## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)
Plaintiff,	) CV No. 17-2511
VS.	<pre>Washington, D.C. April 10, 2018 2:53 p.m.</pre>
AT&T, INC., ET AL.,	) Afternoon Session
Defendants.	) Day 11

TRANSCRIPT OF BENCH TRIAL PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD J. LEON
UNITED STATES SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

## APPEARANCES:

For the Government: Craig W. Conrath Eric D. Welsh Donald G. Kempf, Jr. Andrew Finch, Esquire Claude F. Scott, Jr. Frederick Young Lawrence A. Reicher Shobitha Bhat U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Antitrust Division 450 Fifth Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20530 (202) 532-4560 craig.conrath@usdoj.gov eric.welsh@usdoj.gov donald.kempf@usdoj.gov andrew.finch@usdoj.gov claude.scott@usdoj.gov frederick.young@usdoj.gov lawrence.reicher@usdoj.gov

shobitha.bhat@usdoj.gov

## APPEARANCES CONTINUED

For Defendant AT&T and DirecTV Group Holdings, LLC:

Katrina M. Robson O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP 1625 Eye Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 220-5052 krobson@omm.com

Daniel M. Petrocelli M. Randall Oppenheimer O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP 1999 Avenue of the Stars 8th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067 (310) 553-6700 dpetrocelli@omm.com roppenheimer@omm.com

Michael L. Raiff
Robert C. Walters
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
2100 McKinney Avenue
Suite 1100
Dallas, TX 75201
(214) 698-3350
mraiff@gibsondunn.com
rwalters@gibsondunn.com

For Defendant
Time Warner, Inc.:

Kevin J. Orsini
Peter T. Barbur
CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP
Worldwide Plaza
825 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY 10019
(212) 474-1140
korsini@cravath.com
pbarbur@cravath.com

## APPEARANCES CONTINUED William P. Zaremba Court Reporter: Registered Merit Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter Official Court Reporter U.S. Courthouse 333 Constitution Avenue, NW Room 6511 Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3249 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription

- - -

WITNESS INDEX

- - -

<u>WITNESSES</u> <u>DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS</u>

GOVERNMENT'S:

MADISON BOND 2055 2061 DANIEL YORK 2073 2081

- - -

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

- - -

GOVERNMENT'S IDENTIFIED ADMITTED

PX462 2078

```
PROCEEDINGS
 1
               (Closed session)
 2
 3
               DEPUTY CLERK:
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
               THE COURT:
12
13
14
15
               THE WITNESS:
16
               THE COURT:
               MR. SCOTT:
17
18
19
     BY MR. SCOTT:
20
          Q
21
          Α
22
          Q
23
24
          Α
25
          Q
```

			2056
4			
1			
2			
3	A		
4 5	Q		
5			
6	A		
7	Q		
8			
9	A		
10	Q		
11	A		
12	Q		
13			
14	A		
15	Q		
16			
17			
18	A		
19	Q		
20			
21	A		
22			
23			
24			
25			

		2057
1	Q	
2		
3		
3 4 5		
5	A	
6 7	Q	
8		
9	A	
10		
11		
12	Q	
13		
14		
15	A	
16		
17	Q	
18	A	
19	Q	
20		
21	A	
22		
23		
24	Q	
25	A	

			2058
1			
2	Q		
3	A		
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9	Q		
10			
11			
12			
13	A		
14	Q		
15			
16			
17	A		
18			
19	Q		
20	A		
21	Q		
22			
23			
24			
25			

		2039
1	A	
2	Q	
	Q A	
3	A	
4 5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15	Q	
16	А	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	Q	
25	A	

1	Q			
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7	А			
8				
9				
10				
11				
10 11 12	Q			
13 14 15 16				
15	А			
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
           Q
 7
 8
 9
10
          Α
11
           Q
12
13
           Α
14
           Q
15
16
17
18
19
          Α
20
21
                MR. SCOTT:
22
                THE COURT:
23
24
     BY MR. ORSINI:
25
           Q
```

1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6	A				
7					
8					
9					
10					
10 11					
12					
13					
14					
14 15					
16					
17					
18					
19	Q				
20					
20 21					
22					
22 23	A				
24 25					
25					

		2003
1	Q	
2	~	
3		
4		
5	A	
6	Q	
7		
8	A	
9	Q	
10		
11	А	
12	Q	
13	A	
14	Q	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	А	
20	Q	
21	А	
22	Q	
23		
24		
25	A	

			2064
1			
2			
3	Q		
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	А		
9	Q		
10			
11			
12	А		
13	Q		
14	А		
15	Q		
16			
17			
18	А		
19	Q		
20			
21	А		
22	Q		
23			
24			
25	А		

```
Q
 1
 2
 3
           Α
 4
           Q
           Α
 5
 6
           Q
 7
 8
 9
           Α
10
           Q
11
12
           Α
13
           Q
14
15
16
           Α
17
           Q
18
19
           Α
20
                MR. ORSINI:
21
                THE COURT:
22
                THE WITNESS:
23
                THE COURT:
24
25
```

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	THE WITNESS:
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	THE COURT:
23	
24	
25	

1		
2		
3		
4		
5	THE	WITNESS:
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14	THE	COURT:
15	THE	WITNESS:
16		
17		
18		
19	THE	COURT:
20		
21		
22		
23	THE	WITNESS:
24		
25		

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
                 THE COURT:
 9
                 THE WITNESS:
10
                 THE COURT:
11
                 THE WITNESS:
12
                 THE COURT:
13
14
15
                MR. SCOTT:
16
                THE COURT:
17
18
19
                MR. WALTERS:
20
                 THE COURT:
21
22
                MR. WALTERS:
23
                 THE COURT:
24
                MR. CONRATH:
25
```

```
1
 2
                THE COURT:
 3
                MR. CONRATH:
 4
 5
                 THE COURT:
 6
 7
 8
                MR. WALTERS:
 9
10
11
                THE COURT:
12
13
                MR. WELSH:
14
15
                THE COURT:
16
                MR. WELSH:
17
                 THE COURT:
18
                MR. WELSH:
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	THE	COURT:
2	MR.	WELSH:
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	MR.	WALTERS:
8	THE	COURT:
9		
10	MR.	WALTERS:
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
MR. WELSH:
 1
 2
 3
                THE COURT:
 4
 5
                MR. WELSH:
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
                THE COURT:
25
```

```
1
                MR. WELSH:
 2
 3
 4
                THE COURT:
 5
 6
                MR. WELSH:
 7
                THE COURT:
 8
                MR. WELSH:
 9
10
                MR. WALTERS:
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
                THE COURT:
18
19
20
                MR. WELSH:
21
                THE COURT:
22
                DEPUTY CLERK:
23
24
                (Recess from 3:15 p.m. to 3:41 p.m.)
25
```

```
DEPUTY CLERK: The United States District Court
 1
 2
     for the District of Columbia is again in session, the
 3
     Honorable Richard J. Leon presiding. God save the United
     States and this Honorable Court. Please be seated and come
 5
     to order.
 6
               Your Honor, we are back in public session,
 7
     re-calling Civil Action No. 17-2511, the United States of
 8
     America v. AT&T, Inc., et al.
 9
               THE COURT: All right. Re-call your next witness.
10
               MR. WELSH: Thank you, Your Honor.
               The United States re-calls Mr. Daniel York as an
11
12
     adverse party witness.
1.3
               THE COURT: All right.
14
               Mr. York, you remain under oath, okay?
15
               THE WITNESS: Okay.
16
               THE COURT: Very Good.
17
     DANIEL YORK, ADVERSE WITNESS FOR THE GOVERNMENT, HAVING BEEN
18
     PREVIOUSLY SWORN, RESUMED THE STAND AND TESTIFIED FURTHER AS
19
     FOLLOWS:
20
               MR. WELSH: May I proceed, Your Honor?
2.1
               THE COURT: You may proceed.
2.2
               MR. WELSH: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
23
                          DIRECT EXAMINATION
24
     BY MR. WELSH:
25
               Mr. York, good afternoon.
```

- Good afternoon. 1 2 First of all, Mr. York, I just want to start off 3 by asking you, when we broke with your testimony last week, 4 His Honor spoke to you about your testimony and not --5 telling you you should not be speaking with others about it, 6 and I wanted to just follow up on that. 7 Have you spoken with anyone about the testimony 8 that you gave last week, sir? 9 No, sir. 10 And with respect to the upcoming testimony today, Q 11 have you spoken with anyone, including your counsel, about 12 that? 1.3 No, sir. 14 Have you been provided any notes or any comments Q 15 by anyone, including counsel, about your testimony? 16
  - Α No, sir.
- 17 Q Okay. Great.
- 18 Let's now just move on to questions I have for you 19 today, which are very few.
- 20 Mr. York, in 2014 -- I want to get us all 21 situated. So back in 2014, you were familiar with the 2.2 Dodgers channel; is that correct?
- 23 Α Correct.
- 24 Okay. And that was SportsNet LA; is that correct?
- 25 Α That's the name of it, yes.

```
All right. And Time Warner Cable owns
 1
 2
     SportsNet LA and was licensing the rights out at that time;
 3
     is that true?
                    Guggenheim actually owns SportsNet LA.
 5
     Time Warner Cable funds the network.
 6
               Okay. But Time Warner Cable is involved in the
 7
     aspect of SportsNet LA, correct?
 8
               Correct.
 9
               Okay. And now, back then, DirecTV did not carry
10
     the Dodgers channel, true?
11
               We did not carry SNLA, no.
12
          Q
               SNLA, right, SportsNet LA, right?
1.3
               Correct.
14
          0
               And AT&T at that time also did not carry
15
     SportsNet LA, true?
16
          Α
               Correct.
17
          Q
               And Charter also did not carry SportsNet LA, true?
18
          Α
               In 2014?
19
               Yes, sir, uh-huh.
          0
20
          Α
               Correct.
21
               Okay. Again, in 2014, Cox did not carry
2.2
     SportsNet LA, true?
23
          Α
               Amongst others, yes.
24
               Now, again, from your perspective at DirecTV at
25
     the time in content negotiations, you were interested in
```

```
getting the price of SportsNet LA down lower than what it
 1
 2.
     was being offered to DirecTV at the time; isn't that fair?
 3
          Α
               Yeah.
 4
               As we do in many negotiations, we try and get a
 5
     good price.
 6
               And you had conversations with your boss,
 7
     Mike White. He was a CEO of DirecTV. You had
 8
     communications with him during that time frame about this
 9
     situation involving SportsNet LA; isn't that right?
10
               Some, I believe so.
               All right. And in your communications with
11
12
     Mr. White, Mr. White told you that DirecTV would have more
13
     leverage in the negotiations regarding SportsNet LA if
14
     DirecTV and the other distributors stuck together in those
15
     negotiations, true?
16
               I don't believe that's true.
17
               MR. WELSH: Your Honor, I have an exhibit,
     consistent with Your Honor's order.
18
19
               May I approach?
20
               THE COURT: What's the number?
2.1
               MR. WELSH: It's PX462, Your Honor.
2.2
               THE COURT:
                          Yes. Okay.
23
               MR. WELSH: May I approach the witness,
24
     Your Honor?
25
               THE COURT:
                           You may.
```

```
BY MR. WELSH:
 1
 2.
               Mr. York, you have Plaintiff's Exhibit PX462.
 3
     Do you recognize that, sir, as an exchange of e-mails
 4
     between yourself and your boss, Mr. White, March 15 and
 5
     March 16, 2014?
 6
          Α
               I do.
 7
               You see the bottom email is from Mr. White to you,
 8
     and then you have your response; is that correct?
 9
               Correct.
               And the exchange that's occurring here, the "re"
10
11
     line is Dodgers, correct? Do you see at the very top of the
12
     exhibit?
1.3
          Α
               Yes.
               And what's going on in your exchange with
14
15
     Mr. White on these, in these emails, on these two days
16
     relates to the status of the offers being made with respect
17
     to the Dodgers SNL -- SportsLeague -- SportsNet LA offering,
18
     correct?
19
               Yes. This email is primarily about suggestions on
          Α
20
     new proposals that we could make for carriage.
2.1
               But it had to do with the Dodgers channel --
          Q
2.2
          Α
               Correct.
23
               -- simply put, correct?
          Q
24
               That -- yes.
          Α
25
               MR. WELSH:
                           Okay. Your Honor, I move for
```

```
admission of PX462.
 1
 2.
               MR. WALTERS: Your Honor, we have no objection if
 3
     it's under seal and that it be admitted on a basis that the
     Court has admitted pre-transactions since 2014 documents as
 4
 5
     well under that protocol. On that basis, we have no
 6
     objection.
 7
               THE COURT: It will be admitted under seal and
 8
     will be treated only as to the company he's worked for at
 9
     the time -- the company he was working for at the time.
                              (Government's Exhibit PX462
10
                               received into evidence under seal.)
                           May I proceed, Your Honor?
11
               MR. WELSH:
12
               THE COURT:
                           You may.
13
               MR. WELSH:
                           Thank you.
14
     BY MR. WELSH:
15
               Now, Mr. York, Mr. White starts off the email at
          0
16
     the bottom by talking about the Dodgers channel, correct?
17
     He's been thinking further about the Dodgers?
18
          Α
               Correct.
19
               And Mr. White goes on to mention in his email to
20
     you, he states, "Seems like we may have more leverage if we
2.1
     all stick together."
2.2
               He says that, correct?
23
          Α
               That's one of the sentences, yes.
24
               And, again, what he was telling you in his email
25
     was that if the distributors all stuck together with
```

DirecTV, there would be greater leverage to get the price 1 2. down from the offering by Time Warner Cable; isn't that 3 true? I wouldn't say that definitively as what he meant 5 at all. 6 Well, you see when he says there that he had 7 not -- he had not realized that Time Warner only has 8 something like a 35 percent share. 9 Do you see that? 10 Α Yes. And what he's talking about there and what you 11 12 understood was that Time Warner only had a small share of 1.3 the market for the Dodgers channel, correct? 14 It depends on the definition of the market, the 15 Dodgers footprint is very expansive. It goes to Hawaii, 16 down almost, I believe, to the Mexican border, to Nevada. 17 Their footprint or their marketshare in that broad 18 footprint was probably around this number. They probably 19 have two-thirds marketshare actually in the Dodgers foot 20 present, which is really Los Angeles, L.A. County. 2.1 But what he's referring to there is the 35 percent 2.2 marketshare; isn't that true? 23 Α Yeah, that's what it says. 24 And takeaway from that, at least from his

understanding as it was communicated to you, was that with

the 35 percent marketshare, that left 65 percent with the 1 2. other distributors; isn't that the case? 3 That would be the math, yes. 4 Okay. And he's suggesting here that if the other 5 65, including DirecTV, stuck together, then that could help 6 drive price down, right? 7 I don't -- it could have been about internal 8 discussions that we were having. We had lot of debate about 9 what to offer, how did we value it, finance, marketing, PR, 10 external affairs. 11 We had a debate on how we were going to 12 communicate internally and externally in trying to get 1.3 everybody aligned on that. That could have been what he's referring to. 14 15 But that's not what you understood because that's 16 not how you responded. 17 You didn't respond back to him to say, hey, well 18 our internal folks, yeah, I agree our internal folks need to 19 be on the same page. 20 You didn't say that, did you? 2.1 I did not. Α 2.2 Q Right. 23 What you actually said in response was, "Agreed. 24 Others holding firm is key." 25 Those are your words, sir, aren't they?

1	А	Yes.
	A	
2		After many sentences about what the offer should
3	be.	
4	Q	Right. But what you told him in exchange was,
5	"Others h	olding firm is key."
6		And then you went on to mention other
7	distributors, didn't you?	
8	А	I did, yes.
9	Q	And in 2014, you had communications with your
10	counterparts at these distributors about the Dodgers	
11	channel,	didn't you?
12	А	Yes. There were many business issues that we
13	discussed, yes.	
14	Q	And that would include Mr. Slater at AT&T before
15	the merger, correct?	
16	А	That's correct.
17		MR. WELSH: No further questions, Your Honor.
18		Thank you.
19		THE COURT: All right.
20		Cross-exam or redirect?
21		MR. WALTERS: Very briefly, Your Honor.
22		THE COURT: I don't know what to call it, really.
23		
24		CROSS-EXAMINATION
25	BY MR. WALTERS:	

Q Mr. York, was it your view during this time frame that -- well, let me back up.

Why is it that you ultimately, at DirecTV, decided not to sign up the Dodgers?

A It, in my 30 years of doing content licensing,
I have never seen a worse deal than the deal that was
presented to us to carry the Dodgers.

Just before that offer came in, we carried a network that had the Dodgers, the Clippers and the Ducks on it that cost us probably almost a dollar less per subscriber per month than the offer we got from SNLA for carriage of the Dodgers. It was an insane offer.

We made a very aggressive set of counterproposals, got no movement whatsoever, and couldn't come to terms to carry it.

We desperately wanted to carry the Dodgers and still do.

- Q Do you carry the Dodgers to this day?
- 19 A We do not.

2.2

- Q How is it that you came to understand or believe that others might not likewise sign up the Dodgers during this time frame?
- A Numerous sources, starting with Time Warner Cable themselves. In the very first meeting that we had where they pitched the network to us, they said, these are our

```
economics; we assume that there will never be Dish carriage.
 1
 2.
               It was widely reported in the press. I think Dish
 3
     was out with a public statement.
 4
               We had multiple reporters calling us saying that
 5
     it appears they're not having any luck with carriage.
 6
               We had Time Warner Cable coming after us saying,
 7
     it's really about you.
               We had Time Warner Cable run a full-page ad in the
 8
 9
     L.A. Times touting examples or specific confidential points
10
     in our proposal to them, only about DirecTV.
11
               It was pretty obvious that they were not having
12
     much luck getting distribution with anybody but
1.3
     Time Warner Cable themselves.
14
               In your email with Mr. White, you write that it
15
     was -- that it didn't look like Dish was going to carry the
16
     Dodgers.
17
               Do you recall that?
18
               Yes.
          Α
19
               Okay. How did you come to believe that was the
20
     case?
21
               This was a few months after, two and a half months
2.2
     after Time Warner told us that. And it was, I believe it
23
     was out in the press where Dish had made some statement that
24
     they didn't intend to care the Dodger network.
```

Your Honor, I'd like to mark, just

MR. WALTERS:

```
for identification, DX933.
 1
 2.
               THE COURT: What's the number?
 3
               MR. WALTERS: 933.
               THE COURT: For identification?
 4
 5
               MR. WALTERS: Yes, sir.
 6
               May I approach, Your Honor?
 7
               THE COURT: You may.
 8
     BY MR. WALTERS:
 9
               Now, Mr. York, this is a March 4th L.A. Times
10
     article regarding the issue of the Dodgers.
11
               Do you see that?
12
               THE COURT: What year?
13
               MR. WALTERS: March 4th of 2014, Your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: '14?
15
               MR. WALTERS: Yes, sir.
16
               THE COURT: All right.
17
     BY MR. WALTERS:
18
               And could you recall for us the date of the other
          Q
19
     exhibit, the Exhibit 462. I believe that's dated
20
     March 16th?
21
               March 16th, yes, 2014.
2.2
          Q
               So this March 4th article in the L.A. Times
23
     relates that -- do you see in the second full paragraph, it
24
     begins "negotiations"?
25
          Α
               Yes.
```

```
In the second sentence, it says, "But one provider
 1
 2
     is unlikely to carry the channel, according to Joe Flint of
 3
     the L.A. Times. Dish Network Executive Vice President
 4
     David Shull discussed their stance."
 5
               It goes on to say, "Satellite broadcaster
 6
     Dish Network isn't interested in playing ball with the
 7
     Dodgers. In an interview, David Shull said the majority of
 8
     Dish's LA customers don't care about getting SportsNet LA,
 9
     the new Dodger-owned pay-TV channel that launched last
10
     month."
11
               Do you see that?
12
               I do, yes.
13
               Do you recall this article as being one of several
14
     that announced what Dish's position was at the time?
15
          Α
               Yes.
16
               And was it on that basis that you communicated to
17
     Mr. White some two weeks later?
18
          Α
               Absolutely.
19
               One last question.
          0
20
               To the very best of your recollection, Mr. York,
21
     did you in any way coordinate, collude, or conspire
2.2
     regarding the terms of carriage of the L.A. Dodgers with any
23
     other distributors?
24
               Absolutely not.
25
               MR. WALTERS:
                             Thank you, sir.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: You're excused.
 2.
               THE WITNESS:
                             Thank you.
 3
               THE COURT:
                          You may step down.
 4
               All right.
                           We have some deposition excerpts that
 5
     the defense would like to be read out of order as part of
 6
     its case, and the government is going to read some of its
 7
     own from the same deposition.
 8
               Correct?
 9
               MR. PETROCELLI: Yes, that's correct, Your Honor.
10
               THE COURT: So this is a deposition of -- let's
11
    put the name on the record there of who.
12
               MR. WALTERS: His name is Randy Sejen, S-e-j-e-n.
13
               THE COURT: And what's his position?
14
               MR. WALTERS: He was the content negotiator at
15
     Cable ONE, which is based in Phoenix. It's a mid-sized
16
    MVPD, and he was the content negotiator until March of 2017.
17
               THE COURT: All right.
18
               And he was deposed when?
19
               MR. WALTERS: He was deposed earlier this year.
20
               MR. JONES:
                          February 13th, 2018, Your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: All right. He couldn't be with us
22
     today, unfortunately. We would like to get this -- the
23
     parties would like to get this in before the expert
24
     witnesses testify in the next two days.
25
               So who's going to be playing the role of
```

```
Mr. Sejen.
 1
 2.
               MR. WALTERS: We have Mr. Rich Roschen.
 3
               THE COURT: Come on up, Mr. Roschen.
 4
               THE WITNESS:
                             Thank you.
 5
               THE COURT: We're going to swear you to read it
 6
     exactly as it's in that -- read it exactly like it's in
 7
     there, all right?
 8
               THE WITNESS: To the best of my ability,
 9
     Your Honor.
10
               THE COURT: All right.
11
               And who's going to be questioning him?
12
               MR. WALTERS: So, at Your Honor's direction, both
1.3
     T and --
14
               MR. CONRATH: Your Honor, from our side, my
15
     colleague, Fred Young will be handling the questions.
16
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Young.
17
               MR. WALTERS: And unless you prefer to do
18
     otherwise, we understand the way we will do this is I will
19
     ask our questions, and the DOJ will then ask their
20
     questions. And we'll just do this in sequence in the way
21
     that the testimony appears in the deposition. And we're
2.2
     prepared to do so if that works for you.
23
               THE COURT:
                           I thought the idea was that you were
24
     going to read them in the order in which they appear.
```

In the deposition.

MR. WALTERS: Yes, sir.

```
So we'll go back and forth as they appear in the
 1
 2
     deposition.
 3
               THE COURT:
                           Right.
 4
               So you'll read the ones you want in, and he'll
 5
     read the ones he wants in as they appear throughout the
 6
     text?
 7
               MR. JONES:
                           Jones, that's correct, Your Honor.
 8
               MR. WALTERS: That's correct, Your Honor.
 9
               THE COURT: Very good.
10
               MR. WALTERS: If that's your pleasure.
11
               THE COURT: That would be great.
12
               MR. WALTERS: We'll do that.
13
               We also have, for the Court, copies of the
14
     transcript and a coversheet that actually identifies the
15
     particular pages.
16
               I thought the court reporter would prefer that; as
17
     well as there are four or five deposition exhibits that are
18
     discussed. They're used as point of departures. We don't
19
     intend to offer any of those into evidence. They're simply
20
     for context and reference.
2.1
               THE COURT: Okay.
2.2
               MR. WALTERS: And the number for the deposition
23
     transcript is DX930, marked for identification.
24
               THE COURT: All right. What page are we starting
25
     on here?
```

```
MR. WALTERS: And happily, Your Honor, both sides
 1
 2
     have agreed there will be no -- nobody will interpose any
 3
     objections. So we'll do this as efficiently as possible.
               THE COURT:
 4
                           Okay.
 5
               (Randolph Sejen deposition read into the record.)
 6
     BY MR. WALTERS:
 7
          Q
               Good morning, Mr. Sejen.
 8
               Good morning.
 9
               THE COURT: Very realistic courtroom.
10
               MR. WALTERS: We're nothing if not literal,
11
     Your Honor.
12
     BY MR. WALTERS:
13
               I'd like to learn a little bit about your
14
     background and how you fit into the content negotiation
15
     aspect of Cable ONE's business. But this might help focus
16
     and maybe even, with any luck, limit the deposition today.
17
               If I understand correctly, you're retired; is that
18
     right?
19
               Yes. I retired in March of last year, so it's
20
     been almost a year now.
21
               So March of 2017?
          Q
2.2
          Α
               '17, correct.
23
          Q
               Okay.
24
               Page 9.
25
          Α
               Oh.
```

```
And the last four years I was at Cable ONE, I was
 1
 2
     the chief content negotiator.
 3
               THE COURT:
                           Huh-uh. Chief contract negotiator.
 4
               THE WITNESS: Chief contract negotiator.
 5
     Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: All right.
 7
               THE WITNESS: I apologize.
 8
               THE COURT: Let's get it right.
 9
               THE WITNESS: So I had dealt with Turner through
10
     two contract renewals, as well as virtually all other
11
     programmers had contracts expire or be renewed within that
12
     four-year period that I was overseeing the process.
13
     BY MR. WALTERS:
14
               Let's turn to page 12, line 7.
15
               Okav.
                      Well, that's helpful. Why don't -- this
16
     would also help me focus a little bit on the questioning.
17
               Can you just give me a brief description of your
18
     background in particular, how you got into content
19
     negotiations and what your role was here at Cable ONE.
20
          Α
               Okay.
21
               I worked for Cable ONE for 31 years before
2.2
     retiring last year. And the first 27 of those years I was
23
     in finance department, primarily worked on budgets,
24
     forecasts, but also oversaw programming costs.
25
          Q
               Uh-huh.
```

And eventually or throughout a course of 15 years, 1 2 I gravitated more and more toward the programming world, 3 I think. 4 And I started out just providing financial 5 analysis of potential deals to our chief negotiator at that 6 point in time. 7 Page 13, continue, please. 8 And gradually, like I said, over the course of 9 15 years, I took on more and more responsibilities in the 10 programming area. 11 And then, when Jerry retired or kind of moved on 12 in his last year with Cable ONE, I became the chief 1.3 negotiator for the last four years. 14 Was that, were those your exclusive 15 responsibilities, or did you also have finance 16 responsibilities? 17 By the time I moved to programming for the last 18 four years, that was all I did. 19 Okay. All right. 0 20 Now, was there any particular training that went 21 into that, or was it just sort of a learn on the job? 2.2 Primarily, learn on the job. 23 Like as I said, I had been involved in the process 24 for many years, and I sat in on all the meetings with Jerry

and took the lead in many of the negotiations.

```
I read some books about negotiating and whatever
 1
 2
     else, but I didn't have any formal training.
 3
               Page 15, please, sir.
 4
               Okay. If I understand correctly -- and I'm not
 5
     sure I do -- but were there under your tenure, if you will,
 6
     were there three blackouts or takedowns or whatever you want
 7
     to call it, Turner, Viacom, and maybe Northwest
 8
     something-or-other; is that right?
 9
               Turner and Viacom, yes. I don't recall Northwest.
10
          Q
               Okay.
11
               Okay. And maybe not. I could be wrong.
12
               It could be a retran.
13
               MR. WALTERS: All right.
14
     BY MR. JONES:
15
               Okay. Did you have in mind when you went into a
16
     negotiation, based on those considerations and your own
17
     assessment, for what you were prepared to pay and what you
18
     were prepared to do; and then beyond that, you were prepared
19
     to potentially go dark on a particular network or channel?
20
               Cable ONE had evolved to that point, yes, had
21
     evolved to that point.
2.2
               The concept of a cable operator just walking away
23
     from a programming family was somewhat unheard of until
24
     2013, 2014, I think.
25
               The industry had evolved to a point where I think
```

```
the partnership was honestly broken and that the programmers
 1
 2
     were just trying to raise rates to anything that they could
     get from you. And they were trying to force us to carry
 3
 4
     secondary or minor networks at very little significance just
 5
     to earn more license fee money from us.
 6
               We knew going in, we knew what our programming
 7
     budget and forecast was for costs, what we could afford, to
 8
     some extent. It was a major decision, though, to draw a
 9
     line in the sand and say, we're willing to walk away from
10
     this.
11
          0
               Sure.
12
               THE COURT:
                          What page are you on there?
13
               MR. JONES: Page 24. I just read line 23,
14
     Your Honor.
15
               THE COURT:
                           24. All right.
16
               Because it's not highlighted in this one.
17
     Interesting.
18
               It's not on the index either.
19
               MR. WALTERS: That --
20
               THE COURT: You better make sure you identify page
21
     and line number, because this -- the copy I have is not
2.2
     highlighted.
23
               MR. JONES: Very well. Your Honor, we'll clean
24
     that up after.
25
               MR. WALTERS: We provided the designations, our
```

```
designation. I think you guys have a list as well, don't
 1
 2.
     you, of designations?
 3
               MR. JONES: I understood from our conversations,
 4
     counsel, that you had put all of the designations into the
 5
     copy that you were presenting to His Honor.
 6
               MR. WALTERS: There should be a version with that.
 7
     We should double-check that.
 8
               THE COURT: If there is a version, you should
 9
     probably have two different colors. The yellow would
10
     theirs, and yours would be the orange or something like
11
     that.
12
               MR. WALTERS: I apologize. I think your Clerk has
1.3
     that version. We should switch.
14
               THE COURT: Oh, well...
15
               MR. WALTERS: Very good.
16
               And the green is our designations. The pink is
17
     the government's. And the blue is counterdesignations.
18
               THE COURT: Green, pink and --
19
               MR. JONES: Yellow, I think, Your Honor.
20
               MR. WALTERS: Yellow.
2.1
               We're on page 24.
2.2
               MR. JONES: And when I began reading, Your Honor,
23
     it was the bottom of page 23.
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
24
25
               So had government is in pink?
```

```
I imagine so, Your Honor, if that's
 1
               MR. JONES:
     the color that you have. It's in blue in mine but --
 2
 3
               MR. WALTERS: Yes, sir.
 4
               THE COURT:
                          Blue excerpts.
 5
               All right.
                           Go ahead.
 6
               MR. JONES:
                          So, Mr. Roschen, picking up at line 23
 7
     of page 24, I'll just repeat.
 8
               THE WITNESS: Sure.
 9
               It's a tremendous disruption for subscribers, and
10
     it's a tremendous operation or disruption to your operations
11
     team. And it's not an easy decision to make, not one
12
     we would take lightly.
1.3
     BY MR. JONES:
14
               Okay. So do I understand correctly, so would it
15
     be fair to say -- correct me if I am wrong -- but at least
16
     in the case of some of these negotiations, like Turner or
17
     like Viacom, where you did actually have a brief backout and
18
     then a more extended blackout, that Cable ONE made an
19
     internal decision about what it was prepared to pay; and if
20
     it couldn't get a deal on those terms, it was prepared to go
21
     ahead and go dark?
2.2
               I don't know that we ever drew a line in the sand,
23
     like I said, that early in the process.
24
               We certainly would make a counteroffer that would
25
     be reflective of what we thought was a reasonable price to
```

1 pay. But we maintain flexibility throughout the process.

2 And I am sure in every negotiation, we made subsequent

counteroffers that were higher than our first one.

We were always looking for ways to come to an agreement, certainly.

Q Okay. In the end, you must have made the judgment, say in the case of Viacom, that you could perceive that your business was better off without the Viacom programming than with it at the pricing and terms they were demanding?

A That's true.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

Viacom was looking for a very aggressive rate increase from us. Their ratings were low, and their ratings were it declining. Their channels were not popular channels in our markets.

Like I said before, we operated in smaller rural markets, and the programming just wasn't that relevant.

It was actually a very easy decision in the end when they refused to budge from what they were asking for, and we were prepared to put out replacement networks.

And I told numerous people after the fact that

I think our channel lineup is stronger now than it was when
we had the Viacom channels on, just because we put on some
very popular networks that our subscribers had been asking
for for years.

1 Q Okay.

1.3

2.2

And you as a company made the same judgment vis-à-vis the Turner network in the fall of 2013?

A Not really.

The Turner negotiations were very different than Viacom. We really had no intention of dropping any of the Turner networks. The negotiations were proceeding very normally for several months. And we got to the end of September, I guess it was, and we really were not 100 percent satisfied with the deal terms.

And I had noticed what I can only describe as an oddity in the contract that Turner had with the NCTC, the National Cable Television Cooperative.

O Uh-huh.

A There was a clause in that agreement that said that an NCTC member could sign up for Turner programming for any or all networks. And I look at -- I kind of read that and said, wow, what does that say? And I took it literally, and I checked with our in-house attorney.

And he said, well, yeah, you're reading it right. You can take one Turner network, or you can take ten Turner networks.

I called the NCTC, and they seemed a little surprised that that language was even in agreement. But everybody seemed to have agreed with it that, yes, you can

take some Turner networks and not all.

So more as a negotiating ploy, although it wasn't an idle bluff, we were more than willing to drop some of the Turner networks.

O Uh-huh.

2.

2.2

A We told Turner that we were going to join the NCTC for just three of their networks and discontinue carriage for the remaining five or six, whatever it was.

And I didn't really expect them to accept that offer, but I thought they would come back to me and say, well, let's talk. I mean, we can do this instead. What can we do to preserve the carriage of all networks?

O Uh-huh.

A But instead, they went to great lengths to protect their bundle, at least in my opinion, went to great lengths to protect their bundle. And I think that would have been a major disruption to the business model if a cable operator was allowed to just carry three of their eight or nine channels, whatever the count was.

And then going on in the background during the last couple of months of this negotiation process was something I tried not to get involved in. But, like most programmers, they had done a financial audit of the license fees we had paid them for, I think it was 2011 or a couple of years prior. And they thought we had underpaid them here

1 and there some relatively insignificant amounts.

And they said, well, because you have these audit findings out there, we're not going to let you join the NCTC; and, therefore, we're just going to cut off all their -- all signals on September 30th. Boom, you're done.

Cable ONE was a very honest company, I think, in that we didn't try to fudge our license fees. We paid what we were owed -- what we're due, rather, what we owed. And we never had any significant audit findings.

And Turner had been dragging their feet for months on settling this audit, which I was aware of. And I tried to push them on it.

They wouldn't return phone calls, and they were just holding it out there as a weapon, I think, to use at the end of the negotiations, if necessary, and they certainly did that.

But in the end when we settled the contract, a month later, we settled the audit at the same time, and we paid them just over \$6,000. And we paid them over \$20 million in license fees during the audit period.

So it certainly was an insignificant thing, but, nonetheless, they used it against us.

MR. WALTERS: Bottom of page 30, line 24.

24 BY MR. WALTERS:

2.

2.2

Q The programmers tend to bundle their product,

don't they?

2.

2.2

A They do.

I mean, some will tell you they have an à la carte rate card where you can buy channels, à la carte rate card where you can buy channels individually, but usually by the time you buy even two networks out of eight or ten, it's going to cost them more on an à la carte basis than it would to buy the entire bundle that you're currently carrying. So the system is rigged, in other words.

## BY MR. WALTERS:

Q Page 32, line 13.

Do I understand what you, as a distributor, are prepared to do or not prepared to do, what you're prepared to pay or not pay, or the terms you're prepared to enter into is, do I understand correctly that that's based on your assessment of the value and the quality and the quantity of the content for the purposes of your viewers? Is that a fair statement?

A Mostly, yes.

I mean, we certainly look at the ratings, and we look at the license fees per rating point, like I said earlier. And at some point in time, you've got to say, well, gee, this just isn't worth it. I mean, it is an overpriced network right now for what they're offering.

The ratings are declining, and they want a

20 percent rate increase. I mean, that just doesn't make any sense.

Q Okay. Now, here's what I'm getting at.

Is it fair that -- I mean, do you care what the -let's say the content provider, do you care who the content
provider's owned by or any of their corporate affiliations
or who they might own or any of -- does that enter into -is that relevant at all to your assessment of what you're
prepared to pay and the terms you're prepared to pay to
enter into with that content provider?

A Not really.

I mean, we know some programming entities are huge. I mean, like, NBCUniversal, and Comcast and Fox is certainly big.

And we know that we're going to pay more dollars for that corporate entity than we are to say, like, an AMC or a Crown Media. But, nonetheless, we do recognize value in certain networks. And if the value's there and the license fee in place seems reasonable, well, if Disney gets paid twice as much as, say, Discovery Networks does, well, so be it.

I mean, they have twice as many channels maybe, and they have very important programming to our subscribers, and we have to pay it.

1.3

2.1

2.2

## BY MR. WALTERS: 1 2. But who owns Disney or who Disney owns is not 3 relevant. It's the considerations you've raised, the 4 content and reach and those issues; is that right? 5 Correct. 6 I mean, it doesn't matter to us who owns the 7 network and what is the network. 8 Q Okay. 9 Or who the network owns? 10 It really doesn't matter. It doesn't really 11 matter. 12 BY MR. JONES: 1.3 Turning to page 36, line 5. Q 14 Make sure I understand what you're saying, so the 15 increase in the number of the proliferation of distributors, 16 you think, gave more negotiating prowess or power to the 17 programmers? 18 I think it did, yes, just because of competition 19 amongst cable companies. 20 Turning to page 37, line 7. 21 Okay. Do you believe that from, that the 2.2 programmers' most important source of leverage in 23 negotiations is the ability to withhold content, to just go 24 dark, if you will? 25 Α I mean, that would certainly be their ultimate

weapon, but hopefully, most programmers still have or want to maintain some semblance of partnership with you.

I think in the case of the Turner blackout,

I mean, that was more vindictive on their part. They were
just going to say, well, you cannot break our bundle up, and
they had to make a very strong stand against that. So they
forced us to go dark for a period of time until we were able
to get back together.

## 9 BY MR. WALTERS:

2.1

Q Yeah, and I do want to come back to Turner.

I appreciate that. I want to come back to the Turner specifics.

But I'm just talking about in terms of your negotiation across with programmers. Is it your view that the, that if not the principal source of leverage in the negotiation is the ability to withhold programming itself?

A That's probably the ultimate weapon, like I said. I mean, other than that, what leverage do they have? I mean, they could ask you to carry channels, ask you to pay higher fees, but what's the option? Not carrying them.

MR. JONES: Turning to page 39, line 12.

#### 22 BY MR. JONES:

Q Well, you're there with these, and maybe -I don't know. Did you ever, in the course of your
negotiations, ever deal with NBCU between 2013 and '17?

A I did twice, yes.

2.2

- Q Okay. Did you -- and you're aware you had the right, if you could not reach terms to insist on carriage and then invoke the arbitration mechanism? Were you aware of that?
  - A We were aware of that, yes.
- Q Did you consider that to be of value to you in your negotiations with NBCU, that in the end, they couldn't go dark on you and you had the right to potentially arbitrate if you couldn't reach agreement?
- A Well, we were aware of it, but we never seriously considered doing that or invoking that clause. I did not want to subject the company to being saddled with a contract we didn't know the terms of.
- Q Right. Right.
- The -- have you ever been involved in this so-called baseball arbitration mechanism in one of those proceedings?
- 19 A No, I have not.
  - Q Okay. And as a distributor, would you rather have the right to guaranteed content, the so-called standstill, and, in an arbitration mechanism, than to not have it?
- A Well, I think it's a nice concept or idea, but
  I don't know how practical it is.
- Once again, I just would not want to cede my

1 | control over the company's programming costs.

Q You could always -- you don't have to cede your own control, right? You can always negotiate it to a resolution?

A Well --

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

- Q You don't have to invoke it, right?
- A Well, you don't have to.

But I thought your question was, if we get to the point in time where we don't want to lose the content, we could use that as a fallback position.

But to me it's not a fallback position because I do not want to settle, for all practical purposes, an agreement without knowing what the terms are.

Q Continuing on line 17.

So if -- let me ask you this way to make sure, if a programmer's pricing power or ability to exact a price or raise a price stems from its -- the threat of blackout, that threat of termination, if they don't have that threat of termination, if they have to guarantee the content, does that eliminate the power over price?

A I don't think it does, no.

Just because at some point you reach a limit as to what you're willing to pay for content. And even if an arbitrator can point to instances where another cable company is paying fees that the programmer's asking you to

1 pay, that could still be too high for my company to pay.

Q Continue on page 45, line 18.

May I proceed, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

BY MR. JONES:

2.

2.2

Q Well, if I understand correctly, you were not passing on those rate increases that you were taking it out of margin or reducing your cost structure. And in the end, you got to the point where the video component of your business just wasn't profitable.

Is that a fair summary?

A Mostly.

I mean, like I said, we did not want to penalize our subscribers. I'm not sure what we thought the long-term solution was. But, I mean, it was a big move for a cable company that was always videocentric to get to the point to say, well, gee, I don't know that the video business is sustainable anymore.

We have another product out there, high-speed data; it's a very robust product, very much in demand, growing demand. It certainly did have a higher profit margin than video did. And the way the video business was trending, it just didn't make sense to continue to focus on it.

And we got to the point that we were going to,

- perhaps, drop networks if we couldn't get a reasonable rate. 1 2 And we decided we were no longer going to subsidize the video business with our HSD revenue. 3 4 BY MR. WALTERS: During these years that you were, '13, '14, '15, 5 6 '16, and into '17 that you were doing content negotiation, 7 what percentage of the rate hikes were you passing on? 8 it a quarter? a third? And to what extent was your 9 margin -- and to what extent was your margin on video 10 decreasing? 11 Well, it probably changed over the course of my 12 term. I think by 2016 into 2017, we were taking 8 and \$10 13 increases on the video product, compared to maybe taking 5 14 or \$6 rate increases every other year for several years. 15 So in '13 and '14, we might only have been passing 16 along, I don't know, 25 percent of the increase. 17 just a rough estimate on my part. 18 By '16 and '17, it was probably higher. But we 19 still were not -- at best, we were breaking even on video by 20 2017. There was no profit there. 21 No profit at all? Q
- 22 A Not in video, no.
- 23 BY MR. JONES:
- Q Picking up again on page 48, line 21.
- Okay. In your negotiations, did -- I mean,

did you regularly do drop analyses? Or when would you do
them and when would you not do them?

A Oh, there were very few contract negotiations that I entered into, not really thinking we would come to an agreement.

I certainly thought all along we would come to an agreement with Turner.

Like I said, we never really thought we were going to drop Turner. But we didn't drop Turner; Turner dropped us.

But anyway, Viacom we knew, with the extent of what they were asking for on increases and given their ratings and their popularity in our markets, we knew fairly early on that it was a good chance we might walk away from Viacom. So we did drop analysis on that fairly early.

We looked at potential replacement channels, but that was really the exception, not the norm.

#### BY MR. WALTERS:

2.2

Q Page 50, line 12.

Okay. So Viacom is one of the big six or seven major content networks; is that true?

A Yes, it is. It's probably within the top five.

Q And you did make the decision that you -- you could -- a decision in 2014, that you could run your video business, component of your business without Viacom, without

one of those five? 1 2. Α Yes. 3 Given popularity in our markets of their channels 4 and the rates they were asking us to pay and the 5 availability of potential replacement networks, they made it 6 a fairly easy decision for us. 7 BY MR. JONES: Turning to page 51, line 17. 8 So in -- so I quess my question is a little 9 10 different; make sure we're connecting on this. 11 If you really want to understand how many 12 customers you're going to lose if you don't carry Disney or 1.3 don't carry AMC or don't carry any particular -- and you're 14 not going to carry them for a long period of time or 15 indefinitely, wouldn't you also have to consider what you 16 might do to intervene not to lose those customers? 17 Well, traditionally, yes. 18 But once you realize you're not making any money 19 on these customers, it's a different ballgame. 20 BY MR. WALTERS: 21 Well, I'm not just talking -- I'm not confining it 2.2 to a circumstance where you're not making any money? 23 Α Uh-huh. 24 But in a circumstance where you have a viable

business and you're making money, to understand what the

- impact of dropping any particular channel or particular 1 2 network, wouldn't you also have to consider what you might 3 do to keep those customers, such as promotions or price 4 decreases or whatever it might be?
- 5 In theory, yes, but that's not the situation we're operating under.
  - Because you weren't making money anyway?
- 8 Correct.

6

7

20

21

2.2

23

24

- 9 Okay. But I'm talking about a hypothetical 10 situation where you are making money.
- 11 Sure. Well, hypothetically, yes, but reality, no. Α
- 12 0 For your reality?
- 1.3 Α Uh-huh.
- 14 Because if you're not making any money, who cares Q 15 whether you're losing them; is that right?
- 16 Correct.
- 17 And, yeah, in my opinion, that's correct.
- 18 But Cable ONE was not the only cable operator in 19 this position.
  - I mean, we paid similar rates to every mid- to small-sized cable operator, and the business had changed to the point where nobody was making money on video. And it really called for a new way of analyzing and thinking about the business, and a lot of cable companies were much slower than Cable ONE at coming to that realization.

#### BY MR. JONES:

2.

1.3

2.2

Q If you did want -- if you lost a network and you did want to keep those customers, okay, and you weren't in the opposite mode where you're not making any money so you don't care whether you keep them or not but you actually want to keep them, what are the most effective ways of keeping them in response to losing content?

A I think you would have to keep the subscribers informed as to what's going on in the negotiating process and let them know that we're doing everything we can to resolve this as quickly as possible, things like this Walking Dead promo, I think, would have been helpful, if necessary.

I think it's more than just an information -- it's more just an information exchange.

I mean, I know during the Turner blackout, we were in constant contact with our subscribers through on-air commercials and whatever else, just stating that we were working diligently to resolve all this and we expect to come to a settlement in the near future. But -- and then you just hope they stick with you for a while.

But once again, the reality was, we weren't making any money; so if we lost them, well, okay.

Q Okay. And if you did want to keep those customers, presumably, you could offer price decreases,

- right, because you're paying less for content because you're not taking some content; is that fair?
  - A Yes. We actually gave rebates to our subscribers for the month that Turner was off -- went off.
  - Q Did you do that in the Viacom instance?
- A We did not, just because we replaced the Viacom channels with other networks that we thought were better networks.
- 9 Q Turning to page 57, last line, line 25.
  - Okay. But weren't the ratings on TBS, TNT, and the Cartoon Network, they were declining as well at this juncture, were they not?
- 13 A They probably were.
  - I don't remember the specifics, but Cartoon was targeted to a very narrow audience, obviously, and that was one we felt was worth keeping.
  - TBS and TNT had some very valuable sport programming content, especially during the month of March, with March Madness, the NCAA basketball tournament that we felt we had to continue to provide to our subscribers.
- 21 Q Okay.

3

4

5

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

- 22 A So we chose those three to keep.
- 23 BY MR. WALTERS:
- Q Was there anything about what TNT and TBS offered, other than the sports program that you considered -- other

than the sports programming, that you considered to be 1 2. necessary to keep? 3 The only thing that was unique to those 4 channels was their sports programming, both the NBA, 5 Major League Baseball, and NCAA basketball. 6 Okay. But nothing else? 7 Α Not in my view. I mean, to me, it's --8 9 I'm just asking about your view. It's run-of-the-mill dramas and whatever else. 10 11 And it doesn't matter whether you watch them on U.S.A. or 12 one of the four major networks or TNT. 13 I mean, it's very common, ordinary programming. 14 BY MR. JONES: 15 Okay. In this -- in fact, in the second 0 16 paragraph, it says, Mr. Might, there's a quote attributable 17 to him that says, "However, Turner's demand increase of 18 nearly 50 percent for channels with steadily declining 19 ratings. 20 Do you see that? 21 Yes, I do. Α 2.2 Q Okay. Does that refresh your recollection about the ratings on these channels? Or is it -- do you know or 23 24 do you recall?

I'm sure Tom might

Well, I don't recall that.

25

Α

have looked at the data. We shared the data amongst us, and these were Nielsen, SNL Kagan. I'm sure they were correct.

And I remember the 50 percent for one particular network that they were asking for an increase for, and I know that's factual yes.

### BY MR. WALTERS:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

Q Okay. And in the first sentence, the penultimate paragraph, it says, the historical — quote, "The historical video subscription business model is in decline, and a new video model is taking shape, built on the Internet and consumer choice."

Do you see that?

- A Yes.
- 14 Q Did you agree with that sentiment?
- 15 A Yes, I do.

I mean, the old business model was certainly in decline and was broken. I think the new model taking shape was happening very slowly, but nonetheless, you could see a transition coming.

## BY MR. JONES:

- Q Skipping several pages, now to page 65, line 16.
  What caused you to look at that NCTC agreement?
- A The NCTC had an existing agreement at that point in time that was on a different timeline or term than the Cable ONE agreement. And as fallback position, I thought

we would just join the NCTC agreement, but there were some clauses or stipulations in that contract that were not attractive to us that we just couldn't abide by. So that really was not an option.

But when I saw that it also gave you the option to pick and choose which services you wanted to subscribe to, that was certainly of interest to me.

- Q Were you -- I assume you were a member of NCTC?
- 9 A We were, yes.

5

6

7

8

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

10 Q Turning to page 67, line 4.

Okay. Now, of course, Turner's view was that that contractual provision did not permit programmers to take just the -- or to cherry-pick or to take just the particular channels that they wanted. That was at least their view; was it not?

A No, they never told us that was the reason they weren't allowing us to join the NCTC.

They told us they weren't allowing us to join the NCTC because we owed them money from 2011 due to this audit.

- Q Uh-huh.
- A That was their way of escaping this.
- Q Okay. But you don't recall them articulating that, that they disagreed with that contractual interpretation?
- A No, there was no way they could do that.

# BY MR. WALTERS: 1 2. Page 69, line 16. 3 Okay. And so they were -- the programming was 4 discontinued for how long? 5 About 30 days. 6 0 About 30 days. Okay. 7 And if you'll go to the bottom of page 71, 8 line 25. 9 And so do I understand correctly, then -- correct 10 me if I am wrong, so the absence of Turner really didn't 11 have any real impact; I mean the loss of a few video 12 subscribers, but that was about it? 13 That's pretty much true. I mean, this was during 14 the period in time when Cable ONE, like most cable 15 operators, was losing video subscribers anyway. And it was 16 always very difficult to determine why you lost a 17 subscriber. Was it just because of general, circumstances, 18 what you're charging, or had they moved to DirecTV. 19 I mean, they often wouldn't tell you exactly why 20 they were leaving. 2.1 But there was no seismic shift in subscriber loss 2.2 during the month that Turner was off. 23 Okay. And so did that tell you that the absence 24 of Turner was sort of not a big deal to your subscriber

base, that it wasn't really causing any real departures to

1 | worry about?

2.

2.2

A Well, yes and no.

I mean, during the month of September, there were Major League playoff -- Major League Baseball playoff games on TBS and TNT, but, fortunately, there were no teams from our markets participating that season in the playoffs.

So, once again, there was no real must-have programming on Turner during that month. If a blackout had occurred during the month of March, I mean, I think you would have seen a whole different story, then, given the popularity of the NCAA basketball tournament.

Q Page 74, line 20.

And then on the third bullet, you talk about, we had a bunch of volunteers ready to work, but we ended up sending them home. Is that just because you, perhaps, overestimated the impact of losing, of going dark on Turner?

A Probably, yes.

I mean, we wanted people there to man the phones, and the call volume was just not that significant.

BY MR. JONES:

Q Okay. Now, in the fourth bullet you say, The loss of MLB playoffs was not a significant event, as we planned for it being.

And then you say in that second bullet, we were successful in pointing fans to mlb.com, where all the games

- 1 | are available.
- 2 A Uh-huh.
- 3 Q Do you see that?
- 4 A Yep.

5

6

7

8

10

11

16

17

18

- Q So talk about that a little bit, about -- is that one of those mitigation efforts that we talked about earlier to sort of help customers deal with the eventuality of not particular content?
- 9 A I think so, yes.
  - It was just a way of informing our subscribers of what alternatives were available.
- And I mean, once again, in the background,

  I'm sure we were always saying, we believe this is a

  temporary situation; but in the meantime, there are other

  alternatives available for you.
  - Q So at least in the event of Turner and MLB consumers -- of Turner and MLB, consumers were able to wire around this by accessing mlb.com if they needed to see a particular playoff game that would not be available?
- 20 A Correct.
- 21 BY MR. WALTERS:
- Q And in the final bullet, you say, we promise

  customers a credit, and it will show up in their November

  bills. Most customers thought that was a strong gesture on

  our part. That's yet again another mitigation effort, is it

not? 1 2. Sure. 3 And you could envision that if you had lost Turner 4 indefinitely, that you could have done something like that 5 through a price decrease; that would have been a mitigation 6 effort as well? 7 Either that or adding replacement networks like we 8 did for Viacom. 9 BY MR. JONES: 10 And what kind of replacement networks would you 11 envision adding if you had lost Turner indefinitely or would 12 you have to, given U.S.A. and other networks' availability, 1.3 AMC, whatever it might be? Well, given the popularity of certain months of 14 15 the year of some of the Turner programming, we never 16 honestly considered a longtime drop -- a long-term drop of 17 Turner. 18 BY MR. WALTERS: 19 And the popularity you're talking about is, first 0 20 and foremost, March Madness; is that right? 2.1 Absolutely, yes. Α 2.2 Okay. Anything, anything beyond that? 23 Α Not really. 24 I mean, Turner did have some other sports

programming, MLB and NBA, but there were other outlets for

```
that.
 1
 2.
               Okay.
 3
               I mean, ESPN and your local regional sports
 4
     networks.
 5
               So other than -- other than March Madness,
 6
     everything else was pretty fungible?
 7
               I believe so, yes.
          Α
               Mr. Sejen, this is --
 8
 9
               MR. WALTERS: And this is on page 78, Your Honor.
10
     BY MR. WALTERS:
11
               Mr. Sejen -- at line 12 -- it looks like an
          Q
     SNL Kagan interview with Julie Laulis.
12
13
               Do you see that?
14
          Α
               Uh-huh.
               Who is Ms. Laulis?
15
          0
16
          Α
               She was our Chief Operating Officer at the time.
17
          Q
               Is she now the CEO?
18
               She is, yes, as of January 1st.
          Α
19
               On page 80, at line 10, she says, quote, "Given
          0
20
     that, we made the decision about Turner. The effect really
21
     hasn't been that big, okay? The worst part of this was
2.2
     it happened around Major League Baseball. Once we told our
23
     customers about mlb.com and that they could get the games,
24
     they got it. No one was denied their baseball."
25
               Do you see that?
```

Uh-huh, yes. 1 Α 2 Q Is that a fair, accurate statement? 3 Α Yes, it is. 4 0 Okay. And what she's saying there is, in effect, the --5 6 I'm sorry. 7 What she is saying there is the effect of losing Turner really hasn't been that big on Cable ONE, consistent 8 9 with our previous conversation. 10 Uh-huh, that's true. 11 By the way, today, isn't it available in the 12 marketplace that if you don't have a cable subscription or 1.3 your cable provider doesn't provide, if it doesn't have 14 Turner, that you can go elsewhere for March Madness? 15 I believe most of the content was available online 16 last year, yes. 17 Q Okay. 18 That probably was not the case several years ago. 19 But just, once again, the evolution of technology 20 and so forth, so... 21 Right. So this was back in 2013, correct? 2.2 Α Yes. 23 BY MR. JONES: 24 Q Okay. 25 So presumably, if you were confronted with the

```
same situation today and it were March, you could just, a
 1
 2
     distributor could do the same thing and point customers to
 3
     online availability of March Madness?
 4
               Potentially.
 5
               I think it's fair to say that most content
 6
     providers want to monetize their content. And I know at
 7
     least last year, the viewing of March Madness did not
 8
     require -- did not require authentication through your cable
 9
     operator.
10
               But at some point in time, that's bound to change,
11
               I mean, Turner is not going to broadcast these
12
     games for free, obviously.
1.3
          0
               Right.
               When you say "the content provider," are you
14
15
     talking about the NCAA or are you talking about Turner?
16
          Α
               Turner.
17
     BY MR. WALTERS:
18
               Okay. But in any event, if you didn't have
          Q
19
     Turner, if you didn't have TNT or TBS, whoever does
20
     March Madness today, a consumer could do what they did back
21
     in 2013 with Major League Baseball by finding March Madness
2.2
     online?
23
          Α
               If it's available, yes.
24
     BY MR. JONES:
25
          Q
               Okay.
```

And presumably, that would address the sort of 1 2 must-have nature of March Madness, in the same way it did 3 with MLB back in 2013? 4 It could, as long as the content is available and 5 does not require authentication, yes. 6 BY MR. WALTERS: 7 Page 83, line 18. 0 8 But it sounds like, at least in terms of Turner 9 sports programming, what they do, it's either replaceable, 10 fungible with others, or you can somehow wire around and 11 find it on the Internet. 12 Is that what I'm hearing? 1.3 That was true for March Madness in 2017, yes.

- Line 17, I just want to ask you a couple questions Q about the Viacom drop, and I literally, this is -- looks like a Cable ONE conference call.
- 17 Uh-huh.

14

15

16

18

- And I really just have a question about something Q at the top of page 2, which is part of Mr. Might's comments.
- 20 Uh-huh. Α
- 21 Now, he says at the very top, he says, at the top Q 2.2 of page 2, 2, dropping Viacom was not your strategy. It was 23 a small tactic that fit our strategy very well. It costs 24 just 2 percent of our video subs, not 20 percent.
- 25 Do you see that?

1 A Yes.

2.

1.3

2.2

Q What is he talking about there, if you know?

A Well, what I think he's trying to indicate is that we didn't necessarily plan to drop Viacom. That was not a strategy in and by itself. But our strategy is to focus more on high-speed data and not video. And within that strategy, you need to be somewhat selective in what video content you carry.

And then the second part of the sentence is,

I think, pretty self-explanatory. The losses attributable
to Viacom are very, very small in the general and were not
significant.

Q So he's saying, look, because the way -- you tell me if I misread this, but the -- we choose, we do not carry Viacom. We choose not, and the losses of subscribers as a consequence were very, very small. And it's not a technically profitable business anyway.

So it makes perfect sense for us to go this direction and not carry that network. Is that the thrust of it?

A Yes.

With also the knowledge that there were very good replacement channels available for Viacom, so we could still offer a great product for our customers.

Q Let me show you what we'll mark as Exhibit 6.

## BY MR. JONES: 1 2. Okay. Turning to page 87, line 8. Okay. 3 Okav. How did that -- how did Viacom get back on 4 Cable ONE? 5 Viacom, to this day, is not back on Cable ONE. 6 Oh, so still don't carry it? 7 Α Correct. 8 BY MR. WALTERS: 9 And so consistent with Mr. Might's observation, 10 the elimination of Viacom portfolio of channels in their 11 network, did that, in retrospect, was that a good business 12 judgment for Cable ONE to make, the savings you achieve, 1.3 minus the negligible effect? 14 In my mind, yes, it was. BY MR. JONES: 15 16 Continuing at the bottom. 17 How would you -- how did you go about, or if you 18 did at all, to try to figure out if people are actually 19 dropping as a result of the loss of Viacom? 20 Well, as part of standard operating procedure, any 21 time a subscriber called to discontinue the subscription, we 2.2 asked them why. Most subscribers would, like I said, they 23 just tell you, oh, we're moving, or make some story up just 24 to get off the phone.

At that point in time, they've already made the

decision. They don't want to get transferred to a retention specialist.

I mean, they just want to make it quick and easy and get off the phone.

So it's very hard to track the impact, so especially when we were all ready in a declining environment, like I said earlier.

Q Turning to page 91 at the bottom.

Okay. So this I want to ask you. Have you ever seen this, the chart that's -- this is a correspondence between Mr. Jimenez of Cable ONE and the Department of Justice on some data that was provided to them as part of DOJ's investigation. And I just had some questions about the attached page.

And are you familiar with this page at all?

A I don't recall seeing this before, no.

Q Okay. Let me ask you a couple of questions and see if you can help me understand it a little bit.

And there is some explanation on page 1 about what it is. Why don't you glance at that, and then I'll ask you a question or two and see if you can help me.

A Well, I can try to answer your questions. But, like I said, this document was prepared after I left Cable ONE, and I've never seen it before, but --

2.2

## BY MR. WALTERS: 1 2. But if you'll look at the chart itself, what it 3 seems to purport to do is for 2013, you'll see in October --4 I guess that is the period of the Turner blackout, right? 5 Yes, yes, October 13. 6 And then the 2014 in April is the start of the 7 cessation of Viacom; is that right? 8 Yes, in April. And it looks like there's a sort of percentage, 9 10 monthly churn. And then there's some total residential 11 video numbers below. 12 Do you see that? 1.3 Uh-huh. 14 But look in the upper right-hand column. 15 text, it says, Turner, the churn rates jump by .6 seasonally 16 during the month of dropping Turner. Loss stabilizes after 17 two months. 18 Do you see that? 19 Α Some of those words I see, yeah. 20 Okay. Page 94, line 23. 0 21 So is that number of .6 seasonally during the 22 month of dropping Turner, Mr. Sejen, is that consistent with 23 your recollection of the impact of the Turner drop during

Well, .6 percent sounds very small to me.

WilliamPZaremba@gmail.com

24

25

October 2013?

Α

- 1 I know, or I believe anyway, that our subscriber losses were
- 2 fairly insignificant, so it sounds about right.
- 3 BY MR. JONES:
  - Q Okay.
- 5 A But I'm not sure how the math was done, I guess.
- 6 Q Continuing on page 96.
- 7 And then -- but if you look at it in 2014,
- 8 | September to October, that pops up a little bit. So I guess
- 9 | the idea would be -- and I'm not asking you to verify the
- 10 | numbers, but the idea would be that if you just, that if you
- 11 adjust it for what normally occurs, the increment associated
- 12 | with Turner would be .6 of a percent; is that at least the
- 13 | idea? I'm not asking you to vouch for the numbers.
- 14 A I think that's the idea, but I can't tell you how
- 15 | the numbers were calculated, so --
- Q Okay.
- 17 A I mean, I don't know where the .6 came from, so --
- 18 Q Can you tell from the cover information sort of
- 19 | who did these numbers?
- 20 A No.
- 21 Q Phil Jimenez referred to our analyst.
- 22 | Phil Jimenez is one of our in-house attorneys, but
- 23 I don't know who the analyst was.
- 24 BY MR. WALTERS:
- Q And I know you're at Cable ONE for 31 years.

- Would you expect that Cable ONE, in generating these numbers
  for a Department of Justice investigation, would endeavor to
  make them as accurate as possible?
  - A I would certainly think so.
  - Q And would you expect that this information would be generated based on the records and information kept in the normal course of business by Turner -- I'm sorry, Cable ONE?
- 9 A I would, yes.

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- 10 Q Top of page 98.
  - And to the best of your knowledge, the data and records and information that Cable ONE keeps that would underlie these tables, to the best of your knowledge based on your experience at Cable ONE, would be accurate numbers?
    - A I have no reason to doubt it.
  - Q Okay. Thank you.
  - If you look at the second line below the Turner -- below Turner, it says Viacom, "Viacom, the impact of dropping Viacom was seen over four to five months."
- 20 Line 24: Is that consistent with your 21 recollection?
- 22 A It is.
- Just because I recall making the statement at the time, that after six months, our video losses were less than they'd been in years prior.

So was it your experience that the 1 Okay. 2 permanent drop of Viacom, that the impact of it was felt and 3 absorbed within about a four- to five- or six-month period? 4 Yes, that's true. 5 Okay. And didn't continue past that to the best 6 of your recollection? 7 Α Yes, that is true. 8 Just because we put up some very viable 9 replacement networks. 10 Line 22. 0 11 So through those mitigation efforts or efforts to 12 address the absence of Viacom, you were able to confine any 13 impact to the loss of Viacom to the four- or five- or 14 six-month period. 15 For the most part, yes. 16 Page 103, line 21. 17 So you heard that. You heard that a lot from 18 programmers, didn't you? 19 That's pretty much standard language, yes. 20 Yeah. And, I mean, did you hear from pretty much 21 all programmers that, I mean, that's their job, right? 2.2 Α Of course. 23 Did you hear from them kind of coming and pitching 24 that their content was must-have content?

Oh, absolutely, yes.

25

Α

- Q Okay. You would expect to hear that from all programmers?
- 3 A Pretty much, yeah.
- 4 Q And did you just kind of take that with a grain of 5 salt?
- 6 A Of course.

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

7 | Q Page 105, line 15.

Would you agree with me, though, that if any particular programmer, whether it was NBC or whomever or Turner, merely describing their product as must-have doesn't make it must-have?

- 12 A Not in my mind.
- Q Page 106, line 8, this will be Exhibit 9. Go to the top of page 107, line 2.

In that he says -- Mr. Mite, in that he says, quote, "Residential linear video and phone for many reasons produce very modest operating cash flow today, and no free cash flow to speak of. That is, they have no real margin left and volumes are challenges. Consumers want to migrate to alternatives like smartphones and OTT video. That is, cutting, trimming, shaving, avoiding, or whatever, the cord," closed quote?

- A Uh-huh.
- Q Do you agree that as of March 2016, do you think

  Mr. Mite's statement there is a fair assessment -- is a fair

- 1 | assessment, a fair statement?
- A Yes, I do. I know there was definitely a migration going on, yes.
  - Q Okay. And for a traditional MVPD like you at Cable ONE, was it accurate that there really was no margin left in the product?
    - A Oh, yes. That's absolutely true, yes.
- 8 Q Top of page 108.

5

6

7

9

10

11

- And that was -- that was in large part because at least as of this juncture, you had made the decision not to pass through a lot of those big programming cost increases and take it out of your own margin?
- 13 A That's true, because we were trying to protect our subscribers from excessive rate increases.
- 15 Q Sure. So you were taking the bullet yourselves?
- 16 A We were, for several years, yes.
- 17 Q Is Cable ONE -- Cable ONE is still, of course, in 18 the video business today, isn't it?
- 19 A Correct.
- 20 And why is that, if there's no money to be made?
- A Well, we're a full-service, full-service cable
  provider. And I think I mentioned, before we make the
  service available, we the video service available, we do
  not actively market the service, but it's there if a
  subscriber wants it.

Q Okay. It sounds like more of a convenience or an accommodation to customers who are your Internet customers to make it more attractive that they either stay or attracted to your Internet service; is that fair?

- A It might be easier to bundle the service, yes.
- Q And then line 13.
  - A More convenient for the subscriber.
- 8 Q Okay.

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Next one is page 112, line 20.

Mr. Sejen, I think you said this earlier, but correct me if I have this wrong, but did you -- as competition for Cable ONE increased, including from telephone companies, cable overbuilders and OTT video providers, as well as DBS television providers, in other words, has competition at the distribution level increased over the last five, seven years?

- A Yes, it has.
  - Q Line 14.

Just in terms of with the OTT providers, the

Amazons, the Googles, the overbuilders, all of the things

I just mentioned, would you say that the last five, seven,

eight years, would you say that competition has increased

substantially over the last five, seven, eight years for the

traditional cable companies?

A I would, yes.

In your 31 years in the industry, have you ever 1 2 seen it more competitive at the distribution level? 3 Α No. Top of 114. 4 5 And do you think that -- I mean, just looking in 6 your crystal ball, particularly given the nature of the 7 Internet and cost structure of the Internet, would you 8 anticipate that it would continue to get even more 9 competitive in these non-traditional providers? 10 It seems to be heading in that direction, 11 certainly. 12 Okay. Page 118, line 22. 13 But do you believe that because of these 14 accelerating price increases from programmers, that we sort 15 of reached a gag point with consumers that is causing, 16 galvanizing a lot of this change, unbundling, OTT, 17 fragmentation? 18 In my opinion, yes. 19 Page 121, line 20. 0 20 But just at the programming level, would you agree 21 that you've never seen it in your -- seen it in your time in 2.2 the industry any more competitive and fragmented at the 23 programming level?

providers out there, then, yes, there is more competition

If you mean that there were more and more content

24

```
and more providers.
 1
 2.
               Page 126, line 21.
 3
               So were you ever, through your MFNs, were you ever
 4
     able to really learn anything about other terms that other
 5
     distributors enjoyed with their programmers or programmers
 6
     gave to distributors? I mean, was there any visibility into
     that just by virtue of MFNs?
 7
 8
               No, there really wasn't.
 9
               So just occasionally, twice in the 31 years, over
10
     the transom came a notice saying, we're going to adjust your
11
     rate based on something else?
12
               Yeah, exactly.
1.3
               And you had to take that on faith?
14
               Pretty much.
          Α
15
               MR. WALTERS: Your Honor, page 134, line 2.
16
     BY MR. WALTERS:
17
               Mr. Sejen, and is it fair to say that HBO is a --
18
     supports and advocates for using HBO as a promotional tool?
19
               Historically, within the cable business, they did,
          Α
20
     but Cable ONE certainly had moved away from promoting
21
     premium services such as HBO, just because it increased
2.2
     churn and it just wasn't worth the effort anymore.
23
          0
               So -- line 23.
24
               So Cable ONE, if I hear you correctly, didn't
```

really need or want HBO as a promotional tool?

- That's essentially the case, yes. 1
- 2. Line 13.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Now, HBO itself has always pushed to have you as a 4 distributor use HBO, has it not?

- To use it as a promotional tool?
- Yes, sir.

Α They were always interested in that. They want to -- yes, they want to grow their subscriber base, of course.

- And is it your understanding that HBO has a pretty high churn rate so it really needs to keep pushing its product to replace that churn?
- 13 Uh-huh. I believe that's accurate, yes.
- 14 Top on of page 136, line 3. 0

And so at least from, in your experience in the industry, HBO, as a promotional device, was coming more from the HBO end than it certainly was from the distributor end, at least you as a distributor, Cable ONE?

- Particularly in later years, yes. Α
- Was there any particular, even at the time you were using it as a promotional device, were there any particular restrictions as to how you would use it as a promotional device at Cable ONE that were onerous or difficult or somehow made it very difficult for you to use as a promotional device?

It was just -- it was more just surrounding 1 2 the marketing effort and the operations effort, the call 3 center time; and then knowing that, I don't know, 50, 60, 70 percent of those subscribers would disconnect at the end of 4 5 their three-month promo period or one-month promo period, 6 whatever it was. 7 Just wasn't wort the candle? 8 No, no. 9 BY MR. JONES: 10 Continuing on the next page, page 137. 11 Okay. And if you were to use a premium service 12 hike HBO, would you be just as content to use Starz or Cinemax or some of the other ones? 1.3 14 Oh, I think HBO is the oldest, most-respected 15 premium service out there. And it probably made sense to 16 pony up with them as opposed to somebody else. 17 BY MR. WALTERS: 18 Have you ever used Starz or Cinemax in any 19 promotions that you know? 20 Starz, we have, yes. 21 Cinemax, probably not. Cinemax is obviously owned 2.2 by Time Warner and HBO, and tended to focus on HBO and not 23 Cinemax. 24 Fair enough. 25 But Starz you have?

```
Yes, we have.
 1
 2
               Okay. And did you have the same experience with
 3
     Starz, that it just wasn't worth the candle in the same way
 4
     as HBO?
 5
               Pretty much, yeah.
 6
               Whenever you have a cliff that you fall off of at
 7
     the end of the promotional period and someone goes from zero
 8
     to $5 to $10, whatever, subscribers just aren't going to
 9
     stand for that.
10
               Okay. Bottom line, Cable ONE is a distributor,
11
     doesn't need HBO as a promotional tool?
12
               Given our decreased focus on video business, yes,
1.3
     that's true.
14
               MR. WALTERS: That's all we have, Your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: All right. You can step down.
16
               Let me see counsel.
17
               (Sealed bench conference)
18
               THE COURT:
19
20
               MR. CONRATH:
21
2.2
23
               THE COURT:
24
               MR. CONRATH:
25
```

```
1
 2
 3
 4
                THE COURT:
 5
 6
                MR. CONRATH:
 7
                THE COURT:
 8
 9
                MR. CONRATH:
10
                THE COURT:
11
12
                MR. PETROCELLI:
13
14
                MR. CONRATH:
15
                THE COURT:
16
17
                MR. PETROCELLI:
18
                THE COURT:
19
                MR. PETROCELLI:
20
                THE COURT:
21
22
                MR. PETROCELLI:
23
24
25
                MR. CONRATH:
```

```
MR. PETROCELLI:
 1
 2
 3
               MR. CONRATH:
 4
               THE COURT:
 5
               MR. PETROCELLI:
 6
 7
               MR. CONRATH:
 8
 9
               THE COURT:
10
11
12
               MR. CONRATH:
1.3
               THE COURT:
14
               (Open court)
15
               THE COURT: All right. We're going to take a
     15-minute recess and come back. We'll have some further
16
17
     discussions, probably at the bench, at least initially, with
18
     regard to the expert testimony the next two days.
19
               DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
20
               This Honorable Court will now take a brief recess.
21
               (Recess from 5:00 p.m. to 5:21 p.m.)
2.2
               DEPUTY CLERK: The United States District Court
23
     for the District of Columbia is again in session, the
24
     Honorable Richard J. Leon presiding. God save the United
25
     States and this Honorable Court. Please be seated and come
```

```
1
     to order.
                Your Honor, re-calling Civil Action No. 17-2511,
 2
     the United States of America v. AT&T, Inc., et al.
 3
                (Sealed bench conference)
 4
                THE COURT:
 5
 6
               MR. PETROCELLI:
 7
                THE COURT:
 8
               MR. CONRATH:
 9
                THE COURT:
10
               MR. CONRATH:
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
                THE COURT:
 6
 7
                MR. CONRATH:
 8
                THE COURT:
 9
                MR. PETROCELLI:
10
                MR. CONRATH:
11
                THE COURT:
12
                MR. CONRATH:
13
                THE COURT:
14
15
                MR. CONRATH:
16
17
                THE COURT:
18
                MR. PETROCELLI:
19
                MR. CONRATH:
20
21
                MR. PETROCELLI:
22
23
24
25
```

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
10 11 12	
12	
13	
14	
14 15 16	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
1
 2
 3
 4
                THE COURT:
 5
 6
                MR. PETROCELLI:
 7
 8
                THE COURT:
 9
                MR. PETROCELLI:
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
                MR. CONRATH:
17
18
                MR. PETROCELLI:
19
                MR. CONRATH:
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
 2
                THE COURT:
 3
 4
                MR. CONRATH:
 5
 6
                MR. PETROCELLI:
 7
 8
 9
10
11
               MR. CONRATH:
12
                MR. PETROCELLI:
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
                THE COURT:
                MR. PETROCELLI:
10
                THE COURT:
11
12
                MR. PETROCELLI:
13
14
15
                THE COURT:
                MR. PETROCELLI:
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
                THE COURT:
14
                MR. PETROCELLI:
15
                THE COURT:
16
17
                MR. PETROCELLI:
18
19
20
                THE COURT:
21
                MR. PETROCELLI:
22
23
24
25
                THE COURT:
```

```
MR. PETROCELLI:
 1
 2
                THE COURT:
 3
                MR. PETROCELLI:
 4
 5
                MR. CONRATH:
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
                MR. PETROCELLI:
11
12
                THE COURT:
13
                MR. PETROCELLI:
14
15
16
17
                THE COURT:
18
                MR. PETROCELLI:
19
20
21
22
23
                THE COURT:
24
                MR. PETROCELLI:
25
```

```
1
                THE COURT:
 2
 3
 4
                MR. CONRATH:
 5
                THE COURT:
 6
 7
                MR. CONRATH:
 8
                MR. PETROCELLI:
 9
                MR. CONRATH:
10
                THE COURT:
11
                MR. CONRATH:
12
                THE COURT:
13
14
                MR. PETROCELLI:
15
16
                THE COURT:
17
18
                MR. CONRATH:
19
                MR. PETROCELLI:
20
21
                MR. CONRATH:
22
                THE COURT:
23
                MR. PETROCELLI:
24
25
```

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
                MR. CONRATH:
 7
                THE COURT:
 8
 9
                MR. CONRATH:
10
                THE COURT:
11
12
                MR. CONRATH:
13
                THE COURT:
14
                MR. PETROCELLI:
15
                THE COURT:
16
17
                MR. CONRATH:
18
19
20
21
22
23
                THE COURT:
24
                MR. CONRATH:
25
                THE COURT:
```

```
1
                MR. PETROCELLI:
 2
 3
                THE COURT:
 4
                MR. CONRATH:
 5
 6
                THE COURT:
 7
 8
                MR. CONRATH:
 9
                THE COURT:
10
11
                MR. PETROCELLI:
12
                MR. CONRATH:
13
                MR. PETROCELLI:
14
15
                THE COURT:
16
                MR. PETROCELLI:
17
                THE COURT:
18
19
                MR. PETROCELLI:
20
21
22
23
24
                THE COURT:
25
                MR. CONRATH:
```

```
1
 2
                THE COURT:
 3
                MR. CONRATH:
 4
 5
 6
 7
                THE COURT:
 8
 9
10
                MR. CONRATH:
11
12
                THE COURT:
13
14
15
16
                MR. CONRATH:
17
                THE COURT:
18
19
                MR. CONRATH:
20
                THE COURT:
21
22
23
                MR. CONRATH:
24
25
                MR. PETROCELLI:
```

```
1
 2
               MR. CONRATH:
 3
 4
 5
               MR. PETROCELLI:
 6
               MR. CONRATH:
 7
               THE COURT:
 8
               MR. CONRATH:
 9
10
               THE COURT:
11
12
               MR. PETROCELLI:
               MR. CONRATH:
1.3
14
               THE COURT:
15
16
               MR. CONRATH:
17
               (Open court)
               THE COURT: All right. The parties, having worked
18
     out a number of issues that were causing concerns, happy to
19
20
     report that we can break now for the evening.
21
               We will have the government's expert,
22
     Professor Shapiro, tomorrow. It will be a very full day.
23
     Each side is on the clock, two and a half hours each; that's
24
     all you're getting. If you don't finish, well, it's too
25
     bad.
```

There will be 15 minutes redirect and recross at 1 2 the end of that. 3 So direct and cross, five hours. We'll probably 4 be going late, probably won't break until 6:00, something 5 like that. 6 It will be a long day, but I'm happy to say that a 7 number of the issues that had to be ironed out prior to his appearing have been ironed out by some very hard work and 8 9 some, I think, thoughtful negotiations. Let's just call it 10 that. 11 So I appreciate that, and I applaud both counsel 12 for making it a smoother transition to tomorrow and the next 1.3 day when we'll have the witness, the expert witness for the 14 defense, Professor Carlton. 15 So -- and they have the same ground rules for 16 Thursday as well, I might add. So come Thursday night, 17 you'll definitely need a break. 18 Have a nice evening. 19 DEPUTY CLERK: All rise. 20 This Honorable Court will stand in recess until 2.1 the return of court. 2.2 (Proceedings concluded at 5:39 p.m.) 23 24 25

## C E R T I F I C A T E

I, William P. Zaremba, RMR, CRR, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-titled matter.

Date: April 10, 2018 /S/ William P. Zaremba William P. Zaremba, RMR, CRR