EXHIBIT 6

(FILED UNDER SEAL)

1

IN THE 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

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL--ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
VIDEOCONFERENCED and VIDEO-RECORDED
30(b)(1) DEPOSITION of
Anthropic PBC, by and through its Designated Representative,
DEEP GANGULI, Ph.D.
San Francisco, California 94111
Thursday, November 6, 2025

Reported Stenographically by:
MARY J. GOFF
CSR No. 13427
WA CSR No. 21030779
Job No. 60706930b1
PAGES 1-302

2

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL--ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

VIDEOCONFERENCED and VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION of DEEP GANGULI, Ph.D., Volume I, taken on behalf of Plaintiff Publishers, Oppenheim + Zebrak, LLP, at WilmerHale, 50 California Street, Suite 3600, San Francisco, California 94111, beginning at 12:43 p.m. and ending at 8:13 p.m., on Friday, November 6, 2025, before MARY J. GOFF, California Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 13427 and WA CSR No. 21030779.

3

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff Publishers
Oppenheim + Zebrak, LLP
BY: NICHOLAS C. HAILEY
MICHELLE GOMEZ-REICHMAN
Attorneys at Law
4530 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
5th Floor
Washington, DC 20016
202-480-2999
nick@oandzlaw.com
michelle@oandzlaw.com

For Defendant Anthropic PBC
WilmerHale
BY: TAYLOR GOOCH
Attorney at Law
50 California Street
Suite 3600
San Francisco, California 94111
taylor.gooch@wilmerhale.com
628-235-1026

ALSO PRESENT: Ian Chen, In-house counsel Anthropic
Becky Maz, Esquire, WilmerHale (remote DC)

Videographer: Philip Astor

4

INDEX

WITNESS		EXAMINATION
DEEP GANGULI, Ph.D.		
Volume I		
	ATTORNEY HAILEY	7, 294
	ATTORNEY GOOCH	289

NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
30(b)(1)		
Exhibit 15	Plaintiffs' Notice of Deposition to Deep Ganguli Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(6)	7
Exhibit 16	Defendant Anthropic PBC's Second Amended Initial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed Rule of Civ Procedure	8
Exhibit 17	Deep Ganguli LinkedIn Profile	15
Exhibit 18	About Stanford HAI	43
Exhibit 19	Anthropic Deep Ganguli Info Page Pages 1-8	51
Exhibit 20	Anthropic Societal Impacts page	76
Exhibit 21	Assistant, 2023-10-01 ANTH_SAMPLE000000246	98
Exhibit 22	Predictability and Surprise in Large Generative Models 1747	108

5

EXHIBITS CONTINUED: PAGE

Exhibit 23 In the Dark Room: Deep Ganguli & Alan Parker, 8-21-23 Pages 1-24 114
Exh 23A Live Version, D. Ganguli 132
Exh 23AA In the Darkroom, Part One 137
Exh 24A In the Dark Room, Part Two 132
Exhibit 24 In the Dark Room: Deep Ganguli & Alan Parker, 3-12-24, Part Two 114
Exhibit 25 What Are Some Things I can Use Claude For? Anthropic_0000013680-82 137
Exhibit 26 CLIO: A System for Privacy-Preserving Insights Into Real-World AI Use, 12-14-24 147
Exhibit 27 Anthropic Education Report Anthropic_0000349555-568 193
Exhibit 28 Prompt Anthropic_0000024253-258 198
Exhibit 29 Sign the Statement Pages 1-5 252
Exhibit 30 Translate the Song: "Gimme Three Steps" by Lynyrd Skynyrd into French 290
Exhibit 31 Halo lyrics German translation - CLAUDE Pages 1-7 290

6

San Francisco, California
Thursday, November 6, 2025
12:43 p.m.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Here begins Media Number 1 in the videotaped deposition of Deep Ganguli, individual, in the matter of Concord Music Group, versus Anthropic, in the United States District Court, Northern District of California, San Jose Division, Case Number 5:24-cv-03811-EKL (SVK).

Today's date is November 6, 2025. The time on the video monitor is 12:43 p.m.

The videographer today is Phillip Astor, representing Planet Depos. This video deposition is taking place at WilmerHale Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr, LLP, 50 California Street, Suite 3600, San Francisco, California 94111.

Would counsel please voice identify themselves and state whom they represent.

ATTORNEY HAILEY: Nick Hailey, with the law firm Oppenheim + Zebrak, on behalf of the Plaintiff Music Publishers.

I'm joined by my colleague, Michelle Gomez-Reichman.

ATTORNEY GOOCH: Taylor Gooch, with the

7

law firm WilmerHale, on behalf of Anthropic.

With me here is in-house counsel for Anthropic, my colleague, Becky Maz, and the witness.

THE COURT STENOGRAPHER: The court reporter today is Mary Goff, representing Planet Depos this isn't will now be sworn.

THE COURT STENOGRAPHER: My name is Mary Goff. I am a California Certified Shorthand Reporter, CSR Number 13427. Today's proceedings are being captured by stenographic means.

DEEP GANGULI, Ph.D.,

Being first duly sworn or affirmed to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY HAILEY:

Q Good afternoon, Mr. Ganguli.
Welcome back.
A Good afternoon.
Q How are you doing?
A Good.
Q So we had your 30(b)(6) deposition this morning, and we are now continuing with your deposition in your individual capacity.

(Exhibit 15 was marked for identification

8

and is attached to the transcript.)

Q (BY ATTORNEY HAILEY) I'm showing you an exhibit that we have marked as Exhibit 15. Let me know once you have had a minute a review it.
Have you seen this document before, Mr. Ganguli?
A I may have. I don't recognize it super well. I have see a lot of documents.
Q Okay. The title is "Plaintiffs' Notice of Deposition to Deep Ganguli Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(1)," correct?
A That is correct.
Q Do you understand this to be your deposition notice in this case?
A I do understand it to be as such.

(Exhibit 16 was marked for identification and is attached to the transcript.)

Q (BY ATTORNEY HAILEY) I'm showing you what I have marked as Exhibit 16 to your deposition. It's a document titled "Defendant Anthropic PBC's Second Amended Initial Disclosures Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26."
Have you seen this before?
A I may have, but it is not familiar -- super familiar.

77

A I do. This is the website describing our team.
Q So it's a copy of the Anthropic web page for the "Societal Impacts Team," correct?
A This is true.
Q And there's -- there's a video on the web page titled "Societal Impacts of AI," and that is featuring you --
A That --
Q -- correct?
A -- that is true.
Q And there's a quote next to the video from you that says:
If knowledge is power and we're building machines that have more knowledge than us, what will happen between us and the machines? Did I read that correctly?
A That is true.
Q What is the answer to that question, Mr. Ganguli?
A I do not know what the answer to that question is. I posed it in response to this video, which was driven by our marketing team in which they asked me to discuss some of the more potential kind

78

of catastrophic risks posed by AI systems.
We have many other teams that study the catastrophic risks. Mine doesn't -- my team does not typically study those phenomena.
So here kind of like the intent behind this quote was sort of reflecting on the fact that typically when there are species that are smarter than other species, they tend to be higher up on food chain. Look at us as people compared to chickens. Right.
And so I was just sort of in the process of, like, building this video, riffing back and forth with our creative director. We were kind of discussing that, and he thought that -- I kind of said this, and he thought that quote was powerful and interesting for -- for marketing reasons, and that's what made it into -- into this ad, essentially, for the team and the company.
Q You mentioned the food chain.
Would you say that AI is higher on the food chain than humans?
A I would say that -- going back to some earlier conversations we have had, like these systems can have more net knowledge than any one person can, which means that these machines can kind

79

of connect the dots in really interesting ways because they have access to more of that information than -- than any individual person can, and so that's just kind of an interesting phenomenon to sort of point out.
And the question is here -- kind of like -- kind of speculating on that, right.
That's when I start thinking about more of kind of like the -- you know, the ability for the machines to help excellent science.
Like, for example, as a computational neuroscientist, I was never "neuroscience enough" for the neuroscientists, and I was never "computational enough" for the machine learning people. And I had to learn both of their worlds, and that was what allowed me to -- what allowed me to actually innovative.
The technology like CRISPR, which was, like, invented by a scientist that was dabbling outside of her lane, right, doing something that wasn't in her expertise, and that's what led to this novel creation.
So you know, I was kind of speculating on this. There's pros and cons here, right. So the pros is that perhaps, like -- these machines,

80

because they have such a broad body of knowledge, they can put together in unique ways to advance fundamental discoveries. That's sort of one side of the coin.
And the other side of the coin is: You know, there's a lot of people on the team that sort of work on -- sorry -- not my team, but there's a lot of people on -- at Anthropic that work on the more catastrophic risks, and so there's sort of two sides to that same coin.
And when I look at this kind of quote, I was reflecting on those two things.
Q So -- yeah, so let's talk about the catastrophic risks.
What -- what do you see as the catastrophic risks?
A So again, I do not study those problems very carefully. I am around people who are experts in studying those catastrophic risks. For now we don't have much evidence of those catastrophic risks.
For example -- like one -- one concrete example is people are concerned that someone with an AI might be able to develop, for example, a bioweapon than if they weren't working with AI, and

81

so there's teams that are sort of measuring for that propensity.
We haven't seen it just yet. But if that's a real risk, even if it's a tail risk, I think it's important that Anthropic has people who take that seriously and study it and research it.
I, however, personally do not study those phenomenon very -- carefully as part of my work at Anthropic.
Q What's a tail risk?
A By that -- tail risk, I mean something that's maybe unlikely to happen, but could be catastrophic.
So for example, you know, an example of a tail risk would be a nuclear bomb. Someone launches a nuclear attack or something like this.
Unlikely to happen. Glad it's not happening. If it does happen, that's very bad.
Q What other catastrophic risks are people concerned about with AI?
A They -- the other risks are sort of related to the systems being deceptive and manipulating people. So I'm aware of teams that are sort of studying the propensity for the machines to be deceptive.

82

Human beings, as you know, can also be deceptive. There's instances of deception across the animal kingdom.
These machine systems are trained off of human data, so I sort of intuitively understand that they could also be deceptive, and that could lead to kind of bad outcomes, yeah.
So those are -- those are kind of the two main areas of the -- of the catastrophic risks that -- I know that my colleagues study carefully.
Q What kind of risks have you looked at as part of -- looked at or seen in the research that -- that you have done at AI -- at Anthropic?
A The current -- so we have already talked about the -- in terms of my -- my team and my team's research, we have already talked about kind of what we call the fairness, the bias, the discrimination, right, these representational harms. So that's one category.
The other thing that we're studying is -- again, kind of not super prevalent in the data, nevertheless there -- people using CLAUDE for advice -- subjective advice.
Like we're trying to understand -- well, first, this is a new phenomenon. Typically you go

83

to other people for advice. But we're seeing kind of low rates of people going to CLAUDE for interpersonal advice. Things like this.
And so we want to understand whether CLAUDE is sort of -- what kind of values it brings when people come to it to ask sort of subjective questions that require some kind of a value judgment.
And so, you know, we're trying to understand how CLAUDE might influence people kind of in that way. We're also trying to study -- you kind of mentioned some of our reports on -- on education. Like, how exactly are students at the university level using CLAUDE? How are teachers using it? What does it mean for the nature of pedagogy and learning.
We also started, yeah, the Anthropic Economic Index, which was trying to understand, like, how -- can we get a sense of how much people are using CLAUDE to do economically valuable or meaningful work.
So these are -- this is just a -- kind of a grab bag of the kinds of things we have been studying.
Q And the risk with the economic index would

84

be: Is AI going to replace jobs?
A I wouldn't say that the risk -- the -- what we are trying to do in that research is bring measurement techniques and metrics we can use to track and understand how people are -- are using CLAUDE to do their jobs.
So we're erring on the side here of measurement. There's a lot of speculation on what AI might do to jobs and people's work. What we're trying to do is bring data and evidence that we're uniquely situated to provide because we sit on the actual kind of usage data.
Q Isn't part of what you're looking at, the extent to which CLAUDE is being used to augment versus to automate?
A Yes, we are looking at that.
Q And augmenting is -- would enhance people doing their own jobs, whereas automation would replace jobs; is that right?
A I --
ATTORNEY GOOCH: Objection.
A -- I think there's a lot of nuance and subtly into the automation. There's some things that people might want to automate that help them do other parts of their job that deserve more of their

85

humanity.
So for example, you know, if it's a boring, repetitive task that might need to get done, some people might want automation. I like to automate those tasks away, and it helps me do my job even better because I can then focus on the substantial parts of my job and not the sort of boring, repetitive things.
When we measure automation versus augmentation, the first time we measured it across all of CLAUDE, we found that it's roughly a 60/40 split in favor of augmentation, and so we can track how this changes over time. That's one thing.
We can't manage what we can't measure. We can track it. We know how to kind of measure it.
The other thing I'll say is like any one job has multiple tasks, and we haven't seen evidence of any job being fully automated away.
Like, for example, CLAUDE is very good at software engineering. We're still hiring software engineers.
It can't -- it has not fully automated away any software engineer at the company.
[redacted]

86

[redacted]

87

[redacted]
Q Who do you consider your competitors, by the way?
A I would say it's -- the competitors are OpenAI, Google. Those are probably the big ones.

88

And then after that it becomes META. It becomes Grok. And there's some smaller shops as well like Thinking Machines that are sort of new.
There's companies like Cohere and Canada, so -- but the main ones would be OpenAI, Google.
[redacted]
Q And do your -- does your -- is your equity -- the value of your equity in Anthropic significantly greater than the sum of your other assets?
A Yeah, although, it's -- again, it's a -- it's basically -- I treat it as monopoly money, yeah.
Q You treat your equity in Anthropic as monopoly money?
A I internally view it as that because it's

301

I, MARY J. GOFF, CSR No. 13427, Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, certify;

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place herein set forth, at which time the witness declared under penalty of perjury; that the testimony of the witness and all objections made at the time of the examination were recorded stenographically by me and were thereafter transcribed under my direction and supervision; that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken and of the testimony so given;

That before completion of the deposition, review of the transcript ( ) was (xx) was not requested: ( ) that the witness has failed or refused to approve the transcript.

I further certify that I am not financially interested in the action, and I am not a relative or employee of any attorney of the parties, nor of any of the parties.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California that the foregoing is true and correct, dated this 12th day of November, 2025.

Mary J. Goff

MARY J. GOFF

302

ERRATA SHEET
PLANET DEPOS
451 Hungerford Drive, Suite 400
Rockville, Maryland 20850
888-433-3767

CASE: Concord v. Anthropic

PAGE	LINE	FROM	TO

_____
DEEP GANGULI, Ph.D., 30(b)(6)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of_____, 2025.

_____
Notary Public