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P R O C E E D I N G S
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(Call to order of the court.)
THE COURT: All right. Welcome back, everybody.
Ms. Bellshaw, I am ready when you are.
MS. BELLSHAW: Thank you, Your Honor.
JAMIE ROSENBERG, WITNESS FOR THE DEFENDANT, RESUMED STAND CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) BY MS. BELLSHAW:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Rosenberg.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Staying with the Google Play Store -- well, I guess sort of. The monetary, you -- touched on this in your direct, but the monetary benefits that Google gets from Android is not limited to Search; right?
A. When you're -- if you're talking about the services that we have on Android, that's correct. There are other sources of revenue.
Q. And the other sources of revenue include apps. that Google monetizes, like YouTube and Google Pay?
A. Google Pay is not in MADA.
Q. Okay. But there are other apps. that Google monetizes that are included in MADA, like YouTube?
A. Yes.
Q. And then also the Play Store; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And Google makes a lot of money from the Play Store?
A. The Play Store is a significant source of revenue for us, yes.
Q. I would like to turn your attention to two documents. The first is UPX2118. I'm not really going to ask you any questions about it, except that it's the cover e-mail to UPX2111.

If you would just briefly look at UPX2118, do you see that this is an e-mail from Nicholas Drake to you dated May 26, 2020, with a subject line "for review, deck for tomorrow's Samsung deal"?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. And then if you would turn to the second page of UPX2118.

Do you see that you've sent to Mr. Lockheimer and
Mr. Harrison a presentation for a Samsung deal review?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. So then if you would please turn to UPX2111, UPX2111 is the presentation that was attached to -- or is a linked document in your e-mail in UPX2118.

And UPX2111 is a slide presentation that was prepared for a meeting with Mr. Pichai and his executive team; right?
A. I don't know if Sundar would have been in the review if it was the BC, but it says "BC review" here.
Q. Does it say "exec/BC review"?
A. Yes.
Q. So it's possible that that would have been for more than
just the BC?
A. It's possible. I don't know who else would have been in that review.

MS. BELLSHAW: Your Honor, I would move to admit UPX2118 and UPX2111.

MR. POPOFSKI: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. They will be admitted.
(Exhibits UPX2111 and UPX2118 received into evidence.)
BY MS. BELLSHAW:
Q. And if we could put -- thank you so much.

Looking at UPX2111, do you see that this is a slide deck dated May 26, 2020, with a subject "Samsung Revenue Share Renewal"?
A. Yes.
Q. So at this time in 2020, Google was in the process of restructuring its revenue share agreement with Samsung?
A. Yes. I mean, eventually, that got done in

November of 2020 , but this looked like it was at the beginning of that process.
Q. And that's the 2020 Samsung revenue share agreement that you testified about on your direct?
A. Yes.
Q. And -- withdrawn.

If you would please turn to page 12 of UPX2111. And again, a number of the numbers and graphs here are redacted. So we
will just do our best not to say any of the redacted information aloud.

Looking at the slide on page 12 of UPX2111, do you see the heading "Distribution Deals Designed With," and then there's a dollar amount, "Incremental Margin to Google"? Do you see that? THE COURT: So it's a document that ends with 097. THE WITNESS: Oh, I see.

MS. BELLSHAW: Yes. Apologies.
THE WITNESS: I see that it says that in the header, yes.

BY MS. BELLSHAW:
Q. Okay. So this slide breaks down the various sources of revenue that Google projected it would earn from Samsung devices during the time of the -- during the term of the 2020 RSA; correct?
A. Yes. I just want to say, and I think you understand this, that there was a lot of negotiation that happened between this point and the deal that eventually got signed. So this isn't representative of the deal that got signed.
Q. Understood. So maybe just to clarify for the record a little bit, this presentation in May of 2020 was when Google was discussing the framework that it wanted to negotiate with Samsung for the ultimate 2020 RSA; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then the -- so from this time in May 2020, the
framework would have been finalized within Google, negotiated with Samsung, and then the parties would have reached a final agreement in November of 2020?
A. Yes, and there were some differences between the final agreement and what was contemplated here.
Q. Understood. So just focusing on what Google was contemplating in May of 2020 , this slide 12 in UPX2111 breaks down the various sources of revenue that Google projected it would earn from Samsung devices over the course of a new Samsung revenue share agreement; correct?
A. Yes, I believe that's true.
Q. And do you see there's sort of three buckets of revenue?

And I believe these correspond to the three deals that you discussed earlier.

Does that look right to you?
A. No. I don't believe this -- I don't believe that the go-to-market deal is reflected on this chart.
Q. So do you see that there are three buckets, and the first sort of blue heading is "Search Deal"?
A. Yes.
Q. And then the heading in the middle is "Services Deal"? That's deal number 2 ; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then the third heading is -- that would be deal number 3, $I$ guess what ultimately came to be known as the
"go-to-market deal"?
A. No, that's not what this third column is.
Q. Okay.
A. I think this third column is some analysis of the combination of the first two. The third deal's not represented here.
Q. Okay. That's helpful.

Looking at the chart on the right, the chart on the right reflects -- there's a gray bar chart that has gray and then red on top.

Do you see that? I'm sorry. All the way to the left.
A. There's a couple charts that have gray and red. You mean the one that's on the far left?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. So that chart reflects the expected revenue from Search; right?

Mr. Rosenberg, I will withdraw that question, and I will direct your attention to the notes at the bottom. That might be a little bit easier to parse through.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you see the first note at the bottom -- and again, the exact figures are redacted, but the first line, there's a number and then the words in parens "Distribution Search"?
A. Yes.
Q. So that first number before "Distribution Search" refers to the amount of expected revenue from Search on Samsung devices during the term of a new Samsung RSA; correct?
A. I think this is in reference to the expected revenue coming through the access points where we had terms around promotion in the RSA. There are other aspects of Search that aren't covered here in terms of how users access Search.
Q. So this is the expected revenue through RSA search access points for search. Is that your understanding?
A. In the context of this deal, I'm assuming that's what this means.
Q. And then below that, do you see that there's a number and then the word "Gray"?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's a breakdown of the sort of services revenue, these other monetizeable Google apps. from -- on Samsung devices during the term of a new Samsung RSA; correct?
A. I think that's what this refers to, yes.
Q. And then focusing your attention on that first number, there's a number before the word "Play."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So that number refers to the projected revenue from the Play Store on Samsung devices during the proposed 2020 Samsung RSA deal; correct?
A. I believe that's what that refers to, yes.
Q. Okay. And then if you would please turn to page -- the page ending in Bates number 1120, and we're not going to put this on the screen.

THE COURT: Can I ask a question? I don't think we've addressed this, but can you at a high level just explain to me how Google generates revenue from the Play Store?

THE WITNESS: Yes. The primary way we generate revenue from the Play Store is transaction fees on payments either for apps. or, more commonly, in apps.

So if you download, for example, a game in the Play Store, the way a lot of games work is then the user can usually play a part of the game for free, but then if they want to buy access to another level or a sword or whatever, then that's a paid transaction. We facilitate that transaction through Play and then take a share of the consumer spend.

And there are also ads in the Play Store as well as another source.

THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MS. BELLSHAW:
Q. If you would please turn to the slide where the Bates number ends in 1120. And this one is small, I realize, even smaller than the other ones.

Do you see that this is a further breakdown of the projected revenue from a new deal with Samsung that Google
projects would be generated on Samsung devices?
A. The numbers are very blurry on this printout. It's hard for me to see it. But it seems to be some sort of financial analysis associated with the deal and the different components of the deal.
Q. So looking under "Revenue" in the far left column, do you see there's a line, sort of the third named line, titled "Play"? A. Yes.
Q. So looking all the way across -- I'm not going to ask you the exact numbers, but these numbers, is it your understanding these break down the expected revenue for the Play Store by year of a future deal?
A. Yes, that seems to be what this is doing.
Q. And then if you look all the way on the right, there's a total projected revenue on Samsung devices for the Play Store for the deal term.
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And without saying the actual number, that's an even higher number than the one that we were just looking at on slide 12; correct?
A. Yeah, I'm not sure why that's the case. I see that 2019 is included as a column here, but this was already in 2020. So I'm not sure why the difference between what's on here and the other slide.
Q. It's possible it just includes an extra year or so?
A. Possibly.
Q. Okay. Google has a significant stake in Android's success, even without Search; right?
A. Well, I think Android's success is really the success at advancing computing in a scaled way, which is -- which is meant to serve our core businesses, the products and services that we create. So the motivation for doing Android is to continue to be able to execute on those products and their business components and reach as many users as possible and serve as many users as possible.
Q. So the Play Store is only available on Android devices; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. It's not available on iPhones?
A. Correct.
Q. So the more users on Android devices, the more money Google can make from the Play Store; right?
A. Generally speaking, if we serve those users well.
Q. So if a consumer switches from an Android phone to an iPhone, Google loses all potential Play Store revenue from that user; correct?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. But Google Search is set as the default on both Android and Apple devices; right?
A. Well, Google Search is promoted -- I can't speak to the Apple deal, but Google Search is preloaded on Android devices, as we've discussed. And then in some scenarios where we have an RSA, it's further promoted.
Q. And do you understand that Google Search is set as the default on the Safari browser on iPhones?
A. I think that's the case, but again, I don't work on that part of the business.
Q. So if a user switches from an Android device to an iPhone, Google still gets that Search revenue; correct?
A. It wouldn't necessarily be the same revenue. There's -- if the user uses Search on an iPhone, then Google would have an opportunity to get some revenue there. I wouldn't be able to say that it's one for one.
Q. If you would please turn to slide 14 of UPX2111, looking down in the notes, it says, "Let's directly translate Android's projected share loss into economic impact to Google."

THE COURT: Sorry, Ms. Bellshaw --
MS. BELLSHAW: My apologies, Your Honor. It's the slide ending in 1099.

THE COURT: So we're moving forward, okay. Okay. BY MS. BELLSHAW:
Q. Are you there, Mr. Rosenberg?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see in the notes on slide 14, page 1099 of UPX2111,
it says, "Let's directly translate Android's projected share loss into economic impact to Google"? Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then skipping a paragraph, beneath that, "if we lose share, we lose Play revenue, and our Search TAC goes up to whatever the Apple rate is. We still get Search revenue; it's just more expensive."

Do you see that?
A. I see that. That doesn't necessarily comment on how well Search monetizes in that context on iOS for that user compared to iPhone. It just talks about the distribution cost.
Q. But it does reflect another piece of what we were just talking about, which is that when Google loses market share on Android, it loses 100 percent of the potential revenue from the Play Store that those users might have generated; correct?
A. Yes, there are -- it's not possible to have an app. store on Apple other than the Apple app. store.
Q. And as we just saw, the Play Store is a significant source of revenue on Android for Google; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So even setting Search aside, Google has a significant commercial interest in continuing to invest in and drive the success of Android?
A. I think all these things reinforce each other. I think that the -- what we do to create a compeling experience for

Android, including the way we do Search, including the way we invest in the ecosystem with Search allows us to also invest in building out the developer ecosystem with Play, getting developers interested in bringing their apps. to Play, putting that as a compelling offering in front of users.

So these things, I think they all go hand in hand, and the two together comprise a really important part of both our product strategy and our business strategy for our investment in Android.
Q. But again, setting Search aside, Google has a significant commercial interest in continuing to invest in and drive the success of Android; correct?

MR. POPOFSKI: Objection; asked and answered, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's overruled.
You can answer.
THE WITNESS: I mean, we have -- we certainly have commercial interest in seeing Android succeed because of Play. What I'm saying is that the assumptions that we would see the same success with Play if we weren't also doing a good job with Search, with all of the things that that implies, I don't think it's -- I don't think you can necessarily make that connection. Q. If I could have you flip forward in the slide deck two pages to slide 12. That's the one we were first looking at that is Bates number 1097.

One of the -- I'm sorry. I'll give you a minute to get there. It's two pages forward at 1097.
A. I see it.
Q. So in that middle set of charts, do you see there's a small orange box labeled "Payment to Samsung"?
A. Yes.
Q. One of the elements of the payments to Samsung was revenue share payments on the Play Store; correct?
A. I think that was contemplated here. I think, as you know, we didn't end up incorporating this in the deal.
Q. But it was contemplated, at least initially in May of 2020, that Google would pay Samsung revenue share on the Play Store?
A. It was contemplated in this framework here, yes.
Q. As a Google employee, you used Google's internal chat systems; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you would chat with other employees probably a few times a day?
A. Yes.
Q. And one topic that you discussed on chat was Samsung's request for revenue share on the Play Store; correct?
A. I think I got an update on chat on that based on a call that someone on the team was having, but I wouldn't call it a discussion.
Q. You received an update on chat from Mr. Kolotouros
regarding Samsung's request to receive revenue share on the Play Store?
A. I think I recall seeing an e-mail thread where I referenced that. I don't remember the exact update.
Q. And you were aware that your chats defaulted to "history off" and were deleted within -- in 24 hours; correct?
A. That was the way chat worked by default. I didn't change that setting in the time that $I$ was working on -- at Google full-time.
Q. You never changed your default setting to "history on"?
A. No.
Q. Including on the chat that you had with Mr. Kolotouros regarding Samsung's request to include Play Store revenue share in its agreement with Google; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. One last item in this deck to direct your attention to, and that's slide 6. So we're going forward in the deck to the slide ending in 1091.

So does slide 6 reflect this three-deal structure that you were testifying about in the Samsung 2020 agreement?
A. It reflects broadly a three-deal structure. There was a lot of negotiation between this time and the deal that got signed or the framework that got executed. The framework that got executed had three deals roughly along these lines, but the specifics changed.
Q. This on slide 6 of UPX2111 reflects the framework that Google wanted from Samsung in the new deal before the negotiations with Samsung started and the deal had to be sort of revised over the course of those negotiations?
A. This reflects the framework we were contemplating internally at that time, yes.
Q. Do you see the third deal, the sort of third box all the way to the right, "device quality and market share"?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that the third deal that you referred to earlier as the go-to-market deal?
A. Yes. That's the same bucket. I don't know if the specifics here are exactly the same as the way that it got negotiated.
Q. So at least as originally conceptualized, this third deal would create an investment fund to target share growth in the $\$ 400-\mathrm{plus}$ device tier in top geographies; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that $\$ 400-\mathrm{plus}$ device, is that the devices that Google believed were most likely to compete with the iPhone?
A. That is what we would often refer to as the premium segment, and it was a segment that -- where Apple was most focused. As I talked about earlier, they were starting to focus on other segments as well, but we were -- we and Samsung were particularly focused on being more competitive in the premium
segment, and that's what this was about.
Q. And then looking down at the notes, do you see that there's sort of a description of each of the -- additional description of each of the three deals?
A. Yes.
Q. So the first is the Search deal?
A. Yes.
Q. And then the second is the monetizing services deal?
A. Yes. That changed quite a bit between this time and what was signed.
Q. And then the third one is -- at least here in the notes, deal 3 is referred to as "Share Force Investment."

Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. And so the description of deal 3 is, "Custom program focused on driving share against iOS by improving key aspects of user experience and deeper collaboration on go-to-market activities."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So looking at the description of the three deals in the speaker notes, deal 3 is the only one that addresses competition with iOS; correct?
A. No, I don't agree with that. I think all of these are about making the devices more competitive with iOS. I think
deal 3 is about getting the marketing teams to collaborate on go-to-market activities and adding an additional incentive for Samsung for growing its share relative to iOS.
Q. But in terms of what's written here on the page in UPX2111 and being presented to the BC and Google executives, the only one of the three deals that references competition with iOS is deal number 3; correct?
A. Well, actually, in the execution of this, deal 3, one of the requirements for, $I$ believe, a device to earn the economics under deal 3 was that it met the product conditions of the first two deals. And so deal 3 was sort of saying if the device is good, if it has all these great features, then we will work together on go to market, and as we achieve results, there will be an additional kicker available to Samsung for those results. Q. And Mr. Rosenberg, just to make sure that $I$ get an answer to my question --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in terms of what's written here --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and that was being presented in UPX2111 to the business counsel and Google's executives --
A. Yes.
Q. -- the only one of the three deals that references competition with iOS is deal number 3 ?
A. I think -- I'm not trying to be difficult, but if you're --
Q. Mr. Rosenberg, it is a yes or no question.
A. If you are asking me about these notes and if that's the only part of these notes that mentions iOS, the answer is yes. Q. Thank you.

So you referenced that in order to get the go-to-market funding and other financial benefits of deal 3, Samsung also had to have -- or that the devices also had to qualify for the revenue share agreement; correct?
A. I believe there were -- there were several qualifying conditions for the devices to be eligible for those economics. Some of those had to do with placement of Search. Some of them had to do with commitment to security and updates.

So basically, the thinking was for the best devices, we wanted to put additional go-to-market support behind them.
Q. So to qualify for the go-to-market and promotional support in deal 3, the devices had to have Google Search loaded as the exclusive default search out of the box on the device; correct?
A. I believe that's true. I'd have to go back and look through the agreement to confirm.
Q. And you're aware that the carrier deals that were signed in 2021 did not make the go to market funds contingent on the carrier also signing an RSA; correct?
A. I don't remember the specifics of those deals.
Q. And there's no reason that Google needed to make go-to-market and promotional payments contingent on Search
exclusivity; correct?
A. Well, I think the idea was if we were going to put extra dollars behind promotion and sell-through of these devices, then we wanted to have the assurances that they were products that we were excited about and that we thought would be successful against Apple. And having a good search experience was one of those aspects that we felt was important.
Q. And you've also referenced security upgrades. There is no requirement that security upgrades be tied in any way to Search exclusivity; correct?
A. Which agreement are you asking about?
Q. You referenced that there's security upgrade requirements in the revenue share agreements; is that correct?
A. I believe in the Samsung agreement, there are security requirements in deal 3.
Q. And like with the marketing funds, there is no reason that Google needs to make security upgrades contingent on Search exclusivity; correct?
A. Well, in that construct, the commitment to security updates was separate from the deal that had the commitment to Search exclusivity.
Q. But as we just discussed, deal 3 was contingent on Samsung also signing the first deal, which required Search exclusivity; correct?
A. It wasn't contingent on the first deal. Some of the
funding there was contingent on meeting the product requirements that were contemplated in the first deal.
Q. So you would agree, then, that there's no need to sort of tie Search and security upgrades together?
A. There wasn't a technical requirement that those needed to be together. As I said before, when we had done that in our prior agreements, it was sort of a reinforcement of the product and strategic importance to us that if we were going to invest significant dollars in the form of this revenue share agreement, when we do our highest value commercial agreement with a partner, a precondition for that is that the partner make a strong security promise on the device.

So the spirit of it was to provide the strongest possible motivation to the partner to make a responsible commitment to security.
Q. And I think you referred earlier to security as an existential issue for Google. Given the high importance of security to Google, it could choose to offer Android partners incentives to do regular security upgrades that have nothing to do with Search; correct?
A. Yes, but as I talked about with Mr. Popofski, that wasn't the way we were thinking about it. We weren't thinking about it as this transactional work-for-hire thing. And in fact, we ultimately hoped that the partners would fully internalize the importance to their own businesses of doing security updates.
Q. So setting aside the go-to-market payments and promotional payments, you have no understanding how OEMs use the Search revenue share that Google pays them; right?
A. We don't require them to tell us how they're using the funds.
Q. And you have no understanding how carriers use the search revenue payments that Google pays; correct?
A. With the exception of what's now in some of these go-to-market agreements, we don't require them to share with us how they're using the funds.
Q. And you don't have any understanding as to how carriers or OEMs use the revenue share payments that Google pays them? A. I don't.
Q. And there are no requirements that carriers or OEMs use any of the payments they receive to lower device prices for consumers; correct?

THE COURT: Sorry. Could you repeat the question again?

BY MS. BELLSHAW:
Q. There's no requirement that carriers or OEMs use the revenue share payments they receive from Google to lower the price of Android devices to consumers?
A. That's true.
Q. And there's no requirement that carriers use the revenue share payments from Google to make their wireless plans cheaper

```
for consumers?
```

A. That's correct.
Q. And you're not aware of any analysis at Google showing that Android partners use the RSA payments to either make Android devices cheaper for consumers or wireless plans cheaper for consumers?
A. I'm not aware. What I would say is that particularly with the device manufacturers, selling phones is a highly competitive market. They're competing with each other on price all the time. To the extent that our agreement provides them with a significant benefit to their $P \& L$, $I$ think we can assume that they're able to take that into account in the way that they set their pricing.
Q. But you don't know one way or the other?
A. Correct.
Q. I think you described the competition between Apple and Android as intense as it gets.

Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Given the intensity of competition between Apple and Android, have you ever told anyone that Google should not be paying billions of dollars every year to Android's biggest competitor?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Have you ever had discussions with anyone that Google
shouldn't be paying Apple revenue share?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Focusing on the MADA and the applications that are included in the MADA, a guiding principle for including an app. as a part of the MADA bundle is whether the app. generates revenue for Google; correct?
A. No, I wouldn't say that categorically. I think there's a lot that goes into thinking about what apps. go into the MADA.
Q. If I could direct your attention to UPX706.

MS. BELLSHAW: Your Honor, UPX706 is in evidence. BY MS. BELLSHAW:
Q. Are you there, Mr. Rosenberg?
A. Yes.
Q. UPX706 is an e-mail from you to a colleague at Google dated August 2019.

Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. And 2019 was a renewal cycle for Google with respect to the MADA; correct?
A. I believe that's true.
Q. And during renewal cycles, Google re-evaluates the MADA, including which apps. it wants to include; correct?
A. That's one of the things we evaluate in a renewal cycle, yes.
Q. Could you turn to the second page of UPX706. There's an
e-mail from you at 4:04 p.m.
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So in this e-mail, it appears that you're commenting on a slide deck that you reviewed with Mr. Lockheimer.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Lockheimer was the senior vice president of the platforms in ecosystems?
A. Yes.
Q. So in the first bullet of your feedback on the slide deck that you reviewed with Mr. Lockheimer, you direct your team to "make sure to" -- I think you meant "mark each slide as privileged and have Kate on the distribution for her review."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And Kate refers to Kate Lee?
A. Most likely, yes.
Q. And Ms. Lee was in-house counsel at Google?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you will see above, you've also marked your e-mail as "attorney-client privileged" and asked Ms. Lee to "please advise"?
A. Yes.
Q. Looking at the third bullet of your feedback in UPX706, do
you see that you ask to see the apps. in the MADA bundle characterized by type of app.?
A. Yes.
Q. And by this, did you mean, you know, health app., communication app., that type of thing?
A. Yeah, it looks like, reading the rest of the paragraph, there were some thematic areas that I was suggesting organizing the apps. into.
Q. So you wrote that "the rationale is that a particular app. might not yet be great or have broad usage, but the use case could be super important/strategic to us."
A. Yes.
Q. And by "us," you meant Google?
A. Presumably, yes.
Q. So there might be apps. that Google wants to include in the MADA that aren't very good yet; right?
A. No, I wouldn't characterize it that way. I think health is a good example. Though we didn't ultimately include a health app., but it could be, if we have an important new initiative like the work we were doing on smartwatches to try to counteract what Apple was doing with Apple Watch, we knew that was coming, we knew we were investing in it. We wanted to make sure that phones reliably had a good health app. to go with the product. So it could have been an emerging product category that we thought was going to be very important.
Q. But it's possible that in including the app. in the MADA bundle, that the app. might not yet be great?
A. I see that the language says that here. But the reasons for it not to be great might be that the category is still emerging, we're still working on it, but we want to have a plan to have that app. there as we continue to invest.
Q. And Google might also choose to include in the MADA an app. that's not very popular with users?
A. Yes; for example, for the same reason $I$ just articulated.
Q. Right. Google might choose to include apps. in the MADA bundle that aren't that great or might not be that popular, because it serves a strategic purpose for Google?
A. It could be that it serves an important purpose for the experience on the device. I mean, one example is Google Meet. I think at that time it was Google Duo. Apple has FaceTime on iPhones. We felt that Android needed to have a good, reliable video communication experience on the device. Apple doesn't make FaceTime available for Android. We were building Duo. We were evolving it into Meet. We saw that the category was going to be an important use case. Even if the app. wasn't perfect, we wanted to make sure that it was there.
Q. One of the uses for the MADA bundle is to promote new apps. to users; correct?
A. I wouldn't agree with that positioning.
Q. If you would please turn to UPX296A. It's going to be the
first tab in your binder.
And UPX296A is the linked attachment to your e-mail in UPX706. And I think you saw a version of this presentation with your counsel on direct.

Do you recall that?
A. Yes. I don't know if it's the same version.
Q. It's slightly different. I can represent that to you.
A. Okay.
Q. But it's a similar version to UPX129, which you saw with your counsel.

MS. BELLSHAW: Your Honor, we would move to admit UPX296A into evidence.

MR. POPOFSKI: Our understanding is this is effectively in evidence already, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. We will admit it, then.
(Exhibit UPX296A received into evidence.) THE COURT: Go ahead. BY MS. BELLSHAW:
Q. If you could please turn to slide 8, which is the page ending in Bates number 500 .

Do you see there's a slide "MADA version 2019 and beyond: 8 candidates for 3 slots, which we'll review with the following principles"?

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then there are suggested guiding principles for determining which new apps. to include in the MADA bundle; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the first guiding principle that Google identifies is "generate revenue for Google"; right?
A. I see that here, yes.
Q. So generating revenue for Google is the first principle that Google considered when deciding which applications to include in the 2019 MADA?
A. I don't know if this is a stack rank. It's one of the principles that was considered.
Q. So at least in this list, money is first on the list above user experience; right?
A. Yes, but if you're suggesting this is a ranking, I'm not necessarily agreeing with that.
Q. You can set that one aside. Thank you, Mr. Rosenberg. THE COURT: I'm sorry. Could I just ask a quick question? So what does this mean, " 8 candidates for 3 slots"? THE WITNESS: So what this meant -- sorry. I'm paging back to it. What this meant is we were cognizant of not creating -- not making the bundle more than 11 apps. We wanted to keep it at 11 apps. We had reasonable certainty around eight of the 11, and we were thinking about what are the right choices for the last three.

THE COURT: That's what I thought, but I just wanted to make sure. Thank you.

BY MS. BELLSHAW:
Q. Just while we're on this slide, this slide has ten apps., and then the last app. in the MADA bundle is the Play Store?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. If you would please turn to UPX997.

THE COURT: What was that number again? 997?
MS. BELLSHAW: 997.

BY MS. BELLSHAW:
Q. UPX997 is an e-mail chain between you and others at Google, including Ms. Kartasheva, about AT\&T's 2020 RSA, among other topics; correct?
A. Sorry. I just need a minute to read it.
Q. Sure. And if it helps, the RSA is explicitly referenced in your e-mail on page 5065.
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. So turning back to the first page, do you see that there's an e-mail from Kesh Patel?
A. Yes.
Q. Who is Mr. Patel?
A. Mr. Patel at this time -- I don't know what role he's in now, but he was a member of our partnerships team, and I believe he worked on the relationship with AT\&T.
Q. So in his e-mail, Mr. Patel is recounting a conversation
that he had with AT\&T; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you see Mr. Patel reports that "Google and AT\&T have philosophical differences on the user experience on Android? It's on the fourth line down.
A. Yeah, I think he's recounting something that Jeff Howard said.
Q. And Mr. Patel goes on to report that "AT\&T wants to differentiate the experiences so not all Android devices look the same."
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Android OEMs and carriers don't just compete with Apple; correct?
A. Android OEMs compete with each other. Carriers compete with each other as well.
Q. So AT\&T competes against Verizon to sell AT\&T Android devices, among other things; right?
A. And iPhones, yes.
Q. And Samsung competes against Motorola?
A. Yes.
Q. And Android partners compete against one another by differentiating their devices and device experiences?
A. That's one of the ways they compete, yes.
Q. And differentiation between Android devices can lead to
innovation; correct?
A. Yes, I mean, innovation is one of the ways they can differentiate, like the foldable devices I showed or some of the other innovations that we talked about earlier.
Q. If you would turn back to your e-mail on page 7 of 506 -Bates number 5065. It's page 7 of UPX997.

This is your e-mail where you reference AT\&T's RSA.
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you start your e-mail with "attorney-client privileged" in all caps.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you write in parens "adding Tristan for legal advice, since I'm about to use some trigger words."

Does Tristan refer to an in-house lawyer at Google?
A. Yes.
Q. What trigger words were you referring to?
A. I don't know specifically, but it might have been terms that had particular legal implications that $I$ wanted to make sure Tristan had a chance to weigh in on.
Q. If you look at the first sentence in the body of your e-mail under "trigger words," you wrote, "Sadly, I think this is all about leverage and money."

The trigger word that you were concerned about
was "leverage"; right?
A. I don't -- I don't remember specifically what word I was concerned about.
Q. Google offers guidelines on how employees should communicate in writing; correct?
A. There are some guidelines about communication, yes.
Q. And those guidelines include instructions to employees to avoid using certain words in writing; correct?
A. I believe that's true. I don't remember the specifics.
Q. One of the words that employees are taught not to use
is "leverage"?
A. That might be true in certain contexts. In this context, I think I'm referring to leverage in a negotiation, which I don't think is what's implicated there.
Q. So we can -- if you would please turn to UPX2091. UPX2091 is a document entitled "five rules of thumb for written communications."

Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. So these are Google's guidelines to employees about what they should and should not put in writing; correct?
A. I don't know if I've seen this document. If you're representing that this is a Google document, then I'll trust you on that.
Q. If you want to look at the bottom of the first page, you
can see the source of this document. It comes
from "support.google.com/ethics."
Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. And that's an internal Google website available to employees?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. And so you yourself would have had access to this document? A. Yes.

MS. BELLSHAW: Your Honor, I move to admit UPX2091.
MR. POPOFSKI: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: It will be admitted.
(Exhibit UPX2091 received into evidence.)
BY MS. BELLSHAW:
Q. Looking up at the top of the "five rules of thumb for written communications," do you see that the first paragraph starts, "Words matter. Especially in antitrust law"?
A. I see that.
Q. And then it lists out five rules of thumb that employees should follow in their written communications?
A. Yes.
Q. And then looking at the fifth one, it reminds employees to assume every document you write will be seen by regulators; correct?
A. I see that.
Q. So these are the guidelines that Google employees should keep in mind in case regulators see their e-mails and documents?
A. I think these were general guidelines for communication, written communication.
Q. And below the summary list, it provides additional color on each of these five rules of thumb; right?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. So the first rule of thumb is, "We're out to help users"? A. Yes.
Q. And it tells employees, "Don't focus on what impact we might have on our competition. We are not out to crush, kill, hurt, block, or do anything else that might be perceived as evil or unfair."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it reminds employees about a famous statement that came out during the Microsoft antitrust trial; right?
A. Yes, I think that's what this refers to.
Q. And then the second rule of thumb that Google employees should keep in mind when writing their communications is, "Our users should always be free to switch."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And it instructs employees not to use words like "bundle" or "tie"?
A. I think it's in reference to the language, but I see that those two words are highlighted there.
Q. And then a little bit further down, maybe about two-thirds of the way down, it says, "Likewise, we don't leverage markets, products, or resources. Using the word leverage may make you sound like you went to business school, but it implies exploitation and an absence of consumer choice."

So that's the lesson that you were referring to when you said in your e-mail that you were about to use a trigger word and then wrote the word "leverage"; correct?
A. I wouldn't necessarily draw that connection, because it wasn't in the context of any of these examples. It was about a negotiation.
Q. So you wrote in UPX997, you wrote the word "leverage" and then added in-house counsel to your e-mail; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you asked for legal advice because you were about to use words you knew weren't supposed to be in writing?
A. I think, you know -- I don't know about the term "trigger words." It's not a term I would use today, for a lot of reasons that don't have anything to do with this case. I think the point here was that we were talking about a big partnership. We were talking about deal terms. We were talking about big things. To the extent that there were legal implications of the things we were talking about, I wanted to make sure that Tristan
had a chance to weigh in on those.
Q. So looking at the third rule of thumb, it reminds employees that Google has lots of competitors; right?
A. Yes.
Q. At least in written communication?
A. Yes.
Q. "Google competes with every company that lets users access information and every company that sells advertising."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it admonishes employees not to include lists of competitors. And down at the bottom, it says, "If you really need to list a group of competitors in a particular area, list as many as possible."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then helpfully at the top, there's a list that employees can reference included in the guidelines for their written communications; right?
A. I mean, there's a list of companies. Some of these companies have different names or aren't around anymore. But I think at least at the time this was written, $I$ see there's a list of companies there.
Q. And the list of companies that Google employees are reminded they can use in their written communications include
names like Amazon, Facebook, Twitter, Kayak, and Apple?
A. I see that it says that here. It says "just to name a few." So there are others, but these are examples that were pulled out for this document.
Q. And then looking at the fourth rule of thumb, the fourth rule of thumb is, "Don't define markets and estimate shares"; right?
A. I see that it says that.
Q. And it goes on to say, "There's no problem with referring to a market segment, sector, business, et cetera, but just try and avoid defining the market for what we offer. Similarly, estimating market share is complicated, and it implies a defined market. So guessing or approximating isn't very reliable."

Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. So employees shouldn't use "market share" or "market," but "segment," "sector," "business," those are okay for written communications?
A. I see that the document says that. I think the guidance is probably applied differently to different products ultimately.
Q. This was a -- five rules of thumbs for written
communications that was available to all employees; correct?
A. Yes.

MS. BELLSHAW: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Rosenberg.
I have no further questions.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Cavanaugh, any questions? MR. CAVANAUGH: No questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Popofski, redirect.
MR. POPOFSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. Please just give me one moment.

May I proceed?
THE COURT: You may.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. POPOFSKI:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Rosenberg.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Ms. Bellshaw asked you about some services other than Search that monetize that Google distributes through the MADA. Do you recall that line of questions?
A. Yes.
Q. And one of those services is Play?
A. Yes.
Q. In Europe, was a license fee charged for the eMADA, which includes Play, even though it doesn't include Search and Chrome?
A. Yes.
Q. Why was that, just to remind the Court?
A. Because our business model for Android contemplates all of the revenue from the services we distribute in MADA and the ability for us to then take that, invest it in continuing to grow the platform, competing with iOS in all the ways that we
need to compete, making those services better.
In Europe, when we couldn't count on Search and Chrome being reliably available in MADA, we put a license fee on the other part of MADA so that we could still achieve the same economics per device as we would have had we had the full suite of apps. available.
Q. And, Mr. Rosenberg, if Google had no Search revenue at all, would Google have as much incentive to continue to invest in Android as it has today?
A. No.
Q. Do you recall that Ms. Bellshaw asked you about some security requirements in the Samsung deal 3? That's the go-to-market agreement.
A. Yes.
Q. If there had been no go-to-market agreement with Samsung in 2020, would Google still have pushed to have had security requirements in the search RSA?

MS. BELLSHAW: Objection; calls for a hypothetical.
THE COURT: You can answer. Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: I think we would have. I think we would
have -- along the principle of if we're going to do a big deal with a partner, a foundational commitment needs to be upholding the security principles that we have.

So most likely, we would have found somewhere else to put that.
Q. Thank you.

I would like to show you a document, if I may approach, Your Honor. This is in evidence. It is JX0075.

And I will represent to you, Mr. Rosenberg, it is the go-to-market agreement with Samsung --
A. Okay.
Q. -- from 2020.

Now, I'm going to ask about this elliptically, Your Honor, because a vast majority, if not all, of this document is fully under seal, but $I$ can do this, though, in open session.

Do you recall, Mr. Rosenberg, that Ms. Bellshaw asked you about what devices were covered by this agreement?
A. Yes.
Q. And how that related to deal 1?
A. Yes.
Q. Again, I don't want you to say anything out loud. Would you please turn to page 5 in this document ending in 2368. And it's a section called "eligible device."
A. Yes.
Q. Section 3, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Does Section 3.1.C provide information that was responsive to Ms. Bellshaw's question to you about device prerequisites for this agreement?
A. Yes, I think Romanette -- if that's what it's called,

Romanette 3 here under C provides that information.
Q. And whatever the requirements are for the provisions that are cross-referenced in Romanette 3, they are what they are?
A. Yes.
Q. I don't want to discuss them in open court.

Thank you, Mr. Rosenberg. Nothing further on that document.

Ms. Bellshaw also asked you about use of RSA funds. Do you recall that? She was asking you how partners use them.
A. Yes.
Q. Was one of the objectives, Mr. Rosenberg, of the Search RSA to incentivize OEM and carrier partners to sell more Android devices in competition with iOS?

MS. BELLSHAW: Objection; leading.
THE COURT: Rephrase the question, please.
MR. POPOFSKI: Sure.
BY MR. POPOFSKI:
Q. How, if at all, was the RSA incentive related to iPhone/Android competition?

THE COURT: That's not exactly a rephrase. Why don't we try something a little more open-ended. MR. POPOFSKI: Sure. BY MR. POPOFSKI:
Q. What's your view of one of the purposes of the incentives that are provided in the RSA?
A. Well, the RSA was an attempt to align the partner's business with ours. And so as we were able to make more money for the partner on their Android devices and share that money with them, then we hoped that would motivate them to either sell more Android devices or ship more Android devices, depending on the nature of the partner.
Q. I would like to return to DXD35 and go to slide 9, if we can.

Do you recall Ms. Bellshaw asked you about the Duo?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see on the right side of that image, there is a vertical row of icons?
A. Yes.
Q. What's the top icon, Mr. Rosenberg?
A. I believe that's the Edge browser from Microsoft.
Q. And what is the default search engine, if you know, in the Edge browser?
A. Typically, it's Bing. I assume it's Bing.
Q. Last question, Mr. Rosenberg. If you would go to UPX129 in the binder I handed you. I believe it's the black binder. And we are going to go to page 905.

Do you see there's a second row entitled "Placement, Services, and Integrations"? It's also going to be up on the screen for you.
A. Yes.
Q. And just for the record -- no, I said 905.

What does the first little caret-shaped or chevron-shaped icon represent?
A. That's the Android Auto icon.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Android what?
THE WITNESS: Auto.
BY MR. POPOFSKI:
Q. What does Android Auto do?
A. What Android Auto does is for compatible cars, when you get in your car with your Android phone, then it allows basically the -- you to have some applications and experience that project to the screen in the car, similar to Car Play with iOS.
Q. Why did Google add that service to MADA?
A. We were working really hard with the auto industry to have them evolve their in-car infotainment systems, if you will, to be able to do this what we call projected mode from the phone to the screen. We wanted that to be reliably available on every Android device that we worked with. That was what Apple was working toward with iPhone. I think it was a great way of how a phone has increasingly become useful to users in different contexts as we've moved forward.
Q. Is that a service that Google monetizes?
A. No.
Q. How, if at all, does it relate to the user experience?
A. It just -- it makes the experience better. It makes the
phone useful in more contexts.
MR. POPOFSKI: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Could we go back to that slide for a moment? I want to make sure I'm reading this right.

Do I read this to say that at least in 2019, all of the apps. on the top row were included in the MADA, all of the apps. in the second row were included in the MADA but deleteable, and then those three additional apps. were added?

THE WITNESS: Those were what we call headless apps. So they're not apps. with icons. They're sort of underlying functionality that's a part of the software package.

So one of them -- that's Android Auto. One of them is Family Link, which allows you to have parental controls across your family. I think it exists in device settings, not as an icon necessarily.

And the other one is Digital Wellbeing, which helps you set controls and limits for how much you're using your device.

THE COURT: Okay. I was just curious, because we had talked about 11 apps., and I was counting more than that, but now I understand why you're at 11 still.

Thank you.
MR. POPOFSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. No further questions.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rosenberg, thank you very much for your time and your testimony. Safe travels home.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Mr. Schmidtlein?
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Your Honor, the next witness that we're prepared to call is Jeff Giard from T-Mobile. We have a video deposition that we have coordinated for him. And the run time on that is about one hour and three minutes, four minutes, all in open court.

As we did with the videos last week, we've got designations and counterdesignations from both sides, and we're just going to play it all the way through, you know, all of them together, just a continuous run-through.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: I leave to Your Honor whether you want to take the break now and then just play them all the way through. That might be a better user experience.

THE COURT: There's only one user.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: We've watched them a lot. So yes.
THE COURT: All right. So then $I$ just want to confirm, the Levy and the Ezell that you handed, is that something you intend to run today?

I have to confess, I did not look at them over lunch in the way that I had hoped.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Your Honor, again, it will be sort of your preference sort of where we are at the end of the day. I am conferring -- I'd like to confer with my client as to sort
of how they want to proceed in terms of whether we want to push sort of these today or -- as I said, we will be guided by you.

The next one that we would have to play is Mr. Levy, who is from Facebook. My understanding is that I think all of the parties have agreed upon the designations, the clips. I don't think there are any confidentiality disputes. There are several spots, I think as I indicated to Your Honor before, where there are a handful of places where there are proposed places to -THE COURT: It looks like there's only two. Maybe there's more.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: There is one more that I've been -let me flag for you that has come up as a result of -- and it's on the very, very last page of the material in your binder. And if you go to line 184 -- or page 184, line 19, there is a number, percent revenue.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: And my understanding is that
Facebook's counsel, who is here today, has requested, and I believe the parties have all agreed, that just that specific number could be sort of edited out of the audio.

THE COURT: Okay. It looks like that same number is on page 28, line 184:13.

Does this number relate to -- again, I haven't looked at this, but does this relate in any way to the Apple change in privacy settings and the impact it would have on Facebook's ad
revenue?
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: That is correct.
THE COURT: Okay. I mean, just from my own following of the news, I know Facebook has made announcements about revenue impacts. I do not know whether they've assigned a particular percentage to it.

So I would just ask, at least in terms of thinking of the factors, whether this particular number has been revealed in an investor call or something like that.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: I would recommend -- let me confer with their counsel over the break.

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: And then if they want to be heard on this afterwards, then obviously, I think they can be.

THE COURT: Great. Terrific.
So let's take our break now. It's a little bit before 2:55. So why don't we just plan to resume at 3:10.

Thanks, everyone.
(Recess taken from 2:53 p.m. to 3:10 p.m.)
THE COURT: Okay. So are we ready to roll the tape?
(Videotaped deposition of Jeffrey Giard played.)
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: All right. Your Honor, I want to give you just a little bit of an update on where we are and where we're going.

THE COURT: Okay. Before you do that, have these
exhibits -- are they already in evidence?
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: I believe they are. We can confirm that.

THE COURT: Just make sure Mr. Douyon has those numbers.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Absolutely.
Good news, I think, hopefully to deliver here. Given the progress we've made this week with the variety of the Google witnesses who have testified, we had another witness who was a potential call for tomorrow live that we are not going to call live tomorrow.

And so at this point, we've got -- we have been in discussions with three more deposition videos: The Facebook video that I referenced earlier, and I have conferred with counsel for Facebook who can represent that the percentage figure that we talked about before the last break, as best they've been able to verify, has not been publicly revealed. THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Obviously, you're welcome to talk to them directly about that. But that's the representation I've been told that we can make on their behalf.

The video -- that video is 54 minutes, and then we have Mr. Ezell from AT\&T. He holds a position similar to Mr. Giard, who you just heard from, Mr. Higgins, who you heard from live. He is the individual who has negotiated a number of the AT\&T RSA
agreements. So the run time on that video is an hour and 47 minutes, I think largely because he has actually been employed in this position longer and has a greater breadth.

So we have those two videos that are queued up and ready to go.

I will tell you, we have been in negotiations over another video. We have a variety of disagreements with some of my colleagues, particularly the States, over the propriety of the counters, which have grown in size and scope to a point, Your Honor, that quite frankly, I don't want you to have to fight over -- or deal with our fight over that, nor do I want you to have to listen to the length of the video that would be required, given all of the various parties, the battles back and forth to that.

And so we have decided we're not going to offer to have that played for you, because frankly it's nearly three hours and you have better things to do than watch three hours of that video. We think there are, obviously, relevant portions of it. It's a witness from Amazon. There are also a variety of confidentiality issues that are being -- that became, I think, difficult for us to hash out. And at this late date in the trial, it's not worth the candle is my judgment. We're obviously going to submit the designations to you. They will be available for citation post-trial.

So we basically have tomorrow two videos of two hours and

45 or so minutes or so. And then we're done for tomorrow. As I said, Professor Murphy will be coming first thing on Monday, given scheduling issues that he has.

THE COURT: Okay. Terrific.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Great. Mr. Cavanaugh?
MR. CAVANAUGH: Just a few small things, Your Honor.
We have agreement on 49 additional exhibits that we'll
offer. We also have our deposition designations for witnesses that have not previously been submitted, where the United States put in deponents and we had designations. The United States put those in. These are -- I think only we had designations and Google had designations.

There is one more deponent, Your Honor, where we're trying to finalize the designations. It's the individual who wasn't able -- who we had anticipated coming live but as we discussed couldn't. We should have that by -- I think we owe them counters to counters at this point.

Last thing, as I mentioned, I used a demonstrative, PSX016 with Dr. Israel. It was a SERP. And we would just offer that as a demonstrative.

THE COURT: Okay. So that will be admitted.
(Exhibit PSXO16 received into evidence.)
MS. JENSEN: Elizabeth Jensen with the United States.
I have here some of the demonstratives that we used with Professor Israel on cross. We had mentioned that we'd be
offering these as we've offered demonstratives in the past in this case.

So I have here 23 demonstratives. I would be happy to read them into the record or hand them up if you prefer.

THE COURT: Just hand them up. That's fine. They're already read into the record in terms of their numbers. If they're all admitted, then we just need to record them.

MS. JENSEN: Thank you, Your Honor. May I approach? THE COURT: Sure. Of course.

MR. CAVANAUGH: I forgot one thing.
We have a meet and confer with Google tonight about a handful of exhibits that hopefully we can resolve or at least cut it down to an even lesser number. If not, if we could just take a little time tomorrow to just deal with them and argue the point and get it resolved.

THE COURT: Sure. No problem.
MR. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.
THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else?
MR. DINTZER: Nothing for DOJ plaintiffs, Your Honor.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: And per your request, we will be submitting, if it hasn't already been filed, we will be submitting the confidentiality statement on the Apple documents that you had asked us about yesterday. That will be filed, as I said, if it hasn't been filed already, it's going to be filed this evening for you.

THE COURT: Terrific. Thank you.
All right. Okay. So I think just in terms of outstanding things from my end, we did receive an e-mail last night about the transcripts from the afternoon session in which some numbers were stated on the record inadvertently, both by one of the examiners and by the witness. There's been a request to seal those on the transcripts. And I did ask the court reporter not to send those out until we resolved the issue.

I guess the one thing I wanted to just raise before I proceeded any further, and that is, notwithstanding the inadvertence of it, it's a little unclear to me whether I can sort of take something off the public record that's already been on it, even if inadvertent. I know everybody's been making Herculean efforts to sort of be cognizant of that. But I think that's my concern, that $I$ can't somehow unring the bell.

And if you all think I can and have some authority that would allow me to do that, then I would be happy to consider it.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: If I can ask for your indulgence, let me confer with my client this evening on that point, and I will report back to you first thing tomorrow on it. THE COURT: That's fine. MR. DINTZER: Our basic position, Your Honor, is -and we have been making every effort, is that once they're said in court, of course, reporters are here, and to some extent they may have already reported these things, that the public record
would not match what's already gone out.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: We will report back to you first thing in the morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Great. We will resolve it in the morning.
Okay. So I also know I've got that set of documents that were provided to me. I will make sure I get that taken care of. And then in terms of tomorrow's videos, I know we've got counsel for Facebook here. Would you like to be heard just about -- I'll take a look at the transcripts tonight, but if you would like to put anything on the record at this point, I'm happy to consider it.

MR. LAZEROW: I appreciate that, Your Honor. Andrew Lazerow, Covington \& Burling, on behalf of Meta Platforms, Inc. Thank you for hearing us.

The figure you referenced earlier I have now confirmed was not made public. You will see when you review that document that was an internal discussion in February of 2020 about a long-range plan. The discussion is around Apple but also other potential changes that might be coming. And therefore, it does not tie to the publicly available figure that at the time Facebook reported in February of 2022.

THE COURT: All right. I will keep that in mind. I will take a look at the requested moments of silence in the running video, and $I$ can just rule on those tomorrow morning.

MR. LAZEROW: Thank you.

THE COURT: Is there anything else we need to take care of before we adjourn?

MR. DINTZER: Not for DOJ plaintiffs, Your Honor.
MR. CAVANAUGH: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I do have one question. Just in terms of scheduling, we have, I take it, Google's last witness on Monday of next week, which I assume will bleed into the 14th, likelihood of that being the case.

And then have the plaintiffs -- where are you in your current thinking of your rebuttal cases?

MR. DINTZER: Your Honor, we have three rebuttal witnesses, two will call and one may call. The will calls are Professor Whinston, recalling him, and Professor Oard, and then the may call is Professor Davies, as the Court has heard.

And the order of these is $t / b / d$, but -- so we assume that no matter what we wouldn't start before Wednesday. I assume Professor Murphy's going to take at least a day and flop over. And so we wouldn't start before Wednesday.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Cavanaugh, are you expecting a rebuttal case?

MR. CAVANAUGH: No, Your Honor, not at this point.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: The t/b/d under the Court's order, I believe, is 7:00 p.m. this evening on the order of witnesses for next week. So we've got two and a half hours to firm that up as far as we can tell, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So you're on the clock.
MR. DINTZER: We meet our deadlines, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Good. Well, look, there's an outside chance that we could finish next week. Depending upon the length of the experts and how many, we may bleed into the following week, but we're certainly on course to finish up before the Thanksgiving present that you all give one another. All right. Anything else before we conclude? Thank you, all, very much. We will see you in the morning. (Proceedings adjourned at 4:28 p.m.)
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|  | ```DEFENDANT \({ }_{[1]}\) - 9544:6 define [1] - 9581:6 defined [1] - 9581:12 defining [1] - 9581:11 deleteable [1] - 9588:7 deleted [1] - 9558:6 deliver [1] - 9592:7 demonstrative [2] - 9594:18, 9594:20 demonstratives [3] - 9594:24, 9595:1, 9595:3 Department [2] - 9541:13, 9541:16 deponent \({ }_{[1]}\) - 9594:13 deponents [1] - 9594:10 deposition [5] - 9543:5, 9589:5, 9591:21, 9592:13, 9594:8 described [1] - 9566:16 description [4] - 9560:3, 9560:15, 9560:21 designations [8] - 9589:8, 9590:5, 9593:23, 9594:8, 9594:10, 9594:11, 9594:12, 9594:14 Designed [1] - 9547:4 determining \([1]\) - 9572:2 developer \({ }_{[1]}\) - 9556:3 developers [1] - 9556:4 device [19] - 9554:9, 9559:8, 9559:17, 9559:19, 9561:9, 9561:11, 9562:17, 9564:12, 9565:15, 9566:8, 9570:14, 9570:17, 9574:23, 9583:5, 9584:18, 9584:23, 9587:18, 9588:14, 9588:17 devices [30] - 9547:13, 9548:9, 9550:2, 9550:16, 9550:24, 9552:1, 9552:15, 9553:12, 9553:17, 9553:25, 9554:2, 9559:19, 9560:25, 9562:7,``` | ```9565:22, 9566:5, 9574:9, 9574:18, 9574:23, 9574:25, 9575:3, 9584:12, 9585:13, 9586:3, 9586:5 difference [1] - 9552:24 differences [2] - 9548:4, 9574:4 different [5]-9552:4, 9571:7, 9580:21, 9581:20, 9587:20 differentiate [2] - 9574:9, 9575:3 differentiating [1] - 9574:23 differentiation [1] - 9574:25 differently [1] - 9581:20 difficult [2] - 9561:25, 9593:21 Digital [1] - 9588:16 DINTZER [6] - 9541:13, 9595:19, 9596:22, 9598:3, 9598:11, 9599:2 direct [7] - 9544:12, 9546:21, 9549:19, 9558:16, 9567:9, 9568:12, 9571:4 directly [3] - 9554:16, 9555:1, 9592:20 disagreements [1] - 9593:7 discuss [1] - 9585:5 discussed [5] - 9548:14, 9554:3, 9557:20, 9563:22, 9594:15 discussing [1] - 9547:22 discussion [3] - 9557:24, 9597:17, 9597:18 discussions [2] - 9566:25, 9592:13 disputes [1] - 9590:6 distribute [1] - 9582:23 distributes [1] - 9582:13 distribution [2] - 9555:11, 9568:14 Distribution [3]- 9547:4, 9549:24, 9550:1``` | ```document [15] - 9545:17, 9547:6, 9576:16, 9576:22, 9576:23, 9577:1, 9577:8, 9577:23, 9581:4, 9581:19, 9584:2, 9584:9, 9584:17, 9585:7, 9597:16 documents [4] - 9545:4, 9578:2, 9595:22, 9597:5 DOJ [3]-9541:13, 9595:19, 9598:3 dollar [1] - 9547:5 dollars [3] - 9563:3, 9564:9, 9566:22 done [3] - 9546:17, 9564:6, 9594:1 Douyon [1] - 9592:4 down [10] - 9547:12, 9548:8, 9552:11, 9554:16, 9560:2, 9574:5, 9579:3, 9579:4, 9580:12, 9595:13 download [1] - 9551:11 Dr [1] - 9594:19 Drake [1] - 9545:8 draw [1] - 9579:11 drive [2] - 9555:22, 9556:11 driving [1] - 9560:16 Duo [3] - 9570:15, 9570:18, 9586:9 during [7]-9547:14, 9550:3, 9550:17, 9550:24, 9567:21, 9578:17 DXD35 [1] - 9586:7 \\ ENone``` | ```9554:17, 9555:2 economics [3] - 9561:9, 9562:10, 9583:5 ecosystem [2] - 9556:2, 9556:3 ecosystems [1] - 9568:9 Edge [2] - 9586:15, 9586:17 edited [1] - 9590:20 effectively \([1]\) - 9571:14 effort [1] - 9596:23 efforts [1] - 9596:14 eight [1] - 9572:23 either [3] - 9551:10, 9566:4, 9586:4 elements [1] - 9557:7 eligible [2] - 9562:10, 9584:18 Elizabeth [1] - 9594:23 elliptically [1] - 9584:8 eMADA \({ }_{[1]}\) - 9582:18 emerging [2] - 9569:24, 9570:5 employed \({ }^{11]}\) - 9593:2 employee [1] - 9557:14 employees [19] - 9557:17, 9576:4, 9576:7, 9576:10, 9576:20, 9577:6, 9577:19, 9577:22, 9578:1, 9578:10, 9578:16, 9578:19, 9578:24, 9580:2, 9580:11, 9580:18, 9580:24, 9581:16, 9581:22 end [3] - 9557:10, 9589:24, 9596:3 ended [1] - 9585:21 ending [5] - 9551:3, 9554:20, 9558:18, 9571:20, 9584:17 ends [2] - 9547:6, 9551:22 engine [1] - 9586:16 entitled [3] - 9576:16, 9586:22, 9600:5 especially \({ }_{[1]}\) - 9577:17 ESQ [5] - 9541:13, 9541:15, 9541:19, 9542:2, 9542:4 estimate [1] - 9581:6``` |


| ```estimating [1] - 9581:12 et [2] - 9541:3, 9581:10 Europe [2] - 9582:18, 9583:2 evaluate [1] - 9567:23 evaluates [1] - 9567:21 evening [3] - 9595:25, 9596:19, 9598:23 eventually [2] - 9546:17, 9547:18 evidence [9] - 9546:8, 9567:10, 9571:12, 9571:14, 9571:16, 9577:13, 9584:3, 9592:1, 9594:22 evil [1] - 9578:12 evolve [1] - 9587:15 evolving [1] - 9570:19 exact [3] - 9549:23, 9552:10, 9558:4 exactly [2]-9559:13, 9585:20 EXAMINATION \({ }_{[2]}\) - 9544:7, 9582:8 Examination............ [1] - 9543:4 Examination............. .. [1] - 9543:4 examiners [1] - 9596:6 example [4] - 9551:11, 9569:18, 9570:9, 9570:14 examples [2] - 9579:12, 9581:3 except \([1]\) - 9545:6 exception [1] - 9565:8 excited [1] - 9563:5 exclusive [1] - 9562:17 exclusivity \([5]\) - 9563:1, 9563:10, 9563:18, 9563:21, 9563:23 exec/BC [1] - 9545:23 execute [1] - 9553:9 executed [2]- 9558:23, 9558:24 execution [1] - 9561:8 executive \({ }_{[1]}\) - 9545:20 executives [2] - 9561:5, 9561:21 Exhibit [3]-9571:16, 9577:13, 9594:22 EXHIBITS [1] - 9543:8 Exhibits [1] - 9546:8``` | ```exhibits [3] - 9592:1, 9594:7, 9595:12 existential [1] - 9564:17 exists [1] - 9588:14 expected \([5]\) - 9549:16, 9550:2, 9550:4, 9550:8, 9552:11 expecting [1] - 9598:19 expensive \({ }_{[1]}\) - 9555:7 experience [11] - 9555:25, 9560:17, 9563:6, 9570:14, 9570:17, 9572:14, 9574:4, 9587:11, 9587:24, 9587:25, 9589:15 experiences [2] - 9574:9, 9574:23 experts [1] - 9599:5 explain [1] - 9551:6 explicitly \({ }_{[1]}\) - 9573:15 exploitation [1] - 9579:7 extent [3] - 9566:10, 9579:24, 9596:24 extra [2] - 9553:1, 9563:2 Ezell [2] - 9589:19, 9592:23 \\ F \\ Facebook [7] - \\ 9581:1, 9590:4, \\ 9591:4, 9592:13, \\ 9592:15, 9597:8, \\ 9597:21 \\ Facebook's [2] 9590:18, 9590:25 \\ FaceTime [2] - \\ 9570:15, 9570:18 \\ facilitate [1] - 9551:15 \\ fact \({ }_{[1]}\) - 9564:23 \\ factors [1] - 9591:8 \\ Family [1] - 9588:13 \\ family [1] - 9588:14 \\ famous [1] - 9578:16 \\ \(\operatorname{far}[3]-9549: 13\), \\ 9552:6, 9598:25 \\ features [1] - 9561:12 \\ February [2] - \\ 9597:17, 9597:21 \\ fee [2] - 9582:18, \\ 9583:3 \\ feedback [2] - \\ 9568:11, 9568:25 \\ fees [1] - 9551:9``` | ```felt [2] - 9563:7, 9570:16 few [3]-9557:17, 9581:3, 9594:6 Fifth [1]-9541:16 fifth [1] - 9577:22 fight [2] - 9593:10, 9593:11 figure [3] - 9592:16, 9597:15, 9597:20 figures [1] - 9549:23 filed [4] - 9595:21, 9595:23, 9595:24 final [2] - 9548:2, 9548:4 finalize [1] - 9594:14 finalized [1] - 9548:1 financial [2]-9552:3, 9562:6 fine [2] - 9595:5, 9596:21 finish [2]-9599:4, 9599:6 firm [1] - 9598:24 first [27] - 9545:5, 9548:18, 9549:5, 9549:22, 9549:23, 9550:1, 9550:19, 9556:24, 9560:6, 9561:10, 9563:23, 9563:25, 9564:2, 9568:11, 9571:1, 9572:5, 9572:8, 9572:13, 9573:18, 9575:22, 9576:25, 9577:16, 9578:8, 9587:2, 9594:2, 9596:20, 9597:2 five [5] - 9576:16, 9577:15, 9577:19, 9578:6, 9581:21 flag [1] - 9590:12 flip [1] - 9556:23 flop [1] - 9598:17 focus [2] - 9559:23, 9578:10 focused [3] - 9559:23, 9559:25, 9560:16 focusing [3] - 9548:6, 9550:19, 9567:3 foldable [1] - 9575:3 follow [1] - 9577:20 following [3] - 9571:22, 9591:3, 9599:6 FOR [2] - 9541:1, 9544:6 Force \({ }_{[1]}\) - 9560:12 foregoing [1] - 9600:3 forgot \({ }_{[1]}\) - 9595:10``` | ```form [1] - 9564:9 forth [1] - 9593:14 forward [5] - 9554:21, 9556:23, 9557:2, 9558:17, 9587:21 foundational [1] - 9583:22 four [1] - 9589:6 fourth [3] - 9574:5, 9581:5 framework [7] - 9547:22, 9548:1, 9557:13, 9558:23, 9559:1, 9559:5 frankly [2]-9593:10, 9593:16 free [2]-9551:13, 9578:21 front [1]-9556:5 full [2]-9558:9, 9583:5 full-time [1] - 9558:9 fully \({ }_{[2]}\) - 9564:24, 9584:9 functionality [1] - 9588:11 fund \({ }_{[1]}-9559: 16\) funding [2] - 9562:6, 9564:1 funds [5] - 9562:21, 9563:16, 9565:5, 9565:10, 9585:8 future [1] - 9552:12```  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9559:11, 9560:17, } \\ & \text { 9561:2, 9562:5, } \\ & \text { 9562:14, 9562:15, } \\ & \text { 9562:25, 9565:1, } \\ & \text { 9565:9, 9583:13, } \\ & \text { 9583:15, 9584:5 } \\ & \text { GOOGLE [1] - 9541:6 } \\ & \text { Google [88] - 9544:11, } \\ & 9544: 13,9544: 18, \\ & 9544: 19,9544: 20, \\ & 9544: 21,9545: 1, \\ & 9546: 15,9547: 5, \\ & 9547: 13,9547: 21, \\ & 9548: 1,9548: 6, \\ & 9548: 8,9550: 16, \\ & 9551: 7,9551: 25, \\ & 9553: 3,9553: 17, \\ & 9553: 21,9553: 24, \\ & 9554: 1,9554: 2, \\ & 9554: 5,9554: 10, \\ & 9554: 12,9554: 17, \\ & 9555: 2,9555: 13, \\ & 9555: 19,9555: 21, \\ & 9556: 10,9557: 12, \\ & 9557: 14,9558: 8, \\ & 9558: 14,9559: 2, \\ & 9559: 19,9561: 5, \\ & 9562: 16,9562: 24, \\ & 9563: 17,9564: 17, \\ & 9564: 18,9565: 3, \\ & 9565: 7,9565: 12, \\ & 9565: 21,9565: 25, \\ & 9566: 3,9566: 21, \\ & 9566: 25,9567: 6, \\ & 9567: 14,9567: 18, \\ & 9567: 21,9568: 19, \\ & 9569: 13,9569: 15, \\ & 9570: 7,9570: 10, \\ & 9570: 12,9570: 14, \\ & 9570: 15,9572: 5, \\ & 9572: 6,9572: 8, \\ & 9572: 9,9573: 11, \\ & 9574: 3,9575: 16, \\ & 9576: 4,9576: 23, \\ & 9577: 5,9578: 1, \\ & 9578: 19,9580: 3, \\ & 9580: 7,9580: 24, \\ & 9582: 13,9583: 7, \\ & 9583: 8,9583: 16, \\ & 9587: 13,9587: 22, \\ & 9592: 8,9594: 12, \\ & 9595: 11 \\ & \text { Google's [4] - } \\ & 9557: 14,9561: 21, \\ & 9576: 20,9598: 6 \\ & \text { graphs }[1]-9546: 25 \\ & \text { Gray [2] }-9542: 5, \\ & 9550: 13 \\ & \text { gray [3] - 9549:9, } \\ & 9549: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { great }[9]-9561: 12, \\ 9569: 10,9570: 2, \\ 9570: 4,9570: 11, \\ 9587: 19,9591: 15, \\ 9594: 5,9597: 4 \\ \text { greater }[1]-9593: 3 \end{gathered}$ | Higgins [1] - 9592:24 <br> high [2] - 9551:6, <br> 9564:17 <br> higher ${ }_{[1]}$ - 9552:19 <br> highest [1] - 9564:10 <br> highlighted ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9555:2, 9578:10, } \\ & \text { 9590:25 } \\ & \text { impacts }[1]-9591: 5 \\ & \text { implicated }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 9576:14 } \\ & \text { implications }[2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | ```indicated [1] - 9590:7 individual [2] - 9592:25, 9594:14 indulgence [1] - 9596:18``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { issue }[2]-9564: 17, \\ & \quad 9596: 8 \\ & \text { issues }[2]-9593: 20, \\ & 9594: 3 \\ & \text { item }[1]-9558: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| group [1] - 9580:13 | 9579:2 | 9575:20, 9579:2 | information [4] - | J |
| grow [1] - 9582:25 | highly ${ }_{[1]}$ - 9566:8 | implies [3] - 9556:21, | 9547:1, 9580:8, |  |
| growing ${ }_{[1]}$ - 9561:3 | hire [1] - 9564:23 | 9579:6, 9581:12 | 9584:22, 9585:1 | JAMIE [2] - 9543:4, 9544:6 |
| grown [1] - 9593:9 <br> growth [1] - 9559:16 | history [2] - 9558:5, 9558:10 | importance [3] 9564:8, 9564:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { infotainment }[1] \text { - } \\ & 9587: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9544:6 } \\ & \text { Jeff [2] - 9574:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| guess [3] - 9544:11, | holds [1] - 9592:23 | 9564:2 | initiative [1] - 9569:19 | 9589:4 |
| 9548:25, 9596:9 | home [1] - 9588:25 | important [6] | innovation [2] - | JEFFREY ${ }_{[1]}$ - 9543:5 |
| guessing [1] - | Honor [35] - 9544:5, | 9556:7, 9563:7, 9569-19,9569.25, | 9575:1, 9575:2 | Jeffrey [1] - 9591:21 JENSEN [2] - 9594:23, |
| 9581:13 guidance [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 9546: 4,9546: 6, \\ & 9554: 19,9556: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9569: 19,9569: 25, \\ & 9570: 13,9570: 20 \end{aligned}$ | innovations ${ }^{[1]}$ - 9575:4 | JENSEN ${ }^{[2]-9594: 23,}$ 9595:8 |
| 9581:19 | 9567:10, 9571:11, | important/strategic | instructions [1] | Jensen [1] - 9594:23 |
| guided [1] - 9590:2 | 9571:14, 9577:10, | [1]-9569:11 | 9576:7 | job [1] - 9556:20 |
| guidelines [7] - | 9577:11, 9582:2, | improving [1] - | instructs [1] - 9578:24 | JOHN [1] - 9542:2 |
| 9576:4, 9576:6, | 9582:4, 9584:3, | 9560:16 | Integrations [1] - | JR [1] - 9541:19 |
| 9576:7, 9576:20 | 9584:8, 9588:2 | in-car [1] - 9587:15 | 9586:23 | JUDGE [1] - 9541:10 |
| 9578:1, 9578:3, | 9588:22, 9589:3, | in-house [3] - | intend [1] - 9589:20 | judgment [1] - |
| 9580:18 | 9589:13, 9589:23 | 9568:19, 9575:16, | intense [1] - 9566:17 | 9593:22 |
| guiding [3]-9567:4, | 9590:7, 9591:22, | 9579:15 | intensity [1] - 9566:20 | Justice [2] - 9541:13, |
| 9572:1, 9572:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 9593: 10,9594: 6, \\ & 9594: 13,9595: 8, \end{aligned}$ | inadvertence [1] 9596:11 | $\begin{gathered} \text { interest }[3]-9555: 22, \\ 9556: 11,9556: 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9541:16 } \\ & \text { JX0075 [1] - 9584:3 } \end{aligned}$ |
| H | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9595:19, 9596:22, } \\ & \text { 9597:3, 9597:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { inadvertent }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \\ & 9596: 13 \end{aligned}$ | interested ${ }_{[1]}$ - 9556:4 | K |
| half [1] - 9598:24 | 98:3, 9598:4, | inadvertently [1] - | 9577:5, 9597:17 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { hand }[4]-9556: 6, \\ 9595: 4,9595: 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9598: 11,9598: 21, \\ & 9598: 25,9599: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9596:5 } \\ & \text { Inc }[1]-9597: 13 \end{aligned}$ | internalize ${ }_{[1]}$ 9564:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Kartasheva }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \\ & 9573: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { handed }[2]-9586: 20, \\ & 9589: 19 \end{aligned}$ | HONORABLE 9541:10 | $\begin{gathered} \text { incentive }[3]-9561: 2, \\ 9583: 8,9585: 18 \end{gathered}$ | internally [1] - 9559:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Kate }[3]-9568: 14, \\ & 9568: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| handful [2] - 9590:8, 9595:12 | $\begin{gathered} \text { hoped }[3]-9564: 24, \\ 9586: 4,9589: 22 \end{gathered}$ | incentives [2] 9564:19, 9585:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 9556: 2,9556: 11, \\ & 9564: 8,9570: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Kayak }_{[1]}-9581: 1 \\ & \text { keep }[4]-9572: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { happy [3] - 9595:3, } \\ 9596 \cdot 17 \text { 9597:11 } \end{array}$ | hopefully [2] - 9592:7, 9595:12 | $\text { incentivize }[1] \text { - }$ $9585: 12$ | 9582:24, 9583:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 9578: 2,9578: 20, \\ & 9597: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { hard }{ }_{[2]}-9552: 2, \\ & 9587: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hour }[2]-9589: 6, \\ & 9593: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { include [13]-9544:18, } \\ 9558: 13,9567: 22, \end{gathered}$ | 9569:22 <br> investment [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { KENNETH }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \\ & 9541: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| Harrison [1] - 9545:14 | hours [5] - 9558:6, | 9569:15, 9569:18, | 9556:8, 9559:16 | Kesh [1] - 9573:19 |
| hash [1] - 9593:21 | 9593:16, 9593:17, | 9570:7, 9570:10, | Investment [1] - | key ${ }_{[1]}$ - 9560:16 |
| header [1] - 9547:9 | 9593:25, 9598:24 | 9572:2, 9572:10, | 9560:12 | kicker [1] - 9561:14 |
| heading [4]-9547:4, | house [3] - 9568:19, 9575:16, 9579:15 | 9576:7, 9580:11, 9580:25, 9582:19 | investor [1] - 9591:9 | kill $_{[1]}-9578: 11$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9548:19, 9548:21, } \\ & 9548: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9! \\ \mathbf{H o} \end{array}$ | 9580:25, 9582: <br> included [6] - | iOS [11] - 9555:10, | known [1] - 9548:25 |
| headless [1] - 9588:9 | hurt [1] - 9578:12 | 9544:22, 9552:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 9560: 16,9560: 2 \\ & 9560: 25,951: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $9557: 25,9558: 12$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { health }[4]-9569: 4, \\ 9569: 17,9569: 18, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hypothetical }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \\ & 9583: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9567: 3,9580: 18, \\ & 9588: 6,9588: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 9561:6, 9561:24, |  |
| 9569:23 |  | includes [2] - 9553:1 | 9585:13, 9587:1 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { heard [5] - 9591:13, } \\ 9592: 24,9597: 8, \end{gathered}$ | I | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9582:19 } \\ & \text { including }[7] \text { - 9556:1, } \end{aligned}$ | iPhone [6] - 9553:21, | labeled [1] - 9557:5 <br> language [2] - 9570:3, |
| 9598:14 | icon [4] - 9586:14, 9587:3, 9507:4. | 9558:12, 9567:4, | 9555:11, 9559:20, | 9579:1 |
| hearing [1] - 9597:14 help [1] - 9578:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9587:3, 9587:4, } \\ & 9588: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9567:22, 9570:1, } \\ & 9573: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 9587:19 | largely [1] - 9593:2 <br> last [10]-9558:16, |
| helpful [1] - 9549:7 | icons [2] - 9586:12, | incorporating [1] - | iPhone/Android [1] 9585:19 | $\begin{aligned} \text { ast }[10]-9558: 26, \\ 9572: 25,9573: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| helpfully [1] - 9580:17 | 9588:10 | 9557:1 | iPhones [4] - 9553:15, | 9586:19, 9589:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { helps [2] - 9573:15, } \\ & \text { 9588:16 } \end{aligned}$ | idea [1] - 9563:2 <br> identifies [1] - 9572:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { increasingly }[1] \text { - } \\ & 9587: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9554:6, } 9570: 16, \\ & 9574: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9590: 13,9592: 16, \\ & 9594: 18,9596: 3, \end{aligned}$ |
| Herculean [1] - 9596:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { image }[1]-9586: 11 \\ & \text { impact }[4]-9554: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Incremental }[1] \text { - } \\ & 9547: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Israel [2] - 9594:19, } \\ & 9594: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9598:6 } \\ & \text { late }[1]-9593: 21 \end{aligned}$ |


| law [1] - 9577:17 | LLC ${ }_{[1]}$ - 9541:6 | 9575:5, 9575:7, | 9557:4 | 9587:7 9588:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| lawyer [1] - 9575:16 | LLP [3] - 9541:19, | 9575:10, 9575:23, | might [15]-9549:19, | 9588:22, 9589:3, |
| LAZEROW [2] 9597:12, 9597:25 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 9542:2, 9542:5 } \\ \text { Ioaded }[1]-9562: \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9579:9, 9579:15, } \\ & 9596: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9555:15, 9569:10, } \\ & \text { 9569:15, 9570:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9589:13, 9589:17, } \\ & \text { 9589:23, 9590:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
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