MARTHA GONZALEZ GILLES
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
228 WEBSTER STREET, #F
PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94301

(415) 326-9060

February 25, 1983

Mr. Charles S. Paul c/o Peter Wald, Esq. Heller, Ehrman, White & McAuliffe, Esqs. 44 Montgomery Street San Francisco, California 94104

Re: Magnavox v. Activision

Dear Mr. Faul:

Your deposition taken February 22, 1983, in the above matter has been completed.

The original of this deposition is being held in my office for 30 days, pending filing with the court, to afford you a reasonable opportunity to read and sign same. Please call and make arrangements if you wish to read and sign the original transcript. You may also read your attorney's copy of the deposition and submit any changes and/or corrections you may have in writing.

If I have not heard from you within the prescribed period of time, I will assume you are waiving your signature and will then file the deposition-original.

Very truly yours,

Martha Gonzalez Gilles

cc: Michael A. Ladra, Esq.
Thomas O. Herbert, Esq.
Theodore W. Anderson, Esq.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THE MAGNAVOX COMPANY, a)

corporation, and SANDERS)

ASSOCIATES, INC., a)

corporation,)

Plaintiffs,)

vs.)

ACTIVISION, INC., a)

corporation,)

Defendant.

No. C 82 5270 TEH

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Subpoena, and on Tuesday, February 22, 1982, commencing at the hour of 5:07 p.m., at Atari Incorporated, 1265 Borregas Avenue, Sunnyvale, California, before me, MARTHA GONZALEZ GILLES, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, License Number 3468, a Notary Public in and for the County of Santa Clara, State of California, there personally appeared

CHARLES S. PAUL,

who was called as a witness by the Defendant.

MARTHA GONZALEZ GILLES

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

228 WEBSTER STREET, #F
PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94301
(415) 326-9060

INDEX

2							
3	EXAMINATION	BY:	PAGE				
4	Mr.	Ladra	3				
5	Mr.	Anderson	29				
6	FURTHER EXA	MINATION BY:					
7	Mr.	Ladra	30				
8							
9	DEFENDANT'S	EXHIBITS:					
10	1	A multipage document entitled "Affidavit of	3				
11		Charles S. Paul."					
12	2	A document entitled "Deposition Subpoena to Testify or Produce Documents or Things," and	3				
13		"Notice of Taking Deposition" attached there- to, to Atari, Inc.					
14	3	A document entitled "Deposition Subpoena to Testify or Produce Documents or Things,"	3				
15 16		with "Schedule A" attached thereto, to Charles S. Paul					
17	4	A copy of a multipage document entitled "Non-Exclusive Cross-License for Video	10				
18		Games," dated June 8, 1976.					
19	5	A copy of a multipage document entitled	10				
		"Non-Exclusive Sublicense Agreement for Home Video Game Devices," dated October 1,					
20		1981.					
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

1				A	P	P	E	A	R	A	N	С	E	S			
2																	
3	For	the	Plaintiff						NE	EUN	IAN	١,	W	LLIAMS,	ANDERSON	3	

OLSON, ESQS. BY: THEODORE W. ANDERSON, ESQ. 4 77 West Washington Street 5 Chicago, Illinois 60602

WILSON, SONSINI, GOODRICH & ROSATI, ESQS.

BY: MICHAEL A. LADRA, ESQ. Two Palo Alto Square, Suite 900 Palo Alto, California 94304

> FLEHR, HOHBACH, TEST, ALBRITTON & HERBERT, ESQS. BY: THOMAS O. HERBERT, ESQ. Suite 3400, Four Embarcadero Center

> > HELLER, EHRMAN, WHITE & McAULIFFE, ESQS. BY: PETER WALD, ESQ. 44 Montgomery Street San Francisco, California 94104

> > San Francisco, California 94111

For the Defendant

For Atari Incorporated

8

and

10

7

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

.....

(Whereupon, a multipage document entitled "Affidavit of Charles S. Paul" was marked Defendant's Exhibit 1 for identification.)

(Whereupon, a document entitled "Deposition Subpoena to Testify or Produce Documents or Things," with "Notice of Taking Deposition" attached thereto, to Atari, Inc., was marked Defendant's Exhibit 2 for identification.)

(Whereupon, a document entitled "Deposition Subpoena to Testify or Produce Documents or Things," with "Schedule A" attached thereto, to Charles S. Paul, was marked Defendant's Exhibit 3 for identification.)

CHARLES S. PAUL,

having first been duly sworn by the Notary Public to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth was thereupon examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY MR. LADRA:

MR. LADRA: Okay. Skip, we'll dispense with the usual formalities since I'm sure you're aware of what this is all about, and I promise I won't keep you long. Maybe the first thing to settle is that we have marked the two subpoenas for the deposition Exhibits 2 and 3, respectively. Exhibit 2 is a 30(b) (6) subpoena to Atari in general, and I presume that you are the witness whom Atari has designated to respond to the 30(b)(6) subpoena --

MR. WALD: That's correct.

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR. LADRA: -- for Exhibit 2.

1 Now, attached to both those subpoenas was a list 2 of documents which we requested that you bring with you, and 3 I'm sure, Peter, that you've made a diligent search for those 4 documents and you have them? 5 MR. WALD: I have indeed, pursuant to our telephone 6 conversation this afternoon by which I understood you were 7 interested in getting hold of the license agreement between 8 and among Magnavox, Atari and Sanders, and I guess that's what 9 the '76 license, patent license agreement --10 MR. LADRA: Yes. 11 MR. WALD: That document, a copy of the Activision-12 Atari settlement agreement, and any correspondence between 13 Magnavox and Atari relating to Activision; I have searched the 14 files for those documents and there is no correspondence --15 taking the last in order, there is no correspondence between 16 Atari and Magnavox relating to Activision. 17 This is a copy of the Settlement Agreement and 18 Mutual Release between Activision and Atari settling that 19 litigation. And this is a copy of the signed 1976 patent 20 agreement among Sanders, Atari and Magnavox. 21 You already have those. THE WITNESS: 22 MR. LADRA: Just wanted to make sure that yours looks 23 the same as ours. Do you have copies for everybody? 24 MR. ANDERSON: 25 THE WITNESS: I really don't want this --Let's go off the record. MR. WALD: 26 (Discussion off the record.) 27

Let's go back on the record.

MR. LADRA:

1 Okay. Peter, have we pretty well gone through 2 what documents --3 MR. WALD: Yes. MR. LADRA: -- you produced? 5 MR. WALD: As I said, Mike, pursuant to our phone 6 conversation those were the ones I searched for and that's all 7 that I found. 8 MR. LADRA: There was one thing I didn't mention 9 to you, which was documents which we requested which were those 10 evidencing or relating to any work done by the Flehr, Hobach, 11 Test, Albritton & Herbert firm since January 1 of '78. I take 12 it you didn't look for those? 13 MR. WALD: I didn't look for those. 14 MR. LADRA: That's okay.' But I think that covers all 15 the categories. 16 All right. Mr. Paul, how long have you been working 17 for Atari? 18 Since July 1979. THE WITNESS: A 19 And since that time I take it you've had the same 20 position? 21 Yes, I've been general counsel. 22 Okay. Now, I'm going to show you what's been 23 previously marked as Exhibit 1 to this deposition, which is a copy of an affidavit which I presume you have signed. I want 24 you to take a look at it and make sure that's in fact an 25 affidavit that you recall signing and that is your signature on 26 27 the last page.

28

A

Yes.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Do you have copies for everybody? 2 MR. LADRA: I do have -- that's attached to your 3 memorandum. 4 MR. ANDERSON: Is that what you're actually using? 5 MR. LADRA: Yes, that's the affidavit. I'm sorry, 6 I should have made that explicit. 7 For the record, Exhibit 1 is a copy of the Affidavit 8 of Charles S. Paul which was filed in conjunction with the 9 plaintiff Magnavox Company's motion to disqualify counsel. 10 And I can't remember, did we get an answer to 11 that, Skip, that that is in fact the affidavit that you signed? 12 THE WITNESS: 13 Now I'd like to direct your attention to page 3 of 14 that affidavit, specifically paragraph 4, the last sentence 15 thereof, in which it states, quote, that "Mr. Herbert consulted 16 with technical employees of Atari concerning the subject matter 17 of that patent, possible prior art with respect to that patent, 18 and the validitty of that patent, and conducted extensive 19 searches for prior art with respect to that patent." 20 The question is do you know which Atari employees 21 Mr. Herbert spoke to? 22 Not specifically. A Well, to the best of your ability, could you 23 24 describe what classes of employees he spoke with at Atari, to 25 your knowledge? 26 A Engineers. 27 In any particular area? Q

Consumer engineering.

28

A

- Q Do you know --
- A Coin-op engineering.
- Q Okay. Do you know the subject matter of his conversations with those employees other than as set forth in this last sentence?
 - A Not other than as set forth in that sentence.
- Q Now, I take it at the time that Mr. Herbert conducted these interviews of Atari employees you were not with Atari?
 - A That's correct.
- Q Did you speak to anybody prior to the signing of this declaration concerning the subject matter of Mr. Herbert's conversations with employees of Atari?
- A Not immediately preceding the signing of this document.
- Q Well, I take it that at some point you did talk to somebody concerning what Mr. Herbert talked to Atari employees about; is that right?
 - A That's correct.
 - Q And with whom did you speak concerning that?
- A I don't specifically recall the conversations;
 however, late '79 and early '80 when I was first educating
 myself on the process that was involved in the litigation with
 Magnavox, '75, '76, the way that litigation had been resolved
 and the licenses that were in place, I came to understand
 the work that was done by the lawyers representing Atari in that
 litigation.
 - Q At any time did you learn of any confidential

between Magnavox and Atari. I'd like you to look at that and

```
tell me if that is in fact the license agreement which is
    referred to in the paragraph 5 of your affidavit.
3
              No, this is not the license agreement that's referred
4
    to.
5
                No?
           Q
6
           MR. ANDERSON: May I see whatever it is you showed him,
7
    please?
8
           MR. LADRA: Yes.
9
                Do you have an extra copy, Peter?
10
                          No, I don't. I just have one.
           MR. WALD:
11
           MR. LADRA:
                         Q Well, Mr. Paul, how many license
12
    agreements are you aware of that exist between Magnavox and
13
    Atari?
14
           THE WITNESS: A Two, one in 1975 or '6 and one in
15
    in 1981.
16
                Oh, there's a subsequent license agreement that
17
    was executed in '81?
18
                That's correct.
           A
19
               And this is the one, then?
           Q
20
               That's correct.
           A
21
               And there's a prior license agreement dated --
22
    what again?
23
                I don't know the exact date. I believe it's in
24
    September '75.
25
           MR. WALD:
                          Yes.
           MR. LADRA: Do you have that one, Peter?
26
27
           MR. WALD:
                           Is it this one?
28
           THE WITNESS:
                          June '76.
```

1 MR. WALD: Is this the one? 2 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's the one. 3 MR. LADRA: Okay. Do you mind if we mark that one and then we can have a copy of it later? 5 MR. WALD: Not at all. MR. LADRA: 6 Ask the Reporter to mark the license 7 agreement dated June 8, '76, as Defendant's Exhibit 4, and the one dated October 1, '81 as Defendant's Exhibit 5. 8 9 (Whereupon, a copy of a multipage document entitled "Non-10 Exclusive Cross-License for Video Games," dated June 8, 11 1976, was marked Defendant's Exhibit 4 for identification.) 12 (Whereupon, a copy of a multi-13 page document entitled "Non-Exclusive Sublicense Agreement 14 For Home Video Game Devices." dated October 1, 1981, was 15 marked Defendant's Exhibit 5 for identification.) 16 17 MR. LADRA: Q Okay. Skip, again just to clarify, 18 I'm showing you what's been marked as Defendant's Exhibit 4, which is the license agreement, appears to be between Magnavox 19 and Atari, dated June of '76. I'll ask you the same question, 20 if that's the license agreement referred to in paragraph 5 of 21 22 your affidavit. 23 THE WITNESS: Yes. Since I haven't had a chance to look through the 24 one dated '81, let me ask you, if you know, does the '81 license 25 agreement, Exhibit 5, cover the same patents licensed under 26 27 the Exhibit 4 license agreement? I believe some of the same patents.

Q Okay. Now, again because we haven't had a chance to look through it, and I assume the document will answer the question, but do you know if there are any payments that remain to be paid on this '81 license, Exhibit 5?

A I believe there are some payments that remain to be paid.

Q Can you tell from Exhibit 4 when the last payment was made on the '76 license?

A January 31, 1983.

Q Let's move on, then, to paragraph 6 of your affidavit.

The first sentence of that says, "Atari presently considers it to be in its best interest to remain a licensee under the Reissue 507 patent." And further that Atari "considers that it will be against its best interest for the Reissue 507 patent to be declared invalid or unenforceable by this Court."

I guess I'm more interested in the latter statement, and I'd like to know why, if you know, it would be against Atari's best interest for that patent to be declared invalid.

A We've paid a lot of money as a licensee under some patents.

- Q But those moneys have been paid; correct?
- A That's correct.
- Q Are you aware of any provision in the license that would allow you to seek reimbursement if the patent were declared invalid?
 - A No, I am not.
- Q Is that the only reason that you are aware of why Atari considers it against its best interest that the patent

be declared invalid?

- A Certainly the most important that comes to mind.
- Q Well --

A I can sit and speculate on other reasons, but that's the reason that first came to mind that I had in my mind when I signed this.

Q Well, I don't want you to guess or speculate, but I would like to know every single reason that Atari considers it to be against its best interest that the 507 patent be declared invalid. If that's the only reason, fine, but I want to be sure that there are no others.

- A That's all that presently comes to mind.
- Q Referring back to the first part of paragraph 6 where you state that Atari presently considers it to be in its best interest to remain a licensee under the 507 patent, can you tell me, please, why Atari presently considers it to be in its best interest to remain a licensee?

A We've paid a substantial amount of money as a licensee in support of the patents and we consider the -- that role as a licensee with that financial backdrop to be of some value.

Q Well, assuming that the reissue 507 patent is declared invalid, are you aware of any adverse effect that Atari would suffer as a result of that action?

MR. WALD: Other than what he's testified to?

THE WITNESS: I've already testified --

MR. LADRA: Q Well, you told me why you consider it against your best interest to have it declared invalid, and

I've asked a slightly different question. I've asked what adverse effect, if any, would Atari suffer if the patent were declared invalid.

THE WITNESS: A I've paid a lot of money for those patents to support those patents and I'd like value for the money.

Q Okay. So -- well, correct me if I'm wrong, but as I understand your testimony, what you are saying is that it is Atari's position that they would lose the value of the licenses they paid for if the patent were declared invalid.

- A The value would be compromised. Is that --
- Q That's fine. That's a good enough answer. If you would like to speak with your counsel --
 - A That's okay. Just go ahead.
- Q I'm more interested in finding all the reasons rather than getting any particular one.
 - A You got all the reasons that presently come to mind.
- Q Okay. Let's move on to paragraph 7. The latter part of that paragraph states that "Atari further believes that in their representation of Activision in this action, Mr. Herbert and his firm will make use of information concerning the reissue 507 patent obtained by Mr. Herbert and his firm during the course of their representation of Atari, some of which information was obtained by Mr. Herbert and members of his firm from discussions with Atari officers and employees held during the time Mr. Herbert and his firm represented Atari."

Now, is that statement in paragraph 7 one of the reasons that Atari feels that Mr. Herbert's representation of

Activision in the present suit is adverse to Atari? 1 2 Ask that question again. 3 Okay. I'll put it another way. 4 I'm asking whether the fact that Mr. Herbert 5 obtained information concerning the patent and the possible defenses during the course of his former representation of 6 7 Atari, whether that fact constitutes one of the grounds why 8 Atari asserts that Mr. Herbert's representation of Activision is adverse to Atari. 9 Atari's feeling of there being adversity in the 10 situation arises out of the fact that in 1975 and 1976 Mr. 11 12 Herbert's firm represented Atari in carefully examining those patents and looking at our products and looking at our business 13 and in talking to our people and in litigation up until the eve 14 of trial, and for him to now represent somebody else against 15 those patents to us presents a very clear picture of adversity, 16 and we feel that without any hesitation that it is inconsistent 17 with what we felt were that firm's obligations to this company. 18 Okay. I guess technically I should move to strike 19 because the answer was nonresponsive, but be that as it may, 20 what I'm concerned with is --21

You asked about adversity and I answered.

I asked a specific fact concerning adversity.

I think in the witness's restatement MR. WALD:

he --

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. LADRA: Okay.

MR. WALD: Well, I won't put words into his mouth.

MR. LADRA: Let's drop that for the moment and let's

1 move to another subject. Okay. Given the confidential nature of the document, I'm not going to have this marked as an exhibit to the deposition. 3 4 but I'm showing you a copy of the Settlement Agreement and 5 Mutual Release executed by and between Activision and Atari --6 MR. ANDERSON: I'd like to see a copy of it if you're 7 going to ask the witness about a document, either that or --8 Well, I'm going to ask the witness MR. LADRA: 9 one -- we're not going to discuss it if the witness is going to 10 lodge an objection. I tell you, why don't -- we can read 11 MR. WALD: 12 the one paragraph into the record. 13 MR. LADRA: Okay. No problem with reading that paragraph 14 THE WITNESS: 15 into the record. Let's just do that, then. 16 MR. LADRA: Would that be okay? 17 MR. WALD: 18 MR. LADRA: We're just going to discuss one paragraph. I have to hear it and hear what the MR. ANDERSON: 19 testimony is before I agree that that's okay. I'll have to 20 reserve whatever rights I have. 21 Well, we're not introducing the document, MR. WALD: 22 23 50 --Okay. MR. LADRA: 24 It's on page 7, Mike. MR. WALD: 25 Just for the record, the paragraph to which Mike 26 is referring is the Settlement and Mutual Release between Atari 27

and activision regarding the litigation in 1981 between those

two companies. The agreement itself is sealed under court order pursuant to protective order and is not to be released to outside

And I take it, Peter, that we're agreeing that paragraph -- what is that -- II(f)?

Paragraph II(f), page 7 of that agreement, may be read into the record for these purposes.

I'll just have to record my objection. I understand your concern, but the settlement agreement you're talking about doesn't appear to be at the present relevant to anything we're talking about here in the interrogation by the Activision counsel, and I just object to having a fragment of a document read into the record where I don't get to know what it's all about or what the purpose of the line of inquiry is.

Let's skip the reference to the agreement.

Mr. Paul, you are aware that there was a settlement agreement, however, entered into between Atari and Activision;

Correct.

And do you recall that as part of that settlement agreement Atari agreed to turn over to Activision copies of all files consistent with its confidentiality obligations to Magnavox, copies of all its files concerning its prior patent litigation with Magnavox to Aldo Test, save for those documents subject to the attorney-client or attorney work product privilege?

- That's not correct.
- What was your understanding of that provision?
- During the litigation that we had with Activision I A

had several conversations directly with Mr. Test and a number with people, I believe with you, expressing how we felt about Mr. Test's representation of Activision in the early investment stages and during the development of their product, and we thought that it was ethically difficult to understand how he would represent a company that was doing what Activision was doing at that point in light of the prior representation of Atari and in developing what we were asserting in part as trade secrets.

I had those conversations with Mr. Test, and my feelings were made clearly known to the parties in that litigation. And as part of concluding that litigation with Activision it therefore was natural that Mr. Test's work that he had done would be covered in part by being made available to him, in other words, Atari would make available to Mr. Test copies of those files.

Q Well, do you recall what files were made available to Mr. Test?

A No, no.

Q Well, could they have been the files concerning the Magnavox patent litigation or were those specifically excluded, as far as you understood?

A Those were clearly included.

MR. WALD: We were --

MR. LADRA: You want to go off the record, Peter?

MR. WALD: Yes.

MR. LADRA: Okay.

(Discussion off the record.)

```
1
           THE WITNESS: The position -- could you read back my
 2
    last answer to the last question?
 3
                 (Whereupon, the record was read by the Reporter.)
4
           THE WITNESS: They were his files. We returned his
5
    files to him.
6
           MR. LADRA:
                           Q
                                And, as far as you know, those
7
    files were in fact turned over?
8
           THE WITNESS:
                           A
                                I believe so.
9
                Do you know whether there was any purging of the
10
    files excluding confidential information or those covered by
11
    attorney work product and other privileges or attorney client?
12
                I have no knowledge of such.
13
                Do you know who was responsible for gathering up
14
    the files and turning them over to Mr. Test?
15
           A
                No, I do not.
16
                Who in your organization would know?
17
           A
                I don't know.
18
                          Does Mr. Test know?
           MR. WALD:
19
           MR. LADRA:
                           I don't know. Do you know, Peter?
20
           MR. WALD:
                          No, I don't.
21
                           Well, all right. If nobody knows, that's
           MR. LADRA:
22
    as far as we can go with that.
23
                           Off the record.
           MR. WALD:
24
                 (Discussion off the record.)
25
                                 Just to be clear about the files
           MR. LADRA:
26
    that were turned over, if you know was there any distinction
27
    made between files of Al Test individually or files of the
    Flehr, Hobach, Test, Albritton firm?
28
```

1 I don't know. THE WITNESS: A 2 MR. LADRA: Do you have any further thoughts, Peter? 3 Yes. We probably should check with Al MR. WALD: 4 on it, but as I understood, since you and I drafted this docu-5 ment, Michael, it was understood that Mr. Test had some files. 6 Yeah. No. I understand. MR. LADRA: 7 MR. WALD: And this was just to me his request 8 that we return those to him. 9 MR. LADRA: That's fine. And I'm sure Al will know 10 which files were returned pursuant to the ones he got from 11 Atari. 12 MR. WALD: Okay. 13 I probably asked this question, MR. LADRA: Q 14 but since it might prove to be an issue in the future, I take 15 it you don't know who was delegated the responsibiltiy of 16 turning over the Flehr, Hobach, Test files? 17 THE WITNESS: A No. Those files, I take it, were in Atari's possession? 18 I don't know. 19 A You don't know where they were located or who had 20 21 them? 22 No. I don't. A I might point out, too, that it just 23 MR. WALD: says copies of any files in its possession regarding patents, 24 so why don't we see what was turned over --25 26 MR. ANDERSON: What are you reading from now? Can we read the language in, Mike? MR. WALD: 27 Go ahead. 28 MR. LADRA:

1 Let's just read the language in from MR. WALD: 2 the settlement agreement on page 7, II(f). And I quote: 3 "To the extent consistent with confidentiality obligations to Magnavox, Atari will make available 5 to Aldo Test, Esq., copies of any files in its 6 possession regarding patents for video or game 7 electronics products owned or licensed by Magnavox, 8 save for those documents subject to attorney client 9 or attorney work product privileges." 10 And that is the paragraph that's been the subject 11 of the last testimony. 12 Yes. And that's, I think, all in the MR. LADRA: 13 agreement that refers to this subject. Now, I noted you appeared to be thinking hard about 14 15 who might have had the responsibility for gathering up these 16 documents and turning them over. Have you recalled? THE WITNESS: A That was notwhat I was thinking 17 about. I was thinking hard, though, about a six o'clock meeting. 18 19 Oh, oh. Do you know whether -- maybe this will just jog your memory. Was the Townsend & Townsend firm involved? 20 The Townsend & Townsend firm could have been 21 involved. 22 And is it possible that an attorney by the name of 23 24 Warren Kajawa --K-a-j-a-w-a, I believe. MR. HERBERT: 25 Does that name ring a bell? MR. LADRA: Q 26 THE WITNESS: A I know Warren Kajawa. 27

Okay. Do you recall whether he was involved in this

or not?

A No, I don't recall whether he was involved with this.

Q All right. Let's move on to the last paragraph of your declaration, and I'll paraphrase to keep things moving along here, but basically that last paragraph points out a portion of the settlement agreement --

MR. HERBERT: That's not the last paragraph.

MR. LADRA: I'm sorry. It's the second to the last paragraph.

THE WITNESS: Are you talking about paragraph 8?

MR. LADRA: Q Yes. Paragraph 8 basically recites that there's a settlement agreement between Magnavox and Atari, and a portion of that settlement agreement states that Mr. Herbert's firm will not actively participate in any litigation involving the reissue 507 patent in which Atari is not a party or in which no television game made by or for Atari is involved. And you go on to state that Atari never released Mr. Herbert or his firm from the obligation in paragraph 4 of the settlement agreement.

And the question is whether there was ever any conversation between anybody at Atari and anybody at the Flehr, Hobach, Test firm concerning this particular obligation, that you're aware of.

THE WITNESS: A Not only do I not recall a conversation with anyone at the Flehr, Hobach firm about a waiver of this obligation, but I don't ever recall a conversation with anybody at the Flehr, Hobach firm about any potential conflicts that may have arisen between work that they did for Atari at one

point and work that they were doing for a number of competitors of Atari at later times. 3 Other than your conversation with Al Test that you mentioned earlier? 5 A Yes. 6 Okay. So with that exception? 7 That was not a conversation about anything other than what I thought was an apparent conflict that I was bringing 9 to his attention. 10 But is it fair to state that that was the only 11 occasion that you recall ever talking to anybody at the Flehr, 12 Hobach firm? 13 Yes, about this issue. 14 Have you talked to them about other issues? 15 I don't recall. No, I don't recall. 16 Okay. Finally let's go to the last paragraph in Q 17 which you state Mr. Herbert's law firm continues to represent Atari in certain matters. 18 19 Simple question: What are those certain matters? 20 I don't know. I pay bills, you know, with some regularity, I approve bills that are submitted by Mr. Herbert's 21 firm, and the bills aren't for a large amount, and I don't take 22 a lot of time to delve into that. 23 But you have no idea, I take it, as to what the 24 work that's being billed for is? 25 No, I don't. 26 Peter, just as a request could we have --27 MR. LADRA:

Oh, what was the guestion?

28

THE WITNESS:

```
1
           MR. LADRA:
                           I'd asked what are the matters that you
    stated Mr. Herbert's firm continues to represent Atari on.
3
           THE WITNESS:
                           A
                                Some of the matters involve
4
    coordination of some offshore patents, I know, I mean because
5
    at one point I saw -- when I first saw a bill from them I said
6
    what is this? These are the guys that -- and I was told, oh,
7
    this is for some foreign patent annuities. And so I said --
8
           MR. LADRA:
                           Okay.
9
           MR. WALD:
                           You were about to ask me, Mike?
10
           MR. LADRA:
                           Yes. I was going to ask you, Peter,
11
    if at some point in the near future we could get copies of --
12
           MR. WALD:
                           Bills paid?
13
           MR. LADRA:
                           Yes, bills that have been paid.
14
           MR. WALD:
                          What period?
15
           MR. LADRA:
                           I guess since the termination of --
16
    why don't we say January 1 of '78 again.
17
           MR. WALD:
                           To the present?
18
                           Yes. There was that category of documents.
           MR. LADRA:
19
    '79, why don't you make it '79?
20
                           January '79?
           MR. WALD:
21
           MR. LADRA:
                           Yes.
22
           MR. WALD:
                          We can get those.
23
           MR. ANDERSON:
                          Whatever you produce I'd like to get
24
    those.
                          To be sure. January 1, '79, to the
           MR. WALD:
25
    present?
26
                           To the present.
           MR. LADRA:
27
           MR. WALD:
                           Whatever bills we have.
28
```

1 MR. LADRA: Whatever bills or other evidence of work 2 there was done by the Flehr, Hobach firm for Atari. 3 MR. WALD: Fine. THE WITNESS: Fine. MR. LADRA: Thanks. 6 Do you know whether the Flehr, Hobach firm has 7 ever been asked since January of 1980 for any opinion on any 8 patent matter or copyright or trademark matter? 9 I don't know. THE WITNESS: A 10 I take it there is an attorney in-house who would 11 be responsible for patent, copyright and trademark matters? 12 There are attorneys responsible for each of those 13 areas at Atari. 14 Why don't we just get their names for the record 15 and which areas they're responsible for. 16 Patent counsel at Atari is Michael Sherrard, 17 S-h-e-r-a-r-d. The attorney in charge of copyright and 18 trademark is Ken Nussbacher, spelled N-u-s-s-b-a-c-h-e-r. 19 And trademark? 20 Same quy. 21 Same guy, okay. Q 22 Now, when did you first become aware that there 23 was a lawsuit between Magnavox and Activision? 24 I don't recall. A Well, you have no recollection at all as to when? 25 I recall at some point learning of it. 26 A Well, let's try to get it this way. How do you 27

28

recall learning about it?

- 1
- A I believe I saw a press announcement.
- 2

prior to the filing of the lawsuit did you talk to anyone at

So I take it it's safe to say that at no time

The response is Atari is a licensee under these

- A
- Magnavox concerning the bringing of a lawsuit against Activision?
- 5
- A No, that's not safe to say.
- 6
- Q Well, I take it that you had such a conversation, then, at some point?

patents and we were negotiating with Magnavox during 1980 and

license agreement to cover certain new territories. It was a

commitment for this company, and as a licensee and as a party

to those negotiations we were interested in what efforts they

substantial cash outlay for this company and a substantial

were undertaking to license our other people with whom we

enjoyed the video game market. And as part of that inquiry

I was interested in what enforcement efforts would be -- were

under way, would be under way, what licensing efforts, you know,

what the program looked like that I was committing this company

'81 concerning the amending of our settlement agreement and our

7

8

- A I don't know what kind of conversation you're
- 9
- 10 Q Well, did you discuss with anybody at Magnavox at
- any time that you can recall the bringing of a lawsuit by
- 12 Magnavox against Activision?

Q

referring to.

- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- Q With whom at Magnavox did you speak?
- A Tom Briody.

to spend a fair amount of money on.

Q Do you know how to spell his last name?

1 B-r-i-o-d-y. A 2 Q Now, at that time were you informed that Magnavox 3 had any plans to bring a patent infringement lawsuit against Activision? 5 At what time? A 6 At the time you talked to Mr. Briody. Q 7 A I don't know what you are talking about. 8 Well, you said you had a conversation with Mr. Q 9 Briody --10 A I recall a conversation at some point during a 11 negotiation and I was -- I don't recall being informed of the 12 specific plan to bring a specific action against any company. 13 Well, did you mkae any suggestion to Mr. Briody 14 concerning a lawsuit that might be brought against Activision? 15 Not that I recall. I was very interested as a 16 licensee what was going to be done to enforce those patents and 17 to monitor that program we were spending millions of dollars 18 with. Well, did you make any suggestions at all concerning 19 20 how Magnavox should proceed to, shall we say, protect the 21 patents you were licensing? What do you mean? 22 Α 23 Did you make any suggestions to Mr. Briody concerning how Magnavox should proceed in its efforts to protect the 24 25 patents? Not beyond the scope of expressing concern that the 26 patents be either licensed or enforced if I was going to pay 27

and others in similar situations to me were going to make their

```
decisions like we made ours, and we made ours under the constant
2
    threat of litigation.
3
                 I take it there was no correspondence concerning
    the subject between you and anybody at Magnavox?
5
                Not that I recall.
6
           MR. WALD:
                            I checked the file that I saw today and
7
    there was no correspondence regarding that.
8
           MR. LADRA:
                            Incidentally, what files were searched,
9
    just Skip's?
10
           MR. WALD:
                            There were two files that were given
11
    to me by a legal assistant and they were from the corporate
12
    legal files, and they were entitled Magnavox and License
13
    Agreement, I believe, and they contained both copies of the
14
    license agreements and copies of royalty checks that were paid
15
    over to Magnavox from Atari.
16
           MR. LADRA:
                                 Skip, do you know who else in your
                            Q
17
    legal organization would have had contact with Mr. Briody
18
    or anybody at Magnavox?
19
           THE WITNESS:
                            A
                                 I believe I was the only one.
20
                 When did you first see this affidavit, Exhibit 1?
           Q
21
                 Some days before I signed it.
           A
22
            Q
                 Who prepared it, do you know?
23
                 I believe it was prepared by -- I don't know whether
            A
24
     it was prepared by Atari outside lawyers or Magnavox outside
25
     lawyers.
                 Okay. I take it you reviewed it before you signed
26
            Q
27
     it?
                 Yes, indeed.
28
            A
```

1 Did you make any changes in it? I believe there were some changes made. I can't 3 recall what they were. Do you recall who first contacted you concerning 5 your giving of an affidavit in this matter? 6 I think Mr. Briody. I'm not sure about that, 7 though. 8 Do you recall what he or whoever it was at Magnavox 9 said to you? 10 No. Let's take a very brief 30-second break. 11 MR. LADRA: 12 (Short recess.) 13 MR. LADRA: Just a couple more questions and I'll 14 conclude this. Skip, do you recall at the time that Magnavox 15 16 settled its lawsuit with Atari what products Atari had on the market? 17 18 THE WITNESS: A I was not working here. Well, do you know when the Atari 2600 video computer 19 20 system was introduced? It was introduced -- I'm not sure. I believe it 21 22 existed prior -- in developed form prior to the time Warner 23 acquired Atari, which was in 1976. Do you know when the product actually was marketed, 24 25 however? No. I don't recall. 26 All right. Could you tell me who are Atari's 27 patent counsel at the present time? 28

- A I really don't know with specificity.
- Q You've referred to them as Test files. Were they files that were turned over by Mr. Test to Atari first that were being returned, or what do you mean by Test files?

A If I have referred to them that way, I was using shorthand. They were files which concerned certain patents in our view belonged to Mr. Test. He requested them.

Q How did those happen to be in Atari's possession?

A I don't know whether they were technically in Atari's possession or not. I testified I don't know where they were and who was responsible for them.

MR. WALD: I just think that that may be information that is better gotten from Mr. Test. Pursuant to the settlement of the lawsuit Atari agreed to turn over files in its possession, if there were any, that related to Mr. Test's representation of Atari in the original Magnavox proceeding, and those are the files that Skip's been testifying about.

MR. ANDERSON: Q Those files, then, would be files relating to the Magnavox-Atari litigation in some way?

MR. WALD: Well --

THE WITNESS: A Could be.

MR. WALD: Yeah. I mean as specified by the settlement agreement they were files regarding patents for video game electronic products owned or licensed by Magnavox.

MR. ANDERSON: Q Well, is there any understanding when those files -- if there were any that were turned over to Mr.

Test, that he had the right to use them for any purpose contrary to Atari's best interest?

THE WITNESS: 1 A Certainly not. When they were turned over was there any under-2 standing as to what Mr. Test could or could not do with those 3 4 files, if there were any? Not specifically. I assume they'd be guided by 5 6 the same canon of ethics that every other lawyer we work with. 7 MR. ANDERSON: That completes the cross-examination. 8 MR. WALD: Just one more thing on your last question, 9 Mike, on firms from which Atari gets patent advice presently, as long as it's understood that the witness -- just to make 10 sure the testimony is consistent, Skip's already testified that 11 12 Flehr, Hobach does -- he does continue to pay checks, and we're going to get that evidence for you. 13 THE WITNESS: Those are just the primaries. There are 14 probably five other firms in there. 15 MR. LADRA: Let's clarify that. 16 17 EXAMINATION BY MR. LADRA: (Further) Q Does Atari continue to get advice MR. LADRA: 18 from the Flehr, Hobach firm? 19 I continue to pay Flehr, Hobach. 20 THE WITNESS: A 21 For what I pay we get services. MR. WALD: You know, we're getting copies of the 22 checks and I think that those services speak for themselves. 23 24 You can characterize them how you wish. Well, okay. Does Atari consider MR. LADRA: Q 25 those services legal services? 26 THE WITNESS: A Yes. 27 Did you ever at any time ask anybody at the Flehr, 28

```
Hobach firm for copies of files in their possession that
1
2
    relate to matters Atari was involved in?
              Not that I recall.
3
          A
               Do you know whether somebody at Atari had asked
4
    anybody at the Flehr, Hobach firm for files back concerning
5
    matters that Atari was involved in?
7
               I recall generally a conversation like that, that's
    why I was wondering, but I don't recall specifically what
    matter I was thinking about.
                          All right. That's fine. I think we're
          MR. LADRA:
10
    done. If Mr. Anderson has anything further --
11
          MR. ANDERSON:
                         No.
12
          MR. WALD:
                         Usual stipulations, Counsel?
13
                         Usual stipulations.
          MR. LADRA:
14
                         Meaning that Skip will get a chance to
          MR. WALD:
15
    review the testimony.
16
                         Yes, obviously he'll get a letter from
          MR. LADRA:
17
    Martha telling him that the deposition's ready.
18
                (Discussion off the record.)
19
20
           (Whereupon, the deposition was adjourned at 6:06 p.m.)
21
22
                                           Charles S. Paul
23
    Subscribed and sworn to before me
24
    this _____day
25
    of _____1983.
26
27
    Notary Public in and for the County
28
    of Santa Clara, State of California
```

infringing patents. Flaintiffs also object to this interrogatory to the extent it requests information concerning patents other than United States Patent Re. 28,507 as requesting information which is neither relevant to the subject matter of this action nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and as being premature. See also plaintiffs' response to interrogatory 38.

INTERROGATORY NO. 49

If the answer to INTERROGATORY NO. 48 is other than an unqualified negative:

- A. Identify the game cartridge(s) and the claim(s) infringed by each such cartridge; and
- B. State specifically where each element of each claim identified in response to part A of this interrogatory is found in the game cartridge(s) infringed thereby.

No response required.

INTERROGATORY NO. 50

Identify each television game console which Magnavox and Sanders contend constitutes an infringement of United States Letters Patent Re. 28,507 when one of Activision's game cartridges is used in combination therewith.

Plaintiffs object to this interrogatory as being vague and indefinite; only people, not things, are capable of infringing a patent. The combining of any television game console compatible with any one of the television game cartridges referred to in plaintiffs' response to interrogatory 38 with such a cartridge and the use of that

ļ.

EXHIBIT B