IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

PLUMBERS LOCAL UNION NO. 519 PENSION TRUST FUND; AND CITY OF STERLING HEIGHTS POLICE AND FIRE RETIREMENT SYSTEM, DERIVATIVELY ON BEHALF OF NOMINAL DEFENDANT DISH NETWORK CORPORATION,

Appellants,

VS.

CHARLES W. ERGEN; JAMES DEFRANCO; CANTEY M. ERGEN; STEVEN R. GOODBARN; DAVID K. MOSKOWITZ; TOM A. ORTOLF; CARL E. VOGEL; GEORGE R. BROKAW; JOSEPH P. CLAYTON; GARY S. HOWARD; DISH NETWORK CORPORATION, A NEVADA CORPORATION; AND SPECIAL LITIGATION COMMITTEE OF DISH NETWORK CORPORATION.

Respondents.

Electronically Filed
Mar 29 2021 02:35 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court
Supreme Court No. 81704

District Court No. A-17-763397-B

JOINT APPENDIX Vol. 23 of 85 [JA005021-JA005270]

Eric D. Hone (NV Bar No. 8499) Joel Z. Schwarz (NV Bar No. 9181) H1 LAW GROUP 701 N. Green Valley Pkwy., Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074 Tel: (702) 608-3720

Liaison Counsel for Appellants

J. Stephen Peek Robert J. Cassity HOLLAND & HART LLP 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89134 Tel: (702) 669-4600

Attorneys for the Special Litigation Committee of Nominal Defendant DISH Network Corporation

[Additional counsel appear on next page.]

Randall J. Baron (*Pro Hac Vice*) Benny C. Goodman III (*Pro Hac Vice*) Erik W. Luedeke (*Pro Hac Vice*) ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP

655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101-8498 Tel: (619) 231-1058

Lead Counsel for Appellants

C. Barr Flinn
Emily V. Burton
YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT
& TAYLOR, LLP
Rodney Square
1000 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
Tel: (302) 571-6600

Attorneys for the Special Litigation Committee of Nominal Defendant DISH Network Corporation

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR VOLUME 231

Document	Vol.	Page No.	Date
Report of the Special Litigation Committee of DISH Network Corporation and Appendices of Exhibits Thereto (Exs. 1-792; Appx. Vols. 1-50) Evidentiary Hearing SLC Exhibit 102 ²	4-73	JA000739- JA016874	11/27/18

Volumes 2-85 of the Joint Appendix include only a per-volume table of contents. Volume 1 of the Joint Appendix includes a full table of contents incorporating all documents in Volumes 1-85.

 $^{^{2}\,}$ The Evidentiary Hearing Exhibits were filed with the District Court on July 6, 2020.

and impartial juror? 2 Do any of you have any reason that would make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial, base your verdict on the 3 evidence, and follow the law? No. 4 5 All right. Now, the parties have the opportunity to excuse 6 a pretty small number of you for no reason that they have to 7 explain and so I am going to give them just a few minutes to 8 fill out the form for that purpose and we will just all sit quietly while they fill that out. It shouldn't take but just a 10 few minutes. 11 (Pause in the proceedings.) 12 THE COURT: And just hand it to Ms. Sanders when 13 you're finished. (Pause in the proceedings.) 14 15 Your Honor, the following jurors have been THE CLERK: 16 excused from this proceeding. They need to go to the back of 17 the courtroom: Tiesa Smith, Lorri White. So Ms. Smith and Ms. White -- Lorri White, 18 THE COURT: 19 you can step down and go to the back of the courtroom. 20 THE CLERK: Karen Dove. Ms. Dove, the same. 21 THE COURT: 22 THE CLERK: And Amanda Cloninger. 2.3 THE COURT: And Ms. Cloninger. (Excused prospective jurors left the jury box.) 24 25 THE COURT: All right. So the ten of you will be our

jury.

1.5

2.1

2.3

And I'm going to ask Ms. Martin and Mr. Jackson, if you all will move down one and Mr. Cornwell can step into the -- yeah, that's good -- get into the jury box.

And then, Mr. Richter, yeah, if you would do the same.

And, Ms. White, you can move into the jury box and just have a seat.

I'll be back to you all in just a minute. All right.

Okay. So for those of you on the jury panel, I want to thank you for your time and service in this matter. We will not need you in this case, but I'm not sure what's going on in the criminal case downstairs and so I will ask you to go back to Courtroom 2 -- oh, pardon me. You need to go to the jury assembly room. I'm sorry. That's up on the fourth floor. All right. The jury assembly room. And the clerk's office up there will tell you what needs to happen next and whether you're done with your jury service or need to come back on another day or call back in on another day. I want to thank you for your service and you're excused to go up to the jury assembly room.

(Prospective jurors in the gallery left the courtroom at 2:30 p.m.)

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Good. We're ready to get started just one day behind because of the weather.

The first thing that will happen is that you all will be

impaneled to serve as jurors in this particular case, so please listen to the clerk.

(The jury was duly impaneled.)

2.1

2.3

THE COURT: All right. Members of the jury, you've been sworn and impaneled to serve as jurors in this case and at this time I want to tell you a little about how the trial will proceed and some of the rules that apply so you will know what's going on, give you a few instructions about the law that is likely to apply in this case, and also tell you what the rules are that govern your conduct while you serve as a juror. I may also instruct you from time to time while the trial is going on; and at the end of the case, after all of the evidence is in, I will give you detailed instructions on the law that applies in this case.

In just a few minutes, we will begin the trial. The lawyers first have the right to make opening statements. An opening statement is not evidence and, indeed, nothing that the lawyers say to you is evidence. The lawyers aren't witnesses. They don't have firsthand knowledge of what happened, but they are allowed at the beginning of the case to give you a broad overview or projection of what they believe the admissible evidence will be.

In order to give you that overview, the Plaintiff will go first. They tell me about 40, 45 minutes. We'll take a short recess after that; and then when we come back, we'll have the



defense opening statement, which may be about the same length, maybe a bit longer; and then I anticipate we'll stop for the day. All right.

1.5

2.1

We'll come back in the morning and start with the evidence itself. Witnesses will be called to the witness stand and they'll be sworn or affirmed to tell the truth. They will answer the questions of the lawyers and tell you what they know about this matter.

It is also likely, in fact, I'm sure, there will be exhibits offered into evidence and exhibit — usually it's a document, but it could be a picture or, you know, in criminal cases, we see guns, things like that. You're not going to see any of that, but you may see some demonstrative evidence or some physical items as exhibits. If an exhibit is admitted into evidence, you can consider it, along with the testimony of the witnesses.

In some trials, there are stipulations and I believe you will hear a few in this case. That means the parties have agreed to a fact so that it is not necessary to put evidence on to prove that fact. These save a lot of time, as you can well imagine. So when the parties stipulate to something, you should accept those stipulations as undisputed facts and they should not be given less weight merely because everybody agrees.

The Plaintiff will present his evidence first. This is

1.5

2.1

because Dr. Krakauer, as the Plaintiff, has the burden of proof. He must persuade you by the greater weight of the evidence that DISH has violated the TCPA and that he and other class members are entitled to damages. Because he has the burden of proof he gets to go first in calling his witnesses and offering exhibits. Counsel for the Defendant may cross-examine his witnesses. If the Defendant chooses to put on evidence, it will do so after the Plaintiff has closed his evidence; and the Plaintiff, of course, can cross-examine the Defendant's witnesses. In some cases, the Plaintiff can offer rebuttal evidence after that.

Now, during the trial, an attorney may make an objection to a question asked by another lawyer, to an answer given by a witness or to the admission of certain evidence. When that happens, it merely means that the attorney is asking me to decide whether the testimony or other evidence is proper under the law. You should not draw any conclusions from such an objection or from how I rule on that or hold it against the parties if the attorneys assert an objection. They are allowed to do so.

If I rule on the objection by saying "sustained," that means you should disregard whatever was objected to, the question, the answer or whatever it was, the exhibit. On the other hand, if I rule on the objection by saying "overruled," that means you may consider the evidence. So "sustained" means



forget it. "Overruled" means remember it. And I'll remind you of that the first time or two those words are used during the trial if it is not completely clear from the context.

1.5

2.1

It's also possible, indeed likely, that during the trial I will need to speak to the lawyers outside your presence. I always have to do that at the close of all the evidence and a few other times during the trial. And when the need arises, I may have the lawyers step over to the end of the bench right there like we did during jury selection. They'll turn on that awful white noise so that you can't hear us and we'll whisper to each other for a little bit. If it's going to take longer than, you know, 30 seconds, I may excuse you to go into the jury room while we talk.

You shouldn't worry or speculate about our discussions.

I'll either be asking them a legal question or a housekeeping matter like how long is this witness going to take and when should we go to lunch. Obviously, you will hear all of the admissible evidence in the case.

Now, certain things are not evidence and should not be considered by you. Statements, arguments, and questions by the lawyers are not evidence. Objections are not evidence. If you are instructed that an item of evidence is received for a limited purpose only, you must follow that instruction. If I exclude evidence or tell you to disregard evidence, you must not consider that evidence.

1.5

2.1

Anything, of course, that you see or hear outside the courtroom is not evidence. You are to decide the case solely on the evidence presented here in the courtroom. And if you think about that, the reason is obvious. If you learn something on the Internet or out there in the world, it could be wrong; and the lawyers and the parties have no chance to test that or raise questions about it or demonstrate to you why it's not correct. It's also not very fair, which we're all about here in the courtroom, so please don't consider anything that you have heard outside the courtroom.

Now, as judges of the facts, you must decide which witnesses to believe, which witnesses not to believe, and how much of any witness's testimony to accept or reject. This part of your responsibility is called determining the credibility of a witness. Now, witnesses themselves are often not familiar with the rules and sometimes when a party objects to a question the witness goes ahead and answers it anyway. So if that happens and I say "sustained," then that means the witness should not have answered the question and you should disregard what you have heard. You should not consider that answer or partial answer in your deliberations.

After you have heard all of the evidence, the lawyers get to make closing arguments at the very end, during which they are -- during which time they are allowed to attempt to persuade you to reach a particular verdict. You'll have the



questions in front of you at that point that you're specifically called upon to answer; and after those arguments, I will instruct you fully on the law that applies to this case. Then you'll go to the jury room and deliberate towards a unanimous verdict.

1.5

2.1

2.3

Your duty will be to consider all of the evidence fairly and impartially and to find the facts from this evidence. You, and you alone, are the judges of the facts. You will then apply the law as I give it to you and attempt to reach a unanimous verdict.

Generally speaking, we will start court at 9:30 and you'll need to come from here on out to the jury room that goes with the courtroom. It's through this door right here and you'll see it in a little bit. And I'd ask you to be there by 9:20 or so just in case there's any logistical or housekeeping matters and we'll start about 9:30. We take a morning break every day around 11:00. We break for lunch around 12:30. We resume around 1:45. We take an afternoon break around 3:30 and we leave for the day around 5:00. That's an approximate schedule, but I don't ordinarily keep you much past 5:00 and you can --you might stay five minutes after that. The only time you would really stay past 5:00 would be if you are deliberating and you want to stay a bit longer to see if you can reach a verdict. I may modify this schedule if we fall behind, so please listen, particularly at the end of the day and at the

lunch recess, to just be sure you know exactly when you're going to come back.

2.3

All right. Now let's turn and talk briefly about some of the law that applies in this case and to the meaning of some of the words you'll hear during the trial.

As the presiding judge, I have a number of responsibilities. The main ones you will see are that I act as a sort of referee. I will rule on the legal issues and instruct you on the law, but nothing I say or do during the trial is intended to indicate that I have any opinion about what your verdict should be. It is your exclusive province to find the facts of this case and to render a verdict reflecting the truth as you find it. I'm in charge of the courtroom logistics, as you have seen, at least when I'm not overruled by the important person there in the clerk's office who tends to be in charge of the housekeeping matters, but I will try to see that your time is used efficiently.

I will give you detailed instructions on the law at the end of the case and those will control your deliberations, but I do want to give you an overview to help you follow the evidence of some of the basic legal principles that apply in cases involving the Telephone Consumer Protection Act and this case in particular.

You will remember that Dr. Krakauer, the Plaintiff, has the burden of proof on all issues and he must persuade you by the



greater weight of the evidence before you can find in his favor.

1.5

2.1

Now, one of the questions you'll be asked to answer is whether the company that made the telephone calls, SSN, was acting as DISH's agent when it made the telephone calls at issue. DISH is not liable for telephone calls which were not made by it or by its agent, and here the issue is whether SSN was its agent.

An agent is a person or company empowered by another person or company to act on its behalf. The Plaintiff contends that DISH authorized and empowered SSN to make sales calls on DISH's behalf and that SSN acted on behalf of DISH in making those calls. DISH contends that SSN was an independent contractor, not its agent; and that if SSN was its agent, it acted beyond the scope of its authority.

In an agency situation, the person granting the authority to another to act on his behalf is called the principal and the person who is authorized to act on behalf of the principal is the agent.

Actual authority exists when the principal has expressly or impliedly authorized the agent to act on the principal's behalf with respect to a particular matter. It may be granted by the principal by word of mouth or by writing, or it may be implied by conduct of the principal amounting to consent or acquiescence or by the nature of the work the principal has



entrusted to the agent.

2.1

2.3

In order for agency to exist, the principal must have the power to direct and control the agent's actions. When an agent acts on behalf of its principal and within the scope of its authority, then the principal is responsible for the act so long, as I say, the agent has not exceeded his authority. The act of the agent is treated in law as the act of the principal.

However, a principal is not bound by the act of an agent unless that act falls within the scope of actual authority granted by the principal to the agent. In order to determine the authority of an agent, it is necessary to look to the conduct and statements of the principal, and an agent cannot extend his own authority by his own conduct standing alone and in the absence of conduct or acquiescence by the principal.

So you will want to listen carefully to the evidence so you can decide what, if anything, DISH authorized SSN to do on DISH's behalf considering the written contract between DISH and SSN, how that relationship worked in practice, whether DISH had control over SSN's methods, what knowledge, if any, DISH had about whether and to what extent SSN was violating the TCPA, and other relevant evidence.

So I know that was all kind of abstract, but as you listen to the evidence, you will get a feel for this and I'll go over the law with you again after you have heard all of the evidence.

JA005031

Now, if you find that SSN did act within its authority as DISH's agent, then you will need to decide if the telephone calls that SSN made violate the TCPA.

2.3

Now, by way of background, there is a National Do Not Call Registry created by the federal government to give consumers a choice about whether they want to receive telemarketing calls at home. It allows the consumer to register his or her residential telephone number on the National Do Not Call Registry to avoid receiving those calls.

Federal law provides that no person or entity shall initiate any telephone solicitation to a residential telephone subscriber who has registered his or her number on the National Do Not Call Registry. Such Do Not Call registrations must be honored indefinitely or until the telephone number is canceled by the consumer or removed by the database administrator. Wireless customers are protected too so as long as the cell phone is primarily used for residential and not business purposes.

Under the law, a person who has received more than one telephone call within any 12-month period by or on behalf of the same entity, in violation of these regulations, may bring an action to receive up to \$500 in damages for each violation.

So as to these Do Not Call Registry claims, the Plaintiff must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he and the class members each received at least two telephone



solicitations in any 12-month period, that the numbers called were residential numbers, that the calls were made by or on behalf of DISH Network, and that the calls were made when the telephone numbers had been on the Do Not Call Registry for over 30 days.

1.5

2.1

The Plaintiff and the class will offer evidence from a witness who has reviewed information in various databases about who was on the Do Not Call Registry, as well as telephone records about the telephone calls SSN made. The Plaintiff and the class contend this evidence establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that each class member received calls that violate the TCPA. DISH contends that the evidence is not reliable and is insufficient to establish that the calls were made. DISH also challenges some particular subsets of calls, in particular contending that the evidence does not establish that the numbers in these particular subsets were residential numbers. So you'll want to give all the witnesses who testify about these lists and records your attention.

Now, if you decide that SSN made calls that violate the TCPA and that SSN was DISH's agent, you'll need to decide the amount of damages each class member will recover. The statutory maximum is \$500 per call and there will be a place on the verdict sheet for you to write the amount you decide up to \$500 if you reach that issue.

Now, as I mentioned during jury selection, this is a class



action and Dr. Krakauer is suing on behalf of all persons on the Do Not Call Registry who allegedly received these calls during the class period. The trial will resolve issues common to all class members and subsets of class members, and that decision will be binding on everyone.

2.1

So I've kind of talked to you a bit about some of the evidence in this case, but all of the evidence is important or you would not be hearing it. I'm just trying to give you a little context for what the issues are that you'll be deciding. By not mentioning or mentioning a particular piece of evidence, I'm not making any comment on how important it is. That will be for you all to decide. You obviously need to listen to all of the evidence.

Okay. I have a few words about your conduct as jurors. These instructions are necessary for a fair trial and I told you some of these things before we went to lunch.

First, during the trial, you are to avoid contact with any witness, the Plaintiff, the Defendant's representative, any of the lawyers or anyone who has any interest in this case. Do not talk or have any communication to them. Because you may not know whether a person in the courthouse falls into one of these categories, during breaks you should not speak to anyone in the courthouse you do not know. If anyone tries to talk to you about this case, you will need to bring it to my attention promptly.

2.3

Second, during the trial, you should not discuss the case with anyone or permit anyone to discuss it with you. This includes your family, your friends, your coworkers. And it includes any form of communication, not just talking to people. Don't e-mail, instant message, tweet, post on Facebook or any other website, no Instagram, no blogging. You know, don't -- none of that kind of thing.

People -- and, of course, you don't want to hear what anybody else might say about the case too, which is part of the reason you can't even tell anybody what the case is about. People who aren't in the courtroom could easily be mistaken about the evidence. I don't know about you, but I know people who have opinions about everything, particularly when they don't know the facts, and you don't want to hear those opinions from any of those people. They may be expressing them based on personal feelings and -- just don't talk about it, don't communicate about it, and don't let anybody communicate with you.

Obviously, it's fine to -- you have to -- if you work or have other obligations that are going to be interfered with because of this trial, it's certainly fine to let your employer know "I have been selected for this jury and I will not be able to come to work until it's over and that will be next week sometime." But don't say what kind of case it is, don't answer any questions about it other than that -- you know, scheduling

and logistics, to the extent you have to to make your life work, but nothing about the substance.

1.5

2.3

And if anybody tries to pressure you on that, you just say,
"The judge told me I would go to jail if I talked about the
case." Okay. Now, I'm making a little bit of a joke about it,
but it is really serious and usually if you say that to people
they'll back off and not -- you know, you are subject to
contempt powers, but usually people back off if you tell them
how serious it is.

Now, the prohibition about talking about the case includes your fellow jurors, so you cannot talk to each other about the case while it's going on. You have to wait to talk to each other until all the evidence is in, you've heard the closing arguments of the attorneys, and you've heard my instructions on the law. One of the main reasons for this is that discussing the case can lead to forming an opinion and that is not a good idea before you have heard all of the evidence. Sometimes the most important evidence is the very last piece that comes in, so you want to keep an open mind. Even after deliberations begin you may talk about the case among your fellow jurors only when all of you are present.

Finally, during the trial -- oh, this is not finally. This is just third. Third, during the trial, you're not to gather information, investigate or do anything else to learn about the case outside the courtroom. Do not look anything up on the



Internet, call somebody you know who knows something about the issues in this case, read anything about it, nothing like this. Everything on the Internet is not true and you could look something up and it could be wrong or it could be inaccurate or misleading somehow.

1.5

2.1

You should also avoid exposure to media coverage of the trial, if there is any. I don't know that we have anybody here that's going to report on the case, but if you do see anything in the newspaper, TV, radio or online about this case, do not read it or listen to it. Just like tweets and Internet posts, this kind of information is often inaccurate and incomplete, and it is certainly not given under oath with all the parties present or subject to cross-examination. I know all of us are used to looking things up online, but doing any type of research can cause major problems in a trial and can require us to start over again, so do not do that.

Finally, do not form any opinion until all the evidence is in. Keep an open mind until I tell you to start your deliberations.

These rules I have given you are necessary for a fair trial and a violation of these instructions does subject you to punishment as allowed by law for contempt, as I mentioned to you earlier. I will repeat or summarize these instructions for you throughout the trial, not because you weren't paying attention, but because, in my experience, some of these rules

are a little counterintuitive. I don't know of any other situation in our culture where we ask strangers to sit together watching and listening to something and then we don't let them talk about it. So I will be reminding you about these things from time to time. Please remember the reasons I gave you for these rules and let me know if there are any problems with following these instructions either on your own part or by your fellow jurors.

2.1

Now, while you're in the courtroom, our priority will be to proceed with the testimony and I'll try to avoid delays. The lawyers are coming in early and staying late with me before you get here and after you leave, so we'll be trying to be as efficient as we can. That's the reason we start at 9:30 and not 8:30, and I think you will also find that 9:30 to 5:00 is about as much as you can absorb during the day.

I'll also ask you not to loiter in the corridors of the courthouse just to avoid any contact with any folks; and if anyone attempts to talk to you about it, you do need to let me know immediately. Any contact with me needs to be by way of a note. So you would just write the note indicating what happened and either let the security officer or Ms. Sanders here know that you have something you need to tell me and Ms. Sanders will come collect the note.

If you want to take notes during the trial, I will be glad to let you do that. Ms. Sanders has pencils, legal pads, and

envelopes.

2.1

Are those around?

I'm going to let her hand those out in case any of you want to take notes. I'm just going to give them to everybody, but please do not feel like you have to take notes. Some people actually find it very distracting.

You can just give everybody one in case they -(Ms. Sanders complied with the request.)

THE COURT: Ms. White needs one right there.

Everybody got one? Okay.

So some people find taking notes very helpful. Other people, as I say, find it distracting. You don't want to get so caught up in writing down one thing that you forget to listen to the next thing because, you know, we really don't stop, okay. But that said, I know many people do find it helpful to take notes.

Your notes are not evidence and they should not take precedence over your recollection of the evidence; and if you do take notes, don't talk about them with anybody, you know, while the trial is going on. I will let you take your notes back with you during your deliberations, but, you know, they're not more important than the memory of a juror who did not take notes. And, of course, if you don't take notes, you can't turn over the responsibility to somebody who took notes. It's your responsibility to listen, too. We depend on the judgment of

all the members of the jury.

1.5

2.1

2.3

At every break you'll need to just slide your notes back in the envelope with the pencil and leave them in the chair, and they'll be right there for you when you come back. So don't take them with you. At the end of the case I'll let you take them in the jury room when you deliberate, but up until then just slide them back in the envelope and leave them in your chair.

Finally, if at any time you cannot hear or understand someone, you need to let me know. Witnesses mumble sometimes. The door slams or somebody coughs and you don't hear what's said. I have heard lawyers talk too fast and occasionally I talk too fast. So if you have any problems with hearing or understanding, you just raise your hand; and if nobody notices you, just say, "Excuse me. Did he say red or blue?" Okay. It's very important for you to hear all of the evidence. I know, you know, this is a beautiful courtroom. I come in here every day, so it's not intimidating to me, but I appreciate, you know, you may not feel all that comfortable in here. But please don't hesitate. If you cannot hear or understand, I do need to know that.

All right. So we are going to start with the Plaintiff's opening statement. Then we will take a short break and come back with the Defendant's opening statement.

And the jury is with the Plaintiff.

MR. BICKS: Your Honor, can I just ask one question before we start just because I'm going to be showing graphics?

I'm just wondering, the jurors who are all the way in the corner --

THE COURT: We'll get it arranged during the break so everybody can see.

MR. BICKS: Okay.

1.5

MR. GLASSER: Does this thing work? Great.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we live in a country that has a rule of law, meaning that its citizens, if we all follow the laws, will hopefully have a better quality of life for everybody. One, I will call it quality of life, law passed by Congress is this National Do Not Call law and that's the law at issue in the case you're about to hear.

I'm sure everyone is familiar with the experience of getting a call from someone you don't want to hear from trying to sell you something you don't necessarily need at a time that's awkward for you. Now, that law -- now, that experience Congress took account of and they passed a law called -- we call it the National Do Not Call law. The technical name is Telephone Consumer Privacy (sic) Act. It covers lots of things, but the things particularly at issue here in this case is going to be that Do Not Call list and calling folks that are on it.

Now, officially what the law did is it created a national

1.5

2.1

registry, a big database, and folks can register. And the idea is that once your number is on there the telemarketers can check and exclude it and not call you. So the idea is that by this law -- I mean, Congress is passing all these complicated laws. This one is like -- called, like, the uninterrupted dinner law. It's just a very simple law. So you just register your phone. You can register online. You can call. There's various ways to register. You have a brief waiting period, as the Court said, 31 days, and you're off limits to telemarketers.

Now -- so I think of it as the law sets up kind of a no fishing zone. You can't fish for customers who don't want to be fished for. They're in this zone, the no-call zone. Telemarketers all know that they can't fish in those prohibited waters. The evidence will be, this is Telemarketing 101, you can't fish the prohibited waters.

Now, DISH, their witnesses will admit they know they can't fish in prohibited waters, but the evidence will be that DISH wants the customers. DISH wants the fish and so, in this case, they got someone else to fish for them, this company that the Court has told you the name of, Satellite Systems Network. But DISH will come in here and they will ask you to find them not responsible for that illegal fishing, and we will show the evidence that should make them responsible, in our view, for that fishing and this is what I'm about to preview for you,

that evidence.

1.5

2.1

And the reason -- you know, it's interesting. The telephone does not actually disappear when you sign up for the Do Not Call list, right, so the law -- you know, the -- the -- the rules can still be ignored and so that gets to this -- what we're doing here. Now, this is not a criminal trial. The Court told you it's not a criminal trial. It's not a "beyond the reasonable doubt" trial. It's a "preponderance of the evidence" civil trial.

And so what Dr. Krakauer is is a class representative and he is bringing a private enforcement action saying that he can prove that a company broke the law and looking for the penalty on behalf of all the people who were called in violation of that law. And the amount the Court told you is a whopping up to \$500. So it's not a lot of teeth in the law, but the question is is it going to be enforced or not, is it — and that is the question for you at the close of the case.

People who bring the enforcement suit, like Dr. Krakauer in this instance, are the class representative. They stand here for all the thousands of other people who obviously are not going to be here because what happened to them is the same as what happened to others. It typifies what happened. That's the meaning of being a class representative. And so I kind of call it the "strength in numbers" lawsuit. Maybe nobody in their right mind would bring a lawsuit for a mere \$500, but to

enforce the law, you will bring a lawsuit. And Dr. Krakauer, the Court will tell you, does not get to keep the money himself if you award any. It goes to the class supervised by the Court. He's treated like the other class members.

1.5

2.1

Dr. Krakauer, who is right here, he lives in Durham,

North Carolina. He is not a medical doctor. He is a

zoologist. He's studied birds. He was the director of the

Museum of Life and Science in Durham, California -
North Carolina, North Carolina Museum of Life and Science. I'm

told it's a fun place to visit. I've never been there. He

retired from there and now, you know, lives near Durham.

From 2009 to 2011, Dr. Krakauer got a bunch of telemarketing calls on behalf of DISH despite the fact that his number is on the Do Not Call list. Dr. Krakauer has never been a class representative before. He's never sued anybody before in his life.

The Defendant DISH corporation is a large corporation.

You'll hear from their lawyers what they do. Some of you probably know they deliver satellite service to roughly

14 million Americans. I understand it's like 3,500 channels you can choose from. They have 13 satellites in geosynchronous orbit. Maybe I didn't say that word exactly right, but stationary orbit above the earth that beam down those channels. They're a large corporation. The evidence will be you can't —there's no point in all those satellites, there's no point in

any of that without sales. No sales, no DISH. That's going to be the evidence.

1.5

2.1

2.3

Now, Dr. Krakauer got these calls on behalf of DISH even though he complained to DISH. And this case is about -- not really as much about, in our view, the 5 illegal calls he got -- connected calls after he complained or the 10 calls he got that we have records of -- and I'll get to what we have records of and what we don't have records of -- but it's about the 51,000 other calls made during that same period, which is the period called the class period and I'll get to what that means. And that's connected calls. 51,000 connected calls in a 15-month period that went twice to people on the Do Not Call period. Now, obviously, the telemarketer at issue made a lot more calls, and we'll go into this, and later in my opening I kind of walk through how it starts with 1.6 million calls and works down to the class calls, okay. We'll get into that in a minute.

The class period in this case is defined by the time period where we actually have the call records and those call records -- and you'll hear from witnesses. They will actually be on video because they're from out of state. We can't bring them in here. A subpoena secured the call records of this company for a 15-month period. And so while Dr. Krakauer was first called in a period in 2009, the records that were managed to be kind of frozen in time are from May 1st, 2010, to



August 1st, 2011. So that's the class period where we're looking for the enforcement on the 51,000 calls.

1.5

2.1

It's not us saying those are the only calls. Obviously, there were calls in 2009, the evidence will show, because that's when Dr. Krakauer complained. They have his complaint recorded. We know they were calling before the class period and, you know, after the class period, but the damages in the case have to do with the class period because that's where we have the telephone records for the proof of the damages.

Anyway, that's why there's a 15-month window called the class period.

Now, this case will also cover and delve into facts in other time periods. One time period is the summer of 2009, June of 2009. DISH corporation here entered a settlement agreement in the summer of 2009 with the Attorneys General, the chief law enforcement officer, of 46 states saying it would use its power and control to — to step up and monitor to determine if its telemarketers were complying with the Do Not Call law and, if they found violations, they would cause compliance by discipline or termination.

This agreement that DISH entered with the 46 states was within a month of the first telephone call Dr. Krakauer received in the case; and in this case here, I believe they will stand up and tell you the opposite: That they have no control over these telemarketers; that the telemarketers are

independent, free, independent, not controlled, not under their authority, they can't police them, free as a bird people I believe will be their argument in the case.

2.1

The telemarketer at issue in this case, SSN, is a telemarketer that DISH paid to make calls on its behalf.

DISH -- SSN only were -- in the class period at issue, frankly, from the time 2005 on, but certainly at the time Dr. Krakauer got his call all the way to the end, they only did one thing, sell DISH. They were branded as a DISH fishing boat because they were able to use DISH trademarks. They could put DISH logos out there. The website was my -- yourfreedish.tv or something like that. The web addresses which you will see were -- had DISH in the name. In any event, they sold DISH services only. It was a dedicated company dedicated only to DISH.

The -- according to the Assurance that I talked about, that agreement with the 46 states, DISH was to monitor to determine if SSN was complying with the Do Not Call law and if they found violations shall discipline SSN. The evidence in this case will be overwhelming that both before and after the compliance -- I mean the assurance of compliance agreement, in the summer of '09 that DISH had direct knowledge of SSN's illegal telemarketing ways both before and after they entered the Assurance and both before and after DISH promised that they would use their power and authority to rein in the SSNs of the

world and cause SSN to comply with the law or terminate them.

They will say, though, probably, that we ought to be suing that little, tiny SSN company.

1.5

2.1

The evidence will show that DISH did not in fact monitor SSN and did not in fact use any of its contractual or practical power over SSN to change SSN's behavior at all even when they heard. I believe that the evidence will be that despite this agreement with 46 states they get complaints and they send toothless letters to SSN saying, "Hey, we believe there may be a complaint against you."

So the evidence will be that in that 15-month window where we got the call records -- that 15 months, that's about a year after the first call with Dr. Krakauer -- one out of five of the calls made by SSN on DISH's behalf were in those off-limits fishing waters on the Do Not Call Registry, one out of five.

Our evidence will be that any effective system of monitoring would have stopped that behavior, period. Our evidence will be that DISH had its eyes wide open when it hired SSN and knew what kind of outfit it was getting. It learned along the way in the years prior to 2009 what kind of outfit it had and it kept the outfit on the payroll.

In fact, the evidence will be that in the early 2000s, up to 2004 and 2005 -- in 2004, the State of Florida sanctioned SSN for illegal telemarketing activity and DISH knew about it. In 2005, the State of North Carolina sanctioned SSN for illegal

telemarketing activity, and DISH knew about it and kept them on the payroll. DirecTV, by stark contrast, did the opposite. In the early 2000s up to 2005, SSN sold for both DirecTV and DISH. After the events of 2004 and 2005, DirecTV, no, no more. DirecTV dropped SSN. SSN only sold for DISH after they were sanctioned by Florida and North Carolina.

1.5

2.1

2.3

So when DISH had a decision to make, it made a business decision; and DISH in fact after 2005 integrated SSN into its operations in the most comprehensive ways that you can imagine, such that the evidence will be that SSN was effectively nothing but a DISH sales arm.

Here's how they integrated them. They have lots of retailers. The evidence will be in 2011 they had about 3,500. I say 2011 because it's smack dab in the middle of the class period. Remember the class period is May of '10 to August of '11. June of '11 3,500 retailers around the country. Lots of them are storefront, mom-and-pop, small retailers. Forty-five of the 3,500 are designated national sales partners. You guessed it. SSN is one of those national sales partners. So national sales partners were the -- less than 2 percent of all the retailers.

And the national sales partner SSN had access to an exclusive system called the order entry system and the order entry system is actually DISH's computer system. So here's how it works. The telemarketer on the phone, they've got the

JA005049

1.5

2.1

2.3

caller on the phone — they've got the person on the phone.

They're fired up on their computer. They're on DISH's computer servers. They're on DISH's network. They put the order right into DISH's network. The customer gets a DISH installer assigned. The customer gets a DISH bill. The bill says DISH. The customer's credit is checked and the credit check is paid for by DISH. The customer service, if they need customer service, is back at DISH. Technical support is by DISH. The contract is formed between DISH and the customer, not between the retailer and the customer.

DISH had trainers come to SSN's call center in person, listen to calls, monitor calls, upload recordings of calls.

DISH wrote sales scripts for SSN. Frankly, on the order entry system, the screens would pop up and it was the obligation of the telemarketer to read exactly what DISH wrote, all crafted by DISH.

So here you have an independent company that has no sales training capacity it needs of its own, doesn't need it, doesn't need its own inventory of DISH equipment, doesn't need its own installers, doesn't need its own customer service personnel. It's just a DISH telemarketing arm is what our evidence will show.

Frankly, the evidence will be that the DISH/SSN contract, while it does say the magic words that they're an independent retailer, is so one-sided and controlling that SSN literally

1.5

2.1

had no legal right to the customers it signed up. They weren't SSN customers. They were DISH customers. They had no right to use the data they got about those customers in any way, shape or form. There is literally one clause in there, I think it's Clause 7.3, it's -- I call it the absolute power clause. It literally says: You, SSN, must do or refrain from doing anything we tell you even if we just send it in a fax or an e-mail. You must do or refrain from doing anything we tell you. So our evidence will be that the contract evinces control at the highest level.

DISH will stand up in defense and say, "Well, we ordered SSN to sign up for a service called PossibleNOW" -- I believe the words "PossibleNOW" will be used a hundred, maybe a thousand times in this lawsuit as we, you know, proceed during the week -- "and that PossibleNOW was going to scrub out all those bad numbers. So because we told them to sign up with PossibleNOW, we should not be responsible for the fact that one out of every five calls they made in this 15-month period was to illegal fishing waters."

But the evidence is going to be that SSN did not actually run the calls at issue in this case through PossibleNOW scrubs. They just didn't do it and they told DISH that they didn't do it and DISH didn't do anything about it, didn't tell them to do it and didn't care. That's what the evidence is going to be.

So, yes, on the right hand, the evidence will be that DISH

ordered them to sign up with PossibleNOW; but on boots-on-the-ground level, the evidence is going to be they didn't do it and DISH knew they didn't do it. So DISH didn't care enough to make them do it even after having signed the assurance of compliance. That's what the evidence is going to be.

1.5

2.1

2.3

So there's going to be evidence about the difference between telling them to sign up for PossibleNOW and then actually having them sign up for PossibleNOW or having them use PossibleNOW, not sign up and drop, whatever.

The contemporaneous e-mail traffic at the time will show that SSN did not scrub the calls at issue in this case through PossibleNOW or any other scrubbing and that PossibleNOW was not the monitoring DISH promised. The evidence in this case will be that time and again DISH found out about behavior it ought not to have tolerated and let it continue because they wanted the fish.

So when Mr. Bicks, my opponent, stands up and shows you — flashes contracts and talks about PossibleNOW, I just urge you to wait, see all the evidence in the case, look at the boots—on—the—ground facts and make your decision at the end of the case about how effective or efficient or realistic some of those things are, because a bedrock fact about this case will always be one in five calls made over this 15—month period were in illegal waters.



1.5

2.1

And the evidence will also be that DISH acquiesced in, allowed, and benefited from all this illegal fishing; and at the end of the case, you'll have to make the call whether the existence of SSN -- and Sophie Tehranchi will testify about it, the owner, she'll describe what it is -- ought to be a get-out-of-responsibility card in this case.

THE COURT: Okay. If you'll just limit yourself to the evidence rather than argument.

MR. GLASSER: At the end of the class period, SSN was only selling DISH.

Now, let me talk about the calls. The calls that we got the records on are 1.6 million calls. So the evidence will be that SSN's telemarketers were calling a little over a hundred thousand numbers a month. They were using computers, so the computers could call a lot of people and then, when there's a connection, shoot it through to a telemarketer. So connections are materially less than calls. This is not a case about calls. The 1.6 million calls are kind of the top of the funnel. 231,000 connections, connected calls.

And then we further take out the calls that don't qualify because there was only one call in a 12-month period or the number was not on the Do Not Call list or the number was a business, and so we get down to the calls at issue in the case, which are 51,000 calls. So there will be some evidence about that.



1.5

2.1

So you'll hear from Dr. Krakauer. He'll talk about how he got the first call back in 2009 on behalf of DISH. He called DISH and told them he was on the Do Not Call Registry. Then in the class period alone he got ten more calls, five of which connected.

You will also hear from a series of witnesses who work for DISH and SSN. These are witnesses who will not want to help our case, but obviously we represent a citizen. We don't know what goes in — on inside of DISH or SSN without calling their witnesses, so we'll be calling what are called adverse witnesses, that is, we call the other side's witnesses. We put them on the stand and we ask them questions. Those witnesses will try and cast what they did in a light that makes them look better. So you have to think about that when you're observing their testimony.

One of them is Sophie Tehranchi. She is the leading crew member on that SSN boat I told you about. She is the sister of the owner, Alex Tehranchi. He's known in the e-mail traffic as Alex. You'll see e-mail with Alex. That's Alex Tehranchi, the brother of Sophie Tehranchi.

Sophie Tehranchi will explain that SSN sold only DISH at the relevant time periods for this case after 2005 and certainly at 2009 on, that all its money came from DISH, that it used scripts DISH had okayed, that the telemarketing reps would call people like Dr. Krakauer. When they did that, they

were logged on to DISH's computers with a DISH password, and all the money from the DISH subscriptions they were selling went straight to DISH. SSN got paid for activations only, so they got paid when people activated on DISH.

1.5

2.1

The evidence will be that SSN, the national sales partner, had no power to vary the price, the terms or the conditions of the DISH sale. So no pricing power, no terms and conditions power, no — no power like that to talk about. They sold exactly what DISH told them to sell at the price DISH told them to sell it on the terms set by DISH. That's the evidence from Sophie Tehranchi.

You'll hear from her how DISH would sometimes have people in their call center actually listening in on those calls and score them to see if they made the sales calls exactly the way DISH wanted. That DISH person physically present on the boat would check anything that person wanted.

You will hear that DISH had the right to audit the company, audit its books and records, but, you know, the evidence will be that DISH never monitored, audited or checked compliance with the Do Not Call. They never said, "Hey, why don't you just upload the calls you made in the last 10 days and we'll just check them against the DNC." Never happened. They never spot-checked or audited that area of compliance at SSN at all.

Another one of the witnesses who will testify is Amir Ahmed. He's here in the courtroom. He'll tell you about how

DISH set up the sales system and how it works and how when he recruited SSN he had full knowledge that they had telemarketing issues, consumer complaint issues, AG raising issues, and yet recruited them anyway.

1.5

2.1

You'll hear from Reji Musso, who is present in the courtroom here, who was in charge of compliance at DISH. She was the person who would get these complaints and she would send form letters back to SSN about these complaints. And you'll be the judges of the fact of the effectiveness or the realistic power that these form letters had and whether they were — what message they were really sending is what you'll have to decide in this case.

DISH had SSN completely beholden to it. All SSN's money came from DISH and their sales operations are on DISH computers, and the evidence will be that in fact DISH takes none of the obvious steps that they could have taken to reform the behavior of their telemarketing. So instead of using its power and authority and control to actually monitor compliance with the Do Not Call list, DISH would get complaints and they would send a toothless form letter. As a matter of fact, DISH sent one of those toothless letters to Dr. Krakauer when he complained and it didn't stop anything. I'm sorry. Sent one of those letters not to Dr. Krakauer but to SSN. They actually didn't send a letter to Dr. Krakauer.

Now, you will hear the evidence is that DISH had a written

policy that SSN keep its call records, but, no surprise, DISH never enforced that contractual obligation. The evidence will be that they learned that SSN was not keeping its call records and they didn't do anything about it. And so you will have to judge at the end of the case whether -- why DISH chose not to enforce the policy about keeping written call records.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

2.1

22

24

At the end of the case, our expert will talk about the process of going through the 1.6 million call records and how you whittle it down to the 51,000 and taking the Five9 -- oh, by the way, maybe I didn't say that before. The name of the computer -- the software company that connected the calls was called Five9. Five9's computer brain kept the records of the calls made in the 15-month class period. Those are the 1.6 million calls that our expert looks at and says, okay, there's 1.6 million calls. Now let's check it against databases that have records of who is on the Do Not Call list, check it against databases of businesses to remove businesses. Let's whittle this thing down to the 51,000 calls. So you'll hear all that evidence. And you'll hear from our expert that one out of every five connected calls were made to those numbers on the Do Not Call list.

So I'm getting to the end. It's not that complicated a case actually from our perspective. It's a case about a company that basically used another company to do what it knew it couldn't do. At the close of the case, we will ask you to



put real teeth into the telemarketing law and enforce this law.

My name is Brian Glasser. I'm from Charleston, West

Virginia, originally, and I appreciate your time and your

effort in this case and the time you give me. Thanks a lot.

1.5

2.1

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Glasser.

We'll take a short break and come back for the Defendant's opening statement. If you'll slide your notes in your envelope and leave them in the chair. I'm going to have the clerk -- if you all will be seated, please. Everybody sit down. I'm talking to the jury. Don't get ahead of yourselves.

I'm sorry. They distracted me when everybody kind of stood up there. I'm going to have the clerk take you back here into the jury room and show you the jury room that goes with this courtroom. From now on that's where you'll come and go from. You don't have to go to Courtroom 2. You don't have to go to the jury assembly room unless there's some unusual thing going on.

So during the break, you're free to stretch your legs. You can walk around. I'll just remind you not to have any contact with any of these folks in the courtroom. Don't talk about the case among yourselves or with anyone else and keep an open mind. You've only heard one opening statement and you haven't heard any evidence yet, so don't talk about it or form any opinion.

And we will come back at 3:45. Ms. Sanders will come get

you and bring you back into the courtroom at that time. can leave your notes in your chair. 2 3 And, Ms. Sanders, if you will take the jurors into the --4 show them where they're supposed to go. 5 Everybody please remain seated while the jury steps out. 6 (The jury left the courtroom.) 7 THE COURT: Okay. So I appreciate in some courtrooms 8 folks, judges like people to stand when the jurors come and go, but I actually find it distracting. So I'll ask everybody to 10 please, particularly because we have a lot of people in the 11 courtroom, if you'll just remain seated. Anything we need to take up before the jury -- before we 12 13 take our recess? MR. GLASSER: Not from the Plaintiff, Your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: And if it's not set up the way you want, 16 Mr. Bicks --MR. BICKS: Well, it's set up fine. I was just saying 17 the two jurors up against the wall I don't think will be able 18 19 to see the screen. Since there were two seats open to the 20 right, I was just trying to make sure folks could see. 21 what I was saying. 22 THE COURT: I see. I'll ask the clerk to check on

that and we can easily move them. They might prefer not to be next to the wall anyway.

MR. BICKS: Right. That's why I raised it.

2.3

24

25

1 THE COURT: Thank you for that. 2 Any other logistical, housekeeping matters? No. 3 We'll take a 15-minute recess. (An afternoon recess was taken from 3:31 p.m. until 4 5 3:45 p.m.; all parties present.) 6 THE COURT: All right. I know there's a couple of 7 questions about people who want to bring their phones in. 8 We'll take that up after the jury is gone for the day. there anything we need to do before the jury comes in? 10 All right. If you can get the jurors. 11 I think it probably is a good idea -- well, I'll just tell them after they get in their seats I'm going to move them down 12 13 I think that was a good suggestion for both visibility 14 and ease. 15 You can bring them in. 16 (The jury entered the courtroom.) 17 THE COURT: Okay. Before you get too comfortable, I'm going to ask you to stand up and move -- everybody just move 18 19 down one. I think you'll be able to see the screen better 20 and -- yeah. And also be -- that corner can get a little 21 squished feeling. Okay. So this is your new seat and we'll 22 stay in these seats from here through the rest of the trial. 2.3 All right. 24 If at any time you can't see -- is the screen down there? Oh, there it is. If you can't see an exhibit, it's just like

not being able to hear. You know, raise your hand. Those of you on the back row can stand up without permission, but if anybody has any problems, just let me know.

1.5

2.1

2.3

We're ready now for the Defendant's opening statement and the jury is with DISH.

MR. BICKS: Thank you, Your Honor. Could I just ask to have the system on and -- thank you. Excellent.

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Peter Bicks and I'm hear to talk for DISH and I want to thank you before I give my opening statement for the time that you all have taken to be here. We know we've taken you away from your lives, your families, your jobs, and we appreciate it. We know the weather is tough. So thank you.

You probably heard the expression that there are two sides to every story. Well, in this case, there are two sides to every story and you just heard one side and now it's my turn to tell you the other side so you can hear the whole story.

What's the case about? Well, it involves some telephone calls that were made in 2010, that time period. They were made by a company called SSN. They were not made by DISH, so we're going to have to look real careful at what the evidence is on those calls.

It's also a class action. Dr. Krakauer is the representative of the class. The case will rise or fall on the facts that relate to his situation, so I'm going to ask you all

1.5

2.1

to listen carefully to the facts as they relate to Mr. Krakauer. The evidence will show that DISH acted professionally and responsibly when it came to the facts relating to Mr. Krakauer. Not once did Mr. Krakauer tell DISH about the calls that are at issue in this case and not once did he even talk to SSN, even though he knew SSN made the calls and he bought his DirecTV from SSN, and that's what the evidence will show.

Let me talk to you a little about the burden of proof and what some of the questions are going to be, and let's talk a little bit about timing.

On this graphic, there are some important dates. I have up there 2010 to 2011 because those are the time period during the calls to Dr. Krakauer and there were five calls that are at issue in this case. On those five calls, you will hear no evidence that DISH was even mentioned during those calls, no evidence. The calls lasted in total 2 hours -- 2 minutes 32 seconds, 2 minutes and 32 seconds. And you'll hear evidence about those calls, a couple messages left on an answering machine, somebody was polite, and DISH actually never came up during any of those calls. Two minutes and 32 seconds.

Mr. Krakauer has had his deposition taken, so we knew ahead of time what he would say. And he said, "Frankly, I did not expect this to be a federal case." And that's what the evidence will be. Three years 3 months went by, not a peep,

not a letter to DISH, not a phone call to DISH, not even an e-mail. Same as to SSN. No evidence. Three years 3 months go by. Mr. Krakauer meets with a team of lawyers and a lawsuit gets filed. Never ever did anyone reach out to DISH about any of these calls to see if there was a problem and if it could be corrected and the same as to SSN.

1.5

2.1

2.3

Mr. Krakauer will tell you that he's bringing this case to make things right, it's not about the money; but the evidence will be that he didn't sue the company that did things wrong, SSN, even though he bought his DirecTV subscription from SSN.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the end of this case, the evidence will be that the Plaintiff is trying to seek a windfall for a phone call; and at the end of the case, we will ask you to find out, based on the evidence, that that doesn't make common sense. Mr. Krakauer has got the burden of proof and that's what the judge said. He will not meet his burden of proof.

So what's going to be the questions we're going to talk about? The Court laid it out in some of the things that were said to you. I want to talk about the evidence on these questions. The first question is was SSN DISH's agent at all times. And the word "agent" is going to have specific legal meaning in this case.

THE COURT: Okay. You'll need to limit your argument to the evidence, not the law.

MR. BICKS: Yes.

And the Court is going to instruct on what that means.

The next question is going to be was SSN acting within the

1.5

2.1

scope of actual authority and then the third question is going to be are the damages in this case warranted.

On the first question, was SSN DISH's agent at all times, the evidence will show that Mr. Krakauer will not meet his burden of proof. He will not meet his burden of proof.

Was SSN acting within the scope of actual authority? The evidence on this will be absolutely critical. DISH told SSN, "Do not call Mr. Krakauer."

SSN told DISH, "We will not call him. We've taken him off our list."

The evidence will show that the calls that took place, those five, the 2 minutes and 32 seconds, were outside of the scope of any authority.

And then are the damages warranted. This case, ladies and gentlemen, for those 2 minutes and 32 seconds of calls, adds up to over \$25 million; and at the end of this case, we will say that that's not fair.

So let me tell you a little bit about DISH Network, a little history of the company, so you have things in context. DISH started about the 1980s. Three folks were involved. They're on the screen: Charlie Ergen, Cantey Ergen, and Jim DeFranco. Charlie is the CEO of DISH. Cantey is his wife and she's on the Board; and Jim DeFranco, who will be a witness in

JA005064

this case, was one of the three cofounders. These folks got together in about 1980 and had an idea and their idea was to bring TV to places in rural America and other places. They started out with the idea of using a satellite, and here's a picture of Charlie and Cantey with one of the first DISH satellites. They pooled together \$60,000 to start a company and they had a dream of competing against General Motors and that dream became a reality.

1.5

2.1

What were they trying to do? They were trying to use a satellite to get up into orbit so that signals could come to places where it would be hard to get the signals, in the mountains and other places. You couldn't get cables through the mountains and the old-fashioned rabbit ears would get the — the signals wouldn't work. So they had an idea of launching satellite so the signals could come down.

Here is a picture of one of the first satellites, and that's Jim DeFranco there in the plaid shirt and the jeans.

He's got dark hair. When he testifies, he'll have white hair because that was a long time ago.

That satellite -- they almost lost that satellite and that was pretty much almost their entire investment. It fell off almost on the side of a truck. But they made some progress and they launched a rocket -- the first rocket up into space and this past December I think they launched either their eighteenth or nineteenth rocket up into space to serve almost

13 million customers around the United States.

2.1

Some of their products you may have heard from. They started with that \$60,000. Today they've got over 13 million subscribers. Here are pictures of some of their products that you all may have heard of. They were really one of the pioneers of the DVR technology we use and kind of accept as something that's out there, but DISH was one of the leaders there. One of their great products is something called the Hopper, which allows you to watch eight shows at once from room to room with only one DVR box. AutoHop, that little kangaroo you can see, allows you to skip commercials, which many consumers like. The Tailgater, that white thing over there on the side, is a device that allows you to watch TV when you're traveling, a football game or something like that. But these are some of the products that DISH came out with.

And I mention these because customers like them and DISH has done very, very well with consumers. And I say that because one of the things that was mentioned early is common sense and I want to put a commonsense idea out now. DISH's lifeblood is its relationship with customers. That's why the company does well and it's got great customer ratings because of those products. There's nothing that DISH would — values more than customer relations.

So ask yourself does it make common sense that DISH would want people who don't want to be called and aren't interested

in DISH's products and receiving telemarketing calls to be called. The evidence will show that DISH does not want that and DISH does everything that it can to prevent it from happening. Word travels fast; and when word gets out that things have happened, it's not good for DISH's business.

1.5

2.1

DISH markets its products using independent retailers and there were during this time period approximately 3,500 retailers around the United States and many of those retailers you've -- you've probably heard of: Places like Sears, RadioShack, Amazon, and companies like that. But there are also smaller retailers. SSN is one of those retailers. Ladies and gentlemen, SSN counted for less than one-half of 1 percent of subscriptions for DISH. They were -- if you want to talk about fishing, they were a minnow in an ocean and that's what the evidence will be.

Now, here's some of the witnesses and you'll hear from them. Jim DeFranco I mentioned. There you see he's got white hair and he's the cofounder of DISH and he's going to testify. He's going to testify towards the end of the case.

Amir Ahmed, he's going to testify. I think he'll be the second witness and he's over here. Mike Mills. Mike is here and Mike will be — he'll be also testifying in the case. Mike and Amir, they're on the sales side; and you'll hear from them about why retailers are independent and not agents and how that's important to DISH's business, because the retailers are,

1.5

2.1

to some extent, competitors of DISH. DISH also sells directly to consumers and retailers do too, and it's a tricky relationship because when retailers have their own marketing strategies they don't always want DISH to know about them because they're worried because they're competitors. And they'll talk to you about how DISH uses retailers and how things worked with SSN and how they were less than one-half of 1 percent, and you'll hear that evidence.

Reji Musso. Reji is here. It's Reji Jo Musso. We call her Reji. She was very important in compliance and she's going to be a witness in the case. And Bruce Werner, who is over here as well. Bruce and Reji worked together in compliance and they're going to be very important witnesses because they were dealing with SSN on compliance issues, and what you will hear from them is that they took proactive steps with SSN to do everything possible to make sure that SSN was doing things right, and the information they had was that SSN was doing a pretty decent job.

They had some indication of a complaint here or there, but what you'll learn in this case, ladies and gentlemen, is that when you're involved in any kind of telemarketing that you're talking about huge, huge numbers of calls. You heard

1.7 million calls. So if you see a complaint — one or two complaints in that kind of volume of calls, it's important when you hear the evidence to put things in context. And they'll

talk to you about the steps that they took when it came to dealing with SSN and I think, ladies and gentlemen, the evidence will show that they acted responsibly and DISH did a pretty good job.

1.5

2.1

So those are going to be some of the five key witnesses on the DISH side and what I think you all should remember is the Plaintiff goes first. He's got the burden of proof and he's going to cross-examine our witnesses first and so our story won't come out until it's our turn to ask them questions. So I ask that you be patient, remembering that there are two sides to every story and we don't get to tell our side until they go first.

So those are five key folks from DISH. They're all here.

I'll say one thing about Reji. She's retired from DISH and she doesn't get paid by DISH. She lives in Michigan and she came here for this case because what was said about how DISH handled things goes directly to what she did and she wanted to come here. She's got no dog in the fight because she's not even with DISH anymore, but I want you to hear that evidence and we look forward to telling that story.

So the first question I said is was SSN DISH's agent at all times. And if not, then that's going to be important, but that's going to be the first question, were they the agent.

I want to start with a contract because SSN had a contract and the contracts are important in this business. This is the



way these companies divide up who's responsible for what. And there was a contract here and you all will have the contract. If it's a little tough to read on the screen, don't worry because you're going to have it, but I want to talk a little bit about it because these parties had a contract and that's where they set out who was agreeing to what.

1.5

2.1

And the contract makes clear that SSN was an independent contractor. It's right up in the beginning right in the introduction to the contract, independent contractor. And it's also important that the contract says it's a nonexclusive contract and what that means is that SSN can sell other products if it wants to. It doesn't have to sell DISH. It can sell other company's products. And SSN was selling DirecTV.

And I heard comments made by Plaintiff's counsel. Ask yourself are you going to hear from a witness in this case from DirecTV who's going to come in here and testify. I don't think you're going to hear anybody from DirecTV about why or why not SSN didn't deal with them anymore. So be very careful about what the evidence is, not what a lawyer says. What I'm showing you here is a contract in the case. This is going to be what the evidence is, nonexclusive basis.

Now, there was an entire section in the contract on independent contractor and it wasn't something that was kind of buried somewhere else in the contract. It's right there all as plain as can be. SSN says that they are an independent

JA005070

contractor and that's what DISH says as well. That's what both parties agreed to. And it wasn't just that it was there once. 2 There were three contracts: 2001, 2006, and 2010. Each of 3 4 those contracts says that SSN is an independent contractor. 5 They are not employees or agents and one of the questions 6 that you're going to have to answer is was SSN an agent. 7 contract says that SSN was not an agent and that's what the 8 evidence is going to be, black and white, right in the 9 contract. 10 So you may be saying, What's the difference between an independent contractor and an agent? Companies --11 THE COURT: Okay. Well, you're not going to tell them 12 13 I'll tell them about that. about the law. I'm not going to tell them about the law. 14 MR. BICKS: 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 If you go to an Apple store -- when you MR. BICKS: walk into Apple up at Friendly in the shopping plaza, Apple has 17 people who wear "Apple" on their shirt. You buy a product, you 18 want to get a business card, it's going to say "Apple" on it. 19 20 If you have a problem with an Apple product, you talk to Apple. 21 That's the way Apple runs. Best Buy is different. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Move on. As to all this Apple and 2.3 Best Buy, who aren't here, there's not going to be any evidence about Apple and Best Buy. 24 25 MR. BICKS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Move on.

1.5

2.1

MR. BICKS: You will see the retailer agreement in this case and you will hear how DISH deals with its retailers and you will see in all the contracts every time they are independent contractors. And not only does it call them independent contractors, but the contract makes it clear that someone like SSN, it's in their contract, can't go out and say that "We are DISH". It's very, very clear in the contract and this is what this provision says. So there's detail about what an independent contractor means in this contract and, as I say, you'll have the contract.

You've heard the expression "actions speak louder than words" and what you will see in this case is that it wasn't just in the contract that DISH made it clear that SSN was an independent contractor, but there were communications from DISH to its retailers that made that clear several different times.

One of them was something called a Facts Blast. Facts
Blast is how DISH communicates with its retailers. And in this
Facts Blast that you'll see in this case, it says right up in
the front: Important reminder to independent retailers.

Second, no retailer is permitted to represent itself as DISH
Network. And then it says: The retailer agreement clearly
provides that the relationship is that of an independent
contractor. So this is one way that, when you look at how the
parties dealt with each other, DISH reminded SSN you are an

independent contractor and this was in a Facts Blast.

1.5

2.1

2.3

There will also be evidence of what are called Retailer Chats, where DISH would communicate with its retailers about their relationship and what DISH expected. And here's an example of a Retailer Chat where DISH reminds SSN that retailers are not agents or employees of EchoStar. You'll hear the name EchoStar. That was an earlier name related for DISH, so that for this case is really the same thing as DISH. So here it is in this Retailer Chat that, again, DISH is making it clear to SSN that they are not agents or employees of EchoStar and they're independent contractor. And this is the course of how the parties dealt with each other, clear communication from DISH on this point.

And you'll also hear evidence from SSN in the case. Here is Sophie Tehranchi. She's going to be testifying by videotape deposition and so we know what she's going to say because we have the testimony. And she's going to say, when asked did DISH Network ever provide Satellite Systems with any phone numbers to call — and the answer is no. Did DISH provide you with any contact information of any kind for people to call? And the answer is no. And you will hear that evidence from the SSN witness herself, Ms. Tehranchi.

You will also hear kind of practical, commonsense evidence about how the parties dealt with each other; and the question for you all will be was SSN the agent and what was the level of

control and what happened.

1.5

2.3

Well, here's an interesting example, ladies and gentlemen, of evidence you're going to hear. This is an e-mail from Charlie Ergen. I mentioned who Charlie is. Charlie's the CEO. And it's kind of an interesting story. Charlie got a call at his home in Colorado and Charlie got a call from SSN trying to sell Charlie DirecTV. So the CEO of DISH got a call from SSN trying to sell him DirecTV. He liked the script. He liked the message on his answering machine and he wanted to get it. So he asks his sales guy, Amir Ahmed, "Can you get that script from SSN?" He wanted it. He liked it.

SSN said, "No, we're not going to give you that script that you want."

That will be evidence, practical evidence. The CEO of DISH asks for a script from SSN and he doesn't get it and common sense would think -- when a CEO of DISH is trying to get something from a retailer, you would think the retailer would probably lean on trying to get something if the CEO wanted it, but it didn't happen here.

So that's kind of the practical evidence of how these parties dealt with each other. DISH didn't want to control SSN and SSN didn't want to be controlled by DISH because they were an independent retailer who had their own marketing strategies and this is an example of that.

This will again be testimony you'll hear from Sophie

Tehranchi. Did DISH Network ever provide Satellite Systems

Network with any telephone lines to make calls on? The answer is no. Does DISH Network own the building where SSN's offices are? The answer is no. Did DISH Network own any of SSN's equipment? The answer is no. They're separate companies.

1.5

2.1

And then here's another practical example. Because it's SSN's facilities and they own things, DISH had trouble getting into their facilities when DISH wanted to make sure that communications about DISH's products are accurate. DISH is proud of the fact that when it deals with consumers it wants consumers to get accurate information. If you want to get the Hopper and you're in North Carolina, DISH wants that price to be the same price that somebody up in Maine is being told about the Hopper and DISH really wants people to get accurate product information. SSN wouldn't let DISH into its building to make sure that that was happening.

Again another practical example of how these parties related to each other and that will be one of the questions that you all will have to decide, independent contractor or an agent. The evidence will show, evidence like this, that Plaintiffs can't meet their burden of proof.

The next question is was SSN acting within the scope of their authority, did they do what they agreed to do and what DISH asked them to do or did they go outside. That will be one of the questions. What will be the evidence on that?

JA005075

2.1

2.3

We start with the contract and here it is again three times. SSN agrees in writing that it is solely responsible for complying with the telemarketing laws. And I underlined the word "solely." "Solely" means one and the one was SSN and this is what the parties agreed to in writing.

And you'll hear that there's a commonsense reason for that. If you have 3,500 retailers around the United States -- and the reason there are that many retailers is because the markets are different and the marketing strategy that may work in North Carolina is not going to be the same marketing strategy that's going to work up in the northern parts of Maine, for example.

And when you look at the contract that I showed you, when it says they're an independent contractor, it says they're an independent contractor for marketing, not telemarketing, because the independent retailer decides what kind of marketing that they want to do.

What will work right around here, again, will not work in some other jurisdiction. Use of radio, use of television, use of telemarketing, which is legal, is going to be different when it comes to how effective it is depending on where you're marketing; and it's that independence which is one of the most important things of these marketing relationships for DISH; and that's why the contracts say that the retailer is solely responsible for complying with the telemarketing law.

2.1

2.3

The evidence will show that DISH does not operate SSN's phone systems. DISH does not choose what individuals a retailer will call. It practically would be impossible to do that even if DISH wanted to and it doesn't and the retailer doesn't want that to happen either because that's their business that they run. And this is what the contract says not just once but, the evidence will be, three times.

So I want to start -- and I've kind of divided this part of my presentation into three chapters because it's important in this case to keep track of time. This case, as I said, involves really 14 months, 2010 to 2011; and you'll hear evidence from the Plaintiff that goes all the way back to 2003. But I think it's going to be important to break things out and you'll see why.

2003 Mr. Krakauer signs up with DirecTV through SSN. He signed up through SSN and that's how SSN had his phone number, because he signed up with them.

The National Registry comes out. That's in 2004. That's that Do Not Call list. And companies like DISH and many companies were scrambling, I think it's fair to say, to come up with procedures to deal with this new law because it changed a lot.

SSN, while it was working for DirecTV, had some issues with prerecorded calls and it also had some issues with some DISH calls using prerecorded calls, ladies and gentlemen. That's

1.5

2.1

2.3

using a telephone system to send a message out, like a robot's voice, not a person. And SSN was doing that and DISH told them to stop. This case, ladies and gentlemen, is not about those prerecorded calls that happened in 2004. You'll hear about that. There were a handful, not a huge amount, but there were some issues. And SSN had some issues with DirecTV, too. But not one person who got a prerecorded call is bringing a claim in this lawsuit. That's not what this case is about.

DISH took some steps to improve its compliance to deal with a bunch of issues but -- including some of these prerecorded calls, and it centralized its compliance -- and you'll hear from Bruce and Reji about that -- within the retail services department and it made some changes. Reji actually wasn't even hired at this point in time. So if you hear evidence of 2003, 2004, it's not really what this case is about. And DISH took steps to deal with that. That's kind of 2003 to 2004, '5, in that time period.

2006 to 2009, that's the time period leading up to the calls that are important in this case. DISH hires Reji Musso to step in and help with compliance. She builds out a staff of about six people to deal with compliance issues all coming off of the 2004 change in the law and to improve procedures at DISH.

DISH has a way to investigate complaints, a formal process. And you can imagine with this amount of telemarketing and other

marketing activities a company does get complaints, and they have to have a way to investigate them, and DISH set up a whole system and took proactive measures to deal with that. They sent out Fact Blasts, the things I talked about, to tell retailers about telemarketing issues, the TCPA. That's what the statute is called. And DISH sent out that kind of information.

1.5

2.1

2.3

They had the Retailer Chats on telemarketing compliance where very senior people, including the cofounder, Jim DeFranco, were talking to retailers about the importance of following the telemarketing laws. And you'll hear evidence of this and I think it's going to be important evidence because it shows you that DISH was paying attention to this from the top of the company all the way down. The cofounder was on Retailer Chats with telemarketers and also with other retailers and saying, "You've got to follow the laws."

Compliance training. You'll see something here, Team

Summits. That's when DISH would get together with its

retailers. It had compliance training at those summits and it
invited PossibleNOW to come in. You heard Plaintiff's counsel
talk about PossibleNOW. He said I was going to mention it, I
don't know, thousands of times. I'm not going to mention it
thousands of times, but I'm going to say a little bit about it
because it's important.

PossibleNOW is a company that is probably the leader in the

2.1

market at making sure Do Not Call lists are scrubbed.

"Scrubbed" means you take a Do Not Call list and you compare it to the National Registry list and you mesh them together and you do computer stuff on them and you make sure that the numbers that are not supposed to be called are scrubbed out.

So when you hear the phrase "scrubbing," that's what that's all about.

DISH started working with PossibleNOW in about 2006 and strongly encouraged its retailers to use PossibleNOW to make sure that there weren't telemarketing issues, and PossibleNOW came to Team Summit retailer meetings to help retailers see how important it was to follow compliance and to work with them.

You'll hear from Reji and Bruce, and this is what they will testify: That they educated and assisted SSN with compliance, including explaining PossibleNOW's role as a resource.

PossibleNOW is the market leader. They're the ones who keep track of the National Do Not Call Registry for the government.

They're hired to do that. They're the best in the business.

They will say that DISH investigated complaints to identify retailers responsible for those complaints. And the evidence will be that it is hard a lot of times — you can imagine, if you get a call that you don't want, it's hard a lot of times to figure out where that call comes from; and DISH had set up a way to investigate; and it's not as easy as it may seem. If somebody says, "I got a call from an 800 number," it's not

easy. It takes a lot of work, and you'll hear from Reji and Bruce about the kind of work that they put in on these investigations.

1.5

2.1

And then when there were complaints relating to SSN -- and there were a handful over a several-year period -- you will hear the information DISH got and how they reacted to that; and the evidence will show that they acted both professionally, quickly, responsibly, and reasonably.

I mentioned these Fact Blasts and where DISH would tell retailers how important it was to follow the telemarketing laws. Here is an example and the statement down at the bottom that EchoStar takes telemarketing violations very seriously. For obvious reasons, it's bad for their business when customers get ticked off and they reinforce that message because it's important to the company.

Important reminders. "Here are the telemarketing laws.

Make sure you follow them." Because remember the evidence is that the contract said that SSN has to comply with the telemarketing laws and here is DISH reinforcing how important that is.

PossibleNOW they brought on and it's very important timing, ladies and gentlemen, because the calls, again, here took place in 2010, 2011. DISH brings on PossibleNOW 2008. SSN signs up with PossibleNOW in October of 2008. Here's an important message coming out from DISH to its retailers: Enroll with

JA005081

PossibleNOW. And you'll see this highlighted sentence. It says: To facilitate retailer scrubbing of customer leads against lists. And that's what PossibleNOW does. That's what their business is. So DISH is getting the word out to use PossibleNOW.

2.1

This is a communication with SSN and DISH, and SSN is saying to DISH that they are working with PossibleNOW October of 2008. This is before the calls that are even at issue in this case. DISH is being told, "We're using PossibleNOW." And this is evidence of that that you'll see.

This is April of 2009. DISH -- somebody says to DISH somebody shouldn't have called me. DISH reached out to SSN.
"What's going on here?"

And they're saying, "We're using PossibleNOW. We're scrubbing our lists."

And here's evidence of actually a receipt out of the files of SSN that you'll be able to see in this case. They scrubbed 1,500, it looks like, 62 records. And then you'll see there at the bottom 108 were Do Not Call. They had actually receipts that they were scrubbing these phone numbers and here is an example. They were in fact scrubbing. But one of the things you'll learn in this case is mistakes happen when there are very, very large groups of data that are being scrubbed against each other, but this is evidence that DISH had that SSN was in fact scrubbing. So that's what was kind of going on in 2006 to

2009. I will call that Chapter 2 in the case.

1.5

2.1

2.3

So now let's talk about Chapter 3, which are the calls that we're talking about here. DISH receives two consumer complaints about SSN and investigates them, because one of the questions that probably will come through your mind in the case is why didn't DISH terminate SSN earlier than it did. DISH did end up terminating SSN. And the people who were responsible for making the calls at the time had this kind of information. There were two consumer complaints during this time period about SSN and they were investigated by DISH. SSN was put on hold in August of 2013. And you'll hear evidence about what DISH found out when it did that investigation, and there were good explanations for how that — for how that could happen when it comes to scrubbing and other things, but it's important to put that in perspective.

Let me talk about the timeline of Mr. Krakauer's complaint to DISH. This is what the evidence will show because, again, the timing is very important. I told you when I first stood up that this shows that DISH acted responsibly and professionally. So what exactly will the evidence show on the timeline? 2003, that's when Mr. Krakauer signs up for DirecTV. May of 2009, it's May 9th, he got a telemarketing call from SSN.

And remember SSN was the company that sold him his DirecTV.

They had his information and they thought that they had a

business relationship with him, which you'll hear about, an

established business relationship, which in telemarketing can allow a telemarketer call you if they have this business 2 3 relationship. 4 MR. GLASSER: Objection. 5 This is what they say they thought. MR. BICKS: 6 THE COURT: As to what the law is, you'll take that 7 from me. 8 MR. BICKS: Absolutely. 9 THE COURT: Go ahead. 10 MR. BICKS: So on May 9th, Mr. Krakauer gets a call 11 and he reaches out and he says something to DISH. investigates. The compliance group looks at that. They're 12 13 undertaking an investigation. They confirm and they determine that SSN called Mr. Krakauer. 14 15 They reach out to SSN the day after they conclude that that 16 call came from SSN. They reach out and they say, "We found out 17 about this. We investigated it. We concluded it came from 18 you. Don't do it." Day after. 19 They send a letter following up saying that -- telling them 20 about Mr. Krakauer's complaint and asking for specific details: 2.1 Scrubbing the list, where did it come from, so on and so forth. 22 And this is important because this is what the letter said: "Immediately ensure that this phone number has been added to your internal Do Not Call list." This is what DISH says to 24

SSN.

1.5

2.1

And remember the question did SSN act outside of what it was supposed to do. DISH says, "Add this list to your internal list." And it says, talking about the contract, you're required to comply with the applicable laws. That was the part of the contract I spoke about. And it also said there could be disciplinary action if this isn't done. And this is what DISH communicated.

SSN responds immediately. This is important because SSN, when there were a couple of these complaints, would immediately respond to DISH, wouldn't be sitting there waiting for months. They would get back. And they responded to this and they said, "We think it was a mistake and we've put Mr. Krakauer on our Do Not Call list. We didn't know that he didn't want to be called by us. We had dealt with him before," going back to 2003. And they said that they would not call him again.

And this is the letter, you'll see it, where they responded. They put him on their list the same day that DISH asked them not to do it and they say here — right here in the second paragraph, "Prior to this complaint, we did not know that Mr. Krakauer wanted off of our calling list." And they say they always comply with the laws and they say that they take this seriously. They respond the same day saying, "We've put him on our list. We thought we could call him because we had dealt with him before and we've put him on the list." And then they had deleted his name from their database. That's the

information that DISH had.

DISH gave.

So this is then what the evidence will show on this set of facts because it's so important to the case on one of the key questions, outside of the scope. One, SSN did call
Mr. Krakauer. DISH investigated and determined that SSN made the call.

Step two, DISH says to SSN, "Add Mr. Krakauer's number to your Do Not Call Registry and do not call him again."

SSN says to DISH, "We have already deleted his number and will not call him again."

That's what the evidence will show on this important question did SSN do what DISH said and did they do what they said they would do.

And then what it turns out in this case, 14 months later — go by, and SSN called Mr. Krakauer five times for the 2 minutes and 32 seconds, and DISH did not know about that. That's what the evidence will be. But this, ladies and gentlemen, evidence will show that SSN went directly outside what DISH said. That's what these facts are, outside of the scope. That's what the evidence will be, not following specific instructions that

After these calls -- it's important because a year goes by, right, and DISH -- after this May 2009 call, the letters I just showed and not one thing happened. DISH had no information that there were any issues from SSN.

JA005086

2.1

Here's an e-mail you'll see from Reji Musso to the folks at SSN where they say: "A long time ago -- Sophie will remember, when I first came on to retail services" -- that's 2006 -- "there were some issues, but not again until now." And they see a call.

And there's a discussion here, you'll see the evidence, about did this call -- did it have an established business relationship and Reji says: "Make sure you check with your legal counsel about whether or not you had an established business relationship," and reminds them, "You should use PossibleNOW."

And she makes the comment that a complaint is not always — is an allegation and it's very important — you'll hear in this case that a lot of times DISH will get a complaint on a telemarketing issue like that and it turns out that the person did — what — did deal with DISH or did reach out to DISH and that happens here and that will be the evidence on this point.

The evidence will be that SSN's overall compliance to DISH looked in pretty good shape at this time. That was the information that they had.

And this is important because Plaintiff's counsel said that there were millions of calls made in 2010 and 2011, millions. I think the evidence, ladies and gentlemen, will be in this case 1.7 million calls were made by SSN, okay, but DISH had two indications of a complaint during this time period, two out of

1.7 million.

1.5

2.1

And you'll see those two little red dots. They're probably hard to see. But when you're in telemarketing compliance and you know that somebody makes millions of calls and you only hear two complaints to people whose job this is, that shows things are in pretty good shape and that's what they -- the information that they had at the time.

So this lawsuit is filed in April 2014. DISH learns about these five calls to Dr. Krakauer, the 2 minutes 32 seconds, and they find out about those calls. And ultimately SSN -- SSN is actually put on hold in August 2013 before this case is filed; and when you're put on hold, you're shut off, okay. So DISH shut them off. They're ultimately formally terminated after that, but during that time period between August 2013 and their retailer agreement being terminated, they weren't allowed to do any sales with DISH.

And this is the sequence of those calls, the 2 minutes and 32 seconds, and the evidence will show that Mr. Krakauer never reached out to DISH about those calls and that DISH actually wasn't even mentioned during any of those calls. There were a couple calls to his answering machine that I think the evidence will be that he deleted. And that's — that's what the evidence was at this time, and the evidence will be that DISH didn't know this until much later, and that's the 2 minutes and 32 seconds.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

So the evidence on this will be important that SSN told DISH then that it would not call Mr. Krakauer. It told DISH it was scrubbing the lists -- and you saw some of the -- a receipt, I showed you one -- and that it complied with the law. We do know now that they called Mr. Krakauer after that 2 minutes and 32 seconds, and it must be that they failed to scrub properly all lists. We don't know that for sure, but clearly it wasn't 100 percent scrubbed right, but there can be mistakes in scrubbing. But the evidence is that SSN didn't properly scrub and that SSN didn't comply with the law, and the evidence will be that they acted outside of the scope because the clear instruction was that they were supposed to do that. So are the damages warranted? I told you, ladies and gentlemen, that this is a case where the Plaintiffs, when you add up those numbers, are -- it's over \$25 million based on those 2 minutes and 32 seconds. THE COURT: Well, I think that's a bit misleading so --MR. BICKS: I don't want to be misleading, Your Honor. THE COURT: If you're talking about 51,000 calls, it can't -- this is 5 calls you're talking about 2 1/2 minutes. MR. BICKS: Yeah. And based on these five calls and

the allegations of the class, the witness who will be there

talking about the five calls to him, and the statistics that



will be put on these other calls, which are -- we will show have some questions with them, and you won't hear any other witness come in this courtroom and talk about any call, that the amount of recovery here is over \$25 million.

2.1

And at the end of the case, we will say that that's not going to be fair and that the evidence is going to show here that SSN was not DISH's agent in the case, that SSN acted outside the scope of any authority, and that the damages that are sought in this case are not warranted.

So I thank you for your time. I know I went on, but that's kind of a road map of what the evidence is going to be. So thank you very much.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Bicks.

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we'll start in the morning at 9:30 with the first witness in the case. Even though you've heard the opening statements, of course, as I told you, that's not evidence and you'll need to hear the evidence from the witnesses and the exhibits themselves. So we'll start at 9:30.

Over the evening recess, please do not discuss the case among yourselves or with anyone else. Don't have any contact with the lawyers, parties or witnesses. Do not conduct any independent investigation. No tweeting, no Instagramming, no blogging. And don't talk to any of your family members or coworkers or neighbors about the case beyond, you know, the

logistics of saying that you're here and what your schedule is.

No comment or discussion about the substance.

Also, this is an old building. Sometimes it's cold, sometimes it's hot. There are ways in which I have a lot of power, but I cannot seem to have any power over the heat, so I do suggest to you you bring a coat and a sweater and be prepared for some fluctuations in the temperature over the course of the trial.

And if any of you have a cold or you need water in the courtroom while the trial is going on, please bring one of the bottles with a lid because stuff gets spilled. Please don't bring anything in an open top and don't bring anything other than water because they don't replace the carpet very often, okay.

All right. Thank you all for your time. Leave your notes in your chair. You're excused to your jury room and you can leave from the hallway there. We'll see you in the morning at 9:30.

(The jury left the courtroom.)

2.3

THE COURT: Okay. What do we need to take up before we stop for the day other than these two telephone requests, smartphone requests? Anything for the Plaintiff?

MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, there are a couple matters. We felt that the opening statement really intruded significantly into statements about the law and we would ask

the Court consider an appropriate limiting instruction regarding the law. Scope of actual authority is a matter that came up in the opening, as well as EBR, so we believe that there needs to be some clarification that the law will come from Your Honor and not from counsel.

1.5

2.1

THE COURT: All right. Well, certainly there was a little more about the law than would have been preferable, but I do think I interrupted a couple of times and told them that thing, just that. I don't think I need to do anything else. If there's particular aspects of the law that need to be addressed, I can do that during the course of a witness's testimony if it would be helpful. You all can — either side can draft something up. You know, I would prefer to do it at the end of the case, but I did not cover EBR in my initial instructions, so I don't know if there's — I'll just leave that for another day.

So anything else for the Plaintiff?

MR. BARRETT: Yes, Your Honor, there is another matter. You recall the motions in limine. We moved to exclude a couple of letters that were written to Dr. Krakauer back in 2014 advising him that he had certain rights and inviting him to contact counsel, and Your Honor had excluded that in the motion in limine ruling, those two letters.

The statements in opening about three years going by, 2014 until Dr. Krakauer filed his lawsuit, treads pretty close to

issues that are presented in that letter and will require some clarifying testimony from Dr. Krakauer about why he filed the lawsuit and what he learned, which, of course, intrudes closely again to the letter that he received back in 2014 that Your Honor has excluded.

1.5

2.1

It's kind of a perilous path for us to direct questioning on that point. We want to ensure that we do not open any doors with respect to that issue, but we do need to clarify what Dr. Krakauer learned about his rights and when, and we do not want to intrude upon Your Honor's ruling. We also don't want to intrude upon any advice or information that Dr. Krakauer received from us at that time.

So I'm raising that kind of as a precautionary issue. We do not want to open the door. We do intend to elicit that testimony in response to opening statement and we simply wanted to bring that matter before the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you for letting me know.

MR. GLASSER: So I guess the question is if we ask him

why did -- why did you not sue prior to when you sued and he

says, "Because I didn't know about class actions until 2014 and

that this had happened to lots of people," does the Court

believe that would open the door and undermine the motion in

limine and bring in all this other stuff? I feel like we've

been baited to do that and we should be able to respond to the

idea that he just sat around.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, I don't know exactly what he's going to say so I can't really rule in advance, but, you know, I don't have any problem with him explaining his motivation. You know, that -- that seems like a fair thing so --

MR. BICKS: Well, first of all, Your Honor, your in limine ruling said we could not introduce into evidence written communications with his counsel. I didn't show any of those letters.

THE COURT: Right.

2.3

MR. BICKS: All I said was a meeting took place and a lawsuit got filed. That's all that I said. And so, first of all, I was mindful of your in limine rulings and that's why I didn't publish or even refer to letters or communications. I just said a meeting took place so people can see on a timeline when the case got filed compared to the calls.

So I -- I have told -- Your Honor, I don't know what, you know, Mr. Krakauer is going to say about his motivations, but I had mentioned to Your Honor, you know, that if he starts getting into why, you know, he brought the lawsuit and he starts opening things up, you know, I will deal with what would be permissible on cross at that point.

THE COURT: Right. I mean, I'm not sure I can really rule on it. I mean, certainly an inference one could draw from the opening statement would be that he was motivated to sue

because he met with some lawyers. Now, there are other ways to interpret that argument as well -- that opening statement as well. So, you know, I don't know how to rule on it until I hear what he says.

MR. GLASSER: Okay.

1.5

2.3

THE COURT: You know, just general questions about his motivation that don't lead to long speeches, you know, we shouldn't have any problems.

MR. GLASSER: Thank you, Your Honor. That's it for the Plaintiff.

THE COURT: Anything the Defendant wants to address before we stop for the day?

MS. ECHTMAN: Your Honor, when we spoke on Friday, I mentioned that we had an issue about some expert exhibits and this relates directly to motions in limine as well. Your Honor will recall that Plaintiff moved in limine to exclude all of the defense Exhibit 31 data summaries and Your Honor ruled that we could not use those exhibits in our affirmative case, in cross-examination for any purpose.

Since that time we have had some back and forth about those defense categories and there's a stipulation that's now been entered into and that the Court, I believe, will be reading to the jury.

Recently, within the last two weeks, Plaintiff's counsel gave us some new exhibits that they want to use with their

expert and they are portions of our old Exhibit 31 summaries that were precluded for all purposes. And so we said, "If you're going to use them, then we want to use the rest of them." And the response we got was no.

2.1

So, you know, this gets back to the goose-gander. They can't add new exhibits and use them with their expert when they were not produced as part of expert discovery. They were actually precluded based on their own motion; and if you're going to let them use it, then we've got to be able to use our summaries for all purposes with our witnesses as well. We think it's got to be a level playing field here. They can't come out with new expert exhibits to elicit new expert testimony that we've never heard before based on our exhibits that Your Honor precluded based on their motion.

THE COURT: Okay. Is this the --

MS. ECHTMAN: So it's not what's attached to the stipulation actually. They made their own new versions and they want to use them affirmatively with their expert. We have no idea what their expert is going to say about that.

THE COURT: In connection with Ms. Verkhovskaya.

MS. ECHTMAN: Verkhovskaya's affirmative testimony. There are several exhibits. One is called -- I believe it's PX2000 and what that is -- it's got a cover sheet that says there are approximately -- you know, it's got the number of telephone numbers, and it's got the number of phone numbers,

and then there's an attachment that lists every phone number and how many calls to each of those phone numbers. I think that's fair because that lets everyone know what the scope of the class is. Right, those are the phone numbers that they're suing on that are left in the class and we whittled them down.

2.1

2.3

But on top of that, they have an exhibit that they want to use with their expert that relates to every one of the call buckets that are in the stipulation and they want to have their expert affirmatively testify about those when they were never part of that expert's opinions. They're actually exhibits that we developed in rebuttal, and now they want to make them part of the case in chief and won't let us use other portions that we think are relevant that have the supporting data for those exhibits.

MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, that's not correct.

Exhibits 2001 through 2007 consist of nothing more than the telephone numbers that are within the call categories that the jury is going to have to resolve, the call categories that Your Honor developed for the verdict form. So they are particular challenges. For example, did the LexisNexis data show that this telephone number is unknown at a certain point in the class period and should that preclude the jury from finding that that was a residential number.

It's not new analysis. It's the telephone numbers that are

in the stipulations that we reached with DISH several months ago and that -- actually several weeks ago and that Your Honor has adopted and approved. So it's telephone numbers and it's call counts.

2.1

So, first of all, I don't think there was an accurate description of what these are. It's the telephone numbers that we've all agreed to filed with the Court regarding the categories, the categorical challenges that would be on the verdict form. It's a summary document that shows nothing more than the numbers, as I said, the call counts, but also it totals up the calls and the numbers precisely as the stipulation did. So it's the stipulation. It's not something new.

But beyond that, Your Honor, this is premature. This issue -- we have not presented this evidence. They do not know -- you know, we don't have to disclose exactly how we are going to present this evidence. We have to disclose the exhibit, which we did last week or sooner than that, to allow them to check it for accuracy. They checked it for accuracy. They actually alerted us to some inaccuracies, and we revised the exhibit and sent it back to them, so there's nothing inaccurate. It's a summary of voluminous information that our expert might use on the witness stand.

MS. ECHTMAN: Your Honor, if I just might respond to the assertion that what I informed you of was inaccurate. It's

not. It's actually the Plaintiff taking our work, our data summaries that they said were expert work and weren't merely summaries, because each of them are a portion of what was originally in our Exhibit 31s before we started working collaboratively to narrow them and refine them and make sure we agreed on what was fairly in them. Now --

2.1

THE COURT: So what -- what would you want to do beyond what's --

MS. ECHTMAN: So all they have are the phone numbers and the call counts in each one, and what I was ready to try to talk to Mr. Barrett about is if you want to use these that just have the phone numbers and the call counts, then we also want to use all of the LexisNexis data that supports it.

And we provided them with excerpts from the LexisNexis data, just exactly pulled from those files that relate to all of those phone numbers, and similarly all of the Five9 telephone records that relate to those phone numbers and said, "If you're going to use that with your expert, we want to use the rest of it with our expert."

And the answer was, "No, you can't."

THE COURT: What would it -- I guess I'm not really understanding exactly what -- for what purpose the Plaintiff would use it, nor am I understanding for what purpose the Defendant would use it. I mean, you're describing it to me, but you're not telling me why it's relevant or why it's going

to be helpful to the jury. I mean, I don't really --

2.1

2.3

MS. ECHTMAN: And we don't know for what purpose the Plaintiff is going to use it because the Plaintiff's expert never gave any opinions on these particular defensive challenge buckets; and if they want their expert to give new opinions on them, we need to know what that's going to be. We've had no information from their expert about what she might possibly say about these things because it's not part of the work that she did with respect to their case in chief. And they currently have a ruling that our expert, Debra Aron, can't testify about any of this. So it's very lopsided here where now they want to use these —

THE COURT: I am not following. I mean, I -- you know, I am -- I mean, I hear what you're saying, but I can't -- I'm not really following why -- what -- I mean, I'm not disagreeing with you. I just am not understanding because -- and you're obviously not going to be able to explain to me why the Plaintiff wants to use this evidence. So I'm just going to wait because I don't understand and I -- I'm going to wait and see what they want to use it for; and, you know, if they open some door, we'll -- you know, we'll talk.

MS. ECHTMAN: All right. So our position is they haven't disclosed what their expert's opinions might possibly be about these summaries that were originally precluded -- that we were precluded from using and if they're going -- we object

to their expert using them and giving any new opinions about them that haven't been disclosed; and just for the record, if the Court is inclined to let them do it, which we don't think the Court should --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

THE COURT: I'm not saying that one way or the other.

I'm pretty sure what I just said was I don't know enough about it to rule, so you're going to have to repeat your objections when I do know enough about it to rule in light of what I then do know.

I mean, you can keep talking if you want to right now, but it's really -- it's not being that helpful to me because I don't understand and I don't think I can understand until this is presented to me in some different kind of way. So I'm just not really getting what the Plaintiff might use it for and how this might come up. So when we get there, just object and we'll take it up at that point.

MS. ECHTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Glad to deal with it then.

What else do we need to deal with today?

MR. GLASSER: Nothing from the Plaintiff, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else from the Defendant?

MR. BICKS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So let's see. We have a couple of folks who wanted to bring their smartphones in. Are these Mr. Dodge and -- I don't know if it's Mr. or Ms. Kitei.

MR. BICKS: Kitei.

2.1

2.3

THE COURT: They're both lawyers?

MR. BICKS: Yes, Mr. Dodge is DISH's general counsel. He's right here. This is Mr. Dodge.

And Mr. Kitei is one of the DISH lawyers who has been working on the case.

THE COURT: All right. Well, that's -- as long as they fill out the form, that's fine. I don't, you know -- don't use your phone in the courtroom while court is in session. That's my main rule for everybody and even if you're sitting, you know, in the back because it's obvious when that happens, and it's distracting to me and the jurors. So I just repeat that for everybody. They can do that. I don't know if our IT people are still here.

But, Ms. Sanders, you can communicate with them about that.
All right. Anything else? No? All right. Good.

I have not reduced the time, but obviously we aren't going to finish by next Friday if you all use all of the time. The time was calculated when I thought we had an internal Do Not Call issue, which is gone. So, you know, I'm assuming you all are — we're going to finish and you all told me last week on the phone that we would, so I'm not really going to make any adjustments. I'm just going to rely on you to do it within — you know, within that schedule, unless I start having some concerns about it. But it sounded like you all have been

1 communicating about that and nobody had any real worries. 2 Okay. Anything else? 3 She is going to keep -- continue to keep time. All right. We'll be in recess until 9:30 tomorrow morning. 4 5 (Proceedings concluded at 5 p.m.) 6 7 CERTIFICATE 8 I, LORI RUSSELL, RMR, CRR, United States District Court Reporter for the Middle District of North Carolina, DO HEREBY 9 CERTIFY: 10 That the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the within-entitled action; that I reported the same in stenotype to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced same to typewriting through the use of Computer-Aided 12 Transcription. 13 14 1.5 Lori Russell, RMR, CRR Date: 1/25/17 Official Court Reporter 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 2.3 24 25

EXHIBIT 84

EXHIBIT 84

JA005104

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA		
2			
3			
4	THOMAS H. KRAKAUER, * Case No. 1:14CV333 *		
5	Plaintiff, * *		
6	vs. * Greensboro, North Carolina * January 11, 2017		
7	DISH NETWORK, L.L.C., * 9:30 a.m. *		
8	Defendant. * ***********************************		
9			
	DATIV EDANGODIDE OF EDIAL EFFERINGS		
10	DAILY TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL TESTIMONY BEFORE THE HONORABLE CATHERINE C. EAGLES,		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, and a jury.		
12			
13	APPEARANCES:		
14	For the Plaintiff: JOHN W. BARRETT, ESQUIRE BRIAN A. GLASSER, ESQUIRE		
15	Bailey & Glasser, LLP 209 Capitol Street		
16	Charleston, West Virginia 25301		
17	MATTHEW P. MCCUE, ESQUIRE Law Office of Matthew P. McCue		
18	1 South Avenue, Third Floor		
19	Natick, MA 01760		
20	JACOB M. NORRIS, ESQUIRE The Norris Law Firm		
21	1033 Bullard Court, Suite 207 Raleigh, North Carolina 27615		
22			
23	For the Defendant: PETER A. BICKS, ESQUIRE ELYSE D. ECHTMAN, ESQUIRE		
24	JOHN L. EWALD, ESQUIRE Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP		
25	51 West 52nd Street		

1		RICHARD J. KESHIAN, ESQUIRE Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton, LLP
2		1001 W. Fourth Street Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101
3		WINSCON SAICH, NOICH CAIOITHA 27101
4	Court Reporter:	Lori Russell, RMR, CRR P.O. Box 20593
5		Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27120
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		orded by stenotype reporter.
25	Transcript produced	by Computer-Aided Transcription.

1	INDEX			
2	Plaintiff Witnesses:	Page		
3	THOMAS KRAKAUER			
4	Direct Examination by Mr. Barrett Cross-Examination by Mr. Bicks			
5	AMIR AHMED			
6	Direct Examination by Mr. Glasser 52 Cross-Examination by Ms. Echtman 197 Redinant Examination by Mr. Glasser 240			
7	Redirect Examination by Mr. Glasser 240			
8	PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS			
9	NO.: DESCRIPTION:	ADMIT		
10	PX26	107		
11	PX28	138		
12	PX55	55		
13	PX89	87		
14	PX120 181			
15	PX190			
16	PX194 171			
17	PX241	144		
18	PX282	26		
19	PX334	91		
20	PX504	183		
21	PX656	161		
22	PX1160	157		
23	PX1208	104		
24				
25				

1			DEFENSE EXHIBITS
2	NO.:	DESCRIPTION:	ADMIT
3	DX63		36
4	DX81		32
5	DX84		233
6			
7			JOINT EXHIBITS
8	NO.:	DESCRIPTION	ADMIT
9	1		107
10	2		140
11	3		209
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Good morning. Is there anything we need 3 to take up before the jury comes in? MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, one housekeeping matter. 4 We 5 have a replacement exhibit, PX24, for Your Honor's and the Court's trial exhibit notebooks. We've provided a copy of this 6 7 to -- to DISH. And if I may, perhaps, hand this to 8 Ms. Sanders? 9 THE COURT: All right. MR. BARRETT: I would do whatever you would like. 10 11 THE COURT: You can. 12 MR. BARRETT: Thank you. 13 THE COURT: Anything else? The only other housekeeping matter, Your 14 MR. BARRETT: Honor, is when I question the witness, I have this portable --1.5 may I stand here behind the table and use the ELMO while I 16 question the witness? 17 18 THE COURT: Yes, you may. 19 MR. BARRETT: Thank you. 20 THE COURT: Anything for the Defendants before the 21 jury comes in? 22 Nothing, Your Honor. MR. BICKS: 2.3 THE COURT: All right. You may bring the jury in. 24 All right. There are some wires, you know, associated with the ELMO. So anybody walking around the well, please don't

fall. 2 Is it hot in here? 3 MR. BARRETT: I suppose that brings up another matter. I may need to spray my throat with this from time to time. 4 5 hanging in there. THE COURT: Go ahead. I'm at the tail end of a cold. 6 The clerk has called to see if they can make it less hot. 7 8 (The jury entered the courtroom.) 9 THE COURT: All right. Good morning, ladies and 10 gentlemen. I'm glad you all made it here safely and that all 11 of the snow is melting, and we're ready to get started. We have called about the heat. It's quite warm in here. 12 13 Hopefully, it will cool off a little bit to a better 14 temperature shortly. 1.5 I think we're ready to get going, and the Plaintiff can call its first witness. 16 17 MR. BARRETT: Thank you, Your Honor. The Plaintiff calls Thomas Krakauer. 18 19 THOMAS KRAKAUER, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN 20 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BARRETT: 2.1 22 Good morning, sir. 2.3 A. Good morning. 24 Could you please tell the jury your name.

My name is Thomas Krakauer.

- Q. All right. Dr. Krakauer, where do you live?
- 2 A. I live in Durham County -- northern Durham County in the
- 3 | township of Bahama.
- $4 \parallel Q$. And how long have you lived there?
- 5 A. Since 1985.
- 6 ∥Q. Do you work?
- 7 A. I'm retired.
- 8 Q. And retired from what?
- 9 | A. I'm retired from the North Carolina Museum of Life and
- 10 | Science.
- 11 $\|Q$. What was your job there?
- 12 A. I was a chief executive officer.
- 13 $\|$ Q. And when did you become chief executive officer at the
- 14 | museum?
- 15 A. In 1985, when I moved to North Carolina.
- 16 Q. Now, are you a medical doctor?
- 17 A. No, I'm a Ph.D.
- 18 Q. And what is your Ph.D. field?
- 19 A. It's in zoology.
- 20 Q. I would like to ask you some questions about this lawsuit.
- 21 Did you bring this lawsuit on your own behalf?
- 22 A. I brought it as an enforcement effort. The federal Do Not
- 23 \parallel Call List, the TCPA, says that if somebody receives more than
- 24 | two phone calls in a year, they're authorized to bring suit
- 25 against the company that filed those call -- placed those

- calls.
- 2 Q. So on whose behalf did you bring the lawsuit?
- 3 \parallel A. I brought the lawsuit on behalf of a class of 18,000
- 4 | citizens.
- 5 Q. What is your role in this lawsuit?
- 6 A. I'm the class representative.
- $7 \parallel Q$. And what does that mean to you, sir?
- 8 A. That means three things: I have to be generally familiar
- 9 | with the progress of the case, I have to participate in events
- 10 | like this trial, and I also -- I think it very important, I
- 11 | have to be loyal and faithful to the rest of the class so that
- 12 | I represent their interests, not my own.
- 13 Q. Have you ever been a class representative in a lawsuit
- 14 before?
- 15 A. No, sir, I have not.
- 16 $\|Q$. Have you -- have you ever brought a lawsuit before?
- 17 A. No, sir, I have not.
- 18 Q. I'd like to ask you some questions about the Do Not Call
- 19 | law and the Do Not Call Registry. Are you familiar with the
- 20 | National Do Not Call Registry?
- 21 A. Yes, sir, I am.
- 22 $\|Q$. And what is the Registry?
- 23 A. It was established by the federal government because of the
- 24 outrage of citizens at the uncontrolled proliferation of
- 25 telemarketing practices.

MR. BICKS: Your Honor, I would just object to the witness reciting the history. He's not here to do that.

THE COURT: All right. Well, sustained as to the accuracy of that. He wasn't there, I assume, and doesn't have firsthand knowledge of that. The jury can disregard that.

MR. BARRETT: Yes, Your Honor.

BY MR. BARRETT:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. What does the National Do Not Call Registry allow a person to do?
- 10 MR. BICKS: Your Honor, again, I object. He's not an expert.
- 12 **THE COURT:** Okay. What are you --
- MR. BARRETT: Just leading to the questions about what he did to join the Registry, put his number on the Registry.
- 15 THE COURT: Okay. Well, you can ask those questions.

16 BY MR. BARRETT:

- 17 Q. Did you place your telephone number on the Do Not Call
- 18 Registry?
- 19 A. Yes, sir, I did.
- 20 \parallel Q. And what telephone number is that?
- 21 \parallel A. That was my landline phone number, (919) 471-9459.
- 22 | Q. And when did you first put your telephone number on the
- 23 Registry?
- 24 A. It was in July of 2 -- excuse me --
- 25 THE COURT: July when? I missed the year.

- 1 THE WITNESS: I coughed through the year. I
- 2 apologize. It was in July of 2003.
- 3 BY MR. BARRETT:
- $4 \parallel Q$. Would you like a glass of water?
- 5 A. No, thank you. That will urge me to shorten my testimony.
- 6 Q. Sure. So July of 2003. How did you place your call on the
- 7 | Registry?
- 8 A. I went online and placed it.
- 9 \mathbb{Q} . Now, about the telephone number that you registered, when
- 10 did you first get that telephone number?
- 11 A. That number was the number I had when I first came to
- 12 | North Carolina in 1985.
- 13 Q. And was it a landline telephone number?
- 14 A. Yes, sir, it was a landline.
- 15 0. And whose number was it?
- 16 A. It was my personal number.
- 17 Q. And who paid the bills?
- 18 A. I paid the bills.
- 19 Q. How long did you have that telephone number?
- 20 | A. I had that number from 1985 until 2002 -- late 2002 when I
- 21 decided I just wanted to have a cell phone, and as the
- 22 expression is, I cut the cord.
- 23 Q. Was it 2002 or --
- 24 A. I'm sorry. 2012.
- 25 \parallel Q. When you say "cut the cord," what do you mean?

- 1 \blacksquare A. It means I -- I no longer had landline services, but I only
- 2 paid for a cell phone.
- 3 \parallel Q. Had your phone number ever been removed from the National
- 4 Do Not Call Registry until 2012?
- 5 A. No, sir, it's not.
- 6 Q. I'd like to talk with you about some of the calls that you
- 7 received in this case.
- 8 Do you have a -- backing up, do you have a subscription
- 9 | television service in your home?
- 10 A. Yes, sir, I do.
- 11 Q. Who provides your service?
- 12 A. It's DirecTV.
- 13 Q. And how long have you had DirecTV?
- 14 A. Since early 2003.
- 15 Q. And how did you decide on DirecTV?
- 16 A. I went to a couple of big-box stores, looked at the
- 17 | promotional material, and thought that the benefits of DirecTV
- 18 at that time were superior to those of DISH Network.
- 19 Q. And how did you sign up for DirecTV?
- 20 A. Well, I took the advertising material from the big-box
- 21 store and called the number that was on it for DirecTV.
- 22 Q. Who do you pay for your DirecTV service each month?
- 23 A. Yes, sir, I do.
- 24 Q. Who do you pay?
- 25 A. I pay DirecTV.

- Q. And has that remained the same since 2003?
- 2 A. Yes, sir, it has.
- 3 \parallel Q. Have you ever received calls asking you to switch from
- 4 DirecTV to DISH Network?
- 5 A. Yes, sir, I have.
- 6 Q. When is the first call that you can remember?
- 7 $\|$ A. It was on a Saturday evening of May the 9th, 2009.
- 8 \mathbb{Q} . And was that on -- what telephone number was that on?
- 9 \parallel A. That was on my landline, so (919) 471–9459.
- 10 Q. All right. How did that telephone call begin?
- 11 MR. BICKS: Your Honor, I think this could be hearsay
- 12 | if he's asking what somebody said to him. I'm not sure what --
- 13 THE COURT: Is it -- it's not offered for the truth.
- 14 | I assume it's offered to show what was said to him.
- 15 MR. BARRETT: Yes, it was offered to show what he did,
- 16 what was told to him, and what he did in response.
- 17 THE COURT: Overruled. Go ahead.
- 18 THE WITNESS: The call started with the person -- a
- 19 gentleman said, "I see you've been a longtime customer of
- 20 DirecTV, and I think I can save you some money."
- 21 BY MR. BARRETT:
- 22 Q. Okay. What happened next on that call?
- 23 \parallel A. We talked about the various services I was getting from
- 24 \parallel DirecTV, and at some point, he asked me for the last four
- 25 digits of my credit card.

- Q. Okay. And what happened next?
- 2 \mathbb{A} . Well, I gave him those -- those numbers and he put me on --
- 3 put me on hold.
- 4 Q. Did he come back to the call?
- 5 A. Yeah, he came back to the call; and at that time he told me
- 6 that I had some premiums that I was currently getting from
- 7 DirecTV, and when those premiums expired, he could save me some
- 8 money.
- 9 Q. Save you some money how?
- 10 A. As the call progressed, he indicated that he could save me
- 11 some money by switching to DISH Network.
- 12 Q. During the call, did this gentleman tell you that he
- 13 | represented DISH Network?
- 14 A. No, sir, he didn't, but I assumed that he represented DISH
- 15 Network because he wanted me to switch from DirecTV to DISH.
- 16 Q. And during the call, did this gentleman give you a name and
- 17 | telephone number?
- 18 A. He gave me his name, Ken, and he --
- 19 **THE COURT:** His name Ken?
- 20 | THE WITNESS: Ken, K-E-N. And he gave me the phone
- 21 | number, which I recorded.
- 22 BY MR. BARRETT:
 - \mathbb{Q} . Recorded by -- how?
- 24 \mid A. Handwritten on the back of an envelope.
- 25 \parallel Q. Now, up until that call, May of 2009, had you ever

- contacted DISH to inquire about DISH subscriptions?
- 2 A. No, I had not.
- 3 || Q. Have you since?
- 4 A. No, I have not since.
- $5 \parallel Q$. All right. So you hung up the phone with this gentleman.
- 6 You said his name was Ken. What did you do the next day?
- 7 A. The next morning, I first called DirecTV and told them that
- 8 | it appeared as if someone had impersonated me to get
- 9 | information about my DirecTV account. And they told me to put
- 10 a password protection on my account, which I did. And then I
- 11 talked to a second person, asked if there is a way that I could
- 12 stop the calls, and I was told that I should call DISH Network,
- 13 and they gave me a phone number.
- 14 | Q. And did you call DISH Network?
- 15 A. Yes, sir, I did. I called DISH Network.
- 16 Q. And what happened during the call?
- 17 A. I escalated the call through several levels until I finally
- 18 talked with somebody who seemed aware of the situation.
- 19 Q. What did you tell this person?
- 20 A. I more or less told her what had happened the night before
- 21 and what could be done about it.
- 22 Q. Okay. Did you, at some point, hear back from the person
- 23 you spoke with?
- 24 A. I called on the 10th, and I got a call -- of May, and I got
- 25 \parallel a call back on the 21st of May, a very brief call. So, yes, I

- did hear back.
- 2 Q. And what did the representative tell you?
- 3 A. She told me that they'd identified the caller and that he
- 4 was a contractor, and as such, DISH Network was -- I'm sorry.
- 5 DirecTV was not responsible for his behavior.
- 6 Q. Okay. You said DirecTV wasn't responsible, but --
- 7 | A. I'm sorry, yes. I'm getting confused. I apologize. I
- 8 know this is complex and I don't want to confuse you. But,
- 9 yes, I was talking with the representative of DISH Network, and
- 10 she told me that since the -- the caller was a contractor, DISH
- 11 Network was not responsible for his actions.
- 12 Q. After you received the May 9th, 2009 call that you had
- 13 described, the initial call from Ken, did you take any steps to
- 14 protect your -- protect yourself?
- 15 A. Yeah. Yes, sir, I did. That Monday morning, I called the
- 16 Attorney General's office to protest the fact that somebody was
- 17 | able to call and apparently impersonate me. Since I had given
- 18 | this gentleman my -- the last four digits of my credit card
- 19 | number, I changed my credit card. And I also subscribed to
- 20 | Equifax to protect myself from identity theft.
- 21 $\|Q$. All right. Now, after you contacted the North Carolina
- 22 Attorney General's office, did the calls stop?
- 23 $\|$ A. No, sir, they did not.
- 24 \parallel Q. Did you receive any calls that were similar to the one that
- 25 you received from Ken?

- 1 A. I received a number of calls, so many that I felt it was
- 2 appropriate for me to reregister my number on the federal Do
- 3 | Not Call Registry.
- 4 Q. How would these calls begin?
- 5 A. They all began with, I see you've been a long-term --
- 6 sorry -- a long-term customer of DirecTV and I can save you
- 7 some money.
- 8 \parallel Q. Did you receive more than one call in a 12-month period
- 9 with this similar message?
- 10 A. Yes, sir, I did.
- 11 Q. And you said that you reregistered your telephone number on
- 12 | the Do Not Call Registry?
- 13 | A. Yes, sir, I did.
- 14 Q. The question is, do you understand if you needed to
- 15 | register your phone again on the Do Not Call Registry?
- 16 A. I now know it was not necessary. Once one registers the
- 17 | number, the -- that registry remains in force.
- 18 | Q. And approximately when was it that you reregistered your
- 19 | number?
- 20 \parallel A. I reregistered my number in approximately June of 2011.
- 21 Q. Two thousand --
- 22 A. 2010.
- 23 \parallel Q. 2010. Now, you said that you contacted the State Attorney
- 24 General. I want to ask you about that. Did you hear back from
- 25 the Attorney General's office of North Carolina sometime after

- you had lodged your complaint?
- 2 A. Yes, I did. I got a call asking me if I would be -- attend
- 3 | a deposition with regard to DISH Network's telemarketing
- 4 practices.
- 5 Q. Okay. And when was the deposition?
- 6 A. It was in September of 2011.
- 7 | Q. And was the North Carolina Attorney General's office
- 8 present?
- 9 A. Yes, sir, they were.
- 10 Q. Was DISH Network present?
- 11 A. Yes, sir, they were.
- 12 Q. And who was there for DISH Network?
- 13 A. This is from my memory, but I believe his name was Victor
- 14 Rao.
- 15 | Q. And who did Mr. Rao represent?
- 16 A. He represented DISH Network.
- 17 | Q. Did you testify at your deposition September of 2011 about
- 18 | the May 2009 call?
- 19 A. Yes, sir, I did.
- 20 \parallel Q. Did you testify about other calls that you received?
- 21 | A. Yes, sir, I did.
- 22 Q. When you gave your deposition in September of 2011, when is
- 23 the last time that you received a similar call?
- 24 \parallel A. I was really struck by the fact that I received a call in
- 25 September 2011, just shortly before the deposition. And it

started exactly the same way, and the call went to my voice mail. And I listened to the whole thing, because it -- I found 2 it intriguing that just before I was called to this deposition, 3 I got another call, but I didn't return the call. Once I 4 5 listened to it, I deleted it. 6 At your deposition, were you provided with documents? 7 Yes, sir, I was. Α. 8 MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, it's tab -- I'm sorry, Volume 2, Plaintiff's Exhibit 282 that I would like to show the 10 witness. 11 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. MR. BARRETT: I do not have that on my screen. 12 13 THE CLERK: Oh, sorry. I now have it on mine. 14 THE WITNESS: 1.5 BY MR. BARRETT: 16 You do. Q. 17 Α. Yes, sir. All right. Dr. Krakauer, have you seen Plaintiff's 18 19 Exhibit 282 before? 20 A. I saw it during the Attorney General's deposition. 2.1 MR. BICKS: Your Honor, I don't believe 282 is in 22 evidence, and is it displayed? 2.3 MR. BARRETT: It --24 MR. GLASSER: Yes.

THE COURT: Was there going to be an objection to it

25

or This -- I think if this is the exhibit --2 MR. BICKS: 3 THE CLERK: I took it down. MR. BICKS: Right. This is an exhibit, Your Honor, 4 5 that we had an in limine discussion about, and it wasn't to be raised until we discussed it with you first. 6 MR. BARRETT: May we approach to do so? 7 8 THE COURT: All right. 9 (The following bench conference was recorded.) 10 MR. BARRETT: This is an e-mail that Dr. Krakauer 11 received at his deposition --THE COURT: Yes. 12 13 MR. BARRETT: -- at which DISH was present. 14 reviewed this. And it contains a recitation of a DISH 1.5 representative the day after he received the May 9 call regarding what Dr. Krakauer reported to the DISH 16 17 representative. THE COURT: Uh-huh. 18 19 MR. BARRETT: And what I would like to review is the 20 highlighted portions on mine saying who it was from, TCPA, it's 21 got his number, his name. 22 THE COURT: Yes. For what purpose? 2.3 MR. BARRETT: For the purpose of establishing what she reported -- what he reported to DISH Network, what he told her. 24

He who? Dr. Krakauer?

25

THE COURT:

1 MR. BARRETT: Yes. Okay. And your objection? 2 THE COURT: 3 The objection is, Your Honor, first of MR. BICKS: all, the fact that he saw a document at a deposition doesn't --4 5 is not relevant. It doesn't make this in any way admissible. 6 That's number one. Number two, remember the credit issue that we talked about 7 8 where -- where I told Your Honor they were going to make this argument and he's going to presumably try to say this now, that 10 I found out through this that somebody ran a credit report on 11 me, right? And Your Honor said, I don't see how that's coming into the 12 13 case, and before that comes up, you need to come over and talk 14 to me. 1.5 The part of this thing that's highlighted is that you can 16 see here --17 THE COURT: Okay. So the only thing you object to is that one reference to get personal credit info? 18 19

MR. BICKS: Well, if we take that out of this document, then I'm okay with them using this document. But for him -- a document -- they can ask him what happened on the call. But for him to be looking at a document from a DISH person, reciting what the DISH person was told by him, that's -- that's not admissible.

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, this establishes what he was

told regarding the credit check. And when Rebecca Dougherty called him back -- Rebecca Dougherty, first of all, says in 2 parentheses: I did not inform Dr. Krakauer that his credit was 3 run without his knowledge. So he is still unaware this 4 5 happened. We're not raising this to say this is a violation of the 6 7 law. We're raising this to say that DISH Network protected 8 SSN. 9 THE COURT: Okay. All right. You can ask him 10 questions about this e-mail from the DISH person because that's 11 an admission, you know. In terms of just reading it, I mean, Mr. Bicks is right, it's not relevant just because it came up 12 13 during a deposition. But this is -- if this is a DISH person, 14 that's an admission, so it's not hearsay, and it seems to clearly be relevant, so, at least as to that one e-mail, you 1.5 16 can go ahead. MR. BICKS: But, Your Honor, you have said the credit 17 18 reporting issue --19 Well, I know, but I'm overruling it now in THE COURT: 20 light of the -- his statements, where you questioned his 2.1 motivation. And so, there we are. 22 MR. BICKS: Okay. Just so we're clear, now I'm 2.3 allowed, right, to go into the meetings and the financial --24 THE COURT: No, you're not.

MR. BICKS: -- arrangements he has in the case?

25

1 THE COURT: No, you're not. We'll take this up at the 2 break. 3 COURT REPORTER: Judge, I'm having a hard time hearing Mr. Bicks. 4 (Conclusion of bench conference.) 5 6 MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, is that also visible on the 7 jury's -- thank you. 8 BY MR. BARRETT: Q. Dr. Krakauer, at your deposition, we were before -- before 10 the discussion with the Court, we were reviewing this, and you 11 were provided with this document at your deposition. Is that true? 12 Yes, sir, I was. 13 And what does this document generally represent? 14 This document represents an e-mail chain within DISH that 1.5 16 was as a result of my call on May 10th. 17 MR. BICKS: Again, Your Honor, I would object to the witness describing the document, what it represents. 18 19 THE COURT: All right. Well, do you dispute that 20 these are e-mails between DISH people? 2.1 MR. BICKS: No, I do not. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Overruled. BY MR. BARRETT: Dr. Krakauer, I've highlighted certain portions of the 24

second page of PX 282.

- A. Yes, sir.
- 2 \mathbb{Q} . Do you see at the top it says from Rebecca Dougherty?
- 3 A. Yes, sir, I do.
- 4 Q. And do you see the date of that, Sunday, May 10, 2009,
- 5 | 10:26 a.m.?
- $6 \parallel A$. Yes, sir, I do.
- 7 \mathbb{Q} . And what was the date of the call you received that caused
- 8 | you to contact DISH?
- 9 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Say again.
- 10 BY MR. BARRETT:
- 11 Q. Sure. What was the date of the call that you received that
- 12 | caused you to contact DISH?
- 13 A. May the 9th.
- 14 Q. So the day before?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- 16 | Q. Okay. Do you see in the subject line: Subject: TCPA,
- 17 TCPA, and that telephone number (919) 471-9459? Is that your
- 18 | telephone number?
- 19 A. Yes, sir, I see that, and that is my telephone number.
- 20 \parallel Q. Do you see: Customer information: And the name Thomas
- 21 Krakauer? Do you see that?
- 22 A. Yeah, I see that.
- 23 \parallel Q. And then, the phone number where the call was received.
- 24 And again, that's your telephone number, correct?
- 25 A. Yes, sir, it is --

- Q. All right.
- $2 \parallel A$. -- or was.
- $3 \parallel Q$. And it says: DNC list consumer is on: And national?
- THE COURT: I'm sorry. If you can -- when you look
- 5 down, it is hard for me to hear.
- 6 MR. BARRETT: Okay. Thank you. Fighting through this
- 7 cold so --

8 BY MR. BARRETT:

- 9 $\|$ Q. The portion stating: DNC list consumer is on: National.
- 10 Do you see that?
- 11 A. Yes. It says I'm on the national Do Not Call List.
- 12 Q. On down the page, I'm going to read this to you and ask you
- 13 some questions about it.
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 | Q. Thomas Krakauer received a call last night, Saturday May 9,
- 16 | from a retailer sales partner, question mark, who was claiming
- 17 to be a DirecTV employee. The phone number the call was
- 18 received from is 1-800-375-8211, extension 105, caller's name
- 19 was Ken. Okay?
- 20 A. I see that, yes, sir.
- 21 | Q. And you said that you had written down Ken's telephone
- 22 | number and name. Do you believe this to be the name and
- 23 | telephone number that you wrote down?
- 24 A. I have no evidence to dispute this.
- 25 \parallel Q. Okay. It says, the employee, Ken, right here. The

employee Ken then proceeded to call DirecTV and pretended to be Mr. Krakauer to get information from his account so he could call Mr. Krakauer back and get personal credit info from him, including his SSN and his credit card number. When further into the call, Mr. Krakauer became suspicious. He questioned the agent, who then told him they were from DISH Network and wanted to sell him DISH Network service.

And my question to you, does that generally reflect the conversation that you had with the DISH representative that morning?

A. Yes, sir, that generally reflects the conversation.

unaware this happened. The credit score ID is 8172493.

Q. The next paragraph. I searched Mr. Krakauer's phone number in Echo Admin and found there was a credit check run on him last night. In parentheses: I did not inform Mr. Krakauer that his credit was run without his knowledge, so he is still

And my question to you is, when the DISH representative called you back a few weeks later, a few weeks after the May 9th, 2009 call, did she tell you that DISH had run a credit check on you?

21 A. No, she did not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

16

17

18

19

20

Q. Continuing with this document. Do you see at the top
there's an e-mail from Vendor Inquiries sent on May 18th, 2009,
3:21 p.m., to Rebecca Dougherty. First of all, do you believe
that Rebecca Dougherty is the name of the DISH representative

who called you back in May of 2009? A. The date is May 19th, not the 18th. But, yes, I do believe 2 3 Rebecca Dougherty was the person that I communicated with. Q. Okay. And it says, Rebecca, based upon the information 4 5 provided, we are able to identify the retailer. It has an OE number, 821970. Contact name: Alex Tehranchi, Sophie 6 Tehranchi. Company: Satellite Systems Network. Has the 8 address information, and the e-mail address is alex@yourdishtv and sophie@yourdishtv. 10 My question to you, sir, is, when the DISH representative 11 we now know is Ms. Dougherty called you back, did she tell you that SSN was the entity that placed the call? 12 13 A. She did not. MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, I would move the admission 14 1.5 of PX 282. 16 THE COURT: Did you want to be heard further on your objection? 17 No, Your Honor. 18 MR. BICKS: 19 All right. Overruled. And it'll be THE COURT: 20 admitted. MR. BARRETT: I have a clerk copy of that. Well, I 2.1 will provide that. 22 2.3 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. 24 BY MR. BARRETT:

The first time you learned that SSN placed this call on

behalf of DISH was when?

- 2 A. The first time I learned that DISH had placed this call was
- 3 upon seeing this material at the Attorney General's deposition.
- 4 | Q. And at the deposition -- just one second. Did you receive
- 5 | a letter from Ms. Dougherty back in 2009 telling you about SSN
- 6 or a credit check or other information pertaining to your
- 7 | complaint?
- 8 A. I've had no direct communication from Rebecca Dougherty.
- 9 \mathbb{Q} . After you provided your deposition, moving ahead, in 2011
- 10 | in the Attorney General matter where DISH was represented by
- 11 | counsel, did you receive any communication from DISH,
- 12 | acknowledging that SSN was responsible?
- 13 A. I have not.
- 14 \parallel Q. Did you receive any letter from DISH stating that it was
- 15 | taking some kind of action against SSN in response to your
- 16 | testimony September of 2011?
- 17 A. I've received no letter from DISH.
- 18 Q. When did you first learn that you had the right to file a
- 19 | lawsuit against DISH Network under the Do Not Call law?
- 20 A. This was in 2014.
- 21 \parallel Q. And what did you learn about your right to do so?
- 22 A. I learned that there was enforcement opportunities under
- 23 | the Do Not Call List and that it wasn't just about me. It was
- 24 a class of 18,000 people who had -- who were on the Do Not Call
- 25 List who had received 51,000 calls on behalf of DISH.

- Q. And the year that you filed this lawsuit, this case that we're here on today, is what?
- 3 A. Say that again, please.
- $4 \parallel Q$. What year did you file this lawsuit?
- 5 A. I believe it was filed in 2017.
- 6 | Q. But this is 2017 now, so --
- 7 \blacksquare A. Okay. I'm sorry. It was 2014.
- 8 Q. Okay. Were you here in the courtroom yesterday for opening
- 9 statements to the jury?
- 10 A. Yes, sir, I was.
- 11 Q. And were you here in the courtroom when DISH's counsel said
- 12 | that the Plaintiff, and that's you, is looking for over
- 13 \parallel \$25 million based on five calls lasting 2 minutes and 32
- 14 seconds? Were you here for that?
- 15 A. I was here for that.
- 16 \mathbb{Q} . And what do you think of that, sir?
- 17 MR. BICKS: Again, objection, Your Honor.
- 18 | THE COURT: Well, you need to rephrase that question.
- 19 BY MR. BARRETT:
- 20 \mathbb{Q} . What do you have to say in response to that?
- 21 THE COURT: No, no. What -- I don't know what you're
- 22 asking him. That's --
- 23 MR. BARRETT: I would like for him to be able to
- 24 respond to a statement that --
- 25 THE COURT: Are you asking him if that's true?

1 MR. BARRETT: Yes. BY MR. BARRETT: 2 3 Is that true? That is not true. 4 Α. 5 And why is it not true? I would receive only the same amount as every member of the 6 class, which is set by federal statutes at \$500. 7 8 MR. BICKS: Your Honor, I object. 9 THE COURT: Overruled. Go ahead. 10 BY MR. BARRETT: 11 I'm sorry. Were you finished with your response? Yeah, I think what I said was that I would receive only the 12 13 same amount as all of the other members of the class. 14 Q. And is this lawsuit based on five calls lasting 2 minutes 1.5 and 32 seconds? No, sir, this lawsuit is not based upon that. It's based 16 17 upon enforcing a federal statute based on the Do Not Call List, and, you know, if no efforts are taken to enforce this, wealthy 18 19 telemarketers are free to continue to make calls forever. 20 MR. BICKS: Your Honor, I don't think that's proper 21 testimony. I would object. 22 THE COURT: Well, overruled. Go ahead. You can move 2.3 on. 24 MR. BARRETT: Thank you, Dr. Krakauer. I have no further questions.

1 THE COURT: Questions for DISH? 2 Yes, Your Honor. MR. BICKS: 3 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BICKS: 4 First of all, good morning, Dr. Krakauer. 5 6 Good morning, sir. 7 Do you prefer I call you doctor or mister? 8 A. Yes, sir, I do. If members of Congress feel comfortable about calling me doctor, I would appreciate if you would do the 10 same. 11 Q. All right. Happy to do that. Thank you. And you've been retired since when? 12 13 2004. Α. 14 Q. And you're here -- you're a class representative in this 1.5 lawsuit, right? 16 A. Yes, sir, I am. 17 Q. I want to ask you some questions about Satellite Systems Network. You've heard of Satellite Systems Network? 18 19 I've -- I've heard about it through the e-mail chain in the 20 deposition. 21 Q. Do you remember that Satellite Systems Network was the dealer involved in your original purchase of your DirecTV 22 2.3 account?

What I remember is that I placed DirecTV -- placed a call

to DirecTV, and they forwarded that -- that call to SSN, and I

- had no direct connection with SSN.
- 2 Q. You don't remember filling out an application that
- 3 | indicated that SSN was the dealer when you got your DirecTV
- 4 | account?
- 5 A. I did not know what the -- you know, the eight-point type
- 6 on the agreement to take DirecTV service. So to answer your
- 7 question briefly, no, I do not remember having any dealings
- 8 | with SSN.
- 9 \mathbb{Q} . And in connection -- I think you said, as part of your role
- 10 as a class representative, you're supposed to be generally
- 11 | familiar with what the case -- is on going in the case?
- 12 A. Yes, sir, I remember that.
- 13 Q. And did you -- before you came here to testify, did you
- 14 | look at documents that you signed in connection with getting
- 15 | your DirecTV account?
- 16 | A. Yes, I did.
- 17 | Q. And do you remember the DirecTV Annual Programming
- 18 | Commitment Agreement that you signed on March 6th, 2003?
- 19 A. Vaquely.
- 20 \parallel Q. And -- and do you remember whether or not that indicated on
- 21 | it that the dealer involved was Satellite Systems Network?
- 22 A. I believe that when I called DirecTV, they forwarded my
- 23 \parallel call to SSN, and I'm not sure that what took place in 2003 has
- 24 any relevance to --
- 25 | THE COURT: Okay. Well, you don't need to argue with

him. He's just asking you what you remember. 2 THE WITNESS: Okay. 3 BY MR. BICKS: Q. Yeah. And, sir, let me just ask again. Do you remember 4 5 signing a DirecTV Annual Programming Commitment Agreement on March 6th, 2003, that indicates that the dealer involved in 6 your account was Satellite Systems Network? 8 A. I remember signing a contract for the installation of DirecTV. I do not remember any mention of SSN. 10 MR. BICKS: So, Your Honor, may I approach the witness 11 and show him DX81? 12 THE COURT: You may. BY MR. BICKS: 13 Q. And, Dr. Krakauer, tell me when you've had a moment to look 14 1.5 at that. I have a document called Direct Annual Programming 16 17 Commitment Agreement, and it's -- I check off whether I am a new DirecTV customer. 18 19 Q. And do you see your signature in the middle of that 20 document? 21 A. Yes, sir, I do. 22 MR. BICKS: All right. Your Honor, I'd move to admit 2.3 DX81 and publish for the jury. 24 THE COURT: It will be admitted.

BY MR. BICKS:

- 2 \mathbb{Q} . Do you have -- you can see this document on the screen,
- 3 Dr. Krakauer?
- 4 A. Yes, I can.
- $5 \parallel Q$. And is that your signature in the middle?
- 6 A. Yes, sir, it is.
- $7 \parallel Q$. And tell our jury what date you signed this.
- 8 A. The 6th of March, 2003.
- 9 Q. And what's the agreement say at the top? What kind of
- 10 agreement is it?
- 11 A. It's a DirecTV Annual Programming Commitment.
- 12 Q. And do you see the phone numbers that are on there?
- 13 $\|$ A. The phone number that I -- that I see -- one is my home
- 14 phone, and the other is my office phone.
- 15 $\|Q\|$. And which one is your home phone?
- 16 A. The (919) 471-9459.
- 17 \parallel Q. And is that the same phone number that Ken called you on
- 18 May 9th, 2009?
- 19 A. That is the same phone number.
- 20 Q. And do you see that credit card information on here?
- 21 A. Yes, sir, I do.
- 22 \parallel Q. And what name do you see above the credit card information?
- 23 A. I see Satellite Systems Network.
- 24 | Q. And that's under dealer name, right?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. And that credit card, is that your credit card?
- $2 \parallel A$. Yes, sir, it is.
- 3 \parallel Q. And where do you believe that credit card information came
- 4 from?
- 5 A. I'm sure I gave it when I placed the call to DirecTV to
- 6 subscribe to DirecTV's service.
- $7 \parallel Q$. And you see here that the dealer involved was Satellite
- 8 | Systems Network? Did you see that?
- 9 A. I did not see that then. I see that now.
- 10 Q. All right. And do you also remember the -- the company --
- 11 you got equipment shipped to you, right? Do you remember that?
- 12 A. Yes, I did.
- 13 Q. And do you also remember the name of the company that
- 14 shipped that equipment to you?
- 15 A. It didn't seem important to me. I was getting -- I was
- 16 getting TV, and, you know, some guys were coming in to install
- 17 | it. So I do not remember what that document said. Well, I've
- 18 seen that document. I now can say, yes, I've seen this
- 19 document, but I certainly did not place any importance to it
- 20 when I purchased my DirecTV in 2003.
- 21 | Q. Right. And in connection with your role as being a class
- 22 representative, you've told our jury that you were to kind of
- 23 | be familiar with what's going on in the case and what it's
- 24 | about, right?
- 25 A. Yes, sir.

- Q. And did you look through your files to determine the role of Satellite Systems Network before this case was filed?

 A. Last year when I was -- the brief answer is yes. Last year, when I was filling out my federal income taxes, I came
- 5 across a folder that was titled "DirecTV," and it had the documents in question.
- $7 \parallel 0$. And that was after this lawsuit was filed?
- 8 A. Yes, sir, it was.
- 9 Q. Let me show you DX63.
- 10 **THE COURT:** That's Defendant's Exhibit 63?
- 11 MR. BICKS: Yes.
- 12 **THE COURT:** So, ladies and gentlemen, the parties may
- 13 | say "PX," Plaintiff's exhibit, "DX," Defendant's exhibit.
- 14 You'll get used to the shorthand.
- 15 Go ahead.
- 16 BY MR. BICKS:
- 17 Q. And you've seen this before, Dr. Krakauer?
- 18 A. This is a document that I uncovered in the files and
- 19 forwarded to my attorneys, and they made it available to you,
- 20 but between --
- 21 **THE COURT:** Okay. So what's the question about the
- 22 | document?
- 23 MR. BICKS: I'd like to move its admission, Your
- 24 Honor.
- 25 THE COURT: What is it? I mean, I know it was the

document you found, but what is it? 2 THE WITNESS: It's a document I received that 3 documented the fact that I was getting a satellite receiver and that I was getting, you know, DirecTV equipment. 4 THE COURT: Okay. So a document related to equipment 5 6 you got back in 2003? 7 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir -- I mean, yes, ma'am. 8 THE COURT: That's okay. That happens to me all the 9 time. 10 It's admitted. 11 MR. BARRETT: We have no objection to the admission. MR. BICKS: And may I please -- thank you, Trudy, for 12 13 displaying that. BY MR. BICKS: 14 Q. And do you see at the top there who sent you the equipment? 1.5 Where did it come from? 16 It came from a company called Satellite Systems Network. 17 And is that your handwriting on this document? 18 19 Yes, sir, it is. Α. 20 Q. All right. 2.1 MR. BICKS: And can we go back, Trudy, and can you 22 pull up Defendant's Exhibit 81? BY MR. BICKS: And the credit card information -- do you see that credit 24

card information on here, Dr. Krakauer?

- A. Yes.
- 2 \mathbb{Q} . And I think -- remember you told us about that May 2009
- 3 | call where Ken asked you for credit card information?
- 4 A. Yes, sir.
- $5 \parallel Q$. And did you give him that credit card information?
- 6 A. He asked me for the last four digits of my current credit
- 7 card, which I gave him, yes, sir.
- 8 \mathbb{Q} . And on this application from 2003, this contract you
- 9 | signed, you also provided credit card information?
- 10 A. I was required by DirecTV to provide credit card
- 11 | information to purchase the satellite service, so the answer is
- 12 yes, sir.
- 13 Q. And you don't dispute, do you, sir, that the dealer
- 14 | involved in your original purchase of DirecTV was Satellite
- 15 | Systems Network, as reflected on the contract you signed?
- 16 A. Based upon the contract, that is correct, but I never
- 17 | called SSN. I called DirecTV to purchase the satellite, and
- 18 they assigned it to SSN. So I -- technically, your question --
- 19 the answer to your question is yes, but I never called SSN.
- 20 \parallel called DirecTV to get satellite service, and they assigned my
- 21 | call to one of their at that time dealers.
- 22 | THE COURT: Okay. I think you've said all that. So
- 23 | let's move on.
- 24 BY MR. BICKS:
- 25 \parallel Q. Yeah. And have you previously testified that there was no

printed evidence that SSN was in any way in the loop with your original DirecTV account?

A. I did not find these documents --

MR. BARRETT: Objection as to the mischaracterization of the testimony, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, he can answer.

Go ahead. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: I testified at the Attorney General's deposition in 2011, at which time, I was not aware of these documents. So when I said in 2011 that I was not aware of any documentation linking my DirecTV account to SSN, that was correct.

13 BY MR. BICKS:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

- Q. Uh-huh. And do you recall that you also said that under oath in the year of 2016?
- 16 A. I do not recall that.
- Q. Do you recall testifying in 2016 that you have no direct evidence, no printed evidence, that SSN was in the loop when it came to your DirecTV account?
- A. Again, my answer is the same. I had not found these
 documents until I was working on my federal income tax and
 found a file in my files titled "DirecTV." So based upon
 everything I knew when I gave that testimony, I had no direct
 evidence that SSN was in any way involved.
- $\mathbb{C}[0]$ Q. All right. And so -- so then I'm clear and our jury is

- 1 clear, before the lawsuit was filed that has us in this
- 2 courtroom, did you go look at your DirecTV file to determine
- 3 who the dealer was when you bought your original DirecTV
- 4 | subscription?
- 5 A. I did not.
- 6 Q. All right. Now, let's talk a little bit about the 2009
- 7 call. Are you with me, Dr. Krakauer?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.
- $9 \mid Q$. And you told us that an individual named Ken called you and
- 10 gave you a phone number, right?
- 11 A. I gave him a phone number.
- 12 Q. And he also gave you his phone number, right?
- 13 $\|$ A. He gave me -- I asked -- yes, he gave me his phone number.
- 14 Q. All right. And he was polite and forthright on the call?
- 15 A. Certainly.
- 16 Q. Yeah. And did you ever on that call tell him not to call
- 17 | you back?
- 18 A. I told him I was not interested in DISH Network, and that
- 19 ended the call.
- 20 \parallel Q. And did you have any notes of that phone call?
- 21 \parallel A. The only notes that I took on that call was his name and
- 22 his phone number on the back of an envelope, which I no longer
- 23 have.
- 24 || Q. And what happened to those notes?
- 25 \parallel A. I threw them out. I often throw out notes from telephone

- messages after they no longer seemed important.
- 2 Q. And do you recall whether he said that he personally
- 3 represented DISH Network?
- 4 A. He never said that he personally represented DISH Network,
- 5 but when he told me to switch from DirecTV to DISH, I assumed
- 6 he had a connection to DISH Network.
- 7 \parallel Q. Do you recall whether he stated whether he was an employee
- 8 ∥ of DISH Network?
- 9 A. He never did.
- 10 Q. Do you recall whether he told you he was authorized by DISH
- 11 Network to call you?
- 12 A. He did not tell me.
- 13 Q. All right. And you gave him your credit card information
- 14 after he asked for it, right?
- 15 \parallel A. When he started the call and said he could see that I was a
- 16 | longtime supporter of DirecTV, I assumed he represented
- 17 | DirecTV, and so, yes, I did give him the last four digits of
- 18 the -- of my credit card.
- 19 Q. And then -- and he said he could save you money, right?
- 20 A. Yes, he did.
- 21 Q. And then you spoke to people at DISH, right?
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- 23 Q. And someone named Rebecca Dougherty, right?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 \parallel Q. When you spoke to Rebecca Dougherty, did you tell her that

- 1 you had signed your DirecTV Annual Programming Commitment
- 2 Agreement that showed that Satellite Systems Network was the
- 3 | dealer?
- 4 A. I was not aware of that when I talked to Rebecca Dougherty.
- 5 So the answer to your question is no.
- 6 Q. And I think you told us DISH, to your knowledge, did an
- 7 | investigation of what happened, right?
- 8 A. Yes, they did.
- 9 Q. And you spoke with Ms. Dougherty, and she told you that the
- 10 party that called you was a contractor and that DISH was not
- 11 responsible for the actions of that contractor, right?
- 12 A. More or less, that's what she said.
- 13 Q. Did you ask Ms. Dougherty what was the name of the
- 14 | contractor?
- 15 \parallel A. After she told me that DISH was not responsible for the
- 16 | contractor's name, we terminated the call because I didn't
- 17 | think that it was going to go farther.
- 18 Q. So you did not ask for the name of the contractor?
- 19 | A. I did not.
- 20 \parallel Q. All right. And you did eventually find out that it was
- 21 | SSN, right?
- 22 A. I found that out -- SSN in 2003 was working for DirecTV,
- 23 \parallel and in 2009, subsequently, they were working on behalf of DISH.
- 24 \parallel Q. Did you reach out to SSN and tell them that you didn't want
- $25 \parallel$ to be called?

- A. I did not.
- 2 Q. Did you send a letter, a fax, make a phone call, anything
- 3 | even like that?
- 4 A. I did not.
- $5 \parallel Q$. Now, let me ask you some questions about the calls that are
- 6 at issue in this case. You understand there's a class period
- 7 | in this case, right?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.
 - \mathbb{Q} . And do you know what the class period is?
- 10 A. Are you asking what's the start date and what's the end
- 11 date?
- 12 Q. Yes.
- 13 A. I believe it is from May of 2010 until the same time in
- 14 | 2011.
- 15 \parallel Q. And do you know how many calls that relate to your phone
- 16 number that are in play in this case in that class period? Do
- 17 you know how many?
- 18 A. You know, that's an interesting question and -- because the
- 19 class period is a calendar year, but there's only a certain
- 20 \parallel shorter period that Satellite Systems Network saved the -- the
- 21 | call records. So I remember, you know, at least 10, but there
- 22 are only a smaller number that are in the -- the Five9 records,
- 23 which is the company that placed the call --
- 24 Q. All right.
- 25 || A. -- the computer system that generated the call.

- Q. Do you remember -- you said "10." You remember you talked about your 2011 deposition?
- 3 A. You know, roughly 10.
- 4 Q. Yeah, and do you remember what you said at that deposition
- 5 about how many calls there were?
- 6 A. I think I said at least five.
- 7 Q. Do you remember you said three to five? Does that help 8 your memory?
- 9 | A. | I think my -- what I'm saying today is more correct.
- 10 Q. Well, let me just show you -- well, let me show you your
- 11 \parallel 2011 transcript at 39 to 22, 40 to 5, and I can pull it on the
- 12 screen so you can see it. Maybe it will refresh your memory.
- The question at the bottom was: "Let me first ask you,
- 14 would you say that the number of calls was approximately three,
- 15 more than three, less than three?"
- 16 **THE COURT:** Is there something that refers to a time
- 17 | frame?
- 18 MR. BICKS: I can show the whole thing, Your Honor.
- 19 I'm telling you, having known the deposition, it was how many
- 20 calls took place after 2009, and I can --
- 21 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
- 22 MR. BICKS: And can you go to the next page, Trudy?
- 23 BY MR. BICKS:
- 24 \parallel Q. Do you remember being asked those questions?
- 25 A. I do.

- $1 \parallel Q$. All right. And this was in 2011, presumably when things
- 2 were a lot fresher in your mind than coming here in 2017,
- 3 | right?
- 4 A. I -- I think your characterization of what I remember
- $5 \parallel$ during the deposition in 2011 is somewhat presumptuous. I said
- 6 three to five, but if I'd only received three to five calls,
- 7 | there would have been no reason for me to refile my phone
- 8 | number on the Do Not Call Registry. So the three to five is
- 9 probably not complete. I can't recall exactly how many calls
- 10 there were, but, you know, that's really not the issue.
- 11 | THE COURT: Okay. That's good. Do you have another
- 12 | question?
- 13 BY MR. BICKS:
- 14 Q. That was the testimony that you gave, right, three to five?
- 15 A. That was the testimony I gave.
- 16 | Q. All right. And on these phone calls, was anybody in any
- 17 | way rude or -- in any way to you in these what you said there
- 18 was three to five?
- 19 A. They were not.
- 20 \parallel Q. And a couple of those calls went into your answering
- 21 | machine?
- 22 A. Yes, sir, they were.
- 23 Q. And you deleted that, right?
- 24 A. I did.
- 25 \parallel Q. And is it safe to say that in each of those phone calls

- from 2010 to 2011 that the only satellite service provider that was mentioned was DirecTV?
- 3 A. I think that's correct.
- 4 Q. So no other cable provider or satellite service provider
- 5 was mentioned on any of those calls aside from DirecTV? That's
- 6 true, is it not?
- $7 \parallel A$. That is true.
- 8 Q. And you don't know the name of the individual who called
- 9 you during those what you said here was three to five calls?
- 10 | A. I do not.
- 11 Q. Before this complaint was filed in April 2014, did you ever
- 12 tell anyone at DISH that you received those three to five
- 13 | calls?
- 14 A. I did not.
- 15 \parallel Q. Did you ever send an e-mail, write a letter, or pick up the
- 16 phone and call anybody at SSN to say that you received these
- 17 | calls?
- 18 A. I did not.
- 19 Q. Did you write a letter to the Better Business Bureau about
- 20 these calls?
- 21 A. No, sir, I did not.
- 22 Q. You know that those calls came from a number associated
- 23 | with Satellite Systems Network, correct?
- 24 \parallel A. I think my attorneys will present that information.
- 25 \parallel Q. Do you know that yourself as the class representative with

us today?

4

5

2 THE COURT: Are you asking him if he has learned that

3 during the course of this litigation?

MR. BICKS: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. You may answer.

6 THE WITNESS: I have learned that through the course

7 of this litigation.

8 BY MR. BICKS:

- $\Theta \parallel Q$. But you didn't sue SSN in this case, did you?
- 10 A. I did not.
- 11 Q. And you called this an enforcement action; is that right?
- 12 A. That is correct.
- 13 Q. Do you know -- you're familiar with the complaint, the
- 14 | formal written document that was filed in this case?
- 15 A. Which document are you referring to?
- 16 Q. The document that started this lawsuit that says what your
- 17 | claims are.
- 18 A. Yes, sir, I do.
- 19 $\|Q$. And do you know how much money in that complaint that
- 20 \parallel you're asking for for yourself?
- 21 A. I'm not expecting to get more than \$500.
- 22 | Q. Do --
- 23 \parallel A. And, you know, this is a class action lawsuit and --
- 24 | THE COURT: Okay. Just a second. I think he asked
- 25 \parallel you if -- how much you asked for in the complaint for yourself.

So if you can just answer that question. 2 BY MR. BICKS: Do you know what you asked for in the complaint? 3 THE COURT: For himself? 4 5 MR. BICKS: Yes. THE WITNESS: I do not. 6 7 Can I approach to refresh his memory? MR. BICKS: 8 THE COURT: All right. 9 MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, may I -- may we approach at 10 the sidebar? 11 THE COURT: Okay. (The following bench conference was recorded.) 12 13 THE COURT: Now, I know you don't want to be really close because we're all sick, but we have to be close or they 14 15 can't hear. So you have to speak right into the mike or the 16 court reporter cannot take it down. Okay. So come in closer. 17 MR. BICKS: Okay. Sorry. Go ahead. Your objection? 18 THE COURT: 19 MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, this is misleading. I have 20 no idea what he intends to --2.1 THE COURT: Can you show me? 22 MR. BICKS: Yeah, I'm going to show him the formal 2.3 complaint where he said he wants \$1,500. 24 MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, that's the issue of willfulness, which the Court has --

THE COURT: That says willful or knowing. He's entitled to that, and if you want me to explain to the jury that he's entitled to 1,500 if it's willful or knowing, then, I mean, I guess I can do that. What's the point?

MR. BICKS: Because, Your Honor, when the witness gets up there and says he's asking for \$500 and the complaint says 1,500, that's not true.

MR. BARRETT: That's what he is asking the jury for at this trial.

THE COURT: You know, it just seems like it gets us into a bunch of confusing stuff. I mean, I guess if you want to ask him and you want me to explain to the jury about willful and knowing and that that's a question for the Court, but that seems — that seems not like a good idea to me.

MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, he also said in opening that there's 25 million, I think, at stake here. That is \$500 times the number of class calls.

THE COURT: Okay. I just think under Rule 403 I'm not going to let you do this.

(Conclusion of the bench conference.)

THE COURT: Go ahead.

BY MR. BICKS:

2.1

- Q. Dr. Krakauer, you're asking for money for you in this case, right?
 - A. I'm asking for the jury to tell DISH that they should not

be permitted to make uncontrolled telemarketing calls, and if I get a couple of bucks out of it, that is fine; but my 2 motivation is if DISH Network is -- is not liable for 3 something, there will be no reason for them to stop making 4 calls, and in this case, 18,000 people received 51,000 phone 5 calls on behalf of DISH Network. That's -- that's why --6 that's why I'm doing it. It's -- I didn't enter this for the 7 8 money. It just seemed that somebody had to step forward and say that -- stop it, you know, or pay a penalty. 10 Q. Am I right that then this case for you has nothing to do 11 with money? It has nothing to do with it, but -- but --12 13 THE COURT: Okay. That's good. Just a second. 14 Just let him ask you another question. 1.5 Go ahead. BY MR. BICKS: 16 17 Q. And you talked about, I think, some discussions -- a meeting you had with lawyers, do you remember that, before this 18 19 case got filed? 20 It was in the --2.1

MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, may we approach?

22

THE COURT: Okay. Just let him answer the question yes or no, and I'll let him ask just one or two questions in view of the testimony. So your question is did you meet with lawyers?

1 MR. BICKS: Right, right before this case was filed.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I met with lawyers in 2014 about this trial.

BY MR. BICKS:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. All right. And just so we're clear, this class period is between, say, 2011, right, and that's when it ends, right? You know that?
- 9 A. I do know that.
- Q. And so this case gets filed a little bit over three years after, right, 2011, right? You know that?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- THE WITNESS: Your Honor, may I answer that question a little bit more completely?
- 15 **THE COURT:** Your attorneys can ask more questions on 16 redirect, if they wish.
- Do you have further questions?
- 18 MR. BICKS: Yes.

19 BY MR. BICKS:

- 20 \parallel Q. And my question is during that time period, say, 2011 to
- 21 when you filed this case in 2014, did you ever reach out to
- 22 | anybody at DISH Network?
- 23 A. I did not.
- 24 Q. And you never reached out to anybody at SSN, right?
- $25 \parallel A$. I did not.

And you didn't even think that this would ever be a federal lawsuit until that meeting in 2014, right? 2 3 I think that's correct. I -- I didn't realize that a class action suit could come out of this, and I didn't realize the 4 5 size of the class, the number of people who had received calls 6 and the number of calls they had received; and, you know, if 7 there can't be some enforcement on a federal statute, 8 there's -- there's nothing to keep wealthy companies from continuing to violate the TCPA. 10 MR. BICKS: And, Your Honor, I would move to strike 11 that testimony as not responsive to my question. 12 THE COURT: Well, I think -- it looks like maybe he 13 was explaining his answer, so overruled. You may ask another 14 question. 1.5 BY MR. BICKS: 16 Q. And that was information that you heard from lawyers? 17 MR. BARRETT: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Well, you know, it's not surprising 18 19 that people go to lawyers to be informed about what the law is,

21 MR. BICKS: I've got no further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any redirect?

20

22

2.3

24

25

so move on.

MR. BARRETT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You can step down.

(The witness left the stand.)

JA005155

1 THE COURT: You may call your next witness. The Plaintiff calls Amir Ahmed. 2 MR. GLASSER: 3 THE COURT: Is somebody getting him? MS. ECHTMAN: Yes, Your Honor, we are getting him. 4 5 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 6 So, generally speaking, ladies and gentlemen, the witnesses 7 are out of -- except for the parties, are out of the courtroom 8 during the trial. So between each witness, there will usually be a short delay while -- they're just right down the hall, but 10 unlike on TV, when these things happen in five -- you know, 11 less than a fifth of a second, we have to wait on the witness to get into the courtroom. 12 13 And as I mentioned to you yesterday, we will take a short break probably about eleven o'clock. If at any time my 14 1.5 decision about when to take a break is not matching up with how 16 much coffee you drank this morning, just let me know. It's not 17 an endurance contest. So if you do need to take a break before I say we're going to take a break, just raise your hand and 18 19 I'll be glad to accommodate you on that. 20 (Pause in the proceedings.) 21 (The witness entered the courtroom.) 22 AMIR AHMED, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION 2.3 24 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

BY MR. GLASSER:

- Q. Tell the jury your name, sir.
- 2 A. My name is Amir Ahmed.
- 3 \parallel Q. Mr. Ahmed, I understand you're currently senior vice
- 4 president at DISH?
- 5 A. That is correct.
- 6 Q. From 2000 -- June of 2009 until August of 2013, I
- 7 | understand you were the senior vice president at DISH, whose
- 8 responsibility was indirect sales; is that correct?
- 9 $\|$ A. That is correct.
- 10 Q. Indirect sales are the sales that include the sales of a
- 11 company called SSN, an order entry retailer; is that correct?
- 12 | A. Yes.
- 13 THE COURT: And if you could maybe -- Ms. Sanders, can
- 14 you get the mike a little closer? The witness is soft-spoken.
- 15 | If you can adjust it.
- 16 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 17 | THE COURT: Yes, sir. That's much better. Thank you.
- 18 Go ahead.
- 19 MR. GLASSER: Sorry, Your Honor, I dropped the --
- 20 | BY MR. GLASSER:
- 21 Q. In that capacity, you had principal responsibility for the
- 22 | retailers of DISH services that were not DISH itself; isn't
- 23 | that correct?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 \parallel Q. You reported to a gentleman by the name of Charlie Ergen,

- the owner of the company, or the founder of the company; is that correct?
- 3 A. Yes, he was my -- the boss, but I reported to Mr. Jim
- 4 DeFranco.
- 5 Q. Okay. DeFranco. And we heard about him. He's a gentleman
- 6 on the board of directors of the company and one of the
- 7 cofounders; right?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.
- 9 Q. So you are at the apex power group in this company; isn't
- 10 that fair to say? You're reporting right to the boss?
- 11 A. I'm reporting to, yes, Jim DeFranco, yes.
- 12 Q. And everybody who sold -- who was not DISH itself, you were
- 13 the boss of; isn't that right?
- 14 A. Yes, my responsibility was indirect sales, correct.
- 15 $\|Q$. So we learned in opening arguments from your counsel that
- 16 there were about 3,500 indirect sales retailers out there in
- 17 | the world. Is that consistent with your memory about 2011?
- 18 A. That's correct. That's about right.
- 19 THE COURT: And if I can just -- you're saying
- 20 \parallel "indirect," one word, not "in direct" two words, right? So
- 21 | we're talking about "indirect," one word, sales, right?
- MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am. I'll -- I'll say not DISH
- 23 litself.
- 24 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
- 25 | BY MR. GLASSER:

Q. Right? 2 Yes, those are -- we had about 3500 independent satellite 3 dealers. We also had other accounts. Are you including that we had accounts -- national accounts, or Telco Partners, a lot 4 5 of public, private companies, commercial companies, yes. Q. You were responsible for all that, too? 6 7 That was under me, yes, until 2013. 8 MR. GLASSER: I want to approach the witness with 9 Exhibit 55, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Plaintiff's Exhibit 55? 11 MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am. (Document handed to the witness by Mr. Glasser.) 12 BY MR. GLASSER: 13 Q. Handing you, Mr. Amir [sic], a document called an Assurance 14 1.5 of Voluntary Compliance. You recognize that document; don't 16 you? 17 A. Yes, sir. MR. GLASSER: I move the admission of Exhibit 55, Your 18 19 Honor, and ask to be able to publish it to the jury. 20 THE COURT: It will be admitted. 2.1 MS. ECHTMAN: Your Honor, we stand on our prior 22 objections. 2.3 THE COURT: All right. Noted and overruled. This is the redacted one?

MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am.

24

THE COURT: Okay. It will be admitted.

MR. GLASSER: All right. I want to start at the top.

MS. ECHTMAN: And, Your Honor, I believe we have agreement on a limiting instruction for the Court to read about this particular exhibit.

MR. GLASSER: Do you want to do it at the end or the beginning?

THE COURT: We'll proceed with the testimony. I'll talk to you all about that at the morning break. I will just note, ladies and gentlemen, this is a very long document, and the parts that don't matter to this lawsuit we -- have been blacked out, so there's no confusion on you all's part, and you don't have to read a 40-page document -- 70-page document. It's just they've -- we've cut out the parts that don't matter

16 BY MR. GLASSER:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

- 17 Q. All right. So, Mr. Amir [sic], you see at the top there
- 18 the title of this document is Assurance of Voluntary
- 19 | Compliance; is that correct?

to this case. So go ahead.

- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. What does the word "assurance" mean to you?
- 22 THE COURT: In the context of this document?

23 BY MR. GLASSER:

- 24 \parallel Q. Just in plain English. When you assure somebody something,
- 25 \parallel what do you tell them?

- A. Agreeing.
- 2 Q. And then, here at the bottom, it's kind of the negative,
- 3 | it's a Footnote 1: This Assurance of Voluntary Compliance
- 4 shall, for all necessary purposes, also be considered an
- 5 assurance of discontinuance. Right? Do you see that?
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 Q. And does the word "discontinue" mean to you, to stop
- 8 something?
- 9 A. It could mean that, yes.
- 10 Q. The parties to this Assurance of Voluntary Compliance are
- 11 Attorneys General; is that correct?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. And DISH Network, LLC; is that correct?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. DISH Network, LLC, is the company for which you are the
- 16 | head of sales at the relevant time period, June of 2009;
- 17 | correct?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 $\|Q$. And I think if we count them up, you'll see there are 46
- 20 | separate states that DISH entered this Assurance of Compliance
- 21 | with; isn't that true?
- 22 A. I believe so, yes.
- 23 \parallel Q. Now, the OE retailers that we're going to talk about here,
- 24 \parallel they had a nationwide territorial sales area; isn't that
- 25 correct?

- A. Yes, they could sell around the country.
- 2 \mathbb{Q} . So they would be selling into these 46 states; right?
- 3 | A. Yes.

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

Q. And it's -- and the assurance --

5 THE COURT: I'm sorry. You said OE retailers?

MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: What's that OE?

THE WITNESS: Order entry.

THE COURT: Order entry?

THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

- 13 Q. And here, DISH Network sells and leases to its subscribers
- 14 such receiving equipment both directly and through authorized
- 15 | retailers; right?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 $\|Q$. I don't think this is in dispute in the case, but just to
- 18 get it in the record, DISH Network does this through a fleet of
- 19 | satellites that orbit the earth that beam the services down to
- 20 the receivers; right?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- 22 Q. I think I heard in opening there are about 18 of those
- 23 | satellites; is that correct?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 \parallel Q. And I understand from some things I've read that the total

- 1 amount of channels you all are sending is up to 3,500 channels
- 2 to somebody's receiver; is that right?
- 3 A. That could be, but --
- 4 Q. A lot?
- 5 A. Yeah, that's not realistic. I'm saying that's not what the
- 6 customer is getting.
- 7 Q. Okay. Not what?
- 8 A. I don't know exactly what amount.
- 9 Q. What's it cost a month to get this DISH now?
- 10 A. You're talking about the --
- 11 Q. Like just an average?
- 12 A. Average. The customer average pays about \$90 a month.
- 13 Q. Okay. And has that been the case from 2009 to the present,
- 14 | basically, something like \$90 a month?
- 15 A. In that 80 to 90 range, yes.
- 16 Q. Okay. Now, there's some definitions that I just want to go
- 17 through because when we get to the later parts of the
- 18 assurance, the defined terms are used. So let's just go to the
- 19 | first defined term that I want to talk about, which is "covered
- 20 | marketer."
- 21 THE COURT: Paragraph 2.9?
- MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am.
- 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 24 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 25 Q. Are you with me, Mr. Ahmed?

- A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. So a covered marketer means a third-party retailer;
- 3 | right --
- 4 A. Yes.
- $5 \parallel Q$. -- capital T, and we'll get to the meaning of that -- who
- 6 can directly enter into DISH's Network's order entry
- 7 application system, OE retailer. That's the definition of a
- 8 | covered marketer; right?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And we agree that SSN was a covered marketer; right?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Okay.
- 13 A. They're -- "covered marketer" is defined here as a
- 14 | third-party retailer, yes, as an OE retailer, independent
- 15 | contractor.
- 16 Q. Who has the power to enter sales directly into the order
- 17 entry system of DISH; correct?
- 18 A. Yes, that is the system they can enter an order.
- 19 Q. Okay. And so this part of the deal having to do with
- 20 \parallel covered marketers has nothing to do with the 3500 marketers.
- 21 | It has to do with the subset of marketers who have nationwide
- 22 | sales ability and responsibility who are called OE retailers;
- 23 | isn't that true?
- 24 A. Yes. This is referring to third-party retailers and OE
- 25 retailer, but they're all third-party retailers. All 3500 are

- l | third-party retailers.
- $2 \parallel Q$. I get that. But the definition here is, covered marketer
- 3 | is a third-party retailer. You know what a Venn diagram is?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. All right. So we've got a Venn diagram of all the
- 6 | retailers. There's 3500 in the Venn; right?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. And then there's about -- in 2011, there's about 45 who
- 9 | have that power to enter right into the DISH system; right?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 | Q. All right.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And those 45 are called the order entry retailers; correct?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 \parallel Q. And those 45 have nationwide sales ability; right?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 \parallel Q. And those 45 are less than 2 percent of all retailers;
- 18 | correct?
- 19 A. That would -- yes, very small percentage out of the 3500,
- 20 yes.
- 21 Q. So there's no point in this case talking about 3500
- 22 retailers because what we're talking about is one retailer,
- 23 SSN, which is in the 45; right?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 MS. ECHTMAN: Objection, argumentative.

JA005165

1 THE COURT: Okay. Well, don't argue with the witness. You can ask him a question. 2 3 BY MR. GLASSER: Q. And then the definition of "third-party retailer" is one or 4 5 more independent persons, corporation, partnership, or any 6 other type of entity, as the case may be, that is authorized by 7 DISH Network to offer, lease, sell, advertise and/or install 8 DISH Network services and/or DISH Network goods; right? Yes. Α. 10 So that's the 3500? Q. 11 Α. Yes. Okay. Now, the next section of this assurance discusses 12 13 the application to -- of the assurance to DISH itself and its successors. Are you with me? 14 1.5 **THE COURT:** You're in paragraph 3.1? 16 MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am. 17 BY MR. GLASSER: 18 Are you with me? 19 Yes, I am. Α. 20 Q. All right. I want to go to this. DISH Network shall 21 provide a copy --22 THE COURT: And excuse me. When you read --MR. GLASSER: Stand up. 2.3 24 THE COURT: -- talk slower. 25 MR. GLASSER: Okay.

THE COURT: I'm not trying to make it last longer, but I do want to be able to understand you. And when you're reading out loud, it's harder.

MR. GLASSER: All right.

BY MR. GLASSER:

- Q. So just to summarize, DISH Network is supposed to provide a copy of this assurance to all of its companies and all of its related companies; right?
- 9 | A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- 10 Q. Okay. And all of the officers, directors, employees,
- 11 | shareholders, agents, servants, and assigns who have
- 12 | managerial-level responsibilities in performing the obligations
- 13 outlined in the assurance; right?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. So DISH was obligated under this deal to disseminate this
- 16 | assurance to all its managers so they would follow it; isn't
- 17 ∥ that right?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. It says here: DISH Network shall require its third-party
- 20 realtors -- I'm going to have trouble with that.
- 21 A. Retailers.
- $22 \parallel Q$. Retailers to comply with the terms and conditions of this
- 23 | assurance. Right?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 \parallel Q. Everybody's supposed to abide by it; right? Yes?

- A. Yes.
- 2 Q. And then, the term of the assurance says: Upon execution
- 3 of this assurance, DISH Network shall be bound from directly or
- 4 | indirectly engaging in practices set forth herein and shall be
- 5 ∥ required to directly or indirectly satisfy the affirmative
- 6 requirements set forth herein. Do you see that?
- 7 | A. Yes, I do.
- 8 Q. So there's going to be affirmative requirements, things you
- 9 need to do; right? That's what "affirmative requirements"
- 10 | means?
- 11 A. Okay.
- 12 Q. Do you agree?
- 13 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 14 Q. Do you agree that an affirmative requirement is a thing
- 15 you're supposed to do?
- 16 A. Yes.
- THE COURT: Okay. Is that a good stopping point for
- 18 | our morning break?
- MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am.
- 20 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm
- 21 | going to excuse you for a 15-minute recess. Please leave your
- 22 | notes in your chair. You'll remember during this break, as all
- 23 | breaks, that you won't talk about the case among yourselves or
- 24 with anyone else. Don't have any contact with the lawyers,
- 25 parties, or witnesses. Don't conduct any independent

investigation, or read or listen to anything about the case. And if I forgot to tell you anything else you're not supposed 2 3 to do, you'll remember from yesterday. Go back through the jury room and please be back in the 4 5 jury room in about 15 minutes, shortly before 11:15. 6 The jurors are excused. If everyone else will remain 7 seated while they step out. 8 (The jury left the courtroom at 11:00 a.m.) 9 THE COURT: All right. And the witness may step down. Thank you. 10 11 (The witness left the stand.) 12 If I could just ask, Mr. Glasser, if you THE COURT: would refer to the paragraph number. 13 MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am. 14 15 THE COURT: It's not so much for me or the jurors, but the Court of Appeals might appreciate it one day --16 17 MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am. No problem. THE COURT: -- for ease of reference to the part that 18 19 you're referring to. 20 MR. GLASSER: Okay. No problem. 2.1 THE COURT: And is there anything the Plaintiff wants to take up before we take our recess? 22 2.3 MR. GLASSER: No, ma'am. 24 THE COURT: What about the Defendant? 25 Your Honor, there was reference to the MR. EWALD:

proposed limiting instruction --2 THE COURT: Yes. 3 -- related to this document. And the MR. EWALD: 4 parties, I believe, are in agreement, except for one phrase in 5 one sentence. And I can show the Court what DISH's proposal 6 is, if I may approach. 7 MR. GLASSER: Can I just come to the corner? I don't 8 have my copy. 9 THE COURT: Is it the same one you handed up 10 yesterday? 11 MR. EWALD: No, Your Honor. The parties conferred and we tried to reach agreement, and we did, except for one little 12 13 I have both parties -phrase. THE COURT: All right. Yeah. 14 15 MR. GLASSER: Let's just walk up there and talk. 16 THE COURT: Well, it's awfully hard to talk at that corner. But why don't you all look at it together for a 17 18 second. You can put it up on the screen. I can see it on the 19 screen. 20 MR. EWALD: So I would --21 THE COURT: Just a second. Just let me look at it. 22 (Pause in the proceedings.) 2.3 MR. EWALD: This is Plaintiff's, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Hold on. 25 (Pause in the proceedings.)

1 THE COURT: Okay. Now, let me see the Defendant's. Your Honor, I bracketed the only differing 2 MR. EWALD: 3 language. It's really that first part of that sentence. (Pause in the proceedings.) 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. So the Defendants want me to say: 6 The Plaintiffs are offering the assurance as evidence on the 7 question of whether DISH had control over SSN. And you are to 8 consider it only for that purpose and not for any other purpose. 9 10 And now, can I see the Plaintiff's language again? 11 MR. GLASSER: Your Honor, the Plaintiff says: The Plaintiffs are offering the assurance as evidence that DISH has 12 13 power or control over SSN. And you are to consider it only for 14 that purpose. 15 And the reason we are saying that is the assurance itself 16 obligates DISH to issue business rules causing compliance with 17 the assurance. That's an element of power, Your Honor. MR. EWALD: But, Your Honor, I don't think power comes 18 up in any of the agency context. We talked about control. 19 20 it's not -- I think it's more proper to say "the question of control" rather than "is evidence that." The Court's 2.1 22 stipulation is saying what it's evidence of. 2.3 THE COURT: You spoke awfully quickly. 24 MR. EWALD: I did. 25 THE COURT: And can you hand them up now and let me

look at them together? 2 MR. EWALD: Sure. 3 (Documents handed to the Court.) MR. GLASSER: That's the only difference among the 4 5 two. (Pause in the proceedings.) 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. Well, just looking back at what I 8 told them at the beginning of the case, and I believe this actually was at DISH's request, I said: The principal must 10 have the power to direct and control the agent's actions. 11 So that is, in fact, what this evidence is being offered towards. I don't really see a huge amount of difference in 12 13 this, so --Your Honor, the point I was making earlier 14 MR. EWALD: 1.5 is that it is one thing to say that there is a question the jury must answer, and that this is being offered by Plaintiffs 16 17 for that, as opposed to saying this is, in fact, evidence of 18 that. THE COURT: 19 Well, if it wasn't evidence of that, why 20 would I let it in? I mean, I don't understand what you're 21 saying. I was trying to track Your Honor's -- when 22 MR. EWALD: 2.3 we discussed this yesterday, that was the manner in which you posed the instruction, and we tried to track that. 24 I think it

just is more appropriate for this context.

1 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I don't see a huge amount of difference between these two instructions. So, I'll give the 2 3 one that DISH has handed up just out of an abundance of caution. Okay. So you want me to give that when we come back 4 from the break? 5 6 MR. GLASSER: Sure. 7 THE COURT: Seems like a good time? 8 MR. EWALD: Yes. 9 MS. ECHTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. What time is break over? 10 MR. GLASSER: THE COURT: 11:15. So you all need to be real quick. 11 We'll take a 10-minute recess. 12 13 MS. ECHTMAN: Thank you. (A morning break was taken from 11:05 a.m. until 14 11:15 p.m.) 1.5 16 THE COURT: Anything we need to take up before the 17 jury comes in? 18 MR. GLASSER: Just on housekeeping, Your Honor, I 19 wanted to point out, we do have our expert, Anya Verkhovskaya, 20 I understand the sequestration is to fact witnesses. 2.1 THE COURT: Did you have any objection to her being 22 present? 2.3 MS. ECHTMAN: No problem. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 25 MS. ECHTMAN: And I assume there's no objection if we

bring any of our experts.

2.1

2.3

MR. GLASSER: Correct.

THE COURT: Correct?

MR. GLASSER: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Then the sequestration order only applies to fact witnesses going forward.

All right. We can bring the jury in.

(The jury entered the courtroom.)

THE COURT: All right. Good morning again. Ladies and gentlemen, your — this document that we're — the witness is discussing right now, Plaintiff's Exhibit 55, you are hearing testimony about an Assurance of Voluntary Compliance between certain State Attorneys General and DISH Network, LLC, entered in June of 2009.

And this assurance was entered by all parties to the assurance to resolve a dispute without trial or adjudication of any issue of fact or any finding of liability against DISH of any kind. So the assurance does not constitute an admission by DISH for any purpose of any fact or of any violation of any rule, law, or regulation. So it's not an admission of wrongdoing, and you should not consider it for that.

The Plaintiffs are offering the assurance as evidence on the question of whether DISH had control over SSN. And you are to consider it only for that purpose and not for any other purpose.

Of course, you're the judges of the facts, and subject to that limiting instruction, you should consider this assurance just like any other piece of evidence, giving it the weight or importance you think it deserves in light of all the other evidence. And as I already mentioned, we've redacted the parts that don't have anything to do with this case. Okay. Go ahead.

MR. GLASSER: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. GLASSER:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. So, Mr. Ahmed, I want to apologize. I accidently called you Mr. Amir once, my colleague told me. I'm sorry.
- 12 A. That's all right.
- Q. Anyway, so I want to go to the next section of the assurance, which concerns telemarketing and Do Not Call. Ar
- 15 you with me?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- 17 \parallel Q. All right. DISH Network, it says, in section 4.76 --
- 18 **THE COURT:** 67?

- 20 \parallel Q. 67, sorry. Yeah, 4.67: DISH Network shall comply with all
- 21 | federal, state, and local laws regarding telemarketing,
- 22 | including but not limited to those which prohibit calling
- 23 consumers who are on any federal, state, or local Do Not Call
- 24 List, unless otherwise exempted by such laws. Do you see that?
- 25 A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. So that was the undertaking that you guys took;
- 2 | right?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. Now, the next page, and we'll get to some of this, it
- 5 says -- this is at 4.73, says: DISH Network shall issue
- 6 | business rules to its authorized telemarketers and covered
- 7 marketers requiring them to comply with the terms of this
- 8 assurance. Do you see that?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. Okay. So we'll talk about, when we get to the contract,
- 11 what a business rule is. But just to preview it, because we
- 12 don't have the contract in front of us, I can only examine you
- 13 on one document.
- 14 THE COURT: If you could slow down.
- 15 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 16 \parallel Q. To preview it, the contract has a section that provides
- 17 | that DISH has the power to issue business rules; correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 $\|Q$. And the section says that the retailer must do or refrain
- 20 from doing whatever it is that DISH tells them in the business
- 21 | rule; right? Paraphrasing. Yes?
- 22 A. I'd like to -- yes -- I mean, I would like to read exactly
- 23 what it says.
- 24 | Q. We'll get to it --
- 25 \parallel A. Thank you.

- $\|Q. I\|$ just can only kind of show one document at a time.
- 2 A. Sure. Understood.
- $3 \parallel Q$. Okay. We'll get there. Now, the next section,
- 4 | Section 4.74, says: DISH shall affirmatively investigate
- 5 complaints regarding violations of federal, state, and local
- 6 | laws regarding the telemarketing, including but not limited to
- 7 those which prohibit calling consumers who are on any federal,
- 8 state, or local Do Not Call Lists unless otherwise exempted by
- 9 such laws, and shall take appropriate action as soon as
- 10 | reasonably practicable against any authorized telemarketers and
- 11 covered marketers it has determined to be in violation of the
- 12 requirements of this assurance. Do you see that?
- 13 | A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. All right. Let's talk about some of the clauses in here.
- 15 | First, DISH took on a duty to affirmatively investigate; is
- 16 | that right?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And -- and then, DISH also agreed that it shall take
- 19 | appropriate action as soon as reasonably practicable when its
- 20 | investigation determined a violation; right?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. And this covers covered marketers, right here, which you
- 23 | agree SSN is one?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 \mathbb{Q} . So moving onto Section 4.75, says: Within 30 days of the

- 1 date of the execution of this assurance, DISH Network shall
- 2 provide each authorized telemarketer and each covered marketer
- 3 with a copy of this assurance and inform them that in order to
- 4 continue acting as a DISH Network authorized telemarketer or
- 5 | covered marketer, they must abide by the terms and conditions
- 6 of this assurance; right?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 \mathbb{Q} . So the idea was we're going to get this out to the 45
- 9 covered marketers, and we're going to do what it says?
- 10 A. Yes, it was sent out to all the retailers.
- 11 Q. 4.77 requires DISH Network to require the covered marketer
- 12 to establish written policies and procedures to comply with the
- 13 | telemarketing laws, including the Do Not Call List; right?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 \parallel Q. And then I want to talk about the second duty here at 4.78,
- 16 okay? Are you with me at 4.78?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. It says: DISH Network shall monitor, directly or through a
- 19 | third-party monitoring service approved by DISH, its covered
- 20 | marketers to determine whether they are telemarketing consumers
- 21 | and, if so, to determine whether the covered marketer is
- 22 complying with all federal state, state, and local Do Not Call
- 23 | laws. Do you see that?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.
- 25 $\|$ Q. All right. Let's talk about this sentence. First, it

- says, "DISH shall monitor," right?
- 2 A. Correct.
- 3 Q. Second, it says, directly or indirectly, they shall
- 4 monitor, right? That's what it's talking about it. They shall
- 5 monitor directly or indirectly through a third party, but
- 6 somebody --
- 7 THE COURT: I'm sorry? Where are you saying
- 8 | indirectly?

- 10 Q. So they shall monitor directly through a third party -- oh,
- 11 they shall monitor directly through a third-party monitoring
- 12 service approved -- they shall monitor directly or through a
- 13 | third-party monitoring service. Do you see that?
- 14 A. Yes, that I see.
- 15 $\|$ Q. So DISH can do it itself, or it can hire a monitor?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Okay. To determine, right, whether they are telemarketing
- 18 consumers, right? Are they telemarketing? Are they calling
- 19 | consumers?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. Okay. And whether they -- it -- the covered marketer is
- 22 | complying? Do you see that?
- 23 A. Yes, I do.
- 24 Q. All right. So all those verbs, you agree with me, are
- 25 active verbs? Shall monitor, that's an active thing, right?

- A. Yes.
- $2 \parallel Q$. To determine, that's an active, affirmative act,
- 3 determining, right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- $5 \parallel Q$. Is complying is a continuing thing, is complying, right?
- 6 A. Yes.
- $7 \parallel Q$. It does not say in here monitor only after a consumer
- 8 writes you ten letters, does it?
- 9 A. No, it does not say that.
- 10 MS. ECHTMAN: Objection.
- 11 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 12 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 13 \mathbb{Q} . And you agree with me that 4.78 is a separate obligation
- 14 from the obligation at 4.74 to investigate complaints?
- 15 A. Yes, this is to investigate complaints. Can I see the
- 16 other one, sir?
- 17 | Q. Yes. And this is to monitor and make sure there's
- 18 | compliance?
- 19 A. And this is to monitor, yes.
- 20 \mathbb{Q} . And then at 4.79, it goes into a discipline section, right?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- 22 Q. At 4.79, it says: DISH Network shall appropriately and
- 23 | reasonably discipline a covered marketer if DISH Network
- 24 reasonably determines that, in connection with telemarketing --
- 25 THE COURT: Slow down.

- 2 Q. -- DISH Network goods and/or DISH Network services, the
- 3 | covered marketer has failed to fulfill contract requirements
- 4 with respect to compliance with federal, state, and local
- 5 | telemarketing laws, right?
- 6 A. Yes.
- $7 \parallel Q$. All right. So that's saying we all know that your contract
- 8 says they should comply with the law, but if you find out
- 9 \parallel through your investigation, which is that 4.74 duty, that
- 10 | they're not, we're going to do something, right?
- 11 A. Yes, that's what it says.
- 12 Q. Or, B, violated federal, state, or local telemarketing
- 13 | laws, right?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. Independent of the contract you just -- right? Agree?
- 16 | It's a separate sentence.
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Okay. Or failed to comply with the terms of this assurance
- 19 | as they relate to telemarketing and the Do Not Call Section,
- 20 | right? The third thing, if they don't comply with this deal --
- 21 | if a covered marketer doesn't comply with this deal, we're
- 22 going to discipline them?
- 23 A. That's an option, yes.
- 24 THE COURT: And just be sure you're asking a question,
- 25 Mr. Glasser.

- 2 Q. Okay. You think "shall appropriately and reasonably
- 3 discipline" is an option?
- 4 A. Yes, we have to look at the facts. Those are one of the
- 5 options that we could do, yes.
- 6 \mathbb{Q} . And then there's a set of kind of remedies that are -- I
- 7 | guess some are worse and some are less. Termination, right?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Imposing a monetary fine, right?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 | Q. Withholding of compensation, right?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. Suspending the right to telemarket for a period of time,
- 14 | right?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- 16 Q. Prohibiting telemarketing, right?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Requiring the covered marketer to improve its process or
- 19 procedures for compliance with the TCPA and other federal,
- 20 state, and local laws regarding telemarketing?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- 22 Q. Requiring the covered telemarketer to terminate certain
- 23 employees involved in TCPA violations or other violations of
- 24 state or local laws, right?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. Requiring the covered marketer to terminate telemarketing
- 2 | affiliates?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. That didn't come up in this case. Requiring the covered
- 5 marketer to retrain employees in the TCPA, right?
- 6 A. Yes.
- $7 \parallel Q$. Or other appropriate and reasonable discipline under the
- 8 circumstances, right?
- 9 A. That's correct.
- 10 Q. And then it says: In determining what disciplinary action
- 11 | shall be taken, DISH Network shall take into consideration the
- 12 egregiousness of the covered marketer's conduct, the number of
- 13 | violations, the covered marketer's willingness to cure the
- 14 problem, and whether DISH Network has previously disciplined
- 15 the covered marketer. Do you see that?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- 17 | Q. So it's fair to say that history matters in how you're to
- 18 discipline, right?
- 19 A. Yes, you take -- you have to take a look at each
- 20 circumstance, yes.
- 21 \parallel Q. So what you know about the covered marketer that arose
- 22 | prior to this deal matters to how you're supposed to treat them
- 23 going forward, right?
- 24 \parallel A. Yes, we take every complaint, sir, very seriously, yes.
- 25 \parallel Q. And then here's a section. It's kind of similar to what

the Court just read: 7.2, this assurance does not constitute an admission by DISH for any purpose of any fact or of a 2 3 violation of law, rule, or regulation, nor does this assurance constitute evidence of any liability, fault, or wrongdoing. 4 5 The assurance is entered into without a trial or adjudication, 6 right? 7 Yes, sir. Α. 8 So it's a settlement agreement? 9 Yes. Α. 10 So the reason you must have had to have a settlement 11 agreement with 46 states' attorneys general is because there were widespread problems with telemarketing, correct? 12 13 MS. ECHTMAN: Objection, Your Honor --THE COURT: Well --14 15 MS. ECHTMAN: -- 403. 16 THE COURT: Overruled. You can answer the question. 17 BY MR. GLASSER: 18 In general. 19 This is a customer protection piece. It is. about -- it is about making sure we do agree with the -- with 2.1 the states on telemarketing laws, on terms and conditions, 22 on -- there was specific other markets, to make sure we're doing everything accurately ourselves and our retailers to explain consumer promotions on the terms and conditions and 24

exactly what the laws are in telemarketing, yes.

- 1 Q. Okay. And it says here on page -- on Section 7.3: DISH
- 2 Network shall comply with the terms of this assurance within 90
- 3 days following execution, right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- $5 \parallel Q$. It says here on 8.1 that DISH Network understands --
- 6 | represents -- well, represents and warrants that it's a
- 7 | voluntary and free act to enter into this deal, right?
- 8 A. Yes, that's what it says.
- 9 Q. And is the result of good faith negotiations, right?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. And DISH represents and warrants that the signatories to
- 12 the assurance have the authority to act for and bind DISH,
- 13 || right?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. Okay. And nothing in this assurance relieves DISH of the
- 16 | obligations to comply with all state and federal law. Do you
- 17 | see that?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. And then it says: Within 30 days of this assurance, DISH
- 20 Network shall submit a copy of this to each of its officers,
- 21 directors, and any employee necessary to ensure compliance. Do
- 22 you see that?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- 24 Q. And right here it says: Nothing in the assurance shall be
- 25 \parallel construed to affect, restrict, limit, waive, or alter any

- lacktriangle private right of action that a consumer may have against DISH
- 2 Network. Do you see that?
- 3 | A. Yes, I do.
- 4 | Q. And that's a case like the one we have here today, right,
- 5 private right of action?
- 6 A. Yes.
- $7 \parallel Q$. So I understand, Mr. Ahmed, that you were the person who
- 8 kind of invented in DISH the concept of having OE retailers,
- 9 | right? You were kind of the founder of that program; is that
- 10 | correct?
- 11 A. The founder meaning --
- 12 Q. The person who kind of dreamed it up and thought it would
- 13 be a good idea?
- 14 A. No, the program existed for other accounts, yes, and then
- 15 | we included certain retailers into the OE program, yes.
- 16 Q. Got it. Okay. But weren't you one of the originators of
- 17 the starting of it and getting it started and getting it fired
- 18 up and then for -- in the early years?
- 19 A. As it relates to the OE retailers?
- 20 Q. Yes.
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. Okay. And because you were the president of sale -- or
- 23 | vice president of sales -- senior vice president of sales, you
- 24 | had ongoing responsibility for it. I think we should probably
- 25 point out you worked --

- A. Vice president of sales.
- $2 \parallel Q$. When did you start working for DISH?
- 3 A. I started 1993 of June, sir.
- 4 Q. '93. Okay. And then you worked up until sometime in 2006.
- 5 Can you give me the month?
- 6 A. Yes, January 31, 2006.
- $7 \parallel Q$. All right. So in the beginning of 2006, January 31st,
- 8 2006, you left, went to work somewhere else, and then you came
- 9 | back right at the time this assurance of compliance was
- 10 entered, right?
- 11 A. Yes. I came back on May 31st, 2009.
- 12 Q. Okay. So you have personal knowledge of what happened up
- 13 | 'til January 31st, 2006, inside DISH and then from May 31,
- 14 | 2009, up to the present?
- 15 A. Yes, I'm aware of some of those, yes.
- 16 Q. So I'm going to approach you with Exhibit 89.
- 17 | THE COURT: Plaintiff's?
- MR. GLASSER: Yes, yes, ma'am, Plaintiff's Exhibit 89.
- 19 MS. ECHTMAN: Your Honor, we have objections to this
- 20 exhibit under Rules 802, 401, 403, and 404.
- 21 MR. GLASSER: Can I lay some foundation?
- 22 THE COURT: Hold on just a second. Let me get it in
- 23 | front of me. You can ask some preliminary questions.
- 24 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 25 \parallel Q. All right. So just -- let's look -- look through it to

- yourself. In particular, I want to draw your attention to
- 2 page 3.
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 || Q. The information contained on page 3 in this presentation is
- 5 generally accurate about your position in the company; isn't
- 6 | that true?
- 7 | A. Yes, in --
- 8 Q. As of June --
- 9 ∥A. -- 2011, June 6th.
- 10 Q. Which is the date, right?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. I'd like you to turn to page 4. Page 4 has data about the
- 13 | budget for sales for OE retailers for 2011, the class period in
- 14 | this case; isn't that right?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 \parallel Q. This budget would have been in place as of June 2011 for
- 17 you to be -- it to be discussed inside the sales force team at
- 18 DISH; isn't that right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Turning to page --
- 21 THE COURT: Okay. Excuse me just one second.
- 22 Ladies and gentlemen, let me excuse you to the jury room
- 23 | for a moment while I talk to the lawyers about this exhibit.
- 24 Just leave your notes in your chair.
- 25 (The jury left the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. If I can first just ask DISH,

Ms. Echtman, I don't understand the hearsay objection. This
appears to be a DISH document.

2.1

2.3

MS. ECHTMAN: It is a DISH document. The question is relevance, and it's got a lot of information --

THE COURT: Okay. Stop. You said Rule 802, and that's a hearsay rule. So is that -- do you not have a hearsay objection?

MS. ECHTMAN: I believe that there is hearsay embedded in the document, Your Honor, and that's why we made a hearsay objection.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. And what is the Plaintiff offering it to prove in terms of relevance?

MR. GLASSER: It's relevant because it shows the importance of the OE retailers on a relative basis. They were more than 60 percent or more than 50 percent of sales — it's relevant to show where Mr. Ahmed is in the organization, which he's testified to, but this shows a graph. It's relevant to show the sales expectations internally for OE retailers in 2011, the class period. It's relevant to show the sales that were accomplished by OE retailers in 2010. It's relevant to show the relevant amount of OE retailers compared to general retailers, and it's relevant to show that internally they used the moniker "National Sales Partners."

THE COURT: All right. And for the Defendant on your

objection?

2.3

MS. ECHTMAN: Your Honor, generally, what they're trying to do with this is trying to show that DISH is a wealthy company, which is not an appropriate item here. They want to show total sales of other retailers. We've objected to evidence about other retailers. This is about SSN. This is not about DISH's entire retailer channel. If they want to show information about SSN's activations and sales, that's one thing; but to go into the whole channel just to show that DISH, you know, has a big retailer budget that makes a lot of money, I think that's prejudicial.

THE COURT: All right. Well, assuming you can do this in not very much time --

MR. GLASSER: Yeah, it's fast.

THE COURT: -- I will overrule the objection.

Obviously, the Defendant's concerns are legitimate if you spend too much time on it.

MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: So that would hit the Rule 403 level, or if you attempt to use it for any sort of improper purpose like you got to hold DISH liable because they're a big company, you can't make that argument. Go ahead.

MS. ECHTMAN: Right, and this case is not about penalties. It's about damages. It's not about punishing. The penalty phase is for Your Honor. So emphasis on wealth is

inappropriate. 2 MR. GLASSER: I'm going to use it for --3 THE COURT: I think -- just a second. I'm ruling in your favor, so you don't have to argue further. The points 4 5 that the Plaintiff said they are offering it for, those are, in fact, relevant, and so long as the questions are appropriate 6 and we don't spend too much time on it, I'll let you do it. 7 8 I have Rule 403 concerns, I'll start objecting for the 9 Defendant myself. 10 Thank you, Your Honor. MS. ECHTMAN: 11 THE COURT: Go ahead. Or the Defendant can object again at any point. Go ahead. Oh, wait, the jury. 12 13 MR. GLASSER: The jury. Sorry. I'm forgetting the most important 14 THE COURT: people. 1.5 16 You can bring the jury in. 17 Don't tell anybody I did that. That would be embarrassing. (The jury entered the courtroom.) 18 19 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. 20 MR. GLASSER: I move the admission of Plaintiff's 2.1 Exhibit 89, Your Honor. It will be admitted. 22 THE COURT: BY MR. GLASSER: 24 Okay. Mr. Ahmed, this is a presentation about indirect sales in June of 2011. Do you agree with me?

- A. Yes, sir.
- 2 Q. Turning to page 3, this shows at a high level your position
- 3 \parallel in respect of the sales operations at DISH at the top; is that
- 4 | right?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Turning to the next page, page 4, this shows the 2011
- 7 | indirect activation's budget; isn't that right?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.
- $9 \parallel Q$. All right. And for the OE retailers, the expectation was a
- 10 | little bit over 1 million activations in 2011; is that right?
- 11 | A. Yes, sir.
- 12 Q. All right. And as you can tell from the relative size of
- 13 the pie, the OE retailer portion was more than half of the
- 14 2 million new activations that your sales force was trying to
- 15 get in that year, 2011; is that right?
- 16 A. Yes, that was the OE budget.
- 17 | Q. All right. And the OE retailers are also called National
- 18 | Sales Partners; isn't that true?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 \parallel Q. So when it says here on the right side of Exhibit 89
- 21 | "National Sales Partner, OE tool," that's the slice of the
- 22 retailers that SSN is in, right?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. And just quickly, these full-service retailers are the
- 25 \parallel other 3,500 retailers we've discussed in this case, right?

- A. That is correct.
- 2 Q. Which are expected to bring in about, it looks like,
- 3 | 670,000 activations, right?
- 4 A. Yes, that's the budget.
- $5 \parallel Q$. And then I don't actually know what Alliance Partner is?
- 6 A. Those are Telco Partners, telephone companies, like
- 7 | Windstream, TDS, and Frontier at that time.
- 8 Q. And national accounts, I take it, are probably like deals
- 9 | with Marriott or whatever?
- 10 A. No, that would be -- national accounts would be Costco,
- 11 | would be Sears, would be RadioShack?
- 12 Q. Okay. Great. Turning to page 14, this has the data for
- 13 what happened in 2010, isn't that right, 2010 summary?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 \parallel Q. And the OE tool retailers, the National Sales Partners,
- 16 | brought in about 1,052,000 new activations, right?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. And the other 3,500 retailers brought in, it looks like,
- 19 | something like 630,000?
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 \parallel Q. So it's pretty clear -- we've talked about, you know, the
- 22 | company. It came up in opening. It's come up with you. It
- 23 | has satellites in space. It has all these other things, but at
- 24 \parallel the end of the day, it's depends on customers; isn't that
- 25 ∥right?

- A. It's all about the customers, yes, sir.
- 2 || Q. It depends on new activations every year, right?
- 3 A. Yes, that's important to us.
- 4 | Q. And your compensation, in part, depends on new activations
- 5 | every year because you need to hit your sales budgets, right?
- 6 A. Sir, I'm a sales guy. I'm responsible for sales. Yes, I
- 7 want new activations, but it's very important for you to know
- 8 that it's about quality activations, long-term customers. It's
- 9 | just not about any activations.
- 10 Q. And the OE tool is designed to get quality long-term
- 11 customers like Dr. Krakauer, who happens to be DirecTV, but own
- 12 their own home. That's good, right?
- 13 | A. Yes, it is.
- 14 Q. Are likely to be on for a long time because they're in a
- 15 | residence, right?
- 16 A. We want happy customers for a long time. That's exactly --
- 17 | that's what we need to do.
- 18 Q. But the OE tool was not designed to sell to commercial
- 19 | customers. It was for individual customers, right?
- 20 A. Right, not commercial, right.
- 21 Q. Noncommercial?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 \parallel Q. And so the typical person you're looking for -- you prefer
- $24 \parallel$ people who own their own home, for example, to people who live
- 25 \parallel in apartments who are more migratory, right?

- A. Yes.
- $2 \parallel Q$. And there was a separate sales organization away from the
- 3 OE tool retailers to sell to businesses, wasn't there?
- 4 A. Yes, it's a commercial division.
- 5 | Q. As a person who worked with and managed the OE retailers
- 6 for a long time, you'll be able to tell the jury how the OE
- 7 | tool worked, right, generally?
- 8 A. I think there's others that can do it better, but, yes, I
- 9 can generally talk about it.
- 10 Q. All right. I'm showing you an OE, order entry, tool
- 11 | training agenda. Would that help you -- that would probably
- 12 help you explain it to the jury; isn't that right?
- 13 $\|$ A. Sure. When was this -- when is this from, sir?
- 14 | Q. I don't know the answer to that.
- 15 MS. ECHTMAN: Mr. Glasser, if you could just do me a
- 16 | favor and let us know what exhibit number this is.
- 17 MR. GLASSER: 334. I move the admission of
- 18 Exhibit 334, Your Honor.
- 19 | THE COURT: Well, I'm --
- 20 MS. ECHTMAN: I don't believe we have any objections
- 21 to this exhibit.
- 22 THE COURT: All right. It will be admitted.
- 23 And if the witness needs to see the entire document --
- 24 MR. GLASSER: Oh, I'll take it to him.
- 25 | THE COURT: -- you know, since he indicated he wasn't

- completely sure of the time frame.
- 2 (Copy of exhibit handed to the witness.)

- 4 Q. So, Mr. Ahmed, I just want to generally talk the jury
- 5 | through how the OE tool works in general, okay?
- 6 A. Sure.
- 7 Q. All right. I want to turn to page 3. How does the OE tool
- 8 | work? It says here that the OE tool interfaces with CSG
- 9 EchoStar's billing system for account creation and gives the
- 10 user a realtime DISH Network Service's calendar for the
- 11 earliest available installation date. Do you see that?
- 12 | A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. All right. CSG -- so at all relevant times, which is the
- 14 end of the class period, 2011, the OE tool interfaced with -- I
- 15 | know, EchoStar, DISH, same thing, right?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. -- the DISH billing system, correct?
- 18 A. Yes, all the platforms interface with CSG.
- 19 Q. All right.
- 20 A. You have to know where to bill the customer.
- 21 \parallel Q. Got it. And DISH Network Service -- it also calendared and
- 22 sent out installers. It automated the process, right?
- 23 A. Yes. The customer can choose when they would like it
- 24 | installed, and, yes, they would get installed at that point.
- 25 Q. Turning to page 4, this is a discussion of the relevant

- benefits of using the OE tool to the OE retailer, correct?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 $\|$ Q. Okay. So you tell -- the idea is that an OE retailer
- 4 doesn't have to buy equipment or purchase inventory, DISH's
- 5 | equipment, DISH's hoppers, DISH's whatever; DISH has all that,
- 6 pays for all that inventory, and then ships it right to the
- 7 place where it's installed, right?
- 8 A. Yes, we deliver it to the customer with the installer.
- 9 Q. Right. So this is not a retailer -- the OE retailer is not
- 10 | a retailer like, say, a General Motors dealer who has actual
- 11 cars on the lot that are sitting there that the dealer bought.
- 12 | The cars are at DISH -- the DISH equipment is at DISH, and it's
- 13 delivered straight to the customer?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Inventory is with DISH all the time?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. DISH balance sheet, DISH money pays for all the inventory,
- 18 || right?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 \parallel Q. Okay. The OE retailer has no need to have its own
- 21 | installation guys, right, because DISH provides the
- 22 | installation guys, correct?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 \parallel Q. The OE retailer doesn't actually have to handle any money
- 25 \parallel from the customer, right, because when the deal goes through,

- 1 the customer's billing is straight on the DISH billing system,
- 2 and DISH gets the credit card payment and DISH gets the
- 3 subsequent payments, right?
- 4 A. Yes, we have to bill the customer for the services we're
- 5 providing.
- 6 Q. Okay. And on customer returns, DISH handles all returned
- 7 | equipment and refunds with the customer directly, right?
- 8 A. Yes.
- $9 \parallel Q$. So you don't have to have a staff that deals with returns
- 10 | if you're an OE retailer, right?
- 11 $\|$ A. There are hopefully not a lot of returns, but, yes.
- 12 Q. Okay. And all these things were true at all relevant times
- 13 to this case up through the end of 2011 about OE retailers,
- 14 | right?
- 15 A. Yes, that's the program.
- 16 \parallel Q. And the customer will see DISH on their credit card
- 17 | statement, right?
- 18 A. Yes, it's our billing. We bill the customer. They're
- 19 getting our service.
- 20 \parallel Q. There are some limitations to the OE tool I think we
- 21 discussed. No commercial, right? It doesn't sell
- 22 commercially? It's not for commercial sales?
- 23 \parallel A. Yes. That's why I asked. This is an old document. At
- 24 | that time, no.
- 25 \parallel Q. And when did it become available for commercial sales?

- A. For public-private commercial establishments, I believe they can do that today.
- 4 A. I don't have the exact date.
- $5 \parallel Q$. You do not believe it happened through the end of the class
- 6 period, 2011, do you?

3

7 A. I'm not certain of that, sir. We did include

Today. But when did that happen?

- 8 public-private into the tool. A lot of retailers wanted to
- 9 sell to businesses.
- 10 Q. So as the head of sales, you don't know what day?
- 11 A. I don't know.
- 12 Q. You don't know what year?
- 13 | A. I'm not certain. It could -- I'm not certain when it
- 14 | happened, no.
- 15 $\|$ Q. And you don't know if SSN ever sold more than one
- 16 commercial deal to a business ever?
- 17 A. I don't know that.
- 18 | Q. There is support provided to the OE retailers, right?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. I'm sorry. Wrong page. Let's see. I need to be on
- 21 page 6. Here we go, page 6. So let's walk through the
- 22 | elements of support. There's field sales development, which
- 23 provides weekly sales training on promotions, et cetera, and
- 24 consistent localized support, right?
- 25 \parallel A. Yes, that's what it says.

- Q. So these are field sales training representatives across the country that go into the OE retailers stores and train them, right?
- A. On our consumer promotions. It says weekly. I don't know how often we did that. It's a document, and this actually looks like because of the -- because of the logo, this is probably about 10, 11, 12 years old. So I don't know exactly how often they went, but, yes, on the consumer promotions, yes, we provided training.
- Q. But whether it was weekly or monthly, at all relevant times to this case, DISH field service development -- or field sales development personnel were made available, put into the OE retailers' offices, and trained them on DISH products and
- 15 A. The training on the consumer offer, yes, it's our responsibility to do that.
- 17 Q. Okay.

sales?

14

- A. Make sure they're doing things correctly as it relates to the consumer offer and understanding our technology and our promotions.
- 21 Q. Okay. DNS means DISH Network Service, right?
- 22 A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. And -- and this is just kind of repeating the idea that they'll handle installations and customer complaints or adjustments arising out of installations through the DISH

- Network Services, right?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 \mathbb{Q} . CSC I think is the billing section of DISH, right?
- 4 A. The Customer Service Center.
- 5 Q. Customer Service Center. Okay. So is this saying that,
- 6 hey, our customer service center will deal with customer
- 7 complaints or customer service needs?
- 8 A. No, this is if the platform would go down, that the retail
- 9 | had an opportunity to contact using exceptions line so we can
- 10 | bill the account and not have the customer waiting or losing
- 11 the customer.
- 12 Q. Okay. If the system went down?
- 13 A. Yes, and it frequently went down.
- 14 Q. And then IT is Information Technology, right?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And DISH provides 24/7 maintenance of the OE tool
- 17 performance and operations, right?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And DISH is responsible for the creation, development, and
- 20 | implementation of enhancements to the OE tool, right?
- 21 A. Yes, there's always enhancements.
- 22 | Q. And was that IT support function for DISH Corporate true
- 23 | the whole -- all the relevant time of this case through the end
- 24 of the class period?
- 25 \parallel A. For all platforms, it's a system. You have to have IT

- support to make sure it's functioning.
- 2 Q. Okay. So now let's go to page 9. We'll just walk through
- 3 kind of what it is. So it's basically a computer like the one
- 4 you have in front of you where the screens pop up and the
- 5 | telemarketer walks through the screens with the customer on the
- 6 phone, right?
- $7 \parallel A$. The retailer.
- 8 \parallel Q. Okay. The person on the phone -- okay. The retailer is --
- 9 A. Sales agent, yes.
- 10 Q. Sales agent, great. Okay. The sales agent walks through
- 11 the screens as they pop up on the computer, right?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- 13 Q. A lot of drop-down menus and checking of boxes, right?
- 14 A. Yes, that's very important.
- 15 \parallel Q. All right. And so to get to it, you just type in
- 16 | salespartners.dishnetwork.com/partners/logon.do. Do you see
- 17 | that?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 $\|$ Q. And then this is kind of hard to see. I have another
- 20 version that's a little easier to see, but there's a login ID
- 21 and a password, right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 \parallel Q. So the National Sales Partner, in this case SSN, will have
- 24 | its own passwords to get in?
- 25 A. That's correct.

- 1 Q. Then there's some buttons you click to create new
- 2 customers, right?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Okay. Reschedule customer installation, right?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 \mathbb{Q} . Okay. And that's true at all relevant times of this case,
- 7 || right?
- 8 A. Yes, you have to put the customer information into the
- 9 platform.
- 10 Q. Turning to page 12, there are -- and I'll try -- I've got
- 11 | another one we can quickly go through that's a little easier to
- 12 see on the drop-down menus, but, basically, there's
- 13 | fill-in-the-blanks, right, where you get the customer phone
- 14 number, the address, the city, state, residence, those things,
- 15 | right?
- 16 A. Yes, that's relevant. That's very important.
- 17 | Q. And then the price is calculated by the machine, right?
- 18 A. Yes, based on what the customer is purchasing, yes.
- 19 \parallel Q. So DISH sets the price for DISH products, not the sales
- 20 | agent?
- 21 A. Right, it's our promotion, it's our offer and, yes, we set
- 22 the price.
- 23 \parallel Q. All right. And the machine -- and that's true at all
- 24 | relevant times in this case?
- 25 A. Yes, it's our product.

JA005203

- 1 Q. Then the next page of the computer, which is hard to see,
- 2 but it basically figures out what the customer is qualified for
- 3 and what the customer can get, right?
- 4 A. That's correct.
- $5 \parallel Q$. And that was true at all relevant times of this case?
- 6 A. Right, there are certain promotions for certain customers
- 7 | based on their qualification.
- 8 | Q. Page 16, again, it has to do with the drop-down screen and
- 9 some clicking and filling in of -- of fields, but, basically,
- 10 what happens is the machine sets up and runs a credit check on
- 11 | the customer for their -- if they want to buy DHA or FFA?
- 12 A. Yes, every customer for DISH, every customer.
- 13 Q. Okay. So every customer, the sales agent has them on the
- 14 phone, they take their data, DISH runs a credit check on them?
- 15 A. That's correct.
- 16 \parallel Q. And DISH keeps the results of the credit check? Well, DISH
- 17 owns the credit check. DISH paid for it?
- 18 A. We ran the credit check, yes.
- 19 | Q. And you paid for it? The sales agent's company didn't pay
- 20 | for it, correct?
- 21 | A. We ran the credit check. Yes, I believe that could be
- 22 || right.
- 23 \parallel Q. And then I'll go through the next pages pretty fast because
- 24 there's a lot of them, but it's basically the idea of figuring
- 25 out how many receivers you have, and there's a bunch of

- l clicking and picking, right?
- 2 A. That's very important because we need to know what the
- 3 customer is requesting.
- 4 Q. Okay. Basic program packages that can be available,
- 5 | clicking and picking, right?
- 6 A. Exactly. We need to know what the customer wants in terms
- 7 of programming, what their needs are.
- 8 Q. Picking the local and network channels they want, clicking
- 9 and picking, right?
- 10 A. Same thing. We ask them if they want locals.
- 11 | Q. Deciding on their premium programming, clicking and
- 12 picking, right?
- 13 | A. Sure.
- 14 Q. And then it recalculates the price. It's not up to the
- 15 | sales agent?
- 16 A. No. We need to be accurate with what the customer is
- 17 purchasing so we can give them the correct price.
- 18 Q. So these sales agents aren't independent in the sense of
- 19 | negotiating anything, right?
- 20 | A. It's our promotion, and we can't have 35 -- you just
- 21 | mentioned 3,500 retailers. Can you imagine 3,500 retailers --
- 22 | if we didn't do this, they would all come up with the wrong
- 23 pricing. You can't do that.
- 24 \mathbb{Q} . But, of course, we know that there are only 45?
- 25 A. Or 45.

- 1 Q. Okay. So the next five pages are basically the same type
- 2 of stuff, you agree? Just look through. It's different types
- 3 of programming, different clicking and picking, right? I'm up
- 4 | to page 26 now.
- 5 A. Yes, sir.
- 6 Q. Do you agree with me?
- 7 $\| A. \| I'm \text{ at 26, yes.}$
- 8 Q. Okay. But do you agree with me that the next five screens
- 9 \parallel are virtually the same as what we were talking about before?
- 10 A. Yes, broadband installation date, yes.
- 11 Q. Then DISH takes the credit card payment, right? And then
- 12 additional disclosures will display what you must read to the
- 13 customer before moving forward, correct?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 $\|Q$. And so to make sure that they were reading them correctly,
- 16 DISH had a field representatives who would listen in on calls,
- 17 || right?
- 18 A. Yes, we could do that.
- 19 | Q. Upload recordings of calls to the DISH system every week
- 20 | for quality review -- quality assurance review; right?
- 21 \parallel A. When we'd be requested, we could do that, yes.
- 22 | Q. Okay. And this was true at all relevant times of this
- 23 | case, DISH physically could listen in to calls, and did; right?
- 24 A. Yes, yes.
- 25 \parallel Q. And DISH took recordings of the calls regularly and did

review those; right? A. Yes. And you just showed me the terms and conditions, 2 3 which is so critical because it is about the customer. to say that. You need to make sure what the customer is 4 5 requesting, that it is explained to them accurately. You can't tell them your price is \$29 when it's 49. It's -- so you have 6 to take care of the customer --7 8 I got it. Q. -- okay? I just wanted to --10 Q. So what's going to happen here is I'm going to ask you my 11 questions --I'm sorry. Okay. 12 13 Q. -- and then your lawyer gets to stand up and ask you anything you want, and you get to say whatever --14 1.5 THE COURT: Okay. Well, he can explain his answers. 16 Go ahead. THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm sorry. 17 THE COURT: No, that's all right. 18 19 BY MR. GLASSER: 20 Q. So -- and then, like you said, the terms and conditions are 21 read, and they all pop up automatically; right? 22 A. Yes, sir. 2.3 Q. Okay. Let's just quickly go through a similar order entry tool manual that just had some screens that are easier to read. 24

25

THE COURT:

Which --

1 MR. GLASSER: Plaintiff's Exhibit 1208. I'll approach 2 the witness with it. 3 (Document handed to the witness.) THE COURT: Any objection to this one? 4 5 MS. ECHTMAN: Let me just check. I don't believe so. 6 No. No objection. 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 MR. GLASSER: Okay. I move the admission of 9 Plaintiff's Exhibit 1208. 10 THE COURT: It will be admitted. 11 BY MR. GLASSER: Q. So what we have here, Mr. Ahmed, is just another kind of 12 13 manual on the order entry tool that has a few different pieces of info, so I want to quickly go over that. 14 15 All right. On the first page, the order entry tool is the 16 essential application you will be using to place customer 17 orders for DISH Network equipment and services. That's pretty true for OE retailers; right? 18 19 Α. Yes. Q. Okay. You just access the tool from your web browser by 21 clicking on the DISH Network logo on your screen. Do you see 22 that? 2.3 Α. Yes. So did you guys install software that connected directly to 24

this network on the OE retailer's computer systems?

A. I don't know exactly how it worked. We didn't -- I don't believe we put any software into the retailers' organization.

We had a platform and they had the ability to access it based on the fact that we attached a log-in so it could be tied to the retailer.

THE COURT: And platform, you just mean some --

THE WITNESS: The OE platform.

THE COURT: -- internet out there?

THE WITNESS: Our order entry platform at DISH.

BY MR. GLASSER:

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

- Q. Okay. And then, on page 3, it says here at the top: Enter customer information. Define if your customer owns their residence or not. And down at the bottom, it's: Does your customer own the residence? If no, the customer must have written approval by the owner of the installation. Do you see that?
- 17 A. Yes.
- Q. That's because the order entry tool was focused on residential sales; isn't that true?
- A. No. We wanted to make sure that there's provisions out
 there. There are certain condominium units or apartment units
 that the owners would not allow a satellite DISH, so we wanted
 to make sure that we had the right information.
- Q. And then, again, they get the credit card payment and it goes straight to DISH; right? Is that right?

- A. Yes, we bill the customer.
- $2 \parallel Q$. And then, at the end here, page 15.
- 3 MS. ECHTMAN: Mr. Glasser, I'm sorry to interrupt you,
- 4 | but could you just -- I need you to just say the page number,
- 5 | because it's very hard for me to follow you.
- 6 MR. GLASSER: Yeah, sorry.
- 7 MS. ECHTMAN: Thank you.
- 8 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 9 \parallel Q. At page 15, the order summary, congratulations and welcome
- 10 to DISH Network; right?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. I'm approaching you with Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.
- (Document handed to the witness by Mr. Glasser.)
- 14 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 15 | Q. Do you recognize Plaintiff's Exhibit 26 as an EchoStar
- 16 Retailer Agreement in this case for Satellite Systems Network;
- 17 || right?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 MR. GLASSER: Move the admission of Plaintiff's
- 20 Exhibit 26, Your Honor.
- MS. ECHTMAN: Your Honor, I believe we've replaced
- 22 | this with a joint exhibit, so this is one of the JXs. It's JTX
- 23 1. And there's, of course, no objection.
- 24 THE COURT: Okay.
- 25 MR. GLASSER: So I'd move the admission of Plaintiff's

- 26 and JTX1, Your Honor.
- 2 THE COURT: It will be admitted.

3 BY MR. GLASSER:

- 4 Q. All right. So I want to go over the -- you asked about the
- 5 | contract with SSN, so I want to go over it with you, sir; okay?
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 Q. All right. This is the EchoStar Retailer Agreement
- 8 effective as of December 31, 2006. Do you see that?
- 9 | A. Yes, I do.
- 10 Q. All right. So, we know in this case that Dr. Krakauer was
- 11 called in 2009 for the first time, so this is the agreement
- 12 | that was in effect at the time he was called; right? I've got
- 13 another one for 2010 I'm going to show you in a minute.
- 14 A. Okay.
- 15 Q. Do you agree?
- 16 A. Sure.
- 17 | Q. Okay. And you saw -- your lawyer went through the
- 18 different agreements in opening; right? And this is the part
- 19 that your lawyer pointed out in opening, that they're acting as
- 20 an independent contractor and desire to become authorized to
- 21 market and promote DISH; right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 \parallel Q. Now, I want to focus on some terms and conditions. I'm at
- 24 | Section 1.7. Do you see it down there, "Business Rules"?
- 25 A. Yes, I do.

- 1 Q. All right. So business rule, you'll recall, in the
- 2 Assurance of Compliance, there was that paragraph that said
- 3 DISH shall issue business rules. Do you recall that?
- 4 A. Yes.
- $5 \parallel Q$. All right. So now, we're looking at the definition of
- 6 | "business rule," right?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. It means a term, requirement, condition, condition
- 9 | precedent, process, or procedure associated with a promotional
- 10 program or otherwise identified as a business rule by EchoStar,
- 11 | which is communicated to retailer by EchoStar or an affiliate
- 12 of EchoStar either directly, including without limitation via
- 13 | e-mail, or through any method of mass communication reasonably
- 14 desired -- sorry -- directed to EchoStar's retailer base,
- 15 | including, without limitation, retailer chat, e-mail, facts
- 16 | blast, or posting to EchoStar's retailer website; right?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. All right. So that's a mouthful, but basically, DISH has
- 19 | the power to issue SSN a business rule by sending them an
- 20 | e-mail?
- 21 A. Business rules were sent via e-mails and also posted on the
- 22 | retailer care site, yes.
- 23 \parallel Q. All right. And retailer agrees that EchoStar has the right
- 24 to modify any business rule at any time, defined term, in its
- 25 sole discretion, a defined term; right?

- A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Turning to page 5, it says here: EchoStar hereby appoints
- 3 | retailer as a nonexclusive authorized retailer to market,
- 4 promote, and solicit orders for programming, subject to all the
- $5 \parallel \text{terms}$ and conditions of this agreement and all business rules.
- 6 This is at Section 2.1. Do you see it up here at the top?
- 7 | A. Yes, I do.
- 8 Q. Which are hereby incorporated into this agreement by
- 9 | reference in their entirety. So the business rules issued by
- 10 DISH are part of the contract; right?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Okay. Territory, in this case, is the United States;
- 13 || right?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. So SSN had the power to sell across the United States;
- 16 | right?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And one of the meanings of it being nonexclusive is your
- 19 other 44 national sales partners in 2011 likewise had the power
- 20 to sell across the United States; right?
- 21 \parallel A. Can you repeat that? Did you say nonexclusive?
- 22 | Q. Yes. So, SSN did not have the exclusive right to sell in
- 23 \parallel the United States to the exclusion of your other 44 national
- 24 \parallel sales partners. They also had the right to sell in the United
- 25 | States; correct?

- 1 A. Yes. And they could sell any other product, also, not just
- 2 DISH.
- $3 \parallel Q$. I'll get to that.
- 4 A. Okay.
- $5 \parallel Q$. But you agree that that is a meaning of this contract, that
- 6 SSN cannot say, hey, wait a minute, DISH, I have the right
- 7 | exclusively to the United States of America?
- 8 A. That's correct.
- 9 Q. Okay. And then, "Acceptance," here in 2.3 basically says
- 10 | that: The retailer accepts its appointment as an authorized
- 11 retailer and agrees to use its best efforts to continuously and
- 12 actively advertise, promote, and market programming and to
- 13 | solicit orders therefore, subject to and in accordance with all
- 14 the terms and conditions of this agreement; right?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 $\|Q$. Retailer understands that it may hold itself out to the
- 17 | public as an authorized retailer of EchoStar only after
- 18 fulfilling and for so long as it continues to fulfill all the
- 19 duties, obligations, requirements, and other terms and
- 20 conditions in this agreement; right?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. I forgot to go to the definition of, "sole discretion," so
- 23 \parallel let's go back to 1.64 -- I'm sorry 1.46, on page -- on page 4.
- 24 Do you see that?
- 25 A. Yes, sir.

- Q. "Sole discretion" means a person's sole and absolute discretion for any reason or no reason; right?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. So when the part about business rules said DISH could
- 5 change its business rules anytime in its sole discretion, that
- 6 was saying, in plain English, that DISH can change any aspect
- 7 of this contract it wants at any time for any reason or no
- 8 | reason; right?
- 9 A. Business rules pertaining to our consumer promotions, yes.
- 10 Q. Okay. Turning to Section 5 of the contract on page 9, this
- 11 | just says that EchoStar shall determine the retail prices for
- 12 programming at any time in its sole discretion; right?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Retailer will only solicit orders for programming at the
- 15 | retail prices set by EchoStar from time to time; right?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. EchoStar may increase, decrease, or otherwise modify those
- 18 | prices at any time in its sole discretion; right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 \parallel Q. Any price charges shall be effective immediately upon
- 21 | notification by EchoStar. Okay. Then we go down to
- 22 | "incentives," which is what you call the pay for the OE
- 23 | retailer; right?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 $\|$ Q. Okay. There are -- it says here: In consideration of

retailer's continuing efforts to market, promote, solicit orders for programming and retailer's continuing efforts to 2 provide DISH Network subscribers after an initial activation, 3 retailer may be eligible to receive the following, and, you 4 5 know, the pay; right? 6 (Nodding head.) So there are monthly residential incentives; right? 7 Q. 8 Uh-huh. Α. 9 THE COURT: And if the witness could just answer out

11 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Yes. I'm sorry, Your Honor.

12 | THE COURT: That makes me a little dizzy.

13 BY MR. GLASSER:

10

14

1.5

16

17

19

2.1

22

24

loud.

- Q. I'm at Section 6.1. EchoStar expressly reserves the right to change applicable business rules at any time and from time to time in its sole and absolute discretion for any reason or no reason, upon notice to the retailer; right?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. All right. EchoStar shall determine from time to time in its sole and absolute discretion for any reason or no reason whether a particular DISH Network subscriber is a new residential subscriber account eligible for payment of monthly residential incentives hereunder. EchoStar's calculation and payment of monthly residential incentives shall be presumed conclusively and irrebuttably correct absent a timely notice of

- 1 \parallel claim by the retailer pursuant to Section 15, which we'll get
- 2 to. You see that?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. All right. So, because in their sole discretion, for any
- 5 | reason or no reason -- well, DISH can change the price that --
- 6 the pay they're going to pay for any reason or no reason in
- 7 | their sole discretion anytime; right?
- 8 A. We can adjust the pay, yes, just like we can adjust the
- 9 programming packages, yes.
- 10 Q. And that statement about DISH being able to change the pay
- 11 at any time for any reason or no reason appears in the monthly
- 12 residential MDU incentives, right, right here at Section 6.12?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. In the monthly commercial incentives in 6.13; right?
- 15 A. Can you just tell me -- I just want to make sure. I'm sure
- 16 you're telling it accurately, but --
- 17 Q. No.
- 18 A. -- I just want to make sure I can see it.
- 19 Q. Well, I'll tell you what.
- 20 A. I apologize.
- 21 Q. No, it's fine. Totally fine.
- 22 A. I just want to see that -- exactly that right language is
- 23 | in there.
- 24 Q. Right here.
- 25 MS. ECHTMAN: Does Mr Ahmed have a copy of the whole

document? 2 MR. GLASSER: Yes. 3 What page are we on, sir? THE WITNESS: BY MR. GLASSER: 4 Q. All right. So, basically, my question is -- let's just do 5 this a little faster. There are a series of incentives that 6 7 can be paid. There are monthly incentives; right? 8 Correct. There are additional residential incentives; correct? 10 Α. Correct. 11 Q. There are -- and in each of those incentives, for everything DISH pays, DISH can change what it wants to pay at 12 13 any time in its sole discretion for any reason or no reason; 14 right? 1.5 A. Yes, we can change that based on the competitive nature of 16 the business, yes. 17 Q. I got it. So not only is the price set by DISH, but all the pay is set by DISH and can be changed every day if DISH 18 19 wants? 20 A. That's not realistic, we would change it every day. I think some of it probably didn't change for a couple of years, 21 22 but --2.3 No, I get it. I understand. But I'm saying --24 But that's not realistic.

But the contract --

A. Yes.

1

- 2 | Q. I agree -- so it's a pretty one-sided contract; right?
- 3 A. We can change the pricing on the programming and the 4 incentives.
- 5 Q. So these retailers -- this OE retailer has signed up for a
- pretty one-sided deal in your view, since a completely
 unrealistic price changes could happen every day under this
 contract; right?
- 9 MS. ECHTMAN: Objection, argumentative.
- THE COURT: Well, the witness can answer, but he can explain. He's not limited to "yes" or "no."
- THE WITNESS: I mean, how it's written. But, again,
 you know, you have to look at the context of everything.
- 14 | That's not how a business is run.
- 15 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 16 Q. So, there are things about this contract that are written
- 17 | in here that boots on the ground level never really are true;
- 18 | right?
- 19 A. Well, you can't change pricing every day on programming
- 20 packages, right? Customers sign two-year agreements. You just
- 21 can't change the package pricing. That's what I'm saying, it's
- 22 | not realistic.
- 23 Q. But you have the legal power to do so; right?
- 24 A. The agreement says that, yes.
- $25 \parallel \mathtt{Q}$. In your view, that holds the retailer on a fairly tight

- leash; doesn't it?
- 2 A. Meaning?
- 3 | Q. If I can change your pay -- let's say you work for me, and
- 4 | I can change your pay every day, anytime I want for any reason
- 5 or no reason even though you have a written contract. Isn't
- 6 that contract a pretty short leash for you?
- 7 A. Not if the retailer -- no. I mean, that's what they're
- 8 | agreeing with and that's what we pay them, based on, you know,
- 9 whatever our payment is to all the retailers.
- 10 Q. Okay. Now, there's some other things that the retailer
- 11 | acknowledges and agrees. I'm on page 11, if you want to look
- 12 at the one in your hand or on the screen. Page 11.
- Retailer -- and it's Section 6.25. Retailer acknowledges
- 14 | and agrees that page -- Section II, EchoStar may at any time
- 15 \parallel and from time to time, in its sole and absolute discretion --
- 16 see those words again -- for any reason or no reason, add,
- 17 discontinue, substitute, modify, or otherwise alter any or all
- 18 of the terms and conditions of any promotional program
- 19 | involving the payment of additional incentives. Do you see
- 20 | that?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- 22 Q. That's what we were just talking about; right?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Let's go to Section 6.4, "Payment." It says: Subject to
- 25 the terms of this Section 6.4, all incentives paid to retailers

- 1 shall be made by EFT. I think that's electronic funds
- 2 transfer.
- 3 A. That's correct.
- 4 | Q. And that's generally how these retailers were paid; right?
- 5 A. Right.
- 6 | Q. And Sophie Tehranchi -- well, it's your understanding this
- 7 was a weekly pay?
- 8 A. That's correct.
- 9 \mathbb{Q} . But it was paid on activations?
- 10 A. On activations, correct.
- 11 Q. Okay. Now, I'm turning to Section 7.3, which is on
- 12 page 17. And this is under a section called, "Orders." Do you
- 13 see that?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. These are orders from DISH; right?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Section 7.3: Retailer shall comply with all business
- 18 | rules, including without limitation all business rules which
- 19 govern or are otherwise applicable to any promotional program
- 20 | in which retailer participates --
- 21 THE COURT: Okay. Just --
- 22 MR. GLASSER: Too fast.
- 23 | THE COURT: Slow, and it -- you know, if you can ask
- 24 questions rather than just read.
- 25 MR. GLASSER: Okay. All right.

BY MR. GLASSER:

- $2 \parallel Q$. All right. Here's the part I really want to see. All
- 3 | right. See this section here, where it says: Retailer shall
- 4 | take all action and refrain from taking any action as requested
- 5 | by EchoStar in connection with the marketing, advertisement,
- 6 promotion, and/or solicitation of orders for programming, or
- 7 | the sale, lease, or other transfer of DISH systems. And
- 8 retailer shall cooperate by supplying EchoStar with any
- 9 information arising from or relating to those actions as
- 10 EchoStar reasonably requests. Okay?
- 11 A. Yes, sir.
- 12 Q. All right. So this clause covers two possible things,
- 13 | things you ask them to do, they must do; right?
- 14 \parallel A. As it relates to orders, the consumer promotion terms and
- 15 | conditions, yes.
- 16 Q. All right. Let's read it. I know you're trying to limit
- 17 | -- let's read it. Retailer shall take all action -- refrain
- 18 from taking any action as requested by EchoStar in connection
- 19 | with the marketing, advertising, promotion, and/or solicitation
- 20 of orders. We've just gone through the OE tool; right?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. That's all we're doing. We're marketing, soliciting
- 23 orders. Isn't that true?
- 24 A. This section, 7.3, it's clear, it's about orders, correct;
- 25 and, no, it's about the orders, sir, and it is about exactly

- explaining what the customer is getting, the importance of the terms and conditions, and they must follow that so we know the customers are happy, and they know exactly what they're getting, and they're honestly being informed of what they're
- getting, and they're nonestly being informed of what they're getting. That's what this is about.
- 6 Q. All right. So we looked at the Assurance of Compliance; 7 right?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 THE COURT: Okay.
- 10 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 11 Q. And the Assurance of Compliance said that DISH would issue
- 12 | business rules causing adherence to that Assurance of
- 13 | Compliance; right?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. And that Assurance of Compliance required ongoing
- 16 monitoring. We already discussed that; right?
- 17 A. These business rules about the consumer promotion.
- 18 Q. So, this is the section of the contract that DISH was
- 19 | relying on to tell 46 States Attorneys General that it could
- 20 cause compliance; isn't that true?
- 21 A. Sir, I think you're taking that out of context. This is --
- 22 \parallel you have to look at the entire agreement as a whole. The
- 23 | entire agreement references independent contractors and the
- 24 sole responsibility to be compliant and follow the law. This
- 25 is specifically about orders and the consumer order which is so

- relevant to us because we need to make sure we're processing what the customer wants. That's what this is about, orders. 2
- Q. Find the part in the contract, then, that gives DISH the 3 power to impose the Assurance of Compliance if it's not 4
- 5 Section 7, and point it out to me.

11

17

18

19

2.1

about.

Assurance of Compliance?

- Sir, it's never, ever that I know ever been used more 6 broadly than what it says, which is the orders and compliance 8 on the orders. That's what this is about.
- Q. So you think that DISH was faking out the 46 Attorneys 10 General and didn't, in fact, have the power to impose a business rule causing compliance?
- No. I'm just saying, this is about specific orders, about 12 13 the consumer order. When they purchase something, we need to 14 let them know exactly what they're purchasing. And we want to make sure the retailer is explaining the terms and conditions 1.5 16 and the disclosures to the customer. That's what this is
 - Q. And you want to say that a section of a contract that says, we can order you to take any objection or refrain from taking any action does not give the power to make them comply with the
- 22 A. You have to look at the whole agreement as a whole. where you're taking that, but that's not what it's ever used --I've never used it that way. I don't think anyone's ever used it that way.

- 1 Q. Okay. 7.4 says: Retailer hereby acknowledges and agrees
- 2 | that the relationship, contractual or otherwise, between
- 3 | EchoStar and each DISH Network subscriber is as between
- 4 EchoStar and its retailer for the sole and exclusive benefit of
- 5 EchoStar. Do you see that?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. All right. So that's a section saying when the sales agent
- $8 \parallel \text{signs up}$ a customer, that customer is signed up for the sole
- 9 | and exclusive benefit of DISH; right?
- 10 A. Yes, that customer is in a relationship with DISH. They're
- 11 getting our services, our equipment, and, yes, they're paying
- 12 for the programming to DISH.
- 13 | Q. Okay. And then, the next sentence: EchoStar may
- 14 | conduct -- I'm at 7.4 still -- EchoStar may conduct such
- 15 relationship in any manner that it sees fit at any time in its
- 16 sole discretion without incurring any liability whatsoever to
- 17 the retailer or any of its affiliates; right?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. So that's basically saying once -- once the sales agent
- 20 presses click and congratulations, welcome to DISH, that's
- 21 | solely a DISH customer, not an SSN customer?
- 22 A. This -- it's a DISH subscriber. Yes, they're purchasing
- 23 | our services.
- 24 Q. All right. It says here: Retailer acknowledges and agrees
- 25 \parallel that all records created or maintained by or on behalf of

- EchoStar relating to any DISH Network subscriber are the sole
 and exclusive property of EchoStar, and EchoStar shall not have
 any obligation whatsoever to give or allow retailer access to
 such information, even if authorized or requested by such DISH
 Network subscriber; right?
- 6 A. Yes.

10

11

- Q. So, had Dr. Krakauer been signed up for DISH and known it was SSN, and then later, SSN calls in and says, we'd like to see Dr. Krakauer's records, DISH could say no?
 - MS. ECHTMAN: Objection. This is a hypothetical question for a fact witness.
- 12 **THE COURT:** Well, he can explain what the contract means. Overruled.
- 14 **THE WITNESS:** I think if there was any complaint that 15 came in --

16 BY MR. GLASSER:

- 17 Q. That's not what I asked.
- 18 A. If there was a complaint that came in, I know what it says.
- 19 If a complaint that came in, we would take care of the customer
- 20 | because it's all about the customer. We would identify what
- 21 \parallel the issue is and work with the retailer to identify the issue.
- 22 | Q. I didn't ask you about a complaint. I'm saying -- I'm
- 23 | saying the books, records, the records, the -- the fact of the
- 24 customer's personal information, where the customer lives, what
- 25 \parallel the customer watches on TV, all that stuff is the complete,

- total, exclusive property of DISH and has nothing to do with
 the retailer --
- 3 A. The retailer --
- $4 \parallel Q$. -- right?
- $5 \parallel A$. The retailer sold the customer, they have that information,
- 6 but that is our subscriber. And, yes, we have all that
- 7 | information. We're billing them. They're getting our service.
- 8 We need to know where they live.
- 9 \mathbb{Q} . And even if the subscriber knew the identity, was best
- 10 | friends with the OE retailer that signed him up, and the OE
- 11 | retailer wanted the information, you could say no because
- 12 | that's not the OE retailer's stuff. It's your stuff?
- 13 | A. The OE retailer would have that information, also, right.
- 14 | They sold to the customer. They would have that information.
- 15 | But, yes, that's our customer as we're billing them.
- 16 $\|Q$. Well, you say that, but they click on the machine and it
- 17 goes away, and then they go to the next one; don't they?
- 18 A. They could -- any business retailer, they could keep that
- 19 | information; right.
- 20 Q. What, they would --
- 21 \parallel A. We have to have a platform to process the order so we know
- 22 | what we're installing, where we're sending the signal for the
- 23 | service, where we're billing the customer, right? We have to
- 24 \parallel do that, or how are you going to get a subscriber to watch TV?
- 25 \mathbb{Q} . So is your theory that the OE retailer -- you know, sales

- 1 agent, telemarketer keeps some butcher paper on the side?
- 2 A. Not butcher paper. If they're organized, they would have
- 3 | that information, yes. They have a system, they know who they
- 4 sold to.
- 5 Q. But, in any event, under the contract, the records are
- 6 DISH's, and SSN doesn't even have the legal right to look at
- 7 | them; right?
- 8 A. That's what the contract says.
- 9 Q. Page -- page 18, Section 9.1, I think we saw this in
- 10 opening argument. The retailer promises to abide by the law;
- 11 | right?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. Okay. Let's go to page 9 point -- page 19, Section 9.5, to
- 14 | save reading at least, can you just familiarize yourself with
- 15 | Section 9.5, and then I'll ask you some questions about it?
- 16 A. I'm going to look at it up here, sir. Some of it's not
- 17 coming through. Yeah, that's a little bit better. Thank you.
- 18 Q. Just look up when you're comfortable, you remember what
- 19 | this covers.
- 20 | (Pause in the proceedings.)
- 21 A. Okay, sir.
- 22 | Q. All right. So you agree that under Section 9.5 of the
- 23 contract, SSN had no right to make use of any list of past or
- 24 current DISH Network subscribers, whether delivered by the
- 25 retailer or obtained by EchoStar for any reason? I'm at

- Subsection A, 9.5, Subsection A. Right here.
- 2 A. Yeah, that's what I'm trying to -- it says -- yes, make use
- 3 of any lists of past or current DISH Network subscribers. Yes.
- 4 Q. All right. So, if the retailer had the butcher paper and
- 5 wrote down the names and addresses and then wanted to go sell
- 6 some other product, they had no legal right to use that
- 7 | information; isn't that correct?
- 8 A. Yes. We're protecting the customer there. We don't want
- 9 them using that list for whatever reason.
- 10 Q. So there's no --
- 11 MS. ECHTMAN: Objection, relevance on this whole line.
- 12 | THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's move along. You can
- 13 proceed, but let's --
- 14 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 15 \parallel Q. You can't use any information for the direct or indirect
- 16 | benefit of any other entity; right? Right?
- 17 A. Yes. That's protecting the customer for sure.
- 18 Q. Got it. You can't solicit these customers for any other
- 19 services offered by any other person or entity; right?
- 20 \parallel A. Right. We don't want -- no, we don't want a retailer to
- 21 | bring us a subscriber and then take that customer and sell them
- 22 a competing product.
- 23 $\|$ Q. Okay. I got it. So, in this case, from May of 2010 to
- 24 August of 2011, the evidence will be that there are 231
- 25 connected calls -- 231,000 connected calls. The information

that SSN gleaned from those calls if they signed up a customer, was solely for DISH's use; right? 2 3 MS. ECHTMAN: Objection, lacks foundation. Well, the jury will take the evidence 4 THE COURT: 5 about the numbers from witnesses, not from counsel, but you can 6 answer the question. BY MR. GLASSER: 7 8 Are you following me? 9 No. Α. 10 All right. I guess what I'm trying to say is, you have 11 said on the witness stand and your lawyer said in opening that this -- that this -- this independent retailer had this power 12 13 to market to all these other people. And I'm saying if all the 14 marketing you're doing for more than a year is only DISH and 1.5 only DISH products, and you're under this contract, you can't legally use that information for anything. So how are you 16 going to practically go do something else? 17 THE COURT: You're talking about -- when you say 18 "you," you mean SSN? 19 20 MR. GLASSER: SSN. 2.1 THE WITNESS: You're telling me they're not selling 22 any other product or --BY MR. GLASSER: I'm just saying practically speaking, all the work you've

done.

- A. Uh-huh.
- $2 \parallel Q$. All the customers, all the contact info, all the data,
- 3 | everything is DISH's, on a very concrete, practical level,
- 4 | that's another really short leash, isn't it, Mr. Ahmed?
- 5 A. Ahmed, yes. Yes, our customers, we have information, and
- 6 the retailer can have the information, also.
- 7 $\|$ Q. They can have it, but they can't use it. It's illegal
- 8 under the contract. It's not contractually allowed; right?
- 9 A. If they have the information of the customer, yes, we want
- 10 to protect the customer. We don't want the customer to be
- 11 | harassed or sold a DISH -- a competing product.
- 12 Q. Right. You don't want them going and selling, switching
- 13 | that guy back to DirecTV next month; right?
- 14 A. Financially, it does not make sense, no.
- 15 Q. I agree. It's for DISH's benefit, right?
- 16 THE COURT: Okay. So don't argue or agree.
- 17 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 18 Q. Okay. It's for DISH's benefit, then; correct?
- 19 A. Yes. They're our subscribers. We want to protect our
- 20 | subscribers.
- 21 $\|Q$. You said -- the part where you said this is DISH's data,
- 22 | DISH's people, it's for DISH's benefit, this secrecy and this
- 23 \parallel locking down of the retailer's ability to, in fact, market to
- 24 somebody else is for DISH's benefit; right?
- 25 MS. ECHTMAN: Objection, argumentative, especially for

- the characterizations, and repetitive.
- THE COURT: Okay. If you can ask shorter questions that are less argumentative.

4 BY MR. GLASSER:

- 5 \parallel Q. What you were talking about when you said --
- 6 THE COURT: Okay. So ask -- ask it as a question.

7 | BY MR. GLASSER:

- 8 Q. Okay. What thing were you saying benefited DISH?
- 9 \parallel A. Sir, we're spending close to \$1,000 to acquire a customer.
- 10 We're investing a tremendous amount. Our break-even is close
- 11 \parallel to 3-1/2, 4 years. They're our subscribers, and we want to
- 12 make sure they're going to last with us a long time and they're
- 13 | happy. It's very important to us. We're not making -- that's
- 14 what I was saying earlier. It's not about any acquisition.
- 15 It's about a long-term customer.
- 16 Q. All right. So you said a lot of things there, so let's
- 17 | break it down.
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 $\|Q$. You told me a minute ago or at the beginning of your exam
- 20 | that it was about \$90 a month for a customer; right?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- 22 Q. All right. And \$90 a month is something over \$1,000 a
- 23 | year; right?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.
- 25 \parallel Q. Okay. And you just told me it costs \$1,000 to get a

JA005232

- customer; right?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- 3 Q. So your payback is not three or four years, it's one year
- 4 on the math you gave me?
- 5 A. Sir, may I correct you on that? Not -- nothing in business
- 6 is 100 percent profit. Let's look at this. You just
- 7 challenged me. Yes, average customer pays us \$90. That's the
- 8 | facts, right, when you look at our earnings call.
- 9 You have to pay the programmers, ESPN, CNN, HBO. They
- 10 don't give us programming free. Networks, ABC, NBC, CBS, FOX,
- 11 you have to pay them. That's 50 percent of your cost. You're
- 12 paying commissions, like you mentioned. You sent -- rolling a
- 13 | truck to do installation. Okay. You've got operational costs,
- 14 | satellite that you mentioned. You've got billing costs.
- 15 You've got service calls. There -- and I can go on and on.
- 16 So it's not -- you're saying they're paying \$90 in 12
- 17 | months, you made your money. No.
- 18 What I'm saying is when you break that down, you might be
- 19 | making a very small -- and then that is why the break-even is
- 20 3-1/2, 4 years.
- 21 | Q. That's why it's important to DISH and beneficial to DISH to
- 22 | lock those customers down by not letting SSN go sell them
- 23 | something else; right?
- 24 A. I just explained that we want to take care of our
- 25 customers. They want our service. Of course we want to take

- care of our customers. We want happy customers.
- 2 Q. Okay. Let's go to --
- 3 A. We're in the customer service business.
- 4 Q. Let's go to Section 9.7. 9.7 says that: In the event the
- 5 retailer derives an economic benefit, in any form, from a
- 6 | violation of its obligations under Section 9 -- and that
- 7 ownership of the customer is in Section 9, you agree; right?
- 8 A. Yes.
- $9 \parallel Q$. All right. Then that economic benefit is actually the
- 10 property of EchoStar; right? Do you see that in Section 9.7?
- 11 | A. Yes, I do.
- 12 Q. All right. So if they had the gumption to go out and sell
- 13 some DirecTV, you could just seize the money; right?
- 14 A. No. It's not exclusive. They can sell DirecTV.
- 15 \parallel Q. I know you keep saying it's not exclusive, but if they use
- 16 any of the business they've -- they've done for the last five
- 17 or six years to sell this other product, it's for your benefit?
- 18 THE COURT: That's not a question.
- 19 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 20 $\|$ Q. So how is it -- how is it practically, practically
- 21 possible?
- 22 MS. ECHTMAN: Objection.
- 23 THE COURT: That's not a question.
- 24 THE WITNESS: I don't understand the question, sir.
- 25 MR. GLASSER: I'll move on.

1 THE COURT: You're not asking a clear question. 2 are you asking? 3 MR. GLASSER: I'll move on to the next. All right. THE COURT: Okay. So, maybe that's a good time, 4 5 actually, to stop and go to lunch. All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to excuse you until 2:00. 6 7 That will give you about an hour and 15 minutes to get 8 something to eat, stretch your legs. I suggest to you that you not eat too much so you'll be all right this afternoon. Lay 10 your notes in your chair. Don't talk about the case or have 11 any contact with anyone or form any opinion, and come back at 2:00. Jurors are excused. If everyone will remain seated 12 13 while they step out. (The jury left the courtroom at 12:45 p.m.) 14 15 THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Glasser, you're going to have to stop arguing with the witness. The witness --16 17 MR. GLASSER: I'll move on. THE COURT: -- is not even disagreeing with you. I'm 18 19 having a little trouble understanding exactly why you're 20 arguing with him, because about the relevant points, he's not even disagreeing with you that I heard. 21 22 MR. GLASSER: I'll go quicker through the rest of 2.3 this. 24 THE COURT: So we just need to move a little differently through that. And just, if I can remind you, ask a

question, don't make a statement. And, you know, I tolerate a 2 little bit of making statements and then saying, right, or, 3 correct, but at some point, you know, that's really not 4 helpful. 5 MR. GLASSER: Okay. And then, if I can also just ask all 6 THE COURT: 7 counsel, if there's something happening and you need to say 8 something about it, please direct your comments to the Court, not to opposing counsel. So, you know, if you're having 10 trouble, you don't have an exhibit, just direct your comments 11 to me so that lawyers are not talking to each other in the courtroom in front of a jury, because that's -- that has the 12 13 potential to kind of get out of control, so -- all right? Anything else we need to do before we take our recess? 14 15 Not from us, Your Honor. MR. GLASSER: 16 MS. ECHTMAN: No, I just want to know for planning 17 purposes so we know when to have our next witness ready. 18 MR. GLASSER: I mean, I'm getting to the end of the 19 I mean, it's not going to be -- what time do we come 20 back? 2.1 THE COURT: 2:00. 22 MR. GLASSER: I mean, I think your next -- you'll be 2.3 able to take --24 Say again. I can't hear you. THE COURT: Talk to me. 25 MR. GLASSER: I think she'll be able to take the

witness by three.

1.5

2.1

2.3

THE COURT: All right. So you anticipate another hour on direct?

MR. GLASSER: Maybe less.

THE COURT: Maybe less. All right.

MS. ECHTMAN: Your Honor, I just want to also bring up the point that we made our Rule 403 and 404 objection to certain evidence about other retailers, and we were told that they would not bring it up about telemarketing complaints, violations by other retailers. We were assured that wasn't going to happen, and that it would only be potentially if DISH opened the door.

Now, we did not open any door because we haven't done anything yet, and they put on the Assurance of Voluntary Compliance and said, this must have been because there were widespread problems.

THE COURT: Exactly. I heard the question. The witness, however, denied that. So there is no evidence in front of the jury of widespread problems, and the Plaintiff will not make any argument to that effect, because the statement by counsel is not evidence. So, the witness denied it.

You know, if you want to ask a few more questions about that when it comes your time, you can, but there -- as far as I'm concerned, there is no evidence of that, and the Plaintiff

should not argue about that. And having asked that one question, I wouldn't anticipate any other questions about that 2 3 from Plaintiff's counsel. MR. GLASSER: Okay. 4 5 THE COURT: Right? 6 MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am. 7 THE COURT: Unless there's something I'm missing. 8 Okay. 9 MS. ECHTMAN: Thank you. And, Your Honor, going 10 forward, I will direct the Court -- I just have to say it's 11 been very hard to follow because Mr. Glasser is shuffling through papers, and I know he's not doing it intentionally. 12 13 But, he's quickly mentioning an exhibit, I've got to find it in 14 the binders I have. And when he's shuffling through, I don't 1.5 know what page he's on. THE COURT: Right. And he's doing better, I will say. 16 So, it is very helpful both -- for everybody's purposes to cite 17 the page and paragraph number, and I think he is doing better 18 19 So, just continue for all of our sakes. about that. 20 MS. ECHTMAN: Thank you. 21 THE COURT: Anything else? 22 MR. GLASSER: No, ma'am. 2.3 THE COURT: All right. We'll be in recess until 2:00. 24 (A noon recess was taken from 12:50 p.m. until 2 p.m.; all

parties present.)

1 THE COURT: I think we were short a juror or two the last time the clerk checked. Is there anything the Plaintiff 2 wants to take up? 3 4 MR. GLASSER: No, ma'am. 5 THE COURT: Defendant? 6 MS. ECHTMAN: No, thank you, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: The clerk tells me that -- they're all 8 Okay. The clerk tells me that one of the jurors has a family member who's bringing them back and forth to court who has been in the courtroom some, and so I just want to -- let's 10 11 see. Is that --Yes, that's Mr. Burgess. 12 THE CLERK: THE COURT: Mr. Burgess, is that you back there? 13 MAN IN AUDIENCE: Pardon. 14 THE COURT: Are you Mr. Burgess? Are you Mr. Burgess? 1.5 MAN IN AUDIENCE: No, ma'am. 16 Oh, no, he went back downstairs. 17 THE CLERK: 18 THE COURT: Pardon me. I apologize. In any event, apparently, Ms. Burgess' husband had been in 19 20 here a little bit. So I'm just going to give them an extra 2.1 caution about that. You know, it's not unusual to have the person driving the juror to and from to be here. So I have had 22 to deal with that before. I'll mention it explicitly. All right. You can bring the jury in. And let's see. 24 witness -- yes, you can come on back up. You may have to wait

if the jurors start coming in before you get up there. No, it looks like you can come on.

(The witness returned to the witness stand.)

THE COURT: It's a tight squeeze there.

(The jury entered the courtroom.)

2.1

THE COURT: All right. Before we get started, let me just ask all the jurors — and tell you that you should not come into the courtroom during any of the breaks or before court starts in the morning. The lawyers are talking to each other about the case. Things could be going on in here. So, you know, if you need something that's in the courtroom and it's during a break, please ask one of the security officers or Ms. Sanders to help you so that you're not coming in and out of the courtroom except with the jurors as a whole.

And I know from time to time jurors ride to court with, you know, a family member and that person is around the courthouse, and that's — there's no problem with that. I just want to, you know, make sure that there's no conversation about the case going on even with a spouse who might be here. I will say there's a trial going on downstairs. So anybody looking for something to do could go down there and watch the other case rather than being in here. We just don't want to have any conversation about that with anyone between a juror and anyone else.

And I believe we're ready to continue with direct

examination. So you may proceed.

MR. GLASSER: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. GLASSER:

2

3

4

5

6

8

- Q. I think we're still on the ELMO. Thanks. So I'm at Section 10.2. I'm on page 20, and this is how either party can terminate the contract.
- 7 **THE COURT:** And just to get me back on, this is the

9 MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am, Exhibit 26.

10 **THE COURT:** All right. Go ahead.

2006 contract between SSN and DISH?

- MR. GLASSER: Plaintiff's Exhibit 26. I may need to turn that down a little.
- 13 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 14 Q. So, Mr. Ahmed, do you agree that either party could, for
- 15 | its own convenience, terminate this arrangement on 60 days'
- 16 | notice?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Turning to the next page at Section 11, this is the section
- 19 that you were present for opening that Mr. Bicks went over
- 20 \parallel about the relationship to the parties hereto is that of an
- 21 | independent contractor. Do you see that?
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- 23 Q. So that is in the contract as well, right?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.
- 25 \parallel Q. Okay. We're going to turn next to Plaintiff's Exhibit 28.

1 MR. GLASSER: Any objection to putting this right on the ELMO? It's the OE. 2 3 THE COURT: Okav. MR. GLASSER: Your Honor, I wonder -- I move the 4 admission of Exhibit 28. 5 6 MS. ECHTMAN: No objection. 7 THE COURT: All right. It will be admitted. 8 BY MR. GLASSER: Q. Okay. This is only a couple pages long, so I'm not going 10 to bother to come up there and give you one. This is the OE 11 retailer amendment to the EchoStar retailer agreement, also dated in 2006. Do you see that? 12 13 A. Yes, sir. 14 THE COURT: With SSN? 15 MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am, with Satellite Systems 16 Network here in the top. BY MR. GLASSER: 17 Q. So this, together with the document that we just looked at, 18 forms the contract with SSN, right? 19 20 A. Yes, yes. 21 Q. Okay. Now, right here in the middle at Section 1.44, 22 there's a whole section on residential subscriber accounts. you see that section?

And that's because the main purpose of the OE retailer was

A. Yes, I do.

24

- to sign up residential subscribers, right?
- 2 A. Yes, that's one of our goals to residential subscribers,
- 3 | yes.
- $4 \parallel Q$. And then this is the agreement that actually lets them, at
- $5 \parallel \text{Section 1.56}$, have access and use the OE tool, the order entry
- 6 tool, that we went over at length with the jury on how it
- 7 works, right?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 \parallel Q. And then, just like the monthly incentives that we talked
- 10 about before with the main part of the contract, these
- 11 residential incentives are paid under applicable business
- 12 | rules, right?
- 13 | A. That's correct, for qualifying activations, correct.
- 14 Q. Okay. So it's clear from this contract that the business
- 15 | rules also cover pay, isn't it?
- 16 A. Yes, it says, "Additional residential incentives shall be
- 17 paid to retailer, yes.
- 18 Q. I'm approaching you with Plaintiff's Exhibit 29, which is
- 19 the 2010 version of the contract. Do you recognize it?
- 20 MR. GLASSER: I move its admission.
- 21 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
- MR. GLASSER: It's Plaintiff's Exhibit 29.
- 23 | MS. ECHTMAN: This has actually become JTX2?
- 24 THE COURT: The Joint Exhibit No. 2.
- 25 MS. ECHTMAN: It's Joint Exhibit No. 2, and there's no

objection. 2 THE COURT: It will be admitted. BY MR. GLASSER: 3 Q. Okay. So this, Mr. Ahmed, is the December 10 -- I mean, 4 5 December 2010 version of the contract with SSN, right? Yes, sir. 6 Α. 7 Q. Okay. Business rules -- I'm not going to go through this 8 whole thing, but business rules are still defined as "any term, requirement, condition, precedent, process, or procedure 10 associated with a promotional program or otherwise identified 11 as a business rule by DISH which is communicated to the retailer by DISH or an affiliate of DISH," right? 12 13 Yes, sir. Α. 14 Q. All right. 1.5 **THE COURT:** And that's paragraph 1.7? 16 MR. GLASSER: Yes, ma'am. BY MR. GLASSER: 17 Q. So at paragraph 1.7, it says, "associated with a 18 19 promotional program or otherwise identified as a business rule." Do you see that? 21 A. Yes, I do. Q. So would you agree that in plain English it's both those 22 rules associated with promotional programs or those rules otherwise identified as a business rule? 24

Yes, business rule for promotional programs. It's what it

says.

- 2 Q. Okay. So your answer to me was, yes, business rules for
- 3 promotional programs, which creates an endless loop, and I'm
- 4 asking you, do you see there are two things there: One, rules
- $5 \parallel$ with respect to promotional programs, and, two, or rules
- 6 otherwise identified as a business rule?
- 7 A. Yes, that's what it says.
- 8 Q. So it is not an endless loop. It is both, correct?
- 9 MS. ECHTMAN: Objection, argumentative.
- 10 **THE COURT:** Sustained.

11 BY MR. GLASSER:

- 12 Q. Now I'm at Section 1.46. The definition of sole discretion
- 13 | is the same as before, right?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Okay. And, you know, I don't want to grind through a whole
- 16 other contract for an hour. So is there any part of this
- 17 second contract that you believe changed from the first
- 18 contract that we ought, in fairness, to look at?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. I don't know of any.
- 21 A. I don't know of any either. The retailer is still an
- 22 | independent contractor.
- 23 Q. Okay. I'm going to show you Exhibit 241.
- 24 MR. GLASSER: And I move its admission.
- 25 THE COURT: Plaintiff's Exhibit 241?

1 MS. ECHTMAN: Yes, we have an objection to this. does not pertain to SSN. We have a relevance objection. 2 3 Then I'll lay a foundation, Your Honor. MR. GLASSER: And this applies overall to that general 4 MS. ECHTMAN: 5 objection about information with respect to other retailers, if 6 you look at the last page. 7 THE COURT: Okay. You can ask a few questions directed to showing its relevance. 8 BY MR. GLASSER: 10 Q. So the document I've handed you is an example of a fairly 11 typical promotional program as rolled out to OE retailers, in this instance, an OE retailer other than SSN, right? 12 A. Yes, this went out to all the OE retailers. 13 THE COURT: I'm sorry? It went out to who? 14 15 THE WITNESS: To the OE retailers. BY MR. GLASSER: 16 17 Q. So just because it happens to have the attachment for the exact pricing for one OE retailer, the pricing might be unique 18 19

- - to an OE retailer, but the content of the promotional program is common to the OE retailers, correct?
- 21 That's correct. We're providing the economics that we pay 22 on specific products.
- And the qualifying procedure and just how the promotion is going to run, right, under Exhibit 241, Plaintiff's
- Exhibit 241?

And the, yes, qualifying promotion. 2 MR. GLASSER: I move the admission of Plaintiff's 3 Exhibit 241, Your Honor, just as an example of a typical 4 promotional program. 5 **THE COURT:** Can counsel step up to the bench briefly? (The following bench conference was recorded.) 6 7 Speak directly into the microphone for the THE COURT: 8 court reporter. Why is this relevant? 9 MR. GLASSER: It just shows how they roll out each They do millions over six months --10 promotional program. 11 THE COURT: Yeah, but why do we care? MR. GLASSER: Because it shows sole and complete 12 13 discretion on every item ten times in two pages of DISH, just 14 every single thing about sole and complete discretion ten times in two pages, and so I'm saying every time they roll out a 1.5 16 program, they roll it out under their sole and complete 17 discretion. It just goes to power and control, and I would use the one with SSN if they had produced one with SSN, but they 18 19 just didn't. 20 THE COURT: Okay. MS. ECHTMAN: Well, Your Honor, can we just remove the 2.1 22 last page if it's going to go to the jury because it's got 2.3 rights for a different retailer? 24 THE COURT: All right. We'll remove the last page. That makes sense.

MS. ECHTMAN: That's fine with me.

THE COURT: Good idea.

(End of bench conference.)

THE COURT: All right. We're going to remove the last page, which has to do with another retailer, not this retailer, not SSN, and with that deletion, Plaintiff's Exhibit 241 will be admitted.

BY MR. GLASSER:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

- Q. All right. So let's go quickly through this. Would you agree with me that Exhibit 241 is just kind of generally how different example of how a promotional program is rolled out?
- 13 THE COURT: Is what?

14 BY MR. GLASSER:

- 15 | Q. Rolled out to the OE retailer?
- 16 A. Any promotional program, consumer program, or changes in 17 programming, anything, we do send out a business rule
- 18 explaining exactly what the program is.
- 19 Q. All right.
- 20 A. So every retailer knows.
- 21 \parallel Q. Okay. And I just want to go through it quickly and say
- 22 | that on the first -- second paragraph, do you see that sole and
- 23 | absolute discretion, EchoStar's sole and absolute discretion?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 \parallel Q. And then it gives a program overview, right, at the next

- statement?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Right above that, it says that EchoStar determines whether
- 4 you can participate in their sole and complete discretion,
- 5 | right?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. On the program overview, again, EchoStar's sole and
- 8 complete discretion comes up, right?
- 9 A. Where is that, sir?
- 10 Q. Right where my finger is.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Okay. On the qualifying promotions, they reserve the right
- 13 | in their sole and complete discretion to change it for any
- 14 reason or no reason. Do you see that?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. On the residential incentives, what you're going to get
- 17 paid here at the bottom, they reserve the right to change it in
- 18 their sole and complete discretion at any time, right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. On the next page, on chargebacks or how chargebacks are
- 21 going to be handled for returns, EchoStar retains the right in
- 22 | its sole and complete discretion to figure that out however
- 23 | they want, right?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 | THE COURT: Doesn't it say absolute? I don't know

that that's different.

THE WITNESS: Absolute discretion.

MR. GLASSER: You're right, sole and absolute discretion.

BY MR. GLASSER:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

- Q. And then call monitoring here at the bottom: The retailer acknowledges that EchoStar shall have the right, but not the obligation, at any time and from time to time in its sole and complete discretion to monitor, record, or otherwise access, whether electronically or otherwise and in all cases, at EchoStar's election any and all telephone or other similar communications made between the retailer, and a long list of people, including their own employees. And I'm sure the customer. Is that correct?
- 15 A. I don't know about the customer, but, yes, that's what it 16 says there.
- 17 | Q. Well --
- 18 A. This is -- this is a business rule, and if I can comment on 19 it --
- 20 Q. I haven't asked you a question yet.
- 21 A. I'm sorry. I'm sorry.
- 22 Q. Okay. So -- yeah, it says -- it says, they can call
- 23 monitor between the employees, agents, subagents of the
- 24 retailer and any prospective or actual customer. Do you see
- 25 | that?

1 **THE COURT:** Consumer? 2 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, I do. 3 BY MR. GLASSER: Q. All right. And so that's what we discussed earlier when we 4 5 said that DISH field service representatives could go in and listen to whatever they wanted to listen to, right? Correct? 6 7 Yes, we could require the calls. 8 Q. You also had an audit service run by Bruce Werner that could come in and audit their books and records, right? 10 A. We have a compliance group, that Bruce Werner works there, 11 yes. Bruce Werner is employed in the compliance group, correct. 12 13 Q. And we already talked about the taping that goes on, the 14 taping of the calls that were uploaded on a regular basis for 1.5 review. Remember that? 16 A. Sure, yes. 17 Q. Okay. This is the business rule that allows that access by DISH, right? 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 Q. Okay. A. Now can I comment, sir? I'm just saying it's -- this is 2.1

- 22 important. No, it's very important because, again, we do want to listen to calls to make sure that our promotions are
- accurately explained to the customer because there's so many 24
- facets on the promotion. That's important. It's competitive.

- Business rules have to change. Promotions have to change based on what the competition is doing, whether it's DirecTV, whether it's the cable companies. So they have to change, and we have to control that because it's our promotions. That's what this is. Competition changes based on what they pay out, the economics. Market conditions change so we have to control the
- Q. Okay. And so under this call monitoring business rule,
 after the assurance of compliance, couldn't you have said we'd
 like you to upload to us everyone you called last week so we
 can see if they're on the Do Not Call List?

economics. That's what this is.

- A. I cannot answer that. We required certain calls to be uploaded, and we're making sure that all the terms and conditions are accurately represented. That's very important for us.
- Q. Okay. Then there's a couple more instances of sole and complete discretion. So I've got a two-page document here, and I counted ten instances of sole and absolute discretion on the part of DISH.
- 20 A. Yes.

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

- 21 Q. That's fairly common in the communications with the 22 retailers, right?
- A. It's our consumer offer. We have to protect the customer to make sure that what we're offering as a service is accurately represented to that customer. That's what's

important. Q. Okay. All right. So now we've covered the assurance of 2 3 compliance, how the OE tool works --A. Yes, sir. 4 5 Q. -- and the contract. I want to turn to Satellite Systems itself, okay? 6 7 A. Yes, sir. Q. I want to turn to the time period before you left in 2006, 8 so roughly 2004 to 2006. Are you with me? 10 Yes. Α. 11 Q. At that time you were still vice president in charge of indirect sales, as we established right when you took the 12 13 stand, right? 14 A. Yes, sir. 15 MR. GLASSER: I have Exhibit 1160. I move the admission of it. 16 17 MS. ECHTMAN: Your Honor, if I might have a moment to see what it is? 18 19 THE COURT: All right. 20 (Pause in the proceedings.) 2.1 MS. ECHTMAN: We've got multiple objections to this 22 one. 2.3 MR. GLASSER: So maybe I could lay a foundation? 24 MS. ECHTMAN: May I state my objections? 25

THE COURT: Okay. Just a second. Hold on.

1 (Pause in the proceedings.) 2 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, let me just excuse you to the jury room for a moment. Leave your 3 notes in your chair. 4 5 (The jury left the courtroom.) What's your objection? 6 THE COURT: 7 MS. ECHTMAN: Your Honor, there's -- there's hearsay 8 in here. They're saying there's a lot of complaints about SSN. 9 As we've talked about earlier, and it's covered by one of our motions in limine, this is about an earlier time period. 10 11 It's about different types of issues. This is not about Do Not Call issues. This is a time period where we said this is prior 12 13 to -- 2005 and prior, and it's improper attempt to use character evidence from a completely different time period, 14 from 2005, which is years before Dr. Krakauer got his call, and 1.5 16 we have relevance, unfair prejudice, improper character. 17 THE COURT: I don't understand your hearsay objection. MS. ECHTMAN: I've got the other objections. 18 withdraw the hearsay objection. 19 20 THE COURT: All right. 2.1 MS. ECHTMAN: Other than it has a conversation -- it repeats a conversation with Alex Tehranchi. 22 2.3 THE COURT: Okay. For the Plaintiff? 24 MR. GLASSER: Well, Your Honor, in the opening and again in the cross-examination of Dr. Krakauer, they covered

this period of time. The witness has already testified that under the assurance of compliance the history of SSN is relevant. This 2000 --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Say again.

2.1

2.3

MR. GLASSER: The history, what they know about SSN historically is relevant to the progressive discipline set forth in the compliance. This shows the story of how they were working with both DISH and Direct for a while and then weaned from Direct to only DISH. So it makes that point. It shows how you pay them. It's completely relevant to this case, and then was forwarded again by Mike Oberbillig to Bruce Werner in the risk audit department in 2007. So I just -- I mean, this is the heart of the case.

THE COURT: All right. Overruled.

MR. GLASSER: Now, there are a few more -- this is kind of the -- one of the farthest back in time, but we kind of march forward on a few of these. In each instance, it's Mr. Amir's own e-mail.

Should we -- I mean, I'm happy to lay the foundation every time, I mean, if we're going to object to all of them. How do you want to handle it? Can I give it to the witness, lay the foundation without showing it, they can object, or do you want to do a side --

THE COURT: Well, I'd prefer to keep the jury -- not have the jury go in and out, in and out. It's just I'm having

```
some difficulty with the system -- the sidebar sound system,
   and the court reporter is having trouble hearing us during
 2
3
   those sidebars, so I'm trying to minimize them.
       What are your next exhibits?
 4
 5
             MR. GLASSER: Well, they're the same. They're e-mails
6
   between Mr. --
 7
             THE COURT: Well, which -- what are your next
8
   exhibits?
9
             MR. GLASSER: Oh, okay, yeah. The 656, which is an
   e-mail in -- later in 2004, in September, where they're
10
11
   giving --
             THE COURT: Okay. Just tell me what the numbers are.
12
13
             MR. GLASSER: 656 --
             THE COURT:
                        Uh-huh.
14
15
             MR. GLASSER: -- where additional economics are being
16
   given to SSN and Mr. DeFranco.
17
             THE COURT: Okay. I'm -- I believe I asked you to
18
    just give me the numbers.
19
             MR. GLASSER: 656.
20
             THE COURT:
                        Yes.
21
             MR. GLASSER: 1160.
22
             MS. ECHTMAN: 1160 is what we're on right now, isn't
2.3
   it?
24
             THE COURT: Yes.
25
             MR. GLASSER: Oh, yeah. 194, which is the --
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. I see. 2 MS. ECHTMAN: 194 -- do you want me to wait? 3 THE COURT: Yes, I'm trying to get a list. 504. Oh, no, not --4 MR. GLASSER: 5 THE COURT: All right. 504. 6 MR. GLASSER: Yeah, 504. I think that's it for his 7 e-mail, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 They're all Amir Ahmed e-mail. MR. GLASSER: 10 THE COURT: And is your objection the same on all of 11 those? 12 Well, we have different objections. MS. ECHTMAN: 13 one specifically with 194, that is actually an incomplete 14 document. 504 is a longer version of the same one. Both of 1.5 those documents start out with someone forwarding an e-mail 16 that was not written by anyone at DISH. It is a specific 17 complaint that's been forwarded to people at DISH, and that particular complaint we have a hearsay objection on. 18 19 This is also the Scott Novak --20 THE COURT: I'm totally confused by what you just 2.1 said. You are complaining that they have excluded a hearsay 22 complaint. 2.3 MS. ECHTMAN: No, we're objecting -- okay. I wasn't 24 clear. I'm sorry. Let me back up.

25

THE COURT: Okay.

1 MS. ECHTMAN: Okay. So 194 and 504 are different versions of the same e-mail. The version at 194 is incomplete. 2 3 504 is a longer version -- a more complete version of that e-mail. So that's -- that's one issue is that 194 is 4 5 incomplete. THE COURT: Okay. Is there some reason not to use 6 7 504? 8 MR. GLASSER: I am using 504. I called it out. 9 MS. ECHTMAN: They're both actually -- I'm sorry. 10 They're both incomplete. There's another e-mail that they have 11 that has more on that chain. This is the famous Scott Novak e-mail that Your Honor has a limine instruction about. 12 So I'm 13 sorry, Your Honor. Both 194 and 504 -- oh, gosh. I'm confused now. I'm sorry. Okay. 194 is an incomplete version of 14 1.5 another e-mail. 504 is a completely different e-mail. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MS. ECHTMAN: I apologize for my confusion on that. Five -- so let's start with 194. That one starts with a 18 19 complaint from the Indiana Attorney General, and that complaint 20 is hearsay. 2.1 **THE COURT:** It -- where is that? 22 MS. ECHTMAN: That's at 194-003. That original e-mail 2.3 is from Margaret Sweeney, msweeney@atg.state.in.us. So that complaint is hearsay. 24 25 And then later on, it -- there's a description of another

complaint at the top of that page, again is hearsay, and the document itself --2 3 THE COURT: Okay. MS. ECHTMAN: -- is incomplete. 4 5 **THE COURT:** And it's incomplete? 6 MS. ECHTMAN: It's incomplete because there's a longer 7 version of this with more back-and-forth that's highly 8 relevant. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Well, you can ask him whatever you 10 want about other e-mails; but, you know, to the extent there 11 are complaints in there, I'll be glad to tell the jury that they're offered to show that the complaint was received, not 12 13 that the complaint was true and accurate, since the complainer 14 isn't here under oath. 1.5 MS. ECHTMAN: Okay. 16 THE COURT: I have no problem with doing that. 17 Subject to that, you can go ahead. These are obviously fairly old, so I would hope we could 18 19 move through them quickly. To some extent, that depends on the 20 witness. So -- and, you know -- but we can go ahead with this, 2.1 and I'll overrule the objections, as I -- subject to the 22 limiting instruction that I just mentioned. So --2.3 MR. GLASSER: Just to be clear on how we're going to handle it, I'll go ahead and use them and give them a moment to 24 state an objection and then move on?

1 THE COURT: Right. They can repeat their objection, as we -- as has been stated here and -- in summary form. 2 3 MS. ECHTMAN: Your Honor, if I might clarify? PX120 is the complete version of PX194. Just so I know what the 4 5 ruling was on 194 on the completeness issue. THE COURT: Okay. Well, completeness in an e-mail 6 7 chain, you know, I -- you're just going to have to ask the 8 witness about that. I don't know of any requirement that every single e-mail in an e-mail chain be in front of a jury. If you 10 think there's an e-mail that's left out, I'm glad for you to 11 ask questions about that and put in your -- you know, refer to Plaintiff's Exhibit 120. That's totally fine. I just think 12 13 it's easier to deal with it that way. All right. Bring the jury in. 14 15 MS. ECHTMAN: And, Your Honor, again, also the 194, we've got the Novak limiting instruction. 16 17 THE COURT: Beyond --18 MS. ECHTMAN: The fact that --19 THE COURT: Just a second, Officer. I'm sorry. 20 MS. ECHTMAN: So the issue in 194 -- and I'm sorry. 21 Let me just remind the Court, please, before he brings the jury 22 in, there's a statement by one of DISH's lawyers, and it's 2.3 actually on page 1 of 194, that says: "In the past, we've successfully resisted the argument that we're responsible for 24

the conduct of independent retailers. However, SSN is a

problem because we've cautioned them to stop." And Your Honor had agreed to give an instruction that the jury is not to 2 3 consider the legal analysis contained in the e-mail as an accurate and appropriate explanation of the law in this case. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for reminding me. All 5 6 right. I'll do that, too --7 MR. GLASSER: All right. 8 THE COURT: -- when we get to it? 9 MS. ECHTMAN: Thank you very much, Your Honor. 10 Thank you. Okay. Now we can bring the THE COURT: 11 jury in. MS. ECHTMAN: I've forgotten what exhibit we're on. 12 13 MR. GLASSER: 1160. Thank you. MS. ECHTMAN: 14 (The jury entered the courtroom.) 15 16 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead for the Plaintiff. 17 MR. GLASSER: Your Honor, I move the admission of Plaintiff's Exhibit 1160. 18 19 THE COURT: It will be admitted. 20 BY MR. GLASSER: Q. So, Mr. Ahmed, you recognize your name here on Plaintiff's 21 Exhibit 160 (sic), which is an e-mail chain from July 19, 2004, 22 at 7:51 in the evening; is that right? 24 A. Yes, sir. Some of the other people on this -- we've heard about Mike

- Mills. What does he do in the company at this time?
- 2 A. Mike Mills would have been the account manager.
- 3 \parallel Q. Okay. And what is Jim -- how do you even say that?
- 4 A. Jim Spreitzer.
- $5 \parallel Q$. Who is he?
- 6 A. He was the director of the Sacramento office for the West
- 7 | Coast Region.
- 8 | Q. And that's -- the West Coast is where SSN was, in
- 9 California, right?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. And Mike Oberbillig -- how do you say that?
- 12 A. Mike Oberbillig.
- 13 \mathbb{Q} . And what --
- 14 A. He reports to Jim, and he would be the regional sales
- 15 manager for that office.
- 16 Q. Regional sales manager. Great.
- 17 It says, "Please call Alex in the morning and give them
- 18 some good news. We are increasing Satellite Systems OE
- 19 | activation payment from \$150 to \$175 effective immediately."
- 20 Do you see that?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- 22 \parallel Q. And then a 25-dollar bonus for other type of activations,
- 23 || right?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.
- 25 \parallel Q. And then a 15-dollar bonus for another type of commitment,

- l | right?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- $3 \parallel Q$. All right. And -- and then some other pay increases
- 4 | basically down here at the bottom of the e-mail, right?
- 5 A. No, that's -- that's the same -- I'm just sending that to
- 6 | retail services because they need to change the amount in the
- 7 system.
- 8 Q. Okay. So Eric Miller is to put it in the system about what
- 9 | they're going to get paid?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. "And the idea is to get Alex excited. I want a minimum of
- 12 2,500 activations in August." That's you, right?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. The Alex being discussed in this e-mail is Alex Tehranchi,
- 15 \parallel the owner of Satellite Systems Network, right?
- 16 A. That's correct. And if I could mention that -- you
- 17 mentioned the 25 and 15.
- 18 Q. Yes.
- 19 A. That was across the board for every retailer, not just
- 20 Mr. Tehranchi.
- 21 Q. Okay. And then later in the e-mail chain, Mr. Amir -- I
- 22 | mean, Mr. Ahmed, you and Mike Mills and Oberbillig talk some
- 23 more about Satellite Systems, right?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 \parallel Q. And you say, "You guys need to spend time with Alex on the

- 1 whole program," right?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 | Q. "Make sure he understands the exception process," right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 | Q. "Make sure he does not give us just -- just give us
- 6 apartment sales, " right?
- 7 A. Correct, yes, sir.
- 8 Q. Because you prefer residential sales, right?
- 9 A. Apartment sales, yes, they -- again, we talked about the
- 10 break even.
- 11 Q. And you say, "I'm hearing a lot of complaints on Satellite
- 12 | Systems on telemarketing calls to customers." Do you see that?
- 13 | A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. Okay. This is July 29th, 2004, right?
- 15 A. That's correct.
- 16 Q. And then Mr. Oberbillig on Tuesday, January 30th, 2007,
- 17 | forwards this e-mail to Bruce Werner, right?
- 18 A. In 2007?
- 19 Q. Yes, do you see that at the top?
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 \parallel Q. Bruce Werner is the head of risk audit function at DISH
- 22 | retail sales services, right?
- 23 A. Yes, he's in our risk and audit department.
- 24 \parallel Q. There's no comment on the e-mail, though, and you were not
- 25 | in the company in January of 2007, so I take it you don't know

- 1 the reason why in 2007 Mr. Oberbillig thought Mr. Werner, the
- 2 head of risk audit, ought to see this e-mail?
- 3 A. Yes, I don't have any knowledge of that.
- 4 Q. Turning to Exhibit 656, Plaintiff's Exhibit 656.
- 5 MR. GLASSER: I move its admission, Your Honor.
- 6 THE COURT: It will be admitted.

7 | BY MR. GLASSER:

- 8 Q. So let's start at the back. This is an e-mail between you
- 9 \parallel and Mr. Jim DeFranco -- let's see. The last one was in July.
- 10 So this is September.
- 11 | A. Correct.
- 12 Q. So two months later. And Mr. DeFranco is the man -- he's
- 13 on the board of directors of DISH, right?
- 14 A. Yes, he is. He's also my boss.
- 15 $\|$ Q. He was -- and, actually, we talked about him earlier when
- 16 you took the stand?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. All right. And so you e-mailed Jim, and you say,
- 19 | "Satellite Systems Network is averaging 350 activations per
- 20 | month on the OE tool." That's for you guys, right?
- 21 \blacksquare A. That's what it says, yes.
- 22 Q. That's DISH's tool, right?
- 23 \blacksquare A. That's correct.
- 24 Q. "However, they are averaging 9,000 activations per month
- 25 | for DTV"?

- A. That's -- yes.
- 2 | Q. That's DirecTV, your competitor, right?
- 3 A. That would be DirecTV.
- $4 \parallel Q$. So at this point in time in 2004 is the point in time we've
- 5 | talked about in this case where Satellite Systems Network sold
- 6 for DirecTV and they sold for DISH, right?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. Okay. "After speaking to" -- say that name.
- 9 A. Spreitzer.
- 10 Q. -- "Spreitzer, increasing their activation payment from 175
- 11 | to" --
- 12 THE COURT: Slow down, please.
- 13 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 14 Q. -- "from 175 to \$200 until January 31st, 2015, will get us
- 15 | incremental 2,500 to 3,500 activations per month starting
- 16 October." Do you see that?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. "I'm requesting the same economics as we provide," and you
- 19 | list some more OE retailers, right?
- 20 A. Correct.
- 21 Q. And Mr. DeFranco approves that, right, "proceed"?
- 22 A. Correct. So can I comment?
- 23 Q. When I ask you a question.
- 24 A. Okay.
- 25 \parallel Q. So -- and then you have a private e-mail a little later in

- lacksquare the night, a little -- I think Mr. DeFranco's e-mail was at
- 2 || 7:23 p.m., and at 9:24, you email privately to Jim, right?
- 3 A. To Jim Spreitzer, correct.
- 4 Q. "Go get him." You want to recruit Alex to sell more DISH,
- 5 | right?
- 6 A. Yes, I want more DISH activations.
- 7 \mathbb{Q} . "Need activations. Please tell Alex that I worked my A-S-S
- 8 | off to get him additional economics." Do you see that?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. "I have also had to deal with all his issues related to
- 11 | sales." Do you see that?
- 12 A. Yes, I do.
- 13 Q. And then he says he's out hiring -- Jim replies he's out --
- 14 THE COURT: I'm sorry? What?
- 15 BY MR. GLASSER:
- 16 Q. Jim replies that he, being Alex, is out hiring people for
- 17 DISH this week, expanding the program. Do you see that?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. And, again, in January of 2007, Mr. Oberbillig forwards
- 20 | this e-mail to risk audit for reasons you don't know, right?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- 22 | Q. Again, with no comment, right, no comment from
- 23 Mr. Oberbillig?
- 24 A. That's all I see there, what you're showing me, sir. I
- 25 don't know -- I don't have knowledge of that.

- Q. I'm approaching you with Plaintiff's Exhibit 186.
- 2 MR. GLASSER: Your Honor, I have a certified copy of
- 3 Exhibit 186, and I move its admission.
- MS. ECHTMAN: Your Honor, we stand on our prior objections on rule -- on PX186, and subject to a motion in limine, 802, 401, 403, and 404.
- 7 THE COURT: All right. Overruled. Go ahead.

8 BY MR. GLASSER:

- 9 Q. Plaintiff's Exhibit 186 is a judgment by consent and
- 10 stipulated permanent injunction; is that correct?
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 Q. It was entered in the state of North Carolina in the County
- 13 of Wake, right?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. And it -- it governs a thing called Vitana Financial Group,
- 16 | a California corporation doing business as Satellite Systems
- 17 | Network, right?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And this gentleman we've just been discussing, Mr. Alex
- 20 | Tehranchi, right?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And the date is March 21st, 2005, right?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- 24 Q. And the date that the case started and the attorney -- I'm
- 25 sorry -- the State of North Carolina's Attorney General sued

- Satellite Systems was June 25th, 2004, right?
- 2 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 3 | Q. Let's turn to page 5 of this document, and it puts a
- 4 permanent injunction in place. It says, "The Defendants" --
- $5 \parallel$ and we already remember that we looked at that, Satellite
- 6 | Systems Network and Mr. Tehranchi, right?
- $7 \parallel A$. Yes, sir.
- 8 Q. -- "are hereby permanently restrained and enjoined" -- that
- 9 means they need to stop, right?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- "under North Carolina law from engaging in,
- 12 participating, making, causing to be made, or assisting in any
- 13 | manner or any capacity whatsoever, whether directly or
- 14 | indirectly, in concert with others, or through intermediary,
- 15 \parallel third party, business entity, or device, telephone solicitation
- 16 to telephone subscribers in the state of North Carolina who are
- 17 | signed up on the National Do Not Call Registry or who
- 18 previously communicated a desire to receive no further
- 19 | telephone solicitations from the Defendants, " right?
- 20 A. Yes, that's what it says.
- 21 Q. So your OE retailer is after March 25th, 2005, legally
- 22 ordered by the State of North Carolina to stop calling people
- 23 on the Do Not Call Registry, right?
- 24 A. Yes, based on this document. Obviously, I'm not aware of
- 25 | it at that time, but, yes, what you're showing me.

And then it says, "Moreover, Defendants are hereby 2 permanently restrained and enjoined from engaging in, 3 participating in, making or causing to be made, whether directly or indirectly, in concert with others, telephone 4 5 solicitations via automatic dialing and recorded message 6 players without the express consent of the residential telephone subscriber." 7 That's what you're -- in opening, you were present and 8 Mr. Bicks talked about automessaging and autodialing problems. 10 That covers that, right? 11 A. Yes. Q. Okay. And it's signed by a Superior Court judge, right, in 12 13 Wake County, North Carolina? 14 A. Yes. 1.5 Q. And I think you said you didn't know about it. I heard 16 that. 17 Dr. Krakauer gave a deposition on September 28th, 2011, that we talked about this morning with the North Carolina 18 19 Attorney General and a DISH lawyer named Victor Rao. Are you 20 saying that no one told you about that? 2.1 THE COURT: Told him about the deposition? 22 MR. GLASSER: Yes. 2.3 MS. ECHTMAN: Objection, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Well, what --

MR. GLASSER: I'm laying a foundation.

25