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Q. Have you ever been instructed on techniques for testifying as a witness?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever taken any classes on testifying as a witness?
A. I did take one class, yes.
Q. What class was that?
A. It's a SEAK class.
Q. What is SEAK?
A. It's an abbreviation for something. It's an
expert training course.
Q. Where was that?
A. It was in San Diego.
Q. When did you take that class?
A. It was earlier this -- I think the beginning of this year, January.
Q. How long was that class?
A. It was a two-day class.
Q. Have you ever read any books on testifying?
A. My chairman's written a book on testifying, so I've paged through his book. I don't -- I hate to say, I haven't read it cover to cover, but.
Q. Have you read any articles on testifying?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. Has anybody at your employer ever taught you
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techniques on testifying as a witness?
A. I've been given tips, but, I -- sure, I guess, yeah.
Q. By who?
A. By the chairman of my firm.
Q. How often has he given you tips?
A. I -- I don't know the answer to that.
Q. Okay. Since you've only testified in a deposition once -- and I'm sure Shane and maybe Charles have explained this to you -- I'll take some time and just tell you a little about what we're going to be doing today.
A. Sure.
Q. During the course of the deposition, I guess as you know, I'll be asking you a series of questions and you'll be giving answers. From time to time, Shane may speak up and object. Largely as I understand that, that will be to preserve the record. But for the most part, unless he tells you otherwise, you'll need to answer my questions.

Because the -- because Susan is taking everything down, you know, in a transcript --
A. Sure.
Q. -- all your answers have to be oral, "yes," "no," instead of "uh-uh," "uh-huh." It's being
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recorded also by video, so we'll have the video record. But to make sure that the transcript is clear, have to say everything orally.

## A. Okay

(Mr. Harder joined the proceedings.)

## BY MR. BERRY:

Q. Also to help with the transcript, we'll need to do like we're doing now, go back and forth and try not to interrupt each other. Sometimes I get a little excited and cut folks off before they've finished their answer. I'll do my best to avoid that. And if you do your best to let me finish my question before jumping in with an answer, it will make Susan's job a little bit easier.
A. Sounds good.
Q. The other thing I'd warned Susan about, and now Charles is here and so he can attest to this from our time together, is sometimes I talk quickly. Sometimes I talk quietly. Sometimes I mumble. Sometimes my questions come out and they are more garbled than I intend and they don't make a whole lo of sense.

If at any point for any of those reasons you don't understand what I'm saying, ask me to repeat the question, ask me to clarify the question, I'm
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happy to do so. And I apologize for talking funny sometimes. And if you -- I just want to make sure that we're on the same page --
A. Sure.
Q. -- as we go through it.

During the course of the deposition -- we'll be here for some time obviously, and there will -we'll be going through a bunch of your analysis and talking about what you did as we go through. And if there comes points during the deposition where we'v talked about one aspect of your report or one aspect of your opinion and then move on and talk about something else later and you realize that you want to clarify something or qualify something that we talked about earlier, or if it reminds you of something that we talked about earlier, tell me and we'll go back and we can revisit whatever we've talked about. I just want to make sure that we get everything out today.
A. Okay. Great.
Q. Are you taking any medications or any other substances that ability -- that would affect your ability to testify truthfully today?
A. No.
Q. Any reason that you can't testify truthfully

```
today?
    A. No.
    Q. During the course of the deposition --
        And, Charles, it's actually good that you
came in here.
    During the course of the deposition today,
I'll be showing you a bunch of pieces of paper that
we'll be marking as exhibits and we've been marking
them continuously through the course of the
litigation starting at }1\mathrm{ and --
    Do you recall what we ended with in the --
    MR. HARDER: I can find out for you.
    MR. BERRY: Yeah.
BY MR. BERRY:
    Q. And I -- so we're just going to -- you're
coming into a moving train here. We're going to pick
up wherever the train is.
A. Sure.
Q. Charles will find out the number and we'll just pick up where it is and I'll show you the documents. We'll give a copy to Shane. But they'll start at some random number that we'll find out here shortly.
A. Okay.
Q. Between the time that you prepared your
```

report and today, have you reviewed any new documents pertaining to the case?
A. I believe I got a set of documents that you guys sent to counsel, so I did review 170 -some pages.
$Q$. These are the documents that we produced last Thursday, I believe?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Okay. During the course of the day today, I may be showing you some of those things. We have a requirement in this case to provide any additional documents we plan to show a witness five days before the deposition, and so that's why you got those things.

Other than that set of documents, have you reviewed anything other than what you had reviewed in preparing your report?
A. I don't believe so, no.

MR. BERRY: Okay. Now that Charles is back, we'll --

MR. HARDER: Still trying to get the number.
MR. BERRY: Okay. Well, I won't be showing you anything for a few minutes.

THE WITNESS: Sure.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Do you have any questions before we get
going about the process here?
A. Not right now, no.
Q. Okay. First I'm just going to talk to you a little bit about your background.

Where did you go to college?
A. Went to undergraduate school at Santa Clara University.
Q. And what did -- did you -- I assume you got a degree?
A. I did.
Q. What did you get your degree in?
A. In economics.
Q. What year did you graduate?
A. Graduated in 2006.
Q. And did you go to graduate school after that?
A. I did.
Q. Where did you go to graduate school?
A. To San Diego State University.
Q. When did you go to graduate school?
A. Between 2009 and 2010 or '11. It's a two-year program.
Q. What did you do between the time that you graduated college and then went on to graduate school?
A. I worked.
Q. Where did you work?
A. I worked at Wells Fargo Bank, Bridge Bank, and RXSafe.
Q. I'm sorry. What was the last one?
A. RX, like prescription, Safe.
Q. What did you do at Wells Fargo?
A. I was a business banker.
Q. What does that mean?
A. I take care of loans for customers, handled deposit accounts, give advice as far as financial instrument needs for their business.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Counsel, I'm sorry, I'm getting your right shoulder. If you could just slide -- that's perfect. Thank you.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Were you working in one of the bank branches?
A. I did, yes.
Q. How long were you at Wells Fargo?
A. I'd say approximately two years.
Q. And then you went to Bridge Bank?
A. I did.
Q. How did you come to work at Bridge Bank?
A. I was actually recruited by a client that I
had at Wells Fargo, told Bridge Bank they should hire me.
Q. And what did you do at Bridge Bank?
A. I was an analyst, financial analyst.
Q. Doing what?
A. So I calculated loans, did projections,
figured out how much we should lend someone, how much we should charge for it.
Q. What kind of loans?
A. Business loans.
Q. So a business would come in and want to borrow money for whatever it is they were doing, you would help value the loan?
A. Sure.
Q. Did you do anything else there?
A. I was just an analyst.
Q. How long were you at Bridge Bank?
A. For just under a year.
Q. And why did you leave Bridge Bank?
A. I decided that I wanted to get a master's, master's degree.
Q. And that's when you went on to San Diego State?
A. That's correct.
Q. When did you work at RXSafe?
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A. When I started the master's program.
Q. So you worked --
A. So in 2009-ish.
Q. So you worked through the -- the time that you were getting your graduate degree?
A. I took a month or two off to move and, you know, get into the program, get set up in San Diego, and then I started at RXSafe.
Q. What did you get your graduate degree in?
A. Finance.
Q. And what degree did you get?
A. MBA.
Q. Was that a two-year program or a --
A. Two-year.
Q. And you worked concurrently with your studies?
A. I did.
Q. What did you do at RXSafe?
A. I ran all of the finance, the accounting, inventory management. It was a startup company, so I wore lots of hats.
Q. Right. What was your official title there?
A. Finance consultant, I believe.
Q. How many people worked at RXSafe?
A. Four or five. Pretty small.
Q. And what kind of company was that?
A. It's a pharmaceutical technology company.

It created robotics for pharmacies.
Q. Robotics that would help fill prescriptions?
A. Store and fill prescriptions, yes.
Q. And how long did you work at RXSafe?
A. I want to say two or -- two or three years.
Q. So you continued to work there after you graduated from San Diego State?
A. Yeah, for part -- for sometime after graduating, yes.
Q. What did you do after you left RXSafe?
A. I went to CONSOR.
Q. When did you start at CONSOR?
A. I started at CONSOR right after I graduated.

So that was May? May of 2011? There's a little overlap between RXSafe and CONSOR. I was still doin some work for them.
Q. Still doing some work for Con--- for RXSafe?
A. For RXSafe. I was helping to wrap a couple things up, yeah.

MR. BERRY: Okay. I'm going to go ahead here and we'll mark the first document. MR. HARDER: The last depo exhibit was 167.

If you start at 170 , that would give us a little cushion just in case I'm -- I'm off by a number.

MR. BERRY: Okay. That makes sense here.
Why don't we mark this, then, as Exhibit 170.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 170.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So what I've handed you as document 170 is the report you prepared for this litigation. Right?
A. Can I flip through it real quick --
Q. Oh, absolutely.
A. -- just to make sure it's all there?
Q. Absolutely.
A. Looks like the report. I think there are some exhibits missing though.
Q. Right. Well, yes, you had -- and five exhibits to the report?
A. Right.
Q. I'll separately be asking you about those later. If you'd like, we can mark them now, but we'll get there later in the day.
A. Sure. If I need them, I'll ask for them.
Q. Okay. If you would, turn to page 117
here -- or, I'm sorry, to page 17.
And going to the last paragraph in the text

```
of bio above "Memberships, Speeches and
Publications," it says:
            "Prior to joining CONSOR,
        Mr. Anderson was a finance manager
        in the pharmacy technology
        industry" --
        That was your experience in RXSafe?
    A. That's correct.
    Q. And then the next part of that sentence
says:
        -- "and has had extensive
        experience in the mortgage and
        banking industry."
        Is that referring to your experience at
Wells Fargo and at Bridge Bank?
```

    A. That's correct.
    Q. Okay. Anything else for those two things?
    A. No.
    Q. Since the time that you started at CONSOR,
    have you worked there continuously?
A. I have.
Q. What is CONSOR?
A. We're an intellectual asset management firm.
Q. Intellectual asset management firm?
A. (Nods head.)
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Q. What does that mean?
A. So we do intellectual property valuation, licensing. Help with sale, disposal of intellectual property assets. We focus solely on intellectual property.
Q. So if you were going to try and explain this to my mom who -- you know, 65 -year-old woman down in Birmingham, Alabama, what would you say you do at CONSOR?
A. We do intellec- -- we do anything that touches intellectual property and money. So where intellectual property and money meet, whether that's licensing, sale, expert testimony, valuation for transactional purposes, that's what we do.

> So we are experts when it comes to the value of intellectual property.
Q. And when you talk about intellectual property, what are you talking about?
A. The whole gamut of intellectual property. So patents, trademarks, copyrights, rights of publicity, trade secrets, know-how, databases, Web sites. Any piece of IP.
Q. How many people work at CONSOR?
A. There's approximately ten.
Q. Has that number stayed the same since the
time that you've been there?
A. It's fluctuated by one or two.
Q. I take it from what you said that CONSOR advises in some business transactions?
A. (Nods head.)
Q. "Yes"?
A. Yes.
Q. What kind of transactions?
A. It - - it depends. It could be a bankruptcy.

It could be a buyer wanting to buy an intellectual property asset. It could be a seller wanting to sell and wanting to know what to value it at. It could be somebody that wants to license a piece of their intellectual property. Really any form of monetization of IP.
Q. Has it -- what percentage of the company's work involves expert witness services?
A. About half, I'd say.
Q. Do you know what percentage of the company' revenue has come from expert witness services over the past three years?
A. I --I don't know exactly.
Q. Your title at CONSOR I understand is director of valuation and analytics. Is that right?
A. That is correct.
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Q. How long have you held that position?
A. I want to say going on two years now.
$Q$. What were you before?
A. Before that, I was a senior financial analyst.
Q. Did you do anything at CONSOR before being senior financial analyst?
A. No. That was my only other title.
Q. How many people at CONSOR hold the title director of valuation and analytics?
A. Just me.
Q. Who do you report to at CONSOR?
A. I report to our chairman.
Q. And who is that?
A. Weston Anson.
Q. And is that the fellow you referred to earlier when I'd talked about getting tips for deposition testimony?
A. That's correct.
Q. And what is his - his title is chairman?
A. Correct.
$Q$. Do any people at CONSOR report to you?
A. Yes.
Q. How many people?
A. I have four or five direct reports.

## Q. And what are those people's titles?

A. Senior financial analyst. Financial analyst. Research analyst. And I think that's it.
Q. So there's four or five people who hold those three roles?

## Q. What did you do as a senior financial

A. I did valuations, modeling, writing reports. Basically preparing any type of valuation work that was necessary or licensing if necessary. Whatever work was coming in. Essentially I did a lot of the research behind it and wrote the reports and did the
Q. And you did that both for transactional work and expert services?
A. Primarily transactional work.
Q. As a senior financial analyst, were you ever retained separately as an expert?
A. Not as a senior financial analyst.
Q. As director of valuation and analytics, what is your job responsibilities now?
A. I run the entire valuation department.
Q. And what does that mean?
A. It means I -- I direct and manage almost all
emblem on their $t$-shirt, that would be a licensee. So we as Coca-Cola, the licensor, we would have one of those two gentlemen I spoke of, go out, find the t -shirt manufacturer and negotiate a license to put the Coca-Cola emblem on a t-shirt.
$Q$. And how would those folks know the value of the logo, say, in that case?
A. Sometimes they would ask me.
Q. And so you would help them value whatever IP they're licensing in that particular transaction?
Q. Since becoming director of valuation and analytics, what percentage of your time has involved expert witness services?
Q. And during the rest of your time, you're doing this transactional work?
A. Transactional and licensing, yes.
Q. Give me some examples from over the past year of the non-expert kinds of work you've done.
A. We'll do -- God, it really covers the whole gamut. So we'll help --
Q. I'm sorry. Just you personally, not -- like what kind of work have you personally been doing ovethe past year other than expert work?
of the projects that come into CONSOR.
Q. What -- are there other divisions of CONSOR other than valuation and analytics?
A. We have a licensing division, which I work
Q. All right. And so those are the only two
Q. How many people work over in the licensing
Q. And what do those folks do?
A. They go out and actually actively solicit licensees for licensors that we represent.
Q. Explain what you mean.
A. They go out and will find licensees. So if we represent a licensor, they'll go find licensees to sell whatever products, patent service, whatever it might be that's being licensed.
Q. Okay. So again going back to my mom in Birmingham --
Q. -- what does that mean in plain English?
A. So if I was Coca-Cola and there was a t-shirt manufacturer who wanted to put the Coca-Cola
A. Sure. Transactional work. So clients have a Web site, patent, trademark, copyright that they want to sell, they'll ask us to value it for them. Sometimes they want to go and get financing for their IP, so we'll value that for financing purposes.

They'll want advice on whether or not they should buy a certain asset that someone's offering to sell, and so I'll value it for those purposes.
Q. Without giving me any like client names, give me a couple of specific examples of that kind of transactional work that you've done over the past
A. So we've done a large patent portfolio that dealt with the headphone and speaker space, a company you would know the name of. They wanted to get a loan on their IP. securitize it. so they called us 10

Done work for someone that had -- this is pre-litigation work for a Web site valuation. I'm nol sure if they wanted to go in and do litigation or

It's hard to say. We do -- we do a lot of
work in this space. I mean, it's really all across
Q. Tell me about the Web site valuation. What


| corporations? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A. It's a - it - I don't know the answer to |
| that. Quasi governmental, meaning it's - it's |
| confusmg even to them sometimes. They'r - they |
| border between private and public and so it's -- it |





Q. And it's published by the ABA?
Q. Anybody besides you and Weston Anson as
A. I believe there's one or two others from the office who have contributed.
Q. The June 2014 article, "What is your client really worth? Valuing the licensing potential of celebrities, characters and athletes," who is that published by?
A. I think it was The Licensing Book. Yeah, that's what it says, The Licensing Book.
Q. Sorry. I should have asked a better

Who publishes The Licensing Book?
A. I don't know that.
Q. Does that discuss the valuation of
A. I have to see the article to see if we mention it. I don't recall off the top of my head.
Q. Do you recall in your book whether you all discussed the valuing of Web sites?
A. The book's really rights of publicity specific, but we do go through broad valuation methodologies and techniques, so there may be a
A. On valuing rights of publicity.
Q. Did you write any other part of the book?
Q. Has that book been published previously?
Q. In the report on page 3, it mentions that you served as a teaching assistant for a course on If valuation at Thomas Jefferson School of Law. Where is Thomas Jefferson School of Law? A. San Diego.
Q. And when did you serve as a teaching
A. The course is currently going on.
Q. Have you done that before?
Q. So this is the first semester that you've
been a teaching assistant?
A. As -- yes, yes.
Q. Who teaches that course?
Q. And so he's the professor?
A. Adjunct professor, yes.
Q. Right. And what is your role, then, as teaching assistant?
A. I help him prepare course materials, prepare
mention of it. But I'd have to -- I'd have to look at the book again to know for sure.
Q. Okay. Is Mr. Anson a lawyer?
Q. His background is in business?
Q. In the April 2013 article, "Putting a price on trademarks: Trends in IP valuation and damages calculations," is there any discussion in that article about valuing Web sites?
A. I -- I don't know.
Q. Is the World Trademark Review a journal?
Q. Do you know where that's published?
Q. (Nods head.)
A. I believe in the United States and abroad, but I don't know for certain.
Q. Do you know who publishes it?
A. Not sure who the publisher is.
Q. In the book that is forthcoming that you wrote with Mr. Anson, what was your contribution to
A. I wrote a chapter of the book.
Q. Which chapter?

## - an outline for what to discuss, get a presentation together for him, with him. <br> Q. And what does that course teach? <br> A. It's intellectual property valuation. <br> Q. In that course, does Mr. Anson talk ahout valuing Web sites? <br> A. I believe there's a section in the course, but I -- I think that's for a later course that's -again, the course is going on right now, so I don't know if it's been taught yet. I don't recall.

Q. Other than what we spoke about earlier, have you had any experience in valuing media companies
A. Media companies. What do you mean by that?
Q. Well, earlier you'd mentioned a couple of Web sites that you had done work with either in connection with litigation or just general valuation.
Q. Other than those experiences, have you done any work valuing a media company?
Q. You personally.
A. I've been part of the team doing it, yes.
Q. Which ones?
A. We did some work -- it was a private transaction, so I don't know if I'm allowed to get
into this.
MR. VOGT: Is it subject to a confidentiality agreement?

THE WITNESS: Definitely, yes.
MR. VOGT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: But it was a media mogul, big name, involving a very large newspaper. And there was a valuation of what he brought to the table for this company who acquired another set of large names you would know. And so we helped to value many of the assets in that transaction, but I -- I don't think I can say much more than that. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Did you value any of the newspaper Web sites in connection with the -- that transaction?
A. I don't think the Web sites were involved. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Counsel -MR. BERRY: Shane, if you all are going to put him on up as an expert on valuation on Web sites and media, I think this is fair game to find out specifically what he's done --

MR. VOGT: I understand.
MR. BERRY: -- so.
MR. VOGT: And I don't want to keep you from getting this stuff, but if he's subject to a
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confidentiality agreement, we're going to have to figure out how to address that, because that's not really our call and it's not his call. It's the client -- that client's call.

MR. BERRY: All right. Well, that makes sense. I mean, we'll leave it there. I don't --

MR. VOGT: It may be something we have to address to the court and to the extent that you need to come back later and --

MR. BERRY: No, no, no. I think we can just leave it here.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So other than those instances, have you done any valuations for -- of media companies?
A. I don't recall off the top of my head, but we deal with a lot of -- we deal with every industry, every sector, all types of intellectual property. I've worked on hundreds of cases, private and -- you know, private transactions and litigations. There may have been some others, but I-- off the top of my head, I don't remember.
Q. Setting aside media and Web site companies, have you done any valuation work for a company whose revenue is derived principally from advertising?
A. There may have been some, but I don't know
the names or the specifics, but we deal with clients who have revenues from, again, all different avenues of revenue, so I'm sure we have.
Q. Right. But just you personally, do you recall doing any valuations for a company that derives its revenue principally from advertising?
A. I believe so. But, again, I don't know the specifics, but I believe that I have, yes.
Q. Do you recall when that was?
A. Within the last three or four years.
Q. But you don't recall the specifics?
A. I don't.
Q. Do you know what Alexa is?
A. I've heard of Alexa.
Q. What is it?
A. They track Web site information.
Q. And what kind of information does it have available?
A. I don't want to guess, but analytics of sorts.
Q. Okay. Before you were engaged in this case have you analyzed Internet traffic data before?
A. I have.
Q. What kind of experience have you had with Internet traffic data?
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A. What do you mean by that?
Q. What kind of experience have you had with it?
A. I'm not sure -- experience? Maybe try it a different way.
Q. What kind of work have you done working with Internet traffic data?
A. So the Web sites that I've -- that we spoke about, we've looked at traffic data for those.
Q. And you personally have done that work?
A. Yes.
Q. Where did the data in those instances come from?
A. I don't remember exactly. There's various sources. I'm not sure.
Q. What sources have you used in the past?
A. We've looked at Alexa, Quantcast. I'm sure there's others, but I don't remember the names off the top of my head.
Q. Are you -- have you ever been responsible for collecting the data on Internet traffic?
A. Responsible? I'm responsible for the valuation department, so, in a sense, yes.
Q. Have you ever yourself actually collected the data on Internet traffic?
A. Sure.
Q. And you've done that through Quantcast?
A. Quantcast is one, yes.
Q. Have you ever collected it from anybody else -- any other service?
A. I believe we've looked at others, yes.
Q. Have they -- you --
A. I've looked at others, yes.
Q. Are you familiar with the different terms that Quantcast used to describe the data that it provides?
A. What terms are you speaking of?
Q. Well, just generally how it defines unique page views, how it defines page views. There's a glossary of terms that I think was attached as a document that you had looked at.

Prior to this engagement, were you familiar with those terms?
A. Prior to this engagement, I had generally heard of those terms and used them, yes.
Q. Before you were engaged for this case, had you ever looked at data from Google Analytics?
A. We have.
Q. In what context?
A. I don't recall the specific context, but
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I -- we've used Google Analytics. We've looked at it. We've analyzed it.
Q. For what kind of work?
A. For valuation work.
Q. For the kind of valuation work that we talked earlier about in connection with the expert services you've provided for Web sites' valuations?
A. Could be for that and maybe for other private transactions that didn't necessarily involve a Web site. I'm not sure.

I know we've used Google Analytics before. I don't remember the exact context of that use.
Q. The other thing I should mention is, if you want to take a break at any point -- I'm sure you probably know this. Shane probably told you or Charles -- if you want to step out, go to the bathroom, grab a drink, feel free.
A. I appreciate that.
Q. Kind of change of gears here.

The expert report that you prepared in this case, did other people assist you in the analysis that you did in putting together that report?
A. I had one individual who helped me, yes.
Q. Who assisted you?
A. One of my senior analysts.
Q. What is that person's name?
A. David Noble.
Q. And what assistance did Mr. Noble provide?
A. Under my direction, I might ask him to find a specific piece of data, help me build the model. Maybe, you know, read through, review the report, check for errors. General assistance under my direction. It really depends on -- if there's some specific task I need help with, then he'll help me.
Q. Right. Just talking about this report in particular, what do you recall Mr. Noble doing?
A. I don't remember any -- I don't know specifically what he helped with. Again, he probably helped with finding data. Maybe doing some research for me. Developing -- helping to develop a model. And, again, maybe reading through some of this and helping to, you know, check for errors in the writing.
Q. Did you personally draft this report?
A. I did, yes.
Q. And you personally prepared the analysis for this report?
A. I did.
Q. And so I take it, then, you're sufficiently knowledgeable to testify about the full report?
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A. Absolutely.
Q. And this report reflects your expert opinion?
A. It does.
Q. There's no reason for Mr. Noble to testify as an expert in this case. Right?
A. No.
Q. When were you retained?
A. I want to say a little under a year ago roughly. I don't remember the specific date, but about then.
Q. Approximately how many hours have you worke on this case?
A. A hundred or more.
Q. How about Mr. Noble?
A. I don't know exactly.
Q. More or less than you?
A. I really don't know that.
Q. Following the deposition today, do you plan on doing any additional work for this case?
A. I don't know.
Q. Your report discusses three approaches -three approaches to valuation. Right?

Talks about the income approach?
A. Yes.
Q. And the cost approach?
Q. It talks about the market approach?
Q. And what I'd like to do now is kind of go through these approaches and --
Q. -- kind of under- -- make sure that I

The cost approach I understand you didn't
Q. And the reason that you didn't use it is because you felt that the cost approach doesn't provide an accurate measure of value to Gawker from the Hulk Hogan video. Right?
A. Correct. Cost approach is for typically a piece of software that's proprietary and it's not licensed or sold. There's no transactions around it. And you want to redevelop it, so you look at how much would it cost to redevelop that software and then that's the price you could acquire for rather than putting in the development effort.

So it -- for this asset, no, it does not
Q. So to undertake an analysis using the income approach, you'd look at the company's actual financial data. Right?
Q. You'd look at actual revenue. Right?
Q. You'd look at actual profits. Right?
Q. You'd look at actual growth rates. Right?
Q. You didn't factor Gawker's actual financials into your analysis, did you?
A. Factor -- no, they're not part of the conclusions in my report or my opinion, no.
Q. Okay. So you didn't factor in Gawker's actual revenue. Right?
A. Gawker's actual revenue is not part of my
Q. And neither is its actual profits. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And nor is the actual growth rates for its finances. Correct?
Q. You could have looked at this data, though.
Q. Okay. Just kind of flagging ahead here.

We're going to be talking about the income approach on page 8 in the report.
Q. The income approach looks at the present value of future income. Right?
A. That's correct. Well, earnings.
Q. Right. Basically how much money somebody can expect to make off of something in the future.
Q. And then that amount is discounted to present value terms. Right?
Q. So you get an idea of what the future money that you'll be making off something would be and you put it into today's dollars. Right?
A. You do a present value of the cash flow,
Q. But a present value of cash flow means what that cash flow means to me today. Right?
A. Present value today.
Q. Right. So what somebody would be willing to trade off the future cash flow for today?
A. For a lump sum today.
A. We could have.
Q. But you did not?
A. I believe we looked at the financials, but we did not -- the financials were not used for my opinion that's presented in the report.
Q. Why did you not use those financials in preparing your report?
A. Because the income approach most of the time, the vast majority of the time, will undervalue
Q. Why is that?
A. Because the future -- it's the future
monetization potential of Web sites through their traffic that has value rather than the current income stream they are generating.
Q. So the actual dollars that a Web site is earning is a less good predictor of its value than
A. Than the market.

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
TIIE WITNESS: What the market -- so the
income of a -- a Web site's currently generating is a
far -- it's less of an indication of value of the
Web site than the traffic. And what markets show us
is the true value of a Web site, the market value of

pharmaceutical technology industry that would be considered mature companies. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. Is it your belief in the Web-based -- the content-based Web site arena that there are not mature companies?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it your opinion that there are mature companies within the content-based Web site's base?
A. I'm trying to think of any that would be considered mature at this point. I'm not sure off the top of my head.
Q. At what point will content-based Web site companies become mature companies?
A. When they've realized their maximum value potential and earnings potential, revenue potential.
Q. Could that be considered on a company-by-company basis?
A. What do you mean?
Q. Well, could you determine, you know, company A has met its earnings potential but company $B$ has not?
A. I don't know if you could do that or not. I'd have to see company A and company B to figure that out.
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Q. Well, within the content-based Web site industry, could you make a company-by-company assessment on whether something is mature or not mature? Whether it's reached its full earnings potential?
A. I think the general consensus is that most content-based Web sites are not mature. They're in a growth phase.
Q. And so I guess consistent with what you're saying now, that you believe - and I think this is reflected in your report at page 8 -- that the primary benefit to Gawker from posting the Hulk Hogan video was an increase in its user traffic. Right?
A. There was a large increase in user traffic, yes.
Q. And that was the primary benefit to Gawker in -- in this circumstance. Right?
A. The benefit Gawker received was a large increase in user traffic.
Q. And then do you believe that an increase in user traffic is generally more valuable for the future monetization potential of those additional users because it provides a baseline for future revenue from advertisers rather than using this income approach we were talking about. Right?
A. From advertisers or from other monetization opportunities.
Q. And for that reason, looking at the current income stream to Gawker, it was not appropriate?
A. It undervalues the company.
Q. Did you look at ways that Gawker could increase the monetization of its users?
A. I was not asked to do that.
Q. Did you look at ways that Gawker does monetize its users?
A. I've seen that they have advertising revenue.
Q. But you weren't asked to evaluate whether it could monetize its users further. Right?
A. That was not my task.
Q. It's just -- it's an assumption, though, built into your ultimate analysis. Right?
A. What assumption?
Q. That it could mon- - provide additional monetization of these users that came from the Hulk Hogan video?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: The analysis looks at comparable, other entities in the market, and determines a value based on what those other Page 77
comparable entities transact at. So that's the assumption we're using.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Right. And so if the income stream is less, would value -- Gawker at less than you have valued it, your assumption is that Gawker could be doing more to monetize its user traffic. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: No. The assumption is that there's more value to a Web site than its income stream presents.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But what is that value -- the value actually means money. Right?
A. Well, value, could be whatever currency you want. But value is more than what the income stream would dictate it -- that it is.
Q. So a willing -- I think the phrase that you use in your report is an arm's-length investor or buyer.

An arm's-length buyer would be willing to pay more for Gawker than Gawker actually makes in revenue that would justify its value under an income approach. Right?
A. An arm's-length investor is going to value
Gawker based on the market approach and not on its
income stream that it currently generates.
Q. So it's been more than two years since
Gawker posted the Hogan video. Right?
A. Was --
Q. Gawker posted the video on October 4,
2012 --
A. Came down --
Q. -- right?
A. -- April 2013 , so almost --
Q. Almost two years since it --
A. Almost two years.
Q. -- came down. But it's been more than two
years since it was first posted. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So could you look to see whether Gawker
actually had monetized the posting of the video.
Right?
A. What do you mean?
Q. Well, whether Gawker had actually translated
that additional traffic into dollars in its pocket.
Right?
A. I don't know how that would have had any
effect on our analysis.
Q. You could have looked to determine, did
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Gawker earn additional revenue from the user traffic that was generated by the Hogan video. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: We could have looked at that?
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Yes.
A. It wouldn't have had any bearing on my analysis.
Q. Because you used the market approach?
A. Sure. Companies today -- Internet companies today are still valued based on the market approach, not the income approach.
Q. Right. But you could have determined how much revenue Gawker generated from the Hogan post. Correct?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I was not asked to look at the revenue generated from that, no.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But you could have?
A. I don't know.

MR. VOGT: Objection to form. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. You could have reviewed actual financial data from Gawker to see if the additional traffic had
been monetized. Right?
A. I haven't seen any --I I don't know the answer to that. I haven't seen anything to that.
Q. It wasn't made available to you. Right?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. And so even if that financial data was available to you, it would not have caused you to use the income approach. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: The market approach is the appropriate approach, the most appropriate approach to use when valuing a content-based Web site. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. If you were going to do the income approach, what documents would you need to see to be able to d that?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Off the top of my head, I'd have to get a list of documents. I don't know off the top of my head.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Well, in your experience valuing other companies using the income approach, what kinds of documents have you looked at?
A. Financials. Full financials.

Page 81
Q. Meaning what?
A. Income statement. Balance sheet. Cash flow statement. Projections. Pro formas.

MR. BERRY: Why don't we take a quick break and then we'll --

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Let's go off the record. The time is 11:29.
(Recess taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record at 11:42.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. And so picking up with the report, the analysis that you had done, the approach that you ultimately used to analyze gawker.com's value is the market approach. Right?
A. We used the market approach, yes.
Q. And I guess this was -- we alluded to this a little bit before, but just to be explicit about it, what the market approach basically does is compares one thing that you're valuing to transactions of other similar things to estimate a value for the first thing. Right?
A. Other sales, transactions, it's really, yeah, benchmarking, using other similar data points to compare an asset and derive a value from that.

|  | Page 82 |  | Page 84 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q. And -- right. So you're comparing similar | 1 | being posted. |
| 2 | assets to ultimately establish what the value is of | 2 | MR. BERRY: Okay. And just, Shane, the |
| 3 | whatever it is you're looking at. Right? | 3 | objection to form is to calling it the Hulk Hogan sex |
| 4 | A. Sure. It's like your house when you | 4 | tape or -- |
| 5 | refinance it, you -- they look at other market | 5 | MR. VOGT: It's to calling it the Hulk Hogan |
| 6 | comparables, similar homes, and help determine a | 6 | sex tape. And it's also to the extent that it |
| 7 | value based on how comparable they are. | 7 | mischaracterizes the opinions set forth in his report |
| 8 | Q. And here the asset that you valued initially | 8 | and which he had already asked and answered. |
| 9 | was gawker.com. Right? Like what you're looking at | 9 | BY MR. BERRY: |
| 10 | and -- sorry. | 10 | Q. Okay. Just as we go through the deposition, |
| 11 | A. You say "initially," I'm not sure. | 11 | I might call it "the Hogan video," "the Hulk Hogan |
| 12 | Q. Well, ultimately what your report does is | 12 | video," "Hulk Hogan sex tape," "Hogan sex tape," |
| 13 | attempt to assess the value -- sorry. | 13 | whenever I use any of those terms, what I'm referrin |
| 14 | What your report ultimately does is attempt | 14 | to is the excerpts that were posts on Gawker of |
| 15 | to assess the increase in value to gawker.com from | 15 | Hulk Hogan and Heather Clem together. |
| 16 | posting the Hulk Hogan video. Right? | 16 | You understand that? |
| 17 | A. So we look at the value that Gawker | 17 | A. I understand. |
| 18 | received -- gawker.com received from posting the | 18 | Q. And -- |
| 19 | video on the Web site. | 19 | A. And if I get confused, I will ask you. |
| 20 | Q. And to do that you looked initially at the | 20 | Q. Okay. I appreciate that. |
| 21 | value of gawker.com prior to posting the video and | 21 | So turning to your report, at the bottom of |
| 22 | compared it to its value after posting the video? | 22 | page 8 onto page 9, and I think this is what we were |
| 23 | A. Correct. | 23 | starting to get into a little bit when we were |
| 24 | Q. And by looking at the difference of those | 24 | talking about the income approach, you wrote: |
| 25 | things, you were effectively looking at the market | 25 | "Specifically we analyzed the |
|  | ge 83 |  | age 85 |
| 1 | value of a Hulk Hogan sex tape being posted on | 1 | increase in value of gawker.com |
| 2 | Gawker's Web site. Right? | 2 | based on market multiples" -- |
| 3 | MR. VOGT: Objection to form. | 3 | A. What page are you on? |
| 4 | THE WITNESS: No, that's not entirely right. | 4 | Q. Sorry. The bottom of page 8, the very last |
| 5 | So we looked at the value of gawker.com before the | 5 | line, "Specifically we analyzed" -- |
| 6 | video. The exact dates we used were September 30th. | 6 | A. Oh, okay. |
| 7 | And I just want to check with my report if that's all | 7 | Q. -- "the increase in value of gawker.com |
| 8 | right. It was September 30th, 2012, that's one | 8 | based on market multiples, a |
| 9 | valuation date. And then April 30th, 2013 after it | 9 | variation of the market approach." |
| 10 | was removed, the video was removed. So that gives | 10 | Do you see where I'm at? |
| 11 | you the increase in value of gawker.com. | 11 | A. I do. |
| 12 | We then apportioned that increase in value | 12 | Q. All right. For that sentence, you cite a |
| 13 | based on the traffic that went to the video. So it's | 13 | document number 50 in footnote 35 ? |
| 14 | not just the valuation after -- before. There's a | 14 | A. (Nods head.) |
| 15 | difference there. I think you -- yeah. | 15 | Q. Just for clarification purposes, attached to |
| 16 | BY MR. BERRY: | 16 | your report as Appendix B there's a list of document |
| 17 | Q. Right. Right. We'll kind of go through the | 17 | reviewed. |
| 18 | report and talk about each step. But ultimately what | 18 | A. Correct. |
| 19 | you were looking at was the increase in value | 19 | Q. And I forget how many there is. Fifty |
| 20 | attributable to it posting the Hulk Hogan sex tape on | 20 | something documents, I believe. These are the |
| 21 | the Web site. Right? | 21 | documents that you looked at in connection with this |
| 22 | MR. VOGT: Objection to form. | 22 | case. Right? |
| 23 | THE WITNESS: Ultimately what we were trying | 23 | A. These are the documents that helped me form |
| 24 | to do was determine the increase in value of | 24 | my opinion in this case, yes. |
| 25 | gawker.com that was due to the video of Hulk Hogan | 25 | Q. Okay. We may be going back and forth to |


|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Page 86 |
| 2 | that page, so I'm going to give you a paper clip so |
| 3 | you can mark it. |
| 4 | A. I got it. It's at the end. Thank you |
| 5 | though. Appreciate it. |
| 6 | Q. So I guess to decode the footnote 35 |
| 7 | referring to document 50, if you turn to page 21, it |
| 8 | and finance from a WIPO workshop. Right? |
| 9 | A. Hm-hm. |
| 0 | MR. BERRY: Right. I'm going to mark as |
| 1 | Exhibit Number 172 what is referred to in your report |
| 2 | as document 50. |
| 3 | THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 4 | (The document referred to was |
| 5 | marked as Exhibit 172. . |
| 6 | BY MR. BERRY: |
| 7 | Q. So Exhibit 172, is this document 50 in your |
| 8 | report? |
| 9 | A. I'm flipping through it, but yes, it looks |
| 0 | like it is. |
| 1 | Q. Okay. Yeah, I just want to make sure. If |
| 2 | there is any point where I start to ask questions |
| 3 | before you're done looking, just tell me and I'Il |
| 4 | wait. I want to make sure you have time. |
| 5 | A. Sure. |
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Q. You know, I'm only going to ask you -- ask you about a couple things in here.
A. Okay. I mean, you can ask.
Q. Okay. In this Exhibit 172, it discusses intangible assets which is something that we had talked about earlier. Right?
A. It does.
Q. Okay. And in the circumstances of in- -sorry.

The gawker.com Web site is an intangible asset. Right?
A. It can be considered an intangible asset or an intellectual property. It -- for the purposes of our discussion, I think we can call those two synonymous for this analysis.
Q. Okay. And what about the Hulk Hogan video, is that an intangible asset?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I haven't -- I haven't
classified that and it wasn't part of my assignment. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Based on your discussion of what intangible assets are earlier, would that be considered an intangible asset?
A. It could be an intellectual property. You

Page 88
could copyright it. Right?
Q. But either way, the valuation of the video would be the same whether it's considered intellectual property or an intangible asset. Right?
A. Sure. Whether I'm --

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Whether I'm doing a database valuation of an intangible or a database valuation that's an intellectual property, it's the same -- the same methodologies, the same tools that we would use to do that valuation.

So, again, for the purposes of our discussion, I think you and I can call an intangible asset and intellectual property synonymous.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Okay. If you turn to page 22 of Exhibit 172.

MR. VOGT: Which page? I'm sorry.
MR. BERRY: 22.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. This page discusses the market approach. And the first line under this chart says that: "Difficult to apply to intangibles. Sufficient number of transactions of truly comparable Page 89
assets is rarely available."
That is generally one of the difficulties in the market approach. Right?
A. For certain assets, that can be difficult. But there's no such thing as a truly perfect comparable. But for some assets, sure, it's hard to find comparables.

For Internet-based assets, that is not the case. It is quite easy to find comparables.
Q. Okay. But just in general with the market approach, you need to be sure that the assets that you're comparing are actually comparable. Right?
A. Sure. It's important to have comparable comparables.
Q. Right. So like in your example about houses, when my wife and I bought a house and you ge comps, you are looking at houses in the same neighborhood. Right?
A. Typically.
Q. Houses that have roughly the same number of rooms. Right?
A. It can be a criteria, yes.
Q. Same number of bathrooms. Right?
A. Again, that can be one of the criteria.
Q. Same size yard?

|  | Page 90 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. Sure. |
| 2 | Q. You want to look at a house that's in the |
| 3 | same condition. Right? |
| 4 | A. That can be something you look at. |
| 5 | Q. Okay. But all of those things -- |
| 6 | A. I don't do real estate appraisals, so. |
| 7 | Q. Right. Well, but you have been in the |
| 8 | mortgage industry you'd said. |
| 9 | A. I didn't do real estate appraisals, though. |
| 10 | Q. But you did loans on mortgages? |
| 11 | A. Well, yeah. |
| 12 | Q. But generally the idea is you try and find |
| 13 | something that's as comparable to the asset that |
| 14 | you're looking at so that you're comparing apples to |
| 15 | apples. Right? |
| 16 | A. That's correct. |
| 17 | Q. All right. |
| 18 | A. And they're never identical. |
| 19 | Q. Right, because you're not doing -- dealing |
| 20 | with two of the same exact things. Right? |
| 21 | A. Correct. |
| 22 | Q. You're just trying to find something that is |
| 23 | comparable so that you're comparing an apple to an |
| 24 | apple instead of comparing an apple to an orange? |
| 25 | A. Correct. |
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MR. BERRY: I'd like to mark as Exhibit Number 173.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 173.)
THE WITNESS: Should I give this back to her or --

MR. BERRY: Well, you might just hold on -well, yeah, you can give it back to her. I don't know that we'll be coming back to it.

THE REPORTER: Just put a stack there on the table.

THE WITNESS: I'll stack them up.
THE BERRY: Yeah, we'll stack that up.
We'll go through a bunch of documents now, so.
THE WITNESS: We can do it that way. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. All right. So the document that's been handed to you is Exhibit 173 which is a publication that at the top says "Traditional Intangible Asset Valuation Techniques," and it's apparently an excerpt from a book that was written by Weston Anson. And I'll represent to you that is this an article that came off of the CONSOR Web site.

Are you familiar with this article?
A. It's a chapter of a book. But I'm familiar
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with this, yes.
Q. Okay. So you've read this before?
A. Again, for the record, if my chairman reads it, I don't know if I read it word for word, but I have looked at this, yes.
Q. Okay. I won't tell him.
A. Thank you.
Q. I just want to ask you about one part of it, which is -- and if you want to read, but I'm really only interested in just a small portion of this. From pages 3 to 4, it discusses the market approach of valuation. And the specific part that I'd like to ask you about is in the first full paragraph on page 4. But if you want to take time to read the whole thing, please feel free to do so.
A. Let me just read through it real quick just to make sure.
Q. Yeah.
A. Okay.
Q. All right. So --
A. Thank you.
Q. My pleasure.

And if you want to go back and look at it again after I ask -- I'm only going to ask you a couple of questions about it.

Page 93
That first full paragraph on page 4 starts,
"In addition to the type of asset." On the next --
A. The next page?
Q. Page 4.
A. Okay.
$Q$. The very last sentence says:
"Along with the possible adjustments listed above, the price information contained in comparable sale and licensing transactions will frequently have to be adjusted using a common reference point such as sales, profit margin or net income." Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. Do you agree with that statement?
A. In certain contexts, I do.
Q. In what contexts?
A. This is really speaking to licensing context, if you look at geographical constraints. I mean, exclusivity - I'm at the top of this paragraph now -- exclusivity, payment mechanisms, time frame, among others. This is specifically referring to a licensing arrangement, not an asset like a Web site.

|  | Page 94 |  | Page 96 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | And I know this because I've spoken to my | 1 | income? |
| 2 | chairman specifically about this chapter. We've | 2 | MR. VOGT: Objection to form. |
| 3 | rewritten this chapter in subsequent books. In fact, | 3 | THE WITNESS: Okay. A common reference |
| 4 | the new book that's coming out, we rewrote this | 4 | point such as sales, profit margin, and -- or net |
| 5 | chapter, so. But that's -- that's what that pertains | 5 | income, so if you use a multiple of revenue or net |
| 6 |  | 6 | income, then clearly the revenue or profit is what |
| 7 | Q. Okay. But just in principle, then, the | 7 | you're using that multiple on, so that can change the |
| 8 | price information contained in comparable sales | 8 | value. |
| 9 | transactions -- continuing on -- "will frequently | 9 | In this case, we used monthly unique users, |
| 10 | have to be adjusted using a common reference point | 10 | and so more or less monthly unique users you have |
| 11 | such as sales, profit margin or net income." | 11 | will change the value accordingly. |
| 12 | In sales transactions, would there have to | 12 | BY MR. BERRY: |
| 13 | be adjustments using a common reference point such as | 13 | Q. And there's no, then, back-end analysis |
| 14 | sales, profit margin, or net income? | 14 | that's done to adjust for actual revenue income |
| 15 | MR. VOGT: Objection to form. | 15 | growth or anything like that. Right? |
| 16 | THE WITNESS: Not sure what you mean by | 16 | MR. VOGT: Objection. |
| 17 | "sales transactions." | 17 | THE WITNESS: Again -- |
| 18 | BY MR. BERRY: | 18 | MR. VOGT: Objection to form. |
| 19 | Q. In an asset sale. Right? If you're valuing | 19 | THE WITNESS: Again, valuing content-based |
| 20 | something using the market approach for a sale -- | 20 | Web sites based on their income or revenue is going |
| 21 | A. Okay. | 21 | to undervalue that site in an arm's-length |
| 22 | Q. -- do you agree that you would have to | 22 | transaction. So you use the market approach and |
| 23 | frequently adjust the value assessed by a market | 23 | compare it to market-based benchmarking to determine |
| 24 | approach using a common reference point such as | 24 | what its true value is. |
| 25 | sales, profit margin, or net income? | 25 | BY MR. BERRY: |
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| 1 | MR. VOGT: Objection to form. | 1 | Q. And no adjustment is made on the back side |
| 2 | THE WITNESS: Okay. I understand what | 2 | based on any differences between the comps. Right? |
| 3 | you're saying now. | 3 | MR. VOGT: Objection to form. |
| 4 | And yes, that's how the market approach | 4 | BY MR. BERRY: |
| 5 | works. And it's exactly what we did in this case. | 5 | $Q$. Once you get the -- |
| 6 | It's -- so sales would be -- if you're using the | 6 | A. I'm not sure. |
| 7 | market approach to come up with, let's say, a revenue | 7 | Q. -- the value based on the market multiple |
| 8 | multiple, EBITDA multiple, an EBIT multiple, a net | 8 | you've come up with with unique user, there's no |
| 9 | income multiple -- I'm sure you've heard of some of | 9 | adjustment made for differences in revenue, profits, |
| 10 | these multiples -- that's what makes that adjustment. | 10 | income. Right? |
| 11 | So if you're looking at a multiple of some | 11 | MR. VOGT: Objection to form. |
| 12 | revenue numbers, so clearly the revenue is going -- | 12 | THE WITNESS: Again, revenue and profits |
| 13 | if the revenue changes, the value will change. | 13 | don't come into play in this valuation. |
| 14 | Does that make sense? | 14 | BY MR. BERRY: |
| 15 | BY MR. BERRY: | 15 | Q. Okay. All right. And touching on this same |
| 16 | Q. Right. So how did you do that in this case? | 16 | point and coming back to something we just mentioned, |
| 17 | A. Well, we used a different multiple. We used | 17 | in the market approach, you used -- sorry, let me |
| 18 | a unique user multiple. A viewership multiple. So | 18 | start again. |
| 19 | it's the same concept. | 19 | In the market approach, you're using a |
| 20 | Q. So in this case -- and we'll get to this in | 20 | market multiple to value comparable assets based on a |
| 21 | just a second -- the common denominator was unique | 21 | ratio of some common denominator. Right? |
| 22 | users, and you used that to come up with a market | 22 | A. We're looking to the common denominator |
| 23 | multiple and that is what this sentence refers to, | 23 | being monthly unique users. |
| 24 | you coming up with some sort of market multiple | 24 | Q. Just in general, though, you're looking at a |
| 25 | whether it's based on sales, profit margins, or net | 25 | common denominator when you use the market approact |

A. Sure, you use a common denominator.
Q. And you're assuming, then, that the ratios that come from that common denominator value some flow specific variable the same across all firms. Right? Across the comps you're using.

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: There's always going to be variations in that and that's why you use averages. Sometimes you'd use a median.

In this case, we were conservative. We used the minimum to the average, so because they're -never say "never" -- but almost never going to be identical. That's why you look at a set of comparables for your analysis.
Q. Could you select any common denominator when doing the market approach?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: For what purpose?
Q. For valuing the company. Could you -- here you used unique users. Right? Could you choose some other common denominator?
A. If there was a common denominator that there
was information on, sure, another common denominator could potentially be used. It depends on the context of any valuation. They're all slightly different. It's all what information do you have, what's available, what makes the most sense given the situation that you're in.
Q. Just talking about content-based Web sites, could you use the common denominator of the number of
A. I have not seen that before, but that's not to say it couldn't be done. I have not personally
Q. Could you look at server size used by the
Q. How do you go about selecting a common denominator in the market approach?
A. For a content-based Web site, traffic is the key driver of value. These Web sites are after ultimately advertising and maybe something beyond that later, but it's traffic which is the key driver

So for a common denominator for a content-based Web site, it would be just that. It
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Q. In other contents - in other contexts, what do you look at in determining whether something is an appropriate common denominator in using the marke

MR. VOGT: Objection to form. THE WIINESS: In other contexts?

## Q. (Nods head.)

Q. When you set out to use the market approach, how do you assess what the appropriate common denominator would be?
A. Unfortunately, I don't know the direct answer to that question. I wish I did, but it depends on the situation and the context at hand and, again, what information is available. So I don't --
I don't know the answer to that.
Q. And here, then, explain - and this may have
been in your prior answer, but explain to me clearly
why you chose unique viewers as the benchmark to.

## compare assets?

A. Because Web site, content-based Web site value is directly fied to the amount of trallic they have, the amount of viewers that go to the Web site. That, in turn, drives potential advertising dollars


## traffic drive value?

A. Aside from future monetization potential?
Q. Aside from - sorry. Aside from
A. Future monelization potenlial.
Q. How else do you monetize traffic on a content-based Web site?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know the specific
answer to that. I think that's something a lot of
Web sites are figuring out.

Earlier we talked about what you had taught personally. That is covered by this sentence?
Q. Has CONSOR ever valued a Web site using the market multiple of average unique viewers where the Web site has actually sold for that amount?
A. I don't know what happens after our valuation. We are typically not filled in on the results of any of our advice or reports. It's just it's -- that's not typical.
Q. Are you aware of any situation where CONSOR has ever valued a Web site using this approach that you used in this case where that value was actually awarded as damages in litigation?
A. Again, when it comes to outcomes of cases, I wish I knew the answers to some of them, and I don't
Q. Outside of the work that CONSOR has done, over the past five years, are you aware of any situation in which a Web site was valued for commercial purposes based on unique visitors?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: For commercial purposes? What do you mean by that?
"Over the last several years, CONSOR has valued numerous Web sites using monthly unique user multiples in the context of litigation and private

Earlier we talked about several of those. Is that what that -- the things that we've talked about previously, what that sentence refers to?

Have you ever worked for a Web site, content-based Web site to turn users into income?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I have not.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. In the report at page 9 , in the first full paragraph that starts "For the purpose of our

> | Q. And then in the next sentence, it says: |
| :--- |
| "CONSOR employees have also |
| taught this methodology extensively |
| in valuation presentations and |
| continuing legal education |

Q. For sales. Like for the sale of the Web
A. Typically they don't make public how they came up to any valuation. I'm sure that viewership was used in some of those sales, but I don't have data that shows that.
Q. But you personally are not aware of any
A. I have not -- I have not seen or heard of
Q. Are you aware of any situations where investments have been made to content-based Web sitef based solely on the valuation of the Web site using the kind of analysis that you employed here looking strictly at unique viewers?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't have any specific
Q. But you're not aware of any?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Not that I'm aware of.
Q. Are you aware of any loans that have been
made to Web sites based on the kind of analysis that you undertook in this case?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, I don't know the -- how they came up with the valuations when they did it at the time. That was not made public.
Q. But you personally are not aware of any instances in the past five years where loans have been made based on the analysis -- the kind of analysis that you did in this case?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Other than the articles that l've cited to that speak to it, other than the other investment or investment, consulting, and financial valuation houses that also speak to using market multiples, I don't know of any specific cases. And I think anybody would be hard pressed to find that because they don't make that information public just like our valuations are not made public.
Q. But the bottom line is, you're not aware of any situation then?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't have any specifics,
potential, potential revenue. So I would say they are still in a growth cycle.
Q. How much revenue did Gawker have in 2014:
A. I don't have the numbers in front of me.
Q. Did you ever look to see how much revenue Gawker had in 2013?
A. We may have been presented those numbers. I'm not -- I don't have them in front of me.
Q. How do you assess whether a site had much
A. Again, it goes back to whether you're in a mature cycle like a Coca-Cola or if you're in a growth phase like the general consensus is that most, if not all, content-based Web sites and I think Web sites in general and Internet-based companies are still in a growth phase.
Q. So any -- for any Web site, it doesn't matter -- any content-based Web site, it wouldn't matter how much revenue the site would have to determine whether a revenue multiplier would be appropriate or a market approach would be appropriate. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objcction to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not going to say "any." But, again, the majority and the general consensus is
Q. I want to come back and ask you about a couple of the articles. But first I wanted to mention -- to ask you something about on page 9 , kind of picking up where we left off here.

In the following paragraph, which I think is the second full paragraph on page 9 that starts
"Third-party valuation professionals."
Q. The very last sentence says:
"For sites without much
revenue, price per user can often
be a more accurate gauge of a
site's value than a revenue

Do you see that?
Q. Is Gawker a site without much revenue?

MR. VOGI: Objection to form.
TIIE WIINESS: I would say yes.
A. Again, we go back to the previous conversation about maximum -- maximizing your
that content-based Web sites are, in fact, still in a growth phase and they have more potential than they are actually extracting.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. The phrase here, "revenue multiple," what does that mean? The very last two words in that paragraph, "revenue multiple."
A. So that would be a multiple of revenue, so it would be your value is twenty times revenue, ten times revenue, two times revenue. That would be a revenue multiple.
Q. And for a revenue multiple - when is a revenue multitude used to value something?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: It can be used in various
instances. You can use it for commercial real
estate. You can use it for valuing a business,
valuing publicly traded companies. It's just -- it depends on the specific circumstances and instance we're talking about. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But you would -- you couldn't use a revenue multiplier for gawker.com to assess the value.
A. A revenue multiple would not be as accurate,

## would not provide an arm's-length market value for

the company as a user multiple will.
Again, the traffic is what is key and what
is -- what drives value for these content-based Web
Q. Okay. So going up to that -- the top part of this paragraph, it says:
"Third-party valuation professionals have also recognized the ability to value Web sites based on a multiple of monthly unique users."
Do you see that?
Q. And so earlier you'd mentioned that a couple articles in here - I think this is what you're referring to -- it refers to, in footnotes 37 and 38, documents 52 and 53 .

Do you see that?
A. Those, and others. And other firms that if you go on their --- valuation firms, you go on their Web sites and they discuss the use of market multiples for valuing Web sites as well.
Q. Right. But here in this report you used document 52 and 53. Right?
A. Yeah, I'm just -- I'm telling you for the first sentence, what I'm referring to in the first

MR. BERRY: Okay. Why don't we mark as
(The document referred to was marked as Exhibit 174.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Just using the decoder here from your report, what I've handed you as Exhibit 174 is -what I think is referred to in your report as document 52 , which is a -- something from Cogent Valuation titled "The Pricing of Online Media." Is this the document that you used?
A. This is correct, yes.
Q. Okay. What is Cogent Valuation?
A. I believe it's a valuation firm.
Q. Have you worked with them before?
A. Not directly, no.
Q. Do you know when this article was written?
A. I believe this was written in the nineties.
Q. Okay. The article here he says, under the -- on the first page, "The state of Internet advertising." Well, if you want to take time to
Q. All right. On the first page, it says, "The state of Internet advertising." In the first sentence it says:
"Since its public inception almost five years ago, the Internet has become the fastest growing medium in history with a current reach of 43.2 million active

Do you know how many active users the Internet has now?
A. I don't have an exact number, no.
Q. It's more than 43.2 million. Right?
A. I would hate to guess.
Q. Well, I mean, in your report, it said that BuzzFeed alone had 135 million users. Right?
A. It's more than 43 million, yes.
Q. Okay. Has the Internet changed since 1999? MR. VOGT: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: In what sense?
Q. Have Web site media companies changed sinc

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.

THE WITNESS: I'm sure some things have changed and others remain the same.
Q. Looking at page 2. The very last paragraph, the paragraph starts "The application of traditional valuation methodologies"?
Q. Okay. The second sentence says "Lending to this difficulty," and it's talking about valuing Internet companies.
"Lending to this difficulty are
factors such as the lack of earnings, uncertainty of the mature
state of the industry, and unpredictability of further cash

Do you see that sentence?
Q. Are all those things still true?
A. To some degree, sure.
Q. Does gawker.com have a lack of earnings? MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I would say they -- some would argue they do.
Q. Would you argue that they do?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I think they have future monetization potential that's not being realized today.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Right. But I think my question was a little different.
A. I'm sorry.
Q. Does gawker.com have a lack of earnings?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: And based on what I -- my
statement I just made, I would say yes.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So but your statement -- and let me know if I'm mischaracterizing this in any way, but I think your statement is that they could have more earnings. Right?

It hasn't reached its monetization potential. Correct?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: They have future monetization
potential, so they have the potential to earn more.
So because they could earn more -- I mean, you used
the word "lack," I don't know what your definition of
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it is, but, sure, they are lacking in the fact that
they could have more.
BY MR. BERRY:

## Q. But it does have earnings. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'd have to see their
financials, but I believe they have earnings.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Okay. Do you believe that there's an unpredictability in Gawker's future cash flows?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I think, sure. Sure, there's
unpredictability. I can't predict it exactly.
BY MR. BERRY:

## Q. But could you predict for Coca-Cola?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: To some exact science, I don't know that anybody can exactly predict, so there's some unpredictability in nearly anything.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Do you know how long Gawker has been in existence?
A. Since -- if I can turn to my report real fast. I -- I could guess and be right but rather just tell you.

Since 2002.
Q. So at this point, over twelve years. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. In general, would the value of a company -sorry.

In general, would the value of a content-based Web site go up as the number of uniqu users increases?
A. Generally?
Q. (Nods head.)

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: More unique users implies a higher valuation.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Does the value of a Web site -- a
content-based Web site go up if the number of users is increasing rapidly?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what you mean by that.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Well, you talk about future monetization potential. Does the value go up if the number of unique users for the Web site is going up more quickly?
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MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: The value would go up in relation to proportionally, to the number of unique users that it has increased by.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So if it's increased by greater numbers, the value would go up accordingly. Right?
A. If -- if you have an increase in your unique user traffic, you would have an increase in value.
Q. So if the number of unique users coming to a site increases by 50 percent over a period of time, the value of the Web site would increase by 50 percent?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: It could in that instance. I'd have to see the specific circumstances we're talking about, but generally speaking.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. And if it's a hundred percent growth, it's value could increase a hundred percent. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: It could.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. If the growth were happening quickly, would its value increase quickly?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: It would depend on the circumstances. I can't answer that directly unfortunately.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Turning back to Exhibit 174 here. On page 1 , in that first paragraph, in the third line, towards the end there's a sentence that starts "However."
A. "For the time being"?
Q. Yeah. It says:
"For the time being, the escalating valuations in the Internet space and the Internet content/community ('Online Media') sector in particular, seem to defy all sense of reliance on investment fundamentals."
Is that still true?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: To some degree. BY MR. BERRY:
$Q$. The valuation of online media companies defies all sense of reliance on investment fundamentals?
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MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know what the author is defining as an investment fundamental, but to some degree.
BY MR. BERRY:

## $Q$. What do you consider investment

 fundamentals?MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: This would be your -- I don't
know what he means by that. But from my perspective, it would be blue chip stocks. Investment fundamentals like a basic PE, price-to-earnings ratio.

You're going to see Internet-based companies at much higher multiples of that than any other measure, and so I believe that's what they're speaking to here, and I believe to some degree, that is still true.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. To what degree is it not true?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know specifically how
it is or is not true. I just -- you're asking me in
general. And, in general, I believe to some degree it is still true that there is still -- that it's --
the investment fundamentals are still slightly or to some degree being overseen through an Internet company.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Are Internet companies overvalued then? MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't -- I don't -- I don't
know the answer to that.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Let's take a look at page 3. There's a paragraph there in the second paragraph that says "Price to revenues," and it lists twenty publicly traded online media companies.

After this article was published, do you
know what happened to Lycos's stock?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Where do you see -- oh, Lycos. I do not.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. What about Infoseek?

MR. VOGT: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Do you know what happened to xoom.com? MR. VOGT: Same objection.
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THE WITNESS: I do not.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Do you know what happened to launch.com? MR. VOGT: Same objection. THE WITNESS: I do not.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Do you know how the stock did for goto.com MR. VOGT: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: I do not.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Following the publication of this article, the value of tech stocks dropped dramatically. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: There was a market crash in 2000-2001, yes.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. And people in common parlance refer to that as the dot com --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Would you -BY MR. BERRY:
Q. People in common parlance refer to that as the dot com bubble?
A. I've heard of the dot com bubble.
Q. And that occurred shortly after this article
was published, the bubble burst?
A. That is generally correct, yes.
Q. The second article that you mentioned here is document 53 in your report on page 9 . Right? And footnote 38. Right? You referred to document 53 ?
A. 53, yup.

MR. BERRY: We'll mark as Exhibit 175.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 175.)
MR. VOGT: Are you done with 174 ?
MR. BERRY: Yes.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. The document that has been handed to you is Exhibit 175 which is titled "Valuation Metrics of Large vs. Small Web Site Acquisitions."

This is exhibit -- sorry -- document 53 that you referred to in footnote 39 of your report. Is that right?
A. Yes. Can I take a minute and read through this?
Q. Oh, absolutely.
A. Thank you.

Okay.
Q. Okay. So this is document 53 that you're looking at?
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A. It is, yes.
Q. And I apologize for standing. My back is just killing me.
A. That's fine. I hope your back feels better.
Q. What is seekingalpha.com?
A. Seeking Alpha is an investment-related Web site
Q. And do you know who James Nicholson is?
A. I don't know him personally, no.
Q. Do you consider him to be a valuation professional?
A. I believe he's well knowledged in this space.
Q. What do you base that on?
A. I'm seen his name before on articles.
Q. What kind of articles?
A. Investment-related articles, valuation-related articles.
Q. What else have you read by him?
A. I don't remember.
Q. What is alpha?
A. Alpha?
Q. (Nods head.)
A. In terms of finance?
Q. Yes.
A. It's -- it's what all investors seek to
find. It is the -- trying to figure -- for
your aunt, I'm trying to figure out how to explain this.

In an equation for figuring out value, it's the part that can't be explained but is there.
Q. Trying to find something's intrinsic value?
A. That's one way to put it.
Q. Do you know when this article was written?
A. August 27, 2008.
Q. Under the header "Revenue Multiple,"

Mr. Nicholson writes:
"Larger established Web sites generally have been valued at anywhere from three times to ten times annual revenues." Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Do you know what he means by "larger established Web sites"?
A. This has YouTube being one of them, but large sites like YouTube.
$Q$. But in his view, you could use a revenue multiple for a large established Web site. Correct? MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
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THE WITNESS: In his view, yes.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But I take it from our discussion earlier, you wouldn't categorize gawker.com as a larger established Web site. Correct?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: A revenue multiple would not be appropriate to use for gawker.com.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But it's not a larger established Web site?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not going to use his words to explain that gawker.com using a revenue multiple would not be valued properly.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Okay. But the premise of his article -right? -- is to -- refers to smaller Web sites, it says, being worth under a million dollars. Right?
A. Where do you see that?
Q. In the second paragraph:
"While looking into the market for buying and selling smaller Web sites generally with price tags under a million dollars."
A. Okay.
Q. Right. That's what he's talking about.

## Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: As being --smaller Web sites are under \$1 million.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. And you've valued gawker.com as being well over a million. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Valued the Web site?
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. You valued in this case gawker.com to be worth well more than a million dollars. Right?
A. We valued -- yes.
Q. Down under the "Cost per user" section here, Mr. Nicholson writes:
"For sites without much
revenue, price per user can often
be a more accurate gauge of a
site's value than revenue multiple."
Do you see where I'm at?
A. I do. I see that.
Q. So what he's talking about are sites without much revenue. Right?
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MR. VOGT: Objection.
THE WITNESS: That's what his statement says, yes. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Is Gawker a site without much revenue?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, that -- it could be argued they have future monetization potential, and so they are without much revenue in the sense that they could have more.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Okay. Does this article anywhere say that Web sites are actually valued using this cost per user in the marketplace?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: What do you mean?
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Well, does it say anywhere that a Web site has been valued for sale using this cost per user?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: It doesn't explicitly say XYZ
Web site was valued using cost per user, but it
explains how it can be done.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Right. But he's not saying that any
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Web site has ever been sold using that. Right?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: It doesn't say that they
weren't either. It says that, based on the users and the value, the price per user was X .
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But he's not saying that anything was actually valued in that way?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: And he's also not saying that
it wasn't valued in that way.
MR. BERRY: That's a fair point.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So, I mean, you point out that he mentions a couple here. It says:
"eBay acquired StumbleUpon for
\$75 million last May."
Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. It doesn't say that that $\$ 75$ million figure was arrived at using a cost-per-user valuation, does it?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: And it also doesn't say that it wasn't arrived at using that analysis.
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BY MR. BERRY:
$Q$. Do you know how the valuation was arrived a for StumbleUpon?
A. As I stated I think an hour or so ago, they don't make public the actual calculations that go into any of these transactions.
Q. Apart from these two articles, can you point to any other documents that support your statement
"Third-party valuation
professionals have also recognized
the ability to value Web sites
based on a multiple of monthly
unique users"?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, I have seen other valuation firms who write about using a user multiple to value a Web site. I don't have them in front of me.
BYMR. BERRY:
Q. Can you recall any specifically sitting here today?
A. The name of the firms?
Q. The name of the publication, the name of the
firm?
A. I can't.
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Q. None of the materials that you point to for your report deals with actually valuing a single post on a Web site, does it?
A. Single post?
Q. (Nods head.)
A. What do you mean by that?
Q. Well, here you valued the -- you -- or you were assessing the increased value of the post that contained the Hulk Hogan video. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: We looked at the increase in value of gawker.com at two points in time -- before and after the video was posted -- and then we apportioned that value based on the traffic that went to the video.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Are you aware of any materials where that kind of analysis has been done for a single post like you did in this case?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know that that would ever be available publicly.

What you have to understand here is that the approach we took in valuing the Web site and subsequently apportioning it to the Hulk Hogan video
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THE WITNESS: I don't know. I don't know. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Sitting here today, you are not aware of any other circumstance in which this methodology has beet used to value -- or to assess the increase of value attributable to a single post. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I know that this approach is used to value a Web site.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. My question is about a single post. Are you aware of any other situation in which this methodology has been used to assess the value of a post?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
MR. BERRY: All right.
MR. VOGT: Can we take a break?
MR. BERRY: Yeah.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Let's go off the record. The time is $12: 37$.
(Whereupon at 12:37 P.M., the
videotaped deposition of JEFF
ANDERSON was adjourned for noon recess.)
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was probably the most common approach used in the valuation of any intellectual property of tangible real estate and other assets as well. We took the market approach and we used benchmarking.

So while I don't know if there's any literature that speaks to the specifics you're asking about, I can tell you that the approach in general is probably the most common.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Right. But have you -- are you aware of any other instance in which the increase in value attributed to a company from a single post followed the methodology that you used in this case?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: It's no different from valuing a Web site at two different points in time. So it's the same approach we would use whether I'm going just. valuing a Web site or if I'm looking at the increase in value that's attributable to a post, it's the same approach.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Again, are you aware of any other instance in which the increase in value attributed to a single post followed the methodology you used in this case?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
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(Whereupon, at 1:08 P.M., the
videotaped deposition of JEFF
ANDERSON was reconvened.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back for the afternoon. The time on the video monitor is 1:08.

## EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)

BY MR. BERRY:
Q. I'm going to talk to you now about the specific analysis that you had done for this case, and I think that's what we'll spend the balance of our time today talking about.

And just, can we go off the record for a second?

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Sure. Off the record at 1:08.
(Discussion held off the record.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record at 1:09.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. As I understand it, you were asked to provide an opinion regarding the benefit to Gawker a; measured by the increase in value of the gawker.com

Web site that resulted from Gawker posting on the Web site the video of Mr. Bollea engaged in private consensual sexual relations with Heather Clem.

Is that right?
A. Sounds like it was taken right from my report, yes.

Are we done with this one, too? Can I put this one away?
Q. Yeah, yeah, we're done with that.
A. Thanks.
Q. So just to be clear here, you only measured the value of the gawker.com Web site. Right?
A. Gawker.com, yes.
Q. You didn't measure the value of Gawker Media's other Web sites. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. So you didn't consider the value of gizmodo.com?
A. No.
Q. You didn't consider the value of deadspin.com?
A. No.
Q. You didn't consider the value of jezebel.com?
A. No.
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Q. You didn't consider the value of any of the other Gawker Media Web sites then. Right?
A. No.
Q. And you didn't consider the value of Kinja. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Your consideration of value only focused on the domain gawker.com. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So throughout the deposition, I guess I kind of -- with key words here, whenever kind of going forward I'm talking about Gawker, and particularly in connection with users or visitors, I'm talking just about gawker.com Web site. Unless I say otherwise, I'm not talking about Gawker Media, just for clarity sake.
A. Sure. Sure. Thank you.
Q. Gawker, gawker.com.
A. Got it.
Q. And if I understand this, and it's what I read from your report, you measured the increase in value that was solely attributable to the video. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you watch the video that was posted on

## gawker.com's Web site?

A. I did not see the video.
Q. Your expert opinion ultimately is that the increase in value of gawker.com as a result of Gawke posting the video is between $\$ 4,995,000$ and $\$ 15,445,000$. Is that right?
A. And for simplicity, rather than the decimals, we can -- if it's all right with you, we can say that that 4.995 million, we can round it to 5 million, and the 15.445 , we can just call it 15 million --
Q. Right.
A. -- otherwise, it gets lengthy.
Q. Yeah, no, that's all right.

So it's roughly between 5 - and $\mathbf{1 5}$ million?
A. Five and 15 million, yes.
Q. And this value is based on the market multiple per monthly unique users as measured by a average monthly unique users. Right?
A. So there's a lot in that sentence. I
just -- I'm going to say it back to you so we make sure we get it right for the record.

So this is based on using a monthly unique user multiple value per monthly unique user and then apportioning the value of the increase in the
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Web site to the value of the video based on the traffic, the unique user traffic that went to the video.
Q. Okay. And that was going to be my next question, so. Yeah, they -- that's exactly right. And what we'll do is, we go through some of this, and in just a little bit, we'll go piece by piece through the analysis so you can explain, or at least make sure that I understand exactly what you did.
A. Sure.
Q. You're not, though, offering any opinions other than what's in your report. Right?
A. My opinions are in my report, yes.
Q. You're only offering your opinion on the increase in value to gawker.com attributable to the Hulk Hogan video. Right?
A. Correct, unless something changes. And I think I've noted in my report that I reserve the right to amend or revise the analysis or respond to opposing experts. But, yes, for now, my opinions are strictly in my report.
Q. But you're not planning to do any further analysis at this point. Right?
A. Only if necessary and if I'm asked to.
Q. Okay. You're not expressing any opinion
about any other theory of damages. Right?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what you mean. BY MR. BERRY:
$Q$. Other than the increase in value to gawker.com, you're not assessing any opinion about Plaintiff's other theory of damages. Right?
A. I don't --

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not an attorney, so I
don't know about theories to damages. I was asked to
value the increase in value of the Web site of gawker.com and apportion it based on -- well, I wasn't even asked to apportion it. We apportioned it based on the number of users that went to the Hulk video. That's all I was asked to do.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So you're not expressing any opinion on how much profit Gawker earned from the video. Right?
A. I have not been asked to look at that, no.
Q. And you're not expressing any opinion on what the video itself could have been sold for?
A. I'm not looking at that, no.
Q. And you're not offering an opinion on the market value of the Hulk Hogan sex tape. Right?
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A. Again, I was asked to value -- how the val- -- the video impacted the value of gawker.com.
Q. And so -- this is, I think, implicit in what you're saying -- you're not expressing any opinion on whether Gawker or any of the other defendants are liable in this case. Right?
A. I'm not jumping to any legal conclusions. Again, I'm not an attomey. I was just asked to value how the video increased the value of gawker.com.
Q. So no opinion on whether Gawker committed an invasion of privacy. Right?
A. I was not asked to testify to that.
Q. And no opinion on whether there was any misappropriation of the plaintiff's image or name. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And no opinion on whether the defendant is liable for infringing the plaintiff's right of publicity. Right?
A. Was not asked to look at that.
Q. All right. So now we'll turn and talk specifically about your report. And I'm going to go step by step through different parts of the analysis and just ask you about them to make sure that I

## understand them.

Earlier you had mentioned the exhibits, and as we get into this, I'll bring out the exhibits and we can talk about those as well.
A. Sure.
Q. The first thing that I want to talk about is this concept of a market multiple which we had talked about earlier in the day.

As I understand it, what you did was -- is set out to determine a market multiple per average monthly unique user. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And a monthly unique user, as I understand $i t$, is a single user that visits a Web site one or more times in a month -- in a one-month period.

Is that a correct understanding?
A. That's correct.
Q. So if a person visits a site only once, that person counts as a unique visitor. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. If that single user visits the Web site ten times in a month, they'd still count as one unique visitor for the month?
A. Correct.
Q. To calculate the number of unique visitors, Page 141
you looked at data provided by Quantcast Corp. Right?
A. Wasn't provided by Quantcast, but we got it off the Quantcast Web site, yes.
Q. And so that was available at Quantcast.com?
A. That's where we got the data, yes.
Q. There's a phrase in your report that comes up a couple times, "the market multiple per monthly unique user." That basically assesses a dollar value assigned to each monthly unique user. Right?
A. It's the value of one unique user, yes.
Q. Right. So the market multiple just assigns a specific dollar value to that average monthly unique user. Right?
A. Well, to a monthly --

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: -- unique user.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Right. The dollar value to that monthly unique user?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. In your view, then -- and I think this is what you were saying before the break, but just to refresh -- the market multiple represents the amount added to a company's value for each averag
monthly unique user. Right?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Added that -- maybe -- I want to clear this up for you, so I'm trying to understand your question.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. For each average monthly unique user that is added to a company's Web site, the value of that Web site goes up by the market multiple. Right?
A. By that value per monthly unique user.
Q. Right.
A. Yes. Yes. It's not a multiple at that point. It'd just be the absolute amount for that one unique user, not a -- it's not a multiple anymore.
Q. Sorry, right, but that value represents the value that would be increased -- that the Web site's value would increase per each additional unique user?
A. Correct.
Q. And that value, the market multiple is determined based on transactions involving other companies. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And --
A. Other Web sites.
Q. Right. And so for that valuation of those
companies, you have looked at comparable Web sites. Correct?
A. So Web sites, yes. We looked at comparable Web sites.
Q. And then you used those valuations to determine the market multiples. Right?
A. We looked at the monthly unique user traffic those Web sites had and looked at their valuation at some date -- and it's in the report and I'm sure we'll talk about it -- to determine what that multiple per monthly unique user was.
Q. Okay. So if I understand right, you divided each company's valuation at a specific time by the average of monthly unique users for the preceding twelve-month period. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And in the report, which is Exhibit 170, on page 12 , in the Web site that says -- sorry -- the paragraph that says "Web site traffic fluctuates from month to month"?
A. Okay.
Q. The next sentence says:
"An arm's-length buyer or investor would not rely on a single month's performance because vast
fluctuations in user traffic will
occur with nearly every Web site."
A. "Nearly all Web sites."
Q. Sorry. In "nearly all Web sites." And then it continues on and explains that they would look at the average monthly traffic the site had over some period of time, typically, twelve months. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. Are you aware of any arm's-length buyers that have relied on average monthly traffic data for valuation in buying a Web site?
A. In purchasing a Web site? I don't know.
Q. Have you advised any buyers using that valuation method?
A. We have.
Q. Do you know if the sales consummated based on that valuation?
A. Again, I think we talked about this before, typically, once our report or valuation is provided, there's no more contact with the client after that.

So I have not seen in really any instance or case we've worked on what happens post report.
Q. And the same question, are you aware of any arm's-length investors that have relied on average monthly traffic data for the valuation?

Page 145
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: That relied -- well, again -BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Relied solely on average monthly traffic data for valuation?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Well, again, we've done work in this space, and I know that they used our report.
But I don't know what the outcome of the negotiation or transaction was.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. What the ultimate actual valuation was?
A. I don't know what they ultimately agreed to.
Q. In developing the market multiples, you looked to find comparable companies. Right?
A. We did.
Q. And as I understand the report, you
identified six companies. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. In the Bleacher Report. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. BuzzFeed. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Huffington Post?
A. Correct.

```
    Q. Ozy?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Grandparents.com?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And Yelp. Right?
    A. Correct.
        MR. BERRY: I'd like to now mark this
exhibit, which we'll mark as Exhibit }176
            (The document referred to was
            marked as Exhibit 176.)
BY MR. BERRY:
    Q. So Exhibit 176 are the five exhibits that
were attached to your report. Right?
    A. Correct.
    Q. And these were the exhibits that you had
expected to be there earlier in the day when we were
first looking at your report?
A. Correct.
Q. Turning first to Exhibit 3, this exhibit is titled "Valuation Multiple Per Monthly Unique User." Right?
A. That is the title, yes
Q. And it basically shows a summary of your work to get to the market multiples that we were talking about earlier. Right?
```
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A. That is correct.
Q. And for each company, there's several columns across the page.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. And you used the data in the first two columns there -- "Monthly Unique Users" and "Company Value" -- to end up calculating the monthly unique user. Right?
A. Multiple. The monthly --
Q. Sorry, yeah, monthly --
A. -- unique user multiple, yeah.
Q. Yeah, I apologize.
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. So one of these columns shows the company's value?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And that's -- it shows the value for each of these six companies. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. The next column right next to it says
"Valuation Date." That's the date that the valuation was effective. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And then there's the average monthly -- the
column says "Monthly Unique Users," but that reflects the average monthly unique users based on the preceding twelve months. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And I understand for a couple of these you didn't have data from Quantcast. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. One of them, I think, was Ozy in where you only had one month of data, or two?
A. Right. We did -- it was from Quantcast.
Q. Sorry. But you only had one month's worth, not twelve-month --
A. Right.
Q. -- average?
A. Right.
Q. And then for Huffington Post, the data wasn't available on Quantcast. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. So the column, then, that says "Monthly Unique User Multiple," the value under there is equal to the company's value divided by the number in the monthly unique user. Right?
A. Company value divided by monthly unique user's column, yes.
Q. And that results in the dollar value per

## monthly unique user. Right?

A. Correct.
Q. And so here in the -- that column, "Monthly

Unique User Multiple," the range is between $\$ 6.25$ and \$41.44. Right?
A. Correct
Q. The 6.25 is for BuzzFeed. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the $\mathbf{4 1 . 4 4}$ is for grandparents.com?
A. That is correct.
Q. And then going back to something I think you said earlier before the break, you then added these monthly unique user multiples for each company and divided by 6 to come up with the average monthly unique user multiple?
A. That's how you get an average, yes.
Q. And so, in this case, the average was \$19.34?
A. Per monthly unique user, yes.
Q. There was nothing else that you did to derive that 19.34 number. Right?
A. I didn't actually add them up and divide it
by 6. This was done in -- in Excel, so it's an Excel function, but it's the same exact arithmetic you would use to get to that, yes.
Q. Okay. Why did you calculate the average?
A. We will typically look to an average of a comp set when coming to an opinion of value, or if we're looking at a multiple -- if we're looking at any comps, then we would typically look at either an average or a median.
Q. And because there's only six, there's not much of a median here?
A. Because there's only six, we looked at an average rather than a median.
Q. Okay. So then for Gawker, you looked at the average monthly unique users before the video was posted for a twelve-month period. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And the video was posted -- I think we talked about this before -- on October 4, 2012. Right?
A. Can I -- can I look at the exact date? I don't want to say something incorrect on the record. I apologize.
Q. That's all right. I'll tell you that that's when it was posted.
A. All right.
Q. You can look, but --
A. I'm going to trust on you this one on the
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record here.
Q. All right. And so you looked at the
twelve-month period from October 1st, 2011 through
September 30th, 2012 -- right? -- to get the base number of Gawker's valuation before the video was posted?
A. Oh. For the twelve months prior to Octo- --

Septem- -- September 30th, 2012.
Q. Right. So you looked from October 1, 2011 through September --
A. September 30.
Q. -- 2012?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you recall what -- where you drew that data from? Was it from Quantcast?
A. Quantcast.
Q. And the way that you calculated that average was to add each month's average unique users and then divide by 12. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And if you'd look on Exhibit 4 of

Exhibit 176, the average that you got for that time period ended September 30th, 2012 was 11,989,092. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. You then looked at a monthly unique users for the twelve-month period preceding when the video was removed. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And it was removed in April of 2013. Right?
A. April 25th, I believe.
Q. Okay. That, I don't know. I don't have the correct date for it, but know it was in the month of April.
A. Can I just check really fast? I'd rather --
let's be specific. Right?
Actually, it's going to be right here.
April 25th, 2013.
Q. You have a good memory.
A. So do you.
Q. So you looked at the period, then, for
this -- the preceding twelve months of when it was
taken down, from May 1st, 2012 through April 30th
2013. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And for that, you also looked at the Quantcast data. Correct?
A. We got the data from Quantcast, yes.
Q. And, again, you calculated the average monthly number of unique users by looking at each
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month between that May of 2012 and April of 2013 and got the average. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And the average for that also is reflected on Exhibit 4 to your report, was $14,788,500$-well --578?
A. 578 . Yeah.
Q. So roughly 15 million --- $\mathbf{1 4 . 8}$ million?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Some period of time -- there's some period of time that overlaps between these two twelve-month periods. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. So both periods ended up counting the number of average unique visitors between May 2012 and September 30th, 2012. Right? Like, you looked at --
A. I'd have to draw it out, but there is a -there is a period of overlap.
Q. And that period was between May of 2012 and September 2012. Right?
A. Do you have a calendar? I can write it down. Does it -- is it pertinent to the next line of questioning, 'cause I -- if so, I'd really like to --
Q. Yeah, we could come back.
A. -- just make sure --
Q. Yeah.
A. -- you know.
Q. We will -- may well come back to it.
A. Sure. So we've got October 1, 2011 to

September 30th, 2012, and then here we've got May 1, 2012 to April 30, '13.

So, yeah, from May to September, May 1 to
September 30, and that's what you said?
Q. Correct.
A. Then you -- you have a good memory.
Q. But if -- both periods count those average uniques for that period of time. Right?
A. Both periods look at the same data for that -- from May 1, 2012 to September 30, 2012.
Q. Is that in any way double counting?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Why?
A. Well, what -- what are we double counting?
Q. Is it double counting those average unique users from that month in both periods? I mean, are you -- you're counting them in both calculations. Right?
A. Not -- I'm not sure what you're asking.
Q. You're using those same set of months in both each trailing twelve-month periods. Right?

Page 155
A. Data from May 1, 2012 to September 30, 2012 is used in the average, the trailing twelve-month average for both period calculations that we looked at, yes.
Q. And from your point of view, that doesn't present any problems. Right?
A. No.
Q. Then going back to your calculations for gawker.com, for each twelve-month period, you calculated the value of gawker.com by multiplying the average monthly unique users by the valuation multiples that you had derived from the comps. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. Does it matter that the valuation dates from the comps are different from the date that you were valuing Gawker?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. We have done studies to show that, over a period of time, that the multiples are not going to have -- in fact, it's typically a fairly flat line, especially when you're talking about such a close period of time as these. I mean, we're within a three-year range here on these comps, so it's a tight
enough range.
Now, if it had been thirty years ago, there probably wouldn't be Internet-based companies if we're talking about thirty years ago, but we might look to that as being a potential issue. But a three-year time frame is absolutely not an issue.
Q. So looking at Exhibit 4 to your report, the low end multiple, market multiple that you used was $\$ 6.25$ per unique user. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And the valuation using that multiple as shown on Exhibit 4, the valuation of gawker.com increased from almost $\$ 75$ million to more than $\$ 92$ million. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. So the change in valuation was a little bit more than $\$ 17.5$ million?
A. Correct.
Q. Flipping to Exhibit 5 to your report. You used the average market multiple again from the six comps that we looked at before. Right?
A. Right.
Q. And that average was the $\$ 19.34$ number?
A. That's correct.
Q. Right. And using that multiple, the
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valuation for Gawker increased from nearly $\mathbf{\$ 2 3 2}$ million to almost $\mathbf{\$ 2 8 6}$ million. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So the change in valuation over that period was over $\$ 54$ million using these valuations. Right?
A. The increase in value of gawker.com over that period, yes.
Q. Was over $\$ 54$ million?
A. Over 54 million, yes.
Q. So based on this analysis, if Gawker were to have an average of $\mathbf{1 8}$ million unique users each month, the upper end valuation would end up being like $\mathbf{\$ 3 5 0}$ million. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: If they had more users at that time?
BY MR. BERRY:

## Q. (Nods head.)

A. Then there would have been a higher valuation. I don't know the exact number, but yes.
Q. So for each additional unique user, you would add value equivalent to either $\$ 6.25$ cents or \$19.34. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. Could you total -- could you calculate the
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total estimated value of Gawker Media that same way
if you looked at all the different component
Web sites that we'd mentioned before, the deadspin.com, jezebel.com?
A. Yeah, I --

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know. I haven't -- I haven't looked at those, so I can't tell you that. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But based on the market approach that you've adopted with looking at market multiples of average monthly unique users, if Gawker Media owned a set of Web sites, you could get the total value of Gawker Media by aggregating the value of each of those Web sites. Correct?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, I don't know that it would be that simple. I don't know -- I don't know. I'd have to see it. I'd have to really do the analysis to tell you if that's true or not. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Why would it be more complicated than what you've done here?
A. Because I don't know if there --

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
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THE WITNESS: I don't know if there are users that are cross-pollinating between the Gawker Web sites. I don't know. So I -- it would be a different analysis, and I'd have to do that analysis in order to truly answer that question with conviction.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Could you look at any content-based Web site and look at valuation using the same market multiples?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Using these --
BY MR. BERRY:

## Q. Right.

A. -- market multiples?
Q. Right.
A. Potentially.
Q. Right. So if I wanted to know the value of any Web site for a period ending April 30th, 2013, I could use either of these two market multiples, either the 6.25 or the 19.34 , and come up with a value for the Web site?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'd have to see the specifics, but it is possible, yes.

## BY MR. BERRY:

Q. Would there be any reason that you'd use a different analysis for a content-based Web site than the one you used for Gawker?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, everything in valuation -- and I know we've touched on this -- but it's all context specific. So I -- it could be used, but to say a hundred percent that absolutely, I can't answer it that way.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Okay. And just to be clear, on these valuations that you did at gawker.com, that doesn't show how much money Gawker actually made. Right?
A. No. This is value, the value of gawker.com, not -- and remember, we -- revenue approach does not work for content-based Web sites like Gawker. This is not revenue. This is value.
Q. Right. So the value of gawker.com that you calculate here is not actual money in Gawker's pocket. Right?
A. Not unless they've sold it and put money in their pocket, no.
Q. Okay. And these valuations don't measure Gawker's revenue. Correct?
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MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Correct.
BY MR. BERRY:
$Q$. It doesn't -- these valuations are not
Gawker's profits. Right?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: This -- these valuations do not have anything to do with revenue or profits. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Right. All it does is estimates the market value of gawker.com. Correct?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: We are estimating the value of gawker.com using the market approach and using marke comparables.

## BY MR. BERRY:

Q. Right. And this would value what some arm's-length buyer would pay for Gawker at a particular moment in time. Right?
A. Correct.

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Do you know anybody who would pay
$\$ 286$ million for gawker.com as of April 30th, 2013 ? MR. VOGT: Objection to form.

THE WITNESS: Do I personally know anybody? 1 BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Yes.
A. I -- I haven't asked. I don't know.
Q. Do you know anybody who would pay
$\$ 92$ million for gawker.com?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I haven't gone out and marketed it and tried to sell it, so I don't know. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So you don't know if there's actually a buyer for gawker.com at this value. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I have not done that -- I have
not taken on that task, so I don't know.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. This is all hypothetical. Correct?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: This is, to a reasonable degree of certainty, what the fair value, the market value of gawker.com would be at two points in time, taking the difference in those two points in time, that increase, and apportioning it based on the traffic to the Hulk video. BY MR. BERRY:
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Q. As far as you know, nobody actually offered to buy gawker.com at these values. Right?
A. I don't know if they have or haven't.
Q. And, as far as you know, no one other than
you has valued gawker.com this way. Right?
A. I only know what I know. Unless you tell me that someone else has valued it, I don't know that they have.
Q. Okay. Would you recommend to somebody that they buy gawker.com for $\$ 286$ million as of April 30th, 2013?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: It depends on the
circumstances.

## BY MR. BERRY:

Q. Well, based on the circumstances of valuing
the company at $\$ 286$ million as of April 30th, 2013 , would you recommend that somebody buy gawker.com for that amount of money?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Who are we talking about
buying it?
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. An arm's-length buyer.
A. If there was --

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: - - an arm's-length buyer that came to me and said I want to by gawker.com, how much is it worth at April 30th, 2013, I would say that the value is between an upper end of 285.9 million and at a lower end, 92.479 million.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Would you advise that buyer to look at gawker.com's balance sheet?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: If -- it depends on what they're asking me to do.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. If you were valuing them to buy -- if you were advising them on whether to buy the company of not for the values that you've assessed it at, would you ask them -- would you suggest that they look at the balance sheet?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Typically, when a client comes to us and asks us for a value, we're not giving them legal advice on how to purchase it. It's strictly how much CONSOR, or Mr. Anderson, how much is the value? And I would tell them that the value at April 30th, 2013 is between, again, 92.479 million
and 285.938 million.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. When you were getting your MBA at San Dieg $p$ State, did they suggest to advise buyers on prices without looking at balance sheets?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know if there was any class that spoke about that.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Would you advise a buyer without knowing what the revenue of Gawker was?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm sure you would look at revenue as we looked at the revenue.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Would you advise a buyer to consider buying gawker.com without knowing what its profit was?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: We would look at profit, but that's not a -- again, that's not an -- an ultimate indication, a reasonable indication of value by looking at strictly profit or revenue. Sure, you'd look at it as we looked at it and I looked at it, but --
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But it didn't factor into your analysis here?
A. But if they're going to ask me what is a fair market value for this company, I would tell them, again, it's between 92 million and 285.938 million, rounding here.
Q. Do you know what kind of revenue multiplier these values would mean for Gawker?
A. I don't.
Q. And it doesn't matter in your analysis. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: It's -- it's not necessarily
pertinent to the analysis, no.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Would it matter to an arm's-length buyer?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Would what matter?
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. What kind of revenue multiplier they were looking at?

MR. VOGT: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: It could.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Would it matter to an arm's-length investor?
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MR. VOGT: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: It could.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. All right. Going back to Exhibit 4. And I think the analysis you did for Exhibit 4 and Exhibit 5 was the same, just using different market multiples. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So I'm just going to talk about Exhibit 4 and assume, other than the numbers, that the steps are the same that you went through. Right?
A. Sure.
Q. On Exhibit 4, there's a column labeled "Trailing 12 Month Average Monthly Uniques." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Here this shows, I think, what -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- where you compared the average monthly -- the number of monthly unique users --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. I lost some words
there. Would you mind starting over.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Looking at that column "Trailing 12 Month Average Monthly Uniques," you compared the average
number of monthly unique users for the two periods the one before the video was posted and the one that included the period of time that the video was posted. Right?
A. Before the period was -- before the video was posted and after --
Q. After.
A. -- it was posted.
Q. Correct.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you basically -- here you saw that there was an increase in those two numbers. Right?
A. Increase in -- there's an increase, and it's one number we're looking at, monthly -- trailing twelve-month average monthly means, that's one --
Q. Number.
A. -- number.
Q. That's right.
A. There was an increase in that one number at two periods in time.
Q. Right.
A. Okay.
Q. And they total -- the average monthly uniques increased from roughly 14.8 million from
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## almost $\mathbf{1 2}$ million. Right?

A. It went from just under 12 million to 14.7 million, yes.
Q. And so the change was roughly 2.8 million unique users over that period. Right?
A. Roughly, correct.
Q. And that -- going back to your conversation before, that increase in the number of average monthly unique users is what caused the increase in value that we were talking about. Right?
A. The value of gawker.com increased as a result of the increase in monthly unique user traffic, yes.
Q. Okay. And then your belief is that some portion of that increase in the monthly average unique users is attributable to the Hulk Hogan video Right?
A. That is correct.

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
MR. BERRY: What's the objection?
MR. VOGT: I don't know that it's his
belief. I have a problem with the word "belief." THE WITNESS: My opinion.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Your opinion is that some portion of that
increase - good catch - some portion of that increase in monthly average of unique users is attributable to the Hulk Hogan video. Right?
A. That is my opinion.
Q. Okay. And you then sought to determine what that portion that was attributed to the video was. Right?
A. We sought to determine it?
Q. Yeah. What portion of this $\mathbf{2 . 8}$ million was attributable to the Hulk Hogan video, that was the next step in your analysis. Right?
A. Right.
Q. And so on Exhibit 4, the next little chart, shows that there were $5,357,572$ unique page views of the video. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you divided that number by the length of time that the video was posted. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And the length of time that it was posted was 6.71 months?
A. Correct.
Q. And at that point, you concluded that an average monthly unique views of the video was 700 -was 798,821 . Correct?
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A. That is correct.
Q. And that accounted -- in the next part of that chart, that accounted for roughly 28.5 percent of the increase of Gawker's average monthly unique users. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you recall where the number $5,357,572$ came from?
A. I can tell you. That came from document 7

We'll use my -- the code -- came from GAWKER 01148.
Q. Okay.
A. Google Analytics.

MR. BERRY: All right. So l'm going to mark as Exhibit 177 what is referred to in your report at document number 7, which is Bates-labeled GAWKER 1148.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 177.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So this is the document that you looked at to derive that number. Correct?
A. Yes. This is pretty blurry, but, yes, this was it.
Q. Okay. And so this shows that the unique page views -- this shows that the unique page views
for this page on Gawker was this $\mathbf{5 , 3 5 7 , 0 0 0}$ number. Right?
A. 572 , yes.
Q. And this is -- your understanding that this is the number of unique views of the Hulk Hogan video?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that understanding is what your valuation analysis is then based on. Right?
A. Or the apportionment of the increase in value of gawker.com is based on the, we'll call it 5.4 million unique views of the video, yes.
Q. All right. Turning back to Exhibit 5 of the -- or, sorry, Exhibit 4 of the report. To then measure the value to Gawker attributable to the video, you multiplied the change in value for Gawker during this period that the video was posted by -sorry.

Let me start over.
A. Sure. Sure.
Q. Want to make sure that $I^{\prime} \mathrm{m}$--
A. No problem.
Q. To measure the value to Gawker attributable to the video, you multiplied the change in value for Gawker during those two twelve-month periods by the
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percentage increase attributable to the Hulk Hogan video. Right?
A. It's a lot there. I'm going to make sure we got this right. So I'm going to repeat it --
Q. Yeah, please do.
A. -- back in the correct way -- and not that it wasn't correct, but what we looked at was the percentage of that change in average monthly unique users from September on 30th, 2012 to April 30th, 2013. That percentage, 28.53 percent, we applied that percentage to the increase in value of just over 17.5 million to come to the value that was attributable to the Hulk video.
Q. Okay. So in Exhibit 4, what you're referring to is the last set of calculations here that shows the change in value from Gawker being 17.5 million?
A. Right.
Q. Multiply -- figured out what 28.5 percent of that was. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And the number that you arrived on the low end of the valuation was 4.995 million. Right?
A. Correct. Rounded.
Q. Rounded?
-
A. Rounded, yeah.
Q. On Exhibit 5 to your report, you did the same calculation but for the average market multiple. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And there, again, in the last part of this chart showed the change in value of Gawker was roughly 54 million. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you found what 28.5 percent of that number was. Right?
A. 28.53 , yes.
Q. And the value, then, attributable to the Hogan video at this level was 15.445 million, rounded. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. Again, this is not money that's in Gawker's pocket. Right?
A. No.
Q. No, it's not --
A. No, it is not in Gawker's -- unless there's something you want to tell me and they've sold the company, it's in their pocket, but.
Q. But this is just the valuation. It's not dollars that are flowing to Gawker. Correct?
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A. It's the value of gawker.com, right.

Well, the value of the video to gawker.com.

## Q. Right.

Wait, the value of the video to gawker.com or the --
A. How the --
Q. How it affected --
A. -- video affected the value of gawker.com.
Q. But it's not the value that Gawker would place on the video. That might be something different. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: It's the value that gawker.com that increased in value as a result of placing the video on gawker.com.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Okay. On this Exhibit 4 and 5, when it says "change attributable to the video," does that mean that the video caused the increase in value?
A. The video was a portion of the increase in value.
Q. Right. But the phrase "change attributable to the video," does that mean that the video caused the increase in value?
A. The video caused 28.53 percent of the
increase in value.
Q. How do you know that the video caused that increase in value?
A. Based on the traffic that went to the video.
Q. Do you know whether the increase in average monthly uniques was caused by some other factor other than the video?
A. Well, there --
Q. For -- sorry. For just -- for this 20 -sorry.

For the 28.5 percent that you said is attributable to the video, do you know whether that increase was -- might have been caused by some other factor?
A. The 28.53 percent increase is - it is the traffic to the video. There's no -- it's not a question or a hypothetical. It's -- it's a simple calculation. Right? We just walked through it. It is 28.53 percent of the increase in traffic.
Q. So --
A. So there's nothing else. It's the video, the traffic to the video. I mean, it's quite simple, actually.
Q. Okay. So you didn't look at any other factors of what might have contributed to that Page 177

## 28.5 percent number. Right?

A. I'm not sure what you're asking there.
Q. Whether there were other market conditions that caused the increase in traffic?
A. Again, the average traffic, the average monthly traffic increased from September 30 th, 2012 to April 30 th, 2013 by almost 2.8 million monthly unique users. That 28.53 percent, all that is is the actual traffic. This isn't a hypothetical. This is -- the actual traffic that went to the Hulk video is 28.53 percent of gawker.com's increase in traffic.
Q. Is this correlation or causation?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not sure --

## BY MR. BERRY:

Q. Well, I mean, you're correlating the increase in traffic to the Hogan video. You're not saying that it caused, are you?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Or are you saying that it's caused?
A. I'm -- I don't know how this -- I don't know that it has to do with this analysis here. I'm not sure what you're asking.
Q. The timing that you looked at, the two
timings, you noticed an increase in average unique users. Right?
A. There was -- from September 30th, 2012 to -I only looked at two points in time here.
Q. Correct.
A. So I want to just -- on the record. Right?

So between September 30th, 2012 and April 30th, 2013, yes, there was an increase in monthly unique user traffic, and the average over a trailing twelve-month period was roughly 2.8 million.
Q. And that increase was correlated to the time period that the Hogan video was posted. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: That increase was correlated to the time period that the Hulk video was posted? BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Yes.
A. I'm not sure how that factors into this. I'm not -- I'm not sure of the question.
Q. All right. Why don't we move on here.

Based on this analysis that you did for the Hogan video, could I look at the unique users for any post on gawker.com and figure out how much value that post added?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
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THE WITNESS: We could do an analysis of how much value each post added, sure.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. And you could walk through these same steps to determine that. Right?
A. I could do that.
Q. You basically would then -- you'd consider the number of unique viewers to a post as a percentage of the unique monthly viewers during a twelve-month period, and once you have that percentage, you could do the multiple using the market multiples you've come up with to assess the change in value -- right? -- attributable to a post?
A. I could do an analysis to figure out the value of a post.
Q. Okay. In your report on page 6 and page 7, I think, you talk about Google Trends?
A. Yes.
Q. And on report -- on page 6 of the report, you say that "Gawker benefited from the video by receiving more than 5 million unique page views."

Do you see that? It's just right under
"Google Trends."
A. Oh, down here. Yes.
Q. How are you defining page views? Is that
based on the document 7 that we looked at earlier?
A. Right, the number of unique page views of the video.
Q. Okay. Do you know how Google Analytics defines page view?
A. I believe I've seen a definition at one point in time, but do you have a definition you can show me?
Q. No, I'm asking do you know how Google Analytics defines page views?
A. I believe I've seen it. I could not repeat it back to you word for word right now.
Q. In looking at the Google Trends on page 6, you explain that "Google Trends measures search engine interest of a particular term over a period of time." It's at the end of that first paragraph.
A. That's correct.
Q. Explain what that means.
A. So Google Trends will track -- so we looked at the search term "Gawker," just "Gawker," not "gawker.com," just G-a-w-k-e-r, and it normalizes it.

So it takes the highest amount of search terms for "Gawker," for example, and then whatever that highest number is, it divides it by 100 . So you have a scale of 100 . And then it tracks in
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comparison to before and after at any point in time where the search term "Gawker" falls in comparison to the peak, the highest point of that search term.
Q. It, basically, then, like, if you look at -I think this is what you're referring to -- Figure 1 on page 7 ?
A. Yes.
Q. It essentially shows how popular search term
"Gawker" is on Google at different points in time.
Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's what Figure 1 shows is Gawker's popularity on Google as a search term over this length of time?
A. How many searches for "Gawker" were happening on Google.
Q. Other than print out this chart and look at it, did you do anything else to analyze Google trend data?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: There was -- no.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. How does the Google Trend data factor into your overall analysis of value to Gawker from postin the video?
A. This is strictly a reasonableness check, if you will, to show that the highest point in Google Trends. So the most search activity for "Gawker" occurred directly after the Hulk video was posted on gawker.com.

It's an indication that -- any time a search term has its highest, after some point in time, there's a -- there's an indication that there's something -- there's something of interest going on there. Potentially something of value.
Q. Right. So your belief, then, is that this shows a spike in search for "Gawker" when it published the Hulk Hogan sex tape. Right?
A. After it published the tape, correct.
Q. Off of Figure 1 here, there's a footnote $\mathbf{3 3}$ that refers to document 30 , which --
A. Go to my key here.

MR. BERRY: I would like to mark document 30 as an exhibit. And I think we're up to Exhibit 178.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 178.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Exhibit 178 is Google Trends data. This is what you referred to as document 30 in your report. Is that right?
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A. I believe so, yes.
Q. And at the top right-hand corner, there's an email address that's sort of cut off, but it refers to davidnoble08.

Is that the David Noble who helped you prepare your report?
A. That is.
Q. And what this -- well, wait, what does this chart show that is on Exhibit 178?
A. This shows us the data points that were used for our chart.
Q. The data points from Exhibit 178 , then, were folded into Figure 1 in your report on page 7. Right?
A. Right. You can actually download the data from Google Trends, so it's something that couldn't be printed. But, yes, these show the data points used for our chart. And our chart is more specific because we actually downloaded the daily or weekly units or data points.

MR. BERRY: Okay. I'd like to mark another exhibit here as 179.
(The document referred to was marked as Exhibit 179.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. This is a screen shot of Google Trends data that mirrors your chart, but I think is shown over a month period, over a longer time.

Do you see that?
A. I can't -.

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I can't read the dates on it.
But is it the --
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. The date's at the very bottom of the page.
A. I -- yeah, the date's underneath the graph.
Q. I think it's July 2012, January 2013, July 2013, January 2014, July 2014.
A. Okay.
Q. What this shows is the peak period that's reflected in Figure 1, the highest value for "Gawker" search term occurred from October 14th to October the week of October 14th through the $20 \mathrm{th}, 2012$.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know what occurred during that week?
A. No.
Q. Are you aware that that was the week that Hulk Hogan sued Gawker?
A. I --I don't know.
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Q. Okay. If that was the week that this spike occurred and not -- and it was almost two weeks afte the post, would that spike be attributable to the post?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, this is -- this is an indication that there's some interest in the video. This graph does not at all tie to the analysis or valuation that was done. So I don't know that that would have any effect at all. In fact, it would not have any effect at all.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. On your valuation analysis?
A. Correct.
Q. But it would reflect interest in "Gawker" as a search term on Google. Right?
A. Sure.
Q. As a -- somebody who's an expert in valuation, you could assess the value of a Hulk Hogar sex tape in different ways. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Not sure what you mean. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. A Hulk Hogan sex tape is either an intangible asset or intellectual property. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: It could be seen as that, yes. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Well, I mean, earlier you said it was one of those two things. Right?
A. It could be seen as that, yes.
Q. So if you were going to value that sex tape, you could do it in several different ways. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: If I was going to value the
sex tape?
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. That intangible asset.
A. I didn't value the sex tape.
Q. I'm asking you as an expert in valuation, if you were going to value the Hulk Hogan sex tape, you could do it in several different ways. Correct?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: There likely could be
several -- one or more than one way to do it. But, again, I was not asked to value the sex tape, so I don't know how exactly I would do that at this point in time.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Right. But you could use the market
approach. Right?
A. I would --

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: -- look at the income, cost, and market approach, and any derivations thereof of those approaches, and determine based on the context, the information available, what the appropriate approach to take would be.

But, again, I was not asked to do that, so I don't know specifically which approach would be taken for doing that.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Okay. Well, let's go through them.

For the cost approach, you would look at what it would cost to buy a Hulk Hogan sex tape. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: What it would cost to buy a sex tape? I'm not sure what you mean by that. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Well --

MR. VOGT: Counsel -BY MR. BERRY:
Q. -- how would you value the cost of a -- how would you value a Hulk Hogan sex tape using the cost

## approach?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
Can I just have a standing objection --
MR. BERRY: Yeah, yeah, yeah.
MR. VOGT: -- to all questions about valuing the Hulk Hogan sex tape?

MR. BERRY: Yeah.
MR. VOGT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: So how would I go about -BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Valuing the Hulk Hogan sex tape using the cost approach?
A. On a cost approach? Well, the cost approach takes into account what it actually would cost to develop that. So it would be, you'd be looking at production costs, actor costs, how much time would go into it. There's literally any number of variables that would have to go into it, and I don't know off -- off the top of my head how exactly we would go about doing that.
Q. How would you look at it from a market approach?
A. It would depend on the situation at hand.
Q. Would you look at the value of other similarly situated assets?
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A. You could look at other similarly situated assets.
Q. So you might look at the value added by other celebrity sex tapes?
A. That might be one thing to look at.
Q. You could look at how much value celebrity sex tapes have added to a particular company. Right?
A. What do you mean?
Q. Well, you look here at value that Hulk Hogan sex tape added to gawker.com. You could look and see what the value added to another Web site for posting a celebrity sex tape was. Right?
A. I suppose if there was information, you could look at that, but I -- I don't know without having actually done it.
Q. You could look at pornography sites as comps. Right?
A. I don't know the comparability of the Hulk Hogan sex tape and the pornography sites.
Q. But that's something you could do -right? -- to value?
A. If we're doing "could," I suppose anything could happen.
Q. You could -- if you were valuing something involving Hulk Hogan, you could use him as the common
denominator. Right?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: What do you mean by that?
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Well, here we're talking about a Hulk Hogan sex tape. Right?
A. Is that --
Q. Yes.
A. Where -- you --
Q. We're talking about -- we're talking about a

Hulk Hogan --
A. Yeah.
Q. - sex tape. Right?
A. Okay.
Q. So you could use as a common denominator in the market approach Hulk Hogan and see what value added Hulk Hogan is for a different medium. Right? MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: How would you do that?
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Well, see how much money folks made from using Hulk Hogan's likeness in other contexts. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: For a sex tape? I don't know
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that he's done another sex tape.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. No. To get the value of this sex tape, you might look at other contexts to see what the value is of Hulk Hogan. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'd have to see. It --
valuation is all context, and if you've looked at any of the CLEs we've given or any of the presentations or the articles we've written, I think many times throughout those, the books, context is everything when it comes to valuation.

So in your hypothetical here, I don't know.
I don't know because I haven't done it.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Well, in valuing rights of publicity -right? -- which you are a co-author of a book on now, right? -- how do you measure rights of publicity? What are different ways?
A. There are various measures.
Q. You might look at endorsement deals. Right?
A. You could look at endorsement deals, Twitter followers, Facebook likes. Any number of metrics.
Q. How might somebody have been paid to appear in a television show. You could look at that?
A. To do what?
Q. To assess their right of publicity, the value of the right of the publicity?
A. Depending on what the value of their right of publicity we're looking at for. It depends on the situation. It -- it depends. But you could, yeah.
Q. But in this analysis, you didn't look at the value that Hulk Hogan added to anything other than this gawker.com stuff. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: We were asked to look at how gawker.com benefited from posting the video, the Hulk Hogan video, on their Web site. So that's what we looked at.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So you didn't look at the value that was added to the Jimmy Kimmel show when he was on it one night. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I was not asked to do that. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. And you didn't look at the value he added when he was a host on American Gladiators. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: We were not asked to do that.

BY MR. BERRY:
Q. You didn't look at the added value to Viacom when his reality program was on VH1. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, we weren't asked to do that.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Do you know if any of those things were in the range of what you valued the increase in Gawker to here?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Having not done the analysis, there's no way for me to answer that question.

MR. BERRY: Why don't we take a quick break here.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record at 2:12.
(Recess taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the recor at $2: 25$.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Have you ever reviewed the gawker.com Web site?
A. I've been on the Web site, yes.
Q. Describe what kind of content's on the Web site.
A. Stories, photos, some videos. Some of it gossip related, some of it news related. General content stories.
Q. I want to talk to you about the comps that you selected here. Other than the six companies that you used as comps, did you consider any other companies?
A. Sure. We were -- we looked for as many as we could find.
Q. Which other companies did you look at?
A. So we started with a screening of thousands of Web sites and filtered it down based on -- there's three or four basic criteria that had to be met in order for them to be considered comparables for us.

One was they had to be a content-based Web site, so not an ECommerce or a subscription-based Web site that we talked about earlier.

Two, they had to generate revenues, the majority of the revenues through advertising.

Three, they had to have a publicly available valuation through a reliable source, so not just some article placed out there in the ether. It had to be through a -- a true valuation presented. And then they had to have accurate monthly unique user traffic data.
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So those four criteria had to be met. And these were the only six that met that criteria.
Q. Did you look at that over some period of time?
A. We went back as far as ten years looking for those, or more. I don't know -- in fact, to be honest, I don't know that we put a date filter on there.
Q. And when you ran this filter, what did you filter through? Like, did you -- were you using some database or how --
A. We use Capital IQ.
Q. What is Capital IQ?
A. Capital IQ, it's an $S \& P$ company, like S\&P 500, Standard \& Poor's. They -- it's an aggregator of financial data. They track transactions, mergers and acquisition. They have financial records. It's got a lot of information about businesses in general.
Q. And so the process that you went through is to ask Capital IQ for Web-based companies. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And then applied these four filters to them?
A. Not all four of those. They don't have a filter for monthly unique user traffic. We preferred
to use sites that had Quantcast data just because that's the -- we have information for Gawker from. So that was not a Capital IQ function.
Q. Hm-hm.
A. And neither is content-based Web site.
Q. Does it have a coding field for content-based Web sites in Capital IQ?
A. As I just said, content-based Web site is not --
Q. Sorry.
A. Yeah.
Q. Yeah. In Capital IQ, is there a coding field for Web sites?
A. I believe there's something for Internet-based businesses. I think it's called Internet-based, but it might be Web site. I don't remember off the top of my head.
Q. But you used that as the -- an initial filter?
A. Correct.
Q. And then from there, you made the draw on content-based Web sites looking at the ones that cam back?
A. Looking at them. If they were subscription based, then they were removed. And if they were
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ECommerce sites like Amazon.com, then obviously thos were removed as well.
Q. And I guess through Capital IQ, you were able to get publicly available valuation data?
A. Correct.
Q. And how did you determine whether the Web sites generated their revenue through ads? Was that through Capital IQ?
A. No. By looking at the Web sites and, if necessary, going through their -- if we had to look at a $10-\mathrm{K}$ or some filing or just -- most of the Web sites, they'll tell you how they generate their revenue.
Q. And these were the only six that came back?
A. That is correct. That met all four criteria.
Q. So you weren't able to look at any companies that weren't able to get financing. Right?
A. We -- say that again? I'm sorry.

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So, I mean, in screening through these
comps, if a company failed in its effort to get financing, you weren't able to look at that company. Right?
A. We only looked at companies that had a valuation, a publicly available valuation. So whether that's as a publicly traded company they have a valuation or if there was some round of financing or investment where there was a post-money valuation included, so those -- that's how we got the valuations.
Q. But you weren't able -- there were no weak performing companies that weren't able to get financing in this --

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. -- analysis?
A. I don't know if they're weak performing or exceptionally well performing and not getting the financing, but if the -- if there was a valuation that was made public, then we did not -- then obviously we couldn't use it.
Q. In your report, you wrote that each of those companies has a comparable Web site with similar monetization potential. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you believe that they have similar potential because they're all content-based Web sites that generate revenue from advertising. Right?
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A. I believe they have the same potential -potentially have the same monetization potential based on the fact that they are -- their value and ultimately their revenue is generated as a function of having unique users that go to their sites.
Q. But those users are only valuable to these companies to the extent that that translates into advertising revenue. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I think we talked about that before and that's not necessarily the case.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Do all content-based Web sites that generate revenue from advertising have similar monetization potential?
A. They potentially have the same monetization potential, sure.
Q. Why is that?
A. It's the future monetization potential. So it's the potential to convert those users into dollars later on through -- whether it's through advertising means or through some other means that -that we're not aware of or the owners of those sites are not aware of.

It's similar to -- you know, Facebook didn't
know how they were going to generate revenue and now they're generating revenue. So itt's -- it's the potential in the future to generate that revenue because you have a large user base.
Q. So the valuation of -- let me ask a different way.

The value of a reader or user of slate.com would be the same as usweekly.com. Right?

Like the monetization potential is the same.
Right?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know. BY MR. BERRY:
$Q$. Is the value of a reader -- under this similar monetization potential theory, would the value of a reader of vanityfair.com be the same as ESPN.com?
A. It could potentially. I'd have to look at the actual information and the circumstances to make an absolute determination on that, but it potentially could.
Q. The same for like babycenter.com and hollywoodreporter.com?
A. I'm not too familiar with those sites, so I can't answer that.
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Q. How about latimes.com and tampabay.com?
A. Possibly.
Q. But there are differences in users. Right? MR. VOGT: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What do you mean? BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Well, in advertising, some users are more valuable than others. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I've heard that that can be the case, yes. What specifically --
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So --
A. What specifically are you referring to?
Q. Well, let's talk about something. There might be differences in location of readers. Right?
A. For a newspaper?
Q. For a Web site.
A. Sure.
Q. Yeah, so somebody -- L.A. Times derives mor traffic from Los Angeles than the tampabay.com. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know. I'd have to look at that, but I'm not going make an assumption on
that.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Right, but --
A. It's possible.
Q. It's possible. But the readership of those places is -- of those Web sites is likely different based on location. Right?
A. It could be.

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: But I don't know.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. You also could have differences in readers
based on their interest. Right?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: You could.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So readers of like babycenter.com might be interested in pregnancy and parenting. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know what
babycenter.com is, but they could.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Are you -- are you familiar with the knot.com, the wedding?
A. I am.
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Q. Okay. So people who are interested in weddings would go to the knot.com. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Or people that are going to weddings. It's not just people that are having weddings but --
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But somebody who's interested --
A. -- it's possible.
Q. -- in weddings is going to the knot.com.

Right?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Interested in getting married?
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Interested in weddings.
A. Just weddings in general?
Q. Well, that's what you said. You might be going to a wedding, you might be getting married.
A. There's some -- yeah, there's some tie to a wedding, sure.
Q. But you're not going there to read celebrity gossip, are you?
A. I don't know if -- I don't know if the
knot.com has celebrity gossip on it.
Q. Readers of Hollywood Reporter are folks who 25
are interested in the entertainment industry. Right?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't read The Hollywood Reporter, so I don't know.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Okay. But different advertisers would value the knot.com differently based on the interests of the likely readers of that site. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: It's potential. It's
possible.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Right. So, I mean, but that's basically how advertising works. Like somebody who sells weddins dresses would advertise on the knot.com. Correct?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I -- presumably. I wouldn't know.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But they wouldn't advertise on ESPN.com?
A. I don't know.

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know if that's true or not.
BY MR. BERRY:
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Q. Advertisers try and target their ads to a particular market, don't they?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not an advertising expert, so I --
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But you're saying that Web sites --
A. Probably.
Q. -- content-based --
A. Probably.
Q. -- Web sites have simple --

THE REPORTER: Hold on. There is overtalking in the record and it will be reflected as such and it's getting a little bit worse. One at a time. Thank you.

MR. BERRY: You go first.
THE REPORTER: Somebody pick up with a question.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, go ahead, you go first. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Well, you're valuing -- you're saying that Web sites have -- content-based Web sites have similar monetization potential, but that's based on advertising revenue. But you don't know anything about how advertising works. Right?
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MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: No, it's not just based on advertising revenue. We talked about this.
It's -- advertising revenue is one part of that, but it's also the future potential which could be beyond advertising. So I just want to make that clear. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But the Web sites that you looked at as comps were all -- generated their revenue principally from advertising. Right?
A. Through advertising, yes.
Q. And the way that advertising works is that advertisers try and target their ads to specific markets. Right?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, I'm not an advertising expert, but that's my general understanding. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So they might target certain demographics. Correct?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: They could.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Right. So did you look at whether the comps
```
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are actually able to monetize their unique users?
A. What do you mean by that?
Q. Well, when you were looking at the comps, did you look at whether they were actually able to derive revenue from their unique users?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not -- I'm not sure how -let's look at the comps. So how would -- what specifically are you asking? I'm not -- I'm not -I'm not understanding the question. I apologize. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. For any - for a Bleacher Report, did you look at how it generates revenue from its unique users?
A. Well, all of the comps, as we discussed, generate revenue through advertising.
Q. Did you look at any of the comps' ad inventory?
A. Ad inventory? I don't have that data.
Q. Do you know what ad inventory is?
A. I don't even know what that is.
Q. Did you look at Gawker's ad inventory?
A. What is "ad inventory"?
Q. Do you know what kind of ads the comps use?
A. What kind of ads?
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Q. (Nods head.)
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you know what kind of ads Gawker uses?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you know what percentage of the comps' Web pages have ads on them?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you know what percentage of Gawker's Wel pages have ads on them?
A. No.
Q. Do you know how many ads per Web page the comps sell?
A. No.
Q. Do you know how many ads per page Gawker sells?
A. No.
Q. If you were actually interested in monetizing users, wouldn't that kind of information be relevant?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: If I was interested in
monetizing users, I'd -- I might want to know that, but I'm not here to monetize those users.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But in figuring out the potential, you'd
want to understand that data, too, no?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: The potential, again, is based on having a large unique user set. It's having -it's having those monthly unique users that gives you the potential.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Regardless of the users' demographics. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I have not seen any data that shows the demographics are that -- that much different.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Regardless of location of readers. Right? MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Readers regardless of what? BY MR. BERRY:
$Q$. The location of where most of your readers are?
A. What is regardless?
Q. The monetization potential.
A. Can you ask the whole question? I'm sorry.
Q. In your analysis, it's irrelevant where the location of readers are to a Web site's monetization

## potential. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: This analysis stands, yes, without that analysis that you're talking about. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So you didn't consider the demographic composition of the comps' users and looked to see if that was similar to Gawker's users, did you?
A. We considered demographics, but there was nothing to show that the demographics of the different comp sites we had based on the information we had would change our analysis at all.
Q. What did you look at to determine whether it would affect the valuation at all?
A. There was some demographic information on Quantcast we looked at.
Q. Right. And how did that factor into whether the value of Gawker would change?
A. It didn't. There was not sufficient information or evidence that there would be any change in our analysis based on the demographic information.
Q. So --
A. Can we take a break? I'm just going to shut this off.
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Q. Okay.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Let's go off the record at 2:41.
(Off the record.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record at 2:42.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So in your analysis, each unique user would be valued the same. Right?
A. In this analysis that I've done?
Q. (Nods head.)
A. Each unique user is the same, yes.
Q. And for these purposes, the value of a

Gawker unique user is assumed to be the same as a Bleacher Report user. Right?

I mean when you're looking --
A. No.
Q. -- at the comps.
A. No. That's not how we did it.

So we looked at -- if you go to page 13 of my report, Exhibit -- whatever exhibit it is, 1 -well, you know what exhibit it is. If you look at Figure 2, we're not saying it's the same as Bleacher because Bleacher Report has the 6.64 multiple. Right?
Q. Right, right. No, that's a fair point.
A. So not saying that.
Q. But on the low end, it would have the same as BuzzFeed. Right?
A. On the low end, yeah.
Q. And then on the average end, $i t$ ' $d$ have the composite --
A. The average --
Q. -- average?
A. -- of the 6 .
Q. Right.

Did you look at the distribution of visitors' income for the comps to see if they were the same as Gawker?
A. We did not.
Q. Do you see whether the average user of these

Web sites was wealthier than the average for Gawker
A. We did not.
Q. Did you look at the distribution of users' age for the comps to see if they were the same as Gawker?
A. We did look at some age demographics, yes.
Q. For which sites?
A. I believe Quantcast had information for Bleacher Report, grandparents.com, and Gawker. I Page 213 think those three.
Q. But that didn't factor into the analysis?
A. Well, we saw -- showed that there's no indication that age demographics would have any impact on the valuation. Therefore it was not a pertinent set of data to be used that would adjust our valuation in any way.
Q. Did you look at whether users' educational background for the comps was comparable to Gawker
A. We did not.
Q. For the comps, did you research how long each user spent on the site per visit?
A. Did not have that data.
Q. Did you research whether the users were people who regularly visited the Web site?
A. We did not have that data.

We did ask for Google Analytics data and Vastly data from your client, but we have not received any of that.
Q. Right. But for the --
A. So we'd have to see the data for Gawker in order to compare it to data from the comps. Otherwise, it's -- we're drawing a conclusion based on not having, to use your analogy, apples to apples. Right?

And so we asked for that data and if we receive it, I'd be happy to go back and reanalyze and reassess based on that data, but we haven't -- we haven't received it.
Q. Did you look on Quantcast to see what the distribution of each Web site's users were considered addicts?
A. I have not seen that, no. I did see
something I think on the pages you sent over on Thursday.
Q. Okay. But that was not considered in this analysis?
A. Not factored in.
Q. Did you consider whether the people who were visiting these Web sites only visited occasionally?
A. No.
Q. So you didn't look on Quantcast to determine if they were passers-by?
A. No.
Q. For the comps, did you research how users interact with the Web sites?
A. What do you mean?
Q. Whether they can post content?
A. No.
Q. Did you research how often they post
content?
A. No.
Q. Did you research how many users post comments on those sites?
A. No.
Q. For the comps, did you look at how long the companies had been in existence?
A. We did look at their -- the date that they were started, I believe.
Q. Did that factor into your analysis at all?
A. No.
Q. So did you consider whether a company was a startup?
A. No.
Q. Did you look at the specific kinds of content each of the comps posted?
A. I looked at the content of each of the sites, yes.
Q. Did you look to see if the kinds of content they posted were the same as Gawker?
A. They're all content, so I did look at the sites, yes.
Q. Did you see if the kinds of content that they posted was the same as Gawker?
A. I'm not sure what you mean.
Q. Well, earlier you told me, I think, that Gawker posts news, gossip, photos, videos. Did you look to see whether these comps posted those kinds of things?
A. Yes.
Q. Did they?
A. To some degree, yes.
Q. For the comps, did you look at whether the average monthly unique users were increasing?
A. We did look at historical information on user traffic, yes.
Q. Did you look at the rate of increase?
A. We did look at the rate of increase.
Q. Did that factor into your analysis at all?
A. Not to any effect of the conclusions we've reached.
Q. Did you compare the rates of increase for the comps to Gawker's trends for the number of user that were visiting gawker.com?
A. No.
Q. I want to go through some of the specific comps and talk about them for a couple minutes.
A. Sure.
Q. The Bleacher Report -- I think we'll just go through the order that they're discussed in your
report on page 12 and 13.
A. Okay.
Q. Bleacher Report is a sports media Web site.

## Right?

A. That's correct.
Q. So what kind of content does it post?
A. Typically sports-related content.
Q. Like what kinds of things?
A. They have articles on trades happening, recaps of games, stories on players. Maybe even some gossip on players, things happening. You know, anything really relating to sports.
Q. In August 2012, Turner Broadcasting System bought Bleacher Report. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And the value of that deal was

170 million -- or sorry. Yeah, the value of that deal was -- let me start over.

When Turner Broadcasting System bought Bleacher Report, the value of that deal was $\$ 170$ million. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. Were you involved in that transaction?
A. No.
Q. Did you look at any of the documents from
that transaction to see how that valuation was reached?
A. We did not have any information from that, no.
Q. Do you know whether it was reached through assessing average monthly unique users?
A. I don't have that information.
Q. So you don't know one way or the other?
A. I don't have that information.
Q. Do you know whether it was evaluated using
the income approach?
A. I don't know that.
Q. Did you look at Bleacher Report's balance sheet?
A. I did not.
Q. Did you look at its income statement?
A. I did not.
Q. Did you review any of its financials?
A. I don't believe we did, no.
Q. Do you know what its revenue was at the time it was sold?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you know what its profit was at the time it was sold?
A. I do not.
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Q. Do you know whether its valuation was based on an expectation of future growth?
A. I can't know that for certain, but I can I think safely say that most purchases are made with the understanding that there's going to be some future revenue or earnings generated from that.
$Q$. But you don't know one way or another with respect to Bleacher Report?
A. I don't have any details pertaining to that other than what's presented in my report.
Q. I'm going to be asking you some questions that refer to documents that are referenced in an Exhibit 3 to your report.
A. Sure.
Q. So if you want to grab that, we can go through the key, decoding all these things.

For Bleacher Report, the monthly unique data source was document 43. Right?
A. Yes.

MR. BERRY: I'd like to mark what I believe
is document number 43 as Exhibit 180.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 180.)
BY MR. BERRY:
$Q$. The document that is now marked as

Exhibit 180 is document 43 from your report?
A. It looks to be, yes.
Q. All right. If you turn to the page - the second page, this is a Quantcast printout concerning Bleacher Report data. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And this would show the average number of unique users over a period of time?
A. Yes.
Q. And the time period that you were looking at was the twelve-month period preceding August 2012 Right?
A. Right.
Q. On this chart, is it fair to say that there is a steep increase during that time period?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know if you'd call that a steep increase, but it's -- it looks to be increasing almost linearly.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Linearly, meaning upward?
A. Linearly, meaning in a straight line. I
mean, there's a slight -- a slight upwards curve to
it, but I don't know that I would call it exceptional.
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MR. BERRY: I'd like to mark as document Exhibit 181.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 181.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. This is a Quantcast printout from Bleacher Report that shows the time period from August 1, 2011 through July 30th, 2012, which is the same period that you looked at. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And how many unique visitors went to

Bleacher Report in August of 2011?
A. August, looks like 12,152,540.

MR. BERRY: Now, I'd like to mark as Exhibit 182.
(The document referred to was marked as Exhibit 182.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Exhibit 182 is a Quantcast printout showing the monthly unique users for that same period of tim with the data broken out for July of 2012.

What was the number of uniques in July of 2012?
A. Twenty -- just over 25 million.
Q. So in that twelve-month period, the number

```
of unique visitors to Bleacher Report more than
doubled. Right?
A. That's safe to say.
Q. You can set that aside.
A. All Bleacher Report ones?
Q. Yeah, we'll move on to BuzzFeed.
A. Okay.
Q. BuzzFeed is the second comp that you looked at. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. It's a media company that posts 700 pieces of content a day. Correct?
A. Sounds close to, yes.
Q. Well, that's what your report says. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. So is that right?
A. Sounds accurate and it looks accurate, so.
Q. Do you know how many pieces of content Gawker posts each day?
A. I don't know exactly.
Q. Have you ever been on BuzzFeed's Web site?
A. I have.
Q. What kind of content does it post?
A. Entertainment, social news, news. General content-related topics. Articles.
```
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Q. Do you know how long BuzzFeed has been in existence?
A. I don't know exactly how many years, no.
Q. According to the report, in August 2014, BuzzFeed received $\mathbf{\$ 5 0}$ million in funding in a Series E round of funding. Is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. What is a Series E round of funding?
A. It's multiple rounds of funding they must have had. And so this was a later round of funding where they raised 50 million in capital with a post money valuation of 850 million.
Q. And were you involved in that transaction?
A. No.
Q. And so after this funding, BuzzFeed was valued at -- I think this is what you said -- at $\$ 850$ million?
A. Post money valuation, yes.
Q. Did you look at any documents to see how that valuation was reached?
A. There was no documentation as to calculations or valuations done for that, no.
Q. Do you know whether it was reached through assessing average monthly unique users?
A. I don't know for sure.
Q. Do you know whether it was evaluated using the income approach?
A. That, I don't know.
Q. Did you look at BuzzFeed's balance sheet?
A. No.
Q. Did you look at its income statement?
A. No.
Q. Did you review any of its financials?
A. I don't think so, no.
Q. Do you know what its revenue was at the time?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you know what its profit was at the time?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you know whether its valuation was based on an expectation of future growth?
A. Again, I think that any purchaser is expecting it to grow and earn additional revenues and profits in the future, but I don't know for certain, no.
Q. For BuzzFeed on Exhibit 3, it says that your source for monthly unique data source was document 44. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

MR. BERRY: I'd like to mark as Exhibit 183
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this document that you're being handed.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 183.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Is Exhibit 183 document number 44 from your report?
A. Looks like it, yes.
Q. And the second page on there shows again Quantcast data. Right?
A. Right.
Q. And this data in page 2 is a chart that shows the number of unique users per month. Right*
A. Correct.
Q. And how would you describe the number of -the growth of unique users prior to the time of the valuation?
A. Prior to the time of valuation?
Q. (Nods head.) In the twelve-month -- sorry.

How would you describe the growth of unique users in the twelve-month period preceding the valuation?
A. So August 10 th. So pretty healthy growth.
Q. Did you factor that into your analysis at all?
A. No.

MR. BERRY: I'd like to mark as Exhibit 184.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 184.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. This is Quantcast data showing the average number of unique users from August 2013 through July 2014. That's the same period that you used?
A. I'm not seeing through July. I'm seeing August --

MR. BERRY: Right. Why don't we do it this way. I'll mark as Exhibit 185.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 185.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. This is Quantcast data. It's the same chart with monthly unique users broken out for July 2014. And 184 shows unique users as of August 2013.

Do you see that?
A. This 184 shows August 1 to August 30th, and 185 shows July 1 to July 30th, 2014.
Q. Right. It breaks out the data of unique users for those two dates. Correct?
A. Right.
Q. But the chart itself is the same. It shows the twelve-month period that you used in your
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analysis. Right?
It's a little hard to tell.
A. It's hard to tell, but I'm going to take your word for it. It looks about correct.
Q. Okay. So in August 2013, how many unique users did BuzzFeed have that month?
A. Almost 84 million.
Q. And looking at July 2014, how much did it have?
A. Almost 159 million.
Q. So it had almost doubled the number of unique users in a twelve-month period. Right?
A. Not quite doubled, but almost.

Are we done with that?
Q. Yeah, yeah.

Are you aware that BuzzFeed is the seventh-ranked site by viewers in the United States according to Quantcast?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I believe I might have seen
something to that effect.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Did that factor into the value of the site at all?
A. No.
Q. Other than the fact that they have just a large number of unique users, that would value into any -- that would affect any site's value. Right?
A. Sure.
Q. The next comp you used is
huffingtonpost.com. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. It's a media company that posts content to the Web as well. Correct?
A. It's a content-based Web site media company, yes.
Q. Do you know how many pieces of content it posts each day?
A. I don't.
Q. Have you ever been on that site?
A. I have.
Q. What kind of content does it post?
A. News, entertainment. I think they even have some sports, politics. General, you know, content regarding a lot of different topics.
Q. In March 2011, AOL acquired Huffington Pos for $\$ 295.9$ million. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Were you involved in that transaction?
A. No.
Q. Did you look at any of the deal documents for that transaction to see how the valuation was reached?
A. We did not.
Q. Do you know whether it was reached through assessing average monthly unique users?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you know whether it was reached through using the income approach?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you know whether it was reached based on an expectation of future growth?
A. Again, I think that the buyer is expecting there to be future growth, revenue and profit potential from it. But I don't know for certain.
Q. Did you look at Huffington Post's balance sheet?
A. I do not.
Q. Did you look at its income statement?
A. No.
Q. Did you review any of its financials?
A. No.
Q. Did you know what its - do you know what its revenue was at the time of the sale to AOL?
A. I do not have that information in front of

|  | Page 230 |  | Page 232 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | me. | 1 | page. |
| 2 | Q. Do you know what its profit was? | 2 | A. Yes. |
| 3 | A. I do not know. | 3 | Q. So in that -- in the time period following |
| 4 | Q. Based on your report, I understand the data | 4 | the purchase, the number of unique users to |
| 5 | about Huffington Post's monthly unique users was not | 5 | Huffington Post more than tripled. Right? |
| 6 | available on Quantcast. Right? | 6 | A. That's correct. |
| 7 | A. Correct. | 7 | MR. VOGT: Objection to form. |
| 8 | Q. And so you used an article from | 8 | BY MR. BERRY: |
| 9 | Business Insider? | 9 | $Q$. The next comp that you used was ozy.com. |
| 10 | A. That is correct. | 10 | Right? |
| 11 | Q. Did you do anything to verify the numbers | 11 | A. Yes. |
| 12 | that were reported in Business Insider? | 12 | Q. And that's a media company that posts |
| 13 | A. Business Insider has been a fairly reputable | 13 | content to the Web. Right? |
| 14 | source. We've used it before. And so we took their | 14 | A. That's correct. |
| 15 | -- their monthly unique user data at face value. | 15 | Q. Have you ever been on that site? |
| 16 | Q. But you did nothing to verify it? | 16 | A. I have. |
| 17 | A. We looked on Quantcast, but that information | 17 | Q. What do you -- what kind of content does it |
| 18 | was not available there. | 18 | post? |
| 19 | Q. And so you didn't do anything to verify the | 19 | A. News. Current events. |
| 20 | number that was reported by Business Insider? | 20 | Q. Do you know how many posts it does a day? |
| 21 | A. I'm not sure how we would verify it. We, | 21 | A. I don't. |
| 22 | again, took the information from Business Insider | 22 | Q. Do you know anything about the company? |
| 23 | that we find to be a reputable source and used it. | 23 | A. Other than that they had a transaction and |
| 24 | Q. Okay. And in that Business Insider | 24 | when they started, no. |
| 25 | report -- well, actually, why don't we -- in -- I'll | 25 | Q. Do you know when it started? |
|  | Page 231 |  | Page 233 |
| 1 | show you the document. We'll do it this way. | 1 | A. Actually, I just -- I don't know exactly the |
| 2 | On Exhibit 3 for monthly unique data source, | 2 | date that it started. |
| 3 | it points to document 13? | 3 | Q. Do you have an idea? |
| 4 | A. Correct. | 4 | A. I don't. |
| 5 | Q. Which is that Business Insider article. | 5 | Q. Do you have a sense of whether it's a |
| 6 | Right? | 6 | relatively new Web site? |
| 7 | A. I'll look, but I'm -- | 7 | A. It's fairly new, I believe. |
| 8 | Yes. | 8 | Q. Do you have any sense of how new? |
| 9 | MR. BERRY: I'd like to mark that as | 9 | A. I don't. Sometime last year maybe. |
| 10 | Exhibit 186. | 10 | Q. Do you know what its projected ad revenue |
| 11 | (The document referred to was | 11 | is? |
| 12 | marked as Exhibit 186.) | 12 | A. I do not. |
| 13 | BY MR. BERRY: | 13 | Q. Do you know whether it projects to have |
| 14 | Q. All right. So at the bottom of the first | 14 | future revenue streams other than advertising? |
| 15 | page -- sorry. | 15 | A. I do not. But that would be the potential |
| 16 | Exhibit 186 is document 13 that's referred | 16 | future monetization. |
| 17 | to in your report. Is that right? | 17 | Q. In March 2014, Ozy received $\mathbf{\$ 2 0}$ million in |
| 18 | A. Yes. | 18 | funding. Right? |
| 19 | Q. On the bottom of the first page I think is | 19 | A. Yes. |
| 20 | the sentence that we were talking about. It says: | 20 | Q. Were you involved in that transaction? |
| 21 | "Its audience has more than | 21 | A. No. |
| 22 | tripled from 25 million people | 22 | Q. And at the time of that transaction, it was |
| 23 | before the AOL deal to 84 million | 23 | valued at \$120 million. Right? |
| 24 | at the end of October." | 24 | A. Post money valuation of 120 million, yes. |
| 25 | Do you see that? It runs on to the next | 25 | Q. Did you look at any of the documents in tha |
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transaction to see what that valuation was based on?
A. We did not have that information, no.
Q. Do you know whether it was reached through assessing average monthly unique users?
A. I do not have that information.
Q. So you don't know?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you know whether it was reached by evaluating the income approach?
A. I do not know.
Q. Do you know whether the valuation was based on expectations of future growth?
A. Again, I would assume that a purchaser of that is going to expect there to be future growth potential for revenue and earnings, but I don't have that information.
Q. Did you look at Ozy's balance sheet?
A. I did not.
Q. Did you look at its income statement?
A. I did not.
Q. Did you review any of its financials?
A. I did not.
Q. Do you know what Ozy's revenue was at the time of this funding?
A. I do not know.

## Page 235

Q. Do you know what its profit was at that time?
A. I don't know.
Q. For Ozy, according to Exhibit 3, footnote 2, you only had one month of unique user visitor data available. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that was from October 2014. Is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. You don't know what the unique user data was for prior months. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. On Exhibit 3, it says that the source for monthly unique data was document 47. Do you see that?
A. I do see that.

MR. BERRY: I'd like to go ahead and mark that as Exhibit 187.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 187.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Exhibit 187 is document 47 that you refer to in your report?
A. That's correct.
Q. And this document was printed on January 21st, 2015. Right?
A. Right.
Q. So this shows monthly uniques of -- that's less than -- sorry. Sorry.

That was roughly three months, give or take, after the - three to four months after the funding that it received?
A. Well, the valuation date was March 31 st, 2014, so October would be seven months later.
Q. Okay. Sorry. My question was not either correct or well stated. Let me ask the question I meant to ask you.
A. Sure.
Q. This document was printed in January 2015. Right?
A. That's what the date says.
Q. Excellent. All right. So this was three months after the data was obtained for October 201 that you used in the calculation of average monthly uniques for Ozy. Right?
A. Almost three months.
Q. And at that point, Ozy had roughly 5 million monthly unique users. Right?
A. Right. And by --
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Q. In October, two thou- --
A. In October, correct.
Q. Correct. So if you flip to the second page of Exhibit 187, by the end of December, it had what looks to be at roughly 9 million. Correct?
A. Approximately, yes.
Q. Again, that's slightly less than -- it's
almost doubled the number of unique users between
October and December. Right?
A. Not quite doubled, but.
Q. 80 percent increase or so?
A. About.
Q. For each of those first four comps that we were talking about -- Bleacher Report, BuzzFeed, Huffington Post, and now ozy.com -- do you know wha kind of ads any of them post?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you know the value of the ads that those companies post?
A. What do you mean by that?
Q. How much revenue per ad those companies generate?
A. I do not have that information.
Q. The fifth company you used was grandparents.com?
Q. What is comparable between grandparents.com and gawker.com?
A. They're content-based sites. They have stories, articles. They drive readers. They have users that go to their site in order to absorb
Q. Grandparents.com, according to your report, serves the age 50 -plus demographic market. Right?
A. That's what grandparents.com states, yes.
Q. In reality, though, don't most of grandparents.com's users, aren't their ages even
A. They're actually even younger.
Q. Where is that data from?
A. From Quantcast.
Q. Do you have that available?
A. I don't have it in front of me.
Q. Is it something that you relied on?
A. It's something that I-- again, I think we mentioned this earlier, that we looked at the demographics data of the three sites that Quantcast had information for -- so that was Gawker,
grandparents.com, and Bleacher Report -- and the grandparents.com demographics, according to the data on Quantcast, actually, it skews fairly young.
There's actually a large position of that that's under 18 years old.

So that's why there was no information in that demographics data that we reviewed that showed that demographics would have any effect on the analysis or valuation that we did.

MR. BERRY: I'd like to mark as Exhibit 188.
(The document referred to was marked as Exhibit 188.)
Q. This is a Quantcast report for grandparents.com that was printed on March 19th that shows the distribution of unique users between January 2014 and December of 2014 with the number for December 2014 broken out separately?
A. I didn't give this to you.
Q. I'm sorry. Off of Quantcast about grandparents.com.

If you turn to page 2, the top left-hand corner, there's data about the demographics of grandparents.com that shows the age distribution. Do you see that?
Q. Is that the distribution that you looked at when you said that it skews younger?
A. No, that's an index. That's different. I actually looked at data -- it's on Quantcast -- that shows the percentage of users that go to grandparents.com. So what percentage of each of these age groups are made of and that's the data I was referring to. It was actually a very large portion of the under 18 segment, I think it was -- I don't want to guess, but the data was on Quantcast.

You have to click a little box. I think maybe even the "See More" box right there, I'm not sure there's a box, you click it and it drops down, and then it gives you percentages of each of the demographics. That's the data that I looked at.
Q. And what does this data here show?
A. This is an index, so it just shows that -I'm not sure how they're indexing it, to tell you the
truth. I haven't seen this before.
Are we done with this one?
Q. For now.

You've been to the grandparents.com Web
Q. What kind of content does it post?
A. Again, there's stories, articles. Content to be read by the user base of grandparents.com.
Q. So what kind of content? What kind of
A. I don't remem- -- I'm not going to guess the exact stories, but I looked through four or five or six different stories that were on there,
Q. Were they the kind of stories that you'd also see on gawker.com?
A. I don't know if you would or not.

MR, BERRY; I'd like to mark this as
(The document referred to was marked as Exhibit 189.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Exhibit 189 is a printout of the home page
of grandparents.com.
A. Okay. Well, off of Quantcast.
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| Q. Do you know where it got the information on any of the transactions that we talked about for those four companies? <br> A. Again, probably from public filings of those <br> companies or of the investors that are investing into <br> those companies or Wcb sites. Q. But you don't know - you don't have a |  |  | A. That's -- appears to be correct, yes. Or I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | don't know when it was printed. |
|  |  |  | Q. Well, it says at the bottom left-hand |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Date Created"? |
|  |  |  | Q. -- "Date Created"? |
|  |  |  | A. Yeah, I'm not sure what |
| - specific knowledge for these four companies where |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Q. If you look on the side of that chart, it |
| - | the printouts that you used? |  | hows the total enterprise value under |
|  | A. I don't know specifically where S\&P Capital |  | Capitalization"? |
| - | IQ pot that information, hut Capital IQ and S\&P is |  |  |
|  | of the most reputable data sources when it comes |  | total enter |
| - | ation like this, and we -- we have to, and a |  | 27,260,000. Right? |
|  | licly com- -- public companies that use |  |  |
|  | P Capital IQ for information, have to rely on theii |  | Q. So assuming this was printed on Decen |
|  | data. It is -- it is sound data.) |  | 3rd, the value increased 10 percent in eight days? |
| - | Q. Okay. Sorry for the liftle detour there. I |  | A. No. That's -- that information is not quit |
|  | meant to ask you carlier. |  | for the total enterprise value. |
| - |  |  | You see, they're mixing data from multiple |
|  | Q. Going back to grandparents.com and |  | points throughout the year. The reason we use |
| - | S\&P Capital IQ, so document I-Exhibit 190 show |  | December 31st, 2014 for our value of grandparen |
|  | that the valuation as of December 31st, 2014 was |  | is because that's using --keeping an apples and |
|  | roughly \$31.3 million. Right? |  | tak |
|  |  |  | ation from December 31st and comparing i |
| $\square$ | you familiar with Yahoo Finance? |  | ormation from December 31st. |
|  |  |  | he reason we didn't use this date or Marc |
|  | Q. What is Yahoo Finance? |  | as I believe you're going to show me with the |
|  | A. It's a Web site that has financial |  | Yahoo Finance infornation, is because they're mixi |
|  | infornation on publicly traded companics, |  | old information with current information. So current |
|  | commodities, stocks, financial-related information. |  | markel cap with old debt and cash information, so |
|  | Q. Is the information on there reliable? |  | doesn't give you an accurate picture of the true |
|  | A. If can be, yeah. |  | terpise value |
|  | MR. BERRY: Before we get to Yahoo |  | So by looking at it at December 31st, 2014, |
|  | want to mark as Exhibit 191 |  | we're comparing apple data to apple data. |
|  | S\&P Capital IO. |  | Q. And what - explain to me what information |
|  | (The document referred |  | available on December 31st that wouldn't |
|  | , |  | orrect on December 23rd? |
|  | Y MR. BERRY: |  | A. Well, companies file $10-\mathrm{Ks}$ at the end of |
|  | Q. And this I believe is document 23 in your |  | their fiscal year, and so you're going to have |
|  | report if you look at page 13 of the report -- |  | accurate -- and it takes time for companies to make |
|  |  |  | eir filings. Typically, you know, a couple months |
|  | Q. - in footnote 57. |  | or so. And so their December 31 financials will be |
|  | A. Footnote 57 is document 23, the codex |  | mplete a couple months later. |
|  |  |  | So in the March data -- or December data |
|  | Q. Okay. So this was another document fr |  | here, they're likely using different debt and cash |
|  | \& P Capital IQ that you looked at. Right? |  | information to come up with their enterprise value |
|  | A. That's correct. |  | calculation than they would, it -- so they're using a |
|  | Q. All right. And this was printed on |  | diflerent date for some information than other |
|  | December 23rd, 2014. Is that right? |  | information. Whereas if you look at the December |
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| gossip, but there could be in the reviews on Yelp. <br> Q. Do you know what kind of ads Yelp posts? <br> A. I do not know. <br> Q. Do you know the revenue that's generated by individual ads on Yelp? <br> A. Total aggregate revenue? <br> Q. Aggregate, individual, any way? <br> A. I don't have the exact number, but I know <br> that it's -- 95 percent of revenue is derived from <br> Q. But do you know for any individual ad what <br> Q. Yelp has roughly a hundred million average <br> monthly unique users. Right? <br> Q. And that's more than six times as many <br> monthly uniques as Gawker has. Right? <br> A. And about the same as BuzzFeed, yes. <br> Q. Right, but does that affect valuation? <br> MR. VOGT: Objection to form. <br> THE WITNESS: There was no indication that <br> the monthly unique user base or the size, whether it's a million or a hundred million, had any effect | Q. So what other variables did you use in attempting to do a regression analysis? <br> A. We just looked at monthly unique users compared to the multiple, the monthly unique user <br> Again, there's only six. You really need to <br> have more to do a true statistical analysis of it. <br> So the point was there was not any -- there was not <br> sufficient information to show that the size of the <br> company or the Web site based on monthly unique user <br> traffic would have any effect on the valuation or on <br> our analysis that we did. <br> Q. Through Yelp, an advertiser could reach mor <br> people than through Gawker. Right? <br> MR. VOGI: Objection to form. <br> THE WITNESS: Based on the monthly unique <br> A. That could be inferred from that. <br> Q. Right. So -- <br> A. And about the same as BuzzFeed. <br> Q. Right. Do you know whether Yelp has been around - Yelp and BuzzFeed have been in existence for the same amount of time? |
| :---: | :---: |
| on the monthly unique user multiple. BY MR. BERRY: Q. What did you look at to come to that A. We tried to run a regression analysis, but there's insufficient data to show that there's any statistical inferences that can be made from that. In other words, the - the results came back as null, that there was nothing that could be shown from it. So you couldn't say that a larger amount of monthly unique user traffic generates a higher or lower multiple or vice versa. There was insufficient data to prove that, just to show that it didn't really have an effect on it. Q. In the regression analysis, were you only looking at these six sites and Gawker? Q. What other factors did you use in the Q. regression analysis? A. What do you mean? Q. Well, what other -- well, when you run a regression analysis, you're looking at different variables to see what the effect is on sum total here valuation. Right? | A. I don't know the exact dates that they <br> Q. Do you know whether anything has happened a <br> BuzzFeed over the past several years that would <br> affect its valuation? <br> MR. VOGI: Objection to form. <br> THE WITNESS: They received an investment. <br> I don't -- other than that, I don't know. <br> Q. Yelp is a publicly traded company. Right? <br> Q. And so its valuation changes each day as its <br> stock price changes. Right? <br> Q. Yelp also is one of the largest Internet companies in the country. Is that right? <br> A. It's a large company. Large Web site. <br> Q. It's in the top ten most visited Web sites according 10 Quantcast. Is that right? <br> A. It's a - it's a popular Web site. I don'1 <br> Q. The paint is -- <br> A. -- it's top ten. I--I don't remember <br> seeing that data. <br> Q. Do you know whether Yelp's valuation changes |
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at all based on any single post?
Q. Do you know whether the unique views for any
post affects Yelp's valuation?
Q. Do you know how many different pages there

Can we take a quick break?
Q. Yeah, why don't we take a break. It's actually a good time.
(Recess taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record at
Q. So shifting gears, during the break, I asked you to take a look at Exhibit 177, which is this Gawker 1148 which shows the page views to the Hulk Hogan video.

Do you have that in front of you now?
Q. Okay. This is the page that shows that the number of unique views for the Hogan post was 5,357,572. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Do you know how those views translated into revenue for Gawker?
Q. Do you know whether those views translated into profit for Gawker?
Q. Do you know whether this post had any advertising on it?
Q. Do you know whether gawker.com actually monetized these unique views?
Q. This page also shows the distribution of when those views occurred. Right?
Q. These views didn't happen over a 6.71 -month period, did they?
A. They did.
Q. Nearly all of them occurred in October 2012.
A. Most of them, but they did occur -- there were still small amounts that happened over that 6.71-month period.
Q. Right, but they -- I mean, nearly all of them occurred in October 2012. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Nearly all of them? I'm not going to say nearly all of them. A lot of them. More occurred in that first month than in the latter

BY MR. BERRY:
Q. In the latter months, is there even an uptick on the chart that's Exhibit 177?
A. An uptick? There's -- it's -- it's
Q. Through October, it's declining. And then from November on, is there even any uptick in the number of views?
A. I think the scaling of this graph here is going to make it difficult to say if there's any uptick. Even if that's going from ten views to twenty views, there would be an uptick, but you're not going to see that given the scaling of this
Q. That's 'cause it shows that there were almost 5 million page views -- right? -- at the beginning October?
A. About 5 million, so you're -- to cut down this, we're about a -- what? -- an inch of a graph here to show something like only a hundred page
views, it's not going to show up as a tick on -because of the -- I mean, you understand 'cause the size of this graph. Right?
Q. The distribution that's shown on Exhibit 177 is different than your -- the assumption you used in the calculations in your report. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: The distribution over time?
Q. Of views, yes.
A. The -- the aggregate number of views is the same. And the distribution arithmetically makes no difference for our analysis.

The reason we had to do it as an average over that time period is because this was the only information that I think you or Gawker presented to us on the Google Analytics and we don't have the specific data points for cach of the months. But, again, arithmetically, it makes no difference to the
Q. Do you know that that's the only information we provided, or was that the only information provided to you?
A. About unique views?
Q. (Nods head.)
A. There might have been some other information. It would be on my doc list. Do you have --
Q. No, but you had said that's the only information that we provided.
A. I --
Q. We -- is that the -- do you know that to be that Gawker only provided that data or did Plaintiff's attorney only give you that data?
A. I don't know the answer to that.
Q. Okay. So it may have been that Plaintiff's attorneys only gave you that data?
A. Again, I don't know that.
Q. But it's fair to say that the distribution
of unique views was not evenly distributed over 6.71 months. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So there were not 798,000 -some-odd people -unique visitors to this page each month over that six-month period. Right?
A. On average, there was.
Q. Right. But nearly all of those unique views happened in month 1 in October 2012. Correct?
A. Nearly --

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
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THE WITNESS: Nearly all again, that -- a
lot. The most views happened in that first month that it was posted.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Do you have any reason to think that the unique users from the Hogan post continued to visit Gawker again?
A. According to Mr. Denton -- I'm going turn to a quote on page 11 of my report.

According to Mr. Denton -- he's talking
about monthly unique users -- he says, "This is the figure" -- and it's in bold. We bolded it:
"This is the figure that
journalists cite when judging a
site's competitive position. It's
also the metric by which
advertisers decide which sites they
will shower with dollars. Finally,
a site with plenty of genuine
uniques is one that has good growth
prospects. Each of those
first-time visitors is a potential
convert."
So I think in Mr. Denton's own words, they are potentially converts to the site.
Q. Right. He wasn't talking about the Gawker posting of the Hulk Hogan video, was he?
A. Well, his --

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: -- next quote that we have in here refers to what I believe to be posts such as the Hulk video. So he says -- again, this is Mr. Denton:
"Most of the stories that
resonate are also stories with high
page views -- with the flames that
everyone so prizes -- you have to
be even more original, even more
provocative or even more of a
hustler than usual."
So I think there, he is speaking to posts such as the Hulk video.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But was he actually talking about the Hulk Hogan video?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: In those quotes?
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Correct.
A. Speaking directly to the Hulk video?
Q. Yes.
A. I don't know what specifically he was speaking to. I just know that those are his words.
Q. Right. That was published on January 5th, 2010?
A. Okay. So then it's not in relation to the Hulk video.
Q. Right. And what he said I believe was that they had the potential to become regular viewers.
Right? Or something to that effect?
A. Each of those first-time visitors is a potential convert.
Q. Do you know if any of the unique users for the Hogan post was a convert?
A. Again, based on Mr. Denton's own words, I have to assume that they were hoping that they were converts. And, again -- I think we talked about this hours ago, but we asked for Google Analytics data and for data from Vastly from your client and I don't believe we have received that yet unless there's something that I haven't been shared.
Q. Right, you didn't ask for it. This is
between the plaintiff's counsel and us and the court Right?

Yeah, I mean, he has only --
A. I don't know --
Q. -- one way -- one way or the other to know whether that data is provided or whether the court ruled it to be relevant or irrelevant. Right?
A. I haven't seen that data.
Q. And, again, you have no reason to know one way or another whether any unique viewer of the Hogan post continued to be a viewer of gawker.com?
A. There's no way without that information that we asked for to know if that's true or not.

However, from a valuation perspective, the data that they're going to take -- again, to use Mr. Denton's words, "This is the figure" -- so he's talking about monthly uniques, monthly unique users:
"This is the figure that
journalists cite when judging a
site's competitive position. It's
the metric by which advertisers
decide which sites they will shower with dollars."
So what happens is, these sites present
their monthly user traffic -- unique user traffic
data to potential advertisers -- again, this is
Denton's words, not mine -- and that's how the advertisers decide who they're going shower with dollars.
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Q. But you've never worked in the Web site advertising business. Right?
A. I'm not an advertising expert. I have not worked in that business. You're correct.
Q. And you've never gone to an advertiser to try and get them to advertise on a Web site, have you?
A. I have not.
Q. And you've never talked to Nick Denton before, have you?
A. I don't think so, no.
Q. And you have no idea how gawker.com deals with its advertisers, do you?
A. All I know is what the quote says from Mr. Denton.
Q. Right. But you don't know how gawker.com deals with its advertisers, do you?
A. I don't know their specific conversations or negotiations, no.
Q. Do you have any reason to think that the unique users for the Hogan post had not visited Gawker before?
A. I have no -- there's no indication one way or the other without additional data.
Q. So there may have been people who had
visited the site before. Right?
A. They could have been.
Q. And they could have also been people who hadn't visited the site before. Right?
A. They could have been.

MR. BERRY: I'd like to mark as Exhibit 193. (The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 193.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Exhibit 193 is a Quantcast report for gawker.com showing the period from October 2011 through September 2012.

This is similar to, I guess, data that you looked at?
A. I believe we looked at data similar to this, yes.
Q. Okay. Looking just at the period between

May 2012 and the end of September 2012, how would you describe the trend of unique users?
A. May -- so is May following this -- April,

May, June. Okay. So these are one-month periods?
Q. Hm-hm.
A. So, I'm sorry, what was your question again?
Q. How would you describe the number of unique users during that period?
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A. May through and, I'm sorry again, what was the last month?
Q. September, the last month on here.
A. It's increasing.
Q. On the chart, it's the highest rate of increase of any of this period. Right?
A. I would have to calculate that. I don't know if the October -- the October to October, whatever that first month is, that's fairly steep. I'd have to calcu- -- I'm not going to say it's the highest. I can't do that. I'm sorry.
Q. But in aggregate number of users, it's a the largest increase?
A. In aggregate?
Q. Yeah, the aggregate average over --
A. Over the seven-month period or six-month period, whatever?
Q. Yeah, between May and September.
A. It looks to be the largest aggregate increase.

MR. BERRY: I'd like to mark as 194. (The document referred to was marked as Exhibit 194.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. What Exhibit 194 is, is Quantcast data
showing average monthly unique viewers of gawker.com
from October 1st, 2011 all the way through April 2013, which is the total period of time that you were looking at in your report.
A. Okay.
Q. Right. You had broken it into two separate twelve-month periods, but this shows the entire series of months.
A. Okay.
Q. In May 2012, how many unique viewers were there at gawker.com?
A. Looks like 7.5 million in the United States.
Q. And that way -- you were looking at the U.S. number when you were doing uniques?
A. We were looking at global, I believe.

MR. BERRY: I'd like to show you what's
marked as -- what we'll mark as Exhibit 195.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 195.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Are you sure that you were looking at global?

MR. VOGT: Objection.
THE WITNESS: I'll check that.
I'd -- I'd have to check my documents to
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see. I thought I -- but I think we did global.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Did you do global for the comps?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know if Gawker is able to monetize non-U.S. unique visitors?
A. I don't know why they wouldn't be able to.
Q. Do you know if other -- any of the other Web sites monetize non-U.S. visitors that you had used as comps?
A. They can monetize advertising.
Q. Do you know if they do?
A. I don't know for sure. But there's certainly a value.
Q. Let me show you -- taking a look at Exhibit 195. This is the same -- the chart showing the same period of time.

How many unique users were there in
September 2012?
A. In the United States?
Q. Correct.
A. 12.6 million. Globally? I don't know. You don't have it here.
Q. So just looking at United States, between Exhibit 194 and 195, there was an increase from
7.5 million, roughly, in May to 12.6 in September. Right?
A. Where are you looking at again?
Q. Looking at 194.
A. 194, all right.
Q. Shows that in May of 2012.
A. There was 7.5 million in the U.S.
Q. And in September 2012, there were 12.6 million in the U.S. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So that was an increase of almost 70 percent?
A. About that.
Q. Do you know what that increase was attributable to?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you know whether it was attributable to a specific post?
A. I know there were other posts going on.
Q. But was this increase in traffic, that 5-million-plus people, attributable to any individua post, as far as you know?
A. I think there was a Kate Middleton post that happened in September.
Q. And what about in August?
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A. I don't remember exactly.
Q. So prior to the Hogan post, there was an uptick of 5 million unique visitors in the period between May to September 2012. Right?
A. Approximately.

MR. BERRY: Mark as Exhibit 195 -- oh,
sorry -- 196. Falling behind.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 196.)
THE WITNESS: Can you put these others down for now?
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Sure. We may come back to one of them.

Exhibit 196 is the same span of time, data
from Quantcast for gawker.com. This time with
October 2012 data broken out for unique U.S.
visitors.
The number that month was roughly
14.18 million. Right?
A. Correct.

MR. BERRY: Now mark as Exhibit 197.
(The document referred to was
marked as Exhibit 197.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Exhibit 197 is that same quanteast.com data
for Gawker from October 2011 all the way through April ' 13 -- this time with April 2013 broken out.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And how many unique viewers were there for gawker.com in United States in April 2013?
A. Just over 12.7 million.
Q. So there was a decrease in unique viewers from October 2012 to April 2013. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Do you know what that decrease was attributable to?
A. I do not.
Q. Looking just at Exhibit 196 with the October data broken out.
A. Okay.
Q. The number of unique viewers dropped from October to November. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know what that drop was due to?
A. I do not. This was one of their most exceptional stories they ever had in terms of traffic, so I do not know why.

MR. BERRY: I'd like to mark as 198.
(The document referred to was
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marked as Exhibit 198.)
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Exhibit 198 is the same set of data from

Quantcast for Gawker showing the unique viewers each month from October 2011 through April 2013. This time with the unique users for November broken out.

How many unique users were there in November 2012?
A. Looks like, in the U.S., just over 9.5 million.
Q. And of all the time during the period that you looked at, that's the greatest drop in unique users. Correct?
A. The greatest drop on -- on -- in absolute terms?
Q. Absolute percentage. However you want to look at it, it's the greatest drop. Right?
A. Since when?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. During this whole period that you looked at from October 2011 through April 2013.
A. I don't know if it's the greatest. I mean, it could be close to it. I don't know what happened in December to January. It's a pretty big drop
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A. I believe there was another large story that came out.
Q. Did that large story have anything to do with Hulk Hogan?
A. The story itself?
Q. Yes.
A. I don't think so.
Q. Did that increase have anything to do with the Hulk Hogan post?
A. It could have.
Q. But you don't know?
A. I don't know.
Q. Pulling back out Exhibit 195. That shows the breakout of unique U.S. visitors for gawker.com in September 2012. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that shows 12.6 million people?
A. Roughly, yes.
Q. Then if you look at Exhibit 197 which shows the data broken out for April 2013, how many uniqu visitors was there in April 2013 ?
A. Just over 12.7 million in the U.S.
Q. So September 2012 was the month before Gawker posted the Hulk Hogan video. Right? A. That is correct.
Q. And April 2013 was the month it took it down. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. So the number of users before the Hogan
video was posted and the number through the time the video was removed, looking at these two months, was almost identical?
A. It was close.
Q. Right. There may be a 2 percent increase?
A. I don't know the percentage. It was close.
Q. Going back to Exhibit 4 to your report.
A. Do I put these away for a second?
Q. Yes.

Just looking at Exhibit 4 to your report which was our Exhibit 176.
A. Okay.
Q. Here, just going to go back to where we were earlier in the day.
A. Okay.
Q. Here this says the total unique page views of the video was $5,357,572$. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. That's just the number of unique users who visited that post. Correct?
A. The video -- the page the video's on, yes.
Q. Those users might have looked at other pages on gawker.com. Right?
A. They could have.
Q. They might have visited gawker.com the day before the post. Right?
A. They could have.
Q. They might have visited gawker.com the week before the post. Right?
A. They could have.
Q. They could have looked at gawker.com the month before?
A. They could have.
Q. They could have looked two months before.

## Right?

A. They could have.
Q. But your analysis assumes that these 5.3 million users are unique visitors to gawker.com, new users. Right?
A. Not --

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Not necessarily new users. Again, it's -- some of them could have been new users. But, again, to Mr. Denton's quote, each of those first-time visitors is a potential convert.

So they're presumably hoping some of those
were new users, but I don't have that data. I've asked for that, again, but we haven't received it. If I can't -- so I don't know either way. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. In your analysis, you equate unique page views to this post to unique page views to Gawker. Correct?
A. To the unique users to Gawker visitors? Yes.
Q. Right. So you're using a unique page view for this particular post and saying that that is a unique page view to gawker.com as a whole. Correct?
A. I'm not completely understanding what you're saying there.
Q. The Quantcast data shows the average -- it is a number of unique users for a particular month. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. So in the month of October 2012 we looked at, there was roughly 14 million unique users. Right?
A. Roughly. I'd have to look again, but. Yes, for October.
Q. And your assumption is that the total unique page views, an unique viewer from the Hogan post was Page 285
a unique user for gawker.com for that particular month. Right?
A. So you're asking would they have been counted as a unique -- on Quantcast, would the unique viewers of that page be counted as a unique monthly user of gawker.com?
Q. Well, that's a slightly different question, but you can answer that one first.
A. Yes. They would -- they would be -they're -- they're of the same common denominator.
Q. Earlier in the day, you told me that the unique users per month on Quantcast could view ter articles. Right?
A. They could.
Q. But they could only view one article, too.

## Right?

A. They could.
Q. Your analysis assumes that unique page views for this particular post were unique visits to Gawker as a whole on the Quanteast data. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: No, it doesn't have to be a unique -- okay. So now I understand your question.

No, it does not have to be that one unique viewer of the 5.4 million that saw the video is also
one unique end user per Quantcast data.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But in your analysis, you assume those two things are the same. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: We assume that one unique viewer of the video would be counted as a unique user that's presented in the Quantcast data.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Even though they're counting two different things. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not sure. I'm not
understanding the question completely and I apologize for that, so.
BY MR. BERRY:

## Q. That's all right.

Just a couple minutes ago, you said that a unique viewer of the Hogan post may have looked at other posts on gawker.com that month. Right?
A. Right.
Q. For unique user data from Comcast -- from

Quantcast on a monthly basis, that's one unique user. Right?
A. If they only viewed the Hulk video.
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Q. And if they viewed the Hulk video and they viewed fifteen other posts on gawker.com, that's still one unique user on Quantcast. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. For the Hogan post, that's also one unique viewer. Right?
A. That's -- according to the Google analytics data?
Q. Right.
A. Right.
Q. And so your assumption is that for the Quantcast data, which you used for valuation, that one unique user for the Hogan post is the equivalent of one unique user for the month as a whole. Right? MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: They would be a unique user on Quantcast as well.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. For the month?
A. Correct.
Q. Even though they may have viewed numerous articles on gawker.com?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I think Mr. Denton and Gawker would hope they viewed other articles on gawker.com.

BY MR. BERRY:
Q. All right. Take out Exhibit 177.
A. 178 --
Q. I think you had it out when we started this.

Why don't we go off the record for a minute.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Off the record at 4:31.
(Discussion held off the record.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record at 4:32.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. All right. And so you have Exhibit 177 in front of you?
A. I do.
Q. All right. If you turn the page to

Gawker 1149, this was a document attached to 1148 that your plaintiff's -- that Plaintiff's counsel produced to us that said you had reviewed before.

Have you looked at this?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Okay. Do you know what it is?
A. Looks like the rankings of the top stories that were on gawker.com.
Q. Okay. In 2012?
A. Correct.
Q. And this is Google Analytics data broken down just like 1148 but just for different stories. Correct?
A. That's what it looks like, yes.
Q. And there's a column just like on page 1148, the second column shows unique page views.

Do you see that?
A. 1 do.
Q. The third item in that column -- or, yeah, the third item that's numbered in that column is the Hogan post. Do you see that? Even for a minute?
A. 1 do.
Q. And as of 2012 , the end of 2012 , there were roughly 4.878 million unique views for that post?

Do you see that?
A. That looks correct.
Q. Just beneath that entry is an article titled
"I Am Adam Lanza's Mother." Do you see that, numbr 4 ?
A. I do.
Q. Do you know who Adam Lanza is?
A. I've heard the name, yes.
$Q$. Do you know who he is?
A. He was a distressed kid, I believe.
Q. He was the boy who was the shooter in

```
Newtown, Connecticut, in the elementary school back
in December 2012.
A. He was distressed, yes.
Q. You recall that incident?
A. I do.
Q. That post, according to this data, had
5.394 million unique views in 2012. Right?
A. That's what this says, yes.
Q. How would you value that post?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I would look at a very similar
approach that we took to valuing the Hulk video.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Okay. So this 5.394 number is roughly the same as the Hogan post. Right?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. The number that you ultimately used for the Hogan post.
A. Through December \(31 \mathrm{st}, 2012\) ?
Q. Yeah, but there's \(\mathbf{5 . 3 9 4}\) million for Adam Lanza's -- the Adam Lanza's mother article is roughly the same as the 5.357 million uniques that you used for the Hogan post. Right?
A. Yeah, I mean, we're not comparing the right
```
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time frames here, but are you asking me if 5.3 million is close to 5.4 million? The answer's yes.
Q. Okay. So based on your analysis, this post would have added somewhere between 5 million and $\$ 15$ million to Gawker also?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'd have to see the total unique views that it commanded over whatever period of time that it was up in order to make that analysis. I haven't seen that, so I can't answer that question.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So but the number of uniques would likely be higher, then, at the end of December 2012. Right?
A. It could be.
Q. And if you were going to value it the same way, based on your analysis, if the time periods -one was in December 2012, one was in October 2012 -the likely value was anywhere between 5 - and \$15 million. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, I haven't done that
analysis, so I can't say for sure.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Okay. Going down a little further, do you
see there's one, it's number 6, "NASA's Time-Lapse Video of Hurricane Sandy is Terrifying. Beautiful"
A. I see that.
Q. And that had a number of unique views of roughly 1.5 million. Right?
A. 1.426.
Q. Do you see that?
A. 1.426 million?
Q. Yeah.
A. Yeah.
Q. How do you value that post?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, I'd have to look at the post. I'd have to see it. But it could be, using a very similar approach methodology.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Right. So if you used the unique page views and you look at the same over time, you could value it the same way that you did for the Hogan post. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Correct.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. If you used the same sort of market multiples, you would end up valuing this at about a
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million to $\$ 3$ million of added value to Gawker based on that post?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, I'd have to do the analysis and look at the numbers.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But if this was a -- assuming that the time period was roughly equal and you used the same marke multiples, based on the fact that there's a quarter -- third to a quarter of the number of unique views, the value would be a quarter to a third of the Hogan post. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, I would have to look at the post. I would have to do the analysis, see all of the data, get all the information, the context, you've been talking about the context, so I don't know. I can't answer that question without doing that.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. If you -- but you could do that same analysis for any post on Gawker in 2012. Right? MR. VOGT: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: I could do an analysis. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So in October 2012, you could look at any particular post and figure out what the value is the same way that you did the Hogan post. Right?
A. I could look at --

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: -- different posts and
determine a value.
BYMR. BERRY:
Q. Well, you'd basically look at the unique visitors to the post and assess that added value to gawker.com as a whole. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection --
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. It sounds like you did when --
A. I could look at --

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: -- the traffic --
MR. BERRY: Wait.
THE REPORTER: Hold on. Overtalking and things are getting broken up on the record. Would you mind starting, please.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Yeah. Mr. Anderson, you might want to just give Shane a chance to --
A. All right.
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Q. Yeah, he's cutting you off.

MR. VOGT: Well, and you threw me off 'cause you stopped and then you started asking again. THE WITNESS: Sorry about that. I won't talk anymore. I won't talk anymore.

MR. BERRY: I think he's going to keep
objecting to my questions, you'll keep answering my questions, I'll keep asking questions, and we'll go in a circle.

THE WITNESS: Fair enough.

## BY MR. BERRY:

$Q$. The upshot is that using your methodology, you could look at and apply that methodology to any particular post on gawker.com to assess the increase in value attributable to that post. Right?
A. Theoretically. I'd have to look at it and I'd have to do the analysis. I'm not going to say absolutely, but yes, it's possible.
Q. Are you suggesting that your analysis is not something that could be replicated?
A. I am not.
Q. Okay. So if I went to any other post, could I replicate the value of that post by conducting the same kind of analysis that you have done with the Hogan post?
.
visits post A, post B, post C. Right? They count as
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one unique viewer on Quantcast. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. But they would count as one unique viewer to

Hogan, one unique viewer to post $A$, one unique viewer to post $B$, one unique viewer to post $C$. Correct?
A. They could, yes.
Q. So the sum of the unique views per post far exceeds the number of unique views per month that's measured by Quantcast. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: In total, it could.

## BY MR. BERRY:

Q. Unless there were just one person who looked at one post and that was the only time they visited per month. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And so for the -- if that were to -looking -- so if your analysis, then, were applied to each post for Gawker in October 2012, wouldn't the value attributable to each post exceed the total value of what you valued Gawker at?
A. Not necessarily.

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. If people viewed more than one post, it
would exceed the value. Right?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I would have to look at that
data to do that analysis.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. If you look back at -- well, do you know how many posts appeared on gawker.com in October?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you know how many posts appeared in 2012?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you know how many posts appeared in 2013?
A. I do not.
Q. Looking back at 1149, Gawker 1149 , which is the second page of Exhibit 177.
A. Okay.
Q. In that same column we were looking at showing unique page views, the top line number says 687,661,729. Right?
A. Is -- is that a 5 or a 6 ? I'm not sure if that's 587 or 687 .
Q. Okay. Either way, either 587 million or 687 million. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. That shows the number of total unique page views on gawker.com. Correct? For this 2012.
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A. I believe that's what that says, yes.
$Q$. You couldn't use that number in your analysis, could you?
A. For what?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. To value Gawker?
A. No, that wouldn't make sense.
Q. Right, but that's the aggregate of the unique views per post on gawker.com for 2012. Right?
A. If that's what this data says, yes.
Q. And that's essentially what you did for the Hogan post. Right?
A. What?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form. BY MR. BERRY:
$Q$. Use the unique views for an individual post to value -- to determine the -- sorry.

You used one -- the unique views for a post to assess the overall value of Gawker based on average monthly uniques. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: No. We did not use the unique views of the post to assess the value of Gawker. We looked at the --

## BY MR. BERRY:

Q. To assess the value of that individual post.

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: We looked at the traffic, the monthly unique user traffic to Gawker to determine the value of gawker.com as it was provided through Quantcast. Then using the Google Analytics data here, we looked at the number of unique views of the video to apportion what percentage of that increase in value was from the video.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Okay. Looking at 1149 , the unique for Hogan -- the Hogan post earlier we said was roughly 4.878 million. Right? On the page --
A. Where are you?
Q. -- 11 -- on Gawker 1149.
A. Oh, the Hogan -- okay. Yes.
Q. All right. What percentage of the total unique page views for all of 2012 were the unique page views for the Hogan post?
A. I'd have to use a calculator, but.
Q. I actually have one.

If this is not enough, we'll break out the iPhone.

MR. VOGT: While he's doing that can I ask a
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question? Is there a court record saying you guys didn't have to provide Google Analytics data?

MS. SMITH: They subpoenaed Google and Google said that they're --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Is this on the record or off the record?

MR. VOGT: No.
MS. SMITH: No, sorry. Off the record.
MR. VOGT: No, it's off the record.
THE REPORTER: Off the written record. But the video is rolling.

MS. SMITH: Can we go off the record a second?

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record at 4:46.
(Discussion held off the record.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're on the record at 4:46.

THE WITNESS: I'm breaking your calculator. So you don't have enough decimals.

MS. SMITH: I don't think the iPhone has enough either, but you can try.

THE WITNESS: Do you want me to just give you a rough -- a rough --
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Yeah.
A. -- or do you want an exact down to the millionth decimal point?
Q. No, no, yeah. I mean, you can give me a rough, rough.
A. I'll give you a rough number.

And I'm going to do this as 587- 'cause I don't know if that's a 5 or a 6 .
Q. Either way.
A. I really can't tell. But I think either way, it's going to --

I don't know what's wrong with this calculator. Do we have another calcu- -- I'm sorry, man, I appreciate the calculator.

MS. SMITH: You should -- if you do it the other way, you'll get more decimal points.

THE WITNESS: I don't need that many decimals.

MS. SMITH: Okay.
THE WITNESS: It's -- I understand what you're trying to show.

MR. VOGT: And now we have to enter the phone into evidence. I'm marking it.

THE WITNESS: Less than 1 percent. BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Right. It's about -
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A. 0.83 percent. Yeah.
Q. Okay.
A. Thank you.
Q. So the Hogan post accounted for 0.8 percent of the unique views total that Gawker got in 2012. Right?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: According to this data here, yes.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. But yet in your analysis, the post accounted for over 5 percent of the total value of Gawker. Right?
A. Where are you getting 5 percent?
Q. Well, if you look at Exhibit 5, the value of Gawk- -- do you have Exhibit 5 to your report?
A. I do, yeah.
Q. The value of gawker.com attributed to the video in the upper bound is $\$ 15$ million. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And the total value of Gawker at that point was $\$ 286$ million. Right?
A. Approximately, correct.
Q. So that's a little over 5 percent?
A. A little over 5 percent.
Q. So even though it accounted for less than 1 percent of the total traffic, it somehow accounted for over 5 percent of the total value of Gawker?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, it's the -- in
Mr. Denton's own words --
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. I'm asking you in your analysis, it accounted for over 5 percent of the value of gawker.com.
A. Yes. Because in Mr. Denton's own words,
"Most of the stories that resonate" -- and I'm quoting him from page 11 of my report:
"Most of the stories that
resonate are also stories with high
page views -- with the flames that
everyone so prizes -- you have to
be more original, even more
provacative, even more of a hustler than usual."
And, again, it's each of these first-time visitors is a potential convert. So it's -- yes, it does, it's over 5 percent.
Q. What percentage of the 5.3 million people who viewed the Hogan post were first-time viewers
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A. I don't have that information. MR. VOGT: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So you don't know if that fits in

Mr. Denton's analysis that you keep reading?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't have that information.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. So if Gawker had published the Hulk Hogan
post, the Adam Lanza's mother post, the Kate
Middleton post that had 7 million views, would we be
accounting for 15,20 percent of the value of Gawker
with those three posts?
MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: If we did what now?
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. If Gawker only posted three things --
A. Ever?
Q. -- in 2012, Kate Middleton's post that you mentioned, the Adam Lanza's mother post, and the Hogan post, which were all 5 million, 5 million, and I think 7 million -- a little more for Kate Middleton -- do you think that that would account fo 15, 20 percent of the value of Gawker?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know the exact percentage that would account for. I haven't done that analysis.
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Would your analysis change if the number of unique views for the Hogan video was less?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: The method of the analysis or the actual numbers?
BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Sorry. Again, it's a better question.

Would your conclusion change if the number of unique views for the Hulk Hogan video was less?
A. Likely it would change, yes.
Q. If there were less unique views for the video under your analysis, the added value, then, would be less. Right?
A. If less individuals, unique viewers, viewed the video than there were, then, yes, based on the analysis, the conclusion would be less.
Q. So if the number of unique views of the video was 2.5 million instead of 5 million plus, then the added value would be cut roughly in half. Right?
A. Roughly.
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Q. If the number of unique views was 2 million, then the added value would be reduced by 60 percent. Right?
A. And to correct my last statement, all else being equal, of course.
Q. What else -- all else being equal in your analysis. Right?
A. All else being equal in terms of monthly unique user traffic to gawker.com.
Q. Well, but the traffic is what it was.

Right? I mean --
A. Well, I don't know. We're giving -- we're doing hypotheticals here, so I'm just saying in that hypothetical situation you're presenting to me, all else equal, then, yes, it would be about half.
Q. Right. But if the number of people who viewed the video that was posted in October 2012 was 2.5 million and then the analysis would show that the added value to Gawker would be half of what you concluded. Right?
A. If it was only in October 2012, then I don't know that it would only be half.
Q. That the video was posted in 2012.

If the number of unique views to the video was 2.5 million, then the added value would be cut in

## half. Right?

A. But not just in the month of October.
Q. Right, distributed through April 2013.
A. All else being equal.
Q. Right. We changed the number from 5.35 million to --
A. So let's just say --
Q. - 2.5 --
A. -- exactly half. Let's say exactly half of that.
Q. Right. Right.
A. And all else remained the same, then the value would be half.
Q. Right. And if the number of unique views of the video was 2 million, then it would be reduced by roughly 60 percent, the added value.
A. If there were less -- all else remained the same and less unique viewers viewed the video, the value conclusion would be less.

MR. BERRY: Can we take a quick break?
THE WITNESS: Sure.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record at 4:53.
(Recess taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record at 5:07.
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BY MR. BERRY:
Q. Earlier you had mentioned doing -- or trying to do a regression analysis. Other than that and the other things that we've talked about here today, hav you done any other analysis or attempted to do any other analysis in connection with your report?
A. Other than what's presented in the report?
Q. (Nods head.)
A. Just looking at the demographic information we talked about, I think other than what was discussed here, not that I can recall off the top of my head, no.
Q. Other than what we discussed here today, do you have any other opinions concerning the litigation?
A. Other than what's in my report and what we've discussed, I do not believe so.
Q. Has anything we discussed today changed the opinions that are offered in your report?
A. Nothing has changed it. If additional data or information is provided to me, as I state in my report, I reserve the right to amend my analysis. But, other than that, no.
Q. Without getting into specific conversations that you've had with counsel, did you ask for any

## additional data that was not provided to you? <br> A. As I mentioned earlier, I asked for Google Analytics data and Vastly data. <br> Q. Anything else? <br> A. There may have been other items. I don't recall off the top of my head. <br> Q. What data specifically did you ask for from Google Analytics and Vastly? <br> A. Traffic pertaining to specific users, how they access gawker.com, where they go from gawker.com, how often they to gawker.com, any of the affiliate sites. So where they come from, where they go to, how many of the -- basically any general information that tracks any user to gawker.com. <br> Q. And that's what you requested of Plaintiff's counsel -- that was the only information that you sought that wasn't provided to you? <br> A. I don't know if that was the only information. Again, there might have been other items. But as I sit here right now, that's all that I remember. <br> Q. And we talked about this earlier, but you're not expressing any other opinions other than on the valuation of gawker.com and the change in value attributable to the Hogan post. Right?
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A. I am only looking at how gawker.com's value increased and what portion of that was attributable to the Hulk video.
Q. And your expert opinion is that the increase in the value of gawker.com as a result of Gawker posting that video is between 4.995 million and 15.445 million. Right?
A. Based on the data I have to date, yes.
Q. And having testified here today, your opinion remains the same. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you anticipate doing any further analysis?
A. If it is asked of me and if it is necessary, but I don't -- I don't know.
Q. Do you anticipate doing any future work on your opinion?
A. Only if it's asked of me and if it's necessary.
Q. Why would it be necessary?

MR. VOGT: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: If there's additional data or information that becomes available that I did not have at the time I did my report.

MR. BERRY: I have no further questions.

MR. VOGT: We'll read.
THE WITNESS: What's that?
MR. VOGT: You'll read a copy of your transcript.

THE WITNESS: Oh.
MR. BERRY: You'll have an opportunity to read it, make sure that there's nothing that's out of whack and you can make any corrections.

THE WITNESS: When will I get that?
THE REPORTER: Our normal turnaround time is ten business days.

MS. SMITH: It's possible that we will order it more quickly than that, in which case we'll send it to you as soon as we get it.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Can I get a copy of the video, too?

MR. BERRY: Why don't we go off the record.
Do you have any questions, Shane?
MR. VOGT: No.
MR. BERRY: Okay. We're done. Thank you again for coming today.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This concludes the deposition of Jeff Anderson, Volume Number 1. The original will be retained by Merrill Page 313
Legal Solutions at 20750 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 205, Woodland Hills, California.

Going off the record. The time is $5: 11$.
(Whereupon, at 5:11 P.M., the
videotaped deposition of JEFF
ANDERSON was adjourned.)

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA ) <br> COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ) ss.

I, JEFF ANDERSON, hereby certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
$\qquad$ , 2015, at , California.

JEFF ANDERSON
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## STATE OF CALIFORNIA )

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ) ss.
I, SUSAN NELSON, C.S.R. 3202, in and for the State of California, do hereby certify:

That, prior to being examined, the witness named in the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth;

That said deposition was taken down by me stenographically at the time and place therein named, and thereafter transcribed via computer-aided transcription under my direction, and the same is a true, correct and complete transcript of said proceedings;

I further certify that I am not interested in the event of the action.

Witness my hand this 36 th day of March, 2015.

> Susan Nelson, C.S.R. No. 3202
> Certified Shorthand Reporter
> State of California

| A | 252:17,18 253:10 | addition | 198:25 199:8,14,22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| aba | acquire | 93:2 | 201:7 204:14 205:4 |
| 54:1 | 66:22 | additional | 205:24,25 206:3,4,6 |
| abbreviated | acquired | 15:10 40:3 65:20 | 206:11,12,13,17 |
| 9:8 | 58:9 128:16 228:21 | 75:22 76:19 78:21 | 207:16 233:14 |
| abbreviation | acquisition | 79:1,25 142:17 | 255:17 258:10 263:8 |
| 10:10 | 195:17 | 157:21 224:18 | 271:2,3 275:11 |
| ability | acquisitions | 271:24 309:20 310:1 | advice |
| 13:22,23 110:10 | 4:23 122:15 | 311:22 | 17:11 29:6 104:10 |
| 129:11 | action | address | 164:22 |
| able | 315:17 | 59:2,8 183: | advise |
| 80:15 197:4,17,18,24 | active | addresses | 164:8 165:4,10,16 |
| 198:8,9 207:1,4 | 112:9,11 | 44:5 | advised |
| 275:5,7 | actively | adjourned | 144:13 |
| abrams | 27:13 | 132:24 313:6 | advisers |
| 2:17 | activity | adjunct | 35:12,17 |
| abroad | 182:3 | 56:22 | advises |
| 55:17 | actor | adjust | 24:4 |
| absolute | 188:16 | 94:23 96:14 213:6 | advising |
| 142:13 200:20 279:14 | actual | adjusted | 164:15 |
| 279:16 | 39:20 43:10 68:2,5,7,9 | 93:11 94:10 | affect |
| absolutely | 68:11,16,17,19,21 | adjustment | 13:22 210:14 228:3 |
| 8:22 21:11,13 65:1 | 69:16 70:12 79:24 | 95:10 97:1,9 | 253:23 258:20 261:5 |
| 101:12 122:21 | 96:14 102:17 129:5 | adjustments | affiliate |
| 154:16 156:6 160:9 | 145:12 160:20 177:9 | 93:8 94:13 | 310:12 |
| 295:18 | 177:10 200:19 | adopted | affiliated |
| absorb | 253:11 306:10 | 158:11 | 242:1 |
| 238:6 | ad | ads | affiliation |
| access | 207:17,19,20,22,23 | 197:7 205:1 206:14 | 242:5 |
| 310:10 | 233:10 237:21 | 207:24,25 208:3,6,9 | afternoo |
| account | 258:1 | 208:11,14 237:16,18 | 133:6 |
| 188:14 305:24 306:3 | adam | 258:2,5 | aga |
| accountants | 289:18,21 290:21,22 | advertise | 242:3, |
| 51:11 | 305:11,21 | 204:15,20 271:6 | age |
| accounted | add | advertiser | 212:20,22 213:4 238:9 |
| 171:2,3 303:4,11 | 149:22 151:18 157:22 | 260:13 271:5 | 240:5,14 |
| 304:1,2,9 | added | advertisers | agencies |
| accounting | 141:25 142:3,8 149:12 | 75:24 76:1 204:6 | 32:22 |
| 19:19 305:13 | 178:24 179:2 189:3,7 | 205:1 206:14 267:17 | ages |
| accounts | 189:10,11 190:17 | 270:17,22,24 271:13 | 238:12 |
| 17:11 | 192:8,17,22 193:2 | 271:17 | aggregate |
| accurate | 291:4 293:1 294:10 | advertising | 258:6,7 265:11 273:12 |
| 66:15 107:14 109:25 | 306:17,24 307:2,19 | 35:9 37:15,16 59:24 | 273:14,15,19 299:9 |
| 126:19 194:24 | 307:25 308:16 | 60:6 76:11 99:20 | aggregating |
| 222:17,17 248:19 | addicts | 100:25 101:6,9,11,18 | 158:14 |
| 249:7,16 250:4,19 | 214:7 | 111:24 112:3 194:19 | aggregator |


| 195:16 | 259:10 260:25 | 265:17 269:17 287:7 | 161:23 162:1,5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ago | amounts | 289:1 300:7 301:2 | anymore |
| 31:17 65:9 112:6 | 263:22 | 310:3,8 | 142:14 295:5,5 |
| 129:4 156:2,4 252:16 | analogy | analyze | aol |
| 269:17 286:18 | 213:24 | 81:14 181:18 | 5:18 228:21 229:24 |
| agree | analysis | analyzed | 231:23 |
| 73:17 93:17 94:22 | 13:8 26:14 63:21 | 60:22 63:2 84:25 85:5 | apart |
| agreed | 64:21 68:1,12 76:17 | anderson | 129:7 |
| 145:13 | 76:23 78:24 79:8 | 1:16 2:1 4:3,12,13 7:7 | apologize |
| agreement | 81:13 87:15 96:13 | 8:6,15 22:4 47:25 | 13:1 30:20 40:8 50:17 |
| 44:7 58:3 59:1 242:7 | 98:15 103:8 105:15 | 49:23 132:24 133:3 | 123:2 147:13 150:20 |
| agreements | 106:1,10,11 128:25 | 164:23 294:23 | 207:10 286:14 |
| 33:15 | 130:18 133:12 137:8 | 312:24 313:6 314:5 | apparently |
| ahead | 137:19,23 139:24 | 314:14 | 91:20 |
| 20:23 67:1 112:1 | 157:10 158:20 159:4 | andrew | appear |
| 205:19 235:18 | 159:4 160:3 166:1,10 | 45:12 | 191:24 |
| aka | 166:14 167:5 170:11 | angeles | appearances |
| 1:8 | 172:9 177:23 178:21 | 2:4,21 7:1,16 201:21 | 2:7 3:1 |
| al | 179:1,14 181:24 | 314:2 315:2 | appeared |
| 1:9 | 185:8,13 192:7 | annual | 298:7,9,11 |
| alabam | 193:12 198:13 | 38:10 124:16 | appearing |
| 23:8 | 209:24 210:3,4,12,21 | anson | 3:18 |
| alexa | 211:8,10 213:2 | 25:15 41:16 42:4 54:3 | appears |
| 60:13,14 61:17 | 214:12 215:10 | 55:3,22 56:20 57:5 | 248:1 |
| alia | 216:14 225:23 227:1 | 91:21 | appendix |
| 3:12 7:22 | 239:9 259:5,15,19,22 | ansons | 85:16 |
| alleged | 260:2,7,12 265:13 | 42:10 | apple |
| 38:15 | 283:16 284:5 285:18 | answer | 90:23,24,24 249:10,10 |
| allow | 286:3 291:3,10,17,23 | 11:7,20 12:11,13 | apples |
| 33:14 | 293:5,15,22,24 | 33:13,14 34:2,6 80:3 | 90:14,15 213:24,24 |
| allowed | 295:17,19,24 296:1 | 100:14,17,19 101:24 | 248:23,24,24 |
| 57:25 | 296:12 297:18 298:4 | 102:14 118:3 120:8 | application |
| alluded | 299:3 303:11 304:8 | 159:5 160:10 193:13 | 113:5 |
| 81:17 | 305:6 306:4,6,9,17 | 200:25 266:10 285:8 | applied |
| alpha | 306:21 307:7,18 | 291:10 293:18 | 173:10 195:23 297:18 |
| 123:6,21,22 | 309:3,5,6,22 311:13 | answered | apply |
| amazon | analyst | 84:8 | 88:23 295:13 |
| 53:7 197:1 | 18:4,4,16 25:5,7 26:2 | answering | apportion |
| amend | 26:3,3,8,18,20 | 295:7 | 138:13,14 300:9 |
| 137:19 309:22 | analysts | answers | apportioned |
| american | 63:25 | 11:16,24 104:17 291:2 | 83:12 130:14 138:14 |
| 192:23 242:2,11 | analytics | anticipate | apportioning |
| amount | 5:3 24:24 25:10 26:21 | 311:12,16 | 130:25 136:25 162:23 |
| 67:12 100:23,24 104:7 | 27:3 28:13 60:19 | anybody | apportionment |
| 141:25 142:13 | 62:22 63:1,11 171:12 | 10:25 51:12 54:3 62:4 | 172:10 |
| 163:19 180:22 | 180:4,10 213:17 | 106:18 115:18 | appraisals |


| 90:6,9 | 173:9 177:7 178:7 | 257:15,16 285:13 | 82:8 87:11,12,17,24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| appreciate | 272:20 274:2 278:2,2 | 287:22,25 296:21 | 88:4,14 90:13 91:19 |
| 8:16,20 63:18 84:20 | 278:6,9 279:5,22 | aside | 93:2,25 94:19 185:25 |
| 86:4 302:13 | 281:20,21 282:1 | 59:22 101:16,17,17 | 186:13 |
| approach | 308:3 | 222:4 | assets |
| 65:24 66:1,3,10,14,17 | arbitration | asked | 23:4 48:1,24 49:11 |
| 67:3,5 68:2 69:8 | 42:21 | 54:13 76:8,13 79:17 | 51:7,17,19 58:11 |
| 70:11,17,20,23 71:1 | area | 84:8 133:23 137:24 | 82:2 87:5,23 89:1,4,6 |
| $71: 2572: 4,5,7,7,8,11$ | 30:6 48:19 | 138:11,14,16,20 | 89:8,11 97:20 100:21 |
| $72: 1275: 2577: 24$ | arena | 139:1,8,13,21 162:4 | 131:3 188:25 189:2 |
| 78:1 79:9,11,12 80:8 | 74:5 | 186:21 187:9 192:11 | assigned |
| 80:10,11,11,14,23 | arent | 192:20,25 193:5 | 141:10 |
| 81:13,15,16,19 84:24 | 238:12 | 214:1 262:16 269:17 | assignment |
| 85:9 88:21 89:3,11 | argue | 270:9 284:2 310:2 | 31:1887:20 |
| 92:11 94:20,24 95:4 | 113:24 114:1 | 311:14,18 | assigns |
| 95:7 96:22 97:17,19 | argued | asking | 141:12 |
| 97:25 98:18 99:17 | 127:8 | 11:15 21:19 30:15 | assist |
| 100:4,10 104:13 | arithmetic | 119:23 131:6 154:23 | 63:21 |
| 108:21 130:24 131:1 | 149:24 | 164:12 177:2,24 | assistance |
| 131:4,7,17,20 132:8 | arithmetically | 180:9 186:15 207:9 | 64:3,7 |
| 158:10 160:16 | 265:12,19 | 219:11 285:3 291:1 | assistant |
| 161:14 187:1,5,8,10 | armslength | 295:3,8 304:8 | 56:7,12,17,24 |
| 187:14 188:1,12,13 | 77:19,21,25 96:21 | asks | assisted |
| 188:13,22 190:16 | 110:1 143:23 144:9 | 164:21 | 63:24 |
| 218:11 224:2 229:9 | 144:24 161:18 | aspect | association |
| 234:9 254:23,25 | 163:24 164:2 166:16 | 13:11,11 | 242:2,11 |
| 290:12 292:15 | 166:25 | assess | assume |
| approaches | arrangement | 82:13,15 100:11 108:9 | 16:8 167:10 234:13 |
| 65:22,23 66:6 72:15 | 93:25 | 109:23 132:5,13 | $242: 5269: 15$ 286:3,6 |
| 72:16,20 187:6 | arrived | 179:12 185:19 192:2 | assumed |
| appropriate | 128:21,25 129:2 | 294:10 295:14 | 211:14 |
| 70:21,23 76:4 80:11 | 173:22 | 299:20,24 300:2 | assumes |
| 80:11 100:3,11 | article | assessed | 283:16 285:18 |
| 108:21,22 125:8 | 54:7,19 55:7,10 91:22 | 94:23 164:16 | assuming |
| 187:7 | 91:24 111:20,22 | assesses | 98:3 248:16 $293: 7$ |
| approve | 120:14 121:11,25 | 141:9 | assumption |
| 36:12,14 | 122:3 124:9 125:16 | assessing | 76:16,18 77:2,6,9 |
| approximately | 127:12 194:22 230:8 | 130:8 138:6218:6 | 201:25 265:5 284:24 |
| 17:21 23:24 65:12 | 231:5 285:15 289:17 | 223:24 229:6 234:4 | 287:11 |
| 237:6 277:5 280:12 | 290:22 296:6 | assessment | assumptions |
| 280:14 303:23 | articles | 73:5,7,8 75:3 | 72:21 |
| april | 10:23 50:12,22 106:13 | asset | athletes |
| 55:7 78:10 83:9 152:5 | 107:4 110:16 123:15 | 4:17 22:23,24 24:11 | 54:9 |
| 152:6,9,13,18 153:1 | 123:16,17,18 129:7 | $29: 736: 1348: 2,3,12$ | attached |
| 154:6 159:19 161:24 | 191:10 217:9 222:25 | 48:16,17,18 52:1 | 62:15 85:15 146:13 |
| 163:11,17 164:4,25 | 238:5 241:8,11 | 66:24 72:18 81:25 | 288:16 |


| attempt | 148:17 187:7 194:20 | 49:21 74:21,24 85:16 | 52:18 53:10 70:7,8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 82:13,14 | 197:4 198:2 230:6,18 | 296:25 297:5 | 76:25 78:179:11 |
| attempted | 235:6 238:19 249:12 | babycenter | 82:7 83:13 85:2,8 |
| 309:5 | 250:21 311:23 | 200:22 202:17,21 | 87:22 95:25 96:20 |
| attempting | avenues | back | 97:2,7,20 101:6 |
| 260:2 | 60:2 | 9:24 12:8 13:16 15:18 | 104:22 105:14 106:1 |
| attest | average | 27:20 32:17 34:22 | 106:10 110:11 |
| 12:17 | 98:12 104:6 136:19 | 47:22 49:18,20 50:16 | 114:12 128:4 129:12 |
| attorney | 140:10 141:13,25 | 59:9 81:9 85:25 91:5 | 130:14 136:17,23 |
| 48:6 138:10 139:8 | 142:7 143:14 144:6 | 91:8,9 92:23 97:1,16 | 137:1 138:13,15 |
| 266:9 | 144:10,24 145:4 | 107:3,24 108:11 | 142:20 144:16 148:2 |
| attorneys | 147:25 148:2,14 | 118:6 123:2,4 133:5 | 157:10 158:10 |
| 51:10 266:12 | 149:14,16,17 150:1,2 | 133:20 136:21 | 162:23 163:16 172:9 |
| attributable | 150:6,10,12 151:17 | 149:11 153:24 154:3 | 172:11 176:4 178:21 |
| 83:20 131:19 132:6 | 151:18,22 152:24 | 155:8 167:4 169:7 | 180:1 187:6 194:12 |
| 135:22 137:15 | 153:2,4,15 154:11,19 | 172:13 173:6 180:12 | 196:25 199:3 202:7 |
| 169:16 170:3,10 | 155:2,3,11 156:20,23 | 193:18 195:5 196:23 | 202:13 204:7 205:23 |
| 172:15,23 173:1,13 | 157:11 158:11 | 197:14 211:5 214:2 | 206:2 209:3 210:11 |
| 174:13 175:18,22 | 167:14,19,25,25 | 246:21 259:8 262:13 | 210:21 213:23 214:3 |
| 176:12 179:13 185:3 | 168:16,24 169:8,15 | 277:13 281:13 | 219:1 224:15 229:11 |
| 276:15,17,21 278:12 | 170:2,24 171:4 173:8 | 282:11,17 288:9 | 230:4 234:1,11 |
| 295:15 297:20 | 174:3 176:5 177:5,5 | 290:1 298:6,13 | 243:17,18,18 251:18 |
| 310:25 311:2 | 178:1,9 212:6,8,9,16 | 308:24 | 260:10,16 262:1 |
| attribute | 212:17 216:9 218:6 | backend | 269:14 291:3,17 |
| 38:3 | 220:7 223:24 226:5 | 96:13 | 293:1,9 299:20 |
| attributed | 229:6 234:4 236:20 | background | 306:20 311:8 |
| 131:12,23 170:6 | 258:14 265:14 | 16:4 37:7 55:5 213:9 | baseline |
| 303:18 | 266:21 273:15 274:1 | bajo | 75:23 |
| attribution | 284:15 299:21 | 2:10 | basic |
| 38:6 | averages | balance | 48:13 119:12 194:13 |
| audience | 98:9 | 81:2 133:13 164:9,18 | basically |
| 51:9 231:21 | avoid | 165:5 218:13 224:4 | 26:10 45:19 67:8 |
| august | 12:11 | 229:16 234:17 | 81:19 141:9 146:23 |
| 124:10 217:13 220:11 | awarded | bank | 168:11 179:7 181:4 |
| 221:8,12,13 223:4 | 104:15 | 17:3,3,17,22,24 18:1,3 | 204:13 256:20 294:9 |
| 225:22 226:6,9,17,19 | aware | 18:17,19 22:15 | 310:13 |
| 226:19 227:5 276:25 | 41:20 104:12,20 105:8 | banker | basis |
| aunt | 105:12,21,23,25 | 17:8 | 74:18 286:23 |
| 124:3 | 106:8,22 130:17 | banking | bates |
| author | 131:10,22 132:3,12 | 22:13 | 39:7 |
| 50:9,11 119:2 | 144:9,23 184:23 | bankruptcy | bateslabeled |
| authors | 199:23,24 227:16 | 24:9 | 171:15 |
| 54:4 |  | base | bathroom |
| available | B | 74:9 123:14 151:4 | 63:17 |
| 60:18 80:4,7 89:1 99:5 | b | 200:4 241:9 258:24 | bathrooms |
| 100:16 130:22 141:5 | 2:11 4:10 5:1 6:1 | based | 89:23 |


| beach | benefited | 178:16 179:3 181:22 | best |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 48:25 | 179:20 192:12 | 182:18,22 183:21,25 | 12:11,12 70:17 |
| bearing | berry | 184:9 185:12,23 | better |
| 79:7 | 3:5 4:4 7:19,19 8:14 | 186:3,12,24 187:12 | 48:6 54:13 123:4 |
| beautiful | 12:6 14:13,14 15:18 | 187:20,23 188:4,7,10 | 306:12 |
| 292:2 | 15:21,24 17:16 20:23 | 190:4,20 191:2,15 | beyond |
| becoming | 21:3,7 30:10,23 | 192:15,21 193:1,7,14 | 99:20 206:6 |
| 28:12 | 33:16,22 38:24 39:3 | 193:20 197:21 | big |
| beginning | 41:6,11,13,18 42:1,3 | 198:12 199:12 | 46:7 58:6 279:25 |
| 10:15 264:22 | 58:13,18,23 59:5,10 | 200:13 201:6,12 | bio |
| begins | 59:12 70:2 77:3,12 | 202:2,11,16,22 203:7 | 22:1 47:23 |
| 7:5 | 79:5,19,23 80:13,21 | 203:14 204:5,12,19 | birmingham |
| behalf | 81:4,11 83:16 84:2,9 | 204:25 205:6,16,20 | 23:8 27:21 |
| 2:2 7:25 | 86:10,16 87:21 88:15 | 206:8,19,24 207:11 | bit |
| belief | 88:19,20 91:1,7,13 | 208:24 209:7,14,18 | 12:14 16:4 32:17 |
| 74:4 169:14,22,22 | 91:16 94:18 95:15 | 210:5 211:7 219:20 | 81:18 84:23 137:7 |
| 182:11 | 96:12,25 97:4,14 | 219:24 220:20 221:1 | 156:16 205:14 |
| believe | 98:16,21 100:7 | 221:5,14,18 224:25 | blast |
| 9:4 15:3,6,7,17 19:23 | 101:13 102:1,9,15,23 | 225:4 226:1,4,10,14 | 44:4 |
| 37:4 39:11 45:3 | 103:5 105:1,20,24 | 227:22 231:9,13 | bleacher |
| 46:19 53:20,24 54:5 | 106:7,21 107:2,22 | 232:8 235:18,22 | 5:8,9,11 145:20 |
| 55:17 57:7 60:7,8 | 109:4,21 111:4,8 | 239:10,13 241:18,22 | 207:12 211:15,23,24 |
| 62:6 69:3 75:10,20 | 112:22 113:3,25 | 243:1,8,24 244:25 | 212:25 216:24 217:3 |
| 80:5 85:20 111:17,21 | 114:6,14 115:3,8,14 | 245:4 247:9,14 | 217:14,20 218:13 |
| 115:7,9 119:16,17,24 | 115:20 116:14,21 | 251:16,22 252:2,6,7 | 219:8,17 220:5 221:7 |
| 123:12 152:6 180:6 | 117:5,18,23 118:5,22 | 254:4,10 255:1 257:2 | 221:12 222:1,5 |
| 180:11 183:1 196:14 | 119:5,19 120:4,9,19 | 259:2 260:18 261:9 | 237:14 239:1 245:16 |
| 198:23 199:1 212:24 | 120:23 121:2,6,10,17 | 262:15 264:6 265:9 | blue |
| 215:9 218:19 219:20 | 121:21 122:7,11,12 | 267:4 268:17,22 | 119:11 |
| 227:20 233:7 243:14 | 125:2,9,15 126:6,11 | 272:6,9 273:21,24 | blurry |
| 247:15 249:3 251:5 | 127:4,11,17,24 128:6 | 274:16,20 275:2 | 171:22 |
| 256:4,7 268:6 269:7 | 128:12,13 129:1,19 | 277:6,12,21,24 | board |
| 269:19 272:15 | 130:16 131:9,21 | 278:24 279:2,20 | 29:24 |
| 274:15 280:19 281:1 | 132:2,10,17,19 | 284:4 286:2,9,16 | bold |
| 288:20 289:24 299:1 | 133:10,22 138:4,17 | 287:18 288:1,11 | 267:12 |
| 309:17 | 141:18 142:6145:3 | 290:13,17 291:12,24 | bolded |
| belong | 145:11 146:7,11 | 292:16,23 293:6,20 | 267:12 |
| 35:1,5,8,11,16 | 157:17 158:9,21 | 293:25 294:8,13,18 | bollea |
| benchmark | 159:7,13 160:1,11 | 294:22 295:6,11 | 1:47:7 8:1 134:2 |
| 100:20 | 161:3,9,16,22 162:2 | 296:14,20 297:12,24 | book |
| benchmarking | 162:10,16,25 163:15 | 298:5 299:6,16 300:1 | 10:20,21 45:18,19,21 |
| 81:24 96:23 131:4 | 163:23 164:7,13 | 300:11 301:24 | 50:10 53:22 54:11,12 |
| beneath | 165:2,9,15,25 166:15 | 302:24 303:10 304:7 | 54:15,21 55:2,21,23 |
| 289:17 | 166:19,24 167:3,23 | 305:4,9,17 306:5,11 | 55:24 56:2,4 91:21 |
| benefit | 169:20,24 171:13,19 | 308:20 309:1 311:25 | 91:25 94:4 191:17 |
| 75:12,16,18 133:24 | 175:16 177:15,20 | 312:6,17,20 | books |


| 10:19 50:21 54:23 | bringing | 165:16 | called |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 94:3 191:11 | 30:21 | buzzfeed | 29:16 86:7 196:15 |
| border | broad | 5:13,14,16 112:17 | calling |
| 34:5 | 49:23 52:5,7 54:24 | 145:22 149:7 212:4 | 84:3,5 |
| borrow | broadcasting | 222:6,8 223:1,5,15 | cant |
| 18:12 | 217:13,19 | 224:21 227:6,16 | 13:25 33:14 48:8 |
| bottom | broken | 237:14 245:17 | 102:5,10 115:13 |
| 34:24 35:19 39:8 | 221:21 226:16 239:18 | 258:19 260:22,24 | 118:3 124:6 129:25 |
| 84:21 85:4 106:22 | 274:6 277:16 278:2 | 261:4 | 158:8 160:9 184:5,7 |
| 184:10 231:14,19 | 278:15 279:6 281:20 | buzzfeeds | 200:25 219:3 273:11 |
| 248:3 | 289:1 294:20 | 222:21 224:4 | 284:3 291:10,23 |
| bought | brought | C | 293:18 296:3 302:9 |
| 89:16 217:14,19 | 58:8 | C | cap |
| boulevard | bubble | c | 249:6 |
| 7:13 313:1 | 121:23,24 122:1 | 1:25 2:5 3:15 296:25 | capital |
| bound | build | 297:5 315:4,21 | 6:3,6 195:12,13,14,21 |
| 303:19 | 64:5 | calcu | 196:3,7,12 197:3,8 |
| box | built | 273:10 302:12 | 223:11 245:8,13,18 |
| 240:18,19,20 252:10 | 76:17 | calculate | 245:21 246:9,11,12 |
| boy | bunch | 140:25 150:1 157:25 | 246:16,22 247:11,22 |
| 289:25 | 13:8 14:791:14 | 160:20 273:7 | 253:3 |
| branches | burst | calculated | capitalization |
| 17:18 | 122:1 | 18:6 151:17 152:24 | 6:5 248:11 |
| brand | business | 155:10 252:24 | care |
| 34:21 53:17 | 5:18 17:8,12 18:10,11 | calculating | 17:10 |
| branding | 24:4 45:19 53:18 | 147:8 | case |
| 242:6 | 55:5 109:17 230:9,12 | calculation | 1:6 9:21 15:2,10 21:2 |
| break | 230:13,20,22,24 | 174:3 176:18 236:20 | 28:7 31:13,14,15,25 |
| 63:14 81:4 132:18 | 231:5 256:5,8,15 | 249:23 254:17 | 32:3,19 36:23 37:2,3 |
| 141:23 149:12 | 271:2,4 312:11 | calculations | 37:7,8,20,24 38:14 |
| 193:14 210:24 262:9 | businesses | 55:9 129:5 154:21 | 38:19,21 39:8 40:5 |
| 262:10,16 300:23 | 195:19 196:15 255:10 | 155:3,8 173:15 | 40:21,24 41:14 42:11 |
| 308:20 | buy | 223:22 265:6 | 42:16 43:4,11,14,19 |
| breaking | 24:10 29:7 163:2,10 | calculator | 43:21 45:13,24 46:15 |
| 301:18 | 163:18 164:14,15 | 300:21 301:18 302:12 | 46:17 47:10,10,14 |
| breakout | 187:15,18 | 302:13 | 48:25 49:13 52:8,11 |
| 281:14 | buyer | calendar | 52:16,17 60:21 62:21 |
| breaks | 24:10 36:17 77:20,21 | 153:21 | 63:21 65:6,13,20 |
| 226:21 | 143:23 161:18 | california | 73:14 85:22,24 89:9 |
| brickandmortar | 162:12 163:24 164:2 | 2:4,21 7:1,14 9:12 | 95:5,16,20 96:9 |
| 70:25 | 164:8 165:10,16 | 36:9 313:2 314:1,7 | 98:11 104:14 106:2 |
| bridge | 166:16 229:13 | 314:10 315:1,5,23 | 106:11 126:12 |
| 17:3,22,24 18:1,3,17 | buyers | call | 130:19 131:13,24 |
| 18:19 22:15 | 144:9,13 165:4 | 59:3,3,4 84:11 87:14 | 133:12 139:6 144:22 |
| bring | buying | 88:13 136:10 172:11 | 149:17 199:11 |
| 140:3 | 125:22 144:11 163:22 | 220:17,24 | 201:11 312:13 |


| cases | 314:5 315:5,16 | chevron | 51:8,15 52:3,10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31:22 33:2 34:9 35:21 | chairman | 40:19,22,22 42:15,20 | 134:11 142:4 160:12 |
| 44:11,12 46:20 47:9 | 11:5 25:13,20 41:16 | 43:7 | 206:7 |
| 49:15 59:18 104:16 | 92:3 94:2 | chip | clearly |
| 106:17 | chairmans | 119:11 | 95:12 96:6 100:19 |
| cash | 10:20 | choose | clem |
| 67:18,20,21,24 81:2 | chance | 98:23 | 1:87:8 84:15 134:3 |
| 113:15 115:10 249:6 | 294:24 | chose | cles |
| 249:21 254:16 | change | 100:20 | 191:9 |
| catch | 63:19 95:13 96:7,11 | circle | click |
| 170:1 | 156:16 157:4 169:4 | 295:9 | 240:18,20 |
| categorize | 172:16,24 173:8,16 | circuit | client |
| 125:4 | 174:7 175:18,22 | 1:1,1 | 9:14 17:25 29:9 32:1,9 |
| causation | 179:13 210:12,18,21 | circumstance | 54:7 59:4 144:20 |
| 177:12 | 244:12 250:8,8 | 75:17 132:4 | 164:20 213:18 |
| cause | 251:18 306:6,13,15 | circumstances | 269:18 |
| 30:8,15 153:23 254:18 | 310:24 | 32:14 87:8 109:19 | clients |
| 257:7 264:20 265:2 | changed | 117:16 118:3 163:14 | 29:1 31:23 59:4 60:1 |
| 295:2 302:6 | 112:19,23 113:2 | 163:16 200:19 | clip |
| caused | 250:11 308:5 309:18 | cite | 86:1 |
| 80:7 169:9 175:19,23 | 309:20 | 85:12 267:14 270:15 | close |
| 175:25 176:2,6,13 | changes | cited | 155:23 222:13 279:24 |
| 177:4,18,21 280:15 | 95:13 137:17 244:11 | 106:14 | 282:8,10 291:2 |
| celebrities | 251:17 261:12,13,25 | claim | club |
| 54:9 | changing | 47:11 | 43:10 44:1 |
| celebrity | 245:12 250:14 | clara | coauthor |
| 189:4,6,12 203:21,24 | chapter | 16:6 | 50:11 191:17 |
| 257:23,25 | 55:24,25 91:25 94:2,3 | clarification | cocacola |
| centers | 94:5 | 85:15 | 27:24,25 28:2,5 71:7,9 |
| 36:23 38:1 | characters | clarify | 72:8 73:18 108:12 |
| cents | 54:9 | 12:25 13:14 | 115:15 |
| 157:22 251:1 253:19 | charge | clarifying | code |
| century | 18:8 | 41:23 | 171:10 |
| 2:4,19 7:16 | charles | clarity | codex |
| certain | 2:18 11:10 12:17 14:4 | 135:15 | 247:19 |
| 29:7 53:21 55:18 89:4 | 14:19 15:18 63:16 | class | coding |
| 93:18 206:20 219:3 | chart | 10:6,7,8,14,17,18 | 196:6,12 |
| 224:19 229:15 243:9 | 88:22 170:13 171:3 | 33:23 165:8 | cogent |
| 243:19 244:6 245:24 | 174:7 181:17 183:9 | classes | 4:21 111:12,16 |
| certainly | 183:11,18,18 184:2 | 10:4 | cohen |
| 275:14 | 220:14 225:11 | classified | 2:10 |
| certainty | 226:15,24 248:9 | 87:20 | collected |
| 162:20 | 264:8 273:5 275:16 | cle | 61:24 62:4 |
| certified | check | 51:3 | collecting |
| $315: 22$ | 64:7,17 83:7 152:10 | clear | 61:21 |
| certify | 182:1 274:24,25 | 12:3 47:13 48:20 51:2 | collection |


| 101:2 | 251:12,18 253:16 | 139:11 | 174:23 189:7 195:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| college | 254:21,24 257:22 | commodities | 197:23,24 198:3 |
| 16:5,24 | 263:10 270:7 271:12 | 247:6 | 215:12 222:11 228:8 |
| column | 271:16 272:11 274:1 | common | 228:10 232:12,22 |
| 147:21 148:1,19,24 | 274:11 277:15,25 | 93:12 94:10,13,24 | 237:24 244:9,14 |
| 149:3 167:13,24 | 278:6 281:14 283:2,4 | 95:21 96:3 97:21,22 | 245:10,15 250:20 |
| 289:5,6,9,10 298:16 | 283:7,10,17 284:12 | 97:25 98:2,4,17,24 | 253:24 254:2 260:10 |
| columns | 285:1,6 286:20 287:2 | 98:25 99:1,8,16,23 | 261:10,17 |
| 147:3,7,15 | 287:22,25 288:23 | 100:3,11 121:18,22 | companybycompany |
| com | 294:11 295:14 298:7 | 131:1,8 189:25 | 74:18 75:2 |
| 5:21,22,24 6:3,6,8,11 | 298:25 299:10 300:6 | 190:15 250:18 251:6 | companys |
| 6:13,15,17,19,21 | 303:18 304:10 307:9 | 285:10 | 24:16,19 68:2 72:12 |
| 53:14 82:9,15,18,21 | 310:10,11,11,14,24 | community | 141:25 142:8 143:13 |
| 83:5,11,25 85:1,7 | 311:5 | 118:15 | 147:15 148:21 |
| 87:10 109:23 113:21 | comcast | comp | comparability |
| 114:10 120:24 121:3 | 286:22 | 38:10 150:3 210:11 | 189:18 |
| 121:7,19,23,24 123:5 | come | 222:8 228:5 232:9 | comparable |
| 125:4,8,13 126:7,12 | 8:18 9:24 12:20 17:24 | 255:4 | 76:24 77:1 82:7 88:25 |
| 130:12 133:25 | 18:11 24:20 27:1 | companies | 89:6,12,13 90:13,23 |
| 134:12,13,18,21,24 | 32:17 59:9 61:12 | 57:12,13 59:14,22 | 93:9 94:8 97:20 |
| 135:8,14,18 136:4 | 73:9,11 95:7,22 97:8 | 70:11 71:24 72:10 | 143:1,3 145:15 |
| 137:15 138:6,13 | 97:13 98:4 101:2 | 73:25 74:2,6,9,14,14 | 198:20 213:9 238:2 |
| 139:2,10 141:5 146:3 | 107:3 149:14 153:24 | 79:10,10 80:23 | 255:15 |
| 149:9 155:9,10 | 154:3 159:21 173:12 | 108:15 109:18 | comparables |
| 156:12 157:6 158:4,4 | 179:12 249:22 259:3 | 112:23 113:10 | 82:6 89:7,9,14 98:15 |
| 160:13,15,19 161:11 | 277:13 310:12 | 118:23 119:14 120:5 | 161:15 194:14 |
| 161:14,24 162:6,12 | comes | 120:13 142:21 143:1 | compare |
| 162:21 163:2,5,10,18 | 13:10 23:15 104:16 | 145:15,18 147:19 | 81:25 96:23 100:21 |
| 164:3 165:17 169:11 | 141:7 164:20 191:12 | 156:3 194:5,7,10 | 213:22 216:17 |
| 172:11 175:1,2,4,8 | 246:13 | 195:21 197:17 198:1 | compared |
| 175:13,15 178:23 | coming | 198:9,20 199:7 215:7 | 82:22 167:18,25 260:4 |
| 180:21 182:5 189:10 | 8:15 14:16 26:12 | 237:19,21 246:3,5,6 | compares |
| 192:9,12 193:21 | 34:22 53:24 91:9 | 246:8,15 247:5 | 81:19 |
| 197:1 200:7,8,16,17 | 94:4 95:24 97:16 | 249:14,16 261:16 | comparing |
| 200:22,23 201:1,1,21 | 117:10 150:3 312:21 | company | 82:1 89:12 90:14,23 |
| 202:17,21,24 203:2 | commanded | 19:20 20:1,2 29:14 | 90:24 248:25 249:10 |
| 203:10,24 204:7,15 | 291:8 | 31:6,7 46:7 57:19 | 250:2 290:25 |
| 204:20 212:25 | commencing | 58:9 59:23 60:5 | comparison |
| 216:19 228:6 232:9 | 2:2 | 71:10,11,19 72:8 | 181:1,2 |
| 237:15,25 238:2,3,8 | comments | 73:1,3,3,10,11,13,16 | competitive |
| 238:10 239:1,2,15,24 | 215:4 | 73:18,21,23 74:20,21 | 267:15 270:16 |
| 240:2,5,13 241:4,9 | commercial | 74:24,24 76:5 98:22 | complete |
| 241:16,24 242:1,12 | 104:22,24 109:16 | 102:24 110:2 116:4 | 249:19 315:14 |
| 243:19 244:2,5,8,17 | commission | 120:3 131:12 147:2,8 | completely |
| 244:21 246:15,21 | 9:12 36:9,12,14 | 148:23 149:13 | 284:13 286:14 |
| 248:22 250:25 | committed | 163:17 164:15 166:4 | complicated |


| 158:22 | conditions | 27:1,2 32:20 39:11 | 222:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| component | 33:20 177:3 | 44:16,25 45:17,24 | contents |
| 158:2 | conducting | 91:23 102:18 103:12 | 100:1 193:24 |
| composite | 295:23 | 103:22 104:5,12,19 | context |
| 212:7 | conference | 164:23 | 62:24,25 63:12 93:21 |
| composition | 53:17 | constraints | 99:2 100:15 103:14 |
| 210:7 | confidentiality | 93:21 | 160:8 187:6 191:8,11 |
| compound | 33:15,21 58:3 59:1 | consultant | 293:16,17 |
| 46:6,10 | confused | 19:23 | contexts |
| comps | 84:19 | consulted | 93:18,19 100:1,6 |
| 70:10,10 89:17 97:2 | confusing | 41:10 | 190:22 191:4 |
| 98:6 150:5 155:12,16 | 34:4 | consulting | contingent |
| 155:25 156:21 | connecticut | 30:8 39:21 40:25 | 251:11 |
| 189:17 194:4,6 | 290:1 | 41:21 106:15 | continued |
| 197:23 206:10,25 | connection | consumer | 3:1 20:8 133:8 267:6 |
| 207:3,8,15,17,24 | 38:13 57:16 58:15 | 43:9,23 49:12 | 270:7 |
| 208:5,12 210:7 | 63:6 85:21 135:13 | consummated | continues |
| 211:18 212:13,20 | 309:6 | 144:16 | 50:7144:5 |
| 213:9,11,22 214:20 | consensual | contact | continuing |
| 215:6,16 216:3,8,18 | 134:3 | 144:20 | 9:9 94:9 103:25 |
| 216:22 237:13 | consensus | contained | continuously |
| 243:16 275:3,10 | 73:15,20 75:6 108:13 | 93:9 94:8 130:9 | 14:9 22:20 |
| computeraided | 108:25 | content | contracted |
| 315:12 | consent | 30:2 32:8 52:18,24 | 7:12 |
| coms | 37:18 | 53:1,2,3,4,5,9 118:15 | contributed |
| 81:14 136:1 164:9 | conservative | 194:3 214:23 215:1 | 54:6 176:25 |
| 177:11 238:12 311:1 | 98:11 | 215:16,17,19,21,23 | contributing |
| con | consider | 217:6,7 222:12,18,23 | 50:9 |
| 20:19 33:21 44:13 | 119:6 123:10 134:17 | 228:8,12,17,19 | contribution |
| concept | 134:20,23 135:1,4 | 232:13,17 $238: 7$ | 55:22 |
| 95:19 140:7 | 165:16 179:7 194:6 | 241:7,8,10 243:9,11 | control |
| concerning | 210:6 214:14 215:12 | 243:19,23 244:2,6 | 9:12 36:9,11,14 |
| 42:16,18 220:4 309:14 | consideration | 257:18 | conversation |
| concluded | 135:7 | contentbased | 107:25 169:7 |
| 170:23 307:20 | considered | 70:3,5,8,14 71:24 74:5 | conversations |
| concludes | 74:2,11,17 87:12,23 | 74:9,13 75:1,7 80:12 | 271:18 309:24 |
| 312:23 | 88:3 194:14 210:9 | 96:19 99:7,18,24 | converse |
| conclusion | 214:6,11 257:20 | 100:22 101:21 103:2 | 254:11 |
| 70:7 213:23 259:4 | considering | 105:13 108:14,18 | convert |
| 306:13,21 308:19 | 257:7 | 109:1 110:4 116:7,16 | 102:17 199:20 267:23 |
| conclusions | consistent | 159:8 160:3,17 | 269:11,13 283:24 |
| 68:14 139:7 216:15 | 72:20 75:9 250:17 | 194:15 196:5,7,8,22 | 304:22 |
| concurrently | consor | 198:24 199:13 205:9 | converts |
| 19:15 | 20:13,14, 15,17 22:3 | 205:22 228:10 238:4 | 267:25 269:16 |
| condition | 22:19,22 23:9,23 | 255:8,16,19 | conviction |
| 90:3 | 24:3,23 25:6,9,12,22 | contentrelated | 159:6 |


| copy | 170:16,19,22,25 | 187:4,14,15,18,24,25 | covered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:21 312:3,15 | 171:1,6,21 172:7 | 188:12,13,13,14 | 104:3 |
| copyright | 173:6,7,21,24 174:5 | costperuser | covers |
| 29:2 45:15,20 48:21 | 174:9,16,25 178:5 | 128:21 | 28:21 |
| 88:1 | 180:17 181:11 | costs | crash |
| copyrights | 182:14 185:14 | 188:16,16 | 121:15 |
| 23:20 32:25 34:13 | 186:17 195:22 | couldnt | created |
| 51:24 | 196:20 197:5,15 | 99:11 109:22 183:16 | 20:3 248:5,6 |
| corner | 198:22 204:15 | 198:18 250:13 | criteria |
| 183:2 240:4 248:4 | 206:21 217:5,15,22 | 259:10 299:2 | 89:22,24 194:13 195:1 |
| corp | 220:5 221:10 222:10 | counsel | 195:2 197:16 |
| 141:1 | 222:12 223:7 225:13 | 2:7 3:1 7:17 15:4 | crosspollinating |
| corporation | 226:22 227:4 228:7,9 | 17:13 58:17 187:22 | 159:2 |
| 40:20 | 228:23 230:7,10 | 269:22 288:17 | currency |
| corporations | 231:4 232:6,14 235:7 | 309:25 310:16 | 77:15 |
| 34:1 | 235:10,13,25 236:12 | count | current |
| correct | 237:2,3,5 238:1 | 140:22 154:11 296:25 | 69:14 76:3 112:8 |
| 18:24 22:8,16 24:25 | 239:20 244:10,15,19 | 297:3 | 232:19 249:5,5 253:8 |
| 25:19,21 27:8 32:16 | 245:6,9 246:25 | counted | 253:10 |
| 35:23 36:16,25 37:14 | 247:20,23 248:1,15 | 285:4,5 286:7 | currently |
| 37:19 43:8,11,12,24 | 249:13 251:2 253:24 | counting | 35:1 36:20 56:13 |
| 44:10 47:12,15,21 | 255:6,22,24,25 | 153:14 154:15,18,19 | 69:22 78:2 |
| 53:24 54:2 66:11,12 | 256:10,16 259:17 | 154:21 286:10 | curriculum |
| 66:17 67:7,11 68:20 | 261:11,14 262:25 | country | 4:13 |
| 68:22,23 71:18 73:24 | 263:15 266:16,17,23 | 42:19 261:16 | curve |
| 74:3 78:15 79:15 | 268:23 271:4 275:21 | counts | 220:23 |
| 82:23 85:18 90:16,21 | 276:10 277:20 | 140:19 | cushion |
| 90:25 104:4 111:15 | 278:10 279:13 | county | 21:2 |
| 114:20 116:3 122:2 | 281:16,25 282:3,22 | 1:2 314:2 315:2 | customer |
| 124:24 125:5 134:16 | 282:24 284:7,12,18 | couple | 48:23 |
| 135:6,9,24 137:17 | 287:4,20 288:25 | 20:21 29:10 57:14 | customers |
| 139:17 140:16,17,20 | 289:3,16 292:22 | 87:2 92:25 107:4 | 17:10 |
| 140:24 142:18,22 | 297:2,5,16 298:25 | 110:15 128:15 141:8 | customs |
| 143:2,16 144:8 | 303:20,23 307:4 | 148:5 216:22 249:17 | 44:19 49:3 |
| 145:19,25 146:6,14 | 311:11 314:7 315:14 | 249:19 252:16 | cut |
| 146:18 147:1,20,24 | corrections | 286:18 | 12:10 183:3 264:23 |
| 148:3,4,7,18 149:2,6 | 312:8 | course | 306:24 307:25 |
| 149:10 150:14 | correlated | 10:11 11:14 13:614:3 | cutting |
| 151:13,20,25 152:4,8 | 178:11,14 | 14:6,9 15:8 56:7,13 | 295:1 |
| 152:20,22 153:3 | correlating | 56:19,25 57:3,5,7,8,9 | cuva |
| 154:9 155:14 156:10 | 177:16 | 307:5 | 2:10 |
| 156:15,18,24 157:3 | correlation | court | cv |
| 157:24 158:15 | 177:12 | 1:1 8:2 9:5 42:24 59:8 | 39:11 41:7 44:12 |
| 160:25 161:2,11,20 | cost | 269:22 270:2 301:1 | 48:25 |
| 162:17 167:8,18 | 66:1,10,14,17,21 | cover | cycle |
| 168:9 169:6,18 | 126:15 127:13,19,22 | 10:22,22 | 108:2,12 |


| D | 310:1,3,3,7 311:8,22 | 44:4 | defines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d | database | deals | 62:13,14 72:25 180:5 |
| 3:15 4:1 | 9:13 36:3,4,5,15 43:20 | 130:2 191:21,22 | 180:10 |
| daily | 44:3,6,8 48:17 88:7,8 | 271:12,17 | defining |
| 183:19 244:11,12 | 195:11 | dealt | 119:3 179:25 |
| damages | databases | 29:14 | definitely |
| 38:14 55:8 104:15 | 23:21 32:25 34:20 | debt | 58:4 |
| 138:1,7,11 | 49:16 | 249:6,21 254:16 | definition |
| data | date | december | 73:2 114:25 180:6,7 |
| 36:5 60:22,25 61:7,9 | 7:9 36:5 65:10 83:9 | 237:4,9 239:17,18 | defy |
| 61:12,21,25 62:10,22 | 143:9 147:22,22 | 244:17 246:23 | 118:16 |
| 64:5,14 68:3,24 | 150:18 152:8 155:16 | 247:25 248:16,22,25 | degree |
| 79:25 80:6 81:24 | 195:7 215:8 233:2 | 249:1,9,12,13,18,20 | 16:9,11 18:21 19:5,9 |
| 105:7 141:1,6 144:10 | 236:9,17 248:5,6 | 249:25 250:2,3,8,9 | 19:11 113:20 118:21 |
| 144:25 145:5 147:6 | 249:2,24 250:25 | 250:19 252:19 253:5 | 119:4,17,20,24 120:2 |
| 148:6,9,16 151:15 | 253:5 311:8 | 253:11,12,16 254:6 | 162:20 216:7 |
| 152:22,23 154:13 | dates | 279:25 280:18,25 | demographic |
| 155:1 181:19,23 | 83:6 155:15 184:7,10 | 290:2,20 291:14,18 | 210:6,15,21 238:9 |
| 182:23 183:10,12,15 | 184:11 226:22 261:1 | decide | 309:9 |
| 183:17,20 184:1 | daulerio | 267:17 270:18,24 | demographics |
| 194:25 195:16 196:1 | 7:21,24 | decided | 206:20 209:8,12 210:9 |
| 197:4 207:19 209:1 | david | 18:20 | 210:10 212:22 213:4 |
| 209:11 213:6,13,16 | 64:2 183:5 | decimal | 238:24 239:2,7,8 |
| 213:17,18,21,22 | davidnoble08 | 302:2,15 | 240:4,22 |
| 214:1,3 219:17 220:5 | 183:4 | decimals | demonstration |
| 221:21 224:22 225:9 | day | 136:8 301:19 302:17 | 51:25 |
| 225:11 226:5,15,21 | 15:8 21:21 99:9 140:8 | deck | denominator |
| 230:4,15 231:2 235:5 | 146:16 222:12,19 | 45:18 | 95:21 97:21,22,25 |
| 235:11,15 236:19 | 228:13 232:20 | decline | 98:2,4,17,24,25 99:1 |
| 238:17,24 239:2,7 | 261:12 282:18 283:4 | 280:15 | 99:8,17,23 100:3,12 |
| 240:4,11,14,17,22,23 | 285:11 314:8 315:18 | declining | 190:1,15 250:18 |
| 246:13,17,17 248:20 | days | 264:10,11 | 285:10 |
| 249:10,10,20,20 | 15:11 248:17 312:11 | decode | denton |
| 250:21 252:23 253:3 | deadspin | 86:5 | 7:20,24 267:8,10 |
| 253:6,12 259:6,13 | 134:21 158:4 | decoder | 268:7 271:9,15 |
| 261:24 265:18 266:8 | deal | 111:9 | 287:24 |
| 266:9,12 269:17,18 | 59:16,16 60:1 217:16 | decoding | dentons |
| 270:2,4,11,22 271:24 | 217:18,20 229:1 | 219:16 | 267:24 269:14 270:12 |
| 272:13,15 273:25 | 231:23 | decrease | 270:23 283:23 304:6 |
| 277:14,16,25 278:15 | dealer | 278:8,11 | 304:11 305:6 |
| 279:3 281:20 284:1 | 36:7 | defendant | department |
| 284:15 285:20 286:1 | dealers | 46:22 47:7,8 139:18 | 26:23 61:23 |
| 286:8,22 287:8,12 | 36:6 | defendants | depend |
| 289:1 290:6 293:16 | dealing | 1: $\square$ : | 118:2 188:23 |
| 298:4 299:11 300:7 | 90:19 245:15 | defies | depending |
| 301:2 303:8 309:20 | dealoftheday | 118:24 | 192:4 |


| depends | 79:13 142:20 | 175:11 181:9 185:20 | discussion |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24:9 64:8 99:2 100:15 | determines | 186:8,17 190:17 | 55:9 87:14,22 88:13 |
| 109:19 163:13 | 76:25 | 191:19 200:6 202:6 | 125:3 133:19 288:8 |
| 164:11 192:5,6 | determining | 204:6 209:13 210:11 | 301:15 |
| depo | 100:2 | 228:20 240:10 | disposal |
| 20:25 | detour | 241:14 243:25 244:1 | 23:3 |
| deposed | 246:18 | 249:21,24 250:12 | distressed |
| 8:23,25 36:24 | develop | 255:24 257:24,24 | 289:24 290:3 |
| deposit | 64:15 188:15 | 259:22 262:6 265:5 | distributed |
| 17:11 | developing | 285:7 286:10 289:2 | 266:15 308:3 |
| deposition | 64:15 145:14 | 294:6 | distribution |
| 1:15 2:1 7:6,15 9:18 | development | differently | 212:12,19 214:6 |
| 11:9,14 13:6,10 14:3 | 66:23 | 72:1 204:7 | 239:16 240:5,8 |
| 14:6 15:12 25:18 | diagram | difficult | 263:13 265:4,8,12 |
| 38:18 65:19 84:10 | 51:20 | 88:23 89:4 264:15 | 266:14 |
| 132:23 133:2 135:10 | dictate | difficulties | district |
| 312:24 313:5 315:7 | 77:17 | 89:2 | 42:22 |
| 315:10 | didnt | difficulty | divide |
| derivations | 38:5 52:16 63:9 66:10 | 113:9,11 | 149:22 151:19 |
| 187:5 | 66:13 68:11,15 90:9 | direct | divided |
| derive | 134:14,17,20,23 | 25:25 26:25 43:9,23 | 143:12 148:21,23 |
| 81:25 149:21 171:21 | 135:1,4 148:6 149:22 | 49:12 100:13 | 149:14 170:17 |
| 207:5 | 166:1 176:24 186:14 | direction | divides |
| derived | 192:7,16,22 193:2 | 64:4,8 315:13 | 180:24 |
| 59:24 155:12 252:23 | 199:25 210:6,19 | directly | dividing |
| 258:9 | 213:2 214:17 230:19 | 100:23 111:19 118:3 | 48:5 |
| derives | 239:19 242:9 249:2 | 182:4 244:3 268:24 | division |
| 60:6 201:20 | 259:13 263:16 | director | 27:4,10 |
| describe | 269:21 301:2 | 24:24 25:10 26:21 | divisions |
| 62:10 193:24 225:14 | diego | 28:12 | 27:2 |
| 225:19 272:19,24 | 10:13 16:19 18:22 | disclosed | doc |
| description | 19:7 20:9 56:10 | 40:14,15 41:3,5,6 42:4 | 266:2 |
| 4:11 5:2 6:2 | 165:3 | 43:16 | document |
| details | difference | discounted | 20:24 21:5,8 39:1,4 |
| 34:8 219:9 | 51:18 82:24 83:15 | 67:12 | 62:16 85:13 86:6,12 |
| determination | 162:22 265:13,19 | discounts | 86:14,17 91:3,17 |
| 200:20 | differences | 243:2,7 | 110:25 111:6,12,14 |
| determine | 97:2,9 201:3,16 | discuss | 122:4,5,8,13,16,24 |
| 70:22 71:2,6,20 74:20 | 202:12 | 51:13 53:18 54:17 | 146:9 171:9,15,17,20 |
| 78:25 82:6 83:24 | different | 57:1 110:22 | 180:1 182:16,18,20 |
| 96:23 101:5 108:20 | 31:19 41:24 49:5 | discussed | 182:24 183:23 |
| 140:10 143:6,10 | 50:20 60:2 61:5 62:9 | 54:22 207:15 216:25 | 219:18,21,22,25 |
| 170:5,8 179:5 187:6 | 70:15 71:17 95:17 | 309:11,13,17,18 | 220:1 221:1,3,16 |
| 197:6 210:13 214:17 | 99:3 114:8 131:15,16 | discusses | 224:23 225:1,2,5 |
| 294:7 299:18 300:5 | 139:24 155:16 158:2 | 65:22 87:4 88:21 | 226:2,12 231:1,3,11 |
| determined | 159:4 160:3 167:6 | 92:11 | 231:16 235:15,20,23 |


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 236:1,15 239:11 | $33: 1934: 2,6,16$ | $230: 25232: 21233: 1$ | $213: 23$ |
| $241: 20244: 22245: 2$ | $38: 2340: 1541: 4$ | $233: 4,9234: 6,7,15$ | dresses |
| $245: 5246: 22247: 10$ | $44: 1845: 746: 847: 5$ | $235: 3,11238: 11,20$ | $204: 15$ |
| $247: 12,15,19,21$ | $48: 1053: 2054: 16,20$ | $240: 17241: 12,17$ | drew |
| $252: 3272: 7273: 22$ | $55: 11,1857: 9,10,25$ | $242: 16243: 13,14,22$ | $151: 14$ |
| $274: 18277: 8,22$ | $58: 11,16,2459: 6,15$ | $243: 23244: 7245: 24$ | drink |
| $278: 25288: 16$ | $59: 21,2560: 7,11,12$ | $246: 7,7,11248: 2$ | $63: 17$ |
| documentation | $60: 1961: 14,1862: 25$ | $250: 10251: 20253: 2$ | drinks |
| 223:21 | $63: 1264: 12,1265: 10$ | $253: 17256: 3,19$ | $71: 14,17$ |
| documents | $65: 16,18,2173: 2,7$ | $257: 25258: 8,13$ | drive |
| $14: 2115: 1,3,5,11,14$ | $73: 1474: 2378: 23$ | $261: 1,8,8,20,23$ | $101: 14,15238: 5$ |
| $39: 580: 15,19,24$ | $79: 2180: 2,5,1981: 4$ | $262: 5,10265: 17$ | driven |
| $85: 16,20,21,2391: 14$ | $90: 691: 892: 497: 13$ | $266: 10,13269: 1,18$ | $53: 4$ |
| $110: 18129: 8217: 25$ | $99: 15100: 13,16,17$ | $269: 25271: 11,16,18$ | driver |
| $219: 12223: 19229: 1$ | $101: 23102: 3,7,13$ | $273: 7275: 7,13,22,23$ | $99: 19,21$ |
| $233: 25274: 25$ | $104: 8,17105: 4,6,18$ | $277: 1279: 23,24$ | drives |
| doesnt | $106: 4,17,19,25108: 4$ | $280: 23,24281: 7,11$ | $53: 6100: 25101: 9,10$ |
| $66: 14108: 17127: 21$ | $108: 8111: 4112: 13$ | $281: 12282: 10284: 1$ | $101: 11,11110: 4$ |
| $128: 3,20,24155: 5$ | $114: 25115: 17119: 2$ | $284: 3288: 5293: 17$ | $255: 16$ |
| $160: 13161: 4166: 10$ | $119: 9,22120: 7,7,7$ | $296: 2301: 19,20$ | drop |
| $249: 7256: 2285: 22$ | $120: 22123: 9,20$ | $302: 7,11,16305: 1,5$ | $278: 20279: 12,14,17$ |
| doing | $129: 5,17130: 21$ | $305: 8306: 2307: 12$ | $279: 25280: 7,8$ |
| $11: 1212: 818: 5,12$ | $131: 5132: 1,1,16$ | $307: 21310: 5,18$ | dropped |
| $20: 17,1928: 17,24$ | $138: 8,11144: 12$ | $311: 15,15312: 17$ | $121: 12278: 17280: 13$ |
| $30: 338: 857: 2260: 5$ | $145: 9,13150: 19$ | donziger | drops |
| $64: 11,1465: 2077: 6$ | $152: 7,7157: 20158: 7$ | $40: 20$ | $240: 20280: 3$ |
| $88: 790: 1998: 18$ | $158: 17,18,18,24$ | dot |  |
| $187: 11188: 20$ | $159: 1,3160: 24162: 4$ | $121: 19,23,24$ | drove |
| $189: 22274: 14$ | $162: 9,11,15163: 3,7$ | double | $8: 18$ |
| $293: 18300: 25$ | $165: 7166: 9169: 21$ | $154: 15,18,19$ | due |
| $307: 13309: 2311: 12$ | $177: 22,22178: 20$ | doublecheck | $83: 25278: 20$ |
| $311: 16$ | $184: 25185: 9186: 22$ | $72: 23$ | duly |
| dollar | $187: 10188: 18$ | doubled | $8: 7315: 7$ |
| $141: 9,13,19148: 25$ | $189: 14,18190: 25$ | $222: 2227: 11,13237: 8$ |  |
| dollars | $191: 13,14193: 14$ | $237: 10$ | e |
| $67: 1769: 1678: 21$ | $195: 6,7,24196: 16$ | download | E |
| $100: 25125: 18,24$ | $198: 14200: 12$ | $183: 15$ | $4: 1,105: 16: 1223: 6,8$ |
| $126: 13174: 25$ | $201: 24202: 10,20$ | downloaded | earlier |
| $199: 21267: 18$ | $203: 23,23204: 3,4,21$ | $183: 19$ | $10: 1513: 15,1625: 17$ |
| $270: 19,25$ | $204: 23205: 2,24$ | draft | $35: 2439: 657: 11,14$ |
| domain | $207: 19,21208: 2,4,7$ | $64: 19$ | $63: 687: 6,23103: 17$ |
| $135: 8$ | $218: 7,8,9,12,19$ | dramatically | $104: 2110: 15125: 3$ |
| dont | $219: 7,9220: 17,24$ | $121: 12$ | $140: 2,8146: 16,25$ |
| $10: 2111: 712: 21,24$ | $222: 20223: 3,25$ | draw | $159: 12180: 1186: 4$ |
| $15: 1721: 424: 22$ | $224: 3,9,19226: 10$ | $153: 17196: 21253: 6$ | $245: 10,13246: 19$ |
| $30: 2532: 11,1333: 10$ | $228: 14229: 15$ | drawing | $282: 18285: 11$ |
|  |  |  |  |


| 300:13 309:2 310:2 | effort | entire | et |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 310:22 | 66:23 197:23 | 26:23 34:10 274:7 | 1:9 |
| early | eight | entirely | ether |
| 9:4,4 | 39:15,19 40:2 44:22 | 83:4 | 194:22 |
| earn | 49:7,8,8 248:17 | entities | evaluate |
| 79:1 114:23,24 224:18 | either | 32:22,22 33:7,9,20,24 | 51:23,23 76:13 |
| earned | 53:19 57:15 88:2 | 33:25 76:24 77:1 | evaluated |
| 138:19 | 128:4 150:5 157:22 | entry | 218:10 224:1 |
| earning | 159:20,21 185:24 | 289:17 | evaluating |
| 69:17 | 236:11 245:15 284:3 | equal | 234:9 |
| earnings | 298:21,21 301:21 | 148:20 293:8 307:5,6 | evenly |
| 67:7 74:16,21 75:4 | 302:8,9 | 307:8,15 308:4 | 266:15 |
| 113:13,21 114:10,17 | elementary | equate | event |
| 115:4,7 219:6 234:15 | 290:1 | 284:5 | 315:17 |
| 254:20 | email | equation | events |
| easier | 34:20 44:3,4,5 183:3 | 124:5 | 232:19 |
| 12:14 | emblem | equivalent | evidence |
| east | 28:1,5 | 157:22 287:13 | 210:20 302:22 |
| 2:4,19 7:16 | employed | errors | exact |
| easy | 105:15 | 64:7,17 | 63:12 73:2 83:6 90:20 |
| 89:9 | employees | escalating | 112:13 115:17 |
| ebay | 103:22 | 118:13 | 149:24 150:18 |
| 128:16 | employer | especially | 157:20 241:13 |
| ebit | 10:25 | 155:23 | 253:17 258:8 261:1 |
| 95:8 | ended | espn | 302:1 306:2 |
| ebitda | 14:11 151:23 153:14 | 53:14 200:17 204:20 | exactly |
| 95:8 254:22 | endorsement | esq | 24:22 30:3 45:7 61:14 |
| ecommerce | 191:21,22 | 2:11,18 3:5,12 | 65:16 95:5 115:13,18 |
| 53:7 194:16 197:1 | engaged | essentially | 137:5,9 186:22 |
| economics | 60:21 62:21 134:2 | 26:12 181:8 299:12 | 188:19 222:20 223:3 |
| 16:12 | engagement | establish | 233:1 245:24 277:1 |
| ecuador | 62:17,19 | 82:2 | 308:9,9 |
| 42:18,19,19,20 | engagements | established | examination |
| education | 43:1,3 | 124:13,20,24 125:5,10 | 4:2 8:12 133:8 |
| 103:25 | engine | establishment | examined |
| educational | 180:15 | 53:17 | 8:8 315:6 |
| 213:8 | english | estate | example |
| effect | 27:23 | 90:6,9 109:17 131:3 | 52:15,21 70:9 71:7 |
| 78:24 185:10,11 | enter | estimate | 89:15 102:22 180:23 |
| 216:15 227:21 239:8 | 302:21 | 81:21 | examples |
| 254:2 258:25 259:14 | enterprise | estimated | 28:19 29:10 39:15 |
| 259:23 260:11 269:9 | 248:10,13,19 249:8,22 | 158:1 | 48:15 52:8,11 105:19 |
| effective | 250:16 252:11,17 | estimates | exceed |
| 147:23 | 253:13 254:17 | 161:10 | 297:20 298:1 |
| effectively | entertainment | estimating | exceeds |
| 82:25 | 204:1 222:24 228:18 | 161:13 | 297:8 |


| excel | 241:23 244:20 245:1 | 271:3 311:4 | 216:14 225:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 149:23,23 | 245:3,5 246:22 | experts | 227:23 |
| excellent | 247:10,13 250:7,24 | 23:15 137:20 | factored |
| 236:18 | 252:2,4,8 262:17 | explain | 214:13 254:16 |
| exceptional | 264:8 265:4 272:6,8 | 23:6 27:15 38:7 | factors |
| 220:25 278:22 | 272:10 273:23,25 | 100:18,19 124:3 | 113:12 176:25 178:18 |
| exceptionally | 274:17,19 275:16,25 | 125:13 137:8 180:14 | 259:18 |
| 198:15 | 277:6,9,14,21,23,25 | 180:18 249:11 | factual |
| excerpt | 278:14 279:1,3 | explained | 47:16 |
| 91:20 | 281:13,19 282:11,14 | 11:10 124:6 252:16 | failed |
| excerpts | 282:15 288:2,12 | explains | 197:23 |
| 84:14 | 298:14 303:15,16 | 127:23 144:5 | fair |
| excited | exhibits | explanation | 49:14 58:20 128:12 |
| 12:10 | 14:8 21:15,17 140:2,3 | 48:13 | 162:20 166:4 212:1 |
| exclusivity | 146:12,15 | explicit | 220:14 266:14 |
| 93:22,23 | existence | 81:18 | 295:10 |
| executed | 115:22 215:7 223:2 | explicitly | fairly |
| 314:8 | 260:24 | 127:21 | 51:24 155:22 230:13 |
| exhibit | expect | exploitation | 233:7 239:3 273:9 |
| 4:12,13,15,17,20,22 | 67:9 234:14 | 4:1686:7 | fall |
| 4:24,24,24 5:3,5,6,8 | expectation | expressing | 48:19 |
| 5:9,11,13,14,16,18 | 219:2 224:16 229:12 | 137:25 138:18,21 | falling |
| 5:21,22,24 6:3,6,8,11 | expectations | 139:4 310:23 | 277:7 |
| 6:13,15,17,19,21 | 234:12 | extensive | falls |
| 20:25 21:4,6 34:23 | expected | 22:11 | 181:2 |
| 38:25 39:2 86:11,15 | 146:16 | extensively | familiar |
| 86:17 87:4 88:17 | expecting | 103:23 | 62:9,17 91:24,25 |
| 91:1,4,18 111:5,7,10 | 224:18 229:13 | extent | 200:24 202:23 247:1 |
| 118:6 122:7,9,14,16 | experience | 59:8 84:6 199:7 | fanbased |
| 143:17 146:8,8,10,12 | 22:7,12,14 39:15 | extracting | 32:8 |
| 146:19,19 151:21,22 | 57:12 60:24 61:2,4 | 109:3 | far |
| 153:5 156:7,12,19 | 80:22 |  | 17:11 31:9,9 69:23 |
| 167:4,5,6,10,13 | experiences | F | 72:11 163:1,4 195:5 |
| 170:13 171:14,18 | 57:18 | face | 276:22 297:7 |
| 172:13,14 173:14 | expert | 230:15 | fargo |
| 174:2 175:17 182:19 | 4:12 9:19 10:11 23:13 | facebook | 17:3,7,20 18:1 22:15 |
| 182:19,21,23 183:9 | 24:17,20 26:16,19 | 191:23 199:25 | fast |
| 183:12,22,24 211:21 | 28:14,25 30:8,12 | fact | 115:24 152:10 |
| 211:21,22 219:13,21 | 31:12 35:21 37:23 | 47:16 94:3 109:1 | fastest |
| 219:23 220:1 221:2,4 | 39:15,20,22 40:3,9 | 115:1 155:22 185:10 | 112:7 |
| 221:15,17,19 224:21 | 40:24 41:1,12,14,15 | 195:6 199:3 228:1 | feel |
| 224:25 225:3,5 226:1 | 41:21,21 42:5,11 | 293:9 | 63:17 92:15 252:16 |
| 226:3,11,13 231:2,10 | 43:5,11,13 49:4,5,22 | factor | feels |
| 231:12,16 235:4,14 | 58:19 63:6,20 65:2,6 | 68:11,13,15 166:1 | 123:4 |
| 235:19,21,23 237:4 | 73:10 136:3 185:18 | 176:6,14 181:23 | fellow |
| 239:10,12 241:19,21 | 186:15 205:4 206:18 | 210:17 213:2 215:10 | 25:16 |


| felt | 267:18 | 98:5 110:20,21 129:16 | fluctuated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 66:14 | finance | 129:22 245:21 | 24:2 |
| field | 4:16 6:8 19:10,19,23 | first | fluctuates |
| 196:6,13 | 22:4 86:8 123:24 | 8:7 16:3 20:24 31:25 | 143:19 244:13,14 |
| fifteen | 247:1,3,9 249:4 | 36:1 47:23 56:16 | 280:6 |
| 287:2 | 251:23 252:9,25 | 78:14 81:22 88:22 | fluctuations |
| fifth | 253:19 | 92:13 93:1 103:6 | 144:1 |
| 237:24 | finances | 107:4 111:2,2,23 | flying |
| fifty | 68:22 | 112:2,3 118:7 140:6 | 8:16 |
| 85:19 | financial | 146:17,19 147:6 | focus |
| fighting | 17:11 18:4 25:4,7 26:2 | 180:16 205:16,19 | 23:4 |
| 45:11 | 26:2,7,18,20 35:12 | 231:14,19 237:13 | focused |
| figure | 35:17 68:3 79:24 | 252:10 264:4 267:2 | 135:7 |
| 59:2 74:24 124:2,3 | 80:6 106:15 195:16 | 273:9 285:8 | folded |
| 128:20 178:23 | 195:18 247:4 | firstime | 183:13 |
| 179:14 181:5,12 | financialrelated | 267:22 269:10 283:24 | folks |
| 182:15 183:13 | 247:6 | 304:21,25 | 12:10 27:12 28:6 |
| 184:16 211:23 | financials | fiscal | 33:23 190:21 203:25 |
| 267:12,13 270:12,14 | 6:4 68:11 69:3,4,6 | 249:15 | followed |
| 294:2 296:7 | 80:25,25 115:7 | fits | 131:12,24 |
| figured | 218:18 224:8 229:21 | 305:5 | followers |
| 18:7 102:2 173:19 | 234:21 249:18 | five | 191:23 |
| figuring | financing | 15:11 19:25 21:16 | following |
| 101:25 124:5 208:25 | 29:4,5 197:18,24 | 25:25 26:4 44:21 | 65:19 107:7 121:11 |
| file | 198:4,10,16 | 104:20 106:9 112:6 | 232:3 272:20 |
| 41:14 249:14 | find | 136:16 146:12 | follows |
| filed | 14:12,19,22 27:16,17 | 241:13 | 8:8 |
| 41:11,15 | 28:3 58:20 64:4 89:7 | flagging | footnote |
| files | 89:9 90:12,22 106:18 | 67:1 | 85:13 86:5 122:5,17 |
| 250:22 | 124:2,7 145:15 194:9 | flames | 182:15 235:4 247:18 |
| filing | 230:23 256:20,25 | 268:10 304:16 | 247:19 252:19,22 |
| 48:10 197:11 253:7 | 257:21,22 | flat | footnotes |
| filings | finding | 155:22 | 110:17 |
| 245:20,22 246:4 | 64:14 | flip | foregoing |
| 249:17 253:11 | findings | 21:10 237:3 242:19 | 314:7 315:7 |
| fill | 4:25 | flipping | forget |
| 20:4,5 | fine | 86:19 156:19 | 85:19 |
| filled | 33:16 123:4 | florida | form |
| 104:9 | finish | 1:2 2:14 43:10,25 44:4 | 24:14 69:20 76:22 |
| filter | 12:12 | flow | 77:8 79:3,16,22 80:9 |
| 195:7,9,10,25 196:19 | finished | 67:18,20,21,24 81:2 | 80:17 83:3,22 84:3 |
| filtered | 12:11 | 98:5 | 85:23 87:18 88:6 |
| 194:12 | firm | flowing | 94:15 95:1 96:2,18 |
| filters | 11:5 22:23,24 111:17 | 174:25 | 97:3,11 98:7,19 |
| 195:23 | 129:24 | flows | 100:5 101:7,22 102:6 |
| finally | firms | 113:16 115:10 | 102:12,20 103:3 |

104:23 105:17,22
106:3,12,24 107:20
108:23 109:14
112:20,25 113:22
114:2,11,21 115:5,11
115:16 116:11,18
117:1,14,21 118:1,20
119:1,8,21 120:6,16
121:14 124:25 125:6
125:11 126:3,9 127:6
127:15,20 128:2,9,23
129:14 130:10,20
131:14,25 132:7,15
138:2,9 141:16 142:2
145:1,6 157:14 158:6
158:16,25 159:11,23
160:5 161:1,6,12,21
161:25 162:7,13,18
163:12,20 164:1,10
164:19 165:6,12,18
166:12,17 167:1
169:19 175:12
177:13,19 178:13,25
181:20 184:6 185:5
185:21 186:1,9,18
187:3,17 188:2 190:2
190:18,24 191:6
192:10,19,24 193:4
193:11 197:20
198:11 199:9 200:11
201:4,9,23 202:9,14
202:19 203:3,12
204:2,9,16,22 205:3
206:1,16,22 207:6
208:20 209:2,10,16
210:2 220:16 227:19
232:7 242:22 243:5
243:21 251:13,19
253:25 254:8,14
256:24 258:22
260:15 261:6 264:1
265:7 266:25 268:4
268:20 279:19
283:20 285:21 286:5
286:12 287:15,23
290:10,16 291:6,21

292:12,21 293:3,13
293:23 294:5,16
296:11,18 297:10,23
298:2 299:5,15,22
300:3 303:7 304:4
305:2,7,15 306:1,8
311:21

## formas

81:3
forth
12:8 84:7 85:25
forthcoming
55:21
forward
135:12
found
174:10
foundational
47:16
four
19:25 25:25 26:4 60:10 194:13 195:1 195:23,24 197:15 236:7 237:13 241:13 246:3,8
fraction
70:12
frame
93:23 156:6
frames
291:1
free
63:17 92:15
frequently
93:11 94:9,23
front
9:11 108:4,8 129:17 229:25 238:20 262:20 288:13
full
36:5 64:25 71:4 75:4 80:25 92:13 93:1 103:6 107:8
function
149:24 196:3 199:4
fund

36:1 40:8 49:9,12
fundamental
119:3
fundamentals
118:18,25 119:7,12
120:1

## funding

223:5,6,8,9,10,15
233:18 234:24 236:7
245:16,19

## funds

39:24
funny
13:1

## further

76:14 113:15 137:22 291:25 311:12,25 315:16

## future

67:6,9,15,24 69:12,12
75:22,23 101:1,10,16 101:19 102:8 114:3 114:22 115:10 116:22 127:8 199:19 200:3 206:5 219:2,6 224:16,19 229:12,14 233:14,16 234:12,14 255:18 311:16
G
gambling
9:12 36:6,9,11,14
game
58:20
games
217:10
gaming
36:1 39:24 40:8 49:9 49:12

## gamut

23:19 28:22
garbled
12:21
gauge
107:14 126:19
gawk

303:16
gawker
1:8,9 5:6 6:11,13,15 6:17,19,21 7:20,23 39:8 66:15 75:12,16 75:18 76:4,6,9 77:5,6 77:22,22 78:1,4,6,16
78:20 79:1,14,25
81:14 82:9,15,17,18 82:21 83:5,11,25
84:14 85:1,7 87:10 107:19 108:3,6 109:23 113:21 114:10 115:21 125:4 125:8,13 126:7,12 127:5 130:12 133:24 133:25 134:1,12,13 134:14 135:2,8,12,14 135:15,18,18 136:1,4 136:4 137:15 138:6 138:13,19 139:2,5,10 139:11 150:11 155:9
155:10,17 156:12
157:1,6,10 158:1,12
158:14 159:2 160:4
160:13,14,15,17,19
161:11,14,18,24
162:6,12,21 163:2,5
163:10,18 164:3,9
165:11,17 166:8
169:11 171:10,16
172:1,11,15,16,23,25
173:16 174:7,25
175:1,2,4,8,9,13,15
177:11 178:23
179:20 180:20,20,21
180:21,23 181:2,9,15
181:24 182:4,5,12
184:16,24 185:15
189:10 192:9,12
193:9,21 196:2 208:3
208:14 210:18
211:14 212:14,17,21
212:25 213:9,21
215:20,24 216:2,19
222:19 238:3,25

| 241:16 243:12,13,25 | 6:16 | 78:2 207:13 259:11 | 12:8 13:5,9,16 16:5,15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 244:5 255:15 257:22 | gawker2482124823 | generating | 16:18,20 20:23 27:13 |
| 258:18 259:16 | 6:18 | 69:15,22 200:2 | 27:16,17 28:3 29:4 |
| 260:14 262:18 263:2 | gawker2482424826 | gentlemen | 29:20 51:24,25 54:24 |
| 263:5,10 265:16 | 6:22 | 28:3 | 63:16 66:5 81:6 |
| 266:8 267:7 268:1 | gawker2483924841 | genuine | 83:17 84:10 91:14 |
| 270:7 271:12,16,22 | 6:20 | 267:19 | 92:23 99:16 100:24 |
| 272:11 274:1,11 | gawker2484224843 | geographical | 107:24 110:21,21 |
| 275:5 277:15 278:1,6 | 4:14 | 93:21 | 112:1 116:7,16,23 |
| 279:4 281:14,24 | gawker24847 | getting | 117:2,7 129:5 132:20 |
| 283:2,4,7,10,17 | 5:7 | 17:14 19:5 25:17 34:7 | 133:15 137:6,7 |
| 284:6,8,12 285:1,6 | gawker2484824856 | 41:9 58:25 73:22 | 139:23 182:17 |
| 285:19 286:20 287:2 | 4:19 | 165:3 198:15 203:13 | 187:13 188:9, 16,18 |
| 287:22,24,25 288:16 | gawkers | 203:18 205:14 | 188:19 199:5 203:2 |
| 288:23 291:5 293:1 | 68:11,15,17 83:2 | 294:20 303:14 | 205:16,19,19 211:2 |
| 293:22 294:11 | 115:10 151:5 160:20 | 309:24 | 211:20 214:2 216:21 |
| 295:14 296:8,21 | 160:25 161:5 171:4 | give | 216:24 219:15 |
| 297:19,21 298:7,13 | 174:17,21 181:12 | 14:21 17:11 21:1 | 235:18 238:6 240:12 |
| 298:25 299:7,10,20 | 207:22 208:8 210:8 | 28:19 29:10 48:14,15 | 250:16 253:12,13 |
| 299:24 300:5,6,16 | 216:18 | 52:21 86:1 91:5,8 | 256:5,14,20,23,25 |
| 303:5,12,18,21 304:3 | gears | 102:21 236:6 239:19 | 257:3,3,21,22 282:17 |
| 304:10 305:10,13,18 | 63:19 245:12 262:16 | 249:7 266:9 294:24 | 288:5 295:8 301:12 |
| 305:25 307:9,19 | gene | 301:22 302:3,5 | 310:10,13 312:17 |
| 310:10,11,11,14,24 | 1:47:7 | given | god |
| 311:1,5,5 | general | 9:7 11:2,6 99:5 191:9 | 28:21 |
| gawker0114801149 | 36:23 37:11 38:1 47:2 | 264:18 | goes |
| 5:4 | 57:16 64:7 75:6 | gives | 108:11 142:9 |
| gawker2473624738 | 89:10 97:24 108:13 | 83:10 209:5 240:21 | going |
| 5:10 | 108:15,25 116:4,6 | giving | 11:12 13:8 14:15,16 |
| gawker2473924741 | 119:24,24 131:7 | 11:16 29:9 164:21 | 16:1,3 20:23 21:25 |
| 5:12 | 194:2 195:19 203:16 | 307:12 | 23:6 25:2 27:20 30:5 |
| gawker2474224744 | 206:18 222:24 | gizmodo | 30:6 38:6,24 47:22 |
| 5:15 | 228:19 296:1 310:13 | 134:18 | 49:18,19 56:13 57:9 |
| gawker2474524747 | generally | gladiators | 58:18 59:1 67:2 72:9 |
| 5:17 | 62:13,19 75:21 89:2 | 192:23 | 72:11 77:25 80:14 |
| gawker2474824752 | 90:12 116:9 117:17 | global | 85:25 86:1,10 87:1 |
| 5:25 | 122:2 124:14 125:23 | 274:15,22 275:1,3 | 92:24 95:12 96:20 |
| gawker2475324755 | generate | globally | 98:8,13 108:24 110:6 |
| 5:23 | 194:18 197:12 198:25 | 275:22 | 116:24 119:14 |
| gawker2475624757 | 199:13 200:1,3 | glossary | 125:12 131:17 |
| 6:10 | 207:16 237:22 | 62:15 | 133:11 135:11 |
| gawker2477624778 | generated | gnc | 136:21 137:4 139:23 |
| 6:12 | 79:2,14,18 101:5 | 9:22,23 37:12,21 | 149:11 150:25 |
| gawker2480624808 | 197:7 199:4 206:10 | 38:11,12 40:5,7 | 152:12 155:8,21 |
| 6:14 | 219:6 258:4 | 47:20 | 166:3 167:4,9 169:7 |
| gawker2481824820 | generates | go | 171:13 173:3,4 182:9 |


| 186:7,10,16 197:10 | 5:22,24 6:3,6,8 146:3 | 15:4 301:1 | 158:8 162:4,8 163:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200:1 201:25 203:4 | 149:9 212:25 237:25 |  | 191:14 214:3,4 241:1 |
| 203:10,18,21 210:24 | 238:2,8,10,12 239:1 | H | 253:2 269:20 270:4 |
| 219:5,11 227:3 | 239:2,15,24 240:2,5 | h | 284:2 291:10,22 |
| 234:14 241:12 | 240:13 241:4,9,24 | 4:10 5:1 6:1 | 306:3 |
| 246:21 249:3,15 | 242:1,2,11,12 243:19 | hadnt | head |
| 251:24 256:21 257:7 | 244:2,8,17,21 246:21 | 272:4 | 22:25 24:5 35:14 |
| 264:3,15,16,18 265:1 | 248:22 250:25 | half | 54:20 55:16 59:15,21 |
| 267:8 270:11,24 | 251:12,18 253:16 | 24:18 28:15 306:24 | 61:19 70:19 74:12 |
| 273:10 276:19 | 254:21,24 | 307:15,19,22 308:1,9 | 80:18,20 85:14 100:8 |
| 282:11,17 291:16,25 | graph | 308:9,13 | 116:10 123:23 130:5 |
| 295:6,17 302:6,10 | 184:11 185:8 264:14 | hand | 157:18 188:19 |
| 313:3 | 264:19,24 265:3 | 100:15 188:23 315:18 | 196:17 208:1 211:11 |
| good | gray | handed | 225:18 242:17 |
| 12:15 14:4 51:20,24 | 48:19 | 21:8 39:4 91:18 | 265:25 309:8,12 |
| 69:17 152:14 154:10 | great | 111:10 122:13 225:1 | 310:6 |
| 170:1 262:11 267:20 | 13:20 | handled | header |
| google | greater | 17:10 | 124:11 |
| 5:3,5,6 62:22 63:1,11 | 117:6 296:16 | happen | headphone |
| 171:12 179:17,23 | greatest | 189:23 263:16 | 29:14 |
| 180:4,9,13,14,19 | 279:12,14,17,23 | happened | healthy |
| 181:9,13,16,18,23 | group | 120:15,24 121:3 261:3 | 225:22 |
| 182:3,23 183:16 | 36:2 | 263:22 266:23 267:2 | heard |
| 184:1 185:16 213:17 | groups | 276:24 279:24 | 60:14 62:20 95:9 |
| 265:17 269:17 287:7 | 27:7 240:14 | happening | 105:10 121:24 |
| 289:1 300:7 301:2,3 | grow | 117:24 181:16 217:9 | 201:10 289:22 |
| 301:4 310:2,8 | 224:18 | 217:11 | heather |
| gossip | growing | happens | 1:87:8 84:15 134:3 |
| 194:2 203:22,24 216:2 | 112:7 | 104:8 144:22 270:20 | held |
| 217:11 257:23 258:1 | growth | happy | 25:1 42:24 133:19 |
| goto | 37:25 38:1,2,3,9,10,10 | 13:1 214:2 | 288:8 301:15 |
| 121:7 | 38:17 47:19 68:9,21 | hard | hell |
| government | 71:4 73:3 75:8 96:15 | 29:22 89:6 106:18 | 64:9 |
| 32:21 33:7,7,24,25 | 108:2,13,16 109:2 | 227:2,3 | help |
| governmental | 117:19,24 219:2 | harder | 12:7 18:13 20:4 23:3 |
| 32:22 34:3 | 224:16 225:15,19,22 | 2:17,18 12:5 14:12 | 28:9,22 51:21 56:25 |
| grab | 229:12,14 234:12,14 | 15:20 20:25 | 64:5,9,9 82:6 |
| 63:17219:15 | 267:20 | hasnt | helped |
| graduate | guess | 114:19 | 41:19 58:10 63:23 |
| 16:13, 15,18,20,24 | 11:3,14 39:5 60:19 | hate | 64:13,14 85:23 183:5 |
| 19:5,9 | 73:6 75:9 81:17 86:5 | 10:21 112:15 | helping |
| graduated | 112:15 115:24 | hats | 20:21 42:7 64:15,17 |
| 16:14,24 20:9,15 | 135:10 197:3 240:17 | 19:21 | hes |
| graduating | 241:12 252:15 | havent | 33:14 56:21 58:21,25 |
| 20:11 | 255:20 272:13 | 10:22 73:12 80:2,3 | 123:12 126:1,24 |
| grandparents | guys | 87:19,19 102:3 158:7 | 127:25 128:7,10 |


| 191:1 267:10 270:12 | 289:11 290:15,19,24 | 1:5 66:16 75:12 76:21 | 221:1,14 224:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 295:1,6 300:25 | 292:19 293:11 294:3 | 82:16 83:1,20,25 | 226:1 231:9 235:18 |
| high | 295:25 296:24 297:4 | 84:3,5,11,12,15 | 239:10 241:18 |
| 268:9 304:15 | 299:13 300:13,13,17 | 87:16 130:9,25 | 242:14 244:25 |
| higher | 300:20 303:4 304:25 | 137:16 138:15,25 | 254:18 272:6 273:10 |
| 72:2 116:13 119:15 | 305:10,22 306:7,14 | 162:24 169:16 170:3 | 273:21 274:16,25,25 |
| 157:19 254:5,6 | 310:25 | 170:10 172:5 173:1 | 278:24 284:22 291:7 |
| 259:11 291:14 | hogans | 173:13 177:10 | 292:13,14 293:4 |
| highest | 190:22 | 178:15 182:4,13 | 295:16,17 300:21 |
| 180:22,24 181:3 182:2 | hold | 184:24 185:19,24 | idea |
| 182:7 184:16 273:5 | 9:14 25:9 26:4 91:7 | 186:16 187:15,25 | 67:15 90:12 233:3 |
| 273:11 | 205:12 294:19 | 188:6,11 189:9,18,25 | 271:12 |
| hills | hollywood | 190:5,11,16,17,22 | identical |
| 7:13 313:2 | 203:25 204:3 | 191:5 192:8,12 | 90:18 98:14 282:7 |
| hire | hollywoodreporter | 262:19 268:2,7,16,19 | identified |
| 18:1 | 200:23 | 268:24 269:6 280:22 | 42:4 43:11 145:18 |
| historical | home | 281:4,9,24 286:25 | ill |
| 6:4 216:10 | 241:23 | 287:1 290:12 305:10 | 11:10,15 12:11 14:7 |
| history | homes | 306:14 311:3 | 14:20 21:19,22 29:8 |
| 112:8 | 82:6 | hundred | 86:23 91:12,22 140:3 |
| hmhm | honest | 44:20 65:14 117:19,20 | 150:21 226:11 |
| 39:10 57:17 86:9 | 195:7 | 160:9 258:14,25 | 230:25 231:7 256:4 |
| 113:7 196:4 252:21 | honestly | 264:25 296:21 | 274:24 295:8 302:5 |
| 255:2 260:19 272:22 | 47:5 | hundreds | im |
| hockey | hope | 59:18 | 7:25 11:9 12:24,25 |
| 43:10 44:1 | 5:18 123:4 287:25 | hurricane | 16:3 17:5,13,13 |
| hogan | hoping | 292:2 | 20:23 21:2,2,24 |
| 1:5 66:16 75:12 76:21 | 269:15 283:25 | hustler | 28:23 29:19 30:5,5 |
| 78:4 79:2,14 82:16 | host | 268:14 304:19 | 30:11 31:9 33:20 |
| 83:1,20,25 84:3,5,11 | 192:23 | hypothetical | 38:24 41:8,20 49:19 |
| 84:11,12,12,15 87:16 | hour | 162:17 176:17 177:9 | 49:24 57:25 60:3 |
| 130:9,25 137:16 | 129:4 | 191:13 307:14 | 61:4,15,17,22 63:10 |
| 138:25 169:16 170:3 | hours | hypotheticals | 63:14 74:10,11 82:11 |
| 170:10 172:5 173:1 | 65:12 269:17 | 307:13 | 84:13 85:10 86:1,10 |
| 174:14 177:17 | house |  | 86:19 87:1 88:5,7,18 |
| 178:12,22 182:13 | 82:4 89:16 90:2 | I | 91:25 92:9,24 93:22 |
| 184:24 185:19,24 | houses | id | 95:9 97:6 102:13,21 |
| 186:16 187:15,25 | 89:16,17,20 106:16 | 12:16 17:21 24:18 | 105:5,23 108:8,24 |
| 188:6,11 189:9,19,25 | 245:21 | 25:17 55:1,1 66:5 | 111:1,1,2 113:1 |
| 190:5,11,16,17 191:5 | huffington | 74:24 80:18 91:1 | 114:9,16 116:19 |
| 192:8,13 262:19,23 | 5:19 145:24 148:16 | 92:12 115:6 117:16 | 121:20 123:15 124:3 |
| 267:6 268:2,19 | 228:21 229:16 $230: 5$ | 146:7 152:10 153:17 | 125:12 126:22 |
| 269:13 270:6 271:21 | 232:5 237:15 245:17 | 153:23 158:19,19 | 131:17,18 133:11 |
| 277:2 280:22 281:4,9 | huffingtonpost | 159:4,24 183:21 | 135:12,13,15 136:21 |
| 281:24 282:4 284:25 | 228:6 | 191:7 200:18 201:24 | 137:24 138:3,10,23 |
| 286:19 287:5,13 | hulk | 208:22 214:2 219:20 | 139:7,8,23 142:4 |


| 143:9 150:25 154:23 | income | 280:17 311:2 | 249:24,25 250:1,2,3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 165:13 167:9,18,21 | 65:24 67:2,5,6 68:1 | increases | 253:8,9,10 255:9,21 |
| 171:13 172:21 173:3 | 69:8,14,22 70:11,17 | 116:8 117:11 | 255:23 256:1 257:1,4 |
| 173:4 177:2,14,22,23 | 70:20,22,25 71:25 | increasing | 257:20,21,22,25 |
| 178:18,19,19 180:9 | 72:4,5,8,10 75:25 | 116:17 216:9 220:19 | 260:9 265:16,21,22 |
| 186:15 187:19 | 76:4 77:4,10,16,23 | 273:4 | 266:2,5 270:8 293:16 |
| 197:19 200:24 | 78:2 79:12 80:8,14 | index | 305:1,8 309:9,21 |
| 201:25 205:4 206:17 | 80:23 81:2 84:24 | 240:10,24 | 310:14,16,19 311:23 |
| 207:7,7,9,9,10 | 93:14 94:11,14,25 | indexing | infoseek |
| 208:23 209:23 | 95:9 96:1,5,6,14,20 | 240:25 | 120:20 |
| 210:24 215:25 | 97:10 102:17 103:2 | indication | infringing |
| 219:11 226:8,8 227:3 | 187:4 212:13 218:11 | 69:23 165:21,21 182:6 | 139:19 |
| 230:21 231:7 240:1 | 218:16 224:2,6 229:9 | 182:8 185:7 213:4 | initial |
| 240:19,25 241:12 | 229:19 234:9,19 | 258:23 271:23 | 196:18 |
| 248:7 251:14 253:2 | 254:23 | individual | initially |
| 257:4 264:2 267:8 | incorporate | 63:23 258:5,7,11 | 82:8,11,20 |
| 271:3 272:23 273:1 | 253:7 | 276:21 299:17 300:2 | inquiry |
| 273:10,11 284:13 | incorrect | individuals | 30:6 |
| 286:13,13 295:17 | 150:19 | 306:19 | insider |
| 298:19 301:5,18 | increase | industries | 5:18 230:9,12,13,20 |
| 302:6,12,22 304:8,12 | 75:13,14,19,20 76:7 | 70:16,18,23,24,25 | 230:22,24 231:5 |
| 307:13 | 82:15 83:11,12,19,24 | 72:3 | instance |
| image | 85:1,7 117:8,9,12,20 | industry | 109:19 117:15 131:11 |
| 37:10,13 139:15 | 117:25 130:11 | 22:6,13 59:16 71:2,8 | 131:22 144:21 |
| images | 131:11,18,23 132:5 | 71:10,13,14,16,19 | instances |
| 53:5 | 133:25 135:21 136:4 | 72:6 74:1 75:2 90:8 | 34:7 59:13 61:12 |
| impact | 136:25 137:15 138:5 | 113:14 204:1 | 106:9 109:16 |
| 213:5 | 138:12 142:17 157:6 | inferences | institute |
| impacted | 162:23 168:12,14,14 | 259:7 | 51:3,8,15 52:3,10 |
| 139:2 | 168:20 169:8,9,12,15 | inferred | instructed |
| implicit | 170:1,2 171:4 172:10 | 260:20 | 10:1 |
| 31:22 139:3 | 173:1,11 175:19,20 | information | instrument |
| implies | 175:24 176:1,3,5,13 | 43:9,23 49:13 60:16 | 17:12 |
| 116:12 | 176:15,19 177:4,11 | 60:17 93:9 94:8 99:1 | insufficient |
| important | 177:17 178:1,8,11,14 | 99:4 100:16 106:19 | 44:6 259:6,12 |
| 89:13 | 193:9 216:12,13,17 | 187:7 189:13 195:18 | intangible |
| inception | 220:15,18 237:11 | 196:2 200:19 208:18 | 4:17 48:1,2,3,12,16,17 |
| 112:5 | 273:6,13,20 275:25 | 210:11,15,20,22 | 48:18,24 49:11 51:7 |
| inch | 276:11,14,20 280:24 | 212:24 216:10 218:3 | 51:17 52:1 87:5,10 |
| 264:24 | 281:8 282:9 295:14 | 218:7,9 229:25 | 87:12,17,22,24 88:4 |
| incident | 296:7 300:9 311:4 | 230:17,22 234:2,5,16 | 88:8,13 91:19 185:25 |
| 290:4 | increased | 237:23 238:25 239:6 | 186:13 |
| included | 117:4,6 130:8 139:9 | 245:18,23,25 246:1,9 | intangibles |
| 168:3 198:6 254:19 | 142:16 156:13 157:1 | 246:12,14,16 247:5,6 | 88:24 |
| including | 168:25 169:11 | 247:7 248:18,25 | intell |
| 253:8 | 175:14 177:6 248:17 | 249:1,4,5,5,6,11,22 | 48:20 |


| intellec | investing | issue | join |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23:10 | 246:5 | 156:5,6 | 242:20,24 |
| intellectual | investment | itd | joined |
| 22:23,24 23:2,3,4,11 | 106:15,15 118:17,24 | 51:21 142:13 212:6 | 12:5 |
| 23:12,16,17,19 24:10 | 119:3,6,11 120:1 | item | joining |
| 24:14 32:24 48:4,20 | 198:5 245:21 261:7 | 289:9,10 | 22:3 |
| 50:5,12,25 51:6,14 | investmentrelated | items | jolla |
| 51:16,18 52:1 57:4 | 123:6,17 | 40:2 250:15 254:19 | 8:17,19 |
| 59:17 87:13,25 88:4 | investments | 310:5,20 | journal |
| 88:9,14 131:2 185:25 | 105:13 | ive | 53:9 55:12 |
| intend | investor | 10:21 11:2 21:8 57:22 | journalists |
| 12:21 | 77:19,25 143:24 | 59:18 60:14 61:8 | 267:14 270:15 |
| interact | 166:25 | 62:8 76:11 94:1 | judging |
| 214:21 | investors | 106:14 111:10 | 267:14 270:15 |
| interest | 124:1 144:24 246:5 | 121:24 137:18 180:6 | judicial |
| 180:15 182:9 185:7,15 | involve | 180:11 193:23 | 1:1 |
| 202:13 | 47:14 49:11,15 63:9 | 201:10 211:10 256:3 | judkins |
| interested | involved | 284:1 289:22 | 3:19 7:11 |
| 92:10 202:18 203:1,8 | 28:13 36:1 47:10 |  | july |
| 203:13,15 204:1 | 58:16 217:23 223:13 | J | 184:12,13,13 221:8,21 |
| 208:17,21 315:16 | 228:24 233:20 |  | 221:22 226:7,8,16,20 |
| interests | involves | 2:18 7:21,24 | 226:20 227:8 |
| 204:7 | 24:17 | james | jumping |
| international | involving | 123:8 | 12:13 139:7 251:23 |
| 42:21 | 37:8,10 58:7 142:20 | january | june |
| internet | 189:25 | 10:16 184:12,13 236:1 | 54:7 272:21 |
| 60:22,25 61:7,21,25 | ip | 236:15 239:17 269:3 | justify |
| 79:10 111:23 112:3,6 | 23:22 24:15 28:9 29:5 | 279:25 | 77:23 |
| 112:12,19 113:10 | 29:16 34:10,18,19 | jason |  |
| 118:14,14 120:2,5 | 50:3,24 55:8 56:7 | 9:22,22 36:22 46:24 | Kate K |
| 261:15 | 86:7 | 47:9 | kate |
| internetbased | iphone | jeff | 276:23 305:11,20,23 |
| 72:10 89:8 108:15 | 300:24 301:20 | 1:16 2:1 4:3,12,13 7:6 | keep |
| 119:14 156:3 196:15 | ipo | 8:6 132:23 133:2 | 58:24 250:17 295:6,7 |
| 196:16 | 4:15 | 312:24 313:5 314:5 | 295:8 305:6 |
| interpose | iq | 314:14 | keeping |
| 30:5 | 6:3,6 195:12,13,14,21 | jefferson | 248:23 |
| interrupt | 196:3,7,12 197:3,8 | 56:8,9 | key |
| 12:9 | 245:8,13 246:9,12,12 | jemal | 99:19,21 101:3,4 |
| intrinsic | 246:16,22 247:11,22 | 3:19 7:11 | 110:3 135:11 182:17 |
| 124:7 | 253:3 | jezebel | 219:16 |
| invasion | irrelevant | 134:24 158:4 | kid |
| 139:12 | 209:24 270:3 | jimmy | 289:24 |
| inventory | isnt | 192:17 | killing |
| 19:20 207:18,19,20,22 | 177:9 242:11,21 | job | 123:3 |
| 207:23 | 296:15 | 12:14 26:22 | kimmel |


| 192:17 | 106:4,17 111:20 | 260:23 261:1,3,8,21 | 289:18 290:22,22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| kind | 112:11 114:15,25 | 261:25 262:2,3,5,6 | 305:11,21 |
| 18:9 20:1 24:8 28:24 | 115:18,21 119:2,10 | 263:1,4,7,10 265:21 | large |
| 29:10 30:1 32:7 36:2 | 119:22 120:8,15,22 | 266:7,10,13 269:1,2 | 4:22 29:13 58:7,9 |
| 36:4,8 37:1 40:16 | 120:24 121:3,7 123:8 | 269:12,25 270:1,5,9 | 75:14,18 122:15 |
| 45:6 48:13 60:17,24 | 123:9 124:9,19 129:2 | 271:14,16,18 273:8 | 124:22,24 200:4 |
| 61:2,6 63:3,5,19 66:5 | 130:21 131:5 132:1,1 | 275:5,7,8,12,13,22 | 209:4 228:2 239:4 |
| 66:8 67:1 71:17 | 132:8,16 138:11 | 276:14,17,19,22 | 240:15 261:17,17 |
| 72:23 83:17 101:5 | 144:12,16 145:8,9,13 | 278:11,20,23 279:23 | 280:19 281:1,3 |
| 105:15 106:1,10 | 152:7,8 154:2 157:20 | 279:24 280:15,17,23 | largely |
| 107:5 123:16 130:18 | 158:7,17,18,18,24 | 280:24 281:11,12 | 11:17 |
| 135:10,11 166:7,20 | 159:1,3,18 160:7 | 282:10 284:3 288:21 | larger |
| 193:24 207:24,25 | 161:23 162:1,4,5,9 | 289:21,23 293:18 | 32:21 124:13,19 125:4 |
| 208:3,18 217:6 | 162:11,15 163:1,3,4 | 298:6,9,11 302:7,11 | 125:10 259:10 |
| 222:23 228:17 | 163:6,6,7 165:7 | 305:5 306:2 307:12 | largest |
| 232:17 237:16 241:7 | 166:7 169:21 176:2,5 | 307:22 310:18 | 261:15 273:13,19 |
| 241:10,10,15 245:12 | 176:12 177:22,22 | 311:15 | lasted |
| 258:2 295:24 | 180:4,9 184:21,25 | knowhow | 52:3 |
| kinds | 185:9 186:22 187:10 | 23:21 48:22 | late |
| 28:20 80:23 215:15,19 | 188:18 189:14,18 | knowing | 9:3,17 |
| 215:23 216:3 217:8 | 190:25 191:13,14 | 165:10,17 | latimes |
| kinja | 193:8 195:6,7 198:14 | knowledge | 201:1 |
| 135:4 | 199:25 200:1,12 | 246:8 | launch |
| knew | 201:24 202:10,20 | knowledgeable | 121:3 |
| 104:17 | 203:23,23 204:4,18 | 64:25 | lauren |
| knot | 204:21,23 205:24 | knowledged | 45:13 |
| 202:24 203:2,10,24 | 207:20,21,24 208:2,3 | 123:12 | law |
| 204:7,15 | 208:4,5,7,8,11,14,22 | known | 51:2,8,15 52:3,10 56:8 |
| know | 211:22 217:11 218:5 | 1:5 | 56:9 |
| 11:7,15,22 19:7 23:7 | 218:8,10,12,20,23 | koch | laws |
| 24:12,19,22 28:6 | 219:1,3,7 220:17,24 | 3:4,11 7:19,23 | 314:6 |
| 29:15 30:25 31:9 | 222:18,20 223:1,3,23 |  | lawyer |
| 32:11,12,13 33:10 | 223:25 224:1,3,10,13 | L | 55:3 |
| 34:2,6 38:21,23 | 224:15,19 228:12,19 | 1 | leave |
| 40:15 41:4 42:17 | 229:5,8,11,15,23,23 | 3:12,13 201:20 | 18:19 59:6,11 |
| 44:18 48:5 53:20 | 230:2,3 232:20,22,25 | la | lectured |
| 54:16 55:2,11,14,18 | 233:1,10,13 234:3,6 | 8:17,19 | 50:2,24 |
| 55:19 57:10,25 58:10 | 234:7,8,10,11,23,25 | labeled | left |
| 59:19,25 60:7,13 | 235:1,3,11 237:15,18 | 167:13 | 20:12 107:6 |
| 63:11,15 64:6,12,17 | 241:17 243:13,22,23 | lack | lefthand |
| 65:16,18,21 73:7,14 | 244:5,7 245:24 246:1 | 113:12,21 114:10,25 | 240:3 248:3 |
| 74:20,23 78:23 79:21 | 246:7,11 248:2 | lacking | legal |
| 80:2,19 87:1 91:9 | 249:17 250:6,10 | 115:1 | 7:12 8:3 48:7,11 |
| 92:4 94:1 99:15 | 251:20 253:3,15,17 | lanza | 103:25 139:7 164:22 |
| 100:13,17 101:23 | 256:3,19 257:16 | 289:21 | 313:1 |
| 102:3,14 104:8,18 | 258:2,3,4,8,11 | lanzas | lend |


| 18:7 | 220:19,21,22 | location | 275:15 279:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| lending | list | 201:16 202:7 209:15 | 281:19 284:22 |
| 113:8,11 | 34:23 39:15 80:19 | 209:19,25 | 290:11 292:13,18 |
| length | 85:16 266:2 | logo | 293:5,14 294:1,4,9 |
| 170:17,20 181:14 | listed | 28:7 242:6 | 294:15 295:13,16 |
| lengthy | 93:8 | logos | 298:3,6 303:15 |
| 136:13 | listen | 34:21 | looked |
| level | 51:12 | long | 61:9,17 62:6,8,16,22 |
| 174:14 | lists | 10:17 17:20 18:17 | 63:1 68:24 69:3 |
| levine | 34:20 48:23 120:12 | 20:6 25:1 44:2 52:2 | 78:25 79:4 80:24 |
| 3:4,117:19,22 | literally | 115:21 213:11 215:6 | 82:20 83:5 85:21 |
| liable | 188:17 | 223:1 | 92:5 130:11 141:1 |
| 139:6,19 | literature | longer | 143:1,3,7,8 145:15 |
| license | 131:6 | 184:3 | 150:9,11 151:2,9 |
| 24:13 28:4 | litigate | look | 152:1,16,21 153:16 |
| licensed | 32:6 | 55:1 66:20 68:2,5,7,9 | 155:3 156:21 158:2,8 |
| 27:19 66:19 | litigation | 70:9 76:6,9 78:16 | 165:14,23,23 171:20 |
| licensee | 14:10 21:9 29:20 30:8 | 79:17 82:5,17 90:2,4 | 173:7 177:25 178:4 |
| 28:1 | 30:24 31:20 32:12 | 92:23 93:21 98:14 | 180:1,19 191:8 |
| licensees | 36:10 38:22 39:16 | 99:13 100:2 108:5 | 192:14 194:8 198:1 |
| 27:14,16,17 | 57:16 103:15 104:15 | 111:25 120:10 | 206:9 210:7,16 |
| licensing | 309:15 | 138:20 139:21 144:5 | 211:20 215:17 221:9 |
| 23:3,13 26:11 27:4,9 | litigations | 150:2,5,18,24 151:21 | 222:8 230:17 238:23 |
| 28:10,18 44:19 49:3 | 59:19 | 154:13 156:5 159:8,9 | 240:8,11,22 241:13 |
| 50:4,25 54:8,11,12 | little | 164:8,17 165:13,19 | 242:9 247:22 253:4 |
| 54:15 93:10,20,25 | 11:11 12:10,14 16:4 | 165:23 176:24 | 256:3 260:3 272:14 |
| licensor | 20:16 21:1 34:6 39:7 | 178:22 181:4,17 | 272:15 279:12,21 |
| 27:17 28:2 | 65:9 81:18 84:23 | 187:4,14 188:21,24 | 283:1,10,13 284:19 |
| licensors | 114:7 137:7 156:16 | 189:1,3,5,6,9,10,14 | 286:19 288:19 |
| 27:14 | 170:13 205:14 227:2 | 189:16 191:4,21,22 | 297:13 299:25 300:4 |
| life | 240:18 246:18 | 191:25 192:7,11,16 | 300:8 |
| 255:13 | 253:19 291:25 | 192:22 193:2 194:10 | looking |
| likeness | 303:24,25 305:23 | 195:3 197:10,17,24 | 34:23 70:8 76:3 82:3,9 |
| 37:11 190:22 | Ilc | 200:18 201:25 | 82:24,25 83:19 86:23 |
| likes | 1:8 | 206:25 207:4,8,13,17 | 89:17 90:14 95:11 |
| 191:23 | Ilp | 207:22 210:13 | 97:22,24 105:15 |
| limited | 2:17 3:4,11 | 211:22 212:12,19,22 | 113:4 122:25 125:21 |
| 243:9 | loan | 213:8 214:5,17 215:6 | 131:18 138:23 |
| limits | 18:13 29:16 | 215:8,15,19,21 216:3 | 146:17 150:4,4 |
| 243:20 | loans | 216:8,10,12,13 | 152:25 156:7 158:11 |
| line | 17:10 18:6,9,10 90:10 | 217:25 218:13,16 | 165:5,22 166:21 |
| 30:13 47:23 48:5 85:5 | 105:25 106:9 | 223:19 224:4,6 229:1 | 167:24 168:15 |
| 88:22 106:22 118:7 | local | 229:16,19 231:7 | 180:13 188:15 192:5 |
| 153:22 155:22 | 53:12 | 233:25 234:17,19 | 195:5 196:22,24 |
| 220:22 298:17 | located | 242:14 247:16 248:9 | 197:9 207:3 211:16 |
| linearly | 256:8 | 249:25 259:3 262:17 | 220:10 227:8 249:9 |


| 250:24 252:18 257:4 | 8:20 67:16 | market | matter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 257:9,12 259:16,22 | man | 3:6 66:3 69:19,21,25 | 7:7 9:8 36:2,8,22 37:1 |
| 272:17 274:4,13,15 | 302:13 | 70:13 71:25 72:2,6,7 | 40:11,16 42:6 108:18 |
| 274:21 275:24 276:3 | manage | 72:12,13 76:24 78:1 | 108:19 155:15 |
| 276:4 278:14 282:6 | 26:25 | 79:9,11 80:10 81:15 | 166:10,16,18,25 |
| 282:14 297:18 | management | 81:16,19 82:5,25 | matters |
| 298:13,16 300:12 | 19:20 22:23,24 | 85:2,8,9 88:21 89:3 | 39:19 |
| 309:9 311:1 | manager | 89:10 92:11 94:20,23 | mature |
| looks | 22:4 | 95:4,7,22,24 96:22 | 70:24 71:3,7,11,13,14 |
| 21:14 39:13 67:5 | manufacturer | 97:7,17,19,20,25 | 71:18,19 72:3,6,8,25 |
| 76:23 86:19 220:2,18 | 27:25 28:4 | 98:18 99:17 100:3,10 | 73:2,11,13,16,16,18 |
| 221:13 222:17 225:7 | march | 104:6 106:16 108:21 | 73:23 74:2,6,8,11,14 |
| 227:4 237:5 247:20 | 1:17 2:3 7:2,9 228:21 | 110:1,22 121:15 | 75:3,4,7 108:12 |
| 273:19 274:12 279:9 | 233:17 236:9 239:15 | 125:21 131:4 136:17 | 113:13 |
| 288:22 289:4,16 | 249:2,20 252:9,12 | 138:25 140:7,10 | maximizing |
| los | 253:18,18,21,21 | 141:8,12,24 142:9,19 | 107:25 |
| 2:4,21 7:1,16 201:21 | 254:7 315:18 | 143:6 145:14 146:24 | maximum |
| 314:2 315:2 | margin | 156:8,20 158:10,11 | 74:15 107:25 |
| lost | 93:13 94:11,14,25 | 159:9,15,20 161:10 | mba |
| 167:21 | 96:4 | 161:14,14 162:20 | 19:12 73:22,23 165:3 |
| lot | margins | 166:4 167:6 174:3 | mean |
| 12:21 26:12 29:22 | 95:25 | 177:3 179:12 186:25 | 17:9 23:1 26:24 27:15 |
| 59:16 101:24 136:20 | mark | 187:5 188:21 190:16 | 27:23 29:23 41:6 |
| 173:3 195:18 228:20 | 20:24 21:4,20 38:24 | 205:2 238:9 249:6 | 42:13 48:11 53:2 |
| 246:15 264:3 267:2 | 86:2,10 91:1 111:4 | 253:7 254:25 292:24 | 57:13 59:6 61:1 |
| lots | 122:7 146:7,8 171:13 | 293:8 | 74:19 78:19 87:3 |
| 19:21 | 182:18 183:21 | marketbased | 93:22 94:16 104:25 |
| low | 219:20 221:1,14 | 96:23 | 109:6 112:16 114:24 |
| 156:8 173:22 212:3,5 | 224:25 226:1,11 | marketed | 116:19 127:16 |
| lower | 231:9 235:18 239:10 | 162:9 | 128:14 130:6 138:3 |
| 72:11 164:6 254:13,13 | 241:18 244:25 | marketing | 154:20 155:24 166:8 |
| 259:12 | 247:10 252:2 272:6 | 34:20 37:16 44:3 | 175:18,23 176:22 |
| lump | 273:21 274:17 277:6 | marketplace | 177:16 185:22 186:4 |
| 67:25 | 277:21 278:24 | 127:14 | 187:19 189:8 190:3 |
| lycos | marked | markets | 197:22 201:5 204:13 |
| 120:17 | 21:6 39:2 86:15 91:4 | 69:24 206:15 | 207:2 211:16 214:22 |
| lycoss | 111:7 122:9 146:10 | marking | 215:25 220:23 |
| 120:15 | 171:18 182:21 | 14:8,8 302:22 | 237:20 251:6,14 |
|  | 183:24 219:23,25 | married | 257:19 259:20 |
| M | 221:4,17 225:3 226:3 | 203:13,18 | 263:24 265:2 269:24 |
| m | 226:13 231:12 | mart | 279:23 290:25 302:3 |
| 1:18 2:3 4:5 7:3 | 235:21 239:12 | 48:25 | 307:11 |
| 132:22 133:1 313:4 | 241:21 245:3 247:13 | masters | meaning |
| majority | 252:4 272:8 273:23 | 18:20,21 19:1 | 34:3,11 41:24 81:1 |
| 69:9 108:25 194:19 | 274:17,19 277:9,23 | materials | 220:21,22 |
| making | 279:1 | 56:25 130:1,17 | means |


| 26:25 67:20,21 77:14 | mention | 157:5,8,9,11,13 | 184:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 119:10 124:19 | 54:20 55:1 63:13 | 161:24 162:6 163:10 | misappropriation |
| 168:16 180:18 | 107:5 | 163:17 164:5,6,25 | 139:15 |
| 199:22,22 248:7 | mentioned | 165:1 166:5,6 168:25 | mischaracterizes |
| meant | 35:24 39:6 53:22 | 169:1,2,3,4 170:9 | 84:7 |
| 236:13 245:12 246:19 | 57:14 97:16 110:15 | 172:12 173:12,17,23 | mischaracterizing |
| measure | 122:3 140:2 158:3 | 174:8,14 177:7 | 114:16 |
| 66:15 119:16 134:14 | 238:23 245:10 | 178:10 179:21 | missing |
| 160:24 172:15,23 | 305:21 309:2 310:2 | 217:17,21 221:24 | 21:15 |
| 191:18 | mentions | 223:5,11,12,17 227:7 | mix |
| measured | 35:20 56:6 128:14 | 227:10 228:22 | 45:25 |
| 133:25 134:11 135:21 | menu | 231:22,23 233:17,23 | mixed |
| 136:18 296:17 297:9 | 256:12 | 233:24 236:23 237:5 | 250:15 |
| measures | mergers | 246:24 252:12 | mixing |
| 180:14 191:20 252:11 | 195:17 | 258:14,16,25,25 | 248:20 249:4 253:9 |
| mechanisms | merrill | 264:21,23 274:12 | mockup |
| 93:23 | 7:12 8:3 312:25 | 275:22 276:1,7,9 | 52:17 |
| media | met | 277:3,19 278:7 | model |
| 1:8,9 4:20 7:20,24 | 74:21 194:13 195:1,2 | 279:10 280:8 281:17 | 37:21,22 38:4 64:5,15 |
| 30:2 35:5,11,13 | 197:15 | 281:22 283:17 | modeling |
| 57:12,13,19 58:6,20 | method | 284:20 285:25 | 26:9 |
| 59:14,22 111:13 | 144:14 306:9 | 289:14 290:7,21,23 | models |
| 112:23 118:15,23 | methodologies | 291:2,2,4,5,20 292:5 | 37:10,13 |
| 120:13 135:2,15 | 54:25 88:10 113:6 | 292:8 293:1,1 298:21 | mogul |
| 158:1,12,14 217:3 | methodology | 298:22 300:14 | 58:6 |
| 222:11 228:8,10 | 103:23 131:13,24 | 303:19,22 304:24 | mom |
| 232:12 | 132:4,13 292:15 | 305:12,22,22,23 | 23:7 27:20 |
| median | 295:12,13 | 306:23,23 307:1,18 | moment |
| 98:10 150:6,8,10 | metric | 307:25 308:6,15 | 161:19 |
| medias | 267:16 270:17 | 311:6,7 | moments |
| 134:15 | metrics | millionth | 252:16 |
| medications | 4:22 122:14 191:23 | 302:2 | mon |
| 13:21 | michael | mind | 76:19 |
| medium | 3:5 | 167:22 294:21 | monetization |
| 112:8 190:17 | middleton | mine | 24:15 69:13 75:22 |
| meet | 276:23 305:12,24 | 270:23 | 76:1,7,20 101:1,10 |
| 23:12 | middletons | minimum | 101:16,19 114:4,19 |
| members | 305:20 | 98:12 | 114:22 116:22 127:8 |
| 243:3,10 | mike | minute | 198:21 199:2,14,16 |
| membership | 7:19 | 122:19 288:5 289:11 | 199:19 200:9,15 |
| 242:21 243:13,18,20 | million | minutes | 205:23 209:22,25 |
| 244:4 | 112:9,14,17,18 125:18 | 15:22 52:4,23 216:22 | 233:16 |
| memberships | 125:24 126:5,8,13 | 286:18 | monetize |
| 22:1 34:24 244:6 | 128:17,20 136:9,10 | mirell | 76:10,14 77:7 101:20 |
| memory | 136:11,15,16 153:8,8 | 2:17 | 207:1 208:23 255:18 |
| 152:14 154:10 | 156:13,14,17 157:2,2 | mirrors | 275:5,9,11 |

275:5,9,11
monetized
78:17 80:1 102:5,10
263:11
monetizing
208:18,22
money
18:12 23:11,12 67:8
67:15 77:14 160:14
160:20,22 163:19
174:17 190:21
223:12,18 233:24
256:21 257:9,12
monitor
7:10 133:6
month
19:6 53:25 140:15,22
140:23 143:20,20
148:9 152:8 153:1
154:20 157:12
167:14,24 184:3
225:12 227:6 235:5
264:4 266:19,23
267:2 273:2,3,9 277:18 279:5 281:23
282:1 283:11 284:16
284:19 285:2,12
286:20 287:14,19
296:16 297:8,15
308:2
monthly
96:9,10 97:23 103:13 110:11 129:12
136:18,19,23,24
140:11,13 141:8,10
141:13,15,19 142:1,7
142:10 143:7,11,14 144:6,10,25 145:4 146:20 147:7,8,10,11 147:25 148:1,2,19,22 148:23 149:1,3,13,14 149:19 150:12 152:1 152:25 155:11 158:12 167:14,19,19 167:25 168:1,15,16 168:24 169:9,12,15

170:2,24 171:4 173:8
176:6 177:6,7 178:8
179:9 194:24 195:25
209:5 216:9 218:6
219:17 221:20
223:24 224:22
226:16 229:6 230:5
230:15 231:2 234:4
235:15 236:4,20,24
258:15,18,24 259:1
259:11 260:3,4,10,16
267:11 270:13,13,21
274:1 285:5 286:23
296:4 299:21 300:5
307:8

## months

143:25 144:7 148:3,11 151:7,18 152:17 154:24 170:21
235:12 236:6,7,10,19
236:22 249:17,19 264:5,7 265:18 266:16 274:8 280:4 282:6 283:13
mortgage
22:12 90:8
mortgages
90:10
mother
289:18 290:22 305:11 305:21
move
13:12 19:6 178:20 222:6
moving
14:16
multiple
72:14,16 95:8,8,8,9, 11 95:17,18,18,23,24 96:5,7 97:7,20 104:6 107:16 109:5,7,8,11 109:12,25 110:2,11 124:11,24 125:7,13 126:21 129:12,16 136:18,24 140:7,10 141:8,12,24 142:9,12

142:14,19 143:11
146:20 147:10,12
148:20 149:4,15 150:4 156:8,8,11,20 156:25 174:3 179:11 211:24 223:9 248:20 252:23 253:1 259:1 259:12 260:4,5

## multiples

85:2,8 95:10 103:14 106:17 110:23
119:15 143:6 145:14 146:24 149:13 155:12,21 158:11 159:10,15,20 167:7 179:12 292:25 293:9
multiplied
172:16,24
multiplier
108:20 109:23 166:7 166:20
multiply
173:19
multiplying
155:10
multitude
109:13
mumble
12:19

n
3:13 4:1
name
29:15 45:10 58:7 64:1
123:15 129:22,23,23
139:15 289:22

## named

40:9 49:22 315:6,11
names
29:9 58:9 60:1 61:18
nasas
292:1
nature
31:18 37:5,23 40:23
42:10 43:5,19
nearly
115:19 144:2,3,4
157:1 263:19,24
264:2,3 266:22,24
267:1
necessarily
63:9 101:8 166:13 199:11 253:12
283:21 297:22
necessary
26:11,11 137:24
197:10 253:13
311:14,19,20
need
11:20 12:7 21:22 32:23 59:8 64:9
80:15 89:11 260:6 302:16
needed
44:8
needs
17:12 36:12,14
negative
254:21,22
negotiate
28:4
negotiation
145:9
negotiations
271:19
neighborhood
89:18
neither
68:19 196:5
nelson
1:24 2:5 8:3 315:4,21
net
93:13 94:11,14,25
95:8,25 96:4,5
network
5:13,14,16 36:7
never
90:18 98:13,13,13 271:1,5,9
new
5:20 15:1 42:23,25

| 43:4 94:4 233:6,7,8 | noticed | numbers | 177:13,19 178:13,25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 283:18,21,22 284:1 | 178:1 | 44:15 95:12 108:4,7 | 181:20 184:6 185:5 |
| newly | november | 117:6 167:10 168:12 | 185:21 186:1,9,18 |
| 50:10 | 264:12 278:18 279:6,7 | 230:11 293:5 306:10 | 187:3,17 188:2,3 |
| news | 280:11,25 | numerous | 190:2,18,24 191:6 |
| 194:2 216:2 222:24,24 | null | 103:12 287:21 | 192:10,19,24 193:4 |
| 228:18 232:19 | 259:8 | nutrition | 193:11 197:20 |
| 257:18,19,20 | number | 36:23 37:11 38:1 | 198:11 199:9 200:11 |
| newspaper | 7:5,6 14:19,22 15:20 | 0 | 201:4,9,23 202:9,14 |
| 53:12 58:7,14 201:17 | 21:2 23:25 39:7,21 | 0 | 202:19 203:3,12 |
| newtown | 39:22 40:7,19,19,19 | object | 204:2,9,16,22 205:3 |
| 290:1 | 44:11 45:23 48:25 | 11:17 | 206:1,16,22 207:6 |
| nicholson | 85:13 86:11 88:24 | objecting | 208:20 209:2,10,16 |
| 123:8 124:12 126:16 | 89:20,23 91:2 99:8 | 295:7 | 210:2 220:16 227:19 |
| nick | 112:13 116:7,16,23 | objection | 232:7 242:22 243:5 |
| 7:20,24 271:9 | 117:3,10 138:15 | 30:6 69:20 76:22 77:8 | 243:21 251:13,19 |
| night | 140:25 148:21 | 79:3,16,22 80:9,17 | 253:25 254:8,14 |
| 192:18 | 149:21 151:5 152:25 | 83:3,22 84:3 87:18 | 256:24 258:22 |
| nine | 153:14 156:23 | 88:6 94:15 95:1 96:2 | 260:15 261:6 264:1 |
| 40:6 49:4 | 157:20 167:19 168:1 | 96:16,18 97:3,11 | 265:7 266:25 268:4 |
| nineties | 168:15,17,18,20 | 98:7,19 100:5 101:7 | 268:20 274:23 |
| 111:21 | 169:8 170:17 171:7 | 101:22 102:6,12,20 | 279:19 283:20 |
| noble | 171:15,21 172:1,5 | 103:3 104:23 105:17 | 285:21 286:5,12 |
| 64:2,3,11 65:5,15 | 173:22 174:11 177:1 | 105:22 106:3,12,24 | 287:15,23 290:10,16 |
| 183:5 | 179:8 180:2,24 | 107:20 108:23 | 291:6,21 292:12,21 |
| nods | 188:17 191:23 | 109:14 112:20,25 | 293:3,13,23 294:5,12 |
| 22:25 24:5 35:14 | 216:18 219:21 220:7 | 113:22 114:2,11,21 | 294:16 296:11,18 |
| 55:16 70:19 85:14 | 221:22,25 225:5,12 | 115:5,11,16 116:11 | 297:10,23 298:2 |
| 100:8 116:10 123:23 | 225:14 226:6 227:11 | 116:18 117:1,14,21 | 299:5,15,22 300:3 |
| 130:5 157:18 208:1 | 228:2 230:20 232:4 | 118:1,20 119:1,8,21 | 303:7 304:4 305:2,7 |
| 211:11 225:18 | 237:8 239:17 252:17 | 120:6,16,21,25 121:4 | 305:15 306:1,8 |
| 265:25 309:8 | 252:20 258:8 262:23 | 121:8,14 124:25 | 311:21 |
| nonexpert | 264:13 265:11 | 125:6,11 126:3,9 | obtained |
| 28:20 | 272:24 273:12 | 127:1,6,15,20 128:2 | 236:19 |
| nonu | 274:14 277:18 | 128:9,23 129:14 | obviously |
| 275:6,9 | 278:17 282:4,5,23 | 130:10,20 131:14,25 | 13:7 45:10 197:1 |
| noon | 284:16 289:18 | 132:7,15 138:2,9 | 198:18 |
| 132:24 | 290:14,18 291:13 | 141:16 142:2 145:1,6 | occasionally |
| normal | 292:1,4 293:10 296:5 | 157:14 158:6,16,25 | 214:15 |
| 312:10 | 296:16 297:8 298:17 | 159:11,23 160:5 | occur |
| normalizes | 298:24 299:2 300:8 | 161:1,6,12,21,25 | 144:2 263:21 |
| 180:21 | 302:5 306:6,13,22 | 162:7,13,18 163:12 | occurred |
| north | 307:1,16,24 308:5,14 | 163:20 164:1,10,19 | 121:25 182:4 184:17 |
| 2:12 | 312:24 | 165:6,12,18 166:12 | 184:21 185:2 263:14 |
| noted | numbered | $166: 17,22167: 1$ $169 \cdot 19,20175 \cdot 12$ | 263:19,25 264:4 |
| 137:18 254:20 | 289:10 | 169:19,20 175:12 | octo |


| 151:7 | 85:25 86:13,21 87:3 | ones | organization |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| october | 87:4,8,16 88:16 | 57:23 196:22 222:5 | 35:8,11,16 242:21,25 |
| 78:6 150:16 151:3,9 | 89:10 90:5 92:2,6,19 | 243:16 | organizations |
| 154:4 184:17,17,18 | 93:5,17 94:7,21 95:2 | ongoing | 35:1,5 |
| 231:24 235:8 236:10 | 96:3 97:15 103:9 | 36:20 37:3 | original |
| 236:19 237:1,2,9 | 107:10 110:6 111:4 | online | 268:12 304:18 312:25 |
| 263:19,25 264:11,22 | 111:16,22 112:19 | 4:20 111:13 118:15,23 | otcpk |
| 266:23 272:11 273:8 | 113:8 115:9 122:23 | 120:13 | 251:7 |
| 273:8,8 274:2 277:16 | 122:24 125:16,25 | opened | outcome |
| 278:1,9,14,18 279:5 | 127:12 137:4,25 | 256:6 | 145:9 |
| 279:22 280:11 | 141:22 143:12,21 | operator | outcomes |
| 284:19,23 291:18 | 147:6 150:1,11 152:7 | 7:11 | 104:16 |
| 294:1 296:6,22 | 153:10 160:12,24 | opinion | outline |
| 297:19 298:7 307:17 | 163:9 167:9 168:11 | 13:12 65:3 68:14,18 | 57:1 |
| 307:21 308:2 | 168:23 169:14 170:5 | 69:5 74:8 85:24 | outside |
| offered | 171:11,24 173:14 | 133:24 136:3 137:14 | 104:19 |
| 163:1 309:19 | 175:17 176:24 | 137:25 138:6,18,21 | overall |
| offering | 179:16 180:4 183:21 | 138:24 139:4,11,14 | 181:24 253:23 254:13 |
| 29:7 137:11,14 138:24 | 184:14 185:1 187:13 | 139:18 150:3 169:23 | 299:20 |
| offers | 188:8 190:14 203:1 | 169:25 170:4 311:4 | overarching |
| 255:20,23 256:1 | 204:6 211:1,2 214:11 | 311:10,17 | 48:3 |
| office | 217:2 222:7 227:5 | opinions | overlap |
| 54:6 | 230:24 236:11 | 84:7 137:11,13,20 | 20:17 153:18 |
| officer | 239:21,23,25 241:25 | 309:14,19 310:23 | overlaps |
| 35:3 | 246:18 247:21 252:1 | opportunities | 153:11 |
| official | 262:22 266:11 269:5 | 76:2 | overseen |
| 19:22 | 272:17,21 274:5,9 | opportunity | 120:2 |
| oh | 278:16 282:16,19 | 312:6 | overtalking |
| 8:20 21:11 30:11 40:8 | 285:23 288:6,21,24 | opposed | 205:13 294:19 |
| 49:10 85:6 120:17 | 290:14 291:3,25 | 53:6,8 | overthecounter |
| 122:21 151:7 179:24 | 295:22 296:23 | opposing | 251:3 |
| 246:20 251:24 277:6 | 298:15,21,24 300:12 | 137:20 | overvalued |
| 300:17 312:5 | 300:17 302:18 303:2 | opted | 120:5 |
| okay | 312:15,20 | 44:6 | overview |
| 8:2 9:5,16,24 11:8 | old | oral | 52:5,7 |
| 12:4 13:20 14:24 | 239:5 249:5,6 253:9 | 11:24 | owned |
| 15:8,18,21 16:3 | older | orally | 158:12 |
| 20:23 21:3,23 22:17 | 238:13 253:7 | 12:3 | owners |
| 27:20 30:20,22 31:11 | olive | orange | 199:23 |
| 31:25 33:23 34:22 | 9:22,23 36:22 46:24 | 90:24 | ozy |
| 38:7 39:14 40:2 | 47:10,13 | oranges | 5:21 146:1 148:8 |
| 41:17,19,22 42:10 | once | 248:24 | 232:9 233:17 235:4 |
| 44:24 45:8,12 47:1 | 11:9 97:5 140:18 | order | 236:21,23 237:15 |
| 50:1,16,18 55:3 58:5 | 144:19 179:10 | 159:5 194:14 213:22 | 245:17 |
| 60:21 67:1,4 68:15 | onemonth | 216:25 238:6 291:9 | ozys |
| 81:6 84:2,10,20 85:6 | 140:15 272:21 | 312:12 | 234:17,23 |


| P | panthers | 77:22 161:18,23 162:5 | percentages |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| p | 43:10,25 44:4 | 243:20 | 240:21 |
| 2:10 4:5 6:3,6 132:22 | paper | payment | perfect |
| 133:1 195:14,15 | 14:786:1 | 93:23 | 17:15 89:5 |
| 245:7,13,18 246:9,11 | paragraph | pe | performance |
| 246:12,16,22 247:11 | 21:25 47:23 49:22 | 119:12 | 143:25 |
| 247:22 313:4 | 92:13 93:1,22 103:7 | peak | performed |
| page | 107:7,8 109:7 110:7 | 181:3 184:15 | 47:25 |
| 4:2,11 5:2 6:2 13:3 | 113:4,5 118:7 120:11 | penalty | performing |
| 21:23,24 34:23,24 | 120:11 125:20 | 314:6 | 198:9,14,15 |
| 35:19,20 39:14 47:22 | 143:19 180:16 | pending | period |
| 49:19 50:16,17,19,19 | parenting | 42:22 | 117:11 140:15 143:15 |
| 56:6 62:14,14 67:3 | 202:18 | pennsylvania | 144:7 150:13 151:3 |
| 75:11 84:22,22 85:3 | park | 3:8 | 151:23 152:2,16 |
| 85:4 86:1,6 88:16,18 | 2:4,19 7:16 | penny | 153:10,11,18,19 |
| 88:21 92:14 93:1,3,4 | parlance | 251:8 | 154:12 155:3,9,21,24 |
| 103:6 107:5,8 111:23 | 121:18,22 251:6 | people | 157:4,7 159:19 168:3 |
| 112:2 113:4 $118: 7$ | parower | 19:24 23:23 25:9,22 | 168:5 169:5 172:17 |
| 120:10 122:4 143:18 | 45:12,13 | 25:24 26:4 27:9 | 178:10,12,15 179:10 |
| 147:3 170:14 171:25 | part | 63:21 121:18,22 | 180:15 184:3,15 |
| 171:25 172:1 179:16 | 11:19 20:10 22:9 | 203:1,4,5 213:15 | 195:3 220:8,10, 11,15 |
| 179:16,19,21,25 | 32:20,23 56:2 57:22 | 214:14 231:22 251:8 | 221:7,9,20,25 225:20 |
| 180:2,5,10,13 181:6 | 68:13,17 87:20 92:8 | 256:14,20 257:21,21 | 226:7,25 227:12 |
| 183:13 184:10 | 92:12 110:6 124:6 | 260:14 266:18 | 232:3 263:17,23 |
| 208:11,14 211:20 | 171:2 174:6 206:4 | 271:25 272:3 276:21 | 265:15 266:20 |
| 217:1 220:3,4 225:8 | particular | 280:9 281:17 297:25 | 272:11,17,25 273:6 |
| 225:11 231:15,19 | 28:10 64:11 118:16 | 304:24 307:16 | 273:16,17 $274: 3$ |
| 232:1 237:3 240:3 | 161:19 180:15 189:7 | peoples | 275:17 277:3 279:11 |
| 241:5,23 242:19,20 | 205:2 284:11,16 | 26:1 | 279:21 291:8 293:8 |
| 247:16,17 262:18,22 | 285:1,19 294:2 | percent | 296:10 |
| 263:13 264:21,25 | 295:14 | 44:20 117:11,13,19,20 | periods |
| 266:19 267:9 268:10 | particularly | 160:9 171:3 173:10 | 153:12,14 154:11,13 |
| 282:20,25 284:5,6,10 | 135:12 | 173:19 174:10 | 154:20,25 168:1,21 |
| 284:12,25 285:5,18 | partnership | 175:25 176:11,15,19 | 172:25 272:21 274:7 |
| 288:15 289:5,6 | 242:7 | 177:1,8,11 237:11 | 280:2,7 291:17 |
| 292:17 296:5 298:14 | parts | 248:17 258:9 276:12 | perjury |
| 298:17,25 300:14,19 | 139:24 | 280:13 282:9 302:23 | 314:6 |
| 300:20 304:13,16 | passersby | 303:1,4,12,14,24,25 | person |
| paged | 214:18 | 304:2,3,9,23 305:13 | 140:18,19 297:13 |
| 10:21 | patent | 305:25 307:2 308:16 | personal |
| pages | 27:18 29:2,13 40:17 | percentage | 255:13 |
| 1:10 15:4 92:11 208:6 | 46:1,5,5,10,12,13 | 24:16,19 28:13 173:1 | personally |
| 208:9 214:9 262:6 | 48:21 | 173:8,10,11 179:9,11 | 28:23,24 33:3 39:20 |
| 283:1 | patents | 208:5,8 240:12,13 | 57:21 60:4 61:10 |
| paid | 23:20 34:15,16 51:23 | 279:16 282:10 300:9 | 64:19,21 99:11 |
| 191:24 | pay | 300:18 304:24 306:3 | 102:19 104:3 105:8 |


| 106:8 123:9 162:1 | 7:15 175:10 315:11 | 180:7 181:1,3 182:2 | 179:15 185:3,4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| persons | placed | 182:7 186:22 212:1 | 214:23,25 215:3 |
| 37:17 64:1 | 194:22 | 236:23 250:5 253:14 | 217:6 222:23 223:11 |
| perspective | places | 260:8 261:22 302:2 | 223:18 228:17,21 |
| 119:10 270:10 | 202:6 256:21 | 303:21 | 232:5,18 233:24 |
| pertained | placing | points | 237:15,16,19 241:7 |
| 37:25 | 175:14 | 13:10 81:24 130:12 | 245:17 262:1,4,23 |
| pertaining | plain | 131:16 162:21,22 | 263:7 267:6 269:13 |
| 15:2 219:9 310:9 | 27:23 | 178:4 181:9 183:10 | 270:7 271:21 276:18 |
| pertains | plaintiff | 183:12,17,20 231:3 | 276:22,23 277:2 |
| 94:5 | 1:6 2:9 8:1 43:22 | 248:21 265:18 | 280:22 281:9 282:24 |
| pertinent | 46:22,23,23 47:4,4,5 | 302:15 | 283:5,8 284:6,11,25 |
| 153:22 166:14 213:6 | 47:5,8 | politics | 285:19 286:19 287:5 |
| pharmaceutical | plaintiffs | 228:19 | 287:13 289:11,14 |
| 20:2 74:1 | 138:7 139:15,19 266:9 | poors | 290:6,9,15,19,24 |
| pharmacies | 266:11 269:22 | 195:15 | 291:3 292:11,14,19 |
| 20:3 | 288:17,17 310:15 | popular | 293:2,12,15,22 294:2 |
| pharmacy | plan | 181:8 261:20 | 294:3,10 295:14,15 |
| 22:5 | 15:11 45:19 65:19 | popularity | 295:22,23,25 296:15 |
| phase | planning | 181:13 | 296:24,25,25,25 |
| 75:8 108:13,16 109:2 | 137:22 | pornography | 297:4,5,5,7,14,19,20 |
| philadelphia | play | 189:16,19 | 297:25 299:10,13,17 |
| 3:8 | 97:13 | portfolio | 299:19,24 300:2,13 |
| phone | players | 29:13 32:24 34:10,18 | 300:20 303:4,11 |
| 9:8 302:22 | 217:10,11 | 34:21 | 304:25 305:11,11,12 |
| photos | please | portfolios | 305:20,21,22 310:25 |
| 194:1 216:2 | 7:17 8:4,10 92:15 | 34:19 | posted |
| phrase | 173:5 294:21 | portion | 78:4,6,14 83:1 84:1 |
| 77:18 109:5 141:7 | pleasure | 92:10 169:15,25 170:1 | 130:13 135:25 |
| 175:22 | 92:22 | 170:6,9 175:20 | 150:13,15,22 151:6 |
| pick | plenty | 240:16 311:2 | 168:2,4,6,8 170:18 |
| 14:16,20 205:17 | 267:19 | position | 170:20 172:17 |
| picking | plug | 25:1 239:4 267:15 | 178:12,15 182:5 |
| 81:12 107:6 | 296:7 | 270:16 | 215:16,20,24 216:3 |
| picture | plus | possible | 251:12 267:3 281:24 |
| 249:7 | 306:23 | 72:15,16 93:7 159:25 | 282:5 305:18 307:17 |
| piece | pocket | 202:4,5 203:9 204:11 | 307:23 |
| 23:22 24:13 64:5 | 78:21 160:21,23 | 295:18 312:12 | posting |
| 66:18 137:7,7 | 174:18,23 | possibly | 75:12 78:17 82:16,18 |
| pieces | point | 201:2 256:19 257:8,14 | 82:21,22 83:20 134:1 |
| 14:7 222:11,18 228:12 | 12:23 63:14 74:11,13 | post | 136:5 181:24 189:11 |
| pinellas | 86:22 93:12 94:10,13 | 5:19 79:14 130:2,4,8 | 192:12 251:18 268:2 |
| 1:2 | 94:24 96:4 97:16 | 130:18 131:12,19,24 | 311:6 |
| pitch | 116:2 128:12,14 | 132:6,11,14 144:22 | postmoney |
| 45:18,21 | 129:7 130:1 137:23 | 145:24 148:16 | 198:5 |
| place | 142:13 155:5 170:23 | 178:23,24 179:2,8,13 | posts |


| 84:14 99:9 216:2 | 125:16 | 253:15,17,23 254:1,5 | 51:21 63:15,15 64:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 222:11,19 228:8,13 | prepare | 254:12 261:13 | 131:1,8 156:3 205:8 |
| 229:16 230:5 232:12 | 56:25,25 183:6 | prices | 205:10 242:7 246:4 |
| 232:20 258:2 268:6 | prepared | 165:4 | problem |
| 268:15 276:19 | 14:25 21:9 43:13 | pricetoearnings | 169:22 172:22 |
| 286:20 287:2 294:6 | 63:20 64:21 | 119:12 | problems |
| 296:21 298:7,9,11 | preparing | pricing | 155:6 |
| 305:14 | 15:16 26:10 69:7 | 4:20 111:13 | proceedings |
| potential | prescription | primarily | 12:5 315:15 |
| 54:8 69:13 71:4 73:4 | 17:6 | 26:17 | process |
| 73:12 74:16,16,16,21 | prescriptions | primary | 16:1 195:20 |
| 75:5,22 100:25 101:1 | 20:4,5 | 75:12,16 | produced |
| 101:10,16,19 108:1,1 | present | principally | 15:5 39:6 288:18 |
| 109:2 114:4,20,23,23 | 52:2 67:5,13,18,20,22 | 59:24 60:6 206:10 | product |
| 116:23 127:8 156:5 | 155:6 270:20 | principle | 30:7 |
| 198:21,24 199:1,2,15 | presentation | 94:7 | production |
| 199:17,19,20 200:3,9 | 57:1 | print | 45:4,6,9 188:16 |
| 200:15 204:10 | presentations | 181:17 | products |
| 205:23 206:5 208:25 | 50:21 52:3,10 103:24 | printed | 27:18 53:8 |
| 209:3,6,22 210:1 | 191:9 | 183:17 236:1,15 | professional |
| 229:15 233:15 | presented | 239:15,22 247:24 | 34:25 123:11 |
| 234:15 255:17 | 69:5 108:7 194:23 | 248:2,16 | professionally |
| 267:22 269:8,11 | 219:10 250:1 265:16 | printout | 1:4 |
| 270:22 283:24 | 286:8 309:7 | 5:3,5,6,8,9,11,13,14 | professionals |
| 304:22 | presenting | 5:16,21,22,24 6:7,9 | 35:6,9 51:11 107:9 |
| potentially | 307:14 | 6:11,13,15,17,19,21 | 110:9 129:10 |
| 31:20 32:6 99:2 | presents | 220:4 221:6,19 | professor |
| 159:17 182:10 199:2 | 77:11 | 241:23 252:8 | 56:21,22 |
| 199:16 200:18,20 | preserve | printouts | profit |
| 267:25 | 11:18 | 246:10 | 5:19 93:13 94:11,14 |
| practices | pressed | prior | 94:25 95:25 96:4,6 |
| 44:19 49:3 | 106:18 | 22:3 62:17,19 82:21 | 138:19 165:17,19,22 |
| preceding | presumably | 100:19 151:7 225:15 | 218:23 224:13 |
| 143:14 148:3 152:2,17 | 37:17 204:17 283:25 | 225:17 235:12 277:2 | 229:14 230:2 235:1 |
| 220:11 225:20 | pretty | 315:6 | 263:5 |
| predict | 19:25 171:22 225:22 | privacy | profits |
| 115:13,15,18 | 279:25 | 139:12 | 68:7,19 97:9,12 161:5 |
| predictor | previous | private | 161:8 224:19 |
| 69:17 | 107:24 | 33:25 34:5 57:24 | program |
| preferred | previously | 59:18,19 63:9 103:15 | 16:22 19:1,7,13 193:3 |
| 195:25 | 56:4 103:19 | 134:2 245:19 | projected |
| pregnancy | price | prizes | 233:10 |
| 202:18 | 55:7 66:22 93:8 94:8 | 268:11 304:17 | projections |
| prelitigation | 107:13 120:12 | pro | 18:6 81:3 |
| 29:19 30:17 | 125:23 126:18 128:5 | 81:3 | projects |
| premise | 250:25 251:17 253:8 | probably | 27:1 233:13 |


| promised | 268:13 | 23:14 29:5,8 31:20 | 144:23 159:5 176:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 44:5 | public | 37:15 85:15 87:13 | 178:19 193:13 |
| promotions | 34:5 41:7 105:4 106:6 | 88:12 104:22,24 | 205:18 207:10 |
| 243:2,6 | 106:19,20 112:5 | 211:13 | 209:23 236:11,12 |
| properly | 129:5 198:17 245:20 | put | 272:23 285:7,23 |
| 125:14 | 245:22,23,25 246:4 | 27:25 28:4 58:19 | 286:14 291:11 |
| properties | 246:15 | 67:17 91:10 124:8 | 293:18 301:1 306:12 |
| 48:4 | publication | 134:7 160:22 195:7 | questioning |
| property | 91:18 121:11 129:23 | 252:5 277:10 282:12 | 153:23 |
| 23:2,4,5,11,12,16,18 | publications | putting | questions |
| 23:19 24:11,14 32:24 | 22:2 | 55:7 63:22 66:23 | 11:15,20 12:20 15:25 |
| 48:20 50:5,12,25 | publicity |  | 30:13 33:14 86:22 |
| 51:6,14,17,18 52:1 | 23:21 37:2,8 38:14 | Q | 92:25 188:5 219:11 |
| 57:4 59:17 87:13,25 | 47:11,14 53:23 54:23 | qualifications | 295:7,8,8 311:25 |
| 88:4,9,14 131:2 | 56:1 139:20 191:16 | 49:21 | 312:18 |
| 185:25 | 191:18 192:2,3,5 | qualify | quick |
| proportionally | publicly | 13:14 | 21:10 81:4 92:16 |
| 117:3 | 70:10 109:18 120:12 | quantcast | 193:14 262:9 308:20 |
| proprietary | 130:22 194:20 197:4 | 6:11,13,15,17,19,21 | quickly |
| 66:18 | 198:2,3 244:8 246:15 | 61:17 62:2,3,10 | 12:18 116:25 117:24 |
| prospects | 247:5 261:10 | 141:1,3,4,5 148:6,10 | 117:25 312:13 |
| 267:21 | published | 148:17 151:15,16 | quietly |
| protected | 50:10,22 53:23 54:1 | 152:22,23 196:1 | 12:19 |
| 48:11 | 54:10 55:14 56:4 | 210:16 212:24 214:5 | quite |
| protection | 120:14 122:1 182:13 | 214:17 220:4 221:6 | 89:9 176:22 227:13 |
| 48:7,7,8,11 | 182:14 269:3 305:10 | 221:19 225:9 226:5 | 237:10 248:18 |
| provacative | publisher | 226:15 227:18 230:6 | quote |
| 304:19 | 55:20 | 230:17 238:18,24 | 267:9 268:5 271:14 |
| prove | publishes | 239:3,14,25 240:1,11 | 283:23 |
| 259:13 | 54:15 55:19 | 240:17 261:19 | quotes |
| provide | pulling | 272:10 273:25 | 268:21 |
| 15:10 44:5 64:3 66:15 | 281:13 | 277:15,25 279:4 | quoting |
| 76:19 110:1 133:24 | purchase | 284:15 285:4,12,20 | 304:13 |
| 301:2 | 31:19 32:5 36:12 | 286:1,8,23 287:3,12 287:17 296:17 297:1 | R |
| provided | 164:22 232:4 |  |  |
| 44:9 47:16 63:7 141:1 | purchased | 297:9 300:7 | r |
| 141:3 144:19 265:22 | 44:3 | quarter | 1:25 2:5 315:4,21 |
| 265:23 266:5,8 270:2 | purchaser | 293:9,10,11 | raised |
| 300:6 309:21 310:1 | 224:17 234:13 | quarterly | 223:11 |
| 310:17 | purchases | 250:21 | ran |
| provides | 219:4 | quasi | 19:19 195:9 |
| 62:11 75:23 243:2 | purchasing | 32:22 33:7,24 34:3 | random |
| 245:18 | 32:9 144:12 | question | 14:22 |
| providing | purpose | 12:13,25,25 54:14 | range |
| 32:15 | 98:20 103:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 100: 14102: 14 \quad 114: 7 \\ & 132: 11 \quad 137: 5 \quad 142: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 149: 4 \text { 155:25 } 156: 1 \\ & 193: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| provocative | purposes | 132:11 137:5 142:5 | 193:9 |


| rankings | realized | 81:8 132:25 193:17 | 241:20 245:2 247:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 288:22 | 71:5 73:3 74:15 114:4 | 262:12 308:23 | 252:3 272:7 273:22 |
| rapidly | really | recognized | 274:18 277:8,22 |
| 116:17 | 9:11 24:14 28:21 | 110:9 129:10 | 278:25 |
| rarely | 29:23 51:11 54:8,23 | recommend | referring |
| 89:1 | 59:3 64:8 65:18 | 163:9,18 | 22:14 84:13 86:6 |
| rate | 81:23 92:9 93:20 | reconvened | 93:24 110:17 111:2 |
| 216:12,13 273:5 | 144:21 152:10 | 133:3 | 173:15 181:5 201:14 |
| rates | 153:23 158:19 | record | 240:15 |
| 38:10 68:9,21 216:17 | 217:12 238:15 | 11:18 12:2 81:7,9 92:3 | refers |
| ratio | 259:14 260:6 302:9 | 132:20 133:15,17,19 | 86:7 95:23 103:19 |
| 97:21 119:13 | reanalyze | 133:20 136:22 | 110:17 125:17 |
| ratios | 214:2 | 150:19 151:1 178:6 | 182:16 183:3 244:21 |
| 98:3 | reason | 193:16,18 205:13 | 268:6 |
| reach | 13:25 65:5 66:13 76:3 | 211:3,4,5 262:13 | refinance |
| 112:9 260:13 | 160:2 248:21 249:2 | 288:5,6,8,9 294:20 | 82:5 |
| reached | 254:23 265:14 267:5 | 301:1,6,6,8,9,10,12 | reflect |
| 73:12 75:4 114:19 | 270:5 271:20 | 301:14,15,16 308:22 | 185:15 |
| 216:16 218:2,5 | reasonable | 308:24 312:17 313:3 | reflected |
| 223:20,23 229:3,5,8 | 162:19 165:21 | recorded | 75:11 153:4 184:16 |
| 229:11 234:3,8 | reasonableness | 12:1 | 205:13 |
| read | 182:1 | records | reflects |
| 10:19,22,23 64:6 92:2 | reasons | 195:18 | 65:2 148:1 |
| 92:4,9,14,16 122:19 | 12:23 252:15 | recruited | refresh |
| 123:19 135:21 184:7 | reassess | 17:25 | 141:24 |
| 203:21 204:3 241:9 | 214:3 | redevelop | regarding |
| 312:1,3,7 | recall | 66:20,21 | 36:6 133:24 228:20 |
| reader | 10:24 14:11 43:4 | reduced | regardless |
| 200:7,14,16 | 45:16,24 46:2 54:20 | 307:2 308:15 | 209:8,15,17,21 |
| readers | 54:21 57:10 59:15 | refer | regression |
| 201:16 202:12,17 | 60:5,9,11 62:25 | 121:18,22 219:12 | 259:5,15,19,22 260:2 |
| 203:25 204:8 209:15 | 64:11 129:20 151:14 | 235:23 | 309:3 |
| 209:17,19,25 238:5 | 171:7 290:4 309:11 | reference | regular |
| readership | 310:6 | 93:12 94:10,13,24 | 269:8 |
| 202:5 | recaps | 96:3 | regularly |
| reading | 217:10 | referenced | 213:15 |
| 64:16 305:6 | receive | 219:12 | related |
| reads | 214:2 | referred | 30:7,13 194:2,2 |
| 92:3 | received | 21:5 25:16 39:1 86:11 | relating |
| real | 75:18 82:18,18 213:19 | 86:14 91:3 111:6,11 | 217:12 255:9 |
| 21:10 90:6,9 92:16 | 214:4 223:5 233:17 | 122:5,8,17 146:9 | relation |
| 109:16 115:23 131:3 | 236:8 261:7 269:19 | 171:14,17 182:20,24 | 117:3 269:5 |
| reality | 284:2 | 183:23 219:22 221:3 | relations |
| 193:3 238:11 | receiving | 221:16 225:2 226:2 | 134:3 |
| realize | 179:21 | 226:12 231:11,16 | relationships |
| 13:13 | recess | 235:20 239:11 | 48:23 |


| relatively | 64:6,10,19,22,25 | 91:22 | 259:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 233:6 | 65:2,22 67:3 68:14 | representation | retained |
| relevant | 69:5,7 75:11 77:19 | 250:4,20 | 26:19 31:12 32:3 |
| 208:19 270:3 | 81:12 82:12,14 83:7 | representing | 39:20 40:20 43:11,21 |
| reliable | 83:18 84:7,21 85:16 | 7:20,23 37:20 | 44:16 46:21 65:8 |
| 194:21 247:7 | 86:11,18 103:6 | represents | 312:25 |
| reliance | 110:24 111:10,11 | 141:24 142:15 | retention |
| 118:17,24 | 112:16 115:23 122:4 | reputable | 40:14 |
| relied | 122:17 130:2 134:6 | 230:13,23 246:13 | retentions |
| 144:10,24 145:2,4 | 135:21 137:12,13,18 | requested | 49:4,5 |
| 238:21 | 137:21 139:23 141:7 | 310:15 | revenue |
| rely | 143:9,17 144:19,22 | requirement | 24:20 37:25 38:2,9,16 |
| 143:24 246:16 | 145:8,17,20 146:13 | 15:10 | 47:18 59:24 60:3,6 |
| remain | 146:17 153:5 156:7 | research | 68:5,16,17 74:16 |
| 113:2 | 156:19 171:14 | 26:3,13 64:14 213:11 | 75:24 76:12 77:23 |
| remained | 172:14 174:2 179:16 | 213:14 214:20,25 | 79:1,14,18 95:7,12 |
| 308:12,17 | 179:19,19 182:24 | 215:3 | 95:12,13 96:5,6,14 |
| remains | 183:6,13 198:19 | reservations | 96:20 97:9,12 101:5 |
| 311:10 | 207:12 211:15,21,24 | 256:18 | 107:13,15,19 108:1,3 |
| remem | 212:25 216:24 217:1 | reserve | 108:5,10,19,20 109:5 |
| 241:12 | 217:3,14,20 219:8,10 | 137:18 309:22 | 109:7,8,9,10,10,11 |
| remember | 219:13,17 220:1,5 | resonate | 109:12,13,22,25 |
| 34:17 45:7 46:8 47:6 | 221:7,12 222:1,5,14 | 268:9 304:12,15 | 124:11,23 125:7,13 |
| 59:21 61:14,18 63:12 | 223:4 225:6 230:4,25 | resources | 126:18,20,25 127:5,9 |
| 64:12 65:10 123:20 | 231:17 235:24 | 53:18 | 160:16,18,25 161:8 |
| 160:16 196:17 | 237:14 238:8 239:1 | respect | 165:11,14,14,22 |
| 242:17 261:23 277:1 | 239:14 244:16 | 31:12 219:8 | 166:7,20 197:7,13 |
| 310:21 | 245:17 247:16,16 | respond | 198:25 199:4,8,14 |
| reminds | 265:6 267:9 272:10 | 137:19 | 200:1,2,3 205:24 |
| 13:15 | 274:4 282:11,14 | responsibilities | 206:3,4,10 207:5,13 |
| removed | 303:16 304:13 309:6 | 26:22 | 207:16 218:20 219:6 |
| 83:10,10 152:3,5 | 309:7,16,19,22 | responsible | 224:10 229:14,24 |
| 196:25 197:2 282:6 | 311:24 | 61:20,22,22 | 233:10,14 234:15,23 |
| repeat | reported | rest | 237:21 255:16 258:4 |
| 12:24 173:4 180:11 | 1:23 230:12,20 246:9 | 28:16 | 258:6,9,12 263:2 |
| replicate | reporter | restaurant | revenues |
| 295:23 | 8:2,4 91:10 121:20 | 256:12 257:6,10 | 47:19 60:2 120:12 |
| replicated | 167:21 203:25 204:4 | restaurants | 124:16 194:18,19 |
| 295:20 | 205:12,17 294:19 | 255:9,21 256:11,17 | 224:18 |
| report | 301:5,10 312:10 | result | review |
| 4:12 5:8,9,11 13:11 | 315:22 | 136:4 169:12 175:14 | 15:4 55:12 64:6 |
| 15:1,16 21:9,14,17 | reports | 311:5 | 218:18 224:8 229:21 |
| 25:12,13,22 34:22 | 25:25 26:9,13 104:10 | resulted | 234:21 |
| 40:13 41:12,14,15,20 | 218:13 252:11 | 134:1 | reviewed |
| 42:11 43:5,13 47:22 | represent | results | 15:1,15,15 79:24 |
| 49:18 56:6 63:20,22 | 7:18 27:14,17 36:17 | 72:9 104:10 148:25 | 85:17 193:21 239:7 |


| 288:18 | 122:5,18 125:17,18 | 192:18,23 193:3 | 286:20,21,24 287:3,6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| reviews | 126:1,2,8, 13,25 | 195:21 197:18,25 | 287:9,10,14 288:2,12 |
| 255:20,23 256:1 | 127:25 128:1 130:9 | 198:21,25 199:8 | 288:15 290:7,15,24 |
| 257:19 258:1 | 131:10 132:6,17 | 200:8,10 201:3,8,16 | 290:25 291:14,20 |
| revise | 134:4,5,12,15 135:2 | 201:22 202:3,7,13,18 | 292:5,17,20 293:12 |
| 137:19 | 135:5,8,23 136:6,8 | 203:2,11 204:1,8,13 | 293:22 294:3,11,25 |
| revisit | 136:12,14,19,22 | 205:25 206:11,15,25 | 295:15 296:9,10,25 |
| 13:17 | 137:5,12,16,19,23 | 209:9,15 210:1,17 | 297:1,9,15 298:1,18 |
| rewritten | 138:1,7,19,25 139:6 | 211:9,15,25 212:1,1 | 298:22 299:9,10,13 |
| 94:3 | 139:12,16,19,20,22 | 212:4,11 213:20,25 | 299:21 300:14,18 |
| rewrote | 140:11,19 141:2,10 | 217:4,14,21 219:18 | 302:25 303:6,13,19 |
| 94:4 | 141:12,14,19,21 | 220:3,12,13 221:9 | 303:22 306:18,24 |
| right | 142:1,9,11,15,21,25 | 222:2,9,14,16 223:6 | 307:3,7,11,16,20 |
| 9:14 16:2 17:14 19:22 | 143:6,12,15 144:7 | 225:9,10,12 226:10 | 308:1,3,5,11,11,14 |
| 20:15 21:9,16,18 | 145:15,18,20,22 | 226:21,23 227:1,12 | 309:22 310:20,25 |
| 24:24 26:6 27:6 | 146:5,13,21,25 147:9 | 228:3,6,22 230:6 | 311:7,10 |
| 30:19,19 34:11 35:22 | 147:18,19,21,23 | 231:6,14,17 232:5,10 | righthand |
| 37:2,8 38:14,24 | 148:6,10,13,15,17,22 | 232:13 233:18,23 | 183:2 |
| 39:12 41:8,8,8 42:1,7 | 149:1,5,7,21 150:13 | 235:6,9,12 236:2,3 | rights |
| 45:22 46:11 47:10,14 | 150:17,21,23 151:2,4 | 236:16,18,21,24,25 | 23:20 50:6,25 53:22 |
| 49:7,12,16 56:23 | 151:9,19,24 152:1,3 | 237:9 238:9 240:19 | 54:23 56:1 191:16,18 |
| 57:9 59:5 60:4 64:10 | 152:5,11,12,19 153:2 | 242:2 243:3,10,15,17 | robotics |
| 65:6,23 66:16 67:6,8 | 153:12,16,20 154:12 | 243:20 244:9,14,18 | 20:3,4 |
| 67:10,13,17,21,23 | 154:22,25 155:6,13 | 245:5,8 246:24 | role |
| 68:3,5,7,9,16,19,25 | 156:9,14,21,22,25 | 247:22,24,25 248:12 | 47:13 56:23 |
| 71:9,10,12,17,21 | 157:2,5,13,23 159:14 | 248:14,24 251:1,4 | roles |
| 72:1,3,4,20 73:9,13 | 159:16,18 160:14,19 | 252:17 253:20 | 26:5 |
| 73:19,23 74:2 75:13 | 160:21 161:5,10,17 | 254:11 255:5,21 | rolling |
| 75:17,25 76:14,17 | 161:19 162:12 163:2 | 256:6,9,12,15,18,22 | 301:11 |
| 77:4,7,14,24 78:4,9 | 163:5 166:11 167:4,7 | 257:10,13 258:15,18 | rooms |
| 78:14,18,22 79:2,13 | 167:11 168:4,13,19 | 258:20 259:24 | 89:21 |
| 80:1,4,8 81:15,22 | 168:22 169:1,5,10,17 | 260:14,21,23 261:10 | rough |
| 82:1,3,9,16 83:2,4,8 | 170:3,7,11,12,15,18 | 261:13,16,19 262:24 | 301:23,23 302:4,4,5 |
| 83:17,17,21 85:12,22 | 171:5,13 172:2,9,13 | 263:14,20,24,25 | roughly |
| 86:8,10 87:6,11 88:1 | 173:2,4,18,20,23 | 264:21 265:3,6 | 65:10 89:20 136:15 |
| 88:4 89:3,12,15,18 | 174:4,8,11,15,18 | 266:20,22 268:1 | 153:8 168:25 169:4,6 |
| 89:21,23 90:3,7,15 | 175:1,3,11,22 176:18 | 269:3,7,9,21,23 | 171:3 174:8 178:10 |
| 90:17,19,20 91:17 | 177:1 178:2,6,12,20 | 270:3 271:2,16 272:1 | 236:6,23 237:5 |
| 92:20 94:19 95:16 | 179:5,13,22 180:2,12 | 272:4 273:6 274:6 | 246:24 258:14 276:1 |
| 96:15 97:2,10,15,21 | 181:10 182:11,13,25 | 276:2,5,9 277:4,19 | 277:18 280:8,13 |
| 98:1,6,23 101:6 | 183:14,15 185:16,20 | 278:9,18 279:17 | 281:18 284:20,22 |
| 102:10 108:22 | 185:25 186:5,8,25 | 280:5,9,25 281:15,24 | 289:14 290:14,22 |
| 109:24 110:24,25 | 187:1,16 189:7,12,17 | 282:2,9,21 283:2,5,8 | 292:5 293:8 300:13 |
| 112:2,14,17 114:7,18 | 189:21 190:1,6,13,17 | 283:14,18 284:10,17 | 306:24,25 308:16 |
| 115:4,24 116:2 117:7 | 190:23 191:5,17,18 | 284:21 285:2,13,16 | round |
| 117:20 121:13 122:4 | 191:21 192:2,3,4,9 | 285:20 286:4,11,17 | 136:9 198:4 223:6,8 |


| 223:10 | salon | school | 54:19,19 74:24 78:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| rounded | 256:4 | 16:6,15,18,20,25 56:8 | 79:25 80:15 85:10 |
| 173:24,25 174:1,15 | salons | 56:9 290:1 | 93:15 107:17 108:5 |
| rounding | 256:2 | schultz | 110:13,19 113:17 |
| 166:6 | san | 7:20,23 | 115:6 117:16 119:14 |
| rounds | 10:13 16:19 18:22 | schulz | 120:17 124:17 |
| 223:9 | 19:7 20:9 56:10 | 3:4,11 | 125:19 126:22,23 |
| ruled | 165:3 | science | 128:18 136:2 147:4 |
| 270:3 | sandy | 115:17 | 158:19 159:24 |
| run | 292:2 | screen | 167:15 179:22 184:4 |
| 26:23 46:20 259:5,21 | santa | 184:1 | 184:19 189:10 |
| runs | 16:6 | screening | 190:16,21 191:4,7 |
| 231:25 | saw | 194:11 197:22 | 210:7 212:13,16,20 |
| rx | 168:11 213:3 285:25 | seak | 213:21 214:5,8 |
| 17:6 73:21 | saying | 10:8,9 | 215:19,23 216:3 |
| rxsafe | 12:24 75:10 95:3 | search | 218:1 223:19 224:23 |
| 17:4 18:25 19:8,18,24 | 127:25 128:7,10 | 5:5 180:14,20,22 | 226:18 229:2 231:25 |
| 20:6,12,17,20,21 | 139:4 141:23 177:18 | 181:2,3,8,13 182:3,6 | 234:1 235:15,17 |
| 22:7 | 177:21 205:7,21 | 182:12 184:17 | 240:6,19 241:16 |
| S | 211:23 212:2 284:11 | 185:16 | 244:6,23 248:20 |
| S | 284:14 301:1 307:13 | searches | 252:13,19 254:18 |
| $1: 252.54: 105.16: 13$ | says | 181:15 | 256:5,8,11,14 259:23 |
| 1:25 2:54:10 5:1 6:1,3 | 22:2,10 39:8 41:11 | sec | 264:18 275:1 $278: 3$ |
| 6:6 195:14,15 245:7 | 47:24 50:1,8 54:12 | 250:21 | 289:7,11,15,18 291:7 |
| 245:13,18 246:9,11 | 88:22 91:19 93:6 | second | 292:1,3,7,14 293:15 |
| 246:12,16,22 247:11 | 103:10,21 107:11 | 32:3 33:23 36:22 | seed |
| 247:22 274:13 275:6 | 110:7 111:22 112:2,4 | 39:14 50:1 95:21 | 46:7 |
| 275:9 276:7,9 277:16 | 113:8 118:11 120:11 | 107:8 113:8 120:11 | seeds |
| 279:9 280:4 281:14 | 125:18 127:3 128:4 | 122:3 125:20 133:16 | 45:24 |
| 281:22 315:4,21 | 128:15 143:18,19,22 | 220:4 222:8 225:8 | seeing |
| safe | 147:21 148:1,19 | 237:3 282:12 289:6 | 226:8,8 261:24 |
| 17:6 222:3 | 175:17 222:14 | 298:14 301:13 | seek |
| safely | 224:21 231:20 | secret | 124:1 |
| 219:4 | 235:14 236:17 | 48:9 | seeking |
| sake | 242:20 248:3 252:22 | secrets | 123:6 |
| 135:16 | 267:11 268:7 271:14 | 23:21 48:22 | seekingalpha |
| sale | 282:20 290:8 298:17 | section | 123:5 |
| 23:3,13 36:12,15 | 299:1,11 | 49:21,22 57:7 126:15 | seen |
| 93:10 94:19,20 105:2 | scale | sections | 70:6 71:15 76:11 80:2 |
| 127:19 229:24 | 180:25 | 50:20 | 80:3 99:10 105:10 |
| 245:15 | scaling | sector | 123:15 129:15 |
| sales | 264:14,18 | 59:17 118:16 | 144:21 180:6,11 |
| 81:23 93:13 94:8,11 | scenes | securitize | 186:2,6 209:11 214:8 |
| 94:12,14,17,25 95:6 | 42:8 | 29:16 | 227:20 241:1 253:2 |
| 95:25 96:4 105:2,6 | schachter | see | 270:4 291:10 |
| 144:16 | 45:13 | 39:7,17 49:24 50:14 | segment |


| 240:16 | separate | 83:1,20 84:3,6,12,12 | 265:1 274:16 275:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| seized | 43:1 274:6 | 138:25 182:13 | 302:20 307:18 |
| 42:19 | separately | 185:20,24 186:7,11 | showed |
| select | 21:19 26:19 239:18 | 186:14,16,21 187:15 | 174:7 213:3 239:7 |
| 98:17 | septem | 187:19,25 188:6,11 | shower |
| selected | 151:8 | 189:4,7,10,12,19 | 267:18 270:18,24 |
| 194:5 243:16 | september | 190:6,13,25 191:1,3 | showing |
| selecting | 83:6,8 $151: 4,8,10,11$ | sexual | 14:7 15:9,21 221:19 |
| 99:16253:5 | 151:23 153:16,20 | 134:3 | 226:5 272:11 274:1 |
| sell | 154:5,7,8,14 155:1 | shane | 275:16 279:4 298:17 |
| 24:11 27:18 29:3,8 | 173:9 177:6 178:3,7 | 2:117:25 11:9,17 | shown |
| 162:9 208:12 | 272:12,18 273:3,18 | 14:21 58:18 63:15 | 156:12 184:2 259:9 |
| seller | 275:19 276:1,8,24 | 84:2 294:24 312:18 | 265:4 |
| 24:11 36:18,19 | 277:4 281:15,23 | share | shows |
| selling | series | 250:25 253:8,19 | 105:7 146:23 147:15 |
| 53:8 125:22 | 11:15 223:6,8 274:8 | shared | 147:18 167:17 |
| sells | serve | 269:20 | 170:14 171:24,25 |
| 204:14 208:15 244:5 | 56:11 | sheet | 173:16 181:8,12 |
| semester | served | 81:2 164:9,18218:14 | 182:12 183:10 |
| 56:16 | 56:7 | 224:4 229:17 234:17 | 184:15 209:12 221:7 |
| seminar | server | sheets | 225:8,12 226:17,19 |
| 50:20 | 99:13 | 165:5 | 226:20,24 236:4 |
| seminars | serves | shifting | 239:16 240:5,12,24 |
| 53:16 | 238:9 | 262:16 | 246:22 248:10 |
| send | service | shooter | 262:18,22 263:13 |
| 312:13 | 27:18 62:5 | 289:25 | 264:20 274:7 276:6 |
| senior | services | shops | 281:13,17,19 284:15 |
| 25:4,7 26:2,7,18,20 | 24:17,20 26:16 28:14 | 255:24 | 289:6 298:24 |
| $63: 25$ | 63:7255:9 | short | shut |
| sense | session | 44:2 | 210:24 |
| 12:22 21:3 59:6 61:23 | 4:5 | shorthand | sic |
| 66:25 95:14 99:5 | set | 315:22 | 71:16 |
| 112:21 118:17,24 | 15:3,14 19:7 52:4 58:9 | shortly | side |
| 127:9 233:5,8 244:1 | 84:7 98:14 100:10 | 14:23 121:25 | 40:22 43:16 47:6 |
| 299:8 | 140:10 150:3 154:24 | shot | $48: 1297: 1 \quad 248: 9$ |
| sent | 158:12 173:15 209:4 | 184:1 | significant |
| 15:4214:9 | 213:6 222:4 279:3 | shoulder | 280:3 |
| sentence | setting | 17:14 | similar |
| 22:9 49:20 50:1 85:12 | 59:22 | show | 72:9 81:21,24 82:1,6 |
| 93:695:23 103:19,21 | seven | 14:20 15:11 51:21 | 198:20,23 199:14,25 |
| 104:3 107:11 111:2,3 | 44:22,22 236:10 | 69:24 155:20 160:14 | 200:15 205:23 210:8 |
| 112:4113:8,17118:8 | sevenmonth | 180:8 182:2 183:9,17 | 272:13,15 290:11 |
| 136:20 143:22 | 273:16 | 191:25 192:17 | 292:15 296:12 |
| 231:20 | seventhranked | 210:10 220:7 231:1 | similarly |
| sentences | $227: 17$ | $240: 23 \text { 249:3 259:6 }$ | 188:25 189:1 |
| $51: 1$ | $\operatorname{sex}$ | 259:13 260:9 264:25 | simple |


| 158:18 176:17,22 | 222:21 227:17,23 | 100:15 104:12,21 | 66:19 104:7 128:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 205:11 | 228:10,15 232:15 | 106:23 132:12 | 138:22 160:22 |
| simplicity | 233:6 238:6 242:24 | 188:23 192:6 307:14 | 174:22 218:21,24 |
| 136:7 | 244:3 247:4 255:8,11 | situations | 251:3 |
| single | 255:16,19 260:10 | 32:18 35:25 44:16 | solely |
| 130:2,4,18 131:12,23 | 261:17,20 267:19,25 | 105:9,12 245:14 | 23:4 105:14 135:22 |
| 132:6,11 140:14,21 | 271:1,6 272:1,4 | six | 145:4 |
| 143:24 262:1 | 280:3 | 44:21 47:7 145:18 | solicit |
| sit | sites | 147:19 150:7,9 | 27:13 |
| 310:20 | 23:22 31:23 32:20,23 | 156:20 194:5 195:2 | solutions |
| site | 33:1,6 34:21 51:22 | 197:14 241:14 | 7:12 8:3 313:1 |
| 29:2,19,25 30:1,2,4 | 52:18,24 53:1 54:18 | 258:17 259:16 260:6 | somebody |
| 31:1,3,6,8,10,13,19 | 54:22 55:10 57:6,15 | sixmonth | 24:13 32:4 44:16 67:8 |
| 31:25 32:5,7,8,10,15 | 58:14,16,19 61:8 | 266:20 273:16 | 67:23 73:11 163:9,18 |
| 32:19 35:16 39:12 | 63:7 69:13,22 70:4,5 | sixth | 185:18 191:24 |
| 48:18 52:9,11,14 | 70:9 72:10 74:9 75:7 | 1:1 | 201:20 203:8 204:14 |
| 53:2,3,3,6,12,19 | 96:20 99:7,19 101:25 | size | 205:17 296:24,24 |
| 59:22 60:16 63:10 | 103:13 105:13 106:1 | 89:25 99:13 258:24 | someones |
| 69:10,16,24,25 70:1 | 107:12,15 108:14,15 | 260:9 265:3 | 29:7 |
| 70:14 74:5,13 75:1 | 109:1 110:5,10,22,23 | skews | somethings |
| 77:10 80:12 82:19 | 124:13,20,22 125:17 | 239:3 240:9 | 124:7 |
| 83:2,21 87:10 91:23 | 125:23 126:4,17,20 | slate | soon |
| 93:25 96:21 99:14,18 | 126:24 127:13 | 200:7 | 312:14 |
| 99:24 100:22,22,24 | 129:11 134:15 135:2 | slide | sorry |
| 101:3,6,21 102:4 | 142:16,24 143:1,3,4 | 17:15 | 17:5,13 21:24 28:23 |
| 103:1,2 104:5,7,13 | 143:8 144:3,4 158:3 | slight | 30:11,13 37:6 39:9 |
| 104:21 105:3,14 | 158:13,15 159:3 | 220:23,23 | 40:5,8 44:13 54:13 |
| 107:19 108:9,17,18 | 160:17 189:16,19 | slightly | 82:10,13 85:4 87:9 |
| 108:19 112:23 116:7 | 194:12 196:1,7,13,22 | 99:3 120:1 237:7 | 88:18 97:17 101:17 |
| 116:15,16,24 117:11 | 197:1,7,9,12 198:24 | 250:12 285:7 | 114:9 116:5 121:20 |
| 117:12 122:15 123:7 | 199:5,13,23 200:24 | small | 122:16 142:15 |
| 124:24 125:5,10 | 202:6 205:7,11,22,22 | 4:23 19:25 70:12 | 143:18 144:4 147:11 |
| 126:10 127:5,18,22 | 206:9 209:25 210:11 | 92:10 122:15 263:22 | 148:11 167:21 |
| 128:1 129:17 130:3 | 212:17,23 214:6,15 | smaller | 172:14,18 176:9,10 |
| 130:24 131:16,18 | 214:21 215:4,18,22 | 125:17,22 126:4 | 196:10 197:19 |
| 132:9 134:1,2,12 | 228:3 238:4,24 246:6 | smith | 209:23 217:17 |
| 135:14 136:1 137:1 | 259:16 261:18 | 3:12 7:22,22 301:3,8 | 225:18 231:15 236:5 |
| 138:12 140:14,18,21 | 267:15,17 270:16,18 | 301:12,20 302:14,18 | 236:5,11 240:1 |
| 141:4 142:8,9 143:18 | 270:20 275:9 280:6 | 312:12 | 242:19 246:18 |
| 143:19 144:2,6,11,12 | 310:12 | social | 272:23 273:1,11 |
| 159:8,19,22 160:3 | sitting | 30:2 222:24 | 277:7 295:4 296:4 |
| 189:11 192:13 | 129:20 132:3 | soft | 299:18 301:5,8 |
| 193:22,23,25 194:16 | situated | 71:14 | 302:12 305:3 306:12 |
| 194:17 196:5,8,16 | 188:25 189:1 | software | sort |
| 198:20 201:18 204:8 | situation | 66:18,21 71:16 | 95:24 183:3 245:21 |
| 213:12,15 217:3 | 31:1,11 36:199:6 | sold | 292:24 |


| sorts | 152:11 160:8 183:18 | standing | step |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 60:20 257:20 | 206:14 215:15 | 123:2 188:3 | 63:16 83:18 139:24,24 |
| sought | 216:21 246:8 265:18 | stands | 170:11 |
| 170:5,8 310:17 | 271:18 276:18 | 210:3 | steps |
| sound | 309:24 310:9 | start | 167:11 179:4 |
| 246:17 | specifically | 14:22 20:14 21:1 | stock |
| sounds | 34:8 45:16 46:2,8 | 44:14 86:22 97:18 | 120:15 121:7 244:13 |
| 12:15 47:9 134:5 | 58:21 64:13 84:25 | 102:25 172:19 | 250:14,15 251:4,11 |
| 222:13,17 294:14 | 85:5 93:24 94:2 | 217:18 | 251:17 253:15,17,23 |
| source | 119:22 129:20 | started | 254:1,5,12 261:13 |
| 194:21 219:18 224:22 | 139:23 187:10 | 19:1,8 20:15 22:19 | stocks |
| 224:22 230:14,23 | 201:11,14 207:9 | 194:11 215:9 232:24 | 119:11 121:12 247:6 |
| 231:2 235:14 244:21 | 246:11 254:18 269:1 | 232:25 233:2 261:2 | 251:9 |
| sources | 310:7 | 288:4 295:3 | stopped |
| 61:15,16 245:25 | specifics | starting | 295:3 |
| 246:13 252:24 253:1 | 41:9 60:1,8,11 106:25 | 14:10 46:24 84:23 | store |
| southern | 131:6 159:24 296:2,2 | 167:22 294:21 | 20:5 37:12 38:1,3,10 |
| 42:22 | 296:3 | starts | 38:16 47:19 257:6,13 |
| spa | speeches | 49:23 93:1 103:7 | stores |
| 256:3 | 22:1 50:20 53:16 | 107:8 113:5 118:8 | 37:11,13 255:10 |
| space | spend | startup | stories |
| 29:14,23 45:9 102:16 | 133:13 256:21 257:9 | 19:20 215:13 | 53:5 194:1,3 217:10 |
| 118:14 123:13 145:8 | 257:12 | state | 238:5 241:8,13,14,15 |
| span | spent | 7:18 16:19 18:23 20:9 | 268:8,9 278:22 |
| 277:14 | 213:12 | 111:23 112:3 113:14 | 288:22 289:2 304:12 |
| spas | spike | 165:4 309:21 314:1,6 | 304:14,15 |
| 256:1 | 182:12 185:1,3 | 315:1,5,23 | story |
| speak | spitfire | stated | 44:2 280:19,20 281:1 |
| 11:17 106:14,16 | 45:3,4 47:7 | 129:4 236:12 | 281:3,5 |
| speaker | spoke | statement | straight |
| 29:14 | 28:3 51:3,19 57:11 | 81:2,3 93:17 114:13 | 220:22 |
| speaking | 61:8 165:8 | 114:15,17 127:2 | stream |
| 62:12 93:20 117:17 | spoken | 129:8 218:16 224:6 | 69:15 76:4 77:4,11,16 |
| 119:17 268:15,24 | 50:2,24 94:1 | 229:19 234:19 307:4 | 78:2 |
| 269:2 | sports | states | streams |
| speaks | 217:3,12 228:19 | 55:17 227:17 238:10 | 233:14 |
| 131:6 | sportsrelated | 274:12 275:20,24 | street |
| specific | 217:7 | 278:6 | 2:12 3:6,13 53:9 |
| 29:10 30:6 35:13 46:5 | ss | statistical | strict |
| 46:5 52:8,16 54:24 | 314:2 315:2 | 259:7 260:7 | 33:21 |
| 62:25 64:5,9 65:10 | stack | stayed | strictly |
| 73:7 92:12 98:5 | 91:10,12,13 | 23:25 | 38:9 105:16 137:21 |
| 101:23 105:18 | stage | steep | 164:22 165:22 182:1 |
| 106:17 109:19 | 38:21 | 220:15,18 273:9 | studies |
| 117:16 133:12 | standard | stenographically | 19:16 52:8 155:20 |
| 141:13 143:13 | 195:15 | 315:11 | studio |


| 45:4,6 | suppose | 12:14 | 251:6,8 295:5,5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| study | 189:13,22 | swear | talked |
| 52:11 | supposed | 8:4 | 13:11,14,16,17 25:17 |
| stuff | 44:7 | sworn | 39:22,23 49:5 51:1 |
| 34:18 58:25 192:9 | sure | 8:7315:7 | 63:6 87:6 103:17,18 |
| stumbleupon | 9:25 11:2,9,13,23 12:2 | syngenta | 104:2 140:7 144:18 |
| 128:16 129:3 | 13:2,4,18 14:18 | 45:23 46:7 | 150:16 194:17 |
| subject | 15:23 18:14 21:12,22 | synonymous | 199:10 206:3 246:2 |
| 33:15 58:2,25 | 29:1,20 37:16 42:2,2 | 31:6 87:15 88:14 | 269:16 271:9 309:4 |
| subpoenaed | 44:20 53:13,15 55:2 | system | 309:10 310:22 |
| 301:3 | 55:20 60:3 61:4,15 | 217:13,19 | talking |
| subscription | 61:17 62:1 63:10,14 | T | 13:1,9 23:18 30:11 |
| 53:10 196:24 243:17 | 66:7,8 71:22 72:6,19 | T | 40:18 52:9 64:10 |
| 243:18 | 72:21,24 74:11 79:10 | t | 67:2 75:25 84:24 |
| subscriptionbased | 82:4,11 86:21,24,25 | 4:10 5:1 6:1 | 99:7 102:22 109:20 |
| 194:16 242:25 | 88:5 89:6,11,13 90:1 | table | 113:9 117:17 126:1 |
| subsequent | 92:17 94:16 95:9 | 58:8 91:11 | 126:24 133:14 |
| 94:3 | 97:6 98:2 99:1 | tags | 135:12,13,15 146:25 |
| subsequently | 102:13,21 105:5 | 125:23 | 155:23 156:4 163:21 |
| 130:25 | 113:1,20 115:1,12,12 | take | 169:10 190:5,10,10 |
| substances | 116:19 133:17 | 8:23 10:6,14 11:10 | 210:4 231:20 237:14 |
| 13:22 | 135:17,17 136:22 | 17:10 24:3 63:14 | 267:10 268:1,18 |
| sue | 137:9,10 138:3 | 64:24 72:14,16 81:4 | 270:13 293:17 |
| 43:25 | 139:25 140:5 143:9 | 92:14 111:24 120:10 | talks |
| sued | 153:25 154:4,23 | 122:19 125:3 132:18 | 50:7 65:24 66:3 |
| 184:24 | 165:13,22 167:12 | 187:8 193:14 210:24 | tampa |
| sufficient | 172:20,20,21 173:3 | 227:3 236:6 262:9,10 | 2:12,14 |
| 88:24 210:19 260:9 | 177:2,14,24 178:18 | 262:17 270:11 288:2 | tampabay |
| sufficiently | 178:19 179:2 185:17 | 308:20 | 201:1,21 |
| 64:24 | 185:22 187:19 194:8 | taken | tangible |
| suggest | 199:17 201:19 | 2:2 10:4 38:18 81:8 | 51:18 131:2 |
| 164:17 165:4 | 203:20 207:7 215:25 | 134:5 152:18 162:15 | tape |
| suggesting | 216:23 219:14 | 187:10 193:17 | 83:1,20 84:4,6,12,12 |
| 295:19 | 223:25 228:4 230:21 | 262:12 308:23 | 138:25 182:13,14 |
| suite | 236:14 240:20,25 | 315:10 | 185:20,24 186:7,11 |
| 2:13,20 3:7,14 7:13 | 242:24 243:7 246:20 | takes | 186:14,16,21 187:15 |
| 313:2 | 248:7 251:10,14 | 41:24 180:22 188:14 | 187:19,25 188:6,11 |
| sullivan | 254:3 256:19 259:25 | 249:16 | 189:10,12,19 190:6 |
| 3:4,117:19,23 | 274:21 275:13 | talk | 190:13,25 191:1,3 |
| sum | 277:13 286:13 | 9:24 12:18,19 13:12 | tapes |
| 67:25 259:23 296:15 | 291:23 298:19 | 16:3 23:17 51:5,16 | 189:4,7 |
| 297:7 | 308:21 312:7 | 51:17,22 53:1 57:5 | target |
| summary | susan | 83:18 116:22 133:11 | 205:1 206:14,20 |
| 4:25 146:23 | 1:24 2:5 8:3 11:21 | 139:22 140:4,6 | task |
| support | 12:16 315:4,21 | 143:10 167:9 179:17 | 64:9 76:15 162:15 |
| 39:16 129:8 | susans | 194:4 201:15 216:22 | taught |


| 10:25 57:10 103:23 | 180:23 278:22 | 90:16 91:17 94:4,5,5 | 187:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 104:2 | 279:15 307:8 | 95:4,10 96:14 98:9 | theres |
| teach | terrifying | 98:14 99:10 101:24 | 20:16 23:24 26:4 |
| 52:18,24 57:3 | 292:2 | 104:4,11 114:4 | 34:23 39:7,14 40:6 |
| teaches | terry | 119:16 123:4 124:8 | 48:19 49:7,22 50:19 |
| 56:19 | 1:47:7 8:1 | 126:1 127:2 128:12 | 51:2 52:22 53:4 54:5 |
| teaching | tested | 131:19 133:13 135:6 | 57:7 61:14,18 62:14 |
| 56:7,11,17,24 | 72:22 | 135:9 136:14 137:5 | 64:8 65:5 66:19 |
| team | testified | 138:16 140:17 141:6 | 71:16 73:25 77:10 |
| 57:22 | 8:8 9:5,18 11:8 35:20 | 147:18,22 149:16 | 83:14 85:16 89:5 |
| tech | 38:9,16 42:6,25 | 150:21,21 154:8 | 96:13 97:8 98:8 |
| 121:12 | $311: 9$ | 156:24 157:3 158:20 | 115:9,12,18 118:8 |
| technique | testify | 165:20,20 168:16,19 | 120:10 131:5 136:20 |
| 52:20,22 | 9:13,16 13:23,25 | 174:17 180:17 | 141:7 144:20 147:2 |
| techniques | 64:25 65:5 139:13 | 181:12 183:3 184:15 | 147:25 150:7,7,9 |
| 4:18 10:1 11:1 54:25 | 315:8 | 189:20 192:13 196:2 | 153:10 162:11 |
| 91:20 | testifying | 198:3,6 199:11 | 167:13 168:14 |
| technology | 10:2,5,19,20,23 11:1 | 203:17 204:13,23 | 174:21 176:16,21 |
| 20:2 22:5 74:1 | 41:21 | 205:23 206:18 | 182:8,8,8,9,15 183:2 |
| television | testimony | 211:19 212:1 217:5 | 185:7 188:17 193:13 |
| 191:25 | 9:7,8 23:13 25:18 | 222:3,14 223:7 226:7 | 194:12 196:14 |
| tell | 31:21 37:5,24,25 | 231:16 232:6,12,14 | 203:19,19 213:3 |
| 11:11 13:16 29:25 | 47:17 | 235:13,25 236:4,17 | 219:5 220:23 239:4 |
| 33:19 37:6 46:21 | text | 237:7 238:10 239:4,6 | 240:4,20 241:8 242:5 |
| 86:23 92:6 115:25 | 21:25 | 240:10,10,14,22 | 242:6,7 243:9 252:19 |
| 131:7 150:21 158:8 | thank | 243:9,22,25 246:9 | 254:15 257:15,18,25 |
| 158:20 163:6 164:24 | 8:15,20 17:15 30:21 | 247:23 248:1,18,23 | 258:21 259:6,6 260:6 |
| 166:4 171:9 174:22 | 86:3 92:7,21 122:22 | 250:1,17 251:2,12,20 | 264:9,15 269:19 |
| 197:12 227:2,3 | 135:17 205:15 303:3 | 258:4,17 264:8,16,20 | 270:8 271:23 275:13 |
| 240:25 255:7 302:9 | 312:20,22 | 265:4,21 266:4,17 | 289:5 290:21 292:1 |
| telling | thanks | 270:9,23 273:9 | 293:9 311:22 312:7 |
| 111:1 243:15 | 41:23 134:10 | 276:10 279:12 | theyll |
| tells | thats | 282:23 285:7 286:8 | 14:21 27:17 29:3,6 |
| 11:19 | 15:12 17:15 18:22,24 | 286:17,23 287:2,5,7 | 197:12 |
| ten | 22:8,16 23:12,14 | 289:4,10 290:8 | theyre |
| 23:24 109:9 124:15 | 25:19 26:3 27:19 | 296:17 297:8 298:20 | 28:10 33:19 34:4 45:9 |
| 140:21 195:5 261:18 | 30:7,22 33:3,16 | 299:1,9,11,12 302:7 | 46:7 47:7 52:4 68:13 |
| 261:23 264:16 | 36:20,25 37:19 39:24 | 303:24 310:15,20 | 73:13 75:7 90:18 |
| 285:12 312:11 | 40:1 42:24,25 43:8 | 312:7 | 98:12 99:3 119:16 |
| term | 44:9 45:10 47:12 | theoretically | 164:12 166:3 198:14 |
| 180:15,20 181:2,3,8 | 48:13 49:14,14 52:24 | 295:16 | 198:24 200:2 215:21 |
| 181:13 182:7 184:17 | 53:22,24 54:12 55:14 | theories | 216:25 238:4,14 |
| 185:16 | 57:8,8 59:2 66:18,22 | 138:11 | 240:25 242:6,13,17 |
| terms | 67:7 68:20 69:5 | theory | 242:23 248:20 249:4 |
| 62:9,12,15,18,20 | 73:14 77:1 78:15 | 138:1,7 200:15 | 249:21,23 256:21 |
| 67:13 84:13 123:24 | 83:4,7,8 88:9 90:2,13 | thereof | 270:11,24 283:25 |


| 285:10,10 286:10 | 287:24 288:4 295:6 | 86:24 92:14 93:23 | titled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 301:4 | 301:20 302:9 305:23 | 106:6 111:24 117:11 | 111:13 122:14 146:20 |
| theyve | 305:24 309:10 | 118:10,12 130:12 | 289:17 |
| 12:10 74:15 160:22 | third | 131:16 132:21 133:6 | titles |
| 174:22 | 47:23 118:7 289:9,10 | 133:14 143:13 144:7 | 26:1 |
| thing | 293:10,11 | 151:22 153:10,11 | today |
| 12:16 63:13 81:20,22 | thirdparty | 154:12 155:21,24 | 7:11 8:3,15 11:12 |
| 89:5 92:15 140:6 | 107:9 110:8 129:9 | 156:6 157:16 161:19 | 13:19,23 14:1,6 15:1 |
| 189:5 | thirty | 162:21,22 168:3,21 | 15:8 65:19 67:21,22 |
| things | 156:2,4 | 170:18,20 178:4,11 | 67:24,25 79:10,11 |
| 15:9,13 20:22 22:17 | thomas | 178:15 180:7,16 | 114:5 129:21 132:3 |
| 40:6 48:13 81:21 | 56:8,9 | 181:1,9,14 182:6,7 | 133:14 253:9 309:4 |
| 82:25 87:2 90:5,20 | thou | 184:3 186:23 188:16 | 309:13,18 311:9 |
| 103:18 113:1,19 | 237:1 | 195:4 205:15 218:20 | 312:21 |
| 186:5 193:8 216:4 | thought | 218:23 220:8,10,15 | todays |
| 217:8,11 219:16 | 30:11 253:4 256:14 | 221:7,20 224:11,13 | 7:9 67:17 |
| 250:7,17 286:4,11 | 275:1 | 225:15,17 229:24 | told |
| 294:20 305:18 309:4 | thousands | 232:3 233:22 234:24 | 18:1 63:15 216:1 |
| think | 194:11 | 235:2 249:16 250:5 | 285:11 296:4,5 |
| 10:15 21:14 26:3 | three | 250:18 253:14 | tools |
| 33:19 35:24 40:1,10 | 20:7 24:21 26:5 31:17 | 260:25 262:11 265:8 | 88:10 |
| 46:4,12 48:14 51:2 | 35:21 50:20 60:10 | 265:15 274:3 275:17 | top |
| 52:4,21 54:11 57:8 | 65:22,23 124:15 | 277:14,15 278:2 | 50:19 54:20 59:15,20 |
| 58:12,16,20 59:10 | 194:13,20 213:1 | 279:6,11 282:5 291:1 | 61:19 74:12 80:18,20 |
| 62:15 73:17,20 74:10 | 236:6,7,18,22 238:24 | 291:9,17 292:18 | 91:19 93:22 110:6 |
| 75:6,10 77:18 83:15 | 305:14,18 | 293:7 297:14 311:24 | 183:2 188:19 196:17 |
| 84:22 87:14 88:13 | threeyear | 312:10 313:3 315:11 | 240:3 242:17 261:18 |
| 101:24 106:18 107:7 | 155:25 156:6 | timelapse | 261:23 288:22 |
| 108:14 110:16 | threw | 292:1 | 298:17 309:11 310:6 |
| 111:11 114:3,7,16 | 295:2 | timepieces | topic |
| 115:12 129:4 133:13 | thursday | 46:15 | 50:3 |
| 137:18 139:3 141:22 | 15:6 214:10 | times | topics |
| 144:18 148:8 149:11 | tick | 8:25 33:6,8,24 50:23 | 52:6 222:25 228:20 |
| 150:15 167:5,17 | 265:1 | 109:9,10,10 124:15 | total |
| 179:17 181:5 182:19 | tie | 124:16 140:15,22 | 157:25 158:1,13 |
| 184:2,12 191:10 | 185:8 203:19 | 141:8 191:10 201:20 | 168:24 248:10,13,19 |
| 196:15 199:10 213:1 | tied | 256:13 258:17 | 258:6 259:23 274:3 |
| 214:9 216:1,24 219:4 | 100:23 | timing | 282:20 284:24 291:7 |
| 223:16 224:9,17 | tight | 177:25 | 297:11,20 298:24 |
| 228:18 229:13 | 155:25 | timings | 300:18 303:5,12,21 |
| 231:19 238:22 | time | 178:1 | 304:2,3 |
| 240:16,18 257:25 | 7:9 9:1 11:11,16,16 | tips | touched |
| 264:14 265:16 267:5 | 12:18 13:7 14:25 | 11:2,6 25:17 | 53:20 160:7 |
| 267:24 268:15 | 16:23 19:4 22:19 | title | touches |
| 269:16 271:11,20 | 24:1 28:13,16 52:23 | 19:22 24:23 25:8,9,20 | 23:11 |
| 275:1 276:23 281:7 | 69:9,9 73:22 81:7 | 146:22 | touching |


| 97:15 | train | 216:18 | 312:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| track | 14:16,17 | trial | turner |
| 60:16 180:19 195:16 | training | 9:9,10,11 | 217:13,19 |
| tracks | 10:11 | tried | turning |
| 180:25 310:14 | transact | 162:9 259:5 | 35:19 84:21 118:6 |
| trade | 77:1 | tripled | 146:19 172:13 |
| 23:21 48:9,22 67:24 | transacting | 231:22 232:5 | twelve |
| traded | 72:13 | true | 116:2 144:7 148:3 |
| 70:10 109:18 120:13 | transaction | 69:25 70:3,13 96:24 | 151:7 152:17 |
| 198:3 244:8 247:5 | 28:10 57:25 58:11,15 | 113:19 118:19 | twelvemonth |
| 261:10 | 96:22 145:10 217:23 | 119:18,20,23,25 | 143:15 148:12 150:13 |
| trademark | 218:1 223:13 228:24 | 158:20 194:23 | 151:3 152:2 153:12 |
| 29:2 42:12,13,15,21 | 229:2 232:23 233:20 | 204:23 243:22 249:7 | 154:25 155:2,9 |
| 43:6,7 45:1,2 46:1,4 | 233:22 234:1 | 251:20 254:9,11,15 | 168:16 172:25 178:9 |
| 46:12,17,18 48:21 | transactional | 254:18 260:7 270:9 | 179:10 220:11 |
| 49:2,2 55:12 | 23:14 26:15,17 28:17 | 314:7 315:14 | 221:25 225:18,20 |
| trademarks | 28:18 29:1,11 30:12 | truly | 226:25 227:12 274:7 |
| 23:20 32:25 34:11,12 | 30:18 | 88:25 89:5 159:5 | twenty |
| 42:20 51:23 55:8 | transactions | trust | 109:9 120:12 221:24 |
| trades | 24:4,8 32:21 36:6 | 150:25 | 264:17 |
| 217:9 | 59:19 63:9 66:19 | truth | twitter |
| traditional | 81:20,23 88:25 93:10 | 241:1 315:8,8,9 | 191:22 |
| 4:17 91:19 113:5 | 94:9,12,17 103:16 | truthfully | two |
| traffic | 129:6 142:20 195:17 | 13:23,25 | 17:21 19:6 20:7,7 |
| 52:19 60:22,25 61:7,9 | 245:15,16,19 246:2 | try | 22:17 24:2 25:2 27:6 |
| 61:21,25 69:14,24 | transcribed | 12:8 23:6 52:22 61:4 | 27:11 28:3 31:17 |
| 75:13,14,19,21 77:7 | 315:12 | 90:12 205:1 206:14 | 32:18 33:8,23 34:9 |
| 78:21 79:1,25 83:13 | transcript | 271:6 301:21 | 35:21 40:18 43:1,3 |
| 99:18,21,25 100:23 | 11:22 12:2,7 312:4 | trying | 46:23 49:11 53:16 |
| 101:3,4,9,15,20 | 315:14 | 15:20 74:10 83:23 | 54:5 78:3,11,12,13 |
| 110:3 117:9 130:14 | transcription | 90:22 102:16 124:2,3 | 87:14 90:20 109:6,10 |
| 137:2,2 143:7,19 | 315:13 | 124:7 142:4 302:20 | 129:7 130:12 131:16 |
| 144:1,6,10,25 145:4 | translated | 309:2 | 147:7 148:9 153:11 |
| 162:24 169:13 176:4 | 78:20 263:1,4 | tshirt | 159:20 162:21,22 |
| 176:16,19,22 177:4,5 | translates | 27:25 28:1,4,5 | 168:1,12,21 172:25 |
| 177:6,9,10,11,17 | 199:7 | tuesday | 177:25 178:4 185:2 |
| 178:9 194:24 195:25 | traveled | 1:17 2:3 7:2 | 186:5 194:18 226:22 |
| 201:21 216:11 | 46:13 | turkel | 237:1 274:6 280:7 |
| 259:11 260:11 | trek | 2:10 | 282:6 283:13 286:3 |
| 270:21,21 276:20 | 8:21 | turn | 286:10 |
| 278:23 280:6 294:17 | trend | 5:19 21:23 49:18,20 | twoday |
| 300:4,5 304:2 307:9 | 181:18,23 272:19 | 50:16 86:6 88:16 | 10:18 |
| 307:10 310:9 | trends | 100:25 103:2 115:23 | twoyear |
| trailing | 5:5 55:8 179:17,23 | 139:22 220:3 240:3 | 16:22 19:13,14 |
| 154:25 155:2 167:14 | 180:13,14,19 182:3 | 267:8 288:15 | type |
| 167:24 168:15 178:9 | 182:23 183:16 184:1 | turnaround | 26:10 93:2 257:24 |


| types | 209:1 230:4 265:2 | 221:11,20 222:1 | university |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 59:17 | 285:23 302:19 | 223:24 224:22 | 16:7,19 |
| typical | understanding | 225:12,15,19 226:6 | unpredictability |
| 36:10 53:11 104:11 | 51:21 140:16 172:4,8 | 226:16,17,21 227:5 | 113:15 115:10,13,19 |
| typically | 206:18 207:10 219:5 | 227:12 228:2 229:6 | update |
| 48:5 51:10 66:17 | 284:13 286:14 | 230:5,15 231:2 232:4 | 39:25 |
| 70:24 72:7 89:19 | undertake | 234:4 235:5,11,15 | upper |
| 104:9 105:4 144:7,19 | 68:1 | 236:24 237:8 239:16 | 157:12 164:5 303:19 |
| 150:2,5 155:22 | undertook | 258:15,24 259:1,11 | upshot |
| 164:20 217:7 245:20 | 106:2 | 260:3,4,10,16 262:3 | 295:12 |
| 249:17 | undervalue | 262:23 263:11 | uptick |
|  | 69:9 96:21 | 265:24 266:15,19,22 | 264:8,9,12,16,17 |
| U | undervalues | 267:6,11 269:12 | 277:3 |
| u | 76:5 | 270:6,13,21 271:21 | upward |
| 274:13 276:7,9 277:16 | unfortunately | 272:19,24 274:1,10 | 220:21 |
| 279:9 280:4 281:14 | 100:13 118:4 | 275:6,18 277:3,16 | upwards |
| 281:22 | unique | 278:5,8,17 279:4,6,7 | 220:23 |
| uhhuh | 62:13 95:18,21 96:9 | 279:12 280:3,17 | use |
| 11:25 | 96:10 97:8,23 98:23 | 281:14,20 282:20,23 | 37:10 38:3 52:14,16 |
| uhuh | 100:20 102:4,17 | 283:17 284:5,6,8,10 | 52:22 63:12 66:11,13 |
| 11:25 | 103:13 104:6,22 | 284:12,16,20,24,25 | 69:6 70:20,25 71:24 |
| ult | 105:16 110:12 116:7 | 285:1,4,4,5,12,18,19 | 71:24 72:3,5,6 77:19 |
| 41:22 | 116:12,24 117:3,8,10 | 285:23,24 286:1,6,7 | 80:7,12 84:13 88:10 |
| ultimate | 129:13 136:18,19,23 | 286:19,22,23 287:3,5 | 96:5,22 97:25 98:2,9 |
| 76:17 145:12 165:20 | 136:24 137:2 140:11 | 287:13,14,16 289:6 | 98:10 99:8 100:10 |
| ultimately | 140:13,19,22,25 | 289:14 290:7 291:8 | 109:16,17,22 110:22 |
| 81:14 82:2,12,14 | 141:9,10,11,14,17,20 | 292:4,17 293:10 | 124:23 125:8,12 |
| 83:18,23 99:20 101:4 | 142:1,7,10,14,17 | 294:9 296:5,15,16 | 131:17 149:25 |
| 136:3 145:13 199:4 | 143:7,11,14 146:20 | 297:1,3,4,4,5,7,8 | 159:20 160:2 171:10 |
| 290:18 | 147:7,9,12 148:1,2 | 298:17,24 299:10,17 | 186:25 189:25 |
| umbrella | 148:20,22,23 149:1,4 | 299:19,23 300:5,8,12 | 190:15 195:12 196:1 |
| 48:3 | 149:13,15,19 150:12 | 300:19,19 303:5 | 198:18 207:24 |
| uncertainty | 151:18 152:2,25 | 306:7,14,16,19,22 | 213:24 246:15 |
| 113:13 | 153:15 154:19 | 307:1,9,24 308:14,18 | 248:21 249:2 255:13 |
| undergraduate | 155:11 156:9 157:11 | uniques | 259:18 260:1 270:11 |
| 16:6 | 157:21 158:12 | 154:12 167:14,25 | 296:12 299:2,17,23 |
| underneath | 167:19 168:1 169:5,9 | 168:25 176:6 221:22 | 300:21 |
| 184:11 | 169:12,16 170:2,14 | 236:4,21 258:18 | useful |
| understand | 170:24 171:4,24,25 | 267:20 270:13 | 102:4 |
| 8:16 11:18 12:24 | 172:5,12 173:8 177:8 | 274:14 290:23 | user |
| 24:23 31:21 58:22 | 178:1,8,22 179:8,9 | 291:13 299:21 | 53:6 75:13,14,19,21 |
| 66:9,10 71:22 84:16 | 179:21 180:2 194:24 | united | 77:7 79:1 95:18 97:8 |
| 84:17 95:2 130:23 | 195:25 199:5 207:1,5 | 55:17 227:17 274:12 | 103:13 107:13 110:2 |
| 133:23 135:20 137:9 | 207:13 209:4,5 211:8 | 275:20,24 278:6 | 117:9 126:15,18 |
| 140:1,9,13 142:4 | 211:12,14 216:9 | units | 127:14,19,22 128:5 |
| 143:12 145:17 148:5 | 218:6 219:17 220:8 | 183:20 | 129:16 136:24,24 |


| 137:2 140:11,13,14 | 230:5 232:4 234:4 | 107:9 110:8,21 | 72:11,18 74:15 76:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 140:21 141:9,10,11 | 236:24 237:8 238:6 | 111:13,16,17 113:6 | 77:5,10,13,13,15,16 |
| 141:14,17,20 142:1,7 | 238:12 239:16 | 116:13 118:23 | 77:23,25 81:14,21,25 |
| 142:10,14,17 143:7 | 240:12 255:18 | 122:14 123:10 | 82:2,7,13,15,17,21 |
| 143:11 144:1 146:20 | 258:15 260:3,17 | 128:21 129:2,9,16 | 82:22 83:1,5,11,12 |
| 147:9,12 148:20,22 | 267:6,11 269:12 | 131:2 142:25 143:8 | 83:19,24 85:1,7 |
| 149:1,4,13,15,19 | 270:13 271:21 | 143:13 144:11,14,17 | 94:23 95:13 96:8,11 |
| 156:9 157:21 169:12 | 272:19,25 273:12 | 144:19,25 145:5,12 | 96:24 97:7,20 98:4 |
| 178:8 194:24 195:25 | 275:18 279:6,7,13 | 146:20 147:22,22 | 99:19,22 100:23 |
| 200:4,7 209:4 211:8 | 280:3,17 282:4,23 | 151:5 155:11,15 | 101:10,11,15 102:8 |
| 211:12,14,15 212:16 | 283:1,17,18,21,23 | 156:11,12,16 157:1,4 | 102:11 104:14 |
| 213:12 216:11 | 284:1,8,16,20 285:12 | 157:12,20 159:9 | 107:15 109:9,13,23 |
| 230:15 235:5,11 | 310:9 | 160:7 172:9 173:23 | 110:1,4,10 116:4,6 |
| 241:9 258:24 259:1 | uses | 174:24 185:9,13,19 | 116:15,23 117:2,7,9 |
| 259:11 260:4,10 | 208:3 | 186:15 191:8,12 | 117:12,20,25 121:12 |
| 270:21,21 285:1,6 | usual | 194:21,23 197:4 | 124:5,7 126:20 128:5 |
| 286:1,7,22,23 287:3 | 268:14 304:20 | 198:2,2,4,5,16 200:5 | 129:11,17 130:8,12 |
| 287:13,14,16 300:5 | usweekly | 210:14 213:5,7 218:1 | 130:14 131:11,19,23 |
| 307:9 310:14 | 200:8 | 219:1 223:12,18,20 | 132:5,5,9,13 133:25 |
| users |  | 224:15 225:16,17,21 | 134:12,14,17,20,23 |
| 75:23 76:7,10,14,20 | V | 229:2 233:24 234:1 | 135:1,4,7,22 136:4 |
| 95:22 96:9,10 97:23 | v | 234:11 236:9 239:9 | 136:17,24,25 137:1 |
| 98:23 101:2 102:17 | 40:20 | 244:21 246:23 | 137:15 138:5,12,12 |
| 103:2 110:12 112:10 | val | 252:10 253:6,13,23 | 138:25 139:1,2,9,9 |
| 112:11,17 116:8,12 | 139:2 | 254:6,12,13 258:20 | 141:9,11,13,19,25 |
| 116:16,24 117:4,10 | valuable | 259:24 260:11 261:5 | 142:8,10,15,16,17,19 |
| 128:4 129:13 135:13 | 75:21 199:6 201:8 | 261:12,25 262:4 | 147:8,16,18 148:20 |
| 136:18,19 138:15 | valuation | 265:20 270:10 | 148:21,23,25 150:3 |
| 143:14 147:7 148:1,2 | 4:15,18,21,22 9:13 | 287:12 310:24 | 155:10 157:6,22 |
| 148:24 150:12 | 23:2,13 24:24 25:10 | valuationrelated | 158:1,13,14 159:18 |
| 151:18 152:2,25 | 26:10,21,23 27:3 | 123:18 | 159:22 160:15,15,18 |
| 154:20 155:11 | 28:12 29:19,25 36:3 | valuations | 160:19 161:11,13,17 |
| 157:11,15 158:12 | 36:13 38:5 40:17 | 26:9 44:13 48:1 59:14 | 162:12,20,21 164:5 |
| 159:2 167:20 168:1 | 42:12 43:6,20 44:18 | 60:5 63:7 106:5,20 | 164:21,24,24 165:21 |
| 169:5,9,16 170:2 | 44:21,21,22,23 45:13 | 118:13 143:5 157:5 | 166:4 169:10,11 |
| 171:5 173:9 177:8 | 45:15 50:4,13,24 | 160:13,24 161:4,7 | 172:11,15,16,23,24 |
| 178:2,22 199:5,6,20 | 51:6,10,13 52:9,12 | 198:7 223:22 | 173:11,12,16 174:7 |
| 201:3,7 207:1,5,14 | 52:14 53:18,19 54:17 | value | 174:13 175:1,2,4,8,9 |
| 208:18,22,23 209:5,8 | 54:24 55:8 56:8 57:4 | 18:13 23:15 24:12 | 175:13,14,19,21,24 |
| 210:7,8 212:19 213:8 | 57:16 58:8,19 59:23 | 28:6,9 29:3,5,8 31:19 | 176:1,3 178:23 179:2 |
| 213:14 214:6,20 | 61:23 63:4,5 65:23 | 32:4,15,25 33:1 38:2 | 179:13,15 181:24 |
| 215:3 216:9,18 218:6 | 72:19 73:10 83:9,14 | 42:20 44:8,17 46:14 | 182:10 184:16 |
| 220:8 221:20 223:24 | 86:7 88:2,8,8,11 | 51:16,22 52:18 58:10 | 185:19 186:7,10,14 |
| 225:12,15,20 226:6 | 91:20 92:12 97:13 | 58:14 66:15 67:6,13 | 186:16,21 187:24,25 |
| 226:16,17,22 227:6 | 99:3 103:24 104:9 | 67:18,20,22 69:14,17 | 188:24 189:3,6,9,11 |
| 227:12 228:2 229:6 | 105:5,14 106:16 | 69:23,25,25 70:12,13 | 189:21 190:16 191:3 |


| 191:4 192:3,4,8,16 | 80:12,22 81:20 94:19 | 78:4,6,17 79:2 82:16 | 313:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 192:22 193:2 199:3 | 96:19 98:22 109:17 | 82:19,21,22 83:6,10 | view |
| 200:7,14,16 204:6 | 109:18 110:23 113:9 | 83:13,25 84:11,12 | 49:23 124:23 125:1 |
| 210:18 211:13 | 130:2,24 131:15,18 | 87:16 88:2 130:9,13 | 141:22 155:5 180:5 |
| 217:16,17,20 227:23 | 155:17 163:16 | 130:15,25 133:6 | 284:10,12 285:12,15 |
| 228:2,3 230:15 | 164:14 188:5,11 | 134:2 135:22,25 | viewed |
| 237:18 244:11,13,13 | 189:24 191:16 | 136:2,5 137:1,3,16 | 286:25 287:1,2,21,25 |
| 244:16 245:7 248:10 | 205:21 290:12 | 138:16,19,22 139:2,9 | 297:25 304:25 |
| 248:13,17,19,22 | 292:25 | 150:12,15 151:5 | 306:19 307:17 |
| 249:8,22 250:5,13,16 | vanityfair | 152:3 162:24 168:2,3 | 308:18 |
| 250:20 251:11 | 200:16 | 168:5 169:16 170:3,6 | viewer |
| 252:11,17 253:22 | variable | 170:10,15,18,24 | 270:6,7 284:25 285:25 |
| 254:1,2,17 275:14 | 98:5 | 172:6,12,16,17,24 | 286:7,19 287:6 297:1 |
| 290:9 291:16,19 | variables | 173:2,13 174:14 | 297:3,4,4,5 |
| 292:11,18 293:1,11 | 188:17 259:23 260:1 | 175:2,4,8,10,15,18 | viewers |
| 294:2,7,10 295:15,23 | variation | 175:19,20,23,23,25 | 100:20,24 101:2 102:4 |
| 296:7,8 297:20,21 | 85:9 | 176:2,4,7,12,16,21 | 104:6 105:16 179:8,9 |
| 298:1 299:7,18,20,24 | variations | 176:22 177:10,17 | 227:17 269:8 274:1 |
| 300:2,6,10 303:12,15 | 98:9 | 178:12,15,22 179:20 | 274:10 278:5,8,17 |
| 303:18,21 304:3,9 | various | 180:3 181:25 182:4 | 279:4 285:5 304:25 |
| 305:13,25 306:17,24 | 50:5,25 61:14 109:15 | 185:7 192:12,13 | 306:19 308:18 |
| 307:2,19,25 308:13 | 191:20 | 262:19 268:2,7,16,19 | viewership |
| 308:16,19 310:24 | vast | 268:24 269:6 281:24 | 95:18 105:5 |
| 311:1,5 | 69:9 143:25 | 282:5,6,21,25 285:25 | views |
| valued | vastly | 286:7,25 287:1 | 62:14,14 170:14,24 |
| 32:19,20,23 33:6 | 213:18 269:18 310:3,8 | 290:12 292:2 300:9 | 171:25,25 172:5,12 |
| 34:10 46:10 70:11 | ventura | 300:10 301:11 | 179:21,25 180:2,10 |
| 77:5 79:11 82:8 | 7:13 313:1 | 303:19 306:7,14,17 | 262:3,18,23 263:1,4 |
| 103:12 104:5,13,21 | venture | 306:20,23 307:17,23 | 263:11,14,16 264:13 |
| 124:14 125:14 126:7 | 245:21 | 307:24 308:15,18 | 264:16,17,21 265:1 |
| 126:10,12,14 127:13 | verify | 311:3,6 312:16 | 265:10,11,24 266:15 |
| 127:19,22 128:8,11 | 230:11,16,19,21 | videographer | 266:22 267:2 268:10 |
| 130:7 163:5,7 193:9 | versa | 3:19 7:5 8:2,10 17:13 | 282:20 284:6,6,25 |
| 211:9 223:16 233:23 | 259:12 | 58:17 81:6,9 132:20 | 285:18 289:6,14 |
| 297:21 | versus | 133:5,17,20 193:16 | 290:7 291:8 292:4,17 |
| values | 7:7 9:22,23 36:22 43:9 | 193:18 211:2,5 | 293:10 296:6,15,16 |
| 71:25 72:2 163:2 | 45:12 48:8 | 262:13 288:6,9 | 297:7,8 298:17,25 |
| 164:16 166:8 250:6 | vh1 | 301:14,16 308:22,24 | 299:10,17,19,24 |
| 250:11 | 193:3 | 312:23 | 300:8,19,20 303:5 |
| valuing | viacom | videos | 304:16 305:12 306:7 |
| 31:2,13 34:9 42:14 | 193:2 | 53:5 194:1 216:2 | 306:14,16,22 307:1 |
| 44:24,25 45:1,17,20 | vice | 282:25 | 307:24 308:14 |
| 45:24 46:3,16,18 | 259:12 | videotape | violation |
| 47:14 49:1,15 51:25 | video | 7:6 | 38:15,15 |
| 54:8,22 55:10 56:1 | 7:10,11,15 12:1,1 | videotaped | visit |
| 57:6,12,19 70:14 | 66:16 75:13 76:21 | 1:15 2:1 132:23 133:2 | 213:12 267:6 |


| visited | 127:20 128:2,9,23 | voiceidentify | 3:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 213:15 214:15 261:18 | 129:14 130:10,20 | 7:17 | wasnt |
| 271:21 272:1,4 | 131:14,25 132:7,15 | volume | 80:4 87:20 128:11,25 |
| 282:24 283:4,7 | 132:18 138:2,9 | 7:5 312:24 | 138:14 141:3 148:17 |
| 297:14 | 141:16 142:2 145:1,6 | vs | 173:7 268:1 310:17 |
| visiting | 157:14 158:6,16,25 | 1:74:22 122:15 | watch |
| 214:15 216:19 | 159:11,23 160:5 |  | 135:25 |
| visitor | 161:1,6,12,21,25 | W | way |
| 140:19,23 235:5 | 162:7,13,18 163:12 | w | 61:5 70:15 72:23 88:2 |
| visitors | 163:20 164:1,10,19 | 3:13 | 91:15 114:16 124:8 |
| 104:22 135:13 140:25 | 165:6,12,18 166:12 | wait | 128:8,11 151:17 |
| 153:15 212:13 | 166:17,22 167:1 | 46:24 86:24 175:4 | 154:15 158:1 160:10 |
| 221:11 222:1 266:19 | 169:19,21 175:12 | 183:8 294:18 | 163:5 173:6 186:20 |
| 267:22 269:10 275:6 | 177:13,19 178:13,25 | walk | 193:13 200:6 206:13 |
| 275:9 277:3,17 | 181:20 184:6 185:5 | 179:4 | 213:7 218:8 219:7 |
| 281:14,21 283:17,24 | 185:21 186:1,9,18 | walked | 226:11 231:1 258:7 |
| 284:8 294:10 304:22 | 187:3,17,22 188:2,5 | 176:18 | 270:1,1,6,8 271:23 |
| visits | 188:8 190:2,18,24 | wall | 274:2,13 278:1 284:3 |
| 140:14,18,21 285:19 | 191:6 192:10,19,24 | 53:9 | 291:17 292:19 294:3 |
| 296:24,25 | 193:4,11 197:20 | want | 298:21 302:8,10,15 |
| vitae | 198:11 199:9 200:11 | 9:3,17 13:2,13,18 | ways |
| 4:13 | 201:4,9,23 202:9,14 | 18:11 20:7 25:2 29:3 | 76:6,9 185:20 186:8 |
| vogt | 202:19 203:3,12 | 29:4,6 31:17 45:18 | 186:17 191:19 |
| 2:11 7:25,25 30:5,22 | 204:2,9,16,22 205:3 | 45:25 46:9 58:24 | weak |
| 33:11,13,17 40:25 | 206:1,16,22 207:6 | 60:19 63:14,16 65:9 | 198:8,14 |
| 41:3,8,17,24 58:2,5 | 208:20 209:2,10,16 | 66:20 71:22 77:16 | wealthier |
| 58:22,24 59:7 69:20 | 210:2 220:16 227:19 | 83:7 86:21,24 90:2 | 212:17 |
| 76:22 77:8 79:3,16 | 232:7 242:22 243:5 | 92:8,9,14,23 107:3 | web |
| 79:22 80:9,17 83:3 | 243:21 251:13,19 | 111:24 140:6 142:3 | 23:22 29:2,19,25 30:1 |
| 83:22 84:5 87:18 | 253:25 254:8,14 | 150:19 164:3 172:21 | 30:2,3 31:1,3,6,8,10 |
| 88:6,18 94:15 95:1 | 256:24 258:22 | 174:22 178:6 194:4 | 31:13,19,23,25 32:5 |
| 96:2,16,18 97:3,11 | 260:15 261:6 264:1 | 206:6 208:22 209:1 | 32:7,8,10,15,19,20 |
| 98:7,19 100:5 101:7 | 265:7 266:25 268:4 | 216:21 219:15 | 32:23 33:1,6 34:21 |
| 101:22 102:6,12,20 | 268:20 274:23 | 240:17 242:23 | 35:16 39:12 48:18 |
| 103:3 104:23 105:17 | 279:19 283:20 | 247:10 279:16 | 51:22 52:9,11,14,18 |
| 105:22 106:3,12,24 | 285:21 286:5,12 | 294:23 301:22 302:1 | 52:24 53:1,2,3,3,6,12 |
| 107:20 108:23 | 287:15,23 290:10,16 | wanted | 53:19 54:18,22 55:10 |
| 109:14 112:20,25 | 291:6,21 292:12,21 | 18:20 27:25 29:15,20 | 57:6,15 58:14,16,19 |
| 113:22 114:2,11,21 | 293:3,13,23 294:5,12 | 32:5 107:4 159:18 | 59:22 60:16 61:8 |
| 115:5,11,16 116:11 | 294:16 295:2 296:11 | wanting | 63:7,10 69:10,13,16 |
| 116:18 117:1,14,21 | 296:18 297:10,23 | 24:10,11,12 | 69:22,24,25 70:1,4,5 |
| 118:1,20 119:1,8,21 | 298:2 299:5,15,22 | wants | 70:9,14 71:24 72:10 |
| 120:6,16,21,25 121:4 | 300:3,25 301:7,9 | 24:13 51:12 | 74:5,9,13 75:1,7 |
| 121:8,14 122:10 | 302:21 303:7 304:4 | warned | 77:10 80:12 82:19 |
| 124:25 125:6,11 | 305:2,7,15 306:1,8 | 12:16 | 83:2,21 87:10 91:23 |
| 126:3,9 127:1,6,15 | 311:21 312:1,3,19 | washington | 93:25 96:20 99:7,14 |


| 99:18,19,24 100:22 | 4:23 | wife | 187:4,18 188:9 190:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100:22,24 101:6,21 | wed | 89:16 | 190:19,25 191:7 |
| 101:25 102:4 103:1,2 | 158:3 213:21 | willing | 192:11,20,25 193:5 |
| 103:12 104:5,7,13,21 | wedding | 67:23 77:18,21 | 193:12 199:10 |
| 105:2,13,14 106:1 | 202:24 203:18,20 | wipo | 200:12 201:5,10,24 |
| 108:14,14,17,18 | 204:14 | 4:15 86:8 | 202:10,15,20 203:4 |
| 109:1 110:4,10,22,23 | weddings | wish | 203:13 204:3,10,17 |
| 112:23 116:7,15,16 | 203:2,5,6,10,15,16 | 51:20 100:14 104:17 | 204:23 205:4,19 |
| 116:24 117:12 | week | witness | 206:2,17,23 207:7 |
| 122:15 123:7 124:13 | 39:6 40:10 184:18,21 | 2:1 4:2 8:4 10:2,5 11:1 | 208:21 209:3,11,17 |
| 124:20,24 125:5,10 | 184:23 185:1 283:7 | 15:11,23 24:17,20 | 210:3 220:17 227:20 |
| 125:17,22 126:4,10 | weekly | 28:14 33:12,18 41:2 | 242:23 243:6,22 |
| 127:13,18,22 128:1 | 183:19 | 41:4 42:2 58:4,6 | 251:14,20 252:5 |
| 129:11,17 130:3,24 | weeks | 69:21 76:23 77:9 | 254:1,9,15 256:25 |
| 131:16,18 132:9 | 185:2 | 79:4,17 80:10,18 | 258:23 260:16 261:7 |
| 134:1,2,12,15 135:2 | wells | 83:4,23 86:13 87:19 | 264:2 265:8 267:1 |
| 135:14 136:1 137:1 | 17:3,7,20 18:1 22:15 | 88:7 91:5,12,15 | 268:5,21 274:24 |
| 138:12 140:14,21 | went | 94:16 95:2 96:3,17 | 277:10 283:21 |
| 141:4 142:8,9,16,24 | 16:6,24 17:22 18:22 | 96:19 97:12 98:8,20 | 285:22 286:6,13 |
| 143:1,3,4,8,18,19 | 20:13 83:13 130:14 | 100:6 101:8,23 102:7 | 287:16,24 290:11 |
| 144:2,3,4,11,12 | 137:2 138:15 167:11 | 102:13,21 103:4 | 291:7,22 292:13,22 |
| 158:3,13,15 159:3,8 | 169:2 176:4 177:10 | 104:24 105:18,23 | 293:4,14,24 294:6,17 |
| 159:19,22 160:3,17 | 195:5,20 221:11 | 106:4,13,25 107:21 | 295:4,10 296:12,19 |
| 189:11 192:13 | 295:22 | 108:24 109:15 | 297:11 298:3 299:23 |
| 193:22,23,25 194:12 | weston | 112:21 113:1,23 | 300:4 301:18,22 |
| 194:16,17 196:5,7,8 | 25:15 41:16 54:3 | 114:3,12,22 115:6,12 | 302:16,19,23 303:8 |
| 196:13,16,22 197:7,9 | 91:21 | 115:17 116:12,19 | 304:5 305:3,8,16 |
| 197:12 198:20,24 | weve | 117:2,15,22 118:2,21 | 306:2,9 308:21 |
| 199:13 201:18 202:6 | 13:10,17 14:8 29:13 | 119:2,9,22 120:7,17 | 311:22 312:2,5,9,15 |
| 205:7,11,22,22 206:9 | 49:5 52:16,17 61:9 | 120:22 121:1,5,9,15 | 312:22 315:6,18 |
| 208:6,8,11 209:25 | 61:17 62:6 63:1,1,2 | 125:1,7,12 126:4,10 | woman |
| 212:17 213:15 214:6 | 63:11 70:5 94:2 | 127:2,7,16,21 128:3 | 23:7 |
| 214:15,21 217:3 | 103:18 144:22 145:7 | 128:10,24 129:15 | wont |
| 222:21 228:9,10 | 154:4,5 160:7 191:9 | 130:11,21 131:15 | 15:21 92:6 295:4,5 |
| 232:13 233:6 241:4 | 191:10 216:15 | 132:1,8,16 138:3,10 | woodland |
| 244:3 246:6 247:4 | 230:14 309:4,17 | 141:17 142:3 145:2,7 | 7:13 313:2 |
| 255:8,11 260:10 | whack | 157:15 158:7,17 | word |
| 261:17,18,20 271:1,6 | 312:8 | 159:1,12,24 160:6 | 92:4,4 114:25 169:22 |
| 275:9 280:3,6 | whats | 161:2,7,13 162:1,8 | 180:12,12 227:4 |
| webbased | 73:15,16 99:4 137:12 | 162:14,19 163:13,21 | words |
| 71:23 74:4 195:21 | 169:20 219:10 | 164:2,11,20 165:7,13 | 109:6 125:12 135:11 |
| webinar | 256:11 274:16 | 165:19 166:13,18,23 | 167:21 254:21 259:8 |
| 51:3 | 302:11 309:7,16 | 167:2 169:23 175:13 | 267:24 269:2,14 |
| webinars | 312:2 | 177:14 178:14 179:1 | 270:12,23 304:6,11 |
| 51:14 104:1 | whos | 181:21 184:7 185:6 | wore |
| website | 185:18 203:8 | 185:22 186:2,10,19 | 19:21 |


| work | write | 196:12 201:20 | 252:19 295:7 302:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17:2,24 18:25 20:6,8 | 56:2 129:16 153:21 | 203:19 205:19 212:5 | 312:3,6 |
| 20:18,19 23:23 24:17 | writes | 217:17 222:6 227:15 | young |
| 26:10,12,15,17 27:4 | 124:12 126:16 | 227:15 238:16 | 239:3 |
| 27:9 28:17,20,24,25 | writing | 242:10 247:8 248:7 | youngblood |
| 29:1,11,18,19,23 | 26:9 64:18 | 251:7,8,25 252:6 | 46:15,19 |
| 30:7,12,16 31:12 | written | 255:4 262:10 269:24 | younger |
| 32:21 33:3 40:3,24 | 10:20 50:3,24 91:21 | 273:15,18 289:9 | 238:14 240:9 |
| 57:15,19,24 59:23 | 111:20,21 124:9 | 290:21,25 292:9,10 | youre |
| 61:6,10 63:3,4,5 | 191:10 301:10 | 294:23 295:1 301:25 | 14:15 28:16 46:24 |
| 65:20 70:17 72:23 | wrong | 302:3 303:1,17 | 48:9 53:7 64:24 75:9 |
| 104:19 145:7 146:24 | 167:18 302:11 | year | 81:20 82:1,3,9 86:23 |
| 160:17 254:24 | wrote | 5:20 10:16 16:13 | 89:12 90:14,14,19,22 |
| 311:16 | 26:13 55:22,24 84:24 | 18:18 28:20,25 29:12 | 90:23 94:19 95:3,6 |
| worked | 198:19 | 51:4 65:9 233:9 | 95:11 96:7 97:19,24 |
| 17:1,3 19:2,4,15,24 | X | 248:21 249:15 | 98:3,6 99:6 102:22 |
| 22:20 59:18 65:12 | X | years | 105:21 106:22 |
| 73:21 102:16,18,24 |  | 17:21 20:7 24:21 25:2 | 108:11,12 110:16 |
| 103:1 111:18 144:22 | 4:1,10 5:1 6:1 128:5 | 31:17 35:21 60:10 | 119:14,23 122:24 |
| 271:1,4 | xoom | 78:3,11,12,14 103:11 | 131:6 137:11,14,22 |
| working | 120:24 | 104:20 106:9 112:6 | 137:25 138:6,18,21 |
| 17:17 61:6 | xyz | 116:2 156:2,4 195:5 | 138:24 139:4,4 |
| works | 127:21 | 223:3 239:5 261:4 | 154:21,23,24 155:23 |
| 95:5 204:14 205:25 | Y | yelp | 173:14 177:2,16,17 |
| 206:13 253:3 | yaheo Y | 146:5 255:4,7,11,13 | 177:24 181:5 203:21 |
| workshop | yahoo | 255:15,20 256:5,18 | 205:7,21,21 210:4 |
| 4:15 86:8 | 6:8 247:1,3,9 249:4 | 256:20 257:3,3,15,18 | 211:16 225:1 249:3 |
| world | 251:23,24 252:9,25 | 257:21,23 258:1,2,5 | 249:15 253:9 257:7,9 |
| 55:12 | 253:19 | 258:14 260:13,23,24 | 259:22 264:17,23 |
| worried | yard | 261:10,15 262:7 | 271:4 284:10,13 |
| 41:9 | 89:25 | yelps | 285:3 302:20 307:14 |
| worse | yeah | 261:25 262:4 | 310:22 |
| 205:14 | 8:18,20 11:3 14:13 | yield | youtube |
| worth | 20:10,22 27:22 30:14 | 72:9,11 | 124:21,22 |
| 54:8 125:18 126:13 | 30:17 33:12 39:24 | york | youve |
| 148:11 164:4 | 40:9 44:22 47:3,3,12 | 42:23,25 43:4 | 8:23 11:8 24:1 28:20 |
| wouldnt | 49:10 54:11 81:24 | youd | 29:11 35:20 39:4 |
| 79:7 108:18 125:4 | 83:15 86:21 90:11 | 21:20 49:18 57:14 | 48:22 50:23 51:14 |
| 156:3 204:17,20 | 91:8,13 92:18 111:1 | 68:2,5,7,9 72:14,16 | 56:16 62:2 63:7 92:2 |
| 208:18 249:12 | 118:11 132:19 134:9 | 90:8 98:10 110:15 | 95:9 97:8 126:7 |
| 254:24 275:7 297:19 | 134:9 136:14 137:5 | 151:21 160:2 165:22 | 158:10,23 164:16 |
| 299:8 | 147:11,12,13 153:7 | 179:7 188:15 208:25 | 179:12 191:8 241:4 |
| wound | 153:24 154:1,7 158:5 | 220:17 241:15 | 255:11 271:1,5,9 |
| 32:15 | 170:9 173:5 174:1 | 242:19 294:9 | 293:17 309:25 |
| wrap | $184: 11188: 4,4,4,7$ $190 \cdot 12192 \cdot 6196 \cdot 11$ | youll | yup |
| 20:21 | 190:12 192:6 196:11 | 11:16,20 39:7 67:16 | 122:6 |


| Z | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 2181: 7,10 \quad 151: 23 \\ & 267: 9300: 16304: 13 \\ & 313: 3,4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 136: 6,10,11,15,16 \\ & 153: 8174: 14291: 5 \\ & 291: 20303: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 1950: 17,19157: 11 \\ & 239: 5240: 16277: 19 \\ & \mathbf{1 8 0} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | $305: 13,25311: 7$ | 5:8 219:21,23 220:1 |
| 303:1,4 | 4:20 | 152 | 181 |
| 000 | 1148 | 221:13 | 5:9 221:2,4 |
| 136:5,6 172:1 244:18 | 171:16 262:18 288:16 | 159 | 182 |
| 248:14 | 289:2,5 | 227:10 | 5:5,11 221:15,17,19 |
| 000someodd | 1149 | 167 | 183 |
| 266:18 | 288:16 298:13,13 | 20:25 | 5:6,13 224:25 225:3,5 |
| 01148 | 300:12,16 | 17 | 184 |
| 171:10 | 117 | 21:24 34:23 47:22 | 5:14 226:1,3,17,19 |
| 07 | 21:23 | 49:20 50:16 156:17 | 185 |
| 1:18 2:3 7:3,10 308:25 | 12 | 173:12,17 252:12 | 5:16 226:11,13,20 |
| 08 | 132:21,22 143:18 | 170 | 186 |
| 133:1,6,18 | 151:19 167:14,24 | 4:12 21:1,4,6,8 34:23 | 5:18 231:10,12,16 |
| 09 | 169:1,2 193:16 217:1 | 143:17 217:17,21 | 187 |
| 133:21 | 221:13 275:22 276:1 | 170some | 5:21 235:19,21,23 |
| 092 | 276:8 278:7 281:17 | 15:4 | 237:4 |
| 151:23 | 281:22 | 171 | 188 |
|  | 120 | 4:13 5:3 38:25 39:2,5 | 5:22 239:10,12 |
| 1 | 233:23,24 | 172 | 189 |
| 1 | 12012447ci011 | 4:15 86:11,15,17 87:4 | 5:24 241:19,21,23 |
| 4:24 7:6,6 14:10 39:22 | 1:7 | 88:17 | 1899 |
| 40:7 47:4 118:7 | 122 | 173 | 3:13 |
| 126:5 133:1,6,18,21 | 4:22 | 4:17 91:2,4,18 | 18th |
| 151:9 154:4,5,7,14 | 13 | 174 | 253:18,21 254:7 |
| 155:1 181:5,12 | 154:6 211:20 217:1 | 4:20 111:5,7,10 118:6 | 19 |
| 182:15 183:13 | 231:3,16 247:16,17 | 122:10 | 149:18,21 156:23 |
| 184:16 211:21 221:8 | 278:2 | 175 | 157:23 159:21 |
| 226:19,20 246:22 | 1315 | 4:22 122:7,9,14 | 190 |
| 266:23 292:5,6,8 | 1:10 | 176 | 6:3 245:1,3,5 246:22 |
| 302:23 304:2 312:24 | 133 | 4:24 146:8,10,12 | 1900 |
| 10 | 4:5 | 151:22 282:15 | 2:13 |
| 1:18 2:3 7:3,10 248:17 | 135 | 1760 | 191 |
| 100 | 112:17 | 3:6 | 6:6 247:10,13 250:7 |
| 2:12 180:24,25 | 136 | 177 | 250:24 |
| 1001 | 258:16 | 5:3 171:14,18 262:17 | 19103 |
| 3:7 | 14 | 264:8 265:4 288:2,12 | 3:8 |
| 10k | 153:5,8 168:25 169:3 | 298:14 | 192 |
| 197:11 242:9,14 | 277:19 284:20 | 178 | 6:8 252:2,4,8 |
| 10ks | 146 | 5:5 182:19,21,23 | 1925 |
| 249:14 | 4:24 | 183:9,12 288:3 | 2:3,19 7:16 |
| 10th | 14th | 179 | 193 |
| 225:22 | 184:17,18 | 5:6183:22,24 | 6:11 272:6,8,10 |
| 11 | 15 | 18 | 194 |


| 6:13 273:21,23,25 | 16:21 | 236:19 239:17,17,18 | 250:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 275:25 276:4,5 | 2009ish | 244:17 246:23 | 24 |
| 195 | 19:3 | 247:25 248:22 249:9 | 1:17 2:3 7:2 |
| 6:15 274:17,19 275:16 | 2010 | 250:19 252:19 | 241 |
| 275:25 277:6 281:13 | 16:21 269:4 | 2015 | 5:24 |
| 196 | 2011 | 1:17 2:3 7:2,9 236:2 | 245 |
| 6:17 277:7,9,14 | 20:16 151:3,9 154:4 | 236:15 252:9,12 | 6:3 |
| 278:14 | 221:8,12 228:21 | 314:9 315:18 | 247 |
| 197 | 272:11 274:2 278:1 | 202 | 6:6 |
| 6:19 277:21,23,25 | 279:5,22 | 3:16 | 24842 |
| 281:19 | 2012 | 2031600 | 39:9 |
| 198 | 78:7 83:8 150:16 | 2:22 | 24th |
| 6:21 278:24 279:1,3 | 151:4,8,12,23 152:18 | 205 | 7:9 |
| 1999 | 153:1,15,16,19,20 | 7:13 313:2 | 25 |
| 112:19,24 | 154:5,6,14,14 155:1 | 20750 | 149:4,7 156:9 157:22 |
| 19th | 155:1 173:9 177:6 | 7:12 313:1 | 159:21 193:19 |
| 239:15 252:9,12 | 178:3,7 184:12,18 | 20th | 221:24 231:22 |
| 253:18,21 | 217:13 220:11 221:8 | 184:18 | 252 |
| 1st | 221:21,23 263:19,25 | 21 | 6:8 |
| 151:3 152:18 274:2 | 266:23 272:12,18,18 | 4:12 86:6 250:25 | 25th |
| 2 | 274:10 275:19 276:6 | 215 | 152:6,13 |
| 2 | 276:8 277:4,16 278:9 | 3:9 | 26 |
| 2 | 279:8 281:15,23 | 219 | 252:12 |
| 39:22 40:19,19 47:4 | 284:19 288:24 | 5:8 | 260 |
| 112:9,14 113:4 169:4 | 289:13,13 290:2,7,20 | 21st | 248:14 |
| 170:9 177:7 178:10 | 291:14,18,18 293:22 | 236:2 | 27 |
| 193:16,19 211:3,6,23 | 294:1 296:6,22 | 22 | 124:10 248:14 |
| 225:11 235:4 240:3 | 297:19 298:9,25 | 88:16,19 | 272 |
| 282:9 306:23 307:1 | 299:10 300:19 303:5 | 221 | 6:11 |
| 307:18,25 308:8,15 | 305:20 307:17,21,23 | 5:9,11 | 273 |
| 20 | 2013 | 225 | 6:13 |
| 176:9 233:17 253:19 | 9:3 55:7 78:10 83:9 | 5:13 | 274 |
| 305:13,25 | 108:6 152:5,13,19 | 226 | 6:15 |
| 200 | 153:1 159:19 161:24 | 5:14,16 | 277 |
| 3:14 | 163:11,17 164:4,25 | 23 | 6:17,19 |
| 20002001 | 173:10 177:7 178:7 | 247:15,19 | 278 |
| 121:16 | 184:12,13 226:6,17 | 231 | 6:21 |
| 2002 | 227:5 274:3 278:2,6 | 5:18 | 28 |
| 116:1 | 278:9 279:5,22 | 232 | 39:9 171:3 173:10,19 |
| 20036 | 281:20,21 282:1 | 157:2 | 174:10,12 175:25 |
| 3:15 | 298:11 308:3 | 235 | 176:11,15,19 177:1,8 |
| 2006 | 2014 | 5:21 | 177:11 |
| 16:14 | 9:4,4,17 54:7 108:3 | 239 | 280 |
| 2008 | 184:13,13 223:4 | 5:22 | 244:18 |
| 124:10 | 226:7,16,20 227:8 | 23rd | 285 |
| 2009 | 233:17 235:8 236:10 | 247:25 248:17 249:13 | 164:5 165:1 166:6 |


| 164:5 165:1 166:6 | 33602 | 292:6,8 | 3:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 286 | 2:14 | 43 | 50plus |
| 157:2 161:24 163:10 | 34 | 112:9,14,18 219:18,21 | 238:9 |
| 163:17 303:22 | 149:18,21 156:23 | 220:1 | 52 |
| 29 | 157:23 159:21 | 44 | 110:18,25 111:12 |
| 81:7 | 35 | 149:5,9 224:23 225:5 | 53 |
| 295 | 85:13 86:5 308:6 | 4432199 | 110:18,25 122:4,5,6 |
| 228:22 | 350 | 2:15 | 122:16,24 173:10 |
|  | 157:13 | 445 | 174:12 175:25 |
| 3 | 357 | 136:6,10 174:14 311:7 | 176:15,19 177:8,11 |
| 3 | 170:14 171:7 172:1 | 46 | 308:22 |
| 39:21 40:19 47:4 | 262:24 282:21 | 244:22 245:5 301:14 | 54 |
| 49:19 56:6 92:11 | 290:23 | 301:17 | 157:5,8,9 174:8 |
| 120:10 146:19 | 36th | 47 | 540 |
| 219:13 224:21 231:2 | 315:18 | 235:15,23 | 221:13 |
| 235:4,14 244:20 | 37 | 479 | 57 |
| 246:24 252:19,22 | 110:17 132:21,22 | 164:6,25 | 247:18,19 |
| 262:14 283:17 291:1 | 38 |  | 572 |
| 293:1 304:24 | 110:17 122:5 | 5 | 170:14 171:7 172:3 |
| 30 | 39 | 5 | 262:24 282:21 |
| 151:11 154:6,8,14 | 4:13 122:17 | 4:24 44:24 47:5 | 578 |
| 155:1 182:16,18,24 | 394 | 136:10,15 156:17,19 | 153:6,7 |
| 280:13 | 290:7,14,21 | 167:6 170:14 171:3,7 | 58 |
| 30th |  | 172:1,12,13 173:12 | 262:14 |
| 83:6,8,9 151:4,8,23 | 4 | 173:17,19 174:2,10 | 587 |
| 152:18 153:16 154:5 | 4 | 175:17 176:11 177:1 | 298:20,21 302:6 |
| 159:19 161:24 | 44:11, 15,18 46:20 | 179:21 236:23 | 5millionplus |
| 163:11,17 164:4,25 | 47:5 48:25 78:6 | 242:20 262:24 | 276:21 |
| 173:9,9 177:6,7 | 92:11,14 93:1,4 | 264:21,23 274:12 | 5th |
| 178:3,7,7 221:8 | 136:5,9 150:16 | 276:1,7 277:3 279:10 | 269:3 |
| 226:19,20 | 151:21 153:5 156:7 | 280:8 282:21 283:17 |  |
| 31 | 156:12 167:4,5,10,13 | 285:25 290:7,14,21 | 6 |
| 244:18 246:24 249:18 | 170:13 172:12,14 | 290:23 291:1,2,4,19 | 6 |
| 250:19 288:7 | 173:14,23 175:17 | 292:5 298:19 302:7 | 149:4,7,14,23 156:9 |
| 31st | 242:19 280:8 282:11 | 303:12,14,15,16,24 | 157:22 159:21 |
| 236:9 244:17 246:23 | 282:14 285:25 288:7 | 303:25 304:3,9,23,24 | 170:21 179:16,19 |
| 248:22,25 249:1,9,12 | 288:10 289:14,19 | 305:22,22 306:23,23 | 180:13 211:24 |
| 250:1,2,3,9 252:19 | 291:2 300:14 301:14 | 307:18,25 308:6,8,25 | 212:10 263:16,23 |
| 253:5,11,12,16 254:6 | 301:17 308:22 311:6 | 313:3,4 | 266:15 275:22 276:1 |
| 290:20 | 41 | 50 | 276:8 281:17 292:1 |
| 32 | 149:5,9 211:3 | 85:13 86:6,12,17 | 298:19 302:7 |
| 288:10 | 42 | 117:11,13 223:5,11 | 60 |
| 3202 | 81:10 211:6 | 238:13 | 307:2 308:16 |
| 1:25 2:5 315:4,21 | 424 | 500 | 64 |
| 33 | 2:22 | 153:5 195:15 | 211:24 |
| 182:15 | 426 | 5081125 | 65yearold |


| 23:7 | 303:1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 661 | 84 |
| 298:18 | 227:7 231:23 |
| 687 | 850 |
| 298:18,20,22 | 223:12,17 |
| 7 | 86 |
| 7 | 878 |
| 45:23 47:7 169:3 | 289:14 300:14 |
| $171: 9,15179: 16$ $180 \cdot 1181: 6183 \cdot 13$ | - 9 |
| 274:12 276:1,7 278:7 | 9 |
| 281:22 305:12,23 | 84:22 103:6 107:5,8 |
| 70 | 122:4 164:5 228:22 |
| 276:12 | 237:5 279:10 |
| 700 | 90 |
| 170:24 222:11 | 52:4,23 |
| 71 | 90067 |
| 170:21 266:15 | 2:21 |
| 71 month | 91 |
| 263:16,23 | 4:17 |
| 729 | 92 |
| 298:18 | 156:14 162:6 164:6,25 |
| 75 | 166:5 |
| 128:17,20 156:13 | 938 |
| 788 | 165:1 166:6 |
| 153:5 | 95 |
| $798$ | 258:9 |
| 170:25 266:18 | 9889773 |
| 8 | $3: 9$ 989 |
| 8 (151:23 |  |
| $4: 444: 11,15$ $46: 20$ $\mathbf{9 9 5}$ <br>    <br> $47: 867 \cdot 3$ 75:11 $136: 5,9173: 23311: 6$  |  |
| $47: 8 ~ 67: 3$ $75: 11$ <br> $84: 22$ $85: 4$ <br> $153: 8$ $136: 5,9$ <br> $173: 23$ $311: 6$ |  |
|  |  |
| 177:7 178:10 303:4 |  |
| 80 |  |
| 237:11 |  |
| 800 |  |
| 2:20 |  |
| 813 |  |
| 2:15 |  |
| 821 |  |
| 170:25 |  |
| 83 |  |

