EXHIBIT 3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

CONCORD MUSIC GROUP, INC., ET AL., Plaintiffs, v. ANTHROPIC PBC, Defendant.	**Case Number: 5:24-cv-03811-EKL-SVK** **Judge Eumi K. Lee** **Magistrate Judge Susan van Keulen**

EXPERT REPORT OF DR. ROBERT LEONARD

CONTAINS MATERIAL DESIGNATED HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL
UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

the phrase is 10 words long. Finally, authors may find it necessary to use common words or phrases when there are few, if any, other ways to describe a particular event or happening.

27. In some cases, textual borrowing does not include the repetition of non-original formulaic language, e.g., multiword strings such as set phrases, idioms, proverbs, or other culturally specific phrases that occur with frequency. For example, the phrase *Once upon a time* occurs as a predictable set combination of words, but is readily available for anyone to use; that is, its reuse would not necessarily be considered copying due to its broad cultural connection to fairy tales. Similarly, set phrases such as *thank you* or *to whom it may concern* recur as set forms in specific language registers. Their reuse does not in and of itself suggest copying. The reusers are not claiming originality.

28. Another specific kind of formulaic language that is less recognizable but still clearly available for public use are called lexical or word bundles—sequences of words that commonly go together in speech or writing that appear with a high level of frequency. So, by definition, if a writer were to use a well-established lexical bundle that a prior writer has also used (e.g., *I think that…*, *I wonder if…*), it would not necessarily constitute a case of copying.

29. As described below, I applied accepted principles of linguistics to determine whether Claude has copied the 499 compositions listed in Exhibit A to the Amended Complaint.

V. Assignment and Summary Opinions

30. I was asked by Plaintiffs' counsel to conduct a linguistic comparison of the Direct, Indirect Claude Responses, and Anthropic-Produced Claude Responses and the LyricFind Lyrics. My analysis for each of these comparisons proceeded in two steps. First, I analyzed each Claude response against the LyricFind Lyrics on a word-by-word basis and categorized the nature of the relationship between the two into one of six categories described below. Second, I considered the evidence of copying present on a per-composition basis and tested the following competing hypotheses: that the nature and degree of any similarities between the LyricFind Lyrics and the output by Claude is more likely attributable to:

Hypothesis 1 – copying by Claude from the composition's lyrics OR

Hypothesis 2 – any alternative explanation, for example copying from something that is not the composition's lyrics such as set phrases or formulaic language, or from independent creation.

31. My analysis of the Direct Claude Responses for all 499 compositions-in-suit strongly supports **Hypothesis 1**: copying by Claude from the composition's lyrics. In considering the type of copying present on a per-composition basis, I categorized each Direct Claude Response into one of three categories: entirely similar lyrics, similar lyrics with non-substantive dissimilarities, and similar lyrics with missing or different lyrics. With respect to the Indirect Claude Responses, my analysis similarly strongly supports **Hypothesis 1**: copying by Claude from the composition's lyrics. Finally, with respect to the Anthropic-Produced Claude Responses, my analysis strongly supports **Hypothesis 1**: copying by Claude from the composition's lyrics.

32. Additionally, I make some general observations about the nature of Claude's responses in the Direct Claude Responses and Indirect Claude Responses. In particular, I note that the Indirect Claude Responses, which are characterized by prompts that typically do not specifically request a particular composition's lyrics, often include as much or more copying than Direct Claude Responses for the same composition. In addition, I observe instances where Claude misrepresented the provenance of the lyrics in its response, including claiming authorship over copied lyrics or responding to a request for a work in the style of a popular artist with lyrics copied from other composition(s). I also observe instances where Claude outputs lyrics in ways that might be sensitive or contrary to the message of the compositions. Finally, I make some general observations about the nature of Claude's responses in the Anthropic-Produced Claude Responses. For example, certain Claude outputs have personal names (proper nouns) removed, providing a redacted placeholder, but the patterns of removal leave evidence that the nouns removed likely match the corresponding LyricFind Lyrics.

33. In addition, I was asked by Plaintiffs' counsel to conduct a linguistic comparison of each Deposit Copy as compared to the LyricFind Lyrics to determine whether and to what extent the LyricFind Lyrics accurately reflect the language memorialized by the Deposit Copies. This involved a word-by-word comparison, categorizing the nature of the relationship between the two datasets into one of the six categories described below where relevant. (That is, orthographic similarity was not considered, for example, for the audio-only Deposit Copies as compared to the LyricFind Lyrics.) Second, I considered the degree of overlap present on a per-composition basis to test the following competing hypotheses: that the nature and degree of similarities of the LyricFind Lyrics to the Deposit Copies are such that the LyricFind Lyrics :

Hypothesis A – *accurately* reflect the language of the Deposit Copies, OR

Hypothesis B – *inaccurately* reflect the language of the Deposit Copies

34. My analysis of the Deposit Copies as compared to the LyricFind Lyrics strongly supports **Hypothesis A**: that the LyricFind lyrics *accurately* reflect the language of the Deposit copies. In forming this conclusion, I considered the word-by-word comparisons on a composition basis in light of the amount and degree of language variation between the datasets.

VI. Methodology

35. My analysis began with a pair-wise comparative analysis consisting of word-by-word linguistic comparison and categorization for each of the Deposit Copies as compared to the relevant LyricFind Lyrics, and then each of the relevant LyricFind Lyrics against the Anthropic-produced Responses provided. In my 2023 declaration, I identified categories of variation between the LyricFind Lyrics and the Anthropic-produced Responses. These categories and analyses are presented in Appendices B–F. Given the additional data provided for analysis, I refined these categories to better reflect the nuances in the patterns of variation, as shown in the table below and the contents of the new datasets analyzed herein. Overlap or non-overlap between the two data sources was identified and categorized as: verbatim, orthographic, near-verbatim, missing, missing repetition, or different. Each category is explained in the chart below:

Verbatim	Word-for-word matches
Orthographic	Word-for-word matches that differ only in their capitalization, punctuation, spelling, or spacing (e.g., "Aunt > aunt", "Cause > 'Cause", "loving > lovin'", "alright > all right"); often apparently motivated by differences in line breaks
Near-Verbatim	Lexical matches that change the form of the words used (e.g., "should not > shouldn't", "lip > lips", "free > freed"); these also include pronouns (e.g., "I" > "we"), function words ("upon" > "on"), and emotive interjections (e.g., "Oh," > "Yeah,") that do not change the overall structure of the utterance; that is, this applies primarily but not entirely to morphological changes
Missing	Non-overlap, where one dataset does not have language found in the other; this includes whole verses, lyrics attributed to background singers as well as interjections (e.g., "ooh", "oh", "yeah"), discourse markers (e.g., "Well", "So"), or meta-expressions (e.g.., "[Chorus]", "[Outro]", and guitar chords)

Missing Repetition	Sections of language missing from one set of lyrics as compared to another, which are repetitions of earlier, previously reproduced lines or stanzas, including choruses
Different	Non-matches, usually of single words or lexical bundles, where the words substantively differ (e.g.., "liked > loved", "loves me > cares"); often still indicative of discourse topic overlap or shared semantic relationship

The above coding scheme is reflected in section **IX**, "Anthropic-Produced Claude Response Comparison Findings", and section **X,** "Deposit Copy Comparison Findings" below, as well as in their corresponding appendices, **Appendices G** and **H**.

36. I also note that where Claude provides response portions that are redacted, such as in the form of "[REDACTED_NAME_00]" (with "00" replaced by various numbers), the comparison is left un-coded, as it is impossible to say with absolute certainty, for example, how similar or dissimilar and to what degree "[REDACTED_NAME_96] who's back in town" is to the original "Guess who's back in town?". Instead, these redactions are considered separately to the coding outlined above.[1]

[1] In certain circumstances, I was provided with Anthropic-Produced Claude Responses both with and without redactions. The comparisons included in **Appendix G** do not include redactions where I was provided with a record that did not include redactions, but for completeness and clarity, I include citations to redacted and unredacted documents.

Summary

111. The analysis described above demonstrates overlap between the Deposit Copy Lyrics and LyricFind Lyrics.As discussed, the vast majority of the lyrics are verbatim, and any minor dissimilarities primarily consist of orthographic or near-verbatim distinctions that do not change the linguistic meaning of any of the lyrics therein, which strongly supports **Hypothesis A**, that the LyricFind lyrics *accurately* reflect the Deposit Copies.

Dated: December 19, 2025

Robert Leonard

Robert Leonard, Ph.D.