## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

PLAINTIFF,

V. : C.A. NO. 98-1232

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

DEFENDANT.

STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL.,

PLAINTIFFS,

V. : C.A. NO. 98-1223

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

DEFENDANT.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

COUNTERCLAIM-PLAINTIFF, :

V.

DENNIS C. VACCO, ET AL.,

COUNTERCLAIM-DEFENDANTS.: JANUARY 13, 1999

VOLUME 37-B

TRANSCRIBED DEPOSITION EXCERPTS

COURT REPORTER:

DAVID A. KASDAN, RMR MILLER REPORTING CO., INC.

507 C STREET, N.E.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003

(202) 546-6666

GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC. 507 C STREET, N.E. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002 (DEPOSITION EXCERPTS OF RAYMOND SOLNIK.)

- Q. WAS THE BUNDLING OF NETSCAPE SOFTWARE
  ON OEM'S--WAS THE FACT THAT NETSCAPE'S SOFTWARE
  WAS BUNDLED THROUGH OEM'S AN IMPORTANT
  CONSIDERATION IN SBCIS'S DECISION TO ENTER INTO
  THE AGREEMENT WITH NETSCAPE?
  - A. YES.
  - Q. AND WHY WAS THAT?
- A. WELL, FIRST OF ALL, BY THE WAY, ANOTHER MAJOR CHANNEL OF DISTRIBUTION FOR THEM IS ISP'S.

  I FORGOT TO MENTION THAT ONE. IT'S

  IMPORTANT--THE DEGREE TO WHICH NETSCAPE WAS

  BUNDLED ON PC'S WAS IMPORTANT, BECAUSE IT IS OUR

  BELIEF THAT A LARGE NUMBER OF INTERNET

  SUBSCRIBERS SIGN UP FOR THEIR SERVICE UPON

  PURCHASING A NEW PC, OR WILL CHOOSE THE POINT IN

  TIME WHERE THEY BUY A PC TO SIGN UP FOR AN

  INTERNET SERVICE.

AND SO, TO THE EXTENT THEIR SOFTWARE IS
ON A PC AND WE ARE ONE OF THE ISP'S OFFERED,
THAT'S AN ATTRACTIVE MEANS FOR US TO ACQUIRE
INTERNET CUSTOMERS.

## (EXCERPT.)

Q. DO YOU PERSONALLY HAVE ANY INFORMATION,
SINCE THE TIME THAT SBCIS HAS ENTERED INTO ITS

AGREEMENT WITH NETSCAPE, WHAT'S HAPPENED TO
NETSCAPE'S ABILITY TO BUNDLE ITS CLIENT SOFTWARE
THROUGH OEM'S?

MR. FESSEL: OBJECTION TO THE FORM.

MR. EPSTEIN: ANSWER THE QUESTION, IF YOU UNDERSTAND IT.

THE WITNESS: YOU KNOW, IN AUGUST OF
'96, NETSCAPE WAS BUNDLED ON A BUNCH OF PC'S, AND
A NUMBER OF COMPANIES' PC'S, AND HAD FORECASTS
FOR PARTICIPATING IN THAT TYPE OF DISTRIBUTION
THAT WERE HIGH.

WE, AT ONE POINT, ENVISIONED REQUIRING THEM, OR INCLUDING IN OUR CONTRACT WITH THEM ENSURING THAT THEY GOT ACCESS TO AND BUNDLED ON PC'S, AGAIN, WITH OUR PRIMARY OBJECTIVE OF GETTING A BIG DISTRIBUTION FOR OUR INTERNET SERVICE.

AND SO, DID THEY EVER IMPLEMENT OR

ACHIEVE WHAT WE WOULD HAVE BEEN HAPPY WITH, KIND

OF AS WE TALKED EARLIER ABOUT OUR RELATIVE

HAPPINESS WITH MOMENTS IN THE RELATIONSHIP? NO.

DO I SPECIFICALLY UNDERSTAND WHY THEY
COULDN'T GET ON PC'S? NOT NECESSARILY, BUT WE
WERE NOT PLEASED WITH THEIR INABILITY TO GET ON,
BUNDLED ON PC'S AND GET THAT DISTRIBUTION CHANNEL

BIGGER.

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC. 507 C STREET, N.E. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002