EXHIBIT 7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

Concord Music Group, Inc., et al.,	)	
	)	No. 5:24-cv-03811-EKL
Plaintiffs,	)	
vs.	)	Phoenix, Arizona
	)	March 26, 2026
Anthropic PBC,	)	11:02 a.m.
Defendant.	)	

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE EUMI K. LEE, JUDGE

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

STATUS CONFERENCE

Official Court Reporter:
Christine M. Coaly, RMR, CRR
Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Suite 312
401 West Washington Street, Spc 37
Phoenix, Arizona 85003-2151
(602) 322-7248

Proceedings Reported by Stenographic Court Reporter
Transcript Prepared by Computer-Aided Transcription

MR. MILLER: So Anthropic has everything it needs to test our arguments regarding the effectiveness of the guardrails. First of all --

THE COURT: How can one test without the negatives, the negative outputs, the overall? Like if you can incorporate that in, I just want to have a better understanding.

MR. MILLER: So, first of all, for the -- any investigation we did after filing the complaint regarding the effectiveness of Anthropic s guardrails, Magistrate Judge van Keulen ordered us to produce the entirety of the post-suit investigation, with the one exception of prompts -- prompting conducted specifically by counsel. But everything our investigators did, whether positive or negative, as part of the post-suit investigation, has been produced.

We have not appealed that part of the order. Obviously, we contested that motion. Magistrate Judge van Keulen ruled what she did. We accepted it. We made the production.

For the pre-suit portion of the investigation, again, they have what they need. That evidence is being relied on to prove not that the guardrail --

THE COURT: It's very odd to continue to hear like they have what they -- you know, they have -- basically, they have enough. This is as good as it gets, in terms of for --

MR. MILLER: Let me --

THE COURT: If it's something which plaintiff is relying on affirmatively at trial, or in its --

MR. MILLER: The evidence from plaintiffs' investigators that plaintiffs are relying on from the pre-suit investigation is to prove direct -- to prove that infringement occurred. And Magistrate Judge van Keulen heard argument on precisely this point. And she determined that the -- and this is in her December ruling that is the subject of this appeal. She determined that the evidence from the pre-suit investigation was being offered not to prove that the guardrails were or were not ineffective, but to prove the existence of the infringement.

And so, therefore, while there was a waiver for the post-suit investigation which went to the -- because that was relevant to the guardrails effectiveness -- there was not a waiver regarding the pre-suit investigation.

THE COURT: And with the post-suit investigation, you're saying everything was turned over in accordance with the order except for, but that none of the attorney -- is that what counsel -- what your representation is that the -- all which was excluded?

MR. MILLER: That we excluded prompting that was done solely by outside litigation counsel, which is what Magistrate Judge van Keulen ordered us to do. We complied with her order in full. And there has been no -- I don't think there has been

any -- we have not heard from Anthropic that we substantially failed to comply with that order in any way.

We even produced prompting, in accordance with Magistrate Judge van Keulen's order, prompting done by plaintiffs' investigators based on prompts that counsel provided. So where counsel instructed the investigator to test certain prompts, that was produced. What we withheld were the -- were any instances where litigation counsel ourselves did any prompting. And we're not relying on prompting from litigation counsel for any purpose.

We also provided updated interrogatory responses, which Magistrate Judge van Keulen ordered us to do, that provided statistics about what share of -- from our pre-suit and post-suit investigations, what share -- what percentage of the prompts produce different kinds of outputs, whether those produced verbatim, partially verbatim, non-verbatim outputs, et cetera. There were a number of different subcategories we were required to provide data about, and we did that.

THE COURT: In terms of the efficacy of the guardrails, is the focus for that just in the post-investigation time period after the stipulated interim measures were put into place -- or the lawsuit itself goes back, in terms of the guardrails, previous to that, correct? So it's both pre-suit and post-suit guardrails which are being tested.

MR. MILLER: It is correct that the effectiveness of the guardrails is relevant in both the pre-suit and post-suit periods. However, the distinction that Magistrate Judge van Keulen drew is that the evidence from plaintiffs' investigation of infringement is only -- is not being offered to show the effectiveness of the pre-suit guardrails. We did the pre-suit investigation to find evidence of --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that again, Mr. Miller? I just want to make sure I'm fully appreciating what you're saying.

MR. MILLER: This is what Magistrate Judge van Keulen found was that the purpose of the pre-suit investigation was to develop evidence that infringement is occurring to prove the direct infringement claims. And depending on the outcome on summary judgment, potentially the predicate for the secondary infringement as well, that that evidence was not being offered to test -- that that pre-suit evidence was not being offered to test the effectiveness of the guardrails, it was being offered for the purpose of establishing the existence of infringement.

Magistrate Judge van Keulen concluded that the post-suit investigation was conducted in order to test the efficiency of the guardrails, and so she required full production of that but not of the pre-suit investigation. And that is not --

THE COURT: Is any of the pre-suit -- in terms of the

efficacy of the guardrail, do any of the pre-suit investigation positive outputs, are any of those being included in terms of the analysis which the experts are relying on?

MR. MILLER: For which --

THE COURT: For the pre-suit, are any of the publishers --

MR. MILLER: Publishers' experts --

THE COURT: -- positive outputs being -- were any of those incorporated within the expert's analysis in terms of testing the guardrails, the efficacy of the guardrails?

MR. MILLER: There is general testimony from the expert, from plaintiffs' experts that Anthropic's pre-suit guardrails were not effective.

THE COURT: Were they using -- as part of their dataset to make that conclusion, were they using evidence of positive outputs which were derived from the publishers' investigators, agents, et cetera?

MR. MILLER: I do not believe that Dr. Zhao specifically relied on evidence -- I would have to go back and look at --

THE COURT: What do you mean by specifically?

MR. MILLER: I mean, he offered the opinion that infringement was occurring. I don't think he specifically cited evidence from publishers' investigation to establish that point in his report.

THE COURT: Was he relying on that in terms of the positive outputs?

MR. MILLER: I don't think so, but I would have to go back and look at his report to confirm.

THE COURT: So here's my concern. Because if you're saying, okay, well, Judge van Keulen drew this distinction -- which her distinction makes complete sense. I mean, let's take it outside of -- the magistrate judge decision and the delineation she was trying to draw on this ever -- cutting edge, ever-changing sort of area, like all made sense. But the logic, for example, which was just described, okay, well, the pre-suit investigation, this didn't have to do with the efficacy of the guardrails. This had to do with testing to see whether or not there was infringement or secondary infringement. That distinction makes sense.

But if that's not the reality of what's happening with plaintiffs' evidence, then it doesn't -- then that logic -- it's not a question of that the magistrate judge got it wrong, it's just that the state of what was being said, of what was being relied on was just not how plaintiff is choosing to litigate their case. And that's problematic.

MR. MILLER: So neither our statistical expert or our technical expert relied on the evidence we have produced from our investigation in offering any opinions regarding the effectiveness of the guardrails.

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, CHRISTINE M. COALY, do hereby certify that I am duly appointed and qualified to act as Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the District of Arizona.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing pages constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript of all of that portion of the proceedings contained herein, had in the above-entitled cause on the date specified therein, and that said transcript was prepared under my direction and control.

DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 30th day of March, 2026.

/s/ Christine M. Coaly
Christine M. Coaly, RMR, CRR