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(Outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: We're on the record. The jury's not present.

MR. HAGAN: Our concern is this: Early in the case, I subpoenaed documents from ICG as soon as we found out about that report linking Tarnovsky to the Nipper alias.

They resisted production of those documents. Ultimately I had to file a Motion to Compel. We had a hearing. They were not represented by the defendant's lawyers at that time. They were represented by the same lawyers representing DirecTV, who I was also moving to compel.

We had an informal discussion with you, and you told them that you were prepared to issue an order compelling those documents if they didn't work something out with me.

I had limited knowledge about the case at that
time. I gave them a list of words for them to search through their database.

THE COURT: What year was this?

MR. HAGAN: This was in two thousand and -- I
believe it was the end of '06.

Now, they complained and said, "We can't produce our whole database, you know, it's proprietary" -- blah, blah, blah -- "but we'll give you some selective word searches." And they demanded we pay a hundred thousand dollars for that, which we refused to do.

They gave us the limited documents. Then they retained this witness from ICG as an expert, and his entire testimony revolves around his selective searching of that database and producing documents and showing them in front of the jury from that database. Some of those documents we got for the first time this morning.

Now, we believe that we can still make effective points in cross-examination, but we believe we're entitled -- since he's an expert, since he relied on that database -- to a copy of that database so that we can search it ourselves.

Otherwise, we're going to have to move to strike portions of his testimony.

MR. EBERHART: Your Honor, may $I$ be heard for a moment?

THE COURT: Certainly.

MR. EBERHART: First, the plaintiffs entered into a stipulation regarding their subpoena that they served on ICG in 2006. That was entered as an order by this Court, and $I$ can provide a copy of that order to you.

Pursuant to that order, ICG conducted keyword searches and provided those searches to the plaintiffs.

THE COURT: But I recall that order being a
tentative order to keep the two of you moving with information at that time. That was never meant to be a preclusive order, if you're relying upon a database.

As I put EchoStar through the process in terms of our hearing concerning Mr. Shelton, I'm about to put you through the same process as well concerning your database.

MR. EBERHART: May I be heard for a moment, Your Honor?

Mr. Emerson's report was provided a year ago. At no time did plaintiffs say they needed additional searches of the databases. And it is not true that they were only provided this morning with additional data.

THE COURT: So if I compared his report and there's nothing new in terms of his testimony, then we would wonder why plaintiffs' counsel sat idly on their hands.

MR. EBERHART: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So we should be able to compare what's in that report with the gentleman's testimony today.

MR. EBERHART: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We'll do that at 5:00 o'clock.

Now, if you don't wish to proceed with
cross-examination, you can reserve that.

MS. WILLETTS: I'd like to proceed, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, wait a minute.

MR. HAGAN: We're prepared to proceed, Your Honor, without waiving our right to compel a full image of this database so that we can --

THE COURT: I don't know if it's full images yet.

You're presuming too much. I haven't made that ruling. All

I've said is that you have the option of delaying
cross-examination. That's your choice.

Number 2, how wide the search of that database is depends upon my reading the expert report, knowing what you have had in your possession, and seeing if this gentleman's strayed outside what would normally be the expectation of the data you need.

We can do that between 5:00 and 12:00.

MR. HAGAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, do you want to proceed or not?

MS. WILLETTS: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. HAGAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. We're off the record.
(Brief discussion off the record.)
(Proceedings resumed outside the presence of
the jury.)

THE COURT: We're back on the record. As far as
the cost constraints are concerned, I'm not concerned. In
other words, if I think you're entitled to the database, I'm going to order that, and we'll worry about the cost.

But once an expert's put on the stand, then that party becomes liable for that expert's testimony. So if $I$ believe that you haven't got the adequate testimony, NDS is going to be paying for that. It will come out of their pocket.

But if, in fact -- if this hasn't been a straying from what counsel represents, Mr. Eberhart, this report said, then you sat on your hands. That's your responsibility. So I'll look at the report this evening.

Now, the only thing $I$ heard that $I$ was concerned about was that broad general statement about relying on the database, and that database was probably pretty extensive, but I don't know how long it takes to get that.

So let's just assume that you prevail, the worst situation in terms of CGI and NDS for a moment. How long would it take to get all of that information? I would assume some period of time. And how long would it take you to look at it? Some period of time.

Well, give me an estimate.
MR. HAGAN: I think we could do searches that he testified about relatively quickly. We just want to expand them out with the aliases that Chris Tarnovsky admitted to using.

THE COURT: Okay. Because you had a limited number of aliases at that time. Now, you'd have more aliases in the last couple years.

MR. HAGAN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And he's testifying to which aliases you're concerned about.

MR. HAGAN: Well, he's just testifying, as I understand the testimony, about one particular search and one particular alias. But we want to see if any of those --

THE COURT: Which alias?

MR. HAGAN: That's the NiPpEr2000 alias.
THE COURT: And which alias are you interested in?
MR. HAGAN: All of the ones that Chris Tarnovsky
admitted in his depo 'cause $I$ want to find --

THE COURT: Write them down for me.

MS. WILLETTS: Your Honor, if I may.

While we're writing these down, there's one other issue related to this witness, and that is Exhibit 39, which was previously addressed in a motion in limine.

This is the NiPpEr2000 user information that
relates to ChrisVon@s4.interpass. The defendants offered an
exhibit produced by EchoStar that was the user information that only had the IP address. We would also like to offer the related document that includes the user name which was previously unruled on by this court.

THE COURT: And that's because it had come from NagraVision.

MS. WILLETTS: It comes from EchoStar's production.

THE COURT: EchoStar. Nobody knew where that came from.

MS. WILLETTS: Right. And they've now used a similar document that has the IP address on it, and this witness has relied and testified to that.

MR. EBERHART: Your Honor, I believe it's already been admitted, actually -- Exhibit 39.

MS. WILLETTS: It has not.

THE COURT: No, it has not.
Now he's qualified as an expert, Counsel, and you're going to be allowed to do so. It was either partially or actually nonauthenticated in the past. Now it takes on new meaning in light of NDS qualifying him as an expert.

Now, what was your prior request? Just to run what?

MR. HAGAN: There was certain terms -- and I don't have them -- but I'll pull them up for our hearing this evening.

THE COURT: Write them down. In other words, I'm not going to have him rerun duplicate terms if I decide to
do that, so you need to tell me which terms he doesn't have to rerun.

MR. HAGAN: Can we do that for this evening,
'cause it's going to take some time.
THE COURT: You can do that now.

In fact, I'll give you this back, and you can draw a pencil through the terms that you've already asked.

Now, if I decide to do this, you're on warning as follows: And that is, be careful what you ask for. You may run a database and find out it's not only just exactly what he believes it is at the present time, but there's nothing else. And that puts the gentleman in even a stronger position.

So while you're setting your record, I may be more than pleased to make that order, and you may find your position significantly undermined. Or it may be beneficial.

Certainly NDS is going to be able to come back and ask if that order and request wasn't made on Wednesday, April 30th, and he went back to double check and found nothing else.

But I do agree from my notes just tentatively that that order's probably going to be made -- or some portion thereof.

The gentleman testified that he compared the aliases from the Fourth Amended Complaint. He took mirror
images of the hard drive seized from pirate websites, he searched a Pirate Base concerning NiPpEr2000 postings, he ran searches for Nipper on this Pirate Base, then concerning NiPpEr2000 he found the user name and the database, et cetera.

So his testimony is rather expansive, and I think tentatively, you're probably going to have a right to this information.

MR. EBERHART: To be clear, Your Honor, the materials that he searched --

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Eberhart.

So if that's the case, then you have to make a decision -- if that's simply a tentative feeling on my part, without getting into this further at this time so we can
keep the jury moving -- if you really wanted to
cross-examine the witness at this time or bring him back.
And, of course, if $I$ don't rule and make that a final
ruling, then he's back on the stand tomorrow or the next
day.

Make sure your group collectively makes a collective decision.

Do you want to proceed now or not?

MR. HAGAN: We have decided, Your Honor, after speaking with the client, that we're prepared to go forward with our cross now. And if we believe that we've gotten
sufficient points made with our cross, we can withdraw our request for additional searches of the database so that we don't have to delay the trial.

THE COURT: That's correct?

MR. WELCH: It's what the client agreed to, yes, sir.

THE COURT: Is that correct?

MR. MOSKOWITZ: If we do this and we would like the additional -- or does this preclude us from asking for the additional --

THE COURT: No.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: Then I think that's absolutely correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Then you can tell me at the end of this limited direct examination, if you believe you've been limited, if there's something else. But I'm not going to cause NDS to do a needless act.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: That's entirely -THE COURT: It's time consuming and costly, yes. Kristee, would you be kind enough to get the jury, then.

Mr. Eberhart, why don't you give me that expert report from this gentleman. Just make it available to me this evening.
(In the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: We're back in session.

All parties are present.
If you would have a seat. Thank you for your courtesy.

JAMES EMERSON, DEFENSE WITNESS, PREVIOUSLY SWORN

RESUMED THE STAND

THE COURT: This is cross-examination by

Ms. Willetts on behalf of EchoStar/NagraStar.

Counsel.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Emerson.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Now, you were at some point retained by counsel for the defendants to give opinions in this case; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And before you were ever actually retained as an expert witness, Counsel, Mr. Eberhart, spoke to you; is that right?
A. I don't believe I spoke to Mr. Eberhart until we had actually been retained.
Q. Did -- I thought you testified earlier in your deposition that the contact was made by counsel for defendants, perhaps not Mr. Eberhart. I could be wrong on that, but they contacted you to see if you had information within ICG's possession that would be relevant to this case
or Chris Tarnovsky; is that correct?
A. I think you characterized my testimony correctly. However, I meant that that was part of the post-retention activity.
Q. Are you aware that EchoStar also subpoenaed ICG's records related to Christopher Tarnovsky and the December 2000 posts?
A. I am.
Q. And ICG objected to that subpoena; isn't that correct?
A. I was not party to the legal discussion between Mr. Bedser, DirecTV, and Weston Benshoof, our counsel. So from the standpoint of what was ultimately discussed, how it was worked out, I don't have personal knowledge of how that decision was reached between counsel.
Q. But you do have knowledge that ICG required EchoStar to file a motion in order to get relevant information from your business related to this case; isn't that right?
A. I'm not sure how it was characterized, whether

DirecTV's motion to do that or ICG's motion to do that, because there's information here that's the intellectual property of DirecTV in the midst of this matter. And the evidence that -- the original evidence is DirecTV's evidence in this matter. They were the party to the legal actions that resulted in this evidence.

So from the standpoint of the legal discussion that
occurred between counsel for Echo and our counsel, which was also DirecTV's counsel, I don't know how it was characterized, whether it was ICG's initiative that did that. I wasn't party to that.
Q. So the jury's clear on it, DirecTV's counsel also represented ICG for purposes of that document?
A. That's correct.
Q. And once finally ICG was ordered to produce those relevant documents, isn't it also true that ICG demanded a hundred thousand dollars from EchoStar before they would produce those?
A. I don't have any knowledge of a price, no.
Q. Now, you're also aware that within those records that EchoStar was seeking were several ICG reports linking Christopher Tarnovsky to the alias NiPpEr2000 and the ChrisVon@s4.interpass.com e-mail address; isn't that right?
A. I found a single post related to NiPpEr2000.
Q. Now, let's be clear. We're talking about posts, and there's also separate reports generated by ICG; isn't that correct?
A. The Pirate Base exports data in a number of ways, as I described during my deposition. So I'm not sure. We need to be specific, I think, about the format so that $I$ can be accurate.
Q. Okay. Well, in your expert report that you submitted
in this case, you state: "I further investigated whether any of the user names alleged by EchoStar to be associated with Mr. Tarnovsky were, in fact, associated with him. My examination failed to find any evidence linking Mr. Tarnovsky to those user names."

Do you still stand by that statement in your expert report?
A. I do.
Q. And when you prepared your expert report and the statements contained therein, did you exhaust all evidence that was available to you?
A. I did exactly what's in the report. I used the information that was in the Fourth Amended Complaint for those searches.
Q. Did you care to look at any of the ICG's reports that it prepared prior to this litigation?
A. What specific reports? I mean, I've seen a lot of data at ICG. Can you be more specific? I'm sorry.
Q. Sure. Let's take a look at Exhibit 27.
(Document displayed.)

BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. Have you ever seen this report before, Mr. Emerson?
A. I believe so.

THE COURT: Just a moment. Words like "I believe so," "could have been," "might have been," "the best of my
recollection" -- those are hedge words.

Did you or not?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I don't know if it's the exact report, but I've seen similar material.

THE COURT: Did you or not, or you don't know.
THE WITNESS: I don't know by the -- I don't know. THE COURT: Okay.

Counsel.

BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. Was this one of the reports you reviewed when you conducted an exhaustive analysis to determine whether or not Chris Tarnovsky had any association with aliases alleged in EchoStar's complaint?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. This was not a report that $I$ referred to. It was not part of the evidence set that I relied upon, and I'm not sure why this particular exhibit is associated with my report. It -- I did not have this report to use.
Q. Well, it's an ICG report, and you work for ICG; isn't that correct?
A. This appears to be a report that's inclusive in a set of investigative work that was done called "trap door." And I had nothing to do with that project historically.
Q. So you decided to omit this information when you
decided -- when you were retained by defendants to give an expert analysis in this case?
A. I don't think it was my intent to omit anything. I believe that, just as I've stated in my report, what $I$ attempted to do was to use the evidence that we had that I could validate forensically and to look at the entire body of that evidence as it related to the NiPpEr2000 post. And I did not utilize this particular report because it wasn't something that I could authenticate.
Q. Do you believe it's inaccurate in any way or forged, or is this not an authentic document, in your opinion?
A. The reason I said I don't know whether I've seen it before is because $I$ don't know where it came from, I'm not clear who produced it, and I'm not clear whether the data that's here is factually correct or not.
Q. Let's go back to the statement that you made in your expert report in this case.

Your examination didn't find any evidence linking Mr. Tarnovsky to the user names identified in EchoStar's complaint. That's your statement in your report, right?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Are you aware that Mr. -- EchoStar alleged in this lawsuit that Mr. Tarnovsky used the alias "Von"?
A. I am, yes, I'm aware.
Q. "Vonrola"?
A. I think I've seen that alias, yes.
Q. "VonRat"?
A. Yes.
Q. "Biggun?
A. Yes.
Q. "BG"?
A. Yes.
Q. $\quad$ Shrimp"?
A. Yes.
Q. "Arthur Von Neumann"?
A. Yes.
Q. We've also alleged "NiPpEr."
A. Yes.
Q. And "NiPpEr2000"?
A. Yes.
Q. But you see no evidence linking Tarnovsky to any of those. Is that your opinion in this case?
A. That is my opinion, yes.
Q. Are you aware that Mr. Tarnovsky's admitted to using the aliases Von, Vonrola, VonRat, Biggun, BG, Shrimp, and Arthur Von Neumann?
A. I was not aware that he admitted to those aliases.
Q. Would that be something that you would think would be important in reaching your opinion that there's no evidence linking Tarnovsky to the aliases listed in EchoStar's
complaint?
A. I think that $I$ reviewed those aliases in the process of preparing my report. I ran searches against those aliases to create my conclusions in the report.
Q. Would it not be important for you to find out whether or not Tarnovsky had in fact admitted to any of those?
A. It certainly adds to confirm things based on his testimony at this point. However, it wouldn't change the process involved in my report.
Q. And you, in fact, never spoke to Chris Tarnovsky?
A. That's correct.
Q. You never spoke with anyone from NDS; isn't that right?
A. Not in relation to this case.
Q. And now as a forensic expert, which I believe you testified to earlier; is that correct? -- you're a forensic expert?
A. I said that I've been entered into testimony as an expert to present forensic evidence historically, yes.
Q. And you've done that in connection with a lot of clients, right? Forensically analyzed computer data to link up information; is that correct?
A. I'm only aware of being accepted by a court as an expert prior to this date in one other instance.
Q. And that was in a DirecTV case; isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Now, as someone who's been involved in the industry with experience in forensic analysis, wouldn't you agree that the best place to look for hard evidence linking a person to a post would be the person's hard drive?
A. That's a fair characterization of where we -- one of the places we would look if -- when it's available, yes.
Q. In this case, that would be Chris Tarnovsky's hard drive; isn't that correct?
A. Based on the complaint, it should be relevant.
Q. But you've never been provided any forensic computer data from Mr. Tarnovsky's hard drive; isn't that correct?
A. My understanding from outside counsel for NDS is that it was forensically examined by another party and that that information was provided.
Q. It wasn't provided to you, was it?
A. No, it has not been provided to me.
Q. And you're the expert in this case; isn't that right?

They've retained you as an expert?
A. They have, yes.
Q. And in the other cases you've worked on, you were provided with forensic computer analysis; isn't that right?
A. In some cases we've had hard drives. In other cases, we've just had the websites.
Q. Now, you understand that the allegations in this case is that Mr. Tarnovsky posted the Nipper post on Mr. Menard's
dr7 website; isn't that right?
A. I understand that from review of testimony and the complaint.
Q. And I think you testified earlier that one of the best places to look for forensic analysis or data relating to this Nipper post would be dr7's records; isn't that right?
A. I don't recall my testimony precisely as you've just restated it.

I don't object to the fact that there could be value in looking at the DRC evidence. I agree with that.
Q. But you weren't provided that evidence?
A. We've never had the DRC evidence.
Q. Were you aware that the defendants actually hired

Mr. Menard in 2003?
A. No, I was not.
Q. Were you aware that the reason they wanted to retain Mr. Menard was because he had thousands and thousands of web page dumps and information on his website and other websites?
A. I have no knowledge of the relationship of Menard to any of the parties here.
Q. You've never been provided with any of the information from the dr7 servers that defendants had access to, were you?
A. With the exception of that screen print that I've been
shown earlier today, no.
Q. And wouldn't you agree that that would be one of the first places as a forensic analyst that you would want to look for information related to the NiPpEr2000 post?
A. I think that that particular information could be probative. There might be something there that we would want to look at, yes. I don't -- I have no idea what that would be or whether it would have value at the end of the day.
Q. Now, you testified earlier regarding what you called a MySQL?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's a database, apparently a well-known database related to forums; is that correct? Or websites?
A. It's used for many purposes where database is required, not just forums. But it tends to be common with regard to these particular forums because it's free, and it can handle a great deal of information.
Q. And in this case, that was actually the MySQL database is where you pulled all the information from relating to the NiPpEr2000 posts and the IP addresses that you testified to earlier; isn't that right?
A. That's true.
Q. And I believe you also testified that the MySQL database also reveals evidence relating to a registered
user's corresponding user records or the activities, user name, e-mail addresses; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And ICG obtained all that information in connection
with the NiPpEr2000 posts; isn't that right?
A. With regard -- in a broader sense with regard to

PiratEden.
Q. Okay. Let's take a look at Exhibit 2055.

Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Can you read what the first -- the title page says?
A. ChrisVon@s4.interpass.com.
Q. And is this one of the documents that comes from your Pirate Base database?
A. This is a report. The format is produced in PDF format from Pirate Base, yes.

MS. WILLETTS: Your Honor, at this time defendants would offer Exhibit 2055 into evidence.

MR. EBERHART: No objection.

THE COURT: Received.
(Exhibit 2055 received in evidence.)
(Document displayed.)
BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. So this is another one of the documents that was created using the MySQL database files obtained by ICG from

PiratesDen, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. If you look at the fourth page of the exhibit -- I'm sorry, the fifth page of the exhibit -- it's NDS153183 -can you explain what this page represents here?
A. The Pirate Base database has a function that was designed for a specific litigation requirement for DirecTV that creates a grouping of information from critical fields in the database and puts it into a viewable form that the attorneys that supported DirecTV could very quickly utilize for the purposes of planning litigation.
Q. So if you'll look at the e-mail address associated with the NiPpEr2000 post, can you read that for us?
A. The e-mail address on the left side of the page is ChrisVon@s4.interpass.com.
Q. And do you agree that that e-mail address, ChrisVon@s4.interpass.com, was the e-mail address used to register the NiPpEr2000 alias?
A. It was the e-mail address related to NiPpEr2000 in the user table for dsschat in 2003 when we forensically acquired it.
Q. That's the same user table that you used to come up with the IP address; isn't that right?
A. This came from the active database. The IP address came from a database file that was not part of the active
database.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe that the

ChrisVon@s4.interpass.com e-mail address is not associated with the NiPpEr2000 post?
A. No.
Q. Take a look at Exhibit 39.
A. Thank you.
Q. Have you seen this document?
A. Counsel for NDS showed it to me.
Q. Can you tell us what Exhibit 39 is?
A. It appears to be much like the other exhibit that I described as an admin control panel view. This appears that it might be an admin control panel view for the database through a browser.
Q. And you are referring to the admin control panel for the IP address, a document that the defendants asked you about earlier; isn't that right?
A. It's the same NiPpEr2000, yes.
Q. And this is showing the actual user e-mail address that's also associated with NiPpEr2000; isn't that correct?
A. Yes. This was in the user table, correct.

MS. WILLETTS: At this time plaintiffs would offer

Exhibit 39 into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. EBERHART: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.
(Exhibit No. 39 received in evidence.)
(Document displayed.)

BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. So this document, Exhibit 39, is that consistent with the database that ICG maintains, the Pirate Base database in that ChrisVon@s4.interpass.com e-mail address?
A. The information is, not the format.
Q. The information, the e-mail address is consistent --
A. Yes.
Q. -- with ICG's database?
A. Yes.
Q. Counsel for the defendants spent a great deal of time talking to you about IP addresses and in particular the IP address associated with the NiPpEr2000 post. In fact, that's why you were retained, isn't that correct? -- to give an opinion on that issue?
A. That was part of the reason, yes.
Q. Now, as an expert in forensics, you would agree that it's possible for individuals posting information to conceal their location with proxies, anonymizers and those sort of techniques; isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, it's something that's fairly common in the piracy industry. And you know that because you've dealt
with a lot of issues relating to piracy with DirecTV; isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Are you aware that Chris Tarnovsky has admitted in this case to using proxies, anonymizers and other methods of concealing his location or identity when posting?

MR. EBERHART: Objection. Vague as to time.
THE COURT: No. Overruled.

You can answer that question.
THE WITNESS: I was shown part of Mr. Tarnovsky's testimony indicating that he used an ISDN dial-up line with an ISP in Virginia, and that's all $I$ know about

Mr. Tarnovsky's testimony.

BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. Okay. And let's look -- take a look at one of the exhibits that defendants' counsel showed you. Exhibit 206.

And we established earlier that this is an e-mail sent from Peter Kuykendall, a NagraStar employee, forwarding a post that was made relating to the December 2000, NiPpEr2000 post. I don't think it's clear to the jury exactly what this e-mail actually is, though.

Can you read for us the second sentence after "see attached file," beginning with "I also"?
A. "I also did a Usenet search on the poster
dr7_al@my-deja.com" -- that address being in parentheses --
"at www.deja.com, and came up with a couple of hits that returned the same thing" in parentheses "(see below)."
Q. So the Usenet search that's being done here isn't actually on the NiPpEr2000 post. It's on this post made by dr7_al@my-deja.com; isn't that right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. I believe you testified and the document indicates that that address resolved to Ontario?
A. That's what's said in the e-mail from Mr. Kuykendall.
Q. Now, with your experience relating to piracy, you've heard of dr7; isn't that right?
A. I never worked any investigations related to dr7. I entered the satellite piracy services for DirecTV at a point where they were not an active target.
Q. So you've heard of dr7?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's your understanding that that operation was run by Allen Menard; isn't that right?
A. I've seen information that suggests that's the case, yes.
Q. And Mr. Menard never lived in Ontario; isn't that right?
A. I have no idea where Mr. Menard lived. I'm sorry.
Q. I'll represent to you that he testified at his deposition in this case and it was played to the jury that
he lived in Edmonton his entire life but for two years that he lived in Vancouver.

Do you have any reason -- or do you know why Mr. Menard's e-mail address or address associated with him would resolve to Barrie, Ontario?

MR. EBERHART: Objection. Mischaracterizes the evidence. No foundation.

THE COURT: Overruled. But I can take a recess. Each of you can show him the transcripts from the depo if you would like to. Do you want to take a recess?

MR. EBERHART: My objection, Your Honor, is only to the claim that there is an association between this e-mail address and Mr. Menard. There's been no evidence of that.

THE COURT: No, she's asking, I believe -- is that correct? Just restate the question. Maybe I didn't hear it correctly.

BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. Do you know why any post being made by dr7 or Allen Menard would resolve to Barrie, Ontario? Or do you have any reason -- let me rephrase.

How could a post made by dr7 resolve to Barrie,

Ontario? How could that happen?
MR. EBERHART: Objection. Lacks foundation.

THE COURT: Overruled.

You can answer the question.

THE WITNESS: The header reflects that the poster, the source end of that connection to Usenet was from Vianet in Barrie, Ontario. Determining who was at the keyboard for that particular transaction is not substantively defined by dr7 in the same way that ChrisVon@interpass does not substantively define who was responsible for creating that e-mail account.

BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. Is it fair to say, though, that just because something resolves -- a post or whatnot resolves to Barrie, Ontario doesn't mean that's where that person actually resides?
A. That's possible, yes.
Q. Let's take a look at Exhibit 726-D. It's an exhibit that your counsel questioned you over a little earlier. Do you have that exhibit in front of you?
A. Yes, ma'am, I do.
Q. And I believe you testified that the information -MS. WILLETTS: We can put it up on the screen, Clint.
(Document displayed.)
BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. The information contained in 726-D was additional information you relied on in order to reach your opinions in this case; isn't that right?
A. Something to that effect, yes.
Q. Well, was it relied on by you or was it not relied on by you?
A. I used the data. I think -- I'm not sure what my exact testimony was, but my intent, as depicted in my report, was to run all the keywords that were attributed to Mr. Tarnovsky in the complaint in a way to be able to analyze the other information about those user accounts across the entire set of websites.
Q. And if I understood defense counsel correctly, the point he was trying to make with you and the point you testified to was that the IP address is the most reliable way of tracing a post back to a particular individual.
A. I think I said it's the most reliable piece of information we have here.
Q. Okay. And you believe that's more reliable than an e-mail address that would be associated?
A. Standard practice for any hacking incident, incident response process, a criminal event that involves the Internet, starts with a subpoena for the IP address.
Q. Let's take a look at some of the entries on 726-D. If you'll look at the first page, about a little more than halfway down, we have an entry with user names "bg." There are two in a row.
A. I see.

MS. WILLETTS: Clint, can we blow that up? It's on the 726-D-001, bg. It's towards the middle of the page. (Document displayed.)

BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. Were you aware that "bg" was one of the aliases Chris Tarnovsky admitted to using in this case?
A. I think that you may have just told me that.
Q. The defendants' counsel never bothered to tell you that wasn't (sic) one of the aliases he admitted to using?
A. That was not a part of Mr. Tarnovsky's testimony that I was able to review. I don't know that other than you telling me that today.
Q. Did they just give you select portions of his testimony?
A. Yes. That would be the case.
Q. Were you aware from that testimony that you reviewed that Mr. Tarnovsky resided in California?
A. I think I know that for a different reason.
Q. Now, if you'll look at the location or the IP geo location for the alias "bg," where does that alias and IP resolve to?
A. Chicago.
Q. Are you aware of any instance where Mr. Tarnovsky resided in Chicago, Illinois?
A. I am not, no.
Q. Okay. Let's turn to the next page, 726-D-002 -- I'm sorry, 003 -- the following page.

And again about halfway down the page there's the alias
"shrimp."
A. I see it.

MS. WILLETTS: Can we highlight that, Clint?
(Document displayed.)
BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. Are you aware that "shrimp" was one of the aliases Mr. Tarnovsky admitted to using in this case?
A. I was not.
Q. It's another alias that the defendants' counsel didn't bother to tell you he had admitted to?
A. This is the first time I've heard it.
Q. Where does that alias -- where is the geo location associated with the alias "shrimp"?
A. Anchorage, Alaska.
Q. Do you have any knowledge that Mr. Tarnovsky ever lived in Alaska?
A. I had none, no.
Q. If you go about four lines down, there's several
entries for the alias "BIGGUN." That's about five in a row.

Were you aware that "BIGGUN" was one of the aliases

Mr. Tarnovsky's admitted to using in this case?
A. Again, I heard that here from you, I believe.
Q. Where does the alias "BIGGUN" resolve to?
A. In each case it's Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
Q. Let's go about two more lines down. We see the alias "Von." Were you are aware that "Von" was one of the aliases Mr. Tarnovsky admitted to using in this case?
A. The same response. I heard it from you today.
Q. And where is the geo location associated with the alias "Von"?
A. New York, New York.
Q. Do you have any evidence that Mr. Tarnovsky ever resided in New York?
A. No, I do not.

THE COURT: Now, just one moment, Counsel. All right. Thank you. Please continue.

BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. And let's just continue going down that page. Below "Von" there's an entry for to "ripper" and below that an entry for "mike."

Were you aware that "mike" was one of the aliases used by Christopher Tarnovsky?
A. I'm sorry, where are we on the page?
Q. Two entries down from the "Von" that we just discussed.
A. Okay.
Q. There's an entry for "mike"; is that correct?
A. Yes, I see it.
Q. Were you aware that "mike" was one of the aliases Chris Tarnovsky's admitted to using?
A. I'm learning that from you.
Q. And where does the alias "mike" resolve to, according to this document?
A. Washington, DC.
Q. Now let's turn back in the same exhibit to the first page, 726-D-001. About 11 lines down from the top, there's an alias "shrimp."
A. I see it.
Q. Were you aware that "shrimp" was one of the aliases Mr. Tarnovsky admitted to using in this case?
A. Again, I'm learning that from you today.
Q. And according to this document, "shrimp," the geo location for "shrimp" resolves to Kingston, Ontario; is that correct?
A. It does, yes.

THE COURT: Just a moment, Counsel. I don't see
that, Counsel.
MS. WILLETTS: It's 626-D-001 (sic).

THE COURT: 626-D-001? MS. WILLETTS: That's correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: I may have had the wrong page. Thank you.

BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. And that one is -- eight lines down from the top, I believe.

And going down the same page, the first page, a little over halfway down that page, below "bg" there's three entries in a row with the alias "scatman."

Do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Were you aware that Mr. Tarnovsky admitted in this case to using the alias "scatman"?

MR. EBERHART: Objection. Mischaracterizes the evidence.

THE COURT: I don't recall. I'm going to allow the answer. I'm just not certain, looking back, if Mr. Tarnovsky did or not. But we've got a transcript, and if you need that to be read -- your memory will prevail. If you need testimony read back -- if this is important to you, you can request it --

MS. WILLETTS: I can read this from his depo
transcript, if you'd like, Your Honor. I have the entry.

THE COURT: Oh, this wasn't in trial. This is what may be confusing to the jury. I don't know if that was in front of the jury at trial or not. I just can't remember.

MS. WILLETTS: If you'd like, I could read the two
lines.

THE COURT: Is this the trial testimony?

MS. WILLETTS: This is from his deposition, Your

Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. You may do so.

MS. WILLETTS: Okay.
"QUESTION: Did you admit to using "scatman" S-C-A-T-M-A-N?
"ANSWER: I believe I did use that as well. This would be very early on in time. All the "BIGGUN" nics, n-i-c-s. To clarify this, "BIGGUN/scatman" should have been in the '96 to '97 era of time, no longer afterwards."

THE COURT: And your question is?

BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. Were you aware that Mr. Tarnovsky had admitted to using the alias "scatman"?
A. I'm just learning that now.
Q. That's another one of the aliases that defense counsel did not disclose to you; is that correct?
A. I've heard the alias because of the complaints but not in the context of his admission.
Q. And can you tell us where the alias "scatman" resolves to based on the IP address that's in Exhibit 726-D?
A. I may be looking at the wrong "scatman." There's a "scatman" that doesn't have an IP address.
Q. If you look at your screen.
A. What you've got highlighted on the screen is obviously resolving to Ottawa, Ontario.
Q. And Ontario is where the NiPpEr2000 post resolved to, based on your IP research?
A. That's correct.
Q. If you'll look at the second page, Exhibit 726-D-002, eight entries down there starts a "mike" beginning with IP address 3497. Do you see that entry?
A. Yes.
Q. And there's three of 'em, two more below that or several more below that. And there's another -- were you aware that "mike" was an alias used by Christopher Tarnovsky?
A. I was not.
Q. And there are three "mikes" there, based on the IP research done as shown in Exhibit 726-D, that resolve to Ottawa, Ontario; isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And again, Ontario, that's the location where the

NiPpEr2000 post resolved to, based on your IP research; isn't that right?
A. That's right.

MS. WILLETTS: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: Redirect?

MR. EBERHART: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Eberhart on behalf of NDS. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. EBERHART:
Q. Mr. Emerson, looking at Exhibit 726-D for a moment that you just had in front of you.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Does the fact that Mr. Tarnovsky admitted using the alias "mike," for instance, at one point in time mean that he is the only person who ever used the alias "mike"?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Because, as I mentioned earlier in testimony, when you register for one of these sites, you chose the user name that you want to have.
Q. Does the fact that Chris Tarnovsky admitted using "scatman" in 1996 or 1997 mean that he's the only person who used "scatman" at any time -- at any point in time -THE COURT: Let me pay the same courtesy to both sides. This must be coming in through a deposition. I don't recall, unless the jury does, hearing "scatman" when we were here. So you both can do that, but each of you are assuming something.

So across the board, can you stipulate to the testimony at the time of the deposition, and can you also
stipulate to the time period so you make your point as well?
'Cause right now there's no 1996, 1997 in front of the jury.
So each of you have those pages for a moment?
So apparently, ladies and gentlemen, at a
deposition -- we're about to find out -- and counsel's read
a portion in, but let's find out also if this is 1996 or
1997. Maybe they can just read that in, agree that this is
the depositional testimony without calling Mr. Tarnovsky
back.
Counsel, otherwise, we can get Mr. Tarnovsky back.
MR. EBERHART: I think, Your Honor, we can
stipulate to what he testified to at his deposition.
THE COURT: Why don't you read that portion in
also so you're certain you covered that time period --
MR. EBERHART: Sure.
THE COURT: -- you know, to make your point.
MR. EBERHART: "QUESTION: Do you admit to using
"scatman," S-C-A-T-M-A-N?
"ANSWER: I believe I did use that as well. This
would be very early on in time. All the 'BIGGUN' nics -- to
clarify this, 'BIGGUN/scatman' should have been in the
'96-'97 era of time, no longer afterwards."
THE COURT: All right.
BY MR. EBERHART:
Q. Now, sir, does the fact Mr. Tarnovsky testified at his
deposition that he used -- he believed he used "scatman" in 1996 or 1997 mean that he was the only person to ever use the alias "scatman"?
A. First of all, a large percentage of the sites that are being queried in these searches did not exist in 1996 or '97. Only a very few of them were old enough to have evidence from that period of time.

The second part of my response would be that this speaks back to the issue of a user name again and the ability of anyone to be able to choose that user name if it's available on that particular site.
Q. Does the fact that Mr. Tarnovsky said that he used "bg" or "BIGGUN" as an alias at some point in time mean that he's the only person who could have ever used "bg" or "BIGGUN"?
A. No.
Q. Now, did you search every alias that was listed for Mr. Tarnovsky in the Fourth Amended Complaint?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you searched all of those aliases against your

Pirate Base database, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you reported all of those results, correct?
A. I did, yes.
Q. And you searched those names. Whether or not you believed that Mr. Tarnovsky said he used those names or not,
you just based it on the plaintiffs' allegations, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do any of the IP addresses listed in Exhibit 726-D come even close to matching the IP address that is used -- was used for the NiPpEr2000 posting?
A. None.
Q. And how do you make a determination as to whether those IP addresses are close or not to the NiPpEr2000 IP address?
A. Relationship within a block of IP addresses, proximity.
Q. Do any of the IP addresses listed in Exhibit 726-D fall
within the IP address block that was assigned to Vianet?
A. None.
Q. Now, in response to the subpoena that Ms. Willetts referred to, you conducted searches of Pirate Base, didn't you?
A. I did.
Q. And you provided those searches to counsel to be provided to the plaintiffs?
A. I did.
Q. And those searches were based on keywords that the plaintiffs selected, correct?
A. As they were provided by counsel.
Q. And when you did those searches, had you been retained by NDS?
A. No.
Q. Had you and I ever spoken when you did those searches?
A. No.
Q. Didn't you also give a forensic copy of the Darryl Gray hard drives to the plaintiffs?
A. We did.
Q. And the Darryl Gray hard drives are the location where you found the IP address associated with the NiPpEr2000 posting, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Ms. Willetts asked you about the

ChrisVon@s4.interpass.com e-mail address. Do you remember that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Could that be a fake e-mail address?
A. Could you clarify what you mean by "fake"?
Q. Sure. Could someone sign up for that e-mail address whose name wasn't Chris Von?
A. We do it all the time.
Q. Could Ron Ereiser sign up for an e-mail address like ChrisVon@s4.interpass.com?
A. I have no actions -- I have no knowledge about his actions, but it's possible.

MR. EBERHART: Nothing further.
THE COURT: Recross.

This is Ms. Willetts on behalf of EchoStar.

MS. WILLETTS: Thank you, Your Honor.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. WILLETTS:
Q. Counsel for defendants just asked you about the IP addresses contained in Exhibit 726-D that we just went over extensively, many of which resolve back to Ontario. And he asked you whether or not any of those resolved to a Vianet host or provider, and they did not. Is that your testimony?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. But we did see another post that resolved to Vianet, didn't we?
A. Are you referring to the Usenet exhibit?
Q. Correct.
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And that was the post that was made by dr7_al@my-deja.com?
A. As I recall, that's correct.
Q. Now, you're an expert in forensics. And, as an expert, if you wanted to post something where it can never be traced back to you, conceal your identity so no one ever knew that it was you who was posting the information, what would you do?
A. I can speculate about what the best way would be for the year 2008. I don't know personally what the best way would have been in the year 2000, as I wasn't trying to do
it in the year 2000 .
But the best way would be to mix in with the masses -- to use a public, a very public anonymous proxy in a co-location facility somewhere where there's so much anonymized traffic coming through that box that there's not any chance that the logging or any other documentation normal for an ISP is ever going to be recovered so that I can be identified.

A public shell -- I mean, the deep web -- pirates in the deep web use shells in foreign countries. They're always in co-location facilities, and they generally host tens to hundreds to thousands of people's traffic. Q. So you would conceal your IP address if you didn't want someone to know where you were posting from?
A. I would.

MS. WILLETTS: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Do we need the gentleman back at 5:00 o'clock, Counsel? 5:00 o'clock? Counsel, do we need the gentleman back at 5:00 o'clock?

Better yet, I'm going to order you back at 5:00 o'clock, but if you would also meet us at 3:00 o'clock for just a moment, we'll see if you need to return. That way you won't be inconvenienced if you don't have to return at 5:00. If you do, you'll be here until midnight.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm going to place you on 48 hours' call, though, in case you're needed back or expected to be back in court, but we'll see you back at 3:00 o'clock.
(Witness steps down subject to recall.)

THE COURT: Counsel, your next witness, please.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Your Honor.

The defendants call David Kummer.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And I was just kidding about midnight. You can put that on the record. Although, Counsel, you can share how late we've been together.

MR. STONE: 1:15.

THE COURT: 1:15 in the morning, so they're working hard.

MR. SNYDER: On a Saturday, no less.

THE COURT: Mr. Kummer, if you would be kind enough, sir, to raise your right hand.

DAVID A. KUMMER, DEFENSE WITNESS, SWORN

THE COURT: Have a seat in the witness box.

Sir, would you state your full name for the jury, please.

THE WITNESS: My name is David A. Kummer.

THE COURT: And Mr. Kummer, would you spell your last name, please.

THE WITNESS: It's K-U-M-M-E-R.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

And this is Mr. Snyder on behalf of NDS on direct examination.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Your Honor.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Kummer.

Are you currently the senior vice president of engineering and systems for EchoStar?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And you've held that position since about 2000?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And before being the senior vice president of engineering and systems for EchoStar, you were the vice president of engineering and systems for EchoStar?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And you held that position from about 1998 to 2000?
A. Yes. About that.
Q. Would it be accurate to say, Mr. Kummer, that from 1998 to the present that you have been responsible for the whole satellite system, from end to end?
A. I was responsible for the systems group, but we didn't do, for instance, the uplink sender and the compression equipment. We tested new equipment that would be used there, but we didn't -- weren't responsible for that
portion. But for the design of the system in the satellite set-top boxes, that would be accurate.
Q. Okay. And part of your responsibility as either the vice president or senior vice president of systems and engineering was responsibility for the piracy group; is that right?
A. Well, for the EchoStar signal integrity group. But there were other groups within NagraVision and NagraStar.
Q. Well, within EchoStar there were also other groups that were involved in antipiracy efforts; is that right?
A. Within EchoStar there was a signal integrity group which reported up through me.
Q. And there were portions of the hardware group that also had an antipiracy function?
A. Yes, there were.
Q. Had those reported to you?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. And there were portions of the software group that had an antipiracy function?
A. Yes.
Q. And those also reported to you?
A. Yes.
Q. So the portion of the hardware group responsible for antipiracy and the position of the software group for antipiracy and the signal integrity group, they all reported
to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Were there any other parts of EchoStar that were responsible for antipiracy?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So all of the antipiracy functions at EchoStar reported to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it accurate that one of the responsibilities of the signal integrity group was to monitor the Internet to gain intelligence?
A. Yes.
Q. And one of their responsibilities was to monitor
chatrooms to gain intelligence?
A. Yes.
Q. And one of their responsibilities was to monitor hacker communities to gain intelligence?
A. Yes.
Q. And EchoStar started doing that sometime around 1998?
A. '98, '99 type of time frame, yes.
Q. Was one of their responsibilities to look for account packing?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. What is account packing?
A. Account packing would be where if you had, for
instance, a brother or sister and that you both received a set-top box from EchoStar, but you kept them on the same account, but you actually had them in two physically different locations, that would be considered account packing because you should really have two separate accounts. And so you were saving the cost by only paying a small additional fee for the second set-top box, but you weren't paying for a full other subscription.
Q. Mr. Kummer, is one of the things that the signal integrity group is charged with investigating is gray market piracy?
A. Are you referring, then, from the Canadian side?
Q. Yes.
A. Well, there was some responsibility to investigate piracy that the Canadians were able to get boxes within the United States and activate them and watch United States programming within Canada, yes.
Q. And wouldn't it be part of looking for account packing to look for multiple accounts being sent to a single address?
A. Typically what we looked for was just having a lot of set-top boxes on one account 'cause typically they would only have the bill sent to one of those entities. For instance, if $I$ was sharing with my sister, I would get the bill and pay it, but she would pay me for half of it. So
typically they just looked for a lot of receivers on a single account.
Q. But isn't one of the other things they looked for having multiple accounts at a single address?
A. I don't remember that specifically.
Q. Did part -- did the signal integrity group ever investigate an address at 600 North Main Street in Tonawanda, New York?
A. I'm not aware of that, no.
Q. Was it ever reported to you that there was an investigation of $M$ and $M$ Freight Forwarding?
A. I don't recall that name, no.
Q. Did your group ever investigate Dawn Branton?
A. I don't recall that name either, no.
Q. Did your group ever investigate Margaret Coops (phonetic)?
A. Again, they may have investigated them, but I was not familiar with it, no.
Q. If they did, it wasn't something that was reported to you?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, one of the things that the signal integrity group does is recommend that law enforcement go after certain
pirates that they identify?
A. Yes.
Q. And ultimately that decision rests with you?
A. In some cases they would do that on their own, and I wasn't involved. But in some cases when we got the FBI involved, they did ask for -- if I felt that we should pursue some of that piracy with the FBI.
Q. Okay. And do you also coordinate with Canadian law enforcement in determining whether to chase pirates?
A. I didn't specifically myself, but I know that my group did.
Q. Okay. Has your group ever pursued Ron Ereiser?
A. The name is familiar, and I believe we did, but $I$ don't know the specifics of that.
Q. Is the name familiar because your group chased Ron Ereiser or because he became a NagraStar consultant?
A. I don't remember where $I$ saw the name. We had an ECM report that had a lot of these names in it, and I read those reports on a regular basis. And his name may have been in one of those reports, but $I$ don't remember where I saw it. Q. Are you familiar with the name Charles Perlman,

Mr. Kummer?
A. That name doesn't ring a bell to me.
Q. You don't know whether or not he was someone who was pursued by EchoStar?
A. I do not know.
Q. You do not know whether or not he became a NagraStar
consultant?
A. I don't know that.
Q. Are you familiar with someone named Dean Love?
A. I've heard that name before.
Q. Was he pursued by EchoStar?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you know whether or not he was being compensated by NagraStar as an informant or consultant?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the name Jan Saggiori?
A. No.
Q. Was Mr. Saggiori someone who was pursued by your group -- or antipiracy group?
A. Well, I'm not familiar with him, so --

THE COURT: Excuse me, sir. Who would know, then?

You're in charge of this division. In other words, who knows?

THE WITNESS: Well, some of the people who worked in that that looked at that level of detail may know those people. Renee Coltharp, for instance, was someone who was intimately involved in that. My job was mainly to look at what the pirates were doing and try to figure out --

THE COURT: But you've got reports you can go back and look at, et cetera, to find these answers; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Like I mentioned, we had the electronic countermeasure reports, and these names -THE COURT: Counsel, that's up to you. If you want to continue, you may. If not, I can excuse him, and he can find the answers.

```
MR. SNYDER: We'll continue, Your Honor.
```

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. Mr. Kummer, are you aware of any investigation into a piracy group in Barrie, Ontario done by EchoStar?
A. I've heard the name and the location before, but I don't remember specifically any raids or anything we may have done there. I know we did raids in Canada. And that may be one of them, but $I$ don't specifically remember.
Q. Let me just ask you two more names. Are you familiar with the name Jim Waters?
A. No.
Q. Are you familiar with the name Mike Manieri?
A. No.
Q. I take that back. I'm going to ask you one more.

Are you familiar with the name Mike Maldonado?
A. No.
Q. Any information that anyone in the antipiracy group
from EchoStar or NagraStar ever spoke with Mr. Maldonado?
A. Not that I recall, no.
Q. Now, as part of your work in antipiracy, you would hold
meetings with the various groups that were responsible for antipiracy?
A. Yes. We would hold a meeting and try to discuss the status of piracy and what it looked like they were learning, and if there was ways that we could craft electronic countermeasures to combat piracy. And that was my main focus for chairing that meeting.
Q. Was focusing on countermeasures?
A. Yes.
Q. You know, I'm sorry, Mr. Kummer -- I need to go back for just a moment. I misspoke.

Do you recognize the name Anthony Maldonado? It's not Mike Maldonado. It's Anthony Maldonado.
A. No, I do not.
Q. Tony Maldonado?
A. No.

MR. SNYDER: Could you show the witness, please, Exhibit 1260.

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. Mr. Kummer, I believe you just testified that one of the things you were focused on was ECMs.
A. Yes.
Q. If you'd look at the last page of Exhibit 1260, which is in evidence. It's titled, "EchoStar ECM History." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you seen this before today?
A. I don't know if I've seen this specific one, but $I$ have seen a document that is similar to this. It may be later in time with additional ECMs on it, but I have seen something in this format before and had at least some of these ECMs listed on them.
Q. When was the first ECM for the EchoStar system?
A. I believe it was in the '99 kind of time frame.
Q. And was that ECM successful?
A. Well, if an ECM would stop piracy for some short period of time, it would deem to be successful. And if it maybe took some of the pirate devices out of the field, then that would be deemed successful.

But ECMs had a typical lifetime, and sometimes they would last longer, and then the pirates would figure out a way to pirate the system again, or not.

So successful is -- we would deem it successful if it at least took the pirates down for some period of time and also maybe rendered some pirate devices inoperable.
Q. Mr. Kummer, this list starts with ECM No. 4, and we don't have anything that lists the first three ECMs, which is why I'm so interested in 'em.

When was ECM No. 2?
A. I don't remember the dates of when the other ECMs
were --
Q. Well, --
A. -- were done.
Q. -- when was ECM No. 3?
A. I think it was in the '99 time frame, but I don't remember.
Q. What did ECM No. 1 target?
A. Initially in 1999, the pirate device was more of a hobbiest-type device. They had some blockers that would, for instance, try to block entitlement messages to the cards. And one of the ways that they would exploit that was to authorize their card on the system and then try to make it that we couldn't deauthorize it. So they actually became a subscriber, and then they would call back up a month later and say, "Well, I don't want to be a subscriber anymore," but they would block those messages from the card. So I vaguely remember one of the ECMs was targeting that type of an attack, but $I$ don't remember exactly.
Q. Was ECM No. 1 targeted at ROM 2 cards?
A. Again, I don't remember specifically what ECM 2 was.
Q. Was ECM No. 2 targeted at ROM 2 cards?
A. I don't remember specifically.
Q. Was ECM No. 3 targeted at ROM 2 cards?
A. I don't remember specifically.
Q. If you look at the last page of Exhibit 1260 , it says
that ECM No. 4 was targeting all pirate commercial DNASP-III cards.
A. I see that.
Q. Is it consistent with your recollection that in

November of 2000 there were commercial DNASP-III cards?
A. I believe there was a small number of cards that were available through some pirate websites, but at that point in time, we didn't know how they were modifying those DNASP-III cards. So that was referring to actually modified DNASP-III cards.
Q. Well, it says "commercial DNASP-III cards," doesn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And there were enough of them out there that you issued an ECM?
A. Yes.
Q. And that ECM was listed as very successful, correct?
A. Yes. Again, for the cards that were in the field, it says it looped the cards, which would make them where they would no longer operate in the system.
Q. And it lists the ECM as very successful?
A. That's what it says, yes.
Q. Okay. Let's look at ECM No. 5. That was the next month, in December 2000, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And it targeted DNASP-II cards. That's ROM 2 cards?
A. Yes.
Q. And that -- the note for that ECM is that the kill of the cards was successful; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then ECM 6 was the very next month; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was also targeting ROM 3 cards?
A. Yes. It was targeting modified DNASP-III cards, and it says it was also targeting cards that had an E3M fix, 2 and 3 cards from a new group, so it was also targeting that as well.
Q. And that was also a successful ECM?
A. Again, at the time, it looped those particular cards that were in the stream, but there were a lot of cards that probably weren't in the stream that didn't receive this looping command because they hadn't been in the stream at that time.
Q. Hadn't been in the stream or maybe were behind blockers or something?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Let's look at ECM No. 7. That's in April of 2001, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that one targets all the IRDs, which is set-top boxes?
A. Yes.
Q. That -- "containing any card that blocks Run EMMs or that are behind a blocker device"; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that one is noted as a successful ECM, correct?
A. Yes. Again, that was the -- it says also it's the
first ECM that was targeting IRDs, so this was a countermeasure that we had done that tried to identify that you had a pirate device in your system and actually tried to kill your set-top box rather than kill your Smart Card.
Q. And it was listed as a successful ECM; isn't that right, Mr. Kummer?
A. Yes. Again, for boxes that had pirate devices in 'em. There were a lot of boxes that didn't have pirate devices in 'em --
Q. So you don't --

THE COURT: Strike the answer and strike the question.

All right. Counsel, once again, please.

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. With an ECM, you don't want to kill set-top boxes that have legitimate cards in them, do you?
A. That's correct.
Q. You only want to kill set-top boxes with pirate cards?
A. Correct.
Q. Let's jump down to the bottom of the page, ECM No. 10. That was July 25th, 2001?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was targeting all ROM 2 and ROM 3 cards that had illegal rights and that do not block the run EMMs, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And it was a very successful ECM; is that right?
A. Yes. Again, at the time, it killed those cards that were in the stream.
Q. Now, Mr. Kummer, the ROM 2 and ROM 3 cards were both based on the same chip; isn't that right?
A. The same ST microprocessor Smart Card, yes.
Q. And the ROM 10 and 11 were also based on the same Smart Card?
A. It's my understanding that there were some differences between the 10 and 11 as it related to anti-glitch capabilities, but they used the same family of microprocessor.
Q. And the first generation of the Aladdin card, which was sometimes called the 101 card, also used -- was based on the same family, wasn't it?
A. Yes. And my understanding was it was the same silicone that was used for ROM 11.
Q. Okay. So the same silicone was used for ROM 2 and for ROM 3, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the same silicone was used for ROM 11 and for ROM 101, the first generation of the Aladdin card, correct?
A. That's my understanding, yes.
Q. And you would agree, wouldn't you, that that was a poor design choice?
A. In 20/20 hindsight as we look back on it, we would say that that was a mistake, yes.
Q. And the same silicone that EchoStar used for the ROM 2 and ROM 3 cards was also used in other systems around the world; isn't that right?
A. By "other systems," do you mean other pay television systems?
Q. I'm sorry. Yes, other pay television systems.
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. So it was used by a system in Canada?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was used by a system in Spain?
A. Yes.
Q. And you would agree that that, too, was a design mistake, wouldn't you?
A. Again, in 20/20 hindsight, we probably wouldn't make that mistake again, yes.
Q. In fact, the reason that that's a mistake is because it can cause the domino effect; hacking or piracy of one system
can lead to hacking or piracy of the other?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, I think you described that as putting the dominoes a little too close together?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Now, Mr. Kummer, you learned in 1999 that the EchoStar system was first hacked?
A. In that time frame, yes.
Q. And I believe that you just testified that in late -even as late as 2000 or the end of 2000, you thought it was still at essentially the hobbyist level?
A. Well, I believe after the code and the techniques were put onto the Internet, that it became more than the hobbyist level, that enough people started to be able to get the ROM code and the EEPROM data from the cards, were able to craft a lot more devices at that point. So it began to proliferate after that occurrence of showing up on the Internet.
Q. Well, isn't it true, Mr. Kummer, that you knew that once the pirates had the code, that they would be able to further pirate the EchoStar system?
A. Well, once they had all of the ROM code in the system -- that was the secret element that was in the system. And once all those secrets were out, then that's what allowed piracy to flourish.
Q. And you knew long before the end of 2000 that that ROM code was out, didn't you?
A. We knew that portions of it were out. But we hadn't seen that they had all of the ROM code until after 2000 . Q. Well, let's follow up on that, Mr. Kummer. You had actually put a secret phrase inside the code so you would know when the pirates had that code, correct?
A. That was not the reason we put it in there, but it was certainly an indication that they had portions of the code, yes.
Q. Well, the jury's heard the phrase that "Nipper is a butt licker." And that was in the EEPROM code, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And, in fact, you came up with that phrase?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And you said that it wasn't to find out whether the pirates had it. Why did you put the phrase in there?
A. The phrase was put in because we were building a standard satellite system under a set of standards called DVB. And we were subsidizing those set-top boxes, and we didn't want someone else to be able to use our subsidized box and say, "Here, here's a new Smart Card that you can plug into EchoStar's box and repoint the dish and you can get this new satellite programming from a new service" that they could offer cheaper because they weren't subsidizing
the box.

And so we had placed that phrase in there so that there was a challenge response between the system and the Smart Card to make sure that if you didn't know that phrase, that you wouldn't be able to use our set-top box to run on a different service.
Q. And the test phrase that you chose was "Nipper is a butt licker"?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And once that phrase -- once you saw that phrase on the Internet, you knew that pirates had at least access to that portion of the code?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And that actually occurred sometime in 1998; isn't that right?
A. I don't remember the exact time frame, but in the '98-'99 time frame.

MR. SNYDER: Could you please show the witness

Exhibit 1694?

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. Mr. Kummer, could you look, please, at the very bottom. If you turn the exhibit sideways so it's in landscape view.
A. Yes.
Q. You'll see a printout or a web address across the bottom, and it indicates that this is from archive.org?
A. I see where it says www.dr7.com/echostarnews. Oh, on the last page it has archive.org.
Q. And you're familiar with archive.org, aren't you?
A. Uh, no.
Q. It is a website that archives historical websites?
A. I'm not familiar with it, no.
Q. Are you familiar with dr7?
A. Yes.
Q. dr7 was a very popular piracy source during the -- or at least source for files and information during the late '90s?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware -- did EchoStar ever try to shut dr7 down?
A. I believe we did, but I'm not specifically sure.
Q. Are you aware that NDS and DirecTV succeeded in shutting dr7 down?
A. I was not aware of that, no.
Q. Do you recognize this -- although it doesn't have the graphics, do you recognize this as a posting from dr7?
A. I actually never went to the dr7 site, so I don't recognize it myself, no.
Q. Okay. Would you look at the bottom of the first page, please, where it says "Monday, October 26th, 1998."
A. Yes.
Q. And then if you'd look at the second page, which is some of the text underneath it -- it just has the print on multiple pages -- the third paragraph says "Today I have added a new .zip file, rev 313, which is more valuable info
coming from the Swiss cheese boys." Do you see that?
MR. WELCH: Your Honor, I'm going to object. He's
reading from a document that's not in evidence right now.
THE COURT: Well, sustained.
MR. SNYDER: I'll move 1694, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. WELCH: Objection, Your Honor. Hearsay. No
foundation.
THE COURT: Well, first I'm going to need to know
where this document came from.
MR. SNYDER: This document was produced from
EchoStar's files, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Was this produced from EchoStar?
MR. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor. It has an EchoStar
Bates number on it.
THE COURT: What's the "confidential" down at the
bottom?
MR. SNYDER: That's the designation under the
protective order that EchoStar affixed.
THE COURT: Objection is overruled. It's
received.
(Exhibit No. 1694 received in evidence.)
(Document displayed.)

MR. SNYDER: Could you hand the witness, please, Exhibit 1692.

THE COURT: Now, Counsel, are you done with 1694?

MR. SNYDER: I am, Your Honor.

1692, the next exhibit, I believe, is the dump from the Swiss Cheese Productions rev 313, which is why we're going to it next.

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. Mr. Kummer, have you seen Exhibit 1692 before today?
A. Um, no, I haven't.
Q. In your responsibility as head of the antipiracy function at EchoStar, would they forward to you a dump of an EchoStar card?
A. No. I relied -- at EchoStar we didn't even know what was in the card. We didn't want to know what was in the card. That was really NagraVision's responsibility. So we relied on NagraVision to look at these dumps and determine whether they were from a card or were they authentic or, you know, what they could get out of 'em.
Q. Okay. If you'd look at the bottom of the first page, that's marked 1692-1, you see a number above that that starts with NVNC046851?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you know whether or not that indicates that this was produced by NagraVision/NagraCard for this litigation?
A. I do not know, no.

MR. SNYDER: Your Honor, I move Exhibit 1692.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. WELCH: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Received.
(Exhibit 1692 received in evidence.)
(Document displayed.)
BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. If you would look at the first page, please, under the heading "read me."
A. Yes.
Q. It says, "Dump from running CAM rev 3.13." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's the same revision number that we saw in

Exhibit 1694?
A. Where it said, "Today I've added a new zip file, rev 3.13," yes.
Q. Okay. And then if you look a couple lines down -- I'm still looking at Exhibit 1692 -- it says, "Copyright 1998, Swiss Cheese Productions." Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And then if you'll turn to the next page, please, and
at the very top it's headed Rev 3.13. And then it has a whole bunch of numbers and letters underneath. And everyone in this courtroom's gotten a bit of education. That's hexadecimal code, right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And on the far right-hand side of that is the same hexadecimal code represented in ASCII?
A. Correct.
Q. So when the hexadecimal code translates into regular characters, it's then human-readable?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you look down to the fourth line, it says
"rev 3.13" -- you go up a little bit more. The fourth line from the top, it says "rev 3.13"?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. And then if you go to the seventh and eighth lines, you've got your target phrase?
A. Yes, I see it there. It says "Nipper is a butt licker."
Q. And this code was copyrighted by the Swiss cheese productions in 1998; isn't that right?
A. Yeah. That's what it says on the front page.
Q. And it was posted on the dr7 website, according to

Exhibit 1694, on October 26th, 1998; isn't that right?
A. Again that's, yes, what the document says.
Q. Now, isn't it true, Mr. Kummer, that you were aware of enough piracy of the EchoStar system in 1998 and 1999 that EchoStar actually requested a card swap?
A. I'm not familiar that we had requested a card swap.
Q. Could you take a look, please, at Exhibit 812. I'm sorry, that's not the right exhibit. 828.

MR. SNYDER: And I believe it's already in
evidence, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.
(Document displayed.)

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. This is a letter that was sent by Mr. Sayeedi?
A. I've not seen this before, but I know of a Mr. Sayeedi, yes.
Q. But in 1999 you were responsible for the antipiracy function at EchoStar?
A. I was involved in the antipiracy. I think in 2000 was actually where $I$ took over the systems group where they actually reported to me, but...
Q. Well, in 1998 to 2000 you were vice president of the systems group, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And during that period the signal integrity group reported to you?
A. Yes. That's right.
Q. And the antipiracy portion of the hardware group reported to you?
A. Yes.
Q. And the antipiracy portion of the software group reported to you?
A. Well, again, the hardware and software group as it related to the set-top box, not to the card.
Q. The signal integrity group wasn't focused just on the set-top box, was it, Mr. Kummer?
A. When you say "the hardware and software group," they were just set-top box hardware and software groups. The signal integrity group, who monitored the chat rooms, was a different function. So the hardware and the software were set-top box hardware and software.
Q. And the signal integrity group was the entire system, correct?
A. Signal integrity group, again, that EchoStar had monitored the chat rooms and tried to find out what piracy was available, tried to order piracy devices and verify whether they could actually work on our system.
Q. And it wasn't focused -- that group was not focused just on set-top box piracy, was it, Mr. Kummer?
A. That's correct.
Q. It was any kind of piracy of the EchoStar system?
A. Yes.
Q. But when EchoStar made the decision to demand a card swap in 1999, you weren't told about it?
A. I may have been told. I don't remember. I didn't see this letter, and I don't remember us actually asking for that.
Q. Isn't it also true that in -- that piracy was sufficiently severe in 1999 that EchoStar actually included in its SEC filings that it may need to engage in a card swap?
A. I believe that's true, yes.
Q. Okay. Let's make sure. Could you take a look at Exhibit 1378, please.

This is a copy of EchoStar's $10-\mathrm{K}$ for the period ending December 31st, 1999. Do you see that near the top of the first page, Mr. Kummer?
A. I'm seeing the --
Q. Under the check to the first box.
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. It says, "Annual Report Pursuant to Section 13 or 15-D
of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 for the fiscal year

Ended December 31st, 1999."
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. If you could turn, please, to page 5.

THE COURT: Is that $1378-000$ or 005 or is it
page 5?

MR. SNYDER: 1378-005, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. There's a section near the top that says "conditional access system"?
A. Yes.
Q. If you could look, please, at the second paragraph. Starting at the third line of that paragraph, it says "However, theft of cable and satellite programming has been widely reported, and our signal encryption has been pirated and could be further compromised in the future.
"We continue to respond to compromises of our encryption system with measures intended to make signal theft of our programming commercially uneconomical. We utilize a variety of tools to continue to accomplish this goal.
"Ultimately, if other measures are not successful, it could be necessary to replace the credit card-size card that controls the security of each consumer set-top box at a material cost to us."

Did I read that correctly, Mr. Kummer?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was the disclosure to the American investing public under the rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the year ended 1999; isn't that right?
A. Yes. But it wasn't put out until March, so it may have also included events that occurred between the end of '99 and March of 2000 .
Q. But that was certainly long before the end of 2000 , wasn't it, Mr. Kummer?
A. Yes.
Q. But it's your testimony that by -- near the end of 2000, piracy had been driven back to the hobbyist level; is that right?
A. Well, we were aware that there were some hacks on our system, and we were trying to do countermeasures to contain that. We thought that we could contain that using electronic countermeasures. But we were alerting the public that if we weren't successful at that, that it might be required to do a full card swap.
Q. Okay. Mr. Kummer, you would agree, wouldn't you, that it's just a guess to estimate the number of pirates of $a$ system? Isn't that right?
A. In a system such as ours, which is a one-way deployment, yes, that's a very difficult thing to get a handle on.
Q. In fact, it's so difficult that you actually said it was a guess?
A. Yes. Everyone has their own guess, their own multiple guesses. We try to put some intelligence behind them. But
we would look at the devices and how easy they were to use and how easy they were to obtain and try to make a guess as to how much piracy there was.
Q. But ultimately it was always just a guess, wasn't it, Mr. Kummer?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, going back to your testimony, then, in late 2000 piracy had been driven back to the hobbyist level. That was actually true again in early 2001, wasn't it?
A. I believe that we were making good progress at that time with our countermeasures, and we thought that we were -- we were keeping the piracy at a low enough level.
Q. Right. Between countermeasures and patches, piracy was essentially under control?
A. We would like to see no piracy, but we didn't feel it was at a level that would require us to go through the expense and the hassle to our customers to do a full card swap.
Q. In fact, isn't it true that you were actually congratulated by the president of EchoStar for having driven piracy back to the hobbyist level?
A. I don't specifically remember that, but you obviously have something that says that $I$ was congratulated.
Q. Well, I'm not trying to be tricky, Mr. Kummer. Why don't we look at Exhibit 812.

MR. SNYDER: And I believe this is also already in evidence, Your Honor.
(Document displayed.)

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. There are two e-mails on the first page. Mr. Kummer, I'd like you to look at the one that begins in the middle of the first page, from Mike Dugan.
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Dugan was the president of EchoStar?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is to Kranti Kilaru and Alan Guggenheim?
A. Yes.
Q. And you are one of the cc's, along with Mark Jackson, on this e-mail; isn't that right?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. If you would look at the fourth paragraph that starts "We need 100 percent focus on this stuff."
A. Yes.
Q. Just to be clear, this e-mail is dated January 31st, 2001?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Dugan writes in that third -- fourth paragraph
of the e-mail, "We have made great progress. We have
destroyed the commercial aspect of stealing. We have made
it clear this is not commercial and driven back to the
hobbyist"; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's what your president, Mr. Dugan, wrote to you and others at the end of January 2001?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, later EchoStar did decide to do a card swap; isn't that right?
A. Yes. Ultimately we did swap all of the ROM 2, 3, 10 and 11 cards.
Q. But that was actually much after -- long after Mr. Dugan's January 31st, 2001 e-mail, correct?
A. It was -- when we finally completed the card swap, I believe, was in 2004 or 2005.
Q. So in 2000 you essentially thought that piracy was at a nuisance level; is that accurate?
A. It hadn't risen to an intolerable level where we felt we needed to go through the expense of replacing all the cards.
Q. Well, didn't you say at your deposition, Mr. Kummer, that, "I would say in early 2000 it was at a nuisance level"?
A. Yes, I believe I said that. I think I also said that it was not at an intolerable level at that point, that we knew in 2000 that the secrets had gotten out and that we may eventually have to do a card swap, but we were going to wait
until it was at an intolerable level.

I may have said it was at a nuisance level at that point in time. But certainly, since we weren't actually swapping cards then, it wasn't at an intolerable level. Q. In fact, in 2001 it remained at a nuisance level; isn't that right?
A. In the beginning of 2001, at least here it was at a nuisance level, I believe --
Q. It had not risen to an intolerable level?
A. Well, in -- in order to do the card swap, we had to do a lot of things to get an alternate card system in place. So in 2001 we actually did start that process with NagraVision to design in our Aladdin card system. And we had to do a lot of preparation work in order to get this parallel system in place before we could actually do a card swap. So we actually had started the process.
Q. Well, let me be clear, Mr. Kummer, because I don't want there to be any confusion. EchoStar's CEO, Mr. Ergen, came here and testified that the decision to do a card swap was in 2002. Are you suggesting that the decision was earlier than that?
A. I don't remember exactly when we decided that we were gonna start putting new cards on. But as soon as we knew that the card was compromised, we knew that we were gonna have to work towards a new card system. And we started
that, as I recall, in the 2001 time frame.
Q. But you knew that back in 1998 the card was compromised?
A. Again, we knew that some portions of the card was available, but we didn't think that all of the secrets had been compromised at that point.
Q. Well, let's try and roll time forward a little bit. When piracy got to an intolerable level, it was because of the introduction of free-to-air piracy; isn't that right, Mr. Kummer?
A. Well, I would say that that was the culmination of the piracy and that's when it got to that level, but there was a lot of piracy devices in the interim. And so that's when it got to the level where we no longer felt that we could do electronic countermeasures and we could control it. So it happened to be at the same time that the free-to-air devices were becoming popular as a way to hack our system.
Q. Right. When free-to-air receivers became popular as a way to hack your system, that's when you determined that piracy had reached an intolerable level; isn't that right?
A. That's correct. That's when we decided we had to complete the card swap.
Q. And, Mr. Kummer, free-to-air devices started to become available or popular in 2002; isn't that right?
A. My recollection is more the 2003 time frame.
Q. And isn't it true that when free-to-air boxes became introduced, you could see the writing on the wall a little bit where this was headed, and that's when it became an
intolerable level? Isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And you're referring to the introduction of free-to-air devices?
A. Yes. That's when we could no longer do the countermeasures that we were doing on the set-top box.
Q. And that's because free-to-air devices don't use the EchoStar set-top box; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that's because free-to-air devices don't use the Smart Card?
A. That's correct.
Q. And because free-to-air devices don't use the EchoStar set-top box or Smart Card, you could not control them with ECM's or patches, correct?
A. We still had some ECM's that we could do against the free-to-air boxes, but they were not as effective.
Q. And it was because you could not do effective ECM's and effective patches against free-to-air receivers that

EchoStar decided to do a card swap; isn't that right, Mr. Kummer?
A. Again, it was a culmination of all the hacking devices
at that point where we decided that we needed to do the card swap.
Q. But, Mr. Kummer, I'm asking you a very specific and I don't think very difficult question. When FTA receivers became popular, because you could no longer do ECM's and patches, that is when EchoStar decided to do a card swap; isn't that right?
A. No. That's not the only reason.
Q. It's not because they -- because the free-to-air devices became popular?
A. It was at that time, but it's not the only devices that were available still at that time frame.

MR. SNYDER: Your Honor, I'd like permission to
play Mr. Kummer's deposition at page 196, lines 13 to 23.

THE COURT: You may.
(Videotape played as follows.)
"QUESTION: Was it at a nuisance level in 2001, in
your opinion?
"ANSWER: As I remember" --

THE COURT: Well, Counsel -MR. SNYDER: Just cut it, please. (Video discontinued due to technical

```
difficulty.)
```

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. Mr. Kummer, in your deposition were you asked this
question, and did you give this answer?
"QUESTION: Was it at a nuisance level in 2001, in your opinion?
"ANSWER: As I remember, like I said, until the free-to-air boxes became available, which I believe was in the 2002 time frame -- and even then it was -- you know, it kind of started up at a small ramp. It took them awhile to get to be at a popular level. But that's when they started to become introduced. And when they started to become introduced, we could see the writing on the wall a little bit where this was headed. So that's really where I would say it became an intolerable level."

That was your testimony, wasn't it, Mr. Kummer?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. And when it got to an intolerable level, that was when EchoStar decided to do a card swap; isn't that right?
A. Yes. That's when the piracy had reached a level of intolerance. It happened to coincide when the free-to-air boxes had become available.
Q. Is it your testimony now, Mr. Kummer, that that's just a coincidence?
A. It's my testimony that the free-to-air boxes were the culmination of all the hacking devices that occurred over time. And because the pirates had compromised the secret element of the system, they were able to improve the piracy
devices over time. And free-to-air was just another improvement on piracy devices.
Q. Mr. Kummer, you're aware, aren't you, that the plaintiffs have agreed in this case that NDS is not responsible for FTA piracy?
A. No, I wasn't aware of that.
Q. You don't know that?
A. I was not aware of that, no.
Q. And it was the introduction of FTA piracy that could not be controlled by ECM's and patches that pushed piracy of the EchoStar system from a tolerable level to an intolerable level; isn't that right?

MR. WELCH: Your Honor, I'm going to object. He misstated what the parties were going to stipulate to, which hasn't been done yet, as it relates to free-to-air. We'd move to strike his question and the testimony. THE COURT: Just reask the question.

BY MR. SNYDER:
Q. Okay. Mr. Kummer, isn't it true that the introduction of free-to-air boxes, which are not susceptible to ECM's and which are not susceptible to patches in the same way as Smart Card piracy, is what moved piracy from a tolerable level to an intolerable level?
A. That's when the piracy became an intolerable level for us and we had to complete the card swap.

MR. SNYDER: No more questions.

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

You're admonished not to discuss this matter amongst yourselves nor to form or express any opinion concerning the case.

We'll see you in about 20 minutes.
(Jury recesses.)
(Outside the presence of the jury.)
THE COURT: All right. We're on the record. The jury's no longer present.

The gentleman who testified, Mr. Emerson, do you need him back, Counsel? And if so, we'll have him come back at 5:00. Do you need Mr. Emerson back?

MR. HAGAN: We do not need him back, Your Honor. We are fine with the cross-examination as it stands.

THE COURT: You don't need any further discovery. Are you requesting discovery that you have previously requested at 1:00 o'clock?

MR. HAGAN: We do not feel that we need any further discovery, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
Then, Mr. Emerson, 48 hours' call. Thank you, sir.
(Witness excused subject to recall.)
(Recess held at 3:05 p.m.)
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| 43:2 | 28 89:6 | 714 1:23 |  |  |
| 1998 49:17,19 |  | 726-D 32:14,23 |  |  |
| 51:19 67:14 | 3 | 33:21 39:23 |  |  |
| 68:24 71:22 | 3 59:4,23 61:7,10 | 40:17 41:5 44:3 |  |  |
| 72:21,24 73:2 | 63:4,10,25 | 44:10 46:5 |  |  |
| 73:20 82:2 | 64:10 80:8 | 726-D-001 34:2 |  |  |
| 1999 2:20 59:8 | 3.13 71:14,20 72:1 | 37:8 |  |  |
| 65:6 73:2,15 | 72:13,14 | 726-D-002 35:1 |  |  |
| 75:2,7,14,21 | 3:00 47:21 48:3 | 40:7 |  |  |
| 76:25 | 3:05 88:1 |  |  |  |

