REPLY ISO MIL NO. 1

DECLARATION OF CASSANDRA L. SETO

- I, Cassandra L. Seto, declare and state:
- 1. I am a partner at the law firm of O'Melveny & Myers LLP, counsel of record for defendant Sirius XM Radio Inc. ("Sirius XM") in the above-entitled action. I make this declaration in support of Sirius XM's Reply in Support of Motion *in Limine* No. 1 to Exclude Testimony of Expert Michael Wallace and Any Other Evidence and Argument that Gross Revenue Alone Is an Appropriate Measure of Damages. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this declaration, and if called to testify thereto, I could and would do so competently.
- 2. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of relevant excerpts from the transcript of the April 20, 2015 deposition of Michael Wallace.
- 3. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of relevant excerpts from the transcript of the October 7, 2016 deposition of Mr. Wallace.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration is executed on this 21st day of October 2016 at Los Angeles, California.

Cassandra L. Seto

EXHIBIT A

```
1
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
 4
     FLO & EDDIE, INC., a
                                   )
     California corporation,
     individually and on behalf ) Case No.
 5
     of all others similarly ) CV 13-05693 PSG (RZx)
     situated,
 6
 7
                  Plaintiff,
                                   )
 8
            vs.
 9
     SIRIUS XM RADIO, INC., a
     Delaware corporation; and
     DOES 1 through 10,
10
                                   )
                  Defendants.
11
12
13
14
       VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF MICHAEL J. WALLACE
15
                  Los Angeles, California
                  Monday, April 20, 2015
16
17
18
19
2.0
21
22
     Reported by:
23
     SHANDA GABRIEL, CSR No. 10094
24
     Job No. 2014106
25
     Pages 1-346
                                                    Page 1
```

Case 2:13-cv-05693-PSG-GJS Document 540-1 Filed 10/21/16 Page 5 of 29 Page ID #:22061

```
1
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
 4
        FLO & EDDIE, INC., a
                                      )
        California corporation,
5
        individually and on behalf ) Case No.
        of all others similarly ) CV 13-05693 PSG (RZx)
        situated,
6
                                      )
 7
                     Plaintiff,
                                      )
8
                vs.
9
        SIRIUS XM RADIO, INC., a
        Delaware corporation; and
10
        DOES 1 through 10,
                                      )
11
                     Defendants.
12
13
14
15
              Videotaped deposition of MICHAEL J.
16
     WALLACE, taken on behalf of the Defendant at
     1999 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, California,
17
     commencing at 10:03 a.m., Monday, April 20, 2015,
18
19
     before SHANDA GABRIEL, CSR No. 10094.
20
21
22
23
2.4
25
                                                     Page 2
```

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
4	GRADSTEIN & MARZANO
5	BY: HENRY D. GRADSTEIN
6	Attorney at Law
7	6310 San Vicente Boulevard, Suite 510
8	Los Angeles, California 90048
9	213-776-3100
10	hgradstein@gradstein.com
11	
12	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
13	O'MELVENY & MYERS
14	BY: ROBERT M. SCHWARTZ
15	EVAN T. MAYOR
16	Attorneys at Law
17	1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 700
18	Los Angeles, California 90067
19	310-553-6700
20	rschwartz@omm.com
21	emayor@omm.com
22	
23	
24	ALSO PRESENT:
25	STEVE TOGAMI, VIDEOGRAPHER
	Page 3

1	sound recording over the airwaves, I probably can't	10:13:18
2	think of one that's quite that specific, other than,	10:13:24
3	you know, arguably this case.	10:13:29
4	Q. So just so we're clear, this is the the	10:13:31
5	only case in your career where you've been asked to	10:13:34
6	value the performance of a sound recording on being	10:13:40
7	played on any type of a radio station, be it AM, FM	10:13:46
8	or satellite?	10:13:52
9	A. I haven't been asked in this case to value	10:13:53
10	the playing of a of a sound recording. I've been	10:13:57
11	asked to calculate the revenues attributable	10:14:02
12	sorry, SiriusXM's revenues attributable to the use	10:14:07
13	of pre-1972 recordings.	10:14:13
14	Q. All right. I understand what what	10:14:18
15	you've been asked to do in this case.	10:14:19
16	I just want to make sure I understand what	10:14:21
17	you have or haven't done in your professional	10:14:23
18	career.	10:14:26
19	So, yes or no, have you ever placed a value	10:14:26
20	such as let me do it this way: Have you ever	10:14:29
21	placed a value to a broadcaster of performing a	10:14:32
22	sound recording on its radio station, whether it's	10:14:37
23	an AM, FM, satellite radio station?	10:14:39
24	A. Well, I'd hate to say no, because I've done	10:14:44
25	probably 40 or 50 different music-related cases, and	10:14:53
		Page 13

1	this room. So I'll answer I mean, I understand	12:11:58
2	you're asking what I know.	12:12:00
3	Q. Okay. So if I ask you what you know, will	12:12:02
4	you tell me only what you know?	12:12:03
5	A. I can't promise that.	12:12:06
6	Q. Okay. All right.	12:12:09
7	So	12:12:10
8	A. If you ask me to tell you only what I know,	12:12:10
9	then I'll do my best to do that.	12:12:14
10	Q. Okay. All I can ask is that you do your	12:12:17
11	best and I appreciate your your cooperation here	12:12:18
12	today.	12:12:20
13	The damage method that you used in this	12:12:20
14	case and was that your idea or somebody else's	12:12:32
15	idea?	12:12:37
16	A. What do you mean by "the damage method"?	12:12:38
17	Q. You tell me. What's the damage method?	12:12:40
18	Describe for me in simple terms, so we can have a	12:12:42
19	conversation, what your damage method was in this	12:12:45
20	case.	12:12:47
21	A. Well, usually when I think of damage method	12:12:48
22	or methodology, I think of all the different ways	12:12:51
23	one might measure damages, lost profits, reasonable	12:12:54
24	royalty, increased costs. There's lots of different	12:12:57
25	ways of measuring damages.	12:12:59
		Page 99

1	In this case, the damage method was	12:13:01
2	provided to me. It was gross revenues, attributable	12:13:03
3	pre-'72 sound recordings without deduction of cost.	12:13:08
4	It was an assumption I made. So that was provided	12:13:11
5	by counsel.	12:13:13
6	Q. That wasn't your idea, that was their idea?	12:13:13
7	A. Well, I don't know whose idea it was. But	12:13:16
8	it was ultimately their decision to provide that	12:13:20
9	assumption to me.	12:13:22
10	Q. Okay. And in order to take that assumption	12:13:24
11	and turn it into \$166 million or whatever the number	12:13:26
12	is let's start again.	12:13:30
13	In order to take that assumption and turn	12:13:31
14	it into an actual revenue amount, how would you	12:13:33
15	describe the method you were model that you	12:13:36
16	created in order to do that? I just want to have	12:13:40
17	some terminology we can use to intelligently talk to	12:13:44
18	one another about that.	12:13:47
19	A. Well, the the methodology that I used	12:13:49
20	was to identify data and information that could be	12:13:51
21	used for determining the proportion of SiriusXM's	12:14:00
22	total gross revenues that were attributable to	12:14:07
23	pre-'72 pre-'72 recordings. That's step one.	12:14:10
24	Actually, sorry, step one is to determine	12:14:17
25	the gross revenues attributable to the use of sound	12:14:21
		Page 100

1	plaintiff whole, then generally you attribute any	14:14:21
2	any losses suffered by the plaintiff that are	14:14:32
3	directly or proximately caused by the complained-of	14:14:36
4	conduct in into the measure of damages, and you	14:14:40
5	also include any benefits that are directly or	14:14:44
6	proximately caused that would not otherwise have	14:14:50
7	occurred. So you usually net those two things.	14:14:52
8	And so, for example, you might I mean,	14:14:54
9	the classic example is you count lost revenues but	14:14:56
10	you credit avoided expenses, which are benefits	14:15:02
11	received usually by a reduction in business	14:15:06
12	activity.	14:15:09
13	BY MR. SCHWARTZ:	14:15:09
14	Q. Now, in this case, that's not the approach	14:15:10
15	you took, correct?	14:15:13
16	A. I'm not calculating plaintiff's losses.	14:15:15
17	I'm calculating gross revenues earned by the	14:15:17
18	defendant.	14:15:21
19	Q. Now, earlier did you study whether	14:15:22
20	SiriusXM's performance of pre-1972 sound recordings	14:15:28
21	might have had the effect of causing people to want	14:15:32
22	to go see those performers perform live when they	14:15:36
23	were on concert tours?	14:15:40
24	A. I only considered it in my economic	14:15:45
25	reasoning in the same way that I considered whether	14:15:49
		Page 143

1 I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand 2. Reporter of the State of California, do hereby 3 certify: That the foregoing proceedings were taken 4 before me at the time and place herein set forth; 5 that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, 6 7 prior to testifying, were administered an oath; that a record of the proceedings was made by me using 8 machine shorthand which was thereafter transcribed 9 10 under my direction; that the foregoing transcript is 11 a true record of the testimony given. 12 Further, that if the foregoing pertains to the original transcript of a deposition in a Federal 13 14 Case, before completion of the proceedings, review 15 of the transcript [] was [] was not requested. I further certify I am neither financially 16 17 interested in the action nor a relative or employee 18 of any attorney or any party to this action. 19 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my name. 2.0 21 Dated:4/30/15 2.2 Babriel 23 SHANDA GABRIEL 24 CSR No. 10094 2.5 Page 346

EXHIBIT B

Case 2:13-cv-05693-PSG-GJS Document 540-1 Filed 10/21/16 Page 13 of 29 Page ID #:22069

```
1
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
 4
                                    )
 5
     FLO & EDDIE, INC., a
     California corporation,
     individually and on behalf of)
 6
     all others similarly
                                    )
 7
     situated,
                                    )
                                       No. CV13-05693 PSG (GJSx)
                                    )
 8
                Plaintiff,
 9
           vs.
10
     SIRIUS XM RADIO, INC., a
     Delaware corporation; and
11
     DOES 1 through 10,
12
                Defendants.
13
14
15
         VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF MICHAEL J. WALLACE
16
                    Los Angeles, California
17
                    Friday, October 7, 2016
                            Volume II
18
19
20
21
     Reported by:
22
     NADIA NEWHART
23
     CSR No. 8714
24
     Job No. 2455103
25
     PAGES 347 - 658
                                                        Page 347
```

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
 2
                 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
 4
                                    )
 5
     FLO & EDDIE, INC., a
     California corporation,
     individually and on behalf of)
 6
     all others similarly
                                    )
 7
     situated,
                                    )
                                       No. CV13-05693 PSG (GJSx)
                                    )
 8
                Plaintiff,
                                    )
 9
           vs.
10
     SIRIUS XM RADIO, INC., a
     Delaware corporation; and
11
     DOES 1 through 10,
12
                Defendants.
13
14
15
             Videotaped deposition of MICHAEL J. WALLACE,
16
     Volume II, taken on behalf of Defendant Sirius XM
17
     Radio, Inc., at 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 950,
     Los Angeles, California, beginning at 10:12 a.m. and
18
     ending at 7:20 p.m. on Friday, October 7, 2016,
19
20
     before NADIA NEWHART, Certified Shorthand Reporter
     No. 8714.
21
2.2
23
24
25
                                                        Page 348
```

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	For Plaintiff and the Witness:
4	SUSMAN GODFREY, LLP
5	BY: KALPANA SRINIVASAN
6	Attorney at Law
7	1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 950
8	Los Angeles, California 90067
9	310-789-3106
10	ksrinivasan@susmangodfrey.com
11	
12	For Defendant Sirius XM Radio, Inc.:
13	O'MELVENY & MYERS, LLP
14	BY: VISION L. WINTER
15	BY: PATRICK S. McNALLY
16	Attorneys at Law
17	1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 800
18	Los Angeles, California 90067
19	310-246-8456
20	vwinter@omm.com
21	pmcnally@omm.com
2 2	
23	
2 4	
25	
	Page 349

```
APPEARANCES (Continued):
 1
 2
 3
     Also Present:
 4
           KEITH UGONE, Ph.D.
 5
     Videographer:
 6
 7
           STEVEN TOGAMI
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                                                Page 350
```

1	Q In connection with these with strike	
2	that.	
3	In connection with this assignment, were you	
4	asked to assume anything?	
5	A Yes. 10:26:54	
6	Q What were you asked to assume?	
7	A Well, just in vernacular I have it more	
8	precisely in my reports, but I was asked to assume	
9	that the appropriate measure of damages for Flo &	
10	Eddie's claims in this case are gross revenues 10:27:14	
11	attributable to pre-'72 recordings without deduction	
12	of costs.	
13	Q And who told you to assume that?	
14	A It was either Henry Gradstein or Harvey	
15	Geller. They probably both told me, but I don't 10:27:40	
16	know who told me first.	
17	Q So it was the lawyers who hired you who told	
18	you to assume that the correct measure of damages in	
19	this case is the gross revenue attributable to	
20	pre-'72 recordings without a deduction for costs? 10:27:51	
21	A Correct.	
22	MS. SRINIVASAN: Object to the form.	
23	THE WITNESS: That's right.	
24	BY MR. WINTER:	
25	Q Were there any other assumptions that you 10:28:00	
	Page 362	

1	Q That's not answering my question.	
2	Do you believe the defendants have suffered	
3	harm as a result of Sirius XM playing the pre-'72	
4	music?	
5	A You meant plaintiffs. 12:00:23	
6	Q Let me ask it again.	
7	Do you believe that the plaintiffs have	
8	suffered any harm as a result of Sirius XM playing	
9	their pre-'72 music? That should be a yes-or-no	
10	question. 12:00:39	
11	A I haven't I don't I guess I don't have	
12	an opinion on that. I mean, I explained in my first	
13	deposition why it's economically reasonable to	
14	assume that they did suffer harm, but I haven't I	
15	haven't tried to prove that or calculate an amount 12:01:07	
16	other than the amount that Sirius XM earned by	
17	playing their music without permission.	
18	Q This threshold question, I think, should be a	
19	yes-or-no question.	
20	A Well 12:01:22	
21	Q Do you strike that.	
22	Are you of the opinion that plaintiffs have	
23	suffered any harm as a result of Sirius XM playing	
24	their pre-'72 sound recordings?	
25	A As I said in my first deposition, the 12:01:35	
	Page 422	

1	repeated plays of plaintiffs' sound recordings on	
2	Sirius XM could have the effect of reducing the	
3	amount of records or downloads or other streams that	
4	they could have been paid for if that music wasn't	
5	otherwise available on Sirius XM.	12:02:03
6	And it could have reduced the interest in	
7	concert goers to attend those artists' concerts,	
8	either because they were tired of hearing the music	
9	on Sirius XM or they were reminded by listening to	
10	it on Sirius XM that they didn't actually like that	12:02:24
11	artist. So I haven't done any calculation to that	
12	effect, but it can clearly have an economic impact	
13	on the plaintiffs, these unauthorized plays.	
14	Q So if I understand you correctly, your view	
15	is that plaintiffs may have suffered a harm as a	12:02:41
16	result of Sirius XM playing their pre-'72 recordings	
17	in the form of lost sales and lost concert revenues;	
18	is that correct?	
19	A Those are two possibilities, yes.	
20	Q Are there any other possibilities on how	12:02:55
21	plaintiffs could have been harmed by Sirius XM	
22	playing their pre-'72 recordings?	
23	A Well, yeah, the the dilution of the value	
24	of their work by the economic extraction made by	
25	Sirius XM from the marketplace of revenues	12:03:16
	E	Page 423

1	know, a substantial number of these sound recordings
2	are still generating revenue for the owners, you
3	know, in various forms. But I haven't studied it.
4	I can't tell you that they all all are
5	Q Sure. But but
6	A but it's a reasonable assumption.
7	Q But you've seen some documents. For example,
8	you've seen how the money that Flo & Eddie make on
9	the it's their "Happy Together" sound recording,
10	haven't you? 12:21:18
11	A I've seen some information about that. I
12	don't know if it was accounting records or just in
13	the pleadings. But I know I know Flo & Eddie is
14	making money on "Happy Together."
15	Q And it's a reasonable assumption that at 12:21:28
16	least some portion of the class is also making money
17	by exploiting their sound recordings independent of
18	Sirius' Sirius XM's exploitation of the pre-'72
19	sound recordings, correct?
20	A Yeah, I think it's safe to assume that many 12:21:42
21	of them are.
22	Q So if there's that certain amount of money
23	that the class is making from the exploitation at
24	the same time that Sirius XM is exploiting this
25	intellectual property. It's a certain amount of 12:21:58
	Page 439

1	money. Let's say that's amount A.
2	How much would that amount of money that the
3	class made on the exploitation of its pre-'72
4	recordings have increased if Sirius XM had not
5	played their pre-'72 recordings? 12:22:13
6	A I haven't performed a calculation on that.
7	Q So you have no opinion regarding how much
8	more money the class would have made if Sirius XM
9	had not played their pre-'72 sound recordings,
10	correct? 12:22:29
11	MS. SRINIVASAN: Object to the form.
12	THE WITNESS: See, that's a different
13	question. I have all those opinions I just
14	expressed. I haven't performed a calculation. If
15	you ask me have I performed a calculation as to the 12:22:41
16	amount of additional money they would have earned, I
17	haven't done that.
18	But I have all those opinions I expressed,
19	like how much was extracted from the value of
20	intellectual property. I know you don't want me to 12:22:53
21	go over that again, but when you when you convert
22	it to have you done a calculation to do you have any
23	opinions, it's I have lots of opinions.
24	BY MR. WINTER:
25	Q But you have not calculated the amount of 12:23:06
	Page 440

1	money that the class would have made if Sirius XM	
2	had not performed their pre-'72 recordings, correct?	
3	MS. SRINIVASAN: Object to the form.	
4	THE WITNESS: That's correct. For example, I	
5	haven't calculated lost profits. I haven't 12:23:27	
б	calculated what additional amount they would have,	
7	in fact, earned in the but-for world.	
8	BY MR. WINTER:	
9	Q Have you identified in your report a single	
10	instance of a lost record sale that any of the class 12:23:39	
11	members have suffered as a result of Sirius XM's	
12	performance of class members' pre-'72 recordings?	
13	MS. SRINIVASAN: Object to the form.	
14	THE WITNESS: I haven't studied the	
15	individual record sales, so I don't have any 12:24:00	
16	specific identification of a lost record sale.	
17	BY MR. WINTER:	
18	Q Are do you have any records or opinion	
19	regarding any fewer downloads of any of the class	
20	members' pre-'72 recordings as a result of Sirius 12:24:15	
21	XM's performance of their pre-'72 recordings?	
22	MS. SRINIVASAN: Object to the form.	
23	THE WITNESS: You mean do I have evidence of	
24	it, or or do I think do I have an economic	
25	opinion about whether the availability of the music 12:24:27	
	Page 441	

1	copyright royalty judges concluded that, as well.	
2	BY MR. WINTER:	
3	Q Do you have an understanding of what fair	
4	market value is?	
5	A Yes, I do.	03:03:08
6	Q What is fair market value?	
7	A It's an amount that a willing buyer and a	
8	willing seller would agree to both with full	
9	knowledge of the facts and neither under undue	
10	duress.	03:03:20
11	Q Have you offered any opinions regarding what	
12	the fair market value of the performance right for	
13	the class members' pre-'72 recordings is?	
14	A Like an amount or or an opinion related to	
15	the topic?	03:03:38
16	Q No, an amount.	
17	A Not a specific amount, no.	
18	Q Continuing with Exhibit 16 and the	
19	recognition that the Sirius XM Select package offers	
20	both music and non-music content, do you have any	03:04:17
21	view on the percentage of the revenue as defined in	
22	the CFR that should be attributable to the non-music	
23	content?	
24	A Like a percentage number?	
25	Q A percentage or a number.	03:04:46
		Page 506

1	rate for the performance of a pre-'72 sound	
2	recording.	
3	A On a satellite radio system?	
4	Q On any system.	
5	A There there might be on some other	03:34:11
6	systems, but I'm not aware of any market rates for	
7	performance of a pre-'72 recording on satellite	
8	radio where the parties are in agreement that a	
9	licensee does not otherwise have the right to	
10	broadcast.	03:34:29
11	So I know there's been a lot of settlements	
12	in this case, but I think at least the ones I've	
13	seen say that the parties dispute liability, and	
14	it's a compromise of claims. And so it's not a	
15	market rate.	03:34:42
16	Q I'm just making sure we're not limiting	
17	this your answer to satellite radio.	
18	Do you have an opinion on what the market	
19	rate is for the performance of a pre-'72 sound	
20	recording?	03:35:00
21	A I'm not familiar with any market rates for	
22	that, whether it would be webcasting or terrestrial	
23	or some other setting. I'm not sure. I know	
24	there's a lot of attempts in satellite 1 and 2 to	
25	put in market licenses that, you know, were not	03:35:24
		Page 531

1	directly comparable, and the economists tried to
2	adjust for those things and you know.
3	So I know there's a lot of rates floating
4	around out there, but I I can't tell you that I'm
5	familiar with one where the parties have agreed 03:35:42
6	that, you know, a license is required to perform the
7	pre-'72 recording and they've agreed to a rate for
8	that performance. I'm not familiar with one.
9	Q Would it be fair to say that you're not aware
10	of a market rate for the performance of pre-'72 03:35:56
11	sound recordings, be it on terrestrial radio or
12	satellite radio?
13	A You mean for the right the market rate for
14	the right to perform that song on on as
15	opposed to what a consumer would pay for the right 03:36:14
16	to listen to it?
17	Q Correct. I'm speaking about a market rate
18	for the performance.
19	A Yeah, I guess I'm not sure. All the ones I
20	can think of are, you know, not comparable to what I 03:36:30
21	think you're asking me.
22	Q Meaning that you're aware of certain licenses
23	for
24	A Uh-huh.
25	Q perfor pre-'72 performances but you 03:36:39
	Page 532

1	Mr. Wallace, do you offer any opinions	
2	regarding what a reasonable royalty would be for the	
3	performance of pre-'72 sound recordings?	
4	A Are you asking me if I'm going to have a	
5	number in mind or if I have any opinions about 03:45:31	
6	reasonable royalty?	
7	Q I'll repeat the question again.	
8	Do you offer strike that.	
9	Have you offered any opinions in this case	
10	regarding what a reasonable royalty would be for the 03:45:52	
11	performance of pre-'72 sound recordings?	
12	A To date, I haven't offered an opinion on the	
13	amount of a reasonable royalty.	
14	Excuse me. Can I just go grab my other	
15	bottle of water? I'll be back in one second. 03:46:28	
16	Q Have the members of the class received any	
17	benefits based on the airplay of their pre-'72 sound	
18	recordings on Sirius XM?	
19	A I don't have an expert opinion on that. It's	
20	possible. 03:47:23	
21	Q Have you seen evidence that members of the	
22	class have received benefit from the Sirius XM's	
23	airplay of their pre-1972 recordings?	
24	A I assume you mean any benefit, not like a net	
25	benefit? 03:47:46	
	Page 539	

1	A No. I'm concluding that Sirius XM hasn't
2	produced evidence to demonstrate that they had
3	authorization.
4	Q So you're not expressing any opinion on
5	whether the remaining sound recordings are licensed 05:16:05
6	or not. You're simply saying they weren't on the
7	list that Sirius XM provided that affirmatively
8	stated that these are licensed or authorized; is
9	that correct?
10	A Yeah, I think I think that's fair to say. 05:16:21
11	I'm I'm trying to take everything out of the
12	class damages that Sirius XM indicates they have a
13	license for. And if they don't indicate that to me,
14	I have no basis for taking it out of the damages.
15	Q So your opinion strike that. 05:16:38
16	Do you have an opinion on whether the
17	remaining sound recordings are not licensed or not
18	authorized? Strike that.
19	Do you have an opinion whether the remaining
20	sound recordings are authorized or licensed? 05:16:56
21	MS. SRINIVASAN: Object to the form, calls
22	for a legal conclusion.
23	THE WITNESS: Well okay. The way you want
24	me to answer the question is yes, yes, I do.
25	BY MR. WINTER: 05:17:10
	Page 589

1	Q Have you done anything to verify that these
2	remaining sound recordings belong to any of the
3	class members?
4	MS. SRINIVASAN: Object to the form.
5	THE WITNESS: Well, certainly the Turtle 05:24:18
6	songs are on there, and I know those are owned by
7	the Flo & Eddie, so but no, I haven't gone
8	through the 30-some-thousand sound recordings and
9	attempted to verify directly that some current
10	remaining class member actually has ownership. 05:24:38
11	BY MR. WINTER:
12	Q So aside from the Turtle sound recordings,
13	which you say you verified are owned by the class
14	members, are there any other sound recordings on the
15	remaining sound recordings list that you have 05:24:50
16	verified are owned by the class members?
17	MS. SRINIVASAN: Object to the form; calls
18	for a legal conclusion.
19	THE WITNESS: No. My my methodology
20	didn't attempt to identify ownership. I attempted 05:25:00
21	to identify claims of license and authorization or
22	accepted the claims of ownership for opt-outs.
23	BY MR. WINTER:
24	Q So you haven't done anything to verify that
25	the remaining sound recordings are owned by class 05:25:20
	Page 595

1 I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand 2. Reporter of the State of California, do hereby 3 certify: That the foregoing proceedings were taken 4 before me at the time and place herein set forth; 5 that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, 6 7 prior to testifying, were placed under oath; that a verbatim record of the proceedings was made by me 8 9 using machine shorthand which was thereafter 10 transcribed under my direction; further, that the 11 foregoing is an accurate transcription thereof. 12 I further certify that I am neither 13 financially interested in the action nor a relative 14 or employee of any attorney of any of the parties. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date 15 16 subscribed my name. 17 Dated: 10/12/2016 18 19 2.0 la Dewhart 21 NADIA NEWHART 2.2 CSR No. 8714 23 24 2.5 Page 658