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PROCEEDINGS
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. We're now going on the record. This begins media -- videotape No. 1 in the deposition of Gavin Andresen in the matter of -- in the -- in the matter of the Estate of David Kleiman, et al, versus Craig Wright. This matter is held in the United States District Court, Southern District of Florida.

Today is February 26, and the time is approximately 9:11 a.m. Our deposition is being taken at the Courtyard Marriott Hadley Amherst at the request of Roche Cyrulnik Freedman LLP.

I am the videographer, and, again, my name is Mati Kiin, on behalf of Magna Legal Services. And our court reporter is Lori London, here also for Magna Legal Services.

I will now ask counsel and all parties present to state their appearances and whom they represent.

MR. FREEDMAN: Vel Freedman, for the Plaintiffs.

MR. KASS: Zalman Kass, for Dr. Craig Wright.

THE WITNESS: I'm Gavin Andresen, I'm
being deposed.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you.
Is there anyone remotely?
No. Okay.
MR. FREEDMAN: There is a conference line open, and people may be joining and dropping.

Do you want a record of who's on?
MR. KASS: If somebody's on now, I think they should just state that they are.

MR. FREEDMAN: If anyone's on the record -- if anyone's on the conference line, can you please announce yourself?
(Discussion off the record.)
MR. ROCHE: We're having trouble hearing on the line. Is there any chance you can move the phone or the microphone closer to the witness? That would be helpful.

MR. FREEDMAN: The witness hasn't spoken really yet. You're hearing the videographer from across the room. But we'll -- we'll push it a little closer to the witness.

In the interim, you guys were not on speaker, so we couldn't hear you. Can you re-announce who's on the line telephonically?

MR. ROCHE: Kyle Roche, Roche

Cyrulnik Freedman, counsel for Plaintiff.
MR. KLEIMAN: Ira Kleiman, Plaintiff.
THE STENOGRAPHER: I can't hear the name.

MR. FREEDMAN: Ira Kleiman.
Anyone else?
(No response.)
MR. FREEDMAN: All right, with that, I'm gonna take you off speaker and put you back next to Mr. Andresen.
(Pause.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: At this point, I would like the court reporter to please swear in the witness, and we can get started.

GAVIN A. ANDRESEN,
a witness called for examination by the Plaintiff, having been satisfactorily identified by the production of his Massachusetts driver's license, and duly sworn by the Notary Public, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION
BY MR. FREEDMAN:
Q Good morning, Mr. Andresen. My name is Vel Freedman, I represent the Plaintiff in this action.

Have you ever been deposed before?
A I have never been deposed before, no.
Q So I'm gonna go over some of the ground rules so we can get through this easier and quicker.

It's sometimes more natural for
people to respond with -- non-verbally with shaking your head yes or no, but in order for the court reporter to take down your answers, I need you to try to remember to give a verbal "yes" or a verbal "no" so we have a record of -- of the way you responded.

A Okay.
Q This is not a marathon. If you need a break, let me know, we'll stop; you can go to the bathroom, take a drink, stretch your legs.

You understand that you're under oath today, and the testimony that you're going to give may be shown to a judge or jury, and they may rely on that testimony?

A Yes, I do.
Q And if you don't understand a question, I need you to ask [verbatim] me that you didn't understand the question. If you don't ask me and you answer the question, I'm gonna assume you

1 understood it, and I'm gonna rely on that answer; is that fair?

A Yes.
Q Okay. With that, are there any medications that you're taking today that would affect your ability to testify or recall events?

A No.
Q Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Andresen, can you state your name and date of birth for the record.

A Gavin Alexander Andresen, $\square$ 1966.

Q And is that your birth name?
A That is the name on my birth certificate.
Q That was an interesting response.
A It's complicated. I could get into it if you really want.

Q Why don't you give me the 30 -second version. We'll see if it has any relevance.

A The 30-second version is, actually I was born Gavin Alexander Andresen. My birth certificate was changed to Gavin Alexander Bell, when my mom married my dad way back in 1970 -- '70. And then it was changed back, again -- I actually changed my name back to Gavin Alexander Andresen.

So it's complicated.
Q Got it. And it sounds like it has no relevance, so thank you for that.

Can you tell us your residential address, please.

A 45 High Street in Amherst, Massachusetts.
Q Okay. And do you have a business address?

A I have an office at AmherstWorks, 11 Amity Street in Amherst, Massachusetts.

Q Okay. And you were born where?
A Melbourne, Australia.
Q And what -- sorry. You told me your date of birth, but I've forgotten it. What -- what was the year?

A $\quad 1966$.
Q $\quad 66$.
And when did you leave Australia?
A $\quad 1972$.
Q And where did you go from there?
A Seattle, Washington.
Q And how long were you in Washington for?
A Let's see. Moved from Seattle to Alaska when $I$ was in third grade, which would be '74, maybe ' 75 .
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Q And then...
A And then from Alaska, we moved to southern California; that was in 176 , 1 believe.

Q Okay. And were you in southern
California for a while, or did you --
A I was in southern California, yeah, through most of high -- excuse me -- through most of school, although we did spend a couple months living in Arkansas --

Q Okay.
A -- when $I$ was a freshman in high school.
But most of that time was southern California.
Q All right. And so when did you come to
leave southern California?
A I went to college at Princeton University in Princeton, New Jersey, in 1984.

Q Okay. And graduated...
A $\quad 1988$.
Q Okay. And where did you go after you
left Princeton?
A To -- let's see -- Mountain View, California.

Q Okay.
A Silicon Valley.
Q And were there until...

A Well, I moved around different places in the Bay area from '88 until '96.

Q Okay. And in '96, where did you -- did you -- were you still in California?

A I was still in California, yeah.
Q Did there come a time you left
California?
A Yes. In '96 we moved from Palo Alto, California, to Madison, Wisconsin.

Q Okay. And when you left Wisconsin -- did there come a time you left Wisconsin?

A I left -- left Wisconsin --
Q You're here in Massachusetts. Certainly there came a time you left Wisconsin.

A Yeah. We moved from Madison, Wisconsin, to Amherst, Massachusetts --

Q There we go.
A -- in 1999.
Q Okay. And have you been in Amherst since 1999?

A I have.
Q Okay. Thank you for that.
And so let me take you back a second to your Princeton education. Where -- what did you major in in Princeton?

A I majored in computer science.
Q And then when you graduated in '88 and you moved to California, did you do that for job purposes or --

A Yes, I was hired by Silicon Graphics Computer Systems.

Q Okay. And did you work for Silicon Graphics Computer Systems for a long time or --

A Eight years.
Q Eight years.
And what did you do for them?
A I wrote software.
Q Got it.
And so that would bring us to '96, when you moved to Wisconsin, also for job-related purposes?

A My wife got her PhD from Stanford.
Q Okay.
A And we moved to Wisconsin because she got a job at the University of Wisconsin. So that's why we moved to Wisconsin.

Q And what about your job with Silicon Graphics?

A I left Silicon Graphics and started a startup with a -- a former coworker from Silicon

1 Graphics that failed.

Q Okay. When -- when did it fail, what year?

A It was clear that it failed probably a year and a half, two years later.

Q Like around '98?
A Around '98.
Q And what did you do in '98?
A Let's see. At that time, we moved here to Amherst, and I joined a startup up in North Adams.

Q What was the name of that startup?
A Resounding Technology.
Q How long were you with Resounding

## Technology?

A Oh, gosh. They were -- two years. They were purchased by another Silicon Valley company, Empath Entertainment.

Q Okay. And what did you do for them?
A I wrote software again. I was the chief technical officer.

Q And so when they sold, in about 2000-ish --

A It was 2000-ish, yeah.
Q -- what did you -- did you leave at that

```
point?
```

A At that point, actually, I worked remotely for Empath for about a year.

Q Okay.
A And then -- let's see. Our daughter was born around that time, and I stopped working for a while.

Q Got it.
And are you currently employed?
A No.
Q Okay. Have you been employed since Empath?

A Yes.
Q Okay. For who or in what capacity?
A Let's see. After Empath -- I may get the order of -- of -- of this wrong, because I've done a fair number of things.

I believe after Empath I joined two University of Massachusetts graduates, and we formed a company called "Zform," which made games for blind people and their sighted friends and family. I was the -- again, the chief technical officer and wrote a lot of the code. That company eventually failed. I -- I -- I stayed there for I think it was three or four years.

I worked halftime for a web
development company in Northampton, Massachusetts, called Gravity Switch --

Q Um-hm.
A -- doing kind of back-end web development stuff, three years -- two years, three years, something on that order.

Let's see. After that, $I$ joined a research group at UMass run by Andrew McCallum, who was a friend, doing machine learning stuff. And, again, $I$ was -- I was a programmer in that group doing various programming tasks that their -- their research group needed.

That takes me up to, I believe, 2009. And I quit that job in 2009 to go on a sabbatical in Australia.

Q Okay. And since 2009, have you worked for anyone else, besides yourself?

A Yes. I was hired by the Bitcoin Foundation as the chief scientist of the Bitcoin Foundation in -- I forget which year -- 2012, maybe. I would have to go back and -- and check the years. I'm very good at forgetting dates. And was the chief scientist at the Bitcoin Foundation for several years.

Q Okay. Thank you. That's very helpful.
Why don't we start with, can you tell me when you first heard about Bitcoin?

A I first heard about Bitcoin in May of 2010, after I had gotten back from sabbatical in Australia. I was looking for something interesting to do, and I ran across a magazine article about interesting open-source software projects, and I think Bitcoin was one of seven or eight interesting open-source software projects, and it struck my interest, and that's how I became interested in it.

Q Can we take one step back before we continue down this line, which is, would it be a fair -- would it be fair to say that the vast majority of your professional career has been in writing and developing code?

A Yes.
Q So you find out about Bitcoin in a magazine article in May of 2010. What do you do after that?

A I remember reading the magazine article, and then finding the Bitcoin forum, which is where all of the technical and other discussion about Bitcoin was happening at that time. Through that, I found the source code, so I could actually

1 download and read the source code.

Because, at first, I was skeptical that it would work. It seemed like a crazy idea. But I could see that there was real source code there; there was actually a program I could run. So I downloaded it. I ran it. I tried it out. I think I mined some Bitcoins.

And then shortly after that I decided
I would do a little project involving Bitcoin, and so I created what's called the "Bitcoin faucet," which is -- was a website that gave away Bitcoin to anybody who wanted some. I think the faucet launched in June of 2010.

Q And how did the faucet get supplied with Bitcoin?

A I bought $\$ 50$ worth of Bitcoin with my very own money.

Q And when is the first time you had contact with Satoshi Nakamoto?

A I think it was fairly early in -- again, in -- in May of 2010, and I contacted him via the Bitcointalk forums.

Q Did you -- so you mined Bitcoin in May of 2010, approximately; is that -- is that right?

A I think so. I'd have to go back and
check when I actually flipped the switch to mine some Bitcoin.

Q And then did you ever mine Bitcoin again after that?

A Very briefly in, maybe, 2011. I got an early hardware miner and turned that on and ran it for a little bit and measured its power consumption and realized I was spending more in electricity than $I$ was getting in Bitcoin, so then turned around and resold it.

Q So from -- from -- you mined some in May of 2000 -- or about circa May of 2010, and then not again until sometime in 2011?

A I think that's right. Again, I'd have to go back and check when $I$ actually got that hardware. It might have been 2012.

Q Okay. But at no point after that initial mining -- strike that.

After that initial mining, you did not mine again until you purchased the hardware, be that in 2011 or 2010 --

A Correct.
Q -- '12? I'm sorry.
That's correct. Okay.
So how did you come to be the --
well, let me strike that.
Did there come a time when you became the lead core developer of Bitcoin?

A At the end of 2010, Satoshi -- the -the -- the pseudonym I was communicating with, Satoshi, told me he was going to step back from day-to-day Bitcoin stuff, and he left me with the root privileges, with the -- with the administrative privileges for the source code repository. So at that time only he and I had access to the source forge -- source code repository.

And I had -- through 2010, I had become more and more involved with developing code for the core Bitcoin system. And then by the end of 2010, Satoshi stepped away, and I was left as the -- the lead developer.

Q By default, because you were the only one with access?

A Yes.
Q And I'm handing you, Mr. Andresen, what we're gonna mark as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1. Just take a look at that for me.
(Exhibit 1 marked for identification.)
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Q Do you recognize this email?
A Yes, I do.
Q And this is an email from Satoshi Nakamoto to you?

A Yes.
Q Did you always communicate with Satoshi through the satoshin@gmx.com address?

A Either -- yes, either through that email address or via private messages in the Bitcointalk forums.

Q Did you ever use the Vistomail account?
A I don't think so.
Q And is this the email that you've just described where Satoshi is leaving you the -- the access to the Bitcoin repository?

A No. So before this, there's a -- there's a -- there's a -- a website called "SourceForge" that a lot of open-source software projects use, and people can have administrative rights to be able to write to a source-code repository. And so that was a separate privilege that I got sometime in 2010.

This was the final -- this is about an -- an alert key that would allow anybody to send a message -- excuse me -- send a message over the
network that would appear on everybody's Bitcoin software warning them that they need to upgrade or that there's some security bug, those kinds of things.

Q Got it. So the adding to privileges of SourceForge didn't necessarily come through an email; it was just an action Satoshi took to give you those privileges?

A Yeah, I don't remember exactly how that happened. There was probably an email or a forum message where he told me that he had done that, but. . .

Q After this email from Satoshi, where I think he -- he requests that you stop talking to him as a myster -- about him as a mysterious shadowy figure, and he says, "I've moved on to other things and will probably be unavailable," did you ever hear from Satoshi again through this email account?

A I'd have to go back and look. I don't know.

Q Okay. Do you recall, sitting here today, ever hearing from him again?

Let me -- let me -- let me rephrase the question.

I want you to exclude for a moment the conversations you've had with Craig Wright, and I want to ask, subsequent to this email, have you had, in your mind, conversations with Satoshi Nakamoto subsequent to this email?

A I don't know. The reason I --
Q Because people have reached out to you claiming to be Satoshi --

A Yes.
Q -- and you don't know if it's real?
A Yes. Many people have -- have contacted me claiming to be Satoshi Nakamoto, and I just don't know if any of them are.

Q Okay. Is it fair to say that no one has -- and, again, I want to exclude the conversations with Craig Wright in 2016 for purposes of this question.

Is it -- is it fair to say that no one has convinced you that they are Satoshi Nakamoto -- you know what, strike that question. Sitting here today, do you believe you had communications with Satoshi Nakamoto after this email?

A No.
Q Okay. So you're, at this point in time,
the lead core developer of Bitcoin; is that correct?

A At --
Q At --
A Currently?
Q So about April of 2011.
A Oh, April of 2011, yes.
Q And when did -- when did you step back from being the lead core -- or stop being the lead core developer in Bitcoin?

A Again, I'm very good at forgetting dates, but it's been a few years.

Q Approximately.
A $\quad 2017$.
Q Okay. Why did you stop being the lead core developer at Bitcoin?

A Several reasons. The most immediate reason was I believed that, for Bitcoin to grow, there needed to be more than one implementation; there needed -- needed to be more than one software that people were using.

And so I had taken on the role of chief scientist of the Bitcoin Foundation, and I wanted that role to be not working on one particular implementation of Bitcoin, not one
particular open-source software project, but to be kind of bigger picture and try to encourage other implementations of the Bitcoin protocol and to think about kind of bigger issues facing Bitcoin. And the other reason I stepped away is just because we had a -- a -- there was a team of people who were able to do the job of working on the open-source software. So I felt comfortable stepping back and letting them take over the day-to-day software engineering of the project. So I think those are the two major reasons I -- I stepped back as lead developer.

Q But you stayed on as the chief scientist of the Bitcoin Foundation?

A Yes, I stayed on as chief scientist of the Bitcoin Foundation.

Q Are you still the chief scientist of the Bitcoin Foundation?

A No. I resigned that position a year or two ago.

Q Why did you resign that position?
A The Bitcoin Foundation is a troubled organization. We had two members of our board of directors go to jail, and I -- I believe the Bitcoin Foundation lost the respect of the Bitcoin
community, partly for that reason. Probably mostly for -- for that reason, just the fact that the, you know, members of the board of director turned out not to be trustworthy.

Q Did you take part in forming the Bitcoin Foundation when it -- in its -- when it was originally formed?

A I did, yes.
Q And who did you do that with?
A Peter Vessenes, Roger Ver, Charlie Shrem. I think those were the main people involved in the formation. I could go back and check my notes, see who else was on the -- the emails.

Q And -- and who were the members of the board of directors that went to jail?

A Charlie Shrem and Mark Karpeles.
Q Do you -- I want to segue back -- well, actually, strike that.

Do you -- what is your current involvement with the Bitcoin community?

A I have very little involvement with the Bitcoin community, so $I$ have shed all of my responsibilities.

Q And are you doing anything employment-wise now or...

A My only title is
Entrepreneur-in-Residence, UMass, Data Sciences. That's an unpaid, volunteer position. So I -- I'm not getting a paycheck from anybody.

Q Did you -- the -- approximately how much Bitcoin did you mine in May of 2010?

A I think I mined 11 blocks, each -which -- 50 Bitcoins per block, so that would be 550 Bitcoin.

Q And have you moved those -- have you spent those coin bases?

A Probably.
Q All of them?
A Probably.
Q Can you check, if I were to ask you to?
A Yes, I could check if you asked me to. I could see what happened to them.

Q Can you do that, like, on a break, or would you need to go home and have access to your computers?

A I need to go home and have access to my computers. I don't have those -- I -- you know, I'd have to go back in it and dig out an old wallet, find out what the Bitcoin addresses were, find out where they moved, see if I'm still holding

1 them in some cold wallet somewhere. I just don't 2 know.
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Q Do you know the identity of any other miners who mined Bitcoin prior to August 20th of 2010?

A No.
Q Are you aware of any blocks that Satoshi Nakamoto mined?

A Yes. Block No. 10, I believe, is a famous Bitcoin block. Because Satoshi Nakamoto sent some Bitcoin to Hal Finney as, I believe, the first person-to-person Bitcoin transaction that we know about.

Q Block 9 or block 10?
A Depends on if you start counting at zero or not.

Q Interesting. So the genesis block is zero?

A The genesis block, I believe, is usually counted as zero.

Q And then block 9, it could be 9 or 10, depending if you count the first -- zero block as -- as a -- as a block?

A Correct.
Q Got it.

Are you aware of any others that
Satoshi mined?
A Not directly.
Q And did you ever send Bitcoin to Satoshi or receive Bitcoin from Satoshi?

A Not to my knowledge.
Q Are you aware of any patterns within the blockchain that would reveal which blocks were mined by Satoshi?

A There is a very interesting blog post by Sergio, Sergio Demian Lerner, where he found some patterns that are plausible that might be associated with Satoshi's mined Bitcoins.

Q This is the Patoshi research? I think he calls it the Patoshi research?

A Maybe. I'm not familiar with that.
Q They call it the Patoshi --
A I'm not familiar with that term.
Q Is it -- is it based on the Nonce value?
A Yes, it's based on the Nonce values. And I have --

THE STENOGRAPHER: The what value?
Sorry.
THE WITNESS: Nonce, N-O-N-C-E. It means number used once.

A I have no direct knowledge of that, but his research seems plausible to me.

Q Okay. Is there any reason you can think of that a miner would try to create a coin-based transaction that did not hash to within a specific range of values?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q Do you understand the question?
A I'm not sure I understand the question.
Q Okay. Strike the question.
When did you first learn of Craig
Wright?
A Again, I'm very bad with dates, but Jon Matonis sent me an email saying that $I$ should pay attention to this person, Craig Wright, back in whatever year that was -- sorry. 2020, '19-- '17? '18?

Q Did there come a time before that where Craig Wright applied for a job at the Bitcoin Foundation?

A Yes. When $I$ was responding to the subpoena for this lawsuit, I went back through my old emails, and I did get an email from a Craig Wright asking for a job at the Bitcoin Foundation that $I$ never responded to and,
frankly, I had not recalled until I went through my old emails.

MR. FREEDMAN: So I'm gonna hand you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 2. And it's -- for the record, it's Bates Gavin 1296.
(Exhibit 2 marked for
identification.)
Q Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q And is it fair to say this is Jodie Brady, at the Bitcoin Foundation, forwarding you a job application that she had received?

A Yes.
Q And the job application is from
Craig S. Wright with the email address craig@panopticrypt.com?

A That's --
MR. KASS: Object to form.
THE STENOGRAPHER: Wait. What's the address?

MR. FREEDMAN: Craig@panopticrypt. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Y}-\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{T}$.

MR. KASS: And object to form.
Q So, from time to time, either myself or Mr. Kass, depending on who's asking questions, may
object to form. You can just pause, let them object, and then you can answer the question.

A Okay.
Yes.
Q Okay. Do you -- did you review this job application back in November 2014 when you got it?

A No.
Q You didn't even see it?
A I don't recall.
Q Okay. It's fair to say he did not get a job with the Bitcoin Foundation?

A He did not.
Q Looking back at it now, would he have fit the criteria you were looking for?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A We were not actively looking for people, there was no job opening, so there was no criteria.

Q Fair enough.
So I want to jump back to the 2016 contact that you received from Jon Matonis, and that was...
(Pause.)
Q Let me hand you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 3. And for the record, it's Gavin 796.
(Exhibit 3 marked for
identification.)
Q Is this the email you received from Jon Matonis in March -- on March 14, 2016?

A Yes.
Q And in this email, Jon invites you to a proof session in London?

A Yes.
Q And he ends the third paragraph saying, I per -- "I've never asked you for anything before, so you are just going to have to trust me on this and what I personally witnessed with the block No. 1 sign and verify"?

A What was the question?
Q Is that -- I'm just taking you through the document, highlighting the portions of the document that I -- that -- that I'd like you to take a look at.

A Okay.
Q And what did you take Jon as asking you to do here?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I believe Jon was asking me to physically go to London, and then witness the -- a cryptographic proof of possession of a private key
that corresponds to the public key of one of the early Bitcoin blocks.

Q He says, "As we discussed" in the emails, implying that there had been a previous telephonic communication.

A I believe we did have a telephone call.
Q Do you know what he said on the telephone call?

A I don't recall. MR. KASS: Now, I'm just going to put a standing objection out there to -- oh, well, if you're gonna give it to me, so I don't have to repeat it all the time. In this email it mentions there's a non-disclosure agreement. That non-disclosure agreement was executed. So to the extent you're asking information that is protected by the non-disclosure agreement, I'm just putting a standing objection that there is a non-disclosure out there, agreement out there, and that information needs to be protected.

MR. FREEDMAN: What's the objection? I don't understand the basis of the objection. MR. KASS: I'm just putting on the record that --

MR. FREEDMAN: Are you maintaining

Mr. Andresen --
THE STENOGRAPHER: One at a time.
MR. FREEDMAN: Are you maintaining
Mr. Andresen cannot respond to deposition questions?

MR. KASS: I am not instructing him not to answer. I'm just putting on the record that there's a non-disclosure agreement, and that this testimony that you're asking may not be permitted under the non-disclosure.

MR. FREEDMAN: So you are entitled to seal this deposition and designate it confidential, and you can exercise your right to do so, but I'm -- I'm not sure what you -- I'm not sure what your objection is, so...

MR. KASS: All right. It's on the record, it is what it is. BY MR. FREEDMAN:

Q Okay. We were talking about the telephonic communication between you and -- and Jon. You said you don't recall what he said?

A I don't recall.
Q Did he mention Craig Wright during that phone call?

A I don't recall.

Q Did he -- when you received this email, were you aware that Craig Wright was the person they wanted you to come meet?

A I don't know.
Q Okay.
A I don't recall when the name "Craig Wright" entered the conversation.

Q So what was your initial reaction to -when you finally did find out that there was -- strike that.

What was your initial reaction to somebody claiming to be able to prove that they were Satoshi Nakamoto?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I was skeptical.
Q Fair to say you were extremely skeptical?
A I think that's fair to say.
Q I'm handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4, I believe.
(Exhibit 4 marked for identification.)

Q Do you recognize this email correspondence? This is -- sorry -- for the record, Bates Gavin 1433.
A Yes.

Q And if you look at the email from you -this is an email from you to Jon Matonis and then Jon Matonis responding back?

A Yes.
Q And in it you write to Jon Matonis that you're seeing whispers that Craig Wright is the real deal?

A Yes.
Q So fair to say at this point you were aware it was Craig Wright they were asking you to come meet?

A Yes. I'm trying to remember my state of mind at that time.

I don't know if Jon had mentioned the name "Craig Wright," and I was just seeing Craig Wright in others -- other venues and putting the pieces together. But, yes, certainly the name "Craig Wright" was -- was in the air at that time.

Q Got it.
And right there in the email you said, "I'm extremely skeptical"?

A Yes.
Q Why were you extremely skeptical?
A I have been contacted by many people claiming to be Satoshi Nakamoto in the past. So

1 yet another claimed Satoshi made me extremely
2 skeptical.

Q And in it you -- you lay out four different things that you'd like to see any real Satoshi candidate do?

A Yes.
Q And those were that you'd want to see a message signed with the same PGP key that Satoshi used in 2010; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And a message signed with the keys from early Bitcoin blocks?

A Yes.
Q And a copy of an email or private forum post between you and Satoshi?

A Yes.
Q And you wanted to have a conversation about technical things via email?

A Yes.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q Did you get all four of those things during your interactions with Craig Wright in 2016 and 2017?

A No.
Q Which did you get and which did you not

```
get?
```

A I believed I got a message signed with keys from early Bitcoin blocks.

Q Okay.
A And I did get a conversation about technical stuff. I don't believe I got any email or private forum posts. And I did not get any messages signed with the PGP key that he was using in 2010.

Q Okay. Did you ask for the PGP signature?
A I vaguely recall a conversation about PGP signatures, and I believe Craig gave me some reason why he either did not have the key, or it would not be good proof, but $I$ don't recall the details.

Q And...
A And the private posts, again, I think I recall him giving me -- I believe there was a claim that all of those were deleted. Yeah, if I recall correctly, he claimed that he had deleted those, and they were unavailable.

Q Did you find that credible at the time?
A Yes.
Q Do you still find that credible?
A I have my doubts.
Q Okay. Jon Matonis responds, asking you

```
to -- or -- or suggesting that you forward your
    four expectations to Stefan in advance.
            Do you see that?
    A Yes.
    Q Who is he talking about?
        MR. KASS: Object to form.
    A Craig Wright was working with a couple of
    venture capital-type people. I've forgotten the
    name of their company. Excuse me, I've forgotten
    who is who. But he was one of those venture
    capital-type people who, I believe, were interested
    in helping Craig through this whole process of
    claiming to be Satoshi Nakamoto.
    Q And did you -- had you had interactions
with Stefan before this date?
    A I -- there might have been emails before
    this date.
    Q Okay.
    A I'd have to go back and check. I had not
        met him.
    Q And at this point, were you aware that
    they wanted you to participate in a public
    endorsement of Craig Wright as Satoshi?
            MR. KASS: Object to form.
    A I think so, yes.
```

Q Okay. I'm gonna hand you what's been marked as -- sorry -- been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 5. And for the record, it's Gavin 1286.
(Exhibit 5 marked for identification.)

Q Take a moment to review that. Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q And is it an email from you to craig@ncrypt.com?

A Yes.
Q This was Craig Wright?
A Yes.
Q And in it is it fair to say that you're asking Craig to give you some of his backstory and thoughts on the state of Bitcoin?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Did he give you his backstory and his thoughts on the state of Bitcoin?

A I don't recall.
Q Do you --
A I'd have to go back and look at the email thread.

Q Okay. Did -- did you have a telephonic communication with Craig Wright as of this date?

A I don't believe so, no.
Q Okay. And just -- this is about five days or so before the proof session in London that took place on April 7th?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Correct.
Q Is -- so you don't believe you had spoken to him telephonically yet?

A I don't believe so, but my recollection could be faulty.

Q Fair enough.
I'm gonna hand you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit --

THE STENOGRAPHER: 6.
Q -- 6 -- thank you -- and for the record is Gavin 307.
(Exhibit 6 marked for
identification.)
Q Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q It's an email from Craig to you?
A Yes.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q In response to your last email on the

```
state of affairs of Bitcoin?
```

A Yes.
Q So he did respond to you. Does this help refresh your recollection that he did respond to you about the state of affairs of Bitcoin as of 2016?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And did you read this email at the time?

A Yes, I did.
Q Did you find it convincing?
A I found it convincing enough for me to get on an airplane to London.

Q Fair enough.
I'm handing you what's been marked as
Plaintiffs' Exhibit 7. And for the record, it's Gavin 1120.
(Exhibit 7 marked for
identification.)
Q Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q And it's one from Craig to you?
A Yes.
Q And it -- it includes, underneath that, the thread of a -- of a message from you to Gav -from you to Craig and then, initially, from Craig
to you?
A Yes.
Q And, actually, it includes that email way at the bottom where you're actually asking, that we looked at previously --

A Yes.
Q -- Plaintiffs' Exhibit 5?
MR. KASS: Objection to form.
THE STENOGRAPHER: Wait, wait, wait.
Q So if you take a look at the email from Craig to you, can you look at the -- the last line of that email? He tells you, "The backstory is long. You will have it in installments for this reason, but you will have it."

Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q Did you end up having it?
A I -- some of it --
Q Okay.
A -- maybe. I have my doubts on -- I have many, many doubts in my head about what parts of -what things Craig told me are true and what are not true.

Q Okay. Did he give you a long backstory?
A He gave me a fairly long backstory.

Q Okay. And when did he give you that fairly long backstory?

A In London, in the -- the hotel room.
Q Okay.
A Or the hotel basement.
Q I'm gonna come back to that. In the interim, let me hand you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit -MR. KASS: 8?

Q -- 8. And for the record, it's Gavin 1720.
(Exhibit 8 marked for
identification.)
Q Do you recognize this email -- or these emails, I should say?

A Yes.
Q And it's a -- it's a series of emails between you and Craig?

A Yes.
Q On or about April 6, 2016?
A Yes.
Q And it looks like -- if you look on the midway point of page that's marked 1720 at the bottom, it looks like what you did is you responded to Craig's email by inserting your own comments in

```
line with his email below?
        MR. KASS: Object to form.
    Q Is that what happened?
    A Yes.
    Q And if you look at the second paragraph
up from the bottom of that page, you state to
    Craig, "I know nothing about your business. One
question on my list of things to ask you: Why lots
of businesses if you have lots of coin already?"
                    Do you see that?
    A Yes.
    Q That was from you?
    A Yes, that was from me.
    Q Okay. Did he ever explain that to you?
    A No.
    Q I am handing you what's been marked as
    Plaintiffs' Exhibit 9 --
        THE STENOGRAPHER: Yeah.
    Q -- 9, and I didn't -- accidentally did
not print with the Bates label, but for the record,
    it should match to Bates Gavin 1077 -- 77.
            (Exhibit 9 marked for
            identification.)
    Q Do you recognize this email -- these
        emails?
```

A Yes.
Q And this, similarly, is a email chain between you and Craig on or about April 6 of 2016?

A No --
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A -- this is between me and Andrew O'Hagan.
Q Maybe I handed you the wrong email. Can I grab that back?

MR. KASS: Is this still Exhibit 9,
though?
MR. FREEDMAN: No, that's not. We're gonna redo Exhibit 9. I gave you all the wrong email. Sorry.
(Pause.)
THE WITNESS: So many email.
MR. FREEDMAN: Yeah. I apologize. I just used my printer this morning at the hotel.

THE STENOGRAPHER: Do you want this on?

MR. FREEDMAN: Oh, actually, why don't we go off the record for two minutes.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Sure. The time now is 10:04 a.m. We're going off the record.
(Exhibit 9 marked for
identification.)
(Off record.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time now is
10:13 a.m. We're coming back on the record.
BY MR. FREEDMAN:
Q Okay. I've now handed you the remarked Plaintiffs' Exhibit 9. Do you recognize this email?

A Yes.
Q And is this email an email exchange between you and Craig Wright?

A Yes.
Q On or about April 6, 2016?
A Yes.
Q I've handed you the correct exhibit this time.

So I want to -- I want to ask you some questions about some of the statements in this -- in this email.

In the first paragraph, Craig opens up, he says, "Only time will tell, but I" -- "I made some incredible mistakes."

Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q The email doesn't say what those incredible mistakes are, as far as I'm aware, but

1 do you know what those incredible mistakes are?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q Did you ever come to learn what those incredible mistakes were?

A No.
Q Okay. Did you ask him what he meant by "incredible mistakes"?

A I don't think so, no.
Q Okay. He then -- about halfway down the page, he quotes your email that says, "I know nothing about your businesses."

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q Do you see that?
A Yes, I do.
Q And then he responds, That was part of the idea. It was a front in some ways. I have made some really stupid mistakes.

Do you know what he meant by saying his businesses were a "front" in some ways?

MR. KASS: Object. Object to form.
A No.
Q Did you ever come to learn what he meant by that?

A No.

Q Did you ever ask him what he meant by the fact that his businesses were a "front"?

A No.
Q Did you come to learn that he's claimed millions of dollars in tax rebates from the Australian Tax Office based on these businesses?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I saw that in media reports.
Q Did it strike you as odd that he would be using a front to claim millions of dollars in tax rebates?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't think I ever thought about it.
Q So you didn't learn what the incredible mistakes were. Did you learn what the really stupid mistakes were?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Did you ask him what really stupid mistakes he made?

A No.
Q Then the next paragraph, he says, "The ones that matter remain hidden."

Did you take this to mean the really stupid mistakes that matter remain hidden?

MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q And then he says, "The media has grabbed all of the shit and low-hanging fruit, and they have done no real investigation. Thank God for the laziness of human nature."

Do you know what he was concerned the media would find out?

MR. KASS: I'm gonna object to form.
A $\quad$ No.
Q Did you ever ask him what he was concerned the media would find out about?

A No.
Q In the bottom paragraph on the page, he says, "Now I am this guy who does what the hell he likes, cannot be fired, and who has finally learnt to delegate all he hates."

Did you ever ask him what it is he likes to do?

A Did I ever ask him? He told me what he likes to do.

Q What did he say he likes to do?
A He likes to get PhDs. He likes to do research. He likes to write papers.

Q Okay. And then, if you turn to the next page for me, marked Gavin 1078, on the top of the
page, Craig quotes your email again that says, "One question on my list of things to ask you: Why lots of businesses if you have lots of coin already?"

Do you see that on the top?
A Yes.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q And then he responds, "Bad decisions," full stop.

Do you know what he meant by "bad decisions"?

A No.
Q Did you ever ask him what he meant by

```
    "bad decisions"?
```

A No.
Q You didn't ask him if stealing Bitcoin had anything to do with bad decisions?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No.
Q Then he says, "I was advised about risk diversification in the early days."

Did you ask him -- do -- do you know what he means there?

A No.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q Did you ask him what he meant?

THE STENOGRAPHER: Wait.
A No.
MR. KASS: Vel, if you could pause.
There's gonna be a lot of objections --
THE STENOGRAPHER: Yeah.
MR. KASS: -- throughout the email.
MR. FREEDMAN: No problem.
THE WITNESS: Sorry.
Q Then, in the -- in the third paragraph down from the top, he says, "Then, none of this is about money."

Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q Did you ask him what he meant by none of it being about money?

A No.
Q Did it strike you as odd that it was not at all about money?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A $\quad$ No.
Q So he has a venture capital firm reach out to you; is that -- that's right?

A Yes.
Q And paying for you to come to London, right?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And funding your trip there?
A Yes.
Q And coordinating an entire media blitz;
is that an accurate statement?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And it didn't strike you as odd that none of this was about money?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q Or, I mean, maybe it just didn't occur to you. I mean, like, tell me how -- what -- give me your reaction to the statement that none of this -this is -- "none of this is about money," and, yet, it apparently appears, at least to me, that a ton of it's about money.

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I -- yeah, I was not thinking about money when $I$ received this email. I was thinking about, is this person Satoshi Nakamoto or not. And...

Q That's fair.
A Yeah, that -- that's -- so, yeah, I was not thinking about the money.

Q In retrospect, does it strike you as odd

1 that he said "none of this is about money"? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A No.
Q Why?
A Being Satoshi Nakamoto is about much more than money. He's almost a God-like figure in the Bitcoin community. He's the holy founder of this world-changing technology. So saying "this is not about money" did not strike me as strange because of that.

Because, you know, having been the chief scientist of the Bitcoin Foundation and the lead developer for the project, I had felt the kind of weight of that responsibility, and to take on the mantle of being Satoshi Nakamoto struck me as, you know, much more important than -- than the money. So that's where my head space was through this conversation.

Q So consistent with something Satoshi might actually say?

A Yes.
Q Sitting here today, do you believe this was stated honestly, that it really wasn't about money?

MR. KASS: Object to form.

A I don't know.
Q At the end of that paragraph, the second-to-bottom line, he says, "I have access to systems that transfer more value and transactions a day than the existing BTC network does in a year." Do you understand what he meant by that?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Did you ever come to understand what he meant by that?

A No.
Q Is this a statement that you think is -is -- is possible?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't know. I've never thought about it.

Q And then if we go down, from there, two paragraphs, Craig tells you, "I want to stay as close to the edge as I can without going over." Do you know what he meant by that? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A No. And I think that might be a quote from somebody. It sounds familiar.

Q But you can't recall who?
A No.

Q And then if you go down, you'll see there's a line that begins with the word

```
"frustration"?
```

A Yes.
Q He says, "Frustration should be my middle name."

Do you know why he said frustration should be his middle name?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No.
Q What did you take that statement to mean?
A I can't put myself back when this email was received, so I am projecting backwards. I don't know what I would have thought when I first read this email. Knowing what $I$ know now, my assumption would be he was frustrated that he didn't have complete control over kind of the process.

Because, to me, he claimed that he had been extorted, and, basically, he was forced to step forward and reveal himself as Satoshi Nakamoto. I don't think I knew that when I first read this email, but if $I$ project backwards, I'm -that -- that is what $I$ would assume he meant.

Q And then he says, "Here... well, I have a
plan that is likely to leave me more hated."
Do you know what he meant by that?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No.
Q And then if you -- if you look down toward the -- the end of the -- I guess it's one, two, three, four up from the bottom, he says, "Your mistake may have been the BTC Foundation, mine was that bloody response to a DoS."

Do you know what a "DoS" is?
A DoS is a denial-of-service attack.
Q Do you know what he meant by responding to denial-of-service attack?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No. Wait. Yes, I think he was assuming in 2010 there were denial-of-service attacks against the Bitcoin network and what are called "transaction spamming attacks," where somebody floods the network with lots of tiny transactions. And as part of that, that was -there was a technical change made by Satoshi to limit the Bitcoin block size to 1 megabyte, and that had been, and is still, actually, hugely controversial on whether to increase the block size to allow more transactions. So I believe that's
what he was referring to.
Q Okay. If you turn to the next page, Gavin 1079, and you look two down from the top, he starts the paragraph with, "Some of all this is stranger than fiction."

Do you agree with that statement?
A $\quad$ Some of all of this is stranger than fiction." It's hard to agree with a statement that's so vague.

Q Fair enough. And then if you -- if you go down to the -- I guess two paragraphs down from that, he says, "Why? That is the question. Why not have a life of leisure? Why not a yacht? Yada Yada Yada."

And then if you read the next paragraph he says, "My wife and I spend time in Antigua from time to time. We have friends who live there. It becomes a life draining of vampiric exercise fast. I do not relax well. As for the boat, tried that, a hole in the water that you have to maintain and my wife gets seasick."

What did you take these statements to mean?

A What did I take them to mean? I just took them to be his way of telling me that he has

1 resources and -- and, again, trying to tell me that it's not about money; that he has money already. I think that's probably the way $I$ took it when I read that email.

Q And then if you drop down, he quotes you again, "Why lots of businesses if you have lots of coin already."

Do you see that?
A Yes.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q And then he responds, "Lots is not the issue. Lots has allowed the media to focus in the wrong places. They have no idea what the main business is."

Did you ever get additional detail on what the main business is?

A No.
Q Did you ask?
A No.
Q Do you find that inconsistent with his statement that it's not about money?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Did I find it inconsistent -- I'm not sure I understand the -- the question.

Q Aren't businesses usually about money?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I think at the time $I$ did not find it inconsistent. I mean, if I think back on it now, yeah, it might be inconsistent.

Q He said that -- that the -- the lots of coin or the -- the large amount of coin has allowed the media to focus in the wrong places.

Do you know what the right places they should have focused on was?

A No.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q And then he says, "They even missed that we paid out Hotwire and that none really failed," smiley face.

Do you know what that meant -- means?
A No, I don't know.
Q Did you ever get additional detail?
A $\quad$ No.
Q All right. If you turn to page 1080 for me.

You see in the bottom of the page, this is -- I think now we're in an email that you sent that began on the previous page, and you, again, inserted your comments in line with his email; is that right?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Let me see. Yes.
Q And then way at the bottom, you've told him -- and this is a paraphrase, but let me know if it's fair -- that you've given some thought to the meeting with him tomorrow; you'll be bringing your laptop and a new USB stick, and you'd like a couple of things to verify, one being a PGP signed message, like you had said earlier, and you even gave the phrase "so it goes" as what you wanted him to sign, right?

A Yes.
MR. KASS: Object.
Q And then one or more messages signed using keys from the early Bitcoin blocks, right?

A Yes.
Q And then copies of never-before published private emails or forum posts between you and Satoshi?

A Yes.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q And consistent with your -- would it be consistent with your testimony earlier that you may have gotten No. 2, but you did not get No. 1 and No. 3?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Thank you.
And this was the day before you met Craig in London for the proof session, right? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q If -- if you look before -- no. Sorry. Strike that.

So the next day is April 7th, and you arrive in London for this proof session; is that right?

A Yes.
Q Can you walk -- you know what, why don't we -- it's not really a memory test, so let me give you back what we're now gonna call Plaintiffs' Exhibit 10. And this is missing the -- the Bates, but it is 10 -- no. I'm sorry. It's Gavin 810. (Exhibit 10 marked for identification.)
Q Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q And is this correspondence between you and Andrew O'Hagan?

A Yes.
Q And in it are you describing a meeting

1 you had this day, the April 7th day?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q Okay. Do you want to take a minute to review it?
(Witness perusing document.)
MR. KASS: Vel, I'm just gonna raise my same objection about the non-disclosure. Do you just agree $I$ don't have to raise it again and whatever validity it has, it has?

MR. FREEDMAN: I don't understand. I mean, you've -- you've made your statement before, and the witness --

MR. KASS: Fine.
MR. FREEDMAN: -- is under a subpoena to testify. There's no protective order granted for a nondisclosure. You didn't raise it in front of the Court. So I'm not sure what you're saying, but whatever you're saying, it's certainly there, you don't have to keep saying it.

MR. KASS: Okay. That's all I wanted to know. I just wanted to avoid having to resay it if you agree it's kind of said in that still.

MR. FREEDMAN: Standing -- whatever you said is standing.

MR. KASS: Perfect. That's all I
wanted.
BY MR. FREEDMAN:
Q Have you completed your review?
A Yes.
Q So is it an accurate high-level summary of what happened that day?

A Yes.
Q I want to go into it in a little bit more detail with you, if that's all right.

A Okay.
Q You got off the plane at around 11:00 or so; is that right?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q Arrived at the hotel, I should say, around 11:00?

A That's probably correct.
Q The email, "It was a red-eye flight, so I arrived at the hotel at 11:00 a.m."

We were not following you that day.
A It was a red-eye flight, so I was very tired.

Q Yes. And who -- who were the first folks that you met with that day?

A The venture capital people, who,

1 according to this email, are named Andrew and Rob.

Q Yeah, or -- right. And -- and what did they -- where did that meeting take place?

A That meeting took place in the -- in a conference room in the basement of the hotel $I$ was staying at.

Q Okay. And what did they -- what did they tell you?

A They -- let's see. One of them said he had known Craig for a long time, and that Craig had been talking to him about Bitcoin for a long time, and that over time he had become convinced that Craig was Satoshi and had invented Bitcoin.

And the other one, I believe -- I'm trying to remember the conversation. It's been a very long time. I don't recall the details of that conversation, but it was also -- let's see, he talked about how he was working with Craig business-wise and, you know, was helping facilitate everything that was happening. And, again, I -- I have very little recollection of what exactly we talked about.

Q Did they explain why they were involved? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes. Again, one of them, I don't recall
which, said he had been in -- a business partner or a business associate or somehow involved in Craig's businesses in the past.

And then the -- the other one, the money person, I don't recall if he -- he mentioned how he had gotten involved, if it was Craig or if it was this other person who brought him in. Frankly, I just don't recall.

Q Did there come a time when you learned that this venture capital group intended to sell or license many of Craig's purported intellectual properties and patents under the Satoshi name to monetize those inventions?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A At some point, I learned that, I don't recall when.

Q Could it have been in this conversation? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A It's possible it was in that conversation, yes.

Q In the email to Andrew O'Hagan you say, "They gave me a lot of background and explained their involvement before meeting with Craig."

Was that part of the background that they gave you?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Was what part of the background?
Q That -- this investment and what they were hoping to do with it.

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Possibly. Again, I don't -- I don't recall details of that conversation.

Q And then, from that meeting, did you go to meet Craig?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A That meeting I think -- I'm trying to recall physically where what happened. I believe I met them in the same room, and then Craig came into the room, and $I$ met with Craig for the first time.

Q And what did he tell you there?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A What did he tell me? Again, I don't recall details. If you want to ask something specific, I might be able to --

Q Did he say, "Hi, I'm Satoshi Nakamoto"? Like, do you remember, did he claim to be Satoshi in that -- in that conversation?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't think he ever directly claimed to be Satoshi, although, I might be mistaken.

Q Did you talk at all about Satoshi Nakamoto during that initial conversation?

A I don't recall.
Q Did he -- did you ask him about where all his coins were?

A No.
Q Did you discuss any of the trusts that had been set up?

A No.
Q Did you discuss the creation of Bitcoin at all during that initial conversation?

A I don't think so.
Q Did he mention Dave Kleiman in that initial conversation?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I -- I think he did, but I'm not certain.
I remember him getting emotional. I believe -- I believe at one point there was some mention of Dave Kleiman, and I remember Craig being emotional.

Q Emotional in what way?
A Sad about Dave's death. I did not press or ask.

Q And do you know in what context Dave Kleiman was raised in this initial conversation?

A I think we had a conversation about the person of Satoshi actually being three people --

Q Okay.
A -- being Dave Kleiman, Craig Wright, and some other mysterious person, who I never asked about.

Q And you say you think you had this conversation. Are you sure you had this conversation, or do you think you had this conversation?

A I think $I$ had this conversation. Again, I was jet lagged, and this was four years ago, so --

Q And is the doubt --
A -- my recollection is -- my recollection is very fuzzy.

Q And this -- this conversation -- let me strike that.

Is the doubt that you don't know if
it was during this conversation or a later conversation, or are you concerned you might be imagining the whole thing?

A Yeah, I'm -- I'm certain that, you know, it could have been this conversation or the following breakfast. It's also possible...

Q So is it fair to say Craig told you this,
you just don't remember when?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q Okay. So after you -- you met with Craig in this initial conversation, did you go right to the proof section -- proof session?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes. The proof session was -- it was one continuous meeting in that room at the hotel.

Q Can you -- can you walk me through that proof session?

A Sure. I -- I do recall producing a brand-new USB stick. So I had my laptop with me and a -- put a brand-new, sealed-in-the-package USB stick on the table, which I expected Craig to take and produce some digital signatures that I could then verify on my laptop. That did not happen. Instead, a laptop was procured, a brand-new laptop was procured by an assistant. I think it was an assistant for one of the -- I don't know whose assistant it was.

Craig and I waited in the room while the laptop was purchased. It was then unpacked and booted up for the first time in front of me. And the proof then was Craig downloaded and installed

```
software.
```

And then, after some -- many hours, I don't recall how many hours, but it took much longer than -- than expected, at the end of that, I was convinced that he had taken one of the early blocks and signed a message using its private key.

Q Which block did he use?
A It was the block that -- I believe it was block 10, the block that -- that had the transaction from Satoshi to Hal Finney.

Q So the assistant that went to get the computer -- sorry. Strike that.

Did you accompany the assistant to go purchase the new computer?

A No.
Q When the computer came back, how -- did you verify that it was factory sealed?

A No.
Q When the -- when the computer started up, did it boot up with the typical initial startup that's required on a new computer?

A Yes.
Q Which Bitcoin wallet did -- did Dr. Wright use for the demonstration?

MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Which -- I be -- I'm not sure -- do you -- do you mean which software did he use?

Q Meaning, yes, which software did Craig use to -- to initiate the transaction, the signed transaction?

A I went back and checked my notes this morning, and it was Electrum.

Q Do you have notes of that actual meeting somewhere?

A I don't have contemporaneous notes. The best I have is a -- a Reddit private message thread that I had with a person on Reddit that -- that I gave up as part of discovery. Those are the best -- that's the best notes that I have.

Q And whose -- did you suggest that he use Electrum?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No.
Q He chose Electrum?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A He chose Electrum, yes.
Q How was -- how was -- how was it -- how was it downloaded? How was it -- how did Electrum end up on the computer?

A It was downloaded via the hotel Wi-Fi

1 from the -- and I don't recall if it was from the 2 Electrum website or from GitHub.

Q And did you verify -- did you watch the laptop connect to the hotel's Wi-Fi?

A I don't recall.
Q Did you see him input, like, the log-in codes that are typically associated with a hotel Wi-Fi?

A I don't recall.
Q Is it possible it was not the hotel's Wi-Fi?

A Yes, it --
MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes, it is possible.
Q When Electrum was downloaded either from GitHub or from Electrum's website, did you verify that it had the HTTPS security certificate on the website?

A I don't recall.
Q Did you verify the hash digest of the download against something you had brought with you independently?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A The hash digest of the Electrum software? No, I did not.

Q And I understand you were jet lagged during this. Is it fair to say you were exhausted at this point?

A Yes, I was.
Q So how did -- as I understand it, Craig signed the message on his own computer, and then you verified that signature on the new computer. Is that -- is that right?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No. Everything happened on that new computer. That's not true. There had to be a private key involved.

I don't recall -- I don't recall if
he signed a message on his computer and then transferred it to the new computer, or if he transferred the private key to that new computer. I don't recall which method was used.
(Pause.)
(Exhibit 11 marked for
identification.)
Q So I'm handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 11, and it's been produced by you as -- we've marked it as Gavin 2007.

Take a moment to familiarize yourself with it, and then, if you would, turn to 2009 at

1 the bottom.

Is this that Reddit private message you discussed earlier?

A Yes, it is.
Q And if you go to the bottom of page 2009, do you see it says, CSW signed on his laptop using Electrum. GA -- which I assume is Gavin Andresen -- did not witness the procedure on CSW's screen. CSW put the signature in a text file and put the text file on GA's USB stick.

Does this help refresh your
recollection of --
A $\quad 2009$.
Q -- what happened? Sorry? Do you want to keep reading?

A Let me --
Q Yeah. Go ahead.
A -- find the...
MR. KASS: I'm just objecting to the use of this document.

MR. FREEDMAN: Okay. On what basis? MR. KASS: It's not clear if this is a Reddit post. It looks like something that was copied and pasted into a Word document. Nothing has been established as to the providence of this

1 document. So until that's established...
(Pause.)
BY MR. FREEDMAN:
Q All right. Let me take a step back, actually, before you do that and address Mr. Kass's concern.

Do you recognize this particular
document?
A Yes.
Q Can you explain to me how I obtained possession of this document?

A I went into my Reddit account and went back through my Reddit private messages, and then $I$ copied and pasted into a text document that $I$ sent to you as part of my response to the subpoena I received.

Q And is this an accurate copy and paste of the Reddit messages?

A Some of the formatting is a little weird, but, yes, all of the text is.

Q The substance is accurate?
A The substance is accurate, I believe. MR. FREEDMAN: Okay. Still have an objection? MR. KASS: We'll get to it on cross.
I mean --

MR. FREEDMAN: Okay.
MR. KASS: -- a little better.
Q So, Mr. Andresen, does this help -- is this a completely accurate description of exactly what occurred in that demonstration?

A The -- the text that we were talking about, the -- let's see.
(Pause.)
A Yes. I believe at least everything on page 2009 and 2010, this person I was corresponding with put together from things I had said publicly around the time that this was being discussed.

Q And there's a message here, it says you got -- are you Etmet -- Etmetm?

A No, I am not Etmetm. That was the person I was discussing with that. Etmetm is one of the -- I believe he says he's an Electrum developer.

Q Got it. And there's a message on the -on page 2011, it says, "You got several details wrong. I'll correct when on my computer next." Is that -- is that from you?

A That is from me, yes.
Q Did you ever correct?

A No.
Q Okay. What was wrong?
A Oh, boy. Yeah, I don't recall what was wrong.

Q Regardless, does this -- does this exchange -- does this document help refresh your recollection as to whether the signature was -- the sig -- the proof process was done completely on the new computer or whether it involved two computers?

A I have no memory of it. So this document is the best record of what probably happened.

Q Okay. So you would defer to this document?

A Yes.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q Is one of the mistakes -- do you believe one of the mistakes in the document is that it was signed on Craig's laptop and transferred to yours with a USB stick?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A It's possible that that is one of the mistakes, because I don't remember the USB stick ever being removed from its bubble shell factory -but it might have been.

Q So how did Craig get -- assuming that it
was all done on the new computer, how did Craig get the private key to block 9 onto the new computer?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't know.
Q And then what -- what would have been the -- did you go ahead and verify it after he had signed it?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Did I? If I recall correctly, Craig signed a message, and $I$ saw him do the command to -- to sign the message. I think it must have been on his personal computer. And we probably did use a USB stick to move it to the -- the fresh computer. And then Craig typed on the fresh computer the verify command, which failed initially. We did it a second time, and -- and that verification succeeded.

Q What was different? Why did it fail and then why did it succeed?

A We were verifying a slightly different message. I think that it was, you know, Gavin's favorite number is 11, maybe, if $I$ recall correctly, dash, CSW versus Gavin's favorite number is 11. And we had just -- again, it had been a long day. I was jet lagged. I think Craig was
tired after wrestling with new computers and software, and -- and, hence, the -- the failed first attempt and the -- the successful second attempt.

Q Wasn't the message copied from the original signed message and then pasted and then again copied and pasted to verify?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I'm not sure $I$ understand the question.
Q Was the message, Gavin's favorite -- so we had the signed -- we had the signed message, right?

A You have a message that you then sign and create a digital signature --

Q Right.
A -- yes.
Q Then how did you go about verifying that signature?

A You take the digital signature, you transfer it to -- well, you don't have to transfer it to another computer, but you can then -- given the -- the public key, which -- which I knew from the early Bitcoin block, public key, the signature, and the message that you signed, together, form a verification, so you need those three things.

Q
And so my question is: You didn't -there -- there wasn't a copy and paste of the message you were signing, you didn't create a Word file or a text file of "Gavin's favorite number is 11-CSW," save that, put it on the USB, reopen that, and use that as one of the three factors?

A No, the --
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q Sorry. Go ahead.
A No. The message was --
Q Retyped.
A -- entered, retyped.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Counsel, I'm sorry
to interrupt. I have a bit of a technical issue.
Could we go off the record --
MR. FREEDMAN: Sure.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: -- for a moment?
MR. FREEDMAN: Time is 11:01. We're going off the record. This will mark the end of Media Unit No. 1. We're off the record.
(Off record.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time now is 11:10 a.m. We're coming back on the record. Now beginning Media Unit No. 2 in our deposition with Gavin Andresen. We're on the record.

BY MR. FREEDMAN:
Q Has this discussion at all refreshed your recollection of whether there was, in fact, a transfer of the signature from one computer to another?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No. Again, my -- I don't recollect that level of detail.

Q Is it fair to say that if -- if there was a transfer, you did not verify that there was no other software installed on the USB stick?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q Can you guarantee there was an authentic version of Electrum used for this signing event? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Can I guarantee? No. It's possible that a rogue version was downloaded.

Q Can you guarantee that no code under Craig's control was installed on the computers used to verify the message?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A $\quad$ No.
Q Did you verify the public address of block 9 or 10 with the public address that had been
used to sign the block? Did you go through every letter and verify it matched?

A I brought a list of all the early block public addresses, and I did verify -- I don't recall if $I$ went through every single letter, but I probably did at least the first four to six and the last four to six, which is typically how I verify a public address is -- is what $I$ think it is.

Q During the public proof demonstration, was there any mention of a -- of needing a trust's permission to use the private key?

A I don't recall.
Q Do you recall how the private key to block 9 was stored on Craig's laptop in order for him to sign?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q Let me strike that.
Do you recall how the pub -- the private key to block 9 was stored by Craig Wright? A No.

Q But if it was a valid signing, he had to have had access to the private key of -- of block 10?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.

Q Okay. I think I said 9 before, but if I'm saying block 9 or 10 , I'm referring to the same block, it's that one that Satoshi sent to Hal and Hal sent back. 10 versus 9 being where you're starting from counting, right?

A Yes.
Q Okay.
A And, again, my recollection of the block number could very well be incorrect.

Q Did you choose the message you wanted signed?

A Yes.
Q Including the CSW at the end of the message?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No, I did not choose the including CSW at the end of the message.

Q So he added that on his own? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q I think you've publicly stated that it's certainly possible you were bamboozled by Craig. Do you recall saying that? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.

Q What led to you thinking that it was certainly possible you were -- well, let me take a step back.

Sitting here today, do you believe that you saw a proper signature with the private key to block 9?

A Sitting here today, I think it's more likely than not that $I$ saw a proper signature, but I -- but I do have some doubt.

Q And what made you acknowledge that it's certainly possible you were bamboozled?

A As I think I state in this kind of Reddit private message, I did not expect the private proving session to have as much weight as it did. So there were certainly, you know, pos -- there are places in the private proving session where I could have been fooled, where somebody could have switched out the software that was being used or, perhaps, the laptop that was delivered was not a brand-new laptop, and it had been tampered with in some way. I was also jet lagged.

And, again, $I$ was not in the head space of this is going to prove to the world that Craig Wright is Satoshi Nakamoto. I was in the head space of, you know, this will prove to me
beyond a reasonable doubt that Craig Wright is Satoshi Nakamoto.

And my doubts arise because the proof that was presented to me is very different from the pseudo proof that was later presented to the world.

Q So after the -- after the proof session was over, what happened next?

A I went and got fish and chips, I had a lovely fish-and-chips dinner, and then went to sleep.

The next morning, met with Craig and what's his name and who's his face, the money guys, for a traditional English -- English breakfast at the hotel, the hotel restaurant.

Q Okay. And during the proof session, did Dave Kleiman get brought up at all?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Again, I believe he was mentioned as one of the three people.

Q Let's take that -- let's take that out of it, 'cause I understand you're not sure whether that was said in the first meeting at the proof session or at the breakfast in the morning, so let's take that out.

Aside for this conversation --

A Okay.
Q -- with Dave Kleiman being one of the three people behind the Satoshi Nakamoto moniker, was there any other mention of Dave Kleiman during the proof session?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't recall.
Q So then you -- the next morning you had a proper English breakfast with the money men. Did Craig attend that meeting?

A Yes.
Q So it was four people?
A Four people, yes.
Q Was it four people the entire time?
A Yes, I believe so.
Q Okay. And aside for, again, the conversation, we don't know when it took place, about Dave Kleiman's involvement with Satoshi being one of the three people, was Dave Kleiman raised at that breakfast?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't recall.
Q Were the trusts raised at that breakfast?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't recall.

Q Were any trusts raised at that breakfast?
MR. KASS: Same objection.
A I don't recall.
Q During any of these three conversations with Craig, did you ever talk to Craig about where all of his Bitcoin were?

A No.
MR. KASS: I'm gonna object to form.
Q Can you tell me a bit more about the conversation, whenever it occurred, with Craig about the three people behind Satoshi Nakamoto?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Can I tell you more about that conversation? I don't think so. My memory is very fuzzy. I believe we had a conversation, a short two sentences, about that, but $I$ don't recall details.

Q How did it come up?
A I don't recall.
Q And -- and how did he reference the mysterious third character; what -- what did he -how did he refer to that character?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I think he just said, "And there was somebody else."

1

Q And -- sorry.
A And that's it. I -- I did not -- it didn't seem to be any of my business to ask who the other mysterious third person was.

Q And -- and what was the -- the statement, that these three people what?

A That these three people were involved in creating Bitcoin in 2009.

Q Did he --
MR. KASS: Object to form, prior
question.
Q Did he describe what the duties of each of the three were?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Not that I recall, no.
Q Did he claim one was more Satoshi than the rest?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I believe he claimed that he was the primary inventor.

Q And what did you -- what did he mean by, or did he explain what he meant by, being the "primary inventor"?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I got the impression, or at least I
believe he -- again, $I$ don't recall details, but he might have said something like, "It was my idea."

Q So did he claim credit for anything more than just saying it was his idea or --

MR. KASS: Object.
Q -- did he leave it at, "It was my idea"? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A I believe he left it at, "It was my idea."

Q During any of these conversations, did you ask him why he had disappeared in 2011?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Did he explain why he disappeared in 2011?

A I believe he said that he was, at that time, going through a divorce.

Q Um-hm. And, therefore...
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A That he was going through a divorce and just the personal stress of that contributed to him stepping back, away from the project.

Q I think it was Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1 was Satoshi's message to you that he was moving on to other things. Do you recall that?
A Yes.

Q Did you ask him what those other things were?

A I don't recall. I don't think I did.
Q Did the topic of the other two members of the Satoshi team ever come up in front of the money men?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A They were there during all of my conversations with Craig, at least one of them -one or the other of them were there, so, yes, it would have been in front of them.

Q Do you remember which?
A No, I don't recall.
Q Did they ever express concern about who might have the rights to Satoshi's work product?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A $\quad$ No.
Q Did that issue ever get discussed? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A No.
Q During the conversations with Craig, did his wealth ever come up?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Did his wealth ever come up? No.
Q Did you ever ask him what he intended to

1 do with the fortune of Bitcoin he was sitting on? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A No.
Q Did he say what he intended to do with the fortune of Bitcoin?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Not that I recall.
Q It seems you exercised extreme restraint in not asking.

A Yes, I did.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
(Exhibit 12 marked for
identification.)
Q I want to pull you out of the timeline for a second, just so you see where I'm going with things.

I'm handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 12, and it is comprised of Gavin 683 and 684.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q To put this email -- and this is an email from Robert MacGregor to you and Jon Matonis?

A Yes.
Q CC'ing Stefan Matthews from nCrypt?

A Yes.
Q And these are the money men?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Rob. Yes, I believe they are.
Q Okay. And 683 is the email, 684 is its attachment?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q It's the next page.
A Yes.
Q Do you recall receiving this email and its attachment?

A I recall -- do I recall receiving it? I recall giving it to you as part of the discovery process for the subpoena.

Q So at some point you received it?
MR. KASS: Object.
A At some point I did receive it, yes.
Q Okay. And to put this in context, and we'll get back to the timeline in a minute, Craig attempts to prove to the world publicly that he is Satoshi, and provides less than perfect proof. Is that an accurate statement? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q And when that proof fails to demonstrate
who he says he is, the money men go into crisis mode to save the day. Is that an accurate paraphrase of what's going on?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And as part of that saving of the day to recover Craig's reputation, they propose that there will be -- that Craig will actually send Bitcoin from block 9 or block 10, that -- I think they're referring to it as block 9, but it's the same block, to you and Jon Matonis as unequivocal, uncontrovertible proof that he has the private key to block 9 --

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q -- is that fair?
A Yes.
Q And in the attachment, it lays out kind of the process of what they're going to release -or, rather, it is, in fact, a blog post that they were going to post; is that right?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And it was -- it was a draft blog post for Craig to post?

MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q And in it, it starts off saying, "While Hal Finney was not the second person to actually run Bitcoin as he had speculated, that distinction goes to Dave Kleiman."

You see that?
A Yes, I see that.
Q Is this consistent with your conversations with Craig that Dave Kleiman was the second person to run Bitcoin?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't know that we ever discussed running Bitcoin.

Q Okay.
A So, no, I don't think I ever had any discussion about who was running Bitcoin when with Craig.

Q After you received this message, did you communicate with Craig at all about Dave Kleiman being the second person to run Bitcoin?

A Not that I recall.
Q Did you understand that Craig had signed off on this blog post?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't think I had any knowledge about
whether Craig had seen this blog post prior to me seeing this blog post.

Q And then if you look down at the fourth paragraph, it says, "Obviously, I'm well aware of the furore that has been created because I did not immediately sign a message with the private key from this block. I will make the reasons for this clear and provide further context in an upcoming post."

Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q Did he ever make the reasons for his failure clear?

A I don't think so, no.
Q And did he ever provide further context?
A He wrote a lot -- he wrote a lot afterwards, and -- and a lot $I$ didn't read, so I don't know.

MR. FREEDMAN: Do we want to maybe take a minute and see if we can get them to quiet down?

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Great idea.
The time is 11:31. We're going off
the record.
(Off record.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
11:33 a.m. We're back on the record.
BY MR. FREEDMAN:
Q Are you aware that -- did Craig ever mention Patrick Paige to you?

A Not that I recall.
Q Are you aware that Patrick Paige is -was one of Dave's best friends, Dave Kleiman's best friends?

A No.
Q Are you aware that he testified that in 2014 Craig told him Craig was a part of a group of people that had created Bitcoin?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No.
Q Is that consistent with what Craig told you?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q Did you ever read Andrew -- did you ever come to meet Andrew O'Hagan -- or, sorry. Strike that.

Did you ever come to be introduced to Andrew O'Hagan?

A I don't think I've met him in person.

Q But you spoke with him?
A I don't know if we ever had a phone conversation. I've definitely emailed with him.

Q You've communicated with Andrew O'Hagan?
A I have communicated with Andrew O'Hagan, yes.

Q Did you ever come to read the story he put together called "The Satoshi Affair"?

A Yes, I did.
Q I'm gonna hand you what we're marking as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 13.
(Exhibit 13 marked for
identification.)
MR. FREEDMAN: I might have a second copy for you, but it's 83-1.

MR. KASS: Well, if you have one for me, that will be helpful.
(Pause.)
(Document exhibited to counsel.)
Q Do you recognize -- do you recognize what I've just handed you as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 13?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And can you turn -- and is this "The Satoshi Affair" article that Andrew O'Hagan drafted or wrote -- authored?

A I believe so, yes.
Q And is the characterization of the signing session, the proof session, is that accurate?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I would have to go back and reread it.
Q All right. Well, let's come back to that.

Can you page -- turn to page -- see on the top there's blue page numbers? Sorry. They're not blue in your copy.

Do you see in the top that there's a header, it says page $X$--

A Yes.
Q -- of $Y$ ?
A Yes.
Q Can you -- can you turn to page 26.
A Yep.
Q If you go to the middle paragraph, do you want to read that first sentence for the record?

A "Dave Kleiman was to become the most important person in Wright's professional life, the man he says helped him do Satoshi's work."

Q Is this consistent with statements you heard from Craig?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And can you turn to page 76.
And way at the bottom, this is Andrew O'Hagan recounting a conversation he had with Craig. Can you go ahead and read that back and forth?

A In a conversation I had, right?
Q No. Andrew O'Hagan with Craig Wright. Starting from "but you can say," can you read that for the record, please?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A "But you can say, hand on heart, I am Satoshi Nakamoto."

Q And then Craig's response on the next page, 77.

MR. KASS: Same objection.
A "I was the main part of it. Other people helped. At the end of the day, none of this would have happened with Dave Kleiman, without Hal Finney, and without those who took over, like Gavin and Mike."

Q Are these statements about Dave Kleiman consistent with other statements Craig has made to you?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q Can you turn back to page 27.
And on page 27 -- sorry.
(Pause.)
Q Do you see the paragraph that starts off, "We needed people to respond to us"?

A Yes.
Q Halfway through that paragraph there is a sentence that begins with "If"?

A Yes.
Q It's a -- it's a quote from Craig. Can you read that for the record?

A "If I" -- "if I had come out originally as Satoshi, without Dave, I don't think it would have gone anywhere. I've had too many conversations with people who get annoyed because it's me."

Q Is that also consistent with your conversations with Craig? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q And consistent with statements Craig has told you?

MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q Can you go to page 31 for me?
A (Witness complied.)
Q And in the second paragraph of page 31, Andrew O'Hagan quotes an email dated 12 th March 2008. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q And can you read the -- can you read the quote that he's quoting from that article -- I'm sorry -- can you read the quote of the email that he's quoting?

A That begins, "I need your help"?
Q Yes.
A "I need your help editing a paper I am going to release later this year. I have been working on a new form of electronic money, Bit cash, Bitcoin. You are always there for me, Dave. I want you to be part of it all. I cannot release it as me. GMX, Vistomail, and Tor, I need your help and $I$ need a version of me to make this work that is better than me."

Q Is this email consistent with the story Craig told you about his and Dave's collaboration? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
(Discussion off the record.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: There's a signal going through the audio that is disruptive, but it doesn't prevent you from hearing everything. It's just annoying. I don't know -- it just popped up. I don't know where it's coming from. We could go off the record, we could try to track it down, but I don't know.

MR. FREEDMAN: How bad is it?
Maybe we should go off the record while we're doing this.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Let's go off, yeah. The time is 11:41. We're going off the record.
(Off record.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
11:45 a.m. We're coming back on the record. Now beginning -- no, continuing with Media Unit No. 2. Sorry. We're on the record. BY MR. FREEDMAN:

Q If you turn to page 36, and you go to the bottom of the page, you'll see a sentence that says, "I asked Wright about this, and he told me it was true, that his and Kleiman's mining activity had led to a complicated trust."

Did you discuss trusts at all with
Craig?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't recall.
Q Did you discuss his and Dave Kleiman's mining activity?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No.
(Exhibit 14 marked for
identification.)
Q I'm gonna hand you what has been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 14. And for the record, it's Gavin 1007.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q And it's an email from Craig to you and Jon Matonis?

A Yes.
Q On April 27, 2016?
A Yes.
Q If you look three paragraphs down from the top, do you see where Craig writes to you, "In the past I would joke with Dave before he died about being Bond villains"?

A No, I'm not seeing that. Third paragraph

```
from the --
```

(Counsel indicating.)
A Oh, there. Sorry. I was going from the bottom. Yes, I see that.

Q So you understood this to be a reference to Dave Kleiman?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q So, clearly, you had discussed Dave Kleiman before this date?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q Beyond the statements that he, Dave Kleiman, and a mysterious third person had created Bitcoin together, did the other -- did he make any other statements about Dave Kleiman?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't recall.
Q "Starting a Bitcoin company has meant dealing" --

THE STENOGRAPHER: I'm sorry. Can you start again?

Q "Starting a Bitcoin company has meant dealing with so many people in the past that it made me feel that way."

Did you ever understand why he felt like a Bond villain starting a Bitcoin company?

A No.
Q Do you see the paragraph that starts, "This time"?

A Yes.
Q The last sentence of it, can you read it for the record?

A "I wonder how long I can keep my other wallets secret. Soon it won't matter."

Q Do you know what he meant here by "other wallets"?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A $\quad$ No.
Q Did you ever come to learn what he meant by "other wallets"?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No.
Q Do you see the second-to-last sentence of the paragraph after that? It starts, "But most importantly," and then the whole sentence says, But, most importantly, I have capital?

A Yes.
Q Did you understood -- did you ever come to understand where that capital came from?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No.
Q Do you understand how much capital he had?

A $\quad$ No.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
(Exhibit 15 marked for
identification.)
Q I'm going to hand you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 15 and is Bates labeled Gavin 357.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q Can you explain what these emails were?
(Witness perusing document.)
A Let me -- let me parse out the thread. So I was contacted by Uyen Nguyen -- I don't know how you pronounce the name.

Q I think that's right.
A -- Uyen Nguyen back in 2016. They were -- they claimed that they were trustee for some trust that Craig Wright had set up. And, if I recall correctly, they were -- they were asking if I could help put them in touch with Craig, because they were running into some issues with the IRS or
something. I think that's what the -- and I may be misremembering, 'cause I may have had several communications with them.

Third -- and then this particular document is from Ian Grigg, who was asking me not to make all of the information public about trusts and -- and various other -- I guess about -- about trusts.

Q Do you know Ian Grigg from before this email?

A No.
Q But did you know him by reputation?
A I don't know if I knew him by reputation before this email.

Q Do you know him now?
A I do know him now, yes. He's a technical guy, cryptographer-type person.

Q Have you discussed this email with him?
A I have not, no.
Q If you look on the page Bates-labeled 358, second page, maybe it's the third paragraph up from the bottom, it says, "Craig Wright is one-third of Satoshi Nakamoto. He is the only survivor now."

A I see that, yes.

Q Is that consistent with statements Craig has made to you?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't know that Craig ever talked about the mysterious third person dying, but I suppose it would be consistent.

Q Do you see in the first paragraph Uyen writes, "I was the one chosen, since $I$ knew who and what they were back in 2010"?

A Where is that?
Q It's in the first paragraph of her email.
A I see it, yes.
Q Did you ever have a conversation with Uyen?

A No. I think the email conversations that I produced as part of discovery was the only communications I've had with Uyen.

Q Did you ever talk to Craig about these emails from Uyen?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Did you keep the emails confidential?
A Until I was subpoenaed, yes.
(Exhibit 16 marked for
identification.)
Q I'm handing you what's been marked as
Plaintiffs' Exhibit 16, Bates 622.
Do you recognize this email?
(Witness perusing document.)
A Yes.
Q And do you see your email -- this is
the -- the email we just looked at a moment ago
from Uyen that was at the bottom of the chain of
Plaintiffs' Exhibit 15, right?
A Yes.
Q And then above that, you respond back to
Uyen, right?

A Yes.
Q And you say, "Is it possible there are no
Bitcoins in the trust, and David and Craig were
making up a story all along?"
Which trust are you referring to?
A The trust that Uyen Nguyen claimed they
were a trustee for.
Q But Craig had never mentioned a trustee
before this?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't recall.
Q And then you say -- well, why don't you
read the second paragraph for me, of your email.
A $\quad$ Given his extreme efforts to avoid
releasing a public signature, I'm starting to doubt that Craig actually possesses the key he claims he has, and he did somehow manage to trick me and, perhaps, has been deceiving people for many years."

Q What do you think now? Was -- let me take a step back.

Was that an accurate statement
when -- when you made it?
A Yes.
Q And what do you think now?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I'm not sure what to think. I am -- I might have been bamboozled.

Q In the email that Uyen responds back to your last email, she says, "The troublemaker is Craig himself, not Dave."

Do you see that? Top -- top -- or
second sentence of the email.
A Yes, I see that.
Q Do you know what she's referring to?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No.
Q Did you ever ask Craig what she was referring to?

A No.

Q And she finishes the email with, "nLockTime is what controls the trust."

Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q Do you know what she means?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes. NLockTime is a feature of Bitcoin transactions that allows you to create a transaction that cannot be published to the network to transfer Bitcoins from one person to another until sometime in the future.

Q Okay. Did you ever get any more detail on what she means by "nLockTime is what controls the trust"?

A No.
(Exhibit 17 marked for
identification.)
Q Okay. I'm gonna hand you what's been marked Plaintiffs' Exhibit 17, and it's been Bates-labeled Gavin 33.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q What is this email?
A This is an email from me to Stefan
Matthews about a blog post that $I$ wrote saying that

I believe Craig Wright is Satoshi Nakamoto.
Q Did you end up publishing this blog post?
A Yes, I did.
Q In this form?
A Very close to this form. You can check my blog, it's actually still there.

Q Okay. And that final form is obviously what you, yourself, posted?

A Yes.
Q In the draft, you write, on the second paragraph, last sentence, "After spending an afternoon with him" -- him meaning Craig, right?

A Yes.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q -- "I am convinced beyond a reasonable doubt he is Satoshi."

What convinced you beyond a
reasonable doubt at the time?
A It was the combination of speaking with him, communicating with him via email. It -- he seemed to have the same prickly personality of the person $I$ was communicating with in 2010, combined with a plausible backstory about why he would have stepped away, and then combined with -- I was convinced that he actually did sign and verify a
message using a key from one of the early Bitcoin blocks. So those three things convinced me at the time.

Q And did the convincing -- the convincing reason for why he stepped away was that he was going through a divorce in 2011?

A Yes.
Q Any -- anything else?
A No.
Q Can you look at the third -- or maybe it's fourth paragraph down, and the second sentence starts with "and." Can you read that for me?

A "And he cleared up a lot of mysteries, including why he disappeared when he did and what he's been busy with since 2011."

Q So what are the mysteries he cleared up?
A I don't recall what exactly $I$ was referring to then. Yeah, I don't recall.

Q Is it fair to say that the -- the fact that Satoshi Nakamoto was a team of three individuals is one of those mysteries?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I guess that's fair to say, sure.
Q We covered why he disappeared, right, it was the divorce?

A Yes.
Q And then what he's been busy with since 2011?

A Yes. I believe the academic study. From previous emails, the -- the -- you know, busy getting further degrees $I$ assumed is what he had been busy with.

Q So we've covered three things: Why he disappeared, what he's been busy with, and the identity -- the tri-party identity of Satoshi Nakamoto.

He wrote, "A lot of mysteries." Is there more you just don't recall?

A There's more --
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q I'm just -- was it just an inaccurate statement? Why did you write, "A lot of mysteries"? Because three strikes me as a few, not a lot.

MR. KASS: Same objection.
A I don't recall details. I mean, we discussed some design decisions in Bitcoin software. And, again, I don't recall the details of exactly which of those -- like, you know, why did he choose C++? Why did he use Windows? Why --
why 21 million Bitcoin? Why -- why the name Satoshi Nakamoto?

I believe we discussed some of those things either in London or later in emails, and so those were some of the types of mysteries that I felt like had been cleared up.

Q Why did he choose Satoshi Nakamoto?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A He actually -- oh, he gave me a -- he gave me a -- a book, which I actually haven't read yet, it's a Japanese -- story about a Japanese merchant, $I$ believe. Again, I haven't read the book. But the merchant is named Satoshi. And so that was his explanation for why he chose the name "Satoshi."

Q Got it.
So -- okay. I want to jump back into the timeline now. So we left it that you had just exited the proof session on April 7th, and you walked away from the meeting, beyond reasonable doubt, thinking Craig is Satoshi?

A Yes.
Q And that was April 7th?
A Yes.
Q Craig's press conference was May 2nd.

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q So I want to cover the period between your meeting Craig -- your meeting Craig for the proof session, and then the ultimate failure of his public proof session. Is that okay?

A Okay.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q So on April 12th, I believe, you get an email from Andrew O'Hagan asking whether or not -did I run out -- there I am, thank you -- asking whether or not you could talk.

This is Plaintiffs' Exhibit 18, and
it's Bates labeled Gavin 1762.
(Exhibit 18 marked for
identification.)
Q And in response -- so is that right, you get an email from Andrew O'Hagan asking if you can talk?

A Yes.
Q In response, you forward this to the -the money men and Craig, right?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And you say, I'm not planning on talking to anyone, but let me know if you would like me to
talk to him; is that fair?

A That's correct.
Q Did they end up asking you to talk to him?

A I don't recall.
Q And did they explain to you what Andrew O'Hagan was there to do?

A I don't think so.
Q Did you ever come --
A I don't recall them mentioning Andrew O'Hagan's name at all.

Q Did Andrew O'Hagan ever explain to you what he was there to do?

A I don't think so. I think the -- the -the next time I -- I don't know. I wouldn't be surprised if the next time I heard of Andrew O'Hagan was when the big article was published.

Q Okay. Well, you had that email exchange with him?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q We -- we looked at it earlier. It was -do you mind passing me your exhibits so $I$ can find it for you?

A Sure.
Q That's the downside of using electronic

```
exhibits.
```

Here we are, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 10.
(Document exhibited to witness.)
A April 29th. I sit corrected.
Q So do you recall ever getting explained who Andrew O'Hagan was or what he was doing there?

A No.
Q Somebody must have authorized you to give this detailed account because you were otherwise under a embargo; isn't that right?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't recall.
Q And, in fact, an -- an NDA of some kind?
A I don't recall.
(Exhibit 19 marked for
identification.)
Q Okay. Hand you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 19, and what is Bates-labeled Gavin 15.

Do you recognize this email?
(Witness perusing document.)
A Yes.
Q And this is you writing to Stefan Matthews, I believe; is that right?

MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Probably. I -- I ma -- I don't know who srmatt@hushmail.com is.

Q He was one of the money men?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q Okay. And in the third paragraph down, you tell him, "Convincing Andreas Antonopoulos that Craig has possession of early-in-the-blockchain keys, convincing him that Craig deeply understands Bitcoin would, I think, be very helpful."

Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q Why did you believe it would be helpful to convince Andreas Antonopoulos?

A An -- Andreas Antonopoulos is well-known in the Bitcoin community and is considered to be very trustworthy. He's also very knowledgeable about technical stuff.

Q Do you consider him to be trustworthy? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q Do you consider him to be very
knowledgeable about Bitcoin?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.

Q Would you rank him in the top 10 people in the world in terms of Bitcoin knowledge?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Top 10?
Q Make it top 20.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Top 20? He wrote -- he wrote a whole book about Bitcoin, so he's definitely an expert. If it came to actually working on the code, like doing the software engineering, then he's probably not in the top 20, but, I mean, he definitely understands the Bitcoin system very well.

Q Okay. So there are better coders than him, you're saying?

A There are better coders than him, yes.
Q Would you consider him to be an expert in Bitcoin technologies?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q Did Craig convince Andreas Antonopoulos
-- Andreas Antonopoulos that he had the keys to the early Bitcoin --

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q -- public addresses?
MR. KASS: Object to form.

A No.
Q Why not?
A I believe Andreas refused to meet with Craig.

Q Do you know why?
A I don't know why.
Q Okay. And in this email you're
referencing the blog post that we -- we took a look at earlier, right?

A Yes.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Vel, do you have an idea as to how
much you have left? Because we have a cross-
noticed deposition, and you're probably about three hours.

MR. FREEDMAN: I don't know, but we can take stock of that the next break.

MR. KASS: All right.
MR. FREEDMAN: I'm not sure how it helps, though. I've got to finish, and then we can see how we proceed.

MR. KASS: Well --
(Exhibit 20 marked for
identification.)
Q I'm handing you Plaintiffs' Exhibit 20,

1 and it's Bates marked 1521.

MR. FREEDMAN: Let's discuss it
later.
MR. KASS: Okay. I just want to make clear, though, that we don't consent to you just finishing and not leaving us sufficient time. We can talk about it at the break, but I just wanted to make sure that $I$ wasn't implicitly conceding to your statement.

MR. FREEDMAN: Okay. Your objection
is noted.
MR. KASS: All right.
BY MR. FREEDMAN:
Q All right. So I've just handed you Plaintiffs' Exhibit 20 that is Bates-marked Gavin 1521.

Do you see that email?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Do you recognize it?
A Yes.
Q And is it an email from Stefan Matthews
to you?
A Yes, it is.
Q Does it help you remember who srmatt@hushmail.com is?

A No.
Q Well, do you see the "from" email?
A Oh, Stefan -- Stefan Matthews. Yes.
Okay.
Q So "srmatt" is Stefan Matthews? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A I think so.
Q And one of the money men? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q And what is this email?
A This is Stefan giving me -- encouraging me to communicate with Andrew about the whole Satoshi affair.

Q So I guess it's fair to say this is the introductory explanation of who Andrew O'Hagan is vis-a-vis Craig Wright's coming out as Satoshi? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q And then you went ahead and engaged
Andrew O'Hagan as we saw in that email?
A Yes.
Q But do you recall if you spoke to him on the phone yet?

A I don't recall.
(Exhibit 21 marked for
identification.)
Q I'm handing you -- thank you.
I'm handing you what we're marking as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 21, and it's Bates-labeled Gavin 1179.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q What is this email?
A This is an email from Craig Wright to me, supposedly showing a screenshot that is some early Bitcoin debug logs from the Bitcoin software.

Q And he says they have his name in it?
THE STENOGRAPHER: I'm sorry?
Q They say -- it says that -- sorry. He says that these debug logs have his name in them; is that right?

A Yes, that's what he says.
Q Do you see Craig.Wright in the debug -debug log?

MR. KASS: Object to form. Vel, it's not legible besides.

A Yeah, kind of. I think I do, actually, see it kind of at the beginning.
C:\Users\craig.wright --

MR. FREEDMAN: I can zoom in on it

```
for you.
```

A -- AppData.
MR. KASS: Well, you don't -- well,
if the witness has better eyes than me, he can testify.

Q See the --
A Yes.
Q All right. There we go. This is an electronically zoomed-in version.

What is -- what is this debug log?
A The Bitcoin software can be run with a command line switch to write debugging information to a file, just to help developers to figure out if it makes a mistake.

Q And does this show in any way that Craig is Satoshi?

A No.
Q I mean, I could have run this debug log, right?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yeah. Well, certainly anybody could produce a screenshot that claims anything, so...

Q Well, that's certainly true, right? It could be a doctored screenshot, right?

A Could be a doctored screenshot. I mean, it's possible -- I don't -- I can't read the dates on here. Looks like block height. There's block index, 12,000 -- I don't know. I mean, anybody could have been running Bitcoin very early, so it doesn't really prove anything.

Q I mean, if -- if it is not doctored, is it correct to say that it shows Craig was running Bitcoin somewhere around the 12,000 block?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q I think that's 12,914. I can -- the block index says 12,914. I can kind of zoom in on it on my...

A Yeah, and I think 12 -- I -- block index, 12,914. I think that refers to which block is -is the latest block that it knows about. I'd have to go back and -- and check to double -- make sure it's not referring to some other index.

Q Okay. So when you received this, what were your -- what were your mental impressions?

A My only impression was that, I mean, he's trying to add more evidence that he is Satoshi to try to reassure me. But, I mean, frankly, again, screenshots can be doctored, so it didn't have much effect on me.

Q So on -- on May 1st you -- you set your blog post for release on May 2 nd when the press conference was gonna take place. You recall that?

A Yes.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A The idea was that the -- yeah, my blog post and Craig's blog post would go out at the same time.

Q I think you were at a ConsenSys event at that time, right?

A I was. I was at a ConsenSys New York City conference.

Q What happened?
A Bad things. So the blog post that Craig released was not at all what I expected him to release. I expected him to release a very simple, you know, $I$ am Satoshi, here is some -- here is a simple message signed with an early key from an early block.

> Instead, he released a very wacky supposed proof that actually wasn't a proof of anything but was incredibly technical and hard to follow, and I was as surprised as anybody to see that. And it -- it took, I don't know, a few hours, a day, for somebody to -- to figure out what
all that technical gobbledygook actually meant and to show that it wasn't actually a proof of anything.

Q So he didn't even almost prove he was Satoshi?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Correct. Anybody could have produced that gobbledygook proof.

Q Why didn't he release a simple signed message?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't know.
Q Did you ask him?
A I did not. At least $I$ don't think I did. You're probably about to pull out an email where I ask him.

Q Not yet. Maybe soon.
(Exhibit 22 marked for
identification.)
Q I'm gonna hand you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 22, and it's Bates-labeled Gavin 5.

This is an email from the money man, Stefan Matthews; is that right?

A Yes.

Q To you?
A Yes.
Q On May 2nd, 2016?
A Yes.
Q So this is after the press release went south?

A Yes.
Q The demonstration went south.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q And -- and he opens by telling you that Craig is working on several corrections to his blog post. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q And he delivered some incorrect screenshots?

A Yes.
Q Would there have been correct screenshots that could have fixed this proof?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yeah, there could have been. I don't -let me say I don't recall exactly what was a screenshot in his blog post and what was not. So it's also possible that no -- just new screenshots would not have done anything because he described what he did in text.

Q Right. Did he ever produce the screenshots to you?

A No.
Q Publicly?
A Not that $I$ know of.
Q And then in the fourth paragraph, Matthews asks you, "If we were to be" -- "If we were able to sign a transaction, say you sent BTC to an address associated with block 9, and this was then sent back to you, would that" -- "that be something you would entertain?" Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q Was that something you'd entertain?
A Yes, $I$ believe $I$ actually did send a transaction to block 9.

Q Did he ever send it back?
A No.
Q He owes you money?
A Well, the money's still sitting there in block 9. So I think it was half -- . 11 Bitcoin, because my favorite number's 11, I think.

Q Okay.
A But, again, I -- I could go back and check the blockchain.

```
    Q It's not an insignificant amount of
    money.
    A Yeah.
    Q Have you asked for it back?
    A I have not asked for it back.
        (Exhibit 23 marked for
        identification.)
    Q So then --
        MR. FREEDMAN: Can I get another...
    Q I'm handing you what we've marked as
    Plaintiffs' Exhibit 23, and it's been Bates-labeled
    Gavin 47.
                                    Do you recognize this email?
            A Yes.
            Q And this is, again, from Stefan Matthews
        to -- one of the money men, to you?
            MR. KASS: Object to form.
            A Yes.
            Q On May 2nd, 2016?
            A Yes.
            Q And this is, again, after the fiasco of
        the public proof failed?
            MR. KASS: Object to form.
            A Yes.
            Q And Matthews, the money man, says to you,
```

"Hi Gavin, I've just spoken to CSW" -- that's Craig Steven Wright?

A I believe so, yes.
Q "He has agreed to sign a new message twice, once with block 9 and once with block 9" -sorry -- "once with block 1 and once with block 9 keys. It will include proof of date. Both signed messages will be provided to each of you to give additional evidence should you need it."

And it's sent to you and Jon Matonis, right?

A Yes.
Q With Craig in CC?
A Yes.
Q Did Craig ever respond back and say, "I'm not gonna do this"?

A Not that I recall.
Q Did he say, "I can't do it"?
A Not that I recall.
Q Did he ever do it?
A No.
Q Why not?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't know.
Q I mean, he has -- if -- if the proof

```
session you saw was real, he has the key to
block 9 --
                    MR. KASS: Object to form.
    Q -- is that a fair statement?
    A Yes.
            MR. KASS: Same objection.
    Q Would it have involved significant effort
for him to use that key he clearly has access to,
to send you a message from at least block 9?
                    MR. KASS: Object to form.
                    Vel, you're mixing up dates.
    A No. It would be easy.
    Q It would be easy for him to have done
    that?
    A Yes.
                MR. KASS: Object to form.
            Q But he didn't?
            A No.
            Q Why do you think he didn't?
                MR. KASS: Object to form.
            A I don't really know. If you want me to
        speculate --
            Q Sure.
            A Do you want me to speculate?
            Q Speculate for this question only.
```

MR. KASS: And I'm gonna object to the speculation.

MR. FREEDMAN: Noted.
A If the -- the Bitcoins were supposed to be locked in a trust, but Craig kept the private keys when he was not supposed to, then that would be a good reason for him not to sign something with a key that he is not supposed to have access to. So that is the -- that is my speculation on why he might have been very resistant to signing any messages with those early keys.

Q To show he has access to private keys he really shouldn't have access to?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Correct. Perhaps there is some legal reason he was not supposed to have kept the keys.

Q Is that pure speculation, or can you base it on anything you've heard or seen from Craig or the money men?

A I would say that's mostly speculation. I mean, the discussion of this mysterious trust, or trusts, kind of fed into that theory.
(Exhibit 24 marked for
identification.)
Q So I am handing you what's been marked as
Plaintiffs' Exhibit 24, and it's Bates-labeled
Gavin 161.
And Craig says -- this is an
email from you -- do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q It's an email from Craig to you?
A Yes, and Jon Matonis.
Q And Stefan Matthews?
A And Stefan Matthews.
Q And he says, "Please hold that thought.
I'm going to re-sign the message and post a new,
never-used signature from 9."
So he has clearly committed to sign
using the block key -- using the private key of
block 9; is that right?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q Did he?
A No.
Q Even though it would have been simple for
him to do so?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q Okay.
(Exhibit 25 marked for
identification.)
Q So I'm now handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 25, and it is Gavin 371.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q It is a -- it's an email, on the bottom, from you -- it's an email chain that reflects, first, an email from you to Craig on bottom and then a response from Craig to you; do you see that?

A Yes.
Q And you might have predicted this earlier, but do you see the opening sentence of your email?

A Yes.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q What does it say?
A "Why the OpenSSL hoop-jumping exercise and not just a simple Electrum-signed message?"

Q Which, is it fair, in layman's speak to say, Why didn't you just do the easy signature instead of some complex gobbledygook that turned out to be nothing?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q Okay. What is his response to that?

A He claimed that he -- that the wrong blog post was posted, and at the time that seemed unlikely to me.

Q I mean, like, your question's very understandable, right, why not just do the simple, unequivocal proof? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q And did you find his response unsatisfactory?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I did. I mean, I -- I -- yes, I found it unsatisfactory.
(Exhibit 26 marked for
identification.)
Q So I'm gonna hand you what we're marking as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 26, and it is Bates Gavin 4. And this is an email that reflects a chain between you and Stefan Matthews; is that right?

A Yes.
Q The money man?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And Stefan Matthews says, "CSW" -- it's

Craig Steven Wright -- "has committed to moving a coin associated with block 9 address. The intent is for you to send a coin to that address, and then for CSW to return that coin to you."

Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q And you provided the address?
A Yes.
Q Did you send the coin?
A I did.
Q And you never got 'em back. We covered that already, right?

A Correct.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
(Exhibit 27 marked for identification.)

Q I'm handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 27; it's Bates-labeled Gavin 18. And this is a -- does this -- do you recognize this email?

A Yes.
Q And does it reflect an email chain between you and Stefan Matthews and Craig Wright?

A Yes.
Q And you initially reach out to the two of
them saying that you have sent, at the time, $\$ 50$ worth of Bitcoin to the block 9 address?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And Stefan Matthews, the money man, writes back that he sees the transaction, and then he says, "Will let you know when we do the transfer. It could be several days before we get the necessary authorization fully documented," et cetera.

Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q Is this what you were basing your speculation on earlier?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q What did you understand them to mean when they said "necessary authorization"?

I mean, let me take a step back.
Strike that question for a second.
If I have a private key to a Bitcoin block -- public address, do I need anyone's authorization to use that private key?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No.

Q Okay. So what did you take this to mean, that he needed necessary authorization?

A I'm trying to -- I don't remember what $I$ knew or thought I knew at that time. So I think the best answer would be I don't recall if -- it might have been -- I might have imagined that there was some trustee that would have to sign off on any use of those private keys. But, again, I don't recall at what point $I$ learned about the trust. MR. KASS: So, Vel, we have to resolve the timing issue. I'm happy to go off the record if you want to. MR. FREEDMAN: Let's take a break. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is

12:34 p.m. We're now off the record. (Off record.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
12:44 p.m. We're coming back on the record, continuing Media No. 2.
(Exhibit 28 marked for identification.)

BY MR. FREEDMAN:
Q I'm now handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 28, which is Bates-marked Gavin 1708, but I've printed out the wrong version,
it doesn't have the Bates marking.
Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q Is this an email from Craig to you?
A Yes.
Q And you start off by saying to him, "I'm starting to doubt myself and imagining clever ways you could have tricked me."

Well, let me take that back. He wrote you an email on May 2nd saying, We F'd up and I loaded the wrong post. I'll be loading the correct one shortly.

And then you respond the next day, on May 3rd, saying, "Today, pretty please. I'm starting to doubt myself and imagining clever ways you could have tricked me."

Is that accurate?
A Yes.
Q And what does Craig say in response?
A Do you want me to read that?
Q Sure.
A He says, "There will be a post soon. It is in review to ensure it is all okay. We are going to move coin as well, but we need to get the trust permissions in place. Lawyers..."

Q So was it really speculation?
A About permissions from trusts? No, apparently not. Apparently Craig told me that that was the reason permission was needed.

Q So it's your understanding that Craig is refusing to publicly prove that he holds the private keys to block 9 because it would show he inappropriately kept private keys from the trust?

A Or used them in a way that was outside of some legal agreement in the trust, yes.

Q So that he has them, as he signed with them, but isn't allowed to move coin with them? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q Okay.
(Pause.)
MR. FREEDMAN: I seem to be missing a document. No, it's just out of order.
(Pause.)
Q So as things currently stand, Craig has provided a public proof that failed; the money men are attempting to arrange for Craig to send you Bitcoin from block 9, and they are saying they need authorization from a trust to do this, even though he has the private key. Is that all correct?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I believe Craig said he needs trust permission.

Q That's right.
A I'm not sure the money men --
Q Craig said he needs --
A -- ever said --
Q Right. So modify my -- my question to say Craig said he needed authorization from the trust; is that correct?

MR. KASS: Same -- same objection.
A Yes.
(Exhibit 29 marked for
identification.)
Q Okay. And I'm handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 29, which is Bates-labeled Gavin 1206.

Do you recognize these emails?
A Yes.
Q So if -- if you go to the back of the email, so the beginning of the email chain, and the one sent on May 4th, 2016, and it's Robert MacGregor. He's one of the money men, correct? A Okay.

MR. KASS: Object to form.

Q Do you not recall who --
A I don't recall what Rob -- Robert and Stefan's exact roles were. I don't -- and I don't recall who had known Craig for years and who was owner of the -- the VC, but if you want to call all of them --

Q Part of --
A -- money men, sure.
Q Yeah. Sure. Okay. He -- he writes and says that Rory from the BBC has asked if he could have a one-liner from interviews, that he is comfortable that you are participating, and this isn't yet -- isn't a yet more fantastical hoax.

So the BBC wanted to know that this coin was really gonna get sent, right?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And Jon Matonis says, "I will call Rory"?
A Yes, I see that.
Q And then Stefan says, "Gavin, can you please call Rory"?

A Yes.
Q And then Jon -- and then Robert MacGregor says, "Gavin replied via email, Stefan."

So do you remember reaching out to

Rory at the BBC?
A I don't recall.
Q Do you have any reason to doubt that you didn't?

A No.
Q Jon Matonis said, "I just got off the phone with Rory at the BBC," right?

A Yes.
Q And then Robert MacGregor sends a message on May 4th, 2016, you're all waiting for Craig to send this transaction, and can you read what he says to you?

A "All Stop. Craig has just tried to injure himself and is bleeding badly in the washroom. Stefan is there with him and Ramona and I am en route. Ambulance is on its way."

Q So Craig tried to hurt himself?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A That was my understanding, yes.
Q Did you get any more details then beyond this email?

A I believe there was a phone call, I don't recall with who, who said that -- were they at Craig's house? I don't recall the location, but they were somewhere. Craig disappeared upstairs
and then was found bleeding with cuts to his neck, and then was taken to the hospital in -- in an ambulance with an apparent suicide attempt. I think the word "suicide" was -- was used.

Q And this was by someone who was at the locale?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A If I recall correctly, yes.
Q And they were describing what was going on at the time?

A I believe this happened -- several days or maybe a week or more later, the phone call happened recounting events.

Q That had -- that had happened --
A That had happened in the past, on May 4 th.

Q But you don't recall who that was?
A No, I don't recall.
Q Did you ever talk to Craig about this?
A No.
Things get dark.
Q This stopped the public proof -- this stopped the transfer of Bitcoin?

A Yes.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
(Exhibit 30 marked for
identification.)
Q I'm handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 30, and it's been Bates-labeled Gavin 769.

Do you recognize this email chain?
A Yes.
Q This is an email between you and Robert MacGregor?

A Yes.
Q One of the money men group? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q Okay. And in it you say to Robert MacGregor that you see two possibilities about what's going on, either Craig is Satoshi and is under incredible pressure not to provide proof -or, rather, the pressure of providing proof is too much?

A Yes.
Q Or he's lying to everyone for many years, perhaps from evidence -- perhaps with evidence that he obtained from the real deal?

A Yes.
Q So maybe Dave Kleiman was Satoshi, he got
the keys, and he used one of the keys but doesn't have more?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Sure. Possibly.
Q Possibly. And in response, one of -Robert MacGregor, who has been working with Craig for at least a few months now on this coming out as Satoshi -- is that accurate?

A Yes.
Q -- says, "I agree completely"?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Do you remember receiving an email from Stefan Matthews telling you that there was no indication Craig would default until a minute before, and that they are checking their public position and so should you?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No, I don't recall.
Q Did you ever have any conversations with any of the money men or Craig about why this default happened?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No.
(Exhibit 31 marked for
identification.)

Q I'm handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 31. It's Gavin 41.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q It's an apology email from Craig Wright to you?

A Yes.
Q Sent May 7, 2016?
A Yes.
Q And in the third paragraph down, it says -- Craig tells you, "At no point did I lie to you nor deceive you, but it is better that $I$ am a hoaxer"?

A Yes, I see that he said that.
Q Do you believe that?
A No.
Q What do you really believe?
A He certainly deceived me about what kind of blog post he was going to publish, and that gobbledygook proof that he published was certainly deception, if not an outright lie. So at the very least, that, I consider, you know, that -- he bamboozled me there.

Q And had you known -- strike that. As I understand your testimony, you
went into the proof session as kind of one element of due diligence, but expecting there to be a real public proof posted afterwards; is that fair?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And so you were maybe less than careful -- strike that.

In reliance on what you knew would be coming out, or what you assumed would be coming out based on his word, you weren't as diligent as you might have been otherwise in checking that the proof was truly proof --

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q -- is that fair?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And if you were to do it again today, you might require much more stringent circumstances for that proof?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q So he almost socially engineered you in a way?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q Social hacking?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't think I would use that term.
Q How would you describe it?
A Maybe -- maybe that's accurate. I mean, he certainly misled me. He -- he -- he wanted something from me, and he wasn't clear about what he actually wanted from me. He -- he led me to believe he wanted one thing when I -- I suspect he wanted something else. I'm not sure what that other thing...

Q Well, I mean, you carried a lot of credibility, you still do, within the Bitcoin community; is that fair?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A That's -- yes, that's fair.
Q And your endorsement of him as Satoshi would -- would carry a significant amount of weight?

A Yes. I definitely --
MR. KASS: Object to the form, but, yeah.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.
MR. KASS: That's okay.
A I definitely knew he wanted that from me. But I guess, you know, now, looking back on it, I
wonder, you know, was he also trying to impress the money men, was that part of what he was trying to get out of it? And I don't know.

Q That he could bring -- bring down -bring over Gavin Andresen onto his side?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Right. That that would, you know, maybe help him with his relationship with -- with the money men.

Q At the time, and you tell me if this is a fair characterization, you were probably -- if not the -- one of the most prominent members of the Bitcoin community?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q You were lead core developer?
A Was I still at that time? I think I had stepped away from that role, and I was just chief scientist at the Bitcoin Foundation.

Q I think you stepped down after, but I could be misremembering the time frame.

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q You were certainly chief scientist of the Bitcoin Foundation?

A Yes.

Q And you had been -- you were, and are, the person Craig -- Satoshi Nakamoto had handed over control of Bitcoin to?

A Yes.
Q You were the best replacement to Satoshi
the world had at the moment?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q You don't have to agree with that statement. I mean, strike that.

A I sure was the best.
Q So you certainly brought objective value -- your endorsement certainly brought objective value; is that fair?

A Yes.
Q And do you think that's what he wanted from you?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And what did he lead you to believe that he really wanted from you?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q You said that he -- he led you to believe he wanted one thing from you, and really you thought he really wanted something else.

A I suspect -- yeah, I mean, I guess, you

1 know, I -- I thought that my piece would be part of a larger whole of him proving beyond a reasonable doubt to the world that he was Satoshi Nakamoto. And I thought that that's what he wanted from me. And then he did not complete the rest of the puzzle, and so that makes me wonder, is that really what he wanted from me, or did he have some other ulterior motive for flying me to London and -- and doing this -- the proof session? And I don't know what that other motive would be.

Q Did you ever -- did you ever talk to Ira Kleiman?

A I believe I've received email from Ira Kleiman, but I don't believe I've ever spoken to him.

Q Did you ever -- beyond the emails that we've reviewed from Uyen Nguyen to you with Ian Grigg on them, have you heard from Uyen Nguyen since?

A I don't believe so. There might have been another -- she might have reached -she/he/them? Them. I'll use them. They might have reached out to me again. I seem to recall two sets of emails separated in time, but I have no idea when.

Q Have you spoken with Craig Wright or emailed with Craig Wright in the past year?

A I'd have to go back and check my email.

```
I'm not sure when my last -- when he last contacted
```

me via email was.

Q Have you --
A It might have been more than a year.
Q Have you responded to him within the past year?

A I don't believe I've responded to him in the past year, no.

Q Have you spoken with any of his

## attorneys?

A No.
THE WITNESS: Oh, wait. Are you... MR. KASS: Well, yes.

A Okay.
Q Before today.
A Before today.
MR. KASS: I don't think you got a
good answer to your question.
Q Have you spoken with any of Craig Wright's attorneys before today?

A No.
Q Thank you.
(Exhibit 32 marked for
identification.)
Q I am handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 32, and it's Bates-labeled 1512.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q And is it a email from Craig to you?
A Yes.
(Exhibit 33 marked for
identification.)
Q I am handing you an e -- a document labeled Plaintiffs' Exhibit 33. It is Bates-labeled Gavin 344.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q And is it a email from Craig to you?
A Yes. I think so. It's a different email address, craig@rcjbr.org, but $I$ believe it's from Craig to me.

MR. KASS: And, also, object to form. There's two emails in here.

Q Okay. Is this an email chain between you and Craig where Craig is forwarding you an email?

A Yes.

Q And it appears Craig has forwarded you an email that he received from the Australian Tax Office; is that accurate?

A Yes.
Q And in it he says to you, "They left the audit open"?

A Yes.
Q And he says, "High-wealth individuals are taxed differently. As I have over 100 million, they can assess Bitcoin as a ForEx bank holding." Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q So Craig did, at some point, tell you about his net worth --

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q -- is that an accurate statement?
A Sure. I mean, this email claims to have over a hundred million somethings.

Q He says he has over a hundred million. Well, it can't be Bitcoin.

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Correct, it could not be Bitcoin. There are only -- there are fewer than 21 million Bitcoin.

Q Okay.
(Exhibit 34 marked for
identification.)
Q Did you ever ask him how he got a hundred -- over a hundred million dollars in net worth?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No.
Q I'm handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 34, it's Gavin 732.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q Also from Craig Wright to you?
A Yes.
Q And this has below it -- it's a chain, actually, between you and Craig, right?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And he says in the original email to you, "I am sorry for last year, but I cannot sign." You see that?

A Yes.
Q And then you insert in line in response, Okay. Don't worry about me. I'm enjoying semi-retirement. All the people I care about still love and respect me and don't care that you
bamboozled me, and you did, just not in the way most people think.

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q What did you mean by that?
A I meant that he bamboozled me about the gobbledygook proof, but $I$ still think it's most likely that he did not bamboozle me during the signing ceremony.

Q And he really does have possession of the private key to block 9?

A I still think it's more likely than not that he does.

MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q And then he says, "I have sufficient funds that they can force me to sell."

Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q And you say, "I am not" -- "I am not sure I want to know, but who is "they"? You can be vague: former business partner? Australian government? Somebody else? And sell to pay what?" Right?

A Yes.
Q And he tells you, "They is part a few people, not all, in the tax office"?

MR. KASS: Object to the form.
Q You see that? If you jump back up to the top of the email.

A "They is part a few people, not all."
Yes, I see that.
Q And did you take this to mean that there were people not in the tax office that was trying to force him to sell?

MR. KASS: Object to the form.
A Yes.
MR. KASS: Vel, with regards to the
time, I have a proposal.
MR. FREEDMAN: Let's deal with it at lunch.

MR. KASS: No, no, but $I$ just want to see if we get this on the record.

Why don't we ask the witness how long he can stay today, and then we just divide it?

MR. FREEDMAN: No.
MR. KASS: What do you mean "No"?
MR. FREEDMAN: I mean no. I'm gonna finish. I'm almost finished, but I'm gonna finish, and then you can have the rest of the time and --

MR. KASS: Right. So then I'll have seven hours after that. But I want to make sure

1 the witness is able to stay, because, if not, I may have to get relief. So --

MR. FREEDMAN: You can ask for
relief.
MR. KASS: Well, I'm gonna ask the witness right now how long he can stay today.

Mr. Andresen, how long are you able to stay today?

THE WITNESS: Let me check my calendar.

MR. KASS: Okay.
(Pause.)
THE WITNESS: I can stay till 6:00.
MR. KASS: Until 6:00. Okay.
And then just one other question.
MR. FREEDMAN: Zalman?
MR. KASS: What? One other quick question. I just want to -- I just want to under --

MR. FREEDMAN: One last question.
MR. KASS: That's all I'm asking.
MR. FREEDMAN: All right.
MR. KASS: Okay. Would you be -- if necessary, would you be able to come back tomorrow to continue the deposition?

THE WITNESS: I have -- I'm giving a lecture in the afternoon, but $I$ believe I'm free tomorrow morning.

MR. KASS: Okay.
THE WITNESS: Let me double check.
MR. KASS: Yeah, could you just check what your schedule is like tomorrow morning?

MR. FREEDMAN: Check by lunch.
THE WITNESS: I'm supposed to have a workout from 9:00 to 10:00 a.m., and then my lecture is at 2:30 in the afternoon.

MR. KASS: Okay. So 2:30. And you would be willing to come back?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. KASS: Okay. Back to you, Vel. I just wanted to make sure the witness was...
(Exhibit 35 marked for
identification.)
BY MR. FREEDMAN:
Q Okay. I am handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 35 and Bates-labeled Gavin 1274.

Do you recognize that email?
A Yes.
Q That's an email from Craig to you?

A Yes.
Q And in it Craig says he has -- "I have sufficient funds that they can force me to sell. Signing proves control."

See that?
A Yes.
Q Did you ever find out how much sufficient funds would be?

A No.
Q But then he says, "Right now it would mean dumping 400 million in coin to pay. I will not do that."

Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q Did you take this to mean that Craig was telling you he had over $\$ 400$ million in Bitcoin? MR. KASS: Object to form.

A Yes.
Q Does that strike you as odd?
A No. If he's Satoshi, that would not be an unreasonable amount.

Q Okay. Then he says, "I will not do that."

A Yep.
Q Did you ask him why he didn't say "I
cannot do that" if he was having a problem with the trust allowing him to move coins?

A I don't recall pressing him on that.
Q Do you know what he meant by "signing proves control"?

A Sure. If you create a message signed with a private key, it -- it -- it proves that you have control of that key, that you own that key, that you have access to that key.

Q Unless there's a mysterious trust that prevents you from using it.

MR. KASS: Object to the form.
(Exhibit 36 marked for
identification.)
Q I'm handing you what's marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 36, Bates-labeled Gavin 1439. Do you recognize this email?

A Yes.
Q And it reflects an exchange between you and Craig. I believe this is, again, another -another instance where you've inserted your comments into his below, right?

A Yes.
Q And he's saying, "I would need to pay tax in fiat on the gains at a rate of 51 percent."

You say that's nasty. It's a lot -lot of tax. But then you say, My advice would be to pay it and move on. What is the use of being wealthy if you have to spend your time talking to lawyers or worrying about what your family will do if you die and leave them with a gazillion BTC and a big financial mess to clean up?

What -- what was his response to the suggestion that he just pay the tax and move on?

A I don't recall. I'm not sure I received any response.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're at the
half-hour point. I don't know if it matters anymore, but --

MR. KASS: So, Vel, I just want -- do
I have an agreement with you to stay until 6:00 today or tomorrow morning, if necessary, to complete my deposition?

MR. FREEDMAN: We'll talk about it on the break.
(Exhibit 37 marked for
identification.)
BY MR. FREEDMAN:
Q I'm handing you what's marked as Exhibit 37, which is Gavin 869.

MR. KASS: I suggest we should take a break after this 'cause it's the half point. So ask your questions, but then I'm gonna go off. BY MR. FREEDMAN:

Q Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q This is an email from Craig Wright to you?

A Yes.
Q And here he's sig -- he's sig -- he's telling you that he is an individual with over a hundred million dollars in net worth -- wealth?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Over a hundred million net wealth. I'm not sure -- yes.

Q He says --
A Yes.
Q -- "That was the point of the trust, but it means that $I$ cannot have control"?

A Yes.
Q And then if you look at the second to last and last lines of the typed email, do you see where he says, "A forced sale of 400 million in BTC would be a mess, especially mine"?

A Yes.

Q Do you take this to say Craig is telling you that he has at least 400 million BTC to sell?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
Q And at a rate of 51 percent, that means he has over 800 million?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I'm not sure where you're getting
51 percent.
Q On the previous email, we saw the -- the tax amount would be 51 percent, right?

A Yeah, but he would need to pay 51 percent of the $\$ 400$ million sale is what $I$ would understand the tax.

Q So the total amount being 400 million?
A I think, yeah.
Q And he says, "400 million is too much"?
A Yes.
Q "I am Antiguan now... So in a few years I will pay a lot less"?

A Yes.
Q Did you ever follow up on this, where the money was, where the Bitcoin was?

A No.
Q Did he ever tell you more about this?

A No.
MR. KASS: Okay, Vel, let's go off the record.
(Exhibit 38 marked for
identification.)
Q I'm handing you what's been marked -MR. KASS: Vel --

Q -- as Plaintiffs' --
MR. FREEDMAN: We're not going off the record, Zalman.

MR. KASS: You're running out of tape.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I need to switch
disks in about 4 minutes.
MR. FREEDMAN: Perfect.
BY MR. FREEDMAN:
Q I'm handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 38, which is Bates-labeled Gavin 1974.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q And is this an email from Craig to you?
A Yes.
Q And do you see at the bottom he says, "I am a fraud, but I am a fraud that is free to work
on what I need to do"?
A Yes.
Q How -- what did you take that to mean?
A I don't think I know.
Q Did you ever follow up on it with him?
A Not that I recall, no.
MR. FREEDMAN: Why don't we stop now.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. The time now is 1:19 p.m. We've come to the end of Media Unit No. 2. We're now off the record. (Off record.)
(Lunch recess taken from 1:19 p.m. to 2:23 p.m.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time now is
2:23 p.m. We're coming back on the record. Now beginning Media Unit No. 3 at deposition with Gavin Andresen. We're on the record.

MR. KASS: Vel, I just wanted to
really quickly get on the record where we are with the cross-noticing and the continuation of Mr. Andresen's deposition.

We've agreed that we can go until 6:00 p.m. tonight. It's my position that we should continue tomorrow as the witness is available.

My understanding is I don't have a
firm commitment from you, but that you're open to the idea, maybe if you want to just put your -your position on the record.

MR. FREEDMAN: Position is you don't have a valid subpoena, since you didn't notice the deposition in time under the local rules; but that we're trying to accommodate you, nonetheless, and Mr. Andresen, so he doesn't have to come back. And I will let you know who and if we can cover the deposition tomorrow morning once I can finish this and get into my calendar and make some calls.

MR. KASS: Okay. My position is that -- I'll make this really quick -- that it wasn't invalid; you were here anyways; that you didn't need any additional notice under; it. You didn't object until now; so if there was any objection, you've waived it by now.

Now let's get on with the depo.
MR. FREEDMAN: Okay.
BY MR. FREEDMAN:
Q Mr. Andresen, before we get back into the documents, I want to just talk a little bit more broadly about Bitcoin for a second. Is that okay? A Sure.
Q So can Bitcoin function without miners?

A No.
Q So it -- it needs someone to actively mine in order to function?

A Yes.
Q And in the beginning of Bitcoin's life, is it fair to say that Satoshi was one of the only active miners?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A We assumed that -- yes, we assumed that he was the first miner. Well, we know that he created the -- the very first genesis block, and it's fair to assume that he might have been the only miner for a while.

Q And thereby -- and, therefore, through launching the system -- strike that.

And -- and mining Bitcoin was,
therefore, integral to the creation and sustaining of this new creation; is that a fair statement?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
(Exhibit 39 marked for
identification.)
Q I am going to hand you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 39, and it is Bates-labeled Gavin 1075.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q And it's an email from you to Craig?
A Yes.
Q And on the -- in it you say that you are not angry at him?

A Yes.
Q Is that true?
A Yeah, I don't think $I$ was angry. I was disappointed, but I wasn't angry.

Q Are you angry at him now?
A I tend not to get angry, so I wouldn't say I'm angry.

Q Still just disappointed?
A Still just disappointed, yeah.
Q And then you say, "If you ever need or want to talk, I'll be happy to listen"?

A Yes.
Q Did he ever take you up on that?
A No, not really. I mean, he did send me some emails after this, but it was -- and I think they're all in the -- in the record. But we certainly never had a phone conversation or anything.

```
    Q Is it -- is it fair to say that every
```

email that you've produced to us is an accurate representation of the email you received?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yes.
(Exhibit 71 marked for
identification.)
Q I'm gonna hand you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 40, which is Bates-labeled Gavin 1334.

Do you recognize this email chain?
Just to help you out, I think it's a continuation of that original chain you received from Uyen about the trusts.

A Yes.
Q But $I$ have a particular question -- so do you recognize this chain now?

A Yes.
Q I have a particular question about the May 4th email from Uyen to you. She says, "You deserve the truth. Do not share."

And then you say, "I will not share,
I will destroy."

> What did she -- did she attach something to that email?

A She did.

Q What did she attach?
A I think it was a document related to the Tulip Trust.

Q Okay.
A But I did destroy it. So I read it once and then destroyed it, and I have little recollection of what it -- what the details of it were.

Q Was it an actual trust document?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't know.
Q Do you think you would recognize it if you saw it?

A No.
Q Do you remember anything about its contents?

A No.
Q Do you remember if it talked about who owned or controlled Bitcoin at all?

A No.
(Exhibit 41 marked for identification.)

Q I am handing you Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41. And I have neglected to print out the version with the Bates label, and I can't tell you which it is,

```
unfortunately. Exhibit -- Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41.
        Mr. Andresen, do you recognize this
email chain?
```

    A Yes.
    Q And it's a -- an email from Stefan
    Matthews, a/k/a the money man, to you; is that
correct --
MR. KASS: Object to form.
Q -- with a chain back and forth below
that?

A Yes.
Q And in it Stefan Mathews says to you -and I asked you about this email earlier, but you said you didn't recall it -- "The situation that unfolded this week was horrific. I will say no more other than to say till one minute prior to Craig's actions there was no indication that he would default. You have a public position on this that you will need to correct for sure. And we are looking at our business position today."

And then at the end it says, "CSW defaulted for reasons unknown to us at this stage, other than the conversation we had yesterday."

Do you see that?
A Yes.

Q Do you recall that conversation?
A No.
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I believe he's referring to, perhaps, an email that -- exchange we had the previous day, but I'm not positive about that.

Q And what -- do you remember what that email exchange was about?

A I think that was the email exchange where I put forward the two possibilities of maybe Craig had been conning people for years, or maybe he just couldn't handle the pressure.

Q Got it.
(Exhibit 42 marked for
identification.)
Q All right. I'm handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 42. Again, I did not print out the Bates labels.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q This is an email from Craig Wright to you and Roger Ver; is that right?

A Yes.
Q In mid 2018?
A Yes.

Q It starts, "I have solved Blacknet"?
A Yes.
Q Do you know what that means?
A No clue.
Q He then says, "Atlas has alread" -- I'm assuming that's "already" -- "shrugged."

Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q Do you know what he means there?
A I'm assuming he's referring to the Ayn Rand novel "Atlas Shrugged." But, yeah, no, I don't know what he's referring to.

Q Okay. Did you respond to this?
A No, I did not.
Q Did you talk to Roger about it?
A No, I didn't.
Q You just ignore it?
A I believe I ignored it. I know you maybe -- you have an email where I responded.

Q Whatever you recall.
A But I don't recall --
Q I'm not --
A -- responding to it.
Q -- setting you up for any traps. I'm
just --

A Okay.
Q -- asking your recollection.
A No, I -- I -- and it is a very cryptic email, and I don't recall thinking anything other than maybe Craig Wright is crazy.
(Exhibit 43 marked for
identification.)
Q I am handing you what's been marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 43 Bates-labeled 1482.

Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q It's an email from Craig to you?
A Yes.
Q In May of 2017?
A Yes.
Q He says, "The trust is all cleaned up
now."
You see that?
A I see that.
Q What was unclean about the trust before?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't know.
Q Did you ever ask him?
A No.
Q Did you ever get information -- any

1 information from Craig about the trust after this email that you can recall?

A Not that $I$ recall, no.
Q Has anyone else, beyond Craig, told you about his relationship with Dave Kleiman?

A Possibly Ian Grigg, but I'm not sure about that -- oh, and perhaps one of the money men. Yeah, and, again, I'm not sure about that. I'm not sure who told me what.

Q So you said you thought that maybe Craig Wright is a crazy person. Have you given any more thought to that since that email, and where do you come out?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A Yeah, I've wondered if maybe Craig is paranoid; that he might have, you know, the -- the psychological condition of paranoia. I'm not a psychologist, but it -- it seems like it would fit some of the -- the behavior I've -- I've seen from Craig.

Q Are you aware that in this lawsuit the Court has found that Craig committed perjury under oath?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No, I am not aware of that.

Q And are you aware that the court has also found he submitted forged documents to the Court?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I think I did see media reports about that.

Q That change your opinion of him at all?
A No, I don't think it does.
Q Why?
A Because I think even before that, you know, once he bamboozled me about what he was going to come out with when we were supposed to have these simultaneous blog posts where he announced himself to the world, you know, I realized he -- he was lying at least about that, and so -- and -- and I think in some of our conversations he had said he had lied about things in the past. He had maybe done things to muddy up the record. He didn't go into any specifics. So, you know, I think even before then $I$ got the impression, you know, he's a person who's not a hundred percent honest all the time. So it -- it didn't really change.

Q Were there times that he struck you as honest and others that he struck you as dishonest, or you were unable to tell when you were speaking with him?

A I don't --
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't think I am able to tell.
Q Okay.
MR. FREEDMAN: Let's take a
two-minute break, and I think I'm done, but $I$ just want to circle back with my notes, and we'll finish up our -- our deposition. Thank you.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
2:37 p.m. We are off the record.
(Off record.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time now is
2:50 p.m. We're coming back on the record.
MR. FREEDMAN: Oh, wait. Hold on.
Sorry. Go back off.
(Off record.)
MR. FREEDMAN: All right. We've got
an official conference line, so I hope that's better for anyone who's on the line.

Are we still on the record?
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Yes.
MR. FREEDMAN: Still on the record.
Okay.
BY MR. FREEDMAN:
Q I just want to go back to the
conversations you had with Craig and request
whether or not you had -- recall -- strike that.
Do you recall in any of your
conversations with Craig Wright him referring to Dave Kleiman as his partner?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I don't recall.
Q It's possible he did?
MR. KASS: Object to form.
A It's possible.
Q Beyond the time that he got emotional about Dave Kleiman, do you remember any other reference to Dave Kleiman?

MR. KASS: Object.
A I don't recall.
Q When he told you about the three people behind Satoshi, was that the same time he got emotional about Dave?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A I think so, but I'm not certain.
Q And do you recall -- can you do your best to tell me the words you recall him using when he -- when he told you that?

MR. KASS: Object to form.
A No, I'm sorry, I don't think I can.

Q The -- did he -- do you recall Craig ever mentioning the Tulip Trust to you?

A I think he did say the words "Tulip
Trust," although it might have been one of the money men who mentioned a Tulip Trust. Again, my recollection is very fuzzy, so...

MR. FREEDMAN: All right. No further questions.

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. KASS:
Q Well, Mr. Andresen, my name is Zalman Kass, I represent Dr. Craig Wright.

The previous instructions that you
received from Mr. Freedman, ask if you don't understand any questions or if you need a clarification, if you need a break, just let me know, those will still apply.

Do you recall opposing counsel asking whether sometimes Dr. Wright lied?

A Yes.
Q And your response was you believe he -he did lie in the past, correct?

A Yes.
Q Now, to the extent Dr. Wright told you anything about Dave Kleiman, could he have been
lying?
A Yes.
(Pause.)
MR. FREEDMAN: Objection to form.
Q Mr. Andresen, did you do anything to prepare for today's deposition?

A The only thing I did to prepare was this morning I did go back and look at that Reddit private message thread, just to refresh my memory a little bit about what might have -- what happened during the so-called proving ceremony in London.

Q Okay. And do you recall anything else that you did to prepare?

A No, nothing else.
Q All right. Did you speak to anybody in advance of this deposition related to the deposition?

A I certainly told my wife that I was gonna be at a deposition today --

Q Okay.
A -- but, no. Other than that, no.
Q All right. I'm gonna introduce as Exhibit 44 a document.
(Exhibit 44 marked for identification.)

Q Can you let me know if you recognize this document? And take your time to look through it.
(Witness perusing document.)
A Yes, this is the subpoena I received last year.

Q Okay.
A Last year? I think it was last year. Yeah, last year.

Q And did you produce documents in response to the subpoena?

A Yes, I did.
Q Did you produce all the documents that you had responsive to these requests?

A Yes, I did.
Q And, for example, in Request No. 4, that includes documents related to Craig Wright, Satoshi Nakamoto, or Dave Kleiman?

A Yes.
Q Okay. So would it be accurate to state that all those documents have already been produced in this case by you --

A Yes.
Q -- that you have in your possession?
A Yes. As far as $I$ know, yes.
Q And how did you go about ensuring that
you found those documents?
A Most of the documents -- well, I mean, there are -- there are -- let me back up.

So Craig Wright, Satoshi Nakamoto, and David Kleiman -- Satoshi I only ever communicated via either email or BitcoinTalk private forum messages.

Q Um-hm.
A And so all of those documents -- and the same thing for -- well, besides the in-person meeting with Craig Wright, all of our communications were via email. And so I -- I performed search over all of my Gmail inbox, like all -- you know, all mail sent, all mail received for Craig Wright, Satoshi Nakamoto, and David Kleiman. And then $I$ also did some manual searches in BitcoinTalk private messages, and the Reddit private messages I -- I -- I had related to -- to this matter.

Q Okay. Could we just actually switch exhibits out. I should have given you the marked one.

A Sure.
Q When did you first learn of Dave Kleiman's existence?

A I'm not sure.
Q Okay. Do you know if you learned of Dave Kleiman's existence before you learned of Craig Wright's existence?

A Again, I'm not sure.
Q Okay. Have you ever communicated with Dave Kleiman?

A Not that I know of.
Q Okay. Other than conversations that you may have had with Craig Wright or other people on Craig's -- you know, related to Craig's -- Craig Wright, has anybody ever -- else spoken to you about Dave Kleiman?

A I believe Ira Kleiman contacted me. I'm not sure anybody else has ever spoken to me about Dave Kleiman.

Q Okay. So would it be fair to say that any information that you have related to Dave Kleiman would either come from Ira, Craig, or somebody close to Craig?

A I mean, there's certain -- there have been reports in -- in media that I've read that -that talk about Dave Kleiman. So it's, again, possible I've -- I heard about him through some Reddit post or something that appeared in public
media.
Q Other -- if we were to exclude online media or some sort of posting, as far as like one-on-one conversations with somebody, any information would have come from either Craig -Dr. Craig Wright, Ira Kleiman, or someone close to Craig Wright; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q Are you familiar with the term "firsthand knowledge"?

A Vaguely.
Q Okay. What does it mean to you?
A Firsthand knowledge, it means you actually witnessed something happening; you didn't hear about it from somebody who witnessed a thing happening.

Q Okay. So we're gonna use that definition going forward.

A Okay.
Q Do you have any firsthand knowledge about a partnership between Dr. Wright and Craig -- I'm sorry -- Dr. Wright and Dave?

A No.
Q Okay. Do you have any firsthand knowledge about any intellectual property that Dave

Kleiman developed?
A No.
Q Do you have any firsthand knowledge as to any Bitcoin that Dave Kleiman may have mined?

A No.
Q Do you have any firsthand knowledge about a purported theft of Dave Kleiman's Bitcoin?

A No.
Q Do you have any firsthand knowledge about Bitcoin that Dr. Wright may have mined?

A No.
Q Do you have any firsthand knowledge about Dr. Wright's wealth?

A I'm not sure how to -- I certainly have emails, from an email address that I assumed was Craig Wright, talking about his wealth. Given the definition of firsthand knowledge, I -- that we were discussing --

Q Correct.
A -- I don't know how an email fits into that definition, but that's the only knowledge I have.

Q Okay. Well, let me ask you, those emails mention large sums, correct?

A Yes.

Q All right. I believe there was one about millions -- million something, correct?

A Hundreds of millions of somethings, yes.
Q Somethings, yes. Okay. Right.
Now, you haven't -- have you seen any
bank account statements where you could see hundreds of millions of something?

A No.
Q Okay. So any information -- is it fair
to say that any information that you would have about Dave Kleiman's wealth is based on an email that seems to come from Dave Kleiman's email inbox?

A You mean Craig Wright's email?
Q Craig -- yes. I'm sorry.
That seems to come from Craig Wright's email account, correct?

A Yes, correct.
Q All right. But you haven't verified whether or not -- whether that's accurate?

A Correct, I have not.
Q Okay. So would it be fair to say that you don't have firsthand knowledge as to whether that wealth, in fact, exists?

A I think that's fair to say, yes.
Q And do you have any firsthand knowledge

1 about whether Dave Kleiman -- Ira Kleiman -- Craig Wright has any trusts?

A No, I don't think I do.
Q Have you seen any trust documents?
A I'm not sure.
Q Okay. Do you recall having seen any trust documents?

A The only trust document I would have seen might have been that attachment that I said that I destroyed in an email exchange with Uyen Nguyen.

Q But is it accurate to state you don't really recall what -- it could have been a trust document, but you're just not -- you don't recall?

A That's correct, it could have been a trust document, but $I$ don't recall.

Q Okay. And you weren't a party to setting up of any trusts?

A No, I was not.
Q And do you have any firsthand knowledge of any trusts that Dave Kleiman may have been part of?

A No.
Q Now, I just asked you a whole bunch of questions, whether you had firsthand knowledge about many different subjects, correct?

A Yes.
Q To the extent you have any knowledge about those -- those subjects that is not firsthand knowledge, what would the source of that knowledge be? And we can go one by one if that's easier for you.

A I mean, the -- the -- the sources of any of those would be emails from Craig Wright, emails from Uyen Nguyen, emails from the so-called money guys who are part of the -- the London proving session $I$ was part of, and then any court documents or other things that I've seen reported in -- in public media.

Q Okay. And do you know whether those emails were, in fact, sent by Craig Wright or any of those other parties?

A Do I know for a hundred percent sure? No. Emails can be forged.

Q Sure. And they -- they could also be sent from an email address, but the person sending it is not actually the one who typed up the message, right?

A That is possible, yes.
Q At most we know it's from -- would it be fair to say that the most we know, it's from an
email address that is consistent with an email address that we believe those people use?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Now, you previously testified about a cryptographic proof session in London. Do you recall that?

A Yes.
Q And that cryptographic proof was related to either block 9 or 10 , depending on how you count, correct?

A Yes.
Q Did -- did Dr. Wright show you any cryptographic proofs for any other blocks?

A No.
Q Do you have any knowledge as to whether he has the ability to control any other Bitcoin blocks?

A No.
Q Now, if somebody had access to a Bitcoin private key in the past, does it mean they still have access to a Bitcoin private key?

A No.
Q Is it possible to have access one day and access not the other day?

A Yes, keys can be lost or stolen.

Q Okay. Do you recall the date that you had the proof session with Dr. Wright in London?

A That was one of the things I looked at -(Brief interruption.)
(Phone connection disconnected.)
A That was one of the things I looked at this morning, and I believe it was April 7th.

Q Okay. All right. And do you recall what time of day it was that the actual proof was shown to you?

A I think it was late afternoon.
Q Okay. So would it be fair to say that, at most, you can know that in the late afternoon of April 7th, Dr. Wright could have had the private key to block 9 or block 10, correct?

A Yeah. Yes.
Q You don't know if he had the private key prior to that, correct?

A Correct.
Q And you don't know if he had the private key after that?

A Correct.
Q And you don't know if -- when there were those email conversations going back and forth where people made representations on behalf of

Dr. Wright, that he would transfer money from a certain Bitcoin address, you don't know if he still had the key at that point in time?

A Correct.
Q And if he didn't have the key, it wouldn't be a very easy matter to make a transfer, correct?

A It -- it would be impossible.
Q Okay.
(Calling conference line.)
Q And it's -- and it's also possible that Dr. Wright did not, in fact, have the key in the evening of April 7th, 2016, right?

A Correct.
(Reconnecting into conference line.)
Q You testified before that you corresponded with Satoshi in 2010, correct?

A Correct.
Q And what was the nature of your relationship with Satoshi?

A It was very businesslike, very -- you know, one programming geek talking to another programming geek.

Q Okay. So would it be fair to say that large parts of your conversations were about
programming stuff?
A Yeah, basically all of our conversations were about programming stuff. My conversations in 2010 never really delved into anything personal. Yeah, it was all the bus -- about the business of making the Bitcoin software successful.

Q Okay. And did Satoshi ever share code with you?

A Did he share -- yes, he did share code with me.

Q And did you ever share code with Satoshi?
A Yes.
Q And did you have conversations with Satoshi about the code?

A Yes. We had back and forth about how things should be implemented.

Q And would it be accurate to state that you're familiar with Satoshi's programming abilities?

A Yes.
Q And that would be based on the email conversations that you had with Satoshi, correct?

A Yes, and also the -- the -- the code in -- that is in the Bitcoin repository, that open-source software code, that we know was written

```
by Satoshi.
```

Q Okay. I'm going to introduce Exhibit 48. (Exhibit 48 marked for identification.)

Q And, Mr. Andresen, do you recognize this document?

A 2010. Yeah.
Q What -- what -- what do you believe it is?

A Let's see, what were we doing here?
Q Well, I'm fine with the higher level understanding; like, for example, are you talking code with Satoshi? Let's start, is this an email with Satoshi?

A Yes, this is an email with Satoshi.
Q And are you talking about coding things?
A Yes, we're talking about coding things. I believe this is the new -- yes, this is the new RPC methods for talking to the -- the Bitcoin software and controlling the Bitcoin software.

Q Okay. Now, I'm going to introduce Exhibit 49.
(Exhibit 49 marked for identification.)

Q And do you recognize this document?

A Yes.
Q And is it an email between you and Satoshi Nakamoto?

A Yes, it is.
Q And are you talking about coding things and programming?

A Yes, we are.
Q Okay. And I'm going to introduce as Exhibit 45 this document.
(Exhibit 45 marked for identification.)

Q And if you look at the prior exhibit that I showed you, which was 49, there is an attachment to it. Do you have any knowledge as to whether this attachment is what's referred to in that email?
(Witness perusing document.)
Q If it does help, the -- the Bates numbers are sequential.

A Yes, I think this is the attachment that would go with that email.

Q Okay. Thank you.
And, again, so not only are you
talking about coding stuff in the -- the body of the email, you're actually exchanging code with

Satoshi?
A Yes.
(Exhibit 46 marked for identification.)

Q I'm going to introduce Exhibit 46. And do you recognize this document?

A Yes.
Q And are -- it's a Satoshi email --
MR. FREEDMAN: Zalman, you said 46.
It's 51, I think.
MR. KASS: What -- what was I saying,
please?
THE WITNESS: This says Exhibit 46.
MR. KASS: 46. I had jumped five by mistake, so $I$ just kind of went back to -- to fill in the numbers I didn't have. There were two rows of stickies.

MR. FREEDMAN: This is going to
become your new trademark, Mr. Kass.
MR. KASS: Are you confused yet?
BY MR. KASS:
Q Okay. Exhibit 46, is this an email between you and Satoshi?

A Yes.
Q And what's -- is this email about coding

1 and programming things?

A Yes.
Q Okay.
(Exhibit 47 marked for
identification.)
Q I am introducing Exhibit 47. And do you recognize this document?

A Yes.
Q Is it an email conversation between you and Satoshi Nakamoto?

A Yes.
Q Are you talking about programming and coding things?

A Yes.
Q All right.
(Exhibit 50 marked for
identification.)
Q Okay. I'm going to introduce Exhibit 50. Do you recognize this email?

A Yes.
Q Is this a conversation between you and Satoshi Nakamoto?

A Yes.
Q Is it about coding and programming?
A Yeah. A particularly annoying one, yes.

Q I'm just curious, what was particularly annoying about this one?

A Just the -- cleanly shutting down the application took many revisions. It seems like it should be a very simple thing to do, but it was much more complicated.

Q And did you work with Satoshi on that?
A Yes.
(Exhibit 51 marked for identification.)

Q Now, I'm going to introduce Exhibit 51, which is a sequential Bates number from the prior email that $I$ sent to you. If you could take a peek at it, and let me know if that is an attachment in Exhibit 50.

A Yes, it is.
Q So would it be fair to say that, in addition to speaking about coding in the body of Exhibit 50, you are also sharing code, actual code, with Satoshi?

A Yes.
Q And Satoshi was sharing code with you as kind of back --

A Yes --
Q -- you know, a two-way street?

A -- we would trade what are called
"patches" back and forth.
(Exhibit 52 marked for identification.)

Q Okay. I'm going to introduce Exhibit 52.
Do you recognize this document?
A Satoshi to me. Yes.
Q Is it an email between you and Satoshi
Nakamoto?
A Yes.
Q Are you talking about programming and coding?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And -- okay.
(Exhibit 53 marked for identification.)

Q I'm going to introduce Exhibit 53. Do you recognize this document?

A Yes.
Q Is it a conversation between you and Satoshi Nakamoto?

A Yes.
Q Is it related to programming and coding?
A Yes.
Q I'm going to introduce Exhibit No. 54.
(Exhibit 54 marked for
identification.)
Q Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q Is it an email between you and

```
Satoshi Nakamoto?
```

A Yes.
Q Is it related to programming and coding?
A Yes.
Q Okay.
(Exhibit 55 marked for
identification.)
Q I'm going to introduce Exhibit 55. Do

```
you recognize this document?
```

A Yes.
Q Is it an email between you and Satoshi Nakamoto?

A Yes.
Q Is it related to programming and coding?
A Yes. I'm detecting a pattern.
Q Yes. We're getting to the end of it.
(Exhibit 56 marked for
identification.)
Q I'm introducing Exhibit No. 56. Do you recognize this document?

A Yes.
Q Is it an email between you and Satoshi
Nakamoto?
A Yes.
Q Does it relate to coding -- coding and programming?

A Yes.
Q All right. Is it -- is it fair to say we just looked at a large number of documents that are communications between you and Satoshi Nakamoto related to programming and coding?

A Yes.
Q As it related to the Bitcoin software?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And based on all those emails, did you form an opinion as to Satoshi's coding or programming abilities?

A Yes.
Q And how would you describe his programming and coding abilities?

A I would say he's a very good coder, although a little bit old-fashioned.

Q Okay. I actually have two more exhibits we've got to do.
(Exhibit 57 marked for
identification.)

Q I'm going to introduce Exhibit 57. Do you recognize this document?

A Yes.
Q Is it an email between you and Satoshi
Nakamoto?
A Yes.
Q Does it relate to programming and coding?
A Yes.
Q And, again, I am going to introduce now as Exhibit 58, which is sequentially marked.
(Exhibit 58 marked for
identification.)
Q And do you recognize this to be the -- do you recognize 58 to be the attachment from Exhibit 57?

A Yes.
Q And what is attached, would you -- would it be fair to say, is coding and programming related?

A Yes.
Q Is it actual code?
A It's actual code.
Q And this is actual code from Satoshi
Nakamoto?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Would you consider Satoshi a brilliant programmer?

A Definitely a top 10 percent programmer.
Q All right. And when you say "top" -"top 10 percent," is that in the world? In the US? I just want to understand a little bit more what you mean.

A Among all the programmers that I've interacted with, he's definitely in the top 10 percent. I've known better programmers. I've known a lot of worse programmers.

Q Sure. Okay. And how would you rank yourself in the -- in the hierarchy of programmers?

A I'd say I'm in the top 10 percent also.
Q All right. So --
A I'm a little slower than most programmers, but I'm -- I think I have fewer bugs.

Q Okay. So would you consider yourself on equal footing with Satoshi?

A It depends on what we were programming, but, yeah, roughly equal.

Q Okay.
(Exhibit 59 marked for identification.)

Q I am going to introduce Exhibit 59.
Now, I'm gonna ask you to turn to the second page of the exhibit. And then I'm going to ask you to look at the fifth paragraph from the bottom, and the paragraph starts with "Over."

A Sure.
Q Okay. And then do you see on the second line it says, "I mean, Satoshi is a brilliant programmer, but he also acts like a lone wolf." And then if you go on a little further, this statement is attributed to you. Do you recall making that statement?

A Yes, I believe I did.
Q Okay.
A I've said similar statements in the past.
Q All right. So -- and is that an accurate statement?

A Yes.
Q Okay. So based on your interactions with Satoshi, it's your belief that he was a brilliant programmer?

A Yes.
Q So would it be fair to say that Satoshi would know how to create a simple programmer -program?

A Yes.
Q And if someone told you that Satoshi needed help creating a simple program, what would your reaction be?

A I would need to know a little bit more. I mean, certainly if it was an unfamiliar programming language or unfamiliar programming environment, then I could imagine needing help. Even I would need help writing Ruby code, for example; $I$ don't know the programming language Ruby .

Q Um-hm. But if it wasn't an issue of -of languaging, if you -- if -- if Satoshi was able to use whatever code -- programming language he wanted, would you be surprised that he had difficulty creating a simple program?

A Yes, I would be surprised.
Q All right. And would you be surprised if he would have to reach out to his best friend, who was a programmer, and ask him to create simple programs?

A Yes.
Q What's a -- are you familiar with the term "simple script"?

A $\quad$ Simple script"?

Q Yeah.
A No, I don't think so, at least not as a -- not as a term.

Q Okay. Well, if $I$ were to define a simple script as a series of moderately simple commands, sort of like a macro in Excel --

A Sure.
Q -- would you understand what that is?
A Absolutely, yes.
Q Yeah. Would you consider that programming?

A It's a kind of programming.
Q Do you believe Satoshi's skills were in excess of writing simple scripts?

A Again, it depends. I mean, for example, the first version of Bitcoin ran on Windows, and if Satoshi was a Windows programmer that needed to write some UNIX scripts on a server, then $I$ could imagine him reaching out to somebody to help out with -- with that kind of task. Again, it would be like -- it's -- it's basically a different programming language.

Q Okay. Well, if somebody were to state that Satoshi only knew how to write simple scripts, as a blanket statement, would that be consistent
with your interactions with Satoshi?
A No. The Satoshi $I$ was interacting with had a demonstrated ability to produce code. Or at least, you know, I received code in emails. I have no firsthand knowledge that the person I was communicating via email actually wrote the code.

Q Okay.
A But I assume that it -- that it was the same person.

Q Well, let me ask you. In the emails that we've looked at, in the body of the emails, are there discussions about code?

A Yes.
Q Okay. So based on those -- the messages in the body of the email, would it be accurate to state that this Satoshi, or the person who held himself out as Satoshi that you were speaking with, was a programmer?

A Yes.
Q And a coder?
A Yes.
Q And able to do things more advanced than simple scripts?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Do you recall testifying earlier
on that somebody reached out to you regarding Craig Wright showing himself as Satoshi, correct?

A Yes.
Q And your initial reaction was skepticism?
A Yes.
Q I believe you said highly skeptical?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And that was because other people in the past had claimed they were Satoshi?

A Quite a few, yes.
Q Okay. And, in fact, you said I'm not getting on that plane until I'm -- a plane to London until I'm reasonably certain that Craig Wright is Satoshi?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And there was an email with four different ways that you could be reasonably certain that you were speaking with Satoshi, correct?

A Yes.
Q All right. And if you could take a look at Exhibit 4, previously marked.

A (Witness complied.)
Q Now -- all right, if you look at the bottom, it says, "I want to see" and then you have one, two, three, four. Do you recall if it was
that you wanted to see all four or if one of them was sufficient?

A The more, the better. The more, the more certain $I$ felt $I$ would be.

Q Okay. Now, if you look at all of those four options, or at least the first three of them, there's some language in parentheticals. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And the first one, where you ask for a PGP key that Satoshi used, what do you -what do you state in parentheticals?

A "But his computer could have been hacked."

Q And what's the import of that?
A The import is that a PGP key can be stolen, and somebody else can use it to impersonate somebody if they have access to that piece of data.

Q All right. And, therefore, it's not a perfect proof; is that fair?

A That's fair, yeah, it's not a perfect proof.

Q All right. And then we go down to the second one, which is a message signed with the keys from the early Bitcoin blocks. And, again, there's
something in parentheticals. Could you read that?
A "But his wallet could have been stolen."
Q And what's the import of that?
A Again, I mean, the keys are pieces of data.

Q Um-hm.
A The fact that you have a key, it doesn't tell you anything about how you obtained that key, so keys can be stolen. And so, again, somebody could have stolen those keys and used them to pretend to be the person who actually mined the blocks way back in 2009 .

Q Okay. Now, the third one on that list is an email or private forum post he sent to me in 2010. And, again, you have a parenthetical. What's that parenthetical?

A "But email could have been hacked."
Q And, again, what's the import of that?
A Again, email is just data. So if you hack into a computer, you could steal somebody's emails and then present them as if they were your own.

Q Okay. And then there's the fourth one, which is a conversation about technical stuff, ideally via email, so $I$ can see if it feels like
the same person I communicated with in 2010?
A Yes.
Q Is there any parenthetical after that?
A No.
Q All right. So would it be fair to say, out of those four options, the fourth option would be the most convincing?

A I mean, I -- I'm not sure I would say the most convincing. I mean, certainly if -- if you could produce the other three, I think they would have more weight. I think any individual one -yeah, no, $I$ don't think $I$-- I don't think it's -it's the one that would be most convincing to me.

I think the other three, if you could produce them, would be more convincing, just because I don't trust myself to -- to judge whether, you know, two documents are produced by the same person. That's just not a skill that I feel like, you know, I'm -- I'm super great at.

Q All right. Well, let me ask you. For the fourth one, which was this email conversation, you didn't identify any downsides over there?

A That's correct.
Q All right. And so would it be fair to say that at that point in time, which, based on the
email, is March 29, 2016, you didn't identify that as a downside?

A I didn't identify what as a downside?
Q Your inability to adequately --
A -- judge whether I'm communicating with the same --

Q Yes.
A -- person $I$ was in the past? Correct. Yes.

Q Okay. Now, which of the four did Dr. Wright eventually end up using?

A I believe a message signed with a key from the early Bitcoin block is the only one.

Q That was a poor question. Sorry. Can I take that back?

A Sure.
Q You can -- I don't want to interrupt. You can answer, but I'm gonna change the question anyways. Before you got on the plane to go to London, which one of those four did Dr. Wright use?

A The conversation about technical stuff. So we did have a back-and-forth conversation about the state of Bitcoin --

Q All right.

A -- and what his thoughts were.
Q And was that conversation through email?
A Yes.
Q Was there a phone conversation?
A I don't think so, no.
Q Okay.
A I -- I might be -- I might be

```
misremembering, but I don't think there was.
```

Q I'm going to introduce Exhibit 60. (Exhibit 60 marked for identification.)

Q Do you recognize that document?
A Yes.
Q Is it an email that appears to be from Stefan Matthews to you?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And what does it say about -like, do you -- do you know what the purpose of this email was?

A It was part of the logistics of me traveling to London --

Q Um-hm.
A -- to witness signing of an early Bitcoin block.

Q Okay. And if you look at the third
paragraph, the one that starts with, I am looping Craig into this email so that the two of you have the necessary email contact information for the exchange of information prior to the substantial discussion information exchange in London.

Reading that, do you have any additional recollection as to what the purpose of this email was?
(Pause.)
Q I can re-ask it.
Was one of the reasons of this email
so that Craig could be in contact with you to then give you the fourth -- the fourth option of the list of proofs?

A Yes, probably.
Q And that would just be based on reading that paragraph, what I just read to you?

A Exactly, yes.
Q Okay.
A I mean, I have -- I have very little recollection of exactly what happened when.

Q All right. But this is consistent with what you recall?

A Yes.
Q Okay. I'm going to introduce Exhibit 67.

A This says --
Q I'm sorry --
A -- 61 .
Q -- 61. I misread. Thank you. (Exhibit 61 marked for identification.)

Q Do you recognize this document?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And is it an email between
Dr. Craig Wright and yourself?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Now, I'm gonna introduce another exhibit, and this exhibit is going to be Exhibit No. 62.
(Exhibit 62 marked for identification.)

Q All right. Do you recognize this
document?
A Yes.
Q Is it an email between you and Craig Wright?

A Yes.
Q What is the time -- what -- when was the email sent, what time?

A It says April 3rd, 2016, 11:06 a.m.

Q All right. And then if you look at the other email, which is Exhibit 61, what's the time on that email?

A It says April 3rd, 2016, 11:53 a.m.
Q All right. So would it be fair to say that these emails are about 50 minutes apart, slightly less?

MR. KASS: 50.
A Yes.
Q Now, could you just take a minute to quickly look over the two emails, because I'm going to be asking you questions. I just want to make sure you're familiar with it.
(Witness perusing documents.)
Q And that's fine if you just read the first page of both emails.

A I'll skim.
Q That's fine.
(Witness perusing document.)
A Okay.
Q And would it be fair to say that there are similarities between these two emails?

A Yeah.
Q Okay. And would it be fair to say that, for the most part, it's the same substance, but

```
they're in different writing styles?
MR. FREEDMAN: Objection, form.
```

A Yes.
Q All right. Now, let's go to Exhibit 61. If you look at the first paragraph, does Dr. Wright give any explanation as to why he sent you two emails less than 50 minutes apart with similar substance?
(Witness perusing document.)
A Well, the first paragraph says, Using this style, I've written many blog posts. Has a few minor alterations to my standard prose. The following is more in line to how I naturally write.

Q Okay. Now, when he says, "Using this" -so he says, "The first email I send to you a few moments back." Do you understand that to mean Exhibit 62?

A I'm not sure.
Q Okay. Well, was that email sent a few moments back?

A According to the dates in the sent, then, yes, it was sent 50 minutes before the --

Q Okay.
A -- before Exhibit 61.
Q And it has similar content?

A It does have similar content, yes.
Q But a different writing style?
A Different words, certainly, yes.
Q All right. So would you be comfortable stating that it's probable that is the communication Dr. Wright was referring to?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And if -- if there were no other emails between -- in that 50 -minute span, would you be very convinced that that is the actual -- that Dr. Wright is referring to Exhibit 62 when he says, "The email I send to you a few moments back"?

A Yes.
MR. FREEDMAN: Objection to form.
Q Okay. Now, was part of this, these two emails, did you understand it that Dr. Wright was trying to show you that he could write like Satoshi Nakamoto?

A I hadn't thought about it until now, frankly.

Q All right. And now that you've thought about it...

A Now that I've thought about it, yeah, that seems to be what he's doing here.

Q And you, in fact, were familiar with

Satoshi's writing style, correct?
A Yes. I think I probably read everything that he wrote publicly.

Q Sure. And, in addition to what Satoshi had -- had written publicly, you had also had a series of email conversations with Satoshi, correct?

A Yes.
Q Now, we've seen a lot of them related to coding-type things and programming, correct?

A Yes.
Q But would it be accurate to state that some of those conversations were more expansive than that?

A Yes, we'd talk about things related to making the Bitcoin project succes -- successful. (Pause.)

MR. KASS: We're gonna take a
five-minute break. Off the record.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
3:46 p.m. We're going off the record.
(Off record.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time now is
3:51 p.m. We're back on the record.
(Exhibit 63 marked for
identification.)
BY MR. KASS:

Q I'm introducing Exhibit 63. Do you

```
recognize that document?
```

A Yes.
Q It is an email conversation between you and Satoshi Nakamoto?

A Yes.
Q And in this email, it's -- are you talking about more than just coding?

A Well --
Q Let me rephrase that question. More than just code?

A More than just code. Yeah, we're talking about user interface for the Bitcoin software and how it should work.
(Exhibit 64 marked for
identification.)
Q And I'm going to introduce Exhibit 64.

```
Do you recognize this document?
```

A Yes.
Q And is it an email between you and Satoshi Nakamoto?

A Yes.
Q And are you talking about more -- or is

Satoshi talking to you more than just about code?
A Yeah, he's talking about -- well, he's talking about the design of the -- of the software and how it should work.
(Exhibit 65 marked for identification.)

Q And I'm going to introduce Exhibit 65. Do you recognize this document?

A Yes.
Q Is it an email between you and Satoshi Nakamoto?

A Yes.
Q And are you talking about more than just code?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And would it be fair to -- and would it be fair to say it's a fairly lengthy email from Satoshi Nakamoto to yourself?

A Yeah, it's mostly about code, but there are -- I mean, we do talk about team members and -and kind of higher level software development stuff.

Q Okay. And I'm going to introduce Exhibit 66.
(Exhibit 66 marked for

Q Do you recognize this document?
A Yes.
Q Is it an email between you and Satoshi Nakamoto?

A Yes.
Q Are you talking about anything in addition to code? And by "you," I also mean Satoshi. The conversation, does it involve things in addition to code?

A Yeah, we're talking about potential attacks on the Bitcoin software.

Q All right. So I just showed you four exhibits, and would it be accurate to state that in the last four exhibits that $I$ just showed you, those are examples of conversations you had with Satoshi Nakamoto that encompassed things in addition to coding and programming language?

A Yes.
MR. FREEDMAN: Object to form.
Q So based on that, would -- would it be fair to state that you had an understanding as to Satoshi's writing style?

A I think I had a --
MR. FREEDMAN: Objection to form.

A I would say I had a feeling for Satoshi's writing style. I'm not sure I would say understanding.

Q And do you recall if, after receiving the -- the two emails from Dr. Wright that were about 50 minutes apart, if that was sufficient to convince you to go on a plane to London to meet him?

A Yes, I believe that was sufficient to convince me to get on an airplane.

Q Okay. So would it be fair to state that you believed that that writing style was consistent with the previous writing style of Satoshi?

A Yes. I felt like it could be the same person.

Q Okay. And when Dr. Wright sent you those emails, what year was it in?

A When Dr. Wright sent me those emails, I would have to go back and look at the -- the -- the email headers. 2016, was it? Again, I have a terrible memory for dates.

Q You can look at the email. It's just a few back.

$$
\text { A } \quad 2016 .
$$

Q Okay. Could -- do you know if Dave

```
Wright -- Dave Kleiman wrote those emails for
    Dr. Wright?
    A I'm sorry. Ask that again.
    Q Do you know if -- if Dave Kleiman wrote
those emails for Dr. Wright, those two emails that
were -- that were 50 minutes apart?
    A I -- I don't know.
    Q Do you know if he could have written
those emails?
    A I don't know.
    Q Do you know if he was alive at that point
in time?
    A I don't know.
    Q If I were to tell you he passed away in
        2013, would that affect your answer?
    A If you tell me he died in 2013, then I
        don't believe in ghosts.
    Q So you don't believe it was Dave Kleiman
        who was communicating with you in 2016?
    A Correct. I believe it was Craig Wright.
    Q Okay.
    A Maybe there are ghosts.
    Q How would you describe your relationship
-- your current -- your current relationship with
Craig Wright?
```

A I don't think I have a relationship with Craig Wright at the moment.

Q Okay. How would you describe your relationship with Craig Wright after you flew to London?

A I would say we had a cordial relationship.

Q Okay. And were you shown emails earlier on today where you continued communicating with Dr. Craig Wright after that public session, correct -- or after the -- after the -- Dr. Wright released that -- what appeared -- what he stated was the -the transaction, correct --

MR. FREEDMAN: Objection to form.
Q -- publicly?
A Yes, we continued to have some email conversations sporadically after that whole proving session and then blog post and then mess.

Q Sure. And were there some sort of apologies going back and forth?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And did you tell him that you understood, and you didn't really hold hard feelings?

A I -- well, it's what $I$ said in the email,
which I -- I don't recall exactly what I said, but
it is in the email.

Q Okay.
A I believe I said I was not angry, but I was disappointed, and I certainly, personally, took a lot of heat and abuse.

Q But -- but you weren't angry with him?
A No, I don't think $I$ was angry.
Q Okay. Now, you've testified previously this morning that you've been doing coding for quite a while?

A Yes.
Q And how many years have you been doing coding?

A Well, let's see. I graduated from high school in 1984. I got my first -- I saved up when I was a freshman in high school for my Commodore 64, which would have been 1980 -- about 1980.

Q Um-hm.
A So since 1980, probably, I've been programming.

Q Okay. And was a portion of that programming professionally?

A Yes.

Q Would it be fair to say that you have sufficient skills to look at code that was written and have an understanding as to the coder's coding style?

A Yes.
Q And have you looked at the original Bitcoin software code?

A Yes.
Q Have you read the entire code of the original release?

A I don't think I've read every single line, but I've read large portions of it.

Q Okay. And have you reached any opinion as to how many people wrote the code?

A My impression is that a small number of people, possibly one, wrote the code, just because, in a large programming project, you have to do a -a good job of documenting what you're doing and kind of coordinating among multiple people, and the original Bitcoin code didn't have kind of any of that. It was dense and -- and not a lot of comments, not a lot of explanation of, you know, what different pieces of the code were doing. So that -- that gave me the impression that it was a small number of people, maybe one person.

Q Okay. Would you state that it was likely by one person?

MR. FREEDMAN: Objection, form.
A It could be. I mean, any piece of code, you know, there are -- it wouldn't surprise me at all if -- if different parts were written by different people. I mean, it's -- it's a large -well, it's a moderate size code base --

Q Um-hm.
A -- but a lot of different parts. And so it wouldn't surprise me at all if, you know, some of the networking code was written by a different person, for example.

Q Right. So a discrete portion of it could have been written by someone else?

A Yes.
Q Okay. But as far as the general body of it, would it be fair to say, based on actually looking at the code, that it appears that it likely was one person who did the bulk of the work?

A Probably.
MR. FREEDMAN: Objection to form.
A It's possible it was multiple people who just had the same coding style.

Q Um-hm.

A You know, certainly like if people work together at a company, there's usually a company coding style, and, you know, it is possible to create, you know, a body of code that has a very consistent coding style that's written by more than one person.

Q And if you were to do that, would the coders have to have similar skill sets as far as coding goes?

A No.
Q Okay. So could you have a coder who only knows how to write BASIC script drafting code together with someone who's a brilliant coder?

A Yeah, I'd say that's possible.
Q And -- and how would that work?
A Well --
MR. FREEDMAN: Objection, form.
A -- in any piece of software, there will be parts of the software that are critical --

Q Um-hm.
A -- that have to be absolutely right, and that there will be other parts of the software that just aren't critical. For example, you know, like you might write code that prints out a help message if you get something wrong. You know, a junior
programmer could very easily be in charge of doing all the help messages or something.

Q Right. But would that junior programmer at least need to know how to code and program; that be fair?

A Sure, yes.
Q Okay.
A It's not that hard.
Q Hey, to me this is...
A I'm sure I could teach you.
Q All right. Okay. Now, if we could go back to -- I need to find an exhibit. Sorry.
(Pause.)
Q All right. If you could go back to Exhibit 59.

A (Witness complied.)
Q And if you could go to the last page, so it's 3 of 3.

A Yeah.
Q And do you see where it says, "If you ask a geek to look at some of the code I've written in the past, and look at Satoshi's early code, they can tell it's written by two different people, a different writing style," right? You could tell. "I mean, you could tell the difference between a

```
Kurt" --
```

THE STENOGRAPHER: Excuse me?
MR. KASS: I'm sorry.
Q "You could tell the difference between a Kurt Vonnegut novel and a Jackie Collins novel, or whatever."

Do you recall stating that?
A I don't recall it, but I believe that I did.

Q Okay. So would it be fair to state, at least based on that comment, that you believe there was one person who wrote the Bitcoin code?

A No.
Q Okay. And why, why not?
A Again, you can have multiple people who have the same coding style.

Q Okay. So other than -- okay. Let me rephrase that question.

So would it be fair to state that you believed that the Bitcoin software was written in one style -- coding style?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And that could either mean that one person wrote it, or that more than one person wrote it but that they all had the same coding

A If I recall correctly, I got a little bit of sleep at the hotel room.

Q Um-hm.
A And then I met with the, quote-unquote, money guys; and then, yeah, an hour or two after meeting with them, Craig Wright came into the room.

Q Okay. And do you recall how much sleep you got?

A Just a couple of hours, one or two hours.
Q Okay. So -- and you had previously testified that you were jet lagged?

A Yes. Yes, I -- I -- I can't sleep on airplanes very well, so...

Q Okay. And you had also testified that you don't remember a lot of specific details of
that day?
A Correct. I remember a few details, but not many at all.

Q All right. And, for example, you couldn't remember exactly how the signing took place?

A Correct.
Q And you couldn't remember how the hotel Wi-Fi was accessed?

A Correct.
Q And I'm not gonna go through every single one, but you would agree that today you -- you acknowledge that there are multiple things you could not remember about that, right?

A Yes. Like I wouldn't be able to tell you what brand of laptop was purchased. I just -- I don't remember. I don't know.

Q Okay. And is one reason for that because you were jet lagged?

A Yes, probably. I mean, the other reason would be I -- I tend to have a bad memory for details. Good memory for numbers --

Q Okay.
A -- but bad memory for dates, proper names, details of what happened last week, last
month, last year.

Q And could another reason also be the passage of time?

A Absolutely.
Q Because all this took place in 2016, correct?

A Correct.
Q So almost five years ago?
A 2020. Four years.
Q Four years. Yeah, almost four years ago?
A Yes.
Q Now, you initially stated that you recalled some sort of conversation about Dave Kleiman?

A Yes.
Q But initially you weren't very convinced -- or very -- weren't very -- would it -- would it be fair to say that -- that you weren't very sure in your memories?

A Yes. I certainly -- I don't remember what I heard when or what I have read in public accounts.

Q Okay. And is it possible that what you know about Satosh -- Craig's involvement or Dave's purported involvement in -- at Satoshi came from a
source other than Dr. Craig Wright?
A I think that's unlikely, because I do have that memory of -- of Craig being emotional around the subject of Dave.

Q Okay. So you have in your mind that Dr. Wright was emotional about Craig, and that happened in London, correct?

A Dr. Wright was emotional about --
Q -- Dave.
A -- Dave.
Q And it happened --
A That happened in London, yes.
Q Okay. Around the proof session time?
A Yes.
Q Okay. But -- and that's -- is that because -- and why -- why, in particular, does that stick out in your mind?

A I think it just sticks out because when you see somebody acting obviously emotional, sad, choked up, that's the kind of thing that just sticks in your memory.

Q Okay.
A You know, it's -- it's unusual; you don't generally see a grown man almost crying.

Q So would it be fair to state that

Dr. Wright was upset about the passing of Dave Kleiman?

A Yes, that -- he appeared to be, yes.
Q And he was emotional about that?
A Yes.
Q Now -- but as far as the actual -- actual substance of the conversation that Dr. Wright said about Dave Kleiman, do you recall much about that?

A No, I don't.
Q Okay. So what you really remember most is his emotions?

A Yes.
Q And that there was a conversation about Dave Kleiman?

A A conversation. Yeah, some discuss -some mention.

Q A mentioning?
A Yes.
Q Okay. All right. But -- but you can't state for certain that at that point in time he -Dr. Wright said Dave Kleiman was the third Satoshi? MR. FREEDMAN: Objection, form.

A I do seem to recall him saying that there were three people involved, and that Dave was one of the three people involved.

Q Okay. So now you do recall that that happened at that conversation?

MR. FREEDMAN: Objection.
A I believe that did -- that did happen around -- yes.

Q All right. Could it have been that somebody else had said it --

MR. FREEDMAN: Objection.
Q -- other than Dr. Wright?
MR. FREEDMAN: Objection.
A It's possible.
Q And is it possible -- do you recall that there was a chain of emails from somebody called "Uyen Nguyen"?

A Yes.
Q And do you recall if she talked about Dave Kleiman in those emails?

A I don't recall. I'd have to go back and read those emails.

Q Okay. So if I were to show you an email where she's talking about Dave's involvement in Satoshi, could -- could that be the source of your memory as to Dave's involvement?

A It's possible, but $I$ think unlikely.
Q Okay. Well, how about we look at the

```
emails.
    A Okay.
    Q It's not a memory test.
    A Good, because I would fail, miserably.
            (Exhibit 68 marked for
            identification.)
    Q Okay. I'm going to introduce for the
record -- I'm jumping one 'cause I mislabeled --
we'll get back to it maybe -- but I'm introducing
68.
            Do you recognize this email?
            A Yes.
            Q Is it an email between Uyen Nguyen and
                yourself?
            A Yes.
            Q Okay. Now, do you see in the first
                paragraph how she is mentioning Dave Kleiman?
            A Yes.
            Q And -- and Craig Wright?
            A Yes.
            Q And then if you go down to the paragraph
                that "I write this letter"; you see that?
            A Yes.
            Q And there it says, "Craig is one-third
                Satoshi"?
```

A Yes.
Q And, "He is the only survivor now"?
A Yes.
Q All right. And do you understand if -if Dave Kleiman was alive in 2016?

A You have told me he was not.
Q Okay. Now, would it be fair to state that, based on this email at least, Uyen Nguyen is stating that Craig Wright was only one-third of Satoshi?

A Yes.
Q And that there were other people, I presume, with the other two-thirds?

A Yes.
Q Could this have been the source of your memory that Craig was only a third of Satoshi?

MR. FREEDMAN: Objection, form.
A May 3rd, 2016. I suppose it's possible.
Q Now, I think this actually might help us a lot. Okay.
(Exhibit 69 marked for identification.)

Q I am going to introduce Exhibit 69.
Do you recognize this document?
A Yes.

Q What is it?
A This is the blog post I wrote in 2016 saying that $I$ believe Craig Wright is Satoshi Nakamoto.

Q And what month did you write it in?
A May -- I posted it on May of 2016.
Q That's fair.
And that was after you met with
Dr. Wright in London, correct?
A Yes, that's correct.
Q And that -- that was a few weeks after?
MR. FREEDMAN: Objection.
A Yes.
MR. FREEDMAN: A month.
Q And did you do your best to make sure that what you posted on the blog was as accurate that you believed could be?

MR. FREEDMAN: Objection, form.
A Yes.
Q Let me ask -- let me ask it another way. Would you write something on your blog that you had doubts as to the veracity?

A No.
Q Now, could you read the first sentence of the blog?

1

A "I believe Craig Steven Wright is the person who invented Bitcoin."

Q Now, I want you to focus on the word "the," okay? If you had been told that Craig -- by Craig Wright that he was only one -- a third of Bitcoin, would you have written, "I believe Dr. Craig Wright is 'the' person who invented Bitcoin"?

A Maybe.
Q Okay. Do you care to explain?
A Yeah. Because, if I recall correctly, and it's very possible that $I$ don't, Craig had said that he was the primary creator, the inventor of Bitcoin, the system, but he had help from other people in the beginning to actually make it happen.

Q So when did that -- if that -- if that conversation took place, which we're not sure, wouldn't it have been more accurate to state that I believe Craig Steven Wright is one of the people who invented Bitcoin?

A Inventing means you came up with the idea.

Q Okay.
A So if I had said, you know, I think it -I could say I believe Craig Wright is one of the
people who developed the first version of the Bitcoin software, you know, I think that's what I would have said.

But, I mean, the word "invented" means came up with the idea, sprang out of your head, and so that's what $I$ mean there.

Q Okay. So would it be fair to say that regardless of what conversation you had with Craig Wright in -- in London, which, you know, we understand there's some clouds surrounding it, but whatever had happened, at a minimum, you still believe that Craig Wright was the brain child, the one who came up with the idea?

A I have my doubts at this point.
Q Correct. But at this point, I just want to know --

A When I wrote the blog post, yes, I believed that he was the primary --

Q Sure.
A -- inventor of the idea of Bitcoin.
Q Right. And just to clarify, I'm just trying to work backwards, just to figure out what that conversation could have been. Because we know for sure what you wrote, and we know that you were trying to do your best to make sure it was

1 accurate. So I'm trying to figure out what the parameters of your conversation could have been.

A Okay.
Q Okay. So would it be fair to state that Dr. Wright didn't tell you that Dave Kleiman was an inventor of Bitcoin?

A Correct.
Q Okay. And that, at most, he had an assisting role, if that conversation happened? MR. FREEDMAN: Objection.

A Yes. And I think, for example, he said the third mysterious person -- if I recall correctly --

Q Um-hm.
A -- this third mysterious person helped out with the cryptography.

Q Okay. Do you recall, if this conversation happened, what Dave's role would have been?

A No.
Q We know it could have been something, but not the invention portion of it?

A Sure.
Q Okay. You've been involved in Bitcoin since around 2010; is that accurate?

A Yes.
Q Would it be fair to state that certain people may have very strong opinions as to how Bitcoin should look or function?

A Yes. Yes. Many people have many opinions on how Bitcoin should function.

Q And that some people have done pretty drastic things to try and get their way?

A That's fair to say.
Q Okay. Do you know if people have ever been hacked in the controversy -- in the Bitcoin controversies?

MR. FREEDMAN: Objection, form.
A I don't know if people have been hacked.
I don't have any firsthand knowledge that people have been hacked.

Q Sure. Did there come a point in time where -- are you familiar with -- I believe it's called "Bitcoin XT"?

A Yes.
Q Are you familiar with it?
A Yes. I was one of the creators of Bitcoin XT.

Q Sure. And does Bitcoin XT currently exist?

A $\quad$ No.
Q What happened to Bitcoin XT?
A Bitcoin XT was a project that, if $I$ recall correctly, Mike Hearn and I launched to try to increase the Bitcoin block size to allow more transactions on the Bitcoin network. And it failed to get enough miner support. The Bitcoin miners did not go along with it, and it was extremely controversial when we launched it.

There also -- it was attacked by denial-of-service attacks; and, certainly, Mike and I took a lot of heat for trying to make that change to the Bitcoin software.

Q And do you consider a denial-of-service attack a kind of hack?

A It's -- it's a kind of hack.
Q So would it be fair to say that a hacker worked hard to take down Bitcoin XT?

A Yes.
MR. FREEDMAN: Objection, form.
Q All right. And do you recall if Satoshi's email accounts were ever hacked?

A There was an incident, which I don't have firsthand knowledge of, but I believe the GMX -the reports $I$ saw said that the satoshin@gmx.com
email expired and then was taken over by somebody.
Q All right. I want to show you
Exhibit 70, and we'll see if that could refresh your recollection.
(Exhibit 70 marked for identification.)

A Oh, I forgot about this.
Q Does it -- let's start off with, what is this exhibit, do you recognize it?

A Yes. This is an email from me to the rest of the -- the key Bitcoin developers in 2014.

Q Sure. And does this refresh your recollection as to whether the Satoshi account was hacked?

A Yes. Somebody did get ahold of Satoshi's email address and took over control of the old Bitcoin source repository, which, happily, we had moved away from. So it had no practical -practical effect, but it was not a good thing to happen.

Q Okay. So we just discussed two instances of hacking in the Bitcoin community; is that fair to say?

A Ye -- hacking?
Q The denial of service and then the email.

A Yeah, hacking doesn't have a clear definition; but, yes, those were attacks.

Q Okay.
A Sorry. As a security-conscious person, like, the word "hacking" is very fuzzy, and I much prefer the term "attack."

Q Fine. Attack. Okay. So there were two attacks, computer cyber attacks?

A Yes.
Q And at least in one of those attacks, somebody got access to Satoshi's email account?

A Yes.
Q Are you aware of any other cyber attacks or hacking, however you want to define it, related to Bitcoin?

A Yes. There have been several over the years.

Q Do you care to list -- or please list the ones that you recall.

A Gosh. Somebody in 2010 created a Bitcoin transaction that created 4 billion Bitcoins --

Q Um-hm.
A -- leveraged a bug in the Bitcoin software. Satoshi responded to that by rolling back the chain, as they say, invalidating that
transaction and putting -- putting things back to rights and patching the code.

Q Um-hm.
A We had transaction-spamming attacks in 2010, where people would send millions upon millions of tiny transactions to try to flood the Bitcoin network --

Q Um-hm.
A -- and cause everybody to do a lot of extra work validating those transactions. We had to respond to those.

I don't know. I'd have to go down -there's a -- there's a list on the Bitcoin wiki of all the ways, you know, the -- the core Bitcoin has either had bugs or been hacked. And I'd have to go back and look at that if you want more, but there are -- there are a few more.

Q That's fine. So would it be fair to say that hacking is kind of part of the Bitcoin story?

MR. FREEDMAN: Objection, form.
A Certainly, yes, attacks and security incidents are definitely part of the -- of the Bitcoin story.

Q Now, you testified earlier on today that you had, some -- I believe it was sometime in 2010,

1 but correct me, created something called the
2 "Bitcoin faucet"?

A Yes, I created the Bitcoin faucet as my first Bitcoin programming project.

Q Okay. And what was the Bitcoin faucet?
A The Bitcoin faucet was a website, anybody could go and ask for some Bitcoins, and it would give you some Bitcoin.

Q Was there a limit to how many Bitcoin you could ask for?

A Yes. You were limited to -- when I started, it was limited to five Bitcoins per person per day.

Q Okay. And how long did the Bitcoin faucet run for?

A I'd have to go back and check when I eventually had to shut it down. About two years maybe, a year and a half.

Q Okay. So if you started it sometime in 2010, so maybe sometime 2012 you shut it down; is that fair?

A Yeah. And, again, I'd have to go back and check. My memory is terrible for dates.

Q That's fine. And when you got involved in -- in Bitcoin in 2010, did you believe -- what
did you believe as to its potential?
A I actually gave an Ignite talk in Amherst in, $I$ think -- it was either late 2010 or maybe 2011, where I talked about that.

I thought it had the potential to be a major world currency to compete with the dollar or the Euro or the Yen. I thought it had a small chance of becoming the world's reserve currency, replacing the U.S. dollar, as kind of the currency used for international payments.

I didn't think that that would happen quickly, but $I$ thought that there was a fair chance that that could happen.

Q Considering that, wouldn't it have made more sense to just hold onto your Bitcoin for when they're valuable, and then you could be immensely wealthy?

A Money is not useful unless -- money is not valuable unless people use it.

Q Um-hm.
A And it seemed to me the best way to make Bitcoin valuable was to get people using it. So that was the purpose of the faucet, was to give people some Bitcoin so they could have some experience using it. And I didn't give away all of
my Bitcoin through the Bitcoin faucet, I did hold some for myself.

Q All right. And if $I$ were to ask what percentage of your Bitcoin you gave away through the Bitcoin faucet, do you know that answer?

A I have -- I'm not sure I understand the question.

MR. FREEDMAN: Object.
Q You stated you gave away Bitcoin through the Bitcoin faucet?

A Yes.
Q You also stated that you held onto some Bitcoin?

A Yes.
Q All right. Do you know the -- the relationship between the percentages of Bitcoin that you held onto versus the amount of Bitcoin that you gave away?

A Yes.
Q And what would it be?
A I've given away more Bitcoin than $I$ held.
Q Okay. Do you recall ever stating that not all the people who were involved in early Bitcoin are necessarily wealthy?

A Yes, I wrote a blog post about that not
too long ago.
Q Okay. Let me actually see if $I$ can pull that up.

THE STENOGRAPHER: Can we take a quick break?

MR. KASS: Sure.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is -- the time is 4:34 p.m. We've now reached the end of Media Unit No. 3, and we're off the record.
(Off record.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time now is
4:44 p.m. We're coming back on the record. Now beginning Media Unit 4 in a deposition with Gavin Andresen. We're on the record.

MR. KASS: All right. I'm just going to put on the record the agreement that I have with Mr. Freedman, and if it's inaccurate in any way, Mr. Freedman, please chime in, is that we will be stopping the deposition at 5:00 so Mr. Freedman can catch his flight. We will resume the deposition tomorrow morning at 11:00, and I will have two and a half hours to continue the deposition, which will take us to 1:30, after which Mr. Freedman will have a half hour for cross or redirect.

Do you agree, Mr. Freedman?

MR. FREEDMAN: Yes, as long as you help me with the exhibits like you promised. MR. KASS: Yes, I did, and the witness has indicated that he is -- will show up tomorrow, and he is accommodating us and we appreciate that.

MR. FREEDMAN: Accommodating you. MR. KASS: We have enough things to argue about.

All right. Let's go.
(Exhibit 71 marked for
identification.)
BY MR. KASS:
Q I'm introducing Exhibit -- sorry. What exhibit was that, 71?

A $\quad 71$.
Q 71. All right. Do you recognize this document?

A Yes. This is a blog post I wrote, apparently a while ago, in 2018.

Q But it's fresh in your mind?
A It is somewhat fresh in my mind, yeah. Actually, I wrote another blog post recently and went back and read a couple other of my older blog posts.

Q Okay. Got it. And what's the substance of this blog post?

A A lot of people assume that if you were working on Bitcoin early in 2010, 2011 that you must be fantastically wealthy and have hundreds of millions of dollars.

Q Um-hm.
A And this just goes through reasons why that's a bad assumption and why probably a lot of people who -- who were working on Bitcoin that early do not have as much money as people think.

Q And what are the reasons that you lay out in your blog post?

A The reasons are, you know, back then, people were very free with their Bitcoin, so they weren't worth very much. When I funded the Bitcoins that $I$ gave away in the Bitcoin faucet, I purchased them -- I purchased 10,000 Bitcoins for $\$ 50$ 。

Q Okay.
A So they were worth half a penny apiece, one-half of one cent per Bitcoin, which is why I could give away five of them, because they were only worth two and a half cents.

Q Um-hm.

A And which is why when the Bitcoin faucet got hacked and I lost, I think, 10 Bitcoins that were sitting in the Bitcoin faucet, I didn't cry, because at that time they were worth $\$ 20$ or something. Now those Bitcoins would be worth a hundred thousand dollars, so it would be something to cry -- cry about now. But people confound the value of Bitcoin today with the value of Bitcoin back then. So people were doing things like buying alpaca socks from the alpaca farmer that is across the river here --

Q Um-hm.
A -- for 50 Bitcoin. So people would spend 50 Bitcoin on a pair of socks. Which, again, at a price of $\$ 10,000$ for Bitcoin, you don't want to do that math. That's a very expensive pair of socks. But that's what people did.

I know Jeff Garzik, one of the other core developers who $I$ worked with early on, I think he's pretty public about using -- like spending 10,000 Bitcoin on -- I forget exactly what it was, but some -- he paid 10,000 Bitcoin to somebody to open source some piece of software. Because, again, 10,000 Bitcoins back then wasn't worth that
much.
And the other big reason why people don't have as much as you think is because if you did buy 10,000 Bitcoins for $\$ 50$, and then Bitcoin goes up to $\$ 10$ a piece, suddenly you're sitting on a hundred thousand dollars worth of capital gains, and it -- you -- probably crosses your mind that, well, maybe I'd like to spend $\$ 50,000$ and pay down my mortgage or -- or spend them some other way. So as Bitcoin rises in price, there's more and more an incentive to -- to sell those Bitcoins that you -you purchased earlier.

And so I think most people did not hold on to every Bitcoin that they had. They either spent them or exchanged them and, you know, bought something nice for themselves.

Q Sure. And, you know, based on your -your understanding and everything that you just stated, would -- would you believe it would be inconsistent for someone to be sitting on a large stash of -- stash of Bitcoin worth a couple of hundred million dollars but be in foreclosure and unable to pay a cell phone bill?

A Yes.
Q Okay.

MR. FREEDMAN: Objection, form.
Q Now, I -- I just want to -- one other thing that you just mentioned, I believe you mentioned that Bitcoin faucet was hacked?

A Yes, the Bitcoin faucet was hacked.
Q So is that another instance of hacking?
A Sure. Yes.
Q And that happened to you personally?
A That happened to me personally, yes. The -- well, and, technically, it was the web hosting company that hosted the Bitcoin faucet was hacked, and so the Bitcoin faucet, plus a couple other Bitcoin businesses, were hacked. And, happily, the Bitcoin faucet didn't have many Bitcoins, so I didn't lose much, but one of the others did, and it did lose a significant amount of Bitcoins out of their wallet.

Q All right. So that's another instance of hacking. So, actually, we know at least of -- of two people that were attacked in that hack?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Now, I believe you testified earlier that early on Bitcoin mining was necessary to maintain the -- the blockchain network, the Bitcoin network?

A Yes, it still is.
Q Okay. And if somebody was participating in mining because they wanted to keep the network alive, would kind of a by-product of it be that they would -- would receive Bitcoin?

A Yes, that's correct.
Q And not necessarily were they actually mining to hold those Bitcoin?

A Correct. If there's --
Q Or -- or -- or for the value, whatever value it was in those Bitcoins, correct?

A Sure. Yes.
Q Okay. So if -- and do you have an understanding as to what the value of Bitcoin was in 2010?

A At the beginning of 2010, Bitcoin had no value because there was no way to sell it.

Q How about around August of 2010?
A I'd have to go back and look. And, again, I know May of 2010 I purchased Bitcoins for Bitcoin faucet at about a half a penny apiece. By August, I don't think it had yet reached a dollar, but I don't know. I'd have to go back and -- and look. I don't -- I don't remember.

Q Okay. So if somebody were -- were mining
primarily to keep the network alive, and Bitcoin weren't valued very much, would you be surprised if that person would put the Bitcoin in an encrypted drive and just kind of forget about it for the time being?

A No, that would not surprise me, and I think I've heard stories of people who mined Bitcoin for a little while and then just turned off their machines and reformatted their hard drive and the Bitcoins are lost forever.

Q Okay. Are you familiar with what is called the "genesis" block?

A Yes.
Q What's the genesis block?
A The genesis block is basically a piece of data that's hard-coded, so it's in the software code, that is kind of the beginning of this chain of what are called "blocks." So chains of -- of Bitcoin containing transaction -- Bitcoin block contains transactions, and the genesis block is -is the very first block that everything chains from.

Q So if somebody were to say that the genesis block was mined, would that be an accurate description?

A No. No, the genesis block was created. It didn't have to be mined in the same way --

Q Okay.
A -- as the rest of the blocks.
Q And if somebody made that statement, would you believe that person has a thorough understanding of how the Bitcoin network works?

A Yeah, I mean, the -- you do have to do some work to create a -- a genesis block. So, you know, I would -- I would -- yes, I think you could say it was mined when it wasn't actually mined in the traditional way, and it -- you know, it would be okay. It's a fuzzy enough idea of, you know, what mining is.

Q Well, what if somebody were to say that it was mined in the traditional way; would you consider that person knowledgeable as to the Bitcoin network?

A Well, it's tricky. I mean, I -- I mined the genesis block -- or I created the genesis block for the test network, and it is a very similar process to traditional, you know, Bitcoin mining. So, I mean, there's enough similarity there that I -- you know, I think it is possible to -- to -- to say that. And you're being a little bit fuzzy,

1 but, yeah, I think it's -- it's -- you could say that and still be an expert in -- in Bitcoin.

Q And how are the two -- how -- how was the creation of the genesis block different than the mining of a non-genesis block?

A It's just the -- the -- the -- I mean, the process for creating it requires some technical ability. So, you know, to be -- to mine a regular Bitcoin block, all you needed to do was download the software and there was a menu item that said "start mining," and that's all you had to do.

Q Okay.
A To actually create a new genesis block, you know, when I created the test network, I actually had to write some code that would arrange things in the right way and then do some proof-of-work calculations to create appropriate proof of work for a new genesis block.

And so, you know, it's just -- it takes more -- at that time it took more technical skill to create a genesis block, and it was kind of not built into the software as it -- as it was.

Q All right. When you say "hard-coded," was it just kind of -- you did your stuff on your computer and then you kind of, like, inserted it,
is that --

A Yes.
Q Okay. And -- but it didn't involve, like, a network or other computers and mining?

A No, it's all on a single computer.
Q And it's not passing around --
A No. No, everything's done kind of privately on your own computer.

Q Okay. In -- in comparison with -- well, in contrast to regular mining, where it's generally a collaborative effort?

A Yes, you have to build on other people's blocks or your block will be rejected.

Q Okay. So there are, you know, some distinctions between the genesis block being hard-coded versus a regular?

A Yes.
Q Now, are you familiar with the term
"Bitcoin private key"?

A Yes.
THE STENOGRAPHER: Private key?
MR. KASS: Bitcoin private key, yes.
Q And the term "Bitcoin public key"?
A Yes.
Q What is a "Bitcoin private key"?

A A Bitcoin private key is a -- is a very long number that -- that you keep private as -as it -- as it says. And, basically, private keys correspond to Bitcoins. So if you own a private key, you have the ability to transfer the Bitcoins. It's -- it's -- is that good enough?

Q That's good enough. I know it's a very touchy subject, but for my purposes, it's enough. Now, if I have a private key -- what you define as a private key, which is a -- assume -- let's assume the definition of a private key -well, no, I don't -- I don't want to give you anything -- as you understand a private key to be, okay?

Now, if I have a private key and I share it with you -- correct?

A Yes.
Q -- what is that called now? MR. FREEDMAN: Objection, form.

A Well, I mean, it's still a private key.
Q Um-hm.
A But multiple people now can sign messages with it or can -- if there are Bitcoin associated with that private key, could spend the Bitcoin.

Q So would it be fair to say that whether
something is a private key does not depend on whether I actually keep it private?

A Yes.
Q Okay.
A Best practice is you should keep it private if you want control.

Q Okay. And if somebody were to state that once a private key is shared, it no longer is a private key, would you consider that an accurate statement?

A No. I think it still qualifies as a -as a private key.

Q Okay. Would you consider that person very knowledgeable in Bitcoin terminology? MR. FREEDMAN: Objection, form.

A I -- I think possibly. I mean, you know, your definition of private key may vary from the commonly held idea of what a private key is.

Q All right. So you would at least agree that person's definition is not consistent with what the general Bitcoin community believes?

A I think that would be true, although I haven't polled the Bitcoin community on exactly, you know, Do you call a private key something else if it's been revealed to multiple people?

MR. FREEDMAN: Objection.
Q Based on your --
MR. FREEDMAN: Objection.
Q Based on your understanding of your involvement of the Bitcoin -- in the Bitcoin community, it's a basic general understanding?

A Yes, I mean -- yes.
MR. FREEDMAN: It's almost 5:00. So do you want to stop now?

MR. KASS: Want to stop now?
MR. FREEDMAN: Yeah.
MR. KASS: Okay. So we're going to go off the record now. We will resume tomorrow at 11:00 a.m. here.

THE WITNESS: Oh, 11's my favorite number.

MR. KASS: Oh, yes, there we go.
THE WITNESS: Perfect.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm going to read off the record and close out for today.

MR. KASS: Okay.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time now is 5:00 p.m., and we have reached the end of today's deposition and Media Unit No. 4. We are off the record, and this deposition will continue tomorrow.
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| 223:13 225:25 | fiction 61:5,8 | 102:20 112:7 | 72:24 224:13 | 83:8,24 84:8 |
| 251:18,21 | fifth 211:4 | 112:11 140:8 | follows 9:20 | 85:6,12,16,22 |
| 266:11 269:18 | figure 24:16 57:6 | 175:10,11 | fooled 88:17 | 86:16,24 87:15 |
| familiarize 77:24 | 129:14 131:25 | 190:24 213:16 | footing 210:20 | 87:19,24 89:17 |
| family 17:22 | 249:22 250:1 | 216:6,10 | force 163:15 | 90:6,21,24 91:8 |
| 169:5 | file 78:9,10 84:4 | 223:16 224:5 | 164:8 167:3 | 91:12,23 92:10 |
| famous 30:10 | 84:4 129:14 | 224:10,15 | forced 59:20 | 92:14,18,24 |
| fantastical | fill 203:15 | 233:16 245:16 | 170:23 | 93:7,18 94:7,16 |
| 148:13 | final 23:23 116:7 | 247:24 249:1 | foreclosure | 94:19,23 95:2,6 |
| fantastically | finally 38:9 53:15 | 256:4 266:21 | 263:22 | 95:11 96:3,7,23 |
| 261:5 | financial 2:6 | firsthand 192:9 | forever 266:10 | 97:4,14,21,25 |
| far 50:25 189:24 | 169:7 | 192:13,20,24 | ForEx 161:10 | 98:11,24 |
| 192:3 235:17 | financially | 193:3,6,9,12,17 | forge 22:11 | 100:14,18 |
| 236:8 243:6 | 274:15 | 194:22,25 | forged 184:2 | 102:5 103:1,12 |
| farmer 262:11 | find 19:18 29:24 | 195:19,24 | 196:18 | 104:1,21,25 |
| fast 61:19 | 29:25 38:9 | 196:3 214:5 | forget 18:21 | 105:16,24 |
| faucet 20:10,12 | 41:21,23 45:10 | 251:15 252:24 | 262:22 266:4 | 107:3,7 108:7 |
| 20:14 256:2,3,5 | 53:7,11 62:20 | fish 89:8 | forgetting 18:23 | 108:11,17 |
| 256:6,15 | 62:23 63:2 | fish-and-chips | 26:11 | 109:13,17 |
| 257:23 258:1,5 | 78:18 121:22 | 89:9 | forgot 253:7 | 110:1,6 112:3 |
| 258:10 261:17 | 141:9 167:7 | fit 34:13 183:18 | forgotten 12:14 | 113:21 114:11 |
| 262:1,3 264:4,5 | 237:12 | fits 193:20 | 42:8,9 | 114:21 115:6 |
| 264:11,12,14 | finding 19:22 | five 44:2 203:14 | form 32:7 33:18 | 116:4,5,7,14 |
| 265:21 | fine 66:14 201:11 | 241:8 256:12 | 33:23 34:1,15 | 117:22 118:15 |
| faulty 44:10 | 223:15,18 | 261:23 | 35:22 38:14 | 119:8 120:1,7 |
| favorite 82:22,23 | 254:7 255:18 | five-minute | 40:20 42:6,24 | 120:22 121:20 |
| 83:10 84:4 | 256:24 | 226:19 | 44:5,23 46:8 | 122:11,25 |
| 134:22 272:15 | finish 125:20 | fixed 133:18 | 48:2 49:5 51:3 | 123:4,20,24 |
| feature 115:7 | 164:22,22 | flew 232:4 239:4 | 51:13,21 52:7 | 124:3,6,18,23 |
| February 1:16 | 174:10 185:7 | flight $67: 18,21$ | 52:12,25 53:8 | 124:25 125:11 |
| 7:10 | finished 164:22 | 239:9 259:20 | 54:6,17,24 | 127:6,9,18 |
| fed 138:22 | finishes 115:1 | flipped 21:1 | 55:19 56:1,7,11 | 128:21 129:21 |
| feel 108:25 | finishing 126:6 | flood 255:6 | 56:18 57:2,25 | 130:10 131:5 |
| 218:19 | Finney 30:11 | floods 60:19 | 58:14,21 59:9 | 132:6,11 133:9 |
| feeling 230:1 | 74:10 98:3 | Florida 1:2 2:8 | 60:3,14 62:10 | 133:19 135:17 |
| feelings 232:24 | 103:21 | 2:16 7:9 | 62:22 63:1,11 | 135:23 136:23 |
| feels 217:25 | fired 53:15 | flying 158:8 | 64:1,21 65:5 | 137:3,10,16,20 |
| felt $27: 857: 13$ | firm 55:21 174:1 | focus $62: 12$ 63:7 | 66:2 67:14 | 138:14 139:16 |
| 109:1 119:6 | first 19:3,4 20:2 | 248:3 | 68:24 69:14,18 | 139:22 140:15 |
| 216:4 230:14 | 20:18 30:12,22 | focused 63:9 | 70:1,5,10,16,23 | 140:23 141:7 |
| fewer 161:23 | 32:11 50:19 | folks 67:23 | 71:15 73:2,7 | 141:11,23 |
| 210:18 | 59:14,22 67:23 | follow 131:23 | 74:25 75:17,20 | 142:14 143:3 |
| fiasco 135:21 | 70:14 73:24 | 171:22 173:5 | 76:13,23 77:9 | 143:15,24 |
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| 146:13 147:1 | forum 19:22 | fraud 172:25,25 | 259:25 260:1,7 | Garzik 262:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 147:25 148:16 | 24:10 40:14 | free 166:2 172:25 | 264:1 270:19 | Gav 45:24 |
| 149:18 150:7 | 41:7 64:18 | 261:15 | 271:15 272:1,3 | Gavin 1:15 3:3,9 |
| 150:25 151:12 | 190:7 217:14 | Freedman 2:3,5 | 272:8,11 | 3:11,13,14,15 |
| 152:3,17,22 | forums 20:22 | 3:4 7:13,21,21 | fresh 82:13,14 | 3:16,17,18,21 |
| 154:4,13,15,20 | 23:10 | 8:5,10,18 9:1,5 | 260:21,22 | 3:22,25 4:3,4,6 |
| 154:24 155:1 | forward 42:1 | 9:8,22,24 33:3 | freshman 13:11 | 4:7,8,10,11,12 |
| 155:14,20 | 59:21 120:20 | 33:21 36:21,25 | 233:17 | 4:13,14,15,16 |
| 156:6,14,22 | 180:10 192:18 | 37:3,11,18 | friend 18:10 | 4:17,18,19,21 |
| 157:7,17,21 | forwarded 161:1 | 49:11,16,20 | 212:19 | 4:23,24 5:2,4,5 |
| 160:21 161:15 | forwarding | 50:4 55:7 66:11 | friends 17:21 | 5:6,7,9,14,16 |
| 161:21 162:6 | 33:11 160:24 | 66:15,24 67:3 | 61:17 100:8,9 | 5:17,19,20,22 |
| 162:16 163:3 | found 19:25 | 78:21 79:3,23 | front 51:17,20 | 5:24,25 6:2,4 |
| 163:13 164:1,9 | 31:11 45:11 | 80:2 84:16,18 | 52:2,10 66:17 | 6:10,12,14,16 |
| 167:17 168:12 | 141:12 150:1 | 85:1 99:19 | 73:24 94:5,11 | 6:17,19,20,22 |
| 170:13 171:3,7 | 183:22 184:2 | 100:3 101:14 | fruit 53:3 | 7:4,25 9:15 |
| 175:8,19 177:3 | 190:1 | 106:9,20 | frustrated 59:16 | 11:11,21,22,25 |
| 178:10 179:8 | Foundation | 125:16,19 | frustration 59:3 | 33:5 34:25 |
| 180:3 182:21 | 18:20,21,24 | 126:2,10,13 | 59:5,7 | 38:24 43:3 |
| 183:14,24 | 26:23 27:14,16 | 129:1 135:9 | full 54:8 | 44:16 45:16 |
| 184:3 185:2 | 27:18,22,25 | 138:3 144:13 | fully $143: 9$ | 47:10 48:21 |
| 186:6,9,19,24 | 28:6 32:20,25 | 144:22 146:17 | function 174:25 | 53:25 61:3 |
| 188:4 208:16 | 33:11 34:11 | 164:13,19,21 | 175:3 251:4,6 | 65:17 77:23 |
| 224:2 225:14 | 57:12 60:8 | 165:3,16,20,22 | funded 261:16 | 78:7 84:25 |
| 229:20,25 | 156:19,24 | 166:8,19 | funding 56:3 | 95:19 103:21 |
| 232:14 235:3 | Foundation's 6:7 | 169:19,23 | funds 163:15 | 107:13 110:11 |
| 235:22 236:17 | founder 57:7 | 170:4 172:9,15 | 167:3,8 | 115:20 120:13 |
| 243:22 246:17 | four 17:25 40:3 | 172:16 173:7 | furore 99:5 | 122:19 126:16 |
| 247:18 251:13 | 40:21 42:2 60:7 | 174:4,19,20 | further 99:8,15 | 128:6 132:22 |
| 252:20 255:20 | 72:11 86:6,7 | 185:5,14,17,22 | 118:6 187:7 | 135:12 136:1 |
| 264:1 270:19 | 90:12,13,14 | 185:24 187:7 | 211:11 274:13 | 139:2 140:3 |
| 271:15 | 215:16,25 | 187:14 188:4 | future 115:11 | 141:17 142:18 |
| formation 28:12 | 216:1,6 218:6 | 203:9,18 224:2 | fuzzy 72:15 | 144:25 147:17 |
| formatting 79:19 | 219:10,21 | 225:14 229:20 | 91:15 187:6 | 148:20,24 |
| formed 17:20 | 229:13,15 | 229:25 232:14 | 254:5 267:13 | 151:5 153:2 |
| 28:7 | 241:9,10,10 | 235:3,22 | 267:25 | 156:5 160:14 |
| former 15:25 | fourth 99:3 | 236:17 243:22 | F'd 145:10 | 162:9 166:22 |
| 163:20 | 117:11 134:6 | 244:3,8,10 |  | 168:16 169:25 |
| forming 28:5 | 217:23 218:6 | 246:17 247:12 | G | 172:19 173:16 |
| forth 103:7 179:9 | 218:21 221:13 | 247:14,18 | G7:1 | 175:25 177:9 |
| 198:24 200:15 | 221:13 | 250:10 251:13 | GA 78:7 | 259:13 274:8 |
| 206:2 232:20 | frame 156:21 | 252:20 255:20 | gains 168:25 | Gavin's 82:21,23 |
| 274:9 | frankly 33:1 69:8 | 258:8 259:17 | 263:6 | 83:10 84:4 |
| fortune 95:1,5 | 130:23 225:20 | 259:18,19,23 | games 17:20 | gazillion 169:6 |
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| GA's 78:10 | 27:24 28:12 | 58:19 84:19 | 18:23 26:11 | hack 217:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| geek 199:22,23 | 29:19,21,23 | 88:23 93:16,19 | 41:14 138:7 | 252:15,16 |
| 237:21 | 35:24 42:19 | 95:15 97:3,18 | 159:21 208:21 | 264:20 |
| general 235:17 | 43:22 49:21 | 97:20 99:23 | 234:18 240:22 | hacked 216:14 |
| 271:21 272:6 | 58:17 59:1 | 105:15 106:3 | 245:4 253:19 | 217:17 251:11 |
| generally 242:24 | 61:11 67:9 70:8 | 106:13 108:3 | 270:6,7 | 251:14,16 |
| 269:10 | 73:5 74:13 78:5 | 110:9 117:6 | gosh 16:16 | 252:22 253:14 |
| genesis 30:17,19 | 78:17 82:6 | 139:11 145:24 | 254:20 | 255:15 262:2 |
| 175:11 266:12 | 83:17 84:9,15 | 150:9 151:16 | gotten 19:5 64:24 | 264:4,5,12,13 |
| 266:14,15,20 | 86:1 97:1 102:6 | 153:19 172:9 | 69:6 | hacker 252:17 |
| 266:24 267:1,9 | 102:19 103:6 | 175:23 184:10 | government | hacking 154:25 |
| 267:20,20 | 105:2 106:6,10 | 192:18 198:24 | 163:21 | 253:22,24 |
| 268:4,13,18,21 | 106:12,21 | 201:2,21 202:8 | grab 49:8 | 254:1,5,14 |
| 269:15 | 129:9 130:17 | 203:5,18 | grabbed 53:2 | 255:19 264:6 |
| getting 21:9 29:4 | 131:7 134:24 | 204:18 205:11 | grade 12:24 | 264:19 |
| 71:17 118:6 | 144:11 147:20 | 206:5,17,25 | graduated 13:17 | Hadley 1:17,19 |
| 122:5 171:8 | 159:3 170:3 | 207:13 209:2 | 15:2 233:15 | 7:12 |
| 207:21 215:12 | 172:2 173:22 | 209:10 211:1,3 | graduates 17:19 | Hal 30:11 74:10 |
| ghosts 231:17,22 | 184:17 185:15 | 220:9 221:25 | granted 66:16 | 87:3,4 98:3 |
| GitHub 76:2,16 | 185:25 188:8 | 222:13 223:11 | Graphics 15:5,8 | 103:20 |
| give 10:10,18 | 189:25 196:5 | 226:21 227:19 | 15:23,24 16:1 | half 16:5 134:21 |
| 11:18 24:7 | 202:21 211:10 | 228:7,23 | Gravity 18:3 | 170:2 256:18 |
| 36:12 43:15,18 | 216:23 219:20 | 232:20 245:7 | great 99:22 | 259:22,24 |
| 46:24 47:1 | 224:4 230:7,19 | 246:23 259:15 | 218:19 | 261:21,24 |
| 56:13 65:14 | 237:11,14,17 | 272:12,19 | Grigg 111:5,9 | 265:21 |
| 122:8 136:8 | 239:4 240:11 | gonna 9:9 10:3 | 158:18 183:6 | halftime 18:1 |
| 221:13 224:6 | 244:18 245:21 | 10:25 11:1 | ground 10:3 | halfway 51:10 |
| 256:8 257:23 | 252:8 255:12 | 22:22 33:3 | group 18:9,11,13 | 104:9 |
| 257:25 261:23 | 255:15 256:7 | 36:12 43:1 | 69:10 100:12 | half-hour 169:13 |
| 270:12 | 256:16,22 | 44:12 47:6 | 151:11 | hand 33:3 34:23 |
| given 64:5 83:21 | 260:10 265:19 | 49:12 53:8 55:4 | grow 26:18 | 43:1 44:12 47:7 |
| 113:25 183:11 | 265:23 272:13 | 65:15 66:7 91:8 | grown 242:24 | 101:10 103:13 |
| 190:21 193:16 | 272:17 | 101:10 107:11 | guarantee 85:14 | 107:11 110:9 |
| 258:21 274:11 | gobbledygook | 115:18 131:3 | 85:17,19 | 115:18 122:17 |
| giving 41:17 | 132:1,8 140:21 | 132:20 136:16 | guess 60:6 61:11 | 132:20 141:16 |
| 96:13 127:12 | 153:20 163:6 | 138:1 141:16 | 111:7 117:23 | 175:23 177:7 |
| 166:1 | God 53:4 | 148:15 164:21 | 127:15 155:25 | 274:18 |
| Gmail 190:13 | God-like 57:6 | 164:22 165:5 | 157:25 | handed 49:7 50:5 |
| GMX 105:19 | goes 64:10 98:5 | 170:3 177:7 | guy 53:14 111:17 | 50:14 101:21 |
| 252:24 | 236:9 261:8 | 188:18,22 | guys 8:22 89:12 | 126:14 157:2 |
| go 10:3,15 12:20 | 263:5 | 192:17 211:2 | 196:10 239:15 | handing 22:21 |
| 13:19 14:17 | going 7:3 10:18 | 219:18 222:12 |  | 38:18 45:14 |
| 18:15,22 20:25 | 22:6 35:11 | 226:18 240:11 | H | 48:16 77:21 |
| 21:15 24:20 | 36:10 49:23 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { g o o d }}$ 7:2 9:23 | H 3:6 | 95:17 112:25 |


| 125:25 128:3,4 | 76:24 | hereinbefore | 239:12 240:8 | 115:17 120:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 135:10 138:25 | hated 60:1 | 274:9 | hotel's 76:4,10 | 122:16 125:24 |
| 140:2 142:17 | hates 53:16 | hereunto 274:17 | Hotwire 63:13 | 128:2 132:19 |
| 144:23 147:15 | head 10:8 46:21 | Hey 237:9 | hour 239:15 | 135:7 138:24 |
| 151:3 153:1 | 57:17 88:22,25 | Hi 70:20 136:1 | 259:24 | 140:1 141:15 |
| 160:3,12 162:8 | 249:6 | hidden 52:22,24 | hours 74:2,3 | 142:16 144:21 |
| 166:20 168:15 | header 102:13 | hierarchy 210:14 | 125:15 131:25 | 147:14 151:2 |
| 169:24 172:6 | headers 230:20 | high 12:6 13:7,11 | 164:25 239:8 | 152:25 160:2 |
| 172:17 178:23 | hear 8:23 9:3 | 233:15,17 | 239:19,19 | 160:11 162:2 |
| 180:16 182:8 | 24:18 192:15 | higher 201:11 | 259:22 | 166:18 168:14 |
| handle 180:12 | heard 19:3,4 | 228:21 | house 149:24 | 169:22 172:5 |
| happen 73:17 | 102:25 121:16 | highlighting | HTTPS 76:17 | 175:22 177:6 |
| 244:4 248:15 | 138:18 158:18 | 35:16 | hugely 60:23 | 178:22 180:15 |
| 253:20 257:11 | 191:24 241:21 | highly 215:6 | human 53:5 | 182:7 188:25 |
| 257:13 | 266:7 | high-level 67:6 | hundred 161:18 | 201:4,24 |
| happened 24:10 | hearing 8:15,19 | High-wealth | 161:19 162:4,4 | 202:11 203:4 |
| 29:17 48:3 67:7 | 24:23 106:4 | 161:8 | 170:12,14 | 204:5,17 |
| 70:12 77:10 | Hearn 252:4 | hired 15:5 18:19 | 184:20 196:17 | 205:10 206:4 |
| 78:14 81:11 | heart 103:13 | hoax 148:13 | 262:6 263:6,22 | 206:16 207:2 |
| 89:7 103:20 | heat 233:6 | hoaxer 153:13 | hundreds 194:3 | 207:12,23 |
| 131:13 150:11 | 252:12 | hold 139:10 | 194:7 261:5 | 209:1,13 |
| 150:13,14,15 | height 130:3 | 185:14 232:23 | hurt 149:17 | 210:25 220:11 |
| 152:21 188:10 | held 7:7 214:16 | 257:15 258:1 |  | 222:6,16 227:1 |
| 221:21 240:25 | 258:12,17,21 | 263:14 265:8 | I | 227:18 228:6 |
| 242:7,11,12 | 271:18 | holding 29:25 | Ian 111:5,9 | 229:1 245:6 |
| 244:2 249:11 | hell 53:14 | 161:10 | 158:18 183:6 | 246:22 253:6 |
| 250:9,18 252:2 | help 45:2 78:11 | holds 146:6 | idea 20:3 51:17 | 260:12 |
| 264:8,9 | 80:4 81:6 | hole 61:20 | 62:13 93:2,4,6 | identified 9:17 |
| happening 19:24 | 105:12,14,20 | holy 57:7 | 93:9 99:22 | identify $218: 22$ |
| 68:20 192:14 | 110:24 126:24 | home 29:19, 21 | 125:12 131:6 | 219:1,3 |
| 192:16 | 129:14 156:8 | honest 184:20,23 | 158:25 174:2 | identity 30:3 |
| happily 253:17 | 177:11 202:18 | honestly 57:23 | 248:22 249:5 | 118:10,10 |
| 264:14 | 212:3,8,9 | hoop-jumping | 249:13,20 | Ignite 257:2 |
| happy 144:11 | 213:19 236:24 | 140:17 | 267:13 271:18 | ignore 181:17 |
| 176:17 | 237:2 246:19 | hope 185:18 | ideally 217:25 | ignored 181:18 |
| hard 61:8 131:22 | 248:14 260:2 | hoping 70:4 | identification | imagine 212:8 |
| 232:23 237:8 | helped 102:23 | horrific 179:15 | 22:25 33:7 35:2 | 213:19 |
| 252:18 266:9 | 103:19 250:15 | hospital 150:2 | 38:21 43:5 | imagined 144:6 |
| hardware 21:6 | helpful 8:17 19:1 | hosted 264:11 | 44:18 45:18 | imagining 72:21 |
| 21:16,20 | 101:17 123:10 | hosting 264:11 | 47:13 48:23 | 145:7,15 |
| hard-coded | 123:13 | hotel 47:3,5 | 49:25 65:19 | immediate 26:17 |
| 266:16 268:23 | helping 42:12 | 49:17 67:15,19 | 77:20 95:13 | immediately |
| 269:16 | 68:19 | 68:5 73:9 75:25 | 101:13 107:10 | 99:6 |
| hash 32:5 76:20 | helps 125:20 | 76:7 89:14,14 | 110:8 112:24 | immensely |


| 257:16 | increase 60:24 | installments | 222:12 227:19 | 158:12,14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| impersonate | 252:5 | 46:13 | 228:7,23 245:7 | 191:14,19 |
| 216:17 | incredible 50:21 | instance 168:21 | 246:23 | 192:6 195:1 |
| implementation | 50:25 51:1,5,8 | 264:6,18 | introduced | IRS 110:25 |
| 26:19,25 | 52:14 151:17 | instances 253:21 | 100:23 | issue 62:12 84:14 |
| implementations | incredibly | instructing 37:6 | introducing | 94:18 144:11 |
| 27:3 | 131:22 | instructions | 204:6 207:24 | 212:12 |
| implemented | independently | 187:13 | 227:3 245:9 | issues 27:4 |
| 200:16 | 76:22 | integral 175:17 | 260:14 | 110:25 |
| implicitly 126:8 | index 130:4,12 | intellectual 69:11 | introducto | item 268:10 |
| implying 36:4 | 130:14,18 | 192:25 | 127:16 |  |
| import 216:15,16 | indicated 260:4 | intended 69:10 | invalid 17 | J |
| 217:3,18 | indicating 108:2 | 94:25 95:4 | invalidating | ackie 238:5 |
| important 57:16 | indication 152:14 | intent 142:2 | 254:25 | jail 27:24 28:15 |
| 102:22 | 179:17 | interacted | invented 68:13 | Japanese 119:11 |
| importantly | individual | 210:10 | 248:2,7,20 | 119:11 |
| 109:21,22 | 170:11 218:11 | interacting 214:2 | 249:4 | Jeff 262:19 |
| impossible 199:8 | individuals | interactions | Inventing 248:21 | Jersey 13:16 |
| impress 156:1 | 117:21 161:8 | 40:22 42:14 | invention 250:22 | jet 72:11 77:1 |
| impression 92:25 | Info 1:7 | 211:19 214:1 | inventions 69:13 | 82:25 88:21 |
| 130:21 184:19 | information | interest 19:11 | inventor 92:20 | 239:21 240:19 |
| 234:15,24 | 36:16,20 111:6 | interested 19:11 | 92:23 248:13 | job 15:3,20,22 |
| impressions | 129:13 182:25 | 42:11 274:16 | 249:20 250:6 | 18:15 27:7 |
| 130:20 | 183:1 191:18 | interesting 11:15 | investigation | 32:19,24 33:12 |
| inability 219:4 | 192:5 194:9,10 | 19:6,8,9 30:17 | 53:4 | 33:14 34:5,11 |
| inaccurate | 221:3,4,5 | 31:10 | investment 70:3 | 34:17 234:18 |
| 118:16 259:17 | initial 21:17,19 | interface 227:15 | invites 35:6 | job-related 15:15 |
| inappropriately | 38:8,11 71:2,11 | interim 8:22 47:7 | involve 229:9 | Jodie 33:10 |
| 146:8 | 71:14,24 73:5 | international | 269:3 | joined 16:10 |
| inbox 190:13 | 74:20 215:4 | 257:10 | involved 22:14 | 17:18 18:8 |
| 194:12 | initially 45:25 | interrupt 84:14 | 28:11 68:23 | joining 8:6 |
| incentive 263:11 | 82:16 142:25 | 219:17 | 69:2,6 77:12 | joke 107:23 |
| incident 252:23 | 241:12,16 | interruption | 81:9 92:7 137:7 | Jon 32:13 34:20 |
| incidents 255:22 | initiate 75:4 | 198:4 | 243:24,25 | 35:4,6,20,23 |
| include 136:7 | injure 149:14 | interviews | 250:24 256:24 | 37:21 39:2,3,5 |
| includes 45:23 | input 76:6 | 148:11 | 258:23 | 39:14 41:25 |
| 46:3 189:16 | insert 162:22 | introduce 188:22 | involvement | 95:23 97:11 |
| including 87:13 | inserted 63:24 | 201:2,21 202:8 | 28:20,21 69:23 | 107:17 136:10 |
| 87:16 117:14 | 168:21 268:25 | 203:5 204:18 | 90:18 241:24 | 139:7 148:18 |
| inconsistent | inserting 47:25 | 205:11 206:5 | 241:25 244:21 | 148:23 149:6 |
| 62:20,23 63:3,4 | insignificant | 206:17,25 | 244:23 272:5 | judge 10:19 |
| 263:20 | 135:1 | 207:13 209:2 | involving 20:9 | 218:16 219:5 |
| incorrect 87:9 | installed 73:25 | 209:10 211:1 | in-person 190:10 | mp 34:19 |
| 133:14 | 85:11,20 | 220:9 221:25 | Ira 1:5 2:22 9:2,5 | 119:17 164:2 |
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| jumping 245:8 | 93:18 94:7,16 | 151:12 152:3 | key 23:24 35:25 | 228:21 234:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| June 20:13 | 94:19,23 95:2,6 | 152:17,22 | 36:1 40:8 41:8 | 234:20 242:20 |
| junior 236:25 | 95:11 96:3,7,16 | 154:4,13,15,20 | 41:13 74:6 | 252:15,16 |
| 237:3 | 96:23 97:4,14 | 154:24 155:1 | 77:12,16 82:2 | 255:19 257:9 |
| jury 10:19 | 97:21,25 98:11 | 155:14,20,23 | 83:22,23 86:11 | 265:4 266:4,17 |
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| 36:10,23 37:6 | 109:13,17 | 164:11,15,20 | 163:10 168:7,8 | 90:4,19 98:5,9 |
| 37:16 38:14 | 110:1,6 112:3 | 164:24 165:5 | 168:8,9 197:20 | 98:19 102:21 |
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| 52:7,12,25 53:8 | 119:8 120:1,7 | 169:15 170:1 | 217:7,8 219:12 | 186:5,12,13 |
| 54:6,17,24 55:3 | 120:22 121:20 | 170:13 171:3,7 | 253:11 269:19 | 187:25 189:17 |
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| 36:7 38:4 39:14 | 200:25 205:14 | knows 130:16 | laziness 53:5 | 172:2 174:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 57:11,16 58:1 | 218:17,19 | Kyle 2:4 8:25 | 57:13 156:16 | 233:15 253:8 |
| 58:15,20 59:7 | 220:18 230:25 |  | 157:19 | 260:10 270:11 |
| 59:14,15 60:2 | 231:4,7,8,10,11 | L | learn 32:11 51:4 | level 85:8 201:11 |
| 60:10,12 63:8 | 231:13 234:22 | label 48:20 | 51:23 52:4,14 | 228:21 |
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| 267:25 | 107:21 111:20 | 62:12 63:5 | marathon 10:14 | 204:4,16 205:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| live 61:18 | 117:10 125:8 | love 162:25 | March 35:4,4 | 206:3,15 207:1 |
| living 13:9 | 170:21 188:8 | lovely 89:9 | 105:6 219:1 | 207:11,22 |
| LLC 1:8 | 189:2 202:12 | low-hanging 53:3 | 274:18 | 208:25 209:11 |
| LLP 2:5 7:13 | 211:4 215:20 | lunch 164:14 | mark 22:22 | 209:12 210:24 |
| loaded 145:11 | 215:23 216:5 | 166:8 173:12 | 28:16 84:19 | 215:21 220:10 |
| loading 145:11 | 220:25 223:1 | lying 151:21 | marked 22:24 | 222:5,15 |
| local 174:6 | 223:11 224:5 | 184:14 188:1 | 33:4,6 34:23 | 226:25 227:17 |
| locale 150:6 | 230:19,22 |  | 35:1 38:18,20 | 228:5,25 245:5 |
| location 149:24 | 234:2 237:21 | M | 43:2,2,4 44:12 | 246:21 253:5 |
| locked 138:5 | 237:22 244:25 | ma 123:1 | 44:17 45:14,17 | 260:11 |
| $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { l o g }} 128: 20$ | 251:4 255:16 | MacGregor | 47:8,12,23 | marking 101:10 |
| 129:11,19 | 265:19,24 | 95:23 147:23 | 48:16,22 49:24 | 128:4 141:16 |
| logistics 220:20 | looked 46:5 | 148:23 149:9 | 53:25 65:18 | 145:1 |
| logs 128:12,16 | 113:6 121:21 | 151:9,15 152:6 | 77:19,21,23 | married 11:23 |
| $\log$-in 76:6 | 198:3,6 208:9 | machine 18:10 | 95:12,17 | Marriott 1:17 |
| London 1:21 | 214:11 234:6 | machines 266:9 | 101:12 107:9 | 7:12 |
| 7:16 35:7,24 | looking 19:6 | macro 213:6 | 107:11 110:7,9 | Massachusetts |
| 44:3 45:12 47:3 | 34:13,14,16 | Madison 14:9,15 | 112:23,25 | 1:19 9:18 12:6 |
| 55:24 65:4,10 | 155:25 179:20 | magazine 19:7 | 115:16,19 | 12:10 14:13,16 |
| 119:4 158:8 | 235:19 | 19:19,21 | 120:14 122:15 | 17:19 18:2 |
| 188:11 196:10 | looks 47:22,24 | Magna 1:23 7:15 | 122:17 125:23 | 274:2,6 |
| 197:5 198:2 | 78:23 130:3 | 7:17 | 126:1 128:1 | match 48:21 |
| 215:13 219:21 | looping 221:1 | mail 190:14,14 | 132:18,20 | matched 86:2 |
| 220:21 221:5 | Lori 7:16 | main 28:11 62:13 | 135:6,10 | math 262:17 |
| 230:7 232:5 | Lori-Ann 1:21 | 62:16 103:18 | 138:23,25 | Mati 2:21 7:15 |
| 239:5 242:7,12 | 274:4,23 | maintain 61:21 | 139:25 140:2 | Matonis 32:14 |
| 247:9 249:9 | lose 264:15,16 | 264:24 | 141:14 142:15 | 34:20 35:4 39:2 |
| 274:4,23 | lost 27:25 197:25 | maintaining | 142:17 144:20 | 39:3,5 41:25 |
| lone 211:9 | 262:2 266:10 | 36:25 37:3 | 144:23 147:13 | 95:23 97:11 |
| long 12:22 15:8 | lot 17:23 23:18 | major 14:25 | 147:16 151:1,3 | 107:17 136:10 |
| 16:14 46:13,24 | 55:4 69:22 | 27:11 257:6 | 152:24 153:1 | 139:7 148:18 |
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| 256:14 259:1 | 171:20 210:12 | 226:16 | 169:24 172:4,6 | 199:6 |
| 260:1 270:2 | 226:9 233:6 | $\boldsymbol{m a n} 102: 23$ | 172:17 175:21 | matters 169:13 |
| longer 74:4 271:8 | 234:21,22 | 132:23 135:25 | 175:23 177:5,7 | Matthews 95:25 |
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| 43:22 46:10,11 | 255:9 261:3,9 | manage 114:3 | 188:24 190:21 | 132:24 134:7 |
| 47:22 48:5 60:5 | lots 48:8,9 54:2,3 | mantle 57:15 | 201:3,23 | 135:15,25 |
| 61:3 65:7 99:3 | 60:19 62:6,6,11 | manual 190:16 | 202:10 203:3 | 139:8,9 141:19 |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| mean 52:23 | 108:23 109:11 | 156:2,9 183:7 | 214:14 237:2 | 267:19 |
| 56:12,13 59:11 | 109:15 132:1 | 187:5 | 270:22 | miner 21:6 32:4 |
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| 130:1,4,7,21,23 | 62:12 63:7 | 193:24 243:16 | 100:25 239:7 | 252:7 |
| 136:25 138:21 | 84:20,24 | mentioned 39:14 | 239:14 247:8 | minimum 249:11 |
| 141:4,12 | 106:18 144:19 | 69:5 89:18 | method 77:17 | mining 21:18,19 |
| 143:17,19 | 173:9,16 184:4 | 113:19 187:5 | methods 201:19 | 106:24 107:6 |
| 144:1 155:4,11 | 191:22 192:1,3 | 264:3,4 | Miami 2:8,16 | 175:16 264:23 |
| 157:9,25 | 196:13 259:9 | mentioning | microphone 8:16 | 265:3,8,25 |
| 161:17 163:4 | 259:13 272:24 | 121:10 187:2 | mid 180:24 | 267:14,22 |
| 164:6,20,21 | medications 11:5 | 243:17 245:17 | middle 59:5,8 | 268:5,11 269:4 |
| 167:11,15 | meet 38:3 39:11 | mentions 36:13 | 102:19 | 269:10 |
| 173:3 176:20 | 70:9 100:21 | menu 268:10 | midway 47:23 | minor 224:12 |
| 190:2 191:21 | 125:3 230:7 | merchant 119:12 | Mike 103:22 | minute 66:4 |
| 192:12 194:13 | meeting 64:6 | 119:13 | 252:4,11 | 96:19 99:20 |
| 196:7 197:20 | 65:25 68:3,4 | mess 169:7 | million 119:1 | 152:14 179:16 |
| 210:8 211:8 | 69:23 70:8,11 | 170:24 232:18 | 161:9,18,19,23 | 223:10 |
| 212:6 213:15 | 73:9 75:8 89:22 | message 23:25,25 | 162:4 167:11 | minutes 49:21 |
| 217:4 218:8,9 | 90:10 119:20 | 24:11 40:8,11 | 167:16 170:12 | 172:14 223:6 |
| 221:20 224:16 | 120:3,3 190:11 | 41:2 45:24 64:9 | 170:14,23 | 224:7,22 230:6 |
| 228:20 229:8 | 239:16 | 74:6 75:11 77:6 | 171:2,6,13,15 | 231:6 |
| 235:4,7 237:25 | megabyte 60:22 | 77:14 78:2 | 171:17 194:2 | miserably 245:4 |
| 238:23 240:20 | Melbourne 12:12 | 80:14,20 82:10 | 263:22 | mislabeled 245:8 |
| 249:4,6 267:8 | members 27:23 | 82:11,21 83:5,6 | millions 52:5,10 | misled 155:5 |
| 267:19,23 | 28:3,14 94:4 | 83:10,11,13,24 | 194:2,3,7 255:5 | misread 222:4 |
| 268:6 270:20 | 156:12 228:20 | 84:3,10 85:21 | 255:6 261:6 | misrememberi... |
| 271:16 272:7 | memories 241:19 | 87:10,14,17 | mind 25:4 39:13 | 111:2 156:21 |
| meaning 75:3 | memory 65:14 | 88:13 93:23 | 121:22 242:5 | 220:8 |
| 116:12 | 81:10 91:14 | 98:18 99:6 | 242:17 260:21 | missed 63:12 |
| means 31:25 | 188:9 230:21 | 117:1 131:18 | 260:22 263:7 | missing 65:16 |
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| meant 51:7,19,23 | 96:2 97:1 | 219:12 236:24 | 21:11 29:7 30:4 | 50:25 51:1,5,8 |

## 51:18 52:15,16

52:19,24 81:16
81:17,22
mixing 137:11
mode 97:2
moderate 235:8
moderately 213:5
modify 147:8
mom 11:23
moment 25:1
43:6 77:24
84:17 113:6
157:6 232:2
moments 224:16 224:20 225:12
monetize 69:13
money 20:17
55:11,15,18
56:10,15,17,19
56:24 57:1,6,9
57:17,24 62:2,2
62:21,25 69:5
89:12 90:9 94:5
96:2 97:1
105:16 120:21
123:3 127:8
132:23 134:19
135:2,16,25
138:19 141:22
143:5 146:21
147:5,23 148:8
151:11 152:20
156:2,9 171:23
179:6 183:7
187:5 196:9
199:1 239:15
257:18,18
261:11
money's 134:20
moniker 90:3
month 241:1
247:5,14
months 13:8

152:7
morning 7:2 9:23 49:17 75:7 89:11,23 90:8 166:3,7 169:17 174:10 188:8 198:7 233:10 259:21
mortgage 263:9
motive 158:8,10
Mountain 13:21
move 8:16 82:13
145:24 146:12
168:2 169:3,9
moved 12:23
13:2 14:1,8,15
15:3,15,19,21
16:9 24:16
29:10,25 253:18
moving 93:23 142:1
muddy 184:17
multiple 234:19 235:23 238:15 240:13 270:22 271:25
myster 24:15
mysteries 117:13
117:16,21
118:12,18
119:5
mysterious 24:15
72:4 91:21 92:4
108:14 112:5
138:21 168:10
250:12,15
$\mathbf{N}$

N 3:17:1
Nakamoto 3:8
6:9 20:19 23:4
25:5,12,20,22
30:8,10 38:13

39:25 42:13
56:21 57:5,15
59:22 70:20
71:2 88:24 89:2
90:3 91:11
103:14 111:23
116:1 117:20
118:11 119:2,7
157:2 158:3
189:17 190:4
190:15 202:3
204:10,22
206:9,21 207:6
207:17 208:3
208:10 209:6
209:25 225:18
227:7,23
228:11,18
229:5,17 247:4
name 7:15 9:4,23
11:9,13,14,25
16:12 38:6
39:15,17 42:9
59:6,8 69:12
89:12 110:18
119:1,14
121:11 128:13
128:16 187:11
named 68:1
119:13
names 240:25
nasty $169: 1$
natural 10:6
naturally $224: 13$
nature 53:5
199:19
nCrypt 95:25
NDA 122:13
necessarily 24:6 258:24 265:7
necessary 143:9
143:18 144:2
165:24 169:17
221:3 264:23

| neck $150: 1$ | never-used |
| :---: | :---: |
| need 10:9,14,23 | $139: 12$ |
| $24: 229: 19,21$ | new $13: 1664: 7$ |
| $83: 25105: 12$ | $74: 14,2177: 7$ |
| $105: 14,19,20$ | $77: 10,15,16$ |
| $136: 9143: 22$ | $81: 982: 1,2$ |
| $145: 24146: 23$ | $83: 1105: 16$ |
| $168: 24171: 12$ | $131: 11133: 23$ |
| $172: 13173: 1$ | $136: 4139: 11$ |
| $174: 15176: 16$ | $175: 18201: 18$ |
| $179: 19187: 15$ | $201: 18203: 19$ |
| $187: 16212: 5,9$ | $268: 13,18$ |
| $237: 4,12$ | Nguyen $110: 17$ |
| needed $18: 13$ | $110: 20113: 17$ |
| $26: 19,20,20$ | $158: 17,18$ |
| $104: 7144: 2$ | $195: 10196: 9$ |
| $146: 4147: 9$ | $244: 14245: 13$ |
| $212: 3213: 17$ | $246: 8$ |
| $268: 9$ | nice $263: 16$ |
| needing $86: 10$ | nLockTime |
| $212: 8$ | $115: 2,7,13$ |
| needs $36: 20$ | Nonce $31: 19,20$ |
| $147: 2,6175: 2$ | $31: 24$ |
| neglected $178: 24$ | nondisclosure |
| neither $274: 13$ | $66: 17$ |
| net $161: 14162: 4$ | non-disclosure |
| $170: 12,14$ | $36: 14,15,17,18$ |
| network $24: 1$ | $37: 8,1066: 8$ |
| $58: 560: 17,19$ | non-genesis |
| $115: 9252: 6$ | $268: 5$ |
| $255: 7264: 24$ | non-verbally |
| $264: 25265: 3$ | $10: 7$ |
| $266: 1267: 7,18$ | North $16: 10$ |
| $267: 21268: 14$ | Northampton |
| $269: 4$ | $18: 2$ |
| networking | Notary $9: 19$ |
| $235: 12$ | $274: 5,24$ |
| never $10: 232: 25$ | noted $126: 11$ |
| $35: 1058: 15$ | $138: 3$ |
| $72: 4113: 19$ | notes $28: 1275: 6$ |
| $142: 11176: 23$ | $75: 8,10,14$ |
| $200: 4$ | $185: 7$ |
| never-before | notice $174: 5,15$ |
| $64: 17$ | noticed $125: 14$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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| novel 181:11 | 86:16,24 87:15 | 150:25 151:12 | obtained 79:10 | 80:2 81:2,12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 238:5,5 | 87:19,24 89:17 | 152:3,17,22 | 151:23 217:8 | 87:1,7 89:15 |
| November 34:6 | 90:6,21,24 91:8 | 154:4,13,15,20 | obviously 99:4 | 90:1,16 96:5,18 |
| number 17:17 | 91:12,23 92:10 | 154:24 155:1 | 116:7 242:19 | 98:14 101:23 |
| 31:25 82:22,23 | 92:14,18,24 | 155:14,20 | occur 56:12 | 115:12,18 |
| 84:4 87:9 | 93:5,7,18 94:7 | 156:6,14,22 | occurred 80:6 | 116:7 119:17 |
| 205:12 208:9 | 94:16,19,23 | 157:7,17,21 | 91:10 | 120:5,6 121:18 |
| 234:15,25 | 95:2,6,11 96:3 | 160:21 161:15 | odd 52:9 55:17 | 122:17 123:6 |
| 270:2 272:16 | 96:7,16,23 97:4 | 161:21 162:6 | 56:9,25 167:19 | 124:13 125:7 |
| numbers 102:10 | 97:14,21,25 | 162:16 163:3 | office 12:9 52:6 | 126:4,10,19 |
| 202:18 203:16 | 98:11,24 | 163:13 164:1,9 | 161:3 163:25 | 127:4 130:19 |
| 240:22 | 100:14,18 | 167:17 168:12 | 164:7 274:18 | 134:23 139:24 |
| number's 134:22 | 102:5 103:1,12 | 170:13 171:3,7 | officer 16:21 | 140:25 144:1 |
| N-O-N-C-E | 104:1,21,25 | 174:16 175:8 | 17:23 | 145:23 146:15 |
| 31:24 | 105:24 107:3,7 | 175:19 177:3 | official 185:18 | 147:15,24 |
|  | 108:7,11,17 | 178:10 179:8 | oh 16:16 26:7 | 148:9 151:14 |
| 0 | 109:13,17 | 180:3 182:21 | 36:11 49:20 | 152:12 155:23 |
| O 7:1 | 110:1,6 112:3 | 183:14,24 | 81:3 108:3 | 159:17 160:23 |
| oath 10:17 | 113:21 114:11 | 184:3 185:2 | 119:9 127:3 | 161:25 162:23 |
| 183:23 | 114:21 115:6 | 186:6,9,14,19 | 159:15 183:7 | 165:11,14,23 |
| object 32:7 33:18 | 116:14 117:22 | 186:24 229:20 | 185:14 253:7 | 166:4,12,15,20 |
| 33:23 34:1,2,15 | 118:15 119:8 | 258:8 | 272:15,17 | 167:22 172:2 |
| 35:22 38:14 | 120:1,7,22 | objecting 78:19 | okay 8:4 10:13 | 173:8 174:12 |
| 40:20 42:6,24 | 121:20 122:11 | objection 36:11 | 11:4,8 12:7,11 | 174:19,23 |
| 44:5,23 48:2 | 122:25 123:4 | 36:18,21,22 | 13:4,10,17,19 | 178:4 181:13 |
| 49:5 51:3,13,21 | 123:20,24 | 37:15 46:8 66:8 | 13:23 14:3,10 | 182:1 185:4,23 |
| 51:21 52:7,12 | 124:3,6,18,23 | 79:24 91:2 | 14:19,22 15:7 | 188:12,20 |
| 52:25 53:8 54:6 | 124:25 125:11 | 103:17 118:20 | 15:18 16:2,19 | 189:6,19 |
| 54:17,24 55:19 | 127:6,9,18 | 126:10 137:6 | 17:4,11,14 | 190:20 191:2,6 |
| 56:1,7,11,18 | 128:21 129:21 | 147:11 174:17 | 18:17 19:1 | 191:9,17 |
| 57:2,25 58:14 | 130:10 131:5 | 188:4 224:2 | 21:17,24 24:22 | 192:12,17,19 |
| 58:21 59:9 60:3 | 132:6,11 133:9 | 225:14 229:25 | 25:14,25 26:15 | 192:24 193:23 |
| 60:14 62:10,22 | 133:19 135:17 | 232:14 235:3 | 32:3,10 34:3,5 | 194:4,9,21 |
| 63:1,11 64:1,13 | 135:23 136:23 | 235:22 236:17 | 34:10 35:19 | 195:6,16 |
| 64:21 65:5 66:2 | 137:3,10,16,20 | 243:22 244:3,8 | 37:19 38:5 41:4 | 196:14 197:4 |
| 67:14 68:24 | 138:1,14 | 244:10 246:17 | 41:10,25 42:18 | 198:1,8,12 |
| 69:14,18 70:1,5 | 139:16,22 | 247:12,18 | 43:1,18,24 44:2 | 199:9,24 200:7 |
| 70:10,16,23 | 140:15,23 | 250:10 251:13 | 45:7 46:19,24 | 201:2,21 202:8 |
| 71:15 73:2,7 | 141:7,11,23 | 252:20 255:20 | 47:1,4 48:14 | 202:22 203:22 |
| 74:25 75:17,20 | 142:14 143:3 | 264:1 270:19 | 50:5 51:7,10 | 204:3,18 206:5 |
| 76:13,23 77:9 | 143:15,24 | 271:15 272:1,3 | 53:24 61:2 65:2 | 206:14,14 |
| 81:15,20 82:3,8 | 146:13 147:1 | objections 55:4 | 66:4,21 67:11 | 207:10 208:15 |
| 83:8 84:8 85:6 | 147:25 148:16 | objective 157:11 | 68:7 72:2 73:4 | 208:23 210:2 |
| 85:12,16,22 | 149:18 150:7 | 157:12 | 78:21 79:23 | 210:13,19,23 |


| 211:7,14,19 | 270:14 271:4,7 | original 6:25,25 | Palo 14:8 | 196:11 220:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 213:4,23 214:7 | 271:13 272:12 | 83:6 162:18 | paper 105:14 | 223:25 225:15 |
| 214:14,25 | 272:21 | 177:12 234:6 | papers 53:23 | 255:19,22 |
| 215:8,11,16 | old 29:23 32:23 | 234:10,20 | paragraph 35:9 | participate 42:22 |
| 216:5,10 | 33:2 253:16 | originally $28: 7$ | 48:5 50:19 | participating |
| 217:13,23 | older 260:24 | 104:14 | 52:21 53:13 | 148:12 265:2 |
| 219:10 220:6 | old-fashioned | outcome 274:16 | 55:9 58:2 61:4 | particular 26:25 |
| 220:17,25 | 208:22 | outright 153:21 | 61:16 99:4 | 27:179:7 111:4 |
| 221:19,25 | once 31:25 136:5 | outside 146:9 | 102:19 104:6,9 | 177:15,18 |
| 222:9,12 | 136:5,6,6 | owes 134:19 | 105:4 107:25 | 242:16 |
| 223:20,24 | 174:10 178:5 | owned 178:19 | 109:4,20 | particularly |
| 224:14,19,23 | 184:10 271:8 | owner 148:5 | 111:21 112:7 | 204:25 205:1 |
| 225:8,15 | ones 52:22 | O'Hagan 49:6 | 112:11 113:24 | parties 7:19 |
| 228:16,23 | 254:19 | 65:23 69:21 | 116:11 117:11 | 196:16 274:14 |
| 230:11,16,25 | one-half 261:22 | 100:21,24 | 123:6 134:6 | partly 28:1 |
| 231:21 232:3,8 | one-liner 148:11 | 101:4,5,24 | 153:10 211:4,5 | partner 69:1 |
| 232:22 233:3,9 | one-on-one 192:4 | 103:5,9 105:5 | 221:1,17 224:5 | 163:20 186:5 |
| 233:23 234:13 | one-third 111:23 | 120:9,17 121:7 | 224:10 245:17 | partnership |
| 235:1,17 | 245:24 246:9 | 121:12,17 | 245:21 | 192:21 |
| 236:11 237:7 | online 192:2 | 122:6 127:16 | paragraphs | parts 46:21 |
| 237:11 238:10 | open 8:6 161:6 | 127:21 | 58:18 61:11 | 199:25 235:6 |
| 238:14,17,17 | 174:1 262:24 | O'Hagan's | 107:21 | 235:10 236:19 |
| 238:23 239:3 | opening 34:17 | 121:11 | parameters | 236:22 |
| 239:17,20,24 | 140:12 |  | 250:2 | party 195:16 |
| 240:18,23 | opens 50:19 | P | paranoia 183:17 | passage 241:3 |
| 241:23 242:5 | 133:10 | P7:1 | paranoid 183:16 | passed 231:14 |
| 242:13,15,22 | OpenSSL 140:17 | page 3:2,7 4:1 | paraphrase 64:4 | passing 121:22 |
| 243:10,19 | open-source 19:8 | 5:1 6:1 47:23 | 97:3 | 243:1 269:6 |
| 244:1,20,25 | 19:10 23:18 | 48:6 51:11 | parenthetical | paste 79:17 84:2 |
| 245:2,7,16 | 27:1,8 200:25 | 53:13,25 54:1 | 217:15,16 | pasted 78:24 |
| 246:7,20 248:4 | opinion 184:6 | 61:2 63:19,21 | 218:3 | 79:14 83:6,7 |
| 248:10,23 | 208:16 234:13 | 63:23 78:5 | parentheticals | patches 206:2 |
| 249:7 250:3,4,8 | opinions 251:3,6 | 80:11,21 96:8 | 216:7,12 217:1 | patching 255:2 |
| 250:17,24 | opposing 187:18 | 102:9,9,10,13 | parse 110:16 | patents 69:12 |
| 251:10 253:21 | option 218:6 | 102:17 103:3 | part 28:5 51:16 | Patoshi 31:14,15 |
| 254:3,7 256:5 | 221:13 | 103:16 104:3,4 | 60:20 69:24 | 31:17 |
| 256:14,19 | options 216:6 | 105:2,4 106:21 | 70:2 75:13 | Patrick 100:5,7 |
| 258:22 259:2 | 218:6 | 106:22 111:20 | 79:15 96:13 | pattern 207:20 |
| 261:1,20 | order 10:8 17:16 | 111:21 211:3 | 97:6 100:12 | patterns 31:7,12 |
| 263:25 264:22 | 18:7 66:16 | 223:16 237:17 | 103:18 105:18 | pause 9:11 34:1 |
| 265:2,13,25 | 86:14 146:18 | paid 63:13 | 112:16 148:7 | 34:22 49:14 |
| 266:11 267:3 | 175:3 | 262:23 | 156:2 158:1 | 55:3 77:18 79:2 |
| 267:13 268:12 | organization | Paige 100:5,7 | 163:24 164:4 | 80:9 101:18 |
| 269:3,9,14 | 27:23 | pair 262:15,17 | 195:20 196:10 | 104:5 146:16 |
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| 146:19 165:12 | 263:2,13 | 267:6,17 | 63:7,8 88:16 | 47:23 69:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 188:3 221:9 | 264:20 266:7 | 271:13 | Plaintiff 9:1,2,16 | 71:18 77:3 |
| 226:17 237:13 | 270:22 271:25 | personal 1:5 | 9:24 | 96:15,17 144:9 |
| pay 32:14 163:21 | people's 269:12 | 82:12 93:20 | Plaintiffs 1:9 2:2 | 153:11 161:13 |
| 167:11 168:24 | percent 168:25 | 200:4 | 7:22 22:22 33:4 | 169:13 170:2 |
| 169:3,9 171:12 | 171:5,9,11,12 | personality | 34:24 38:19 | 170:18 199:3 |
| 171:20 263:8 | 184:20 196:17 | 116:21 | 43:2 44:13 | 218:25 231:11 |
| 263:23 | 210:4,6,11,15 | personally 35:12 | 45:15 46:7 47:8 | 243:20 249:14 |
| paycheck 29:4 | percentage 258:4 | 233:5 264:8,9 | 48:17 50:6 | 249:15 251:17 |
| paying 55:24 | percentages | person's 271:20 | 65:15 77:22 | polled 271:23 |
| payments 257:10 | 258:16 | person-to-pers... | 93:22 95:18 | Ponce 2:15 |
| peek 205:13 | perfect 67:1 | 30:12 | 101:11,21 | poor 219:14 |
| penny 261:21 | 96:21 172:15 | perusing 66:6 | 107:12 110:10 | popped 106:5 |
| 265:21 | 216:20,21 | 110:15 113:3 | 113:1,8 115:19 | portion 233:23 |
| people 8:6 10:7 | 272:18 | 122:21 189:3 | 120:12 122:2 | 235:14 250:22 |
| 17:21 23:19 | performed | 202:17 223:14 | 122:18 125:25 | portions 35:16 |
| 25:7,11 26:21 | 190:13 | 223:19 224:9 | 126:15 128:5 | 234:12 |
| 27:7 28:11 | period 120:2 | Peter 28:10 | 132:21 135:11 | pos 88:15 |
| 34:16 39:24 | perjury 183:22 | PGP 40:8 41:8,10 | 139:1 140:3 | position 27:19,21 |
| 42:8,11 67:25 | permission 86:11 | 41:11 64:8 | 141:17 142:18 | 29:3 152:16 |
| 72:1 89:19 90:3 | 146:4 147:3 | 216:11,16 | 144:24 147:16 | 173:23 174:3,4 |
| 90:12,13,14,19 | permissions | PhD 15:17 | 151:4 153:2 | 174:12 179:18 |
| 91:11 92:6,7 | 145:25 146:2 | PhDs 53:22 | 160:4,13 162:9 | 179:20 |
| 100:13 103:18 | permitted 37:9 | phone 8:16 37:24 | 166:21 168:16 | positive 180:6 |
| 104:7,17 | person 32:15 | 101:2 127:24 | 172:8,18 | possesses 114:2 |
| 108:24 114:4 | 38:2 56:21 69:5 | 149:7,22 | 175:24 177:8 | possession 35:25 |
| 124:1 162:24 | 69:7 72:1,4 | 150:12 176:23 | 178:23 179:1 | 79:11 123:8 |
| 163:2,25 164:4 | 75:12 80:11,16 | 198:5 220:4 | 180:17 182:9 | 163:9 189:23 |
| 164:7 180:11 | 92:4 98:3,10,20 | 263:23 | plan 60:1 | possibilities |
| 186:16 191:10 | 100:25 102:22 | phrase 64:10 | plane 67:12 | 151:15 180:10 |
| 197:2 198:25 | 108:14 111:17 | physically 35:23 | 215:12,12 | possible 58:13 |
| 215:8 234:14 | 112:5 115:10 | 70:12 | 219:20 230:7 | 69:19 72:24 |
| 234:16,19,25 | 116:22 157:2 | picture 27:2 | planning 120:24 | 76:10,14 81:21 |
| 235:7,23 236:1 | 183:11 184:20 | piece 158:1 | plausible 31:12 | 85:17 87:22 |
| 237:23 238:15 | 196:20 214:5,9 | 216:18 235:4 | 32:2 116:23 | 88:2,11 113:13 |
| 243:24,25 | 214:16 217:11 | 236:18 262:24 | please 8:12 9:13 | 130:2 133:23 |
| 246:12 248:15 | 218:1,18 219:8 | 263:5 266:15 | 12:5 103:11 | 186:8,10 |
| 248:19 249:1 | 230:15 234:25 | pieces 39:17 | 139:10 145:14 | 191:24 196:23 |
| 251:3,5,7,10,14 | 235:2,13,20 | 217:4 234:23 | 148:21 203:12 | 197:23 199:11 |
| 251:15 255:5 | 236:6 238:12 | place 44:4 68:3,4 | 254:18 259:18 | 235:23 236:3 |
| 257:19,22,24 | 238:24,24 | 90:17 131:3 | plus 264:12 | 236:14 241:23 |
| 258:23 261:3 | 248:2,7 250:12 | 145:25 240:6 | point 9:12 17:1,2 | 244:11,12,24 |
| 261:10,11,15 | 250:15 254:4 | 241:5 248:17 | 21:17 25:25 | 246:18 248:12 |
| 262:8,10,14,18 | 256:12 266:3 | places 14:1 62:13 | 39:9 42:21 | 267:24 |


| possibly 70:6 | 151:18 180:12 | 143:23 144:8 | 218:10,15 | 252:3 256:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 152:4,5 183:6 | presume 246:13 | 146:7,8,25 | produced 77:22 | projecting 59:13 |
| 234:16 271:16 | pretend 217:11 | 163:10 168:7 | 112:16 132:7 | projects 19:8,10 |
| post 6:21,24 | pretty 145:14 | 188:9 190:7,17 | 177:1 189:20 | 23:18 |
| 31:10 40:15 | 251:7 262:21 | 190:18 197:20 | 218:17 | prominent |
| 78:23 97:19,20 | prevent 106:4 | 197:21 198:14 | producing 73:12 | 156:12 |
| 97:23,24 98:23 | prevents 168:11 | 198:17,20 | product 94:15 | promised 260:2 |
| 99:1,2,9 115:25 | previous 36:4 | 217:14 239:5 | production 9:18 | pronounce |
| 116:2 125:8 | 63:23 118:5 | 269:19,21,22 | professional | 110:18 |
| 131:2,7,7,14 | 171:10 180:5 | 269:25 270:1,2 | 19:15 102:22 | proof 35:7,25 |
| 133:12,22 | 187:13 230:13 | 270:3,4,9,10,11 | 274:5 | 41:14 44:3 65:4 |
| 139:11 141:2 | previously 46:5 | 270:13,15,20 | professionally | 65:10 73:6,6,8 |
| 145:11,22 | 197:4 215:21 | 270:24 271:1,2 | 233:24 | 73:11,25 81:8 |
| 153:19 191:25 | 233:9 239:20 | 271:6,8,9,12,17 | program 20:5 | 86:9 89:3,5,6 |
| 217:14 232:18 | price 262:16 | 271:18,24 | 211:25 212:3 | 89:15,22 90:5 |
| 247:2 249:17 | 263:10 | privately 269:8 | 212:16 237:4 | 96:21,25 97:12 |
| 258:25 260:19 | prickly 116:21 | privilege 23:21 | programmer | 102:3 119:19 |
| 260:23 261:2 | primarily 266:1 | privileges 22:8,9 | 18:11 210:3,4 | 120:4,5 131:21 |
| 261:13 | primary 92:20 | 24:5,8 | 211:9,21,24 | 131:21 132:2,8 |
| posted 116:8 | 92:23 248:13 | probable 225:5 | 212:20 213:17 | 133:18 135:22 |
| 141:2 154:3 | 249:18 | probably 16:4 | 214:18 237:1,3 | 136:7,25 141:6 |
| 247:6,16 | Princeton 13:15 | 24:10,17 28:1 | programmers | 146:21 150:22 |
| posting 192:3 | 13:16,20 14:24 | 29:12,14 62:3 | 210:9,11,12,14 | 151:17,18 |
| posts 41:7,16 | 14:25 | 67:17 81:11 | 210:18 | 153:20 154:1,3 |
| 64:18 184:12 | print 48:20 | 82:12 86:6 | programming | 154:12,12,19 |
| 224:11 260:25 | 178:24 180:18 | 123:1 124:10 | 18:12 199:22 | 158:9 163:6 |
| potential 229:11 | printed 144:25 | 125:14 132:15 | 199:23 200:1,3 | 197:5,8 198:2,9 |
| 257:1,5 | printer 49:17 | 156:11 221:15 | 200:18 202:6 | 216:20,22 |
| power 21:7 | prints 236:24 | 226:2 233:21 | 204:1,12,24 | 239:5 242:13 |
| practical 253:18 | prior 30:4 92:10 | 235:21 240:20 | 206:11,23 | 268:18 |
| 253:19 | 99:1 179:16 | 261:9 263:7 | 207:8,19 208:6 | proofs 197:13 |
| practice 271:5 | 198:18 202:12 | problem 55:7 | 208:11,17,20 | 221:14 |
| predicted 140:11 | 205:12 221:4 | 168:1 | 209:8,19 | proof-of-work |
| prefer 254:6 | private 23:9 | procedure 78:8 | 210:21 212:7,7 | 268:17 |
| prepare 188:6,7 | 35:25 40:14 | proceed 125:21 | 212:10,14 | proper 88:5,8 |
| 188:13 | 41:7,16 64:18 | process 42:12 | 213:11,12,22 | 90:9 240:24 |
| present 2:20 7:19 | 74:6 75:11 | 59:18 81:8 | 226:10 229:18 | properties 69:12 |
| 217:21 | 77:12,16 78:2 | 96:14 97:18 | 233:22,24 | property 192:25 |
| presented 89:4,5 | 79:13 82:2 | 267:22 268:7 | 234:17 256:4 | proposal 164:12 |
| press 71:21 | 86:11,13,19,22 | procured 73:18 | programs 212:21 | propose 97:7 |
| 119:25 131:2 | 88:5,13,13,16 | 73:19 | project 20:9 27:1 | prose 224:12 |
| 133:5 | 97:12 99:6 | produce 73:16 | 27:10 57:13 | protected 36:16 |
| pressing 168:3 | 138:5,12 | 129:23 134:1 | 59:23 93:21 | 36:20 |
| pressure 151:17 | 139:14 143:21 | 189:9,12 214:3 | 226:16 234:17 | protective 66:16 |
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| protocol 27:3 | 153:20 | 32:10 34:2 | rank 124:1 | 63:13 65:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| prove 38:12 | publishing 116:2 | 35:14 48:8 54:2 | 210:13 | 130:6 137:21 |
| 88:23,25 96:20 | pull 95:14 132:15 | 61:12 62:24 | rate 168:25 171:5 | 138:13 146:1 |
| 130:6 132:4 | 259:2 | 83:9 84:1 92:11 | reach 55:21 | 148:15 153:17 |
| 146:6 | purchase 74:14 | 137:25 143:20 | 142:25 212:19 | 157:20,23,24 |
| proves 167:4 | purchased 16:17 | 147:8 159:21 | reached 25:7 | 158:7 163:9 |
| 168:5,7 | 21:20 73:23 | 165:15,18,20 | 158:21,23 | 173:19 174:13 |
| provide 99:8,15 | 240:16 261:18 | 177:15,18 | 215:1 234:13 | 176:20 184:21 |
| 151:17 | 261:18 263:12 | 219:14,18 | 259:8 265:22 | 195:12 200:4 |
| provided 136:8 | 265:20 | 227:12 238:18 | 272:23 | 232:23 243:10 |
| 142:7 146:21 | pure 138:17 | 258:7 | reaching 148:25 | reason 25:6 |
| providence 78:25 | purported 69:11 | questions 33:25 | 213:19 | 26:18 27:5 28:1 |
| provides 96:21 | 193:7 241:25 | 37:5 50:17 | reaction 38:8,11 | 28:2 32:3 41:12 |
| providing 151:18 | purpose 220:18 | 170:3 187:8,15 | 56:14 212:4 | 46:14 117:5 |
| proving 88:14,16 | 221:7 257:23 | 195:24 223:12 | 215:4 | 138:7,16 146:4 |
| 158:2 188:11 | purposes 15:4,16 | question's 141:4 | read 20:1 45:7 | 149:3 240:18 |
| 196:10 232:17 | 25:17 270:8 | quick 165:17 | 59:15,23 61:15 | 240:20 241:2 |
| pseudo 89:5 | push 8:20 | 174:13 259:5 | 62:3 99:17 | 263:2 |
| pseudonym 22:5 | put 9:9 36:10 | quicker 10:5 | 100:20 101:7 | reasonable 89:1 |
| psychological | 59:12 73:14 | quickly 173:19 | 102:20 103:6 | 116:15,18 |
| 183:17 | 78:9,9 80:12 | 223:11 257:12 | 103:10 104:13 | 119:20 158:2 |
| psychologist | 84:5 95:22 | quiet 99:20 | 105:8,8,10 | reasonably |
| 183:18 | 96:18 101:8 | quit 18:15 | 109:7 113:24 | 215:13,17 |
| pub 86:18 | 110:24 174:2 | quite 215:10 | 117:12 119:10 | reasons 26:17 |
| public 9:19 36:1 | 180:10 259:16 | 233:11 | 119:12 130:2 | 27:11 99:7,12 |
| 42:22 83:22,23 | 266:3 | quote 58:22 | 145:20 149:11 | 179:22 221:11 |
| 85:24,25 86:4,8 | putting 36:17,23 | 104:12 105:9 | 178:5 191:22 | 261:8,12,14 |
| 86:9 111:6 | 37:7 39:16 | 105:10 | 217:1 221:17 | reassure 130:23 |
| 114:1 120:5 | 255:1,1 | quotes 51:11 | 223:15 226:2 | rebates 52:5,11 |
| 124:24 135:22 | puzzle 158:6 | 54:1 62:5 105:5 | 234:9,11,12 | recall 11:6 24:22 |
| 143:22 146:21 | P-A-N-O-P-T-.. | quote-unquote | 241:21 244:19 | 34:9 36:9 37:21 |
| 150:22 152:15 | 33:22 | 239:14 | 247:24 260:24 | 37:22,25 38:6 |
| 154:3 179:18 | p.m 144:15,18 | quoting 105:9,11 | 272:19 | 41:11,14,17,18 |
| 191:25 196:13 | 173:9,12,13,15 |  | reading 19:21 | 43:20 58:24 |
| 232:10 241:21 | 173:23 185:10 | R | 78:15 221:6,16 | 68:16,25 69:5,8 |
| 262:21 269:23 | 185:13 226:21 | R 7:1 274:1 | real 20:4 25:10 | 69:16 70:7,12 |
| 274:5,24 | 226:24 259:8 | raise 66:7,9,17 | 39:7 40:4 53:4 | 70:18 71:3 |
| publicly 80:12 | 259:12 272:23 | raised 71:24 | 137:1 151:23 | 73:12 74:3 76:1 |
| 87:21 96:20 |  | 90:19,23 91:1 | 154:2 | 76:5,9,19 77:13 |
| 134:4 146:6 | Q | amona 149:15 | realized 21:8 | 77:13,17 81:3 |
| 226:3,5 232:15 | qualifies 271:11 | ran 19:7 20:6 | 184:13 | 82:9,22 86:5,12 |
| publish 153:19 | question 10:22 | 21:6 213:16 | really $8: 1911: 17$ | 86:13,18 87:23 |
| published 64:17 | 10:24,25 24:25 | Rand 181:11 | 51:18 52:15,18 | 90:7,22,25 91:3 |
| 115:9 121:17 | 25:17,20 32:8,9 | range 32:6 | 52:23 57:23 | 91:16,19 92:15 |
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| 93:1,24 94:3,13 | 34:20 35:3 38:1 | 260:17 | 150:13 | 209:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 95:7 96:10,12 | 56:20 59:13 | recollect 85:7 | recover 97:7 | related 178:2 |
| 96:12,13 98:21 | 79:16 96:15 | recollection 44:9 | Reddit 75:11,12 | 188:16 189:16 |
| 100:6 107:4 | 98:18 130:19 | 45:3 68:21 | 78:2,23 79:12 | 190:18 191:11 |
| 108:18 110:23 | 158:13 161:2 | 72:14,14 78:12 | 79:13,18 88:12 | 191:18 197:8 |
| 113:22 117:17 | 169:10 177:2 | 81:7 85:3 87:8 | 188:8 190:17 | 206:23 207:8 |
| 117:18 118:13 | 177:12 187:14 | 178:7 182:2 | 191:25 | 207:19 208:11 |
| 118:21,23 | 189:4 190:14 | 187:6 221:7,21 | redirect 259:24 | 208:13 209:20 |
| 121:5,10 122:5 | 214:4 | 253:4,13 | redo 49:12 | 226:9,15 |
| 122:12,14 | receiving 96:10 | Reconnecting | red-eye 67:18,21 | 254:14 274:14 |
| 127:23,25 | 96:12 152:12 | 199:15 | refer 91:22 | relationship |
| 131:3 133:21 | 230:4 | record 7:3 8:7,11 | reference 91:20 | 156:8 183:5 |
| 136:17,19 | recess 173:12 | 8:13 10:11 | 108:5 186:13 | 199:20 231:23 |
| 144:5,9 148:1,2 | recognize 23:1 | 11:10 33:5 | referencing | 231:24 232:1,4 |
| 148:4 149:2,23 | 33:8 38:22 43:7 | 34:24 36:24 | 125:8 | 232:7 258:16 |
| 149:24 150:8 | 44:19 45:19 | 37:7,17 38:24 | referred 202:15 | relax 61:19 |
| 150:17,18 | 47:14 48:24 | 43:3 44:15 | referring 61:1 | release 97:18 |
| 152:18 158:23 | 50:6 65:20 79:7 | 45:15 47:10 | 87:2 97:10 | 105:15,18 |
| 168:3 169:10 | 95:20 101:20 | 48:20 49:21,23 | 113:16 114:20 | 131:2,16,16 |
| 173:6 179:14 | 101:20 107:14 | 50:1,3 81:11 | 114:24 117:18 | 132:9 133:5 |
| 180:1 181:20 | 110:12 113:2 | 84:15,19,20,21 | 130:18 180:4 | 234:10 |
| 181:21 182:4 | 115:21 122:20 | 84:23,25 99:24 | 181:10,12 | released 131:15 |
| 183:2,3 186:2,3 | 126:19 128:7 | 99:25 100:2 | 186:4 225:6,11 | 131:20 232:11 |
| 186:7,15,21,22 | 135:13 139:4 | 102:20 103:11 | refers 130:15 | releasing 114:1 |
| 187:1,18 | 140:4 142:19 | 104:13 106:1,7 | reflect 142:22 | relevance 11:19 |
| 188:12 195:6 | 145:2 147:18 | 106:10,14,15 | reflects 140:7 | 12:3 |
| 195:12,13,15 | 151:6 153:3 | 106:17,19 | 141:18 168:19 | reliance 154:8 |
| 197:6 198:1,8 | 160:6,15 | 107:12 109:8 | reformatted | relief 165:2,4 |
| 211:12 214:25 | 162:10 166:23 | 144:12,15,16 | 266:9 | rely 10:19 11:1 |
| 215:25 221:23 | 168:17 170:5 | 144:18 164:16 | refresh 45:3 | remain 52:22,24 |
| 230:4 233:1 | 172:20 176:1 | 172:3,10 | 78:11 81:6 | remarked 3:20 |
| 238:7,8 239:9 | 177:10,16 | 173:10,11,15 | 188:9 253:3,12 | 50:5 |
| 239:11,17 | 178:12 179:2 | 173:17,19 | refreshed 85:2 | remember 10:10 |
| 243:8,23 244:1 | 180:19 182:10 | 174:3 176:22 | refused 125:3 | 19:21 24:9 |
| 244:12,16,18 | 189:1 201:5,25 | 184:17 185:10 | refusing 146:6 | 39:12 68:15 |
| 248:11 250:12 | 203:6 204:7,19 | 185:11,13,16 | regarding 215:1 | 70:21 71:17,19 |
| 250:17 252:4 | 206:6,18 207:3 | 185:20,22 | regardless 81:5 | 73:1 81:22 |
| 252:21 254:19 | 207:14,25 | 226:19,21,22 | 249:8 | 94:12 126:24 |
| 258:22 | 209:3,14,15 | 226:24 245:8 | regards 164:11 | 144:3 148:25 |
| recalled 33:1 | 220:12 222:7 | 259:9,10,12,14 | Registered 274:4 | 152:12 178:15 |
| 241:13 | 222:17 227:4 | 259:16 272:13 | regular 268:8 | 178:18 180:7 |
| receive 31:5 | 227:20 228:8 | 272:20,25 | 269:10,16 | 186:12 239:25 |
| 96:17 265:5 | 229:2 245:11 | 273:1,2 274:11 | rejected 269:13 | 240:2,5,8,14,17 |
| received 33:12 | 246:24 253:9 | recounting 103:5 | relate 208:5 | 241:20 243:10 |
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| 265:24 | reserve 257:8 | 164:23 253:11 | 149:7 156:7 | 8:14,25,25,25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| remotely 8:3 | residential 12:4 | 267:4 | 162:15 163:22 | Roger 28:10 |
| 17:3 | resign 27:21 | restaurant 89:14 | 164:24 165:6 | 180:22 181:15 |
| removed 81:23 | resigned 27:19 | restraint 95:8 | 165:22 167:10 | rogue 85:18 |
| reopen 84:5 | resistant 138:10 | resume 259:20 | 168:22 171:11 | role 26:22,24 |
| repeat 36:13 | resold 21:10 | 272:13 | 180:16,22 | 156:18 250:9 |
| rephrase 24:24 | resolve 144:11 | retrospect 56:25 | 185:17 187:7 | 250:18 |
| 227:12 238:18 | Resounding | return 142:4 | 188:15,22 | roles 148:3 |
| replacement | 16:13,14 | retyped $84: 11,12$ | 194:1,4,18 | rolling 254:24 |
| 157:5 | resources 62:1 | reveal 31:8 59:21 | 196:22 198:8 | room 8:20 47:3 |
| replacing 257:9 | respect 27:25 | revealed 271:25 | 199:13 204:15 | 68:5 70:13,14 |
| replied 148:24 | 162:25 | review 34:5 43:6 | 208:8 210:5,16 | 73:9,22 239:12 |
| reported 196:12 | respond 10:7 | 66:5 67:4 | 211:16 212:18 | 239:16 |
| reporter 1:21 | 37:4 45:2,3 | 145:23 | 215:20,23 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { r o o t }} 22: 8$ |
| 7:16 9:13 10:9 | 104:7 113:10 | reviewed 158:17 | 216:19,23 | Rory 148:10,18 |
| 274:5 | 136:15 145:13 | revisions 205:4 | 218:5,20,24 | 148:21 149:1,7 |
| reports 52:8 | 181:13 255:11 | re-announce | 219:25 221:22 | roughly 210:22 |
| 184:4 191:22 | responded 10:12 | 8:24 | 222:17 223:1,5 | route 149:16 |
| 252:25 | 32:25 47:24 | re-ask 221:10 | 224:4 225:4,21 | rows 203:16 |
| repository $22: 10$ | 159:8,10 | re-sign 139:11 | 229:13 235:14 | RPC 201:19 |
| 22:12 23:15,20 | 181:19 254:24 | right 9:8 13:13 | 236:21 237:3 | RPR 1:21 274:23 |
| 200:24 253:17 | responding 32:21 | 20:24 21:14 | 237:11,14,24 | Ruby 212:9,11 |
| represent 7:20 | 39:3 60:12 | 37:13,16 39:20 | 240:4,14 | rules 10:4 174:6 |
| 9:24 187:12 | 181:23 | 55:22,25 63:8 | 243:19 244:6 | run 18:9 20:5 |
| representation | responds 41:25 | 63:19,25 64:11 | 246:4 249:21 | 98:4,10,20 |
| 177:2 | 51:16 54:7 | 64:15 65:4,11 | 252:21 253:2 | 120:10 129:12 |
| representations | 62:11 114:14 | 67:10,13 68:2 | 258:3,15 | 129:19 256:15 |
| 198:25 | response 9:7 | 73:5 77:8 79:4 | 259:15 260:10 | running 98:13,16 |
| representative | 11:15 44:24 | 83:12,15 87:5 | 260:17 264:18 | 110:25 130:5,8 |
| 1:6 | 60:9 79:15 | 97:20 102:7 | 268:16,23 | 172:11 |
| reputation 97:7 | 103:15 120:16 | 103:8 110:19 | 271:19 | Russell 1:18 |
| 111:12,13 | 120:20 140:9 | 113:8,11 | rights 23:19 |  |
| request 7:13 | 140:25 141:9 | 116:12 117:24 | 94:15 255:2 | S |
| 186:1 189:15 | 145:19 152:5 | 120:16,21 | rises 263:10 | S 2:7 3:6 7:1 |
| requests $24: 14$ | 162:22 169:8 | 122:10,24 | risk 54:19 | 33:15 |
| 189:13 | 169:11 187:21 | 125:9,18 | river 262:12 | sabbatical 18:15 |
| require 154:18 | 189:9 | 126:12,14 | RIVERO 2:14 | 19:5 |
| required 74:21 | responsibilities | 128:17 129:9 | Rob 68:1 96:4 | sad 71:21 242:19 |
| requires 268:7 | 28:23 | 129:20,24,25 | 148:2 | sale 170:23 |
| reread 102:6 | responsibility | 131:10 132:24 | Robert 95:23 | 171:13 |
| resay 66:22 | 57:14 | 134:1 136:11 | 147:22 148:2 | tisfacto |
| research 1:8 18:9 | responsive | 139:15 141:5 | 148:23 149:9 | 9:17 |
| 18:13 31:14,15 | 189:13 | 141:20 142:12 | 151:8,14 152:6 | Satosh 241:24 |
| 32:2 53:23 | rest 92:17 158:5 | 147:4,8 148:15 | Roche 2:4,5 7:13 | Satoshi 3:8 4:2 |

Case 9:18-cv-80176-BB Document 590-5 Entered on FLSD Docket 06/19/2020 Page 303 of 313
CONFIDENTIAL
Page 29

| 6:8 20:19 22:4 | 210:20 211:8 | 50:20 51:11 | 129:25 130:1 | 48:10 50:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22:6,16 23:3,6 | 211:20,23 | 52:21 53:2,14 | 133:22 | 51:14 54:4 |
| 23:14 24:7,13 | 212:2,13 | 54:1,19 55:10 | screenshots | 55:12 59:1 62:8 |
| 24:18 25:4,8,12 | 213:17,24 | 58:3 59:5,25 | 130:24 133:15 | 63:21 64:2 68:9 |
| 25:19,22 30:8 | 214:1,2,16,17 | 60:7 61:12,16 | 133:17,23 | 68:17 76:6 78:6 |
| 30:10 31:2,4,5 | 215:2,9,14,18 | 63:12 78:6 | 134:2 | 80:8 95:15 98:6 |
| 31:9 38:13 | 216:11 225:17 | 80:14,18,21 | script 212:24,25 | 98:7 99:10,20 |
| 39:25 40:1,5,8 | 226:4,6 227:7 | 97:1 99:4 | 213:5 236:12 | 102:9,12 104:6 |
| 40:15 42:13,23 | 227:23 228:1 | 102:13,23 | scripts 213:14,18 | 105:6 106:22 |
| 56:21 57:5,15 | 228:10,18 | 106:23 109:21 | 213:24 214:23 | 107:22 108:4 |
| 57:19 59:21 | 229:4,9,17 | 111:22 114:15 | seal 37:12 274:18 | 109:4,19 |
| 60:21 64:19 | 230:13 241:25 | 128:13,15,16 | sealed 74:17 | 111:25 112:7 |
| 68:13 69:12 | 243:21 244:22 | 128:18 130:12 | sealed-in-the-p... | 112:12 113:5 |
| 70:20,21,25 | 245:25 246:10 | 135:25 139:3 | 73:14 | 114:17,19 |
| 71:1 72:174:10 | 246:16 247:3 | 139:10 141:25 | search 190:13 | 115:3 123:11 |
| 87:3 88:24 89:2 | 253:13 254:24 | 143:7 145:22 | searches 190:16 | 125:21 126:17 |
| 90:3,18 91:11 | satoshin@gmx... | 148:10,18,20 | seasick 61:21 | 127:2 128:19 |
| 92:16 94:5 | 23:7 252:25 | 148:24 149:12 | Seattle 12:21,23 | 128:24 129:7 |
| 96:21 101:8,24 | Satoshi's 31:13 | 152:10 153:11 | second $14: 23$ | 131:23 133:12 |
| 103:14 104:15 | 93:23 94:15 | 161:5,8,19 | 48:5 82:16 83:3 | 134:12 140:9 |
| 111:23 116:1 | 102:23 200:18 | 162:18 163:14 | 95:15 98:3,10 | 140:12 142:5 |
| 116:16 117:20 | 208:16 213:13 | 167:2,10,22 | 98:20 101:14 | 143:11 148:19 |
| 118:10 119:2,7 | 226:1 229:23 | 170:16,23 | 105:4 111:21 | 151:15 153:14 |
| 119:13,15,21 | 230:1 237:22 | 171:17 172:24 | 113:24 114:18 | 161:11 162:20 |
| 127:14,17 | 252:22 253:15 | 177:19 179:12 | 116:10 117:11 | 163:16 164:2,5 |
| 129:17 130:22 | 254:11 | 179:21 181:5 | 143:20 170:21 | 164:16 167:5 |
| 131:17 132:5 | save 84:5 97:2 | 182:16 203:13 | 174:23 211:3,7 | 167:13 170:22 |
| 151:16,25 | saved 233:16 | 211:8 215:24 | 216:24 | 172:24 179:24 |
| 152:8 155:16 | saving 97:6 | 222:1,25 223:4 | second-to-bott... | 181:7 182:18 |
| 157:2,5 158:3 | saw 52:8 82:10 | 224:10,14,15 | 58:3 | 182:19 184:4 |
| 167:20 175:6 | 88:5,8 127:21 | 225:11 237:20 | second-to-last | 194:6 201:10 |
| 186:17 189:16 | 137:1 171:10 | 245:24 270:3 | 109:19 | 211:7 215:24 |
| 190:4,5,15 | 178:13 252:25 | schedule 166:7 | secret 109:10 | 216:1,8 217:25 |
| 199:17,20 | saying 32:14 35:9 | school 13:8,11 | section 73:6 | 233:15 237:20 |
| 200:7,11,14,22 | 51:19 57:8 | 233:16,17 | security 24:3 | 242:19,24 |
| 201:1,13,14,15 | 66:18,19,20 | science 15:1 | 76:17 255:21 | 245:16,22 |
| 202:3 203:1,8 | 87:2,23 93:4 | Sciences 29:2 | security-consci... | 253:3 259:2 |
| 203:23 204:10 | 98:2 115:25 | scientist 18:20,24 | 254:4 | seeing 39:6,15 |
| 204:22 205:7 | 124:14 143:1 | 26:23 27:13,15 | see 11:19 12:23 | 99:2 107:25 |
| 205:20,22 | 145:6,10,14 | 27:17 57:12 | 13:21 16:9 17:5 | seen 99:1 138:18 |
| 206:7,8,21 | 146:23 168:24 | 156:19,23 | 17:15 18:8 20:4 | 183:19 194:5 |
| 207:6,16 208:2 | 203:11 243:23 | screen 78:8 | 28:12 29:17,25 | 195:4,6,8 |
| 208:10 209:5 | 247:3 | screenshot | 34:8 40:4,7 | 196:12 226:9 |
| 209:24 210:2 | says 24:16 36:3 | 128:11 129:23 | 42:3 46:15 | sees 143:6 |
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| segue 28:17 | server 213:18 | 229:13,15 | signing 84:3 | skill 218:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sell 69:10 163:15 | service 253:25 | showing 128:11 | 85:15 86:21 | 236:8 268:21 |
| 163:21 164:8 | Services 1:23 | 215:2 | 102:3 138:10 | 274:12 |
| 167:3 171:2 | 7:16,17 | shown 10:19 | 163:8 167:4 | skills 213:13 |
| 263:11 265:17 | session 35:7 44:3 | 198:9 232:8 | 168:4 220:23 | 234:2 |
| semi-retirement | 65:4,10 73:6,8 | shows 130:8 | 240:5 | skim 223:17 |
| 162:24 | 73:11 88:14,16 | Shrem 28:10,16 | Silicon 13:24 | sleep 89:10 |
| send 23:24,25 | 89:6,15,23 90:5 | shrugged 181:6 | 15:5,7,22,24,25 | 239:12,17,22 |
| 31:4 97:8 | 102:3,3 119:19 | 181:11 | 16:17 | slightly $82: 20$ |
| 134:15,17 | 120:4,5 137:1 | shut $256: 17,20$ | similar 211:15 | 223:7 |
| 137:9 142:3,9 | 154:1 158:9 | shutting 205:3 | 224:7,25 225:1 | slower 210:17 |
| 146:22 149:11 | 196:11 197:5 | side 156:5 | 236:8 267:21 | small 234:15,25 |
| 176:20 224:15 | 198:2 232:10 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i g }} 81: 8170: 10$ | similarities | 257:7 |
| 225:12 255:5 | 232:18 239:5 | 170:10 | 223:22 | smiley 63:14 |
| sending 196:20 | 242:13 | sighted 17:2 | similarity 267:23 | Social 154:25 |
| sends 149:9 | set 71:8 110:22 | sign 35:13 64:11 | similarly 49:2 | socially 154:22 |
| sense 257:15 | 131:1 274:9,17 | 82:11 83:13 | simple 131:16,18 | socks 262:11,15 |
| sent 30:11 32:14 | sets 158:24 236:8 | 86:1,15 99:6 | 132:9 139:20 | 262:17 |
| 63:23 79:14 | setting 181:24 | 116:25 134:8 | 140:18 141:5 | software 15:12 |
| 87:3,4 134:8,10 | 195:16 | 136:4 138:7 | 205:5 211:24 | 16:20 19:8,10 |
| 136:10 143:1 | seven 19:9 | 139:13 144:7 | 212:3,16,20,24 | 23:18 24:2 |
| 147:22 148:15 | 164:25 | 162:19 270:22 | 212:25 213:4,5 | 26:20 27:1,8,10 |
| 153:8 190:14 | shadowy 24:16 | signal 106:2 | 213:14,24 | 74:1 75:2,3 |
| 196:15,20 | shaking 10:7 | signature 41:10 | 214:23 | 76:24 83:2 |
| 205:13 217:14 | share 177:20,21 | 77:7 78:9 81:7 | simultaneous | 85:11 88:18 |
| 222:24 224:6 | 200:7,9,9,11 | 83:14,18,19,23 | 184:12 | 118:23 124:10 |
| 224:19,21,22 | 270:16 | 85:4 88:5,8 | single 86:5 | 128:12 129:12 |
| 230:16,18 | shared 271:8 | 114:1 139:12 | 234:11 240:11 | 200:6,25 |
| sentence 102:20 | sharing 205:19 | 140:20 | 269:5 | 201:20,20 |
| 104:10 106:22 | 205:22 | signatures 41:12 | sit 122:4 | 208:13 227:15 |
| 109:7,19,21 | shed 28:22 | 73:16 | sitting 24:22 | 228:3,21 |
| 114:18 116:11 | shell 81:23 | signed 40:8,11 | 25:21 57:22 | 229:12 234:7 |
| 117:11 140:12 | she/he/them | 41:2,8 64:8,14 | 88:4,7 95:1 | 236:18,19,22 |
| 247:24 | 158:22 | 74:6 75:4 77:6 | 134:20 262:3 | 238:20 249:2 |
| sentences 91:16 | shit 53:3 | 77:14 78:6 | 263:5,20 | 252:13 254:24 |
| separate 23:21 | short 91:15 | 81:18 82:7,10 | situation 179:14 | 262:24 266:16 |
| separated 158:24 | shortly 20:8 | 83:6,11,11,24 | six 86:6,7 | 268:10,22 |
| sequential | 145:12 | 87:11 98:22 | size 60:22,24 | sold 16:22 |
| 202:19 205:12 | show 129:16 | 131:18 132:9 | 235:8 252:5 | solved 181:1 |
| sequentially | 132:2 138:12 | 136:7 146:11 | skeptical 20:2 | somebody 38:12 |
| 209:11 | 146:7 197:12 | 168:6 216:24 | 38:15,16 39:21 | 58:23 60:18 |
| Sergio 31:11, | 225:17 244:20 | 219:12 | 39:23 40:2 | 88:17 91:25 |
| series 47:17 | 253:2 260:4 | significant 137:7 | 215:6 | 122:8 131:25 |
| 213:5 226:6 | showed 202:13 | 155:17 264:16 | skepticism 215:4 | 163:21 191:20 |
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| 192:4,15 | 246:15 253:17 | 191:12,15 | 246:7 248:18 | 141:25 142:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 197:19 213:19 | 262:24 | sporadically | 250:4 251:2 | 143:5 148:20 |
| 213:23 215:1 | SourceForge | 232:17 | 271:7 | 148:24 149:15 |
| 216:17,18 | 23:17 24:6 | sprang 249:5 | stated 57:23 | 152:13 179:5 |
| 217:9 242:19 | sources 196:7 | srmatt 127:5 | 87:21 232:12 | 179:12 220:15 |
| 244:7,13 253:1 | source-code | srmatt@hush... | 239:7 241:12 | Stefan's 148:3 |
| 253:15 254:11 | 23:20 | 123:2 126:25 | 258:9,12 | STENOGRAP... |
| 254:20 262:23 | south 133:6,8 | SS 274:3 | 263:19 | 9:3 31:22 33:19 |
| 265:2,25 | Southeast 2:6 | stage 179:22 | statement 56:6 | 37:2 44:14 46:9 |
| 266:23 267:5 | southern 1:2 7:8 | stand 146:20 | 56:14 58:12 | 48:18 49:18 |
| 267:15 271:7 | 13:3,4,6,12,14 | standard 224:12 | 59:11 61:6,8 | 55:1,5 108:21 |
| somebody's 8:8 | so-called 188:11 | standing 36:11 | 62:21 66:12 | 128:14 238:2 |
| 217:20 | 196:9 | 36:18 66:24,25 | 92:5 96:22 | 259:4 269:21 |
| somethings | space $57: 17$ | Stanford 15:17 | 114:7 118:17 | step 19:12 22:6 |
| 161:18 194:3,4 | 88:23,25 | start 19:2 30:15 | 126:9 137:4 | 26:8 59:21 79:4 |
| somewhat 260:22 | spamming 60:18 | 108:22 145:6 | 157:9 161:16 | 88:3 114:6 |
| soon 109:10 | span 225:9 | 201:13 253:8 | 175:18 211:11 | 143:19 |
| 132:17 145:22 | speak 140:19 | 268:11 | 211:12,17 | stepped 22:16 |
| sorry 12:13 | 188:15 | started 9:14 | 213:25 267:5 | 27:5,12 116:24 |
| 21:23 31:23 | speaker 8:23 9:9 | 15:24 74:19 | 271:10 | 117:5 156:18 |
| 32:16 38:23 | speaking 116:19 | 256:12,19 | statements 50:17 | 156:20 |
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| 155:6 174:14 | 32:22 33:1 | wife 15:17 61:16 | 94:15 102:23 | 38:2,7 39:6,10 |
| 176:10 212:12 | 74:11 75:6 | 61:21 188:18 | 105:20 172:25 | 39:15,16,18 |
| 262:25 267:11 | 79:12,12 86:5 | wiki 255:13 | 205:7 227:16 | 40:22 42:7,23 |
| watch 76:3 | 89:8,9 127:20 | willing 166:13 | 228:4 235:20 | 43:12,25 50:10 |
| water 61:20 | 133:5,8 154:1 | Windows 118:25 | 236:1,15 | 72:3 74:24 |
| way 10:11 11:23 | 203:15 260:24 | 213:16,17 | 249:22 255:10 | 86:19 88:24 |
| 46:3 61:25 62:3 | weren't 154:10 | Wisconsin 14:9 | 267:9 268:18 | 89:1 103:9 |
| 64:3 71:20 | 195:16 233:7 | 14:10,11,12,14 | worked 17:2 18:1 | 106:23 110:22 |
| 88:21 103:4 | 241:16,17,18 | 14:15 15:15,19 | 18:17 252:18 | 111:22 116:1 |
| 108:25 129:16 | 261:16 266:2 | 15:20,21 | 262:20 | 128:10 136:2 |
| 146:9 149:16 | we'll 8:20,20 | witness 7:25 8:17 | working 6:8 17:6 | 142:1,23 153:5 |
| 154:23 163:1 | 10:15 11:19 | 8:18,21 9:14,16 | 26:24 27:7 42:7 | 159:1,2 162:12 |
| 217:12 247:20 | 79:25 96:19 | 31:24 35:24 | 68:18 105:16 | 170:7 180:21 |
| 251:8 257:21 | 169:19 185:7 | 49:15 55:8 66:6 | 124:9 133:11 | 182:5 183:11 |
| 259:17 263:9 | 245:9 253:3 | 66:13 78:8 | 152:6 261:4,10 | 186:4 187:12 |
| 265:17 267:2 | we're 7:3 8:14 | 105:3 110:15 | workout 166:10 | 187:19,24 |
| 267:12,16 | 22:22 49:11,23 | 113:3 122:3,21 | works 267:7 | 189:16 190:4 |
| 268:16 | 50:3 63:22 | 129:5 155:22 | world 88:23 89:5 | 190:11,15 |
| ways $51: 17,20$ | 65:15 84:18,20 | 159:15 164:17 | 96:20 124:2 | 191:10,12 |
| 145:7,15 | 84:23,25 99:23 | 165:1,6,9,13 | 157:6 158:3 | 192:6,7,21,22 |
| 215:17 255:14 | 100:2 101:10 | 166:1,5,9,14,16 | 184:13 210:6 | 193:10,16 |
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| 195:2 196:8,15 | 236:5 237:21 | 130:14 131:6 | Z | 262:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 197:12 198:2 | 237:23 238:20 | 133:20 135:3 | Zalman 2:13 | 10,000 261:18 |
| 198:14 199:1 | 248:6 | 148:9 155:21 | 7:23 165:16 | 262:22,23,25 |
| 199:12 215:2 | wrong 17:16 49:7 | 157:25 166:6 | 172:10 187:11 | 263:4 |
| 215:14 219:11 | 49:12 62:13 | 171:12,16 | 203:9 | 10:00 166:10 |
| 219:21 222:10 | 63:7 80:22 81:2 | 176:9,15 | zero 30:15,18, 20 | 10:04 49:23 |
| 222:21 224:5 | 81:4 141:1 | 181:11 183:8 | 30:22 | 10:13 50:3 |
| 225:6,11,16 | 144:25 145:11 | 183:15 189:8 | Zform 17:20 | $100161: 9$ |
| 230:5,16,18 | 236:25 | 198:16 200:2,5 | zkass@rivero... | 1000 2:15 |
| 231:1,2,5,20,25 | wrote 15:12 | 201:7 204:25 | 2:18 | 1004 6:16 |
| 232:2,4,10,11 | 16:20 17:23 | 210:22 213:1 | zoom 129:1 | 1007 4:3 107:13 |
| 239:6,7,16 | 99:16,16 | 213:10 216:21 | 130:12 | 101 4:2 |
| 242:1,6,8 243:1 | 101:25 115:25 | 218:12 223:23 | zoomed-in | 107 4:3 |
| 243:7,21 244:9 | 118:12 124:7,7 | 225:23 227:14 | 129:10 | 1075 5:7 175:25 |
| 245:19 246:9 | 145:10 214:6 | 228:2,19 |  | 1077 3:19 48:21 |
| 247:3,9 248:1,5 | 226:3 231:1,4 | 229:11 236:14 | \$ | 1078 53:25 |
| 248:7,19,25 | 234:14,16 | 237:19 239:15 | \$10263:5 | 1079 61:3 |
| 249:9,12 250:5 | 238:12,24,25 | 241:10 243:15 | \$10,000 262:16 | 1080 63:19 |
| Wright's 102:22 | 247:2 249:17 | 248:11 254:1 | \$20 262:4 | 11 3:22 12:10 |
| 127:17 159:23 | 249:24 258:25 | 256:22 260:22 | \$400 167:16 | 29:7 77:19,22 |
| 191:4 193:13 | 260:19,23 | 267:8 268:1 | 171:13 | 82:22,24 |
| 194:13,16 | www.MagnaL... | 272:11 | \$50 20:16 143:1 | 134:21,22 |
| write 23:20 39:5 | 1:25 | year 12:15 16:3,5 | 261:19 263:4 | 11's 272:15 |
| 53:23 116:10 | W\&K 1:7 | 17:3 18:21 | \$50,000 263:8 | 11-CSW 84:5 |
| 118:17 129:13 |  | 27:19 32:16 |  | 11:00 67:12,16 |
| 213:18,24 | X | 58:5 105:15 | 0 | 67:19 259:21 |
| 224:13 225:17 | x 1:4,13 3:1,5,6 | 159:2,7,9,11 | $010351: 19$ | 272:14 |
| 236:12,24 | 102:13 | 162:19 189:5,7 |  | 11:01 84:18 |
| 245:22 247:5 | XT 251:19,23,24 | 189:7,8 230:17 | 1 | 11:06 222:25 |
| 247:21 268:15 | 252:2,3,18 | 241:1 256:18 | $13: 87: 4$ 22:22 | 11:10 84:23 |
| writes 107:22 |  | years 15:9,10 | 22:24 35:13 | 11:31 99:23 |
| 112:8 143:6 | $\frac{\mathrm{Y}}{}$ | 16:5,16 17:25 | 60:22 64:24 | 11:33 100:2 |
| 148:9 | Y 102:15 | 18:6,6,6,23,25 | 84:20 93:22 | 11:41 106:13 |
| writing 19:16 | yacht 61:13 | 26:12 72:11 | 136:6 | 11:45 106:17 |
| 122:23 212:9 | Yada 61:13,14,14 | 114:4 148:4 | 1st 131:1 | 11:53 223:4 |
| 213:14 224:1 | Ye 253:24 | 151:21 171:19 | 1:19 173:9,12 | 110 4:4 |
| 225:2 226:1 | yeah 13:6 14:5,15 | 180:11 233:13 | 1:30 259:23 | 112 4:5 |
| 229:23 230:2 | 16:24 24:9 | 241:8,9,10,10 | $103: 2130: 9,14$ | 1120 3:16 45:16 |
| 230:12,13 | 41:18 48:18 | 254:17 256:17 | 30:21 65:16,17 | 1154.6 |
| 237:24 | 49:16 55:5 | Yen 257:7 | 65:18 74:9 | 1179 4:10 128:6 |
| written 200:25 | 56:19,23,23 | Yep 102:18 | 85:25 86:23 | 12 3:24 21:23 |
| 224:11 226:5 | 63:4 68:2 72:22 | 167:24 | 87:2,4 97:9 | 95:12,18 |
| 231:8 234:2 | 78:17 81:3 | yesterday 179:23 | 122:2 124:1,4 | 130:14 |
| 235:6,12,15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:13 117:18 } \\ & \text { 128:23 129:22 } \end{aligned}$ | York 131:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 197: 9198: 15 \\ & 210: 4,6,11,15 \end{aligned}$ | 12th 105:5 120:8 |
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| 12,000 130:4,9 | 168 5:4 | 125:23,25 | 110:20 133:3 | 26 1:16 4:15 7:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12,914 130:11,12 | 169 5:5 | 126:15 | 135:19 147:22 | 102:17 141:14 |
| 130:15 | 17 4:6 32:16 | 20th 30:4 | 149:10 153:8 | 141:17 |
| 12:34 144:15 | 115:16,19 | 200 2:7 | 199:13 219:1 | 260 6:24 |
| 12:44 144:18 | 1708 4:17 144:25 | 2000 21:12 | 222:25 223:4 | 265-266 5:15 |
| 120 4:7 | 172 5:6 | 2000-ish 16:23 | 230:20,24 | 27 4:16 104:3,4 |
| 1206 4:18 147:17 | 1720 3:17 47:11 | 16:24 | 231:19 241:5 | 107:19 142:15 |
| 122 4:8 | 47:23 | 2007 3:23 77:23 | 246:5,18 247:2 | 142:18 |
| 125 4:9 | 175 5:7 | 2008 105:6 | 247:6 | 275 5:16 |
| 1260-1262 6:13 | 1762 4:7 120:13 | 2009 18:14,15,17 | 2017 26:14 40:23 | 276 5:18 |
| 1274 5:3 166:22 | 177 5:8 | 77:25 78:5,13 | 182:14 | 28 4:17 144:20,24 |
| 128 4:10 | 178 5:10 | 80:11 92:8 | 2018 180:24 | 29 4:18 147:13,16 |
| 1286 3:14 43:3 | 18 4:7,16 32:17 | 217:12 | 260:20 | 219:1 |
| 1296 3:10 33:5 | 120:12,14 | 201 5:14,16 | 202 5:17 | 29th 122:4 |
| 13 4:2 101:11,12 | 142:19 | 2010 19:5,19 | 2020 1:16 32:16 | 293 5:18 |
| 101:21 | 180 5:11 | 20:13,21,24 | 241:9 274:18 | 297 6:5 |
| 132 4:11 | 182 5:12 | 21:12,21 22:4 | 203 5:19 | 298-299 6:6 |
| 1334 5:9 177:9 | 188 5:13 | 22:13,16 23:22 | 204 5:20,21 |  |
| 135 4:12 | 19 4:8 32:16 | 29:6 30:5 40:9 | 205 5:22 | 3 |
| 138 4:13 | 122:15,18 | 41:9 60:16 | 206 5:24,25 | 3 3:11 34:24 35:1 |
| 139 4:14 | 1966 11:12 12:16 | 80:11 112:9 | 207 6:2,3,4 | 64:25 173:16 |
| 14 4:3 35:4 107:9 | 1970 11:23 | 116:22 199:17 | 208 6:5 | 237:18,18 |
| 107:12 | 1972 12:19 | 200:4 201:7 | 209 6:6 | 259:9 |
| 141 4:15 | 1974 5:6 172:19 | 217:15 218:1 | 21 4:10 119:1 | 3rd 145:14 |
| 142 4:16 | 1980 233:18,19 | 250:25 254:20 | 128:1,5 161:23 | 222:25 223:4 |
| 1433 3:13 38:24 | 233:21 | 255:5,25 | 210 6:7 | 246:18 274:18 |
| 1439 5:4 168:16 | 1984 13:16 | 256:20,25 | 22 3:8 4:11 | 3:46 226:21 |
| 144 4:17 | 233:16 | 257:3 261:4 | 132:18,21 | 3:51 226:24 |
| 1467 6:10 | 1988 13:18 | 265:15,16,18 | 220 6:10 | 30 4:19 151:1,4 |
| 147 4:18 | 1999 14:18,20 | 265:20 | 222 6:11,12 | 30-second 11:18 |
| 1482 5:12 182:9 |  | 2011 21:5,13,21 | 226 6:14 | 11:20 |
| 154:4,8 110:7,10 | 2 | 26:6,7 80:21 | 227 6:16 | 305.445.2500 |
| 113:8 122:19 | $23: 933: 4,6$ | 93:11,14 117:6 | 228 6:17,19 | 2:17 |
| 15th 11:11 | 64:24 84:24 | 117:15 118:3 | 23 4:12 135:6,11 | 305.753.3675 2:9 |
| 151 4:19 | 106:18 144:19 | 257:4 261:4 | 24 4:13 138:23 | 307 3:15 44:16 |
| 1512 4:22 160:5 | 173:10 | 2012 18:21 21:16 | 139:1 | 307-309 6:11 |
| 152 4:21 | 2nd 119:25 131:2 | 256:20 | 2456:20 | 31 4:21 105:2,4 |
| 1521 4:9 126:1,16 | 133:3 135:19 | 2013 231:15,16 | 246 6:21 | 152:24 153:2 |
| 16 4:5 112:23 | 145:10 | 2014 34:6 100:12 | 25 4:14 139:25 | 311 6:15 |
| 113:1 | 2:23 173:13,15 | 253:11 | 140:3 | 32 4:22 160:1,4 |
| 160 4:22,23 | 2:30 166:11,12 | 2016 25:16 34:19 | 251 5:20 | 33 3:9 4:6,23 |
| 161 4:13 139:2 | 2:37 185:10 | 35:4 40:22 45:5 | 2525 2:15 | 115:20 160:10 |
| 162 4:24 | 2:50 185:13 | 47:20 49:3 | 253 6:2,22 | 160:13 |
| 166 5:2 | 20 4:9 124:5,7,11 | 50:12 107:19 | 257 6:19 | 33131 2:8 |
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| 33134 2:16 | 182:6,9 | 209:15 | 260:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 4:24 162:1,9 | 44 3:15 5:13 | 59 6:7 210:24 | 732 4:25 162:9 |
| 344 4:23 160:14 | 188:23,24 | 211:1 237:15 | 74 12:24 |
| 348-349 6:18 | 45 3:16 5:17 12:6 |  | 75 12:25 |
| 353:11 5:2 | 202:9,10 | 6 | $7613: 3$ 103:3 |
| 166:17,21 | 46 5:19 203:3,5,9 | 6 3:15 44:14,15 | 769 4:20 151:5 |
| $3574: 4$ 110:11 | 203:13,14,22 | 44:17 47:20 | 77 3:22 48:21 |
| 358 111:21 | 47 3:17 4:12 5:20 | 49:3 50:12 | 103:16 |
| 359 5:19 | 135:12 204:4,6 | 6:00 165:13,14 | 796 3:11 34:25 |
| 36 5:4 106:21 | $483: 18$ 5:14 | $169: 16173: 23$ $606.10 ~ 220: 9,10$ | 8 |
| 168:13,16 | 201:2,3 | 60 6:10 220:9,10 | 8 |
| 37 5:5 169:21,25 | 49 3:20 5:16 | 61 6:11 222:3,4,5 | 8 3:17 47:9,10,12 |
| 370 6:4 | 201:22,23 | 223:2 224:4,24 | 800 171:6 |
| 371 4:14 140:3 | 202:13 | 62 6:12 222:14,15 | 810 3:21 65:17 |
| 375-376 6:23 |  | 224:17 225:11 | 83-1 101:15 |
| $383: 12$ 5:6 172:4 | 5 | 622 4:5 113:1 | 866-624-6221 |
| 172:18 | 53:14 4:11 43:3 | 63 6:14 226:25 | 1:24 |
| 380 5:21 | 43:4 46:7 | 227:3 | $8695: 5$ 169:25 |
| 3815:23 | 132:22 | 64 6:16 227:17,19 | 88 14:2 15:2 |
| 383 5:23 | 5/29/2026 274:25 | 233:18 | 893 6:20 |
| 39 5:7 175:21,24 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \mathbf{5 : 0 0} 259: 19 \\ 272: 8,23 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \mathbf{6 4 1} 5: 25 \\ \mathbf{6 4 5} 6: 3 \end{array}$ | 9 |
| 4 | 50 5:21 29:8 | 65 3:21 6:17 | 9 3:4,18,20 30:14 |
| 43:12 4:15 38:19 | 204:16,18 | 228:5,7 | 30:21,21 48:17 |
| 38:20 141:17 | 205:15,19 | 66 6:19 12:17 | 48:19,22 49:9 |
| 172:14 189:15 | 223:6,8 224:7 | 228:24,25 | 49:12,24 50:6 |
| 215:21 254:21 | 224:22 230:6 | 67 221:25 | 82:2 85:25 |
| 259:13 272:24 | 231:6 262:14 | 68 6:20 245:5,10 | 86:14,19 87:1,2 |
| 4th 147:22 | 262:15 | 683 3:25 95:19 | 87:4 88:6 97:9 |
| 149:10 150:16 | 50-minute 225:9 | 96:5 | 97:10,13 134:9 |
| 177:19 | 51 5:22 168:25 | 684 3:25 95:19 | 134:16,21 |
| 4:34 259:8 | 171:5,9,11,12 | 96:5 | 136:5,5,6 137:2 |
| 4:44 259:12 | 203:10 205:9 | 69 6:21 246:21,23 | 137:9 139:12 |
| 40 5:8 177:8 | 205:11 |  | 139:15 142:2 |
| 400 167:11 | 52 5:24 206:3,5 | 7 | 143:2 146:7,23 |
| 170:23 171:2 | 53 5:25 206:15,17 | 73:16 45:15,17 | 163:10 197:9 |
| 171:15,17 | 54 6:2 206:25 | 153:8 | 198:15 |
| 41 4:21 5:10 | 207:1 | 7th 44:4 65:9 | 9:00 166:10 |
| 153:2 178:21 | 55 6:3 207:11,13 | 66:1 119:19,23 | 9:11 1:16 7:11 |
| 178:23 179:1 | $55029: 9$ | 198:7,14 | 9:18-cv-80176-... |
| 415 5:24 | 56 6:4 207:22,24 | 199:13 | 1:3 |
| 42 5:11 180:14,17 | 57 6:5 208:25 | 70 6:22 11:23 | 953:24 |
| 423 1:18 | 209:2,16 | 253:3,5 | $9614: 2,3,8$ 15:14 |
| 43 3:14 5:12 | 58 6:6 209:11,12 | $\begin{array}{\|r} 716: 24177: 5 \\ 260: 11,15,16 \end{array}$ | 98 16:6,7,8 |

