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SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 2008 Day 11, Volume II (10:22 a.m.)
(In the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record. All counsel are present. The parties are present. The jury is present.

Counsel, would you call your next witness, please.
MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor, Kenneth Klein representing the defendants.

And we call Mr. Tony Peluso, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
Would you step forward and raise your right hand. Kristee, our clerk, will administer an oath to you.

ERNEST F. PELUSO, DEFENSE WITNESS, SWORN

THE WITNESS: I do.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

Would you please be seated in the witness box to my left.

When you're comfortably seated, would you be kind enough to face the jury and state your full name and spell your last name.

THE WITNESS: My real first name is

Ernest F. Peluso, P-E-L-U-S-O, Your Honor, but I'm known as Tony for the last 40 years.

THE COURT: This is direct examination by Mr. Klein on behalf of NDS.

MR. HAGAN: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KLEIN:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Peluso.
A. Good morning, sir.
Q. Could you please tell us about your educational and professional background?
A. I have a bachelors degree from Arizona State University in history from 1972. I have a law degree from St. Mary's University in 1974. It's a small school in San Antonio, Texas. And then 10 years later, in 1984, I got a masters of law, something called an LLM, from

George Washington University in Washington, DC.
Q. Did you serve in the military?
A. Yes, I did. I'm a retired soldier. Retired from the Army in 1992.
Q. Tell us a little bit about your military career.
A. I started -- I dropped out of college in 1967, joined the Army, went airborne, went to Vietnam as a paratrooper. Served a tour in Japan after that. Then I got out, finished up at Arizona State University, went to law school, and in 1974 I got a reserve commission as a JAG officer after law school.

Then I served another 17 years in the Army as a JAG officer, various assignments all over the United States including the $82 n d$ Airborne Division.

And then in 1990, while $I$ was still on active duty, $I$ was sent to Tampa at the beginning of Operation Desert Shield to prosecute some procurement fraud cases. As a Lt. Colonel, I was a Special Assistant U.S. Attorney. And then when $I$ retired in 1992, I just stayed with that office until 2006 when $I$ retired again. And now I'm deputy chief legal counsel for the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office. Q. So there was a period of time in there after the Army and before the sheriff's office where you were working for the United States Attorney?
A. I actually was working for the United States Attorney while $I$ was on active duty for my last two years. So from 1990 until 2006, I was a Special Assistant or a Regular Assistant U.S. Attorney.
Q. And which U.S. Attorney's Office did you work in?
A. The Middle District of Florida, the Tampa Division.
Q. What was your title when you worked with the
U.S. Attorney's Office?
A. Everything. I was an Assistant U.S. Attorney for most of that time, for about three and a half years. I was also the chief of the organized crime section until we did away with the organized crime section in approximately 2001,
right around the time of 9/11.
Q. Now, when you were with the U.S. Attorney's Office, did you receive any awards?
A. Yes. I have received some superior achievement awards. But in 2001, I received the Attorney General's award for exceptional service.
Q. Now, when you were in the U.S. Attorney's Office, were you a trial attorney?
A. Yes.
Q. So you would be the person here, and you'd be asking the questions, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I'd like to direct your attention to the 1998/'99 time period. Were you working at the U.S. Attorney's Office at that time?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And what were your duties?
A. Pardon me?
Q. What were your duties at that time?
A. Somewhere during that time I became the chief of the organized crime section. So I had duties as investigating and prosecuting organized crime-type cases, but I was also responsible for doing complex white-collar crime cases
including satellite piracy cases after 1998.
Q. Now, I'm gonna ask you some questions relating to the
work that you did in the U.S. Attorney's Office, and I understand you've been out of that office for a couple of years.

Have you had a chance to review your files from the
U.S. Attorney's Office since you left?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Why not?
A. I'm not permitted. I'm no longer a federal employee. I'm not permitted access to those files.
Q. Now, with that in mind -- well, let me ask you another question.

Are some of the cases that you worked on confidential?
A. Oh, virtually every one of them is.
Q. So if -- during the course of the examination, if I ask you a question that --

THE COURT: Counsel, counsel, if it is relevant, by putting him on the stand, I'll override any agency, FBI, or anybody else, and direct him to answer the question.

MR. KLEIN: I understand that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So shape your questions appropriately
and vice versa on cross so we don't put you in that situation.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: If I direct you, you can answer. THE WITNESS: Very well, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Counsel.

BY MR. KLEIN:
Q. Did there come a time in 1998, '99 when you began working on a case involving satellite piracy?
A. Yes.
Q. Tell us a little about how that came about.
A. The first one I did involved a Canadian citizen and a Mexican citizen, and they were involved in a sting where they were buying basically a shoebox full, hundreds of access cards, from an undercover customs agent, and I ended up handling that case. That was my very first one.
Q. And after that, did you again handle other satellite piracy cases?
A. Yeah. It was my fortune to be the duty officer when the customs agents came in and wanted to do a search warrant on a company called Blue Skies Technology in Tampa. And whenever you are the duty officer and you handle the initial proceedings, they usually assign the case to you, regardless of what your discipline is or what section you're in. And that ended up being a satellite TV case, the Blue Skies Technology case. We called it The United States v.

Paul Maxwell King.
Q. In subsequent years between when you got that first case and when you eventually left the office in 2006, can you give us some idea of how many satellite piracy cases you
worked on?
A. I worked on many cases, scores of cases.
Q. And during that time period -- again, 1998, 1999, to 2006 -- to your knowledge, was there any

United States Attorney in your office who handled more satellite piracy cases than you?
A. No, there were not.
Q. During that same period of time, to your knowledge, was there any United States Attorney in the entire country who handled more satellite piracy cases than you?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Did there come a time when you heard the name John Norris?
A. Yes.
Q. And were you aware at some point that he was the head of security over at NDS?
A. Yes.
Q. And did there come a time when you met with Mr. Norris?
A. Yes, there was.
Q. And do you recall approximately when that was?
A. Sometime in late 2001 or early 2002.
Q. Did Mr. Norris aid you in your efforts to investigate and prosecute satellite pirates?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. During what time period?
A. From the time I first met him through sometime where he was assisting me, sometime very late in 2005 when I was getting ready to leave the U.S. Attorney's Office. So until I left -- until I retired, essentially.
Q. And it began somewhere around 2001?
A. Or late -- or early 2002, yes.
Q. And could you tell us in general terms what were the kind of things Mr. Norris and NDS did to aid you in investigating and prosecuting satellite pirates?
A. Well, he helped me in basically three ways. Probably the most important to me was that he provided technical or what I would call forensic support.
Q. What's the word? What is "forensic"? What do you mean by that?
A. Scientific. The access cards and the programming devices that were used to reprogram the access cards had just a boatload of technical information associated with them. And I learned after I got involved in these cases the fraud aspect of them; that the FBI labs couldn't support me, and the customs lab, such as it was, couldn't support me.

I even looked into getting the Florida Department of Law Enforcement to try to help. They had no analyst or technicians who understood the science involved, and frankly, there was intellectual property involved by both the major vendors, EchoStar and DirecTV NDS. So it was
impossible for me to use the normal technical or what $I$ call forensic support. So Mr. Norris made his technical people at NDS available.

He also helped explain the technology to me to the extent -- I don't pretend to be an expert on it, but to the extent I could then explain it to a jury if it ever came to that. So that was one way. That was a major way.

Another thing that he did for us was that he helped provide us with what I call investigative slash intelligence support. We were interested in a lot of individuals up in Canada, for example, and he had investigators or agents or private investigators, if you will, who were operating up there, and they would provide me with intelligence about several individuals who were of interest to us.

And then another important thing he did for us, the third major area was, there was a business associated with a provision of this direct home satellite transmission, and it's a unique sort of business. They go out and buy intellectual property like movie rights from the people who own them, and then they provide those services to people in their homes. And you have to understand that.

And also associated with that, there's a loss associated with this pirating business. And he provided me with witnesses who would be able to explain in court if we
needed to what the loss would be.
Q. Now, I want to get a little specific. Did you investigate and prosecute an individual named Paul Maxwell King?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And what period of time did you investigate and prosecute Mr. King?
A. Somewhere around 2000. I haven't seen the files in
three years. Somewhere around 2000, and I continued prosecuting him until I retired, and he eventually pled guilty after I retired.
Q. What was the general nature of the crimes for which he pled guilty?
A. Mr. King was a British subject. He was living in York in England, and he had a manufacturing facility where he built what would be described, $I$ think, generally as a card reader/writer, which they called a programmer or reprogrammer. And what that did is, it allowed you to put an access card into the programmer, plug the programmer into a computer. If you had the right software on your computer, then you could read the card and rewrite over it, changing whatever the software was on it so that when you took the card out of the programmer, you could put it in the receiver of either the EchoStar system or the DirecTV system. And then you could decrypt the entire transmission, the entire
signal. So he built those programmers.
He also built something called an unlooper. An unlooper was a device that was able to counteract the electronic countermeasures that both EchoStar and NDS and DirecTV were using to keep people from using pirated cards. So he sold those devices as well.
Q. Did Mr. Norris and NDS provide any help to you with respect to the prosecution of Mr. King?
A. Oh, absolutely. Yes.
Q. Can you give us some idea of what they did?
A. Well, aside from all the things I told you generally, Mr. King's case was the single biggest one $I$ had because it involved three British subjects in England, a British subject in the United States, and two American citizens. So I had sort of learned the business or cut my teeth on this whole technology, with Mr. Norris' help, through the Maxwell King case. So that was the first thing he did. That was a very important part, but specifically to Maxwell King.

Mr. King, his solicitors contacted me through the process and basically told me it would be impossible for me to extradite him from Britain based on the kinds of charges that I was contemplating, and they were close to being right, but ultimately they were wrong.

Mr. Norris helped me during the extradition process
because at one point Mr. King fled to Tunisia, where he knew we could not -- it was impossible to extradite him. And so we stopped the process, which is very lengthy and cumbersome and has to be done within a certain time period or it won't work by treaty. And Mr. Norris alerted us to when Mr. King returned to Britain, and then, frankly, he had people in England who took pictures -- first picture I ever saw of Mr. King was a picture that Mr. Norris' agents in London actually took of him.

And he kept me apprised. And frankly, the day that we won the extradition hearing in Britain, Mr. Norris called me on the telephone from Europe. I was driving with my family, and I got a call on my cell phone, so that kind of thing.
Q. Now, did you prosecute an individual named Stephen Frazier?
A. Yes, I did. THE COURT: I'm sorry. Stephen who? MR. KLEIN: Frazier. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. KLEIN:
Q. Was he convicted?
A. Yes, he was, sir.
Q. Do you recall what his sentence was?
A. Five years.
Q. What was the general nature of the crimes for which he
was convicted?
A. Mr. Frazier had been a subject of ours during the Paul Maxwell King case. He had brought a programmer and unlooper from Mr. King. He agreed to cooperate with us and basically commit no more crimes, so we let him go back to Sacramento -- someplace around Sacramento where he lived. And then later we learned that he had violated his promise to us and linked up with an individual named Stephen Lamothe, $\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{E}$, and we had been looking at Mr. Lamothe because he was running a business in the Tampa area in a place called Holiday Florida called -- three words -- Kick Ass Clones.

And we'd stopped looking at Mr. Lamothe because DirecTV, through their civil lawyers, had worked out a civil arrangement with Mr. Lamothe.

But Mr. Norris gave us intelligence that these two individuals, one who I had essentially given a bye to -- he didn't have immunity, but $I$ decided not to prosecute him -and one that we weren't gonna prosecute because DirecTV had worked it out civilly with him. We had plenty of other people to look at. We didn't need to do double duty.

But they had gone to Canada, and they were involved with, I know for sure, a guy named Lloyd and I think a guy named Love.

THE COURT: Excuse me.

Ladies and gentlemen, could I excuse you for just a moment.

My apologies.
(Jury exits the courtroom proceedings.)
(Outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Mr. Peluso, this conversation out of the presence of the jury has nothing to do with your testimony.

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Counsel, what is this being offered for? I'll let you lay a brief foundation, but this is nothing more than character evidence bolstering Mr. Norris as, quote/unquote, a good person who helped law enforcement. This was not your representation to me.

Counsel, I'm speaking.

This is nothing more than character evidence.

Unless you step in, I'm going to step in. This was not the representation that was given to this Court concerning this gentleman's testimony. I never heard that we were going to go through a detailed explanation of case by case and what you've worked on.

So Mr. Peluso, this is not your fault.

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You and $I$ both know that this is character evidence to bolster Mr. Norris, his goodness in
terms of helping you, and it has a scintilla of that relationship with Mr. Norris.

Counsel, how are we going to resolve this other than Mr. Peluso stepping down and off the stand?

MR. KLEIN: If I may respond.

What I said was, Mr. Peluso, after he talks about this prosecution --

THE COURT: You're forewarned, Counsel. Get to the point. How are we going to resolve this?

MR. KLEIN: This is exactly what I told the Court, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Peluso, you may step down.

Thank you very much, sir.
(Witness steps down subject to recall.)

THE COURT: Call your next witness.

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, may I respond for the record. I'd like to make a record.

THE COURT: When you mislead this Court --

MR. KLEIN: That's why I'd like to make a record so it will be clear what $I$ was going to do and there'll never be a question.

THE COURT: No. Counsel, this is improper character evidence. It's as simple as that. You can put the gentleman on the stand for the limited basis. His contact -- I've let you lay a brief foundation. We are not
going through that case after case.
You can say he's the foremost person in the
United States. I've let you do that. And now you're going
through a whole series of fact situations. This only
serves, frankly, to bolster Mr. Norris' credibility as a
good person.

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, if I may respond.
I will explain exactly what relevance this has and why it ties into exactly what I told the Court yesterday.

What Mr. Peluso would testify is that -- and I was going to mention the next person was Mr. Mullen -- is that he went and told people from EchoStar, among them Mr. Gee, about these people he was prosecuting. And he told them, "I'm prosecuting these people," and he wanted to get them -he wanted to get their help.

They told him, "We don't have any problem with these people." And that's what I told the Court, that they were gonna tell him, "We don't know anything about these people. They're not problems for us."

THE COURT: I offered you the opportunity last night to have a hearing outside the presence of the jury about 8:00 o'clock.

The Court was here with you and all counsel until about 11:00. I did have court reporters available. Two came up.

You declined that offer, begged the Court on an offer of proof that the following would happen.

I will let Mr. Peluso have a hearing outside the presence of the jury, as I offered before. But he will not testify now until $I$ hear exactly what he's going to say on the witness stand. This is improper character evidence.

Call your next witness.

Kristee, get --

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, I just want to state for the record -- I think Mr. Peluso has to leave now. I just want to make it clear for the record --

THE COURT: No. He's ordered to remain. You don't have a choice.

MR. KLEIN: Well --

THE COURT: Kristee, get the jury.

MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Call Mr. Peluso back into court, please, for just a moment.

Mr. Klein, get Mr. Peluso.

Mr. Peluso, no discourtesy by this Court towards you. You are ordered to remain, sir. We'll come back to you as soon as we can.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You can wait outside. Thank you very much.
(In the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Thank you. Pardon me for the interruption.

Mr. Peluso may be rejoining us shortly, but counsel will call another witness.

Counsel, call another witness.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Tom McGuire, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. McGuire, if you'd step between the double doors. And, sir, would you please raise your right hand.

THOMAS W. McGUIRE, DEFENSE WITNESS, SWORN

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Would you please be seated in the witness box to my left. And after you're comfortably seated, would you state your full name for the jury, please.

THE WITNESS: Thomas W. McGuire.

THE COURT: Would you spell your last name.

THE WITNESS: M-C, capital G-U-I-R-E.

THE COURT: And this is direct examination by

Mr. Klein on behalf of NDS.

MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Your Honor. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KLEIN:
Q. Good morning, Mr. McGuire.
A. Good morning.
Q. Where are you employed?
A. $M$ and $M$ Forwarding.
Q. Are you one of the owners of $M$ and $M$ Forwarding?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. How long have you been an owner of $M$ and $M$ Forwarding?
A. I've been an owner since 1990.
Q. Can you tell us what the business is of $M$ and $M$ Forwarding?
A. We do cross-border transportation services at the

Canadian border between Buffalo and Canada.
Q. Do you do mail forwarding?
A. Yes, we do.
Q. Now, what part of your business is the mail forwarding?
A. Mail forwarding is a very small part of our business.

Less than 1 percent of our revenues are generated from it.
Q. Do you have -- you or your business have any connection
to NDS or to News Corporation?
A. No, we do not.
Q. Now, we've heard evidence about an Exhibit 191, which is a December 24 th posting, and a password -- none of which involves you, sir -- but we have an address of an EchoStar subscriber at 600 Main Street, Tonawanda, New York. Do you recognize that address?
A. Yes, sir. It's the address of my business.
Q. So your business, M and M Forwarding, is at 600 Main Street, Tonawanda, New York?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, does M and M Forwarding have a customer named Tech Electronics?
A. Yes, we do.
Q. How long has Tech Electronics been a customer of $M$ and $M$ Forwarding?
A. Since 1995.
Q. Are they still a customer?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. Now, what services has $M$ and $M$ Forwarding been providing for Tech Electronics?
A. We provide consolidation services for packages and shipments coming in from the US going to Canada, and we also provide mail forwarding service for them.
Q. When you say you provide "mail forwarding," what do you mean by that? What do you do?
A. We allow them to use our address to receive mail, and then we will forward that mail to them in their offices in Canada.
Q. Now, over the years that Tech Electronics has been a customer, has there been a particular sender that you have observed to frequently be sending mail to $M$ and $M$ to be forwarded to Tech Electronics?
A. Yes.
Q. And who was that sender?
A. DISH Network.
Q. And how do you know that DISH Network has been sending mail to Tech Electronics -- to $M$ and $M$ to be forwarded to Tech Electronics?
A. I observed the mail coming in during the day, and there would be stacks of envelopes from the DISH Network.
Q. And how do you know it was from DISH Network?
A. Because of the logo on the envelope coming in.
Q. Now, beginning in approximately 2000 -- and let's go through to about through to 2005 -- can you give us some understanding as to the amount of envelopes that $M$ and $M$ would typically receive from DISH and then forward to Tech Electronics?
A. I don't have an exact count, but every day there would be a stack of -- could have been 50, could have been a hundred, just a sizeable number of envelopes.
Q. And they would be from DISH?
A. From the DISH Network, yes.
Q. And they would all be forwarded to Tech Electronics?
A. Correct.
Q. In fact, at some point did the volume of mail from DISH to Tech Electronics become an annoyance for you?
A. It became kind of an annoyance simply because of the
volume of it. It would -- common sense would tell me that nobody was really opening each of those envelopes and going through them, and it was -- it was obvious -- there was more mail than they needed forwarded to them.

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, I would ask that
Exhibit 2500 be shown to the witness, please.

THE COURT: 2500. Thank you.
(Exhibit shown to witness.)
BY MR. KLEIN:
Q. Now, did there come a time when you received a subpoena for documents?
A. Yes, there was.
Q. And if you look at Exhibit 2500 -- and I'll direct your attention to the third page, which is 2500-002 through 2500-006.

Can you tell us, are those documents belonging to
$M$ and $M$ Forwarding?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. And were these documents prepared in the regular course of business?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. And were these the documents you provided pursuant to the subpoena?
A. Yes.

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, I would ask that

Exhibit 2500 be received into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. NOLL: No objection.

THE COURT: All right. Received.
(Exhibit No. 2500 received in evidence.)

THE COURT: And once again, where was

Tech Electronics located, sir?

THE WITNESS: They were located in Lindsay,

Ontario.

THE COURT: Lindsay, Ontario.

Just a moment, counsel.

And Counsel, could you help the Court and the
jury. How far is Lindsay, Ontario from this gentleman's address at $M$ and $M$--

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: -- in Tonawanda?

If you could look at Tonawanda. How close is it
to the border?

BY MR. KLEIN:
Q. As best you can, tell us where is Tonawanda.
A. Tonawanda, New York is a suburb of Buffalo.
Q. How far is it from the Canadian border?
A. It's right at the Canadian border. The ridges across the Niagara River come right into Buffalo.
Q. Are you familiar with Lindsay?
A. Not really. It's pretty far north in Canada.
Q. Now, do your records indicate what town you were
forwarding all these letters from DISH?
A. We were sending them to Lindsay, Ontario.
Q. And that's where Tech Electronics is?
A. Correct.
Q. And do your records indicate -- and I'll direct your attention to 2500-003 -- do they indicate the name

Dawn Branton?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. And what do your records tell you with respect to

Dawn Branton?
A. Dawn Branton would have been our contact at

Tech Electronics.

THE COURT: Which is in Lindsay.

THE WITNESS: In Lindsay, Ontario.

BY MR. KLEIN:
Q. So that was a person that, as far as you knew, worked for Tech Electronics?
A. Correct.

MR. KLEIN: Thank you.

Your Honor, no further questions.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Cross-examination.

MR. NOLL: Yes. Cross-examination, Your Honor.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. NOLL:
Q. David Noll on behalf of the plaintiffs, EchoStar and NagraStar.

We met last night; is that correct, Mr. McGuire?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to talk to you about some of the things that Mr. Stone -- I mean, Mr. Klein just asked you questions about. I want to make sure it's clear to the jury what was going on here.

As I understood it, at present you have about 200
customers that you do business with; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And about 10 of those customers ask you for a service that you call mail forwarding; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And what you do for those 10 customers is, packages are mailed to your address in Tonawanda, New York, and then you forward those packages on to customers in Canada; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you do that through one of two ways. One way is, you load that mail on with freight, and it's driven across the border to your customers in Canada; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And there's another way you would do it, which is the way you were doing with Tech Electronics. All these DISH Network envelopes were coming to you, and you'd compile them all and put 'em in a UPS box, and then you'd UPS them to the location in Canada; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you say you've been doing this since approximately 2000; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And to make sure I understand this correctly, the amount of invoices that was coming was a substantial amount; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. I mean, according to you, it could have been 2- or 300 invoices a month; is that right?
A. Yes.

THE COURT: Once again, remind the jury. Who are these coming from?

THE WITNESS: The invoices were coming from the DISH Network.

BY MR. NOLL:
Q. And you were sending all these invoices to this company called Tech Electronics in Canada, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that's part of the service that you'd provide,
right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say you were charging Tech Electronics 50 bucks a month to do this; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did anything seem odd to you about sending 2- or 300

DISH Network invoices in a UPS to a location in Canada?
A. It would seem like a lot of invoices, but not necessarily odd.
Q. Now, did those invoices from DISH Network have anybody's name on them?
A. They had each individual name on it that it was being directed to.
Q. In other words, they weren't all directed to

Tech Electronics, right?
A. No, no, they were not.
Q. They had -- and they weren't directed to businesses
either. It was to individuals' names; is that right?
A. As far as I know they were individual names, yes.
Q. Okay. And you approved this process as the president of $M$ and $M$ i is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then at some point it started to get ridiculous, to use your words, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. I mean, there was tons of mail coming in, and you had your office forwarding it to Canada until you decided to put a stop to it in 2006; is that right?
A. I put a stop to the paper invoice part of it, yes.
Q. And just so the jury knows, the way it would work is, you had a woman named Patricia Plummer, who would sort all the mail for you, and then she will put it in the envelopes and send it to Tech Electronics, correct?
A. At the time these envelopes were coming, Trisha was not an employee of ours. We had a guy by the name of Tom Pendleton that was doing it.
Q. And do you know why Tech Electronics didn't just receive the mail directly in Canada?
A. From my understanding, that -- they had to be a U.S. address where they had the envelopes coming to.
Q. And while we're talking about Tech Electronics, you've been in business with them since 1995, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And in that time frame, you've had occasion to send them satellite equipment, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In other words, it showed up at your office in Tonawanda, New York, and you loaded it from your docks onto trucks, and it was driven into Canada; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that satellite equipment would be DISH Network equipment, DirecTV equipment, or any other satellite provider in the U.S., right?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, you talked a little bit about Dawn Branton, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's your testimony you've never met Dawn Branton?
A. No.
Q. You've never spoken to Dawn Branton?
A. Not that $I$ recall, no.
Q. But your company's been in business with

Dawn Branton -- in a business relationship for the last 10 years, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, when you decided to stop this mailing process, how did you do that?
A. We had one of the -- one of our entry data entry clerks that would be working with Tech Electronics on their shipments ask them if they could have it stopped.
Q. And so the jury has a picture of this, you don't have like mailbox slots at $M$ and $M$ in Tonawanda. In other words, all this mail was coming to the same address. It just had different people's names on it; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that address is 600 Main Street, Box 888,

Tonawanda, New York 14151, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So you told one of the people that works for you to call Tech Electronics and to have this mail stop coming; is that correct?
A. To ask if they could get it stopped, yes.
Q. And then eventually a month or two later, the mail stopped -- the DISH Network mail stopped coming; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, these -- the mail -- the DISH Network mail and the satellite equipment -- you would deliver that to Tech Electronics, but from where it went from there, you have no idea; is that correct?
A. I don't know; that's correct.
Q. And you would describe this mail as -- I mean, it's voluminous. This was a lot of mail, 2- to 300 envelopes a month, right?
A. Correct.
Q. You don't know whether the satellite equipment or the mail that was delivered by you to Tech Electronics went back to the United States, to Europe, to California -- you have no idea where it went, right?
A. I don't know where it went, no.
Q. And you have no way of tracking that --
A. No, I --
Q. Cause you didn't keep any records of this stuff, right?
A. No, our transaction ended when Tech Electronics would sign for the shipment that we turned over to 'em.
Q. You don't know whether any of the satellite equipment or any of the things that were in the DISH Network envelopes were ever provided to individuals such as Zvi Shkedy or

David Mordinson; is that correct?
A. I would not know that, no.
Q. You don't know whether any of this information ended up in Chris Tarnovsky's or Al Menard's hands?
A. I don't now that.

THE COURT: Let's find out also if he's aware of any of these people.

BY MR. NOLL:
Q. Have you ever heard of Chris Tarnovsky?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Al Menard?
A. No.
Q. A man named Zvi Shkedy?
A. No.
Q. How about Dave Mordinson?
A. No.
Q. In other words, there were so many bills and invoices
that came from DISH Network you don't even know what they
were for; is that right?
A. I don't know specifically what they were for, no.
Q. Now, do you know anybody that's ever been involved in satellite piracy, sir?
A. No.
Q. Do you know whether Tech Electronics was involved in satellite piracy?
A. No.
Q. You ever heard that Tech Electronics was involved in satellite piracy?
A. No.
Q. As far as you know, Tech Electronics was running a legitimate business, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. I mean, you wouldn't stay in a business relationship for 10 years with a company that was illegitimate, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you know if Tech Electronics is still in business today?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. And you have no knowledge as to whether or not

Tech Electronics was involved in DISH Network satellite
piracy; is that right?
A. I have no idea if they were.
Q. As far as you knew, they might have been forwarding the
mails to somebody else once they received it?
A. As far as $I$ know.
Q. You ever heard of a man name Anthony Maldonado?
A. No.
Q. You ever heard of a group called the Barrie group?
A. No.
Q. You ever heard of a lab in Thunder Bay, Ontario?
A. No.
Q. You ever heard of a man named Jim Waters?
A. No.
Q. You ever heard of a man named Laurent Pilon?
A. No.
Q. You ever heard of Don Nance?
A. No.
Q. Bill Osborne?
A. No.
Q. You ever heard of DISH Plex?
A. No.
Q. You ever heard of anybody using the alias Nipper?
A. No.
Q. You ever hear of Nipper?
A. No.
Q. You involved in satellite piracy, sir?
A. No.
Q. You ever been involved in satellite piracy?
A. No.
Q. You ever been investigated by the government, to your knowledge?
A. No.
Q. And you've never been convicted of a felony, correct?
A. That's correct.

MR. NOLL: All right. No further questions. Pass the witness.

THE COURT: Redirect, Mr. Klein, on behalf of NDS. MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KLEIN:
Q. Just a few questions.

Counsel asked what you don't know. Let's see if we can see what you do know.

Am I correct you know that all of the envelopes came from DISH, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And once you received all the envelopes, they all were sent to Tech Electronics?
A. That is correct.
Q. Did Mr. Gee, a man named Mr. Gee, did he ever come and visit you and discuss the fact that all of these envelopes were being sent from DISH to Tech Electronics?
A. No.
Q. Did anybody from EchoStar ever come and visit you to discuss all of these DISH envelopes that you were receiving and forwarding to Tech Electronics?
A. No.

MR. KLEIN: Thank you.

No further questions.

THE COURT: Recross, please.

MR. NOLL: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Sir, thank you very much.
We've been asking all of the witnesses to remain
on call. I can't imagine your returning to this Court.

Do you have any planned vacation, though, anything
of that nature in the next, let's say, two weeks?

THE WITNESS: I don't have anything planned, no.

THE COURT: Well, do me a favor. Don't plan one, okay?

Would you remain available for us until May 15?

THE WITNESS: That's fine.

THE COURT: Just so counsel can contact you. If, by any stretch of the imagination, we need you back, we'd ask you to come back.

THE WITNESS: I'll be available.

Thank you.
(Witness steps down subject to recall.)

THE COURT: Counsel, your next witness, please.

MR. STONE: Thank you, Your Honor.

Defendants call Mark Jackson.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

If you would be kind enough to step forward and if you would be kind enough to raise your right hand, sir.

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

Thank you, sir.
MARK JACKSON, DEFENSE WITNESS, SWORN

THE WITNESS: I do.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

Would you please be seated in the witness box to my left, and after you're seated, please state your full name for the jury.

THE WITNESS: I'm Marcus Wayne Jackson. THE COURT: And how do you spell your last name, sir?

THE WITNESS: J-A-C-K-S-O-N.

THE COURT: And they introduced you previously as Mark, but your true name is Marcus?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, sir.

THE COURT: Do you go by the name of Mark?
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: This is direct examination by

Mr. Stone on behalf of NDS.

MR. STONE: Thank you, Your Honor. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. STONE:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Jackson.
A. Good morning.
Q. You were president of EchoStar Technologies

Corporation, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And when did you become president?
A. I'm not quite for sure, but I would say around five years ago.
Q. And prior to becoming president of EchoStar Technologies Corporation, did you having a position with EchoStar?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And what was that?
A. I've had numerous positions. I've been senior vice president of engineering. I've been senior vice president of satellite services. I've been vice president of engineering and director of engineering.
Q. And what was your position in December of 2000?
A. In December of 2000 I was probably senior vice president of engineering at that time.
Q. And what were your responsibilities as senior vice president of engineering?
A. I was responsible for the development of our set-top box product line.
Q. And can you tell us a little bit about what EchoStar Technologies Corporation does within the EchoStar companies?
A. EchoStar Technologies is the developer for all of our set-top boxes, a lot of different services that we have on our platform. We manage the uplink facilities which broadcast all of our service to the satellite. We're in charge of all the manufacturing logistics for ordering our product and getting them out to our distribution centers. We also have the system engineering group within that which ties everything together, you know, like our conditional access system, our subscriber management system, and our set-top box --

THE COURT: We're going to strike the answer. Counsel, you can reask the question: Can you tell us a little bit about EchoStar Technologies Corporation --

MR. STONE: And what it does within the EchoStar companies, briefly.

THE COURT: You can be long, just slow.
THE WITNESS: So we develop all of the hardware, software, services, for DISH Network, and we also manage the uplink facilities which broadcast all of our television programming. And we also oversee the manufacturing of all the products and pieces of gear that we need to install a
satellite receiver in a home.

BY MR. STONE:
Q. Now, in the 2000 and 2001 time frame, to whom did you report?
A. I believe I reported in that time frame to Mike Dugan.
Q. And what was Mike Dugan's position?
A. I believe he was either the president of EchoStar

Technologies or the president of DISH Network.
Q. And then you became president of EchoStar Technologies in roughly 2002?
A. That sounds correct.
Q. There's been a concept that we've talked about before you came here, with Mr. Orban, of ARPU, A-R-P-U.
A. Yes.
Q. Are you familiar with that concept?
A. Yes.
Q. And it stands for average revenue per unit?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's the average revenue per subscriber?
A. Yes.
Q. But just to be clear, that's not profit, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. That's simply a revenue figure?
A. Yes.
Q. So there would have to be expenses and costs deducted
from that to arrive at any kind of a profit number?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you for clarifying that.

Now, you're familiar with the Signal Integrity Group at EchoStar?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's the group responsible for combating piracy
of the system?
A. I wouldn't say they're necessarily responsible for combating. They're basically an investigation arm, in my opinion, predominantly.
Q. And that group began reporting to you in April of 2000, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Kummer was one of the employees in that group?
A. No, sir.
Q. What group was Mr. Kummer employed by?
A. He was part of overall ETC, kind of our chief architect.
Q. What about Mr. Kilaru?
A. That group reported to Mr. Kilaru?
Q. "That group" being the Signal Integrity Group?
A. Yes.
Q. So the Signal Integrity Group reported up to Mr. Kilaru?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Kilaru reported to you?
A. Yes.
Q. And was Mr. Kilaru in the engineering department, or was he in signal integrity?
A. He was part of the engineering group.
Q. And did you receive most of your information about the conditional access system from either Mr. Kummer or Mr. Kilaru?
A. Predominantly those two, but also Mr. Guggenheim.
Q. And what was Mr. Guggenheim's position at the time?
A. I believe he was in charge of our NagraStar division.
Q. And as of the date that you were deposed, you were, as
far as you knew, kept up to date by Mr. Kummer and
Mr. Kilaru regarding the status of the security system, correct?
A. Predominantly.
Q. And Mr. Guggenheim kept you updated, as far as you knew, as well, correct?
A. He also had input, yes.
Q. Now, you understand what the term "outright
destruction" means, correct?
A. I think we've been through this before. I -- I'm not quite clear on that, no, sir.
Q. Well, is it correct that neither Mr. Kummer nor

Mr. Kilaru ever informed you in late 2000 or early 2001 that there had been outright destruction and full compromise of the conditional access system?
A. Well, $I$ think they certainly informed me that we had been hacked and we had been compromised in a large way.
Q. Well, isn't it true that no one told you that, in late 2000 or early 2001, something had been posted on the Internet that allowed every ROM 3 card to be compromised?
A. I was told that there was a posting on the Internet.
Q. But you were not informed that it led to the outright destruction of the system, correct?
A. All I was informed of was that it really compromised our system and that the keys to the kingdom had been put out on the Internet and we had no more secrets.
Q. And Mr. Guggenheim never told you that the security system had been destroyed; is that correct?
A. Again, they all told me that we had been severely hacked and compromised.
Q. Well, didn't you learn that there were instructions on the Internet in 1999 that compromised the system?
A. I think in 1999 we had heard rumors that we had been compromised, but that's all I recall.
Q. You don't recall learning of something called "The Beginner's Guide to Hacking" posted on the Internet in early 1999?
A. No, sir.

MR. STONE: If you could show the witness Exhibit 524, please, which is in evidence.

MR. O'DONNELL: (Complies.)
BY MR. STONE:
Q. And had you heard the term -- that the system had been hacked prior to December of 2000?
A. Again, I think we had heard rumors that we had possibly been compromised in 1999, but we weren't able to substantiate those rumors, as far as I can recall.
Q. So nobody had ever told you that there was sufficient evidence of anything prior to 2000 that might require a card swap?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. And no one had ever told you there were instructions posted on the Internet that allowed an emulation hack of the EchoStar Smart Cards in early 1999?
A. Not that I recall, sir.
Q. Looking at Exhibit 524, does that refresh your recollection at all --
A. No, sir.
Q. -- about --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Wait for the question.
Finish your question, please, Mr. Stone.
MR. STONE: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. STONE:
Q. Does this refresh your recollection that something called "Unleash Your Power of EchoStar and Beginner's Guide to Hacking EchoStar" was posted on the Internet in January of 1999?
A. No, sir.
Q. What was your position with the company in January of 1999?
A. I believe I was senior vice president of satellite services.
Q. And when did you become senior vice president of engineering?
A. It's been a while, but my recollection is probably mid-2000.
Q. April 2000, roughly?
A. Again, I would be speculating.
Q. Did you ever become aware of any demand for a parts
lock that occurred prior to your becoming senior vice president of engineering?
A. At what time frame?
Q. When you became senior vice president of engineering, did you ever become aware of a demand for a card swap that had occurred prior to your becoming senior vice president of engineering?
A. No.
Q. And who was in that position before you took it over?
A. I believe it would be Mike Dugan.
Q. Were you involved in the decision to swap the cards in $2004 ?$
A. Not in the decision, just in the execution of. THE COURT: Counsel, you can ask him if he attended meetings, et cetera.

BY MR. STONE:
Q. Were you ever told about the decision-making process for the card swap that began in 2004?
A. No.
Q. Were you provided with any memos or documents of the decision-making process?
A. No, sir.
Q. Do you know who made the decision to engage in the card swap in 2004?
A. I believe it was Mr. Ergen.
Q. Did Mr. Ergen ever tell you the reason for that card swap?
A. Well, I think I told him that, you know, and made recommendations that we probably needed to do it along with others, such as Mr. Kilaru and Mr. Dugan -- that we probably needed to do it because all of our efforts had become ineffective in combating piracy.
Q. Had you ever seen a report on free-to-air piracy prior
to 2004?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Did you ever have any discussions with the engineering department about the free-to-air piracy?
A. We had lots of discussions about piracy of many different forms and factors, but I -- at that time frame, I don't believe free-to-air was a big factor.
Q. Didn't free-to-air become a big factor beginning in 2003?
A. I don't know. It's a big factor today for us.
Q. But do you recall it becoming a big factor in 2003 as well?
A. No, sir.
Q. And who would have been responsible for monitoring the state of free-to-air piracy in 2003?
A. Mr. Kilaru for the ETC side and Mr. Guggenheim on the NagraStar side.
Q. Mr. Guggenheim and his team?
A. Mr. Guggenheim. I'm not sure who-all on his team.
Q. Have you ever heard the name J.J. Gee?
A. Yes.
Q. And what do you understand Mr. Gee's position to be in the organization?
A. I'm not sure. I know he's one of the staffers at NagraStar.
Q. Did you ever have a discussion with Mr. Gee about the state of free-to-air piracy in 2003?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever attended any meetings where there were presentations about free-to-air piracy in 2003?
A. No, sir.
Q. When did you first learn that there was going to be a card swap?
A. We probably started planning it sometime in '03 or '04. THE COURT: I'm sorry. The word "probably." We speak like that in your everyday life oftentimes. But from my perspective, those are hedge words. Words like "it may have been," "could," "to the best of my recollection."

If you know the answer, then just state you do.

Or if you don't or if you don't know, state you don't know.
"Probably" doesn't leave the jury with any
indication whether you do or not.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: We need the accuracy. THE WITNESS: Do my best, sir.

So in 2003, I couldn't say for sure, so no.
BY MR. STONE:
Q. Did you ever gain an understanding that free-to-air piracy was not very susceptible to electronic
countermeasures?
A. Well, as it stands today, there are no secrets. They are very hard to combat.
Q. "They are" meaning free-to-air?
A. Free-to-air, yes.
Q. All right. So free-to-air piracy is not susceptible to electronic countermeasures is your testimony?
A. No. That's not my testimony. I guess what I'm trying to say, it's a complex issue in the fact that we try electronic countermeasures, but they can see everything that we do because there's no secrets in our security system. So it's effective for a period of time. It can be short, it can be a little longer. We measure it in days, weeks, months, and then they figure out a way around it, and then we're back to where we started from.

And sometimes it takes us six, eight months to come up with an electronic countermeasure that they can get around in a matter of days or weeks.
Q. Do you recall that the cards that were used in the card swap were immediately hacked?
A. I believe they were hacked within three months of the swap being finished.
Q. And do you recall that when you became president of EchoStar Technologies you had a lot of hard talks with Kudelski about the fact their cards were subject to glitch
attacks?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you recall testifying that while the card swap was going on, nobody at Kudelski informed you that the new cards were susceptible to a glitch attack?
A. Well, we certainly had a lot of hard talks about why the card swap did not last very long and what the problem was. I can't say that we knew at that time it was a glitch attack that caused our problem, but we knew we had a problem, and we were pretty upset about why we had a problem.
Q. Did anyone from Kudelski tell you while the card swap was going on that they knew the new cards were susceptible to that attack?
A. No, sir.

THE COURT: Is that the free-to-air attack or the

ROM 3? "That attack" -- which attack?

BY MR. STONE:
Q. The attack being the new cards that were swapped out -the Aladdin system, correct?
A. We swapped out with the Aladdins, and they were compromised fairly quickly. Yes, that is correct. And we didn't know why.
Q. So you're aware there's no claim in this lawsuit that NDS is somehow responsible for those card swap cards being
hacked, right?
THE COURT: "Those" referring once again --
because there's been ROM 3, 10, 11, 2, Aladdin --

MR. STONE: The Aladdin, which I think is the

ROM 101 through 104.

THE COURT: And the approximate year of that is?

MR. STONE: 2004.

THE COURT: All right.

THE WITNESS: I would say currently we don't know who's behind the current problems that we're having with our security system. We're trying to find out who that is.

BY MR. STONE:
Q. And that would be the folks at NagraStar?
A. NagraStar, my own internal group.
Q. And did you ask for any price adjustments from Kudelski after you learned that the cards that were swapped in 2004 were susceptible to a glitch attack?
A. We're currently under negotiations for what possible compensation we would get.
Q. And that would be current negotiations with Kudelski?
A. Yes.
Q. And about how long have those negotiations been going on?
A. For over a year.
Q. And do you know who's involved in those negotiations?
A. Mr. Kudelski himself, the president of the company, Pierre Roy, and the president of NagraStar, Pascal.

THE COURT: Now, is that Andre Kudelski or

Henri Kudelski?

THE WITNESS: Andre Kudelski, sir.

THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. STONE:
Q. I believe your complaint with NagraStar was the cost of the access cards was too high, correct?
A. Well, we're always working with our vendors to get the best possible price. That is correct.
Q. Well, wasn't that your testimony, that one of the complaints you had was that the cards cost too much?
A. Well, again, we're always just trying to get the best price that we can out of our vendors.
Q. Didn't you ask for price adjustments numerous times from Kudelski?
A. Yes.
Q. And no price adjustment was offered until these current negotiations, correct?
A. We're currently entering negotiations on how we're going to move forward and what the cost will be.
Q. Is there a new card swap that is in the works currently?
A. Yes.
Q. And are those cards being provided for free?
A. No.
Q. Are those new cards part of the current negotiations, as far as you understand it?
A. Yes.
Q. Has a price been settled upon for the new cards that will be swapped out in 2008?
A. Not yet. We're negotiating that right now.
Q. And I'm sorry. I forgot, sir. Those negotiations began when?
A. Over a year ago, sir.
Q. Do you recall having discussions with NDS in 2006 about NDS becoming a conditional access supplier to EchoStar?
A. Well, I remember discussions with NDS, yes.
Q. Well, and you met with them to discuss the potential of NDS becoming the supplier of either all or part of EchoStar's conditional access system, correct?
A. Well, no. I mean, the reason we met with NDS was that my biggest customer, which is ExpressVu -- which is part of Bell Canada -- they're a clone of the DISH Network system -they were having security problems also with the Nagra system. And their new president, Gary Smith, had come from a company in England called BSkyB, and BSkyB uses NDS, and he had had a good relationship with NDS. And as the new president of ExpressVu and the problems that they were
having with their security at the Nagra, he was leaning towards switching to NDS, away from Nagra, and we would have to do all the engineering and development work to do that. And he asked me to start talking to them to figure out what it was gonna cost and take and what the effort was going to be to do that. So that was the main reason that we met with NDS at that time frame.
Q. But my question was, the reason you had the meeting was to consider NDS as a potential conditional access supplier, correct?
A. No, not really. Like I just testified, that was the main reason.

MR. STONE: Michael, could you show the witness
Page 55, Lines 9 through 14 of his deposition, and his Honor as well, please. MR. O'DONNELL: (Complies.) THE WITNESS: Which pages? MR. STONE: 55, Lines 9 through 14. THE WITNESS: Okay.

BY MR. STONE:
Q. Does that refresh your recollection that you testified that you met with NDS to discuss the potential of NDS becoming the supplier of all or part of a conditional access system?
A. Well, I say that it was initiated by a customer of
mine, so they initiated it, like I said, and NDS certainly was there to try to sell me their system to DISH Network. MR. STONE: Your Honor, I would ask permission to read Page 55 or play Page 55, Lines 9 through 14.

THE COURT: You may.
(Video deposition played as follows.)
"QUESTION: When did you meet with NDS to discuss the potential of NDS becoming the supplier of all or part of a conditional access system?
"ANSWER: I'd say over the last 18 months.
"QUESTION: When was the first time? 2006?
THE WITNESS: I would say, yes."
BY MR. STONE:
Q. And you've testified that you initiated those discussions because you'd received a recommendation from your largest customer, Bell ExpressVu, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And currently EchoStar supplies the Smart Cards to Bell ExpressVu in Canada, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you had several meetings with NDS after they were recommended by your customers, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And those were meetings to consider switching the business to NDS, correct?
A. They were certainly working me to look at them hard on that, yes.
Q. Well, and you're the one who invited NDS to these meetings, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. They didn't initially approach you. You asked them to come in and present, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you had more than one meeting to discuss with NDS becoming a conditional access supplier, correct?
A. A conditional access supplier -- it was part of those discussions as well as what it would take to transition Nagra off of Bell ExpressVu.
Q. Well, do you recall that at the first meeting between EchoStar and NDS that the main issue to be discussed was economics?
A. Economics were a factor in both switching out -- what it would cost us to support ExpressVu -- to switch over from Nagra to NDS, and then also we asked them what the costs would be for DISH Network also.
Q. And the purpose of the second meeting you had with NDS was haggling over price, correct?
A. Well, we were certainly haggling over price, and it's always good to get competitive information of -- of, you know, so you can negotiate with your current supplier, new
suppliers. It's just negotiation.
Q. So, I'm sorry. Was your answer, yes, that this purpose was to haggle over price at the second meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. And then you asked NDS for price quotes for the conditional access system, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you received those price quotes, correct?
A. I received verbal quotes, yes.
Q. And nobody at the organization told you not to meet with NDS to discuss with them serving as a conditional access supplier, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you asked for price quotes from NDS, you asked for those in good faith, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And as of the date of your deposition, August 2007, there was not an official end to the talks between EchoStar and NDS concerning EchoStar converting to the NDS system, correct?
A. I don't think I understand that question. I'm sorry.
Q. Well, as of August of 2007, there had been no official end to those talks with NDS, correct?
A. Well, I would have to say that, you know, we ran into an issue in our discussions, that's for sure.
Q. But you had not officially called off the talks with NDS as of August 2007, correct?
A. Well, I told Dov that we would have to get this lawsuit issue resolved if they wanted to move forward with us.
Q. And this followed a meeting where you got price quotes from NDS, correct?
A. I got a very general verbal quote.
Q. Well, you had asked for a price quote, hadn't you, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And this followed the meeting where you were haggling over price, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And despite all the accusations in this lawsuit, nobody directed you not to negotiate with NDS in good faith, correct?
A. No.

MR. STONE: Thank you. No further questions. THE COURT: Thank you. Cross-examination? MR. WELCH: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. WELCH:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Jackson.
A. Mr. Wade, how are you?
Q. I'm hanging in there. It's been a while.

First thing I'd like to do: Could you tell the jury
where are you from?
A. I'm from Plainview, Texas.
Q. And how long did you stay in Texas?
A. Until I finished up with the university, which was probably '83.
Q. And where do you currently live, Mr. Jackson?
A. I live in Castle Rock, Colorado.
Q. Do you have family?
A. I do.
Q. Can you tell us about Lisa and the kids?

THE COURT: Well, Counsel.

MR. WELCH: Ms. Jackson and the kids.

THE COURT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: My wife -- I have a wife who I met
at EchoStar, and we have two young girls. I have a
four-year-old and a one-year-old who keep me quite busy.
BY MR. WELCH:
Q. Could you briefly tell the jury about your work history prior to joining EchoStar?
A. Prior to joining EchoStar, I worked at Texas

Instruments when $I$ went to the University of Texas Tech at the same time under a student development program, and I developed educational products like speak-and-spells, and calculators and stuff.

And then I went to work for a company called

Franklin Computer up in Pennsauken, New Jersey, and we developed Apple clones and spellcheckers.

And then I went to work for a company called Integrated Circuit Systems, and I was a hired gun, so to speak, and I developed integrated circuits or chips that go into a variety of different consumer electronics and products.

And then $I$ went to work for a company called Tandy Computers in Simi Valley, California, and we developed personal computers during the start-up and heyday of personal computers, 46's and such.

And then $I$ was recruited to come to EchoStar in probably '93, April of '93, and as director of engineering to help them get into the small satellite service, small dish satellite service and develop that system from scratch, way back when EchoStar had only about 300 employees. Just to put it in perspective, today we have about 27,000 employees.
Q. Now, the small satellite system that you became involved in, is that the system we're talking about today?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you generally tell the jury what your role was in helping to develop that direct broadcast system?
A. Charlie, at the time recruited me --

THE COURT: Is that Charlie Ergen?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, I'm sorry. Charlie Ergen.

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Recruited me to develop the small
satellite system. At the time, as I said, EchoStar was
probably around 300 people and, you know, I interviewed with
him, and I said, "Well, what does it take to do this?"
And he said, "We got to launch two satellites."
"How much does a satellite cost?"
"\$250 million each."
I go, "How much money you got in the bank?"
And he goes, "60 million."
I was like, "How are we going to do this?"
He goes, "Don't worry. I'll find the money."
Which he did. And we were able to successfully
launch our first satellite system against all the odds.
Nobody thought we'd be successful because we were competing
against General Motors, which owned DirecTV at the time,
which at the time was the largest corporation in America.
And we were a little start-up, so to speak.
And we had to do it all from scratch and develop
all the technology and infrastructure because nobody
believed in us and wouldn't help us.
So I led the engineering team that kind of
developed all the product in the system and the
infrastructure for the DISH Network as it stands today.

BY MR. WELCH:
Q. Mr. Jackson, we've spent a lot of time in the trial talking about conditional access. I don't think we've ever backed up and explained satellites, the uplink facility, and how the satellite transmits the signal and how it's received. So what $I$ want to do is walk through those things for you.

When was the first satellite launched for DISH Network?
A. Very late '95.
Q. Okay. And could you explain to the jury basically how the process goes about putting the satellite up in the sky? A. Well, we will go and get a contract for the manufacturer for the satellite, give 'em a spec of what we want it to do. At that time, it was Lockheed Martin.

And then we go and find a rocket manufacturer, and we tell them we want to do it, we write them a check, and they put it all together.

We launched -- our first satellite launch was on a Long March Chinese rocket, only because it was cheap. It was $\$ 60$ million, and everybody else was charging 120 million.

We were only one of two successful launches from the Chinese. They've never been successful since '96 in launching a commercial payload, so we got very lucky.

We also launched with U.S. manufacturers, French,

Russian, and conglomerate now called C-Launch, which is Russian and American and Swedish.

So we are the only company that's done the round robin of launching, and there's a 20 percent failure rate on launches, so it's interesting business.

So anyway, so we launch it up, and we have to put it in Geosynchronous order, which is about 34,000 miles over the equator, and it stays put, or it follows the spin of the earth. So you can lock it over one point in space, and then you point a dish at it.

And the new technology that came about in this time allowed us to use very small dishes -- 20-, 13-inch-type dishes instead of very large dishes in the old days, which were 6, 8 feet.

The other thing we were able to do is, digital compression came along, and we were able to put a lot of channels on this satellite. So, you know, when we first launched, we were selling 60 channels. Just so you know, today we broadcast about 3,000 channels.

But we were able to put a package together to compete effectively against cable. And at the time people fundamentally hated their cable company, and they were looking for choices. So we were able to give 'em good choice, good value with the product.

And then we invented a lot of other technology along
the way. Like you see digital video recorders that, instead of a VCR with a blinking "12," you can press a button with an electronic guide and record things and watch them later. And we invented a lot of this technology at our company to just make it an easiest experience to watch television. You're not locked into a certain time. You can watch what you want to watch.

And then we also invented a thing to skip commercials, which people find very useful in their lives.

Think of it as a microwave oven. A microwave saves you time in your household life, and we do the same thing with television today, and we give you a lot of choice for good value, we believe.
Q. Now, we talked about an uplink facility. Could you explain to the jury what an uplink facility is?
A. We have nine uplink facilities. Our major one is
located in Cheyenne, Wyoming. And it's there because
electricity is cheap. Again, trying to give you good value.
And what it does is, it has these big 13-meter dishes that we broadcast and we shoot a signal up to the satellite, but we aggregate a lot of channels, again, through satellite, like $H B O$, Showtime. We aggregate those, we get them down. We aggregate 'em, digitize them, and we squirt 'em back up to the satellite.

The Cheyenne facility is the length of two U.S.
football fields. One is two stories tall, a football field size. One's three stories tall, and there is no room in these buildings. They're completely packed with electronic -- they're technological monstrosities. And that's fundamentally what a broadcast center is. Q. We talked about the set-top box, or IRDs. Were you actually involved in the development of these set-top boxes?
A. Intimately involved in the development of all of our set-top boxes.
Q. Could you tell the jury what goes into developing one of these set-top box boxes?
A. Our engineering group at ETC is 1600 people. So there's hundreds of hardware, software, mechanical engineers who develop these products. We develop our contract to get developed integrated circuits or chips to keep the cost down, so they put a lot of functionality in a piece of silicon. And we manage and design all the functionality in the software that goes into making your television viewing experience very easy and simple at home in this product.

And we design towards the lowest common denominator, which is my mom, to try to make it really easy. 'cause if my mom can't use it, you know, lots of other people can't use it. So we try really hard to make it easy to use and simple. And there's a lot of thought that goes behind all
those types of things, right?
Q. Okay. Now, I would want to kind of get into the meat and potatoes of this lawsuit.

Are you generally aware of the allegations that the plaintiffs have brought against the defendants?
A. Generally.
Q. Okay. And what's your understanding in a general fashion?
A. In a general fashion, I believe that we allege that they have hacked our system, and then they published the software or the keys to the kingdom out on the Internet.
Q. Now, how do pirates or hackers benefit from activities like that?
A. Well, once they get all the code inside the Smart Card and they learn how it works, they can do workarounds on that, or they can emulate it and work around all of our security methodologies. And when they have this code and we try to broadcast electronic countermeasures or fixes, they can see 'em. And then we -- we try to hide them in the code; but, you know, they can record the code as it comes down from the satellite 'cause that's how we try to fix it. We broadcast new software via the satellite to the set-top box or to the Smart Card, and because they know all the secrets, they can see what we're doing. And then they see what we did, and they go off and think about it, and then
they work around it. And you get television for free because, you know, our average ARPU, as we talked about, is like $\$ 65$ a month. So, you know, we're talking $\$ 800$ a year that people can get stuff for free.
Q. So they're getting this pay TV that you're trying to provide, and they're getting that for free?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. How many channels is it today that you broadcast?
A. Around 3,000.
Q. And now within these 3,000 programs, is some of it DISH Network original programming itself?
A. No.
Q. I mean, do you have channels where you have your own commercials?
A. Yes, we do do some of that, but it's predominantly $H B O$, pay TV.

THE COURT: And, Counsel, would you, either party, remind the jury once again of what DISH Network is. We have EchoStar, NagraStar, NDS. But just the innerplay -- because that word has been frequently thrown around the courthouse.

MR. WELCH: Sorry about that, Your Honor.
BY MR. STONE:
Q. Mr. Jackson, tell us what the relationship is between DISH Network and the plaintiffs?

THE COURT: And who DISH Network is.

THE WITNESS: We just split our companies apart. We were all one company called EchoStar up until the end of this year. And at the end of this year, we split into two pieces. There's DISH Network, which is the seller of programming, and they do install customer service. Like when you call and say, "I'd like HBO," we have 9,000 people that answer the phone. So that's all DISH Network. They're the service provider. They're customer-facing.

EchoStar is the equipment and engineering and manufacturing side of the business where we build all the equipment and supply it to DISH Network.

But prior to this year, we were all one company called EchoStar. And DISH Network is what we always referred to the service side of the business.

THE COURT: Did you refer to that service side clear back when you were EchoStar as DISH Network also?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

BY MR. WELCH:
Q. Now, these 3,000 channels: Was that copyrighted programming?
A. Yes.
Q. And the conditional access system: Does that protect the copyright revenues?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, we've had some -- we've talked to the jury -we've had various witnesses talk about card swap. I want to focus you on that right now. Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. Did you have involvement in the actual card swap?
A. I was in charge of the logistics and execution of physically executing on the swap.
Q. And could you tell what you mean by "the logistics of executing on the card swap"?
A. Well, at the time I think we had 20 million active set-top boxes in the field, and we have to send new cards out to each customer. And customers have typically more than one set-top box in their home. And we had to come up with all the methodologies of telling the customer, "Take this card, put it in this box; take the old one out," and matching that up correctly. How to handle all their phone calls 'cause people get confused, so we had to write scripts and stuff for our call center. And we had to get 20 million cards and mail 'em out. That's a huge process. We had specialized equipment and a team of people that would print, address, put 'em in an envelope, and ship 'em out to everybody. And we can only do so many a month, so just that whole process of getting that completed.
Q. Did you have to purchase new equipment to do that?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Do you have to hire additional support to do that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, we've talked about piracy in general. How does
the pirate-free world -- the world free from conditional
access hackers -- how does that benefit consumers?
A. It's to the detriment of consumers.
Q. No. But a pirate-free world, not having hackers and pirates.
A. I'm sorry. I didn't understand the question.

Well, when you got everybody paying, you spread the cost over a wider group of people, obviously. You got to pay the producers, actors, everybody in that whole food chain of making content, right? So the less people are paying for it, the more it costs; and the more people are paying for it, the more you spread that cost over a wider group of people, so the less it costs. If that makes sense.
Q. Now, the defendants made certain allegations about stolen documents, 26,000 pages worth of proprietary DirecTV or NDS documents.

Do you have any knowledge about that?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever commission anybody to go out and get any documents from them?
A. No.
Q. Now, one of their contentions is that EchoStar somehow
engages in hacking competitors such as DirecTV or NDS. Does EchoStar Technologies or EchoStar engage in any type of activities like that?
A. No.
Q. Now, one of things that Mr. Stone talked to you about was a meeting that you had with Mr. Dov Rubin in 2006 . And that's Mr. Rubin there?
A. Yes, I didn't recognize him over this. Hi, Dov.
Q. Now, what was the reason for that meeting, again?
A. Again, one of our big customers, which was our biggest customer at the time, which was ExpressVu, which again is a clone of DISH Network up in Canada, they were very unhappy with the Nagra system because it was compromised. And their new president had a good dealing and good relationship with NDS, and he wanted us to look at switching from a NagraStar security system for ExpressVu to an NDS security system.

And he asked us to start talking about, you know, how we would execute on that, which was a really big job. So we wanted to do that, and then at the same time we wanted to get competitive pricing information so I would know if $I$ could get a better price from NDS, maybe I could get a better price from Nagra.
Q. Why were you trying to do that?
A. We make our living on trying to be the low-cost provider at DISH Network, and our programming costs are the
lowest, our system costs are the lowest. So we were working trying to get the lowest possible cost across the board on everything to -- to be that. So we sell on cost, and then we like to try to up-sell you over time. But we try to get you hooked on it's cheap up front.
Q. And I think one of the things we talked about was, you brought up this lawsuit would have to be resolved before you could do anything like that?
A. That's correct.
Q. What was Mr. Rubin's response?
A. I think he responded back, "Are you kidding me?" MR. WELCH: I think I'm almost done, Your Honor.

BY MR. WELCH:
Q. One of the areas that Mr. Stone talked to you about was ARPU. Okay? The average revenue per unit or the average revenue per sub.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you understand what a thing called "margin" is?
A. I think so.
Q. Okay. And if we wanted to find what actually you lost in profits, how do we do that? Would we take the ARPU and multiply that by the margin?
A. Well, say this again, Mr. Welch?
Q. Okay. I'll start over.

How would you use ARPU and margin to determine your
lost profits? We've had Mr. Orban testify about both ARPU and margin.
A. Well, we take our ARPU, and then we take our programming costs, and we subtract that out, and then we get what we call our gross margins. And then we have to go and take all of our variable costs, like all of our people -what it costs to run the business -- and then subtract it from that, and luckily sometimes you're making a profit, and sometimes you're not.
Q. Okay. And we can -- we can look back at Mr. Orban's testimony and get those. I just wanted to get the jury acclimated --

THE COURT: Slower, Counsel, slower.
BY MR. WELCH:
Q. Now, going back to the card swap issue. We talked about the card swap beginning in approximately 2003. If the posting was done in 2000, late 2000, why didn't you immediately begin a card swap?
A. Well, it's really detrimental at that point to your business to do a card swap. There's a lot of reasons for this. One is, A, it costs a lot of money to go out and do a swap.

But the really bigger reason is that -- we just talked about how we had to send all these cards off to our customers, and they have to go in there, and they have to
match up the right card with the right box. And it's a hassle.

And anytime time you hassle your customer, they think about "Do I really want to be hassled?" And they think about what their options are. And our customers get bombarded weekly, as you guys probably do, with offers in the mail about here's a great new video offer, and here's a deal for you.

And when they get that card in the mail, they start thinking about those offers, and we get higher churn. And that's really detrimental to us because, remember, we give our systems away, or we subsidize them heavily, and it costs us on average $\$ 700$ to get us a customer. And if they churn on you, you just wasted that $\$ 700$. And on top of that, you don't get money on an ongoing basis from the customer.

So churn is what really, really hurts us a lot when we do a card swap besides just the cost. And on top of that, we have to spend a lot of resources, so you've got what's called opportunity cost. Like I can have my engineers design new products instead of working on how we're going to do a swap and keep our system secure.

So those are some of the issues why you want to postpone doing a swap as long as possible, in general. MR. WELCH: I have no further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Stone, how long will you be on redirect?

I want to provide all the time you need. I'm just curious.

MR. STONE: Five, ten minutes I would imagine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Then we'll go to lunch.
You're admonished not to discuss this matter among yourselves nor form or express any opinion concerning this case.

We'll see you. Have a nice lunch.
Sir, you may step down.
THE WITNESS: Certainly.
(Witness steps down.)
(Outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: (To the reporter:) I want to stay on the record, Debbie.

Mr. Klein, why don't you have Mr.-- why don't you and I have our discussion first outside Mr. Peluso's -- I think in a few moments $I$ want to provide you the opportunity to continue as long as you'd like in this discussion to set your record.

Just be very expectant that I'm also going to set a record. So I leave that first decision to you. And if you want to have a colloquy with the Court, I'm providing
you all that opportunity to protect the record.
Expect a response from the court, though, so I want you to consult with your co-counsel for just a moment because $I$ have some very strong things to say. But I'll let you take the first opportunity.

Now, second, your client -- or your witness -- is not being precluded. But he will not be taking the stand until we have that hearing out of the presence of the jury. I'm going to try to create a neutral record. None of my comments have been in front of the jury.

At this time I'm finding no fault with you. I'm going to simply leave it as a misunderstanding. But that misunderstanding comes on top of another misunderstanding.

So I leave whatever you want to do to you first in your decision-making process, and I'll take my lead from you. Why don't you talk to your co-counsel.
(Brief pause in the proceedings.)

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, the only point I want to make is that what $I$ was asking Mr. Peluso was intended to lead up to the fact that these same pirates about whom he was testifying were the ones who he then went to the EchoStar people, talked to them about these people, and they said that they weren't concerned about pirates like these. They were concerned about Mr. Tarnovsky. And I was trying to lay the foundation to get there.

THE COURT: I take that in good faith, at least for my record, and indicate to you once again that $I$ had previously believed that the discussion that NDS had complained about involving former United States Attorney James Spertus was really caused by this Court's allowing NDS to previously ask that witness or a witness about the United States Attorney's Office and investigation. That was my effort to have a broad lawsuit.

There is a strong argument that this testimony is completely irrelevant; that what happens in Florida has no occasion in terms of what happens in California, that this gentleman is only a part of the satellite United States Attorneys, and he may be the best down in Florida, but this is nationwide, just as much centered in Los Angeles potentially, as -- Los Angeles, and perhaps more strongly so when you take the whole office as a coordinated body over one criminal head of a section in Florida.

Frankly, without denigrating Bill Flock, who's a wonderful chief judge down in Florida and a good friend, they're volume -- not in the narcotics field -- but it doesn't match the Central District with 19 million people, frankly.

So this gearing up or whatever happened in California now leads to a whole set of collateral issues. In other words, if $I$ let you get into this, then $I$ see no
reason why I'm not going to really reopen the door, and I'm not going to hear complaints from NDS about you're in

California. And it's perhaps going to go far beyond what counsel for NDS envisions. I just don't know where the questions lead.

The difficulty is that $I$ really did want to hear last evening, you know, in an out-of-the-presence hearing of the jury, and you saw me call not only a reporter up, I had two available at 8:00 o'clock. I'm finding no fault with you, again, so I protect exemplary counsel.

This was not the representation. The whole flavor of this leading up, as you say -- and you can make an argument this eventually will get to your point -- the whole flavor of this is character evidence. The inference of this is, if you believe the relationship and goodness of a former United States attorney and his association with Mr. Norris, it makes Mr. Norris a more virtuous person in the eyes of the jury.

I think my effort to provide each of you a full lawsuit on each side is well-taken in some accounts. I'm not sure it's well-taken on this account.

Therefore, I don't wish to inconvenience the gentleman. I don't wish to strike his testimony at this time until we have that hearing, because if $I$ turn out to be wrong, I will humbly back off our conversation today and let
it go forward. But if you can't get him back -- I'm not working on his convenience. You're working on this jury's convenience. So I think we ought to pay him the courtesy of asking him when he can return, if you choose to do so. If you don't, then I'm going to choose to strike his testimony.

But my record's clear. He's not foreclosed in any way from testifying about those points and in the manner that you indicated to me last evening.

And I frankly don't find the initial questions to be within the spirit of the Court's ruling last evening. So we can argue about that, but $I$ will prevail on it.

Why don't you go out and talk to your witness and see when he can return; and if he can't, then his testimony will be stricken. But that's your choice.

MR. STONE: When you say --

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, when you say "he can return," should I take that to mean that he won't be able to testify today?

THE COURT: Well, we're going to finish this witness, and then we're going to have a hearing outside the presence of the jury. And how long that takes or how long Mr. Stone is on redirect or counsel on recross, I don't know.

MR. KLEIN: What I would be willing to do that maybe would --

THE COURT: I can take him out of order as the next witness. Glad to do so. But what I'm not going to do now is quibble about your schedule and when Mr. Kudelski's available or Suzanne Guggenheim. That's your problem, Counsel.

MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So talk to him.

MR. SNYDER: Would you like us to get an answer right now?

THE COURT: Right now. 'Cause he said he had a flight to catch, recognizing he can certainly return. But you have to provide me the time to have that hearing now, which I offered last evening, and you apparently didn't want to do.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Pause in the proceedings at 12:05 p.m.)
(Proceedings resumed at 12:11 p.m.)

MR. KLEIN: Can we tell you at 1:00 o'clock what our decision is, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Absolutely.

You wanted to voice an objection?

MR. HAGAN: I can do it at the hearing,
Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, we can do it right now. We're still on record. All counsel and all the parties are
present.

And, Counsel, your objection on behalf of EchoStar.

MR. HAGAN: Your Honor, real briefly, my objection would be that we don't believe there's any relevant testimony from Mr. Peluso under 402, and any probative value would be substantially outweighed by the prejudice that they're trying to imply with respect to the AUSA investigation under 403.

THE COURT: After having given the admonition to the jury concerning the inferences that they could draw based upon the decisions of the United States Attorney's Office, this seems to be along the same vein, at least the lead-up.

I thought that this was going to be a discussion about NDS, in a sense, working with Mr. Norris, but not a litany of all the cases and the home phone calls, et cetera. And I thought that that would be brief and succinct leading into the relationship with Mr. Gee and the offer of Mr. Gee to come to the -- if not the defense, but the character of apparently Mr.-- was it Mullen -- Mr. Marty Mullen.

In addition, that would have led, then, to the collateral area that $I$ would allow you to, of course, get into: What was occurring in California, what U.S. Attorneys you were dealing with, what was said during those
conversations. And at the time, initially I had thought that NDS's evidence might possibly be probative because of Mr. Gee's position.

And I think that what it does is potentially undermine the Court's decision that the United States Attorney's Office and their activities and amended complaints should have absolutely no bearing on this case.

And that's why I was reluctant last evening and had indicated clearly to all counsel I didn't want Mr. Peluso on the stand until we'd had the hearing. I offered that at 8:00 o'clock.

It was represented to me, though, that this was -or at least $I$ had the impression -- finding no fault with you, Mr. Klein -- let me take the full burden so that this remains neutral and none of this is in front of the jury, so it doesn't impact the jury in having this discussion with you -- I thought it best that this would be a very brief presentation about the actions concerning Mr. Gee in relationship to the Florida office, not what seems to be unwinding in terms of literally 20 minutes of a background involving Mr. Norris' character. And, quite frankly, it's improper character evidence.

And so, therefore, I'm going to go back to my original position, and that is Mr. Peluso is not taking the stand until we have a hearing and $I$ hear every single
potential question that could be asked and I hear his answer. Right now the prejudicial effect does outweigh the probative value until that hearing takes place, and I'm prepared to strike his entire testimony up to this point. That can be harmful for NDS, so hopefully that doesn't have to be stricken.

Hopefully I'm wrong, Mr. Klein, and hopefully you'll give me the time to find out I'm wrong. If you don't give me that time and keep applying this "they've got to be on a plane, boat, train" -- I'm kidding -- then if their time schedule is more important than the Court's, then you place yourself in jeopardy.

Finally, let me sort out one other thing over the recess. I'm prepared to give a series of instructions that are fairly finite about this cross-examination and what came in for the truth of the matter asserted and what came in as nonhearsay.

Here's the difficulty for both of you to decide: Mr. Snyder, on some occasions the Court is saying concerning witness so-and-so, these statements are -- like Ereiser -"These statements are for the truth of the matter asserted." I'm not going to cite 804(b)(3), for instance. But I would think from your side that highlights -- although, from the Circuit's side, they'd like to see the record. As a trial judge, it highlights that these are for the truth. It has a
special meaning. And on other occasions, they're not for the truth of the matter asserted.

Now, you and $I$ know that, for the Circuit, that means a tremendous amount, and it should. But as a practical matter down here in the trial courts, I think we both recognize, Mr. Hagan, that although that works for Circuit, that can have, you know, a devastating impact.

For instance, as I go through a litany of four or five witnesses and pick out certain sections and state to the jury, "This was introduced for the truth of the matter asserted; you can view this as truthful." And on other occasions I turn to the jury and say, "This is not for the truth of the matter asserted." Equally devastating to one or both of your sides, depending upon what's being said.

Now, I'm not suggesting this, but I must give that instruction or $I$ can't protect myself in terms of this record on appeal.

But you two might get together for the first time in this case and decide if it's not in your mutual interest to stipulate that that instruction not be given. Because depending upon the way that that works out -- remember, the majority of these did come in for the truth of the matter asserted, but there's a lot of information that did not. And how you sort that out for the jury, you know that this is really for the record and for the Circuit.

So I'll wait for your wisdom concerning that. But it would be quite an instruction. And all of us know that as far as the jury is concerned, it's going to be almost, in the real world, impossible to follow.

MR. SNYDER: And you're referring specifically to Mr. Gee's testimony?

THE COURT: I'm referring to all of their testimony. You have to remember I made rulings just to begin with concerning Love, Scullion, certain parts of Scullion -- I don't know.

MR. SNYDER: I'm sorry, Your Honor. My --
THE COURT: Was Mr. Gee's testimony about each of those?

MR. SNYDER: About each of those people, yes.

THE COURT: And we can go through Ereiser or --

MR. SNYDER: But it's Mr. Gee's testimony about conversations about all those people.

THE COURT: All the things we did last evening, you can imagine what that instruction would look like. And then the Court, in doing the right thing legally, ends up with now you're to consider this for the truth of the matter asserted. It gives it added impetus concerning corroboration.

And then I say at different times, "You're not to assume that this is for the truth of the matter asserted; it
is only meant to show the actions or activities by the person." In a practical sense, we know that the jury can't sort that out.

MR. SNYDER: I understand the issue, Your Honor. THE COURT: And the end result means that each of you, quite frankly, equally get gored in looking at this. And looking at the instruction I'm starting to prepare, there's harm to both sides.

So the only way I know to resolve that is by stipulation, because otherwise I don't protect my record, and I have to give that instruction. And unless I have a stipulation from both of you, that instruction is going to be given.

MR. SNYDER: May I have the lunch hour to review my notes?

THE COURT: A.bsolutely.

MR. SNYDER: I understand the Court's request.

THE COURT: Frankly, one of you might think it's a 60 percent/40 percent win for you. Be careful, because the case is a long way from being done. Once we start that process, we go through that process potentially again with another witness. And this time it may be the reverse of what Counsel thought. So we set the precedent here in terms of that instruction being given.
I'm just -- So I thank you.

I don't know how that gets resolved, but I would suggest the two of you ought to talk about it after you talk internally.

MR. HAGAN: Thank you.

MR. SNYDER: 1:00 o'clock, Your Honor?

THE COURT: 1:00 o'clock.
(Lunch recess held at 12:19 p.m.)
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