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SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, MAY 2, 2008 DAY 15 - VOLUME III (1:01 p.m.)
(The following proceedings is taken outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: All right. We are back on the record. All counsel are present.

Thank you for your courtesy, Counsel.

And Counsel, we are going to recall Mr. Kahn?

MR. EBERHART: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SNYDER: Your Honor, before we get the jury, can I tell you NDS's --

THE COURT: Certainly. Have a seat.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you.

We'd like to finish with Mr. Kahn, and then play
the video of Mr. Osborne, and then NDS will rest.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, let me make certain that I consistently --

I'm sorry, Mr. Kahn, pardon my discourtesy. If you'd wait outside for just a moment.

I think your position is in stone, and I hear that; I respect it. I take it that you have not called Dr. Peled.

MR. SNYDER: Actually, your Honor, I did speak
briefly to Dr. Peled.

THE COURT: Okay. And is your position still the same, that he will not appear?

MR. SNYDER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Then this has tremendous
ramifications, potentially, for NDS, not in terms of judicial proceedings, but I hope that you and Dr. Peled have discussed his position representing NDS, just as Mr. Ergen or Kudelski represent their respective companies. For a significant period of time, not only have I placed all parties on notice concerning the gravity of the allegations, but also tried to make a record that people were put on the stand who had limited information, regardless of your designating them corporate representatives. Mr. Lenoir, Mr. Rubin, very nice gentlemen, but limited information, from my perspective, and $I$ think the jury's.

Not only is the conflict between the two of you -have taken on some of the aspects of a duopoly, but in reflecting on my prior comments, I not only believe it affects the American subscriber, but it affects the respective shareholders of your corporations. And whether it's Mr. Peled or Mr. Ergen, if you're publicly traded, you place yourself in a far different position than you do as a privately held company.

So if a verdict returns that's unfavorable to
either of the parties, and those who have what appears to be the most information and are available to that company -Mr. Eberhart, why don't you have a seat. Then, unrelated to this case, I can imagine that the shareholder suits that might grow out of -- out of that failure or unwillingness for the very echelon or top people to appear. Now, that has nothing to do with this lawsuit, but it has a lot to do with presidents and CEOs taking those responsible positions and realizing that they not only represent shareholders explicitly, but also the effect of this lawsuit does affect the subscribing public, generally. It's almost unimaginable to me that the heads of corporations, although I haven't said that to the jury and I will not, and all my comments have rather been insulated from the jury, except for the somewhat facetious tongue-in-cheek statement that all parties were warmly invited to attend. Beyond that, none of my comments have come in front of the jury thus far.

The question becomes whether this Court would view this as an adverse inference, and I will probably decline to call for the jury making an adverse inference, but Mr. Peled, on behalf of NDS, the company he ably represents, puts himself in the position when the jury is informed of his ability to appear and actually having had him here, and a videotape is then played of not having the following
benefit. And I just want to say this to you, abide by your decision. Sometimes that what seems harmful is mollified by virtue of taking the witness stand and being able to comment upon what the meaning of -- of a statement is. It's never quite as bad, in other words, as it seems, and it's never quite as good as it seems, and that's supposed to be the American adversarial system.

Well, Dr. Peled, literally, is here and apparently makes the choice, and maybe with the advice of counsel, I'm not going to subscribe to that, leaves this jurisdiction. This Court's already taken its position, and from the beginning of this case to the end, I've been consistent in that, and I will not back away from it.

Now, how I word that $I$ hope will be informational, and I'll let the jury draw their own inference from the instructions, because there's an instruction concerning consciousness of guilt or the unwillingness or ability not to produce a party. And by that party having been here and taken the conscious choice so close in time to a deposition that may or may not be favorable, which literally, NDS now controls in terms of how they play this deposition -- I'm sorry, EchoStar now controls in how they play this
deposition. It places Dr. Peled, potentially, in the worse position of having all the bad things played that might have occurred, and of course, your designations following, but he
can't explain. He can't mollify. He can't say the intent that was on his mind or the goodness he had for the company. So I think it's actually with great sadness, not with any joy in my heart, that I'm going to need to take that position with the jury. But in consistently forewarning both of you, I set the stage early on, so this should come as no surprise to EchoStar, whose been leaned on very hard by the Court, and it should come to no surprise as to NDS.

I think you're right, Mr. Snyder, you have the way -- you have the right to control the tactics of your case. You can make those decisions. I'm sure you've expressed or talked about the potentiality of any shareholder suits that grow out of this if there is an adverse verdict and Dr. Peledson (sic) not taking the stand to explain NDS's position personally. But $I$ think the greatest concern is that if there is material information that he possesses, of all the people in the corporate structure, Charlie Ergen and Dr. Peledson (sic) appear to be the two primary people that really represent the corporations and set the tone of responsibility. And it's a little difficult to watch EchoStar and NDS put on a case where well-intentioned and semi-knowledgeable people take the stand, but there is always an insulation that they weren't at a particular meeting, didn't have that responsibility or segmented out in some way.

So I know you thoughtfully considered it. It's, frankly, with great sadness and great concern on my part that the Court's in this position. I will follow through, though, on my admonishment.

All right. If you'd be kind enough to have Mr. Kahn take the stand, and we'll say, instead of admonishment, information to the jury.

Oh, and by the way, on that subject, the Court's found numerous cases in which the Court can draw an adverse inference, which $I$ will not be drawing, that it be left for argument and instructions. And the Court believes that this will be the middle position in terms of sharing this information with the jury.
(The following proceedings is taken in the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: The jury is present. All counsel are present. The parties are present.

Counsel, thank you for your courtesy.

And Counsel, if you'd like to proceed with your examination.

This is Mr. Eberhart.

RAYNOLD KAHN, DEFENDANTS' WITNESS, RESUMED

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. EBERHART:

Q Good afternoon, Dr. Kahn.

Before we took the lunch break, you were asked several questions about whether you were comfortable with certain information being shared. I have a few questions for you along those lines as well.

Would you be comfortable with confidential DirecTV documents being shared with Ron Ereiser?

A Absolutely not.
Q Would you be comfortable with stolen DirecTV documents being in the hands of NagraStar and EchoStar?

A Absolutely not.
Q Would you be comfortable with NagraStar's investigator, JJ Gee, purchasing stolen DirecTV documents for $\$ 5,000$ from a known pirate?

A Absolutely not.
Q You testified before lunch that DirecTV did not care about the status of piracy of the vendors they were talking to in 1998 and '99. Can you explain to the jury why that was the case?

A Well, what $I$ said was that the fact that a particular card which was already an old card was pirated was not a concern, because it was an expectation. What was much more interesting to us would be how a security company would respond to piracy, both in terms of countermeasures and operational capability, and also, in talking to companies that we might work with to what their technical security
technology capabilities were that we could work together with in order to develop what we knew was a necessity to jointly develop a next generation card --

Q Okay.
A -- which was not available on the market at that time. Q You also testified about potential acquisition of a conditional access company by DirecTV; do you recall that? A Yeah.

Q What company was that?
A I was not directly involved, but I believe there were talks with Irdeto in that direction.

Q Now, you also testified this morning that the engineering group at DirecTV was skeptical about doing a swap in the 1998 or 1999 time frame; why was that?

A Well, besides the fact that -- that a conditional access system would require many changes in order to match our requirements, and those are all of the parts of the system, the card as well as the headend systems, there were a few other issues that were a real problem.

One of the issues was that the card needs to interface with software in the set-top box, and at that time, a large part, if not the majority of the set-top boxes that DirecTV had fielded in the field were of original legacy models, which did not have the capability for any kind of software download. So for that population of 3 or 4 million boxes,
a -- a swap of CA would not entail only the cards, but would necessitate sending completely new boxes to all of those customers.

And then the other -- and the other subset of boxes which were capable of software downloads, the way DirecTV at that point managed set-top boxes was that there were many different companies that provided set-top boxes, and each of those companies developed their own software. And so in order to do a -- upgrade those boxes for a new CA system, there would need to be an integration process with every one of those manufacturers and development of new software and scheduled downloads, a potential nightmare. Some of the older boxes that were downloadable, the manufacturers were no longer supporting further changes, so that part of it was very difficult.

But another part that is not insignificant at all is the impact on -- on the normal operations of our business. I mean, it's amazing when you have to mail out millions of Smart Cards, just simple Smart Cards that you put in an envelope and send to someone, how much that disrupts normal business operations and how much customer service calls you have to field just to deal with customer questions. And so having to replace millions of set-top boxes or downloads to boxes that are synchronized with -- when new cards arrive is really a nightmare, not only in terms of the cost involved
and in terms of the effort, but it -- it kind of violates
our prime directive, which is to keep our customers happy.
And I mean, that's -- that's the most important thing, is to
provide the -- the quality television experience to the
customers. So there's a -- the risk of disrupting our
service by -- by doing something like -- like -- like a
swap-out would -- of that nature would be, you know,
extreme.
And looking at our headend systems, that -- it's very
sensitive, and it's taken a long time to stabilize, you
know, a billing system that runs smoothly and that customers
have -- you know, have continual availability and
scalability and interfaces. It's a very difficult process,
and to take a system that you've spent seven years, seven,
eight -- eight years developing and -- and fine-tuning, and
then sort of ripping it out or rewriting it and starting
from fresh, it really is -- you know, it's a threat to the
business to undertake such a thing.
So it's -- it was our evaluation that -- that, you
know, such an undertaking would not, you know, be anything
that -- that the business would really undertake. But we
needed to go through the -- the analysis and be able to show
to our management this is what we'll have to change, and
this will be the impact, and this is how much it's going to
cost the company, and they would bear that in mind while
looking at financial options. You know, so the amount of financial savings in such an approach would have to be, you know, really major.

And -- and so that's part of the reason why we believe that, you know, since we had secured the right through our negotiation with NDS that if DirecTV became the successor contractor, then DirecTV had the rights to use all of the technology, and so we would continue to use the system as built and make improvements thereupon, which was -- which had much less risk to our, you know, fundamental business. MR. EBERHART: Michael, could you show the witness Exhibit 1565, please. BY MR. EBERHART:

Q Mr. Kahn -- Dr. Kahn, I only have one question about this document that plaintiffs' counsel showed you before lunch. Who is the recipient of this request for information?

A Well, it says "Nagra."
Q It's not NagraStar, is it?

A No, it's not.

MR. EBERHART: Could you show the witness
Exhibit 1556, please.
BY MR. EBERHART:

Q Who is the contracting party with DirecTV on

Exhibit 1566, which is the study contract?

A Kudelski, SA.

Q It's not NagraStar or EchoStar, is it?

A No.

MR. EBERHART: Please show the witness

Exhibit 530.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, sir, what was that last
exhibit? Was that 1556 that was in front of you?

MR. EBERHART: 1566, your Honor.
THE COURT: 1566.

BY MR. EBERHART:

Q Dr. Kahn, who is the recipient of Exhibit 530, which is
a letter from DirecTV?

A It's Alan Guggenheim, Nagra, Kudelski, SA.

Q And is there an address there?

A Cheseaux, Switzerland.

Q That letter is not addressed to NagraStar or EchoStar, is it?

A No.

Q In fact, none of DirecTV's interactions with potential conditional access vendors were with NagraStar or EchoStar; that's correct, isn't it?

A Yes.

MR. EBERHART: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Counsel, any questions?

MR. HAGAN: No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. You may step down.

And I believe that the evidence will conclude no later than next Tuesday, so if you can remain available, sir, until the date of -- well, I'm going to say May 9th just to be certain, but the jury is going to be gone -- just May 9th, sir, okay?

Thank you very much.

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

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, your Honor. The defense calls by video William Osborne.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

This is a videotape, again, of the witness.

Is it William Osborne, Counsel?

MR. SNYDER: Yes, William Osborne. He goes by
"Billy Joe."

THE COURT: Okay. You may play the videotape of William Osborne.
(Videotape played of William Joe Osborne.)

6:10 Q. Good morning, Mr. Osborne. Would you
please state your full name for the record.
6:12 A. Bill -- actually, Billy Joe Osborne, Jr.
6:13 Q. And where do you reside, Mr. Osborne?

6:14 A. In Pikeville, Tennessee.

6:15 Q. And approximately how long have you lived in Tennessee?

6:17 A. Four years.

6:18 Q. Where did you reside before then?

6:19 A. Bolingbrook, Illinois. It's over by

6:20 Chicago.

Page Range: 7:14-7:16

7:14 Q. And you understand that you are giving
testimony today under oath?
7:16 A. Yes.

Page Range: 051:22-54:22

51:22 Q. Now, who were the members of the Dishplex and Digital Adventures groups? And I say groups in the plural because it sounds like there's --

51:25 A. Multiple groups.

52: 52 Q. Multiple groups, and -- but with a lot
of associations, whether they're obvious associations or not.

52: 4 A. Right. Well, let's see. Digital Adventures was spearheaded by Dennis Renaud, and he had Larry Pilon working with him and Pat St. James in Canada.

52: 7 The U.S. arm would include Bob and John --

52: 8 Q. And Bob and John, would that be Bob

Schultz?

52: 9 A. Yeah, Bob Schultz.

52:10 Q. And is it John Winiecki?

52:11 A. Yeah, it's John Winiecki.

52:12 Q. Okay.

52:13 A. And Chad Arnett, alias, which would be Tim Nemeth, and myself.

52:15 Q. How about Dale Kubin? Was he an associate of either Digital Adventures or Dishplex?

52:17 A. He was. He was like myself. We were -- we never tied ourselves down to one particular group.

52:19 I mean we were -- we would go where the technology was.

52:21 Q. And what about Don Nance? Was he associated with Digital Adventures?

52:23 A. Don Nance was associated with Dishplex.
52:24 Anybody involved with Dishplex, it's safe to say that they were involved in all groups --

53: 1 Q. Okay.
53: 2 A. -- that I've mentioned here today.

53: 3 Q. Was Bryan Dorsett involved in Digital
53: 4 Adventures or Dishplex?

53: 5 A. To a point. When -- when there was
something -- when Pete would get stuck on an item he would e-mail part of some source code to Bryan Dorsett which would take a look at it, and then he would tell Don about it. And it was -- it was more of like a favor-type deal. They
weren't expecting anything out of it except maybe to make their own devices.

53:13 Q. Okay. Am I correct that Mr. Dorsett was an active hacker as known by you?

53:15 A. Yes, probably the best out there.

53:16 Q. And was there a particular system that Mr. Dorsett hacked?

53:18 A. Yes, the DIRECTV.

53:19 Q. Okay. And am I correct that Mr. Dorsett is currently incarcerated?

53:21 A. Yes.

53:22 Q. You mentioned a collaboration it sounds like between Mr. Dorsett and Pete. Do you know Pete's last name?

53:25 A. No, not off --

54: 1 Q. Do you --

54: 2 A. -- the top of my head.

54: 3 Q. Do you know where Pete resides?
54: 4 A. He -- he lived down in a -- in a rented house from Dennis Renaud in Thunder Bay.

54: 6 Q. Did Pete use an alias or nickname as known by you?

54: 8 A. He had one in an -- in an IRC channel. I don't recall what it was though off the top of my head.

54:11 Q. Are you familiar with the name Dish

Farmer?

54:12 A. Yes.

54:13 Q. Do you associate that name with this individual Pete?

54:15 A. It's been so long. That Dish Farmer
name -- I -- you know, two people come to mind when $I$ hear that. Pete is one of them, and then the other one is someone that was known as Gunsmoke 2, but Dish Farmer was -- was always in the -- in Dishplex IRC channels. So I would -- I would take an educated guess -- I can't be for sure it was so long ago -- that Dish Farmer I'm fairly certain was Pete.

Page Range: 072:16-74:8
72:16 Q. Now, in spring of 2000 as relates to this date, to your knowledge was there a -- an available hack for the EchoStar system?

72:19 A. Spring of 2000?
72:20 Q. Yes.

72:21 A. To my knowledge there was always a hack for EchoStar.

72:23 Q. When was the first time you were aware that there was a hack for the EchoStar system?

72:25 A. It was a -- you know, I would say as soon as I got involved with Dishplex, I always knew that you know, all of the smaller dishes could be hacked to some degree. The -- the actual hack, we really weren't focused on
that for EchoStar until -- until we started having problems with DIRECTV. And then that's when the groups started their really hard push for EchoStar.

73: 8 I mean, it was always there, but then they tried to hack it and secure the hack, which is very difficult to do even in the best -- even the best programmer couldn't keep that from happening.

73:12 Q. Okay. Let's understand this better. When was the first time you put your hands on a device for hacking the EchoStar system, if you recall?

73:15 A. I don't recall the date. The first time would be when I had the key puller dropped off at my house.

73:18 Q. And that was the device you received from Mr. Renaud?

73:20 A. Yes. And it was dropped off by Bob Schultz and John Winiecki.

73:22 Q. Okay. And that would have been when you were still living in Illinois?

73:24 A. Yes. They -- they dropped it off because they were going to spend the next two weeks in Thunder Bay setting up Pete's lab.

74: 2 Q. What is this lab that you're referring to?

74: 3 A. It's a house that was rented and Bob and John had rented some pretty heavy duty equipment, one being
a focused ion beam, and other devices that Pete said he
would need to continue to hack the EchoStar and the DIRECTV
without the assistance of Don Nance and Dorsett.
Page Range: 076:13-78:10
76:13 Q. Okay. Let me -- let me better understand
this lab that you're referring to. You said that it was in
Thunder Bay, Ontario, correct?
76:16 A. Yes.
76:17 Q. And the lab was set up at least by
Mr. Renaud; is that correct?
76:19 A. Yes.
76:20 Q. And the technical person that was
associated with this lab was Pete whose last time you do not
know, correct?
76:23 A. Right, yes.
76:24 Q. And you said that -- I think you said Bob
and John provided certain equipment to the lab?
77: 1 A. Yeah. They -- they provided the -- they
provided the financial needs for the lab. If there wasn't
any working devices or no monies coming in from any type of
sale or devices then, you know Bob and John would pull it
out of their own pockets. Yeah. I know that they -- they had
rented a lot of that equipment that -- that was up there.
77: 9 Q. And did you ever visit the lab in Thunder
Bay?

77:11 A. No. I was -- I was unable to go into

Canada. I only went to Canada twice because of a prior felony conviction. Canada -- Canada would not let me in.

77:15 Q. Okay. And -- but when you say Bob and John were getting equipment for the lab, did they provide it to Thunder Bay as far as you know?

77:18 A. Yes, they -- they drove it up there.

77:19 Q. Okay. And what type of equipment did you understand they were bringing to this lab?

77:21 A. Well, one that really sticks out the most was the -- the focus ion beam, big microscope thing they had because $I$ know that was a fairly expensive piece of equipment. And they had rented it, and they were making some pretty substantial payments.

78: 1 I just remember them telling me verbally from all of them that, you know, they're paying upwards of $\$ 20,000$ a month in rental fees for all the different items that they had up there, not to mention paying Peter a salary.

78: 6 Q. Okay. And you -- you refer to Bob and

John. That's Bob Schultz?

78: 8 A. Yes.

78: 9 Q. And John Winiecki?

78:10 A. Yes.

Page Range: 079:5-80:25

79: 5 Q. Okay. And what was the purpose of acquiring the focus ion beam?

79: 7 A. From my understanding, it's what's needed to look into that gold chip on the back.

79: 9 Q. And you're referring to the microprocessor that is found on the EchoStar access Card?

79:11 A. Yes.

79:12 Q. And the purpose for getting into that chip if you will was for what? What -- why would one need this piece of equipment to get into the chip?

79:15 A. Well, they needed to pull the source code from that chip and they needed it to navigate through the chip if I'm not mistaken.

79:18 Q. Do you know if Pete or anyone associated with this lab was successful in that respect?

79:20 A. Yes.

79:21 Q. And how do you know that?

79:22 A. Because it was -- part of it was posted on Dishplex website for validity that, hey, this was hacked and this is what -- they gave, you know -- they gave like a few lines of it that a -- a good programmer might be able to realize, okay, yeah, this was actually pulled.

80: 3 Q. So am I correct that as you understood portions of the EchoStar code were extracted from the EchoStar card and posted on the Dishplex website?

80: 7 A. Yes. If I'm not mistaken, I -- I think I may have that. Might be in there in that software that I gave you guys.

80:10 Q. And it's your belief that the purpose for doing that was to show that the group had successfully hacked into the EchoStar card?

80:13 A. Yes.

80:14 Q. And do you know when about that -- what time that took place?

80:16 A. I can't recall exact time.

80:17 Q. 2000, 2001?

80:18 A I would still -- I would still say it was 2000 .

80:20 Q. Okay. Was the research used to develop a particular device or product?

80:22 A. Yes, the EK-1.

80:23 Q. Okay. So this research took place prior to the development of the EK-1?

80:25 A. Yes.

Page Range: 082:10-84:6
82:10 Q. And you understood that other pieces of equipment were being acquired for purposes of -- of this lab up in Thunder Bay?

82:13 A. Yes.

82:14 Q. And, again, this equipment was to be used
for hacking the EchoStar system, correct?
82:16 A. Yes.
82:17 Q. Did Pete also engage in hacking other
satellite systems?
82:19 A. DIRECTV stuff.
82:20 Q. Okay. So the lab was being used for both
purposes?
82:22 A. Yes.
82:23 Q. But the results of the hack research at
least as it related to EchoStar was the posting of code
extracted from the card on the Dishplex website?
83: 2 A. Yes.
83: 3 Q. As well as the development of the EK-1
device?
83: 5 A. Yes.
83: 6 Q. Would it have also included the
development of the key puller device that you testified
about?
83: 8 A. Yes.
83: 9 Q. Were there other devices or technology
that were developed out of the lab in Thunder Bay that
related the EchoStar system?
83:12 A. I'm sure there were some others out
there. The names elude me at present. I would -- how that
lab operated -- the lab always operated in a catch-up mode,
meaning that Dennis and Pete were always in competition with Don Nance and Bryan Dorsett. Bryan Dorsett would be your, let's say the Ferrari of programmers, and Pete would be
your -- your Dodge Charger, let's sort of say, you know.
83:20 So, there was a lot of -- there was some
sharing on the premise that, hey, we're all in -- in one
group, but one group stemmed in a bunch of little groups.
And, you know, no -- everybody didn't know what the other
hand was doing. It was -- it's -- oh, it was like everybody
for themselves almost.
84: 2 Q. But the group shared a common goal that
if you developed a device like the EK-1, you all --
84: 4 A. Yes.
84: 5 Q. -- benefited from the sales?
84: 6 A. Yes.
Page Range: 098:15-99:18
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98:15 Q. Okay. Would it be fair to say that there
was a point in time when you were aware there were ways to
hack the EchoStar system?
98:18 A. Well, from day one when $I$ first found
hacks for the DIRECTV.
98:20 Q. So back in 1998, '99, you were aware that
there were --

98:22 A. Yes.

98:23 Q. -- ways to hack? But that your personal interest in hacking the EchoStar system came about when the EK-1 device was developed; is that correct?

99: 2 A. Yes.

99: 3 Q. And that device was developed because there was a shift in the market and the sale of hack devices for the EchoStar system were either more popular or easier to manufacture than devices for the DIRECTV system?

99: 8 A. Yeah. It worked like that and -- and -and it's like a supply and demand type issue. There was really -- there was two really big ECMs that DIRECTV had shot down and that kept -- that kept users down a couple of months. And during that couple of months, you know, everybody was starting to look at EchoStar then because the primary -- the first thought of it was that, okay, they shut it down for good this time. And then that's when Dorsett, you know, came across the -- the patch or the fix for the Black Sunday.

Page Range: 089:9-93:14

89: 9 Q. Okay. So the first step in this process would be the customer would give you his or her --

89:11 A. Card.

89:12 Q. -- EchoStar card? Okay. You would extract the key from that card and give it to the customer?

89:14 A. Yes. You know, there were times that the customer did have their keys already.

89:16 Q. Okay. And then you indicated that the -there is source code that is stored on the Atmel chip that is -- the chip on the circuit board is pictured in Exhibit Number 141?

89:20 A. Yes.

89:21 Q. And how was that source code applied?
89:22 A. Through an Atmel chip programmer.
89:23 Q. Was that a function that you performed?

89:24 A. No.
89:25 Q. Who performed that function?
90: 1 A. Chips were given to me personally by Bob and John.

90: 3 Q. And that would be Bob Schultz --

90: 4 A. Bob Schultz and John Winiecki.
90: 5 Q. Okay. And so the -- the devices were given to you already with the source code on the Atmel chip?

90: 8 A. Yes.

90: 9 Q. Was any other code needed to be applied at that point for the device to function?
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90:11 A. No.

90:12 Q. Okay. And then you said the next step in

90:13 this process was to insert the circuit board

```
into the IRD, correct?
```

90:15 A. Yes.

90:16 Q. And how would you insert the device?

Where would it go?
90:18 A. It would go in where the card normally goes.

90:19 On the bottom of the EK-1, as you can see here, there's a little pad that would go to the IRD inside the receiver, and that would go back into here in the chip replacing card.

90:23 Q. Okay. Just so I'm correct in understanding the circuit board was actually inserted into the card slot on the IRD?

91: 1 A. Yes.

91: 2 Q. And on a lawfully subscribed EchoStar system, there'd be an EchoStar access Card in that slot?

91: 5 A. Yes.

91: 6 Q. But on a hack system, this circuit board device would be inserted in place of the card?

91: 8 A. Yes, that's correct.

91: 9 Q. And then you described one last step in this process. You said something about rolling keys. Can you explain what you meant?

91:12 A. The -- to my knowledge, the security that

Echostar was using, they would remodulate the keys or they would do something that required numeric codes to be typed into this device.

91:16 $I$ don't know the exact mechanics of it on the -- on the -- the source code level, but I'm familiar with, you know, the string of keys. I want to say they're double digits, maybe seven keys. If I remember correctly, maybe seven parts of keys. And they were each, like, dual sides like 0108 17. Things of that nature. And they would be typed in there.

91:24 Q. Okay. Well, let's -- let's break that down.

91:25 The -- as you understood, EchoStar was issuing commands that required new keys to be entered for these devices to function, correct?

92: 3 A. Yes.

92: 4 Q. What was your understanding of why EchoStar did that?

92: 6 A. That was their -- their way of counter measuring the theft.

92: 8 Q. So they were trying to stop pirate devices?

92: 9 A. Yes.

92:10 Q. Okay. And your response to that was to supply your customers, and $I$ think you said you did it by

```
e-mail --
    92:13 A. Yes.
    92:14 Q. -- with the new keys?
    92:15 A. Yes.
    92:16 Q. And those new keys would be inputted into
the EK-1 device using the key pad that you identified?
    92:19 A. Yes.
    92:20 Q. How would you or your group obtain the
new keys that had to be inputted by the customers?
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    92:22 A. Those were handed down from -- or by
Dennis by way of Peter.
    92:24 Q. So was this part of the research that was
taking place in Thunder Bay?
    93: 1 A. Yes.
    93: 2 Q. And so as part of that research as
Understood by you, the new keys were being identified or
extracted and being sent to you or to the customers of
Dishplex and Digital Adventures?
    93: 6 A. Yes.
    93:7 Q. And did those new keys work?
    93: 8 A. Yes.
    93: 9 Q. Did you personally go through this
process of entering keys into a device?
```

93:11 A. Yes.

93:12 Q. And how frequently would you have enter these new keys for the device to work?

93:14 A. Usually once a week.
Page Range: 015:16-17:16

15:16 Q. Okay. You were associated with this
entity called Digital Adventures; is that correct?

15:18 A. Yes.

15:19 Q. And there's a description on this
Airbill -- directing your attention to the handwritten portion towards the bottom of the document. Can you just read for the court reporter what it says there?

15:23 A. It's an EK-1.
15:24 Q. And what was an EK-1?
15:25 A. An EK-1 was a device that was designed by

Dennis and with another gentleman by the name of Peter.
Basically what it was, it was a circuit board that would slide into the receiver, and attached to it was a ribbon, like a cable ribbon and it had a keypad on the end of it. And the keypad, it would put in the keys that -- that EchoStar, DISH Network, would require to activate the card, the sequence to get it to go and use all the channels.

16:10 Q. Okay. Let me see if I can break that
down.

16:11 You indicated this was a device designed by

Dennis and Peter. Am I correct that Dennis is Dennis Renaud? 16:14 A. Yes.

16:15 Q. Okay. And you previously showed us
shipping records between yourself and Mr. Renaud; is that correct?

16:18 A. Yes.

16:19 Q. And you indicated that there was somebody named Peter who was also involved in designing the EK-1? 16:22 A. Yes.

16:23 Q. And am I correct that the purpose of the EK-1 was to receive satellite television programming?

17: 1 A. Yes.

17: 2 Q. What satellite service was the EK-1 used to -- to receive the program?

Page 8

Osborne_Designations_V1
17: 4 A. For DISH Network.

17: 5 Q. Okay. So the -- the EK-1 would allow the user to receiver DISH Network television programming?

17: 8 A. Yes.

17: 9 Q. And would the user be required to pay for
that programming?
17:11 A. Yes. A one-time fee for the EK-1 device itself.

17:13 Q. Okay. So they would be paying to purchase
the EK-1 device, but would not as far as you were aware paying EchoStar or the operator?

17:16 A. No, they were not.

Page Range: 086:15-86:23

86:15 Q. Okay. I'd like to show you what the court reporter has marked. And the sticker is on the back of the document, but this is Exhibit Number 141. Can you identify that document for me?

86:19 A. It's an EK-1.

86:20 Q. This is the device you have testified
that your group was responsible for making; is that correct?
86:23 A. Yes.

Page Range: 021:3-23:10
21: 3 Q. So the transaction that we see in
exhibit -- in the document ending in the Bates number 1041 was a payment by Digital Adventures either by yourself or Mr. Nemeth to Mr. Renaud; is that correct?

21: 7 A. Yes.

21: 8 Q. And the monies were being sent to

Mr. St. James who you identified as a runner for Mr. Renaud?

21:11 A. Yes.

21:12 Q. And what was the nature of the payment?
21:13 What was the purpose for that?

21:14 A. The payment at this time -- I don't see
the date. It could have been payment for pulling keys off of
cards or it could have been proceeds from U.S. sales of the EK-1 going to Dennis Renaud, his share of those proceeds of the -- from the sale.

21:19 Q. Let's break that down for a minute. Am I correct that as part of your association with Digital Adventures, you were pulling keys; is that correct?

21:23 A. Yes, I did.

21:24 Q. And when you say pulling keys, can you describe for the record what that entailed? What was the purpose of pulling a key?

22: 2 A. Dennis had -- Dennis and Pete had a -they devised a machine about -- about that wide (indicating) --

22: 5 Q. Okay.
22: 6 A. -- kind of tall. It had 12 slots in it that would fit DISH Network cards into them. And you would run a simple DOS program on any computer, and it would generate the actual keys that were involved for the DISH Network. To the best of my knowledge, that was how that was -- that worked.

22:12 Q. Did you use this particular machine?

22:13 A. Yes, I did.

22:14 Q. Okay. And am I correct in understanding that you used the machine to identify keys that were necessary to hacking the EchoStar system?

22:17 A. Yes.

22:18 Q. And you gave one possible interpretation of the exhibit we just looked at as the shipment of monies to Mr. Renaud. That would be monies for using his machine?

22:22 A. Yes.

22:23 Q. You also indicated that the payment could have related to your sale -- or strike that. You also testified that the shipment that we just looked at in the -the exhibit ending in 1041 could have been the sale of EK-1 devices by Digital Adventures, correct?

23: 4 A. Yes.

23: 5 Q. And you testified that the EK-1 device was a device for hacking the EchoStar system?

23: 7 A. Yes.

23: 8 Q. And that was a device that you and Mr. Nemeth sold as part of Digital Adventures?

23:10 A. Yes.

Page Range: 115:16-116:6

115:16 Q. Were you aware of DIRECTV ever suing people engaged in satellite signal theft?

115:18 A. Yes.

115:19 Q. The dealers and developers?

115:20 A. Yes.

115:21 Q. To your knowledge did EchoStar take any steps to have your group criminally prosecuted?

115:23 A. No.

115:24 Q. Did DIRECTV ever take such steps?

115:25 A. Yes.

116: 1 Q. In fact, you were indicted on DIRECTV satellite piracy, isn't that correct?

116: 3 A. Yes.

116: 4 Q. And is it your understanding that that was initiated by DIRECTV?

116: 6 A. Yes.

Page Range: 030:12-030:16
30:12 Q. And what was the nature of that prosecution?

30:13 A. It was for the illegal manufacturing of satellite piracy devices. The actual charge conspiracy to commit copyright infringement, also to modify Access Cards.

Page Range: 030:24-31:6
30:24 Q. And what is the document that we've
marked as Exhibit Number 139?
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31: 1 A. It is a federal indictment against myself and Dale Kenneth Kubin.

31: 3 Q. And was Mr. Kubin a -- an associate of yours in the business of Digital Adventures?

31: 5 A. He was. I -- I can't remember the

```
exact -- how much he was involved exactly.
    Page Range: 031:23-31:25
    31:23 Q. And what is the status of this case?
    31:24 A. It is over with. I pled guilty and
sentenced was -- just sentenced April 2nd.
    Page Range: 32:1-33:18
    32: 1 Q. Okay. There are two counts in the
indictment that's marked as Exhibit Number 139. Do you see
the two counts identified in the document?
    32: 4 A. What page was that on?
    32: 5 Q. Page 4.
    32: 6 A. Page 4. Yes, I see it there.
    32: 7 Q. Am I correct that the government charged
you with conspiracy to sell and distribute satellite signal
theft devises --
    32:10 A. Yeah.
    32:11 Q. -- in violation of 47, U.S. C, 605
(e)(4)?
    32:12 A. Yes.
    32:13 Q. And that there's a second count that
charged you with sale and distribution of signal theft
devices in violation of 47, U.S.C., 605 (4)?
    32:16 A. Yes.
    32:17 Q. You indicated a moment ago that you had
entered a guilty plea; is that correct?
```

32:19 A. Yes.

32:20 Q. And that occurred on April 2nd of this year?

32:21 A. Well, the sentencing was April 2nd of this year. The guilty plea was sent -- was given prior.

32:23 Q. I appreciate the clarification. So you previously had entered a guilty plea?

32:25 A. Yes.

33: 1 Q. Did you plead guilty to both counts?

33: 2 A. No, I did not.
33: 3 Q. Do you recall which count you entered a guilty plea?

33: 5 A. For the conspiracy.

33: 6 Q. And would that be conspiring with Mr.

Kubin and others?

33: 8 A. Yes.

33: 9 Q. To your knowledge, has Mr. Kubin entered any kind of plea in this case?

33:11 A. Yes.

33:12 Q. What did -- what plea did Mr. Kubin
enter?

33:13 A. Guilty.

33:14 Q. And has Mr. Kubin also been sentenced?

33:15 A. Yes.

33:16 Q. The complaint relates to the theft of

```
satellite signal services; is that correct?
    33:18 A. Yes.
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    Page Range: 033:19-34:5
    33:19 Q. And you were charged with these two
counts relating to the sale and distribution of signal theft
devices; is that correct?
    33:22 A. Yes.
    33:23 Q. What satellite system are you alleged to
have had?
    33:25 A. On the -- on these particular charges, I
    34: 1 believe they were DIRECTV.
    34: 2 Q. And so when you entered a guilty plea,
you were pleading guilty to hacking the DIRECTV satellite
system?
    34: 5 A. Yes.
    Page Range: 34:6-34:15
    34: 6 Q. What sentence did you receive on
April 2nd of this year?
    34: 8 A. Three years probation with six months of
at-home confinement.
    34:10 Q. Was any restitution ordered?
    34:11 A. Yes.
    34:12 Q. In what amount?
```

34:13 A. \$800,000.

34:14 Q. To whom is the restitution owed?

34:15 A. DIRECTV.

Page Range: 34:25-35:14

34:25 Q. Do you recall that the lawyers for NDS

Americas submitted a letter on your behalf to the sentencing judge in this case?

35: 3 A. Yes.

35: 4 Q. Can you identify that document, please?

35: 5 A. This would be the said letter that was given to my attorney and myself and to Judge Trauger.

35: 7 Q. And when was that letter sent?

35: 8 A. March 14th.

35: 9 Q. Okay. Prior to your sentencing?

35:10 A. Yes.

35:11 Q. That would make sense.

35:12 A. Yes.

35:13 Q. And obviously prior to today's
deposition?

35:14 A. Yes.

Page Range: 35:23-36:6

35:23 Q. Am I correct that NDS supported the plea agreement that you had reached --

35:25 A. Yes.

36: 1 Q. -- with the government?

36: 2 A. Yes, it was -- it was favorable, yes.
36: 3 Q. And do you know if the sentencing judge took that comment into account in rendering your sentence against -- in your case?
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36: 6 A. I believe so, yes.

Page Range: 040:8-40:14

40: 8 Q. Okay. And you mentioned that you came in touch with Dennis Renaud; is that correct?

40:10 A. Yes.

40:11 Q. Was Mr. Renaud associated with a particular website at that time?

40:13 A. Yes, Dishplex. He was the owner and operator.

Page Range: 116:7-117:11
116: 7 Q. I'd like to review with you some of the parties to this lawsuit, this civil action in California, and ask you to what extent these groups or individuals were in any way associated with the development of the EK-1

```
device --
```

116:12 A. Okay.

116:13 Q. -- for hacking the EchoStar system. To your knowledge, was NDS Group PLC in any way involved with the development of the EK-1?

116:16 A. That name does not sound familiar.

116:17 Q. You've never heard of the company?

116:18 A. No, NDS I have.

116:19 Q. Okay. But the company NDS, to your knowledge did they have any involvement with your group in developing the EK-1?

116:22 A. No, not to my knowledge.

116:23 Q. Okay. How about NDS Americas? Is that a
company that you've heard of?
116:25 A. Yeah, I've heard of it.

117: 1 Q. And did that company have any
involvement of any kind with the development of the EK-1
device?

117: 3 A. No.

117: 4 Q. How about an individual named John

Norris?

117: 5 A. John who?

117: 6 Q. John Norris.

117: 7 A. Norris?

117: 8 Q. Yes.

117: 9 A. No.

117:10 Q. Reuven Hasak?

117:11 A. No.

Page Range: 117:20-118:9
117:20 Q. Christopher Tarnovsky?

117:21 A. That name sounds familiar. That name sounds real familiar. I just can't recollect.

117:23 Q. Okay. Was -- was Mr. Tarnovsky as you recall in any way associated with the Dishplex group?

118: 1 A. No.

118: 2 Q. Was he in any way associated with the development of the EchoStar hack at the --

118: 4 A. No.

118: 5 Q. -- Thunder Bay lab?
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118: 6 A. No.

118: 7 Q. Was he in any way involved with you in selling those devices through Digital Adventures?

118: 9 A. No.

Page Range: 118:10-118:19

118:10 Q. Okay. But you have heard of the name Christopher Tarnovsky?

118:12 A. Yes.

118:13 Q. Okay. How about Allen Menard? Was he involved with Dishplex?

118:15 A. No. He had his own website, DR7.

118:16 Q. Okay. Was Mr. Menard in any way associated with the efforts of the lab in Thunder Bay Ontario?

118:19 A. No, he was their rival.

Page Range: 121:1-121:8

121: 1 Q. Any persons using the alias Nipper 2000?

121: 2 A. No.

121: 3 Q. Nipper Clause?
121: 4 A. No.

121: 5 Q. XBR21?

121: 6 A. No.

121: 7 Q. Are any of those aliases familiar to
you?

121: 8 A. No.

Page Range: 123:3-124:6
123: 3 Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say that at least at some point in fall of 2000 you had a device for hacking the EchoStar system?

123: 6 A. Yes.

123: 7 Q. And your hack was developed through the lab that your group was running in Thunder Bay Ontario?

123:10 A. Yes.

123:11 Q. And it did not involve Mr. Menard, who was doing business as DR7?

123:13 A. No, it did not.

123:14 Q. And it didn't involve any of the people that we just reviewed a moment ago?

123:16 A. No, it did not.

```
    123:17 Q. Based on your personal knowledge then,
would it be an -- would it be an incorrect statement for
EchoStar to allege in this case that Mr. Menard was the only
person until early 2001 to be able to hack the EchoStar
system?
    123:22 A. Before 2001?
    123:23 Q. Yeah.
    123:24 A. That he was the only one?
    123:25 Q. Yeah.
    124: 1 A. No.
    124: 2 Q. Because in fact your group was doing it?
    124: 3 A. Yes.
    124: 4 Q. And selling it to customers in Canada
and the United States?
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    124: 6 A. Yes.
    Page Range: 041:16-42:3
    41:16 Q. To your knowledge who was responsible for
developing and selling the Wild Thing?
    41:18 A. Well, he goes by several names, Ron
Silver Ron E-Rizer, Hooks.
    41:20 Q. Where does Mr. Ereiser live, if you know?
    41:21 A. Canada.
    41:22 Q. And to your knowledge was Mr. Ereiser
```

active in hacking the DIRECTV satellite system?
41:24 A. Yes.
41:25 Q. How did you know that?
42: 1 A. Through various conversations with other
people in the industry and eventually by his own mouth to my
ear.
Page Range: 043:7-45:20
43: 7 Q. And you do remember that Mr. Ereiser was
active in hacking the DIRECTV satellite system based on the
conversations you had with him personally and with others?
43:11 A. Yes.
43:12 Q. Did Mr. Ereiser ever provide you with any
devices for hacking the DIRECTV satellite system?
43:14 A. Yes.
43:15 Q. What -- what device or what was the name
of the device that he provided?
43:17 A. It was the Wild Thing unlooper.
43:18 THE COURT REPORTER: What?
43:19 BY MR. WILSDON:
43:20 Q. What was the purpose for the Wild Thing
unlooper?
43:22 A. It was a device that would -- if there
was an ECM that was sent out, it would -- it would repair
the damage that an ECM would do. You could also use it as
programmer.

44: 1 Q. Okay. Again, just so I'm clear, you've testified that ECMs were electronic counter measures initiated by the broadcaster, in this case DIRECTV, to disable signal theft devices, correct?

44: 5 A. Yes.

44: 6 Q. And so the device that Mr. Ereiser sold you allowed you to restore pirate functionality of those devices?

44: 9 A. Yes.

44:10 Q. In effect overcoming the effects of the electronic counter measure?

44:12 A. Yes.

44:13 Q. Did you receive any other hacking equipment from Mr. Ereiser?

44:15 A. Software updates.

44:16 Q. And how did Mr. Ereiser transmit these software updates to you?

44:18 A. Via e-mail.

44:19 Q. And what was the purpose of these updates?

44:20 A. There was a few tough ECMs that came down through -- over the -- over the period of time that needed special changes -- modifications made to the software, and then that next part of it was glitching, a certain way of glitching the card.

44:25 Q. Okay. Am I correct in understanding that these software fixes are sometimes referred to as a patch?

45: 3 A. Yes.

45: 4 Q. Okay. And Mr. Ereiser was providing these
patches -- patches to you; is that correct?

45: 6 A. Yes.

45: 7 Q. And you used those patches to continue to Receive free satellite television programming?

45: 9 A. Yes.

45:10 Q. To your knowledge, was Mr. Ereiser selling these devices like the Wild Thing unlooper? Was he selling those to other people?

45:13 A. Yes.

45:14 Q. And was he providing these patches that you've testified about? Was he providing those to other people?

45:17 A. Yes.

45:18 Q. Do you recall approximately when you
purchased the Wild Thing unlooper from Mr. Ereiser?

45:20 A. I would say in 1999.
Page Range: 47:17-47:21

47:17 Q. So, for example, the Wild Thing that you received from Mr. Ereiser, that wouldn't work --

47:19 A. No.

47:20 Q. -- to modify an EchoStar card?

47:21 A. No.

Page Range: 124:14-125:11
124:14 Q. To your knowledge, was Mr. Ereiser involved in selling hack devices for the EchoStar system?

124:16 A. No. He was not, not with us.

124:17 Q. Okay. Not through your group at least?

124:18 A. Yeah. To my knowledge, he had nothing to
do with the EchoStar.

124:20 Q. Okay. But he was active in the DIRECTV
hack?

124:22 A. Yes.

124:23 Q. Would you -- would it be fair to say he was a prominent figure in the hack of the DIRECTV system?

125: 1 A. Yes.

125: 2 Q. Prominent in the sense that he had
access to technology before others had that?

125: 4 A. Yes.

125: 5 Q. And that he controlled distribution of the DIRECTV hack?

125: 7 A. Yes. For quite some time until Don Nance broke his partnership with him.

125: 9 Q. Okay. There was some partnership between Mr. Nance and Mr. Ereiser at some point?

125:11 A. Yes.
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Page Range: 126:16-127:5

126:16 Q. Did you have any personal experience with Mr. Ereiser?

126:18 A. Telephone conversations.

126:19 Q. In those conversations or any of your interactions with Mr. Ereiser, did you have any concerns for your personal safety?

126:22 A. I didn't myself; others have.
126:23 Q. Can you describe those?

126:24 A. Well, there was death threats made to Dennis, to Don, to Matt, just about all the -- all the head guys that were involved.

127: 2 Q. And where did those threats originate?
127: 3 A. From him.

127: 4 Q. From Mr. Ereiser?

127: 5 A. Yes.

Page Range: 127:6-127:8

127: 6 Q. Were you concerned for your personal safety with respect to Mr. Ereiser?

127: 8 A. No.

Page Range: 127:25-129:9
127:25 Q. So Mr. Ereiser hired somebody to surveil
a mailbox that you were using as part of your business?

128: 3 A. Yes. He also -- he also paid somebody to
go in there with a fake ID and try to act like myself to get into those mailboxes.

128: 6 Q. Would that be pretexting? Is that a term you're familiar with?

128: 8 A. No.

128: 9 Q. Okay. You're not familiar with the term?

128:10 A. No.

128:11 Q. Somebody was pretending to be you?
128:12 A. Yes. Yes.

128:13 Q. And you believe that was done at the direction of Mr. Ereiser?

128:15 A. Yes. And I actually confronted him about it.

128:17 Q. And what did he say?

128:18 A. He said that he was willing to do just about anything to get his hands on that hack.

128:20 A. And by confronting, you're talking about confronting Mr. Ereiser?

128:22 A. Yes. On the phone I confronted him about his behavior towards myself and other people involved in the group.

128:25 Q. And did these events give -- cause you to re-think or in any way change your involvement in this business?

129: 3 A. Well, it brought a lot of attention to
the fact that there's a lot of desperate people out there that were willing to do just about anything to get their hands on this technology, and it probably started myself thinking that this is something that I don't want to be involved in anymore.

Page Range: 129:24-130:15

129:24 Q. Would you judge Mr. Ereiser based your interaction with him to be a truthful person?

130: 1 A. No.

130: 2 Q. Would you judge him to be honest?

130: 3 A. No.

130: 4 Q. Or reliable?

130: 5 A. Reliable? He was reliable in delivering Wild Thing devices when they were asked for.

130: 7 Q. How about reliable in the sense of being candid and being truthful?

130: 9 A. No.

130:10 Q. And you testified Mr. Ereiser had made threats against members of your group, correct?

130:12 A. Yes.

130:13 Q. Did Mr. Ereiser ever acknowledge making
those threats?

130:15 A. Yes.

Page Range: 42:4-42:5

42: 4 Q. Did you ever meet with Mr. Ereiser?

42: 5 A. No, not in person, always on the phone.
Page Range: 46:2-46:4
46: 2 Q. When is the last time you were in
communication with Mr. Ereiser?
46: 4 A. End of '99 into 2000 probably.
Page Range: 133:17-134:10
133:17 Q. Okay. It's been a long morning and -and part of an afternoon. And thinking back on your testimony, is there anything to which you've testified about that you wish to clarify or explain?

133:22 A. No. I believe -- I believe I've answered your questions as best as I could.

133:24 Q. So to the best of your knowledge, you've fulfilled your obligation to testify fully and truthfully in this matter?

134: 2 A. To date, yes.
134: 3 Q. Has anybody told you what you should be testifying about?

134: 5 A. No.
134: 6 Q. And you're here on your own -- on your
own behalf? You're not --
134: 8 A. Yes.
134: 9 Q. -- being paid by any respect?
134:10 A. No.
(Videotape ended.)

MR. SNYDER: That concludes the defendants' designations, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any cross-designations?

MR. HAGAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If you'd like to play the
cross-designations, then, at this time, please.

MR. HAGAN: Thank you.
(Videotape played of William Joe Osborne.)
131:15 Q. And the court reporter has marked for you Exhibit Number 144. Can you identify that document for the record?

131:18 A. It is the letter that was handed to Judge Trauger by you guys, by your firm.

131:20 Q. Counsel for NDS, correct?

131:21 A. Yes.

131:22 Q. And this was in connection to your sentencing on the hack of the DIRECTV satellite system, correct?

131:25 A. Yes.

132: 1 Q. And do you recall what the purpose of this letter was?

132: 3 A. It was a -- it was a -- not so much a character letter as a factual letter of what I've -- I am doing today and what $I$ have been doing, cooperating with you to the fullest of my ability.

132: 7 Q. And directing your attention to the last sentence of the letter, can you just please read that for the record?

132:10 A. Sure.

132:11 Q. It begins at the bottom of page 2.

132:12 A. Mr. Osborne's cooperation has materially contributed to NDS's understanding of the hack of it's Period 3 Access Cards and the identities and roles of other individuals who participated in that effort.

132:17 Mr. Osborne was candid and forthcoming. NDS as a victim of the activity charged in the indictment believes that Mr. Osborne has provided substantial cooperation to NDS anti-piracy investigation. NDS submits this letter in support of the plea agreement that was reached between the government and Mr. Osborne and respectfully request that the Court consider the cooperation NDS received in sentencing Mr. Osborne.

133: 1 Q. Just to summarize, it was your understanding that this letter was in support of the plea agreement that you and your lawyer negotiated with the government?

133: 5 A. Yes.

133: 6 Q. And you were in fact -- you did in fact plead guilty?

133: 8 A. Yes.

133: 9 Q. And you did in fact receive a sentence?
133:10 A. Yes.

133:11 Q. Three years' probation?
133:12 A. Yes.

133:13 Q. Six months' home confinement?

133:14 A. Yes.

133:15 Q. And a restitution order?

133:16 A. Yes, restitution of $\$ 800,000$.
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Description: Page 136:16-136:20
136:16 Q. And if $I$ understood your testimony, prior to your involvement with the EK-1 hack, you didn't have any involvement with any devices that could be used to hack DISH Network; is that correct?

136:20 A. That's correct.

Description: Page 137:10-137:14

137:10 Q. Prior -- all right, withdrawn. Prior to you becoming involved with the EK-1 device, did you know how DISH Network could be hacked, what were the methods?

137:14 A. No.

Description: Page 138:23-139:3
138:23 Q. Prior to your involvement in the EK-1
hack had you ever seen a hacking device for DISH
138:25 Network?

139: 1 A. No.

139: 2 Q. Actually seen one in use?
139: 3 A. No.

Description: Page 149:10-149:24

149:10 Q. And did I understand your testimony that the EK-1 was the only device you ever dealt with that could hack DISH Network programming?

149:13 A. Yes.

149:14 Q. So after the EK-1, you had no involvement in any type of device that could hack DISH Network?

149:16 A. Yeah, that's right.
149:17 Q. And I believe you said that the EK-1 was a short-lived device?

149:19 A. Yes, it was.
149:20 Q. And, I mean, in fact, it only lasted a

```
couple of months, right?
```

149:22 A. Yes.

149:23 Q. So you didn't make much money from that?

149:24 A. No.

Description: Page 151:11-151:25
151:11 Q. Ever heard of a 3M Card?

151:12 A. Yes.
151:13 Q. What's a 3M Card? Let me go on, have you ever heard of an E3M Card?

151:15 A. No. E3M, it sounds familiar.

151:16 Q. Well, maybe I should back up. Let's go
back to 3M. To your knowledge, what's a 3M Card?

151:18 A. Give me a minute here. I want to --

151:19 Q. Sure.

151:20 A. 3M Card, the term sounds really
familiar. I may have spoke to quick on saying that I knew what that was.

151:23 Q. That's fine.
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151:24 A. 3M. I'm going to leave that one alone for right now.

Description: Page 152:13-152:16

152:13 Q. That's fine. You testified previously
that DR7 was a competitor to your group on Dishplex, correct?

152:16 A. Yes.

Description: Page 152:22-155:2

152:22 Q. Are you -- did you ever become aware that the website DR7 was selling equipment that could hack DISH Network programming?

152:25 A. Yes.

153: 1 Q. And when did -- when did you become aware of that?

153: 3 A. I actually knew that when $I$ first got involved with Dishplex because Dennis Renaud had told me about the strenuous relationships that he's had with all the other websites with all the other people involved like Ereiser, Shawn Quinn, all those guys. And I decided out of all of them that Dennis Renaud was the most trustworthy person.

153:10 Q. So when you first became involved with Dishplex --

153:12 A. Dishplex.

153:13 Q. -- Dennis Renaud told you that DR7 had a hack for DISH Network programming?

153:15 A. Yes.

153:16 Q. And you said he explained to you the kind of the bad relationship that he had had with other websites?

153:19 A. All of them. He don't -- he don't have a working -- he don't -- he never had a working relationship with any of them. That's why I think I was important as far as he's concerned is because I -- I was -- I've always been good with people and I'm not a vindictive person like Dennis Renaud is. Dennis Renaud a big, very scary-looking man when he wants to be.

154: 2 Q. Do you recall, him -- Mr. -- or Dennis Renaud telling anything specifically about his relationship
with DR7?

154: 5 Q. Just that they -- they constantly bickered back and forth publicly in the forums, calling each other at home, cell phones. It was just a very bad-blood type of relationship.

154: 9 Q. Did the term flaming -- is that a term you're familiar with?

154:11 A. If -- well, flaming as far as in the IRC we go in there and the -- the forums, yeah. They would flame each other pretty hard.

154:14 Q. Do you recall anything else he told -Mr. -- Dennis Renaud told you about his relationship -- his prior relationship with the DR7 website?

154:18 A. No. Just that him and his -- Dennis's partner, Larry, constantly nonstop all the time would just go on that guy's website and torture him. And then of course he would in turn -- it was -- it was like they were in kindergarten. It was really bad.

154:24 Q. Uh-huh. And when you first became involved in Dishplex, do you remember how long after that the EK-1 device came out?

155: 2 A. It was more than a year.
Description: Page 155:3-155:9

155: 3 Q. When you first got involved in Dishplex, was your focus hacking DIRECTV?

155: 5 A. Yes.

155: 6 Q. And selling a -- selling materials that could be used to hack DIRECTV?

155: 8 A. Yes. Actually I had -- I had -- I wanted
to affiliate myself with one of these websites and --

Description: Page 155:12-155:16

155:12 Q. And so -- and so it's fair to say that you were involved in Dishplex for more than a year before you became involved in the EK-1, the device to hack DISH Network programming?

155:16 A. Yes.
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Description: Page 157:15-157:22

157:15 Q. You weren't involved in the actual
development of -- or the creation of the EK-1 card, right?

157:18 A. No.

157:19 Q. That was all -- as far as you were you
aware, that was being handled by Dennis Renaud in Canada?

157:22 A. Yes, and Pete.

Description: Page 158:7-158:10

158: 7 Q. Once -- I'll try to repeat it -- once you actually started selling the EK-1 devices, you only had about a couple of months where you could actually sell the device, correct?

Description: Page 158:12-158:21

158:12 THE WITNESS: The -- the device was

158:13 sold with no problems for a couple of months. You know, myself, personally, backed away from that project because during that time, Don Nance and Bryan Dorsett came up the way to repair the -- I want to say the $H$ cards at the time. And so I withdrew myself basically from the EK-1. What happened to it after that, I'm kind of sketchy on my -- on my part because my focus was always and has been toward DIRECTV.

Description: Page 158:23-159:2
158:23 Q. And as far as your -- withdrawn. It's your understanding that actually a couple of months after the EK-1 device came out there was some code posting on the internet that basically made the EK-1 worthless, right?

Description: Page 159:7-159:13
159: 7 THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say worthless. I would say not as worth it -- not as worth what it was. It gave -- it gave end users or anybody with a soldering gun or basic knowledge of circuitry could very well build their own product for probably around $\$ 40$ at the time if my math is right as far as the parts are concerned.
(Videotape ended.)

THE COURT: Does that conclude the
cross-designations?

MR. HAGAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, Counsel, just a moment. I am going to excuse the jury for just a moment.

I'll be back with you anywhere between five minutes and five hours.
(Laughter.)

THE COURT: I'm just kidding you.

I am going to speak to counsel for just a moment. Why don't you take at least a 20-minute recess, and I'll come back and get you in just a moment.

Please don't discuss this matter, nor form or express any opinion concerning the case.

See you in 20 minutes.
(The following proceedings is taken outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Now, last evening, informally, Mr. Stone approached the Court with all counsel present sometime in the evening hours and stated that you wanted to have Mr. Barr testify as an expert, and there was a discussion between counsel concerning what Mr. Barr would testify to. One of the areas that the Court was not concerned with was Mr. Barr having gone to Barrie, Ontario, I believe, and witnessed a black -- black box in Barrie, Ontario. The part that had concerned the Court was that apparently EchoStar represented that there would be an
attempt to match that black box to another similar black box that was compared in a photograph obtained from --

MR. STONE: Mr. Masco (phonetic).
THE COURT: From Mr. Masco?

MR. STONE: Mr. Masco, yes.

THE COURT: Who may be Jim Waters?

MR. STONE: No. He dealt with Jim Waters.

THE COURT: Okay. And the Court was concerned and did not acquiesce to that, based upon the offer of proof being made by either side, EchoStar and NDS, and indicated that I wanted a full and complete hearing outside the presence of the jury, and see what that evidence would be that was forthcoming.

Also, EchoStar was concerned that there were a number of statements that were not being conveyed to the Court last evening by NDS and called to the Court's attention on behalf of EchoStar what you believed to be a series of hearsay statements. I took the rather cautious approach and told counsel for all parties that I would hear that outside the presence of the jury, try to fit it in over the lunchtime and decided not to, because I wanted the court reporters to have an hour break. But it's 2:15, and if your representation is correct and you are prepared to rest, so be it. If you want to call Mr. Barrie (sic), I think we have enough time to take his testimony and to make rulings
and hopefully get back to the jury. Now, if we don't, so be it. I don't know what it entails, but I'll certainly pay you that courtesy, and $I$ don't want you precluded.

MR. STONE: I understand that, your Honor. For a variety of reasons, we've decided to withdraw Mr. Barr and -- and rest today.

THE COURT: All right.
Now, let me discuss two other things with you. Your resting is the same as I perceive EchoStar's resting, and that is, you need to go over each item of evidence. Make certain each item that you believe has been received into evidence is, in fact, received, and I've reserved that for both of the parties.

I don't expect items to be brought in front of the Court that were not moved into evidence and simply neglected, but I do expect that your records would comport with those items you believe are in evidence. And let me state to you that if an item is amiss as far as the jury is concerned, I will not grant a new trial. At the end of our discussion today or this evening, you'll sign an evidence tag that Kristee prepares, and that means that each of you have gone over each piece of evidence, that you believe that the record is in order. And that way, in case a piece of evidence is missing, $I$ view that as counsel's entire responsibility. Motion with new trial will be met with a
denial.

Third, $I$ still don't know if we're going to the jury on Tuesday or Wednesday, but I'm hopeful that we do. So, Counsel, who do you propose to call in rebuttal so I know when to bring the jury back?

MR. HAGAN: Our rebuttal case, your Honor, will consist of the following:

We will call Mr. Andre Kudelski. If we are not able to reach a stipulation with the defendants on two particular pieces of evidence from EchoStar's CSG database, we will call NagraStar's CEO, Pascal Lenoir, to authenticate a couple of documents. And then we will conclude with reading certain portions of Dr. Peled's testimony into the record. And I just want to make clear to the Court we -that deposition was taken at the courthouse, and it was not able to be videotaped.

THE COURT: No, and in fact, it was my order that it not be videotaped, because the expectation was Dr. Peled would testify, and therefore, the jury would be further precluded from seeing his demeanor because of the expectation that he would, in fact, testify.

Each of you are aware of why Pascal Lenoir would be testifying. Are you able to reach an agreement, or is he going to take the stand? In other words, what I'm trying to sort out is, is the case really going to the jury on Tuesday
or Wednesday. I assumed that the transcripts of Dr. Peled and the cross-designations may not be that long, but $I$ just don't know. I haven't gotten a time estimate yet. I don't know how long Pascal Lenoir testifies, and I have no idea what the expectation is concerning Andre Kudelski.

MR. HAGAN: If -- I think that Darin and I will be able to reach a stipulation, and we can work on that.

THE COURT: I'll -- I'll wait.

MR. HAGAN: This afternoon.

THE COURT: Why don't you go over and talk to him. In other words, let's find out right now, and if you can't, that's fine, and if you can, that's fine. Then I'm going to have that stipulation, if you do reach it, put on the record now. If you can't reach it, so be it.
(Attorney discussion held off the record.)

THE COURT: All right. Now, while the jury is out of our presence, I want to discuss how the Court is going to handle the information conveyed to the jury concerning Dr. Peled. I want to keep this as neutral as possible, convey the information, and then let each of you argue whatever you'd like to. So I think the most appropriate thing is the following:

Dr. Peled is the CEO, president of NDS. He was not subpoenaed by EchoStar, and voluntarily flew to the United States and was placed on the witness list by NDS as a

```
witness in this trial and was to testify. He arrived
earlier this week and had his deposition taken outside of
your presence on Wednesday evening, April 30th.
    Dr. Peled flew back to the United Kingdom on
Thursday evening, May 1st, 2008. In the absence of
Dr. Peled, the Court will allow EchoStar to read into the
record portions of his testimony, and NDS to cross-designate
and read into -- and read into the record portions of
Dr. Peled's testimony.
    Now, that simply informs when he was present, when
he left, and you can argue all the inferences which are left
to the jury. I'm a little concerned if I go any further
than that factual misstatement and it turns into an adverse
inference, and it causes the Court concern. By the same
token, I think it gives NDS the right to argue and EchoStar,
certainly, the right to argue that Peled was here,
available, and you have an instruction right on point in
your instruction packet, if you look at it, about witnesses
able to testify.
    Now, the question is, of course, NDS is going to
object to any instruction to the jury, and of course you
want a stronger inference given to the jury. I think that's
a well-balanced statement by the Court and doesn't carry the
Court's frustration over to the -- to the jury, so it gives
EchoStar the leeway to argue that he wouldn't subject
```

himself to an appearance in court. And by the same token,
it isn't the Court making that statement, which is harmful.
But let me hear from EchoStar concerning that.
MR. HAGAN: Two points, your Honor. First, I
think it is within the Court's discretion to issue an
adverse inference for Mr. Peled's failure to attend trial
and failure to allow us to cross-examine him in front of the
jury.

THE COURT: And by the way, over the weekend, we are going to look at that further, if I read this or another admonition or adverse inference, however you want to do that, or information. I want to see what the outer parameters are. In other words, courts oftentimes can give an adverse inference, but it's an extreme measure. This doesn't pass, though, without, you know, factual comment about what occurred. But yes, I can give an adverse inference.

MR. HAGAN: And in the event that the Court is not inclined to do that, which -- to preserve our record, we would object to, especially given the history of the Court's guidance and instructions for all other witnesses who have attended live at trial, then we would ask if the Court, subject to our objections, if the Court is going to give a factual statement about the circumstances surrounding Mr. Peled's leaving the United States and going back to the

United Kingdom, we would ask that that statement be a complete factual record of what happened, and that is, that Mr. Peled left without us having the opportunity to subpoena him, because he left without notifying the Court or notifying plaintiffs' counsel before getting on a plane and leaving the jurisdiction.

THE COURT: Okay. In other words, it's not fair to say that -- from your perspective, that he was not subpoenaed by EchoStar, but by the same token, it's not fair to recognize that NDS had him voluntarily appear. So that's the beginning point, that's the truth. But once he was here, your concern is that you didn't subpoena him, relying upon your expectation that he would, in fact, testify.

MR. HAGAN: Our expectations and the representations of the defense counsel.

THE COURT: And those representations were made to the Court, also, that he would testify, and the frustrating part to the Court is it reminds me of the deposition that everybody walked out on in the middle of the evening and didn't notify the Court. Here is another example of the Court not being notified, and the gentleman is already on the airplane while we are sitting here in court on Thursday evening.

Well, whatever $I$ do in this regard, it will occur Tuesday, because it's the appropriate place for that
admonition or that information or that adverse inference to take place. It's not this evening on the resting of NDS's case. It also gives NDS every opportunity over the weekend to rethink their position, which I assume they're not, but I want to be as cautious as possible, give NDS all the time to contemplate the ramifications of this.

All right. While I'll not settled on it, let me turn to Mr. Snyder so he can make his record, and of course, that will be that nothing should be said.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, your Honor. I am not going to repeat my previous objection.

THE COURT: I -- I want you to. I want you to protect your client. I want it on the record.

MR. SNYDER: I believe I previously put on the record, and I -- I will repeat that $I$ do not believe that it was appropriate for the Court to comment on Dr. Peled's absence, essentially, for two reasons.

First, Dr. Peled was never requested by the plaintiffs. He was never asked to appear, never appeared on their witness list.

Second, as I've indicated to the Court previously, it is the defendants' position that our defense in this case is based on not having participated, not having committed the alleged conduct and that we have -- we have obviously made the decision on behalf of the defense that for a
variety of reasons regarding the quality of that defense and presenting it to the jury, that it is in the company's best interest not to present Dr. Peled's testimony.

THE COURT: You do understand, though, that
although I agree that you have the option of producing Dr. Peled, and if he had not been produced in any way, shape or form, it simply would have been an inference that I'm allowing both counsel to argue or the parties to argue about who's not appearing, whether it's Kudelski, who I believed would not appear up until recently. I'm still not sure if he'll really be here, or Murdoch or Peled.

But what I've deprived EchoStar of, based on my belief and your representation, I mean, you collectively, not personally, but NDS's -- I want to take the attorneys out of this -- was that a video deposition wasn't necessary, and therefore, what EchoStar doesn't have is the benefit of a deposition that is videotaped, because everybody's expectation was that Peled would testify, and I'd supplied the same opportunity concerning Charles Ergen. So now, the jury has an even more difficult task, because with that expectation and non-notice to the Court and simply Dr. Peled leaving for the United Kingdom, this jury doesn't even have the equal ability to have a video deposition, as some of the witnesses who testified. I'm a little concerned that at least the Court didn't have notice until he was already in

England.

MR. SNYDER: Your Honor, may we make one other point for the record?

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. SNYDER: As I indicated previously, NDS does not believe that Mr. Peled's proper -- proffered testimony on the topics identified by plaintiffs are proper rebuttal, and likewise, notes that plaintiffs rested their case before there was any indication that Mr. Peled would appear, which would negate any suggestion that plaintiffs believed that Mr. Peled's testimony was necessary for their case.

THE COURT: And in response to this not being appropriate rebuttal?

MR. WELCH: Your Honor, that's where we had cut off earlier in the -- in the day when $I$ was listing the things that -- that's where we got cut off earlier in the day when $I$ was listing the things that Dr. Peled testified about, your Honor. He was also going to testify about his knowledge or the lack of knowledge about the cash payments, his lack of knowledge about NDS paying for the mailboxes, and that he would have liked to know this type of information. It would have been important to him. This also gives a great deal of testimony about how satellite operators make their business decisions, and that satellite operators do not run out and automatically perform card
swaps. They try to perform these ECMs or patches as long as you can. That directly refutes their argument that EchoStar should have gone out and made changes in an immediate fashion.

In addition, he talks about the types of harm that falls upon satellite operators when you have piracy. In addition to that, he discusses the effects that the Canal+ post would have on Sogecable, which is still pending. That came down from the Ninth Circuit, so Sogecable still has a claim. That's presumably one of the reasons why they do not want his testimony to be heard by the jury, because it shows the widespread pervasiveness and the harm that they did on the entire industry.

Another point that he will talk about in his deposition is the state of the knowledge that NDS had at the time the lab was built, who the major competitors were, and that what they did with this lab was, rather than make their product better, they went and they attacked the various other systems that were their major competitors.

He also discusses the fact that DirecTV was potentially looking to switch. There is a variety of reasons that they did not bring him, and he covers most of the topics, but are the subject of their counterclaim. He talks about the documents and how flippant the claim is that Ray Adams allegedly said that these were stolen, and that
he -- that's where we are really harmed by not having a video, because he just is like -- the fact that his wife's car got broken into, the less expensive car, spoke volumes, and it's those type of things that were prejudiced by not having a video.

In addition, your Honor, as the Court's well aware, we didn't take a full deposition, because there are some things that we would like to save for trial. At the end of the deposition, I made the comment to Mr. Snyder that, "I guess we're going to see Mr. Peled at trial," and Darin cut me off and said, "Tomorrow."

Based on that, and the fact --

THE COURT: Is that on the video?

MR. WELCH: It is. It's in the -- it's in the record, your Honor, at page 170.

THE COURT: Read it to me.

MR. WELCH: Starting at line 8.

THE COURT: Read it to me.

MR. WELCH: "We've concluded our questioning for the day of Dr. Peled, and I guess we're going to see him at trial."

Mr. Snyder cuts me off and says, "Tomorrow," and I said, "Tomorrow."

And in addition, I said, "And we've made a couple of document requests of you, and I guess you are going to
take those, you're going to think about that tonight, and you'll let us know in the morning."

Now, one of the things that Dr. Peled had was a
time line of various events that occurred. I asked Mr. O'Donnell, who's their paralegal, as well as Mr. Snyder yesterday, by e-mail on various occasions. And I also told him to let Chad know and provide the document to Chad. They failed to respond at all. Even as of late last night, they failed to respond. It was not until 6:00 a.m. this morning that first they say, "Here is our lineup."

And I said, "So I assume you're not going to be calling Dr. Peled, or are you?"

And then Mr. Snyder responded, "You can infer that I'm not going to call him."

Now, I don't know if he was on a direct flight to the UK from here, or if he flew from here to New York, and then he took the first flight out of New York, and they waited until such time as he was in the air from New York before they gave us their tactical decision. I don't know why they delayed, but we asked numerous times for the time line, and there is information in the time line that we're not going to be able to ask Mr. Peled about.

In addition to that, your Honor, there are certain documents that we would have liked to question Dr. Peled about. We're not going to get to do that, because he is not
on the stand. For instance, your Honor, there is a January 30th, 2001 press release issued by NDS that we were going to mark as an exhibit. And in that document, it clearly shows that not only they get the DirecTV conditional access revenues, but they've built an entire business off of keeping the DirecTV business, because it was their first digital platform.

THE COURT: But you had no power to get Dr. Peled here other than his voluntary appearance. In other words, I hear that you're chagrined once he was here and how frustrating that is. By the same token, in an abundance of caution, you could have subpoenaed him. You relied upon the representation of other counsel, which you feel you've been misled by. But Dr. Peled had the choice of never appearing, and you would have never had that opportunity.

MR. WELCH: Had they told us, had they not
mentioned that they were going to be here on Thursday, because we were going to -- they were going to call him at noon, and we were late Wednesday night speaking with your Honor. They again made that representation that we would see him, because they -- he wanted to catch a flight to go home.

THE COURT: On what day?
MR. WELCH: That he was going to catch a flight
after Thursday's testimony.

THE COURT: Now, the expectation on Thursday, according to my notes, was that we were hopeful of finishing Christopher Dalla, David Kumar and Jim Emerson. And we had also stated -- I'm sorry.

MR. WELCH: That was Wednesday.

THE COURT: That was on Wednesday, my apologies. And on Thursday, we believed that we were going to have started Reuven Hasak either late Wednesday or early Thursday, and there was a request to have Dr. Peled testify, and I believe that Dr. Peled would testify on Thursday. Dr. Peled could have been called anytime on Thursday, but instead, after Reuven Hasak finished, we went on to --

MR. WELCH: Maldonado.

THE COURT: Maldonado?

MR. WELCH: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: So there can't be any confusion in this record that NDS did have the ability and had requested that he testify on Thursday, but it was no fault of any of the parties, nor the Court, because we could have gotten to him in some portion, if not totally, on Thursday.

MR. SNYDER: May I make two points, your Honor?

THE COURT: Please.

MR. SNYDER: First, as I believe the Court has pointed out, whatever concerns plaintiffs' counsel may have about Dr. Peled, they are unquestionably in a better
position now than if Dr. Peled had never appeared and had not been deposed. It was always the defendants' choice whether to bring him. He was not subpoenaed; he was not requested. He did not appear on a plaintiffs' witness list, and the plaintiffs rested without any indication that Dr. Peled would appear.

Second, although plaintiffs have identified a number of topics on which they will either present Dr. Peled's testimony or would present Dr. Peled's testimony, I don't believe that any of those are properly rebuttal topics. They are all topics that go to plaintiffs' case in chief, which they were voluntarily willing to rest without the presence of Dr. Peled.

THE COURT: Just a moment. Just a minute.
(Interruption in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: Now, Counsel, there are a lot of other options. One, trying to balance the fact that Dr. Peled did not appear or did not have to appear originally, I can simply stop the proceedings, bring the jury back in a week and give you the option, and Dr. Peled, of conducting a deposition by video if you believe you're severely harmed in London.

Mr. Hagan is shaking his head.
Number two, I can state in front of the jury without giving the present admonition that the Court's
requesting Dr. Peled return to the United States, giving NDS another week to produce him. And then if $I$ read an admonition, I'll have a much stronger record. And that means the record goes -- I bring the jury back in a week. Now, think about that for a moment. I am not proposing either of them. I am tossing out all the possible options here.
(Attorney discussion held off the record.)

THE COURT: Because you see, Counsel, I think I'm on safe ground, quite frankly, with the initial research I've done, but I want the weekend. I could give an adverse inference. I may choose not to place myself in that position and have you argue that adverse inference, in other words, just simply give the jury the facts of what occurred. But $I$ am not certain that the facts I'm giving are balanced, because you're right, there are some things that occurred that should be added to this transcript. By the same token, no matter what I add, you're deprived, once he was here, of a video deposition, because everybody expected that he would testify, just like Charles Ergen. But in a sense, I am also calling you on your statement and forcing you to respond, that if you believe that that video deposition is, you know, so important. The Court's not on a fast-track concerning this case. They can return in a week. They would probably welcome it.
(Attorney discussion held off the record.)
MR. WELCH: Your Honor, after consulting with our client, what we'd like to do is read the deposition to keep the process moving quickly and accept whatever admonition the Court would like to give to the jury.

THE COURT: You see, that puts me in a position of quashing down the admonition. When I start giving you options and you decline them, it moves the Court away from, quite frankly, the strength that $I$ feel that is called for in this situation. So $I$ want to be very certain that you're turning down a video deposition in London. Now, I don't know if he'll comply.

Number two, requesting that NDS produce Dr. Peled under these circumstances, and then having Dr. Peled not return, places this Court in a better position concerning the admonition or the information, and it may strengthen your position concerning his unwillingness to be here.

Now, all that negates, though. All that causes a delay, and you have to decide, you know, with the tactics that both EchoStar and NDS are employing, you know, how old your case is getting to the jury. But by the same token, if this goes over a week, that's my discretionary call, the case gets old for NDS, also. Frankly, right now NDS is pushing to get this to the jury, because, in my opinion, the evidence is freshest in the minds of the jurors with the
presentation of the defense case.
I'd continue this case a week or two weeks and
find out when the jury is available. This case is now old
for everybody, though, and you've accomplished much of your
case on behalf of EchoStar through NDS, just as NDS
accomplished much of their case through EchoStar's
presentation, so it's kind of balanced. Each of you have
to, really, weigh how much you gained when supposedly it was
your case in chief, but each of you made, you know,
tremendous strides in terms of your own presentation.

In what is supposed to be the plaintiffs' case, NDS had some good points. And what was supposed to be NDS's case, EchoStar had some good points. So if it's harmful to both of you, then that last option is off the table, but $I$ want to discuss all of those. If I was sitting on the circuit, I'd want to make certain that, you know, all of the options were heard by the trial court and all the options were considered by counsel.

Now, why don't you have another discussion. NDS ought to talk about this for a moment.
(Attorney discussion held off the record.)
THE COURT: And Counsel, I will understand if you decline to go to London. It will take NDS off the hook, because the claim would be, of course, Dr. Peled could have testified and you didn't want to go, so be careful.
(Attorney discussion held off the record.)

THE COURT: All right. Counsel on behalf of EchoStar.

MR. HAGAN: Your Honor, our preference would be and our request would be that the Court compel the defendants to produce Dr. Peled live for testimony on Tuesday morning.

THE COURT: And -- and how can I do that?

MR. HAGAN: He's a -- he's the CEO of a party, and this is a particular issue that we briefed prior to the trial when we made a motion to compel the trial attendance of the Israeli engineers, David Mordinson and Zvi Shkedy, and I will rest on the legal arguments that are in those briefs. If the Court is not inclined to compel --

THE COURT: Well, if I -- if I had the power, Counsel. If I had the power in a criminal matter, certainly under these circumstances, that person would appear. The question is if $I$ have that power.

MR. HAGAN: I think that the Court does have that power, and I think that the legal authority from the Ninth Circuit supporting that is in our brief, which we filed prior to trial, moving to compel the attendance of Mr. Mordinson and Mr. Shkedy, one of which was a 30 (b) (6) representative for the defendants. If the --

THE COURT: Now, let's assume that NDS finds,
tactically, that his depositional testimony was so harmful and declines the order. What would the order -- what would the Court do then, find NDS in contempt?

MR. HAGAN: No.

THE COURT: In other words, I shouldn't make a frivolous order that I am not willing to back up.

MR. HAGAN: I think that the -- that the impact of a decision, a tactical decision by the defendants to fail to comply with that order should be a fairly harsh adverse inference, which the Court has on numerous occasions through the course of this trial indicated that it was willing to give --

THE COURT: Uh-huh. MR. HAGAN: -- and if that -- if the Court's concern -- and first of all, we think that you do have the -- the authority and the discretion to give that type of an adverse inference, but if the Court is concerned about what the circuit may or could do, and the Court wants to take the conservative approach, which is the middle ground, then we would request that that instruction be factually accurate and include a provision that said Dr. Peled -- it was represented to us that Dr. Peled would appear live. He left the country without notifying the court or plaintiffs' counsel and affording them an opportunity to issue a subpoena.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll need a copy of that transcript, because I don't have it.

All right. Mr. Snyder.
MR. SNYDER: Your Honor, as I've indicated previously, plaintiffs never put Dr. Peled on any iteration of their witness list.

THE COURT: Just a moment. How could they? They allegedly didn't have the authority to subpoena him, but now they are telling me that they do have the authority or $I$ have the authority to order him into court.

MR. SNYDER: They requested the presence at trial of several NDS employees, including employees from Israel, and NDS complied with that request at -- at the Court's urging, but in cooperation with the Court and plaintiffs' counsel and the administration of this trial. They never requested that Dr. Peled appear as a trial witness. Defendants indicated that they would call Dr. Peled and made the decision not to call Dr. Peled.

If the Court is inclined to give an instruction, I agree that it need be factually accurate, although I do not agree to the addition of the material that plaintiffs have suggested, which, for example, omits the accurate fact that plaintiffs never requested Dr. Peled's appearance at the trial. They rested their case without requesting Dr. Peled or even any indication that Dr. Peled would appear, so they
did not believe that his testimony was critical or even important to their presentation of the evidence.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, it gives me the weekend to resolve this, and I think the better part of caution right now is simply to send the jury home, that $I$ make no further statement to them, certainly, without trying to think this out over the weekend, or any state to them -- any statement to them at this time. And if the Court's going to make any type of statement, the most appropriate time would obviously be on Tuesday morning just before the playing of this deposition.

Now, knowing who those parties are that are going to be called in rebuttal, is there surrebuttal?
(Attorney discussion held off the record.)

MR. SNYDER: Your Honor, at the moment, we don't contemplate a surrebuttal, but I do not yet know what the scope of Mr. Kudelski's testimony is going to be.

THE COURT: All right. Then, is there anything further as far as the jury is concerned other than you resting in their presence and sending them home, and then we can continue on this evening with other matters?

MR. SNYDER: I don't believe so, no, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Kristee, would you be kind enough to get the jury.

MR. SNYDER: Oh, actually, we will want to move
two exhibits, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure.
(The following proceedings is taken in the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: The jury is present. All counsel are present.

Mr. Snyder on behalf of NDS.
MR. SNYDER: Thank you, your Honor.

Defendants move Exhibit 141, which is the photo of the EK1 device described by Mr. Osborne.

THE COURT: Any objection, Counsel?
MR. HAGAN: No objections, your Honor.
THE COURT: 141 is received.
(Defendants' Exhibit No. 141 is received into evidence.)

MR. SNYDER: We also move Exhibit 136-A, which are the airbills identified by Mr. Osborne in his testimony.

MR. HAGAN: No objections, your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.
(Defendants' Exhibit No. 136-A is received into evidence.)

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, your Honor.

And with that, the defense rests.
THE COURT: NDS has rested, and we are absolutely
right on schedule. We said four weeks. Next Tuesday is
actually the end of the four-week period. We are well aware of different needs that you have. Your daughter's graduation, vacation is planned. Our hoped schedule from this point forward is to conclude rebuttal and possibly surrebuttal sometime on Tuesday of next week, to hopefully, in a perfect world, read a pack of instructions to you Tuesday afternoon and send you home and have argument take place on Wednesday.

Now, of course, when are you going to deliberate? Well, we've been discussing that, and all counsel want to keep all eight of you. It's not a situation where they are asking to shed one of the jurors. But when the case is eventually submitted to you, we don't want your -- your personal lives, vacation, et cetera, to be affected, and we're going to try to work with you in that regard. But also, these case facts need to be rather fresh in mind, and so does the evidence. So six of you don't have commitments, two of you do at various times. I think about the best we can say is that we'll see how you do.

So right now, tentatively, we're planning on going through Wednesday and planning on being out of session on Thursday and Friday, because we've known about the commitment of your daughter's graduation. And on Monday, you know that that day is blanked out for the court.

Now, if we do complete jury deliberations, though,

I am going to ask you -- you know, jury instructions and arguments on Monday, I'm going to ask you to reconvene the following Monday for a change. So you have Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday.

And we believe that you leave as a juror on Friday.

THE JUROR: Thursday.

THE COURT: On Thursday. We've got out -- what time, in the morning or the afternoon?

THE JUROR: It's a business trip.

THE COURT: In the morning or afternoon?
THE JUROR: I leave early Thursday morning.
THE COURT: How long will you be gone?

THE JUROR: Two weeks. I don't come back until

```
after --
```

THE COURT: Okay. We are going to have to discuss that amongst ourselves. We are all aware of it. I don't know how counsel are going to feel about that.

THE JUROR: We are willing to stay late when we deliberate.

THE COURT: I mean, so be it, but remember, I'm also cautioning you $I$-- I don't want that to be a rush to judgment. It may take literally hours, or it may take a lot of days, you just don't know, yet. So let's just work together. We'll do our best, and I know you already have.

But I can assure you, we are on a schedule. We got half an hour, literally, behind one day, and we got an hour and a half ahead another day, so we're there. But the case hasn't concluded, yet. There is more rebuttal and possibly surrebuttal evidence on -- on Tuesday, and I am going to ask you not to form or express any opinion concerning this case.

Now, let me talk to counsel about one more thing before you leave.

Counsel, could I just see just counsel for a moment in the hallway.
(The following proceedings is held in camera, outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: We are on the record at sidebar out of the presence of the jury, actually in the hallway. And I wanted to raise with counsel the news media that the court is most concerned about in terms of nationwide coverage and jury influence, and that is the -- the gentleman who has been with us from ABC, Len Tepper, very nice gentleman, but he's repeatedly called Millie and the Court keeping track of the case and apparently has a long-term interest in this and represented to all of you, and I heard that I think he's with Dateline --

MR. NOLL: Nightline.
MR. SNYDER: Nightline.

THE COURT: And when a media story hits, at least in my experience with the $A B$ and Mexican Mafia, if it hits the national AP or Reuters, because every paper picks it up, but the far more difficult thing for this Court to deal with in the past was something like the History Channel, National Geographic, believe it or not, on something like the Aryan Brotherhood or Anna Nicole Smith. And what happens is that when a national story hits, those agencies that weren't interested, including local media agencies, now flock to the courthouse. I have no way unless I reach out to Mr. Tepper, which I'm reluctant to do in a personal conversation and ask when he is going to run that story. I think he's a real gentleman. I think he'll probably tell the Court, but that story can literally run Tuesday of next week, Wednesday of next week and immediately when you are done with your arguments, and you know they are out of session Wednesday and Thursday. One is gone and seven are here.

So I raise with you both again as a courtesy, I don't have any particular wisdom in this area, but $I$ had an awful lot of cases like this where there was national coverage, and in the past we've just taken it head-on. So far we've been kind of nebulous about there might be some immediate coverage and stay away from it. If that's your present position and say nothing, let's just let the jury go home today. If it's not, if any of you have any thoughts,
then, and you want to take this head-on, then we need to forewarn them, because what $I$ will not do is if one of them watches a portion of it, and they have a great lead-in piece of some type before they recognize the story, or see enough of it to turn it off, I'm not going to grant a new trial, nor am I going to hear that the jury was unfairly tarnished, because we all had choices.

We said to stay away from Nightline and ABC, you know, for the next week or two. The problem with that is once you start singling out one service, it does two things. It raises the perception in the jury's mind that this is a really important case. And the second thing is, if you get into that trap, why shouldn't we be warning the jury of the next article that comes out?

Now, I'm not concerned about the printed press. They are going to follow that admonition. I'm concerned about television. That really has an impact, and I'm concerned about the internet, but you have to consider Google, the internet, and if this isn't getting national play on the front page of the New York Times or the Washington Post, it isn't going to get front page on AOL or Google, in my opinion, until and unless ABC does the story, and then it might.

So if you have any wisdom, tell me now; otherwise, I'll just follow our course and send the jury home with our
thanks, and we'll see them Tuesday at 8:00. So why don't you talk about that separately back here for just a moment, because $I$-- I'm saying to all of you that I'm not going to grant a new trial or be too concerned of jury prejudice and placing people on notice. We do have options.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you.

THE COURT: And by this time, for NDS and
EchoStar, Darin and Chad, you're both in the same position, now. My fear was that this was going to hit partway through with just the head report out, and $I$ think Len Tepper has been a real gentleman about that in terms of holding off so you ought to have a flavor of everything that's happened right now, have a pretty balanced story.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you.
(Attorney discussion held off the record.)

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SNYDER: Thank you, your Honor.

NDS's preference would be that we not give the
jury any admonition.

THE COURT: Okay.
Your thoughts?
MR. HAGAN: We are fine with that. The standard
admonition of not to form or express --

THE COURT: I agree. Until we come to a
consolidated agreement on that, I agree at this point. I
just want to keep raising it with each of you, make you
aware that the court clerk's been getting phone calls,
Millie has downstairs. It's --
MR. SNYDER: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right.
(The following proceedings is taken in the
presence of the jury.)
THE COURT: We are back in session. The jury is
still present. All counsel are now present.
I'll see you Tuesday at 8:00. Please drive
safely. Rebuttal will begin at 8:00 promptly Tuesday. Good
night.
Once again, please do not discuss this matter
amongst yourselves, nor form or express any opinion
concerning this case, and don't discuss it with anybody
else.
All right. Counsel, if you'd be seated, please.
(The following proceedings is taken outside
the presence of the jury.)
THE COURT: I want to raise one other issue before
we go into chambers and do some work and you do some work,
also.
I want to raise the last testimony of Mr. Kahn for
a moment in relation to the lost profits disgorgement issue.
I think we agreed last evening, as EchoStar was laying out
various exhibits for the Court's consideration, that it was premature for the Court to make a ruling until the Court had heard from Mr. Kahn. And I think it was also agreed that it was premature for the Court to make a ruling on this issue until the Court had heard from, potentially, Mr. Andre Kudelski if he was appearing.

Now -- now, the interesting thing about this is, what standard should the Court be applying? It's a strange question to ask, but if this was a Rule 50, for instance, all inferences are made on behalf of the plaintiff, basically, all reasonable inferences, or is this by preponderance or -- or clear and convincing? I don't know. And I'd like, in whatever I'm doing, to have some standard to operate by in making this ruling, rather than just handing down an edict. Now, maybe there is no standard I -I should be paying attention to, but I'm not quite certain if I'm to draw all favorable inferences on behalf of the plaintiff in this regard.

The second thing is, the gentleman who testified, Mr. Kahn, in looking through the documents, it could be argued, isn't even a part of these meetings. He's -- he's an engineer who is testifying in an area that he has no familiarity with, quite frankly. By the same token, that is the record in front of the court right now, the separateness of these entities. So what am I going to hear, potentially,
from Mr. Kudelski, or is this going to be a state of the evidence that I'm going to rule on, or do you even know? Because what -- what $I$ can't do is this. What I'm not going to do is get pushed into a box where I'm deciding that important an issue, you know, at 11:55 after Mr. Kudelski testifies and I'm supposed to read instructions at 2:00. It's too vital an issue. I'll just send the jury home, and if $I$ have to send them home for a day or two, that's what I'll do, and we'll start the following week. So I'm not going to put myself in a box intellectually on something that is so important, $\$ 800$ million, potentially, in disgorgement that you are arguing for and $\$ 800$ million, potentially, that could be swept off the table. How are we going to handle that?

MR. HAGAN: Three points, your Honor.

The first, we believe that the appropriate standard of review is the standard for Rule 50, which is consistent.

THE COURT: How do I know that? I know you believe that. Where do I find that?

MR. HAGAN: The language of Rule 50 and the case law interpreting it. There is also a case, Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc. --

THE COURT: Now, just a moment. What's my proper standard of review concerning this question, NDS?

MR. SNYDER: Well, $I$ think that -- that there is ultimately two standards, your Honor. We do intend to move for a directed verdict under Rule 50 on the disgorgement issue, given Mr. Kahn's testimony, and that, of course, will have to be decided under the Rule 50 standard.

THE COURT: And you know that in all likelihood, I have the latitude of either denying that or delaying that, and I can delay that until the jury, so with that possible expectation, waiting for Mr. Kudelski.

MR. SNYDER: The -- I believe the plaintiffs would have to prove by a preponderance of the evidence, and there are certain rules on what kinds of evidence can be considered in these circumstances. They would have to prove by the -- preponderance of the evidence that, but for the defendants' alleged conduct, they would have received the contract.

THE COURT: And where do I find support for preponderance of the evidence?

MR. SNYDER: I -- I'm sorry, your Honor, I can't cite the case to you right now, but I can --

THE COURT: Okay. Well, you are both on fair notice that we are looking at that in chambers, and any help that you can give to the Court this evening would be beneficial to either preponderance standard or the Rule 50 standard.

Now, I think in reality, this Court's going to need whatever is left of Tuesday and Tuesday night to make that final decision after I hear Mr. Kudelski. And so, therefore, $I$ think you are going to be placed in the position of either having the Court instruct on Tuesday morning and both of you trying to argue Tuesday, or arguing Tuesday and have the Court instruct after your argument.

MR. SNYDER: Excuse me, your Honor. Do you mean Wednesday?

THE COURT: I mean Wednesday. I'm sorry, I said Tuesday. Thank you, Mr. Snyder.

I just want you to anticipate that. Do you still want two-and-a-half hours?

MR. WELCH: Yes.

THE COURT: I promised each of you that, and if one of you wants it, that's what you've got.

All right. Now, how long will it take you to go through the record this evening and get these evidentiary items out of the way? Because that's another reason that this case will not go to the jury until I know I've got a complete record concerning that evidence, and so if you don't have it tonight and you don't have it Tuesday afternoon, all that takes time.

MS. WILLETTS: We're prepared to go through the exhibits this evening or right now.

THE COURT: Okay. Kristee will be at 5:00. MR. HAGAN: And before we go off the record, your Honor, I anticipate that both parties will need to urge certain Rule 50 motions on a couple of issues, whether it be claims or defenses. The defendants just formally rested in front of the jury, and so we would request that the court set a time so that both sides could preserve their record and make any Rule 50 motions that --

THE COURT: Do you want to do your Rule 50 motions now?

MR. SNYDER: We could do it now, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why don't we do it right now.

I'll just caution you, you're getting yourselves in a time box with the evidence, so if one of you who is sitting there could designate yourself out to be the person who goes through the evidence, because I have no hesitancy putting this case over.
(Attorney discussion held off the record.)
(Live reporter switch with Debbie Gale.)
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