```
Page 1
             UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
         FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
VIACOM INTERNATIONAL, INC., COMEDY )
PARTNERS, COUNTRY MUSIC
TELEVISION, INC., PARAMOUNT
PICTURES CORPORATION, and BLACK
ENTERTAINMENT TELEVISION, LLC,
                 Plaintiffs,
vs.
                                   ) NO. 07-CV-2203
YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC,
and GOOGLE, INC.,
                 Defendants.
THE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION PREMIER
LEAGUE LIMITED, BOURNE CO., et al.,)
on behalf of themselves and all
others similarly situated,
                 Plaintiffs,
                                   ) NO. 07-CV-3582
vs.
YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC, and
GOOGLE, INC.,
                 Defendants.
          VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF ERIC SCHMIDT
               SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
                WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 2009
JOB NO. 16802
```

	Page 2
1	MAY 6, 2009
2	9:14 a.m.
3	
4	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF ERIC SCHMIDT,
5	held at the offices of WILSON, SONSINI,
6	GOODRICH & ROSATI, 601 California Avenue,
7	Palo Alto, California, pursuant to notice,
8	before ANDREA M. IGNACIO HOWARD, CLR, CCRR, RPR,
9	CSR License No. 9830.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS VIACOM INTERNATIONAL, INC.:
4	JENNER & BLOCK, LLP
5	By: SUSAN J. KOHLMANN, Esq.
6	1099 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 900
7	Washington, D.C. 20001
8	(202) 639-6000 skohlmann@jenner.com
9	
10	FOR THE LEAD PLAINTIFFS AND PROSPECTIVE CLASS:
11	PROSKAUER ROSE, LLP
12	By: TANYA L. FORSHEIT, Esq.
13	2049 Century Park East, Suite 3200
14	Los Angeles, California 90067-3206
15	(310) 284-4508 sforsheit@proskauer.com
16	
17	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS VIACOM INTERNATIONAL INC.:
18	SHEARMAN & STERLING, LLP
19	By: STUART J. BASKIN, Esq.
20	SEAN T. STRAUSS, Esq. (San Francisco)
21	599 Lexington Avenue
22	New York, New York 10022-6069
23	(212) 848-4000 stuart.baskin@shearman.com
24	
25	

	Page 4
1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
2	APPEARANCES (Continued.)
3	
4	FOR THE DEFENDANTS YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC and
5	GOOGLE, INC.:
6	MAYER BROWN, LLP
7	By: JOHN MANCINI, Esq.
8	DAVID H. MCGILL, Esq.
9	1675 Broadway
10	New York, New York 10019-5820
11	(212) 506-2279 jmancini@mayerbrownrowe.com
12	
13	ALSO PRESENT:
14	GOOGLE
15	By: KENT WALKER, Esq.
16	CATHERINE LACAVERA, Esq.
17	1600 Amphitheater Parkway
18	Mountain View, California 94043
19	(650) 214-4879
20	
21	KEN REESER, Videographer.
22	
23	000
24	
25	

		Page 5
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
	2	PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA
	3	WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 2009, 9:14 A.M.
	4	
	5	
09:14:24	6	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning.
09:14:25	7	Today's videotaped deposition of Eric Schmidt
09:14:28	8	is taken on May 6th, 2009, at 601 California Avenue,
09:14:36	9	Palo Alto, California.
09:14:38	10	In the matter of Viacom International,
09:14:38	11	et al., vs. YouTube, Incorporated, et al., and The
09:14:38	12	Football Association Premier League Limited, et al.,
09:14:38	13	vs. YouTube, Incorporated.
09:14:49	14	Case Nos. 07-CV-2203 and 07-CV-3582. In the
09:15:01	15	U.S. District Court for the Southern District of
09:15:03	16	New York.
09:15:04	17	My name is Ken Reeser. I represent David
09:15:07	18	Feldman Worldwide, located at 600 Anton Boulevard,
09:15:13	19	Suite 1100, Costa Mesa, California.
09:15:15	20	We are now commencing at 9:14 a.m.
09:15:17	21	Will all present please identify themselves,
09:15:21	22	beginning with the witness.
09:15:22	23	THE WITNESS: Eric Schmidt.
09:15:24	24	MR. MANCINI: John Mancini, Mayer Brown, for
09:15:26	25	defendants Google and YouTube.

		Page 6
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
09:15:29	2	MR. MCGILL: David McGill, also from Mayer
09:15:32	3	Brown, for the defendants.
09:15:33	4	MR. WALKER: Kent Walker, Google.
09:15:35	5	MS. LACAVERA: Catherine Lacavera, Google.
09:15:40	6	MR. BASKIN: Stuart Baskin, Shearman &
09:15:42	7	Sterling, for Viacom.
09:15:42	8	MR. STRAUSS: Sean Strauss, Shearman &
09:15:43	9	Sterling, for Viacom.
09:15:43	10	MS. KOHLMANN: Susan Kohlmann, Jenner &
09:15:45	11	Block, for Viacom.
09:15:48	12	MS. FORSHEIT: Tanya Forsheit, Proskauer
09:15:53	13	Rose, for The Premier League and The Class.
09:15:53	14	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you.
09:15:54	15	Would the court reporter please swear in the
09:15:56	16	witness.
09:15:56	17	ERIC SCHMIDT,
09:15:56	18	having been sworn as a witness testified as follows:
09:15:56	19	
09:16:07	20	EXAMINATION BY MR. BASKIN
09:16:07	21	MR. BASKIN: Good morning, sir.
09:16:13	22	Q Did you have the opportunity to prepare for
09:16:15	23	this deposition?
09:16:16	24	A I did.
09:16:17	25	Q And how long did you prepare for the

		Page 7
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
09:16:18	2	deposition?
09:16:21	3	A Yesterday, a few hours.
09:16:23	4	Q Now, I assume you have e-mail service on your
09:16:31	5	computer at Google?
09:16:32	6	A I do.
09:16:33	7	Q How many computers do you have, by the way?
09:16:36	8	I'm impressed with all the computers in the room. How
09:16:39	9	many computers do you have?
09:16:40	10	A Me personally, probably 30.
09:16:41	11	Q And over the course of these 30 computers, do
09:16:47	12	you frequently e-mail during the course of the day?
09:16:49	13	A I do.
09:16:52	14	Q Did you participate in gathering documents
09:16:56	15	for or your e-mails in connection with this
09:16:59	16	litigation?
09:17:01	17	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form.
09:17:03	18	MR. BASKIN: Q. Did you play any role in
09:17:04	19	collecting your e-mails or other documents for this
09:17:06	20	litigation?
09:17:07	21	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form.
09:17:08	22	THE WITNESS: I yes.
09:17:10	23	MR. BASKIN: Q. What did you do, sir?
09:17:17	24	A I was given what I believe is a protective
09:17:21	25	order, is what it's called, and I followed that.

		Page 8
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
09:17:25	2	Q And did you make the selection yourself as to
09:17:29	3	what is produceable in this litigation?
09:17:31	4	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form.
09:17:32	5	THE WITNESS: No.
09:17:37	6	MR. BASKIN: Q. You made it in conjunction
09:17:38	7	with somebody else?
09:17:41	8	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form.
09:17:42	9	THE WITNESS: Yes.
09:17:42	10	MR. BASKIN: Okay.
09:17:43	11	Q And with whom did you make the decision as to
09:17:47	12	what is produceable in this litigation?
09:17:50	13	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form.
09:17:52	14	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I understand the
09:17:54	15	question very well, because you're using a precise
09:17:57	16	word, which is jointly producing something.
09:18:00	17	MR. BASKIN: Okay. Well let me let me
09:18:02	18	let me show you what let's mark as Schmidt
09:18:07	19	Exhibit 1.
09:18:07	20	(Document marked Schmidt Exhibit 1
09:18:10	21	for identification.)
09:18:10	22	MR. BASKIN: I'll pass these out to the gang.
09:18:21	23	MR. MANCINI: The court reporter will hand it
09:18:22	24	to you.
09:18:23	25	MR. BASKIN: And let me hand you Schmidt

		Page 17
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
09:28:36	2	related to this case but none that are related to this
09:28:40	3	case?
09:28:40	4	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation.
09:28:42	5	THE WITNESS: Some people have permanent data
09:28:51	6	stores of all communications for their whole lives.
09:28:55	7	Other people over time either delete or lose some of
09:29:01	8	that e-mail.
09:29:03	9	It has been my practice for 30 years to not
09:29:05	10	retain my e-mails unless asked specifically.
09:29:11	11	There are other people who would have copies
09:29:13	12	of e-mails that I had sent, for example, in 2005, that
09:29:20	13	you might find an e-mail that I sent to them that
09:29:23	14	would not be in my copy but might be in their copy.
09:29:27	15	MR. BASKIN: Q. Now, do I understand that it
09:29:34	16	has been your practice for strike that.
09:29:37	17	For 30 years, for how long have you preserved
09:29:43	18	your e-mails before they are deleted?
09:29:47	19	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form; objection to
09:29:49	20	the characterization of the testimony.
09:29:50	21	THE WITNESS: That's not what I said, so
09:29:53	22	MR. BASKIN: Okay.
09:29:53	23	Q I thought you told me if not I'm not
09:29:56	24	fencing with you. I just want to know the answer.
09:29:56	25	You said that
1		

		Page 18
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
09:29:58	2	A Yeah.
09:29:58	3	Q I thought you said that for 30 years it's
09:30:01	4	been your practice not to preserve or to delete
09:30:05	5	e-mails?
09:30:05	6	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form; objection to
09:30:07	7	the characterization of the testimony.
09:30:09	8	MR. BASKIN: Q. Is that accurate?
09:30:10	9	A Again, I'll answer the question previously
09:30:14	10	asked, which was it has been my practice to not keep
09:30:16	11	my e-mails.
09:30:17	12	Q And is this on some sort of automatic system
09:30:20	13	where they are deleted in the ordinary course over
09:30:24	14	some ordinary period of time?
09:30:25	15	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form; objection,
09:30:26	16	lacks foundation.
09:30:27	17	THE WITNESS: Depending on the e-mail system
09:30:29	18	and the company and so forth, the answer would vary.
09:30:32	19	MR. BASKIN: Okay.
09:30:32	20	Q Well, let's take Google in 2005. What was
09:30:41	21	your practice then as to the length of time in which
09:30:44	22	you preserved your e-mails before they were deleted?
09:30:47	23	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form.
09:30:48	24	THE WITNESS: It was my practice to delete or
09:30:52	25	otherwise cause the e-mails that I had read to go away

		Page 19
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
09:30:56	2	as quickly as possible.
09:30:57	3	MR. BASKIN: Q. Within days?
09:31:01	4	A Yes.
09:31:01	5	Q And I assume that practice carried over to
09:31:11	6	2006 and 2007 and 2008?
09:31:13	7	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation.
09:31:14	8	THE WITNESS: In again, without the
09:31:21	9	specific dates, in principle, yes.
09:31:24	10	MR. BASKIN: Q. Now, when the lawsuit was
09:31:28	11	filed in February 2007, did anyone instruct you that
09:31:36	12	you should preserve your e-mails relevant to the
09:31:41	13	litigation?
09:31:44	14	Excuse me. As of excuse me. As of the
09:31:47	15	filing of this complaint, which is March of 2007, did
09:31:50	16	anyone instruct you to preserve your e-mails that
09:31:53	17	might be relevant to this litigation?
09:31:54	18	MR. MANCINI: Objection to the extent it
09:31:55	19	calls for a privileged communication.
09:31:58	20	THE WITNESS: I want to be careful not to
09:32:04	21	discuss a legal conversation that I had.
09:32:08	22	You used a precise month. A a clear a
09:32:14	23	clear and precise answer would be that I did change my
09:32:16	24	practice after this lawsuit was filed and I was
09:32:20	25	notified.

		Page 65
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
10:26:34	2	MR. BASKIN: Q. And do you recall whether
10:26:36	3	Mr. Drummond's various numbers were reduced to writing
10:26:42	4	for the board or were they only communicated orally?
10:26:44	5	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form; objection to
10:26:46	6	the characterization of the testimony.
10:26:46	7	THE WITNESS: I have no recollection of how
10:26:48	8	they were communicated, but certainly verbally at a
10:26:53	9	minimum.
10:26:54	10	MR. BASKIN: Q. Now, you are aware, I
10:26:56	11	assume, that the acquisition agreement contains an
10:27:03	12	indemnification provision relating to copyright
10:27:06	13	lawsuits?
10:27:06	14	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation.
10:27:08	15	THE WITNESS: I am aware of what I'm going to
10:27:14	16	call a holdback. I don't know the details of exactly
10:27:19	17	the terms of the holdback, but it is my understanding
10:27:22	18	that it includes areas of copyright.
10:27:25	19	MR. BASKIN: Q. And was that discussed by
10:27:29	20	the board in and around October 9, 2006?
10:27:32	21	A Yes.
10:27:32	22	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form.
10:27:33	23	THE WITNESS: Yes.
10:27:33	24	MR. BASKIN: Q. And do you remember that
10:27:34	25	discussion, sir?

		Page 66
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
10:27:35	2	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form.
10:27:36	3	THE WITNESS: No.
10:27:39	4	MR. BASKIN: Q. Was it a factor in your
10:27:45	5	mind, in recommending the transaction, that there was
10:27:47	6	a holdback provision to protect Google in the event of
10:27:52	7	copyright infringement lawsuits?
10:27:53	8	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form; and
10:27:54	9	objection to the extent it seeks communications from
10:27:58	10	counsel, to which I instruct the witness not to
10:28:00	11	answer.
10:28:00	12	THE WITNESS: It is common for us to have a
10:28:02	13	holdback, and this holdback was sorry. Let me say
10:28:10	14	it more concretely.
10:28:11	15	It is when we do we do loss of
10:28:15	16	acquisitions, it is common to have a holdback for
10:28:17	17	legal issues, surprises and what have you.
10:28:23	18	My judgment was this holdback was sort of in
10:28:26	19	the ballpark, and that's the level of conversation
10:28:28	20	that I recall.
10:28:29	21	MR. BASKIN: Q. Now, give me one second,
10:28:50	22	sir. I want to collect my thoughts, because we may be
10:28:52	23	able to jump ahead a little bit.
10:28:55	24	A Sure.
10:29:02	25	THE WITNESS: May I give this back to you?

		Page 74
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
10:38:05	2	MR. MCGILL: I'm fine. Thank you.
10:38:06	3	MR. BASKIN: Q. Most importantly, would you
10:38:06	4	like one, sir?
10:38:09	5	A I'm fine.
10:38:09	6	Q You okay? Okay.
10:38:09	7	A Thank you.
10:38:14	8	Q Prior to Google's purchase of YouTube, did
10:38:19	9	you ever hear a Google executive complain that YouTube
10:38:26	10	was competing unfairly because of the way it dealt
10:38:30	11	with copyrighted material on its site?
10:38:33	12	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation;
10:38:35	13	and objection to the form to the extent it seeks a
10:38:37	14	legal conclusion.
10:38:38	15	THE WITNESS: I'm trying to think.
10:38:50	16	I don't recall. I mean, I may someone may
10:38:55	17	have said something, but it would have been in general
10:38:59	18	terms. It wouldn't have been with the specificity of
10:39:02	19	your question.
10:39:03	20	MR. BASKIN: Q. Well, did you ever hear any
10:39:08	21	Google executives criticize YouTube because of the way
10:39:11	22	it dealt with copyright issues
10:39:15	23	MR. MANCINI: Same objections.
10:39:16	24	MR. BASKIN: Q prior to your acquisition
10:39:17	25	of it?

		Page 75
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
10:39:17	2	MR. MANCINI: Same objections.
10:39:19	3	THE WITNESS: Again, I recall complaints
10:39:27	4	about YouTube having different policies, but not
10:39:31	5	specific in the way you asked your question.
10:39:36	6	MR. BASKIN: Q. Well, did you ever read an
10:39:39	7	internal Google document in which a Google executive
10:39:44	8	criticized YouTube because of the way it dealt with
10:39:47	9	copyright issues?
10:39:47	10	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation;
10:39:50	11	calls for a legal conclusion; and objection to form.
10:39:52	12	THE WITNESS: I may have. I don't I don't
10:39:55	13	recall specifics.
10:39:56	14	MR. BASKIN: Q. Do you remember being told
10:40:12	15	by a senior Google executive that a large part of
10:40:20	16	YouTube's traffic is from pirated content?
10:40:24	17	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation;
10:40:26	18	objection to form.
10:40:29	19	THE WITNESS: No specific recollection, no.
10:40:34	20	MR. BASKIN: Let me hand you what we will
10:40:36	21	mark as Schmidt 7. It was Drummond 17, I believe, and
10:40:47	22	Eun is that the way you pronounce it, E-U-N, Eun,
10:40:50	23	Eun 12?
10:40:51	24	THE WITNESS: Eun.
10:40:51	25	///

		Page 76
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
10:40:51	2	(Document marked Schmidt Exhibit 7
10:40:51	3	for identification.)
10:40:51	4	MR. BASKIN: Q. Who is Mr. Eun, Mr. Schmidt?
10:40:52	5	A I assume you're referring to David Eun at UM?
10:40:58	6	Q Correct.
10:41:02	7	Who is he?
10:41:03	8	A An executive that we hired from Time Warner
10:41:05	9	who was doing media media partnerships. He he
10:41:13	10	became Jennifer Feikin's boss.
10:41:17	11	Q Was he, in the pecking order of things,
10:41:19	12	basically the senior executive dealing with
10:41:23	13	partnerships with content providers?
10:41:25	14	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form.
10:41:26	15	THE WITNESS: As I recall in the org chart,
10:41:31	16	he did content or media partnerships reporting, I
10:41:38	17	think, to Omid Kordestani, who was responsible for
10:41:41	18	overall partnerships.
10:41:43	19	MR. BASKIN: Okay. Fair enough.
10:41:44	20	Q Now, let me hand hand you Exhibit 7.
10:42:06	21	A Okay.
10:42:12	22	Q And Mister
10:42:13	23	A What would what would you like me to focus
10:42:16	24	on?
10:42:16	25	Q Well, first, would it be fair to say that you

		Page 77
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
10:42:24	2	sent this e-mail and the chain that follows it
10:42:30	3	strike that.
10:42:30	4	Is it fair to say the Eric Schmidt from whom
10:42:34	5	this e-mail was sent is you?
10:42:35	6	A That is correct.
10:42:36	7	Q And Mr. Kordestani, the cc, is the gentleman
10:42:40	8	you referred to a few seconds ago as Mr. Eun's direct
10:42:45	9	report; correct?
10:42:46	10	A That is correct.
10:42:46	11	Q And going down to Mr. Eun's e-mail, that
10:42:55	12	e-mail was sent to you in and around May 12th, 2006;
10:42:59	13	right, sir?
10:43:00	14	A Yes.
10:43:00	15	Q And that e-mail was sent to you prior to
10:43:02	16	something called the Video GPS; correct?
10:43:08	17	A That's correct.
10:43:08	18	Q And am I correct that GPS is a basically,
10:43:16	19	a quarterly review of product lines within Google that
10:43:16	20	you
10:43:23	21	A No.
10:43:23	22	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation.
10:43:24	23	THE WITNESS: No.
10:43:24	24	MR. BASKIN: Q. What was the Video GPS then?
10:43:27	25	A Well, GPS stands for Google product strategy,

		Page 78
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
10:43:30	2	and it's a series of meetings that occur on typically
10:43:35	3	Tuesdays on a rotating basis. And Video GPS would
10:43:39	4	have been a review of the video Google Video
10:43:43	5	product of some kind.
10:43:47	6	And I would read this as I read I read
10:43:52	7	this e-mail as he's briefing me ahead of the meeting.
10:44:00	8	Q And I take it you did in fact attend the
10:44:05	9	Video GPS, to your recollection?
10:44:06	10	A I normally attend them.
10:44:08	11	Q And in addition to you, would the executive
10:44:11	12	management committee of the company attend GPS
10:44:16	13	meetings?
10:44:16	14	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation.
10:44:18	15	THE WITNESS: Approximately half of the
10:44:19	16	executives senior executives do, yes.
10:44:21	17	MR. BASKIN: Q. So would Mr. Kordestani have
10:44:23	18	attended in the ordinary course?
10:44:25	19	A Normally not.
10:44:27	20	Q Since this fell within his jurisdiction, is
10:44:30	21	it likely he attended?
10:44:31	22	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form.
10:44:34	23	THE WITNESS: He would have to tell you, but
10:44:37	24	it's again un I would be speculating to know to
10:44:39	25	know that. Again, normally Omid is not in the

		Page 79
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
10:44:42	2	meetings. Normally I am in the meetings.
10:44:43	3	MR. BASKIN: Q. What about Mr. Brin?
10:44:46	4	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation.
10:44:48	5	THE WITNESS: Some percentage of the time.
10:44:51	6	MR. BASKIN: Q. Do you recall if Mr. Brin
10:44:53	7	attended
10:44:54	8	A I do
10:44:54	9	Q the Video GPS?
10:44:56	10	A I do not. I do not.
10:44:57	11	Q And what about Mr. Page?
10:45:02	12	A Again, no recollection.
10:45:03	13	Q In the ordinary course, does he tend to
10:45:08	14	attend Video GPS meetings?
10:45:09	15	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form.
10:45:13	16	THE WITNESS: Larry more than Sergey. But
10:45:17	17	their meetings the GPS's are built around me, so
10:45:20	18	the normal course of business, I'm there and the
10:45:23	19	others may or may not be there.
10:45:26	20	MR. BASKIN: Okay.
10:45:28	21	Q Now, you said I think you said that you
10:45:30	22	read Mr. Eun's am I pronouncing that right, by the
10:45:35	23	way?
10:45:36	24	A That's correct.
10:45:37	25	Q So it's E-U-N.

		Page 80
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
10:45:38	2	You read Mr. Eun's e-mail as preparatory to
10:45:42	3	the Video GPS; correct?
10:45:45	4	A That is correct.
10:45:46	5	Q Now, he tells you that strike that.
10:46:00	6	Do you read this e-mail as focusing on the
10:46:03	7	issue of how to beat YouTube?
10:46:05	8	MR. MANCINI: Objection to the
10:46:06	9	characterization of the document.
10:46:07	10	THE WITNESS: Well, I haven't read the whole
10:46:12	11	e-mail, but it starts by saying, "We are preparing in
10:46:18	12	preparation for the GPS how we beat YouTube in the
10:46:23	13	short term and how we win over time."
10:46:25	14	So that would be consistent with your
10:46:25	15	assertion.
10:46:27	16	MR. BASKIN: Q. And do you recall that one
10:46:28	17	of the topics being discussed as a way of beating
10:46:32	18	YouTube was whether Google Video should relax
10:46:36	19	enforcement of our copyright policies in an effort to
10:46:41	20	stimulate traffic growth?
10:46:43	21	MR. MANCINI: Objection to the
10:46:43	22	characterization of the document.
10:46:45	23	THE WITNESS: You would have to point me to a
10:46:47	24	paragraph or a sentence here.
10:46:49	25	MR. BASKIN: Q. Well, first, do you do
		~ , , ,

		Page 81
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
10:46:51	2	you recall this e-mail?
10:46:52	3	A I do not.
10:46:52	4	Q Have you seen this e-mail prior to today, to
10:46:55	5	the best of your recollection?
10:46:57	6	A I think
10:46:58	7	MR. MANCINI: Objection.
10:46:58	8	THE WITNESS: Go ahead.
10:46:59	9	MR. MANCINI: Objection to the extent it
10:47:01	10	seeks communications with counsel.
10:47:02	11	MR. BASKIN: Okay. Fair enough.
10:47:03	12	Q Now, so let's go to the e-mail, sir, at the
10:47:05	13	bottom. You see it says the paragraph that reads
10:47:11	14	as follows, let me point it out to you, "there is a
10:47:17	15	chance of pursuing short-term goals with such
10:47:21	16	zealousness that we develop blind spots that could
10:47:25	17	hurt us later. For example, there was heated debate
10:47:31	18	about whether we should relax enforcement of our
10:47:34	19	copyright policies in an effort to stimulate traffic
10:47:38	20	growth, despite the inevitable damage it would cause
10:47:43	21	to relationships with content owners."
10:47:48	22	Do you see that, sir?
10:47:50	23	A I do see that paragraph.
10:47:51	24	Q Do you remember reading that paragraph in and
10:47:53	25	around May 2006?

		Page 82
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
10:47:55	2	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation.
10:47:56	3	THE WITNESS: As I indicated, I do not recall
10:47:58	4	the e-mail.
10:47:58	5	MR. BASKIN: Q. Do you recall being party to
10:48:00	6	a discussion as to whether Google Video should relax
10:48:04	7	its copyright policies
10:48:05	8	MR. MANCINI: Objection to the extent it
10:48:06	9	seeks a leading conclusion.
10:48:06	10	MR. BASKIN: Excuse me. Excuse me. Let me
10:48:08	11	finish. Then you may register your objection.
10:48:11	12	Q Do you recall whether strike that.
10:48:17	13	Do you recall being involved in discussions
10:48:20	14	in and around May 2006 on the topic of whether Google
10:48:29	15	Video should relax enforcement of its copyright
10:48:31	16	policies in an effort to stimulate traffic growth?
10:48:34	17	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form; and
10:48:35	18	objection to the extent it seeks communications with
10:48:37	19	counsel, to which I instruct the witness not to
10:48:39	20	answer.
10:48:39	21	THE WITNESS: I only have a vague
10:48:43	22	recollection of their as I testified previously, I
10:48:48	23	have only a vague recollection of us talking about the
10:48:51	24	difference between their policies, "their" being
10:48:55	25	YouTube's and ours.

		Page 83
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
10:48:57	2	MR. BASKIN: Q. So you do not have a
10:48:58	3	recollection of being party to a discussion about
10:49:01	4	whether Google Video should relax its policies to
10:49:03	5	comport with YouTube's?
10:49:05	6	MR. MANCINI: Same objections.
10:49:07	7	THE WITNESS: And again, I have no specific
10:49:08	8	recollection in that area.
10:49:11	9	MR. BASKIN: Q. Now, in the next paragraph,
10:49:16	10	Mr. Eun says, "I think we should beat YouTube - and
10:49:25	11	all competitors - but not at all costs. A large part
10:49:31	12	of their traffic is from pirated content."
10:49:34	13	Do you see that, sir?
10:49:35	14	A I see that.
10:49:36	15	Q Does do you recall reading that sentence
10:49:38	16	in and around May of 2006?
10:49:39	17	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation.
10:49:40	18	THE WITNESS: As I previously said, I don't
10:49:43	19	recall this e-mail and, therefore, I don't recall this
10:49:44	20	sentence.
10:49:45	21	MR. BASKIN: Q. Do you recall a conversation
10:49:46	22	with Mr. Eun on the topic that a large part of
10:49:54	23	YouTube's traffic is from pirated content?
10:49:57	24	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form; lacks
10:49:59	25	foundation.

		Page 155
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
12:39:01	2	companies to protect the their content on the
12:39:06	3	YouTube website?
12:39:07	4	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation;
12:39:08	5	and objection to form.
12:39:09	6	THE WITNESS: Okay. There were a lot of
12:39:12	7	negatives in that question.
12:39:13	8	MR. BASKIN: Yeah. It was a lousy question.
12:39:15	9	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
12:39:16	10	MR. BASKIN: Let me withdraw it. That was a
12:39:16	11	real bad question. Let me try again.
12:39:18	12	MR. MANCINI: Good idea.
12:39:20	13	MR. BASKIN: Q. Did you ever reach the
12:39:22	14	conclusion, in your own mind, sir, that Google simply
12:39:29	15	couldn't afford the license fee necessary to make
12:39:35	16	Audible Magic technology available to content owners
12:39:39	17	who wanted it in the end of 2006 and the early parts
12:39:46	18	of 2007, irrespective of whether they entered into a
12:39:50	19	license agreement with YouTube?
12:39:51	20	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation;
12:39:53	21	objection to form; and objection to the extent it's
12:39:56	22	seeking mental impressions.
12:39:57	23	THE WITNESS: I I have no recollection in
12:39:59	24	this area.
12:40:15	25	MR. BASKIN: Q. Let me ask you this: Based

		Page 156
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
12:40:37	2	on your strike that.
12:40:44	3	Q In 2006, can you tell us, for the record, the
12:41:00	4	name of even one large media company that was given
12:41:09	5	access to available fingerprint technologies on
12:41:15	6	YouTube in the absence of a revenue-sharing agreement?
12:41:19	7	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form.
12:41:21	8	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. In 2006, I I
12:41:27	9	don't know.
12:41:28	10	MR. BASKIN: Q. And what about 2007? Can
12:41:32	11	you give me the name of one media company that was
12:41:37	12	given access to available fingerprint technologies in
12:41:45	13	the absence of a revenue deal?
12:41:46	14	MR. MANCINI: I just want to object
12:41:48	15	continuing objection that the witness has indicated
12:41:49	16	his lack of recollection in this area.
12:41:52	17	THE WITNESS: Yeah. I just I don't know
12:41:54	18	the details, so I don't recall.
12:41:55	19	MR. BASKIN: Q. You don't recall the name of
12:41:57	20	one company, right, sir?
12:41:59	21	MR. MANCINI: Same objection.
12:42:01	22	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
12:42:04	23	MR. BASKIN: Q. Correct?
12:42:04	24	A That is correct.
12:42:05	25	Q Now, I just want to do five more minutes and

		Page 173
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
13:47:46	2	Q Are you familiar that there's a segment of
13:47:49	3	the YouTube website that displays so-called private
13:47:53	4	videos?
13:47:55	5	MR. MANCINI: Objection to form.
13:47:56	6	THE WITNESS: I've heard the term, but I
13:47:58	7	don't know what "private videos" means.
13:48:00	8	MR. BASKIN: Q. So you have no idea how the
13:48:02	9	private videos sector of the website operates?
13:48:07	10	A No.
13:48:09	11	Q Okay. Would you know, as you sit here today,
13:48:20	12	whether a content company is capable of searching the
13:48:31	13	private sector of the website to ascertain whether any
13:48:36	14	of its copyrighted materials are contained in the
13:48:39	15	private sector of the website and to try to take it
13:48:41	16	down?
13:48:41	17	MR. MANCINI: Objection; the witness has
13:48:43	18	testified to his lack of knowledge in this area.
13:48:46	19	THE WITNESS: I don't know what private part
13:48:48	20	of the website is.
13:48:49	21	MR. BASKIN: Okay. Fair enough.
13:48:50	22	Q Now, in 2006 and early 2007, am I correct
13:48:59	23	that Viacom and Google were in a negotiation to try to
13:49:03	24	achieve a revenue-sharing deal between the companies?
13:49:07	25	MR. MANCINI: Objection to the

		Page 174
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
13:49:07	2	characterization.
13:49:08	3	THE WITNESS: We were attempting to do a
13:49:12	4	business deal, so yes.
13:49:13	5	MR. BASKIN: Q. And and that negotiation
13:49:15	6	went on for several months; did it not?
13:49:19	7	A Yes, that's correct.
13:49:19	8	Q And you were personally involved in the
13:49:22	9	negotiations to some degree; weren't you?
13:49:25	10	A That's correct.
13:49:25	11	Q And from time to time, you and Mr. Dauman,
13:49:28	12	the Viacom your counterpart at Viacom, would be in
13:49:31	13	communication either by either orally or by e-mail;
13:49:34	14	is that correct?
13:49:35	15	A Well, and in person, yes.
13:49:37	16	Q And in person as well?
13:49:39	17	A Yes, absolutely.
13:49:39	18	Q In fact, you visited the Viacom premises at
13:49:42	19	one point to participate, in part, in the
13:49:44	20	negotiations; didn't you?
13:49:49	21	A I participated, I believe, twice with meeting
13:49:52	22	with Philippe in his office to discuss the business,
13:49:56	23	potential business deal.
13:49:57	24	Q And at the same time, you were also
13:50:01	25	negotiating with some of the other the chief

		Page 175
	1	SCHMIDT, ERIC
13:50:04	2	executives of other media companies; weren't you?
13:50:07	3	A Yes.
13:50:10	4	Q Now and I guess we already discussed as
13:50:14	5	part of the business review you were getting periodic
13:50:18	6	reports of the status of negotiations with the big
13:50:20	7	media companies; correct?
13:50:23	8	MR. MANCINI: Objection to the
13:50:23	9	characterization of the prior testimony.
13:50:25	10	THE WITNESS: That is correct.
13:50:34	11	MR. BASKIN: Q. Now, so the jury can
13:50:43	12	understand what a revenue deal like this is, am I
13:50:45	13	right that, as structured, these transactions provided
13:50:54	14	that the media companies' property, videos, would be
13:51:02	15	displayed on YouTube alongside advertisement?
13:51:05	16	MR. MANCINI: Objection; lacks foundation;
13:51:07	17	objection to form; and objection to the presence of a
13:51:10	18	nonexistent jury.
13:51:12	19	THE WITNESS: As a general statement about
13:51:13	20	the business deals, the copyright owner would enter
13:51:22	21	into a license agreement with Google where Google
13:51:27	22	would show the videos or music or what have you and
13:51:32	23	would be compensated on a per-play basis based on some
13:51:37	24	form of advertising product either then in existence
13:51:42	25	or one hoped for in the future.