COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STORIX, INC.,

Plaintiff/Respondent,)

VS.

) FROM SAN DIEGO COUNTY) HON. KEVIN A. ENRIGHT

ANTHONY JOHNSON,

) COA NO. D075308

Defendant/ Cross-Complainant/) 37-2015-00034545-Appellant;

) SUPERIOR COURT NO.) CU-BT-CTL

DAVID HUFFMAN, et al.,

Defendants/ Cross-Defendants/ Respondents.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT ON APPEAL

Monday, February 5, 2018

(Pages 1313 through 1506, Inclusive)

Volume 11

1100 Union Street, Department 904 San Diego, California

Reported By: Leyla S. Jones CSR No. 12750

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

ANTHONY JOHNSON and ROBIN SASSI, derivatively on behalf of STORIX, INC., <u>Hon. Kevin A. Enright</u> a California corporation,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

DAVID HUFFMAN, an individual; RICHARD TURNER, Case Nos.: 37-2016an individual; MANUEL ALTAMIRANO, an individual; and 37-2015-DAVID KINNEY, an individual; 00028262-CU-BT-CTL) DAVID SMILJKOVICH, an individual; and DOES 1-20,

CASE NO. 37-2015-00034545-CU-BT-CTL (Consolidated with 00030822-CU-MC-CTL

Defendants,

Trial, Day 6

STORIX, INC., a California corporation;

Nominal Defendant.

AND CONSOLIDATED ACTIONS

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

(Pages 1313 through 1506, Inclusive)

Volume 11

February 5, 2018

8:52 a.m.

1100 Union Street, Dept. 904 San Diego, California

REPORTED BY:

Leyla S. Jones

CSR No. 12750

| 1 | APPEARANCES: | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2 | For Defendant/Cross-Complainant/Appellant, Anthony Johnson: | | |
| 3 | LAW OFFICES OF BERNARD F. KING III | | |
| 4 | BERNARD F. KING III, ESQ. 1455 Frazee Road, Suite 500 | | |
| 5 | San Diego, California 92108 858.746.0862 | | |
| 6 | bking@bernardkinglaw.com | | |
| 7 | For Plaintiffs/Respondent, Storix, Inc: | | |
| 8 | PROCOPIO | | |
| 9 | SEAN M. SULLIVAN, ESQ. 525 B Street, Suite 2200 | | |
| 10 | San Diego, California 92101 619.525.3859 | | |
| 11 | sean.sullivan@procopio.com | | |
| 12 | For Defendants/Cross-Defendants/Respondents, David Huffman, et al.: | | |
| 13 | WILSON ELSER MOSKOWITZ EDELMAN & DICKER | | |
| 14 | DAVID J. AVENI, ESQ. MICHAEL P. MCCLOSKEY, ESQ. | | |
| 15 | 401 West A Street, Suite 1900 San Diego, California 92101 | | |
| 16 | 619.321.6200 david.aveni@wilsonelser.com | | |
| 17 | michael.mccloskey@wilsonelser.com | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |

| 1 | INDEX OF WITNESSES | |
|----|---|---------------|
| 2 | PLAINTIFFS/RESPONDENT WITNESS: ANTHONY JO | <u>)HNSON</u> |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | EXAMINED BY: | PAGE |
| 5 | CROSS-EXAMINATION RESUMED BY MR. KING | 1326 |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |

| | | | | 1317 |
|----------|---------|--|----------|------|
| 1 | | INDEX TO EXHIBITS | | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | EXHIBIT | DESCRIPTION | MARK/REF | REC |
| 4 | 121 | E-mails, page 1 dated 6/11/14 | 1425 | 1426 |
| 5 | 124 | E-mails, page 1 dated | 1378 | |
| 6 | 124 | 8/19/14 | 1370 | |
| 7 | 189 | SB Admin Security Enhancements | 1370 | |
| 8 | 337 | E-mails, page 1 dated | 1427 | 1428 |
| 9 | | 6/12/14 | | |
| 10 | 338 | E-mails, page 1 dated 7/16/14 | 1437 | 1438 |
| 11 | 517 | Notice of Special Meeting | 1473 | 1473 |
| 12 | | 5/18/15 | | |
| 13 | 601 | E-mails, page 1 dated 6/23/11 | 1339 | 1339 |
| 14 15 | 631 | Profit and Loss dated January - December 2015 | 1495 | |
| 16 | 774 | E-mails, page 1 dated 8/29/11 | 1348 | |
| 17 | 785 | (No description provided) | 1495 | |
| 18 19 | 820 | E-mails, page 1 dated 1/14/16 | 1495 | |
| 20 | | | | |
| 21 | | | | |
| 22 | | | | |
| 23 | | | | |
| 24 | | | | |
| 25 | | | | |
| 26 | | | | |
| 27 | | | | |
| 28 | | | | |

1 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA; 2 MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2018; 8:52 A.M. 3 4 5 (Outside the presence of the jury.) THE COURT: All right. Good morning. 6 7 We're outside the presence of the jury. There's a number of exhibits I wanted to address, and the 8 9 first one is Exhibit 139. I believe I ruled on the 10 objections. And in further review, it's a four-page 11 e-mail from Mr. Johnson. 12 Looking at the last paragraph, I'm inclined 13 to sustain the objection as to the last paragraph, 14 and the objection is 1152. And then I want to ask 15 Mr. King about -- I know we've had discussion with 16 regard to other exhibits about the entirety versus redacting. 17 18 But I'm inclined to sustain, as I say. 19 the last paragraph should be redacted. The rest of 20 the objection is overruled. Objections are 21 overruled. But with regard to that, I'm 22 wondering -- and then I'll hear argument with regard 23 to 1152. 24 Thoughts? 25 MR. KING: One second. 26 THE COURT: Yes. 27 MR. KING: So, Your Honor, my preference

is, as stated before, that if part of it is

objectionable, we'd like to see the whole document excluded. Alternatively, if that's not what the Court's inclined to do, we would request that that paragraph be blacked out.

THE COURT: Okay. And just so it's clear, like I said, my ruling previously on 139 stands. I don't think it's subject to 1152, but the last paragraph I think is in a different status and I think is.

And so any thoughts?

MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, I don't think we would object to that, except for the first sentence of the last paragraph.

THE COURT: "I'm going to start looking for office space on Monday"?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

THE COURT: That's fair.

MR. KING: I think that goes in with the settlement. I mean, that's -- that's part of the settlement communication.

THE COURT: Office space?

MR. KING: Yeah. I mean, it was -- it's the -- Mr. Johnson is using the threat of competition as leverage in settlement negotiations, which he can do.

THE COURT: I understand. But with regard to the entirety of Exhibit 139, I don't find that subject to 1152. And I -- I think that's talking

about the situation. There's frustration. And as he terms it, his "final" final thoughts for you to consider.

And so I guess I'm wondering how office space competition goes to 1152, offer to compromise. And again, I read the definition previously on 1152, offer to compromise. Threats or "You better do this" or "Get out," I don't think are --

MR. KING: Well --

THE COURT: -- humanitarian, as the definition talks about, or more particularly offer to compromise.

MR. KING: I understand. My concern about it is this: In any offer to compromise and any time you have a settlement offer, you're going to have two parties. You're going to have one, This is what with we're offering. This is your way out. This is your golden range. And then you're going to have a second part, which is, And if you reject it, this is what we're going to do.

And my position on all of these is that you can't separate easily the -- both -- either of those parts, and I think that's what we're trying to do here. And I think that the policy of it to encourage these requires that we extend the protection and the inadmissibility to the entire communication.

THE COURT: All right. Other thoughts?

MR. SULLIVAN: I agree with Your Honor's initial thoughts that to the extent that it would be considered an offer to compromise, it would have to be necessary and related to the purpose of the litigation that was at issue at the time. There was a copyright infringement lawsuit.

I agree the discussion of a license agreement would potentially be within the scope of that, as that's the remedy of relief he can seek as part of a -- being a plaintiff in a copyright litigation. But forensic competition are outside the scope of the remedy he would have been entitled to, so they're not within the realm of what would be considered an offer to compromise supported by the policy under 1152.

THE COURT: Mr. McCloskey, any thoughts?

MR. MCCLOSKEY: I agree with Mr. Sullivan,

Your Honor. I have nothing else to offer.

THE COURT: Okay. With regard to this, then, as to the first sentence of the last paragraph on page 4 of Exhibit 139, the objection is overruled for the same reasons that I've said on this and other exhibits. I don't think that fits within 1152. And for that reason, the objection is overruled. Starting with, "I told you," et cetera, through the end of the paragraph sustained, and that should be redacted.

MR. KING: Your Honor --

THE COURT: That last paragraph has not 1 2 been shown to the jury. 3 MR. KING: Your Honor, if we're going to 4 redact everything after that first sentence, then we 5 would prefer to have no redactions. THE COURT: Okay. Then -- all right. And 6 7 that's why I asked you and you mentioned that. no redactions. The ruling I made previously stands 8 9 with regard to 139. Similarly, 874 --10 Tom, is the jury here? 11 THE BAILIFF: We're missing three, 12 Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: My understanding is on 874, the 14 second and third paragraphs are verbatim of exhibits 15 previously entered. 16 MR. KING: Second and third pages, I 17 believe. 18 THE COURT: Well, it starts at the bottom 19 of page 1, 9/26 and then 10/6, I believe are just 20 restatements of exhibits already entered, if I'm 21 correct. 22 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Exhibit -- or the 23 e-mail that starts 9/26 is the -- I believe it's 356. 24 25 THE COURT: It's the "Buckle up, boys." 26 MR. KING: Yeah, yeah. 27 MR. SULLIVAN: Exhibit 356 has been 28 previously admitted.

THE COURT: And then 10/6 is the customer. 1 2 MR. SULLIVAN: And I believe that's 3 Exhibit 22. 4 THE COURT: Okay. So in looking at new material under 876, I'm looking at page 1, the 5 majority of page 1, and I have a similar ruling and 6 7 I won't restate it all. But with regard to this, the last sentence of the October 7 e-mail from 8 Mr. Johnson, I have similar thoughts. That should 9 be sustained under 1152. 10 11 If there is a -- and again, the similarity 12 of -- I mean, the similar position, Mr. King, that 13 you'd just as soon have it all, that's -- I 14 understand and that's fine. But my inclination --15 MR. KING: We'll go ahead and redact that 16 last sentence. 17 THE COURT: Pardon me? MR. KING: We will go ahead and redact that 18 19 last sentence. 20 THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Sullivan? 21 MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, the portion at 22 the end there, "a way to get out of this before you lose your home," that's more consistent with the 23 24 threats that we discussed before that are not under 25 the scope of the settlement offer to compromise. 26 The purposes and policies supporting that 27 offer, that's a threat to make Mr. Kinney homeless

if he did not concede to Mr. Johnson's threats.

I would say that that's outside the scope of -- the settlement communication should not have that.

THE COURT: Mr. McCloskey, any thoughts?

MR. MCCLOSKEY: I agree with Mr. Sullivan,

Your Honor. I have nothing else to add.

THE COURT: The difficulty -- and I understand the sentiment. It does fit with threat. But it's, "Call me"; in other words, it's the last sentence of a lengthy e-mail saying to Mr. Kinney -- trying to persuade him to change his ways, and he's saying, "Call me."

And so I think if we try to parse that sentence, I wonder how we would do it, because the "call me" I think is part of "lose your home." In other words, I'm going to eject you from your house, your home. But I think the first part of that is "call me."

And I -- I'm sensitive to what you're saying. But I guess as a practical matter, we can be surgical, but maybe that's two academically surgical, and whatever we end up with, parsing that won't make any sense contextually. That's my thought. I'm sensitive to what you're saying, because it does fit with, Get out and if you don't get out, you're going to lose your home.

MR. SULLIVAN: Exactly. And the fact that he's saying, "Call me," but only under the pressure of threats to lose your home and become homeless or

to suffer the detriment of an announcement e-mail going out to customers and causing you to lose revenues and having your attorneys gather, it's all part and parcel of the same modus operandi. It's all like, You will talk to me under my conditions and only under those conditions or else you will suffer the harm.

And that's not an offer to compromise under 1152. That's a, you know, talk to me under force of threat or be harmed. Losing your home is not something that Mr. Johnson would be entitled to as relief in -- as a plaintiff in his case, so I don't see that as in the scope of the 1152 communication.

THE COURT: So -- all right. I understand. How would we redact that? I think that, "Or call me and we'll see if there's a way to get you out of this," which I think is 1152. He has a lot of stuff ahead -- in front of that that fit with threats and fit with, you know, you better do this, you better do that. And it's clearly one way, not an offer to negotiate or compromise.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, then, you know, if -if it's going to be redacted, I think it does more
harm than good to parse that sentence, and we would
just go with redacting the whole sentence. I think
the sentiment of threat is apparent throughout that
e-mail.

THE COURT: And I was going to say that,

1 because not only in this e-mail but in others, it's 2 pretty clear what Mr. Johnson's position is. 3 mean, it's not like he's mincing words. 4 Mr. King, you want it redacted? 5 MR. KING: I would like it redacted, yes. 6 THE COURT: All right. So as to 874, the 7 document is received in evidence. The objection is 8 overruled with the exception of the last sentence on 9 the first page of the first e-mail starting 10 October -- or dated October 7 from Mr. Johnson. So 11 the sentence "Or call me" is redacted in its 12 entirety, sustained under 1152. There's other 13 rulings I want to make. 14 But, Tom, could you check and see if the 15 jury is out there? 16 (Exhibit 874 received.) 17 THE BAILIFF: They are, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: They are. Okay. And it 19 relates to -- well, other exhibits. But let's -- I 20 think it can wait. Let's bring the jury in, unless 21 there's anything else. 22 MR. KING: Nothing further. 23 THE COURT: And we're going to continue 24 with Mr. Johnson; is that correct? 25 MR. KING: Yes. 26 THE COURT: And, Mr. Johnson, if you'd be 27 so kind.

(Whereupon the jurors enter the courtroom.)

| 1 | THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and |
|----|--|
| 2 | gentlemen. Good to see you all again. Hope you had |
| 3 | a great three days. Welcome back. |
| 4 | And good morning, Mr. Johnson. |
| 5 | MR. JOHNSON: Good morning. |
| 6 | THE COURT: And, Mr. Johnson, you recall |
| 7 | you're still under oath? |
| 8 | MR. JOHNSON: I do. |
| 9 | THE COURT: Thank you. |
| 10 | And, Mr. King? |
| 11 | ANTHONY JOHNSON, |
| 12 | having been first duly sworn, was examined and |
| 13 | testified as follows: |
| 14 | |
| 15 | CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) |
| 16 | BY MR. KING: |
| 17 | Q. Good morning, Mr. Johnson. |
| 18 | A. Good morning. |
| 19 | Q. Let's start from the beginning. |
| 20 | MR. SULLIVAN: Objection, Your Honor. |
| 21 | There's items being shown that are not admitted on |
| 22 | the screen. |
| 23 | THE COURT: If you can take it down. Thank |
| 24 | you. |
| 25 | BY MR. KING: |
| 26 | Q. Anthony, tell me where you're from. |
| 27 | A. I grew up in the Las Vegas area. |
| 28 | Q. How did you make it to San Diego? |

A. I initially moved to Los Angeles area when I had, I guess, my first full-time computer job. I worked there for four years and then moved to Texas to work for IBM for about nine years.

And after about nine years, I decided I didn't want to work for a large corporation anymore, so I made plans to move back to L.A., but got sidetracked and moved to San Diego instead. I did not have a job at the time, but had enough savings that I kind of anticipated taking some time to figure out what I wanted to do.

- Q. How did you end up starting Storix?
- A. Well -- well, what actually happened is a week before I was leaving Dallas to move to

 Los Angeles, I got in a very bad car accident and was hospitalized for between three and four weeks.

 And when I -- this was, of course, after I had already packed up my house -- or apartment, that is, and was getting ready to move.

A couple of my family members came down and packed up the house and moved it to San Diego for me, where I had actually already rented an apartment. And when I got out of the hospital, you know, they kind of, you know, helped me in the apartment. At the time I was in a wheelchair for two or three weeks.

- Q. What does that have to do with Storix?
- A. Well, because when I moved to San Diego, I

wasn't mobile. I wasn't able to look for a job and wasn't sure what it was I was going to do, but I figured I would find about anything I could do to just kind of supplement my income to make it last a bit longer until that decision came around. But since I was pretty much laid up in my apartment for a good eight months or so, I started writing some software.

Q. What software did you write?

A. Well, when I worked for IBM, I created a product that was called SysBack. And it was a backup product, not very dissimilar to what SB Admin is today, except it was -- it didn't have much of a user interface to it. It didn't -- well, a lot of things that it didn't do.

And I decided -- I had worked with a contract with my old IBM colleagues to create a -- basically a new product that used some of the SysBack code underneath, and it basically simplified and kind of centralized a lot of the management of the backups on networks. And that became SB Admin, and I sold that product and then provided a license fee to IBM for it. And that was what was referred to as the first version of SB Admin.

- Q. And about what year was that?
- A. I began the development in 1998, the same year that I moved. And by nine -- it was released in 1999 at the same time I created the copyright for

1 | it.

- Q. Had you started up any businesses before that or was this your first business?
- A. Yes and no. It was sort of a business within a business that I actually ran within IBM. I wasn't in a product division in IBM. I was actually in a technical support division. But I was working on a system called AIX, which is IBM's version of Unix, which we've heard before. Unix is different -- flavors of Unix that SB Admin supports. AIX was the first, and that's IBM's version.

When I was working in technical support, one of the things that I found that customers were lacking was the ability to do full system recovery. And I started creating tools for their use that became popular, and that came with additional requests for more features until it eventually turned into a product itself that eventually got named SysBack.

And so we ended up actually selling the product within the support division. And about the time that I left IBM, which was in 19 -- 1998, that product got moved into the product division, and they started selling it as a -- sort of an add-on to, you know, another storage product that IBM sells.

Q. And so how is SB Admin that you developed after IBM -- how did -- what was different about

that?

A. Well, what was different was, like I said, the product I wrote for IBM was less user friendly. It had a lot of commands that you could run from the command line in order to perform backups and various tasks, and there was a basic menuing facility that was kind of incorporated into IBM's normal system administrator interface.

But SB Admin was -- pardon me -- created primarily to kind of centralize all of the management, whereas rather than going to every client system that you're going to back up and every server system and configuring them manually with these demands and then running all the backups from the client and pushing them to the server, I created an interface whereas from one central server and one graphical interface, you were able to configure all of the clients and the servers and configure backup jobs and schedule backups to run and a number of other administrative tasks that could all be done from a central location.

- Q. You wrote all the code for that?
- A. Yes.
- Q. How long did you spend on that?
- A. Well, that's hard to say. It probably took -- it probably took about a year before the first version came out.
 - Q. How long -- well, you started it in your

apartment? Is that what you -- is that what you testified to?

A. Yes, yes.

- Q. How long were you in your apartment before you moved to an actual office?
- A. Well, shortly after I released the first version of SB Admin, Version -- Version 1, my sister was still helping me out a lot because I wasn't very mobile and kind of needed a little bit of help with things like laundry and so forth. And she actually helped me set up an office. It was just a small office, just the two of us. And, you know, she basically helped get -- helped me with just kind of getting the business end of things up and running and --
 - Q. Which sister was this?
 - A. That's my sister Michelle.
- Q. Okay.
- A. And we were in the office. I suppose -
 I'm sorry. The question was, like, how long -- what

 was the question again? I'm sorry.
 - Q. So how long were you in the apartment before you got an actual office?
 - A. I would say about a year and a half.
 - Q. Okay. And then after you got an actual office, how long was it before you hired an employee other than your sister? because I don't know if your sister was an employee or not.

A. Well, my sister was I guess -- well, she was an employee, I suppose, but that was only for maybe -- I can't remember now -- a three- to six-month period. She was just there to kind of help get the ball rolling, I suppose.

- Q. Okay. So how long after she left did you hire another employee, your first employee?
- A. It would come shortly after, but it wasn't -- I didn't need anybody at that point to help with the kind of administrative tasks anymore. It was more I needed to bring someone in to now start learning more about the product and help with the technical support.
 - Q. And who was that first employee you hired?
- A. I don't remember names, to tell you the truth. I remember one person named Devin. I was pretty green when it came to hiring people and kind of vetting people, and I found the first two people that I brought in.

Since I wasn't in a position to, you know, hire highly skilled employees, I was looking to bring people in that were maybe recently graduated from a trade school or something that could kind of grow -- grow with the company. But the first couple of people that I hired I found were actually just job hopping for short periods of time in order to keep their unemployment current.

Q. When did you meet David Huffman?

- A. Well, of course he, you know, answered an ad, I guess. And I brought him in to interview him in 2002, I believe. Yeah, 2002.
 - Q. Okay. And when -- after the interview, you hired him?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And at that point in time, how many employees did you have or was it just you and Mr. Huffman?
- A. It was just Mr. Huffman, and there was one other technical support employee that I had at the time.
- Q. Okay. And what did you hire Mr. Huffman to do when he first came on?
- A. It was primary technical support and kind of assisting with some of the research that needed to be done, because I was now expanding from the AIX system that we supported for IBM to the -- to the Linux system, which is another flavor of Unix that was kind of coming about.
- Q. Was Mr. Huffman hired to program code for SB Admin?
 - A. No
- Q. Did you have any understanding of what Mr. Huffman's programming skills were when you hired him?
- A. I don't -- I'm not aware that he actually had program skills. I'm sure that there was -- that

he touched on it, because I think he came from a trade school of some sort and they always touch on it to some degree. I didn't anticipate he had any particular skills in programming.

But this -- you know, when I hired

people -- you know, I didn't have the resources, as

I said, to bring in highly skilled people. So I was

really looking for people that looked like, I guess,

kind of go-getters that, you know, were anxious to

learn and to -- and that I thought would maybe grow

with the company. And so I wasn't -- I'm -- it -
there was a good chance that he would grow into the

programming position if that's where he wanted to

go.

- Q. What, if anything, did you teach him over the course of his employment about programming?
 - A. In the course of his programming? I --
 - Q. No, in the course of his employment.
- A. Of his employment. Well, he learned about the product that I created. He learned more about, I guess -- I imagine he learned about how the product was used, why it was used, how customers were using it, the needs of the customers, and particularly, I think he started learning a great deal more about Linux, because there was, you know, a lot of -- because of the nature of the product and how it has to kind of integrate with the operating system itself, you know, you really had to learn a

- little bit more of the inner workings of the operating system to be able to either support it or, you know, provide any help in that area.
 - Q. Did you teach him how to program for SB Admin?
 - A. I wouldn't say that I taught him how to program, no.
 - Q. Okay. Mr. Turner, Rich Turner, how did you meet him?
 - A. Turner was hired shortly after Huffman, just about four or five months later, I think. Same thing, just looking for people that -- and I think Mr. Turner had just come out of a trade school at the time. I think he might have had a position -- some sort of technical -- or technical job before that, maybe doing support or something, but not a lot of experience.
 - Q. When you hired Mr. Turner, how many employees did you have?
 - A. I don't know if the first person that I mentioned was still there. He was removed from the company when he was arrested.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. But that had nothing to do with my business. But -- so I don't know if he came in when the person was there or not, but it soon became just Mr. Huffman, Mr. Turner, and myself.
 - Q. How long was it just the three of you?

1 A. I couldn't say.

- Q. Who was the next employee that was hired?
- A. It -- again, it was a long time ago. There hasn't been a lot of people -- there really haven't been many people. I think I brought in a marketing person at one point that didn't work out, wasn't really contributing.
 - Q. Did you hire anyone -- did you hire anyone for sales?
 - A. Well, he was there for, basically, you know, marketing and sales, but that was prior to Mr. Altamirano. This person was there for maybe six months, but he -- one of his big problems was he lived in Murrieta. He didn't want to make the travel.
 - Q. So you decided to hire someone for marketing and sales, hired someone from -- and you hired -- first person from Murrieta didn't work out. And then you met Mr. Altamirano?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And you hired him for that position?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And for a while, was it just you

 Mr. Altamirano, Mr. Turner, and Mr. Huffman?
 - A. I think for a period of time, there was.
- Q. When did you meet Mr. Kinney?
 - A. Kinney was the last -- I think the last person that I've hired, and that was around 2009,

1 maybe.

- Q. And so --
- A. Actually, it was earlier than that, because he was there about four years when I left in 2011.
- Q. So by the time -- 2010, it was you, and then you had Mr. Huffman, Mr. Kinney,
 Mr. Altamirano, and Mr. Turner working at Storix,
 correct?
- A. Yes, and Mr. Altamirano hired another person to come in to help with sales. At the time that I left, he had only been there about three months or so, and I understand that they let him go shortly after I left.
 - Q. In 2010, how many shareholders did Storix have?
 - A. Just one. That would be me.
- Q. You were the only shareholder from the time Storix was founded until 2010?
- 19 A. Yes.
 - Q. In 2011, things changed, right?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Tell me how they changed.
 - A. Well, it was -- probably started in 2010, I started having some health problems kind of cropping up in different ways, and it took some time. It wasn't until early 2011 before I received a diagnosis. It turned out to be melanoma.

28 And I guess around June of 2011, I got a

prognosis and it was that the melanoma had

metastasized and was malignant, had expanded into my

lymphatic system, and was at that point looking

pretty dire.

- Q. What do you mean "pretty dire"?
- A. Well, it was in -- I think, around the end of June that I got -- the prognosis was that I was Stage 3C. They're pretty -- they have a lot of data on melanoma, so it's rather more specific than a lot of other things. At that stage, the prognosis was that the average survival rate was about 20 months.
- Q. So what did you do with respect to Storix after you received your prognosis?
- A. Well, I was primarily trying to -- trying to put my affairs in order in such a way that basically things and people were taken care of, and my first thought was to base -- to try to find someone to sell the company that would keep it intact.

MR. KING: Your Honor, may I approach and show the witness an exhibit?

THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. Showing you what is marked as Exhibit 601, could you tell me what that is, Mr. Johnson?
- A. Yeah. This was an e-mail that I had sent
 to one -- well, our -- really, our one business
 partner at that point that was selling the software

1 as an OEM vendor, meaning that they were basically 2 selling it under their own brand. 3 (Exhibit 601 referenced.) 4 BY MR. KING: 5 Q. Okay. The company is called Quest. It was 6 7 formerly called Backbone, and they have since been 8 bought by Dell. 9 MR. KING: Okay. Your Honor, I move to 10 have Exhibit 601 admitted and published. 11 MR. SULLIVAN: I have no objection. 12 MR. MCCLOSKEY: No objection. 13 THE COURT: Received. 14 (Exhibit 601 received.) 15 THE COURT: Do you want the lights dimmed 16 or not? 17 MR. KING: Yeah. 18 BY MR. KING: 19 So looking at the last paragraph, what 20 are -- what are you -- what are you communicating 21 here to Mr. -- Mr. Keiper at Quest? 22 Α. I think, as I mentioned at the last part of 23 the paragraph, this was 2011 and this is following the 2008 to 2010 financial crisis in the country. 24 25 And there was significant layoffs, particularly 26 around 2010, in the IT industry and jobs were very 27 hard to come by. 28 So my primary goal here was to make sure

that my employees -- my employees', you know, jobs and incomes were protected in what was a very difficult job market at the time.

- Q. In other words, you -- so just so I'm clear, you wanted -- you were asking Quest if they wanted to buy Storix?
- A. Yeah. They were ideally suited for it because they were already selling the product under their own brand.
- Q. But you were saying, If you do want to buy Storix, you have to keep my employees employed?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. What was the response?
- A. I don't recall the specific response, but they turned it down. They weren't interested in purchasing the company. And I -- I think that part of the reason was that they were already under negotiation to sell their company to Dell at the time, so they -- I don't think they could have entered into any agreements if they wanted to.

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

Lacks foundation. Calls for speculation. Move to strike.

THE COURT: As to the last portion, granted.

26 BY MR. KING:

- Q. What other options did you explore?
- 28 A. I -- I contacted a few companies that

provided active management -- active management, and these were companies that basically provided skilled professionals and often professionals that were very knowledgeable and had a lot of contacts in the industry -- in our case, the computer storage industry -- and was looking basically for someone to come in to, you know, manage the company.

Q. And why not go that route?

- A. Because I only dealt with two of them or really talked with two of them, and what I found was that their interest was more in ownership or taking control of the company or a large share of the company. And it it just evolved into putting them in a position where they could kind of do whatever they wanted with the company as far as sell it, disassemble it, distribute the customer list, and there was there was no no guarantee that the employees wouldn't be, you know, let go in the process.
 - Q. So what did you end up doing?
- A. Well, I think, as I said in the e-mail there, that my, you know -- my -- my thought was, you know, if I don't find at least one of those two things, then I would be giving a significant share of the company to the employees themselves and do what I could to kind of get them into a position where they could keep it running themselves.
 - Q. So what did -- so what did you tell your

- employees when -- you know, after your diagnosis?
- A. Well, I told them that I -- I think at the same time I told them about my diagnosis and, you know, to kind of give them a reason for, you know, big changes that were coming; that I would be, say, significantly less active in the company since I didn't anticipate having a long time to live and had a lot of bucket list items, I suppose, I wanted to
 - Q. So set the scene for me. Where did you tell them this?
 - A. Well, I had explained this to David Huffman first.
 - Q. Okay.

check off and --

- A. And the reason for that was that, you know -- I think it was after this e-mail was sent and while I was still kind of pursuing other options, David Huffman came into my office and told me that he was planning to leave the company to go back to school full-time.
- Q. And that was before he heard anything about your diagnosis?
 - A. No. I knew about the diagnosis.
- Q. Before Mr. Huffman knew about your diagnosis?
- A. Oh, no, no one knew. In fact, this is the only person that knew about it. To tell you the truth, I didn't tell anybody else even what my

1 reason for leaving was.

- Q. And so what was your response when Mr. Huffman said he was thinking about leaving?
- A. Well, I -- I was literally that day, you know, working with one of these firms to try to find active management, and it didn't look like it was going very well. And I had already made the decision that I'm going to find a way to transfer shares to the employees, but I was kind of investigating how to do that.

I wasn't quite ready to make an announcement yet, so I told David -- I said, Listen, I understand what you're saying. I get it, but there's change -- there's a change going to happen very soon that I think you might want to change your mind.

He was pretty adamant that no, he's made the decision and he's going to do this. But I said, Well, just, you know, give, you know -- I can't remember if I told him at that time or I said, Just, you know, give me a couple of days.

You know, I think he came to me on Friday. I think I said, you know, Give me until Monday to, you know, kind of collect my thoughts or put this together and, you know, just keep an open mind and we'll talk about it on Monday.

Q. So when Monday came around, what did you tell him?

- explained to him the situation, and I told him then that I was going to be transferring on -- I think I told him at that point I decided that I was going to give 60 percent of the shares of the company to the employees and that, you know, they would be in a position then to run the company.
 - Q. Did you tell him he needed to do anything in exchange for those shares?
 - A. No. I --
 - Q. At that meeting, at that meeting.
 - A. No.

- Q. Okay. And how did Mr. Huffman react when you told him that?
- A. At the time he found it intriguing. He said that he had a decision to make and, you know, it was -- he was weighing his options. I guess he was very interested in going to school, but this was what he -- what he did tell me was that this -- you know, he was going to business school.

And, you know, he said something about, you know, given the opportunity, you know, he'd rather get the real-life experience and kind of apply what business studies that he had in this area. So eventually, he -- you know, he told me that he decided that he would stay.

Q. Now, before you told the rest of the employees, did you have any one-on-one conversations

with any other employee?

- A. No, I didn't.
- Q. So tell me about the time you told the rest of the employees. This was in a meeting with all of them, right?
- A. Yes. I think -- you know, once the decision was made, I pulled everybody together for a meeting in the conference room and sat them down and explained my health situation, that I would be leaving and turning over control, and that I was going to be issuing 60 percent of the shares of the company to those employees.
 - O. And --
 - A. After --
- Q. -- did any one of the employees react negatively to that offer? In other words, did any of the employees at that time say, "No, I don't want it"?
- A. Oh, well, no. I -- I think it was -- there was a lot of information, obviously, that was probably very surprising or shocking, you know, but certainly nobody was opposed to the idea.
- Q. Now, at some point the plan to transfer the shares just outright kind of modified a little bit; is that right?
- A. Well, what we had found -- what I found was I probably should have done a lot more research before making that announcement, because I later

found that, you know, what I thought I -- I thought I would simply be able to take, you know, my 1,000 shares and just give -- split 600 shares amongst the other employees.

But the -- as the accountant explained to me -- and eventually another attorney was brought in on the -- on the deal -- was that because I was the sole owner of the company, any gift of shares that I gave them, even if it were my own shares, would be considered by the state and federal tax authority to be -- to be, basically, taxable income.

Q. Okay.

- A. And this created a major tax liability for them by giving -- by my giving them the shares, so --
- Q. So what did you decide to do as a way to try and mitigate that?
- A. Well, at the same -- well, basically, around this same time, I actually brought my sister back into the company for a short time.
 - Q. This is Michelle?
- A. Michelle, yes. She -- she had -- she was right at the time in between jobs. Her husband had just moved to Las Vegas. They were -- she had repairs to do on the home, and they were going to sell it. So she was going to stay behind for a little while, so she offered to come in and help me kind of with my transition, because she has a lot of

business experience.

And, you know, the reason I say this is that, you know, she was much more involved in this than I was. And by "this," I mean that once we discovered this was going to be --

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. The witness is narrating.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. So I -- my question is specific. What was the -- what was the next form of proposal for transferring the shares?
- A. My preface was just getting to that answer, which was once it was decided that this was going to be overly complicated, Michelle got involved in this as well and worked with the accountant and the attorney to come up with an alternative that would be more beneficial to the employees financially.

And that was to create a bonus plan, so basically a contractual bonus agreement with the employees so that rather than receiving the stock right away, they would receive 60 percent of all of the profits of the company, which would equate to the same amount of money. But rather than get the stock right away, I would transfer the stock to them in my trust.

- Q. Okay.
- A. And by transferring it in the trust, it

- would not be taxable because it was -- you know, it had to be over \$5 million or something before it became taxable. So this would have been a much more beneficial solution to them and --
 - Q. So after you told the employees about this new kind of form for doing the transfer, what was the reaction?
 - A. Well, we had a meeting to discuss it, and I kind of showed them the numbers, and they were going to save a tremendous amount of money by not having to pay these taxes. So I didn't really get any reaction from them other than, Okay.

But after we left the meeting, David

Huffman pulled me aside and said that he thought I

was kind of reneging on the deal and he wanted the

stock or he was going to leave.

MR. KING: Your Honor, may I approach and show the witness an exhibit?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Your Honor, may we have an exhibit number?

MR. KING: 774.

(Exhibit 774 referenced.)

BY MR. KING:

- Q. Mr. Johnson, I'm showing you an exhibit marked 774. Do you recognize this?
- A. It's multi parts. If I could just take one second.

1 Yes. This is -- well, this is an e-mail forward from David Huffman to Robin Sassi. It looks 2 3 like he's forwarding an e-mail from my sister where 4 she's asking him to review some information that was 5 provided by Gary Armstrong -- and this was the 6 attorney we brought in on the transfer -- where they 7 were discussing --THE COURT: I think he's answered the 8 9 question. If you could take down what's on the 10 screen right now until the exhibit has been 11 admitted. 12 MR. KING: So, Your Honor, we'd move to 13 have Exhibit 774 --14 MR. MCCLOSKEY: I'd like to look at it, 15 Your Honor. Can I see it? 16 MR. KING: Yeah, absolutely. It's not in 17 your binder? 18 MR. MCCLOSKEY: It's not in there. 19 We object on the basis of two privileges, 20 Your Honor. Marital to begin with, and then 21 attorney-client as well. 22 THE COURT: I don't have 774. 23 MR. SULLIVAN: And further objection on 24 foundation, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: As to that, sustained. 26 So, Mr. King, as to the foundation 27 objection, it's a two-page document. I'm seeing

three different e-mails. So as to foundation,

1 sustained. 2 MR. KING: Okay. All right. 3 BY MR. KING: 4 Mr. Johnson, after there was objection from Mr. Huffman about doing the employee bonus plan, 5 what eventually did you end up deciding to do? 6 7 Well, Mr. Huffman's rejection I took rather 8 personally, because it was specific to his not 9 trusting that I would give them the stock, and I 10 would. 11 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 12 witness is narrating. 13 THE WITNESS: Sorry. 14 THE COURT: Sustained. 15 BY MR. KING: 16 So --0. 17 So I --Α. 18 THE COURT: No. 19 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'll answer the 20 question. 21 BY MR. KING: 22 So the question is: What did you decide to do instead of the employee bonus plan after 23 Mr. Huffman said, I don't want to do it? 24 25 Α. I was at that point frustrated and I told 26 my sister, who was working at the company and had 27 been working on the whole bonus plan stock transfer

issue with the attorneys and all of that --

1 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 2 witness does an end run around the objections we 3 just had to these documents. He's telling now about 4 his sister talking to attorneys. 5 THE WITNESS: That was --6 THE COURT: Sustained. Next question. 7 BY MR. KING: 8 0. So --9 I asked my sister to --10 THE COURT: No, no, no. 11 THE WITNESS: Answer the question? 12 THE COURT: We have to go question, answer. 13 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. 14 THE COURT: So question? 15 BY MR. KING: 16 So we're just talking about instead of the 17 employee bonus, how was the transaction structured 18 after you learned of Mr. Huffman's objection? 19 I told my sister to handle it. Okay. 20 What did that mean for the transaction? 21 It meant -- I told her that it's going to 22 have to be a stock transfer, and I -- I didn't want 23 to deal with it anymore. This had taken three months already out of my life, and I was done. And 24 25 I told --26 MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Narrative, 27 Your Honor.

THE WITNESS: -- her to --

1 THE COURT: Sustained. 2 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Move to strike. 3 THE COURT: I think he answered the 4 question. 5 BY MR. KING: 6 So you told your sister to handle it. What 7 did your sister come up with for a way to get the transfer done? 8 9 A. Well, she and the attorney had come together, came up with --10 11 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 12 Move to strike. That's nonresponsive. He just said 13 the attorney and him came together. 14 THE COURT: Just the ground of the 15 objection, please. 16 MR. SULLIVAN: Lacks foundation. 17 THE COURT: Sustained. 18 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Privilege. 19 THE COURT: Granted. 20 BY MR. KING: 21 What did your sister tell you she came up Q. 22 with or she decided to do with whoever else she was 23 working after you told her to figure it out? 24 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection. That calls for 25 hearsay, Your Honor. 26 THE COURT: Sustained. 27 BY MR. KING:

What ended up happening with the transfer?

28

Q.

How was the transfer structured?

- A. I'm sorry. The objections are a bit confusing. Because I -- I received most of this information in e-mail forwards.
- Q. I'm just asking -- you know how the transfer was eventually structured, correct?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. How were they structured?
- A. It was decided that the -- these gentlemen would be offered an opportunity to take what is called an 83(b) tax election. This enabled them to receive the stock in a compensatory manner such that they would not have to pay employment taxes on it, although they would pay income taxes on it. The difference would be that rather than reporting this as income at the end of the year with their annual taxes, which would cost them a great deal more because now their entire income for the year -- MR. SULLIVAN: Objection, Your Honor.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ MCCLOSKEY: And the witness is narrating.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Improper opinion.

24 BY MR. KING:

- Q. So we'll be very specific on this. Was there -- the stock was eventually transferred to the employees, correct?
- 28 A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. And was it -- and how was it transferred?
- A. It was decided that rather than my giving them my shares, it would be easier for the company to issue new shares so that I would retain

 40 percent and new shares equivalent to 60 percent would be issued to the employees.
- Q. Okay. Now, at the time you decided to transfer it that way, how many people were on the board?
 - A. One.
 - Q. Who was that person?
- A. Me.

- Q. And you were also the president of Storix, right?
- A. Yes, yes.
- Q. Now, in conjunction with this transfer, were you also going to step down?
- A. From the board and as president and CEO, yes.
 - Q. And were you going to continue to receive some sort of compensation or payment from Storix after you stepped down?
- MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Leading.
- 25 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 26 BY MR. KING:
- Q. After the transfer, what were you going to receive from Storix, if anything?

- 1356 I would -- I reduced my salary from 175- to 1 2 5 -- thousand -- to 50,000 and continued receiving 3 that so that I could, at least on paper, remain an 4 employee in order to keep my group insurance, 5 because under my condition, I would not be able to receive individual health insurance anymore. 6 7 If any of the employees you were -- who were becoming 60 percent owners had told you that 8 9 they were going to cancel your health insurance after the transfer, would you have gone through with 10 11 the transfer? 12 MR. SULLIVAN: Objection, Your Honor. 13 Lacks foundation. Calls for speculation. 14 MR. MCCLOSKEY: It's hypothetical as well, 15
 - Your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: It would have been unfathomable for them to refuse that, given that -what they were receiving in return. So I can't --

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

THE WITNESS: -- not sure I can answer the question.

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Move to strike as nonresponsive.

THE COURT: Granted.

26 BY MR. KING:

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

So this is -- so pay attention to the question.

1 If the employees had told you that they 2 were going to cancel your health insurance after 3 they received the transfer of 60 percent of that 4 stock, would you have transferred that stock? 5 Certainly not. Did any of the employees -- well, did --6 7 the employees, when they got that transfer, did they 8 know that you -- the company was going to be paying 9 you \$50,000 a year and continuing to provide you with health insurance? 10 11 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 12 That lacks foundation. Calls for speculation. 13 THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. KING: 14 15 So just so I'm clear, after the transfer, 16 the company was going to continue paying you \$50,000 17 on payroll? 18 Α. Yes. 19 And was going to continue to provide you 20 with health insurance, correct? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Did the employees know about that before 23 they received their stock? 24 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 25 Lacks foundation. Calls for speculation. 26 THE COURT: Sustained. 27 BY MR. KING:

Did you tell the employees about that

28

Q.

- before you received your stock -- before they received their stock?
 - A. I believe so.
 - Q. Did any of the employees object to you continuing to receive that?
 - A. No.

- Q. Did you tell the employees that there was going to be an end date on when those payments would stop?
- MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

 11 Leading.
- 12 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 13 BY MR. KING:
 - Q. When, if at all, were those payments scheduled to end?
 - A. When I died.
 - Q. Now, what was your role, if anything, at Storix after you stepped down as president?
 - A. We -- part of the -- it's hard to call it an agreement, because it wasn't so much contractual.

 The understanding, I should say, was that I would be -- I would make myself available when I was able and available to assist in any way that I could.
 - Q. Why?
 - A. Well, first, I wanted, obviously, to make sure that they were successful, that the company remained successful. And I was still a 40 percent owner of the company, and, you know, that was

worthwhile to me to make sure the company was sustained.

- Q. After you stepped down, did you continue coming to work every day?
 - A. No.

- Q. Did you continue coming to work at all?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. How often?
- A. I would come in to kind of check in periodically to see how things were going when they were having their typical Monday morning meetings, and I was asked to assist with a few projects here and there that sometimes were a week and sometimes took as much as maybe six weeks or so on a project.
- Q. What was the first project you were asked to assist with after you stepped down as president?
- A. If I recall, I think the first thing that I was asked to assist with was the -- was called SEO.

 It has to do with facing -- basically getting good

 Web search rankings with your website when people are doing Web searches.
- Q. So when you say SEO, you mean search engine optimization?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Tell me about what you did in that project.
- A. We were using Google Adwords, which is a service with Google for paid advertising. And it's somewhat complicated on how you arrange your Web

- 1 pages, the content of your Web pages.
 - Q. Who, if anyone, asked you to undertake that project?
 - A. Mr. Huffman.

- Q. What did he tell you?
- A. He told me that some changes were made to the website and what we were paying, which -- about -- was about \$8,000 a year in Web ads on Google -- for Google, had increased to \$50,000 a year.
- Q. And the work that he wanted you to do to update that, did that require you to come to the office?
- A. It was more convenient for me. I don't think I had to, but I did.
- Q. Did you have a big office when you came in to do that?
- A. No. I had sort of a half of a cubicle, I suppose. I just had a workstation, one computer, and a chair and a small desk.
- Q. If you stood up and stretched your arms out, could you touch both sides of the cubicle?
- A. Yes.
- Q. How long did that project last?
 - A. I really don't remember. I -- I spent some time and put quite a bit of detail into it. But as far as how long it took, I basically produced a report for Mr. Huffman that had some details as to

what had kind of gone wrong, some things that could be -- a couple of alternatives on how he could change things to kind of get it back to where it was.

Q. Okay. What was the next project you did?

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

Vague as to time.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I believe we're probably around early 2013 now, maybe -- maybe later in 2012. Give me a moment, because I'm trying to think of kind of the order of things.

They had told me that, you know, they wanted to produce a new version of the software and they were lacking any features, I guess, that were more visible to the customer. And they were looking for me to do some enhancements to the -- the interface to make it, I guess, you know, more -- more visible to the customer that there were changes worthy of a new version, I guess.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. And where did you work on that project?
- A. At the office.
 - Q. Same cubicle?
 - A. At the time, I think so.
- Q. How long did that take?
 - A. There were a number of kind of pieces to it that occurred. I was probably there a couple of

1 months.

- Q. Anyone help you with that?
- A. I would provide changes to the software and other -- and integrate them with the -- whatever testing release that they were working with, and others would usually, you know, help test them.
- Q. Anyone complain about your programming at that point?
- A. Not at that time, except that -- except
 there was one exception, because there was one
 program that I worked on that -- it's -- it was a -kind of an underlying command in the product that
 just accumulates a list of files to be backed up.

 It's sort of a pre-backup process where it just
 comes up with a list of files to back up. And I
 made some changes to that to make it run much faster
 or more efficiently. And in the process, I made a
 change to the way you call the command by adding -
 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. The
 witness is narrating.

THE COURT: Sustained.

22 BY MR. KING:

- Q. There was some objection to the change of -- the little change you made in the process you were just describing, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Was that the only objection?
- 28 A. As far as I know, yes.

Q. And what -- was this part of an update to the software?

- A. It was when they were wanting to release a new version. That would be 8.1.
- Q. Now, I'm going to kind of shift gears and go back in time a little bit.

Back when you left in 2011, you had -what, if anything, did you ask your sister to do to
be involved -- sorry. What if anything, did you ask
your sister, Michelle, to do with Storix after you
stepped down?

A. I guess her role was, you know, primarily just to take over the administrative tasks that I did as far as billing, accounts receivable, you know, the bookkeeping end of things. But also -- because I -- because I did everything myself prior to that, and now there were potentially new and different people that were going to be working on this.

It was more a matter of kind of organizing some of the things that I had done into more formal processes and to take doc -- you know, paperwork that I threw in a file cabinet and scan it in and keep it all electronically.

- Q. Why her?
- A. Well, there were a lot of reasons. Because it was -- it was good timing in that -- you know, for her. It was also a temporary position that we

anticipated might go for a year while she was still remaining in -- she was planning on moving with her husband to San -- to Las Vegas. He was already there. So it was convenient for her to have this temporary position.

She also had a lot of -- a lot of business experience in a lot of different areas, not necessarily all, but I know she's a very quick learner and a very quick researcher. And obviously, it gave me the opportunity, I guess, to, you know, exit a little earlier without having to do all of that skill transfer myself.

- Q. Okay. So -- and then she ended up -- her position was temporary, you said?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. When did she end up leaving?
- A. I believe she ended up leaving two or three months before the year that she anticipated being there.
 - Q. So after nine months, approximately?
 - A. Roughly, yeah, I think so.
- Q. Now, during the time that you were gone, 2011 and 2012, did any of the defendants ever send you an e-mail?
- A. I don't think -- I don't think so, unless maybe in the case of that SEO project. I think that after I got engaged in that, Huffman and I may have exchanged some e-mails, but I don't know of any

1 others.

- Q. Did any of the defendants contact you to check in and see how you were doing?
 - A. No.
- Q. Did they ever contact you after you returned from any of your vacations?
- A. Well, I wouldn't call it a vacation, but I went on a three-month trip to Africa to do some charity work. And after I was gone for three months, I was contacted by Huffman to say, Hey, we want to have a dinner to welcome you back from your trip.
- Q. And did you have a welcome-back meal with Mr. Huffman and the others?
 - A. We did.
- Q. And was it shortly after that that you started doing these projects?
- A. Yeah. That was -- the point of, I think, the meal was to engage me and -- on other projects.
 - Q. Why do you say that?
 - A. Well, because that's when they asked me to do it.
- Q. Yeah, but why do you say that was the point of the meal?
- A. Because I -- I hadn't heard from them in many months. I didn't anticipate -- well, I mean, when I received the e-mail, it seemed rather odd that -- it just was a little out of place to welcome

me back from a trip. I kind of -- I mean, I knew they were going to be asking me to do something, so -- and I didn't mind.

Q. How did you know that?

- A. Because that's -- the only time that they spoke with me was when they needed me to do something.
- Q. And was that correct then? I mean, did they, in fact, ask you to do something at that meal?
- A. Well, at the end of the meal, if -- there was sort of a little bit of discomfort. You know, Huffman was getting a little squirrely as we were getting toward the end of the meal.

So I -- you know, I anticipated what was coming, and I made a comment about, Now that I'm back from this, you know, I have to figure out what else to do now, you know.

And Huffman of course said, Hey, well, if you're bored, we've got work to do.

I was throwing him a bone and he bit, and so I did -- I didn't mind. I knew, you know, what they were going to ask.

- Q. Did you mind getting back involved?
- A. No. No, not at all.
- Q. At some point in 2013 you found out your health improved, right?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. What did the doctor tell you, that you were

getting better?

- A. Well, I'll try to answer the question without narrating, because it's not a simple answer. Effectively, my symptoms had not continued to progress as expected. And by the end of about 18 months, I was told that I was essentially clear of the melanoma.
 - Q. No more tumors?
- A. No more tumors. It was anticipated that at my stage that I would be continually having tumors cropping up and, you know, keep dealing with them until there's just -- until they crop up somewhere where you can't.
- Q. But you're one of the rare cases where they just stopped cropping up?
- A. Very rare, yes. About -- I was told about a 3 percent --
- MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Improper opinion.
- 20 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 21 BY MR. KING:
 - Q. After you found out your health improved, did you make an announcement at all?
 - A. I made it known in a number of ways, I suppose. You know, I don't know an announcement, per se. I mean, I announced on Facebook, I suppose, that my health had improved. But I spoke to different people. I don't remember specific

1 conversations, but I think I made it known. 2 Q. Okay. 3 THE COURT: Is this a good time for our 4 morning recess? 5 MR. KING: It is a good time. THE COURT: All right. Ladies and 6 7 gentlemen, we'll take our morning recess. And just 8 so you know, today we're going to recess at 11:45 9 for scheduling reasons and then resume at 1:30. So 10 remember the admonition and have a great break here, 11 and we'll see you back in 15 minutes. Thank you. 12 (Whereupon the jurors exit the courtroom.) 13 (Brief recess.) 14 (Whereupon the jurors enter the courtroom.) 15 THE COURT: Welcome back, ladies and 16 gentlemen. 17 Mr. King. BY MR. KING: 18 19 At some point you returned on a more 20 regular basis to work at Storix in 2013? 21 Α. Yes. 22 When you returned to work at the company 23 around that time, what, if any, discussion was there about you having a management or decision-making 24 25 role? 26 I wouldn't call it a discussion. 27 Mr. Huffman -- I was probably involved in the

project for some time already when Mr. Huffman

approached me and asked me what my intentions were, did I anticipate coming back to the company full-time, and did I -- was I expecting my old salary back.

- Q. And what did -- and what did you say in response?
- A. I -- I said that I wasn't prepared to make a permanent or a long-term commitment at this time, but I'd revisit the issue, I guess, after I completed this project, which was still many months of work.
- Q. Was Mr. Huffman offering you the chance to come back in a decision-making role?
- A. Well, it sounded like it by the fact that -- well, he was asking me if I was wanting to come back to -- I'm trying to -- trying to remember the words or at least paraphrase them properly. He asked me if -- he effectively was asking me if I wanted my old job back.
- Q. And this was, you described, after you started in on this project that you were working on at the time. Tell me about that project.
- A. Well, the project was going to be to create a new version of the product, understanding that when I left the company, Version 7 was available, specifically release 7.2. After I left the company, they began working on a new version, which became Version 8.1.

- 1
- Okay. Q.
- 2 3
- now working on release 8.2, release being the second

Okay. At the time I came back, they were

- 4
- Okay. I was working on a new version,
- 5
- which would be called -- which would be 9.1.

more specifically, it was -- the primary goal of

- 6
- 7 this version was to increase -- well, dramatically
- 8
- improve the network security of the product.
- 9
- Were you asked to work on Version 8.2 with
- 10

them?

on 8.2.

- 11 There might have been a time or two
- 12 when they asked for some advice on something, but I
- 13 wasn't involved really, to my knowledge, in any way
- 14
- 15 You were only asked to work on Version 9.1?

It -- I guess we kind of collectively

- 16
- 17 decided that I would work on a separate version.
- 18
- 0. And who decided exactly what you would be doing on 9.1?
- 19
- 20 You might have to rephrase the question as

to what you mean by "decided."

- 21
- Q. What was your scope of work on 9.1?

what was -- what was considered obsolete security

My scope of work was -- basically, I

23

- 24 defined the scope of work by basically doing, you
- 25
- know, research into the needs of updating the --
- 26
- 27 standards of the software and basically how to go
- 28
- about doing that.

1 MR. KING: Your Honor, may I approach? THE COURT: Yes. 2 BY MR. KING: 3 4 Take a look at Exhibit 189. Mr. Johnson, 5 can you tell me what Exhibit 189 is? This is a document that's about 35 pages 6 Α. 7 called "SB Admin Security Enhancements." 8 (Exhibit 189 referenced.) BY MR. KING: 9 10 Q. Did you write this document? 11 A. I did. 12 And is this your scope of work that you 13 were going to be doing on Version 9.1? Yeah, this is a detailed design document of 14 15 exactly how I was going to do it. 16 Did you share this document with the other 17 defendants? 18 Α. Yes, yes. 19 Did you share it with them before you 20 started work on it? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. Did any of the defendants say any -- have 23 any objection to the scope of work you described? 24 Not at the time, no. About what time did you show this design 25 Ο. 26 document to the defendants? 27 It's hard to nail down a time frame.

could have been around October/November of 2013, the

1 first version anyway. There were slight 2 modifications along the way. 3 MR. KING: Your Honor, I move to have 4 Exhibit 189 in evidence. 5 MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Foundation. Improper opinion. Hearsay. And Storix's motion in 6 7 limine on technical details. 8 THE COURT: Response as to the latter? 9 MR. KING: Not too much technical detail in 10 there, especially because none of these were 11 actually implemented in Storix software. 12 THE COURT: Were not? 13 MR. KING: Were not. 14 MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, it's a 35-page 15 document providing technical details of both prior 16 versions and proposed versions of the software. 17 THE COURT: Absent further foundation and 18 relative to that motion, sustained at this point. 19 BY MR. KING: 20 Mr. Johnson, we heard testimony from 21 Mr. Huffman and Mr. Turner that the work you did on 22 Version 9.1 went beyond the scope that you described 23 in Exhibit 189. 24 Can you tell me where your scope -- where 25 the work on Version 9.1 exceeded the scope you

MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Misstates prior testimony.

described on 189, if at all?

26

27

1 THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what Mr. Huffman was referring to except for one specific example, which was actually incorrect, because the only example he provided was that I had modularized the code. I don't -- I won't go into a big explanation of what that means, but it's just sort of reorganizing things, you know, to be a little bit neater and more efficient within the code.

But that -- what he's referring to is actually something that I did with the software after I left Storix in May of 2014. It was not part of the 9.1 project or any part of the project plan.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. So as far as you're aware, there's nothing that you did on Version 9.1 while you were at Storix that exceeded the scope in that design document?
- A. I wouldn't say that entirely. One thing that I did do is as I was making changes for Version 9.1, which really required a code change throughout virtually all of the product, I also at the same time added some sort of code tracing and debugging facility into it so that as I was making changes both for this and for all time in the future, I had the ability to, you know, very easily, you know, trace what was going on in the code and much more quickly isolate problems, debug, and fix them. So that was, you know, generally something

that you would do -- that's the kind of project you
would do when you were engaged in --

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. The witness is narrating.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. So other than that, did you -- is there anything else you're aware of where your work on 9.1 went beyond the scope you described in Exhibit 189?
- A. Other than the ordinary course of code cleanup, I would say no.
- Q. Who else at Storix was helping you with the Version 9.1 updates?
 - A. No one.
 - Q. Why?
- A. They were working on -- concurrently on their release 8.2. And other company activities were happening, such as moving into new offices and some other tasks involved in that. And why not?

 I -- I can't really say why not.
- Q. Did you ask if anyone wanted to be involved on your work on 9.1?
- A. I suggested in a meeting once that, you know, at least in part, someone should probably work with me, you know, at some stage to learn what it was that I was doing.
- Q. And what was the response to your suggestion?

A. That they were all too busy on their project and they didn't have time for it.

- Q. Did anyone ask you to help out with Version 8.2 that the other employees were working on?
- A. Well, I think -- as I said, I think that there was perhaps, you know, a question or two that came my way on -- you know, for advice, but it was never anything extensive. I didn't do, to my knowledge, any work -- any programming work on 8.2.
- Q. Did you offer to contribute any of the stuff you were working on in Version 9.1 to the Version 8.2 that the other employees were working on?
 - A. Not Version 8.2, no.
- Q. Tell me what you -- tell me what you did offer.
- A. Well, Version -- this Version 9.1 was a very complicated project involving many pieces, and some of these pieces could be kind of isolated and done, you know, in parts.

I suggested at one meeting that -- that it might be advisable to take the first part of the project that I completed and actually release it as a Version 8.3. Rather than going straight from 8.2 to 9.1, we could release it as a 8.3, which would mean less -- it would make it easier to test things in part, release it in part, rather than kind of

- throw, you know, the -- everything at the customer at one time. So --
 - Q. How was that offer received?

 MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Vague.

5 THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Turner got very angry when I suggested that, Mr. Turner. And I didn't quite understand why, because I -- it seemed like a reasonable suggestion. So I -- I really don't know why that -- you know, I guess don't know why that was until he got on the stand yesterday and testified that I was trying to get my changes into Version 8.2, which was not true at all. I wasn't suggesting they change anything with --

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. The witness is narrating.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. Were you trying to change what they were working on with 8.2?
 - A. Not in any way.
- Q. How did you feel about your place on the team at that point?
- A. I was never made aware of any team. I don't know that the word was ever used at the time that I was working there, that there was a team of any kind.
 - Q. What do you mean? I mean, you're working

- with a bunch of employees together at the same office. You didn't feel like you were a team?
 - A. I know I wasn't a team. I was working entirely independent, and no one was working with me and no one wanted to.
 - Q. But you were invited to all the same discussions and meetings as all these other guys, right?
 - A. No, not at all.

- Q. Why do you say that?
- A. Well, they had Monday morning meetings typically. And I started coming to those to, you know, just try to show a little bit more support, but, you know, not necessarily trying to intrude.

 Often the meetings were canceled and I was told that an e-mail went out, but I never received the e-mail. So -- in fact, I never received an e-mail that was sent to what they referred to as the team.
- Q. Before you came back to work on Version 9.1, what, if anything, had the defendants told you about their plans to buy out your shares?
- A. Oh, there was no -- I was not aware of any such plan.
- Q. What, if anything, had the defendants told you about their plans to propose all the shareholders sign a buy-sell agreement?

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.
Assumes facts not in evidence.

THE COURT: Sustained. 1 2 BY MR. KING: 3 What, if anything, did the defendants tell 4 you about a potential buy-sell agreement before you 5 came back to work on Version 9.1? There was no mention. 6 Α. 7 What, if anything, did the defendants tell you about Storix getting a loan for the purpose of 8 buying your shares before you came back to work --9 10 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection. 11 BY MR. KING: 12 -- on Version 9.1? 0. 13 MR. MCCLOSKEY: I'm sorry. Assumes facts not in evidence. 14 15 THE COURT: Sustained. 16 BY MR. KING: 17 What, if anything, did the defendants tell Q. 18 you about buying out your shares before you came 19 back to work at Storix on Version 9.1? 20 There was no discussion. 21 What, if anything, would you have done 22 differently had you known in February 2013 that 23 Defendants were looking for a loan to buy out your 24 shares? 25 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 26 Assumes facts not in evidence. And as a result, 27 calls for speculation.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:
Q. Wha
differently

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. What, if anything, would you have done differently had you known that Defendants were looking at entering a buy-sell agreement before you came back to work at Storix?

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. That assumes facts not in evidence and calls for speculation.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

Q. If you had known someone -- one of the defendants had told you -- said, "We are looking at getting a loan to buy your 40 percent shares," would you have come back to work for -- at Storix in 2013?

Assumes facts not in evidence. Calls for a hypothetical.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. KING: May I approach, Your Honor?

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Pardon?

MR. KING: May I approach the witness?

THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. Taking a look at Exhibit 124. Have you seen this document before, Mr. Johnson?
- 26 A. Yes.

27 (Exhibit 124 referenced.)

1 BY MR. KING:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Where did you see it?
- A. This was a document that was produced in the discovery during the copyright litigation.
 - Q. Who produced that document?
- A. Storix.
- Q. What is the document you're looking at?
 - A. It is a chain of e-mails between David

 Smiljkovich, the defendant, who is the former CFO of

 Storix, and a woman at Wells Fargo bank.
 - Q. Had you ever seen this document before?
 - A. Not prior to it being produced in that discovery.
 - Q. If you had seen this document before -- if you had seen this document before you started working at Storix in 2013, would you have agreed to come back and work on Version 9.1?
 - A. Definitely not.
 - Q. Why not?
 - A. Because it became clear to me -- and this was for the first time and about a year into the copyright litigation that I first discovered why we were in litigation, and the -- the clear intent here was that --
- 25 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.
 26 That calls for speculation. Lacks foundation.
- 27 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 28 THE WITNESS: Um.

THE COURT: No. 1 2 Next question. 3 THE WITNESS: Why would I have not --4 THE COURT: No. 5 Question. THE WITNESS: Sorry. 6 7 BY MR. KING: What did you learn from Exhibit 124? 8 9 I learned that during the entire time that I was working on the Version 9.1 changes, which was 10 11 about nine months into a year-long project, the 12 defendants were simultaneously attempting to --13 well, they were -- they were devising a plan to 14 force me to buy -- to sell the remaining shares I 15 had of Storix to the company. 16 MR. KING: Your Honor, I move to have 17 Exhibit 124 admitted into evidence. 18 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. Ιt 19 lacks foundation and it's hearsay as well. 20 THE COURT: Sustained. 21 BY MR. KING: 22 Now, at some point after the -- at some 23 point while you were working on Version 9.1, the 24 defendants finished their Version 8.2, right? 25 Α. Correct. 26 And at that point were they ready to help 27 you on 9.1?

28

Α.

No.

1 Why not? Q. 2 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 3 Calls for speculation. 4 THE COURT: Sustained. 5 BY MR. KING: Why did -- why did they -- what did they 6 7 tell you as far as why they were not able to help you on 9.1? 8 9 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. Assumes facts not in evidence. 10 11 THE COURT: Sustained. 12 BY MR. KING: 13 Did you ask Defendants to help you on Q. Version 9.1 after they finished 8.2? 14 15 I asked at various times whether they were 16 prepared to start at least looking at what I was 17 doing. 18 Q. And what did they tell you in response? 19 They had several excuses over the course of 20 several months, beginning with that the offices were 21 moving to a new location, that they ran in --22 customers were running into problems with 23 Version 8.2 that they had to take time to fix. 24 There were about three weeks where, you 25 know, all the technical staff was busy working on 26 problems with the new phone system and reconfiguring 27 the network in the new office, just various -- it

28

just seemed like excuses.

- Q. Eventually, they did take a look at what you'd done on Version 9.1?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And what did they -- what did they say?
- A. There's a lot of -- there's a lot of answer to that. I'm -- you know, they said that it didn't work; that I wasn't testing it enough; that it didn't do what anybody wanted; that no customer would want to use it. I mean, the list goes on.
 - Q. Why didn't it work?
- A. Well, first of all, it -- we were about four months away from release, so not all of the things in the design were completed yet.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. Okay. So they were provide -- I provided them basically a list of those things that were working and ready to test and those that weren't. But before they wanted to start testing things, they wanted me to take all of the changes that they had made for Version 8.2, which was done simultaneously with my work, and apply the changes that they made for 8.2 to my Version 9.1.
- Q. Just so I'm clear, when you did

 Version 9.1, Version 8.2 wasn't ready yet, right?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. So you built 9.1 on top of what?
- A. Well, there -- you always start -- we're about -- we were all working on updates to the

software, but they were working on one release of an update. I was working on a separate version, but we both started with the same base, which were --

- Q. What was the base?
- A. That was Version 8.1.
- Q. Okay. And so after you finished with 9.1 with 8.1 as the base, they asked you to merge it with their 8.2 they did?

9 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection. Leading, 10 Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. What did they ask you as far as merging the software, if anything?
- A. They asked me to take all of the changes that they made from Version 8.1 to their Version 8 dot -- or release 8.2 and apply those changes to my Version 9.1.
 - Q. And what happened when you did that merger?
- A. Much of the things that were working before weren't working anymore in my version.
 - Q. Did you know why they weren't working?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Why?
- A. It's a rather -- a little bit of a complicated answer.
- Q. Give me the 30-second version.
- A. The -- the method that they went about of

making their changes was extremely haphazard. And they did what we commonly refer to as a lot of hard coding, which means they were -- rather than -- rather than changing the design of the software to accomplish what they needed to do, they would circumvent the design of the software by making exceptions to the rules.

And those exceptions were very numerous and when applied to my version, which did have some design changes to it, I anticipated it would be a pretty smooth transition, but it -- it was quite a mess, actually.

- Q. Did you ask them for help in making your Version 9.1 compatible with their Version 8.2?
- A. I'm not sure I understand the question as far as compatible with 8.2. I think the -- it was more an issue of trying to get the changes that they made to work with my Version 9.1.
- Q. Okay. And did you ask them for help with that?
- A. Well, Rich Turner first approached me to say -- you know, he wanted to see what we had and they would begin testing it. When they began testing it, they started seeing a lot of the problems, but I tried to fix as -- much of it before I gave it to them. But when I did give it to them, I said, Look --

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

- 1 Nonresponsive. The witness is narrating.
- 2 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 3 BY MR. KING:

- Q. At first, you approached -- you gave the software to Rich Turner and said, "All right. It's ready for testing." Fair statement?
- A. No.
 - Q. All right. Tell me what happened.
 - A. At some point while I was continuing my work on Version 9.1, Richard Turner said to me, "Okay. We're ready to see what you have."
 - Q. Okay. And then what did you do?
 - A. I was in the middle of a lot of changes. I was primarily trying to work through the problems we just discussed.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. And I told them that I needed time, you know, to work out some things that I hadn't finished yet.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. And it took a couple of weeks.
- Q. And after those couple weeks, what did you do?
- A. It wasn't all completed, but at least I had parts of the product done to where I gave it to them and said, Well, here -- here's what I have finished that you can test with. Here's some other things to avoid for the moment, because I'm still working on

it and so forth, but that they should avoid using this new feature that they added in Version 8.2 because it was still problematic and I would need their help in resolving it because I didn't quite understand what they were doing there.

- Q. And what did you expect the -- Mr. Turner and the other people on the development team to do?
- A. To -- well, to begin testing those things that, you know, were ready for testing in my opinion and report back to me any problems they had and -- so I could fix them, or in some cases, they could -- you know, if it's easy enough to do, find and fix them themselves.
- Q. Why did you expect that was going to be the case? Why did you expect it was going to be -- transpire the way you described?
- A. Well, because at least prior to my leaving in 2011, that's how we worked as a team.
 - Q. What actually happened?
- A. That's really a lot of -- where a lot of the hostility began.
 - Q. What do you mean?
- A. That -- there was so much that it's hard -it's hard to put into, you know, a concise

 statement. But they ultimately didn't -- they
 thought -- I'm not sure why. Mr. Turner said that
 there were too many bugs, it wasn't ready for
 testing, and I had to do the testing myself before I

gave it to them to test. That was the first of many problems, I suppose.

- Q. Did they offer to help you in some way, or did -- or was it simply fix it yourself and come back when it's better?
- A. I don't think Mr. Turner or Mr. Huffman had ever actually seen or tried to use it themselves, but they had a new support person that was with the company about three months and he was running through some testing and reporting to me some problems. They weren't significant.

And I would fix those problems and basically post those problems to what we call a repository, where others can then, you know, download and continue, you know, with whatever the latest version was. But Mr. Turner kept complaining that I wasn't -- I had to have everything fixed before I could make -- before I could put any code changes into the repository, I had to have everything fixed.

- Q. Is that the only thing he complained about?
- A. No.

- Q. What else did he complain about?
- A. I know that at one point he complained that as I was making code changes -- this was entirely working on my own -- I was, you know, making code changes and posting them to this repository, not so much that other people could take it and use it,

because they weren't doing so, but that by posting changes incrementally to the repository, it keeps track of all the changes you made. And if you need to, you can back something out or go back and look at what change you made at what point. And one of the things that you do when you post things to a repository is you typically put in --

- Q. Okay. So what did Mr. Turner complain about it? I know you're getting to it. I just need you to tell me.
- A. I'm sorry. I tend to answer things backwards.

He was complaining that I wasn't putting enough comments in when I was posting my changes to the repository describing all the changes that I was making.

- Q. Is that true?
- A. For the most part, no. But occasionally, I would make changes that were not relevant to anyone but me, particularly if I was making multiple iterations of changes to the same code.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. Because no one else was looking at it yet.

 And by the time anyone did look at it, those changes would be irrelevant.
- Q. In other words, by the time it was ready for someone to look at it, there would be a comment there explaining what the change was?

A. Oh, yeah. They would understand,

of course, what the overall changes were. They

didn't need to know every incremental change I made

to the code to get there.

- Q. What did you understand Mr. Turner was mad about then?
- A. Mr. Turner was mad about everything. I honestly -- I just couldn't -- I -- nothing that I did he agreed with. Everything I did was wrong.

 You know, he -- this was such a ridiculous complaint. Because the moment he said -- said that to me, I started making comments on everything that I did and I -- and without fail, never did, but he's continued complaining about it ever since that I never do that.

But the moment he told me that, I started putting in these comments, as unnecessary as it was, every single time, without fail, but he never stopped complaining that I never comment in my code. You know, so that was just another example.

- Q. What, if anything, did Mr. Turner tell you about a password on the Version 9.1?
- A. I would say it was about halfway through the project, I suppose, as far as development goes and just -- and went to one of these Monday morning meetings to update everybody on what I was working on. This was shortly after I completed the design document that detailed exactly how I was going to do

everything.

I presented that to them, and initially, they were fine with it. But then when I came back after actually beginning the programming and Mr. Turner decided that he didn't want any passwords to be added to the software that -- he said that this was too much of an inconvenience on the customers. He didn't want me to be putting in any -- any change that would require any -- the customer to do something that they didn't have to do before.

- Q. Wait, wait, wait. You -- this -- this was -- the password thing was something that you had described in your design document before you started work on this?
 - A. Yes.

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection. Leading.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. Where did you first -- where did you first notify the defendants, if at all, about this password requirement?
 - A. It was all detailed in the design document.
- Q. What objections, if any, did Mr. Turner have when you showed him the design document?
- A. There were none.
 - Q. How long was it that you were working on

Version 9.1 until Mr. Turner raised an objection about this password issue?

- A. I was working on Version 9.1 for several months before completing the design document, and it was several months after beginning the programming based on a design document that he complained about the -- using a password.
- Q. Was -- was -- removing the password, was that an easy fix?
 - A. It was an impossibility.
- Q. In other words, what was the point of you doing all this work if you were going to remove the password?
- A. Mr. Turner's complaint was that each client's system that you're going to back up -- and we referred to them as clients, the system you're going to back up -- when you configure within the software that as a client to be backed up, you would assign a password to it. And this -- that was added to this design document.

His complaint was that he didn't want the customer to have to enter a password for each client when they configured it. Mr. Kinney then suggested that we have a global password that -- or we'll call it a group password so that all the clients in the group -- client, computers, or systems in the group would all use the same password.

I -- I didn't like that idea because it

actually lessened the security from what we had before, but I nevertheless -- Richard Turner seemed to agree that that was an acceptable solution.

So I altered the design and also updated the design document, and I created a group password option so that when the customers -- customers could simply choose a single option. They said I want this pass -- this group password to apply to all clients, or I can assign a different password to every client. And that was then added to the design document, distributed, and I probably took about an extra three weeks or so getting that -- that change made.

- Q. So after that, you never heard anything again from Mr. Turner on the password issue, right?
- A. No. I heard about it again, but it was several months later.
- Q. Okay. I'm starting to get the sequence. You're saying that before you started the programming, you did the design document, right?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And then after the design document came out and everyone looked at it, Mr. Kinney said, Let's put in a global password instead of an individual client password?
- A. That wasn't until after Richard Turner later complained about the password, but that was Mr. Kinney's ultimate solution.

- Q. And that was after you already started coding or working on the software?
 - A. Yes, sometime later.

- Q. And after you implemented the global password solution, what did you hear from Mr. Turner about the password?
- A. It wasn't until several months later that -- and at this point where Mr. Turner said, Okay, we're ready to now start looking at the software and testing it, that suddenly became a major problem again.
- Q. When you say that became a major problem, what do you mean? What did Mr. Turner say that made you believe that?
- A. He -- Mr. Turner said that despite the changes that I made to the -- that he seemed to approve would satisfy -- satisfy his need, I could not -- I -- that he would not allow any change to the software that required a password, period.
- Q. Okay. So after first approving and saying you can do a password for each system and then after approving a global password, now Mr. Turner said, I'm not approving anything to have any password?
- A. It was actually even more specific than that.
 - Q. What did he say?
- A. I asked Mr. Turner -- well, Mr. Turner said he didn't want there to be any change to the

software where the customer had to do anything different. My response was -- and I can almost quote it -- "Rich, are you telling me that you won't allow me to make any change to the software that a customer can actually see?" And he said yes.

- Q. If that's -- if that was the goal, what would that have meant for Version 9.1 updates that you were doing?
- A. Well, obviously, they would never -- I mean, I can't imagine anything new ever getting released. I mean, I was just -- I didn't know how to -- I was stunned. I didn't know how to respond to that. And immediately after saying that, he ended the meeting and walked away, so I was just kind of -- I don't know. I wouldn't know what to do or say.
- Q. How did that comment make you feel about the work you had been doing for the past seven months?
- A. I was -- I was -- it was -- I was so confused. I was just -- I was just so confused. There was so much I didn't understand. Okay. This was not the Richard Turner that I knew. Okay. What he was saying and the things that he -- the demands he was making and it was -- it was just -- not just unreasonable, but completely irrational and I knew it.

And I looked to David Huffman many of the

times when these things were being said, but David never said anything, but just sort of had this almost satisfied look on his face.

And I looked to David Kinney, and David
Kinney was always -- he would always just kind of,
you know, look down, like, you know, I -- he wasn't
paying attention. I mean, this wasn't -- this was
just -- it was just so irrational and so
unreasonable that it clearly wasn't about passwords.

Mr. Turner put passwords in his own software. So I
don't know why -- what was going on.

- Q. Okay. When you say Mr. Huffman had a satisfied look on his face, were you having these conversations in front of Mr. Huffman?
- A. Oh, yeah. These conversations always happened at sort of a technical staff meeting.
 - Q. Is this different than the Monday meeting?
- A. Well, on Monday, they would have a meeting with the full staff, which included the sales staff.

 And then the sales staff would go away, and they would have a technical meeting.
- Q. And so all of these -- all of these kind of disputes you're talking about with Mr. Turner, they're all occurring at these technical staff meetings. Fair statement?
- A. Yes, I think so.
- Q. And you said Mr. Huffman had a satisfied look on his face. Why do you say that? What did

you see?

A. Because I was looking to someone, particularly Mr. Huffman, to say, you know, This makes no sense. What's happening here?

But, you know, like I said, it was just -he just had this look on his face like -- like, Boy,
good for you, Rich. You really told him off. And
I --

- Q. Was he smiling?
- A. Kind of a bit of a smirk, I guess, if -you know, I guess that's what I would call it. He
 just -- he didn't intervene or say anything, at
 least not at that point, not until things got really
 out of control and, you know --
 - Q. What was the next thing that happened?
- A. Again, at a staff meeting -- I had again been just working as hard as I could, as fast as I could, to try to -- you know, to get any problems resolved to -- so that -- you know, to cut down on Mr. Turner's complaints about my not testing things enough before I give it to them to test.

And, you know, it was -- it -- you know, at another staff meeting, I -- you know, Rich was complaining about me not testing enough before I was testing things, and yet they had this other person kind of testing things and reporting bugs to me, which I was fixing. And I was posting, you know -- you know, I would post them to the repository so

that he could test those changes, but Rich was complaining that I was posting changes to the repository without everything being fixed yet.

And my response to that was, you know,
Rich, I'm making changes to 150,000 lines of code
across the entire product. I can't do it all at one
time. Okay. I need -- and if somebody has a
problem with something, I need to be able to post
that fix and let him work with that.

But the way the repository was, you kind of had to commit everything you're working on at once. So those things that weren't working before, I would post changes and those things would still not be working. And Rich wanted everything working before I posted any changes.

- Q. And he wanted you to fix it?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Was there anyone else at Storix that had the capability to fix it?
- A. There were areas I was working in that no one else could have -- there were other things that if they took the time to look at it, could probably have been much more helpful.
- Q. Did you expect them to provide you more help in putting the -- fixing the problems that were uncovered in Version 9.1?
- A. I wasn't really getting any -- much of any help, and I was expecting quite a bit since they had

nothing else to do at that point.

Q. We heard from -- I believe it was

Mr. Turner and Mr. Huffman that before they became

60 percent owners in stock -- the defendants became

60 percent owners of Storix that Mr. Turner and

Mr. Huffman were sort of the cleanup crew after you

would do most of the major coding.

Do you recall that testimony?

A. Yes.

- Q. Was that an accurate characterization of the working relationship before you left in 2011?
- A. Well, I don't know that "cleanup crew" is a very good description, because it kind of implies that I demolished everything before they had to come and clean it up, you know.
- Q. Okay. But as far as the description of you doing the major coding and they kind of -- Huffman and Turner kind of being in charge of fixing and cleaning up the stuff that you did, is that a fair description?
- A. I think it was a -- kind of a fair description. It's not like I just wrote code and gave it to them but never actually did any testing at all.
- Q. Okay. So when you came back in 2013, were you expecting that it was just going to be like before, that Anthony, the boss, gets to tell Mr. Huffman and Mr. Turner what to do?

1 A. No, not at all.

- Q. What were you expecting?
- A. Well, I -- no one talked to me about any environmental changes to the way things worked.

 Nobody told me that there were any new policies or anything of that sort. And when I came back to work, I was working on the code all by myself, as I often did before.

So I -- I had no reason not to think that as I was making changes to code and at least releasing it to them in stages to test in stages that they would do it the same way that they did before.

- Q. And were you expecting that the people that would be doing the kind of testing and reporting -- "cleaning up," we'll use -- were you expecting those people would still be Mr. Huffman and Turner, or were you expecting it was just going to be someone?
- A. I didn't have an expectation of who it would be, but there were only -- I mean, it was only Mr. Kinney, Mr. Turner, Mr. Huffman, and then this one new person that -- you know, at the company.

 But most of the bugs that were reported to me came from this new person that had only been at the company for three months, I think.
- Q. Did you ever approach Mr. Huffman one-on-one to complain about what -- how difficult the environment was before you -- while you were

1 working at Storix in 2014?

- A. Mr. Huffman was present during all of these difficulties, so I didn't approach him separately.
- Q. Did you ever have any discussions with Mr. Huffman about these issues in 2014?
 - A. When I sent a resignation letter, I did.
- Q. Tell me -- was there something that preceded the resignation letter that sparked you to send it?
- A. Yeah. I think it was the final Monday meeting when after all the efforts that I made to try to really bend over backwards to do everything that -- that Mr. Turner kept demanding, I made all of the -- I was doing all of the code changes in large bulk and testing it as best I could before submitting it.

You know, they had even created a new level to this repository to which they called the sandbox where I could post changes to this without having to have all of the changes --

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. Narrative.

THE WITNESS: -- done, but --

THE COURT: Sustained.

THE WITNESS: Sorry. I --

BY MR. KING:

Q. Hold on, hold on, hold on.

Tell me specifically what happened at this

last Monday meeting before you sent your resignation.

- A. All of the things that I had done to try to bend over backwards to meet their demands they were still complaining about.
- Q. What specifically did they say at this meeting?
- A. After repeating most of the things that they said before, Mr. Turner said that base -- he said that because there was still the need for a password, one password that you put in one time when you install the software, that no customer would ever use this.

He said, I don't know anything about what customers want, because I don't take customer calls. And he said that -- you know, that no one was going to use this if it required a password and he would not allow it to be released.

And I looked to David Huffman and David Huffman said, You know, Anthony, nobody asked for any of this anyway.

- Q. Was that true?
- A. No.
- Q. What did you do right after Mr. Huffman said that?
 - A. I left. I just left.
- Q. You mean you walked out of the room or you left the office?

- A. I -- I don't remember exactly. I don't -I don't think I had any response to that. I was -I had -- I had just no response to it. I think I
 left at that point, and I think I left the office
 and I just -- I didn't return for a couple days.
 - Q. What did you interpret Mr. Huffman to mean when he said no one asked for that anyway?
 - A. That the last nine or ten months worth of work that I did was for nothing.
 - Q. Did you come back to the office that day?
 - A. No.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. Did Mr. Huffman attempt to call you that day?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Did Mr. Turner attempt to call you that day?
- 17 A. No.
 - Q. Did you come back the next day?
- 19 A. No.
- Q. Either Mr. Huffman or Mr. Turner attempt to call you the following day?
 - A. No one tried to call, no.
 - Q. Anyone try and contact you one way or the other, e-mail, text, anything?
 - A. I don't believe so. I think I might have gotten a quick text from either Mr. Turner or Mr. Kinney saying, "Are you coming in today?" And I replied no. That was the second day.

- Q. When you decided to make these employees 60 percent owners of Storix, is this what you expected?
 - A. Certainly not.

- Q. What did you expect?
- A. Well, I expected that I was going to die in two years. Okay. So obviously, that changed.

The question is what did I expect. I expected that, you know -- I basically gave, on average, 15 percent of my company to my four long-term employees, effectively making them partners.

And even though I wasn't expected to return for a long project and I wouldn't have taken on such a long project if I had not been, you know -- if my health hadn't changed, I would have expected to have been treated like a partner, possibly even a senior partner, given that I still had twice the shares of anyone else. But instead, I just -- I was just not welcome. I was not -- it seemed like they were taking advantage of my skills to do --

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. The witness is narrating.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. Why did you think they were taking advantage of you?
- A. They weren't -- they weren't getting a lot

done on their own. There wasn't -- there wasn't

a lot of change happening with the software. What

was being done was taking a very long time and

didn't -- and didn't create a lot of marketable

change and --

- Q. But how are they taking advantage of you on Version 9.1? They didn't even want the software.
 - A. They did want the software.
 - Q. How do you know that?
- A. Well, there were several -- several things to tell me that, one of -- one of which involved David Huffman literally screaming at me after I had left the company because he was angry that I didn't finish all of the 9.1 changes before I left and that I knew that the company was dependent on that and how dare I leave the company without finishing it.
- Q. These are the changes that Mr. Turner -neither Mr. Turner nor Mr. Huffman were willing to
 help you out on, right?

MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Leading.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. Let's take a look at your resignation letter -- your resignation e-mail, Exhibit 116, which is already in evidence.
- MR. MCCLOSKEY: Your Honor, 116 is not in evidence.

28 MR. KING: Oh.

1 THE COURT: Correct. 2 MR. KING: Oh, I'm sorry about that. 3 bad. 4 MR. SULLIVAN: 138. 5 MR. KING: 138 is the version. MR. SULLIVAN: Right. 6 7 MR. KING: All right. Let's do 138. 8 THE CLERK: Let me know when she's ready. 9 MR. KING: Are you ready, Robin? 10 MS. SASSI: Yes. 11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 BY MR. KING: 13 This is your resignation letter, correct? Q. 14 Α. Yes. 15 You say you no longer feel there is 16 opportunity for me at Storix that provides a 17 position of trust or respect given my experience, 18 knowledge, and qualifications. 19 What -- what position did you expect you 20 would have? 21 I wasn't expecting, you know, a formal 22 title of any kind. And as I'd always said, I was 23 going to let them run the company however they felt. 24 But I -- I mean, not only was I expecting that I 25 would still have a role in their product 26 development, that they, you know, kept asking me to

come back to do just that. So my role was, you

know, as a product developer. But seeing that I --

27

no one was more knowledgeable on the product than I
was --

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

Nonresponsive. The witness is narrating.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. What role were you expecting to have in terms of software development?
- A. I'd always been the lead developer. I expected that I would still be the lead developer.
- Q. But, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Turner and
 Mr. Huffman testified and then you also testified
 that when they came and asked you if you wanted a
 decision-making role or controlling role on software
 development, you said no?
- A. I'm not sure that's entirely true. It wasn't so much a decision-making role on the software development. I think it was more of a decision-making role in the company. But nevertheless, it wasn't a decision-making role in the software that I was looking for. It was --well, certainly, a major participation. And I expected that given my knowledge and experience that my -- that my opinion of how the software should be developed would be respected.
 - Q. And you feel it wasn't?
 - A. It most certainly wasn't.
 - Q. You go on to say, "While I have no issues,

nor attempted to intervene in any way, with the
company operations, it's no secret I disagree with
basic policy, progress and vision regarding the
software."

You weren't attempting to intervene in the company operations?

- A. No. In no way did I ever try to do that.
- Q. Now, it's no secret that they were doing things a little bit differently or some of it differently, you know, in terms of the process and the procedure for software development, right?
- A. No. I wasn't aware that they were doing anything differently than we had before.
- Q. I guess what I'm getting at is that why -why was your -- your disagreement, why was it more
 than just Mr. Johnson comes back to the company and
 doesn't like the way the new management is running
 things?
- A. Because I didn't have any disagreement with the way the new management was running things. I had disagreement with the -- just -- the way I was being disrespected, and it just felt abusive. It felt irrational and it seemed that they were just looking for reasons to complain about me that just, frankly, made no sense.
- Q. Mr. Johnson, you gave them 60 percent of your company, correct?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Why shouldn't they be able to exclude you from the company if they want?
- A. Well, we may not have had a detailed written agreement to any effect, but there was certainly a -- I would certainly hope, an understanding that I didn't -- that I retain 40 percent of the company, not that -- and I continued to offer my help wherever I could, that I was -- I should be entitled to a job at the company that I founded and working on the software that I wrote. I don't see why there -- why anybody would disagree that that was a reasonable assumption.
 - Q. The second paragraph, you say, "I sincerely hope to see Storix succeed, as I continue to have a financial stake, but I don't feel I can contribute in this environment."

What was the environment you're referring to?

A. The hostile environment that led to my -MR. SULLIVAN: Objection, Your Honor.
Motion in limine.

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Motion in Limine Number 13.

24 BY MR. KING:

Q. What about the environment made you feel like you could not contribute?

THE COURT: Sustained.

A. I'm not sure -- pardon me -- what I can say that doesn't exceed that objection, because I'm not

sure what it is. I was treated horribly. I just -- you know, I was treat -- I was completely disrespected, cast aside, you know, set to work on something that was of -- of huge importance. But as I was getting closer and closer to completing the project, the hostility became unbearable. THE COURT: Let me ask. Is this a good time for our recess? MR. KING: It is. THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we'll take our recess at this time. We'll be in recess until 1:30. Remember the admonition. Have a great lunch. Thank you. (Whereupon the jurors exit the courtroom.) (Afternoon recess taken from 11:44 to 1:41 p.m.)

| 1 | SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA; |
|----|---|
| 2 | MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2018; 1:41 P.M. |
| 3 | |
| 4 | THE COURT: Good afternoon. Thank you for |
| 5 | your patience. |
| 6 | And let's bring in the jury, please. |
| 7 | Mr. Johnson, if you'd be so kind. Thank |
| 8 | you. |
| 9 | (Whereupon the jurors enter the courtroom.) |
| 10 | THE COURT: Good afternoon. Thank you very |
| 11 | much for your patience this afternoon, ladies and |
| 12 | gentlemen. And the candy there in front of [Juror |
| 13 | No. 12] is not just for [Juror No. 12]. Or it was |
| 14 | in front of [Juror No. 10] now, but she passed it |
| 15 | away. That's courtesy of our courtroom staff and |
| 16 | it's for you. So feel free to take it and pass it |
| 17 | amongst yourselves. |
| 18 | UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: Thank you. |
| 19 | THE COURT: You're welcome. |
| 20 | All right. And continuing, Mr. King. |
| 21 | MR. KING: May I approach the witness and |
| 22 | show him a couple exhibits? |
| 23 | THE COURT: Yes. |
| 24 | BY MR. KING: |
| 25 | Q. So, Mr. Johnson, when we left we were |
| 26 | talking about your resignation e-mail. And if you |
| 27 | turn to Exhibits 117 and 118, I believe these are |
| 28 | the responses to your resignation e-mail from |

```
1
     Mr. Huffman on 117 and Mr. Turner on 118.
2
              MR. KING: Your Honor, I believe 118 is
3
     already in evidence. We're moving for 117 in
 4
     evidence.
5
              (Exhibit 117 referenced.)
              THE COURT: Any objection?
 6
7
              MR. MCCLOSKEY: 118 is in evidence,
8
     Your Honor.
 9
              THE COURT: Yes.
10
              MR. MCCLOSKEY: 117 is not.
11
              MR. SULLIVAN: I believe it's already been
12
     entered under a different number.
13
              MR. MCCLOSKEY: Yeah, it's a different
14
     number.
15
              THE COURT: Which number? Do we know?
16
              MR. MCCLOSKEY: It's 196, Your Honor.
17
              THE COURT: All right. Why don't we use --
18
     I think we have enough exhibits without duplication.
19
     Is it all right if we use 196?
20
              MR. KING: That's fine. I just thought it
21
     might be easier because they're right next to each
22
     other, so --
23
              THE COURT: That's fine. We'll use 117.
24
     We'll admit it. But then we're going to delete one
     or the other with counsels' discussion. All right.
25
26
     Go ahead.
27
              (Exhibit 117 received.)
28
              MR. KING: Robin, if we could pull up 117.
```

1 BY MR. KING:

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

18

19

21

22

- Q. Mr. Johnson, this is the e-mail you received from Mr. Huffman in response to your resignation, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Same day, right?
- 7 A. Yes.
 - Q. Did you receive any other communication from Mr. Huffman that day?
- 10 A. No.
 - Q. Mr. Huffman says in this e-mail that we developed our own culture within the company to survive, the third paragraph.
- 14 MR. KING: Scroll down a little bit.
- 15 BY MR. KING:
- 16 0. See that?
- 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. Was the culture they developed any different than the culture you had before you left?
- 20 A. I wasn't made aware of anything.
 - Q. It talks about that this has produced a team mentality where mutual respect reigns.
- Do you agree with that?
- A. I thought we had more of a team mentality before.
- MR. KING: Robin, if you could scroll down.

 Next page, the paragraph that starts, "We welcomed."

BY MR. KING:

Q. He says, "We welcomed your help with the software and recognize what a tremendous asset you are." And then the next paragraph he says, "Just to be clear, we want and need you here. However, we want you to join the team as it now works."

When you resigned -- when you sent that resignation letter in -- earlier that day, did you expect your resignation to be permanent?

- A. I was hoping it wouldn't be.
- Q. Are some of the things that Mr. Huffman says in this e-mail later that day some of the things you were hoping you'd hear from him?

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. Leading.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. What, if anything, did you expect from Mr. Huffman after the response to your resignation?
- A. I was expecting him to respond to the issues I raised in my resignation letter, I guess.
 - Q. And you believe he didn't respond to those?
- A. I saw nothing in here that responded to that.
- Q. Can you take a look at Exhibit 118. This is Mr. Turner's e-mail to you the same day, on May 8.

Did Mr. Turner respond to any of the

concerns you raised in your resignation letter?

A. No.

- Q. Were -- these letters that you received or e-mails that you received from Mr. Turner and Mr. Huffman, were they consistent with what you heard from them earlier that week?
- A. No. I would say we -- earlier that week was two days earlier, when I left after a very big argument in the office that I think I described earlier. And none of this -- this was not very -- well, this is kind of out of character with where they left things.
- Q. How were these e-mails from Mr. Huffman and Mr. Turner different from what you heard on that previous Monday?
- A. I don't know how to describe it, other than I got the impression that they were trying to document something, because it was just too far removed from what had been going on and what finally escalated into my resignation.
- Q. In the beginning of the third paragraph,
 Mr. Turner in his e-mail says, "I honestly listen,
 respect, and value your opinion with relation to
 software more than anyone on the planet."

Is that consistent with what he told you on Monday?

A. It wasn't consistent with the way he had responded to me my whole duration of the time that I

was working on Version 9.1.

- Q. He says, "Everything I know and have learned was from you." Is that a fair statement?
- A. Well, I don't know about everything -- about everything, but I know he learned a great deal from me on the technical aspect of what we did.
- Q. He says he doesn't get -- he says his feeling is that he doesn't get the same level of respect from you.

Do you agree with that?

- A. If in the past he had that feeling, then I would -- and expressed that to me, I would be somewhat mortified and try to rectify that situation. But the events leading up to my resignation, he showed no respect for me at all. So that's not consistent with the recent events, certainly.
- Q. What did you do after you read these e-mails from Mr. Turner and Mr. Huffman?
- A. I took a little time to absorb it. This is -- you know, in my resignation, I said that I would continue working on the software at home to avoid any further confrontation. Mr. Kinney asked me to come back into the office in -- you know, during a time when Mr. Huffman and Mr. Turner were going to be out of the office to work with him, and I did so, but I remained working in the office after they returned.

1 MR. KING: Your Honor, may I approach? 2 THE COURT: Yes. 3 BY MR. KING: 4 Mr. Kinney sent you an e-mail as well 5 about -- about your resignation, didn't he? He mentioned my resignation in an e-mail 6 7 that actually had to do with a technical question. Take a look at Exhibit 85. 8 0. 9 (Exhibit 85 referenced.) BY MR. KING: 10 11 Do you recognize this e-mail? Q. 12 I do. Α. 13 What is this? 0. 14 It is an e-mail exchange between myself and 15 David Kinney regarding some questions that he had 16 about the Version 9 software changes I was made -- I had made during the time that I was trying to 17 18 provide some guidance on, you know, them kind of 19 taking over from that point. 20 MR. KING: Your Honor, I move to submit 21 Exhibit 85 into evidence. 22 MR. SULLIVAN: No objection, Your Honor. 23 MR. MCCLOSKEY: No objection, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Received. 25 (Exhibit 85 received.) 26 BY MR. KING: 27 This e-mail from Mr. Kinney to you is dated Q. 28 May 16, 2014. This is eight days after your

- 1 resignation e-mail, correct?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And at this point in time, have you left the company for good or where -- what are you doing with relation to Storix?
- A. My resignation letter, as you said, was on the 8th, and I said there that I would spend the next two weeks working on the software at home to avoid any personal confrontations.
- Q. Okay. And Mr. Kinney has some questions about your Version 9?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Before this e-mail, had Mr. Kinney asked you any questions about Version 9?
- A. Well, before this e-mail, I guess he -I -- and before my resignation, I think that he had
 some questions on Version 9 that we were back and
 forth with.
 - Q. Then he goes on.
- 20 MR. KING: Robin, if you can scroll down to
- 22 BY MR. KING:
 - Q. He says, "To switch gears a bit, I apologize for any role I have in your decision to leave the company."
 - What role did Mr. Kinney have in your decision to leave the company, if any?
- 28 A. I don't know that his role was direct. I

1 | think it was just more passive.

- Q. Who had a direct role in your decision to leave the company?
- A. Most directly, it was Mr. Huffman and Mr. Turner.
- Q. What do you mean when you say Mr. Kinney's role was indirect?
- A. Mr. Kinney is the -- the third technical person on the team other than Mr. Turner,
 Mr. Huffman, and I guess myself, although I wasn't technically on the team. Mr. Kinney had a rather passive role. And as these arguments were taking place, he kind of disassociated and -- in places where he certainly could have taken part and provided an opinion. I felt a little abandoned.
- Q. What did you expect Mr. Kinney to do differently?
- A. Well, he has spoken up before. And, you know, like when we discussed the whole password issue, he was the one that suggested the alternative that Rich was willing to accept. And even though I didn't particularly like the idea, I did it anyway because I wanted to smooth things over. So, you know, he had -- he certainly had an opinion and he had a contribution. But I think when things get heated, he kind of disappeared.
 - Q. When was your last day working for Storix?
 - A. It was the 22nd of May.

- Q. And when were you taken off payroll?
 - A. May 31st or June 1st.
 - Q. After the 22nd -- on the 22nd, did anyone at the company wish you farewell and say good-bye?
 - A. No. I was working in the office that last week, and no one spoke to me and -- at all about the resignation or my leaving.
 - Q. Did you see Mr. Turner in the office that week?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Did you have any conversations with him?
- 12 A. He came to me once to ask a technical question.
 - Q. Did he say anything about reasons for your resignation?
 - A. No. No.
 - Q. Did you see Mr. Huffman in the office that week?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Did he say anything about the reasons for your resignation when you saw him?
 - A. Not the reasons, no.
 - Q. Did he say anything at all to you?
 - A. I raised the question with him the day before I was to leave, and I suggested to him that if they were going to finish this project, or even without the project, you know, they were going to be in need of a strong programmer, particularly with

1421 1 network programming skills. And I reminded him that 2 I was leaving on Thursday, which was either the next 3 day or two days away. 4 What did -- what was his response? 5 His response was that SB Admin is good 6 enough the way it is and we'd rather focus on other 7 types of business. What, if anything, did he say about 8 9 finishing your updates to Version 9.1? 10 The impression that I got from the Α. 11 statement was he didn't care about that anymore. 12 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 13 Nonresponsive. Move to strike. 14 THE COURT: Granted. 15 BY MR. KING: 16 What, if anything, did Mr. Huffman say 17 during that conversation about finishing your 18 updates on Version 9.1? 19

- A. Well, the statement that he thought

 SB Admin was good enough the way it was I think told

 the story that he didn't intend to pursue it.
- Q. You wrote an e-mail that's already been admitted into evidence on May 27th, titled "Final Thoughts."

Do you recall writing this e-mail? It's Exhibit 28.

27 THE CLERK: Sorry?

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

MR. KING: Twenty-eight.

THE CLERK: Thank you.

BY MR. KING:

O. And it looks like you

- Q. And it looks like you had sent an e-mail originally in, and then had to send -- send a subsequent e-mail with a paragraph that you left out?
 - A. Yes, I recognize this.
- Q. And that's that -- that paragraph that you left out is the one that appears right there, right below this one, correct?
- A. Yes.

MR. KING: Robin, if you'd scroll down.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. Did you feel that you had not completely explained all of your reasons prior to sending this e-mail?
- A. No, I hadn't completely explained the reasons. I think I was elaborating on my resignation and the issues I noted there.
- Q. Take a look at the paragraph beginning with "You've done great at managing a company with strict policies and procedures."

Did you mean that?

- A. I suppose I did.
- Q. What did they not do great?
- A. Well, they weren't improving the software.

 And their strict policies and procedures were -
 really limited their ability to produce any

1 improvements to the software, you know, at any 2 reasonable rate. 3 MR. KING: Robin, if you'd go down to the 4 next paragraph. 5 BY MR. KING: 6 It starts off -- you say, "You 7 enthusiastically supported my adding SSL into the product until I actually did it." 8 9 "SSL," what does that stand for? 10 That is the Version 9 primary changes to Α. 11 the software, security of the software, particularly 12 the network security. 13 And at this point you believed that they Q. didn't actually want it? 14 15 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection. Leading. 16 THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- What, if anything, did you believe about their desire for the 9.1 updates at the time you wrote this e-mail?
- I believed they wanted it and needed it very much.
- Now, you just testified before we went to lunch that before your resignation, they told you that, in so many words, they didn't want those updates.

How do you reconcile what you just said with your prior testimony?

- A. Actually, what I said was they told me that no one ever asked for it. No one ever said they needed it. They were actually speaking in reference to the customers. But nevertheless, I think that was being -- they were stating it as their own opinion, but I knew that not to be true.
 - Q. Why?

- A. Why did I believe it not to be true?
- Q. You said you didn't just believe it. You said you knew it not to be true.
- A. Well, we knew for quite some time, even before, you know, my diagnosis and leaving in '11 -- in 2011 that there were security vulnerabilities in the software. We knew that it was an issue that needed to be addressed and one that was on -- you know, that was a top priority for me and certainly expressed and some of the issues that they brought up to me, that they claimed customers had reported this being an issue.

And I had planned back in 2010 to undergo this as a -- as a priority. But because my health problems that I began to have that persisted for some time, I couldn't commit to that long-term a project.

- Q. So if you're so sure they wanted this update, what is it that they -- what is it that you believe they did not want?
 - A. They didn't -- they didn't want me to own

- 1 stock in the company anymore.
- 2 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.
- 3 Move to strike. That's speculative.
- 4 THE COURT: Sustained. Granted.
- 5 BY MR. KING:

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. How did the defendants respond to this e-mail that you sent on May 27th?
 - A. I received an e-mail from Mr. Huffman that simply -- that basically said, I guess, So be it.

 We'll send you a resignation letter -- I mean a
 - Q. Take a look at Exhibit 197, which I believe is already in evidence.
 - A. I'm sorry. I got a lot of things to move around here. Okay.
 - Q. Your e-mail on May 27th was several pages, correct?
 - A. Yes.

separation agreement.

- 19 Q. And this is Mr. Huffman's response?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. Did Mr. Huffman offer any other response to your e-mail on May 27th?
 - A. No. After this e-mail, I had not had a conversation with him for about a year.
 - Q. At this point how did you feel?
 - A. I felt like I was -- that my efforts to kind of keep the door open to discuss the issues, to elicit some sort of a response to, you know, how I

- felt I was treated and, you know, how just degrading
 this was for me and he shut the door.
 - Q. What was the next you heard -- the next correspondence you had with any of the other defendants?
 - A. I received a separation agreement from David Smiljkovich.
 - Q. And after the separation agreement, what was the next correspondence you had?
 - A. I asked David Smiljkovich to send me, I think, a copy of the company bylaws and --
 - Q. What, if any, correspondence did you have with Mr. Altamirano?
 - A. Oh, well, I -- I don't recall if

 Mr. Altamirano -- I'm sorry -- Altamirano sent me an
 initial e-mail before or after this date, but it was
 somewhat -- somewhat similar to the first ones,
 saying he regretted --
 - Q. If you could turn to Exhibit 121.

 (Exhibit 121 referenced.)
- 21 BY MR. KING:

- Q. Do you recognize this document?
- **A.** Yes.
- Q. Is it an e-mail chain between yourself and
 Mr. Altamirano?
- A. Yes. If you'll give me just a moment.

 Pardon me if I back up through the e-mails and read

 it in order.

Okay. Yes. Manuel Altamirano responded to my e-mail when I, I guess, detailed my reasons for leaving on May 29th.

MR. KING: Your Honor, I'd like to move Exhibit 121 into evidence.

MR. SULLIVAN: No objection, Your Honor.

MR. MCCLOSKEY: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.

(Exhibit 121 received.)

BY MR. KING:

- Q. What does Mr. Altamirano say in his e-mail?
- 12 A. Well, his e-mail begins on the second page.
- 13 It -- would you like me to read it?
- 14 Q. Yes.
 - A. Okay. No matter what, I always -- I'm always going to have a connection to you. You were my boss for many years and we managed to experience a few great times together. Like any relationship, a business relationship takes work from all involved. We can go around pointing faults all day long, but that never works, right? Communication and commitment is the key. I'm not sure where things end up in the future, but I won't hold any grudges. Let's just make -- let's just make -- I really think he meant to put "sure." Let's just make sure we all learn how to do this better. Until then, enjoy the fruits of your labor.
 - Q. Now, did you continue having back-and-forth

- with Mr. Altamirano over the course of the next few
 weeks?
 A. I did, yes.
 - Q. And we'll get to some of that. But in the meantime, you mentioned that you had a communication with Mr. David Smiljkovich. What was that?
 - A. I had -- I had asked Mr. Smiljkovich to send me a copy of the bylaws of the company. I don't recall exactly why I wanted to look at them, but he responded with something other than bylaws.

MR. KING: Your Honor, if I may approach?

THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. How did you ask him? Did you call him? Did you write to him?
- A. I believe I sent him an e-mail. I don't think I would have called.

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Your Honor, as counsel is handing Mr. Johnson the notebook, any way to get an exhibit number so we can be prepared by the time he talks?

MR. KING: It's Exhibit 337.

(Exhibit 337 referenced.)

BY MR. KING:

- Q. Can you tell me what Exhibit 337 is, Mr. Johnson?
- A. Give me a moment, because it's, again, an e-mail chain, so I want to make sure I read it in

1 the -- the order.

Well, it begins on June 12th, 2014, from

Mr. Smiljkovich, "I'm sorry I missed your call." So

it could be that I called his number and left a

message.

MR. KING: Move to -- Your Honor, move to submit Exhibit 337 into evidence.

MR. SULLIVAN: No objection, Your Honor.

MR. MCCLOSKEY: No objection.

THE COURT: Received.

(Exhibit 337 received.)

BY MR. KING:

- Q. So if we could go about on the bottom, the start of the conversation. It looks like it is on June 12th. And that's Mr. Smiljkovich responding to your call, correct?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And your call, you testified, was just asking about the bylaws and the minutes?
 - A. No. I just asked for the bylaws.
- Q. What did you think was strange about Mr. Smiljkovich's response?
- A. Well, it was clear -- I guess it was -- seemed to me that he was concerned about perhaps my reasons for wanting to see the bylaws, because the response was somewhat defensive in providing me a lot of information about things I did not know about.

- Q. At this point in time -- well, in his -- in the second paragraph of his e-mail, starting on the third sentence, it starts with "In my personal experience" --
 - A. Yes.

Q. There's a paragraph that starts with "Here is the situation." And then the third sentence starts with "In my personal experience." He says, "Most nonpublic corporations have a succession plan in place to address various scenarios that would affect company ownership."

Did you have any idea what he was talking about?

- A. I was starting to understand.
- Q. At the time you had only asked for copies of the bylaws?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Did you have any idea why he was talking about succession plan?
- A. Not specifically. I knew what it was. I just didn't know why this was suddenly an issue.
 - Q. Okay.

MR. KING: If you can go up, Robin.

24 BY MR. KING:

Q. In your response, you say, "I assumed this to be a change in the bylaws. It doesn't come as a surprise." And so you say, "I don't need a certified copy. Just an e-mail attachment would be

1 appreciated."

You're still -- it seemed like you're still on relatively good terms with Mr. Smiljkovich. Fair statement?

- A. Well, I guess I -- I didn't really know Mr. Smiljkovich.
- Q. So you had no reason to be -- there's nothing -- there's no reason -- you really didn't bear any unusual animosity towards anyone at this point?
 - A. Any animosity towards Mr. Smiljkovich?
- Q. Towards Mr. Smiljkovich or any of the defendants.
- A. Well, animosity, no. I mean, suspicion, maybe, but not animosity.

MR. KING: And if you'd go up, Robin.
BY MR. KING:

Q. Mr. Smiljkovich says, "That's not a problem. I'm happy to get you whatever you need."

And then the second paragraph, he says, "By the way, if we end up hiring a new person in the next few weeks, we'll be a set of keys short. Would you mind dropping by or sending us your set?"

He responds at the top, It's no problem. I only have a single building key. If I'm out, I'll drop it by tomorrow. Otherwise, I'll drop it in the mail.

Did you -- at this point, had you heard

- anything about Storix hiring a new person or is this the first you'd ever heard of it?
 - A. Not until the -- the June 12th response when he said I -- he missed my call.
 - Q. Now, at some point later in June 2014, what, if anything, did you learn about this new person they hired?
 - A. That they were moving him from Texas to take over my role.
 - Q. How did you learn that?

- A. There was another e-mail that I don't recall if it was from Smiljkovich or a communication between Manuel and myself that said that the new person started today.
- Q. How did you know what the new person was doing?
- A. I don't recall the details of what that said. But Mr. Smiljkovich's e-mail says that, you know, they -- he was on another call at the time, and then our software engineer candidate arrived. So clearly, they were interviewing software engineering candidates.
- Q. Are you talking about Mr. Smiljkovich's earlier -- the first e-mail we looked at?
- A. Yeah, the first part of it when he -- he said he missed my call.
- Q. How did you react when you heard that a new software engineer was being hired at Storix?

A. Well, when I left the company or a

couple -- a day or two before I left the company, I

talked to Mr. Huffman and he indicated to me that

he -
MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

This is nonresponsive. The witness is narrating.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. When you learned that they were hiring a new software engineer, how did you react to that news?
- A. It was surprising, because I was led to believe they weren't going to.
- Q. Your belief at this point was that they did not want to finish the work that you started?
- A. I wasn't -- well, that's hard to say. I can't say that was my belief. It was what I -- it was effectively what I was told or led to believe, and not those words. They were told it wasn't needed. Nobody wanted it.

But I knew that not to be true and I knew it was opposite of everything that had led up to that for -- you know, and even conversations we had had for years.

- Q. So did -- did the hiring of a new software engineer contradict what you'd been told by Mr. Huffman?
- A. Yes.

1 Q.

How?

- A. Because I strongly -- I literally said the words, I strongly suggest that you get a -- a software designer in here that, you know, has knowledge, particularly in the network security, that, you know, can both complete this project and go on from there.
- Q. When you learned that they were actually bringing someone in -- sorry. You had -- you previously made a suggestion to hire a software engineer to Mr. Turner -- Mr. Huffman, right?
 - A. Yes, as I was on my way out.
- Q. And your testimony was that Mr. Huffman said, Not necessary?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Now you find out he's hiring one, and now how does that change how you feel about leaving?
- A. Well, it was -- what impacted me the most was that it happened so quickly. Within a month of my leaving, a person they hired from Texas was already starting work. So my feeling was -- I mean, I had a pretty strong feeling before, obviously, they wanted to get rid of me. And this kind of confirmed that they had no intention of keeping me there.
- Q. Did you communicate your concerns with any of the defendants?
 - A. I did when I -- I began having phone

conversations with Manuel Altamirano.

Q. You told him about your concerns about Mr. Hawkins as a software engineer -- a software engineer being hired at Storix?

MR. SULLIVAN: Objection.

THE WITNESS: I did, yes.

I'm sorry.

MR. SULLIVAN: Leading.

THE COURT: Leading, did you say?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Leading, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. What, if anything, did you tell
 Mr. Altamirano in these conversations? What did you
 tell Mr. Altamirano in these conversations?
- A. I think the conversation began with the fact that I was having some serious concerns based on a number of events that had basically occurred, you know, as I was leaving and after I left on May 22nd.

And this was a particular concern, that this software programmer had been brought in to do exactly what they told me they didn't need. And I -- and I told him that, you know, my -- my sister had previously expressed to me her concern that David Huffman was trying --

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

This calls for hearsay. It's beyond --

1 THE COURT: Sustained.

THE WITNESS: I was concerned --

3 THE COURT: No. Wait for a question.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Please.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. Did you ask Mr. Altamirano to communicate anything to the defendants?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. What did you ask him to do?
- A. I asked Mr. Altamirano to help me in opening a dialogue with any or all of the defendants to try to -- to try to open a dialogue to figure out what had gone wrong here. There were still too many things I didn't understand, and I was hoping -- and I was asking him to -- both to help me understand it from what -- from what he knew, and to try to open a dialogue with the other defendants in order to try to resolve our differences and find a way to work together again.
- Q. Did you ask Mr. Altamirano to tell the defendants that you demanded your job back?
- A. No. At the time I was just trying to get -- most of the conversation had to do with my trying to understand what he knew, because I did not understand what happened here. I did not understand what all of the hostility was about.

And -- and now there's other things happening that are making me question motives, and I

- was trying to get him to explain to me what he knew,
 because he wasn't part of the technical team. He
 wasn't part of the -- I guess the arguments that
 were going on. And so I --
 - Q. So what specifically did you ask him to communicate to the defendants about that you wanted to sit down and discuss?
 - A. I wanted to discuss -- well, both -- whatever issues it was that we needed to resolve so that we could find a way to work together again.
 - Q. And this was in a phone conversation when you had this with Mr. Altamirano, correct?
 - A. Yes. We had many phone conversations.
 - Q. The next day or shortly later after that, he called you back to discuss how the defendants responded?

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. This is leading.

19 THE COURT: Sustained.

20 BY MR. KING:

- Q. What happened after the phone conversation with Mr. Altamirano?
- A. He told me that he discussed my proposal to sit down and discuss the issues with the other defendants and they said no.
- Q. What specifically were the words that

 Mr. Altamirano used to communicate the defendants'

 response to your proposal?

- A. He said, "They don't want you back."
 - Q. "They don't want you back"?
 - A. "They don't want you back."
- Q. Was that consistent with what you heard
- from Mr. Turner and Mr. Huffman on May 8?
- 6 A. No.

- Q. In your communications with Mr. Altamirano,

 did you communicate -- did you tell him to

 communicate that you wanted to put certain
- 10 conditions on coming back?
- 11 A. No. I only communicated that I wanted to talk.
- Q. If you can turn to the next exhibit in your binder. It's Exhibit 338.
- 15 (Exhibit 338 referenced.)
- 16 BY MR. KING:
- 17 Q. Do you recognize this document?
- 18 A. Yes.
- A. After one of our phone conversations where
 Manuel had asked me to tell me what conditions were
 necessary for me to come back, this was my response
 to him.
- Q. Hold on. Hold on. There's two e-mails?
- 25 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Do you recognize both of those e-mails?
- 28 A. I do, yes.

- Q. And are those e-mails that you sent to Mr. Altamirano?
 - A. Yes, they are.

MR. KING: Your Honor, I'd like to move Exhibit 338 into evidence.

MR. MCCLOSKEY: No objection, Your Honor.

MR. SULLIVAN: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.

(Exhibit 338 received.)

MR. KING: Robin, if you can scroll down to the first e-mail. So go back up and -- yeah, right there.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. This e-mail you sent to Manuel on July 16, 2014, at 12:10 p.m.?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. You say, "I apologize for getting a bit worked up during our conversation yesterday. After hearing that you had shared our prior talks with David and Rich and that they were not interested in any compromise, it brought back a lot of anxiety around the reprehensible way I was treated."

The conversation that you're referring to, is that the conversation with Manuel where he told you they don't want you back?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Prior to this e-mail, had you said anything to any of the defendants about threatening to take

- away the copyright for SB Admin?
 - A. I had no conversations with any of the defendants other than Manuel in these e-mails since I left on May 22nd.
 - Q. Prior to the conversation that you referenced in this e-mail to Manuel, had he ever said as a -- had you ever said that you wanted to come back and you -- under certain specific conditions?
 - A. No.

- Q. Had you ever said that you wanted to come back and you wanted Mr. Huffman to step down as president prior to that conversation you referred to on July 16?
 - A. No.
- Q. But when you heard that they don't want you back, things changed. What changed?
- A. Well, that was about the third time that he told me they didn't want me back, that I was not welcome. Okay?
 - Q. That was the third time?
- A. Well, I had been communicating with him -with Manuel Altamirano on -- you know, prior to this
 e-mail chain, it was all phone conversations. I
 think it took place over about six weeks.
 - Q. It was all phone conversations?
- A. Yes. And it was all about trying to find a way to get these guys to talk to me or any other

compromise that we could find, you know, but it -the last conversation we had was just a final, "No,
they do not want you back."

- Q. The first time you heard that they didn't want you back, what was your reaction?
- A. "Why?" I just -- I was literal -- I mean,
 I was practically begging him repeatedly to just
 explain to me why, what did I do.
- Q. The second conversation you had where he said they don't want you back, what was your response to that?
- A. You know, it was pretty much the same thing. And, you know, he even said he was getting annoyed with me because I was just repeating myself. Like, why? Why won't they do this? Why can't anyone talk to me? Why -- and, you know, it just went nowhere.
- Q. And then this e-mail is after the third conversation?
- A. Yeah. I'm trying -- I'm sorry. There's two e-mails, and I have to --
 - Q. Yeah. Be really --
 - A. -- remember which one's which.

Yes. Yeah, it was a -- essentially a final no at this point. And I -- we were still on the phone, and I was frustrated and I -- I don't think I lashed out at Manuel himself. But I was obviously ranting, I suppose, so I apologized for getting

1 worked up.

- Q. Is this what you expected would happen when you invited Defendants to become co-owners in Storix with you?
 - A. Certainly not.

MR. KING: Robin, if you'd go down to the second half of this e-mail.

BY MR. KING:

Q. You say, So here's the situation. I own the legal copyright to the original software, not Storix, and that you'd never transfer that asset to Storix.

And then the next paragraph, you say, So I'm telling you this in an informal manner rather than surprising David with a letter from my attorney.

Is this the first time you had told anyone at Storix that you believed you were the copyright owner of SB Admin?

- A. I don't know if it's the first time I told anyone that I was the copyright owner. It's the first time that I had threatened to use my copyright ownership as leverage.
- Q. And if we can go up to the top -- the e-mail at the top of this exhibit, later e-mail, this is your e-mail. It's about -- about an hour or so later. It says, "Thanks for the call."

So there's a call between you and

1 Mr. Altamirano between these two e-mails, correct?

A. Yes.

- Q. What did he say in that call?
- A. Obviously, I raised a concern, which was what I hoped to do. And he called me to say that he was -- they were going to have a powwow, I guess, and discuss the issue and he was hoping we could come to a resolution.

And -- but more specifically, he said -- in regards to my coming back to the company, you know, he was asking me for any, you know, particular conditions at this point for my coming back to the company.

Q. So in your second sentence, it says, As you asked, I'd like to be more specific on exactly what changes I want to see in the management, but then that's not my goal.

This is the first time you've communicated any conditions on your return to Storix, correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. What was their response?
- A. I'm sorry. Whose response?
- Q. Any of the defendants. Did they respond to you?
- A. Yes. Manuel Altamirano called me and he simply said, "They said no."
- Q. So he said -- he first said they don't want you back. And then after you threatened the

- copyright, they said, Give us your conditions. And after that, they said no. Fair statement?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 340, which I believe is already in evidence.
 - A. I'm sorry. Did you ask a question?
 - Q. Could you take a look at 340 in your --
 - A. Yes, I have it.
- MR. KING: Robin, if you could put that up.

 BY MR. KING:
 - Q. This is your e-mail on July 20, 2014, to Mr. Huffman, right?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. In the second paragraph, first sentence, you say, "Since you were informed that I was prepared to take legal action and chose not to talk to me, I'm copying board members and shareholders on this note."
 - Why do you say Mr. Huffman chose not to talk to you?
 - A. Because he didn't.
 - Q. You go on to describe starting, "Three years ago, I said I would let you run the business and I would not interfere. And I didn't. I came back to Storix with a new attitude and motivation, but I was never made part of your team."
 - You say, "I was expected to work alone and do everything myself." Is that true?

1 A.

Yes.

- Q. Is this e-mail an accurate summary of some of the issues you were experiencing before you resigned?
- A. Well, to answer the question with total accuracy, I would have to read it in detail, but I can say that this was a last-ditch effort to try to open a dialogue before this came to legal action.

 So I can't imagine that I would have been attempting to inflame anyone at this point.

Whether I was tactful enough, I can't say.

I'm not well known for that. But I tried to let

them know in as clear and concise a way as I can

that this is about to turn very serious, and I -
that was my intent.

Q. If you can turn to the last paragraph of this e-mail. You say, [as read] "I gave up everything to people I trusted and never gained the respect or appreciation I think I deserve. Perhaps that was my own fault in the past, but I didn't deserve this and I no longer feel bound by any former promises."

Why did you no longer feel bound?

A. Well, the former promises that I was referring to -- and this goes more to, I think, the conversations between Manuel and myself -- is where I said I'm not going to interfere in the business.

Obviously, if I am forced to file a lawsuit in order

to enforce my rights to the software I wrote, that's going to interfere with the business.

Q. But why did you no longer feel bound to that promise that you'd no longer interfere?

- A. Because they clearly were not bound to any promises that I made and were -- had just utterly and completely destroyed, you know, any -- or just ignored or destroyed any trust that I had in them and had -- I mean, the things that they had done here clearly were in no -- certainly, unexpected and not -- not reasonable or rational given the situation and the position that I put them in.
- Q. These promises that you talk about, they go both ways. Is that what you're saying?
 - A. Well, of course, yes.
- Q. Where's the written document that describes each one of these promises and obligations that everyone has to do in order to be -- to be acting properly?
- A. There is no document of that type of detail.
- Q. So there's no document that says you promised not to interfere with the business? Is that what you're telling me?
 - A. I don't think so, no.
 - Q. So where do these obligations come from?
- A. Just trust, I suppose. I mean, I thought these were my friends in 2011, and I thought I could

- trust my friends. And what I came back to in 2013

 were not my friends, and I can't trust them anymore.

 I mean, look at what they're doing to me.

 Q. So after this e-mail, that really -- that
 - Q. So after this e-mail, that really -- that then begins the start of copyright litigation, right?

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection. Leading.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. What -- what happened with respect to the copyright litigation, if anything, after this e-mail?
 - A. I got no response to this e-mail.
- Q. What was the next thing -- the next communication you had with the defendants?
- A. I wasn't entirely sure they were taking me seriously yet, so I engaged an attorney to send a cease and desist letter to the company.
 - Q. And how did they respond?
- A. They responded by hiring Procopio, which is Storix's counsel, a different attorney at the time, although I think Mr. Sullivan was second counsel.

 The attorney, however --
 - Q. Hold on. Hold on.
 What was their response?
- A. The response was that because I simply decided I didn't want to work anymore and forced my company -- forced my employees to buy stock in my

1 company in order to keep their jobs, but did not 2 disclose to them that the company didn't own the 3 software when they bought their shares that they 4 were going to sue me for security fraud. 5 Well, first let me ask you this: Was it 6 true you forced the employees to buy stock in your 7 company to keep their jobs? 8 They were given the stock for free, and 9 they weren't even forced to take it for free. 10 What happened after that letter? Q. 11 We filed the copyright lawsuit. 12 When you say "we," you meant you? Q. 13 I meant, yes, I -- my attorney that I had Α. 14 then hired filed the suit. 15 Who did you file the lawsuit against? Q. Against Storix. 16 Α. And then how did Storix respond to that 17 Q. 18 lawsuit? 19 They filed a counterclaim. 20 THE COURT: Before we get there, is this a 21 good time for our recess? 22 MR. KING: It is a perfect time. 23 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and 24 gentlemen, we'll take our afternoon recess. 25 Fifteen minutes, please. Remember the admonition. 26 (Whereupon the jurors exit the courtroom.) 27 (Brief recess.)

(Whereupon the jurors enter the courtroom.)

1 THE COURT: All right. We're all back.

2 Mr. King.

3 BY MR. KING:

- Q. Mr. Johnson, before we left, we talked about events -- everything that led up to the copyright lawsuit --
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. -- litigation.

Why not just step away, remain a 40 percent shareholder, and let them do what they want with the business? Why did you feel you had to file the copyright lawsuit?

- A. Well, the primary reason was that the software was my creation. It was 15 years of my life. It was being sorely neglected. I founded the company to sell the software. And the company profits were declining year over year since I left, which meant my income, which I now needed to depend on, was declining year over year. And with no end in sight as to when any updates or improvements would be made to the software, I didn't -- I didn't expect that was going to stop.
- Q. So after you filed the copyright litigation, you met -- or actually, after you left -- well, let me -- just foundation.

When did you first meet Robin Sassi?

A. Well, Robin Sassi was at one point married to David Huffman. And I think we had only met in

passing in the office before, so nothing more than a, you know, "Hello. How are you?"

But outside of that, it was just -- after I left the company and I had my initial conversations with Manuel Altamirano, I decide -- I decided to contact Robin, because I knew that she had acquired a certain percentage of Dave Huffman's shares in their divorce settlement.

And I was hoping that if her shares that she received were 10 percent or more, then -- then I could offer to purchase her shares, in which case I would have a majority share of the company and avoid any more of this.

- Q. Did you offer to purchase her shares?
- A. I did. Well, yes and no.
- Q. What was her response to your offer?
- A. I correct my answer. I didn't offer to purchase her shares, because she told me that she had only 8.7 percent of the shares and it wouldn't have helped any.
- Q. After the copyright litigation began, did you continue to communicate with Ms. Sassi?
 - A. I did, yes.
- Q. Did she tell you what her view was on the dispute between you and the defendants?
- A. There were a lot of disputes I -- disputes of different natures between me and the defendants.
 - Q. Did she, in general, take your side?

- A. She -- she definitely did take my side, I quess, on pretty much all of the issues, I suppose.
- Q. And in early 2015, you and Robin decided to seek election to the board, correct?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Tell me what your plan was.
- A. Well, the defendants had recently increased the board size from four to five, which meant that any three board members would have a majority. With my 40 percent share alone, if there had been four board members, I would have had 50 percent of the board. But with three members, I would have -- I mean -- I'm sorry.

With a five-member board, I -- the best I could do was to put two members on a five-member board. However, with Ms. Sharey -- I'm sorry. With Ms. Sassi's shares, we had approximately 48 percent and the other defendants had 52 percent.

- Q. How did that enable you to get three of the five board seats?
- A. Well, you'd kind of have to do the math, because certainly -- I mean, first of all, I had a short -- at a shareholder meeting, you elect the board and this happens once a year and you vote your shares. Everyone doesn't get a vote. They get a vote for each share that they own.
- Q. Okay. So I'm going to ask -- we've already admitted Exhibit 633. Ask Robin to put it up on the

1 screen.

Now, in early 2015, there was a -- originally a shareholder meeting scheduled sometime for January, right?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And what happened with the originally scheduled shareholder meeting?
- A. Well, it was canceled. It was -- it was canceled, I believe, in part based on a conversation that I did have with three of the defendants.
 - Q. Why do you believe that?
- A. Because -- well, it went very well. I mean, I spent --
- Q. Okay. Okay. So you had a good conversation with three of the defendants, and -- and then you get -- you find out that the shareholder meeting for that year is going to be postponed, correct?
- A. Yes. Well, the shareholder meeting was scheduled for the -- the next day or perhaps the day after. Thirty minutes after I had the meeting with these individuals, the shareholder meeting was canceled, which was a very promising sign.
- MR. KING: Now, Robin, if you can scroll down here, which is Exhibit 633 that we looked at. BY MR. KING:
- Q. This is the unanimous consent to the nomination of five directors.

Do you see that?

A. Yes.

- Q. Tell me how this document related to your and Ms. Sassi's plan to have three board -- three directors on the board?
- A. Well, Ms. Sassi and I, you know, had become friends. This -- we're taking about a period of about six months now that had gone by from the time I met her during the Manuel e-mails up to this point in time. We'd become friends, but we make no secret now of the fact that we concealed our friendship.
- Q. Okay. I'm asking this document right here. How does this document play -- relate to your plan to elect three members to the board of directors?
- A. Okay. The fact that the defendants did not know that Robin and I were communicating was an important factor in this.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. The nominees there included four of the defendants and myself. They included myself, because, first of all, I indicated that I planned to nominate myself as a director. And with 40 percent share, I'm going to be a director if I so choose, okay, a bona fide member of the board.
- Q. Okay. So what did the significance of them having four other directors mean to you?
- A. The other four -- the other four directors that are named there tell me that those -- well,

- that the remaining shareholders other than

 Ms. Sassi, who hold 52 percent of the board -- I'm

 sorry -- two -- 52 percent of the shares of the

 company, were planning to split their votes between

 those four candidates.
 - Q. Okay. So what did that -- how did that lead to your plan to try and elect a slate of three directors?
 - A. Ms. Sassi and I, if we combined our 42 percent of the shares --
 - Q. 48 percent.

- A. I'm sorry. 48 percent of the shares and elected a third director and split our votes three ways, then the other defendants, having split their votes four ways, would actually only -- our three candidates would have the three highest number of votes, and two of their four candidates would have the other two seats if you do the math.
 - O. Got it.
- A. We're assuming that they're going to split their votes four ways, and we certainly led them to -- and I don't lie. I led them to believe that I was going to simply nominate myself with my votes, and they didn't know that we -- that Robin and I were friends. So Robin introduced a third candidate.
- Q. Okay. So now let's go to the meeting. February 12th, 2015, right?

1 A. Yes.

- Q. Where is the meeting taking place?
- A. At the offices of Procopio -- the law offices of Procopio.
 - Q. And you and Ms. Sassi attend the meeting, correct?
 - A. Yes. We came in separately.
 - Q. Okay. Ms. Sassi brought someone else with her, you say. Who was that person?
- A. Well, that person actually was a friend of mine, a softball buddy that actually owned his own business.
 - O. What was his name?
 - A. Jeff Harding.
 - Q. All the defendant shareholders, they appeared, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And the point of the meeting was to elect directors for the board?
 - A. It was to elect -- it's an annual shareholder meeting in which you elect the board of directors for the -- the next year.
 - Q. So what happened?
 - A. Well, Mr. Smiljkovich, who was the CFO of the company, also a defendant, he was serving as the inspector of elections. And the inspector of elections is -- his responsibility is to, you know, ensure the fairness and integrity of the vote and to

tally the votes and report the results and, you know, validate proxies, anything necessary like that.

- Q. So what happened? Was there a vote?
- A. There -- well, the vote began.
- Q. How did it begin? Did they pass out ballots?
 - A. They passed out ballots.
- Q. Okay. Ballots made of -- paper ballots, right?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. And instructions were for everyone to write down the number of votes they had to allocate to the candidates they wanted to vote for, correct?
- MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Leading,
 Your Honor.
 - THE COURT: Treat it as foundational. Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Based on -- based on the shares of each shareholder, the shareholders in attendance were given a ballot in which they voted their shares to whatever candidates, and they could split those shares across whichever candidates they choose.

26 BY MR. KING:

- Q. And who did you split your shares between?
- 28 A. I -- oh, I have to think exactly how I did

- 1 this, but I -- I can only say Robin and I split our
 2 42 percent shares --
 - Q. 48 percent.
 - A. I'm sorry. Again I said 42. 48 percent shares equally across myself, herself, and Jeff Harding.
 - Q. Okay. Now, after you got done filling out your ballot, what did you do?
 - A. Well, we passed them in to Mr. Smiljkovich.
- 10 Q. You passed your ballot in to
- 11 Mr. Smiljkovich?

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

18

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Yes.
 - Q. Did you just hand it to him?
- 14 A. Hand it to him?
- 15 Q. Hand it.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 \blacksquare Q. And you saw other shareholders do that too?
 - A. I saw all of the shareholders do that.
- 19 Q. Then what happened?
 - A. Then Manuel Altamirano, who was sitting down the table -- I guess down the table from me, he suddenly spoke up and said to Mr. Smiljkovich, who was about to count the votes, "Wait a minute. I need to talk to you outside."
 - Q. Then what happened?
- A. Well, my copyright attorney was there with us as well.
- 28 Q. Mr. Gary Eastman?

- 1 A. Mr. Gary Eastman, yes.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. And he --
- Q. So wait. What happened with Mr. Altamirano and Mr. Smiljkovich after Mr. Altamirano stood up and said this to Mr. Smiljkovich?
- A. They left the room and they went outside the room while we waited.
- Q. What happened while they were outside the room that you could see?
- A. You know, I could see -- well, I was sitting directly across from David Huffman on the long end of the table. Okay. And I know that Mr. Turner was -- positioned his -- to his left and Mr. Kinney to his left.

And all of a sudden, the three of them kept kind of grouping together and chatting about something. And then I see -- I see them kind of like all of a sudden scribbling numbers or scribbling something down, doing cal -- it looked like they were doing calculations.

- Q. Then what happened?
- A. Then Mr. Altamirano and Mr. Smiljkovich returned back in the room and --
- Q. What did they say when they came back in, if anything?
- A. I don't think they said anything.

28 Mr. Smiljkovich went back to his side of the table,

1 which was to my left, and --

2

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

- Then what happened? 0.
- 3 And Mr. Kinney sat back down next to 4 Mr. Altamirano -- I'm sorry. Mr. Altamirano sat 5 back down next to Mr. Kinney. And Mr. Kinney suddenly said to David Smiljkovich, you know, "Hold 6
 - 0. Did he say why?
 - I don't think he did. Α.

I need a new ballot."

- What did Mr. Smiljkovich do? Q.
- 11 He handed him a new ballot and asked for 12 his old ballot back.
 - What did he do with the old ballot? 0.
- Well, actually, he had -- let me correct Mr. Kinney asked to get his ballot back first, and so Mr. Smiljkovich gave Kinney his ballot back. And then after he looked at it, he said, "I made a mistake. I need a new ballot." So 19 Mr. Smiljkovich handed him a new ballot and took
 - Q. Mr. Smiljkovich tore up the old ballot?
 - Α. Yes.
 - You saw that? Q.
- 24 He tore it two ways and left it on the Α. 25 desk.

Mr. Kinney's old ballot back and tore it up.

- 26 You saw him do that? 0.
- 27 Everyone saw him do that. Α.
- 28 Q. What happened after Mr. Smiljkovich tore up

the ballot?

- A. Well, my attorney was objecting to this happening, because he objected to their -- to the inspector of elections leaving the room to speak with a candidate in the middle of the vote without closing the election first -- first. And then --
- Q. What did you hear Mr. Eastman say in response to Mr. Smiljkovich tearing up the ballot?

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection. That's hearsay.

THE COURT: Just a minute. Sustained.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Just a minute.

THE WITNESS: Sure.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. Did you hear anyone at that meeting object to the tearing up of the ballot?
 - A. I don't even --

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection to the extent that it calls for hearsay, Your Honor. This could be backdooring it.

THE COURT: On hearsay, any response?

MR. KING: It's not intended for the truth of the matter asserted. It's intended for the effect on (inaudible).

THE COURT: Intended for the effect on?

MR. KING: For the effect on the witness.

MR. SULLIVAN: That's irrelevant.

THE COURT: For this witness?

MR. KING: Yes, and on Mr. Smiljkovich. 1 2 THE COURT: Response? 3 MR. MCCLOSKEY: That's irrelevant. 4 fact, on that witness or on Mr. Smiljkovich, 5 Your Honor, it is irrelevant. THE COURT: I'm inclined to sustain unless 6 7 there's anything else. In other words, I think it's for the truth of the matter. So sustained. 8 9 BY MR. KING: 10 Did you voice any objection yourself? 11 I -- I voiced it to my attorney, and my 12 attorney voiced the objection, I guess, on my 13 behalf. MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 14 15 Move to strike. 16 THE COURT: Granted. 17 BY MR. KING: 18 Did you make a request for -- to 19 Mr. Smiljkovich that he preserve the ballot? 20 Not to Mr. Smiljkovich, because 21 Mr. Smiljkovich had given the ballots to the 22 secretary of the meeting. 23 Who was the secretary of the meeting? 24 Well, the acting secretary of the meeting, 25 his name is Bryce Allen (phonetic), and he's a 26 former attorney at Procopio. 27 Okay. And how did you know Mr. Allen was

the secretary at the meeting?

- A. Because -- well, they announced at the beginning of the meeting that he would be acting as secretary and that he would be taking notes for the minutes of the meeting.
 - Q. Did Mr. Smiljkovich ever indicate that he would preserve a copy of the ballots that he had torn up?
 - A. As I said, he -- at the request of my attorney, he handed --

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

Move to strike.

THE COURT: Granted.

THE WITNESS: Mr. Smiljkovich --

THE COURT: No. No.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. What did Mr. Smiljkovich say, if anything, about preserving the ballots that he had ripped up?
 - A. He didn't say anything.
- Q. At any point in time after the meeting did you request to inspect those ballots?
- A. I'm sorry. I'm having difficulty because I'm being objected to for narrating, but then we're missing stuff that I --
 - O. So --
 - A. Where I'm at --
- Q. So let's just finish up with the meeting.
 What else happened at the meeting?

1 Mr. Smiljkovich gave all of the ballots to 2 Bryce Allen, the acting secretary, who was asked to 3 preserve the ballots of the meeting. 4 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 5 Move to strike. THE COURT: Granted. 6 7 THE WITNESS: Mr. Allen --8 THE COURT: No, no. Wait for the next 9 question. 10 THE WITNESS: Okay. 11 BY MR. KING: 12 Why didn't you make a request that 13 Mr. Smiljkovich preserve the ballots at that 14 meeting? 15 Because I asked my attorney to make the 16 request. 17 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 18 Move to strike. 19 THE WITNESS: I don't know how else to 20 answer it. 21 MR. KING: Your Honor, that's a different 22 scenario. It's not for the truth of the matter. 23 THE COURT: Overruled. Denied. 24 BY MR. KING: 25 Q. You can go ahead and answer. 26 Α. Could you repeat the question? 27 THE COURT: I think he already answered.

28

Next question.

- 1 BY MR. KING: 2 After your -- after your attorney requested 3 to Mr. Smiljkovich --MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 4 5 Move to strike the question. 6 THE COURT: That's granted. 7 BY MR. KING: Okay. After Mr. Smiljkovich handed the 8 9 torn-up ballots to Mr. Allen, what was the next 10 thing that happened at that shareholder meeting? 11 Mr. Allen put both the completed ballots 12 and the torn-up ballots into an envelope, and I 13 asked him to be sure to preserve those ballots. 14 Q. Did he respond to you? 15 That he would do so.
- 16 MR. SULLIVAN: Objection, Your Honor.
- 17 Hearsay.
- 18 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 19 BY MR. KING:
 - Did anything else happen at that shareholder meeting? Let me ask you this: After --
- 22 I'm sorry. I'm a little thrown because, Α. 23 you know, obviously, I can't -- I haven't been able 24 to talk about much.
 - MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection. No question pending, Your Honor.
- 27 THE COURT: Granted.

25

26

20

1 BY MR. KING:

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. After Mr. Kinney filled out a new ballot,
- 3 who -- did Mr. Smiljkovich tally the votes?
 - A. Yes, yes. I'm sorry. Then Mr. --
 - Q. Hold on. Who ended up winning the election to the five board of director seats?
 - A. It was three of the defendants, Mr. -Mr. Huffman, Mr. Altamirano, and Mr. Turner.
 - Q. Who were the other two directors?
 - A. Myself and Robin Sassi.
 - Q. And you believe that something that occurred during that meeting -- there was some misconduct at that meeting. Is that a fair statement?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. If there was some misconduct in that election, how did it damage you?
 - A. Well, it damaged everyone, myself more than others, obviously, because had -- had the original votes been tallied without the change --
 - MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

 He's speculating. Calls for -- lacks foundation.
- 23 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 24 THE WITNESS: Had --
- THE COURT: No.
- 26 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I apologize.
- 27 BY MR. KING:
- 28 Q. I'm going to move on. I'm going to talk

about -- briefly about some of the Janstor issues
that we discussed last week before we go to lunch.
We had looked at documents that said you formed the
Janstor corporation the day after you were elected
to the board of directors.

Do you recall that?

A. I believe so.

- Q. Why did you form Janstor Technology corporation the day after that election?
- A. Because the defendants remained in control of Storix.
- Q. And what does that -- how does that relate to Janstor Technology?
- A. As I mentioned previously, Janstor was formed because of the fear based on actions that had taken place that Storix would likely collapse under the litigation of the copyright suit and the just ongoing neglect of the software and so forth.
- Q. Why not file -- or why not form Janstor before that board of director election?
- A. Because we believed that if we had been able to take over the board with our three seats, that we could have ended the copyright litigation since the copyright ownership wouldn't have been really relevant at this point. The software would have been improved and their -- all litigation would have ended three years ago.
 - Q. Storix's counsel spent considerable time

1467 1 talking about port numbers and your application for 2 port numbers. I don't want to go back over a lot of 3 this, but I want to be clear. 4 If you -- what we talked about last week 5 was that in applying for these port numbers that you made up a character, Berg, to help convince someone 6

at IANA that they should issue port numbers.

Do you recall that general discussion?

Yes. Α.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

26

27

28

- Okay. Now, were you -- were you misrepresenting some fact about your application that -- that caused them then to issue those port numbers?
- No. I was clarifying an issue that I had previously inadvertently confused.
- Did the statements that the character Berg made -- were those statements at all untrue?
- Α. No. They were accurate and concise and -and answered all of the questions that had -- I had caused confusion over.
- Q. You were embarrassed by having caused the confusion?

23 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection. That's leading.

THE COURT: Sustained.

25 BY MR. KING:

- Why did you create this character Berg instead of just telling the truth, that --
 - Α. Because this -- this conversation had gone

back and forth, and it was -- it was just becoming
just a very -- it was just becoming more confusing.
And I was on the verge of giving up and just not
registering port numbers. They weren't necessary,
particularly.

And I figured just one last shot. Let's just have somebody else explain it to her that knows more about this than me, and he was much more concise and clear on the issue than I was and problem solved.

Q. Storix asked you about the date you filed your request to dissolve Janstor.

Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

- Q. And they showed that you filed the request that was on file with the Secretary of State after Janstor litigation had been filed, right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Was that the first request for dissolution you filed with the Secretary of State?
 - A. No.
 - Q. What was the first request?
- A. The first request I -- I was a bit confused over whether I served it in June or July or filed it in June or July, because it was quite some time ago. But I had a recollection of having filed it when I was still in San Diego, and yet I had a vague recollection of filing it when I was in Florida.

And I moved to Florida between June and July, so I was very confused as to when I filed it.

And when he showed me the September filing that I had never seen before, I guess, other than when I filled it out and sent it in -- I had no recollection of it -- but suddenly, it made sense.

I filed the form in June before I left San Diego and, apparently, filed a corrected form in September after I moved to Florida.

- Q. What was incorrect about your first form?
- A. My first form was -- it was -- it was -- I don't know -- a form that you would normally use to dissolve a corporation that lists its assets and its shareholders. And I guess it is a complicated process of making sure when it's dissolved, any remaining assets are distributed the way they need to be.
 - Q. So why did you file a second form?
- A. The -- I don't recall if I got a -- I think
 I got a phone call from someone that --
 - Q. Someone with who?
 - A. Someone with the Secretary of State.
 - Q. What did they tell you?
 - A. They told me that based on the fact that I had kept filling out zeros and "not applicable" all over the form, they said, "Well, did the company have any assets?" It did not. Did it have a bank account? It did not. Okay. It didn't operate. It

didn't do anything. It was just formed. It didn't do anything.

They said, "Well, this is not uncommon.

Just file the short form, which is specifically for corporations that don't have any assets."

And so I filed the short form and just forgot about it.

- Q. You filed the short form, and that's what eventually dissolved the corporation?
- A. Eventually. I think it took about a year before it actually -- maybe not that long. It -- it took several months before it actually showed up as --
 - Q. Okay.

- A. -- dissolved.
- Q. So let me ask you. If the corporation was not formed for any wrongful purpose in terms of competing with the company, why did you want to dissolve it?
- A. Because I was moving to Florida and it was a California corporation.
- Q. Okay. Why not start up a Florida corporation?
- A. Because by that time, they won the shareholder -- they won the board majority. They were going to litigate the company into bankruptcy, but it was clearly going to take some time. And it didn't -- just didn't see any -- any point in trying

to prepare for the worst anymore, because it was dragging on endlessly.

- Q. And you were on the board of directors when Janstor corp -- when the Janstor lawsuit was filed, right?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And did anyone at Storix ever inform you about the intention to file the Janstor lawsuit before it was filed?
 - A. No.
- Q. Did you ever discuss the potential of the Janstor lawsuit at any board of director meeting?
 - A. I didn't know there was a potential.
- Q. Did you receive any request for written unanimous consent to file that on behalf of Storix?
- A. No.
- Q. Any one of the defendants ever come to you and say, "Anthony, what's up with this Janstor corporation?"
 - A. No.
- Q. Did you ever receive any written notice there was going to be a board meeting or anything regarding Janstor was going to be discussed?
- A. No.
 - Q. Has Janstor ever sold anything?
- 26 A. No.
- Q. Has Janstor ever gotten a bank account?
- 28 A. No.

Janstor ever done any advertising? 1 Q. 2 Α. No. 3 Janstor ever had any employees? Q. 4 No. Α. 5 Janstor ever paid any employee? Q. 6 No. Α. 7 Has Janstor done anything to compete with Q. Storix? 8 9 No. Α. 10 MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Calls for a 11 legal conclusion. 12 THE COURT: Sustained. 13 BY MR. KING: After the February of 2015 board of 14 15 director meeting, there was further board of 16 director meetings in 2015. We looked at one that 17 occurred on April 13th, 2015. 18 Do you recall that meeting? 19 Α. Yes. 20 And what do you recall was discussed at Q. 21 that meeting? 22 The -- one was a proposal for a shareholder Α. 23 agreement that would take place between the company 24 and the four shareholder defendants. The second

to -- to investigate a employee stock option plan. MR. KING: Your Honor, may I show the witness an exhibit?

issue was the potential formation of a committee

25

26

27

1 THE COURT: Yes. 2 MR. KING: 516. 3 MR. MCCLOSKEY: What is it? 4 MR. KING: 516. 5 516 has been admitted, right? Okay. 6 Robin, can you put 516 up there. 7 (Exhibit 516 referenced.) BY MR. KING: 8 9 This is the meeting you attended on that 10 day, right? 11 This is the notice of the meeting, yes. 12 MR. KING: Scroll down, Robin, to the 13 minutes. Actually -- yeah, keep going. BY MR. KING: 14 15 So one of the things that was presented at 16 this meeting that we looked at was the shareholder 17 agreement. 18 Did you have an opportunity to express your 19 opinion on whether or not the company should enter 20 into that shareholder agreement at that meeting? 21 I need to be clear on which meeting. Α. 22 I've -- I was given an opinion -- I was given the 23 opportunity to request that my attorney speak and 24 give his opinion. 25 Q. Okay. And is that your attorney's opinion 26 right there summarized on Paragraph Number 6? 27 I've read it before and I don't take issue Α.

with it. No, that -- that's correct.

- 1 Q. Okay. Now, if you turn to the next 2 exhibit, Exhibit 517, in your binder, can you tell 3 me what Exhibit 517 is? 4 This is a notice of the next special 5 meeting of the board of directors to take place on May 18th. 6 7 (Exhibit 517 referenced.) BY MR. KING: 8 9 And are there minutes attached to that Q. 10 notice as well? 11 Yes, there are. Α. 12 And are those the minutes from that Q. 13 meeting? 14 Α. They appear to be. 15 MR. KING: Your Honor, I'd like to move 16 Exhibit 517 into evidence. MR. SULLIVAN: No objection, Your Honor. 17 18 MR. MCCLOSKEY: No objection, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Received. 20 (Exhibit 517 received.) 21 MR. KING: And if we could go to the 22 minutes portion of this document, Robin. So 23 start -- stop right here. 24 BY MR. KING: 25 Do you see this is the -- this is the --Q. 26 these are the minutes, Mr. Johnson?

Yes.

Α.

27

28

Q. And the -- Number 5, it says shareholder

1475 1 agreement was introduced, and then there's a motion 2 to accept the shareholder agreement and it passed. 3 How did you vote on that? 4 I voted against it. Α. 5 And how many people voted for it? 0. Unfortunately, Ms. Sassi was unable to 6 7 attend this meeting, so there were four of us. think the three that voted for it were David 8 9 Huffman, Rich Turner, and Manuel Altamirano. Now, it talks about a period of discussion. 10 Q. 11 During this period of discussion, were you able to 12 express your opinion at the board meeting on this 13 item? 14 I very much -- well, in the -- I was only 15 entitled to three minutes to speak on any topic, 16 seeing that the first item of discussion was to vote 17 on a code of conduct, which limited my ability to 18 speak to three minutes. So my primary goal there --19 I had many issues with the bylaw --20 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 21 Narrating here. 22 THE COURT: Sustained. 23 THE WITNESS: Okay. 24 BY MR. KING: 25 So my question is: Did you have an 0.

shareholder agreement at that meeting? 28 I had had an opin -- time to express some

opportunity to express your opinion on this

26

1 of my opinion.

- Q. And what was your opinion?
- A. Most notably that because this was a shareholder agreement between the company and four shareholders and those four shareholders were not entitled to vote on a transaction to which they were a party to --
 - Q. Okay.
- A. -- therefore, my vote was the only valid vote and it was a nay.
- Q. Okay. Now, we saw a previous exhibit that your attorney had requested that a -- a shareholder agreement that -- that did not -- that included all shareholders, not just -- all shareholders except for you and Ms. Sassi.

Do you recall that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Did -- the shareholder agreement that was voted on and approved at this meeting, did that include you and Ms. Sassi?
 - A. It did not.
- Q. Did anyone offer you the opportunity to become a party to that shareholder agreement prior to approval of this meeting?
 - A. No.
- Q. Even if -- let me ask -- let me ask this:

 If you were offered an opportunity to become a shareholder or to become a party to the shareholder

agreement, would you still have had any objection to it?

- A. I can't answer it as of that time because too many -- too many facts and situations have changed. I would have -- I would have, if given the time to do so, spent more time on that particular issue.
- Q. The bylaw amendments, did you have any objection to those that were proposed and voted on?
 - A. Very many.

- Q. What were your objections?
- A. Again, with the limited speaking time that I had, I voiced some legal -- legal objections to the board of directors altering bylaws that affect shareholder rights without the shareholders' approval; the board of directors passing bylaws that give themselves additional rights while restrict -- actually, rights to the majority of directors while restricting the rights of minority directors; and allowing themselves to -- even as shareholders, to hold a majority vote to pass motions or actions without even informing the minority until after the action has been taken. That's about all I had time to speak with, but --
- Q. And how did the defendants respond to your objections?
- A. There was no -- no response, and they just voted to approve it.

Q. I want to go to -- let me go to -- take a look at Exhibit 21.

After these were approved, the Janstor suit was filed in August of 2015. Exhibit 21, which has been admitted, that was your e-mail to the defendants on September 26, 2015?

THE CLERK: Did you say 21?

MR. KING: Yes.

THE CLERK: It was not admitted.

MR. KING: I'm sorry. Okay. Robin, can you do 356?

BY MR. KING:

- Q. This is the "Buckle up, boys" e-mail that we looked at last week. Do you recall this?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Now, tell me what caused you to send this e-mail. And I know this -- this one might be -- this one might involve several things. So if there are a number of things that caused you to send this e-mail, list those and we'll go -- tackle them each one by one. Okay?
- A. There are many things that caused me to send this e-mail.
- Q. Okay. Start with Number 1. We'll do a quick list.
- A. Number 1, they cheated the shareholder election, okay, only a few months earlier.
 - Number 2, they passed shareholder agreements and new

bylaws that gave them rights that Ms. Sassi and I did not get.

Q. Okay.

A. Number 3, I found out the copyright -- this is during a period in which the copyright litigation was still going on. I found out in the copyright discovery that the entire time I had been working on my Version 9, the defendants had been enacting a plan to force me to give up my remaining shares of the company. And this -- I learned about this only a year into the -- you know, now -- now a year into the copyright litigation.

I had just flown -- I had -- well, first of all, I had to sell my San Diego house because I could no longer afford the litigation or afford -- at least afford to get through the litigation anymore. I needed to raise the cash. So I sold my house -- I meant my house in San Diego -- and moved to Florida, where I bought a home there for about a third of the price, which gave me enough cash, which I had hoped would be enough to get through the litigation.

I then flew from San Diego -- I'm sorry -from Florida back to San Diego to attend a
settlement conference in the copyright case.

Needless to say, there was no settlement, because
again, no one would speak to me or see me.

And I went back to Florida to get -- to

- find out that I had just been served another lawsuit, which was filed three hours before the settlement conference started.
 - Q. What was that lawsuit?
 - A. That was the Janstor lawsuit.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. And I --
- Q. I've got four on my list right now. Is there a fifth? Were there any other additional reasons?
- A. There are probably many others. One of -the most important one is that I had also discovered
 that the company was now -- as I expected, was now
 losing money. But I had no idea --
 - Q. How did you discover that?
- A. Well, I discovered that in the quarterly shareholder meeting. I don't know if it was a June meeting, because this is now in September.

 Actually, it was -- I think it may have been a third quarter report that I had seen only days earlier, and it showed that the company was now I think approaching \$600,000 in debt.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. I -- I knew -- I knew this was going to happen if I couldn't get them off the board, and now it's happening.
- MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. The witness is narrating.

1 THE COURT: Overruled.

You may continue.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. So --
 - A. Everything --
- Q. So let me just -- let me just make sure I'm clear.
 - A. Sure.
- Q. Shortly before that e-mail, you had -- you had received information that said the company was losing money?
 - A. Yes. It was bleeding rather badly.
- Q. How many times quarterly -- you know, on a quarterly basis the company reports revenue -- had you seen numbers where the company showed a loss for that quarter?

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. That violates the best evidence rule.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: The company had never lost money up until at least the time the copyright suit was filed through the end of 2014. It -- I -- I knew in 2015 that the company was almost out of cash at the first quarter, and this made -- made taking over the board rather -- BY MR. KING:

- DI III. KING.
- Q. Okay. So what I'm getting at is was -- the information you got in 2015 that the company was

losing money, was that the first time in your experience with the company that you had ever seen the company lose money?

A. Yes. Yes, it was.

- Q. Is there a sixth reason that went into the "Buckle up, boys" e-mail?
- A. I've forgotten where I left off, to be honest.
- Q. So we've got your -- your concerns about being treated unfairly by the shareholder agreements and bylaws; your concerns about what happened at the last shareholder meeting election; your concerns that the defendants were -- had attempted to take your shares when you were working at the company in 2014; the fact that they filed the Janstor lawsuit against you; the fact that the company was losing money.

Is there anything else that went into this?

- A. To be honest, I'm a little overwhelmed right now. This is -- it's taking me back and I'm getting a little -- a little frustrated at the moment.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. I -- you know, I --

MR. KING: Your Honor, may I approach so I can show the witness the exhibit so he can take a look at it?

28 THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. This is the e-mail, correct, Mr. Johnson?
- A. This is the e-mail that you were --
- Q. Yeah.
 - A. -- starting to display?
- Q. Yep.
- 7 A. Yes.
 - Q. Now, at the time all these concerns that you just mentioned -- you just discussed -- and I'm not -- and I realize there might be some others that may not come to mind right now.

At the time, what did you -- what action did you want to take about these concerns?

A. Well, I think what I've been reminded about, looking at it here a little closer, is that one of my frustrations, which I mentioned earlier, was their having filed the Janstor suit and not only done it during -- I mean, literally three hours before a settlement conference, but that they were filing it against me as a director by my own company, which I knew was completely improper. I mean, I --

MR. SULLIVAN: Objection, Your Honor. Improper legal opinion.

THE WITNESS: I was, I suppose, expecting that.

27 THE COURT: Sustained.

1 BY MR. KING:

- Q. You believed it was improper?
- A. I knew it was improper.

MR. SULLIVAN: Same objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Same ruling.

BY MR. KING:

Q. What did you believe was the proper way the Janstor suit should have been filed?

MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Calls for a legal opinion.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. What did you want to do about the concerns you had that you listed, including the Janstor suit? What action did you want to take?
- A. I wanted to take action to try to protect the company from them doing any more damage than they have already done.
- Q. So what did -- what specifically did -- do you mean by that?
- A. Ms. Sassi and I got together and decided to file a shareholder suit on behalf of the company in order to prevent the defendants from doing any more damage to the company in their attack on me. Now, I'm not claiming any more damages for myself, but we're trying to protect the company. But nevertheless, the company is being damaged because of all of their efforts to destroy me.

- MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.
- 2 Motion to strike. Motion in limine.
- THE COURT: As to the last portion, qranted.
- 5 BY MR. KING:

- Q. How does this "Buckle up, boys" e-mail relate to the shareholder action you were describing?
- A. Needless to say, I -- with everything that had happened, probably within the last 30 days, I wasn't exactly in my most tactful state of mind.
 - Q. Okay. I understand that.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. My question is not --
- 15 A. Okay. And --
 - Q. My question is: How does this relate to the actual shareholder action you described?
 - A. I was conveying to them in as strong a words as I could muster that if they did not -- if this did not end immediately and they did not leave the company, then -- then this shareholder derivative suit would be filed against them, in which case they would not be able to use the company in their defense the way they have ever since.
 - MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

 Motion to strike. Motion in limine.
- 27 THE COURT: Granted as to the last portion.

1 MR. KING: Robin, if you could scroll down 2 to the paragraph that starts "First of all." 3 BY MR. KING: 4 Those are the -- you say, "First of all, I 5 have over a dozen indefensible allegations against you." 6 7 Those allegations are -- did those include some of the things we just listed? 8 9 Some of them, yes. 10 Okay. And those -- you intended to assert 11 those in the shareholder action with Ms. Sassi? 12 Yes, and they have been. 13 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 14 Motion to strike. 15 THE COURT: Granted. 16 BY MR. KING: 17 Q. So why not just file the action without 18 sending this e-mail? Why send them the e-mail 19 first? 20 For the same reason that I -- I sent 21 e-mails and plead -- and pleaded with them before, 22 you know, not to make me file the copyright action. 23 The last thing I wanted was another lawsuit. And, 24 you know, I know they can't be reasoned with, so 25 yeah, I resorted to threats. And that was -- this 26 was a threat. I don't deny it.

Q. A threat to what?

28

A. A threat -- a threat to file the

shareholder lawsuit against them if they didn't get out. And I only needed one of them to accept that offer and all of this would be over.

- Q. Did you intend to hurt the company? Did you intend to hurt Storix with this e-mail?
 - A. I don't see -- no, of course not.
 - Q. Did you ever intend to hurt Storix?
 - A. I never intended to hurt Storix.
 - Q. How does this e-mail help Storix?
- A. It doesn't. Well, it -- well, it didn't because it didn't work.
- Q. Okay. How was it your -- how did you envision that this e-mail would help Storix or could help Storix?
- A. My threat, I believe, was not just to file the derivative claims -- I'm sorry -- the shareholder claims against them, but to also expose the despicable things that they had been doing now for a year and a half and hoping that one of them would see enough reason to -- to say, "What can we do end this?" What -- you know, just one of them.
- Q. When you say just one -- you just needed one of them, why?
- A. Because with any one of them, we would have had the shareholder votes we needed to end all of this.
- Q. And how was that in the best interest of Storix?

- 1 Well, they have spent 3 1/2 million dollars 2 on litigation since this time. So obviously, that 3 would have been a benefit to Storix. 4 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. 5 Motion to strike. Motion in limine. THE COURT: Granted. 6 7 THE REPORTER: As to the whole answer, 8 Your Honor? 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 BY MR. KING: 11 I want to take a look at Exhibit 22, I 12 believe. Let me show you that. 13 MR. KING: Robin, if we can pull up Exhibit 22. 14 15 BY MR. KING: 16 Now, you alluded to this in the "Buckle up, boys" e-mail. But this is not about any shareholder 17 lawsuit, right? 18 19 Α. No. 20 What is -- what is the reason or the 21 purpose behind this e-mail? 22 Well, this is a toned down version of the 23 e-mail that I attached to this "Buckle up, boys" e-mail that I told the defendants that I was 24 25 threatening to send to everyone in the world, I 26 suppose, to expose the things that they had been
 - Q. Did anyone tell you to file this e-mail --

28

doing.

- 1 send this e-mail?
 - A. Pardon me?
 - Q. Did anyone tell you to send this e-mail?
 - A. Well, my attorney suggested --
- 5 MR. SULLIVAN: Objection, Your Honor.
- 6 Hearsay.

3

4

- 7 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 8 BY MR. KING:
- 9 Q. Just to be clear, this e-mail is October 6,
- 10 2015, right?
- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. This is still in the middle of the copyright litigation?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. And at the time -- this is before the copyright trial, correct?
- 17 A. It was three weeks before the motion for summary judgment in the -- in the --
- 19 Q. Which is also before the trial, correct?
- 20 A. Yes.

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. What was your belief at the time about how the copyright litigation would turn out?
- A. I was entirely convinced beyond any doubt in my mind that Storix would have no chance at becoming the first company in the history of the 1976 copyright act to --
- MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

 Calls for a legal conclusion. Lacks foundation.

- 1 Entirely speculative.
- 2 THE COURT: Granted.
- 3 BY MR. KING:

- Q. Without going into the reasons, what did you believe about your -- about how the copyright litigation would turn out at this point?
- A. I believed with 100 percent certainty that my ownership in the copyright to the software that I registered federally in 1999 was still mine.
 - Q. You believed you would win the litigation?
 - A. I -- I wasn't the only one.
- Q. Did you believe you would win the litigation?
 - A. I --
 - Q. Is that a yes?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. How did -- now, you recognize now that your belief was wrong. You lost that litigation. You don't deny that, right?
- A. I don't deny that we lost at trial.
- Q. Okay. You don't deny that you appealed the litigation and the appellate court has issued a ruling affirming the trial -- affirming the jury's verdict, correct?
- A. They didn't confirm the jury verdict. They confirmed that the judge had the authority to give the verdict to the jury to make.
 - Q. You don't deny that the decision has not

- 1 been reversed on appeal, correct?
 - A. No, but it is also not --
- Q. You're not challenging that right now,
 4 correct?
 - A. I am, yes.
 - Q. Sorry. But not in this case.
- 7 A. Pardon me?
- Q. You're not challenging the copyright in this case, right?
- 10 A. You mean in this case in this room?
- 11 O. Yes.

5

6

15

16

17

18

21

- 12 A. No, of course not. No, I'm not challenging
 13 the fact that they did win. They did win the
 14 ownership of the copyright.
 - Q. Okay. But at the time when you believed that you were going to win, you sent this e-mail, right?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. How did that belief in the strength of your case impact your decision to send this e-mail?
 - A. I'm sorry. Did I lose the exhibit number?

 Can you help me again?
- 23 Q. Sure.
- MR. KING: Your Honor, may I approach?
- THE WITNESS: Oh, I don't have it,
- 26 actually.
- THE COURT: Twenty-two.
- 28 THE WITNESS: I don't have -- I don't need

1 to worry about it.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. How did -- your belief at the time in the strength of your case, how did it impact your decision to send this e-mail?
- A. I believed at the time I sent this e-mail that it would -- well, primarily, I wanted Storix management, the defendants, to be informed that despite their effort, you know, their -- I mean, they filed a restraining order to try to prevent me from sending it and it was denied.

So I felt, first of all, that I needed to follow through, to some extent at least, on my threat, rather than it, you know, be ignored, as every other. But I was concerned, first of all, that they were not going to update the security to the software. And customers needed to be informed that there were known security vulnerabilities in the software that the defendants were well aware of and --

- Q. Did your e-mail actually inform them of that?
 - A. Yes. Well --
 - Q. So -- point to where.
- A. I'm sorry. It's kind of small lettering, so it's hard to skim. Yes, in the -- you'll need to go down to about the fifth paragraph, "No new programmers were hired." And I said, "Working alone

for nine months on major enhancements to address known security vulnerabilities and increase the network security."

job.

I made other reference to the fact that these -- in the last paragraph, "The security enhancements to the software have been completed, along with much more."

Unfortunately, you know, effectively, I'm informing a small set of customers -- potential customers that I sent this out to that there are vulnerabilities in the software. Those vulnerabilities had been fixed. This copyright decision of -- in confirming my ownership is going to be made in three weeks. I was anticipating that at least.

And when that happened, if the defendants were to have received a couple of phone calls from customers saying, "There's vulnerabilities in the software. When are we getting them fixed?" well, what will their answer be? The person who owns the software is Anthony Johnson. Anthony Johnson fixed these vulnerabilities in the software --

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor.

THE WITNESS: -- but we won't give him a

MR. MCCLOSKEY: The witness is narrating. We're talking about security vulnerabilities.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. How did you get the names of the people -of the customers to send this to and their e-mail
 addresses? How did you get that?
- A. David Huffman had sent out an e-mail that had a link on it where he had created a Google map where he imported a bunch of customer data, and I just kind of grabbed some e-mail addresses out of -- out of that list.
 - Q. Is this publicly accessible information?
 - A. It was.
- Q. Did you need a password to access that information?
- A. No. You -- you needed the link. But, you know, who knows who the e-mail could have gone to or who could have seen it. So anyone who had seen the e-mail or forwarded it to anyone, it was anyone --

MR. MCCLOSKEY: Objection, Your Honor. The witness is narrating again.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KING:

- Q. How many customers did you send this e-mail to?
- A. You know, I -- I don't remember. It's hard for me to even put a real range to it. I would say because of the address it was sent to and the way it was sent, it would have been limited to, I would say, around 50.

6

7

5

8

9

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

Now, you -- let's see. In the first paragraph that we see up there on the screen, the last sentence of that, you write, "However, I must demand you cease any further payment to Storix in relation to this software and refrain from downloading any further copies."

Why did you tell that to the customers you sent this to?

- Well, because, first of all, I'm informing them that I'm the copyright owner. I also told them that if they have the software, they're welcome to keep using it. But I also intended in three weeks' time, once my ownership was confirmed and whatever else happened to get one of these guys to finally stop suing me and end this stuff, that I could easily retract the e-mail and say, "It's all good. And by the way, here's the security software that I promised you."
 - How is that in the best interest of Storix?
- Well, the alternative is and has been that the security hasn't been updated and there hasn't been a new release of the software in four years.
- If you could turn to Exhibit 23 in that binder, which I believe has also been admitted. This is the third e-mail that we looked at yesterday. Mr. Bonert.

What was the purpose behind this e-mail?

Α. Well, by this time -- well, things were

1 looking pretty dire for Storix from my perspective, 2 and the debt that they were in was in pretty 3 crippling shape. They clearly were not going to 4 update the software. They were not going to work 5 with me. The copyright trial did -- certainly didn't 6 7 go my way and Storix was confirmed as the owner of the copyright, which then gave the majority of the 8 board of directors the right to never update the 9 10 software. 11 MR. KING: Your Honor, may I approach and 12 show the witness some exhibits? 13 THE COURT: Yes. BY MR. KING: 14 15 Now, prior to January '16 -- in January of 16 that year, you had a shareholders meeting, correct? 17 Α. Yes. 18 And the exhibits I'm going to show are 820, 19 631 and 785. This is Exhibit 820. Do you recognize 20 this exhibit? 21 A. I'm going to need a minute. Yes, I recall 22 this. 23 (Exhibit 820 referenced.) 24 (Exhibit 631 referenced.) 25 (Exhibit 785 referenced.) 26 BY MR. KING:

What is this?

This is an e-mail that I sent to David

27

28

Q.

1497 1 Huffman where I believe I attached a spreadsheet 2 that I created having to do with the financial 3 trends of the company over the years. 4 What was the date of this e-mail? 5 January 14th, 2016. 6 MR. KING: Your Honor, I move to admit 7 Exhibit 820. 8 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Your Honor, it's 9 unaccompanied by the spreadsheet. 10 MR. KING: Just the e-mail. MR. MCCLOSKEY: It's hard for me to assess 11 12 its admissibility or whether it's worthy --13 THE COURT: Let's do this. 14 MR. MCCLOSKEY: -- of objection absent 15 seeing the spreadsheet. 16 THE COURT: But is there an objection? Not 17 an objection? 18 MR. MCCLOSKEY: I object because I don't 19 have the document in front of me, Your Honor. 20 There's a --21 THE COURT: He's doing only the e-mail, not 22 the spreadsheet. 23 MR. MCCLOSKEY: But the whole e-mail is 24 about the spreadsheet, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's take our afternoon We'll be in recess until 9 o'clock tomorrow recess. morning. Have a great evening. Remember the admonition. Thank you.

25

26

27

(Whereupon the jurors exit the courtroom.) 1 2 THE COURT: We're outside the presence of 3 the jury. There's a number of things, and we need 4 to be on the record. 5 First is I have a jury note. "I am trying to understand the original driver/intent of the 6 7 bylaw amendment. I'm not clear on whether it was in 8 response to Robin Sassi getting Storix shares 9 (related to David Huffman's divorce). When was 10 Ms. Sassi awarded Storix shares date?" 11 So that's one thing. Then Exhibit 141, as 12 I recall, we had a discussion that we were going to 13 admit that exhibit subject to motion in limine Number 6 of the defendants, and I think everyone was 14 15 in agreement. I'm wondering if that's been done in 16 terms of the redactions relative to the Court 17 granting that motion. 18 MR. SULLIVAN: We do have a redacted copy. 19 We'll bring the hard copies tomorrow. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Is there any objection 21 to its admission? The clerk is wondering whether 22 it's been admitted or not. And I think, as I 23 recall, I admitted it subject to the redactions. 24 MR. SULLIVAN: I believe that was the 25 ruling. 26 THE COURT: But my clerk has it not in, and

MR. KING: As soon as I see the redactions,

I want to make sure we're all on the same page.

27

I can tell you whether or not we have any further objection.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's do that tomorrow morning. And then on scheduling -- and I know,

Mr. King, you're in examination. It's not meant just because you're in examination now.

But I fear we have woefully miscalculated on when this case is going to the jury, and that leaves the Court with a number of options. I can keep, at every break, pleading with you, talking with you, berating you, whatever it takes.

But we are now -- and I expected

Mr. Johnson, along with Mr. Huffman, to be probably
lengthy witnesses, but we're in Examination 2 of 3
before we even get to recross and redirect. And I
have -- I expected Mr. Johnson to go the rest of the
day, but we only have two more days of testimony
before we plan to argue on Thursday. Now, maybe
we've figured out that that's dreamland, but no
one's communicated that to me. And I'd like to know
what remains.

In looking at the witness list, it looks like we have a lot that remains, including two experts. And maybe they're not going to be lengthy, but I fear the worst.

Remember, [Juror No. 6] is only paid ten days, and I assured her that that's probably going to be fine, didn't know for sure. But the way it's

going, I expect her to be excused at some point.

And if she's -- if we're going to go the rest of the month, we should excuse her now instead of abusing her and going ten days.

And then we are down to two alternates, but the -- both alternates and all 12 remaining jurors expect this case to go to the jury, because I told them so, the week of the 13th and I think I said early. There may be a second phase, and I think we're on the verge of abusing the jury and I'm the one that steps in to prevent that.

So I have alternatives. I can mistry it.

I don't want to do that. I can set time limits from here on out. I don't want to do that. I can ask you to and beseech you to prune your own tree. I think it's getting fairly repetitious. I think a lot of the questions are very specific; answers, not so much. A lot of motions to strike granted or portions thereof.

And I think the jury -- more importantly than anything I've just said, I think it's dragging. I think we are in danger of losing the jury. When it drags, minds wander. And so that's not doing any service to any of your respective clients.

I know it's hard fought. But I would ask that you listen to me and think about it, and then we can look at alternatives. I'm not interested in anyone not having their fair day. You get your fair

day. We're trying three lawsuits. But something is going terribly wrong, unless I'm -- I misunderstood everyone at the outset.

But this case is not going to get to the jury anytime soon. It won't be this week and I fear it won't be next week, and then we're going to lose jurors. And then we're going to have angry jurors. And angry jurors don't decide it on whatever the exhibit says, whatever the witness says. They decide it because they're angry. And that's a disservice, I think, to everyone. It doesn't help one side. It doesn't help the other.

So I'll stop talking, because I know I'm talking quite a bit, but listen to what I'm saying and take it to heart. I'm the one watching the jury. And I know you're all watching the jury, but -- and I think, fortunately, we have a good jury. Let's not abuse them.

My main issue is there's no way we're arguing Thursday at the rate we're going. And, okay, maybe Tuesday. I don't see that happening. Okay. Maybe Wednesday, Valentine's Day. I don't see that happening unless these witnesses are not going to be called.

I think the jury has a lot of information.

We've been at this now for a while. They -- I think
they have the understanding that the parties are
frustrated with each other and maybe angry with each

other and here's all the reasons why. I think they pretty much have those reasons. That's my view.

So I promised I'd stop talking. Thoughts?

Am I wrong? Are we going to argue on Thursday?

MR. MCCLOSKEY: We're not going to argue on Thursday, Your Honor. You're not wrong. I think you're dead on. We need to get our act together and prune this case.

THE COURT: Just get in and get out. From a lawyer point of view, you know what you need. And I'm not --

I know, Mr. King, I'm talking while you're doing your examination. I'm talking to everyone.

But get in and get out. They have heard a lot and they're a good jury, I think. But we don't -- we don't want to drag. We don't want to bore them. We don't want to make them angry. We don't want to have them looking at me like, Who's in charge of this? Why, Judge, are you allowing them to do this? And then they won't decide it based on the facts and the law. They'll decide it because they're angry.

And I've had cases like that, and that's not -- that does no one a service of any kind.

A lot of money spent, a lot of emotions, and then an angry jury decides. And that's not really the way we would expect the adversary system of justice in our country to work, at least not well.

So other thoughts? So here's another thought, homework assignment. Go back tonight and write down how much time you think you need -- I know you can't control the other side or how the other side's witness answers or doesn't answer questions. I get that.

But you say, I'm in charge. I ask the questions. So no one's going to talk unless there's a question asked, and no one's going to talk beyond the scope of the question. So you figure out how much time I'm going to spend with this witness.

So I would say, "Mr. King, how much longer with Mr. Johnson? Mr. McCloskey, how much time are you going to spend with Mr. Johnson?" And then there might be recross and there might be redirect, and there might be recross. Calculate all that out, even though I know you don't know well how to do the recross and redirect, because you don't know exactly what's coming, but I suspect you have a fair idea. And then do it for each witness, and then we're going to do the math and we're going to see where we end up.

And at a minimum, I need to tell them the good news is we're really ahead of schedule, or the bad news is we're really behind and here's what I think now, because we're having this discussion. We don't leave them in the dark and say, "By the way, it's going to last another month."

So do the homework tonight, how much time I 1 2 need. And I would suggest you prune your own tree, 3 get in, get out. They have heard it. They have 4 seen these e-mails. They have seen them a lot. 5 everyone -- you know, I mean, we're not even in to 6 Mr. McCloskey yet. So the way we're going, I mean, 7 we might be -- so please do that math and then give it to me tomorrow. We'll look and see where we are. 8 9 The alternative then becomes time limits. 10 I'm not saying I'm going to do that, but I'm asking 11 for your help in keeping the jury tuned in to 12 deciding this case based on the way the lawyers want 13 the case decided. So I'm asking for your help. 14 So other thoughts? 15 MR. MCCLOSKEY: We'll get it done, 16 Your Honor. 17 MR. SULLIVAN: Certainly. 18 THE COURT: Make sense? 19 MR. KING: It does. THE COURT: All right. So thank you. 20 21 Enough said. 22 Now, there was an objection relative to the 23 last exhibit and -- so, Mr. King, I'm taking you 24 want to admit the e-mail without the spreadsheet? 25 Mr. McCloskey, you want it with the 26 spreadsheet? 27 MR. MCCLOSKEY: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. KING: This is their exhibit.

```
THE COURT: So thoughts? Why don't you do
1
2
     this. It's late. I want to give Leyla a break.
     Meet and confer. Come back tomorrow morning. We'll
 3
     talk about it. And then if I need to rule, I'll
 4
 5
     rule. Okay?
 6
              MR. KING: Okay.
7
              THE COURT: Thank you. We're in recess.
           (The proceedings concluded at 4:41 p.m.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
```

| 1 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA) |
|----|--|
| 2 | COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO) |
| 3 | |
| 4 | I, Leyla S. Jones, a Certified Shorthand |
| 5 | Reporter, do hereby certify: |
| 6 | That prior to being examined, the witness |
| 7 | in the foregoing proceedings was by me duly sworn to |
| 8 | testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing |
| 9 | but the truth; |
| 10 | That said proceedings were taken before me |
| 11 | at the time and place therein set forth and were |
| 12 | taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter |
| 13 | transcribed into typewriting under my direction and |
| 14 | supervision; |
| 15 | I further certify that I am neither counsel |
| 16 | for, nor related to, any party to said proceedings, |
| 17 | nor in any way interested in the outcome thereof. |
| 18 | In witness whereof, I have hereunto |
| 19 | subscribed my name. |
| 20 | |
| 21 | Dated: June 16, 2019 |
| 22 | 0 - 0/ |
| 23 | Levia S. Jones |
| 24 | CSR No. 12750 |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |