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COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. The Court is now in session; the Honorable Amit \(P\). Mehta now presiding.

THE COURT: Please be seated, everyone.
Good morning, everyone.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Civil Action 20-3010, the United States of America, et al., versus Google LLC.

Kenneth Dintzer for the DOJ.
Jonathan Sallet on behalf of Plaintiff States. John Schmidtlein for Google.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning, everyone.

I hope you are well.
Okay. So anybody want to raise anything before a few matters that \(I\) have?

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Good morning, Your Honor.
As we noted yesterday, we're going to start off today with Mr. Levy from Facebook. I have binders of exhibits that are going to be referenced --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: -- during his deposition.

There is one exhibit where there are some redactions that Facebook has requested. I don't know if there's a dispute as to those, and I think we're okay on redactions having to do with the exhibits that are
referenced in the deposition, so I think that one is going to be ready to play.

If you are following along in the clip report we gave you yesterday, this morning the government has asked to take out a small section, which \(I\) think we have been able to remove, but we don't have new clip reports for you.

So if you see --

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: -- a small little section that skips, don't be alarmed, that's on purpose. I don't think it materially changes the length which, I said, is about 54 minutes --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: -- this morning.
So that's for our first order of business this morning.

We did get last night the ordering of the rebuttal witnesses from the plaintiffs. They are still, as they, I guess, noted yesterday, they have Mr. Davies as some sort of conditional may-call witness as the first witness for Wednesday, I guess, assuming that we're going to get done with Professor Murphy on Tuesday.

As we have indicated previously, Mr. Davies is an improper rebuttal witness for a whole variety of reasons. That is fully briefed.

He is also an improper witness under Daubert. He is basically, as \(I\) now understand it, he is going to try to respond on factual issues that he thinks that Mr. -- or Professor Murphy does economic analyses as part of his economic opinions. Mr. Davies is not an economist. He purports to be some sort of smartphone industry expert. And he is offering essentially factual opinions, in our judgment, factual opinions that should have been adduced from the actual fact witnesses like those you have seen either live or by video deposition of the carrier witnesses.

He also was initially disclosed as an affirmative expert witness in the case. He was supposed to testify, I believe, in week two, and, for reasons that only the plaintiffs know, he was not called as an affirmative witness.

So the issues that he is being offered on, to the extent that they could be viewed as appropriate, were issues that should have been offered in the plaintiffs' case-in-chief and not in rebuttal.

And so I don't want to make Your Honor do more work than you need to, but this is a real live issue, and Mr. Davies should not be permitted to lead off.

In our view, Mr. Oard should be able to testify first thing on Wednesday. He should have limited opinions that are addressed only to Professor Fox's DRE; and then,
given the length of testimony which they've estimated to be two hours, he will be off the stand by early Wednesday afternoon, in our view. Professor Whinston, they've indicated his testimony is two and a half hours, we think he should take the stand Wednesday afternoon, and we will bid you at least a brief adieu on Thursday under that schedule.

So that is our position. Again, we would like that ruled on. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.
Mr. Dintzer, before you --
MR. DINTZER: Good morning, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. DINTZER: So counsel raises a number of issues; I'll try to hit them.

We were under the impression that the Court wanted to wait and address the Davies issue after Professor Murphy testified to see if there was a live issue. We are prepared to have an argument on that if the Court -- if it pleases the Court. But as far as we're concerned, I mean, if Professor Murphy doesn't go into the waters that he and Mr. Davies have conflicted about, then we won't have anything to rebut, and, if he does, then we believe we should be able to rebut it. But we are prepared to address their filing if the Court -- if that would please the Court.

With respect to our schedule, if Mr. Davies
testifies, he'd testify first. If he doesn't, either because Professor Murphy doesn't go into these waters or because, obviously, if the court grants their motion and we can't bring him, then Professor Oard would be the first person, he would testify Wednesday morning.

Either way, for Professor Whinston to be fully prepared, we would like to call him Thursday, given that we have not raised any issues about Google's carrying Professor Murphy to next week and all of us sitting through video and half-days to accommodate him, and we've made no issue. We're kind of surprised that they didn't even raise this with us before they raised it with the Court. But we stand ready, of course, to do it as the Court would prefer. THE COURT: Okay. Let's do this. Let me go back. I read the papers a few days back. Let me refamiliarize myself with them when we take a break this morning, and then we can have a conversation about it after the videos have run, and so it will be fresh in my mind.

You know, I would -- well, let's just do it that way, and we'll have some time obviously probably later this morning or just around lunchtime to have a discussion about that.

MR. DINTZER: We appreciate that, Your Honor.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. So -- all right. Just quickly then, unless there's anything else, let me just state for the record, I have reviewed the parties' designations for Mr. Levy, it is, right, and Mr. Ezell's proposed video depositions that will be played in open court.

In both instances, both -- at least the third parties; that is, Facebook in one case and AT\&T in the other, and also presumably Google, at least with respect to Mr. Ezell's transcript, is seeking the muting of certain testimony in open court. That information largely falls into three categories. One is revenue share percentages that are reflected in Mr. Ezell's transcript, revenue share amounts that are reflected in Mr. Ezell's transcripts, and then internal figures concerning impacts of certain technological changes that are reflected in the Facebook transcript of Mr. Levy.

So I've reviewed those proposed redactions or mutings for public playing. I think it is appropriate, given the Hubbard factors, to do it that way.

Again, while there is a public interest because these are being presented in an open, public trial, these are not numbers that have been publicly disclosed previously. They are highly sensitive commercial information that, if disclosed, could cause either
competitive disadvantage or the disclosure of material, nonpublic information that could have market effects in particular, certainly Facebook's projections about revenue losses as a result of certain changes made by Apple. So I think, for those reasons, I agree that the propose -- I'm fine with the proposed redactions in the transcript and muting those portions while the live transcripts are being played -- excuse me, while the live testimony is being played.

All right. So with that --
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Just one more thing just to clarify for the record.

On the Levy one, just to clarify, we're doing this a little bit out of order in the sense of the other depositions you've seen sort of have just played sequentially as the deposition occurred. In this, we're flipping them a little bit because Google's examination of Mr. Levy came second in time during the deposition. As you recall, we had a discussion about how to allocate the time when both parties cross noticed.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: So you will hear sort of Google's examination first even though it occurred second in time and then the counter-designations from government counsel's examination will be the second encounters.

THE COURT: Great. Okay. Thank you. MS. TRAGER: Good morning, Your Honor.

Lara Trager.

With respect to the video designations of
Mr. Levy, there's also one document that we understand is in the Court's binder only in redacted form, and we have stickered that and would like to hand that up.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. TRAGER: Thank you.
THE COURT: Just two more housekeeping matters.

With respect to the filings from Apple and Google last night about the two exhibits, I've reviewed both of those filings that were made, I want to give it some more thought. I had hoped to be in a position to rule orally this morning, I don't think I am, because \(I\) do want to take a closer look at the prior transcripts and some of my prior rulings before I make a firm decision. So we'll either issue a written order this afternoon or \(I\) may just rule orally on Monday.

And then insofar as the exhibits that were presented to me on October \(19 t h\), I will be ready to talk about those at the end of the morning, so we can discuss those after the video exhibits have been played, okay?

All right. With that, we roll the tape.
(Video deposition of Daniel Levy played)

THE COURT: Can we pause this for a moment? Can I have somebody direct me to where in this document he's being -- it's a long email so \(I\) want to just have where you all are.

I see where we are. Thank you.
(Video played)
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: That's the conclusion of Mr. Levy.

The next one Your Honor, the witness we would call is Jeffrey Ezell from AT\&T. The approximate run time on his video is about an hour and 47 minutes. So we're happy to start that or we'll break or whenever.

THE COURT: Why don't we go ahead and start it and we'll break at our usual time at 11:00.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Okay.
MS. TRAGER: May I, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yeah.

MS. TRAGER: Before we move on to that, I would just like to note that most of the documents included in the testimony that was just played via video have been admitted but not all, and we would move to admit the ones that have not. May I read those into the record?

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. TRAGER: UPX2113, UPX2114, UPX2116, UPX2117, and UPX2131. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Counsel. (Plaintiffs' Exhibits UPX2113, UPX2114, UPX2116, UPX2117, and UPX2131 received into evidence.)

MS. WASZMER: Your Honor, when we discussed this with the government yesterday, they told us they would give us a chance to try to respond to whatever they sought to admit so \(I\) just ask the chance for us to discuss with them.

THE COURT: Oh, okay. When you say respond, you mean --

MS. WASZMER: So there are more exhibits that we were presented and we asked them yesterday whether they were going to seek to admit them and they said we'd deal with it later. I would just like to confer with my colleagues and the government because there's more documents in that binder.

THE COURT: Oh, okay.
I just assumed that these were the exhibits that were referred to during the deposition.

MS. WASZMER: We would just like a chance to look at them. Because we're in meet-and-confers about all exhibits being pushed in.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. WASZMER: Thank you.
(Video deposition of Jeffrey Ezell played)

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: I'd ask to pause there if that's
a good time.
THE COURT: That's a great time. Thank you.
All right. Let's resume at 11:15. See you all
shortly. Thank you.
COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. This Court stands in
recess.
(Recess from 11:01 a.m. to 11:18 a.m.) COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.

This Honorable Court is again in session. THE COURT: Please be seated. Thank you, everyone.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: So, Your Honor, mindful of, I know we usually break at 12:30 for lunch. The remainder of the video is going to -- if we play it all the way through right now, we'll go till, I think, roughly 12:45.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: So with your indulgence, let's -- we'd like to just play it and be done.

MR. SALLET: Can \(I\) just note one thing that you and I talked about?

At the end, even though it will be 12:45, Mr. Schmidtlein and I have an agreement on the introduction of some exhibits, a statement about a couple of exhibits and an agreement that some contested issues should be dealt with in post-trial briefing.

Might \(I\) do that at the end as well?
THE COURT: Sure.

MR. SALLET: Thank you.
THE COURT: That's fine.

Yeah, we'll have some time to wrap things up.
We've got some issues that \(I\) want to -- now I see Professor -- I mean, Mr. Davies' rebuttal, I want to talk about that and a few other things. So we'll just tack that on to the end of the testimony instead of breaking it up with lunch.

All right.
(Video deposition of Jeffrey Ezell continued)

THE COURT: All right, everyone.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Your Honor, just for the record, there were a variety of exhibits that you were able to see and you had in your binder.

It's my understanding all of those exhibits have already been admitted into evidence, so no more housekeeping needs to be done on the Ezell deposition.

THE COURT: Okay. Terrific. Thank you.
All right. Mr. Sallet, you wanted to put something on the record?

MR. SALLET: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.
So Google and we, Mr. Schmidtlein and I, have reached an agreement on the handling of a set of exhibits
that have been in controversy.
I'd like to hand up a set and push into evidence exhibits on which we agree, although there is a statement I will make as attached to four of them.

So these -- this is an agreement on different documents that we have been discussing, some of which have to do with SA360, for example, one of which is a correction of a mistake, we just made a typographical error earlier. Google agrees to this.

We've also agreed that an explanation will be provided to the Court as regards to the exhibits that have the most digits in them. There are four Baker exhibits, PSX00866.020, -021, -022, and -023.

And as to those exhibits, we want to represent that they contain analysis from the plaintiffs' expert -Plaintiff States' expert Jonathan Baker, regarding SVPs share of visits referred by general search firms. At the request of the defendant, the Plaintiff States represent that these figures contain analysis from Similarweb, which monitors website traffic and does not include traffic to SVP apps.

Defendants have moved into evidence similar analysis from their expert, Professor Elzinga, such as DX0256, containing information in both website and app traffic for the same SVPs.

Your Honor, there is a dispute between the experts on the appropriate methodology, which Professor Baker described in his testimony.

We'd just like the Court to have that in connection with these particular exhibits.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SALLET: And then there are a handful of exhibits, one of which relates to Professor Baker, three of which relate to Microsoft documents subject to an earlier motion in limine, to which the parties have a current disagreement. Mr. Schmidtlein and I both agree that the best way to handle that would be through post-trial briefing of the kind Your Honor has previously referenced.

Do I have that correct?

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. That work perfectly well.

MR. SALLET: So we move to push these in. Can we request that they be admitted?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

So they'll be admitted.
(Plaintiffs Exhibits PSX00866.020, -021, -022, and -023 received into evidence.)

MR. SALLET: Great.

And as to the four documents, we'll raise them in post-trial briefing.

THE COURT: Terrific.

MR. SALLET: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.
All right. Ms. Waszmer?

MS. WASZMER: Your Honor, Wendy Waszmer for

Google.

Just to clean up on the exhibits from the Levy video deposition designation, Ms. Trager and I have reached an understanding and as to the government's exhibits that she sought to introduce, UPX2113, UPX2114, UPX2116, UPX2117, and UPX2131, Google does not object to admission.

And then we just have one that was also
referenced, DX3246, and Ms. Trager has indicated the government does not object to that admission. Thank you.

MS. TRAGER: That's right.

THE COURT: All right. Terrific.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibits UPX2113, UPX2114, UPX2116, UPX2117, and UPX2131 received into evidence.)
(Defendant's Exhibit DX3246 received into evidence.)

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Schmidtlein.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's all right.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: I've been told by my team that

I should clean up our houses as well.
I'm just going to hand up another set of exhibits that we're pushing into evidence. We've conferred with counsel for the plaintiffs, and I believe that the representations on here they're either unobjected to or is our standard hearsay, embedded hearsay objection and/or they're demonstratives that will be treated as demonstratives.

THE COURT: Okay.
These are previously shown or these are --
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Yes, either previously shown in terms of demonstratives or exhibits that the parties have conferred on about pushing in and we have agreement.

THE COURT: Great. Okay. Thank you.
MS. JENSEN: Your Honor, the government has no objection except for the stated objections in the handout.

THE COURT: Oh, okay.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: It's the embedded hearsay.
MR. SALLET: And, Your Honor, Plaintiff States take the same position.

THE COURT: Terrific. All right. Well, let's just take a few minutes to address a few outstanding matters.

To close up on an issue that was at the end of the day yesterday, \(I\) had -- this was the request to seal a
couple of percentages that had been mentioned in the public proceeding inadvertently, and \(I\) just sort of put to you, Mr. Schmidtlein, whether there was any authority for me to kind of retroactively remove those from the public record. MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: I am told that there is mixed authority at best on that proposition.

I will also -- I'd also just like to state, Your Honor, we did get an outreach last evening from Verizon's counsel, and I think they are still considering whether they want to be heard on these issues, because these are percentages that pertain to the negotiations with them and they only heard about them late yesterday.

I guess I would also just say, I am aware of at least one instance of inaccurate reporting of those percentages, in other words, a mischaracterization by a news organization that is following this proceeding about these percentages. That is very harmful to us.

I'm also -- I just want to state for the record, I'm also very troubled by Mr. Dintzer's statement yesterday that -- I'm not going to characterize or I'm certainly not going to suggest that people are intentionally violating the rules of the Court here by disclosing these matters or that people are not doing their very best; but there have been numerous instances where government counsel or one of their witnesses has uttered things that are confidential, that are
very, very sensitive business terms. We had a filing about one of these the other day, where they had to pull something down because their filing improperly included materials.

And for them to stand up and suggest at this point that every time this happens, oh, that once it's out in the wild, gee, there's just nothing we can sort of do about it, suggests to me that whatever rules we have here have no teeth to them, and I'm certainly not going to get up here and try to suggest we should start sanctioning attorneys for this; but if we have no mechanism, limited as it may seem to the Court, to be able to try to address these things, you know, we still have expert witnesses who are going to be testifying about things that matter very deeply to my client and to third parties here.

And so I'm not going to sit here and tell Your Honor I've got ironclad authority, and there's certainly cases out there where the courts have said, once it's out, it's out. But \(I\) would respectfully ask that, under these circumstances, we do have an interest and Verizon may want to be heard on that, and I know there's a timing issue and you are trying to be, as you should be, very cognizant of pushing out transcripts and making these things public.

I don't know if they're going to want to file something today. We've told them that Your Honor is
urgently trying to address these things and I'm going to confer with them later this afternoon.

But our request stands that we would like this redacted, given the broad interest and the harm that we think has occurred as a result of some of these disclosures in the past.

Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DINTZER: Your Honor, regarding this specific disclosure that counsel references, it was -- there was a reference made by our attorney and then there was a separate reference made by the witness.

I don't know how you equivocate those or measure those. I believe everybody is doing their best. The idea of wafting sanctions and then saying, we're not asking for them, I don't even know what that means. And counsel has not shared their legal authority with us that they say is mixed.

All \(I\) can say is that we've spent, \(I\) think \(I\) can say with confidence, hundreds of hours doing everything we can do keep the train moving, to keep confidentiality and to do everything as the Court has asked, and as we believe is our responsibility.

And so, you know, I appreciate the sensitivity that they bring. My entire team appreciates that, and we
have all done our best. And sometimes mistakes are made by us or the witness or Google's counsel or the people running the charts or whatever. It raises a completely separate question about what happens when that's on the record.

By our read, I mean, we don't have a dog in the fight except for making sure that the record is accurate and the public gets the information to which they're entitled to. Once it's on the record, to take it off the record would seem to be inconsistent.

They show us -- we have not done the research. If they show us research that says otherwise, I'd be happy to discuss it. They haven't shared that with us. But I have to address this with when counsel is wafting accusations without any merit or -- and not even asking for anything, just floating that. So I did need to address that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
You know, we'll take a look, too, Mr. Schmidtlein. If you want to send us any authorities that you think are relevant, we're happy to take a look.

And in terms of the, what \(I\) think as a general proposition has been inadvertent disclosures, we weren't going to bat a thousand, it's just human nature, and I think we've done a pretty good job overall in maintaining the confidentiality -- or the areas that I think are
appropriately confidential and, you know, even the best tennis players have an occasional foot fault, and \(I\) think that's where we find ourselves.

Okay. So that's that.
Let's talk quickly about the exhibits that are here. Let me just go through them if \(I\) can, and if \(I\) want discussion, I'll ask for it.

So the first one is UPX711, which \(I\) take it is simply an example of an instance in which employees of Google have affixed a confidentiality -- privileged confidentiality stamp to an email without getting any legal advice in return.

MR. GOWER: Your Honor, that's a part of it, but not actually the primary piece.

The part that we're most interested in was on page 2 , where the author of an email said, "I've obfuscated the per device search monetization into three buckets; high, medium, and low, annual 2019 search rev per device as per legal guidance from a litigation perspective." We say this is an instance of Google transforming evidence that might be unfavorable into evidence that is either favorable or less unfavorable for the purposes of it looking better later in court.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Schmidtlein.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Your Honor, they're
misrepresenting what the import of that email has to do with. If they had asked Mr. Yoo, who sat right there in the witness chair in this courtroom when he was called to testify by the United States, he would have explained that this has to do with making sure that monetization figures that are being circulated, that are specific to certain types of devices, do not get shared with other people in the organization; i.e., people dealing with Apple who are not allowed to get access to those types of things.

This has nothing to do with hiding information from legal. They had an opportunity to ask the witness who wrote this email and they chose not to.

MR. GOWER: Your Honor, we note that it says "per legal guidance from a litigation perspective." It does not appear to be an instance of trying to make sure that the information is not leaked to a third party.

As to raising this with a witness, I'll note that this is one of only two documents in the binder that was authored by a witness that testified here. At the time we moved to admit them, the witness had already left the stand. We believed that pushing in documents were appropriate and we believed that this document spoke for itself.

THE COURT: Okay.
Well, look, given the inference that the government would like, the plaintiffs would like me to draw
from this, it doesn't seem to be on a topic that is relevant to the issues at hand. Maybe I'm misinterpreting it, but bottom line is, there was a witness here, it does seem to me to be unfair for me to draw any kind of inferences from a document that could have been explicated, not only by the plaintiffs but Google would have had an opportunity to have done that while the witness was on the stand. So given that feature of this, I am going to exclude that particular exhibit.

All right. Let's turn to the next one which is UPX929. And I take it this is an example of what we saw yesterday concerning sort of guarded language about antitrust topics or antitrust issues.

MR. GOWER: Yes, there's two instances here of mentionings of a search market, including search market by country, which is exactly the market we've alleged. The person who said it was told not to say that and was told that this was unhelpful.

THE COURT: Let me just ask Google what their view is on this one. I don't think any of these witnesses have come in to testify. I don't know whether any of them were deposed.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: No, Your Honor, these -everybody who is involved here, this has to do with Europe and matters going on in Europe. This has nothing to do with
the United States and none of these witnesses were called to -- were deposed in the -- were deposed in this case.

THE COURT: All right.
So I'll allow this one in. I think there's some probative value to this. Since we saw the document yesterday that was providing advice about how to handle it antitrust concepts and communications, and this, I think, is an example of it even though it falls outside of the U.S. market that's been alleged here. And I don't think the unfair prejudice outweighs the probative value of it, unlike the prior document that I'm excluding.

MR. GOWER: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So what do we have next? Next we have UPX973.

Now, isn't this already in evidence?
MR. GOWER: This is a document that we were able to use with a witness after we had moved him in and it was the only opportunity after moving so we did it.

Sorry, the initial motion was on October 19th, I believe, and Mr. Pichai testified after that so we made sure to use this document from the binder with him and it is now in evidence, so this document is no longer part of our motion.

THE COURT: That's what I thought. I thought this was in evidence. That solves that one. Okay.

Then we've got 1039. I didn't put a note on this. Help me place why --

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: This is an example, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Hang on, Mr. Schmidtlein.
Hang. Let me ask counsel for the Department first and then I'll get a response.

MR. GOWER: Right.

Now, this is the second of two documents that \(I\) mention that are still alive that was written by a witness. It was -- we believe it speaks for itself. There was a request for an attorney to give advice towards the bottom of the page; someone notified the person, you didn't even include the attorney on the email, and then the response was, "I think \(I\) just now typed, Kate, please advise, on autopilot."

We don't believe that this requires any imagination to understand what this person was saying, the requests for legal advice are sometimes used on autopilot and we believe that's a relevant fact.

THE COURT: Okay.
Look, again, \(I\) think this falls in the same category as the first document. If this was something that plaintiffs wish to have introduced, Ms. Kartasheva was here, not only are you asking me to draw certain inferences that she might have had the opportunity to explain, obviously

Google counsel could have also questioned her about it. So I do think the prejudicial quality of this, not having had the opportunity for a witness who was here live to explain it, outweighs its probative value.

MR. GOWER: Understood.

THE COURT: All right. So the next one, 1042. MR. GOWER: Yes.

This one, the focus is primarily on this third and second email down from the top. This is Android employees discussing the MADA. One writes, "Thread kill please," and the other basically advises the person that rather than saying "Thread kill, you should copy a lawyer and make it privileged to get internal consultation."

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: This document involves matters that are completely unrelated to any of the claims that are in this lawsuit, and it involves witnesses who -- I mean, just the subject matter, you read through this, this has nothing to do with any issues in the case, and it certainly has nothing to do with any witnesses who've been called in the case.

I don't know how we can defend ourselves against an email that has zero context to anything that is still live in dispute in the lawsuit.

MR. GOWER: Your Honor, with respect to relevance, we'd direct Your Honor to the second page of our Q2 list. "What do we say when Android partners want to load the same apps on their Play Store list Android devices." This thread is discussing the MADA, it's discussing the Play Store. We believe the relevance ties in through the MADA.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: The Q1 talks about Android run time on Tizen, which is a completely different operating system that Samsung operate -- I think you may have heard some passing reference to it. And I think this has to -I'm being told -- yeah, this has to do with matters in Korea. This literally has nothing to do with the United States market whatsoever.

THE COURT: Okay.
Look, in a sense, this all seems somewhat cumulative to me. I understand the desire to -- because of the word that was used here by the Google employee, but we've seen lots of -- to the extent that plaintiffs are going to stand up at the end here and ask me to draw some inferences about Google's treatments of attorney-client or at least the label attorney-client privilege, there are lots of documents that you can use as examples of that. So given the fact that this is not directly related, I think we'll go ahead and just exclude it.

MR. GOWER: Understood. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And the next three are sort of the same bucket and they all just relate to changes in the chat retention policy.

MR. GOWER: Correct.
The first version of the chat retention policy was entered -- excuse me, the first version of a written formal chat retention policy was entered through Mr. Kolotouros.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. GOWER: A 2008 emailed version of the chat retention policy was entered through Mr. Pichai. These three are the three most recent versions, specifically descendants of the ones looked at with Mr. Kolotouros.

THE COURT: Any objection to these?
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: No, no objection.
THE COURT: So they'll be admitted then.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibits UPX973, UPX711, UPX929, UPX973, UPX1039, UPX1042 received into evidence.)

THE COURT: So 1095 is a document that is hard to understand, but I take it you'd like to admit it because somebody references a chat-off request.

MR. GOWER: Yes, Your Honor.

The relevance of this document is all at the top. You can see, first of all, a note that WPA at the top is a whole page auction so this is related to an auction for search ads.

But more importantly the main reason why we've introduced this is to show that even employees who want to preserve chats affirmatively have those chats deleted because of the history-off policy. So we think that further enforces the consequences of having history-off defaulted -as the default. Even employees that want to preserve their chats have them lost.

THE COURT: Can \(I\) ask the following question, which is, \(I\) mean, there are two issues here, it seems to me, but -- that emerge from the same topic which is this chat-off history stuff.

There's the question of the sanctions, and it's not clear to me that this would be relevant to the sanctions because the email is dated 2017, and so conduct that precedes whatever the magic date is that they should have preserved, this wouldn't fall within that bucket. That's one.

Two, I mean, are you seeking to use this potentially alternatively, \(I\) suppose, as sort of -- some kind of state of mind evidence? Is that what we're talking about here?

MR. GOWER: Well, I'll say first, with regard to your first point, we're not saying this is sanctionable conduct. I mean, this employee wants chats retained. We're using this to show Your Honor that employees who do want
their chats retained lose them because of the default setting on chats is powerful, and we think that fact, although it was stated in 2017 , remains -- that's a facts true throughout the time of this case and throughout the entire computer era.

So we think it goes -- yes, we think it does go to spoliation. The motion even though the evidence itself comes from before with the time, this is not the conduct we're saying is unlawful, we're saying these are the facts that should have been interpreted -- that should have been known when we view the decision that Google made to set its policy to history off.

THE COURT: Okay.
Well, if that's the basis, then I'm going to exclude it because \(I\) do think if it's primarily -- if what I'm hearing you say is this relates to the spoliation issue, given that the email is prior to any investigation that was launched by the Department of Justice or the States, it seems to me pretty weak evidence of the spoliation argument that you want to make, and so I don't see the relevance of it at the end of the day to a spoliation issue. All right. So I'll exclude 1095.

And then we've got an example, maybe this was in and maybe it wasn't, but this is UPX1100, and I guess I should have named the last exhibit which was UPX --

MR. GOWER: 1096 precedes that one.

THE COURT: Right, UPX1096, sorry.

This, I think raises the same issue, right?
MR. GOWER: So, Your Honor, for this one, we're pointing to Bates 409 , \(I\) think it's the, let's see, first, second, third.

THE COURT: Right, this is just in terms of a policy change of how the chats would be preserved?

MR. GOWER: So we're offering this just to show that Google has the technological capability to set the chat history to on and that Google has the technological capability to ensure that --

THE COURT: Is there any dispute about that?

MR. GOWER: Well, I don't know. If they'll stipulate to the two facts, if I can say them both, that they can turn history on and that they can make it where the custodian is not able to flip history off, those are the two facts we're trying to establish through this email. So if they're stipulated to, then we don't need this document.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: This is actually a very, very technical issue that has not been raised with us. If they want to raise with us the specific technical things that they want a stipulation to, we'll hear them, but it hasn't been raised to us, and this document certainly does not provide some sort of categorical explanation on this issue,
that's for sure.

THE COURT: Okay. So why don't you all have a discussion about it and then we can, if there's still a dispute, we can take it up.

MR. GOWER: Understood.

THE COURT: And then UPX, and that last one was UPX1096 so we're up to UPX1100. And is this --

Well, tell me what you think this is an example of.

MR. GOWER: Right.
Yes, Your Honor.
If you look at the top, there's a discussion about Mr. Jerry Dischler, who's not on the thread but he's discussed, you've heard from him.

And then below, a deponent in this case says, "I can set up a briefing meeting," this is on the third line, and then she explains in her next message why she wants to discuss it in person as opposed to in writing and she says, "The DOJ case is making the content very sensitive to share via email these days."

And we think this is another instance of Google avoiding putting unfavorable facts into a preserved form.

THE COURT: Okay. Any response?
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: This is certainly not evidence of people trying to hide unfavorable facts. It's a
discussion about, we should talk about this live in person before people start willy-nilly writing things that may or may not be accurate. This is -- to the extent they -- this is cumulative of others -- you know, evidence of people saying, hey, listen, we're under scrutiny here, be careful about how we think and write about things, and they haven't used this with any witness during -- either during discovery or during trial.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: This -- I think one of the witnesses who was on this chain was initially on their witness list for the trial and they then dropped her and didn't call her.

THE COURT: All right. I'll allow it in. I mean, there's some probative value to it, and I don't think it's unduly or unfairly prejudicial.

So I'll allow UPX1100 in, okay?

MR. GOWER: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit UPX1100 received into evidence.)

MR. GOWER: And just for the record, I'd like to just read out the UPXs for the three chat policies, and that was UPX1089, UPX1090, and UPX1091. And I understand those were admitted.

THE COURT: Yes, they were admitted.

MR. GOWER: Great. Thank you.
(Plaintiffs Exhibits UPX1089, UPX1090, and UPX1091 received into evidence.)

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Your Honor, as you may remember from the briefing on this issue, we produced, as exhibits to our briefs, a voluminous collection of correspondence with the department and other materials that we say evidences the fact that they were aware of --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: -- all these collection policies?

Do you want us to push those into evidence?

THE COURT: No.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: No, I can now -- thank you for raising it. What I can formally say is that whatever was submitted in connection with those exhibits, I will consider as part of the overall record. Whatever has been admitted at trial, I consider to be a supplement of the record that was made in writing.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you.
THE COURT: Okay.
All right. Let's see if we can get through this last issue quickly and that concerns our expert. What did I
do with my papers? There they are.
All right. So look, I guess the question, maybe let me just -- let me just put the question to the plaintiffs, which is, if -- what is it about Professor Murphy's testimony that you expect that you would call Mr. Davies to rebut?

I mean, you've provided some examples, but it would be helpful to have that clarified.

MS. ONYEMA: Veronica Onyema for the United States, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Onyema.
MS. ONYEMA: At this time, we don't know precisely, obviously, what Professor Murphy is going to testify about. But in terms of sort of the relationship between the reports between Professor Murphy and Mr. Davies, we anticipate that Professor Murphy might get into talking about market dynamics in terms of how OEMs respond to those dynamics and enter in contracts related to these search distribution contracts and the MADA. There could be other issues that come up. We really would want to wait to hear his testimony to be able to see what we can directly rebut based on Mr. Davies expertise and his opinions that he's provided.

THE COURT: And you just -- I think I read his summary a while ago, but just give me a preview of what --
if he's going to testify about, sort of consistently with the back and forth with Professor Murphy; and if Professor Murphy brings up those topics, what's he going to come in and say?

MS. ONYEMA: Well, in terms of what he's already kind of articulated in his opinions that the Court has, I believe, seen before, he'll talk about how, for example, Professor Murphy's analysis of the MADA is flawed, he'll talk about potentially this idea that the MADA is a barter between OEMs and Google. He'd be able to talk about those issues. But they would relate to his core opinions which do relate to the MADA.

We did tell Google, I can't recall when at this point, that we were not anticipating that he was going to provide testimony about the excluded opinion, Opinion 5.

But, again, this is rebuttal testimony so it really just depends on what Professor Murphy does. We would be directly refuting that.

THE COURT: Okay.
So, Mr. Schmidtlein, let me put the question to you, which is, do you anticipate Professor Murphy touching on the subjects that might draw a request for rebuttal testimony?

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Your Honor, what you've just heard are facts. This is -- he's not offering an expert
opinion. He wants to come in here and say, I disagree with the facts, the fact record about what OEMs have actually done in the case, and then Professor Murphy analyzes and does an economic analysis of those facts. And they want this expert to come in and say, I disagree with what the OEMs sort of incentives are or what the OEMs -- you've heard from the OEMs and you've heard from the carriers on this point.

So Professor Murphy does do economic analyses base -- and is going to do some economic analyses and offer opinions based upon observations in the record, the factual observations about what OEMs and carriers have actually done.

What this witness has been from day one is an attempt to sort of rebut or try to get in, sneak in fact testimony that he is completely unqualified and has no bases to offer because he's not an OEM and he's not a carrier.

He claims to have talked to them over the years. He's not talked to them about the Android operating system agreements.

And so what you've heard here is completely improper. And he has no bases -- he's offered no opinions about the "barter," you know, Professor Murphy's analysis of the barter.

And, finally, as I said before, if he wanted to
offer those opinions, he needed to be here in the case-in-chief to offer them, not on rebuttal.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, just, let me just address that last point.

I mean, I've looked at the cases that Google has cited and I don't see any of them that sort of stand for this proposition because somebody was designated as an affirmative expert and wasn't called in the case-in-chief, he can't be called in rebuttal.

Now, depending upon the subject matter, I understand, you know, the one Third Circuit case that was cited, for example, actually involved an expert doing testing the night before the person was going to be called, so we're in a slightly different situation, I would say.

But all that said, look, I think, you know, I think it would be imprudent of me to make a determination right now without having a full opportunity to hear what Professor Murphy is going to say and what the potential rebuttal is.

What \(I\) can do is the following, which is recognizing the uncertainty of whether he's going to be called or not and what he would testify about, I can order them to re-jigger the order of their witnesses to ensure that you have adequate time to prepare for any rebuttal if I allow it.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Okay. That would be fine.
I also --

THE COURT: Because \(I\) recognize the unfairness of where we are in some sense. And if Professor Murphy finishes on Tuesday, to then have Mr. Davies go first thing Wednesday morning would probably be -- would put some -present some challenges.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: The other thing, I guess, just to remind you, we do have a very, very live Daubert motion. THE COURT: No, I know. MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: On every aspect -THE COURT: Which I need to go back and refamiliarize myself with. I was able to re-read what was recently filed, but in light of this, I do need to go back and look at their Daubert motions because I guess until a few days ago, I didn't even know it was going to be an issue.

MS. ONYEMA: Your Honor, if \(I\) may, just to note, we certainly don't want to rehash our Daubert opposition right now, unless the Court would like to us to, but Mr. Davies has 30 years of experience, he has worked with numerous smartphone vendors. We're happy to talk about the Daubert, but we believe it should be denied.

And I also just want to sort of, again, reiterate the point that we make in our brief that Google's motion is
untimely. It's waived, in our view, because they have known since the fifth day of trial that DOJ Plaintiffs intended to not call Mr. Davies in their affirmative case and to save him for any possible rebuttal. And so if they truly believed that he was properly brought in our affirmative case-in-chief, they should have raised it at a time when our affirmative case-in-chief was not yet concluded. So that is prejudicial to the Justice Department.

THE COURT: As I think I've ruled at least on the timing issue, I'm not --

MS. ONYEMA: Understood.
THE COURT: -- I don't think that's the issue for me.

The ultimate issue is going to be twofold: One is whether he's actually going to come in and offer testimony that is actually truly rebuttal testimony, one; and, two, and I suppose the pre -- you know, the precursor question is whether he's qualified to do that. But we'll just have to wait and see what Professor Murphy says and whether there's a basis to have him rebutted.

I guess that means, in terms of your sequencing, I'd like to have Professor -- excuse me, Mr. Davies, if he testifies, be the last of your three rebuttal witnesses.

MR. DINTZER: That won't be a problem, Your Honor. Then what we'll do is we'll bring Professor Oard on

Wednesday, Professor Whinston on Thursday, and if he flops over to Friday, to Friday, and then immediately after that, Mr. Davies.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DINTZER: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Schmidtlein.
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: I don't know why
Professor Whinston is not taking the stand on Wednesday.
THE COURT: I thought you said he would take the stand on Wednesday.

MR. DINTZER: No, Professor Whinston Thursday, Professor Oard Wednesday.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.
Is Professor Whinston not available on Wednesday?
MR. DINTZER: Since Professor -- what counsel is trying to do is they're trying to create a situation where Professor Murphy finishes and 12 hours later Professor Whinston has to take the stand without having the chance to digest what Professor Murphy says.

In the same way that if -- \(I\) mean, it's really amazing that counsel is raising this since they could have called Professor Murphy today to start today and we could have started him, and we have raised no issue about that, and could have had him for the rest -- or started this morning or instead of videotape.

We've been very, very cooperative with them with respect to playing tape as opposed to actually bringing live witnesses. And to deny us the order and the starting time that we've asked to accommodate our witnesses and to make sure we're prepared for court is really remarkable, Your Honor, but that is what we are asking. Wednesday for Professor Oard, Thursday for Professor Whinston. And to the extent he needs to go Friday morning, which we're hoping he doesn't, then Mr. Davies directly after that.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. DINTZER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We'll work it out. You all don't need to wait.

That's fine, we can start Professor Murphy -excuse me, Professor Whinston, excuse me, on Thursday. I'm just trying to figure out whether we can move something that we have on Friday to give us a little extra time, which it looks like we may need, particularly if Mr. Davies testifies.

MR. DINTZER: We appreciate that, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Alternatively, it may just -- well, if you're only expecting -- you're expecting two and a half hours for Professor Whinston on direct?

MR. DINTZER: That is correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. So we ought to be able to
finish his examination on Thursday.
All right. So let's see where we are, okay?
Thank you, everyone we'll see you on Monday. Have
a nice long weekend. See everybody Monday. Thank you. Don't wait for me, please.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: The Court stands in recess.
THE COURT: I would ask however if we could get one more housekeeping with respect to these binders. Thank you.
(Proceedings adjourned at 1:30 p.m.)
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9642/7
\end{tabular}
competitive [1] 9625/1
completely [5] 9638/3
9644/16 9645/8
9655/16 9655/21
computer [2] 9616/7 9648/5
computer-aided [1] 9616/7
concepts [1] 9642/7
concerned [1] 9622/19
concerning [2]
9624/15 9641/12
concerns [1] 9652/25
concluded [1] 9658/7
conclusion [1] 9627/7
conditional [1]
9620/20
conduct [3] 9647/14
9647/24 9648/8
confer [2] 9628/13 9637/2
conferred [2] 9634/3
9634/13
confers [1] 9628/20
confidence [1]
9637/20
confidential [2]
9635/25 9639/1
confidentiality [4]
9637/21 9638/25
9639/10 9639/11
conflicted [1] 9622/21 connection [2] 9632/5
9652/18
CONNOLLY [1]
9615/13
consequences [1] 9647/5
consider [2] 9652/18 9652/20
considering [1] 9635/9
consistently [1]
9654/1
Constitution [1]
9616/4
consultation [1]
9644/13
Consumer [1] 9615/3 contain [2] 9631/15 9631/19
containing [1] 9631/24 content [1] 9650/19 contested [1] 9629/24 context [1] 9644/23 continued [3] 9615/1 9616/1 9630/12 contracts [2] 9653/18 9653/19
controversy [1] 9631/1 conversation [1]

9623/18
cooperative [1] 9660/1 copy [1] 9644/12 core [1] 9654/11 correct [4] 9632/14
9646/4 9660/24 9662/3 correction [1] 9631/7 correspondence [1] 9652/7
could [10] 9621/17 9624/25 9625/2 9641/5 9644/1 9653/19 9659/21 9659/22 9659/24 9661/7 counsel [13] 9622/13 9628/1 9634/4 9635/9 9635/24 9637/10 9637/16 9638/2 9638/13 9643/5 9644/1 9659/15 9659/21
counsel's [1] 9625/25 counter [1] 9625/24 counter-designations [1] 9625/24
country [1] 9641/16
couple [2] 9629/23 9635/1
course [1] 9623/13 court [26] 9613/1 9616/2 9616/3 9619/2 9622/15 9622/18
9622/19 9622/24
9622/24 9623/3
9623/12 9623/13
9624/6 9624/11 9629/5
9629/9 9631/11 9632/4
9635/22 9636/11
9637/22 9639/23
9654/6 9657/20 9660/5 9661/6
Court's [1] 9626/6
courtroom [1] 9640/3
courts [1] 9636/17
create [1] 9659/16
cross [1] 9625/20
CRR [2] 9662/2 9662/8
cumulative [2] 9645/16 9651/4
current [1] 9632/10
custodian [1] 9649/17

9657/21 9658/3
9658/22 9659/3 9660/9
9660/18
Davies' [1] 9630/7
day [6] 9613/7 9634/25 9636/2 9648/21 9655/14 9658/2
days [4] 9623/10
9623/16 9650/20
9657/16
deal [1] 9628/12
dealing [1] 9640/8
dealt [1] 9629/24
decision [2] 9626/17 9648/11
deeply [1] 9636/13 default [2] 9647/6 9648/1
defaulted [1] 9647/5
defend [1] 9644/22
defendant [3] 9613/7
9615/13 9631/18
Defendant's [1]
9633/19
Defendants [1]

\section*{9631/22}
deleted [1] 9647/3
demonstratives [3]
9634/7 9634/8 9634/12 denied [1] 9657/23
Denver [1] 9615/6
deny [1] 9660/3
department [8] 9614/2 9614/7 9614/13 9615/3 9643/5 9648/18 9652/8
9658/8
depending [1] 9656/10 depends [1] 9654/17
deponent [1] 9650/15 deposed [3] 9641/22
9642/2 9642/2
deposition [11]
9619/21 9620/1
9621/10 9625/16
9625/18 9626/25
9628/18 9628/24
9630/12 9630/19
9633/8
depositions [2] 9624/5 9625/15

9643/1 9643/12
9651/13 9657/16
different [3] 9631/5
9645/8 9656/14
digest [1] 9659/19
digits [1] 9631/12
Dintzer [3] 9614/2
9619/9 9622/10
Dintzer's [1] 9635/19
direct [3] 9627/2
9645/2 9660/23
directly [4] 9645/23
9653/21 9654/18
9660/9
disadvantage [1]
9625/1
disagree [2] 9655/1 9655/5
disagreement [1] 9632/11
Dischler [1] 9650/13
disclosed [3] 9621/11
9624/23 9624/25
disclosing [1] 9635/22
disclosure [2] 9625/1 9637/10
disclosures [2] 9637/5
9638/22
discovery [1] 9651/7
discuss [4] 9626/22
9628/7 9638/12
9650/18
discussed [2] 9628/4 9650/14
discussing [4] 9631/6
9644/10 9645/5 9645/5
discussion [6] 9623/22
9625/19 9639/7 9650/3
9650/12 9651/1
dispute [5] 9619/24
9632/1 9644/24
9649/13 9650/4
distribution [1]
9653/19
DISTRICT [3] 9613/1
9613/1 9613/10
Division [1] 9614/8
do [41] 9619/25
9621/20 9623/13
9623/15 9623/20
9624/20 9626/15
9630/1 9631/7 9632/14
9636/6 9636/19
9637/21 9637/22
9640/1 9640/5 9640/7
9640/10 9641/24
9641/25 9642/13
9644/2 9644/19
9644/20 9645/3
9645/11 9645/12
9647/25 9648/15
9652/13 9653/1
9654/11 9654/21
9655/9 9655/10
9656/20 9657/9
9657/14 9658/18
9658/25 9659/16
do you [1] 9654/21
document [15] 9626/5
9627/2 9640/22 9641/5
9642/5 9642/11
9642/16 9642/21
9642/22 9643/22
9644/15 9646/18 9646/22 9649/19 9649/24
documents [9]
9627/19 9628/14
9631/6 9632/9 9632/24
9640/18 9640/21
9643/8 9645/22
does [12] 9621/4
9622/22 9631/20
9633/11 9633/14
9640/14 9641/3 9648/6
9649/24 9654/17
9655/4 9655/9
doesn't [5] 9622/20
9623/1 9623/2 9641/1 9660/9
dog [1] 9638/5
doing [5] 9625/13
9635/23 9637/14
9637/20 9656/12
DOJ [4] 9614/2 9619/9
9650/19 9658/2
don't [28] 9619/23
9620/6 9620/10
9620/10 9621/20
9626/15 9627/13
9636/24 9637/13
9637/16 9638/5
9641/20 9641/21
9642/9 9643/16
9644/22 9648/20
9649/14 9649/19
9650/2 9651/15
9653/12 9656/6
9657/19 9658/12
9659/7 9660/12 9661/5
done [9] 9620/21
9629/18 9630/19
9638/1 9638/10
9638/24 9641/7 9655/3
9655/13
down [2] 9636/3 9644/9
draw [5] 9640/25
9641/4 9643/24
9645/19 9654/22
DRE [1] 9621/25
dropped [1] 9651/12
during [6] 9619/21
9625/18 9628/18
9651/7 9651/7 9651/8
DX0256 [1] 9631/24
DX3246 [2] 9633/13
9633/19
dynamics [2] 9653/17
9653/18

\section*{E}
E.V [1] 9614/6
earlier [2] 9631/8
9632/9
early [1] 9622/2

CV [1] 9613/4

D
D.C [5] 9613/5 9614/3 9614/9 9615/14 9616/5 Daniel [1] 9626/25 date [2] 9647/15 9662/7
dated [1] 9647/14 Daubert [5] 9621/1 9657/9 9657/15 9657/19 9657/23 Davies [17] 9620/19 9620/23 9621/5 9621/22 9622/16 9622/21 9622/25 9653/6 9653/15 9653/22 9657/5
descendants [1] 9646/12
described [1] 9632/3
designated [1] 9656/7 designation [1] 9633/8 designations [3]
9624/4 9625/24 9626/4
desire [1] 9645/16 determination [1] 9656/16
device [2] 9639/17 9639/18
devices [2] 9640/7 9645/4
did [6] 9620/17 9635/8
9638/15 9642/18
9652/25 9654/13
didn't [5] 9623/11
-
(
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline E & 9636/5 & 9636/12 9652/25 & first [16] 9620/15 & 9619/19 9620/1 \\
\hline & & 9654/25 9655/5 9656 & 9620/20 9621/24 & 9620/21 9621/2 \\
\hline 9621/5 9655/4 9655/9 & everybody [3] 9637/14 9641/24 9661/4 & 9656/12 \({ }^{\text {expertise [1] 9653/22 }}\) & 9623/1 9623/4 9625/23 & \[
9628 / 129629 / 1
\] \\
\hline 9655/10 & everyone [6] 9619/4 & expertise [1] \(9653 / 22\)
experts [1] \(9632 / 1\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
9639/8 9643/5 9643/22 \\
9646/5 9646/6 9646/23
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9634 / 2 \text { 9635/20 } \\
& 9635 / 219636 / 8
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline economist [1] 9621/5 & 9619/5 9619/12 & explain [2] 9643/25 & 9647/22 9647/23 & 9636/12 9636/15 \\
\hline fects [1] 9625/2 & 9629/11 9630/13 & \(9644 / 3\) & 9649/5 9657/5 & 636/24 9637/1 \\
\hline either [9] 9621/10 & 9661/3 & explained [1] 9640/4 & flawed [1] 9654/8 & 638/23 9641/8 \\
\hline 9623/1 9623/6 9624/25 & everything [2] 9637/20 & explains [1] 9650/17 & flip [1] 9649/17 & 641/25 9645/19 \\
\hline 64/11963 & 9637/22 & explanation [2] & flipping [1] 9625/17 & 48/14 9653/ \\
\hline 9651/7 & evidence [22] 9628/2 & 9631/10 9649/25 & floating [1] 9638/15 & 54 \\
\hline Elizabeth [1] 9614/13 & 9630/18 9631/2 & explicated [1] 9641 & Floor [2] 9615/6 & 5/10 96 \\
\hline & 9631/22 9632/21 & extent [4] 9621/17 & 9615/18 & 56/18 9656/21 \\
\hline 9614/16 & 9633/17 9633/19 & 9645/18 9651/3 9660/8 & flops [1] 9659/1 & 57/16 96 \\
\hline else [1] 9624/2 & 9634/3 9639 & extra [1] 9660/17 & focus [1] 9644/8 & 58/1 \\
\hline Elzinga [1] 9631/23 & 9639/21 9642/15 & Ezell [4] 9627/10 & following [4] 9620 & Golden [1] \\
\hline email [21] 9614/4 & 9642/22 9642/25 & 9628/24 9630/12 & 35/16 9647 & ood [9] \\
\hline 9614/10 9614/11 & 9646/16 9647/2 & 9630/19 & 9656/20 & 19 \\
\hline 9614/11 9614/16 & 9648/7 964 & II's [4] 9624 & [1] & 9622/11 9622/12 \\
\hline 9615/12 & 9651/19 9652/3 & 9624/14 & & \\
\hline 9627/3 9639/11 & 965 & F & 96502 & 9619/5 9619/12 \\
\hline 9639/16 9640/1 & ces [1] 9652 & & rmal [1] 964 & 22/11 9622/ \\
\hline 9640/12 9643/13 & & Facebook [4] 9619/18 & formally [1] 9652/17 & 626/2 \\
\hline 9644/9 9644/23 & & 4/8 & [1] 9654/2 & GOODRICH \\
\hline 9647/14 9648/17 & & 4, & [3] 963 & 15/1 \\
\hline 9649/18 9650/20 & 9625/25 9661/1 & & 1/12 963 & GOOGLE [23] 961 \\
\hline emailed [1] 9646 & example [9] 9631 &  & Fox's [1] 9621/25 & 9615/13 9619/8 \\
\hline mbedded [2] 9634/6 & 9639/9 9641/11 9642/8 & 9645/23 9648/2 9652/9 & Francisco [1] 9614/ & 19/11 96 \\
\hline 9634/18 & 9654/7 9656/12 & factors [1] 9624/20 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { fresh [1] } 9623 / 1 / 1 \\
& \text { Friday [4] } 9659
\end{aligned}
\] & 9631/9 9633/6 9633/ \\
\hline merge [1] 9647/10 & examples [2] 9645/22 & facts [9] 9648/3 9648/9 & 9659/2 9660/8 9660/17 & 9639/10 9639/20 \\
\hline ployee [2] 9645/17 & 9653/7 & 9649/15 9649/18 & full [1] 9656/17 & 4/ \\
\hline employees [5] 9639/9 & except [2] 9634/16 & 9650/22 9650/25 & fully [2] 9620/25 & 4/ \\
\hline employees [5] 963 9644/9 9647/2 964 & 9638/6 & 9655/4 & 9623/6 & 49 \\
\hline 47/25 & ex & fa & further [1] 9647/4 & 9650/21 9654/10 \\
\hline encounters [1] & & & G & 9656/5 9619/8 \\
\hline & excluded [1] 9654/15 & falls [3] 9624/11 & Gate [1] 9614/14 & oogle's [6] 9623 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
end [7] 9626/22 \\
9629/21 9630/1
\end{tabular} & excluding [1] 9642/11 & 9642/8 9643/21 & gave [1] 9620/4 & 625/17 9625/23 \\
\hline 4/24 9645/19 & excuse [5] 9625/8 & far [1] 9622/19 & gee [1] 9636/6 & 38/2 9645/2 \\
\hline  & 9646/6 9658/22 & fault [1] 9639/2 & general [2] 9631/17 & 9657/25 \\
\hline  & 9660/15 9660/15 & rable [1] 9639/2 & 9638/21 & got [4] 9630/6 9636/ \\
\hline ensure [2] 9649/12 & exhibit [5] 9619/2 & ure [1] 9641/8 & get [12] 9620 & 3/1 964 \\
\hline 56/23 & 9633/19 9641/9 & & & ernment [8] \\
\hline [1] & 9648/25 9651/19 & & & \\
\hline ered [3] 9646 & ex & &  & \\
\hline 9646/7 9646/10 & 9619/19 9619/25 & & 53/16 9655/15 & 34/15 9635/24 \\
\hline entire [2] 9637/25 & 9626/12 9626/20 & fifth [2] 9614/8 9658/2 & 9661/7 & 40/ \\
\hline 9648/5 & 9626/23 9628/2 & [1] 9638/ & gets [1] & ment's \\
\hline titled [1] 9638/7 & 9628/10 9628/17 & figure [1] 9660/1 & getting [1] 9639/1 & 633/ \\
\hline uivocate [1] 9637/13 & 9628/21 9629/23 & figures [3] 9624/15 & give [5] 9626/13 & wer [1] \\
\hline [1] 9648/5 & 9629/23 9630/15 & 9631/19 9640 & 28/5 9643/1 & ants [1] 9623/3 \\
\hline or [1] 9631/8 & 9630/17 9630/2 & file [1] 9636/24 & & eat [5] 9626/1 962 \\
\hline sentially [1] 9621/7 &  & filed [1] 9657/14 & (en/7 9624/20 9637 & 532/23 9634/1 \\
\hline ablish [1] 9649/18 & 9631/12 9631/14 & filing [3] 9622/24 9636/1 9636/3 & 9640/24 9641/7 & \\
\hline timated [1] 9622/1 & 9633/7 9633/9 9633/17 & filings [2] 9626/11 & 9645/22 9648/17 & guarded [1] 9641/12 guess [8] 9620/19 \\
\hline et [2] 9613/3 9619/8 & 9634/2 9634/12 9639/5 & 9626/13 & go [12] 9622/20 9623 & 20/21 9635/13 \\
\hline et al [1] 9619/8 & 9646/16 9652/3 9652 & finally [1] 9655/25 & 23/15 9627/13 & 648/24 9653/2 965 \\
\hline Europe [2] 9641/24 & 9652/18 & find [1] 9639/3 & 9629/15 9639/6 & 57/15 9658/21 \\
\hline 9641/25 \({ }^{\text {even [12] 9623/11 }}\) & expect [1] 9653/5 & fine [5] 9620/8 9625/6 & 45/24 9648/6 965 & guidance [2] 9639/19 \\
\hline 9625/23 9629/2 & expecting [2] 9660/22 & 6/14 & & \\
\hline 37/16 963 & &  & go ahead & H \\
\hline 9639/1 9642/8 9643 & \[
\text { expert [11] } 9621 / 6
\] & 9/1 & 5/ & had [15] 9625/19 \\
\hline 9647/2 9647/6 9648/7 9657/16 & \begin{tabular}{l}
9621/12 9631/15 \\
9631/16 9631/23
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
firm [1] 9626/17 \\
firms [1] 9631/17
\end{tabular} & goes [1] 9648/6 going [31] 9619/17 & had
\(9626 / 14\) 9630/16
\(9634 / 259635 / 19636 / 1\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline H & he & 21 & I mean [11] 9622/19 & inaccurate [1] 9635/14 \\
\hline 36/2 & & 9647/25 9649/4 & 7 & \\
\hline 640/2 9640/11 & 9654/1 9654/5 9654/25 9655/17 9655/17 & 9650/11 9651/18 9652/5 9653/10 & \begin{tabular}{l}
9647/9 9647/18 \\
9647/24 9651/14
\end{tabular} & inadvertently [1] \\
\hline 9640/20 9641/6 & 9655/19 9655/22 & 9654/24 9657/18 & 9653/7 9656/5 9659/20 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { inadvertently [1] } \\
& 9635 / 2
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9642 / 17 \text { 9643/25 } \\
& 9644 / 29659 / 24
\end{aligned}
\] & 9656/21 9658/15 & 9658/24 9659/5 9660/6 & I should [2] 9634/1 & incentives [1] 9655/6 \\
\hline [3] 9622/4 9623/10 & 9658/18 & 9660/11 9660/20 & 9648/25 & include [2] 9631/20 \\
\hline 60/22 & hear [4] 9625/22 & 9660/24 & I think [23] & \\
\hline f-days [1] 9623/10 & 9/23 9653/20 & RABL & 0/5 962 & included [2] \(9627 / 19\) \\
\hline nd [4] 9626/7 9631/2 & & & & \\
\hline 9641/2 & 9635/12 9636/20 & hoped [1] 9626/14 & 9638/25 9639/2 9642/4 & inconsistent [1] \\
\hline  & 9645/9 9650/14 & hoping [1] 9660/8 & 9642/7 9643/14 & 9638/9 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ndle } \\
& 542 / 6
\end{aligned}
\] & 9654/25 9655/6 9655/7 & hour [1] 9627/11 & 3/21 9645/9 & INDEX [1] 961 \\
\hline ndling [1] 9630/25 & /21 & hours [5] 9622/2 & 5/10 9645/2 & icated [3] 9620 \\
\hline handout [1] 9634/16 & hearing [1] 9648 & 622/4 9637/20 & 9649/5 9651/10 & 22/4 9 \\
\hline Hang [2] 9643/4 & hearsay [3] 9634/6 & 9659/17 9660/23 & 9653/24 9656/15 & ence \\
\hline 43/5 & Help [1] 9643/2 & 9626/10 9630/18 & Ithought [3] 9642/24 & industry [1] 9621/6 \\
\hline happens [2] 9636/5 & helpful [1] 9653/8 & /8 & 9642/24 9659/9 & ference [1] 9640/24 \\
\hline py [4] & her [4] 9644/1 9650/17 & houses [1] 9634/1 & 1 understand [3] & ferences [3] 9641/4 \\
\hline 8/11 9638/20 & 9651/12 9651/13 & how [8] 9625/19 & 9645/16 9651/23 & 9643/24 9645/20 \\
\hline 57/22 & here [22] 9634/5 & 9637/13 9642/6 & 9656/11 & mation \\
\hline ard [1] 9646/18 & 9635/22 9636/7 9636/8 & 9649/8 9 & want [4] 962 & /1196 \\
\hline harm [1] 9637/4 & & & & 9631/24 \\
\hline harmful [1] 9635/17 & 9639/6 9640/19 9641/3 & however [1] 9661/7 & ] 9657/13 & \(109640 / 16\) \\
\hline has [33] 9619/23 & 9641/14 9641/24 9642/9 9643/23 9644/3 & Hubbard [1] 9624/20 & I will [4] 9626/21 & initial [1] 9642/19 initially [2] 9621/11 \\
\hline 9620/4 9632/13 & 9642/9 9643/23 9644/3
9645/17 9645/19 & human [1] 9638/23 hundreds [1] 9637/20 & \begin{tabular}{l}
9631/4 9635/7 9652/18 \\
I'd [6] 9628/25 9631/2
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{9651 / 11}^{\text {initially [2] } 9621 / 11}\) \\
\hline 9633/13 9634/15 & 47/9 9647/21 9651/5 & & 365/7 9638/1 & insofar [1] 9626/2 \\
\hline 635/25 9637/5 & 9655/1 9655/21 9656/1 & I & 219658 & instance [5] 9635/14 \\
\hline 9640/1 96 & hey [1] 9651/5 & I also [2] 9657/2 & I'II [9] 9622/14 9639/7 & 9639/9 9639/20 \\
\hline 640/10 9641/24 & hide [1] 9650/25 & 9657/24 & 9640/17 9642/4 9643/6 & 9640/15 9650/2 \\
\hline 9641/25 9644/18 & hiding [1] & I am [3] 9626 & 9647/22 9648/22 & nces [3] 962 \\
\hline 9644/20 9644/23 & & 9635/13 9641/8 & 9651/14 9651/1 & /24 9641/14 \\
\hline 9645/10 9645/11 & highly [1] & I believe [4] 9634/ & [16] 9625/6 963 & 9630/9 \\
\hline 96 & & & & \\
\hline 96 &  &  & 955/20 9635/20 & tended [1] 9658/2 \\
\hline 9652/19 9654/6 & 9658/4 9658/20 & 9637/19 9650/16 & 9636/8 9636/15 & intention \\
\hline 9655/14 9655/16 & 9659/23 9659/24 & 9652/16 9652/17 & 9645/11 9648/14 & erest [3] 9624 \\
\hline 655/22 9656/5 & his [11] 9619/21 & 9656/20 9656/22 & 9648/16 9658/10 & 9636/19 9637/4 \\
\hline 7/21 9657/21 & 9621/4 9622/4 9627/10 & I did [1] 9638/15 & 9660/16 & terested [1] 9639/1 \\
\hline & 9632/3 9653/21 & I didn't [2] 9643/1 & I'm going [2] 9637/1 & ternal [2] 9624/ \\
\hline [93] & 9653/22 9653/24 & 9657/16 & 9648/14 & 644/13 \\
\hline haven't [2] 9638/12 & 9654/6 9654/11 9661/1 & I don't [12] 9619/2 & I'm just [2] 9634/2 & terpreted [1] 964 \\
\hline 9651/6 & story [7] 9647/4 & & & \\
\hline ving [5] 9619/25 & 9647/11 & & & duced [2] 96 \\
\hline 644/2 9647/5 9656/17 & & \(9641 / 209641 / 21\) & & \\
\hline 9659/18 & 649/16 9649/17 & 9642/9 9644/22 & I've [7] 9624/18 & roduction [1] \\
\hline he [36] 9621/1 96 & \[
\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned}
& \text { his } \\
& 96
\end{aligned}\right.
\] & 9659/7 & 9633/25 & \\
\hline 9621/2 9621/3 9621/5 & hit [1] 9622/14 & I don't know & /5 & 4/1 \\
\hline 9621/7 9621/11 & Honor [49] 961 & 4/14 & i.e [1] 9640/8 & ed \\
\hline 9621/12 9621/14 & 9619/16 9621/20 & I guess [7] 9620/1 & idea [2] 9637/1 & 56/12 \\
\hline 9621/16 9621/24 & 9622/11 9623/24 & 9620/21 9635/13 & 9654/9 & involves [2] 9644/1 \\
\hline 9622/2 9622/4 9622/20 & 9626/2 9627/9 9627/16 & 9648/24 9653/2 9657/8 & imagination [1] & 9644/17 \\
\hline 9622/22 9623/1 9623/5 & 9628/4 9629/12 & 9657/15 & 9643/17 & ironclad [1] 9636/1 \\
\hline 9640/3 9640/4 9654/3
\(9654 / 149655 / 1\) & 9630/14 9630/23 & I have [7] 9619/15 & immediately [1] 9659 & is [131] \\
\hline 9654/14 9655/1 & 9632/1 9632/13 9633/2 & 9619/18 9624/3 & impacts [1] 9624/15 & Is there [1] 9649/1 \\
\hline 9655/16 9655/18 & 9633/5 9633/23 & 9629/22 9632/14 & import [1] 9640/1 & isn't [1] 9642/15 \\
\hline 55/22 9655/25 & 9634/15 9634/19 & 9633/8 9638/12 & importantly [1] 9647/ & ue [19] 9621/21 \\
\hline 656/1 9656/9 9656/2 & 9635/8 9636/16 & I hope [1] 9619/13 & impression [1] & 22/16 9622/17 \\
\hline 657/21 9658/5 & 9636/25 9637/7 9637/9 & I just [5] 9628/7 & 9622/15 & 23/10 9626/18 \\
\hline 9660/8 9660/8 & 9638/16 9639/13 & 9628/17 9635/2 & improper [3] 9620/24 & 34/24 9636/21 \\
\hline & 9639/25 9640/13 & 35/18 9643/14 & 9621/1 9655/22 & 9648/16 9648/21 \\
\hline 9654/10 & 9641/23 9642/12 & I know [3] 9629/13 & improperly [1] 9636 & 9649/3 9649/21 \\
\hline he'll [2] 9654/7 9654/8 & 9643/3 9644/25 9645/2 & 9636/20 9657/10 & imprudent [1] 9656/16 & 9649/25 9652/6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 9621/14 9623/20 & light [1] 9657/14 & 9640/15 9644/12 & message [1] 9650/17 \\
\hline [6] 9652/25 & 9629/13 9636/12 & like [19] & 9648/20 9649/16 & \\
\hline 9657/17 9658/10 & 9636/20 9636/24 & 9623/7 9626/7 9627/19 & 9656/16 9657/25 & 9632/2 \\
\hline 9658/12 9658/14 & 9637/13 9637/16 & 9628/13 9628/19 & 9660/ & crosoft [1] 963 \\
\hline 9659/23 & 9637/24 9638/18 & 9629/18 9631/2 & making [4] 963 & [5] 9630/1 \\
\hline issues [14] 9621/3 & 9639/1 9641/2 & 9635/7 9637/3 96 & 9638/6 9640/5 9650/19 & 9639/20 9643/25 \\
\hline 21/16 9621/17 & 9651/4 9653/12 & 9651/21 9657/20 & 9641/15 9641/15 &  \\
\hline 22/14 9623/8 & 9655/23 9656/11 & 9658/22 9660/18 & 9641/16 9642/9 & 9647/20 \\
\hline 629/24 9630/6 & 9656/15 9657/10 & limine [1] 9632/10 & 9645/13 9653/17 & mindful [1] 9629/1 \\
\hline 9635/10 9641/2 \(9644 / 19\) & 9657/16 9658/1 & limited [2] 9621/24 & material [1] 9625/1 & minutes [3] 9620/12 \\
\hline 47/9 9653/20 & 9659/7 & 9636/10 & materially [1] 9620/1 & 9627/11 9634/2 \\
\hline 9654/11 & known [2] 9648 & line [2] 9641/3 9650/17 & materials [2] 9636/3 & mischaracterizatio \\
\hline it [82] & & & & \\
\hline it would be [1] & \[
9646 / 12
\] & 1 & \[
/ 189656 / 1
\] & ;41/ \\
\hline & Korea [1] 9645/12 & literally [1] 9645/12 & 9662/4 & misrepresenting [1] \\
\hline 9630/17 9634/18 & L & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ation } \\
& 0 / 14
\end{aligned}
\] & matters [7] 9619/ 9626/10 9634/23 &  \\
\hline 6/5 9636/18 & labe & little [4] 9620/9 & 35/22 96 & mistakes [1] 9638/1 \\
\hline 9638/23 9645/5 & language [1] 9641 & 9625/14 9625/17 & 44/15 96 & mixed [2] 9635/5 \\
\hline 9647/12 9648/15 & Lara [2] 9614/6 9626/3 & 9660/17 & may [13] 9620/20 & 9637/18 \\
\hline 9649/5 9650/25 & Lara Trager [1] 9626/3 & live [10] 9621/10 & 26/18 9627/16 & moment [1] 9627 \\
\hline 651/15 9658/1 & lara.trager [1] 9614/10 & 9621/21 9622/17 & 9627/22 9636/10 & Monday [3] 9626/19 \\
\hline 9659/20 & 24 & 625/8 964 & 9636/20 9645/9 9651/2 & 9661/3 9661/4 \\
\hline its [2] 9644/4 9648/11 & 9626/12 9635/8 & 9651/1 965 & & monetization [2] \\
\hline & 259650 & LLC [2] 9613/6 9619/8 & may-call [1] 9620/20 & \\
\hline & 9652/25 9656/4 & LLP [2] 001519061513 & ay-cll & \\
\hline J & 9658/23 & load [1] 9645/3 & 9648/23 9648/24 & 962 \\
\hline Jeffrey [3] 9627/10 & late [1] 96 & long [2] 9627/3 9661/4 & 9653/2 & 26/1 \\
\hline 9628/24 & later [5] & longer [1] 9642/22 & me [34] 9623/1 & 9628/14 9630/18 \\
\hline sen [1] 9614/13 & 9628/13 9637/2 & look [11] 9626/16 & 9623/16 9624/3 9625/8 & 9647/1 9661/8 \\
\hline Jerry [1] 9650/13 & 9639/22 9659 & 9628/19 9638/18 & 9626/21 9627/2 9635/3 & morning [18] 9619 \\
\hline jigger [1] 9656/23 & launched [1] 9648 & 9638/20 9640/2 & 9636/7 9639/6 9640/25 & 9619/6 9619/12 \\
\hline job [1] 9638/24 & LAW [1] 9615/3 & 9643/21 9645/15 & 9641/3 9641/4 9641/19 & 9619/16 9620/4 \\
\hline John [2] 9615/13 & lawsuit [2] 9644/17 & 9650/12 9653 & 96 & 9620/14 9620/16 \\
\hline 9619/11 & 9644 & 9656/15 9657/15 & 964 & 9622/11 9622/12 \\
\hline jon.sallet [1] 9615/7 & lawyer [1] 9644/1 & looked [2] 9646/12 & 46/6 9647/9 9647/13 & 23/5 9623 \\
\hline Jonathan [3] 9615/2 & lead [1] 9621/22 & 9656/5 & 48/19 9650/8 9653/3 & 3/22 \\
\hline 9619/10 9631/16 & leaked [1] 9640/16 & looking [1] 9639/22 & 9653/25 & 9626/15 9626/22 \\
\hline Jr [1] 9615/8 & least [6] 9622/6 9624/7 & looks [1] 9660/18 & 9656 & 57/6 9659/25 966 \\
\hline jschmidtlein [1] & 9624/9 9635/1 & lose [1] 9648/1 & 9656/16 9658/13 & most [4] 9627/19 \\
\hline 9615/15 & 9645/21 & losses [1] 9625/4 & 9660/1 & 9631/12 9639/15 \\
\hline & left [1] 9640/20 & lost [1] 9647/7 & 9661/5 & 9646/11 \\
\hline \[
\text { judgment [1] } 96
\] & legal [6] 9637/17 & lots [2] 9645/18 & mean [12] 9622/19 & motion [7] 9623/3 \\
\hline \[
\text { Judicial [1] } 961
\] & 9639/11 9639/19 & 9645/21 & 28/9 9630/7 9638 & 9632/10 9642/19 \\
\hline just [58] & 9640/11 9640/14 & low [1] 9639/18 & 9644/17 9647/9 & 9642/23 9648/7 965 \\
\hline JUSTICE [5] 9614/2 & 9643/18 & lunch [2] 9629/13 & 9647/18 9647/24 & 9657/25 \\
\hline 9614/7 9614/13 & length [2] 9620/11 & 0/ & 9651/14 9653/7 9656/5 & motions [1] 9657/15 \\
\hline 9648/18 9658/8 & & lunchtime [1] 9623/22 & & \\
\hline K & l & M & & 9660/ \\
\hline Kartashev & 23/16 9624/3 9639/6 & MADA [7] 9644/10 & measure [1] 9637/13 & moved [3] 9631/2 \\
\hline 9643/23 & 9641/19 9643/5 & 9645/5 9645/6 9653/19 & mechanical [1] 9616/6 & 9640/20 9642/17 \\
\hline Kate [1] 9643/14 & 9653/3 9654/20 9656/3 & 9654/8 9654/9 9654/12 & chanism [1] & ving [2] 9637/2 \\
\hline keep [2] 9637/21 & let & \[
\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{a}}
\] & 36/10 & 42/1 \\
\hline 9637/21 &  & 9625/4 9626/13 9631 & medium [1] 9639/ & [1] 9621/3 \\
\hline Kenneth [2] 9614/2 & 9629/18 96341/2 9641/10 9649/5 & 96 & t [1] 9628/20 & [47] 9619/1 \\
\hline 9619/9 &  & 9642 & meeting [1] 9650/16 & 621/5 9621/22 \\
\hline kenneth.dintzer2 [1]
\[
9614 / 5
\] & 9652/24 9661/2 & magic [1] 964 & MEHTA [2] 9613/9 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9621 / 59621 / 22 \\
& 9621 / 23 \\
& 9622 / 10
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline kill [2] 96 & 9661/2 & main [1] 9647/1 & mention [1] 9643/9 & 22/2 \\
\hline 9644/12 & Levy [9] 9619/1 & Maine [1] 9615/1 & mentioned [1] 9635/1 & 24/4 \\
\hline kind [6] & 9624/4 9624/17 & maintaining [1] & entionings [1] & 4/13 9624 \\
\hline 1/13 9635/ & 9625/13 9625/18 & 9638/24 & 641/15 & 24/17 9625/4 \\
\hline 9647/20 9654/6 & 9626/5 9626/25 9627/8 & make [10] 9621/20 9626/17 9631/4 & merit [2] 9616/2 & 9626/5 9627/8 9629/22 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline M & muting [2] 9624/10 & & /10 & 9637/3 9637/11 \\
\hline Mr.... [26] 9630/24 & & numerous [2] 9635/24 & 1/2 & \[
7 / 239638 / 196
\] \\
\hline 2/11 9633/22 & & 2 & \[
36 / 17 \text { 9638/8 }
\] & 52/25 9657/19 \\
\hline 9635/3 9635/19 & 6/16 9628/1 & 9616 & one [34] 9619/22 & 57/25 9658/1 9658 \\
\hline 642/20 9643 & 30/17 9633/25 & NY [2] 9615/1 & 9620/1 9624/8 9624/12 & 9658/6 966 \\
\hline 46/7 9646/10 & 9636/13 9637/25 & 9615/ & 9625/11 9625/13 & ourselves [2] 9639 \\
\hline 46/12 9650/13 & & 0 & ( 9627/5 9629/19 & 9644/22 \\
\hline 965 & 96 & 0 & 9635/14 9635/24 & 149636 \\
\hline 5 9657/21 9658 & N & & 9636/2 9639/8 9640/18 & 3/17 96 \\
\hline 9659/3 965 & & 9/12 96607 & 41/10 9641/20 & 36/18 9636/22 \\
\hline 9660/9 9660/18 & nam & obfuscated [1] & 9642/4 9642/25 964 & 51/22 9660/1 \\
\hline Davies [16] & nature [1] & 9639/16 & 10 & 9660/16 \\
\hline 9620/19 9620/23 & need [7] 9621/2 & object [2] 9633/1 & 7/17 9649/1 9649 & outreach [1] 963 \\
\hline 1/5 9621/22 & 9638/15 9649/19 & 9633/14 & 9651/10 & outside [1] 9642/8 \\
\hline 21 9622/25 &  & & 9656/1 & anding [1] \\
\hline /6 9653/15 & needed [1] 9656/ & 9646/14 & \[
9661 / 8
\] & outweighs [2] 96 \\
\hline 553/22 9657/5 & needs [2] 9630/1 & objections [1] 9634/ & ones [2] 96 & \[
9644
\] \\
\hline 657/21 9658/3 & 9660/8 & observations [2] & 9646/12 & er [2] 9655/18 \\
\hline 58/22 9659/3 9660/9 & negotia & 9655/11 9655/12 & only [9] 962 & /2 \\
\hline vies & 9 & obviously [4] 962 & 21/25 962 & [2] 9638/24 \\
\hline Mr. Dintzer [1] 9622/10 & new [3] 9615/11
\(9615 / 19\)
\(9620 / 6\) & 9623/21 9643/25 & 35/12 9640/18 & \\
\hline Mr. Dintzer's [1] & news [1] 9635/19 & occasion & \[
96
\] & P \\
\hline & next [8] 9623/9 9627/9 & occurred [3] 9625/ & On & p.m [1] 9661/1 \\
\hline Mr. Ezell's [4] 962 9624/10 9624/13 & 9641/10 9642/13 & 9625/23 9637/5 & 9653/9 9653/11 & page [4] 9639/16 \\
\hline 9624/14 & /113 9644/6 964 & October [2] 9626 & 9624/6 & 1/12 9645/2 \\
\hline rry D & & & 19624/2 & \\
\hline 13 & nice [1] 9661/4 &  & operate [1] 9645/9 & ge 2 [1] 9639/16 \\
\hline ol & night [3] 9620/17 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { OEMs [7] 9653/17 } \\
& 9654 / 10 \\
& 9655 / 2 \\
& 9655 / 6
\end{aligned}
\] & operating [2] 9645/8 9655/19 & papers [2] 9653/1 \\
\hline 9646/7 9646/12 & nilly [1] 9651/2 & 9655/6 9655/7 965 & opinion [3] 9654/15 & part [5] 9621/4 9639 \\
\hline Mr. Levy [6] 9619/18 & no [18] 9613/4 9623/10 & off [10] 9619/17 & 9654/15 9655/1 & 9639/15 9642/22 \\
\hline 625/4 9624/17 9626/5 9627/8 & 9630/18 9634/15 & 9621/22 9622/2 96 & opinions [10] 9621/5 & /18 \\
\hline O25/18 9626/5 9627/8 & 36/1 & 9646/20 9647/4 964 & 9621/7 9621/8 9621/24 & cular [3] 96 \\
\hline Oard [1] 9621/23 & 9641/23 9642/ & /11 9648 & 4/6 & / 9641/8 \\
\hline Pichai [2] 9642/20 & 9646/14 9646/1 & 9/17 & 9654/11 9655/11 & cularly [1] \\
\hline & 9652/14 9652/1 & offer [5] 9655/10 & 56/ & 60/18 \\
\hline allet [1] & 9655/16 9655/22 & 9655/17 9656/1 9656/2 & opportunity [6] & parties [5] 9624/ \\
\hline Schmidtlein [10] & 9655/22 9657/10 & 9658/15 & 9640/11 9641/6 & 625/20 9632/10 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9629 / 229630 / 24 \\
& 9632 / 11 \\
& 9633 / 22
\end{aligned}
\] & 9659/11 9659/23 & offered [3] 9621/16 & 9642/18 9643/25 & 9634/12 9636/1 \\
\hline /3 9638/18 & none [1] 9642/1 & 9621/18 9655/22 & 9644/3 9656/17 & parties' [1] 9624/4 \\
\hline 9/24 9643/4 & nonpublic [1] 96 & [3] 962 9654/25 & [2] 9650/ & ers [1] 9645 [2] 9618/4 \\
\hline /20 9659/6 & note [7] 9627/19 & Official [1] 9616/3 & & ty [2] 9618/4 40/16 \\
\hline Mr. Yoo [1] 9640/2 & \[
\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{|l|l|}
\text { note [7] } \\
9629 / 19 & 9640 / 19
\end{array}\right.
\] & oh [4] 9628/8 9628/16 & opposition [1] 9657/1 & sing [1] 9645 \\
\hline Ms [1] 9653/11 & 9640/17 9643/1 & oh [4] 9628/8 9628/16 9634/17 9636/5 & orally [2] 9626/19 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { assing [1] 9645/ } \\
& \text { ast [1] } 9637 / 6
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Ms. [4] 9633/4 9633/8
\(9633 / 139643 / 23\) & 9646/23 9657/18 & okay [44] 9619/1 & order [6] 9620/15 & ATTERSON [1] \\
\hline lich & noted [2] 9619/17 & 9619/20 9619/24 & 9625/14 9626/18 & 9615/9 \\
\hline Ms. Kartasheva [1]
\[
9643 / 23
\] & 9620/19 & 9620/8 9620/13 9622/9 & 9656/22 9656/23 & pause [2] 9627/1 \\
\hline & nothing [6] 9636 & 9623/14 9626/1 9626/8 & 9660/3 & 9628/25 \\
\hline Ms. Trager [2] 9633/8
\(9633 / 13\) & 9640/10 9641/25 & 9626/23 9627/1 & ordering [1] 9620/17 & pbwt.com [1] 9615/ \\
\hline Ms. Waszmer [1] & 9644/19 9644/2 & 8/8 9628 & nization [2] & [1] 9615/17 \\
\hline \[
9633 / 4
\] & 9645/12 & 9628/22 9629/1 & 5/16 9640/8 & ple [8] 963 \\
\hline Murphy [2 & noticed [1] 9625 & 9630/20 9632 & er [10] 9624/9 & 35/23 \\
\hline 9621/4 9622/16 & notified [1] 9643/12 & 96 & 9625/14 9630/8 & 9640/8 9650/25 96 \\
\hline 9622/20 9623/2 9623/9 & November [2] 9613/5
\(9662 / 7\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9634 / 149634 / 17 \\
& 9637 / 89638 / 179639 /
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9635 / 159636 / 29640 \\
& 9644 / 11965 / 8
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
9651/4 \\
per [4] 9639/17
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 9653/13 9653/15 & now [13] 9619/2 & 9639/24 9640/23 & 53/19 9657/8 & 39/18 9639/18 \\
\hline 9653/16 9654/2 9654/3 & 9619/3 9621/2 9629/15 & 9642/25 9643/2 & hers [1] 9651/4 & 40/13 \\
\hline 5/3 9655/9 965 & 9630/6 9642/15 & 9644/14 9645/14 & otherwise [1] 9638/1 & percentag \\
\hline 9657/4 9658/19 & 9642/22 9643/8 & 9648/13 9650/2 & ought [1] 9660/25 & /12 9635/1 \\
\hline 9659/17 9659/19 & 9643/14 9652/16 & 9650/23 9651/9 & our [24] 9620/15 & 35/11 9635/1 \\
\hline 9659/22 9660/14 & 9656/10 9656/17 & 9651/17 9652/1 & 9621/7 9621/23 9622 & 9635/17 \\
\hline Murphy's [3] 9653/5 9654/8 9655/23 & \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
9657 / 20 \\
\text { number [1] } 9622 / 13
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9652 / 239654 / 19 \\
& 9656 / 39657 / 19659 / 4
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9622 / 79622 / 25 \\
& 9627 / 149634 / 19634 / 6
\end{aligned}
\] & perfectly [1] 9632/16 permitted [1] 9621/22 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{\(\mathbf{P}\)}
person [8] 9623/5
9641/17 9643/12 9643/17 9644/11 9650/18 9651/1 9656/13
perspective [2] 9639/19 9640/14 pertain [1] 9635/11 Pichai [2] 9642/20 9646/10
piece [1] 9639/14 place [1] 9643/2 Plaintiff [5] 9615/2 9619/10 9631/16 9631/18 9634/19
PLAINTIFF'S [1] 9616/7
plaintiffs [13] 9613/4
9614/2 9620/18
9621/14 9632/21
9634/4 9640/25 9641/6
9643/23 9645/18
9652/3 9653/4 9658/2
plaintiffs' [6] 9621/18
9628/2 9631/15
9633/17 9646/16
9651/19
play [5] 9620/2
9629/14 9629/18
9645/4 9645/5
played [9] 9624/5
9625/8 9625/9 9625/15
9626/23 9626/25
9627/6 9627/20
9628/24
players [1] 9639/2
playing [2] 9624/19
9660/2
please [7] 9619/4
9622/24 9629/10
9632/19 9643/14
9644/10 9661/5
pleases [1] 9622/18
point [6] 9636/4
9647/23 9654/14
9655/8 9656/4 9657/25
pointing [1] 9649/5
policies [2] 9651/22
9652/12
policy [7] 9646/3
9646/5 9646/7 9646/10
9647/4 9648/12 9649/8
portions [1] 9625/7
position [3] 9622/7
9626/14 9634/20
possible [1] 9658/4 post [3] 9629/25
9632/12 9632/25
post-trial [3] 9629/25
9632/12 9632/25
potential [1] 9656/18
potentially [2] 9647/19 9654/9
powerful [1] 9648/2
pre [1] 9658/17
precedes [2] 9647/15 9649/1
precisely [1] 9653/13
precursor [1] 9658/17 prefer [1] 9623/13 prejudice [1] 9642/10 prejudicial [3] 9644/2 9651/16 9658/8 prepare [1] 9656/24 prepared [4] 9622/17 9622/23 9623/7 9660/5 present [1] 9657/7 presented [3] 9624/22 9626/21 9628/11 preserve [2] 9647/3 9647/6
preserved [3] 9647/16 9649/8 9650/22 presiding [1] 9619/3 presumably [1] 9624/9 pretty [2] 9638/24 9648/19
Prettyman [1] 9616/4 preview [1] 9653/25 previously [5] 9620/23 9624/24 9632/13 9634/10 9634/11 primarily [2] 9644/8 9648/15
primary [1] 9639/14 prior [4] 9626/16
9626/16 9642/11
9648/17
privilege [1] 9645/21 privileged [2] 9639/10 9644/13
probably [2] 9623/21
9657/6
probative [4] 9642/5
9642/10 9644/4
9651/15
problem [1] 9658/24 proceeding [2] 9635/2 9635/16
proceedings [4]
9613/9 9616/6 9661/10 9662/4
produced [2] 9616/7 9652/6
Professor [46] 9620/22 9621/4 9621/25 9622/3
9622/16 9622/20
9623/2 9623/4 9623/6
9623/8 9630/7 9631/23
9632/2 9632/8 9653/4
9653/13 9653/15
9653/16 9654/2 9654/2
9654/8 9654/17
9654/21 9655/3 9655/9
9655/23 9656/18
9657/4 9658/19
9658/22 9658/25
9659/1 9659/8 9659/11
9659/12 9659/14
9659/15 9659/17
9659/18 9659/19
9659/22 9660/7 9660/7
9660/14 9660/15
9660/23
Professor Baker [1]

9632/2
Professor Whinston
[6] 9623/6 9659/8 9659/14 9659/18 9660/7 9660/23
projections [1] 9625/3
properly [1] 9658/5
propose [1] 9625/6 proposed [3] 9624/5 9624/18 9625/6 proposition [3] 9635/6 9638/22 9656/7 Protection [1] 9615/3 provide [2] 9649/25 9654/15
provided [3] 9631/11
9653/7 9653/23
providing [1] 9642/6
PSX00866.020 [2]
9631/13 9632/21
public [7] 9624/19
9624/21 9624/22
9635/1 9635/4 9636/23 9638/7
publicly [1] 9624/23
pull [1] 9636/2
purports [1] 9621/6
purpose [1] 9620/10 purposes [1] 9639/22 push [3] 9631/2 9632/17 9652/13
pushed [1] 9628/21 pushing [4] 9634/3 9634/13 9636/22 9640/21
put [6] 9630/21 9635/2 9643/1 9653/3 9654/20 9657/6
putting [1] 9650/22

\section*{Q}

Q1 [1] 9645/7
Q2 [1] \(9645 / 2\)
qualified [1] 9658/18
quality [1] 9644/2
question [7] 9638/4
9647/8 9647/12 9653/2
9653/3 9654/20
9658/17
questioned [1] 9644/1
quickly [3] 9624/2
9639/5 9652/25

\section*{R}
raise [4] 9619/14
9623/11 9632/24
9649/22
raised [6] 9623/8
9623/12 9649/21
9649/24 9658/6
9659/23
raises [3] 9622/13 9638/3 9649/3
raising [3] 9640/17
9652/16 9659/21
Ralph [1] 9615/4
rather [1] 9644/11
re [2] 9656/23 9657/13
re-jigger [1] 9656/23 re-read [1] 9657/13 reached [2] 9630/25 9633/8
read [7] 9623/15
9627/22 9638/5
9644/18 9651/22
9653/24 9657/13
ready [3] 9620/2
9623/13 9626/21
real [1] 9621/21
really [4] 9653/20
9654/17 9659/20
9660/5
Realtime [1] 9616/3
reason [1] 9647/1
reasons [3] 9620/24
9621/13 9625/5
rebut [5] 9622/22
9622/23 9653/6
9653/21 9655/15
rebuttal [13] 9620/17
9620/24 9621/19
9630/7 9654/16
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline T & 9647/16 9648/3 & 9642/1 9646/10 & 9621/9 9624/18 9625/5 & \\
\hline technological... [1] & 9658/12 9660/14 & 9650/20 9652/11 & 9626/22 9626/23 & \[
\text { 7] } 9613
\] \\
\hline /11 & their [16] 9622/24 & 9653/18 9661/8 & 9627/22 9630/17 & 4/13 9624/17 \\
\hline 3] \(9636 / 15\) 9650/8 & 9623/3 9631/23 & they [44] 9620/18 & 9631/14 9635/4 & 25/7 9662/3 \\
\hline \[
4 / 13
\] & 9635/23 9635/24 & 9620/18 9620/19 & 9635/14 9637/13 & nscription [1] \\
\hline tennis [1] 9639/2 & 9636/3 9637/14 & 9621/17 9623/11 & 9637/14 9640/9 9647/3 & 9616/7 \\
\hline [8] 9634/12 & 9637/17 9641/19 & 9623/12 9624/24 & 9649/17 9651/23 & nscripts [4] 9624/14 \\
\hline 36/1 9638/21 9649/7 & 9645/4 9647/6 9648/1 & 9628/5 9628/5 9628 & 9652/13 9652/18 & 9625/8 9626/16 \\
\hline 9653/14 9653/17 & 9651/11 9656/23 & 9628/11 9628/12 & 9653/17 9654/3 & 9636/22 \\
\hline 9654/5 9658/21 & 965 & 9631/15 9632/18 & 9654/10 9655/4 9656/1 & transforming [1] \\
\hline Terrific [4] 9630/20 & them [30] 9622/1 & 9635/9 9635/10 & though [4] 9625/23 & 9639/20 \\
\hline 633/1 9633/16 & 9623/16 9625/17 & 9635/12 9636 & 9629/21 9642/8 9648/7 & treated [1] 9634/7 \\
\hline 9634/21 & 9628/7 9628/1 & 9637/17 9637/2 & thought [4] 9626/14 & treatments [1] 9645/20 \\
\hline testified [3] 9622 & 9628/12 9628/20 & 9638/10 9638/1 & 9642/24 9642/24 & trial [9] 9613/9 9624/22 \\
\hline 9640/19 9642/20 & 9631/4 9631/12 & 9638/12 9640/2 & 9659/9 & 9629/25 9632/12 \\
\hline testifies [3] 9623/1 & 9632/24 9635/11 & 9640/11 9640/12 & thousand [1] 9638/23 & 32/25 965 \\
\hline 9658/23 9660/19 & 9635/12 9636/4 9636/8 & 9646/2 9647/15 & thread [4] 9644/10 & 1/12 9652/ \\
\hline testify [9] 9621/12 & 9636/25 9637/2 & 9649/16 9649/16 & 9644/12 9645 & 88/2 1 \\
\hline 9621/23 9623/1 9623/5 & 9637/16 9639/6 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9649 / 21 \text { 9649/23 } \\
& 9651 / 39651 / 69651 / 12
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9650 / 13 \\
& \text { three [8] 9624/12 }
\end{aligned}
\] & troubled [1] 9635/19 true [1] 9648/4 \\
\hline 9640/4 9641/21 & 9647/7 9648/1 9649/15 & 9652/1 9652/9 9653/1 & 9632/8 9639/17 9646/1 & truly [2] 9658/4 \\
\hline 9653/14 9654/1 & 9649/23 9655/18 & 9654/11 9655/4 9658/1 & 9646/11 9646/11 & 9658/16 \\
\hline 9656/22 \({ }^{\text {testifying [1] 9636/13 }}\) & 9655/19 9656/2 9656/6 & 9658/4 9658/6 9659/21 & 9651/22 9658/23 & try [6] 9621/2 9622/14 \\
\hline tifying [1] 9636/13 & 9656/23 & they'll [3] 9632/20 & through [10] 9623 & 1/6 9636/9 96 \\
\hline timony [15] 9622/1 & then [30] 9621/25 & 9646/15 9649/14 & 9629/15 9632/12 & 55/15 \\
\hline (e27/4 9624/11 9625/9 & 9622/21 9622/22 & they're [7] 9634/5 & 9639/6 9644/18 9645/6 & trying [8] 9636/21 \\
\hline 9630/9 & 9623/4 9623/17 9624/2 & 9634/7 9636/24 9638/7 & 9646/7 9646/10 & 9637/1 9640/15 \\
\hline & 9624/15 9625/24 & 9639/25 9649/19 & 9649/18 9652/24 & 9649/18 9650/25 \\
\hline 9654/23 9655/16 & 9626/20 9632/7 & 9659/16 & throughout [2] 9648/4 & 59/16 9659/16 \\
\hline 9658/15 9658/16 & 9633/12 9637 & they've [2] 9622/1 & & 9660/16 \\
\hline testing [1] 9656/13 & 9637/15 9643/1 9643/6 & & Thursday & Tuesday [2] 9620/22 \\
\hline than [2] 9621/21 & \[
96
\] & thing [5] 962 & & \\
\hline 9644/11 & & 96 &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& n+2] \\
& 49 / 16
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline thank [32] 9622/8 & 96 & things [11] 9630 & \[
\text { till [1] } 9629 / 15
\] & two [14] 9621/13 \\
\hline 9626/1 96 & 9651/12 9655/3 & 9630/8 9635/25 & time [19] 9623/21 & 9622/2 9622/4 9626/10 \\
\hline 9626/9 9627/5 9627/25 & 9658/25 9659/2 9660/9 & 9636/11 9636/13 & 9625/18 9625/19 & 26/12 9640/18 \\
\hline 628/1 9628/23 9629/2 & there [25] 9619/22 & 9636/23 9637/1 9640/9 & 9625/24 9627/10 & 641/14 9643/8 9647 \\
\hline 29/4 9629/10 9630/3 & 9619/22 9622/17 & 9649/22 9651/2 9651/6 & 9627/14 9629/1 9629 & 47/18 9649/15 \\
\hline 9630/20 9630/23 & 9624/21 9628/10 & think [44] 9619/24 & 9630/5 9636/5 9640/1 & 49/17 9658/16 \\
\hline & 9628/25 9630/15 & 9620/1 9620/5 9620/10 & 9645/8 9648/4 9648/8 & 660/22 \\
\hline 9637/7 9642/12 & 9631/3 9631/12 9632/1 & 9622/4 9624/19 9625/5 & 9653/12 9656/24 & twofold [1] 9658/14 \\
\hline 9645/25 9651/18 & 9632/7 9635/3 9635/5 & 9626/15 9629/15 & 9658/6 9660/3 9660/17 & TYLER [1] 9615/9 \\
\hline 9652/2 9652/16 & 9635/23 9636/17 & 9635/9 9637/5 9637/19 & timing [2] 9636/21 & d [1] 9643/14 \\
\hline 9652/22 9659/5 & 9637/10 9637/1 & 9638/19 9638/21 & 9658/10 & es [2] 9640/7 \\
\hline /11 9661/3 9661/4 & 9640/2 9641/3 9 & 9638/23 9638/25 & titled [1] 9662/4 & \\
\hline 9661/9 & 9645/21 9647/9 & 9639/2 9641/20 9642/4 & Tizen [1] 9645/8 & typographical \\
\hline k you [28] 9622/8 & 9649/13 9653/1 & 9642/7 9642/9 9643/14 & today [4] 9619/18 & 9631/8 \\
\hline 23/25 9626/1 96 & 9653/19 \({ }^{\text {there's [14] } 9619}\) & 9645/10 9645/23 & & U \\
\hline 96 & 9624/2 9626/5 9628/14 & 9647/4 9648/2 9648/6 & told [7] 9628/5 9633/2 & U.S [4] 9614/2 9614 \\
\hline 9628/23 9629/2 9629/4 & 9636/6 9636/16 & 9648/6 9648/15 9649/3 & 9635/5 9636/25 & 9614/13 9642/8 \\
\hline 9630/3 9630/20 & 9636/20 9641/14 & 9649/5 9650/8 9650/21 & 9641/17 9641/17 & imate [1] 9658 \\
\hline 4 9633/21 & 9642/4 9647/12 9650/3 & 9651/6 9651/10 & 9645/11 & uncertainty [1] \\
\hline 9633/21 & 9650/12 9651/15 & 9651/15 9653/24 & too [1] 9638/18 & 9656/21 \\
\hline & 9658/19 & 9656/15 9656/16 & top [4] 9644/9 9646/22 & under [5] 9621/1 \\
\hline & these [30] 9623/2 & 9658/9 9658/12 & 9646/23 9650/12 & 9622/6 9622/15 \\
\hline 9652/22 9659/5 & 9624/22 9624/22 & thinks [1] 9621/3 & topic [2] 9641 & 336/19 9651/5 \\
\hline 9661/4 9661/9 & 9628/17 9631 & third [7] 9624/7 & 9647/10 & derstand [7] 962 \\
\hline that [240] & 9631/19 9632/5 & 9636/14 9640/16 & topics [2] 9641/13 & 26/5 9643/17 \\
\hline that's [22] 9620/8 & 9632/17 9634/10 & 9644/8 9649/6 9650/16 & & 45/16 9646/19 \\
\hline 9620/10 9620/15 & 4/10 9635/10 & 9656/11 & touching [1] 9654/21 & 9651/23 9656/11 \\
\hline 9627/7 9628/25 9629/2 & & & & 2/17 \\
\hline 9630/4 9633/15 & 6/11 9636/19 & this [124] & 9631/20 9631/25 & Understood [4] 9644/5 \\
\hline 9633/24 9638/4 9639 & 9636/22 9637/1 9637/5 & This is [1] & rager [4] 9614/ & 9645/25 9650/5 \\
\hline 9639/4 9639/13 9642/9 9642/24 9643/19 & 9641/20 9641/23 & those [26] 9619/24 & 9626/3 9633/8 9633/13 & 9658/11 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline U & UPX929 [2] 9641/11 & & 9649/4 9649/9 9649/18 &  \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{unduly [1] 9651/16 unfair [2] 9641/4 9642/10 unfairly [1] 9651/16 unfairness [1] 9657/3} & 9646/16
UPX973 [3] 9642/14 & vs [1] 9613/5 & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline 9650 / 79651 / 59656 / 14 \\
9657 / 229660 / 59660 / 8 \\
\text { we've [14] } 9623 / 10
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{when [11] 9623/16 9625/20 9628/4 9628/8 9638/4 9638/13 9640/3} \\
\hline & UPX973 [3] 9642/14 & W & & \\
\hline & 1/22 & W.H [1] 9615/16 & & 45/3 9648 \\
\hline & ntly [1] 9637/ & wafting [2] 9637 & 366/25 9637/19 & 54/13 9658 \\
\hline & us [19] 9623/9 9623/ & 9638/13 & 9638/24 9641/16 & whenever [1] 962 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
unfavorable [4] \\
9639/21 9639/22
\end{tabular}} & 9628/5 9628/6 9628/7 & wait [5] 9622/16 & 9643/1 9645/18 9647/1 & where [13] 9619/22 \\
\hline & 9635/17 9637/17 & 9653/20 9658/19 & 9648/23 9660/1 9660/4 & 9627/2 9627/3 9627 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{|l}
9650 / 229650 / 25 \\
\text { unhelpful [1] 9641/18 }
\end{array}
\]} & 9638/2 9638/10 & 9660/13 9661/5 & weak [1] 9648/19 & 9636 \\
\hline & 9638/11 9638/12 & waived [1] 9658/1 & WEBB [1] 9615/9 & 963 \\
\hline Unit [1] 9615/4 & 9638/19 9649/21 & want [26] 9619/14 & website [2] 9631/20 & 39/16 9649/16 \\
\hline UNITED [8] 9613/1 9613/3 9613/10 9619/7 & 9649/22 9649/24 & 9621/20 9626/13 & 9631/24 & 9657/4 9659/16 966 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{9640/4 9642/1 9645/13 9653/10} & 9652/13 9657/20 & 9626/15 9627/3 9630 & Wednesday [12] & whether [9] 9628/11 \\
\hline & 9660/3 9660/17 & 9630/7 9631/14 & 9620/21 9621/24 & 9635/3 9635/10 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{United States [4] 9640/4 9642/1 9645/13} & usdoj.gov [5] 961 & 9635/10 9635/18 & 2/2 9622/5 9623 & 41/21 965 \\
\hline & 9614/10 9614/11 & 9636/20 9636/2 & 9657/6 9659/1 96 & 58/15 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{9653/10} & 9614/12 9614/16 & 9638/19 9639/6 9645 & 59/10 9659/12 & 58/19 96 \\
\hline & use [4] 96 & 64 & 9659/14 9660/6 & which [27] 9620/5 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { unlawful [1] 9648/9 } \\
& \text { unless [2] } 9624 / 2 \\
& 9657 / 20
\end{aligned}
\]} & 9642/21 & 9648/20 9649/22 & week [2] 9621/ & 20/11 962 \\
\hline & 9647/18 & 9649/23 9652/1 & 9623/9 & 1/6 9631/ \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{unlike [1] 9642/10 unobjected [1] 9634/5 unqualified [1]} & used [3] 964 & 9653/20 9655/4 & weekend [1] 966 & 32/2 9632/8 963 \\
\hline & 9645/17 965 & & [14] 9619/ & 963 \\
\hline & 速 & wanted [3] 9622 & 9630/1 & 41 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
9655 / 16
\]} & [1] 9627/ & 9630/21 9655/25 & 9632/16 9634/1 & 41/16 \\
\hline & [1] & wants [3] 9647 & 9634/21 9640/24 & 9647/10 9648/25 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
unrelated [1] 9644/16 \\
until [1] 9657/15 untimely [1] 9658/1
\end{tabular}} & uttered [1] 9 & & 9647/22 9648/14 & 9653/4 9654/1 \\
\hline & V & & 9649/14 9650/8 96 & 9654/21 9656/20 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{up [16] 9626/7 9630/5} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & & & \\
\hline & & & Wendy [2] 9615/16 & \\
\hline 9634/1 9634/2 9634/24 & 9651/15 & & & \\
\hline 36/4 9636/8 9645/ & variety [2] 9620/24 & &  & \\
\hline 650/7 96 & , & Waszmer [3] 9615/16 & 06 & [ \\
\hline 9653/20 965 & vendors [1] & \(3 / 4\) 9633/5 & 962817 & - \\
\hline upon [2] 9655/11 & Verizon [1] 9636/ & waters [2] 9622/20 & 8/18 9630/15 & 59/11 965 \\
\hline & Verizon's [1] 9635/9 & 9623/2 & 630/15 9640/21 & 659/18 9660/7 \\
\hline X [2] 9648/25 & Veronica [2] 9614/7 & way [6] 9623/6 962 & 仿1/21 9642/1 9642 & 9660/15 9660/23 \\
\hline & & 20 9629/1 & 9642/2 9642/16 & who [11] 9636/1 \\
\hline PX1039 [1] 9646/16 & veronica.n.onyema [1] & 9632/12 9659/20 & 9651/24 9652/1 9652/9 & 640/2 9640/8 9640 \\
\hline UPX1042 [1] 9646/16 & veronica.n.onyema [1] & wc.com [1] 9615/15 & 9654/14 & 9641/17 9641/24 \\
\hline UPX1089 [2] 9651/23 & version [3] 96 & we [121] & weren't [1] 9638/2 & 9 \\
\hline 10930 & 9646/6 9646/9 & we believe [5] 9622/22 & wfcavanaugh [1] & 9647/25 9651 \\
\hline UPX1090 [2] 9651/23 & versions [1] 9646/1 & 7/22 9643/10 & 9615/12 & who's [1] 96 \\
\hline & versus [1] 9619/8 & 9643/19 9645/6 & what [38 & ve [1] 9644/20 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { UPX1091 [2] } 96 \\
& 9652 / 3
\end{aligned}
\] & very [14] 9635/17 & we believed [2] & 8/4 9638/21 964 & hole [2] 9620/2 \\
\hline UPX1096 & 9635/19 9635/23 & 0/21 9640/22 & 1/11 9641/ & 46/24 \\
\hline \[
9650 / 7
\] & 6/19636/1 9636/13 & we will [1] 9622/5 & 12/13 9642/2 & [6] \\
\hline UPX110 & 9636/22 9649/20 & would [1] 9627 & /17 9645 & 443/2 9647/1 965 \\
\hline 0/7 9651/17 & 9649/20 9650/19 & d [4] 9628/12 & 9648/ & 50/17 9659 \\
\hline 51/19 & 9657/9 9657/9 9660 & 9629/18 9632/4 9645 & 9650/8 9652/17 & Id [1] 9636/6 \\
\hline 2113 & & we'll [16] 9623/21 & 9652/25 9653/4 & III [13] 9622/2 \\
\hline 28/2 9633/10 & via [2] 9 & 9626/179627/1 & 9653/13 9653/2 & 962 \\
\hline & video [13] 9621/10 & & & \\
\hline 2114 [4] 9627/24 & 9623/9 9624/5 9626/4 & 30/5 9630/8 963 & 4/17 9654/2 & 219629 \\
\hline 28/2 9633/10 & & 9638/18 9645/23 & 55/2 9655/5 96 & 631/4 9631/10 96 \\
\hline 9633/17 & & 9649/23 9658/18 & 55/ & 35/7 965 \\
\hline UPX2116 [4] 9627/24 &  &  & & \\
\hline 9633/10 & 9633/8 & we're [27] 9619/17 & & \\
\hline 9633/17 & videos [1] 962 & 9619/24 9620/21 & 9658/19 9658/2 & \\
\hline 9633/10 & videotape [1] & 9622/19 9623/1 & 9659/15 9659/1 & willy-nilly [1] 9651/2 \\
\hline 2 9633/10 & vi & 9625/13 9625/1 & \[
9660
\] & WILSON [1] 9615/17 \\
\hline 9633/17 & 9 & 9627/11 9628/2 & & [1] \\
\hline UPX2131 [4] 9627/25 & 9648/11 9658 & 9634/3 9637 & & 9647/ \\
\hline 9628/2 9633/11 & vie & 9638/20 9639/ & 9636/7 9638/3 9647/15 & thout [4] 9638/1 \\
\hline UPX711 [2] 9639/8 & violating [1] & 9647/20 9647/23 & 9652/17 9652/19 & 9656/17 \\
\hline UPX711 [2] 9639/8 & visits [1] 9631/17 & 9647/24 9648/9 9648/9 & whatsoever [1] & 59/1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

