct.
Q. I don't want to go back over all of this. THE COURT: Oh, I do. MR. SNYDER: Okay.

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. The top line is the number, Shelton Net Piracy Total, that is a number that you transferred from the bottom of the second page of 103 , correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's all your estimate of all piracy in North America cards plus FTA; is that right?
A. Well, in '99 it would just be cards.
Q. 'Cause in '99 there was no FTA?
A. Right.
Q. But that's the number for North America?
A. Correct.
Q. And this row, Total EchoStar Pirates Cards Plus FTA, at the very bottom, your testimony now is that that's the number for the United States?
A. Just the U.S.
Q. Okay. And the only difference between the top line,

Shelton Net Piracy Total, and the bottom line, Total
EchoStar Pirates Cards Plus FTA --

THE COURT: 50,000.
BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. -- is that you have deducted for non-U.S. So the top
row is North America; the bottom row is the United States, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Can we go across and see what those percentages look like?
A. Okay.
Q. In 1999, you estimate 70,000 pirates in North America, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then in the row, Total EchoStar Pirates in 1999 for the U.S., you say 50,000?
A. Correct.
Q. So that's a deduction of about 30 percent?
A. Yes, we basically go very conservative on reporting.
Q. Okay. And that's to eliminate non-U.S. pirates?
A. Correct.
Q. Now let's look at 2000. In 2000, you estimated 150,000
pirates in North America, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Then the bottom line is also 150,000, right?
A. Correct.
Q. So you didn't detect anything for pirates outside the United States; it's the same number, right?
A. Right.

THE COURT: Time out. Why? That's what we were
going back to chambers and trying to calculate using your methodology, expecting uniformity regardless of whether there was free-to-air piracy. We know there's not in 2000, so that can't be the explanation. So why?

THE WITNESS: No. I have no explanation other than like I said...

THE COURT: Okay. 2001.

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. Let's look at 2001. In 2001, you estimated 400,000 pirates in North America, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And in your last line, Total EchoStar Pirates Cards Plus FTA, you also include 400,000, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So you have no deduction whatsoever for pirates outside the United States?
A. Correct.
Q. All right.
A. And let me add that --

THE COURT: No, no. Don't add. Let's just --

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. Let's keep going across here.

In 2002, you estimate 560,000 pirates --
A. Correct.
Q. -- in North America, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And on the last line, Total EchoStar Pirates Cards Plus FTA, you estimate 492,000, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And so that's a reduction of about 12 percent, a little more than 10 percent?
A. Correct.
Q. And in the next year, 2003, you estimated 700,000 pirates; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And the Total EchoStar Pirates Cards Plus FTA in 2003
is 600,240, correct?
A. Correct. That's correct.
Q. And that's a reduction of about 15 percent?
A. Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, 2004.

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. In 2004, it goes down even further. You estimate 970,000 pirates in all of North America, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And Total EchoStar Pirates Cards Plus FTA, you have 768, 307?
A. That's what it looks like, yes.
Q. And that's a reduction of about 22 percent?
A. Correct.

THE COURT: So excuse me. Then I'm mistaken.

That's not an increase as I thought.

MR. SNYDER: The percentage deduction increased; the number went down.

THE WITNESS: Decrease.

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. And in 2005, you had you estimated 1,010,000 pirates in

North America, right?
A. Correct.
Q. But for Total EchoStar Pirates Cards Plus FTA, you estimated 885,000?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's a difference of about 12 percent?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you explain why the different percentages were used?
A. Yes. This was an internal document. Basically --

THE COURT: But it became a public document for me.

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

My top line was my own independent work that I was
doing irregardless of Carmel Group. Carmel Group was doing their own work in earlier reports, including the 2003. I was not working with the Carmel Group until 2005. THE COURT: So what I'm hearing in a roundabout
way is the top numbers are your numbers; the bottom numbers are Carmel Group.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Simple as that.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Where did Carmel Group get those numbers?

THE WITNESS: They did that independently on their own.

THE COURT: Nobody knows. MR. SNYDER: I've got no further questions. THE COURT: Counsel, do you have any further questions?

MS. WILLETTS: I do not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I'm just going to have a little discussion in chambers again. We're going to take a sharp pen and do some of our own arithmetic for awhile and look at these things. We'll be back.

Mr. Shelton, if you would like to remain, sir, on the stand.
(Pause in the proceedings at 9:21 a.m.)
(Proceedings resumed at 9:54 a.m.)
THE COURT: Okay. Let's go on the record for a minute.

All right. The Court's been in session since

8:00 o'clock out of the presence of the jury.

Mr. Shelton, I want to thank you for your testimony this morning.

RULING RE PLAINTIFF'S EXPERT WITNESS

THE COURT: On oral argument, the Court discovered a number of differences between the statistics reflected in Mr. Shelton's handwritten notes and the spreadsheet produced to summarize his findings. Mr. Shelton indicated that he reduced the total number of pirates to reflect the possibility of individuals creating multiple accounts on pirate websites. However, the percentage difference between the handwritten notes and the summary varied year by year without sufficient explanation.

Additionally, Mr. Shelton again reduced his piracy total to back out the number of Canadian pirates and isolate the American pirates only. However, during questioning this morning by opposing counsel, it was pointed out that the percentage used to account for Canadian pirates was based on number of TV households versus the number of pirates, which fails to take into account the differences between the United States and Canada in the market for piracy devices. Additionally, the percentage reduction varied from year to year with no explanation forthcoming. Indeed, Mr. Shelton indicated he had based his calculations on the Carmel Group findings. However, the parties have stipulated
that the Carmel Group's findings will not be presented.
At present, it is not clear that Mr. Shelton used a consistent methodology in calculating the number of pirates in the United States using the ROM 3 card.

He indicated that he is not proficient with the spreadsheets that he created, and he relied on excluded information in reaching his opinions.

He also indicated that many of the records underlying his findings were lost or discarded. These problems raise substantial concerns about the methodology employed under the Kuhmo/Daubert standard for admission of expert testimony.

While the Court does recognize that it is a unique area of expertise and would be favorable to the plaintiff's argument in that regard, without a consistent applied methodology, this Court cannot permit Mr. Shelton to testify as an expert at this time.

Therefore, this Court tentatively excludes Mr. Shelton's testimony.

But that's not the end of our discussion. EchoStar will be permitted to rely on the testimony of Christopher Tarnovsky. You're not precluded from arguing lost profits, and you're not precluded from arguing the hundred thousand number that's indicated both in the e-mail, regardless of whether Mr. Tarnovsky has a
methodology or not. Now, although that wasn't advertised, et cetera, it still is an internal document circulated with some credibility inside NDS.

If Mr. Shelton is able to reconstruct your analysis, though, using information other than the Carmel Group report, I'll conduct another evidentiary hearing tomorrow morning at 7:30 to give you the opportunity once again to testify during the plaintiff's case in chief. If you cannot do that by that time, you will not be taking the stand during plaintiff's case in chief.

Now, it gets even more complicated. I want to trace out so that there's no surprise in the future what may occur.

Since you're not precluded from arguing lost profits based upon Tarnovsky, the arguments will go back and forth in this regard:

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, on behalf of EchoStar you should find credibility in Mr. Tarnovsky. He says he doesn't have a methodology, he doesn't know how he came up with them, but look at NDS and how they relied upon this hundred thousand number.

The counterargument's going to be, "We don't know where he got it from."

```
    "Weren't you guessing, Mr. Tarnovsky?"
    "Yes, I was guessing."
```

And that's for the jury now to decide. That doesn't go to admissibility. That goes to weight.

So there's no preclusion, once again, from lost profits. There's a preclusion from the methodology thus far with Mr. Shelton.

Now, assume for a moment, since experts can rely upon hearsay and literally almost the universe, that NDS puts up a damages expert. Mr. Shelton may be back. In other words, we're not done with Mr. Shelton, and we're not done with the damages expert. That now becomes NDS's call.

So NDS is forewarned, and you can do whatever you want to tactically, but if an expert comes on the stand, you may be opening the door for Mr. Shelton because that expert's allowed to be asked in cross-examination, "Did you read the expert report of Mr. Shelton?" "Did he reach a conclusion different than yours?"

Regardless of methodology, that becomes a difficult tactical choice for both of you. Damages expert on the stand for NDS, other than swap out, cross-examination's appropriate. Questions concerning "did you read the other expert's report?" Of course he did. "Why did you differ from those numbers?" "Did you take them into account?"

Now, when we finally get down to it, there's not much of a disparity. I keep pointing out to you that
however this gentleman reached his figures -- Mr. Shelton -and Tarnovsky reached his figures, we're about 9,000 off. A hundred thousand to 109,000 if you average it out.

I'll leave that to your discretion. Mr. Snyder, you will have the initial choice to make. If you put up a damages expert, other than swap, then the cross-examination extends to the other expert's report.
(To the witness:) And you may be needed for rebuttal at that time.

THE WITNESS: (Nods.)

THE COURT: In the meantime, these numbers, as you know, in my findings are not sufficient in terms of methodology, so you have a lot of work to do.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Either between now and tomorrow morning at 7:30, or I'll stay until 6:00 or 7:00 or 8:00 o'clock tonight.

So, Counsel, if you can come up with it in your case in chief, you'll be allowed to present it. But if not, you may not be done with Mr. Shelton. So the doors haven't closed yet, but they certainly have at this point on presenting Mr. Shelton as an expert in this area because of the methodology and the Kuhmo-Daubert test.

That's complicated, but I'm trying to trace out for both of you so there are no surprises later on of a
claim, "We didn't see this coming." Forewarning NDS and telling you, I'd keep Mr. Shelton around potentially, and NDS has a tactical decision to make if they're going to go into lost profits.

Now, I don't know what that does to Mr. Rock. Seems to me Mr. Rock becomes somewhat irrelevant at this point, but what do we do with Mr. Rock?

MS. WILLETTS: Your Honor, Mr. Rock's lost profits calculations, he can certainly take the hundred thousand that Mr. Tarnovsky estimates. However, to come up with a lost profits final number, he does have to rely on two certain factors. He won't be relying on the actual total number of piracy that Mr. Shelton has testified.

THE COURT: He won't take the stand again until we have another hearing outside the presence of the jury this afternoon or this evening. I want to hear exactly what he's going to say.

Everybody seems to be straying over the line a little bit. I'm not going to allow that.

Mr. Shelton, you're ordered to remain. You have some work to do unless EchoStar decides to release you. And you may be needed in rebuttal in a couple weeks. We'll see.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. You may step down.
(Witness steps down subject to recall.)

All right. Now, once again, I'm going to wait to see what Mr. Tarnovsky says. He may deny that that's even an e-mail that he produced. So I may be supposing he's not going to be coming up with a methodology. We'll find out.

All right. Are you ready to proceed with

Mr. Tarnovsky?

MR. HAGAN: We are, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Kristee, could you get the jury.
(In the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: All right. If you would be seated, please.

Counsel, if you would be kind enough to call your next witness.

The record should indicate all the parties and counsel are present, as well as the jury.

MR. HAGAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

The plaintiffs call to the stand

Christopher Tarnovsky.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Tarnovsky, if you would step forward, sir.
Would you be kind enough to raise your right-hand.

Kristee, who is the clerk, will administer an oath
to you.

CHRISTOPHER TARNOVSKY, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

If you would please be kind enough to take the witness stand which is located to my left.

Sir, would you be kind enough to have a seat.

Would you turn your chair around and face the jury, please. Slide the chair a little bit closer. Now, move the microphone closer to you, sir. Thank you.

Would you state your full name for the jury.

THE WITNESS: My name is Christopher George

Tarnovsky.
THE COURT: Spell your last name, sir.
THE WITNESS: T-A-R-N-O-V-S-K-Y.

THE COURT: Thank you.

This is direct examination by Mr. Hagan on behalf
of EchoStar NagraStar.

MR. HAGAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HAGAN:
Q. Good morning Mr. Tarnovsky.
A. Good morning, Mr. Hagan.
Q. You understand you were just administered an oath; is
that correct, sir?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. To tell the truth subject to the penalties of perjury?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And that's the same oath that you were administered previously when you gave deposition testimony in this case; is that correct, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, Mr. Tarnovsky, we're going to get into your employment relationship with NDS in a minute, but before we do that, I want to talk a little bit about the years that preceded that relationship.

You were living in Europe in 1995/1996 time frame; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And during that time, you were engaged in efforts to compromise conditional access technology; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you understand what that means is to circumvent a system, to steal the programming -- a security system in order to try to steal the programming that's encrypted by it; isn't that correct, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you were a member of a Internet group called
tv.crypt; is that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Can you explain to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury
what tv.crypt was?
A. The tv.crypt was a private e-mail list. There was no such thing as the Internet, a WWW-based Internet back then. It was typically students in college going for their PhDs and such, and it was a very elite list of people that had a fascination with Smart Card technology in general. But it was focused on getting access to English programming.
Q. It was a group of people that were interested in hacking, correct?
A. Yes. And most of the list was PhD candidates in college or professors, even.
Q. But it was a group of people interested in hacking security systems for TV providers, correct?
A. Primarily, yes.
Q. And you posted information on this list, sir; isn't that right, Mr. Tarnovsky?
A. Yes.
Q. And you understood at the time that the information you were posting was to help people steal this programming, correct?
A. I disagree, no.

MR. HAGAN: Let's take a look at Exhibit 6-A if we could, Christine.

BY MR. HAGAN :
Q. Now, Mr. Tarnovsky, you're getting a copy of what's
been marked Exhibit 6-A.

If you could take a minute to look at that document. It's one of the ones that we covered in your deposition. Do you recognize it, sir?
A. I do.
Q. And this is a copy of one of the postings that you made on the tv.crypt site or an e-mail that you sent related to that tv.crypt site; is that correct?
A. It appears to be.
Q. And the "from" line has "Christopher Tarnovsky" and then an e-mail address. Starts with ATVSCS27. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And that is your e-mail address; isn't that correct, sir?
A. That was, yes.
Q. And in this posting --

MR. HAGAN: Clint, if we could blow this one up?

Your Honor, I would offer Exhibit 6-A into
evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. KLEIN: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
(Exhibit No. 6-A received in evidence.)
(Document displayed.)

BY MR. HAGAN:
Q. If you'll look at the first line, you admit, "My name is Chris Tarnovsky, and I'm a hacker"; is that correct, sir?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. So at this time, you weren't trying to hide the fact that you were engaged in hacking activities; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now, you moved back to the United States in 1996; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You recall the month?
A. Yes.
Q. What month was that?
A. July.
Q. So July of '96 you moved back to the United States, but you didn't stop your hacking activities, did you, Mr. Tarnovsky?
A. No.
Q. In fact, you continued to engage in posting information on various Internet websites related to hacking; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, during the time that you were in Europe, you met an individual named Jan Saggiori; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you understood at that time that Mr. Saggiori was also interested in hacking conditional access technology?
A. Yes.
Q. And you shared files and codes and information with

Mr. Saggiori; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And, in fact, you provided him with files for the European battery card for a Dalas 5002 processor; isn't that right?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. You understood at the time that Mr. Saggiori wanted to use that information to further his hacking efforts, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when you got to the United States in '96 and you continued to engage in hacking efforts, you were being paid money from various individuals in Canada; isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And I asked you in your deposition if you recalled approximately how much money you got during that time frame.

Do you recall that, sir?
A. No.
Q. I believe you testified that it was somewhere between
$\$ 40,000$ and $\$ 50,000$ US; is that right?
A. Speculating, I believe that's correct.
Q. And the bottom line is, you have to speculate because you don't recall how much money you received from the Canadians for your assistance in piracy?
A. That is correct, after 11 years.
Q. Well, it -- it's also correct that you shredded all of the shipping labels and shipping envelopes that that money came in; isn't that correct?
A. Speculating, I probably did.
Q. Now, do you know any of these Canadian individuals that you were assisting in piracy in the '96 time frame?
A. No.
Q. In your deposition, you testified that you felt you needed to help these "poor, poor Canadians" receive
television. Do you recall that testimony?
A. I'm sure -- I believe you.
Q. But you can't identify any of these poor, poor

Canadians who you were helping and who sent you money; is
that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In 1997, you started working for the defendants; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were aware at that time that they had knowledge
of your efforts to hack and compromise their security system and technology, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, you're aware that they considered -- the defendants considered you one of the two best hackers in the world at the time they tried to recruit you; is that correct?
A. I don't know that. I don't know.
Q. Now, you understood in the '97 time frame that the defendant's conditional access technology was compromised, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Partly because you were assisting in the compromise of that technology; is that right?
A. Prior to my employment, yes.
Q. And you understood that that technology was compromised both here in the United States, as well as in Europe; is that correct?
A. I am not sure about that. I don't believe it was compromised in Europe.
Q. Which conditional access provider were you hacking or circumventing when you were in Europe in the '95/'96 time frame?
A. The British Sky Broadcasting, the BSkyB signal, coming into England and the signals out of the Scandinavian
countries, TV1000 and so forth, based on the EuroCrypt scrambling system.
Q. Well, let's talk about the BSkyB system. That's one of the systems that you were hacking. You understood that that system was protected by the defendant's technology, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So you understood in the '95/'96 time frame that that technology in Europe was compromised?
A. No, you're incorrect there.

They actually swapped out to a secure access card, and they were no longer compromised.
Q. When you first began working for defendants, one of your roles was to continue acting like a pirate, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. To continue posting information on websites, monitoring pirate websites, and gathering information about other pirates, correct?
A. No.
Q. As part of your work for the defendants, you were obligated to sign a confidentiality agreement. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.

MR. HAGAN: Let's take a look at Exhibit 4-A, Christine.
(Live reporter switch at 10:16 a.m.)
(Further proceeding reported by Jane Rule in Volume II.)
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